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Plate I. Restoration of the Great Pyramids and Other Tomb Monuments in the Ancient Cemetery of Gizeh, Egypt. (After Hoelscher)
PLATE I. These royal tombs (pyramids) belonged to the leading kings of the early part of the Pyramid Age (about 3000 to 2500 B.C.). The Great Pyramid, the tomb of King Khufu (Greek Cheops), is on the right (see p. 29). Next in size is that of King Khafre (Greek Chephren) on the left. On the east side (front) of each pyramid is a temple (see also Fig. 22), where the dead king received food, drink, and clothing for the life hereafter. These temples, like the pyramids, were built on the desert plateau above, while the royal town was in the valley below (on the right, see p. 30 and Fig. 10). For convenience, therefore, the temple was connected with the town below by a covered gallery, or causeway, of stone. This causeway may be seen descending in a straight line from the pyramid and temple of King Khafre, and terminating below just beside the Sphinx, in a large oblong building of stone, called a valley-temple, to distinguish it from the pyramid temple on the plateau above. It was a splendid structure of granite, serving not only as a temple, but also as the entrance to the causeway from the royal city. This valley-temple was adorned with magnificent statues of the king, a number of which were discovered at the bottom of a well in the valley-temple, where they had at some time been hurled by enemies. They now adorn the great Museum at Cairo; the head of the finest of them may be seen in Fig. 23. Here beside his valley-temple we see another great statue of King Khafre, which he had carved as a colossal portrait of himself, with the body of a lion. It is commonly called the Great Sphinx. It is the largest portrait figure ever executed; the head is sixty-five feet high; the body is one hundred eighty-five feet long, and the face is about fourteen feet across. The pyramids are surrounded by the tombs of the queens and the great lords of the age (see Fig. 15). At the lower left-hand corner is an unfinished pyramid, showing the inclined ascents up which the stone blocks were dragged. These ascents (called ramps) were built of sun-baked brick and were removed after the pyramid was finished.
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PREFACE

General European history is one of the most perplexing subjects to deal with in the high school. It seems essential that boys and girls should have some knowledge of the whole past of mankind; without that they can have no real understanding of the world in which they live, for the simple reason that the present can only be explained by the past. The older historical manuals were, in the main, short accounts of past events; but it is really past conditions and past institutions that are best worth knowing about. The older books tended, moreover, to give too much attention to the remote past and too little information in regard to recent history, so that there was little chance of the pupil's realizing the vital bearing of the past on the present.

The aim of the "Outlines of European History" is to avoid these defects of the older books, first, by frankly subordinating the mere happenings of the past to a clear statement of the conditions under which men lived for long periods and of the ideas which they held; and, secondly, by devoting about half of the work, namely, Part II, to the past hundred and fifty or two hundred years, which concern us most immediately.

The arrangement of the volumes is novel in a number of respects. Each chapter is divided into several topical sections, as will be seen by consulting the Table of Contents. The topics are, of course, arranged with strict attention to chronology, but the writers have always before them a particular subject which they aim to make plain under each section heading. In short, each section is a discussible topic and not a fragment of chronology. The authors hope that this plan of presentation will serve to make the books more useful and teachable than the older method of arrangement.
In the preparation of Chapters XII-XXVIII the writer has made free use of the corresponding matter in his *Introduction to the History of Western Europe*. But a good deal in the older book has been omitted, new matter has been introduced, many fundamental readjustments have been made, and the method of presentation has been reconsidered from beginning to end.

Great attention has been given to the illustrations, especially in Part I, where the vastness of the field to be covered and the necessary brevity of the text render it absolutely essential to reënforce the written word by reproductions of the actual vestiges of the past. Not only have the illustrations been carefully chosen with a view of corroborating and vivifying the text but under each picture a sufficiently detailed legend is given to explain its significance, and these often add materially to the information given in the letterpress. The pictures consequently give a sort of parallel narrative and furnish a helpful supplement and corrective to the text itself. Everything which does not obviously bear upon the chief matters under consideration is sedulously excluded.

These volumes meet the growing demand for a two-year course in European history in the high school and the preparatory schools. The great achievements of the oriental peoples and of the Greek and Roman periods are brought into immediate relation with later European development, without devoting a whole year's study to them. English history, if somewhat briefly treated, is given its proper association with that of the neighboring nations on the Continent. By devoting the whole second year to the history of the last two centuries, the student will be in a position to grasp the more immediate causes of the conditions in the midst of which we live.

In the preparation of Part I the authors have received great aid from Professor David S. Muzzey in the difficult task of presenting the development of Greece in a brief form; valuable suggestions and emendations have also been contributed by Dr. Carl F. Huth and Mr. A. F. Barnard of Chicago. To
Dr. Huth's kindness is also due the valuable bibliography for Chapters V–XI, for which the authors are greatly indebted to him. Hearty thanks are due to Mr. E. R. Smith of the Avery Library and to the publishers for their hearty coöperation in solving the complicated problems involved in the selection and reproduction of the illustrations. To Mrs. William T. Brewster we are indebted for the delightful water-color sketch of the plain of Argos from the citadel of ancient Tiryns (Plate II, p. 124).

Besides photographs furnished by the University of Chicago Egyptian Expedition, many illustrations in Chapters I–XI have been contributed by a number of foreign scholars, to whom the authors would here express their thanks, especially to Bissing (Munich), Borchardt (Cairo), Déchelette (Roanne), Dörpfeld (Athens and Berlin), Hoernes (Vienna), Koldewey (Babylon), Montelius (Stockholm), Schaefer (Berlin), Steindorff (Leipzig), and some others, who have kindly furnished photographs and sketches. In these chapters (I–XI) the authors are also especially indebted to Messrs. Underwood & Underwood for permission to use their unrivaled series of Egyptian, oriental, and Mediterranean photographs as the basis for a number of sketches: Figs. 9, 10, 54, 57, 69, 72, 76, 80, 81, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89, 90, 94, 103, 109, 117, also tailpiece, p. 110. In no other way can impressions of the places and scenes where the men of the early world lived and wrought be obtained so vividly as by the use of these Underwood photographs in stereoscopic form. Teachers who make the Underwood stereographs, from which the above list of figures is taken, a part of their equipment will find that their teaching gains enormously in effectiveness.
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CHAPTER I

EARLY MANKIND IN EUROPE

SECTION I. EARLIEST MAN’S IGNORANCE AND PROGRESS

A new-born child placed in the wilds of a tropical forest and left there alone would of course die. If, however, we can imagine him possessing the strength to survive until he reached the age of ten years, he would know none of the many things which a boy of ten in your town or city now knows. Hunger would have led him to eat the nuts, fruits, and digestible roots and tubers which he would find in the forest. But if you should show him a chair, he would not know what its use might be. If you placed him in front of a door, he would not know how to open it. He would possess no tools or weapons or implements of any kind, nor any clothing. He would probably never have seen a fire; or, if so, he would not know how to make one or realize that his food might be cooked. Finally, he would not even know how to speak, or that there was such a thing as speech.

All these things every child among us learns from others. But the earliest men had no one to teach them these things, and by slow experience and long effort they had to learn them for themselves. Everything had to be found out; every tool, however simple, had to be invented; and, above all, the earliest man had to discover that he could express his feelings and ideas by making sounds with his throat and mouth. At first thought the men who began such discoveries seem to us to be
mere animals. Nevertheless the earliest man possessed, among other advantages, three things which lifted him high above the animals. He had a larger and a more powerful brain than any animal; he had a pair of wonderful hands such as no other creature possessed, and with these he could make tools and implements; finally, he had a throat and vocal organs such that in the course of ages he would learn to speak.

At first man must have roamed the tropical forests without any clothing, without huts or shelter of any kind, with no tools or weapons, eating roots, fruit or berries where he found them. Occasionally he may have found a dead bird or animal killed by some other creature, and thus learning the taste of flesh he would be led to pursue the less dangerous animals and to lay them low with a stone or a club. His food was of course all raw, for he could not even make a fire, nor did he know that roasted flesh was better food.

Men so completely uncivilized as this no longer exist on earth. The most savage tribes found by explorers have learned how useful fire is and they understand how to make it. The people whom the English found on the island of Tasmania a century or so ago were among the lowest savages known to us. They wore no clothing; they had not learned how to build a hut; they did not know how to make a bow and arrows, nor even to fish. They had no goats, sheep, or cows, no horses, nor even a dog. They had never heard of sowing seed nor raising a crop of any kind. They did not know that clay will harden in the fire, and so they had no pottery jars, jugs, or dishes for food.

Naked and houseless, the Tasmanians had learned to satisfy only a very few of man's needs. Yet that which they had learned had carried them a long way beyond the earliest men. They could kindle a fire, which kept them warm in cold weather, and over it they cooked their meat. In order to secure this meat they had learned to construct very good spears, though without metal tips, for they had never heard of metal. These
spears they could throw with great accuracy and thus bring down the game they needed for food, or drive away their human enemies. They could take a flat stone, and by chipping off its edges to thin them they could produce a rude knife with which to skin and cut up the game they killed. They were also very deft in making cups, vessels, and baskets of bark fiber. Above all, they had a simple language, with words for all the things they used, and this language served for everything they needed to say.

It is certain that man has existed on the earth for several hundred thousand years at least. We cannot now trace all the different stages in his progress, which brought him at last as far as the savage Tasmanians had come. We do not know all the various steps which finally enabled him to speak. With fire he would become acquainted from the forest fires kindled by lightning, or from the floods of molten lava descending the slopes of the fiery mountains along the Mediterranean. The wooden clubs and other weapons or tools of wood which he made in this stage of his career have, of course, long ago perished. As soon as he began to make stone tools, however, he was producing something which might last for untold thousands of years. This art he first learned in Europe some fifty thousand years ago. After that he left behind him a trail of stone tools, and by these we can follow him through the different stages of his upward progress, as they show us his increasing skill in such matters. We thus find that he passed through three stages: the Early Stone Age, the Middle Stone Age, and the Late Stone Age.

Section 2. The Early Stone Age

A few rough and irregular fragments of flint still survive to show us man’s earliest attempts to make weapons or tools of stone. The form which he finally adopted as his first successful tool, however, is a roughly shaped piece of flint as long as a man’s hand, which we call a fist-hatchet (Fig. 1). Its ragged
edge was sufficiently sharp so that its owner could cut and chop with it. Its maker had not learned to attach a handle, but he grasped it firmly in his fist. The first of these fist-hatchets discovered in modern times was found in England two hundred years ago, but at that time no one understood its enormous age, or guessed who had made it. For the last fifty years such fist-hatchets have been found in large numbers deeply buried under the sand and soil that has gathered since their owners used them along the rivers of France, Belgium, and England. They are found side by side with the bones of tropical animals of vast size, showing that the men who made these stone tools lived in a much warmer climate than that of Europe to-day.

We may call the period of the fist-hatchets the Early Stone Age. The man of that day, some fifty thousand years ago, led the life of a hunter, roaming about in the shadows of the lofty forests which fringed the streams and covered the wide plains of western Europe. The ponderous hippopotamus wallowed along the banks of the rivers. The fierce rhinoceros with a horn three feet long charged through the jungles of what is now France and England.

The hunter fleeing before them caught dim glimpses of mountainous elephants plunging through the thick tropical growth.
Herds of bison and wild horses grazed on the uplands and the glades resounded far and wide with the notes of tropical birds which settled in swarms upon the tree tops. At night the hunter slept where the chase found him, trembling in the darkness at the roar of the lion or the mighty saber-tooth tiger.

For thousands of years the life of the hunter went on with little change. He slowly improved his rough stone fist-hatchet, and he probably learned to make additional implements of wood, but of these last we know nothing. Then he began to notice that the air of his forest home was losing its tropical warmth. Geologists have not yet found out why, but as the centuries passed, the ice which all the year round still overlies the region of the North Pole and the summits of the Alps began to descend. The northern ice crept further and further southward until it covered England as far south as the Thames. The glaciers of the Alps pushed down the Rhone valley as far as the spot where the city of Lyons now stands. On our own continent of North America the southern edge of the ice is marked by lines of bowlders carried and left there by the ice. Such lines of bowlders are found, for example, as far south as Long Island and westward along the valleys of the Ohio and the Missouri. The hunter saw the glittering blue masses of ice with their crown of snow, pushing through the green of his forest abode and crushing down vast trees in many a sheltered glen or favorite hunting ground. Gradually these savage men of early Europe were forced to accustom themselves to a cold climate, but many of the animals familiar to the hunter retreated to the warmer south, never to return.

1 Geologists have now shown that the ice advanced southward and retreated to the north again, no less than four times. Following each advance of the ice a warm interval caused its retreat. There were four warm intervals, and we are now living in the fourth. The evidence now indicates that man began to make stone implements in the third warm interval. The last advance of the ice therefore took place between us and them. It is perhaps some thirty thousand years ago that the ice began to come south for the last time.
Section 3. The Middle Stone Age

Unable to build himself a shelter from the cold, the hunter took refuge in the limestone caves, where he and his descendants continued to live for thousands of years, during the next or "Middle Stone Age." Archaeologists now find in the caverns of France, Spain, and Italy numerous objects used by these cave men during their long sojourn in the caverns. Rubbish, once even as much as forty feet deep, accumulated on the cavern floor, as century after century the sand and earth blew in, and fragments of rock fell from the ceiling. To-day we find among all this also many layers of ashes and charcoal from the cave dwellers' fire, besides numerous tools, weapons, and implements which he used. These things disclose, step after step, his slow progress and show us that man had now left the old fist-hatchet far behind and become a real craftsman.

**Fig. 2. Selection of Flint Tools of Middle Stone Age Man**

These tools are not only more highly varied than man possessed before (see Fig. 1) but they are much more finely finished, especially along the edges, where you can see that tiny flakes have been chipped off in a long row, producing a sharp cutting edge. Many thousands of years elapsed from the time of Fig. 1 to that of Fig. 2.
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We see him at the door of his cave, carefully chipping off the edge of his flint tools and producing such a fine cutting edge that he can use it to shape bone, ivory, and especially reindeer horn. The mammoth furnishes him with ivory, and great herds of reindeer which had come southward with the ice are grazing before the mouth of the cavern. The hunter has a considerable list of tools from which he can select. We see at his elbow knives, chisels, drills and hammers, polishers and scrapers, all of flint (Fig. 2); while with these he works out pins, needles, spoons, and ladles, all of ivory or bone, and carves them with pictures of the animals he hunts in the forest (Fig. 4). He now fashions a keen, barbed ivory spear point, which he mounts on a long wooden shaft. He has also discovered the bow and arrow and carries at his girdle a sharp flint dagger. The fine ivory needles (Fig. 3) show that the hunter’s body is now protected from cold and the brambles of the trackless forest by clothing sewed together out of the skins of the animals he has slain.

Thus equipped the hunter of the Middle Stone Age was a much more dangerous foe of the wild creatures than his ancestors of the Early Stone Age. In a single cavern in Sicily archaeologists have dug out the bones of no less than two thousand hippopotami which these Middle Stone Age hunters killed. Here too lay even the bone whistle with which the returning hunter announced his coming to the hungry family waiting in the cave. Surrounded by revolting piles of garbage and amid foul odors of decaying flesh our savage European ancestor crept into his cave dwelling at night, little realizing that many feet beneath the cavern floor on which he slept lay the remains of his ancestors in layer upon layer, the accumulations of thousands of years.
It is not a little astonishing to find that these Middle Stone Age hunters could draw and even paint with the greatest skill. In the caverns of southern France and northern Spain their paintings have been found in surprising numbers in recent years. Long lines of bison, deer, or wild horses cover the walls and ceilings of these caves. They are startling in their lifelikeness and

**Fig. 4. Drawings carved by Middle Stone Age man on ivory**

1, marching line of reindeer with salmon in the spaces — probably a talisman to bring the hunter and fisherman good luck (see p. 9); 2, a bison bull at bay (not on ivory but incised in the rock of a cavern wall; over one hundred fifty caverns containing such paintings and carvings are known in France and Spain); 3, a grazing reindeer; 4, a running reindeer. These carvings are the oldest works of art by man, made fifteen or twenty thousand years ago. The work was done with the pointed and edged tools of flint shown in Fig. 2.
vigor. Sometimes they are carved in the rock wall of the cavern (Fig. 4, 2); again the ancient hunter employed colored earth mixed with grease, and thus produced paintings which still survive on the cavern wall. We may suppose that the hunter believed the presence of this pictured game filling his cavern

**FIG. 5. RESTORATION OF A SWISS LAKE-DWELLERS' SETTLEMENT**

The lake-dwellers felled trees with their stone axes (Fig. 7, 5) and cut them into piles some twenty feet long, sharpened at the lower end. These they drove several feet into the bottom of the lake, in water eight or ten feet deep. On a platform supported by these piles they then built their houses. The platform was connected with the shore by a bridge, which may be seen here on the right. A section of it could be removed at night for protection. The fish nets seen drying at the rail, the "dug-out" boat of the hunters who bring in the deer, and many other things have been found on the lake bottom in recent times would work magically to aid him in filling it with the real game which he daily sought to bring in there. For the same reason also he decorated the ivory and bone weapons which he used with the figures of the animals he pursued (Fig. 4, 1, 3, 4). This is the earliest art in the whole career of man, in so far as we know.
Section 4. The Late Stone Age

The signs left by the ice, and still observable in Europe, would lead us to think that it withdrew northward for the last time probably some ten thousand years ago. The climate again grew warmer and became what it is to-day. Men were soon after making rapid advances. They had now learned that it was possible to grind the edge of a stone ax or chisel (Fig. 7) as we now do with tools of metal. They were also able to drill a hole in the stone ax head and insert a handle (Fig. 7). With such an ax they could fell trees and build houses. The common use of the ground stone ax brings in the Late Stone Age. From the forests of southern Sweden southward to Sicily and the heel of Italy, from the marshes of Ireland and the harbors of Spain eastward to the
Greek islands and the shores of the Black Sea, the villages of Late Stone Age man stretched far across Europe. The smoke of his settlements rose through the forests and high over the

**Fig. 7. Part of the Equipment of a Late Stone Age Lake Dweller**

This group contains the evidence for three important inventions made or received by the men of the Late Stone Age: *first*, pottery jars, like 2 and 3, with rude decorations, the oldest baked clay in Europe, and 1, a large kettle in which the lake-dwellers' food was cooked; *second*, ground-edged tools like 4, stone chisel with ground edge (p. 10), mounted in a deerhorn handle like a hatchet, or 5, stone ax with a ground edge, and pierced with a hole for the ax handle (the houses of Fig. 5 were built with such tools); and *third*, weaving, as shown by 6, a spinning "whorl" of baked clay, the earliest spinning wheel. When suspended by a rough thread of flax eighteen to twenty inches long, it was given a whirl which made it spin in the air like a top, thus rapidly twisting the thread by which it was hanging. The thread when sufficiently twisted was wound up, and another length of eighteen or twenty inches was drawn out from the unspun flax to be similarly twisted. One of these earliest spinning wheels has been found in the Swiss lakes with a spool of flaxen thread still attached. (From photograph loaned by Professor Hoernes)

lakes and valleys of Switzerland and northern Italy, where his villages of pile dwellings (Fig. 5) fringed the shores of the lakes. His roofs dotted the plains and nestled in the inlets of the sea,
whence they were strewn far up the winding valleys of the rivers into the interior of Europe.

The wooden dwellings of the Late Stone Age are the earliest such shelters found in Europe. Sunken fragments of these houses are found all along the shores of the Swiss lakes, lying at the bottom, among the piles which supported the houses of the village (Fig. 6). Pieces of stools, chests, carved dippers, spoons, and the like, all of wood, show that these houses were equipped with convenient wooden furniture. The householder now knows that clay will harden in the fire, and he makes handy jars, bowls, and dishes of burned clay (Fig. 7). Although roughly made without the use of the potter’s wheel and unevenly burned without an oven, they add much to the equipment of his dwelling. Before his door the women spin their flax, and the rough skin clothing of his ancestors has given way to garments of woven stuff. Up the hillside stretches the field of flax, and beside it another of wheat or of barley. The seeds which their ancestors once gathered from the scattered tufts of the wild grasses, these Late Stone Age men have slowly learned may be planted near the dwelling in ground prepared for the purpose. Thus wild grain is domesticated, and agriculture has been introduced.

On the green uplands above are now feeding the creatures which the Middle Stone Age man once pursued through the wilds, for the mountain sheep and goats and the wild cattle have now learned to dwell near man and submit to his control. Indeed, the wild ox bows his neck to the yoke and draws the plow across the forest-girt field where he once wandered in untrammeled freedom. Fragments of wooden wheels in the lake-villages show that he is also drawing the wheeled cart, the earliest in Europe. Groups of massive tombs still surviving, built of enormous blocks of stone (Fig. 8), requiring the united efforts of large numbers of men, disclose to us the beginnings of coöperation and social unity. The driving of fifty thousand piles for the lake-village at Wangen shows that men were learning to work together in communities, but a flint arrowhead
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These tombs are found in great numbers, especially along the Atlantic coast of Europe (but also in north Africa) from Gibraltar to the Norse peninsulas, where they still stand by thousands. One Danish island alone contains thirty-four hundred of them. It was in such a tomb that a dead chief of the Late Stone Age was buried. The stones, weighing even as much as forty tons apiece, were sometimes dragged by his people many miles from the nearest quarry found still sticking in the eyehole of a skull reminds us that these communities were often at war with one another; while amber from the north and the wide distribution of a certain kind of flint found in only one mine of France tell us of the commerce which wandered from one community to another.

Such mines reveal very vividly the industries of this remote age. A mine opened by archaeologists in England still contained eighty much-worn picks of deerhorn used by the flint miners; while in Belgium a fall of rock from the ceiling covered and preserved to us even the body of one of these ancient miners.
Section 5. Late Stone Age Europe and the Orient

There are certain traders whose wares these Late Stone Age villagers inspect with eagerness. They come from the coast and they are already threading the Alpine passes leading northward from southern Europe—roads which are yet to become the great highways of the early world. These traders entertain the villagers of the European interior with the tales which circulate among the coast settlements, telling how huge ships (Fig. 14)—which make their own rude dugouts (Fig. 5) look like tiny chips—ply back and forth in the eastern waters of the Mediterranean. Such ships have many oarsmen on each side and mighty fir trunks mounted upright in the craft, carrying huge sheets of linen to catch the favoring wind which drives them swiftly, without oars, from land to land. They come out of the many mouths of the vast river of Egypt, greater than any river in the world, says the tale, and they bear crowded cargoes of beautiful stone vases, strings of shining blue-glazed beads (see cut, p. 16), bolts of fine linen, and, above all, axes and daggers of a strange, heavy, shining substance, for which these European villagers have no name. They listen with awe-struck faces and rapt attention; and in their traffic they desire above all else the new axes and daggers of metal which take a keener edge than any they can fashion of stone.

Strings of Egyptian blue-glazed beads,1 brought in by traders, wandered from hand to hand and people to people in western Europe; and we find them now lying in graves among the ornaments once worn by the men of the Late Stone or early Copper Age in England. In the East the people of a Late Stone Age village on the low hill in northwestern Asia Minor where later rose the walls of Troy (p. 117); likewise the people of another settlement of the same age near the north shore of the Island of Crete, yet to become the flourishing city of Cnossus (p. 120);

1 Examples of these blue-glazed Egyptian beads discovered in prehistoric graves of England will be found in the drawing at the end of Chapter I (p. 16).
and other communities scattered through the Aegean islands,—these eastern people have even seen those marvelous ships of the Nile with their huge spars and wide sails and have trafficked with them on the seashore.

Thus at the dawn of history, barbarian Europe looked across the Mediterranean to the great civilization of the Nile, as our own North American Indians fixed their wondering eyes on the first Europeans who landed in America and listened to like strange tales of great and distant peoples. But these Late Stone Age men had now (about 2500 B.C.) reached the limit of their resources. Without writing (for the records of business, government, and tradition); without metals (save the trader's copper ax and dagger); without stanch ships in which to develop commerce,—they could go no further. Perhaps the Late Stone Age villagers recalled a dim tradition of their fathers that grain and flax, cattle and sheep, first came to them from the same wonderland of the far East, whence now came the copper ax and the blue-glazed beads. It was after receiving such contributions as these from the Orient, that Europe went forward to the development of a higher civilization, and in order to understand the further course of European history, we must turn to the Orient whence came these things by which the life of our European ancestors entered upon a new epoch.

Let us remember as we go to the Orient that the age of man's prehistoric career^1 lasted some fifty thousand years, and that in the Orient he began to enter upon a high civilization in the historic epoch during the thousand years from 4000 to 3000 B.C. (in eastern Europe a thousand years later).^2 Civilization is thus between five and six thousand years old. It arose in the Orient, in the eastern Mediterranean region, and civilized supremacy both in peace and war shifted slowly from the Orient westward. It was not till about 500 B.C. that the Greeks became the leaders in matters of civilization. They, with the rest of the

1 That is, before he began to leave any written traces of his existence.
2 In western Europe not until after 500 B.C. or even much later.
Mediterranean world, were gradually subdued by the Romans, until Roman power was supreme and practically universal not long after 200 B.C. We have therefore first to trace the career of the Orient, and then to follow civilization as it developed among the Greeks and Romans.

QUESTIONS

SECTION 1. How did early man learn to do things? Was there any one to tell him? Describe the probable condition of the earliest men. What men have actually been found in a state almost as low as this? Describe their possessions. How long has man existed on earth? At what point can we begin to trace his progress?

SECTION 2. Describe man's earliest tools. How did he live, and what was Europe then like? What do we call this age? What great change brought it to an end?

SECTION 3. Where did man then take refuge? Describe his progress; his home. What art did he possess?

SECTION 4. When did the ice withdraw for the last time? What new treatment of his edged tools did man now discover? Make a list of his new possessions in this age. What remains and evidences of the existence of towns and communities still survive?

SECTION 5. What wares did the traders bring into the Late Stone Age settlements of inland Europe? How were they brought across the Mediterranean? What great people already had ships? Where did high civilization first arise?
CHAPTER II

THE STORY OF EGYPT

Section 6. Egypt and its Earliest Inhabitants

The traveler who visits Egypt at the present day lands in a very modern looking harbor at Alexandria. He is presently seated in a comfortable railway car in which we may accompany him as he is carried rapidly across a low flat country, stretching far away to the sunlit horizon. The wide expanse is dotted with little villages of dark, mud-brick huts, and here and there rise groves of graceful palms. The landscape is carpeted with stretches of bright and vivid green as far as the eye can see, and wandering through this verdure is a network of irrigation canals (Fig. 10). Brown-skinned men of slender build, with dark hair, are seen at intervals along the banks of these canals, swaying up and down as they rhythmically lift an irrigation bucket attached to a simple device (Fig. 9), exactly like the "well sweep" of our grandfathers in New England. It is kept going day and night, as one man relieves another, and the irrigation trenches, branching all over the field, are thus kept full of water for about a hundred days until the grain ripens. It is the best of evidence that Egypt enjoys no rain.

The black soil we see from the train is unexcelled in fertility, and it is enriched each year by the overflow of the river, whose turbid waters rise above its banks every summer, spread far over the flats (Fig. 10) and stand there long enough to deposit a very thin layer of rich earthy sediment. All this plain over which the train moves southward consists of such sediment, which the river has brought down from its sources far away in Africa. In the course of ages it has filled up the ancient

Egypt of to-day

Its soil and area
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Fig. 9. An Egyptian Shadoof, the Oldest of Well Sweeps, irrigating the Fields

The man below stands in the water, holding his leather bucket. The pole of the sweep is above him, with large ball of dried Nile mud on its lower end as a lifting weight, or counterpoise, seen just behind the supporting post. This man lifts the water into a mud basin just at his left elbow behind the supporting post. A second man (in the middle) lifts it from this first (lower) basin to a second (middle) basin into which he is just emptying his bucket; while a third man (above) lifts the water from the middle basin to the uppermost basin on the top of the bank, where it runs off to the left into trenches spreading over the fields. The low water makes three successive lifts necessary.

triangular gulf of the Mediterranean which we call the Delta, and which we are now crossing. Lying with its point to the south, this Delta is connected with the Nile valley beyond as a flower is attached to its stem, the Delta being the flower and the long valley on the south the stem (see map, p. 56). The Delta and the valley together as far as the First Cataract contain over ten thousand square miles of cultivable soil, or somewhat more than the state of Vermont.

As our train approaches the southern point of the Delta, about a hundred and twenty-five miles from the sea, we begin to see the heights on either side of the valley into which the narrow end of the Delta merges. These heights (Figs. 10, 29) are the plateau of the Sahara Desert through which the Nile has cut
a vast, deep trench as it winds its way northward from inner Africa. This trench, or valley, is seldom more than thirty miles wide, while the strip of soil on each side of the river rarely exceeds ten miles in width. On either edge of the soil strip, one steps out of the green fields into the sand of the desert, which has drifted into the trench; or if one climbs the cliffs forming the walls of the trench, he stands looking out over a vast waste of rocky hills and stretches of sand trembling in the heat of the blazing sunshine, which flames far across the desert. Then one realizes that Egypt is simply a low, narrow, winding line of green (see map, p. 56), watered by the Nile, in the midst of a rainless desert plateau which looks down upon it from either side.

As we journey on let us realize also that this valley can tell an unbroken story of human progress such as we can find nowhere else. The earliest chapter of the story must be sought in the oldest cemeteries in the world. We look out upon the sandy

---

**Fig. 10. View across the Nile Valley from the Top of the Great Pyramid**

Our point of view is from an elevation on the plateau of the western (Sahara) desert, looking eastward to the corresponding cliffs, or heights (p. 19), which limit the great trench of the Nile valley on the other (east) side. At the left (north) expands the vast plain of the Delta (p. 18). We can see the irrigation canals below, and nearer, just along the margin of the desert, once stretched the royal city of the kings buried in the pyramids of Gizeh (Plate I)
margin of the desert where there are thousands of low undulating mounds, covering the graves of the earliest ancestors of the brown men we see in the Delta fields. When we have dug out such a grave to the bottom we find the ancient Nile peasant lying there, surrounded by pottery jars and stone implements (Fig. 11). There he has been lying for over six thousand years, and the stone tools which he used so long ago tell us that he lived all his life without having known anything about metal. Occasional grains of wheat, barley, or millet, however, show that his women were already cultivating grain—the grain that later passed to Europe (p. 12). A fragment of linen in such a grave shows us also where Europe derived its flax. The peasant at the bottom of this grave was therefore watering his fields of flax and grain down on the fertile soil of the valley over six thousand years ago, just as the brown men whom the traveler sees from the car windows to-day are still doing.

The villages of low mud-brick huts which flash by the car windows furnish us also with an exact picture of those vanished prehistoric villages, the homes of the early Nile dwellers who are still lying in yonder cemeteries on the desert margin. In such a village, six to seven thousand years ago, lived the local chieftain who controlled the irrigation canal trenches of the district. To him the peasant was required to carry every season a share of the grain and flax which he gathered from his field; otherwise the supply of water for his crops would stop, and he would
receive an unpleasant visit from the chieftain, demanding instant payment. These were the earliest taxes. Such transactions led to scratching a number of strokes on the mud wall of the peasant’s hut, indicating the number of measures of grain he had paid. At length a rude picture of the basket grain-measure was also scratched there, to make it clear to what the strokes referred. In this and many other ways the peasant’s dealings with his neighbors or with the chieftain led him to make picture records (Fig. 12), and these are the earliest writing known,

Gradually each picture which he employed came to have a fixed form, and each picture always indicated the same word. Let us imagine for convenience that “Egyptian” contained the English word “leaf.” It would be written thus: 🕔. The Egyptian would in course of time come to look upon the leaf as the sign for the syllable “leaf,” wherever it might occur. By the same process 🕑 might become the sign for the syllable “bee” wherever found. Having thus a means of writing the syllables “bee” and “leaf,” the next step was to put them together thus, 🕑atsapp, and they would together represent the word “belief.” Notice, however, that in the word “belief” the sign 🕑 has ceased to suggest the idea of a bee but only the syllable “be.” That is to say, 🕑 has become a phonetic sign.

In this way early man could write many names of things of which you cannot make a picture. It is impossible to make a picture of “belief,” as you can of a jar or a knife.
If the writing of the Egyptian had remained merely a series of pictures, such words as "belief," "hate," "love," "beauty," and the like could never have been written. But when a large number of his pictures had become phonetic signs, each representing a syllable, it was possible for the Egyptian to write any word he knew, whether the word meant a thing of which he could draw a picture or not. This possession of phonetic signs is what makes real writing for the first time. It arose among these Nile dwellers earlier than anywhere else in the ancient world. Indeed, the Egyptian went still further, for he finally possessed a series of signs, each representing only one letter, that is, alphabetic signs, or, as we say, real letters. There were twenty-four letters in this alphabet, which was known in Egypt long before 3000 B.C. It was thus the earliest alphabet known.

The inconvenience of scratching this writing on mud walls, pieces of bone, or broken pottery soon led the Egyptian to a more practical equipment for writing. He found out that he could make an excellent paint or ink by thickening water with a little vegetable gum, and then mixing in a little soot from the blackened pots over his fire. Dipping a pointed reed into this mixture he found he could write very well. He had also learned that he could split a kind of river reed, called papyrus, into thin strips, and that when these were dried he could write on them much better than on the bits of pottery, bone, and wood which he had thus far used. Desiring a larger sheet on which to write, the Egyptian hit upon the idea of pasting his papyrus strips together with overlapping edges. This gave him a thin sheet. Then by pasting two such sheets together, back to back with the grain crossing at right angles, he produced a smooth, tough, pale yellow paper. The Egyptian had thus made the discovery that a thin vegetable membrane offers the most practical surface on which to write, and the world has since discovered nothing better. In this way arose pen, ink, and paper.

1 See the word “beauty,” the last three signs in the inscription over the ship (Fig. 14).
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(see Fig. 16). All three of these devices have descended to us from the Egyptians, and paper still bears its ancient name, "papyros,"¹ but slightly changed.

The invention of writing and of a convenient system of records on paper has had a greater influence in uplifting the human race than any other intellectual achievement in the career of man. It was more important than all the battles ever fought and all the constitutions ever devised. As a result of it the early Egyptian peasants, now lying in the thickly clustered graves on the margin of the desert, went rapidly forward to new achievements in civilization.

They had early found it necessary to measure time, for the peasant needed to know when he ought to go into the town for the next religious feast, or how many days still remained before he must pay his neighbor the grain he borrowed last year. Like all other early peoples he found the time from new moon to new moon a very convenient rough measure. If he agreed to pay the grain he borrowed in nine moons and eight of them had passed, he knew that he had one more moon in which to make the payment. But the moon-month varies in length from twenty-nine to thirty days, and it does not evenly divide the year. The Egyptian scribe early discovered this inconvenience, and soon showed himself much more practical in this respect than his neighbors in other lands.

He decided to use the moon no longer for dividing his year. He would have twelve months and he would make his months all of the same length, that is, thirty days each; then he would celebrate five feast days, a kind of holiday week five days long, at the end of the year. This gave him a year of 365 days. He was not yet enough of an astronomer to know that every four years he ought to have a leap year, of 366 days, although he

¹ The change from "papyros" to "paper" is really a very slight one. For ως is merely the Greek grammatical ending, which must be omitted in English. This leaves us παπυρ as the ancestor of our word "paper," from which it differs by only one letter. On the other Greek word for "papyrus," from which came our word "Bible," see page 140.
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discovered this fact later (p. 236). This convenient Egyptian calendar was devised in 4241 B.C., and its introduction is the earliest-dated event in history. Furthermore, it is the very calendar which has descended to us, after more than six thousand years—unfortunately with awkward alterations in the lengths of the months; but for these alterations the Egyptians were not responsible (see p. 268).

It was probably in the Peninsula of Sinai (see map, p. 56) that some Egyptian wandering thither, once banked his camp fire with pieces of copper ore lying on the ground about the camp. The charcoal of his wood fire mingled with the hot fragments of ore piled around to shield the fire, and thus the ore was "reduced" as the miner says; that is, the copper in metallic form was released from the dark recesses of the lumps of ore. Next morning as the Egyptian stirs the embers, he discovers a few glittering globules, now hardened into beads of metal. He draws them forth and turns them admiringly as they glitter in the morning sunshine. Before long, as the experience is repeated, he discovers whence these strange shining beads have come. He produces more of them, at first only to be worn as ornaments by his women, then to be cast into a blade and to replace the flint knife which he carries in his girdle.

Without knowing it this man stands at the dawning of a new era, the Age of Metal; and the little disk of shining copper which he draws from the ashes, if this Egyptian wanderer could but see it, might reflect to him a vision of steel buildings, Brooklyn bridges, huge factories roaring with the noise of thousands of machines of metal, and vast stretches of steel roads along which thunder hosts of rushing locomotives. For these things of our modern world, and all they signify, would never have come to pass but for the little bead of metal which the Egyptian held in his hand for the first time on that eventful day so long ago. Since the discovery of fire over fifty thousand years earlier (p. 3) man had made no conquest of the things of the earth which could compare with this in importance.
Fig. 13. Diagram illustrating the Rise of Architecture in Stone within a Century and a Half

Note the distribution of time: The middle bracket (below the pyramids) represents the thirtieth century B.C., and the brackets on each side of it represent about a quarter of a century before and after the thirtieth century — together about a century and a half. The transition from a brick-lined pit (1) to a stone-lined pit (2) was made just before the thirtieth century, and the Great Pyramid was begun at the end of the thirtieth century. The progress from a small brick structure (1) to a colossal stone structure (6) lies chiefly in the thirtieth century (3-5) (see p. 28)
At this point we realize that we have followed early man out of the Stone Age (where we left him in Europe) into a civilization possessed of metal, writing, and government. We begin to see that dry and rainless Egypt furnishes the conditions for the preservation of such plentiful remains of early man as to make this valley an enormous storehouse of his ancient works and records. These are the only link connecting prehistoric man with the historic age of written documents, which we are now to study, as we make the voyage up the Nile and learn to read the monuments along the great river like a vast historical volume, whose pages will tell us age after age the fascinating story of ancient man and all that he achieved here so many thousands of years ago. The wonderful achievements of the earliest Egyptians we have recalled as we journeyed across the Delta; but now as the journey up the river proceeds we shall be able to watch the continuous progress of the Egyptian in the long centuries after his discovery of metals and writing.

Such are the thoughts which occupy the mind of the well-informed traveler as his train carries him southward across the Delta. Perhaps he is pondering on the possible results which the Egyptians would achieve as he sees them in imagination throwing away their flint chisels and replacing them with those of copper. The train rounds a bend, and through an opening in the palms the traveler is fairly blinded by a burst of blazing sunshine from the western desert, in the midst of which he discovers a group of noble pyramids rising above the glare of the sands. It is his first glimpse of the great pyramids of Gizeh, and it tells him better than any printed page what the Egyptian builder with the copper chisel in his hand could do. A few minutes later his train is moving among the modern buildings of Cairo, and the very next day will surely find him taking the seven-mile drive from Cairo out to Gizeh.
Section 7. The Pyramid Age.

No traveler ever forgets the first drive to the Pyramids of Gizeh, as he sees their giant forms rising higher and higher above the crest of the western desert (Plate I). A thousand questions arise in the visitor’s mind. He has read that these vast buildings he is approaching are tombs, in which the kings of Egypt were buried. Such mighty buildings reveal many things about the men who built them. In the first place, these tombs show that the Egyptians believed in a life after death and that to obtain such life it was necessary to preserve the body from destruction. They built these tombs to shelter and protect the body after death. Hence, also, came the practice of “embalmment” by which the body was preserved as a mummy (Fig. 32). It was then placed in the great tomb, in a small but massive room deep in the heart of the pyramid masonry. Other tombs of masonry, much smaller in size, cluster about the pyramids in great numbers (Frontispiece). Here were buried the relatives of the king, and the great men of his court, who assisted him in the government of the land (Fig. 15).

These people had many gods, but there were two whom they worshiped above all others. The Sun, which shines so gloriously in the cloudless Egyptian sky, was their greatest god, and their most splendid temples were erected for his worship. Indeed, the pyramid is a symbol sacred to the Sun-god. They called him Re (pron. ray). The other great power which they revered as a god was likewise a visible force in their daily lives. The shining Nile which the traveler has just crossed on his way to the pyramids gives life to the fields and brings forth the harvest. So the Nile, and the fertile soil he refreshes, and the green life which he brings forth—all these the Egyptian thought of together as a single god, Osiris, the imperishable life of the earth which revives and fades every year with the changes of the seasons. It was a beautiful thought to the Egyptian that this
The progress of the Egyptians before they built stone masonry

same life-giving power which furnished him his food in this world would care for him also in the next, when his body lay out yonder in the great cemetery which we are approaching.

But this vast cemetery of Gizeh tells us of many other things besides the religion of the Egyptians. As we look up at the colossal pyramid of Khufu (Cheops) we can hardly grasp the fact of the enormous stride forward which the Egyptians have taken since the days when they used to be buried with their flint knives in a pit scooped out on the margin of the desert (Fig. 11). It is the use of metal which has since then carried them so far. That Egyptian in Sinai who noticed the first bit of metal (p. 24) lived over a thousand years before these pyramids were built. He was buried in a pit like that of the earliest Egyptian peasant (Fig. 11).

It was a long time before his discovery of metal resulted in copper tools which made possible great architecture in stone. Not more than a hundred and fifty years before the Great Pyramid of Gizeh, the Egyptians were still building the tombs of their kings of sun-baked brick. Such a royal tomb was merely a chamber in the ground, roofed with wood (Fig. 13, 7).

Then some skillful workman among them found out that he could use his copper tools to cut square blocks of limestone and line the chamber with these blocks in place of the soft bricks. This was the first piece of stone masonry ever put together in so far as we know (Fig. 13, 2). It was built not long before 3000 B.C., and less than a century and a half later, that is, by 2900 B.C., the king’s architect was building the Great Pyramid of Gizeh (Fig. 13, 6). What a contrast between the sun-baked brick chamber and the Great Pyramid of Gizeh only a century and a half later! Most of this progress was made during the thirtieth century B.C.; that is, between 3000 and 2900 B.C. (Fig. 13). Such rapid progress in control of mechanical power can be found in no other period of the world’s history until the nineteenth century, which closed not long before many of the readers of this book were born.
It helps us to grasp the extent of the Egyptian's progress when we know that the Great Pyramid covers thirteen acres. It is a solid mass of masonry containing 2,300,000 blocks of limestone, each weighing on an average two and a half tons; that is, each block is as heavy as an ordinary wagon load of coal. The sides of the pyramid at the base are 755 feet long; that is, about a block and three quarters (counting twelve city blocks to a mile), and the building was nearly five hundred feet high. An ancient story tells us that a hundred thousand men were working on this royal tomb for twenty years, and we can well believe it (see Plate I).

We can also learn much about the progress of the Egyptian government from this cemetery of Gizeh. We perceive at once that it must have required a very skillful ruler and a great body of officials to manage and to feed a hundred thousand workmen around this great building. The king who controlled such vast undertakings was no longer a local chieftain (p. 20), but he now ruled all Egypt. He was so reverenced that the people did not mention the king by name, but instead they spoke of the palace in which he lived; that is, the "Great House," or, in Egyptian, "Pharaoh." 1 He had his local officers collecting taxes all over Egypt. They were also trying cases at law wherever they arose, and every judge had before him the written law which bade him judge justly. A large office with its corps of officials was also keeping the irrigation canals (Fig. 10) in order.

The king's huge central offices occupying low sun-baked brick buildings sheltered an army of clerks with their reed pens and their rolls of papyrus (p. 22), keeping the king's records and accounts. The tax payments received from the people here were not in money, for coined money did not yet exist. Such payments were made in produce: grain, livestock, wine, honey, linen, and the like. With the exception of the cattle, these had to be stored in granaries and storehouses, a vast group of which

1 This word is a title, not the name of any particular king.
formed the treasury of the king. The villas (Fig. 21) of the officials who assisted the king in all this business of government, with their gardens, formed a large part of the royal city.

The greatest quarter, however, was occupied by the palace of the king and the luxurious parks and gardens which surrounded it. Thus the palace and its grounds, the official villas, and offices of the government made up the capital of Egypt, the royal city which extended along the foot of the pyramid cemetery and

![Image: Earliest Representation of a Seagoing Ship (Twenty-eighth Century B.C.)](image)

The people are all bowing to the king whose figure (now lost) stood on shore (at the left), and they salute him with the words written in a line of hieroglyphs above, meaning: "Hail to thee! O Sahure [the king's name], thou god of the living! We behold thy beauty." Some of these men are bearded Phoenician prisoners, showing that this Egyptian ship has crossed the east end of the Mediterranean and returned. The big double mast is unshipped and lies on supports rising by the three steering oars in the stern stretched far away over the plain, of which there is a fine view from the summit of the pyramid (Fig. 10). But the city was all built of sun-baked brick and wood, and it has therefore vanished.

The city of the dead, the pyramids and the tombs clustering around them, being built of stone, have fortunately proved more durable and they have much to tell us still. The weary climb to the summit of the Great Pyramid (Fig. 10) gives us a view southward, down a straggling but imposing line of pyramids rising dimly as far as we can see on the southern horizon. The line is over sixty miles long, and its oldest pyramids represent the
first great age of Egyptian civilization after the land was united under one king.\(^1\) We may call it the Pyramid Age and it lasted about five hundred years, from 3000 to 2500 B.C. It was an age of great prosperity and splendour. Otherwise it would have been impossible to erect buildings of such grandeur as these in the Gizeh cemetery.

In the Pyramid Age the Pharaoh was powerful enough to seek wealth beyond the boundaries of Egypt. A few surviving blocks from a fallen pyramid-temple (Fig. 22) south of Gizeh bear carved and painted reliefs (Fig. 14) showing us the ships which he dared to send beyond the shelter of the Nile mouths far across the end of the Mediterranean to the coast of Phoenicia (see map, p. 56). This was in the middle of the twenty-eighth century B.C., and

---

\(^1\) Before this, little kingdoms scattered up and down the valley had long existed but were finally united into one kingdom, under a single king. The first king to establish this union permanently was Menes, who united Egypt under his rule about 3400 B.C. But it was four centuries or more after Menes that the united kingdom became powerful and wealthy enough to build these royal pyramid-tombs, marking for us the first great age of Egyptian civilization.
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this relief (Fig. 14) contains the oldest-known representation of a seagoing ship. Yet the Pharaoh had already been carrying on such over-sea commerce for centuries at this time, and an ancient record tells us that he sent forty ships to Phoenicia to bring back cedar of Lebanon in the middle of the thirtieth century B.C., two centuries before our earliest picture of such an ancient salt-water vessel.

These are the ships which carried metal and other products of civilization to the peoples who lived on the Mediterranean shores of Europe in the Late Stone Age (p. 14).

The king was also already sending caravans of donkeys far up the Nile into the Sudan to traffic with the blacks of the south, and to bring back ebony, ivory, ostrich feathers, and fragrant gums. The officials who conducted these caravans were the earliest explorers of inner Africa, and in their tombs at the First Cataract they have left interesting records of their exciting adventures among the wild tribes of the south—adventures in which some of them lost their lives.1 Expeditions to the south

1 The teacher will find it of interest to read these records to the class. See Breasted’s Ancient Records of Egypt, Vol. I, pp. 325–336, 350–374.
end of the Red Sea to procure the same products early led to the excavation of a canal connecting the easternmost Nile branch in the Delta with the Red Sea. This predecessor of the Suez Canal was dug about 4000 years ago.

A stroll among the tombs clustering so thickly around the pyramids of Gizeh is almost like a walk among the busy communities which flourished in this populous valley in the days of the pyramid builders. We find the door of every tomb standing open (Fig. 15), and there is nothing to prevent our entrance. We stand in an oblong room with walls of stone masonry. This is a chapel-chamber to which the Egyptian believed the dead man buried beneath the tomb might return every day. Here he would find food and drink left for him daily by his relatives. He would also find the stone walls of this room covered from floor to ceiling with carved scenes, beautifully painted, picturing the daily life on the great estate of which he was lord (Figs. 16–20). The place is now silent and deserted, or if we hear the voices of the donkey boys talking outside, they are speaking Arabic; for the ancient language of the men who built these tombs so many thousand years ago is no longer spoken. But everywhere, in bright and charming colors, we see looking down...
upon us from these walls the life which these men of nearly five thousand years ago actually lived.

Dominating all these scenes on the walls is the tall form of the noble (Fig. 16), the lord of the estate, as he stands looking out over his fields and inspecting the work going on there. These fields where the oxen draw the plow, and the sowers scatter the seed (Fig. 17), are the oldest scene of agriculture known to us. Here too are the herds, long lines of sleek fat cattle grazing in the pasture, while the milch cows are led up and tied to be milked (Figs. 16, 18). These cattle are also beasts of burden; we have noticed the oxen drawing the plow. But we find no horses in these tombs of the Pyramid Age, for the horse was then unknown to the Egyptian, but the donkey is everywhere, and it would be impossible to harvest the grain without him (Fig. 19).

On the next wall we find again the tall figure of the noble overseeing the booths and yards where toil the craftsmen of his estate. We can almost hear the sounds of hammer and anvil and the hum of industry as we look here upon these artisans of the early oriental world at their busy tasks. Yonder is the smith. He has never heard of his ancestor who picked up the first bead of copper probably over a thousand years earlier (p. 24). This man has made progress however. He is now able to harden his tools by the addition of a small amount of tin to the molten metal, which then cools into a much harder state than that of pure copper. We call this mixture bronze.\(^1\) This harder metal

\(^1\) The origin of bronze is probably natural. Professor J. L. Myres of Oxford informs me of the recent discovery of ore containing both copper and tin in the northern Mediterranean. The metal yielded by such ore would itself be bronze.
here in the Age of Copper gives the workman the same advantage obtained in the Age of Iron by the invention of steel.

On the same wall we see the lapidary holding up for the noble’s admiration splendid stone bowls, cut from diorite, a stone as hard as steel. Nevertheless the bowl is ground to such thinness that the sunlight glows through its dark gray sides. Other workmen are cutting and grinding tiny pieces of beautiful blue turquoise. These pieces they inlay with remarkable accuracy into recesses in the surface of a magnificent golden vase, just made ready by the goldsmith. The booth of the goldsmith is filled with workmen and apprentices, weighing gold and costly stones, hammering and casting, soldering and fitting together richly wrought jewelry which can hardly be surpassed by the best goldsmiths and jewelers of to-day.

In the next space on this wall we find the potter no longer building up his jars and bowls with his fingers alone, as in the Stone Age. He now sits before a small horizontal wheel, which he keeps whirling with one hand. Upon this potter's wheel, the ancestor of the lathe, he deftly shapes the vessel as it whirs round and round under his fingers. When the soft clay vessels are ready, they are no longer unevenly burned in an open fire, as the Late Stone Age potter in the Swiss lake-villages managed it (Fig. 7); but here in the Egyptian potter’s yard are long rows of closed furnaces of clay as

1 Among the marvelous works of the ancient Egyptian goldsmith one of the best pieces now surviving is a beautiful golden tiara in the form of a chaplet of flowers, found on the brow of an Egyptian princess just as it was put there in the Feudal Age nearly four thousand years ago. It may be seen drawn as resting on a cushion at the end of Chapter II (p. 55).
tall as a man, where the pottery is packed in, protected from the wind and evenly burned. These two inventions, the potter’s wheel and the potter’s furnace, were carried over to Stone Age Europe like many other contributions from the Orient. Indeed, we discover in the next booth also the source of those bright blue-glazed beads which found their way from Egypt to far-off England in the Late Stone or early Bronze Age (p. 14). This is the earliest-known glass. The Egyptians were making it for centuries before the Pyramid Age. It was spread on tiles in gorgeous glazes for adorning house and palace walls, or wrought into exquisite many-colored glass bottles and vases, which were widely exported (Fig. 48).

Yonder the weaving women draw forth from the loom a gossamer fabric of linen. The picture on this wall could not tell us of its fineness, but fortunately pieces of it have survived, wrapped around the mummy of a king of this age. These specimens of royal linen are so fine that it requires a magnifying glass to distinguish them from silk, and the best work of the modern machine loom is coarse in comparison with this fabric of the ancient

1 The tailpiece of Chapter I (p. 16) shows blue- and green-glazed Egyptian beads found in prehistoric graves of England. Compare page 14.
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Egyptian hand loom. At one loom there issues a lovely tapestry, for these weavers of Egypt furnished the earliest-known specimens of such work, to be hung on the walls of the Pharaoh's palace or stretched to shade the roof garden of the noble's villa.

Into the back door of the next booth pass huge bundles of papyrus reeds, which we see barelegged men gathering along the edge of the Nile marsh. These reeds furnish piles of pale yellow paper in long sheets (p. 22). The ships which we have followed on the Mediterranean (p. 31) will yet add bales of this Nile paper to their cargoes, and carry it to the European world. For fifteen hundred years these papyrus booths along the Nile were the world's paper mills, until the libraries of wealthy Greeks and Romans (p. 140) were filled with papyrus books. Thus these papyrus marshes of the Nile were exhausted and the papyrus plant at last became extinct in Egypt. The modern traveler looks for it in vain as he journeys up the river.

We can easily imagine the hubbub of hammers and mauls as we approach the next section of wall, where we find the shipbuilders and cabinetmakers. Here is a long line of curving hulls, with workmen swarming over them like ants, fitting together the earliest seagoing ships (Fig. 14). Beside them are the busy cabinetmakers, fashioning luxurious furniture for the noble's villa. The finished chairs and couches for the king or the rich are overlaid with gold and silver, inlaid with ebony and ivory, and upholstered with soft leathern cushions (Figs. 20, 33). As we look back over these painted chapel walls, we see that the tombs of Gizeh have told us a very vivid story of how early men learned to make for themselves all the most important things they needed. We should notice how many more such things these men of the Nile could now make than the Stone Age men, who were living in the lake-villages of Europe (Fig. 5) at the very time these tomb-chapels were built.

It is easy to picture the bright sunny river in those ancient days, alive with boats and barges moving hither and thither, and often depicted on these walls, bearing the products of all
these industries, to be carried to the treasury of the Pharaoh as taxes or to the market of the town for traffic. Here on the wall is the market place itself. We can watch the cobbler offering the baker a pair of sandals as payment for a cake, or the carpenter’s wife giving the fisherman a little wooden box for a fish; while the potter’s wife proffers the apothecary two bowls fresh from the potter’s furnace in exchange for a jar of fragrant ointment. We see therefore that the people have no coined money to use, and that in the market place trade is actual exchange of goods. Such is the business of the common people. If we could see the large transactions in the palace, we would find there heavy rings of gold of a recognized weight, which circulated like money. Rings of copper also served the same purpose. Such rings were the forerunners of coin (p. 152). These people in the gayly painted market place on the chapel wall are the common folk of Egypt in the Pyramid Age. Some of them were free men, following their own business or industry. Others were slaves working the fields on the great estates like the one which is pictured on these walls. Over both these humbler classes were the great officials of the Pharaoh’s government, like the owner of this tomb whose tall form (Fig. 15) we find so often shown upon these chapel walls. We know many more of them by name, and a walk through this cemetery would enable us to make a directory of the wealthy quarter of the royal city under the kings who were buried in these pyramids of Gizeh. It would be a kind of social Blue Book of the capital of Egypt in the Pyramid Age. We know the grand viziers and the chief treasurers, the chief judges and the architects, the chamberlains and marshals of the palace, and so on. We can even visit the tomb of the architect who built the Great Pyramid of Gizeh for Khufu.

We can observe with what vast satisfaction these nobles and officials presided over this busy industrial and social life of the Nile valley in the Pyramid Age. Here on this chapel wall again we see its owner seated at ease in his palanquin, a luxurious
wheel-less carriage, borne upon the shoulders of slaves, as he returns from the inspection of his estate where we have been following him. As he is carried through the gate of his garden he retires into a veritable paradise (Fig. 21). The slaves set down the palanquin in the shade and their master steps out to
recline by the cool waters of the fishpool, where he watches the slow and stately dances of his women or the pranks of his children as they romp about the pool. The villa (Fig. 21) which peeps through the verdure is light and airy and gay with brightly colored tapestry hangings. It is a work of art, bright in all its decorations with the beauty of the outdoor world which the Egyptian so much loved. His lady comes forth to greet him in a long closely fitting robe of spotless white linen. She is in every

---

**Fig. 22. Colonnades in the Court of a Pyramid-Temple (Twenty-eighth Century B.C.)**

Notice the pyramid rising behind the temple (just as in the Frontispiece also). The door in the middle leads to the holy place built against the side of the pyramid, where a false door in the pyramid masonry serves as the portal through which the king comes forth from the world of the dead into this beautiful temple to enjoy the food and drink placed here for him and to share in the splendid feasts celebrated here. The center of the court is open to the sky; the roof of the porch all around is supported on columns, the earliest known in the history of architecture. Each column reproduces a palm tree, the capital being the crown of foliage. The whole place was colored in the bright hues of nature, including the painting on the walls behind the columns. Among these paintings was the ship in Fig. 14
The king wears a linen headdress, and a false beard hanging from his chin. A falcon, symbol of the king (see Fig. 12), hovers protectingly over his head. The material is diorite, a stone so intensely hard that no modern sculptor would try to use it. Found in Khafre’s valley temple by the Sphinx at Gizeh (Plate I)
Fig. 24. THE COLOSSAL COLUMNS OF THE NAVE IN THE GREAT HALL OF KARNAK

These are the columns of the middle two rows in Fig. 28. The tiny human figures below show by contrast the vast dimensions of the columns towering above them (p. 46)
way his equal, his sole wife, his constant companion, enjoying every right possessed by her husband.

The Egyptians could not have left us this beautifully painted and sculptured room (the tomb-chapel) unless they had possessed trained artists. Indeed, we can find the artist who painted these walls, where he has represented himself enjoying a plentiful feast among other people of the estate in one corner of the wall. Here he has written his name over his head, and we read in handsome hieroglyphs, “Nenekheptah, the artist.” His drawings all around us show that he has not been able to overcome all the difficulties of placing objects having thickness and roundness on a flat surface. Animal figures are drawn, however, with great beauty and lifeliness (Figs. 16–20), but “perspective” is entirely unknown to him, and objects in the background or distance are drawn of the same size as those in front.

The sculptor was the greatest artist of this age. In a secret chamber alongside this chapel there is a portrait statue of the dead lord whose tomb we have visited. A multitude of these statues have been found in this cemetery. They were thought to furnish the dead with an additional body, in case the mummied body should perish. These are the earliest portraits in the history of art. They were colored in the hues of life; the eyes were inlaid of rock crystal, and they still shine with the gleam of life. More lifelike portraits have never been produced by any age. Such statues of the kings are often superb (Fig. 23). They were set up in the temples which the Pharaoh erected. In size, the most remarkable statue of the Pyramid Age is the Great Sphinx, which stands here in this cemetery of Gizeh. The head is a portrait of Khafre, the king who built the second pyramid of Gizeh (see Frontispiece), and was carved from a promontory of rock which overlooked the royal city. It is the largest portrait ever wrought.

1 Wonderfully colored ducks and geese from an Egyptian tomb painting of the Pyramid Age will be found as headpiece of Chapter 11 (p. 17).
2 The art of the age of course also included architecture. Its most important achievement in the Pyramid Age was the colonnade, of which a good example will be found in the court of a pyramid-temple in Fig. 22.
Section 8. The Feudal Age

Probably there is no journey more interesting than the voyage up the Nile with all its revelations of the story of the Nile dwellers. As the river swings from cliff to cliff the steamer in which the traveler leaves Cairo is carried under many a tomb door cut in the face of the cliff and giving entrance to a tomb excavated in the rock (Fig. 25). Here are the tombs of the nobles of some 2000 B.C. Their ancestors were officials of the Pharaohs in the Pyramid Age. But the nobles who made these later tombs have succeeded in gaining greater power than their ancestors. They no longer live at the court of the king, nor build their tombs around the pyramid of the Pharaoh. They are barons holding large estates, which they bequeath to their sons, and the Pharaoh has only a very loose control over them, by arrangements which in later ages are called feudal (Chapter XVI). We therefore call this the Feudal Age, in Egyptian history. It lasted for several centuries and was flourishing by 2000 B.C.

These feudal barons ruled the people on their great domains with much kindness. The age made great progress in the realm of conduct and kindly treatment of one's neighbors and especially of those over whom one had power (Fig. 25). In the story of man we find here the earliest chapter in human kindness. The evidence for it is not lacking in the cemetery, but in the Feudal Age our story is not drawn from the tomb records only, as in the Pyramid Age. Fortunately fragments from the libraries of these feudal barons—the oldest libraries in the world—have been discovered in their tombs. These oldest of all books are in the form of rolls of papyrus which once were packed in jars, neatly labeled and ranged in rows on the noble's library shelves. Here are the oldest storybooks in the world: tales of wanderings and adventures in Asia; tales of shipwreck at the gate of the unknown ocean beyond the Red Sea—the earliest Sindbad the Sailor; and tales of wonders wrought by ancient wise men and magicians.
Some of these stories set forth the sufferings of the poor and the humble and seek to stir the rulers to just and kind treatment of the weaker classes. Some picture the wickedness

Fig. 25. Cliff-Tomb of an Egyptian Noble of the Feudal Age

The chapel entered through this door contains painted reliefs like those of the Pyramid Age (Figs. 16–20) and also many written records. In this chapel the noble tells of his kind treatment of his people; he says: "There was no citizen's daughter whom I misused; there was no widow whom I oppressed; there was no peasant whom I evicted; there was no shepherd whom I expelled; ... there was none wretched in my community, there was none hungry in my time. When years of famine came I plowed all the fields of the Oryx barony [his estate] ... preserving its people alive and furnishing its food so that there was none hungry therein. I gave to the widow as to her who had a husband; I did not exalt the great above the humble in anything that I gave" (p. 44)

of men and the hopelessness of the future. Others tell of a righteous ruler who is yet to come, a "good shepherd" they call him, meaning a good king who shall bring in justice and
happiness for all. We notice here a contrast with the Pyramid Age. With the in-coming of the pyramid-builders we saw a tremendous growth in power, in building, and in art; but the Feudal Age reveals progress in a higher realm, that of conduct and character (see description under Fig. 25).

Very few rolls were needed to contain the science of this time. The largest and the most valuable roll of all contains what they had learned about medicine and the organs of the human body. This oldest medical book when unrolled is about sixty-six feet long and has recipes for all sorts of ailments. Some of them call for remedies, like castor oil, which are still in common use; many represent the ailment as due to demons, which were long believed to be the cause of disease. Other rolls contain the simpler rules of arithmetic, geometry, and elementary algebra. Even observations of the heavenly bodies with crude instruments were made; but these records, like those in geography, have been lost.

Section 9. The Empire

As we continue our Nile journey southward, the course of the river swings sharply eastward toward the Red Sea, and we round a great bend in the stream (see map, p. 56). All at once, as we look toward the east bank through the thick palm groves, we catch glimpses of vast masses of stone masonry and lines of tall columns. They are the ruins of the once great city of Thebes. Our voyage up the river has now carried us through many centuries. The monuments along its banks have told us the story of two of the three periods\(^1\) into which the career of this great people of the Nile falls. At Thebes we reach the Empire, the third of those periods.

A walk around the temple of Karnak\(^2\) here is as instructive for this period as we have found the Gizeh cemetery to be for

---

\(^1\) These three ages are (1) Pyramid Age, about 3000 to 2500 B.C. (section 7); (2) Feudal Age, flourishing 2000 B.C. (section 8); (3) The Empire, about 1580 to 1150 B.C. (section 9).

\(^2\) Karnak is a tiny modern village by the greatest temple at Thebes.
The Pyramid Age. As we pass along the north wall of this vast temple we find it covered with enormous sculptures in relief, depicting the wars of the Egyptians in Asia. We see the giant figure of the Pharaoh as he stands in his war chariot, towering above all his fleeing foes, whom he drives before his plunging horses (Fig. 26). This is the first time we have met the horse on the ancient monuments. The animal has been imported from Asia, the chariot has come with him, and Egypt has learned...
warfare on a scale unknown before. The Pharaohs are now great generals, who lead their armies into Asia and establish an empire which extends from the Euphrates in Asia to the Fourth Cata- ract of the Nile in Africa.

This world-power of the Pharaohs lasted from the early sixteenth century to the twelfth century b.c., something over four hundred years. The greatest of the conquerors during all this period was Thutmose III, who ruled for over fifty years, beginning about 1500 b.c. We may call him the Napoleon of Egypt, for he was the first great general in history, and he carried on wars in Asia for nearly twenty years, during which he led no less than seventeen campaigns there. His empire was slowly lost under the less powerful rule of Ramses II and his successors.

The wealth which the Pharaohs captured in Asia and Nubia during the Empire enabled them to live in such power and magnificence as the world had never seen before. The battle scenes we have just found (Fig. 26) are carved on the walls of a hall of the temple of Karnak—a hall so large that you could put into it the whole cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris. The columns of the central aisle are sixty-nine feet high. The vast capital forming the summit of each column is large enough to contain a group of a hundred men standing upon it at the same time.
Fig. 28. Restoration of the Great Hall of Karnak—Largest Building of the Egyptian Empire

With the wealth taken in Asia the Egyptian conquerors of the Empire enabled their architects to build the greatest colonnaded hall ever erected by man. It is three hundred thirty-eight feet wide and one hundred seventy feet deep, furnishing room for the entire cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris, although this is only a single room of the temple. There are one hundred thirty-six columns in sixteen rows. The nave (three central aisles) is seventy-nine feet high and contains twelve columns in two rows higher than the rest. The resulting break in the level of the roof is filled up with windows lighting the hall. This "clerestory" (see p. 48) is already found in Khafre's valley-temple at Gizeh (Plate I). This type of building passed to Greece and Rome as the "basilica" (Fig. 113), out of which grew the plan of the Christian cathedral.
As will be seen in Fig. 28, these central columns are taller than those on each side, and the resulting difference in the level of the roof permits the insertion of a row of windows on each side of the central aisle. Such an arrangement of the roof is called a clerestory ("clear story"), and the aisle with its columns and windows is termed a "nave." It is found in simpler form as far back as the Pyramid Age. Later it passed over to Europe, where it finally appeared as the leading form of Christian architecture—the cathedral church, whose nave, side aisles, and clerestory windows¹ (Fig. 170) have descended to us from the colonnaded temple halls of Egypt. These buildings of the Empire form the leading chapter in the early history of great architecture, though we should not forget that the columns employed here were already in use in the Pyramid Age (Fig. 22).

Such temples as these at Thebes were seen through the deep green of clustering palms, among towering obelisks, and colossal statues of the Pharaohs (Fig. 29). The whole was bright with color, flashing at many a point with gold and silver, and, mirrored in the unruffled surface of the temple lake, it made a picture of such splendor as the ancient world had never seen before. These temples and their surrounding monuments were connected by imposing avenues of sphinxes, and thus grew up at Thebes the first great monumental city ever built by man—a city which as a whole was itself a vast and imposing monument.

Much of the grandeur of Egyptian architecture was due to the sculptor and the painter. We have already viewed the vast battle scenes carved on the temple wall (Fig. 26). These scenes, like the rest of the temple, were painted in bright colors. Portrait statues of the Pharaoh also were set up before these temples; they were often so large that they rose above the towers of the temple front itself,—the tallest part of the building,—and they could be seen for miles around (Fig. 29). The sculptors cut these colossal figures from a single block, although they were

¹ These things were borrowed by the Christian architects from the Roman basilica, which in turn was derived from Greece, whither it had gone from Egypt.
Fig. 29. Gigantic Portrait Statues of a Pharaoh of the Empire at Thebes (1400 B.C.)

They are seventy feet high; the right-hand figure bears many inscriptions of eminent Greek and Roman visitors (see p. 286). In the cliffs behind is the vast cemetery of Thebes (pp. 49-52)
Four such statues, seventy-five feet high, adorn the front of this temple. They are better preserved than those in Fig. 29, and show us that such vast figures were portraits. The face of Ramses II here closely resembles that of his mummy. Grand view of the Nubian Nile, on which the statues have looked down for thirty-two hundred years (see p. 49). View taken from the top of the crown of one of the statues and never before published. (Photograph by The University of Chicago Expedition)
sometimes eighty or ninety feet high and weighed as much as a thousand tons. This is a burden equivalent to the load drawn by a modern freight train, but it was not cut up into small units of light weight convenient for handling and loading like the train load. Nevertheless the engineers of the Empire moved many such vast figures for hundreds of miles. They generally dragged the statue on a huge sledge to the river, and then transported it in a large boat. It is in works of this massive monumental character that the art of Egypt excelled (Fig. 30).

Two of these enormous portraits of the Pharaoh still stand on the western plain of Thebes (Fig. 29). A splendid temple, now vanished, once rose behind them. In the background we see the majestic cliffs of the western valley wall. Behind these cliffs is a lonely valley (Fig. 31) where the Pharaohs of the Empire were buried in tombs reached by long galleries cut far into the mountain. Some of their bodies have been preserved; and we are able to look into the very faces of these great emperors who lived as much as thirty-four hundred years ago (Fig. 32).

In these cliffs (Fig. 29), which look down upon the Theban plain, are cut hundreds of tomb-chapels belonging to the great
Men of the Empire. Here were buried the able generals who marched with the Pharaoh on his campaigns in Asia and in Nubia. Here lay the gifted artists and architects who furnished a new chapter in the history of art— the men who were in charge of erecting the vast buildings and sculptured monuments (Fig. 30) of Thebes— the men whose genius made it the first great monumental city of the ancient world, so that its ruins are, as we have seen, the marvel of a host of modern visitors. We can enter these chapels and read the names of these men on their walls— and not only their names but long accounts of their lives and the great deeds which they wrought. Here is the story of the general who saved Thutmosc III's life in a great elephant hunt in Asia, by rushing in and cutting off the trunk of an enraged elephant which was pursuing the king.

Here is the tomb of the general who captured the city of Joppa in Palestine by concealing his men in panniers loaded on the backs of donkeys, thus bringing them into the city as merchandise— an adventure which afterward furnished part of the story of "Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves."
The very furniture which these great men used in their houses was put into these tombs. Many beautiful things, like chairs covered with gold and silver and fitted with soft leathern cushions (Fig. 33), beds of sumptuous workmanship, jewel boxes and perfume caskets of the ladies (Fig. 34), or even the gold-covered chariot in which the Theban noble took his afternoon airing, thirty-three or thirty-four hundred years ago, have been found in these tombs and may now be seen in the National Museum at Cairo. This city of Thebes with its majestic temples and monuments and its vast cemetery is thus a great chapter in that vast historical volume of the Nile which we are reading — it is the chapter which tells us the impressive story of the Egyptian Empire.

This cemetery discloses to us also how much further the Egyptian has advanced in his religion since the days of the pyramids of Gizeh. Each of these great men buried in the Theban cemetery looked forward to a judgment in the hereafter — a judgment at which he would be called upon to answer for the

---

**Fig. 33. Armchair from the House of an Egyptian Noble of the Empire**

This chair with other furniture from his house was placed in his tomb at Thebes in the early part of the fourteenth century B.C. There it remained for nearly thirty-three hundred years, till it was discovered in 1905 and removed to the National Museum at Cairo (p. 51)
character of his life on earth and to show whether it had been good or bad. Osiris was the great judge and king in the next world, for he himself had suffered death but had triumphed over it and had risen from the dead (p. 27). Every good man might rise from the dead as Osiris had done; but in the presence of Osiris he would be obliged to see his soul weighed in the balances over against the symbol of truth and justice (Fig. 35). The dead man's friends always put into his coffin a roll of papyrus containing prayers and magic charms which would aid him in the hereafter, and among these was a picture of the judgment. We now call this roll the "Book of the Dead."

It was in these great days of the Empire that some of the leading Egyptians gained the belief in a single god to the exclusion of all others. Such a belief we call monotheism (see p. 108). Ikhnaton, the greatest of their kings, endeavored to make this faith in one god the religion of the Empire, but the opposition of the priests and the people was too strong, and he perished in the attempt.

But these monuments of Thebes do not tell us of the Egyptians alone. We find also in the temple-sculptures and the
tomb-chapel paintings many a scene which shows us the peoples of the northern Mediterranean whom we left in the Late Stone Age. On these Egyptian monuments we find them after they have received metal. With huge metal swords in their hands (Fig. 106) we see them serving as hired soldiers in the Egyptian army. These northerners finally entered Egypt in such numbers that in the twelfth century B.C. the weakened Egyptian Empire fell and never again recovered her old leadership. But the civilization of Egypt did not perish with the fall of the Egyptian Empire. Its culture survived far down into the Christian Age and greatly influenced later history, contributing many things to Europe, as, for example, the ancient calendar of the Nile dwellers (p. 23).

Fig. 35. Judgment Scene from the Book of the Dead

At the left we see entering, in white robes, the deceased, a man named Ani, and his wife. Before them are the balances of judgment for weighing the human heart, to determine whether it is just or not. A jackal-headed god adjusts the scales, while an Ibis-headed god stands behind him, pen in hand, ready to record the verdict of the balances. Behind him is a monster with head of a crocodile, fore quarters of a lion, and hind quarters of a hippopotamus, ready to devour the unjust soul. The small figure of a man at the left of the scales is the god of destiny, and behind him are two goddesses of birth. These three who presided over Ani's arrival in this world now stand by to watch the result of his life, as his heart (symbolized by a tiny jar), in the left scalepan, is weighed over against right and truth (symbolized by a feather) in the right-hand scalepan. The scene is painted in water colors on papyrus. Such a roll is sometimes as much as ninety feet long and filled from beginning to end with magical charms for the use of the dead in the next world. Hence the modern name for the whole roll, the "Book of the Dead."
The voyage up the Nile has told us, age by age, the story of Egypt and disclosed to us early man advancing out of the Late Stone Age to the discovery of metal, and then going on to develop a high civilization of far-reaching power and influence. Our Nile journey has also showed us how we gain knowledge of ancient men and their deeds, through the monuments and records which they have left behind. Such monuments and records have also been discovered along the Euphrates and Tigris rivers in Asia. They show us that, following the Egyptians, the Asiatic peoples rose to the leading position of power in the ancient world, and we must therefore turn in the next chapter to the story of the early Orient in Asia.

**QUESTIONS**

**Section 6.** Where is Egypt? Describe the modern traveler's journey into the country. Whence came the soil of Egypt? What are the shape and character of the country? Give its area. Describe its climate. What is the adjoining country like?

What remains have the Stone Age Egyptians left behind? Describe their life, industries, and government. How did they originate writing? writing materials? Is there any more important achievement of civilization than the invention of writing?

Describe the origin of the calendar and its final form in Egypt. Whence came our calendar? Describe the probable manner of the discovery of copper. What great ages of the career of man do Egyptian remains link together for us? Have we any such link anywhere else? Do the monuments along the Nile continue for us the story of man after the discovery of metal, writing, etc.? Why may we call the Nile valley a historical volume?

**Section 7.** What was the purpose of a pyramid? What do such buildings reveal to us about Egyptian religious beliefs? Give an account of the gods of Egypt. What does the cemetery of Gizeh reveal to us about the early Egyptian's progress in building?

How long before the Gizeh pyramids was he still building royal tombs of sun-baked brick? Draw the line of surviving tomb buildings in which we can follow the Egyptian's progress from sun-baked brick
to stone masonry (Fig. 13). How much time was needed for this progress? In what century did most of it fall?

With what other century may we compare it in such matters? What do such buildings reveal to us about government in the Pyramid Age? Give the date and length of the Pyramid Age. Date and describe the earliest-known seagoing ships.

Discuss foreign commerce in the Pyramid Age. Describe a tomb-chapel in the Pyramid Age. Write an account of the industries and the social life revealed in the tomb-chapels of the Pyramid Age. Describe the art of the Pyramid Age.

SECTION 8. How does the Nile voyage continue the story of the Egyptians? Discuss the Feudal Age. Give its date. Give an account of the feudal barons. Catalogue the contents of a library of this age. What kind of progress was being made?

SECTION 9. Through what ages has the voyage up the Nile carried us? What great age do we find revealed at Thebes, and what is its outstanding character? Give the date and extent of the Egyptian Empire. Who was its greatest conqueror? Describe the great buildings of the Empire. Describe a clerestory, and draw a diagram representing a cross section of one.

Compare it with a cross section of a Christian cathedral (Fig. 182). Describe the painting and sculpture in the Empire temples. Give an account of the cemetery at Thebes. How do the tombs differ from those of the Pyramid Age?

Recount some of the stories of the great men of the Empire which the Theban tomb-chapels tell us. What do they reveal of Egyptian progress in religion? What foreigners do the Theban monuments reveal to us? Did Egyptian civilization continue after the fall of the Empire? Give an example of its later influence.
CHAPTER III

WESTERN ASIA: BABYLONIA, ASSYRIA, AND CHALDEA

Section 10. The Lands and Races of Western Asia

The westernmost reach of Asia is an irregular region roughly included within the circuit of waters marked out by the Caspian and Black seas on the north, by the Mediterranean and the Red seas on the west, and by the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf on the south and east. It is a region consisting chiefly of mountains on the north and desert on the south. The earliest home of men in this great arena of western Asia is a borderland between desert and mountains—a kind of cultivable fringe of the desert—a fertile crescent having the mountains on one side and the desert on the other.

This fertile crescent is approximately a semicircle, with the open side toward the south, having the west end at the southeast corner of the Mediterranean, the center directly north of Arabia, and the east end at the north end of the Persian Gulf (see map, p. 56). It lies like an army facing south, with one wing stretching along the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, the other reaching out to the Persian Gulf, while the center has its
back against the northern mountains. The end of the western wing is Palestine, Assyria makes up a large part of the center, while the end of the eastern wing is Babylonia.

This great semicircle, for lack of a name, may be called the fertile crescent. It may also be likened to the shores of a desert-bay, upon which the mountains behind look down—a bay, not of water but of sandy waste, some five hundred miles across, forming a northern extension of the Arabian desert, and sweeping as far north as the latitude of the northeast corner of the Mediterranean. After the meager winter rains much of the northern desert-bay is clothed with scanty grass, and spring thus turns the region for a short time into grasslands. Much of the history of western Asia may be described as an age-long struggle between the mountain peoples of the north and the desert wanderers of these grasslands—a struggle which is still going on—for the possession of the fertile crescent, the shores of the desert-bay.

Arabia is totally lacking in rivers and enjoys but a few weeks of rain in midwinter; hence it is a desert very little of which is habitable. Its people are and have been from the remotest ages a great white race called Semites, with two of whose tribes we are familiar, the Arabs, and the Hebrews whose descendants dwell among us. They all spoke and still speak dialects of the same tongue, of which Hebrew was one. For ages they have moved up and down the habitable portions of the Arabian world, seeking pasturage for their flocks and herds. Such wandering shepherds are called nomads.

From the earliest times, when the spring grass of the northern wilderness is gone, they have been constantly drifting in from the sandy sea upon the shores of the northern desert-bay. If they can secure a footing there, they slowly make the transition from the wandering life of the desert nomad to the settled life.

1 There is no name, either geographical or political, which includes all of this great semicircle (see map, p. 56). Hence we are obliged to coin a term and call it the "fertile crescent."
of the agricultural peasant. This slow shift at times swells into a great tidal wave of migration, when the wild hordes of the wilderness roll in upon the fertile shores of the desert-bay—a human tide from the desert to the towns which they overwhelm. We can see this process going on for thousands of years. Among such movements we are familiar with the passage of the Hebrews from the desert into Palestine, as described in the

![Fig. 36. The Euphrates at Babylon in Winter](image)

The winter rainfall (p. 61) is so slight that the river shrinks to a very low level and its bed is exposed and dry almost to the middle. In summer the rains and melting snows in the northern mountains swell the river till it overflows its banks and inundates the Babylonian plain. The house on the right is the dwelling of the German Expedition still engaged in excavating Babylon.

Bible; and we shall later learn (Chapter XIV) of the invasions of the Arab hosts of Islam, which even reached Europe. After they had adopted a settled town life the colonies of the Semites stretched far westward through the Mediterranean, especially in northern Africa, even to southern Spain and the Atlantic (see diagram, Fig. 49). But it took many centuries for the long line of their settlements to creep slowly westward until it reached the Atlantic, and we must begin with the Semites in the desert.
The life of the wandering Semites in the desert is very simple. They possess only scanty, movable property, chiefly flocks and herds. They hold no land, they know no law, they are unable to write. They are practically without industries, and thus the desert tribesmen lead a life of untrammeled freedom. Their needs oblige them to traffic now and then in the towns, and through such connections with the townsmen these desert wanderers often become the common carriers of the settled communities, fearlessly leading their caravans across the wastes of the desert sea, especially between Syria-Palestine and Babylon.

The wilderness is the nomad's home. His imagination peoples the far reaches of the desert with invisible and uncanny creatures, who inhabit every rock and tree, hilltop and spring. These creatures are his gods. Each one of these beings controls only a little corner of the great world; he becomes the nomad's tribal god and journeys with him from pasture to pasture, sharing his food and his feasts and receiving as his due from the tribesman the first-born of the flocks and herds. The thoughts of the desert wanderer about such a god are crude and barbarous, and his religious customs are often savage, even leading him to sacrifice his children to appease the angry god. On the other hand, the nomad has a dawning sense of justice and of right, and he feels obligations of kindness to his fellows which he believes are the compelling voice of his god. Such lofty moral vision made the Semites the religious teachers of the civilized world. At the same time these Semites had practical gifts which made them the greatest merchants of the ancient world, as their Hebrew descendants among us still are at the present day.

As early as 3000 B.C. or a little after, they were drifting in from the desert and settling in Palestine, where we find them in possession of walled towns by 2500 B.C. (Fig. 55). These predecessors of the Hebrews in Palestine were a tribe called Canaanites (p. 102); further north settled a powerful tribe known as Amorites (p. 67); while along the shores of north Syria some of these one-time desert wanderers had taken to the sea,
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and had become the Phœnicians (p. 137). By 2000 B.C. all these settled communities of the Semites had developed no mean degree of civilization, drawn for the most part from Egypt and Babylonia.

At the same time we can watch similar movements of the nomads at the eastern end of our fertile crescent (p. 56), along the lower course of the Tigris and Euphrates (Fig. 36). These two rivers rise in the northern mountains (see map, p. 56), whence they issue to cross the fertile crescent and to cut obliquely southeastward through the northern bay of the desert (p. 57). As the rivers approach most closely to each other, about one hundred and sixty or seventy miles from the Persian Gulf,¹ they emerge from the desert and enter a low plain of fertile soil, formerly brought down by the rivers to fill a prehistoric bay like the Delta of the Nile. This plain is Babylonia, the eastern end of the fertile crescent.

¹ This distance applies only to ancient Babylonian and Assyrian days. The rivers have since then filled up the Persian Gulf for one hundred and fifty to one hundred and sixty miles, and the gulf is that much shorter at the present day (see note under scale on map, p. 56).
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Rarely more than forty miles wide, this plain contained probably less than eight thousand square miles of cultivable soil—roughly equal to the state of New Jersey or the territory of Wales. It lies in the Mediterranean belt of rainy winter and dry summer, but the rainfall is so scanty (less than three inches a year) that irrigation of the fields is required in order to ripen the grain. When properly irrigated the plain is prodigiously fertile, and the chief source of wealth in Babylonia was agriculture. This plain was the scene of the most important and long-continued of those frequent struggles between the mountaineer and the nomad, of which we have spoken.

Section 11. The Earliest Babylonians

The mountaineers were not Semitic and show no relationship to the Semitic nomads of the Arabian desert. We are indeed unable to connect the earliest of these mountain peoples with any of the great racial groups known to us. We find them shown on monuments of stone, as having shaven heads and wearing heavy woolen kilts (Fig. 41). While they were still using stone implements, some of these mountaineers, now known as Sumerians, pushed through the passes of the eastern mountains at a very early date. Long before 3000 B.C. they had reclaimed the marshes around the mouths of the two rivers of Babylonia.

Their settlements of low mud-brick huts soon creep northward along the river banks. They learn to control the spring freshets with dikes and to distribute the waters in irrigation trenches. They already possess cattle, sheep, and goats. The ox draws the plow, and the ass pulls wheeled carts and chariots, and the wheel as a burden-bearing device emerges here for the first time. But

1 On the other hand, although they were certainly white races, the mountaineers exhibited no relationship to the Indo-European group of peoples who were already spreading through the country north and east of the Caspian at a very early date. The Indo-European peoples, from whom we ourselves have descended, are discussed in section 16.

2 Probably earlier than the wheel in the Swiss lake-villages of the Late Stone Age (p. 12).
the horse is still unknown. Traffic with the upper river brings in metal from the Nile valley, and the smith learns to fashion utensils of copper. But he has not yet learned to harden the copper into bronze by admixture of tin.

Traffic and government have taught these people to make records, scratched in rude pictures with the tip of a reed on a flat piece of soft clay. Speed in writing simplified these pictures into groups of wedge-shaped marks, once the lines of the picture (Fig. 37). Hence these signs are called cuneiform, meaning "wedge-form," writing (Latin, cuneus, "wedge"). This writing was phonetic, but did not possess alphabetic signs. In order to date events in a given year, each year received a name, after some important event which had happened in it. The year was composed of moon-months, twelve of which fall very far short of making up a solar year. An extra month must be inserted every three years or so. This inconvenient calendar was also employed by later peoples of the Mediterranean, until it was replaced by that of Egypt (pp. 23 and 268), which we now use.\(^1\)

In the midst of their most sacred town we see rising a tall pyramidal mount of brick (compare Fig. 43) which serves as the

---

\(^1\) The moon-month calendar is still in use among the oriental Jews and Mohammedans.
dwellings of Enlil, their great god of the air. It is an artificial mountain, built in memory of an ancient temple on a hilltop in their former mountain home. It was such a temple-tower in Babylon which later gave rise to the story of the "Tower of Babel" among the Hebrews. Such "nature gods" as Enlil form the center of their life; the temple in each community is the center of the town, around which the sun-baked brick houses (Fig. 38) of the townsmen spread out for a few hundred feet. These houses, of which only the foundations now remain, tell us little of the life which once moved in these streets, and the meager story is not enlivened by beautiful scenes on the walls of tomb-chapels, such as we find in Egypt.

**Fig. 39. A Sumerian Line of Battle**

The troops of a Sumerian city-king, marching into battle, about 2900 B.C. The king himself, whose face is broken off from the stone, marches at the right, heading his troops, who follow in a close phalanx, with spears set for the charge. Tall shields cover their entire bodies, and they wear close-fitting helmets, probably of leather. They are marching over dead bodies (symbolical of the overthrow of the enemy). The scene is carved in stone. It is a good example of the rude Sumerian sculpture in Babylonia in the days of the Great Pyramid in Egypt (contrast with Figs. 23 and 40)
Hence we cannot visit the country and make its monuments tell us its story as we have done in Egypt. The Sumerians built no such tombs, nor had they any belief in a blessed hereafter. Their business documents, written on clay tablets, reveal to us a class of free, landholding citizens, working their lands with slaves, who form a large part of the population, and trading with caravans and small boats up and down the river.

Over both these classes, free and slave, there is a numerous body of officials and priests—the aristocrats of the town. They are ruled, along with all the rest, by a priest-king. Such a community, forming a town or city kingdom and owning the lands for a few miles round about the town, is the political unit, or state. Babylonia as a whole consisted of a number of such small city-kingdoms, and this earliest Sumerian period may be called the Age of the City-States. These early city-states were more skilled in war (Fig. 39) than the Egyptians and were constantly fighting each with its neighbors. Such struggles among themselves seriously weakened the Sumerians and made them less able to resist the incoming men of the desert.

The tribesmen from the desert had early begun to filter into the Euphrates valley. They were finally settled in such numbers along the narrow strip of land where the two rivers approach each other most closely that they took possession of northern Babylonia. By the middle of the twenty-eighth century B.C. they had established a kingdom there known as Akkad. These Akkadians, under a bold and able leader named Sargon, descended the Euphrates and overthrew the Sumerians far and wide. Thus arose the first Semitic kingdom of importance in history, and Sargon I, its founder, is the first great name in the history of the Semitic race.

These one-time wanderers of the desert learned to write the Sumerian wedge-writing, and it was now that a Semitic language was written for the first time. Sargon and his people gained Sumerian civilization. Their own vigorous life, fresh as the breath of the desert, also contributed much, especially in art (Fig. 40),
Fig. 40. A King of Akkad storming a Fortress — the Earliest Great Semitic Work of Art (about 2700 B.C.)

King Naram-Sin of Akkad (son of Sargon I, p. 64) has pursued the enemy into a mountain stronghold. His heroic figure towers above his pygmy enemies, each one of whom has fixed his eyes on the conqueror, awaiting his signal of mercy. The sculptor, with fine insight, has depicted the dramatic instant when the king lowers his weapon as the sign that he grants the conquered their lives. Compare the superiority of this Semitic sculpture of Akkad over the Sumerian art of two centuries earlier (Fig. 39).
in which they far surpassed their Sumerian teachers. Thus the
life and qualities of the desert Semite and those of the non-
Semitic mountaineer now mingle on the Babylonian plain, as
Norman and English later mingled in Merry England. On the
streets and in the market places of the Euphrates towns, where

![Fig. 41. A Semitic Noble and His Sumerian Secretary](image)

The third figure (wearing a cap) is that of the noble, Ubil-Ishtar, who
is brother of the king. He is a Semite, as his beard shows. Three of his
four attendants are also Semites, with beards and long hair; but one of
them (just behind the noble) is beardless and shaven-headed. He is the
noble's secretary, for being a Sumerian he is skilled in writing. His
name "Kalki" we learn from the inscription in the corner, which reads,
"Ubil-Ishtar, brother of the king; Kalki, the scribe, thy servant." This
inscription is in the Semitic (Akkadian) tongue of the time and illus-
trates how the Semites have learned the Sumerian signs for writing.
The scene is engraved on Kalki's personal seal, of which the above is a
drawing. It is a fine example of the Babylonian art of seal-cutting in
hard stone. The original is in the British Museum

once the bare feet, clean-shaven heads, and beardless faces of
the Sumerian townsmen were the only ones to be seen, there is
now a plentiful sprinkling of sandaled feet, of dark beards, and
of heavy black locks hanging down over the shoulders of the
swarthy Semites of Akkad (Fig. 41).
SECTION 12. THE AGE OF Hammurapi AND AFTER

Centuries of struggle between the Sumerians and Semites ensue. A tribe of Amorites from the west (p. 59) gains control of the little town of Babylon. Hammurapi, one of their kings, fights for thirty years and conquers all Babylonia (about 2100 B.C). Again the desert wins, as this second great Semitic ruler, Hammurapi, raises Babylon, thus far a small and unimportant town, to be the leading place in the plain which we may now more properly call "Babylonia."

Hammurapi survived his triumph twelve years. It is not a little interesting to watch this great man, still betraying in his shaven upper lip (a desert custom) the evidence of his desert ancestry, as he puts forth his powerful hand upon the teeming life of Babylonia, and with a touch brings in order and system where before all had been confusion. He collects all the older laws and customs of business, legal, and social life and issues these in a great legal code. Engraved upon a splendid shaft of diorite, these laws have survived to our day, the oldest-preserved code of ancient law (Fig. 42). On the whole it is a surprisingly just code and shows much consideration for the poor and defenseless classes.

Thus regulated, Babylonia prospers as never before, and her merchants penetrate far and wide into the surrounding countries. The clay-tablet invoices in Babylonian writing which accompany their heavily loaded caravans have to be read by many a merchant in the towns of Syria and behind the northern mountains. Thus the wedge-writing of Babylonia gradually makes its way through western Asia. There is as yet no coined money, but lumps of silver of a given weight circulate so commonly (p. 98) that values are given in weight of silver. Thus a man may say an ox is worth so many ounces of silver, only he would use "shekels" (the name of a weight) in place of ounces. Loans are common, and the rate of interest is twenty per cent. Babylonian civilization is above all things mercantile. Merchandising is the chief occupation and even invades the temples.
The temples are trading centers, owning vast properties, carrying on banking, and controlling much of the business of the people. Nevertheless there are some indications of higher desires. The ritual of the temples contains a small group of prayers which indicate a deep sense of sin; but the chief teachings of religion show a man how to obtain prosperity from the gods and how to avoid their displeasure. Among such teachings are methods of foretelling the future by reading the stars. This art, now called “astrology,” formed the beginnings of astronomy (p. 83).

A journey through Babylonia to-day could not tell us such a

* A shaft of stone (diorite) nearly eight feet high, on which the laws are engraved, extending entirely around the shaft and occupying over twenty-six hundred lines. Above is a fine relief showing King Hammurapi standing at the left, receiving the laws from the Sun-god seated at the right. Hammurapi’s shaven upper lip proclaiming him a man of the Syrian desert (p. 67) is here in the shadow and cannot be seen. The flames rising from the god’s shoulders indicate who he is. The flames on the left shoulder are commonly shown in the current textbooks as part of a staff in the god’s left hand. This is an error. This scene is an impressive work of Semitic art, six hundred years later than Fig. 40.
story as we read among the monuments on our voyage up the Nile. To-day the Babylon of Hammurapi has perished utterly. The meager remains of his age do not reveal a bright and sunny outlook upon life, which felt deeply the beauty of the world and clothed with that beauty all the surroundings of house, furniture, and garden (Fig. 38). There is no painting; the sculpture of the Semites is in one instance (Fig. 40) powerful and dramatic, but portraiture is scarcely able to distinguish one individual from another. Of architecture little remains. There were no colonnades and no columns, though brick supports were employed. The chief architectural creation is the temple tower (as in Fig. 43), but of the temples no example has survived. The beautiful art of gem-cutting, as we find it in their seals, was the greatest art of the Babylonians (Fig. 41).

We may summarize the history of Babylonia as a thousand years of developing civilization and of struggle, during which Sumerian and Semite each rose and fell twice—a thousand years reaching its highest point and its end in the reign of Hammurapi. Thenceforth the barbarians from the mountains poured into the Babylonian plain. They brought with them the horse, which now appears for the first time in Babylonia. They divided and then destroyed the kingdom of Hammurapi. After him there followed more than a thousand years of complete stagnation. Henceforth Babylonia plays but a minor part in the history of the East, until in the seventh century B.C. a new line of desert nomads, the Chaldeans (see p. 80), established that Empire made famous by the name of Nebuchadnezzar and the Babylonian captivity of the Hebrews. The influence of the venerable Babylonian civilization lived on, especially in writing, religion, and literature. The old Sumerian tongue—thehough no longer spoken—was employed in religious documents as a sacred language, which only the priests understood, as Latin has survived in the ritual of the Roman Catholic Church.

1 It was a few centuries later that the horse entered Egypt, as we have seen (p. 45). We shall soon learn (p. 90) whence these Babylonian horses came.
Section 13. Early Assyria and her Rivals

The history of our great fertile crescent (see p. 58) did not end, however, with this decline of Babylonia. We find its story continuing among other settlements of the desert nomads extending all along the shores of the northern desert-bay. In the northeast corner of the desert-bay, in the days when Sargon I and his line were ruling in Babylonia, a Hittite chief (Fig. 60) from the mountains of Asia Minor had built his castle. It was really a mountain outpost within the desert-bay, whose rolling hills enveloped it on all sides. Seeking the northern pastures, a tribe of desert nomads who called themselves Assur (whence Assyria) seized this stronghold and its outlying villages. Thus arose the little kingdom of Assur, like a dozen others along this desert margin. It was nearer the middle of the great crescent than Babylonia and held a position better suited to rule the shores of the desert-bay.

In climate more invigorating than the hot Babylonian plain, Assur had many fertile valleys and an agricultural population. The Assyrians early learned cuneiform writing (p. 62), and their language was the same as that of Semitic Babylonia, with slight differences in dialect. In the days when Hammurapi's ancestors had seized Babylon (2225 B.C.) (p. 67), Assur was already strong enough to dispute the boundary line with them. Constantly obliged to defend their uncertain frontiers and settlements, both against their kindred of the desert and against the mountaineers, the Assyrians were toughened by the strain of unceasing war. By 1100 B.C. their peasant militia had beaten the western kings in Syria and looked down upon the Mediterranean, where the Egyptian Empire had collapsed two generations before (p. 53). Thrown back at this time, they reached it again in the ninth century B.C., and likewise made their power felt through a wide region of the northern mountains, around which they passed in a march of a thousand miles. At the same time the Assyrian kings more than once occupied and ruled Babylonia.
Meanwhile a new wave of Semitic nomads had rolled in from the desert-bay and by 1400 B.C. occupied its western shores; that is, Palestine and Syria. These were the Hebrews in Palestine, and somewhat later the Arameans, who founded a powerful kingdom at Damascus. The expansion of Assyria was stopped in the west by the Aramean kings of Damascus, who were wealthy commercial rulers. Indeed, these Arameans persistently pushed their caravans and settlements all along the shores of the desert-bay, and after the decline of Babylonia they held the commerce of western Asia. They received alphabetic writing from the Phoenicians, the earliest system of writing known which employed only alphabetic signs (p. 139). The Aramaic language of this merchant people of Damascus finally displaced that of the Hebrews, and Aramaic became the tongue spoken by Jesus and the other Hebrews of his time in Palestine. It is called Aramaic because it was spoken by the Arameans, and it is a Semitic dialect differing but little from its sister tongue, Hebrew.

Section 14. The Assyrian Empire (about 750 to 606 B.C.)

By the middle of the eighth century B.C., however, Assyria resumed her plans of westward expansion. We can follow her irresistible western campaigns not only in the clay-tablet records of her kings but also in the warnings and appeals of the Hebrew prophets, as they talked to their people. But they were unable to prevent the advance of the Assyrians as they beheld Damascus, the only defense between them and the armies of Assyria, slowly giving way. In the midst of these great western campaigns of Assyria one of the leading Assyrian generals usurped the throne (722 B.C.) while he was besieging the unhappy Hebrew city of Samaria (p. 106). He was a very skillful soldier, and as king he took the name of Sargon, the first great Semite of Babylonia, who had reigned two thousand years earlier (p. 64). The new
Sargon (Fig. 43) and his line raised Assyria to the height of her grandeur and power as a military empire. Damascus at last fell, and the two little Hebrew kingdoms of Israel and Judah were then helpless before their terrible assailant (p. 106). At the same time the prosperous Phœnician cities of the coast were all humiliated and made subject kingdoms.

Far up into Asia Minor the name of Sargon's son Sennacherib was known and feared, as he plundered Tarsus and the easternmost Ionian Greek strongholds (p. 146) just after 700 B.C. A crushing burden of tribute was laid on all subject states, and hence Egypt, fearing Assyrian invasion, was constantly able to stir revolt among the oppressed western peoples. Perceiving that Egypt's interference must be stopped, Sennacherib's son was knocking at the gates of the eastern Delta defenses by 674 B.C. Repulsed at first, he returned to the attack, and Egypt at last fell a prey to the Assyrian armies.

By the middle of the seventh century B.C. the Assyrian Empire included all of the fertile crescent (p. 58). It thus extended entirely around the great desert-bay, including also the mountain country far behind. It also held the lower Nile valley in the west, though this last was too distant and detached to be kept long. Built up by a century of irresistible and far-reaching military campaigns, the Assyrian conquests formed the most extensive empire the world had yet seen.

Along the Tigris the vast palaces (Fig. 43) and imposing temple towers of the Assyrian emperors arose, reign after reign. Sennacherib devoted himself to the city of Nineveh, just north of Assur, and it became the far-famed capital of Assyria. The lofty and massive walls of the city which he built stretched two miles and a half along the banks of the Tigris. Here in his gorgeous palace he ruled the western Asiatic world

---

1 The dynasty of Sargon II is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sargon II</td>
<td>722–705 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sennacherib</td>
<td>705–681 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esarhaddon</td>
<td>681–668 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurbanipal (called Sardanapalus by the Greeks)</td>
<td>668–626 B.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with an iron hand, and collected tribute from all the subject peoples. The whole administration centered in the king’s business office, where he received the letters and reports of some

![Fig. 43. Restoration of the Palace of Sargon II of Assyria (722–705 B.C.)](image)

The palace stands partly inside and partly outside of the city wall on a vast elevated platform of brick masonry, to which inclined roadways and stairways rise from the inside of the city wall. The king could thus drive up in his chariot from the streets of the city below to the palace pavement above. The rooms and halls are clustered about a number of courts open to the sky. The main entrance (with stairs before it leading down to the city) is adorned with massive towers and arched doorways built of richly colored glazed brick, and embellished with huge human-headed bulls carved of alabaster (see cut, p. 85, also Figs. 44 and 45). The pyramidal tower behind the great court was inherited from Babylonia (p. 63). It is a sacred dwelling place of the god, and his temple (with two others) stands just at the foot of the tower on the left.

sixty governors, besides many subject kings who were sometimes allowed to rule under Assyrian control. The Emperor lived in dazzling splendor, surrounded by an imposing array of courtiers and officials who were his assistants in the work of administration.
Fig. 44. Assyrian Soldiers pursuing the Fleeing Enemy across a Stream

The stream occupies the right half of the scene. As drawn by the Assyrian artist, it may be recognized by the fish and the curling waves; also by the bows and quivers full of arrows floating downstream, along with the bodies of two dead horses, one on his back with feet up. Two dead men, with arrows sticking in their bodies, are drifting in midstream. Three of the living leap from the bank as their pursuers stab them with spears or shoot them with drawn bow. The Assyrian spearmen carry tall shields, but the archer needs both hands for his bow and carries no shield. The dead are strewn along the shore, occupying the left half of the scene. At the top the vultures are plucking out their eyes; in the middle an Assyrian is cutting off a head; beside him another plants his foot on a dead man's head and plunders him of his weapons. The vegetation along the river is shown among the bodies. As art, compare this sculpture with Semitic relief two thousand years older (Fig. 40 and see p. 77)
Amid this outward magnificence we discern the army as the center of the Emperor's power, and indeed of the state itself. The state is a vast military machine, more terrible than any such agency mankind had ever yet seen (Fig. 44). An important new fact aided in bringing about this result. The Assyrian forces were the first large armies to bear weapons of iron, replacing the older armament of bronze, as borne for example by the armies of the Egyptian Empire (p. 53). A single arsenal room of Sargon's palace contained two hundred tons of iron implements when uncovered by modern excavators. The bulk of the army was composed of archers, supported by heavy-armed spearmen and shield bearers (Fig. 44), and the famous horsemen and chariots of Nineveh (Fig. 45 and headpiece, p. 56).

Besides their iron weapons the Assyrian soldiers possessed a certain inborn ferocity which held all western Asia in abject terror before the thundering squadrons of the Ninevite. The reigns of the Assyrian emperors were each one long war on all frontiers. Wherever their terrible armies swept through the land, they left a trail of ruin and desolation behind. Around smoking heaps which had once been towns, stretched lines of tall stakes on which were stuck the bodies of revolting rulers flayed alive; while all around rose mounds and piles of the slaughtered, heaped up to celebrate the great king's power and serve as a warning to all revolters. Through clouds of dust arising along all the main roads of the Empire the men of the subject kingdoms behold great herds of cattle, horses, and asses, flocks of goats and sheep, and long lines of camels loaded with gold and silver, the wealth of the conquered, converging upon the palace at Nineveh. Before them march the chief men of the plundered kingdoms, with the bloody and severed heads of their former princes tied about their necks. Thus a vast and relentless system organized for plunder was absorbing the wealth of the East.

While this plundered wealth was necessary for the support of the army it also served high purposes. We behold magnificent

---

1 See Nahum iii, 2–3.
palace fêtes and banquets at which all the nobles and officers of the court are present, to celebrate the completion of some huge royal castle; or we see the Emperor amid music and sacrifice receiving the good wishes of his lords as he returns from a successful lion hunt (Fig. 45). The Assyrian palaces are now imposing buildings (Fig. 43), suggesting in architecture

![Fig. 45. An Assyrian King hunting Lions](image)

The king stands in the chariot, and while his driver urges the horses (notice loose reins and whip) at full gallop, he draws his bow to the arrowhead and discharges arrows full into the face of an enraged lion just leaping into the chariot. Three foot soldiers follow behind, and another lion with body full of arrows sinks down to die. A fine example of the Assyrian sculptor's skill in drawing animals. Such scenes as this and Fig. 44 (also cut, p. 85) were carved on large slabs of stone (alabaster) and in long bands they stretched along the base of the walls of halls and corridors of an Assyrian palace (Fig. 43) for hundreds of feet. They display both the art of Assyria and the terrible ferocity of her soldiers (Fig. 44 and p. 77)

something of the far-reaching power of their builder. His architects appreciate the beauty of the arch, and we must number among great works of architecture the impressive arches of the palace entrance, faced with glazed brick in gorgeous colors (cut, p. 86). On either side are vast human-headed bulls wrought in alabaster, and above the whole tower lofty castellated walls of baked brick, visible far across the royal city.

1 One of these gigantic sculptures may be seen at the end of Chapter III (p. 85).
Within, as a dado along the lower portion of the walls of corridors and halls, are hundreds of yards of reliefs cut in alabaster, displaying the brave deeds of the Emperor in campaign and hunting field (Figs. 44, 45). The human figures are monotonously alike, hard and cold, but those of wild beasts are sometimes splendid in the abandon of animal ferocity which they display. The tiger was in the blood of the Assyrian and it here comes out in the work of his chisel. There was no art of portraiture in statue form as in Egypt.

To be sure, these great works were largely executed by foreign labor, for the emperors were obliged to depend not a little on foreign skill both in art and industries. With one exception all the patterns of their decorative art came from Egypt, and the finer work of their palace adornment and their furniture in ebony and ivory clearly betray Egyptian origin. The art of glazing the colored brick for the palace front, and all work in glass likewise, had been borrowed from Egypt (Fig. 48). Sennacherib frankly confesses that his craftsmen were very unskilled in making large bronze casts needed for his palace in Nineveh, and boasts that he himself personally overcame the difficulties. It is in this ability to use foreign resources that we must recognize one of the greatest traits of the Assyrian emperors. Thus Sennacherib tells us that he had in his palace “a portal made after the model of a Hittite palace.”

In the great gardens which he laid out along the river above and below Nineveh he planted unknown trees and strange plants from all quarters of his great empire. Among them were cotton trees, ² of which he says, “The trees that bore wool they clipped and they carded it for garments.” In this enterprise of an Assyrian king we thus see appearing for the first time in civilization the cotton which now furnishes so large a part of our own national wealth. Nor was such insight as the king showed

¹ A further example of such relief sculpture of the Assyrians shows us Assyrian horsemen hunting. See the headpiece of Chapter III (p. 56).
² This cotton tree was doubtless related to the lower-growing cotton plant of our Southern states.
in this matter wholly devoted to mere wealth, for higher interests were also cultivated and literature flourished.

Modern excavation has uncovered the buildings of Ashurbanipal, Sennacherib’s grandson at Nineveh, and here was found a great library of clay tablets. In this library the religious, scientific, and literary documents of past ages had been systematically collected by the Emperor’s orders. His agents passed around among the ancient cities with authorization to take all the old writings they could find. These thousands on thousands of clay tablets arrayed on shelves formed the earliest library known in Asia, and represented an idea quite in advance of Babylonian civilization described above. The usual impression that Assyrian civilization was but an echo of Babylonian culture is very misleading. The Assyrians were far more advanced in these matters than the Babylonians.

Like many another later ruler, however, the Assyrian emperors made a profound mistake in policy. They destroyed the industrial and wealth-producing population, first within their own territory and then throughout the subject kingdoms.¹ In spite of interest in introducing a new textile like cotton, the Emperor did not or could not build up industries or commerce like those of Babylonia. The people were chiefly agricultural, and in the old days it had sufficed to call out levies of peasant militia to defend the frontiers. With the expansion of the Empire, however, such temporary bodies of troops were insufficient, and the peasants were permanently called away from the fields to fill the ranks of an ever-growing standing army. We discern disused canals and idle fields as we read of Sargon’s efforts to restore the old farming communities. But even so the vast expansion of the Empire exceeds the power of the standing army to

¹The fact that industries, agriculture, commerce, and wealth are historical forces of the first rank was first discerned by historians in the nineteenth century. The importance of these things in the career of a nation, however, was understood by some rulers as far back as the Egyptian Empire. It is therefore the more remarkable that historians should have been so long in discovering the power of such forces.
defend it. As reports of new revolts come in the harassed ruler at Nineveh commands the enforced service of militia from among the subjects of the foreign vassal kingdoms. To a larger and larger degree the imperial army thus becomes a medley of foreigners. With an army made up of foreigners to a dangerous extent, with no industries, with fields lying idle, and with the commerce of the country in the hands of the Aramean traders (p. 71), the Assyrian state fast loses its inner strength.

In addition to such weakness within, there were the most threatening dangers from without. These came, as of old, from both sides of the fertile crescent. Drifting in from the desert, as we have seen, the Aramean hordes were constantly absorbing the territory of the Empire. Sennacherib in one campaign took over two hundred thousand captives out of Babylonia, mostly Arameans. At the same time another desert tribe called the "Kaldi," whom we know as the Chaldeans, had been for centuries creeping slowly around the head of the Persian Gulf and settling along its shores at the foot of the eastern mountains.

On the other hand, in the northern mountains the advancing hordes of Indo-European peoples are in full view (see pp. 86 ff.). Their eastern wing, which has moved down the east side of the Caspian, fills the northeastern mountains, especially south of the Caspian; its leaders are the tribes of the Medes and Persians (see p. 92). These movements shake the Assyrian state to its foundations. The Chaldeans master Babylonia, and when in combination with the Median hosts from the northeastern mountains they assault the walls of Nineveh, the mighty city falls. In the voice of the Hebrew prophet Nahum we hear an echo of the exulting shout which resounds from the Caspian to the Nile as the nations discover that the terrible scourge of the East has at last been laid low. Its fall was forever, and when two centuries later Xenophon and his ten thousand Greeks marched past the place (p. 211) the Assyrian nation was but a vague tradition, and Nineveh, its great city, was a vast heap of rubbish as it is to-day.

1 Especially ii, 8-13, and iii entire.
Section 15. The Chaldean Empire: the Last Semitic Empire

With the fall of Nineveh (606 B.C.) we enter upon the third and final period of Semite power in western Asia— a power which had begun over two thousand years earlier under Sargon of Akkad. The Kaldi, or Chaldeans, the new group of desert wanderers, now held possession of Babylonia. They made Babylon their capital and gave their name to the land, so that we now know it as “Chaldea” (from Kaldi). The whole mountain region of the north and on the east of the Tigris was at the same time in possession of the Medes (p. 93). The Chaldeans were therefore obliged to divide the Assyrian Empire with the Medes, and the Chaldean share was the south and west. But in order to hold their western possessions the Chaldeans were obliged to fight Egypt. The Chaldean crown prince Nebuchadnezzar beat off Egypt, and thus Assyria was followed by Chaldean Babylon as lord of Syria and Palestine (605 B.C.).

At Babylon Nebuchadnezzar now began a reign of over forty years — a reign of such power and magnificence, especially as reflected to us in the Bible, that he has become one of the great figures of oriental history. Exasperated by the obstinate revolts prompted by Egypt in the west, Nebuchadnezzar punished the western nations, especially the little Hebrew kingdom of Judah. He finally carried away many Hebrews as captives to Babylonia and destroyed Jerusalem, their capital (586 B.C.), having previously defeated the Egyptian army of relief, on which the Hebrews had depended.

1 The three great ages of Semite power in western Asia are:
1. Early Babylonia (Sargon I about 2750 B.C., Hammurapi about 2100 B.C.; there was an interval of Sumerian power between these two great Semitic kings).
2. The Assyrian Empire (about 750 to 606 B.C.).
3. The Chaldean Empire (about 606 to 539 B.C.).

We might add a fourth period of Semite supremacy, the triumph of Islam in the seventh century A.D., after the death of Mohammed (sections 58-59).

2 The monuments show that the real spelling of this name was “Nebuchadnezzar,” but to avoid confusion the old Biblical spelling has been retained.
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In spite of long and serious wars the great king found time and wealth to devote to the enlargement and beautification of Babylon. Profiting by the example of the imperial architecture which had once adorned Nineveh (p. 76), Nebuchadnezzar was able to surpass his Assyrian predecessors in the splendor of the great buildings which he now erected. In the large temple quarter in the south of the city he rebuilt the temples of the long-revered Babylonian divinities (Fig. 46). Leading from these to the palace he laid out a festival avenue which passed through an imposing gateway called the “Gate of Ishtar” (Fig. 47), for it was dedicated to this goddess. Behind it lay the vast imperial palace and the offices of government, while high over all towered the temple-mount which rose by the Marduk temple as a veritable “Tower of Babel” (see p. 63). Masses of rich tropical verdure, rising in terrace upon terrace, forming a lofty garden,

1 A’lion of brilliant blue-glazed brick, discovered by the Germans in the Festival Street of Nebuchadnezzar at Babylon, will be found at the head of Chapter IV (p. 86).
crowned the roof of the imperial palace and, overlooking the Ishtar Gate, enhanced the brightness of its colors. Here in the cool shade of palms and ferns, inviting to voluptuous ease, the great king might enjoy an idle hour with the ladies of his court and look down upon the splendors of his city. These roof gardens of Nebuchadnezzar’s palace are the mysterious “Hanging Gardens” of Babylon, whose fame spread far into the west until they were numbered by the Greeks among the Seven Wonders of the World.

It is this Babylon of Nebuchadnezzar whose marvels over a century later so impressed Herodotus (p. 188), as is shown in the description of it which he has left us. This, too, is the Babylon which has become familiar to all Christian peoples as the great city of the Hebrew captivity (p. 107). Of all the glories which made it world renowned in its time, little now remains. The excavations of the Germans, who have been uncovering the city since 1899, are slowly revealing one building after
another, the scanty wreckage of the ages. To them we owe the recovery of the Festival Street and the Ishtar Gate (Fig. 47), but the Ish:ar Gate is practically the only building in all Babylonia of which any impressive remains survive. Elsewhere the broken fragments of dingy sun-baked brick walls suggest little of the brilliant life which once ebbed and flowed through these streets and public places.

The Chaldeans seem to have absorbed the civilization of Babylonia in much the same way as other earlier Semitic invaders of this ancient plain. Commerce and business flourished, the arts and industries were highly developed, religion and literature were cultivated and their records were put into wedge-writing on clay tablets as of old. Science made notable progress in one important branch—astronomy. Still with the practical purpose of reading the future rather than of furthering science, the Babylonians continued the ancient art of discovering the future in

---

**Fig. 48. Glass of the Sixth Century B.C. Found in Chaldean Babylon**

The art of glazing and glassmaking, so extensively used in adorning Assyrian and Chaldean buildings, was not native to Asia, but arose far earlier on the Nile (see p. 36, and cut, p. 16). Thus, for example, the glass bottle shown here is of a shape and pattern borrowed by the Babylonians from Egypt. At this time exactly the same pattern of bottle was being used also in north Italy, which likewise received it from Egypt.
the heavenly bodies (see p. 68). The art was now very systematically pursued and was really becoming astronomy. The equator was divided into 360 degrees, and for the first time they laid out and mapped the twelve groups of stars which we call the "Twelve Signs of the Zodiac." Thus for the first time the sky and its worlds were mapped out into a system.

The five planets then known (Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn) were especially regarded as the powers controlling the fortunes of men, and as such the five leading Babylonian divinities were identified with these five heavenly bodies. It is the names of these Babylonian divinities which, in Roman translation, have descended to us as the names of these five planets. So the planet of Ishtar, the goddess of love, became Venus, while that of the great god Marduk became Jupiter, and so on. The celestial observations made by these Chaldean "astrologers," as we call them, slowly became sufficiently accurate, so that when inherited by the Greeks they formed the basis of the science of astronomy, which the Greeks carried so much further (p. 162). The practice of "astrology" has survived to our own day; we still unconsciously recall it in such phrases as "his lucky star" or an "ill-starred undertaking."

This Chaldean age is in many respects an effort to restore the civilization of the earlier Babylonia of Hammurapi's day (pp. 67-69). The scribes now love to employ an ancient style of writing and out-of-date forms of speech; the kings tunnel deep under the temple foundations and search for years that they may find the old foundation records buried (like our corner-stone documents) by kings of ancient days. Likewise in Egypt and among the Hebrews, as well as in Babylonia, the men of the East are deeply conscious of the distant past through which their ancestors have come down through the ages. The oriental world is growing old, and men are looking back upon her far-away youth with wistful endeavors to restore it to the earth again. Indeed, the leadership of the Semitic peoples in the early world is drawing near its close, and they are about to give way before the advance of the Indo-European race, to which we must now turn.
QUESTIONS

SECTION 10. Give the water boundaries of westernmost Asia. Where do desert and mountains chiefly lie? What lies between them? Summarize the history of the fertile crescent. Make a sketch map showing its situation. What land occupied its east end? its west end?

What is a “nomad”? Mention some Semitic peoples. Whither does the wandering desert tribe often shift? Do you recall any Semites who have so shifted? Describe the nomads’ life; their religion. Describe the Babylonian plain, giving size, climate, and products.

SECTION 11. Describe Sumerian civilization and invasion of the Babylonian plain. What do we call the earliest age of Sumerian history?

Who were the earliest Semites in Babylonia? Give an account of their first great leader. How did these Semites gain their earliest civilization, for example, writing? Did Sumerian and Semite mingle?

SECTION 12. Who was Hammurapi? Give an account of his laws. Describe Babylonian commerce in his age. How can we summarize Babylonian history?

SECTION 13. Locate Assyria on the fertile crescent. Whence did its people receive their civilization? What stopped early Assyrian expansion westward? Who were the Arameans? Where was their capital?

SECTION 14. What did the Assyrian Empire at its largest chiefly include? Describe the Assyrian state; the army. Give some account of Assyrian civilization. Outline the causes of the fall of Assyria.

SECTION 15. Who were the Chaldeans? Who were the Medes? How did they divide the East between them? Describe Chaldean Babylon; its chief buildings. Discuss Chaldean astronomy.
CHAPTER IV

WESTERN ASIA: THE MEDO-PERSIAN EMPIRE, THE HEBREWS

SECTION 16. THE INDO-EUROPEAN PEOPLES AND THEIR DISPERSION

We have seen that the Arabian desert has been a great reservoir of unsettled population, which was continually leaving the grasslands on the margin of the desert and shifting over into the towns to begin a settled life (pp. 57 f.). Corresponding to these grasslands of the south, there are similar grasslands in the north (Fig. 49), behind the mountains of western Asia and southern Europe (see map, p. 80). These northern grasslands stretch from central Europe, behind the Balkans, eastward along the north side of the Black Sea through southern Russia and far into Asia north and east of the Caspian. They have always had a wandering shepherd population, and time after time, for

---

1 Section 16 deals with a series of racial movements which anticipate a large part of ancient history. They are at first not easy for a young student to visualize. They should therefore be carefully worked over by the teacher with the class before the class is permitted to study this section alone. The diagram (Fig. 49) should be put on the blackboard and explained in detail by the teacher, and the class should then be prepared to put the diagram on the board from memory. This should be done again when the study of the Greeks is begun (p. 123), and a third time when Italy and the Romans are taken up.
thousands of years, these northern nomads have poured forth over Europe and western Asia, just as the desert Semites of the south have done over the fertile crescent (pp. 59 ff.).

These nomads of the north were from the earliest times a The two great white race, which we call *Indo-European*. We can perhaps best explain this term by saying that the present peoples of Europe are almost all Indo-European, and as most of us are of the same stock their ancestors were also ours, as we shall see. These nomads of the *northern* grasslands, our ancestors, began to migrate in very ancient times, moving out along diverging routes. They at last extended in an imposing line from the frontiers of India on the east, westward across all Europe to the Atlantic, as they do to-day (Fig. 49). This great northern line was confronted on the south by a similar line of Semitic peoples, extending from Babylonia on the east, through Phoenicia and the Hebrews westward to Carthage and similar Semitic settlements of Phoenicia in the western Mediterranean.

The history of the ancient world, as we are now to follow it, is largely made up of the struggle between this *southern Semitic* line which issued from the southern grasslands, and the *northern Indo-European* line which came forth from the northern grasslands to confront the older civilizations represented in the southern line. Thus as we look at the diagram (Fig. 49) we see the two great races facing each other across the Mediterranean like two vast armies stretching from western Asia westward to the Atlantic. The later wars between Rome and Carthage (pp. 258 ff.) represent some of the operations on the Semitic left wing; while the triumph of Persia over Chaldea (p. 97) is a similar outcome on the Semitic right wing.

The result of the imposing struggle was the complete triumph of our ancestors, the Indo-European line, which conquered along the center and both wings and gained unchallenged supremacy throughout the Mediterranean world under the Greeks and Romans (pp. 123 ff.). This triumph was accompanied by a long struggle for the mastery between the members of the northern
line themselves, as first the Persians, then the Greeks, and finally the Romans, gained control of the Mediterranean and oriental world. The great civilized peoples of Europe at the present day are, as we have said, the offspring of the victorious Indo-European line. These Indo-European peoples are also the forefathers of the American colonists, who with later immigrants now make up the people of the United States.¹

Let us now turn back to a time before the Indo-European people had left their grasslands and see if we can find their original home. Modern study has not yet determined with certainty the exact region where the parent people of the Indo-European nomads had their home. The indications now are that this original home was on the great grassy steppe in the region east and northeast of the Caspian Sea.² Here, then, probably lived the parent people of all the later Indo-European race. At the time when they were still one people, they were speaking one and the same tongue. From this tongue have descended all the languages later spoken by the civilized peoples of modern Europe, including, of course, our own English, as we shall see.

The parent people were still in the Stone Age for the most part, though copper was beginning to come in, and the time

¹ Although our Indo-European ancestors gained full control of the Mediterranean world, we shall find that the final result was nevertheless a mixed civilization, containing many things of Semitic and oriental origin. Especially was this true in religion, for the great religions of the modern world, especially Christianity, are of oriental origin.

² There has been great difference of opinion regarding the original home of this parent people, from whom we ourselves have descended. The whole question was opened only fifty years ago, when scholars mostly maintained that the central Asiatic plateau was the earliest home of the parent people. Later researches led most scholars to believe in a central or northern European home of these people. This is still the prevailing opinion. But the recent discovery of documents in the Tokhar language, spoken by the tribes of old Tokharistan along the upper valley of the Jaxartes River far east of the Caspian Sea, has shown that Tokhar was an Indo-European language. This discovery of an Indo-European language so far east has made the theory of a European home of the parent people almost impossible and an Asiatic home much more probable. Its exact situation in Asia is, however, still uncertain.
Fig. 49. Diagram suggesting the two lines of Semitic and Indo-European Dispersion

The actual lines along which these peoples lie are of course not straight. The lines sometimes overlie each other, as in Sicily, mentioned in both lines. Egypt, which geographically belongs in the southern line, has been omitted because it is not purely Semitic, although closely related to the Semites. On the Aryan group at the east end of the Indo-European line, see p. 91. Notice also that in the west the two races face each other for the most part across the Mediterranean; in the east they confront each other along the "fertile crescent" (p. 56)
must therefore have been not later than 2500 B.C. Divided into numerous tribes, they wandered at will, seeking pasture for their flocks, for they already possessed domestic animals, including cattle and sheep. But chief among their domesticated beasts was the *horse*, which, as we recall, was still entirely unknown to the civilized oriental nations until after Hammurapi's time (see p. 69). They employed him not only for riding but also for drawing their wheeled carts, and from these northern nomads has descended the widespread story of the chariot and the horses of the sun. The ox already bore the yoke and drew the plow, for some of the tribes had adopted a settled mode of life and possessed fields in which they cultivated grain, especially barley. Being without writing, they possessed but little government and organization. But they were the most gifted and the most highly imaginative people of the ancient world.

As their tribes wandered farther and farther apart they lost contact with each other. Local peculiarities in speech and customs became more and more marked, until wide differences resulted. While at first the different groups could doubtless understand one another when they met, these differences in speech gradually became so great that the widely scattered tribes, even if they happened to meet, could no longer make themselves understood, and finally all knowledge of their original kinship was totally lost. This kinship has only been rediscovered in very recent times. The final outcome, in so far as speech was concerned, was the languages of modern civilized Europe; so that, beginning with England, we can trace many a word from people to people entirely across Europe and eastward into northern India. Note the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Old Persian and Avestan (in Central Asia)</th>
<th>East Indian (Sanskrit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>brother</td>
<td>bruder</td>
<td>frater</td>
<td>phratēr</td>
<td>brata</td>
<td>pracar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother</td>
<td><em>mutter</em></td>
<td>mater</td>
<td>mētēr</td>
<td>matar</td>
<td>macar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father</td>
<td>vater</td>
<td>pater</td>
<td>patēr</td>
<td>pitar</td>
<td>pacar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The asterisk denotes a word from Sanskrit, and the multiplication sign indicates a loanword from one language to another. The Tokhar language is spoken in Central Asia.

TOKHAR (in Central Asia) (See footnote, p. 88)
In the west these wanderers from the northern grasslands had already crossed the Danube and were far down in the Balkan peninsula by 2000 B.C. Some of them had doubtless already entered Italy by this time. These western tribes were, of course, the ancestors of the Greeks and Romans. We shall yet join them and follow them in their conquest of the Mediterranean (pp. 123ff.). Before doing so, however, we have to watch the eastern wing of the vast Indo-European line as it swings southward and comes into collision with the right wing of the Semitic line.

Section 17. The Aryan Peoples and the Iranian Prophet Zoroaster

It is now an established fact that the easternmost tribes of the Indo-European line were by 2000 B.C. already pasturing their herds in the great steppe on the east of the Caspian. Here they formed a people properly called the Aryans (see Fig. 49) and here they made their home for some time. The Aryan people had no writing, and they have left no monuments. Nevertheless the beliefs of their descendants show that the Aryan tribes already possessed a high form of religion, which summed up conduct as "good thoughts, good deeds." Fire occupied an important place in this faith, and they had a group of priests whom they called "fire-kindlers."

When the Aryans broke up, perhaps about 1800 B.C., they separated into two parts. The eastern tribes wandered southward and eventually arrived in India. In their sacred books,

1 The Indo-European parent people apparently had no common name applicable to all their tribes as a great group. The term "Aryan" is often popularly applied to the parent people, but this custom is incorrect. Aryan (from which Iran and Iranian are later derivatives) designated a group of tribes, a fragment of the parent people, which detached itself and found a home for some centuries just east of the Caspian Sea. When we hear the term "Aryan" applied to the Indo-European peoples of Europe, or when it is said that we ourselves are descended from the Aryans, we must remember that this use of the word is historically incorrect, though very common. The Aryans, then, were eastern descendants of the Indo-European parent people as we are western descendants of the parent people. The Aryans are our distant cousins but not our ancestors.
which we call the "Vedas," written in Sanskrit, there are echoes of the days of Aryan unity, and they furnish many a hint of the ancient Aryan home on the east of the Caspian. The other group, whose tribes have kept the name "Aryan" in the form "Iran," also left this home and pushed westward and southwestward into the mountains bordering our fertile crescent (p. 58). Among them were two powerful tribes, the Medes and the Persians.

About 2100 B.C., in the age of Hammurapi, long before they reached the fertile crescent, their coming was announced in advance by the arrival of the horse in Babylonia (see p. 69). We recall how in the days of Assyria's imperial power, nearly fifteen hundred years later, the Medes descended from the northern mountains against Nineveh (p. 79). This southern advance of the Indo-European eastern wing was thus overwhelming the Semitic right wing (Fig. 49), occupying the fertile crescent.

1 They have given their name to the great Iranian plateau, which stretches from the Zagros Mountains eastward to the Indus River. This whole region was known in Greek and Roman days as Ariana, which (like Iran) is, of course, derived from "Aryan."
By 600 B.C. the Medes had established a powerful Iranian Empire in the mountains east of the Tigris. It extended from the Persian Gulf, where it included the Persians, northwestward in the general line of the mountains to the Black Sea region. The front of the Indo-European eastern wing is thus roughly parallel with the Tigris at this point, but its advance is not to stop here. Nebuchadnezzar (p. 80) and the Chaldean masters of Babylon look with anxious eyes at this dangerous Median power. The Chaldeans on the Euphrates represent the leadership of men of Semitic blood from the southern pastures. Their leadership is now to be followed by that of the men of Indo-European blood from the northern pastures. As we see the Chaldeans giving way before the Medes and Persians (p. 97), let us bear in mind that we are watching a great racial change, and remember that these new Persian masters of the Far East are our kindred; for both we and they have descended from the same wandering shepherd ancestors, the Indo-European parent people, who once dwelt in the far-off pastures of inner Asia, probably five thousand years ago.

All of these Iranians possessed a beautiful religion inherited from old Aryan days (see p. 91). Somewhere in the eastern mountains, as far back as 1000 B.C., an Iranian named Zoroaster 1 began to look out upon the life of men in an effort to find a religion which would meet its needs. He watched the ceaseless struggle between good and evil which seemed to meet him wherever he turned. To him it seemed to be a struggle between a group of good beings on the one hand and of evil beings on the other. The Good became to him a divine person, the Median (Indo-European) Empire threatens Chaldean (Semitic) Babylonia

---

1 The Greek form of the name; it is taken from the Persian form Zarathushtra. Some scholars support a date for Zoroaster several centuries later than 1000 B.C., among them Professor A. V. W. Jackson, in his very valuable book on Zoroaster; but two proper names of certain royal Medes, occurring in the records of the Assyrian Sargon (722-705 B.C.), have the form “Mazdaka,” containing the name of Zoroaster’s god. His teaching had therefore been taken up by the Median royal house long before 700 B.C., and Zoroaster himself must therefore have lived far earlier than this. The date 1000 B.C. is a rough estimate by Eduard Meyer.
whom he called Mazda, or Ahuramazda, and whom he regarded as God. Ahuramazda was surrounded by a group of helpers much like angels, of whom one of the greatest was the Light, called "Mithras." Opposed to Ahuramazda and his helpers was the evil group, among whom the Spirit of Evil and another of Darkness were prominent.

Thus the faith of Zoroaster grew up out of the struggle of life itself, and became a great power in life. It called upon every man to stand on one side or the other; to fill his soul with the Good and the Light, or to dwell in the Evil and the Darkness. Whatever course a man pursued he must expect a judgment hereafter. As a visible symbol of the Good and the Light, Zoroaster maintained the old Aryan veneration of fire (Fig. 50), and he preserved the ancient fire-kindling priests.

Zoroaster went about among the Iranian people preaching his new religion, and probably for many years found but sluggish response to his efforts. We can discern his hopes and fears alike in the little group of hymns he has left, probably the only words of the great prophet which have survived. It is characteristic of the horse-loving Iranians that Zoroaster is said to have finally converted one of their great kings by miraculously healing the king's crippled horse. The new faith had gained a firm footing before the prophet's death, however, and before 700 B.C. it was the leading religion among the Medes in the mountains along the fertile crescent. Thus Zoroaster became the first great founder of a religious faith.

As in the case of Mohammed, it is probable that Zoroaster could neither read nor write, for the Iranians seem to have possessed no system of writing in his day (see p. 91). With the exception of the hymns mentioned above, we possess none of his original words; but his teaching has descended to us in certain fragments of older writings put together in the early Christian centuries, over one thousand years after the prophet's death. They form a book known as the Avesta. This we may call the Bible of the Persians, in whose tongue the book is written.
SECTION 18. THE PERSIAN EMPIRE

No people became more zealous followers of Zoroaster than the Persians. Through them a knowledge of him has descended to us. At the fall of Nineveh (606 B.C.) (p. 79) they were already long settled in the region at the southeastern end of the Zagros Mountains, just north of the Persian Gulf. The northern shores of the Persian Gulf are little better than desert, but the valleys of the mountainous hinterland are rich and fertile. Here the group of Iranian tribes known as the Persians occupied a district some four hundred miles long. They were a rude mountain peasant folk, leading a settled agricultural life, with simple institutions, no art, no writing or literature, but with stirring memories of their past, including some grand sagas which had come down from the distant...
Aryan days. As they tilled their fields and watched their flocks they told many a tale of the ancient prophet who had died four hundred years before, and whose faith they held.

They acknowledged themselves vassals of their kinsmen the Medes, who ruled far to the north and northwest of them. One of their tribes dwelling in the mountains of Elam (see map, p. 56), a tribe known as Anshan, was organized as a little kingdom. About fifty years after the fall of Nineveh, this little kingdom was ruled over by a Persian named Cyrus. He succeeded in uniting the other tribes of his kindred Persians into a nation. Thereupon Cyrus at once rebelled against the rule of the Medes. He gathered his peasant soldiery, and within three years he defeated the Median king and made himself master of the Median territory. The extraordinary career of Cyrus was now a spectacle upon which all eyes in the west were fastened with wonder and alarm. The overflowing energies of the new conqueror and his peasant soldiery, fresh and unspent for centuries among their eastern hills, proved irresistible. The Persian peasants seem to have been remarkable archers, and the mass of the Persian army was made up of bowmen (Fig. 51) whose storm of arrows at long range overwhelmed the enemy long before the hand-to-hand fighting began. Bodies of the skillful Persian horsemen, hovering on either wing, then rode in and completed the destruction of the foe.

The great states Babylonia (Chaldea), Egypt, Lydia under King Crœsus in western Asia Minor, and even Sparta in Greece formed a powerful combination against this sudden menace, which had risen like the flash of a meteor in the eastern sky. Without an instant's delay Cyrus struck at Crœsus of Lydia, the chief author of the hostile combination. One Persian victory followed after another. By 546 B.C. Sardis, the Lydian capital, had fallen and Crœsus, the Lydian king, was a prisoner in the hands of Cyrus. Cyrus at once gained also the southern coasts of Asia Minor. Within five years the power of the little Persian kingdom in the mountains of Elam had swept across Asia Minor to the
Mediterranean, becoming the leading state in the oriental world.

Turning eastward again, Cyrus had no trouble in defeating the army of Babylonia led by the young Belshazzar, whose name in the Book of Daniel is a household word throughout the Christian world. In 539 B.C. the Persians entered the great city of Babylon seemingly without resistance. Thus only sixty-five years after the fall of Nineveh (p. 79) had opened the conflict between the former dwellers in the northern and the southern grasslands, the Semitic East completely collapsed before the advance of the Indo-European power. Some ten years later Cyrus fell in battle (528 B.C.) as he was fighting with the nomads in northeastern Iran.

All western Asia was now subject to the Persian king; but in 525 B.C., only three years after the death of Cyrus, his son Cambyses conquered Egypt. This conquest of the only remaining ancient oriental power rounded out the Persian Empire to include the whole civilized East. The great task had consumed just twenty-five years since the overthrow of the Medes by Cyrus.
The Persian Empire (about 530 to 330 B.C.)

Persians adopt cuneiform and Aramean writing

Organization of the Persian Empire by Darius

Coinage

The rude simplicity of the Persian kings now rapidly gave way to the more civilized life of the conquered states. The Persian scribes were soon writing their own language with Babylonian cuneiform (p. 62), from which they adopted thirty-six signs as an alphabet. Darius recorded his triumph over all his foes at home and abroad in a vast inscription in cuneiform on the great cliff of Behistun looking down upon the ancient highway leading from Babylon to Ecbatana; but the king’s office documents were written on parchment with the Aramean alphabet (see p. 71).

The organization of such a vast empire, stretching from the Indus to the Aegean Sea, had been too big a task to be completed by Cyrus. It was carried through by Darius the Great (521-485 B.C.). He did not desire further conquests, but he planned to maintain the Empire as he had inherited it. He caused himself to be made actual king in Egypt and in Babylonia, but the rest of the Empire he divided into twenty provinces, each called a “satrapy,” each being under a governor called a “satrap,” who was appointed by the Great King. The Persian rule was just, humane, and intelligent, but of course tribute was collected from all parts of the Empire.

In the West, chiefly Lydia and the Greek settlements in western Asia Minor (p. 127), where the coinage of metal was common by 600 B.C. (p. 152), this tribute was paid in coined money. The eastern countries — Egypt, Babylonia, and Persia herself — were not quick to adopt this new convenience. Here during most of the Persian period commerce was content to employ gold and silver in bars which could be cut up and weighed out at each payment (p. 67). Darius, however, began the coinage of gold and permitted his satraps to coin silver. The rate was about thirteen to one, that is to say, gold was worth about thirteen times as much as silver. Thus the great commercial convenience of coined money issued by the State began to come into the Orient during the Persian period.

The Persian kings fostered business and commerce, maintained excellent roads from end to end of the great Empire, and
introduced royal messengers along these roads, who formed the beginnings of a postal system. These roads converged upon the royal residence in the ancient Elamite city of Susa, in the Zagros Mountains, where the king lived much of the time. The mild air of the Babylonian plain attracted him during the colder months, when he went to dwell among the palaces of the vanished Chaldean Empire at Babylon. The old Persian home of the Great King lay too far from the centers of oriental civilization for him to spend much time in Persia. But Cyrus built a splendid palace near the battle field where he had defeated the Medes at Pasargadæ, and Darius also established a new residence at Persepolis (Fig. 52), some twenty miles south of the palace of Cyrus. Near the ruins of these buildings the tombs of Cyrus, Darius, and other great Persian kings still stand (Fig. 53). The art of these buildings is made up of elements borrowed from the great oriental civilizations of Egypt, Babylonia, and Assyria. The enormous terraces on which they stood suggested Babylonia; the vast colonnades which swept along the front were more rich and sumptuous than the East had ever seen before, but they showed the influence of Egypt, Assyria, Phœnicia, and Asia Minor. The great civilizations which made up the Empire were thus merged together in Persian art.

The later world often represents the Persian kings as cruel and barbarous oriental tyrants. This unfavorable opinion goes too far. Such impressions have descended to us from the Greeks, who thrust back the Persians from Europe (p. 177). The Persian kings were fully conscious of their great mission as civilizing rulers. This is shown when Darius finds Scylax, a skillful sea captain who had learned navigation along the shores of Asia Minor, and dispatches him to explore the course of the great Indus River in India. Then he is ordered to sail along the coast of Asia from the mouth of the Indus westward to the Isthmus of Suez. Here Darius restores the ancient but long filled-up canal of the Egyptians connecting the Nile with the Red Sea (p. 33). It was thus possible in Persian times for Mediterranean
commerce to pass up the Nile and through the Red Sea to India. Darius also cherished what proved to be a vain hope, that the south coast of Persia might come to share in the now growing commerce between India and the Mediterranean world. Although proud of their mastery of the world, the Persian kings felt a deep sense of obligation to rule the nations of the earth in accordance with the Good and the Right which Ahuramazda personified.

![Fig. 53. The Tombs of the Persian Kings](image)

The fronts of the tombs are carved in the cliffs at the left. They begin with the tomb of Darius, about 500 B.C. The tomb of Cyrus (in the vicinity) is a detached stone structure not shown here. The detached building on the right has nothing to do with the tombs.

Unfortunately, as time passed, the Persian kings grew more and more inefficient and unsuccessful as rulers.

The Persian rulers were devoted followers of Zoroaster's teaching and felt keenly the sharp line which that faith drew between good and bad. The Persian power carried this noble faith throughout western Asia and especially into Asia Minor. It had here the form which it gradually came to take under the later Persian kings. In this form Mithras, made by Zoroaster a helper of Ahuramazda (p. 94), appears as a hero of light, and
finally a sun god, who gradually outshines Ahuramazda himself. From Asia Minor Mithras passed into Europe, and, as we shall see, the faith in the mighty Persian god spread far and wide through the Roman Empire, to become a dangerous competitor of Christianity (p. 298).

In matters of religion the Persian Empire marked the breakdown of national boundaries and the beginning of a long period when the leading religions of the East were called upon to compete in a great contest for the mastery among all the nations. The most important of the religions which thus found themselves thrown into a world struggle for chief place under the dominion of Persia was the religion of the Hebrews. While we leave the imperial family of Persia to suffer that slow decline which always besets a long royal line in the Orient, we may glance briefly at the little Hebrew kingdom among the Persian vassals in the West, which was destined to influence the history of the world more profoundly than any of the great imperial powers of the early world.

**Section 19. The Hebrews**

The Hebrews were all originally men of the Arabian desert, wandering with their flocks and herds and slowly drifting over into their final home in Palestine, at the west end of the fertile crescent (p. 56). For two centuries their movement into Palestine continued (about 1400 to 1200 B.C.). When they entered it as nomad shepherds (see p. 59), the Hebrews possessed very little civilization. A southern group of their tribes had been slaves in Egypt, but had been induced to flee by their...
heroic leader Moses, who led them to Palestine. Here they found flourishing towns of the Canaanites (p. 59), who had long been settled in Palestine. The Canaanites also had once come from the desert; they spoke a language hardly differing from Hebrew. But they had so long led a settled life that their towns were protected by massive walls (Figs. 55, 56). The camel caravans which entered their gates brought in merchandise both from the Nile and the Euphrates. There was here, therefore, a

![Fig. 54. The Central Ridge of Palestine seen from the Plain of Jericho](image)

Palestine is much cut up by such bare and sterile ridges of limestone, which produce nothing. Locate on map, p. 102; see Fig. 55

jumble of civilization from both these rivers. The Canaanites had learned from Egypt the manufacture of many valuable articles of commerce; from Babylonia the caravans had brought in bills and lists on clay tablets, and the Canaanites had thus learned to use Babylonian cuneiform writing (p. 62). The Hebrews were unable to destroy the Canaanites and their walled towns. They settled on the land around such towns and slowly mingled with the Canaanites until the two peoples, Hebrew and Canaanite, had become one. This process was of great advantage to the Hebrews, who thus gained the civilization of the Canaanites.
The situation of Palestine, with Egypt on one side and Assyria and Babylonia on the other, was a dangerous one. These great powers would not allow another strong nation to grow up in Palestine. Fortunately for the Hebrews, Egypt, as we have learned, fell into a state of feebleness by 1150 B.C. (p. 53); and, on the other side, the Aramean kingdom of Damascus was a protection against the advance of Assyria (p. 71). Thus the Hebrews were permitted to grow into a nation, and before 1000 B.C. we find them under their first king, Saul. But immigrants from Crete in the Mediterranean—a people called "Philistines" (Fig. 70)—had recently settled on the coast of Palestine (see map, p. 102). From their new home they greatly troubled the Hebrews. They slew Saul and in one war after another they nearly destroyed the young Hebrew nation.

The old nomad customs were still strong; for Saul, the first king, had no fixed home but dwelt in a tent. His successor, David, saw the importance of a strong castle as the king's permanent home. He therefore seized the old Canaanite fortress of Jerusalem. The Hebrews had been dwelling under its shadow for centuries, unable to take it from the Canaanites. From Jerusalem, as his residence, David extended his power far and wide and made the Hebrews a strong nation. His people never forgot his heroic deeds as a warrior nor his skill as a poet and singer, and centuries later they revered him as the author of many of their religious songs or "psalms."

Fig. 55. The Long Mound of the Ancient City of Jericho

The walls of the city and the ruins of the houses (Fig. 56) are buried under the rubbish which makes up this mound. Many of the ancient cities of Palestine are now such mounds as this
Solomon, David’s son, delighted in oriental luxury and showy display. He weighed down the Hebrews with heavy taxes. The discontent was so great that, under Solomon’s son, Rehoboam, the ten northern tribes withdrew from the nation and set up a king of their own. Thus the Hebrew kingdom was divided before it was a century old. Solomon’s son continued to rule at Jerusalem over a little kingdom of southern Palestine known as Judah. The Hebrews of the northern tribes were far more numerous, their land was much more fertile, and they formed a much stronger kingdom, called Israel. Their capital, after some changes, was finally Samaria (see map, p. 102).

There was much hard feeling between the two Hebrew kingdoms, and sometimes fighting. Israel was rich and prosperous; its market places were filled with industry and commerce; its fields produced plentiful crops. Israel displayed the wealth and success of town life. Judah, on the other hand, was poor, her land was meager (Fig. 57), she had few large and powerful towns. Many of the people still wandered with their flocks. The south thus remained largely nomad. Here are two different ideals of life: a settled life of wealth, luxury, and oppression of the poor; and a wandering life of simplicity, where each was glad to share his prosperity with all the brethren of the tribe, and equality reigned. These two methods of life came into conflict in many ways, but especially in religion. Every old Canaanite town had for centuries worshiped its baal, or lord, as its local god was called. These had never died out. Many Hebrews accepted the baals as the gods of the rich and the prosperous in the towns. The Hebrew God Yahweh (or Jehovah⁠¹), on the other hand, as the god of the nomad and the desert, was felt to be the protector of the poor and needy.

Thoughtful Hebrews then began to think of him as a god of fatherly kindness, who rebuked the wealthy class in the towns.

⁠¹ The Hebrews pronounced the name of their God “Yahweh.” The pronunciation “Jehovah” began less than four hundred years ago and was due to a misunderstanding of the pronunciation of the word “Yahweh.”
Their showy clothes, fine houses, beautiful furniture, and their hard-heartedness toward the poor were things unknown in the desert. Men who chafed under such injustices of town life turned fondly back to the grand old days of their shepherd wanderings out yonder on the broad reaches of the desert,

![Fig. 56. Ruins of the Houses of Ancient Jericho](image)

Only the stone foundations of these houses are preserved. The walls were of sun-baked brick, and the rains of over three thousand years have washed them away; for these houses date from about 1500 B.C., and in them lived the Canaanites, whom the Hebrews found in Palestine (p. 102). Here we find the furniture of these houses, in so far as it consisted of things durable enough to survive, like the pottery jars, glass, and dishes of the household; also things carved of stone, like seals, amulets, and ornaments of metal

where no man "ground the faces of the poor." It was a man with such admiration for the nomad life of the fathers who became the earliest-known historian¹ and told the immortal tales of the Hebrew patriarchs, of Abraham and Isaac, of Jacob and

¹ Unfortunately we do not know his name, for the Hebrews themselves early lost all knowledge of his name and identity, and finally associated the surviving fragments of his work with the name of Moses.
Joseph. These tales, preserved to us in the Old Testament, are among the noblest literature which has survived from the past.1

Other men were not content merely to tell tales of the good old days. Amos, a simple herdsman, who came from the south, entered the towns of the wealthy north and denounced their luxury and corruption. The God whom the people once thought of only as a leader in the fierce tribal wars of the wilderness, Amos now announced as a God of mercy and kindness in the social struggles of the town. Thus these social and religious reformers, like Amos, whom we call prophets, were gaining a larger vision of God as they watched the struggles of men.

By this time the Hebrews had learned to write. They were now abandoning the clay tablet which the Canaanites had received from Babylonia (p. 67), and they wrote on sheepskin and papyrus (p. 22) in long strips, which were rolled up when not in use. They used the Egyptian pen and ink, and the alphabet they employed came to them from the Phoenician merchants (p. 139). The "rolls" containing the tales of the patriarchs and the teachings of such men as Amos were the first books which the Hebrews produced — their first literature. Literature was the only art the Hebrew possessed. He had no painting, sculpture, or architecture, and if he needed these things he borrowed from his great neighbors, Egypt, Phœnia, Damascus, or Assyria.

While the Hebrews were deeply stirred by their own affairs at home, they were now rudely aroused to dangers coming from beyond their own borders. Assyria first swept away Damascus (p. 72). The kingdom of Israel, thus left exposed, was the next victim, and Samaria, its capital, was taken by the Assyrians in 722 B.C. (p. 72). Many of the unhappy people were carried away as captives. The feeble little kingdom of Judah survived for something over a century and a quarter more. During this time it beheld and rejoiced over the destruction of Nineveh (p. 79).

1 The student should read these tales, especially Gen. xxiv, xxvii, xxviii, xxxvii, xxxix–xlvi, 12.
But it had only exchanged one foreign lord for another, and Chaldea followed Assyria in control of Palestine (p. 80). Then their unwillingness to submit brought upon the men of Judah the same fate which their kindred of Israel had suffered. In 586 B.C. Nebuchadnezzar, the Chaldean king of Babylonia, destroyed Jerusalem and carried away the people to exile in Babylonia.¹

**Fig. 57. The Stony and Unproductive Fields of Judah**

Judah is largely made up of sterile ridges like this in the background. Note the scantiness of the growing grain in the foreground (p. 104)

Forced to dwell in strange lands the Hebrews were now faced by the great question: "Does Yahweh dwell and rule in Palestine only, as we have always thought; or is he also ruler of all nations, and does he dwell with us in our exile in a strange land?" Like all nomads, they had at first believed that their God had no power beyond the corner of the desert where they lived (p. 59); next they believed him to be lord of Palestine

¹ The headpiece of this chapter shows a lion of blue-glazed brick from the buildings of Nebuchadnezzar at Babylon.
only; now, in exile, they perceived for the first time that he was king of all the earth and righteous ruler of all the nations. We call belief in such a god monotheism, which is a Greek word meaning "one-god-ism." This belief denies the existence of all other gods. To reach the belief in such a god the Hebrews had passed through a long development and discipline, lasting many centuries, during which they had outgrown many imperfect ideas, thus illustrating the words of the greatest of Hebrew teachers, "First the blade, then the ear, then the full grain in the ear."¹

While the Hebrews were exiles in Babylonia, the victories of Cyrus (p. 96) overthrew their Chaldean lords and gave to the Hebrews Persian masters instead. With great humanity the Persian kings allowed the Hebrew exiles to return to Palestine, their native land. At different times enough of them went back to Jerusalem to rebuild the city on a very modest scale. Their leaders restored the temple, and the old worship there was resumed. These men arranged and copied the ancient writings of their fathers, such as the stories of the patriarchs or the speeches of Amos (p. 106). They also added other writings of their own. All these writings, in Hebrew, form the Bible of the Jews at the present day. They have also become a sacred book for all Christians and translated into English, they are called the Old Testament. They form the most precious legacy which we have inherited from the older Orient before the coming of Christ (p. 300).

It should be remembered, then, that one of the most important things which we owe to the Persians was their restoration of the Hebrews to Palestine. For the oriental world as a whole, Persian rule meant about two hundred years of peaceful prosperity (ending about 333 B.C.). The Persian kings, however, as time went on, were no longer as strong and skillful as Cyrus and Darius. They loved luxury and ease and left the task of government to their governors and officials. The result

¹ The words of Jesus; see Mark iv, 28.
was weakness and decline, until the final fall of Persia and the
surrender of political leadership of the Orient to the men of
Europe, whose career in the eastern Mediterranean we must
now take up.

QUESTIONS

SECTION 16. What is the extent of the northern grasslands?
Trace them on the map on page 56. As a source of migrating popu-
lation how do they resemble the southern grasslands? Diagram the
two racial lines, Indo-European and Semitic.

What is the relation of these two lines in the history of the ancient
world? From which line are we descended? Give some account of
the Indo-European parent people. Discuss their dispersion. What
proof of the relationship between their modern descendants still
exists? Where are the two ends of the Indo-European line in the
Old World now? of the Semitic line?

SECTION 17. Locate the Aryan tribes on the map on page 80
(the are not marked) and give some account of them. Into what
two groups did they separate? What became of the eastern group?
Where did the western group settle?

What were its two leading peoples? What Indo-European people
first invaded the fertile crescent, and when? Who overthrew Assyria,
and when? Who was Zoroaster? What did he teach? Whom did
he convert? What peoples adopted the religion he taught? What
is the Avesta?

SECTION 18. Who were the Persians? Who was Cyrus? Where
did his people live? Whom did he first conquer? Where were his
next great conquests? Describe Persian methods of fighting. What
great ancient city did Cyrus finally conquer? What race then con-
trolled the fertile crescent?

What other ancient land did the son of Cyrus conquer? What
was then the extent of the Persian Empire? Who organized it?
Describe Persian rule. Where did the Persian kings live? What
was their character? Whither did Persian religion spread?

SECTION 19. What kind of a life did the Hebrews originally lead
and whence did they come? Where is Palestine? Whom did the
Hebrews find there? What was the final result of the Hebrew inva-
sion? Tell the story of the Hebrew kingdom. Did it remain united?
What kind of great men arose under the two kingdoms? What were their ideas of God? What happened to the two kingdoms? What happened to the surviving Hebrews? What was their idea of God? Who allowed some of the exiles to return to Palestine? What did the returned exiles do? What is the Hebrew Bible or Old Testament?
CHAPTER V

THE MEDITERRANEAN WORLD AND THE EARLY GREEKS

Section 20. The Ἀειγεαν Civilization

The Mediterranean Sea was the ocean where the ancient world carried on its commerce by ship, its explorations of unknown shores, and the settlement of colonies in newly discovered regions, just as later, men of Europe explored and colonized the shores of the Atlantic. The Mediterranean is, moreover, a body of water so vast that it bounds a large part of Europe on the south. It is about twenty-four hundred miles long and, laid out across the United States, would reach from New York over into California. Nowhere else on the globe is there a great landlocked inland sea with a coast so irregular and indented as to produce a whole series of smaller seas and sheltered basins. All this, as we have seen, favored the early rise of seagoing ships and made the Mediterranean the earliest home of navigation, which is far earlier than historians formerly supposed. Nor have the current books yet taken knowledge of the fact that large fleets sailed the Mediterranean in the thirtieth century B.C. These earliest vessels transformed the Mediterranean from a separating barrier into a connecting link, joining together the surrounding lands which made up the ancient world.

The food of the Mediterranean peoples to-day is chiefly bread, wine, and oil; wine is their tea, and oil their butter. It was
Food products and climate of the Mediterranean equally so in ancient times. In the Homeric poems bread and wine are the chief food of all, even of the children; and Euripides praises bread and wine as the earliest gifts of the gods to men. In spite of the dry summer heat, the grapevine and the olive tree grow and ripen their fruit without irrigation. This is a condition in the Mediterranean countries, then, very different from what we have found in Egypt and Babylonia. The shores of the northern Mediterranean are on the whole so cut up by steep and rugged mountains that they are well suited to flocks and herds, but agriculture and gardening also flourish where river valleys and shore plains, as in Italy, offer a wider stretch of moist and cultivable soil. A mild climate with a dry summer and a rainy season during winter makes the conditions of life easy and favorable.

**FIG. 58. THE MOUND OF ANCIENT TROY (ILIUM)**

When Schliemann first visited this mound (see map, p. 146) in 1868, it was about one hundred and twenty-five feet high, and the Turks were cultivating grain on its summit. He excavated a pit like a crater in the top of the hill, passing downward through nine successive cities built each on the ruins of its predecessors. At the bottom of his pit (about fifty feet deep) Schliemann found the original once bare hilltop about seventy-five feet high, on which the men of the Late Stone Age (p. 14) had established a small settlement of sun-baked brick houses about 3000 B.C. (First City). Above the scanty ruins of this Late Stone Age settlement rose, in layer after layer, the ruins of the later cities, with the Roman buildings at the top. The entire depth of fifty feet of ruins represented a period of about thirty-five hundred years from the First City (Late Stone Age) to the Ninth City (Roman) at the top. The Second City (p. 117) contained the earliest copper found in the series; the Sixth City was that of the Trojan War and the Homeric songs (p. 142). Its masonry walls may be seen in Fig. 71.
The view at the top shows the ruins of the great walled city which covered a group of hills like those of Rome. A modern village close by called Boghaz-Köi, has given the place its modern name; but the Hittites called the city Khatti. The view below shows a portion of the masonry walls of the city as they once were, when the Hittite kings lived here in the thirteenth century B.C.
As early as three thousand years before the Christian Era Egyptian seagoing ships¹ (p. 32 and Fig. 14) began to issue from the Nile and cross the Mediterranean northward. The copper which these ships brought into the Aegean (p. 14) then slowly spread, through the Mediterranean, from people to people. It finally crossed Europe as the trader carried it with his pack trains up the Rhone and the Danube, or over the Alpine passes into the valley of the Elbe and there shifted his cargo to river boats, in which he floated downstream to the northern seas—where by 2000 B.C. copper became common as far north as Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. In return the trader carried back amber to the Mediterranean ports.

Stone implements had, however, by no means disappeared in Europe, but the northern craftsman, pleased with the form of

¹ The student should here reread pp. 14 f.
copper ax or dagger, imitated the metal shapes in stone with brilliant success. So long as he was obliged to depend entirely upon imported metal he was slow to learn the new art of shaping it. At last the knowledge that metal might be found in mountain ores reached him, and he sought and found the precious veins of metal in his own mountains. In the British Isles the galleries which the ancient miner pushed into the mountain side, although they have sometimes caved in, still contain the stone pickaxes which he used there; while in the Austrian Alps we find the remains of his rude equipment for getting out the ore, with even his ore-crushers and smelting furnaces still preserved. The lens-shaped disks of copper which came from these furnaces still show us the form of the raw metal as it went from the smelting furnaces to the craftsman. Such miners also discovered the tin mines of Portugal and of Cornwall in England, and with this they were able to harden copper into bronze (see p. 34), which was common in the Norse countries as early as 2000 B.C.1

Notwithstanding the fact that they now possessed metal, the peoples of western and northern Europe still failed to advance to a high type of civilization. As we have seen, they learned to build vast structures of rough stone all along the shores of the Atlantic (p. 12 and Fig. 8), like the great stone circles at Stonehenge; but they were unable to advance to real architecture in

1 For a long time stone and metal were used side by side. In one of the lake-villages of Switzerland, preserved in a peat bog, three successive towns lie one over the other. Stone implements are found in all three, but the upper two, that is the later two, contain also objects of copper along with those of stone. Slowly stone gave way before metal, and the ancient art of chipping flint gradually disappeared as metal became more plentiful. We should remember, however, that some races still surviving, like the Bushmen of South Africa and the Australians and Tasmanians (p. 2), continue at the present day in the use of stone, and have not yet learned to work metal nor to make metal tools. Indeed, even in Europe certain stone implements lingered on in use among the peasants of the north of Sweden as late as the nineteenth century, nearly four thousand years after metal was introduced in the Norse countries. A vague tradition of the Stone Age survived even into Roman times, although by that time the world at large had forgotten this long chapter in the story of their ancestors, and the stone axes which the peasants picked up now and then in the fields, they fancied were thunderbolts of the sky god.
stone, and this failure to make further progress in architecture illustrates their backwardness in all the arts of civilization. The advance to a high civilization in Europe after the introduction of metal — such an advance as we may call real historical progress — was made in the eastern Mediterranean, in the Aegean lands, under the influence of oriental culture. It was this oriental stimulus which carried Europe forward to the development of the civilization which we have inherited.

The Aegean world consists of the islands of the Aegean Sea and the lands which surround this sea in neighboring Asia and Europe, which here face each other across its waters. For the Aegean world is the region where Asia thrusts forward its westernmost heights (Asia Minor) and Europe throws out its southernmost and easternmost peninsula (Greece) into the waters so early crossed and recrossed by Egyptian ships (p. 31). At the same time the east and west valleys of Asia Minor furnished roads for the early trade which linked the Aegean world with the Euphrates and Babylonia. Thus the Stone Age settlements of the Aegean

Fig. 61. One of the Large Decorated Cretan Jars, nearly Four Feet high, found at Ancient Cnossus

A fine example of the originality, power, and beauty of Cretan decorative art; although the leading design, the lotus flower, is drawn from Egypt, it is treated in the masterly Cretan manner (see p. 120)
The Mediterranean World and the Early Greeks

The Mediterranean region naturally became the outposts of the great oriental civilizations which we have found so early on the Nile and the Euphrates. From these centers the Ægean world, at first slow and backward like western and northern Europe, received continual impulses toward a higher civilization — impulses felt in trade, metal-working, pottery, house-building, and in many other ways.

At the northwest corner of Asia Minor, controlling the profitable trade crossing from Asia to Europe at this point, stood the ancient and highly prosperous Ægean city of Troy. By 2500 B.C., some centuries after it had received the first metals, its rulers had erected a strong citadel of sun-baked brick, with massive stone foundations, the earliest fortress in the Ægean world (the Second City, Fig. 58). Here they carried on industries in pottery, metal-working, and textiles, which show wide foreign-trade connections. Their kindred and neighbors on the east were the Hittites. In the later days of the Egyptian Empire the Hittites themselves held a great empire in central and eastern Asia Minor (Figs. 59, 60). They gave Egypt much trouble in Syria, and they early invaded Babylonia and Assyria also (p. 70).

Toward the east, then, the population of Asia Minor merged gradually with the Tigris-Euphrates world, whose history we have
followed (pp. 56 ff.); while in the west other Ægean kindred of these Trojan and Hittite peoples had their homes in the Ægean islands, even as far as Crete. Some of them, too, formed the population of Greece, where they were the predecessors of the people known to us as the Greeks. These predecessors of the Greeks in the Ægean world belonged to a great and gifted white race, whose origin and relationships with other peoples are still quite undetermined. We shall call this race the Ægeans.

All of these Ægean peoples were so long without writing, that they at first left no written monuments to tell us their story; hence the difficulty in the disentangling of their relationships. Some time after 2000 B.C. the Hittites invented a system of hieroglyphic writing (Fig. 60) showing Egyptian influence, which we find inscribed on stone monuments widely scattered through Asia Minor and northern Syria. Later they also found that their commerce with Babylonia brought into their hands

---

**Fig. 63. Ruins of the Main Entrance to the Cretan Palace at Cnossus, built about 1800 B.C.**

It is on the north side, facing the harbor three and a half miles away, from which a road leads up to this entrance. Notice the heavy masonry of stone—the only portion of the palace built for defense, the rest being of sun-baked brick.
bills and business documents written in cuneiform (wedge-writing), on clay tablets (Fig. 37). They therefore began to write the Babylonian cuneiform also. Their capital in central Asia Minor (Fig. 59), recently excavated, has furnished great numbers of such clay tablets, but they cannot yet be read. When they have been deciphered we shall learn many of the secrets of this great world of Asia Minor, which links the Ægean with the Asiatic Orient.

As Asia Minor was the link between the Ægean on the west and the Euphrates world on the east, so Crete was the link between Egypt on the south and the Ægean Sea on the north. This large island lies so far out in the Mediterranean that one is almost in doubt whether it belongs to Europe or Africa. Even in ancient ships the mariners issuing from the mouths of the Nile and steering northwestward would sight the Cretan mountains in a few days. Excavations in this island since 1900 have uncovered the ruins of palace after palace and revealed a new chapter in the story of the ancient world.

For a thousand years after Crete had received copper her people showed but little sign of progress. While the great pyramids of Egypt were being built (p. 29), the Cretan craftsman

![Fig. 64. A Colonnaded Hall and Staircase in the Cretan Palace at Cnossus](image)

The columns and roof of the hall are modern restoration. The hall is in the lower portion of the palace, and the stairway, concealed by the balustrade at the back of the hall, led up, by five flights of fifty-two massive steps, to the main floor of the palace.
learned from his Egyptian neighbor the use of the potter's wheel and the closed oven (p. 35) for shaping and firing his clay vases (Fig. 61). About 2000 B.C. the Cretans began a distinct forward movement under the influence of the great nation on the Nile. Commerce between the two countries was constant. Egyptian craft (Fig. 14) were a common sight in the Cretan harbors, while the prevailing north wind of summer easily carried the galleys, which the Cretans learned to build on Egyptian models, across to the Nile Delta.

At Cnossus, near the middle of the northern coast of Crete, arose a prosperous city, whose ruler was able to build a palace arranged in the Egyptian manner, with a large cluster of rooms

**Fig. 65. An Open-Air Theatrical Area beside the Cretan Palace at Cnossus**

This area is about thirty by forty feet, and on two sides rise tiers of seats, accommodating four or five hundred spectators. Open-air athletic spectacles, like boxing matches, probably took place here to divert select groups of Cretan lords and ladies; the area is not large enough for the bullfights in which the Cretans took great delight (compare the exciting bull-hunt at head of Chapter V, p. 111, and footnote, p. 121).
about a central court. A similar palace also arose at Phæstus in southern Crete, perhaps another residence of the same royal family. These palaces were not castles, for neither they nor the towns connected with them were fortified. Several indications, like the statue of an Egyptian official found under the pavement of the oldest palace at Cnossus, suggest that the Egyptian Pharaohs of the Feudal Age (p. 42) may have exercised political power as well as commercial and cultural influence over the men of Crete. In the storerooms of the palace at Cnossus invoices scratched on clay tablets have been found in great numbers. This writing is a kind of hieroglyphic clearly showing the influence of Egyptian writing; but much study has not yet enabled scholars to decipher and read these precious records, the earliest-known writing in the European world (Fig. 62).

As the older palace of Cnossus gave way to a more splendid building (about 1800 B.C.), the life of Crete began to unfold in all directions (Figs. 61–66). Noble pottery (Fig. 61) was painted or molded in grand designs drawn often from the life of the sea, where Cretan power was already expanding. This painted pottery shows the most powerful, vigorous, and impressive decorative art of the early oriental world. The palace walls were also painted with fresh and beautiful scenes from daily life, all aquiver with movement and action; or they were adorned with glazed porcelain figures incrusted upon the surface of the wall.\(^{1}\) The method of use and the execution of the work everywhere show that this new art was due to suggestion from Egypt; but in spite of this fact the powerful individuality of the Cretan artist did not permit him to follow slavishly the Egyptian model. His work is alive with his own vigor and his own character.

Cretan civilization culminated in the century from 1600 to 1500 B.C., when the sea power of the Cretan rulers was carrying

\(^{1}\) The Cretans produced also the most magnificent metal work; see the bull-hunt wrought in a band around a golden goblet (at head of Chapter V, p. 111). Nothing could be more vigorous than the charging bull, going his pursuers (at the left). Two such golden goblets were found at Vaphio, near Sparta, showing how Cretan art at its highest reached the southern mainland of Greece (see p. 123).
their influence and their art far and wide through the Mediterranean. At the highest level of their civilized development, however, the kings of Crete were vassals of the Pharaoh, and the Cretan cities were not free. An Egyptian general of Thutmose III (p. 46) bore the title of "governor of the islands in the midst of the sea," as the Egyptians called the islands of the Ægean. Here, a new world, shaking off the old Stone Age lethargy of early Europe, under the magic touch of riper Egyptian culture, sprang into vigorous life. Beside the two older centers of civilization on the Nile and the Euphrates in this age, there thus arose here in the eastern Mediterranean, as a third great civilization, this splendid world of Crete and the Ægean Sea, to carry us from the Orient to Greece and later to Europe.¹

¹ An interesting evidence of the transmission of oriental civilization from the Nile to Crete and Europe will be found in a scene carved on a stone vase in Crete, about 1800 B.C. (see cut, p. 135). It depicts a harvest festival procession in Crete, the men marching with wooden pitchforks over their shoulders, and a chorus of open-mouthed singing youths, led by a shaven-headed Egyptian priest with a sistrum (an Egyptian musical rattle) in his hand.
THE MEDITERRANEAN WORLD AND THE EARLY GREEKS

SECTION 21. THE EARLY GREEKS

Thus far the islands had been leading the civilization of the Aegean world, but the fleets of Egypt and Crete carried a constant flow of commerce from the islands to the mainland of Greece. Massive strongholds, with heavy stone masonry foundations, have been excavated at Tiryns (Fig. 67) and Mycæae (Fig. 68) in southern Greece. The Aegean princes who built these strongholds a little after 1500 B.C. imported works of Cretan and Egyptian art in pottery and metal. These things, with fragments of Egyptian glaze, still lying in the ruins, are the earliest tokens of a life of higher refinement as it displaced the barbarism of the Stone Age on the continent of Europe. But the mainland still lagged behind the islands, for Cretan writing seems not to have followed Cretan commerce, and there was as yet no writing on the continent of Europe. Regions on the north of Greece, such as Thessaly, were covered with scattered settlements which had advanced but little beyond the Late Stone Age civilization of the rest of Europe. Metal was not common in Thessaly until about 1500 B.C. The cultured Cretans had little influence here in the north, where a hostile race was already appearing. As far back as 2000 B.C. we see these invaders appearing behind the passes of the Balkan Mountains. These newcomers and not the gifted Cretans and their Aegean kindred were to possess the Greek peninsula.

The people whom we call the Greeks were a large group of tribes of the Indo-European race. We have already followed

1 Also at Troy, the Sixth City, the Homeric Troy (Fig. 71).
2 See the relief on the golden goblet, a work of Cretan art, found at Vaphio, near Sparta, in southern Greece (p. 111).
3 The discoveries of Schliemann at Mycenæ were among the first revelations of pre-Greek art and civilization in the Aegean world. The discoveries in Crete had not yet been made, and the Cretan source of Mycenaean art was unknown. Hence this pre-Greek civilization of the Aegean is still commonly called "Mycenaean," although, as we have seen, Mycenæ represents only a late and declining stage of the high Aegean civilization attained by Crete.
4 The student should here carefully reread pp. 86–88.
Fig. 67. Restoration of the Castle and Palace of Tiryns. (After Luckenbach)

Unlike the Cretan palaces, this dwelling of an Ægean prince is massively fortified. A rising road (A) leads up to the main gate (B), where the great walls are double. An assaulting party bearing their shields on the left arm must here (C, D) march with the exposed right side toward the city. By the gate (E) the visitor arrives in the large court (F) on which the palace faces. The main entrance of the palace (G) leads to its forecourt (H), where the excavators found the place of the household altar of the king (p. 144). Behind the forecourt (H) is the main hall of the palace (I). This was the earliest castle in Europe with outer walls of stone. The villages of the common people clustered about the foot of the castle hill. The whole formed the nucleus of a city-state (p. 130) in the plain of Argos (see Plate II, p. 180) the scattered tribes of the Indo-European parent people until their diverging migrations finally ranged them in a line from the Atlantic Ocean to northern India (p. 87 and Fig. 49). While their eastern kin-dred were drifting southward on the east side of the Caspian toward India, the Greeks on the west side of the Black Sea were likewise moving southward from their broad pastures along the Danube.

Driving their herds before them, with their families in rough carts drawn by horses, the rude Greek tribesmen must have looked out upon the fair pastures of Thessaly, the snowy summit of Olympus (Fig. 69), and the blue waters of the
Ægean not long after 2000 B.C. The Greek peninsula which they had entered contains about twenty-five thousand square miles. It is everywhere cut up by mountains and inlets of the sea into small plains and peninsulas, separated from each other either by the sea or the mountain ridges (Fig. 87). The Greeks found the Thessalian plains dotted with the settlements of mud-plastered wattle huts, the agricultural villages of the Europeans of the Late Stone Age (p. 123), while the islands which the newcomers could dimly discern across the waters were already carrying on busy industries in pottery and metal, which a thriving commerce was distributing. With a wonder like that of the North American Indians as they beheld the first European ships, these earliest Greeks must have looked out upon the white sails that flecked the blue surface of the Ægean Sea.

It was to be long, however, before

1 It is about one sixth smaller than the state of South Carolina. The very limited extent of Greece will be evident if the student notes that Mount Olympus on the northern boundary of Greece can be seen over a large part of the peninsula. From the mountains of Sparta one can see from Crete to the mountains north of the Corinthian Gulf (see Fig. 87), a distance of two hundred twenty-five miles.
these inland shepherds should themselves venture timidly out upon the great waters which they were viewing for the first time.

Gradually their vanguard (called the Achæans) pushed southward into Peloponnesus, and doubtless some of them mingled with the dwellers in the villages which were grouped under the walls of Tiryns and Mycenæ (Figs. 67, 68, Plate II). Some of their leaders may have captured these Ægean fortresses.¹ But our knowledge of the situation in Greece is very meager because the peoples here could not yet write, and have left no written documents to tell the story.

Although Mount Olympus is on the northern borders of Greece, it can be seen from Attica and the south end of Eubœa. It approaches ten thousand feet in height, and looks down upon Macedonia on one side and Thessaly on the other (see map, p. 146). As we look at it here from the south, we have a portion of the plain of Thessaly in the foreground, where the first Greeks entered Hellas (p. 124), and where later the earliest Homeric songs were composed (p. 142).

¹ The student will recall a similar situation, as the incoming Hebrew nomads took the strongholds of their predecessors in Palestine (p. 102).
rivers, mountains, and plants, the old language of the Ægeans left its traces in the Greek tongue; and doubtless much of the supreme genius of the classical Greeks was due to this admixture of the blood of the gifted Cretans, with their open-mindedness toward influences from abroad and their fine artistic instincts.

The Dorians did not stop at the southern limits of Greece, but, learning a little navigation from their Ægean predecessors, they passed over to Crete, where they must have arrived by 1400 B.C. Cnossus, unfortified as it was, and without any walled castle (p. 121), must have fallen an easy prey of the invading Dorians, who took possession of the island, and likewise seized the other southern islands of the Ægean. Between 1300 and 1000 B.C. the Greek tribes took possession of the remaining islands, as well as the coast of Asia Minor, the Æolians in the north, the Ionians in the middle, and the Dorians in the south. Thus during the thousand years between 2000 and 1000 B.C. the Greeks took possession of the entire Ægean outpost of the Orient, including the islands of the Ægean Sea, the coasts of Asia Minor, and the easternmost peninsula of Europe.

Driven from their native harbors by the Greeks, the Ægean mariners fled and their fleets appeared in great numbers along the coasts of Syria and Egypt, where they assisted in inflicting the deathblow on the Egyptian Empire in the twelfth century B.C. (see p. 53). Some of them, expelled from Crete, took refuge on the coast of Palestine, and we have already met them as the Philistines (Fig. 70 and p. 103). Thus the effect of the advance of the Indo-European line to the Mediterranean along its northern shores was felt by the older civilizations of the Orient on its other shores.

Section 22. The Greek City-States under Kings

In spite of their seaward expansion the Greeks were still a barbarous people of flocks and herds. As a race they had not yet taken to the water, and even as late as 700 B.C. we find their
peasant-poet Hesiod looking with shrinking eye upon the sea. As they took possession of the more fertile districts of the peninsula, the Greek shepherds slowly began the cultivation of land. This forced them to give up a wandering life and live in

*Fig. 70. Philistine Warriors — a Cretan Tribe driven out by the Greeks*

These men with tall, feathered headdress are depicted among the captives taken by Ramses III, the last of the Egyptian emperors in the twelfth century B.C., at a time when he was desperately striving to repel an invasion of Egypt by Mediterranean peoples, who were being displaced by the incoming Greeks and therefore sought new homes in Syria, Palestine, and Egypt (see p. 53 and map, p. 56)

permanent homes, to watch over the fields and gather the harvests. War and care of the flocks long continued to be the occupation of the *men*, who at first left the cultivation of the field to the *women*, a condition still found in later times in the remote valleys of inner Greece. Furthermore, flocks and herds
made up the chief wealth of the Greeks for many centuries after they had begun agriculture.

Nomad life as we have seen it along the fertile crescent in Asia (p. 59) possesses no state government, for there is no public business which demands it. No taxes are collected, there are no officials, there are no cases at law, no legal business, and society is controlled by a few customs like the "blood revenge," which places the punishment of the murderer in the hands of the injured family. Such was exactly the condition of the nomad Greeks when they began a settled life in the Aegean world. From their old wandering life on the grasslands they carried with them the loose groups of families known as tribes, and within each tribe an indefinite number of smaller groups of more intimate families called "brotherhoods."

A "council" of the old men ("elders") occasionally decided matters in dispute, or questions of tribal importance, and probably once a year, or at some important feast, an "assembly" of all the weapon-bearing men of the tribe might be held, to express its opinion of a proposed war or migration. These are the germs of later European political institutions and even of our own in the United States to-day.¹ At some stage in their early career the old-time nomad leader in war, religion, and the settlement of disputes had become a rude shepherd king of the tribe. Each tribe seems to have gained such a king, although a whole group of tribes might occasionally be found under the rule of one king.

During the four centuries from 1000 to 600 B.C. we see the Greeks entangled in the problem of learning how to transact the business of settled landholding communities, and how to adjust the ever-growing friction and strife between the rich and the poor, the social classes created by the holding of land and the settled life. We gain some idea of the difficulties to be met as

¹ Compare the House of Lords (= the above "council") and the House of Commons (= the above "assembly") in England, or the Senate (derived from the Latin word meaning "old man") and the House of Representatives in the United States.
a government grows up slowly out of the old wandering life on the grasslands, when we recall that the transition had to be made without writing. There arose in some communities a "rememberer," whose duty it was to notice carefully the terms of a contract, the amount of a loan, or the conditions of a treaty with a neighboring people, that he might remember these and innumerable other things, which in a more civilized society are recorded in writing.

In course of time the group of villages forming the nucleus of a tribe grew and merged at last into a city. This is the most important process in Greek political development; for the organized city became the only nation which the Greeks knew. Each city-state was a sovereign power; each had its own laws, its own army and gods, and each citizen felt a patriotic duty toward his own city and no other. Overlooking the city from the heights in its midst is the king's castle (Fig. 67), which we call the "citadel," or "acropolis," and around the houses and the market below extends the city wall. The king has now become a revered and powerful ruler of the city, and guardian of the worship of the city gods. King and Council sit all day in the market and adjust the business and the disputes between the people. These continuous sessions for the first time create a state and an uninterrupted government. To be sure it is crude, corrupt, and often unjust.

By fraud, oppression, unjust seizure of lands, union of families in marriage, and many other influences, the strong man of ability and cleverness was able to enlarge his lands. Thus there arose a class of large landholders and men of wealth. Their fields stretched for some miles around the city and its neighboring villages. In order to be near the king or secure membership in the Council and control the government, these men often left their lands and lived in the city. After a time they formed a class of hereditary nobles called "eupatrids." Such was the power of the eupatrids that the Council finally consisted only of men of this class. Wealthy enough to buy costly weapons, with
leisure for continual exercise in the use of arms, these nobles became also the chief protection of the state in time of war.

Thus grew up a sharp distinction between the city community and the peasants living in the country — a division altogether unknown in the old wandering life on the grasslands, where

![Fig. 71. The Walls of Homeric Troy, built about 1500 B.C.](image)

A section of the outer walls of the Sixth City in the mound of Troy (Fig. 58). The sloping outer surface of the walls faces toward the right; the inside of the city is on the left. These are the walls built in the days when Mycenae was flourishing — walls which protected the old Aegean inhabitants of the place from the assaults of the Greeks in a remote war which laid it in ruins after 1200 B.C., a war of which vague traditions and heroic tales have survived in the Homeric poems (p. 142). Schliemann never saw this Sixth City, the real Homeric city, which was not excavated until after his death. The walls of the houses of the Seventh City are visible here resting on those of the Sixth

there were no towns. The country peasant was obliged to divide the family lands with his brothers. His fields were therefore small and he was poor. He went about clad in a goatskin, and his labors never ceased. Hence he had no leisure to learn the use of arms, nor any way to meet the expense of purchasing
them. He and his neighbors were of small account in war. When he attended the Assembly of the people in the city, he found but few of his fellows from the countryside gathered there—a dingy group, clad in their rough goatskins. The powerful Council in beautiful oriental raiment was backed by the whole class of wealthy nobles, all trained in war and splendid in their glittering weapons.

Intimidated by the powerful nobles, the meager Assembly, which had once been a muster of all the weapon-bearing men of the tribe, became a feeble gathering of a few peasants and lesser townsmen, who could gain no greater recognition of their old-time right of self-government than the poor privilege of voting to concur in the actions already decided upon by the king and the Council. The peasant returned to his little farm and was less and less inclined to attend the Assembly at all. Indeed, he was fortunate if he could struggle on and maintain himself and family from his scanty fields. Many of his neighbors sank into debt, lost their lands to the noble class, and themselves became day laborers for more fortunate men, or, still worse, sold themselves to discharge their debts and thus became slaves. These day laborers and slaves had no political rights and were not permitted to vote in the Assembly.

There were hundreds of such city-states in Greece, and, of course, the more powerful endeavored to seize the land of the weaker—a tendency resulting in frequent petty wars, some of which continued for a thousand years of intermittent hostilities down into Roman days. The country was so cut up by mountains and deep bays that the various state communities were quite separated. They thus developed local habits and local dialects as different as those of North and South Germany, or Brittany and Provence, or even more different than those of our own Louisiana and New England. Such differences made union difficult. Only two complete and permanent unions were effected among the various groups of Greek city-states: one under the leadership of Sparta in Laconica and the other in
Attica under the control of Athens. Both of these states, of course, made various endeavors at expansion, as we shall see. Loose groups of city-states elsewhere, as in Thessaly, arose here and there, but these alliances did not prove stable or permanent.

Although no political union into a single Greek nation was possible, religion and commerce furnished motives toward intimate relationships. In order that all might have a voice in the management of great temples or holy places revered by all the Greeks, the different city-states concerned formed several religious councils, called "amphictyonies," in the membership of which each state had representatives. The most notable of these were the council for the control of the Olympic Games, another for the famous sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi, and also the council for the great annual feast of Apollo in the Island of Delos.

For the adjustment of trade between the states there were only the most primitive arrangements. A stranger sojourning abroad had no legal rights in a foreign city, and could only secure protection by appealing to the old desert custom of "hospitality," after he had been received by a friendly citizen as a guest. For the reception of a foreigner who might have no friend to be his host, a citizen was sometimes appointed to act as official host representing the city. A sentiment of unity also arose under the influence of the Homeric songs (p. 142) with which every Greek was familiar — a common inheritance depicting all the Greeks united against the Asiatic city of Troy (Fig. 71).

Such influences as these led the Greeks to regard themselves as a distinct body of people closely bound together by ties of race, language, customs, common traditions, religion, and trade. They called all men not of Greek blood "barbarians," a word not originally a term of reproach for the non-Greeks. Then the Greek sense of unity found expression in the first all-inclusive term for themselves. They gradually came to call themselves "Hellenes," and found pleasure in the belief that they had all descended from a common ancestor called Hellen. But it should be clearly understood that this new designation did not
define a political *nation* of the Greeks, but only the group of Greek-speaking peoples or states, often at war with one another as hostile nations. The most fatal defect in Greek character was the inability of these states to forget their local differences and jealousies and to unite into a common federation or great nation including all Greeks.¹

**QUESTIONS**

**SECTION 20.** Give an account of the Mediterranean: its shores, extent, climate, and the early food products. Discuss the incoming of metal in Europe, and the outgoing Stone Age. Did Europe *as a whole* at once advance to high civilization? Where did the advance begin and under what influences? Give an account of the early *A*Egean and Asia Minor peoples. Who were the Hittites? Where was their home? their capital (Fig. 59)?

Who were the Trojans and where was their city? Did the mainland or the islands lead the way in the first great advance of *A*Egean civilization? Where is Crete (read explanation of Fig. 87)? Under what influences did Cretan civilization advance? Mention some examples of this influence. What do you know of Cretan art? Was it mere imitation of Egypt? When did Cretan civilization culminate?

**SECTION 21.** Where did Cretan civilization begin on the mainland? Did it spread throughout Greece? Give some account of civilization on the mainland of Greece when the Greeks came in. To what great race do the Greeks belong? Whence did their ancestors come? How did they enter Greece? Were they nomads or townsmen? Who were two of the earliest Greek peoples in Greece?

What became of the old pre-Greek *A*Egean people of Greece? Have we found such a situation anywhere else? Whither did the Greeks next go? What now happened to Crete? Who were the Philistines? What *A*Egean lands did the Greeks finally hold?

**SECTION 22.** Describe the transition of the Greeks from nomad to settled life. Describe their government and its different institutions. What problems did their new settled life create? What about writing among them?

¹ We may recall here how slow were the thirteen colonies of America to suppress local pride sufficiently to adopt a constitution uniting all thirteen into a nation. It was local differences similar to those among the Greeks which afterward caused our Civil War.
Describe the rise of the Greek city. What is a city-state? Who were the eupatrids? How did they gain power? What then happened to the peasant in the city-state? How did he and the Assembly lose power? What were the relations of these city-states to each other? What two unions early took place? What were the influences toward a union of all Greek city-states? Did a feeling of union result in a single political nation uniting all Greeks?
CHAPTER VI

THE AGE OF THE NOBLES AND THE TYRANTS
IN GREECE

Section 23. Civilization in the Age of the Nobles

We have seen how the noble class and the Council which it controlled had finally shorn the popular Assembly of its power. The same nobles not only thus crushed the people below but they also slowly undermined the power of the king above. In the century between 750 and 650 B.C. the kingship quite generally disappeared, and the leader of the State became an elective officer chosen for a year.\(^1\) At Athens he was termed "archon," or "ruler." With the disappearance of the king the royal castle (Fig. 67) was vacated. As it fell into decay the old holy places and shrines which it protected were still cherished, but they

\(^1\) A noticeable exception, however, was Sparta, where the Assembly of the people still retained its power. The voting citizens forming the Assembly became a military class, controlling a large body of slaves and other nonvoters in neighboring communities. Thus the whole body of voting citizens became a superior class, who were really nobles. This class did not depose the king but checked his power by maintaining two kings at once, and by the appointment of administrative officers who held some of the privileges formerly enjoyed by the king.
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were gradually transformed into temples. Thus on the citadel at Athens, there had been a palace of the old king Erechtheus. The little shrine of Athena in this palace later became a temple of the goddess, called the "Erechtheum,"¹ after the old king. In this way the castle of the ancient Attic kings was followed by the famous temples of Athens on the citadel mount, Acropolis (Fig. 91 and Plate III).

During the centuries of social and political ferment which brought forth a noble class and placed them in power, the civilization of the Ægean world had undergone great changes. The open-minded and clever Greek had meantime learned from his Ægean predecessors many of the arts which had so highly developed in the days of Cretan splendor. Iron had become common after 1000 B.C. and had deeply influenced all industry. The Ægean waters gradually grew familiar to the Greek communities, until they proved a far easier line of communication than a road through the same number of miles of forest and mountain.

Especially important and rich was the traffic between the Greek cities of the Asiatic coast on the east and Attica and Euboea on the European side. Among the Asiatic Greeks it was the Ionian cities which led in this commerce. The ships used by all were open, undecked craft accommodating about fifty oarsmen. The Greek trader was met by sharp competition in the hands of Phœnician mariners and merchants, who were common in these waters since Cretan days. Once dwellers in the desert, like the Hebrews and other Semites, the Phœnician townsmen along the Syrian coast (see Fig. 72 and map, p. 56) early took to the sea and became clever navigators. They gained a foothold in Cyprus and thence sailed into the Ægean. The Phœnician craftsman of Tyre or Sidon was a clever imitator. He received the patterns and the methods of the older oriental civilizations, especially Egypt and Assyria, and easily employed them

¹ The porch of the Erechtheum, supported by figures of beautiful maidens, will be found as headpiece of this chapter. The situation of the building on the Acropolis may be seen in Fig. 91, at the extreme left (east) end of the Parthenon.
for his own gains. Great Phoenician platters of metal with rich Egyptian designs, fine linens and purple raiment, Egyptian glass and porcelain, — all things which the Greek craftsman could not yet equal, — these made the Phoenician galley a welcome sight in every harbor of Greece. As Crete once kept the

![Fig. 72. A Glimpse along the Coast of Phoenicia](image)

The mountain at the right is Carmel, and we look northward across the harbor of Akko toward Tyre and Sidon. From these harbors sailed the Phoenician ships which became so familiar to the early Greek settlers in Hellas

Ægeans in close connection with the Orient, so now the Phœnicians played the same part for the Greeks. The work of the Phœnician craftsmen spread widely and became proverbial in Greece, appearing often in the Homeric songs (p. 142). The influence of such work gave to early Greek crafts a decidedly oriental character, which continued for a long time.

1 The flat, round dish of pure silver shown at the end of this chapter (p. 165) is a good example of such work as done in Egypt. The design shows a marsh as a circle of water around the center, with plentiful vegetation, and four Egyptian boats bearing a picnic party.
The Greek now received from the Phoenician a priceless gift, far more valuable than all the manufactured wares of the Orient. This new gift was an alphabet. Until long after 1000 B.C. the Greek was as unable to write as he had been on the grasslands of inner Asia fifteen hundred years earlier. The Orient, however, as we have seen (pp. 21, 62), had been writing for several thousand years. The Phoenician merchant had by this time long abandoned the inconvenient Babylonian clay tablet (p. 62). About 1000 B.C. he or his kinsmen had developed an alphabet of twenty-two consonants but still without any signs for the vowels (p. 71). For several centuries the Phoenicians of the city of Byblos had been importing the Egyptian papyrus paper (p. 22), on which they wrote with their new alphabet. The Greek merchant, thumbing the bits of papyrus bearing the Phoenician tradesman’s written list of goods, finally learned the alphabet in which it was written, and slowly began to note down Greek words in the same way. Here the Greek soon displayed his usual mental superiority; for, finding signs for certain Phoenician sounds which did not occur in Greek and were therefore superfluous to him, he used these signs for the Greek vowels and thus perfected the first complete system of alphabetic writing. It slowly spread among the Greek states, beginning in Ionia. It long remained only a convenience in business and administration. For centuries the nobles, unable to read or write, regarded writing with misgivings. The Homeric songs (p. 142), which were at first not written but were handed down orally from generation to generation, speak of the “deadly signs” used in writing. But even the painters of pottery jars had learned to use it by 700 B.C., when we find it on their decorated vases (compare Fig. 75). Shortly after this it was common

1 They probably devised it, by adaptation from Egyptian signs, or at least under their influence.

2 It is important to notice that all the alphabets of western Asia and all the alphabets of European countries, including our own alphabet, are descended from this old Phoenician alphabet. The student should recall its adoption by the Arameans (p. 71) and its spread eastward under the Persians (p. 98).
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Among all classes. Literature, nevertheless, long remained an oral matter and was much slower than business to resort to writing.

The Greeks often called the Egyptian paper, brought in by the Phœnicians, byblos, after the name of the Phœnician city by way of which it came. Thus when they began to write books on rolls of such paper (Fig. 104) they called them biblia. It is from this term that we received our word "Bible" (literally "book" or "books"), and hence the English word "Bible," once the name of a Phœnician city, is a living evidence of the origin of books and the paper they are made of, in the ancient Orient, from which the Greek received so much.

There was now wide intercourse among the Greek states; the constant commingling of their interests, the ebb and flow of their material life, developed and refined the Greek mind. The life which the Hellenes now led was much richer and more highly developed than that of their rude nomad ancestors. The contests in feats of arms and athletic games with which they had been accustomed to honor the burial of a hero in earlier days finally came to be practiced at stated seasons in honor of the gods. As early as 776 B.C. such contests were celebrated as public festivals at Olympia. Repeated every four years, they eventually aroused the interest and participation of all Greece. Later, similar contests were also established elsewhere (Figs. 81, 82). Various Greek states offered money prizes to the victors, and the winners were regarded as having gained undying fame both for themselves and the fortunate cities to which they belonged. They were finally celebrated by the

1 Few Greek inscriptions now surviving are as early as the seventh century B.C. The earliest inscription dated with precision belongs a little after 600 B.C. The written list of victors in the Olympian games went back to 776 B.C.

2 As far as I know this remark is new; but in view of the fact that the Egyptians were exporting papyrus paper to Byblos by the 12th century B.C., it is evident that the Greeks called it byblos because they received it from there, as we call stuff from Damascus, "damask," and from Calcutta, "calico." Another Greek word for Egyptian paper was "papyros," hence our word "paper" (see p. 23, note 1).
greatest poets, an honor which led the noble class to spend much of their time in manly exercises.

In art there had been distinct decay in the ΑEgean with the incoming of the Greeks. The art of the Cretan palaces which the Dorians had sent up in smoke and flame long surpassed anything the Greek could produce. Echoes of it survived on the coast of Asia Minor, where they were finally received by the Ionian Greeks. But for a long time the early Greeks fell under the influence of the oriental art imported in such abundance in the works of the Phœnician craftsman. Greek sculpture had hardly begun to produce rude figures; painting was confined to the decorative efforts of the craftsman, like the work of the painter of pottery jars. There was no great architecture, for the State employed only the simplest buildings of sun-baked brick, and the earliest Greek temples were merely houses, like those of private citizens, consisting of a square room built of sun-baked brick, with a wooden roof and timbers, and a porch across the front with wooden posts supporting it.

It was in literature that Greek genius achieved its first great triumph in this age of the disappearing kingship and the rule of the nobles. In the pastures of Thessaly where the singer

**FIG. 73. AN IDEAL PORTRAIT OF HOMER**

This head, from the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, is a noble example of the Greek sculptor's ability to create an ideal portrait of a poet whom he had never seen. Such work was unknown in the archaic days of Greece; it was produced in the Hellenistic Age (p. 232)
looked up at the cloud-veiled summit of Mount Olympus (Fig. 69), the home of the gods, there grew up a group of songs telling many a story of the feats of gods and heroes. Into these songs were woven also vague memories of remote wars which had actually occurred. By 1000 B.C. these songs had crossed to the coasts and islands of Ionia on the Asiatic side of the Aegean Sea.

Here arose a class of professional bards who graced the feasts of king and noble with songs of battle and adventure recited to the music of the harp. Framed in exalted and ancient forms of speech, and rolling on in stately measures,¹ these heroic songs resounded through many a royal hall—the oldest literature born in Europe. After the separate songs had greatly increased in number, they were finally woven together by the bards into a connected whole—a great epic cycle especially clustering about the traditions of the Greek expedition against Troy. They were not the work of one man, but a growth of several centuries by generations of singers, some of whom were still living even after 700 B.C. It was then that they were first written down.

Among these ancient singers there seems to have been one of great fame whose name was Homer (Fig. 73). His reputation was such that the composition of the whole cycle of songs, then much larger than it now is, was attributed to him. Then as the Greeks themselves later discerned the impossibility of Homer's authorship of them all, they credited him only with the Iliad,² the story of the Greek expedition against Troy; and the Odyssey, or the tale of the wanderings of the hero Odysseus on his return from Troy. These are the only two series of songs that have entirely survived, and even the ancient world had its doubts about the Homeric authorship of the Odyssey. These ancient bards not only gave the world its greatest epic

¹ These were in hexameter; that is, six feet to a line. This Greek verse is the oldest literary form in Europe.
² So named after Ilium, the Greek name of Troy.
in the Iliad, but they were, moreover, the earliest Greeks to put into permanent literary form their thoughts regarding the world of gods and men. At that time the Greeks had no other sacred books, and the Homeric songs became the veritable Bible of Greece. They gave to the disunited Greeks a common literature and the inspiring belief that they had once all taken part in a common war against Asia. But the heroic world of glorious achievement in which the vision of these early singers moved, passed away, and with it passed their art.

The Homeric singers never refer to themselves; they never speak of their own lives, but retire behind the stirring pictures of heroic adventure which absorb their thought and completely occupy them with the lives of their heroes who had died long, long before. But now the problems of the present begin to press hard upon the minds of men; the peasant farmer’s distressing struggle for existence (see p. 132) makes men conscious of very present needs. Their own lives become a great and living theme. The voices that once chanted the hero songs die away, and now we hear the first voice raised in Europe on behalf of the poor and humble. Hesiod, an obscure farmer under the shadow of Mount Helicon in Bœotia, sings of the dreary and hopeless life of the peasant — of his own life as he struggles on under a burden too heavy for his shoulders. We even hear how his brother Persis seized the lands left by their father, and then bribed the judges to confirm him in their possession.

It is not a little interesting to observe that this earliest protest against the tyrannies of wealthy town life is raised at the very moment when across the corner of the Mediterranean the once nomad Hebrews are passing through the same experience (see p. 104). The voice of Hesiod raising the cry for social justice in Greece sounds like an echo from Palestine. We should notice also that in Palestine the cry for social justice resulted finally in a religion of brotherly kindness, whereas in Greece it resulted in democratic institutions, the rule of the people who refused longer to submit to the oppressions of the few and powerful.
Homer was the religious teacher of the Greeks, for the Homeric songs brought vividly before them the world of the gods. In this Homeric world the gods have become human, and act like men. Of course they possess more power than mortals, and at the same time they enjoy the gift of immortality which raises them high above the world of men. Each god has a kingdom and a function of his own. Zeus rules the sky; Dionysus brings forth the vine, and the goddess Demeter the wheat, from the earth which both control; Poseidon rules the sea; Athena with shining weapons glories in war; Apollo with his golden arrows is the deadly archer of the gods, and Hermes of the winged feet is their messenger; Hera is protectress of marriage, and Aphrodite the goddess of love. They show decidedly human defects of character; they practice all sorts of deceit and display many other human frailties.

Nor do the gods demand anything better in the character of men, for at death all men go to a gloomy world of spirits beneath the earth (Hades), where no distinction is made between good and bad. As a special favor of the gods, the heroes are at last endowed with immortality and permitted to enjoy a life of endless bliss in the beautiful Elysian Fields or the Islands of the Blest somewhere in the Far West, toward the unexplored ocean. The altars of the gods were at first always set up under the open sky without any sheltering roofs, as we should expect among tribes of wandering shepherds. But the settled life had brought permanent shrines in the royal castle, and, when the castle was vacated by the king (p. 136), these shrines became temples, dwelling houses of the gods, made like the dwellings of men. The citadel mount was thus transformed into the sacred inclosure of the gods, like the Acropolis of Athens (Fig. 91).

1 See the altar in the forecourt of the prehistoric castle of Tiryns (Fig. 67).
Fig. 74. Ruins of the Greek Theater at Taormina (Ancient Tauromenium), Sicily

The Greek colony of Tauromenium was on the east coast of Sicily (see map, p. 245). We look down from the seats of the theater, across the stage below (compare Fig. 94), where a gap in the wall behind the stage reveals a long vista of the beautiful Sicilian shore; while in the distance towers the majestic volcano of Etna, nearly eleven thousand feet high, often displaying a wisp of smoke above its crown of snow.
Section 24. Greek Expansion in the Age of the Nobles

The oppressive rule of the nobles, and the resulting impoverishment of the peasants, was an important influence, leading the Greek farmers to seek new homes and new lands beyond the Aegean world. Greek merchants were not only trafficking with the northern Aegean, but their vessels had penetrated the great northern sea, which they called the "Pontus," known to us as the Black Sea (see map, p. 146). Their trading stations among the descendants of the Stone Age peoples in these distant regions offered to the discontented farmers of Greece plenty of land with which to begin life over again. Before 600 B.C. they girdled the Black Sea with their towns and settlements, but no such development of Greek genius took place in this harsher climate of the north as we shall find in the Aegean. The Pontus became the granary of Greece but never contributed anything to its higher life.

In the east, along the southern coasts of Asia Minor, there were already maritime peoples in possession; but Greek expansion in this direction was stopped by the Assyrian Sennacherib (p. 72) when he defeated a body of Greeks in Cilicia about 700 B.C., in the earliest collision between the Hellenes and a great power of the Tigris-Euphrates world. At the eastern end of the Mediterranean, Greek colonists absorbed nearly all of the large Island of Cyprus, which long remained the easternmost outpost of the Greek world. In the south they found a friendly reception in Egypt, where they were permitted to establish a trading city at Naukratis (Mistress of Ships), the predecessor of Alexandria. West of the Delta also they eventually founded Cyrene.

It was the unknown west, however, which became the America of the early Greek colonists. Many a Columbus pushed his ship into this strange region of mysterious dangers on the distant borders of the world, where the heroes were believed to live in
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the Islands of the Blest. But step by step the dreaded regions were explored. Flourishing cities like Corinth, in trading with the western coast of Greece, pushed northward, where the seamen could discover the shores of Italy as they looked westward toward the heel of that great peninsula. It was indeed but fifty miles distant from the west coast of Greece. When they had once crossed to it, their trading ventures carried them on coasting voyages around Sicily and northward far into the west, at last even to the then unknown shores which we call the French and Spanish coasts. Here was a new world. Its discovery was as momentous for the Greeks as that of America for later Europe.

By 750 B.C. their colonies appeared in this new western world, and within a century they fringed southern Italy from the heel to a point well above the instep north of Naples, which was also a Greek colony known as "Neapolis," or "New City," like our Newburgh or Newtown. So numerous were the Greek settlements that this region of southern Italy came to be known as "Great Greece." Here the Greek colonists looked northward to the hills crowned by the rude settlements which were destined to become Rome. They little dreamed that this insignificant town would yet rule the world, making even the proud cities of their homeland its tributaries. As the Greeks were superior in civilization to all the other dwellers in Italy, the civilized history of that great peninsula begins with the advent of the Hellenes. They first brought in such things as writing, literature, architecture, and art (see headpiece of Chapter VII, p. 166).

The Greek colonists crossed over also to Sicily (Fig. 74), where they drove out the Phoenician trading posts except at the western end of the island, and there the Phoenicians held their own. These Greek colonists in the west shared in the higher life of the homeland; and Syracuse, at the southeast

---

1 One of the oldest of all Greek temples now surviving stands in a wonderful state of preservation on the Italian coast south of Naples at the ancient Poseidonia (Poseidon's town), afterward called Pæstum. It was built about 500 B.C. (see the drawing at head of Chapter VII, p. 166).
corner of the Island of Sicily, became at one time the most cultivated, as well as the most powerful, city of the Greek world. At Massilia (Marseilles), on the coast of later France, the western Greeks founded a town which controlled the trade up the Rhone valley; and they reached over even to the Mediterranean coasts of Spain, attracted by the silver mines of Tartessus.

Thus, under the rule of the eupatrids, the Hellenes expanded till they stretched from the Black Sea along the north shore of the Mediterranean almost to the Atlantic. In this imposing movement we recognize a part of the far outstretched western wing of the Indo-European line (see p. 87); but at the same time we discover that the Semite has also taken to the water, and in the Phœnician Empire of Carthage, reaching from Sicily along the northern coast of Africa even to the Atlantic coast of Spain, the Semite has likewise flung out his western wing along the southern Mediterranean, facing the Indo-European peoples on the north.¹

SECTION 25. THE INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL REVOLUTION

The remarkable colonial expansion of the Greeks, together with the growth of industries in the home cities, led to profound changes. The new colonies not only had needs of their own, but they also made connections with the inland, behind which opened up extensive regions of Europe as a market for Greek wares. The home cities at once began to meet this demand for goods of all sorts. The Ionian cities led the way as usual, but the islands also, and finally the Greek mainland, felt the new impulse. Ere long the great commercial fleets of the Hellenes were threading their way along all the coasts of the northern, western, and southeastern Mediterranean, bearing to distant communities Greek metal work, woven goods, and pottery. They brought

¹ The diagram (Fig. 49) should be carefully studied again at this point, especially the west end. Compare the diagram with map of Roman Empire.
back either raw materials and foodstuffs, such as grain, fish, and ambe; or finished products like the magnificent utensils in bronze from the cities of the Etruscans in northern Italy (p. 246 and Fig. 107). At the yearly feast and market on the Island of Delos the Greek householder found the Etruscan bronzes of the West side by side with the gay carpets of the Orient.

To meet the increasing demands of trade the Greek craftsman was obliged to enlarge his small shop, once perhaps only large enough to supply the wants of a single estate. Unable to find the necessary workmen, the proprietor, who had the means bought slaves, trained them to the work, and thus enlarged his little stall into a factory with a score of hands. Henceforth industrial slave labor became an important part of Greek life.

Athens entered the field of industry much later than the Ionian cities, but when she did so, she won victories not less decisive
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than her later triumphs in art, literature, philosophy, or war. Her factories must have assumed a size quite unprecedented in the Greek world, for of the painted Greek vases — discovered

Fig. 76. The Isthmus of Corinth, the Link between the Peloponnesus and Northern Greece

The observer stands on the hills south of ancient Corinth (out of range on the left) and looks northeastward along the isthmus, on both sides of which the sea is visible. On the left (west) we see the tip of the Gulf of Corinth (see map, p. 146), and on the right (east) the Saronic Gulf. The commerce across this isthmus from the Orient to the West made the Gulf of Corinth an important center of traffic westward, and Corinth early became a flourishing commercial city. Through this sole gateway of the Peloponnesus (see map, p. 146) passed back and forth for centuries the leading men of Greece, and especially the armies of Sparta, some sixty miles distant (behind the observer). The faint white line in the middle of the isthmus is the modern canal — a cut from sea to sea, about four miles long and nearly two hundred feet deep at the crest of the watershed by excavation — which are signed by the artist, about half are found to have come from only six factories at Athens. It is not a little impressive at the present day to see the modern excavator
opening tombs far toward the interior of Asia Minor and taking out vases bearing the signature of the same Athenian vase-painter whose name you may also read on vases dug out of the Nile Delta in northern Africa, or taken from tombs in cemeteries of the Etruscan cities of Italy (Fig. 75). We suddenly gain a picture of the Athenian craftsman and merchant in touch with a vast commercial domain extending far across the ancient world.

Soon the shipbuilder, responding to the growing commerce, began to build craft far larger than the old “fifty-oar” galleys of the Homeric Age. The new “merchantmen” were driven by sails, an Egyptian invention of ages before (Fig. 14). They were so large that they could no longer be drawn up on the strand as before; sheltered harbors were necessary, and for the first time in history the anchor appeared. The protection of such

![Fig. 77. Specimens illustrating the Beginning of Coinage](image)

These are rough lumps of silver, as long before used in the Orient (pp. 38, 67), flattened by the pressure of the stamp. Gradually they became round, and the stamp itself was finally made round instead of square, as in these early examples. 1, both sides of a Lydian coin (p. 98) (about 550 B.C.); 2, both sides of a coin of the Greek island of Chios (500 B.C.), showing how the Greeks followed the Lydian model (r); 3, both sides of a Carian coin of Cnidus (650–550 B.C.), an example of the square stamp; 4, both sides of a coin of Athens (sixth century B.C.), bearing head of goddess Athena and an owl with olive branch (square stamp). The inscription is an abbreviation of “Athens”
merchant ships demanded more effective warships, and the distin-
tinction arose between a "man-o'-war," or battleship, and a
"merchantman." Corinth (Fig. 76), an older commercial center
than Athens, boasted the production of the first decked warships,
a great improvement, giving the warriors above more room
and better footing, and protecting the oarsmen below. The latter
were arranged in three rows, three men on the same bench, each
man wielding an oar, and thus the power of an old "fifty-oar"
could be multiplied by three without essentially increasing the
size of the craft. These innovations were all in common use by
500 B.C. With their superior equipment on the sea, the Hellenes
were soon beating the Phoenicians in the Mediterranean markets,
and at the same time the Greek craftsmen had not only broken
away from the leading strings of the Orient, but were already
showing superiority in many lines of industry and art.

The Ionian cities, which enjoyed important commerce with
the peoples of inner Asia Minor, besides receiving the Babylonian
system of weights and measures,\(^1\) began to use the precious
metals in making business payments. The metals were first used
in bars and rods of a given weight, as had been the custom in
the Orient for thousands of years before (pp. 38, 67). When the
kings of Lydia late in the seventh century B.C. began to cut up
these bars into small pieces of a fixed weight, and to stamp these
pieces with some symbol of the king or state, we have the earliest
coined money (Fig. 77, \(\ast\)). The Ionian cities were soon using
this new convenience, and it quickly passed thence to the islands
and the European Greeks (Fig. 77, 2–4\(^\circ\)). It rapidly became a
powerful influence in Greek society.

Wealth had formerly consisted of land and flocks, but now
men began to accumulate capital in *money*; loans were made,
and the use of interest came in from the Orient. The developing
industries and the commercial ventures on the seas rapidly created

---

1 This system has 60 as a basis and underlies also the division of the circle (360°)
which we have inherited. The smaller subdivisions of Greek weights were on a
decimal system derived from Egypt.
fortunes among a class before obscure. There arose a prosperous industrial and commercial middle class who demanded a voice in the government. At the beginning of the sixth century B.C. even a noble like Solon could say, "Money makes the man."

Section 26. Rise of the Democracy and the Age of the Tyrants

While the prosperous capitalistic class was thus arising, the condition of the peasant on his lands grew steadily worse. His fields were dotted with stones, each the sign of a mortgage. The wealthy creditors were foreclosing these mortgages and taking the lands; and the unhappy owners were being sold into foreign slavery, or were fleeing abroad to escape such bonds. The eupatrids in control did nothing as a class to improve the situation. They were usually divided among themselves into hostile factions, however, and in time able leaders among them placed themselves at the head of the dissatisfied people in real or feigned sympathy with their cause. In this way such a leader of the nobles was able to gain the support of the people, and thus to overcome and expel his own rivals among the noble class and gain control of the State.

Such a ruler was in reality a king; but the new king differed from the kings of old, in that he had no royal ancestors and had seized the control of the State by violence. The people did not reverence him as of ancient royal lineage, and while they may have felt gratitude to him, they felt no loyalty. The position of such a ruler always remained insecure. The Greeks called such a man a "tyrant," which was not at that time a term of reproach as it is with us. The word "tyranny" was merely a term for the high office held by such a ruler. Nevertheless the instinctive feeling of the Greeks was that they were no longer free under such a prince, and the slayer of a tyrant was regarded as a hero and savior of the people.
One of the fancied remedies for their wrongs which the people had long demanded was the putting of the recognized laws into writing (Fig. 78). Hitherto all law, so long ago reduced to writing in the Orient (see Fig. 42), had been a matter of oral tradition and custom in Greece. It was easy to twist such law to favor the man who gave the judge the largest present, just as the judge did for Persis when he swindled his brother Hesiod out of their
father's lands and secured them himself (see p. 143). After a long struggle the Athenians secured such a written code, arranged by a man named Draco about 624 B.C. It was an exceedingly severe code, so severe, in fact, that the adjective "Draconic" has passed into our language as a synonym for "harsh." It did nothing to relieve the agricultural class, and the mortgage stones in the Attic grain fields were no fewer than before.

The situation in Athens was much complicated by hostilities with neighboring powers like Megara, Aegina, and Sparta. The merchants of Megara had seized the Island of Salamis (Fig. 86), overlooking the port of Athens, while a little further south was another commercial rival in the little Island of Aegina (see map, p. 146). The loss of Salamis and the failure of the eupatrids to recover it aroused intense indignation among the Athenians. Then a man of the old family to which the ancient kings of Athens had belonged, a wealthy noble named Solon, who had increased his wealth by many a commercial venture on the seas, roused his countrymen by fiery verses, calling upon the Athenians not to endure the shame of such a loss. Salamis was recovered, and Solon gained great popularity with all classes of Athenians.

The verses of Solon (which in a later day when the Greeks had begun to write prose would have taken the form of political speeches) pictured the distressing condition of the Attic people with startling effect. The result was Solon's election as archon (p. 136) in 594 B.C. He was given full power to remedy the evil conditions. To save the peasants, he declared void all mortgages on land and all claims of creditors which endangered the liberty of a citizen. Furthermore, citizens who had been sold into foreign slavery to satisfy such claims Solon repurchased at the cost of the State, and they returned as free men to Attica. But Solon was a true statesman, and to the demands of the lower classes for a new apportionment of lands held by the eupatrids he would not yield. He did however set a limit to the amount of land which a noble might hold.
Fig. 79. Monument of the Tyrant-Slayers of Athens, Harmodius and Aristogiton

On the slopes of the Areopagus (see plan, p. 173, and Fig. 91) overlooking the market place, the Athenians set up this group, depicting at the moment of attack the two heroic youths who lost their lives in an attempt to slay the two sons of Pisistratus and to free Athens from the two tyrants (514 B.C.) (p. 157). The group was carried off by the Persians after the battle of Salamis; the Athenians had another made to replace the first one. It was afterward recovered in Persia by Alexander or his successors and restored to its old place where both groups stood side by side. Our illustration is an ancient copy in marble, probably reproducing the later of the two groups.

Further, he proclaimed a constitution which gave all but the very lowest classes a voice in the control of the State. It was not democratic, for it recognized an aristocracy of wealth in the place of the old aristocracy of birth. There were three political classes according to income. Only the men who belonged to the first class, with the largest income (five hundred measures of grain, or of oil and wine together), could hold the highest offices in the State; but the humblest free craftsman could vote in the Assembly of the people. Otherwise, the established institutions were little changed by Solon. He left also a written code of law by which all free men were for the first time given equal rights in the courts. Some of these laws have descended to our own time and are still in force.

Solon is the first great Greek statesman of whom
we obtain an authentic picture, chiefly through those poems of his which have survived to our day. The leading trait of his character was moderation, combined with unfailing decision. When all expected that he would assume permanent authority over the Athenian State and make himself "tyrant" at the end of his official term, he laid down his archonship without a moment's hesitation and left the city for several years, to give his constitution a fair chance to work.

Solon saved Attica from a great social catastrophe, and it was chiefly due to his wise reforms that Athens achieved her industrial and commercial triumphs. But his work, though it deferred the humiliation, could not save the Athenian State from subjection to the tyrant. After an unsuccessful attempt to seize the government, Pisistratus, a member of one of the powerful eupatrid families, returned from exile and gained control of the Athenian State. He ruled with great sagacity and success, and many of the Athenians gave him sincere allegiance. But his two sons, Hippias and Hipparchus, though able men, were unable to overcome the prejudice against a ruler on whom the people had not conferred authority. One of the earliest exhibitions of that love of the State which we call patriotism is the outburst of enthusiasm at Athens when two youths, Harmodius and Aristogiton (Fig. 79), at the sacrifice of their own lives, struck down one of the tyrants (Hipparchus). Hippias, the other one, was eventually obliged to flee. Thus, shortly before 500 B.C., Athens was freed from her tyrants.

The people were now able to gain new power against the eupatrids by the efforts of a noble friendly to the lower classes, named Clisthenes. He broke up the old tribal divisions of blood and established purely local lines of division, so cleverly adjusted that city and country communities were combined to form part of each tribe. This gave the country communities an equal chance with the city. Moreover the development of tactics of war under the leadership of the Spartans had produced close masses of spearmen, each mass (phalanx) remaining an
impenetrable unit throughout the battle. Against such infantry, the horsemen or the individual champions of ancient times, always men of the noble class, were powerless. Thus the demand for the ordinary citizen in the army much increased the importance and power of the people in the State as over against the eupatrids. The new tribal divisions of Clisthenes were also the military divisions of the country, and again, as in the old nomad days, citizenship and the bearing of arms in defense of the State were more closely identified. In the Assembly of the people and on the field of battle the townsman and the country peasant henceforth stood shoulder to shoulder.

In order to avoid the rise of a new tyrant, Clisthenes established a law that the people might once a year by vote declare any prominent citizen dangerous to the State and banish him for ten years. On the day appointed for the voting a citizen had only to pick up one of the pieces of broken pottery lying about the market place, write upon it the name of the citizen to be banished, and deposit it in the voting urn. As such a bit of pottery was called an "ostrac" (Fig. 88), to "ostracize" a man (literally to "potsherd" him) meant to interrupt his political career by banishment. Although the men of five hundred measures' income (see p. 156) were still the only ones to whom the office of archon and the other high offices were open, Attica had now (about 500 B.C.) gained a form of government giving the people a high degree of power, and the State was in large measure a democracy.

Although a tyrant here and there survived, especially in Asia Minor, Greece at this time passed out of the Age of the Tyrants. As a group, the leaders of this age made an impression upon the mind of the people which never entirely disappeared. They were the earliest statesmen in Greece, if not in history, and some of them were led by high-minded motives in their control of the Greek states. The people loved to quote their sayings, such as "Know thyself," a proverb which was carved over the entrance of the Apollo temple at Delphi; or Solon's wise
maxim, "Overdo nothing." There came to be collections of such sayings, and the most famous of the men of the age were grouped together as the "Seven Wise Men." ¹

Section 27. Civilization in the Age of the Tyrants

The Age of the Tyrants was a period of unprecedented progress among the Hellenes, in industries, in commerce, and in the higher life which we call civilization. The old sun-baked brick and wooden temples were replaced by structures of limestone, and the front of the temple of Apollo at Delphi was even clothed with marble, but the building was painted in colors as before. Sculpture adorned the temple front, the statues of the gods being in human form and showing strong influences from the Orient, especially Egypt. Not only religion but patriotism also found its voice in art, as shown by a noble group representing the two youths who endeavored to free Athens from the tyranny of the sons of Pisistratus (see p. 157 and Fig. 79).

The tyrants loved music and it was much cultivated. A system of writing musical notes, meaning for music what the alphabet means for literature, now arose. The flute was a favorite instrument, and one musician even wrote a composition for the flute which was intended to tell the story of Apollo's fight with the dragon of Delphi. In literature the old heroic meter of the Homeric poems, with its six feet, was abandoned for less stately and monotonous forms of verse. From serious discussions in verse like those of Solon (p. 155), the poets passed to the expression of momentary moods, longings, dreams, hopes, and fiery storms of passion. Each in his way found a wondrous world within himself which he thus pictured in short songs.

The Homeric songs were the impersonal voice of an age as a whole; but now these new songs reveal inner experiences of the

¹ The list of the Seven Wise Men is as follows: Solon of Athens, Periander of Corinth, Chilon of Sparta, Thales of Miletus, Pittacus of Mitylene, Bias of Priene, and Cleobulus of Lindus.
individual singers. Among them the poetess Sappho was the earliest woman to gain undying fame in literature. In Sicily

\[\text{FIG. 80. RUINS OF THE HALL OF THE "MYSTERIES" AT ELEUSIS}\]

Very little of the building survives; remnants of the columns once supporting the roof are seen on the left; on the right are the seats cut from the solid rock, on which the initiates (p. 162) sat while watching the sacred ceremonies of the "Mysteries," the spring and autumn feasts celebrated here. Especially at the autumn feast, after five days' preparation, multitudes came out from Athens, seventeen miles distant, along the Sacred Way, and spent five days more here at Eleusis. Emblems of the undying life of the earth, like heads of grain, displayed at these ceremonies, suggested the immortal life promised to all initiates (compare the similar Osirian beliefs, pp. 27–28). In the distance we see the Bay of Eleusis and beyond it the heights of the northern part of the Island of Salamis (Fig. 86 and map, p. 146)

the poet Stesichorus developed a kind of country festival songs (the dithyramb), sung by peasant choruses as they marched in procession at many a picturesque harvest or spring feast. These songs told the stories of the gods from the old myths. They
were sung responsively by chorus and leader, and the leader illustrated with gestures the story told in the song. He thus became the forerunner of the actor in a play, and in Athens, not long after, such songs led to the drama actually presented in a theater (Fig. 94).

Such literature reveals the profound changes in the religion of this age—changes due to the growing discrimination between right and wrong. Men could no longer believe that the gods led the evil lives pictured in the Homeric songs. Stesichorus had so high an ideal of womanly fidelity that he could not accept the tale of the beautiful Helen’s faithlessness, and in his festival songs he told the ancient story in another way. Men now felt that even Zeus and his Olympian divinities must do the right. Mortals too must do the same; for men
had now come to believe that in the world of the dead there was punishment for the evil-doer and blessedness for the good.

In the temple at Eleusis (Fig. 80) scenes from the mysterious earth life of Demeter and Dionysus, to whom men owe the fruits of the earth, are presented by the priests in dramatic form before the initiated, and he who views them may be received into the Islands of the Blessed, where once only the ancient heroes were admitted. Even the poorest slave is permitted to enter this fellowship and be initiated into the "Mysteries," as they were called. More than ever, also, men now turned to the gods for a knowledge of the future in this world. Everywhere it was believed that the oracle voice of Apollo revealed the outcome of every untried venture, and his shrine at Delphi (Figs. 81, 82) became a national religious center, to which the whole Greek world resorted.

On the other hand, some thoughtful men began to reject the beliefs of the earlier day regarding the world and its control by the gods. When Thales of Miletus, from his study of the Babylonian astronomical lists (p. 84), correctly predicted an eclipse of the sun in the year 585 B.C. and boldly proclaimed that the movements of the heavenly bodies were due not to the whims of the gods but to fixed laws of nature, he banished the gods from a whole world of their former domain. Likewise, when the Greeks learned of the enormous age of the oriental peoples, especially of the Egyptians, it was at once perceived that the gods could not have been wandering on earth like men only a few generations earlier. Such men as Thales, therefore, became the founders of natural science and philosophy. At this point in their thinking they entered upon a new world, which had never dawned upon the greatest minds of the early East. This step remains and will forever remain the greatest achievement of the human intellect—an achievement to call forth the reverence and admiration of all time.

Just at this point, when the Greek was standing on the threshold of a new world, the Persian hosts suddenly advanced
Fig. 82. Restoration of the Temple and Sacred Inclosure of Delphi. (After Luckenbach)

The famous temple of Apollo, where all Greece and many foreigners came to hear the oracles (p. 162), is the large building in the center, up to which leads the paved zigzag path visible also in Fig. 81. On both sides of this path are seen the small buildings containing the costly gifts presented by the various Greek states—often the spoils of war to commemorate some victory. A forest of statues not shown here rose everywhere in the inclosure, until it became a vast treasury not only of memories and of the noblest Greek art but also of the precious metals so freely used in making the statues, tripods, etc. which filled the inclosure. The value of these things proved fatal. It was finally plundered by the Romans (p. 284), but although the Roman emperor Nero (54-68 A.D.) removed five hundred statues from here, there were still three thousand left when Pliny visited the place some years later.
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Advance of Persia to the Ægean (see p. 96) and absorbed the Ionian cities. The Persians represented a high civilization and an enlightened rule; but with these things went lack of free citizenship, political bondage, and intellectual subjection to religious tradition. Whether or not the Greek states had developed the power to throw off the Asiatic assailant, whose supremacy in Greece would have checked the free development of Greek genius along its own individual lines,—this was the question which now confronted the Hellenes. They little dreamed of the importance which the ensuing struggle would assume for the future career of civilized man.

QUESTIONS

SECTION 23. Who overthrew the Greek kings? Who then ruled? What institutions came in as a result? What became of the citadel and king's castle? Describe Greek commercial and industrial development in the Age of the Nobles. Who led in these matters? Who were the chief competitors of the Greeks? How did the Greeks gain an alphabet? How did such intercourse affect the Greeks?

What were the hero songs? Where did they chiefly flourish? To whom were they attributed? Which of them have come down to us? How does Hesiod differ from the Homeric singers? Give an account of him and compare him with the Hebrew prophets. Give some account of early Greek gods. Were they free from moral faults?

SECTION 24. Describe Greek colonization in north and east; in south and west. Whom did they find as competitors already in the west? Where were the Phoenician colonies? Which was the most famous? What two racial lines were then facing each other across the Mediterranean?

SECTION 25. How did the new colonies affect trade and industry in the homeland? Describe the growth of commerce. What were the results at Athens? Where was the painted vase of Fig. 75 made and where was it found? Has the work of its makers been found elsewhere? How did the growth of commerce affect shipbuilding? How and when did coinage arise? What class did the introduction of money create? What effect did it have on the peasants?

SECTION 26. How did some of the eupatrids make use of the discontent of the people? What is a "tyrant" in this ancient age? Why did the people demand written laws? Whose was the first
written code of laws in Athens? Did it prove a remedy for the distress of the peasant class? Who was Solon? Outline his reforms. Did Solon save Athens from the "tyranny"? Did the tyranny last long at Athens?

What reforms did Clisthenes introduce? What change in military service and weapons had now taken place? Of what advantage was this change to the ordinary citizen? What was ostracism? Tell something of the "Seven Wise Men."

Section 27. What advances in civilization were made in the Age of the Tyrants? in sculpture? music? literature? poetry? What progress do we now discover in religion? Was there now life hereafter for all? What were the "Mysteries" of Eleusis? What were oracles? Who was the great god of oracles and where was his temple?

Who was Thales? What did he do? What effect did his prediction have on thinking men's ideas of the world and its control by the gods? What did they thus create? Who now appeared in Asia Minor (p. 163)?
CHAPTER VII

THE REPULSE OF PERSIA AND THE ATHENIAN EMPIRE

Section 28. The Struggle with Persia

When the Ionian cities which Persia had captured in her advance to the Ægean\(^1\) revolted, their friend and relative, Athens, sent twenty ships to aid them. This act brought a Persian army of revenge, under King Darius, into Europe. The long march across the Hellespont and through Thrace cost the invaders many men, and the fleet which formed one wing of the Persian advance was wrecked in trying to round the high promontory of Mount Athos (492 B.C.). The advance into Greece was therefore abandoned for a different plan of invasion, which would avoid the long march around the Hellespont.

In the early summer of 490 B.C. a considerable fleet of transports and warships bearing the Persian host put out from the Island of Samos, sailed straight across the Ægean, and entered the straits between Euboea and Attica (see map, p. 146, and Fig. 83). The Persians began by burning the little city of Eretria, which had also sent ships to aid the Ionians against Persia, and then landed on the shores of Attica, in the Bay of Marathon

\(^1\) The student should here reread pp. 96-97.
(see map, p. 146, and Fig. 83), intending to march on Athens, the greater offender. They were guided by the aged Hippias, son of Pisistratus, once tyrant of Athens, who accompanied them with high hopes of regaining control of his native city.

All was excitement and confusion among the Greek states. The defeat of the revolting Ionian cities, and especially the Persian sack of Miletus, had made a deep impression throughout Greece. An Athenian dramatist had depicted in a play the plunder of the unhappy city and so incensed the Athenians that
they passed weeping from the theater to prosecute and fine the author. Now this Persian foe who had crushed the Ionian cities was camping behind the hills only a few miles northeast of Athens. After dispatching messengers in desperate haste to seek aid in Sparta, the Athenian citizens turned to contemplate the seemingly hopeless situation of their beloved city. Here was a tiny Greek state confronted by the army of the Lord of Asia, the Emperor of the world, who regarded the peoples of the West as insignificant communities which had been troubling the frontiers of his vast world empire.

Thinking to find the Athenians unprepared, Darius had not sent a large army. The Persian forces probably numbered no more than twenty thousand men, while at the utmost the Athenians could not put more than half this number into the field. Fortunately for them there was among their generals a skilled and experienced commander named Miltiades, a man of resolution and firmness, who, moreover, had lived on the Hellespont and was familiar with Persian methods of fighting. To his judgment the commander-in-chief, Callimachus, yielded at all points. As the citizen-soldiers of Attica flocked to the city at the call to arms, Miltiades was able to induce the leaders not to await the assault of the Persians at Athens, but to march across the peninsula (see map, p. 146) and block the Persian advance among the hills overlooking the eastern coast and commanding the road to the city. This bold and resolute move roused courage and enthusiasm in the downcast ranks of the Greeks.

Nevertheless, when they issued between the hills and looked down upon the Persian host encamped upon the Plain of Marathon (Fig. 83), flanked by a fleet of hundreds of vessels, misgiving and despair chilled the hearts of the little Attic army. But Miltiades held the leaders firmly in hand, and the arrival of a thousand Greeks from Plataea revived the courage of the Athenians. The Greek position overlooked the main road to Athens, and the Persians could not advance without leaving their line of march exposed on one side to the Athenian attack.
Unable to lure the Greeks from their advantageous position after several days' waiting, the Persians at length attempted to march along the road to Athens, at the same time endeavoring to cover their exposed line of march with a sufficient force thrown out in battle array. Miltiades was familiar with the Persian custom of massing troops in the center. He therefore massed his own troops on both wings, leaving his center weak. It was a battle between bow and spear. The Athenians undauntedly faced the storm of Persian arrows, and then both wings pushed boldly forward to the line of shields behind which the Persian archers were kneeling. In the meantime the Persian center had forced back the Greeks, while the two Greek wings

\[\text{1 See page 96 and Fig. 51.}\]
closed in on either side and thrust back the Persian wings in confusion. The Asiatic army crumbled into a broken multitude between the two advancing lines of Greeks. The Persian bow was useless, and the Greek spear everywhere spread death and terror. As the Persians fled to their ships they left over six thousand dead upon the field, while the Athenians lost less than two hundred men (Fig. 84). When the Persian commander, unwilling to acknowledge defeat, sailed around the Attic peninsula and appeared with his fleet before the port of Athens, he found it unwise to attempt a landing, for the victorious Athenian army was already encamped beside the city.

Among the men who stood in the Athenian ranks at Marathon was Themistocles, the ablest statesman in Greece, a man who had already occupied the office of archon, the head of the Athenian state. As archon Themistocles had striven to convince the Athenians that the only way in which Athens could hope to meet the assault of Persia was by making herself undisputed mistress of the sea. He had failed in his effort. But now the Athenians had seen the Persians cross the Ægean with their fleet and land at Marathon. It was evident that a powerful Athenian navy might have stopped them. They began to listen to the counsels of Themistocles to make Athens the great sea power of the Mediterranean.

Darius the Persian died without having avenged his defeat at Marathon, but his son and successor, Xerxes, took up the unfinished task. He was prevailed upon by his able general Mardonius to adopt the Hellespont route. When the Athenians saw that Xerxes’ commanders were cutting a canal behind the promontory of Athos, to secure a short cut and thus to avoid all risk of such a wreck as had overtaken their former fleet in rounding this dangerous point, Themistocles was able to induce the Assembly to build a great fleet of probably a hundred and eighty triremes.

1 The mound raised by the Athenians in honor of the fallen Greeks still marks the battlefield, a sacred memorial reverently visited by many travelers.
Themistocles’ masterly plan of campaign corresponded exactly to the plan of the Persian advance. The Asiatics were coming in combined land and sea array, with army and fleet moving together down the east coast of the Greek mainland. The design of

**Fig. 85. The Pass of Thermopylae**

In the time of the Persian invasion the mountains to the left dropped steeply to the sea, with barely room between for a narrow road. Since then the rains of twenty-four hundred years have washed down the mountainside, and it is no longer as steep as formerly, while the neighboring river has filled in the shore and pushed back the sea several miles. Otherwise we would see it here on the right. The Persians, coming from beyond the mountains toward our point of view, could not spread out in battle array, being hemmed in by the sea on one side and the cliff on the other. It was only when a traitorous Greek led a Persian force by night over the mountain on the left, and they appeared behind the Greeks in the pass, that Leonidas and his Spartans were crushed by the simultaneous attack in front and rear (pp. 172-174)

Themistocles was to meet the Persian fleet first with full force and fight a decisive naval battle as soon as possible. If victorious, the Greek fleet commanding the Ægean would then be able to sail up the eastern coast of Greece and threaten the
communications and supplies of the Persian army. There must be no attempt of the small Greek army to meet the vast land forces of the Persians, beyond delaying them as long as possible at the narrow northern passes, which could be defended with a few men. An attempt to unite all the Greek states against the Persian invasion was not successful, but Sparta and Athens united to meet the common danger. Themistocles was able to induce the Spartans to accept his plan only on condition that Sparta be given command of the allied Greek fleets.

In the summer of 480 B.C. the Asiatic army was approaching the pass of Thermopylæ (Fig. 85), just opposite the westernmost point of the Island of Eubœa (see map, p. 146). Their fleet moved with them. The Asiatic host must have numbered over two hundred thousand men, with probably as many more camp followers, while the enormous fleet contained presumably about a thousand vessels, of which perhaps two thirds were warships. Of these they lost a hundred or two in a storm, leaving probably about five hundred warships available for action. The Spartan king Leonidas led some five thousand men to check the Persians at the pass of Thermopylæ, while the Greek fleet of less than three hundred triremes was endeavoring to hold together and strike the Persian navy at Artemisium, on the northern coast of Eubœa. Thus the land and sea forces of both contestants were face to face.

After several days' delay the Persians advanced to attack on both land and sea. The Greek fleet made a skillful and creditable defense against superior numbers, and all day the dauntless Leonidas held the pass of Thermopylæ against the Persian host. Meantime the Persians were executing two flank movements by land and by sea — one over the mountains to strike Leonidas in the rear, and the other with two hundred ships around Eubœa to take the Greek fleet likewise from behind. A storm destroyed the flanking Persian ships, and a second combat between the two main fleets was indecisive, but the flanking of the pass was successful. Taken in front and rear,
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Locate on this map Figs. 86, 89, 91, 94, 97, and Plates III and IV, pp. 186 and 188. Find all points discussed in section 30.
the heroic Leonidas died fighting at the head of his small force, which the Persian host completely annihilated. The death of Leonidas stirred all Greece. With the defeat of the Greek land forces and the advance of the Persian army, the Greek fleet, seriously damaged, was obliged to withdraw to the south. It took up its position in the Bay of Salamis (see map, p. 146, and Fig. 86), while the main army of the Spartans and the allies was drawn up on the Isthmus of Corinth (Fig. 76), the only point at which the Greek land forces could hope to make another defensive stand.

As the Persian army moved southward from Thermopylae, the indomitable Themistocles gathered together the Athenian population and carried them in transports to the little islands of Salamis and Ægina and to the shores of Argolis (see map, p. 146, and Plate II, p. 124). Meantime the Greek fleet had been repaired, and with reinforcements numbered over three hundred battleships. Nevertheless it shook the courage of many as they looked northward, where the far-stretching Persian host darkened the coast road, while in the south they could see the Asiatic fleet drawn up off the old port of Athens at Phalerum (see map, p. 173). High over the Attic hills the flames of the burning Acropolis showed red against the sullen masses of smoke that obscured the eastern horizon and told them that the homes of the Athenians lay in ashes. With masterly skill Themistocles held together the irresolute Greek leaders, while he induced Xerxes to attack by the false message that the Greek fleet was about to slip out of the bay.

On the heights overlooking the Bay of Salamis the Persian king, in the midst of his brilliant oriental court, took up his station to watch the battle. The Greek position between the jutting headlands of Salamis and the Attic mainland (see map, p. 146, and Fig. 86) was too cramped for the maneuvers of a large fleet. Crowded and hampered by the narrow sea-room, the huge Asiatic fleet soon fell into confusion before the Greek attack. There was no room for retreat. The combat lasted the entire
day, and when darkness settled on the Bay of Salamis the Persian fleet had been almost annihilated. The Athenians were masters of the sea, and it was impossible for the army of Xerxes to operate with the same freedom as before. By the

**Fig. 86. Piræus, the Port of Athens, and the Strait and Island of Salamis**

The view shows the very modern houses and buildings of this flourishing harbor town of Athens (see map, p. 173). The mountains in the background are the heights of the island of Salamis, which extends also far over to the right (north), opposite Eleusis (see map, p. 146), as we saw in Fig. 80. The four steamers at the right are lying at the place where the hottest fighting in the great naval battle here (p. 174) took place. The Persian fleet advanced from the left (south) and could not spread out in a long front to enfold the Greek fleet, because of the little island just beyond the four steamers, which was called Psyttaleia. The Greek fleet lying behind Psyttaleia and a long point of Salamis came into action from the right (north), around Psyttaleia. A body of Persian troops stationed by Xerxes on Psyttaleia were all slain by the Greeks creation of its powerful fleet Athens had saved Greece, and Themistocles had shown himself the greatest of Greek statesmen.

Xerxes was now troubled lest he should be cut off from Asia by the victorious Greek fleet. Indeed, Themistocles made every
effort to induce Sparta to join with Athens in doing this very thing; but the cautious Spartans could not be prevailed upon to undertake what seemed to them so dangerous an enterprise. Had Themistocles’ plan of sending the Greek fleet immediately to the Hellespont been carried out, Greece would have been saved another year of anxious campaigning against the Persian army. With many losses from disease and insufficient supplies, Xerxes retreated to the Hellespont and withdrew into Asia, leaving his able general Mardonius with an army of perhaps fifty thousand men to winter in Thessaly. Meantime the news reached Greece that an army of Carthaginians which had crossed from Africa to Sicily had been completely defeated by the Greeks under the leadership of Gelon, tyrant of Syracuse. Thus the assault of the Asiatics upon the Hellenic world was beaten back in both east and west in the same year (480 B.C.)

The brilliant statesmanship of Themistocles, so evident to us of to-day, was not so clear to the Athenians as the winter passed and they realized that the victory at Salamis had not relieved Greece of the presence of a Persian army, and that Mardonius would invade Attica with the coming of spring. Themistocles, whose proposed naval expedition to the Hellespont would have forced the Persian army out of Greece, was removed from command by the factions of his ungrateful city. Nevertheless the most tempting offers from Mardonius could not induce the Athenians to forsake the cause of Greek liberty and join hands with Persia.

As Mardonius at the end of the winter rains led his army again into Attica, the unhappy Athenians were obliged to flee as before, this time chiefly to Salamis. Sparta, always reluctant

1 It is evident that Xerxes by his control of the Phoenician cities had induced Phoenician Carthage to attack the Greeks in the west while he himself attacked them in the east. The Persian fleet defeated at Salamis was largely made up of Phoenician ships. The Phoenicians in east and west (Carthage) thus represent the two wings of the great Semitic line, in attack on the Indo-European line (Fig. 49) represented in east and west by the Greeks.
and slow when the crisis demanded quick and vigorous action, was finally induced to put her army into the field. When Mardonius in Attica saw the Spartan king Pausanias advancing through the Corinthian Isthmus and threatening his rear, he withdrew northward, having for the second time laid waste Attica far and wide. With the united armies of Sparta, Athens, and other allies behind him, Pausanias was able to lead some thirty thousand heavy-armed Greeks of the phalanx, as he followed Mardonius into Boeotia.

In several days of preliminary movements which brought the two armies into contact at Plataea, the clever Persian showed his superiority, out-maneuvering Pausanias and even gaining possession of the southern passes behind the Greeks and capturing a train of their supply wagons. But when Mardonius led his archers forward at double-quick, and the Persians kneeling behind their line of shields rained deadly volleys of arrows into the compact Greek lines, the Hellenes never flinched, although their comrades were falling on every hand. With the gaps closed up, the massive Greek phalanxes pushed through the line of Persian shields, and, as at Marathon, the spear proved invincible against the bow. In a heroic but hopeless effort to rally his broken lines, Mardonius himself fell. The Persian cavalry covered the rear of the flying Asiatic army and saved it from destruction.

Not only European Greece, but Ionia too, was saved from Asiatic despotism; for the Greek triremes, having meantime crossed to the peninsula of Mycale on the north of Miletus, drove out or destroyed the remnants of the Persian fleet. The Athenians now also captured and occupied Sestus on the European side of the Hellespont and thus held the crossing from Asia into Europe closed against further Persian invasion. Thus the grandsons of the men who had seen Persia advance to the Ægean had blocked her further progress in the west and thrust her back from Europe. Indeed, no Persian army ever set foot in European Greece again.
Section 29. The Rise of the Athenian Empire

As the Athenians returned to look out over the ashes of what was once Athens, amid which rose the smoke-blackened heights of the naked Acropolis, they began to realize the greatness of their deliverance and the magnitude of their achievement. With the not too ready help of Sparta, they had met and crushed the hoary power of Asia. They felt themselves masters of the world. The past seemed narrow and limited. A new and greater Athens dawned upon their vision.

On the other hand, the stolid Spartans, wearing the fetters of a rigid military organization, gifted with no imagination, looked with misgivings upon the larger world which was opening to Greek life, and although they desired to lead Greece in military power, they shrank from assuming the responsibilities of expansion. They represented the past and the privileges of the few. Athens represented the future and the rights of the many. Thus Greece fell into two camps as it were: Sparta (Fig. 87), the bulwark of tradition and limited privileges; Athens (Plate III, p. 180), the champion of progress and the sovereign people. And thus the sentiment of union born in the common struggle for liberty, which might have united the Hellenes into one Greek nation, was followed by an unquenchable rivalry between the two leading states of Hellas, which finally cost the Greeks the supremacy of the ancient world.

Themistocles was now the soul of Athens and her policy of progress and expansion. He determined that Athens should no longer follow Sparta. He cleverly hoodwinked the Spartans, and in spite of their objections completed the erection of strong walls around a new and larger Athens. At the same time he fortified the Piræus, the Athenian port (see map, p. 173, and Fig. 86). When the Spartans, after the repulse of Persia, relinquished the command of the combined Greek fleets; the powerful Athenian fleet, the creation of Themistocles, was master of the Ægean.
Fig. 87. The Plain where once Sparta stood

The olive groves now grow where the Spartans once had their houses. The town was not walled until long after the days of Spartan and Greek power were over. From the mountains (nearly eight thousand feet high) behind the plain the visitor can see northeastward far beyond Athens, almost to Euboea; one hundred miles northward to the mountains on the north of the Corinthian Gulf (see map, p. 146); and one hundred and twenty-five miles southward to the Island of Crete. This view shows also how Greece is cut up by such mountains.

As the Greek cities of Asia still feared the vengeance of the Persian king, it was easy for the Athenians to form a permanent defensive league with the cities of their Greek kindred in Asia and the Ægean islands. The wealthier of these cities contributed ships, while others paid a sum of money each year into
the treasury of the League. Athens had command of the combined fleet and collected the money. This treasure was placed for protection in the temple of Apollo, on the little Island of Delos. Hence the federation was known as the Delian League. It was completed within three years after Salamis. The transformation of such a league into an empire, made up of states subject to Athens, could be foreseen as a very easy step. All this was therefore viewed with increasing jealousy and distrust by Sparta.

**Fig. 88. Potsherd bearing the Name of Themistocles and his Place of Residence**

The name of Themistocles is scratched in the surface of this fragment of a pottery jar (*ostracon*, p. 158). It was written there by some citizen of the six thousand who desired and secured his ostracism in 472 B.C., or may have served a similar purpose in the earlier but unsuccessful attempt to ostracize him.

Under the leadership of Cimon, the son of Miltiades the hero of Marathon, the fleet of the League now drove the Persians out of the region of the Hellespont entirely. Cimon did not understand the importance of Athenian supremacy, but favored a policy of friendship and alliance with Sparta. Hence political conflict arose at Athens over this question. Noble and wealthy and old-fashioned folk favored Cimon and friendship with Sparta, but progressive and modern Athenians followed Themistocles and his anti-Spartan plans.

Themistocles was unable to carry the Assembly; he was
The modern city lies in the hollow on the left (north), behind which rises Mount Lycabettus. Of the buildings on the Acropolis we can see the Parthenon at the right, and at the left the colonnaded approach (propylaea), to which stairways lead up (p. 188). The Pnyx (Fig. 89) lies behind the trees in the foreground, exactly in a line with the stairways. The Areopagus (Fig. 91) is nearer to the Acropolis but at the left, behind the tall poplar; still further to the left is the temple of Theseus (Fig. 91). Compare plan, p. 173. (From painting by Bethe-Löwe. Rhine Prints. by B. G. Teubner, Leipzig. The Prang Company, New York)
The Repulse of Persia and the Athenian Empire

ostracized (Fig. 88), and at length, on false charges of treason, he was condemned and obliged to flee for his life. The greatest statesman in Athenian history spent the rest of his life in the service of the Persian king, and he never again saw the city he had saved from the Persians and made mistress of an empire.

When a Persian fleet of some two hundred ships now came creeping westward along the southern coast of Asia Minor, Cimon not only destroyed the entire hostile fleet, but he also landed and crushed the Persian land force which had fortified itself at this point (468 B.C.).

Covered with glory, Cimon returned to Athens and urged the dispatch of troops to Sparta in response to a request from the Spartans for help in quelling a revolt among their own subjects. Herein Cimon overestimated the good feeling of the Spartans toward Athens; for, in spite of the continuance of the revolt, the Spartans after a time curtly demanded the withdrawal of the very Athenian troops they had asked for. Stung by this rebuff, to which Cimon’s friendly policy toward Sparta had exposed them, the Athenians voted to ostracize Cimon (461 B.C.).

The name of Pericles, the statesman who succeeded Cimon as the leader of Athens, is the most illustrious in her history. He was a handsome and brilliant young Athenian, descended from one of the old noble families, of the line of Clisthenes, who two generations before had done so much for Athenian democracy (see p. 157). Like his great ancestor, he fearlessly championed the cause of the people, and he also accepted the "imperialistic program" of Athenian supremacy over the other Greek states. He desired to rear the splendid Athenian empire of which Themistocles had dreamed. He put himself at the head of the party of progress and of increased power of the people. Increasing prosperity had been creating an ever-growing body of wealthy men who rose from the lower classes. They hoped for wide expansion of Athenian power, for they felt the competition of the merchants of Ægina and of Corinth, the powerful commercial ally of Sparta.
The speakers' platform with its three steps is immediately in the foreground. The listening Athenian citizens of the Assembly sat on the ground now sloping away to the left, but at that time probably level. The ground they occupied was inclosed by a semicircular wall, beginning at the further end of the straight wall seen here on the right, extending then to the left, and returning to the straight wall again behind our present point of view (see semicircle on plan, p. 173). This was an open-air House of Commons, where, however, the citizen did not send a representative but came and voted himself as he was influenced from this platform by great Athenian leaders, like Themistocles, Pericles, or Demosthenes (p. 216). Note the Acropolis and the Parthenon, to which we look eastward from the Pnyx (see plan, p. 173).

The Areopagus is just out of range on the left (see Fig. 91).

A long struggle of the people for power had brought about changes in the constitution providing that all citizens holding state office should receive pay for such service. The people were in the saddle (Fig. 89). It was now possible even for men of very limited means to hold office, and all were permitted to
do so except members of the laboring class entirely without property. With one exception there was no longer any election of the higher officers, but they were now all chosen by lot from the whole body of eligible citizens. The result was that the men holding the once influential positions in the State were now mere chance "nobody" and hence completely without influence.

It was, however, impossible to choose a military commander (strategus) by lot. These important offices remained elective and thus open to men of ability and influence, into whose hands the direction of affairs naturally fell. It thus became more and more possible for a strong and influential leader, a man of persuasive eloquence like Pericles, to lay out a definite series of plans for the nation and by his oratory to induce the Assembly of the Athenian citizens on the Pnyx (Fig. 89) to accept them. Year after year Pericles was thus able to retain the confidence of the people. He became the actual head of the State in power, or, as we should say, the undisputed political "boss" of Athens from about 460 B.C. until his untimely death over thirty years later.

Pericles had won favor with the people by favoring a policy of hostility to Sparta, a policy opposed to Cimon's attitude of friendship toward the only dangerous rival of Athens in the struggle for the leadership of Hellas. Pericles greatly strengthened the defenses of Athens by inducing the people to connect the fortifications of the city with those of the Piræus harbor by two "Long Walls," thus forming a road completely walled in, connecting Athens and her harbor (Fig. 86 and plan, p. 173). The inevitable war with Sparta lasted nearly fifteen years, with varying fortunes on both sides. The Athenian merchants resented the keen commercial rivalry of Ægina, planted as the flourishing island was at the very front door of Attica (see map, p. 146). They finally captured the island after a long siege. Pericles likewise employed the Athenian navy in blockading for years the merchant fleets of the other great rival of Athens and friend of Sparta, Corinth (Fig. 76), and thus brought financial ruin on its merchants.
Pericles shifted the treasury of the Delian League from Delos to Athens, an act which made the city more than ever the capital of an Athenian Empire. The assassination of Xerxes and a consequent revolt against the Persians in Egypt had induced the Athenians to resume the conflict with Persia (459 B.C.). They therefore dispatched a fleet of two hundred ships against the Persians in Egypt and had thus been fighting both Sparta and Persia for years. The entire Athenian fleet in Egypt was lost. Some Attic successes in Boeotia were followed by defeats in which the Athenians lost all that they had gained in the north.

When peace was concluded (446 B.C.) all that Athens was able to retain was the Island of Aegina. It was agreed that the peace should continue for thirty years. Thus ended what is often called the First Peloponnesian War with the complete exhaustion of Athens as well as her enemies in the Peloponnesus. The Athenians then arranged a peace with Persia also, over forty years after Marathon. But the rivalry between Athens and Sparta for the leadership of the Greeks was still unsettled. The struggle was to be continued in another long and weary "Peloponnesian War." Before we proceed with the story of this fatal struggle we must glance briefly at the new and glorious Athens now growing up under the hand of Pericles.

Section 30. Civilization of Imperial Athens in the Age of Pericles

Although the first fifteen years of the leadership of Pericles were encumbered with the Spartan and Persian wars, the higher life of Athens continued to unfold, and the next fifteen years brought to fruition the tremendous and revolutionary experiences through which Greece and especially Athens had been passing for half a century. The new vision of the glory of the State, discerned nowhere in the world before this age, caught the imagination of poet and painter, of sculptor and architect,
and not of these alone but of the humblest artizan and tradesman. All classes alike participated in the public festivals which were conducted by the State every six or seven days. The great Pan-Athenaic festival, which occurred every four years, gathered all the people in stately processions and splendid games, bringing into their lives the memories of a heroic past and the imposing honors paid to the great gods who sheltered and protected the Athenian State. The wealthy citizens themselves paid the expenses of competing choruses, and each successful competitor proudly erected a graceful monument of victory (Fig. 90) in a street especially reserved for such memorials. These choruses were made up of the men and boys of Athens. The citizen thus found music, the drama, art and architecture,

**Fig. 90. Monument commemorating the Triumph of an Athenian Citizen in Music**

An entire street of Athens was filled with such monuments (p. 185). We learn the name of the citizen, Lysicrates, who erected this beautiful monument, from the inscription it still bears, which reads: "Lysicrates . . . was choragus [leader of the chorus] when the boy-chorus of the tribe of Akamantis won the prize; Theon was flute-player, Lysiades of Athens trained the choir. Euænetus was archon." The archon's name dates the erection of the monument for us in 335 to 334 B.C. Beyond the monument we look westward to the back of the Acropolis (see plan, p. 173)
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profundely touched by the new and exalted vision of the State, thrust into the foreground of his life.

We can still follow the citizen and note a few of the inspiring monuments that met his eye as he went about the new Athens which Pericles was creating. Wandring into the market place (see plan, p. 173, and Fig. 91), the citizen found an imposing colonnaded porch along one side, presented to the city by a wealthy noble: the wall behind the columns bore a long series of paintings by an artist from one of the island possessions of Athens, a gift of the painter to the Athenians, depicting their glorious victory at Marathon. Here in splendid panorama was a vision of the heroic devotion of the fathers. In the thick of the fray the citizen might pick out the figure of Themistocles, of Miltiades, of Callimachus who fell in the battle, of Æschylus the great tragic poet. He could see the host of the fleeing Persians and perhaps hear some old man tell how the brother of Æschylus seized and tried to stop one of the Persian boats drawn up on

* In this view we stand inside the wall of Themistocles, near the Dipylon Gate in the Potters' Quarter (see plan, p. 173). In the foreground is the temple of Theseus, the legendary unifier of Attica, whom all Athenians honored as a god, and to whom this temple has long been supposed to have been erected. It is built of Pentelic marble and was finished a few years after the death of Pericles; but now, after twenty-three hundred years or more, it is still the best preserved of all ancient Greek buildings. Above the houses, at the extreme right, may be seen one corner of the hill called the Areopagus (see plan, p. 173), often called Mars' Hill, where sat the ancient criminal court of Athens—a court made up of the most influential and respected old citizens. It was probably here that the apostle Paul (p. 300) preached in Athens (see Acts xvii). The great hill of the Acropolis was once crowned by the dwellings of the prehistoric kings of Athens (p. 136). The buildings we now see there are all ruins of the structures erected after the place had been laid waste by the Persians (p. 174). At the right (west) are the approaches built by the architect Mnæsicles under Pericles (p. 188). The Parthenon (p. 188), in the middle of the hill (see plan, p. 173), shows the gaping hole caused by the explosion of a Turkish powder magazine ignited by a Venetian shell in 1687, when the entire central portion of the building was blown out. The space between the temple of Theseus, the Areopagus, and the Acropolis was largely occupied by the market place of Athens (p. 186 and plan, p. 173).
Fig. 91. The Temple of Theseus, the Areopagus, and the Acropolis of Athens*
the beach, and how a desperate Persian raised his ax and slashed off the hand of the brave Greek. Perhaps among the group of eager listeners he might notice one questioning the veteran carefully and making full notes of all that he can learn from the graybeard. The questioner is Herodotus, the "father of history," the first great prose writer to devote himself to the story of the past. He is collecting from survivors the tale of the Persian wars for a history which he is writing (p. 203).

The citizen wanders on toward the theater. Above him towers the height of the Acropolis crowned with the Parthenon (Plate IV, p. 192, and Fig. 91), a noble temple to Athena, whose protecting arm is always stretched out over her beloved Athens. There on the Pnyx (Fig. 89) Pericles made the splendid speech in which he laid before the Assembly of the people his plans for the beautification of the Acropolis and the restoration of the temples which the Persians had burned. As he passes the Hill of the Areopagus the citizen remembers the discontented mutterings of the old men in the ancient council which convenes on its summit (Fig. 91), when they heard the vast expenses required for Pericles' building plans, and he smiles in satisfaction as he reflects that this unprogressive old body, once so influential in Athens, has been deprived of its powers to obstruct the will of the people in anything they wish to do. Here before him rise the imposing marble colonnades of the magnificent monumental approach to the Acropolis (Fig. 91). It is still unfinished, and the architect Mnesicles, with a roll of plans under his arm, is perhaps at the moment directing a group of workmen to their task. The tinkle of many distant hammers from the height above tells where the stone cutters are shaping the marble blocks for the still unfinished Parthenon (Fig. 91 and Plate III, p. 180); and there, too, the people often see Pericles intently inspecting the work, as Phidias the sculptor and Ictinus the architect of the building pace up and down the inclosure, explaining to him the progress of the work. In these wondrous Greek buildings architect and sculptor work hand in hand.
Fig. 92. Part of the Frieze of Phidias, showing Athenian Youths riding in the Pan-Athenaic Festival

Notice the marvelous dash and vigor of the horses; also the strength of the last youth, as he reins in his steed till the animal's jaw is drawn back to its neck. The reins and trappings were of metal, and have disappeared.
The uplifted right hand (now broken off) of the god probably held a bunch of grapes, with which he was amusing the child. This wonderful work was wrought by the sculptor Praxiteles and illustrates the culmination of Athenian art in the fourth century B.C., in the days of the political weakness of Athens, when Thebes was overthrowing Sparta (p. 212), and Macedonia was gaining the leadership of the Greeks (p. 216)
Phidias is the greatest of the sculptors at Athens. In a long band of carved marble extending entirely around the four sides of the Parthenon, at the top inside the colonnades (Plate IV, p. 192), Phidias and his pupils have portrayed, as in a glorified vision, the sovereign people of Athens moving in the stately procession of the Pan-Athenaic festival (Fig. 92). To be sure, these are not individual portraits of Athenian folk, but only types which lived in the exalted vision of the sculptor, and not on the streets of Athens. But such sculpture had never been seen before. How different is the supreme beauty of these perfect human forms from the cruder figures which adorned the temple burned by the Persians. The citizen has seen the shattered fragments of these older works cleared away and covered with rubbish when the architects leveled off the summit of the Acropolis. Inside the new temple gleams the colossal figure of Athena, wrought by the cunning hand of Phidias in gold and ivory — his masterpiece. Even from the city below the citizen can discern, touched with bright colors, the heroic figures of the gods with which Phidias has filled the triangular gable ends of the building.

These are the gods to whom the faith of the Athenian people still reverently looks up. Have not Athena and these gods raised the power of Athens to the imperial position which she now occupies? Do not all the citizens recall Æschylus' drama "The Persians," in which the memories of the great deliverance from Persian conquest are enshrined? How that tremendous day of Salamis was made to live again in the imposing picture which the poet's genius brought before them, disclosing the mighty purpose of the gods to save Hellas! As he skirts the sheer precipice of the Acropolis the citizen reaches the theater

1 Till recently they lay buried under the rubbish on the slope (Fig. 91). The excavations of the Greek government have recovered them, and they are now in the Acropolis Museum at Athens.
2 These figures will be found at the end of Chapter VII (p. 195). They represent the battle between Athena and Poseidon, god of the sea, for possession of Attica.
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(see plan, p. 173, and Fig. 94), where he finds the people are already entering. Only yesterday he and his neighbors received from the state treasury the money for their admission. It is natural that they should feel that the theater and all that is done there belong to the people, and not the less as the citizen looks down upon the stage and recognizes many of his friends and neighbors and their sons in the chorus for that day’s performance.

A play of Sophocles is on, and his neighbor in the next seat leans over to tell the citizen how as a lad many years ago he stood on the shore of Salamis, whither his family had fled (p. 174), and as they looked down upon the destruction of the Persian fleet, this same Sophocles, a boy of sixteen, was in the crowd looking on with the rest. How deeply must the events of that tragic day have sunk into the poet’s soul! For does he not see the will of the gods in all that happens to men? Does he not celebrate the stern decree of Zeus everywhere hanging over human life, at the same time that he uplifts his audience to adore the splendor of Zeus, however dark the destiny he lays upon men. This is the only attitude which can bring consolation in the tragedy of life, and the citizen feels that Sophocles is a veritable voice of the people, exalting the old gods in the new time. Moreover, in place of the former two, Sophocles has three actors in his plays, a change which makes them more interesting and full of action.¹ Even old Æschylus yielded to this innovation once before he died. Yet too much innovation is also unwelcome to the citizen.

The citizen feels this especially if it is one of the new sensational plays of Euripides which is presented. Euripides (Fig. 95) is decidedly an innovator, a younger poet, the son of a farmer who lives over on the Island of Salamis (Fig. 86); he has for some time been presenting plays at the spring competition. His new plays are all inwrought with problems and mental struggle regarding the gods, and they have raised a great many questions

¹ These actors were once only the leaders of the choruses at the spring feast (see p. 161).
This theater was the center of the growth and development of Greek drama, which began as a part of the celebration of the spring feast of Dionysus, god of the vine and the fruitfulness of the earth (p. 161). The temple of the god stood here, just at the left. Long before any one knew of such a thing as a theater, the people gathered at this place to watch the celebration of the god's spring feast, where they formed a circle about the chorus, which narrated in song the stories of the gods (p. 161). This circle (called the orchestra) was finally marked out permanently, seats of wood for the spectators were erected in a semicircle on one side, but the singing and action all took place in the circle on the level of the ground. On the side opposite the public was a booth, or tent (Greek skēnē, "scene"), for the actors, and out of this finally developed the stage. Here we see the circle, or orchestra, with the stage cutting off the back part of the circle. The seats are of stone and accommodated possibly seventeen thousand people. The fine marble seats in the front row were reserved for the leading men of Athens. The old wooden seats were still in use in the days when Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides presented their dramas here, in competition for prizes awarded to the finest plays (pp. 190-192). From the seats the citizens had a grand view of the sea, with the Island of Ægina, their old-time rival (p. 155); and even the heights of Argolis, forty miles away, were visible; for orchestra and seats continued roofless, and a Greek theater was always open to the sky. In Roman times a colonnaded porch across the back of the stage was introduced, and such columns of Roman date may be seen in Fig. 74.
and doubts which the citizen has never been able to banish from his mind since he heard them. In their pictures of men, too, they are nearly always very dark and gloomy and discouraging. The citizen determines that he will use all the influence he has to prevent the plays of Euripides from winning the prize, which the State grants to the most successful among the competing play writers each spring.

When the Athenian citizen turns homeward from the theater, he and his neighbor perhaps discuss, as they walk, how they shall educate their sons. There are the old subjects which the State schools teach: reading and writing, the study of the old poets, music and dancing, and the athletic exercises at the gymnasium. But their sons are not satisfied with these; they want tuition money to hear the lectures and the instruction of private teachers, a class of new and clever-witted lecturers, who wander from city to city, and whom the people call "Sophists." The Sophists are far worse than Euripides; they doubt everything, and make all conclusions impossible. Yes, to be sure, but they are wonderful speakers, much better than Herodotus when he recites his historical tales in the market place. And they teach a young man such readiness in speech that he can carry the people with him in the Assembly. They have indeed created a new art, the art of oratory and of writing prose, and no young man can do without it.
Looking through the colonnades (p. 189) at the southeast corner of the building to the distant hills of Hymettus. On the left is the base of the wall of the interior, blown out by the explosion of the Turkish powder magazine (Fig. 91). At the top of this wall was the frieze of Phidias, extending around the inner part of the building (p. 189 and Fig. 92). (From painting by Bethe-Löwe, Rhine Prints, by B. G. Teubner, Leipzig. The Prang Company, New York)
They are such useful teachers, it is a pity they are such an impious crew, these Sophists; but when one of them actually writes a book which begins with a statement doubting the existence of the gods, what is a citizen to do but vote that the book be burned? And the worst of it is that there are several bookshops in the city and people read such books. Why, even the sausage-peddler who delivers meat at the citizen’s door can read! And the book was read aloud in the house of Euripides too! There should be no hesitation in condemning and banishing such infidels, even if they are friends of Pericles, and he steps in to help them. But the citizen and his friend chuckle as they recall how Pericles was well roasted for it in the last comic play (comedy) they went to see.

In spite of the fact that the Sophists teach a little arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy, natural science is a line of progress of which the Athenian citizen has not even a vague intimation. To be sure, he has seen on the Pnyx (Fig. 89) a strange-looking tablet set up by Meton, the builder and engineer; it is said to be a calendar which will bring the short moon-month year (p. 62) and the long solar year together every nineteen years. But this is all quite beyond the citizen’s puzzled mind. Moreover, the archons have all shaken their heads at it and will have nothing to do with it. The old moon months are good enough for them. But practical men like Meton, whose callings in life carry them into such investigations, are making much progress in science. The physician especially has largely outgrown the old Egyptian medical roll (p. 44) which his fathers found very useful; he has made many important and new observations of his own, and there is even a Greek physician in Persia at the court of the Great King. Interesting progress is being made in mathematics also by the surveyor, and a new science known as “land-measuring,” geometry, is taking form.

The reader will readily perceive how different from the Athens of the old days before the Persian wars was this imperial Athens! — throbbing with new life, astir with a thousand
questions eagerly discussed at every corner, keenly awake to the
demand of the greater State and the sovereign people, deeply
pondering the duties and privileges of the individual who felt
new and larger visions of himself conflicting with the exactions
of the State and the old faith, already troubled by serious doubts,
but clinging with wistful apprehension to the old gods and the
old truths. Under Pericles Athens had become, as he desired
it should, the teacher of the Greek world. It now remained to
be seen whether the people, in sovereign control of the State,
could guide her wisely and maintain her new power.

QUESTIONS

SECTION 28. What was the chief provocation of the war with
Persia? By what route did Darius first attempt the invasion of
Greece? What route was next adopted? Where did the Persians
land? Why did not the battle take place at Athens? Describe the
device of Miltiades. What was the outcome? What was the policy
of Themistocles? What led the Athenians to vote the building of
a fleet?

What route did Xerxes select for the next (third) Persian invasion?
Outline Themistocles' plan of campaign. Describe the battle of Ther-
mosyli and Artemisium. What was the next move of the Persians?
Describe the battle of Salamis. Outline the remaining course of the
campaign under Mardonius, and the battle of Platea. What was the
final result of the Asiatic invasion of Greece and Sicily? What were
the racial lines of the struggle?

SECTION 29. What rivalry dominated the Greek situation after
the repulse of Persia? What did Themistocles accomplish? Describe
the Delian League. Contrast the policies of Cimon and Themistocles.
What was the fate of Themistocles?

What victory did Cimon win? Describe the Imperial Party at
Athens. Who was its ablest young leader? What happened to
Cimon? How did democracy now gain complete leadership at
Athens? Who became the leader of the democracy? Outline the
first war with Sparta (First Peloponnesian War).

SECTION 30. Describe the awakening in Greece and especially
Athens after the repulse of Persia and in the Age of Pericles. De-
scribe a great painting of the time. What buildings were being
erected at Athens? What great sculptor was at work, and what are some of his works? Who were the great dramatists? What was the position of Aeschylus toward the gods?

What attitude toward the gods did Sophocles teach? What feeling did Euripides show toward them? How did these things affect the life of Athens? Its education? Who were the Sophists? What did they teach? How did the people feel toward them? Did the people know any science? What sciences were now making progress?
CHAPTER VIII

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE ATHENIAN EMPIRE AND THE END OF GREEK POWER

SECTION 31. THE SECOND PELOPONNESIAN WAR AND THE FALL OF ATHENS

The outward splendor of Athens, her commercial prosperity, her not very conciliatory attitude toward her rivals, the visible growth of her power, and the example she offered of the seeming success of triumphant democracy—all these things were causes of jealousy to a backward and conservative military State like Sparta (Fig. 87). This feeling of unfriendliness toward Athens was not confined to Sparta but was quite general throughout Greece. The merchants of Corinth (Fig. 76) found Athenian competition a continuous vexation, and Corinth did all in her power to aggravate the situation by stirring up the sluggish Spartans to action. When Athenian possessions in the north Aegean revolted and received support from Corinth and Sparta, the fact that hardly half of the thirty years' term of peace (p. 184) had expired did not prevent the outbreak of war.

It seemed as if all European Greece not included in the Athenian Empire had united against Athens, for Sparta controlled the entire Peloponnesus except Argos, and north of Attica Boeotia led by Thebes, as well as its neighbors on the west, were hostile to Athens. The support of Athens consisted of the Aegean cities which made up her empire and a few outlying allies of little power. She began the war with a large war treasury and a fleet of warships which made her undisputed mistress of the sea. But she could not hope to cope with the land forces of the enemy, which, some thirty thousand strong,
had planned to meet in the Isthmus in the spring of 431 B.C. When this army entered Attica the outlying communities were at once obliged to leave their homes and take refuge in the open markets and squares of Athens, the sanctuaries, and especially between the Long Walls leading to the Piraeus. To offset the devastation of Attica by the Spartan army, all that Athens could do was to organize destructive sea raids and inflict as much damage as possible along the coasts of the Peloponnesus or destroy Corinthian commerce as of old.

The masses of people crowded within the walls of Athens under unsanitary conditions exposed the city to disease; a plague, probably brought in from the Orient, broke out in the port, spread to the city, and raged with intermissions for several seasons. It carried off probably a third of the population, and from this unforeseen disaster Athens never recovered. With such a visitation Pericles had of course been unable to reckon. Constantly under arms for the defense of the walls, deprived of any opportunity to strike the enemy, forced to sit still and see their land ravaged, the citizens at last broke out in discontent.

In spite of his undaunted spirit Pericles was unable to hold the confidence of a majority. He lost control, was tried for misappropriation of funds, and fined. The absence of his steadying hand and powerful leadership was at once felt by the people, for there was no one to take his place, although a swarm of small politicians were contending for control of the Assembly. Realizing their helplessness the people soon turned to Pericles again and elected him strategus, but he was stricken with the plague and died soon after his return to power. Great statesman as he was, he had left Athens with a system of government which did not provide for the continuation of such leadership as he had furnished, and without such leadership the Athenian Empire was doomed. This was the great mistake in the statesmanship of Pericles.

Men of the prosperous manufacturing class now came to the fore. They possessed neither the high station in life, the ability
as statesmen, nor the qualities of leadership to win the confidence and respect of the people. Moreover these new leaders were not soldiers, and could not command the fleet or the army as Pericles had done. The only notable exception was Alcibiades, a brilliant young man, a relative of Pericles and brought up in his house. The two sons of Pericles had died of the plague, and Alcibiades, if he had enjoyed the guidance of his foster father a few years longer, might have become the savior of Athens and of Greece. As it happened, however, this young leader was more largely responsible than any one else for the destruction of the Athenian Empire and the downfall of Greece.

Unsteadied by a statesman whose continuous policy formed a firm and guiding influence, the management of Athenian affairs fell into confusion, rarely interrupted by any display of firmness and wisdom; the leaders drifted from one policy to another, and usually from bad to worse. It seemed impossible to regain stable leadership. The youthful Aristophanes depicted the rudderless condition of the ship of State in one clever comedy after another, in which he ridiculed in irresistible satire the pretense to statesmanship of such "men of the people" as Cleon the tanner. A typical example of the ill-considered actions of the Assembly was their treatment of the revolting citizens of Mitylene. When the men of Mitylene were finally subdued, the Assembly on the Pnyx (Fig. 89) voted that they should all be put to death, and a ship departed with these orders. It was with great difficulty that a more moderate group in the Assembly secured a rehearing of the question and succeeded in inducing the people to modify their barbarous action to the condemnation and execution of the ringleaders only. A second ship then overtook the first barely in time to save from death the entire body of the revolting citizens of Mitylene.

In spite of such revolts Athenian naval supremacy continued; but as the war dragged on, the payment of army and fleet reduced Athenian funds to a very low state. Cleon the tanner
succeeded in having an income tax introduced, and later on the tribute of the Ægean cities was raised. The only great battle during the first decade of the war was fought at Delium in the north, and this the Athenians lost; but there was really no military disaster of sufficient importance to cripple seriously either Sparta or Athens. It was the devastation wrought by the plague which had seriously affected Athens. When after ten years of warfare peace was arranged for fifty years, each contestant agreed to give up all new conquests and to retain only old possessions or subject cities.

The attack of the allies on Athens had not realized their hope of breaking up her empire and overthrowing her leadership of the Ægean cities. Nevertheless Athens and the whole Greek world had been demoralized and weakened. The contest had in it no longer the inspiration of a noble struggle such as the Greeks had maintained against Persia. Unprecedented brutality, like that at first adopted toward Mitylene, had given the struggle a savagery and a lack of respect for the enemy which completely obscured all finer issues, if there were any such involved in the war. Meantime serious difficulties arose in carrying out the conditions of the peace. One of the northern subject cities of Athens which had gone over to Sparta refused to return to Athenian allegiance. Athens took the unreasonable ground that Sparta should force the recalcitrant city to obey the terms of peace. It was at this juncture that Athens especially needed such guidance as a statesman like Pericles could have furnished. She was obliged to depend for leadership upon Nicias, one of her old commanders, and the unprincipled Alcibiades.

Nicias had adjusted the peace compact and he continued to urge a conciliatory attitude toward Sparta; but the gifted and reckless Alcibiades, seeing a great opportunity for a brilliant career, did all that he could to excite the war party in Athens. In spite of the fact that troubles at home had forced Sparta into a treaty of alliance with Athens, Alcibiades was able to carry the Assembly with him. After complicated negotiations
he involved Athens in an alliance with Argos against Sparta, and thus Attica, exhausted with plague and ten years of warfare, was enticed into a life-and-death struggle which was to prove final.

Several years of ill-planned military and naval operations followed the fruitless peace of Nicias. Under the spur of Alcibiades' persuasion the Athenians at length planned a great joint expedition of army and navy against Sicily, where the mighty Corinthian city of Syracuse was leading in the oppression of certain cities in alliance with Athens. The Athenians placed Alcibiades and Nicias in command of the expedition. Just as the fleet was about to sail, certain sacred images about the city were impiously mutilated, and the deed was attributed to Alcibiades. In spite of his demand for an immediate trial, the Athenians postponed the case until his return from Sicily. When the fleet reached Italy, however, the Athenian people, with their usual inability to follow any consistent plan and also desiring to take Alcibiades at a great disadvantage, suddenly recalled him for trial. This method of procedure not only deprived the expedition of its only able leader but also gave Alcibiades an opportunity to desert to the Spartans, which he promptly did. His advice to the Spartans now proved fatal to the Athenians.

Nicias, though a brave man, was totally lacking in initiative and boldness, such as a Themistocles or a Miltiades would have shown under the same circumstances. The appearance of the huge Athenian fleet off their coast struck dismay into the hearts of the Syracusans, but Nicias entirely failed to see the importance of immediate attack before the Syracusans could recover and make preparations for the defense of their city. He wasted the early days of the campaign in ill-planned maneuvers, only winning a barren victory over the Syracusan land forces. When Nicias was finally induced by the second general in command to begin the siege of the city, courage had returned to the Syracusans and their defense was well organized.
On the advice of Alcibiades the Spartans had sent an able commander with a small force to support Syracuse, and the city was confident in its new ally. When Nicias made no progress in the siege, Athens responded to his call for help with a second fleet and more land forces. No Greek state had ever mustered such power and sent it far across the waters. All Greece watched the spectacle with amazement. Meantime the Syracusans too had organized a fleet. The Athenians were obliged to give battle in the narrow harbor, where there was no room for maneuvers or for any display of their superior seamanship, and the fleet of Syracuse was victorious in several actions. The Athenians were caught as they themselves had caught the Persians at Salamis two generations before.

With disaster staring him in the face, the superstitious Nicias refused to withdraw in time because of an eclipse of the moon, and insisted on waiting another month. The Syracusans then blockaded the channel to the sea and completely shut up the Athenian fleet within the harbor, so that an attempt to break through and escape disastrously failed. The desperate Athenian army, abandoning sick and wounded too late, endeavored to escape into the interior, but was overtaken and forced to surrender. After executing the commanding generals, the Syracusans took the prisoners, seven thousand in number, and sold them into slavery or threw them into the stone quarries of the city, where most of them miserably perished. Thus the Athenian expedition was not only defeated, but captured and completely destroyed (413 B.C.). This disaster, together with the earlier ravages of the plague, brought Athens near the end of her resources.

Sparta, seeing the unprotected condition of Athens, now no longer hesitated to undertake a campaign into Attica. On the advice of Alcibiades, again the Spartans occupied the town of Decelea, almost within sight of Athens. Here they established a permanent fort held by a strong garrison, and thus placed Athens in a state of perpetual siege. All agriculture ceased and
The Athenians lived on imported grain. The people now understood the folly of having sent away on a distant expedition the ships and the men that should have been kept at home to repel the attacks of a powerful and still uninjured foe. The Ægean cities of the Empire began to fall away; there was no way to raise further funds, but by desperate efforts a small fleet was gotten together to continue the struggle.

The failure of the democracy in the conduct of the war enabled the opponents of popular rule to regain power. For a time the old Council was overthrown and in the name of a new council, in the election of which the people had little voice, a group of aristocratic leaders ushered in a period of violence and bloodshed. These men strove to restore peace with Sparta, but their own excesses and the war sentiment in the fleet provoked a reaction too strong to be overcome. The democracy with some modifications was restored.

Both Athens and Sparta had long been negotiating with Persia for support, and Sparta had concluded an agreement with Persia, which recognized Persian rule over the Greek cities of Asia. Alcibiades had now fallen out with the Spartans and gone over to Persia. He skillfully used his influence with the Persians to arouse their hostility toward Sparta and attach them to Athens. He intended this action to pave the way for his return to favor with his own fellow citizens, and it did in fact lead to his recall and appointment to command the Athenian fleet. Thus the one-time union of Greece in a heroic struggle against the Asiatic enemy had given way to a disgraceful scramble for Persian support and favor. The only benefits resulting were enjoyed by Persia as she stood by and watched the Hellenes exhausting their power and squandering their wealth in a fruitless struggle among themselves. A naval defeat followed by several victories of the Athenian fleet enabled the blind leaders of the people’s party at Athens to refuse Spartan offers of peace more than once, at a time when the continuance of war was the most evident folly.
Then the Attic fleet of a hundred and eighty ships, lulled into false security in the Hellespont near the river called Α'gospotami, was surprised by the able Spartan commander Lysander and captured almost intact as it lay drawn up on the beach. Not a man slept on the night when the terrible news of final ruin reached Athens. It was soon confirmed by the appearance of Lysander's fleet blockading the Piræus. The grain ships from the Black Sea could no longer reach the port of Athens; the Spartan army wandered through Attica plundering at will. Athens saw starvation before her, and there was nothing to do but surrender. The Long Walls and the fortifications of the Piræus were torn down, the remnant of the fleet handed over to Sparta, and Athens was forced to enter the Spartan League. These hard conditions saved the city from the complete destruction demanded by Corinth. Thus the century which had begun so gloriously for Athens with the repulse of Persia, the century which under the leadership of such men as Themistocles and Pericles had seen her rise to supremacy in all that was best and noblest in Greek life, closed with the annihilation of the Athenian Empire (404 B.C.).

Section 32. The Higher Life of Athens after Pericles

During this last quarter century which brought such ruin upon her, the inner life of Athens was more than ever a seething whirlpool of conflicting tendencies, in which the old currents of life, as it was in the days of the fathers, met the counter currents of more modern feeling and discernment. All felt the supreme importance of the State and of the high mission of Athens, so long held up before their eyes by Pericles. At the very time when Pericles fell a victim to the plague Herodotus had issued his history (p. 188). It was a history of the world so told that the glorious leadership of Athens would be clear to all Greeks and would show them that to her the Hellenes owed
their deliverance from Persia. Throughout Greece it created a deep impression, but so tremendous was its effect in Athens that, in spite of the financial drain of war, the Athenians voted Herodotus a reward of ten talents, some thirteen thousand dollars. In this earliest history of the world which has come down to us, Herodotus traced the course of events as he believed them to be directed by the will of the gods, and as prophesied in their divine oracles. There was little or no effort to explain events as the result of natural processes, even though Herodotus was too modern and had seen too much of the ancient Orient to believe that the gods were actually present and active on earth only a few generations back.

But the old beliefs of the fathers regarding the gods had been rudely disturbed by such men as theSophists, and by the insistent problems of destiny which the tragedies of Euripides still placed upon the stage (Fig. 94). The people responded with delight to the mockery with which Aristophanes in his comedies ridiculed the mental struggles of Euripides, and they keenly enjoyed the railleries in which he travestied the teaching and methods of the Sophists. To be sure, they were also obliged to see the rule of the people with all its weaknesses and mistakes ridiculed on the same stage, much as we see the faults of our own lawmakers caricatured in the cartoons which adorn our daily papers. Thus, while the citizens were still ready for any popular experiment in government by the people at the expense of the aristocrats, they shared the feelings of the aristocrats in their resentment toward those who stirred up doubt regarding the gods of the fathers.

Aristophanes was sure of a sympathetic audience of Athenians when he put upon the stage a caricature of a certain pestiferous citizen, whose ill-clothed figure and ugly face (Fig. 96) had become familiar in the streets to all the folk of Athens since the outbreak of the second war with Sparta. He had just returned from a campaign in the north; his name was Socrates, and he was the son of a stone mason. He was accustomed to
stand about the market place, the street corners, and the public baths all day long, insisting on engaging in conversation every citizen he met, and asking a great many questions, which left the average citizen in a very confused state of mind. He seemed to call in question everything which the citizen had formerly regarded as settled. Yet this familiar and homely figure of the stone mason's son was the personification of the best and highest in Greek genius. Without desire for office or a political career, Socrates' supreme interest nevertheless was the State. He believed that the State, made up as it was of citizens, could be purified and saved only by the improvement of the individual citizen through the education of his mind to recognize virtue and right.

Herein lies the supreme achievement of Socrates as he daily confronted problems which the mind of man was clearly stating for the first time; he planted his feet upon what he regarded as an immovable rock of truth; namely, that the human mind is able to recognize and determine what are truth and virtue, beauty and honesty, and all the other great ideas which mean so much to human life. To him these ideas had reality. He taught that by keen questioning and discussion it is possible to reject error and discern these realities. Inspired by this impregnable belief,
Socrates went about in Athens, engaging all his fellow citizens in such discussion, convinced that he might thus lead each citizen in turn to a knowledge of the leading and compelling virtues. Furthermore, he firmly believed that the citizen who had once recognized these virtues would shape every action and all his life by them. Socrates thus revealed the power of virtue and similar ideas by argument and logic, but he made no appeal to religion as an influence toward good conduct. Nevertheless he showed himself a deeply religious man, believing with devout heart in the gods, although they were not exactly those of the fathers, and even feeling, like the Hebrew prophets, that there was a divine voice within him, calling him to his high mission.

The simple but powerful personality of this greatest of Greek teachers in the streets of Athens often opened to him the houses of the rich and noble. His fame spread far and wide, and when the Delphian oracle (Fig. 82) was asked who was the wisest of the living, it responded with the name of Socrates. A group of pupils gathered about him, among whom the most famous was Plato. But it was inevitable that his aims and his noble efforts on behalf of the Athenian state should be misunderstood. His keen questions seemed to throw doubt upon all the old beliefs. The Athenians had already vented their displeasure on more than one leading Sophist who had rejected the old faith and teaching (see p. 193).

They summoned Socrates to trial for corrupting the youth. Such examples as Alcibiades, who had been his pupil, seemed convincing illustrations of the viciousness of his teaching; everybody had seen and many had read with growing resentment the comedy of Aristophanes which held him up to contempt and execration. Socrates might easily have left Athens when the complaint was lodged against him. Nevertheless he appeared for trial, made a powerful and dignified defense (Fig. 96), and, when the court voted the death penalty, passed his last days in tranquil conversation with his friends and pupils, in whose presence he then quietly drank the fatal hemlock (400 B.C.). Thus
the Athenian democracy, which had so fatally mismanaged the affairs of the nation in war, brought upon itself much greater reproach in condemning to death, even though in accordance with law, the greatest and purest soul among its citizens (Fig. 97).

Fig. 97. Street of Tombs outside Ancient Athens

It was the custom both of Greeks and Romans (Fig. 127) to bury their dead outside one of the city gates, on either side of the highway. This Athenian cemetery, outside the Dipylon Gate (see plan, p. 173), was on the Sacred Way to Eleusis (Fig. 80, and plan, p. 173), both sides of which were lined for some distance with marble tomb-monuments. The Roman Sulla (p. 265), in his eastern war, while besieging Athens, piled up earth as a causeway leading to the top of the wall of Athens (see plan, p. 173) at this point. The part of the cemetery which he covered with earth was thus preserved, to be dug out in modern times — the only surviving portion of such an ancient Greek street of tombs. In this cemetery the Athenians of Socrates' day were buried. The monument at the left shows a brave Athenian youth on horseback, charging the fallen enemy. He was slain in battle against Corinth and buried here a few years after the death of Socrates (p. 207).

The undisturbed serenity of Socrates in his last hours, as pictured to us in Plato's idealized version of the scene, profoundly affected the whole Greek world, and still forms one of the most precious possessions of humanity. But the glorified
figure of Socrates, as he appears in the writings of his pupils, was to prove more powerful even than the living teacher. The past could not be recalled, and, in spite of themselves, thinking people were tinctured through and through with the very views which they had striven to stamp out by such means as the verdict against Socrates. The historian Thucydides, who was now writing his great account of the wars which destroyed the Athenian Empire, no longer discerned only the will of the gods in these events but, with an insight like that of modern historians, was tracing events to their natural causes in the world of men where they occur.

Section 33. The Age of Spartan Leadership

The long duel for supremacy in the Greek world between Athens and Sparta, which occupied a large part of the latter half of the fifth century before Christ, ended toward the close of that century in the complete collapse of Athens. While the two states were devouring one another Persia had again appeared on the scene, and it was only by the use of Persian money that Sparta had compassed the destruction of the last Athenian fleet. It now remained to be seen whether Sparta (Fig. 87) could maintain the leadership of the Greek world, and thrust back the Persians in Asia as Athens had done.

Sparta was now dominated by the commanding figure of Lysander, who had destroyed the last remnants of Attic sea power. Under his guidance the popular party in each of the city-states, including Athens, was deprived of power as far as possible, and the control placed in the hands of a group of the old aristocrats. A garrison under a Spartan officer was placed in many of the cities, and Spartan control was maintained in much more offensive form than was the old tyranny of Athens in her empire over the island cities, against which Sparta had always protested. The Athenian democracy, however, finally regained and maintained control of Attic affairs.
It is one of the ironies of the whole deplorable situation that when Sparta finally fell out with Persia, and stepped in to defend the Ionian cities, a fleet of Athens made common cause with the Persians and helped to fasten Persian despotism on the Greek cities of Asia. The Greeks had learned nothing by their long and unhappy experience of fruitless wars. When peace was at last established it was under the humiliating terms of a treaty accepted by Hellas at the hands of the Persian king, to whom the Greek states had appealed. It is known as the King’s Peace (387 B.C.). It recognized the leadership of Sparta over all the Greek states; but the Greek cities of Asia Minor were shamefully abandoned to Persia.

The period of the King’s Peace brought only discontent with Sparta’s control and no satisfactory solution of the question of the relations of the Greek states among themselves. The inflexible military organization of Sparta had long ago smothered individual aspirations for a higher culture, and even all individual genius in leadership had been suppressed. Even men like Pausanias, the victor over the Persians at Platæa, or Lysander, the conqueror of the Athenian fleet at Ægospotami, were unable to transform the rigid Spartan system into a government which should sympathetically include and direct the activities of the whole Greek world.

At Athens the burning question had now become the problem of the proper form of a free state—the problem which the efforts of Socrates toward an enlightened citizenship had thrust into the foreground. What should be the form of the ideal state? The Orient had already had its social idealism. By 2000 B.C. the Egyptian sages were striving for a state which should realize brotherly kindness and social justice. The more hopeful among them thought to find it under a righteous king and just officials. Later on in the eighth century B.C. the Hebrews also had begun to dream of an ideal state ruled by a righteous king like the David of their fond idealization of the past. In the Orient, however, it had never occurred to these social dreamers to discuss
the *form of government* of the ideal state. They accepted as a matter of course the monarchy under which they lived as the obvious form for the state. But in Greece the question of the form of government, whether a kingdom, a republic, or what not, was now earnestly discussed. Thus there arose a new science, the *science of government*.

Plato, the most gifted pupil of Socrates, published much of his beloved master’s teaching in the form of dialogues, supposedly reproducing the discussions of the great teacher himself. Then after extensive travels in Egypt and the west he returned to Athens, where he set up his school in a grove near the gymnasium of Academus (hence our word “academy”). Convinced of the hopelessness of democracy in Athens, he reluctantly gave up all thought of a career as a statesman, to which he had been strongly drawn, and devoted himself to teaching. He was both philosopher and poet. The ideas which Socrates maintained the human mind could discern, became for Plato eternal realities, having an existence independent of man and his mind. The human soul, he taught, had always existed, and in an earlier state had beheld the great ideas of goodness, beauty, evil, and the like, and had gained an intuitive vision of them which in this earthly life the soul now recalled, and recognized again. The elect souls, gifted with such vision, were the ones to control the ideal state, for they would necessarily act in accordance with the ideas of virtue and justice which they had discerned. It was possible by education, thought Plato, to lead the souls of men to a clear vision of these ideas.

In a noble essay entitled *The Republic* Plato presents a lofty vision of his ideal state. Here live the enlightened souls governing a society which is the embodiment of righteousness and justice. They do no work, but depend on craftsmen and slaves for all menial labor. And yet the comforts and luxury which they enjoy are the product of that very world of industry and commerce in a Greek city which Plato so thoroughly despises. The plan places far too much dependence on education,
and takes no account of the dignity and fundamental importance of labor in human society. Moreover, Plato’s ideal state is the self-contained, self-controlling city-state as it had in times past supposedly existed in Greece. He fails to perceive that the vital question for Greece is now the relation of these cities to each other. He does not discern that the life of a cultivated state unavoidably expands beyond its borders, and by its needs and its contributions affects the life of surrounding states. It cannot be confined within its political borders, for its commercial borders lie as far distant as its galleys can carry its produce.

Thus boundary lines cannot separate nations; their life overlaps and interfuses with the life round about them. It was so within Greece and it was so far beyond the borders of Greek territory. There had grown up an ancient world which was reading Greek books, using Greek utensils, fitting up its houses with Greek furniture, decorating its house interiors with Greek paintings, building Greek theaters, learning Greek tactics in war—a great Mediterranean and Oriental world bound together by lines of commerce, travel, and common economic interests. For this world, as a coming political unity, the lofty idealist Plato, in spite of his travels, had no eyes. To this world, once dominated by oriental culture, the Greeks had given the noblest and sanest ideas yet attained by the mind of civilized man, and to this world likewise the Greeks should have given political leadership.

Men in practical life, like Isocrates, a very able Athenian writer of political pamphlets, clearly understood the situation at this time (first half of the fourth century B.C.). Isocrates urged the Greeks to bury their petty differences, and expand their local patriotism into a loyalty for the united Greek world. He told his countrymen that, so united, they could easily overthrow the decaying Persian Empire and make themselves lords of the world, whereas now they were but the feeble creatures of the king of Persia. Xenophon also, who had marched into the heart of the Persian Empire with the ten thousand Greek troops hired by Cyrus the Persian prince to assist him in overthrowing...
his brother, Artaxerxes II,—Xenophon had witnessed the defeat of a large Persian army of archers by the impact of the irresistible Greek phalanx. Xenophon wrote out the story of his journey, and his book was widely read. To all Greece the weakness of the Persian State was obvious. Every motive toward unity was present. But yet no Greek city was ready to submit to the leadership of another, and no plan of federation could be devised which proved satisfactory to all.

Section 34. The Leadership of Thebes

Within ten years after the beginning of the King’s Peace, Athens had recovered sufficient sea power to begin the organization of a second maritime alliance like her old Empire. The Spartan fleet was beaten and an alliance with Thebes was arranged which greatly disquieted Sparta. Thebes succeeded in gaining the leadership of Boeotia, and when during the arrangement of a peace with Sparta the Spartans refused to recognize Thebes as the head of Boeotia, the Thebans made ready to oppose the Spartan invasion and the two armies met at Leuctra. The skillful Theban commander Epaminondas drew up his troops in a manner altogether novel, so placing his line that it was not parallel with that of the Spartans, his right wing being much further from the Spartan line than his left. At the same time he massed his troops on his left wing, making it many shields deep. This last was an old device.¹

As the lines moved into action the battle did not begin along the whole front at once; but the Theban left wing, being furthest advanced, met the Spartan line first and was at first engaged alone. Its onset proved so heavy that the Spartan right opposing it was soon crushed, and the rest of the Spartan line was unable to stand as the Theban center and right came into action.

¹ It is frequently stated that the new device of Epaminondas was the massing on his left wing. But this was not a new device; the Thebans had employed it against the Athenians at the battle of Delium (424 B.C.) Epaminondas’s innovation consisted in the obliqueness of his line of battle as it advanced.
The long invincible Spartan army was thus at last defeated. While continuing the war into Spartan territory, even to Sparta itself, Thebes under Epaminondas’s leadership likewise created a navy and greatly weakened Athenian supremacy at sea. Thus, with Spartan power at last shattered, and Athens held in check on the sea, Thebes gained the leadership of Greece.

But it was a supremacy based upon the genius of a single man, and when Epaminondas fell in a final battle with Sparta at Mantinea (362 B.C.), the power of Thebes by land and sea again collapsed. Thus the only powerful Greek states, which might have developed a federation of the Hellenic world, having destroyed each other, were ready to fall helplessly before the conqueror from the outside. He appeared in the person of Philip of Macedon, the father of Alexander the Great. Nor were the powerful and highly civilized Greek cities of the west in Italy and Sicily, like Syracuse, able to assume the political leadership of the Hellenes. The Greek world, whose culture was everywhere supreme, was politically prostrate and helpless.

**QUESTIONS**

**Section 31.** What causes contributed to hostilities between Athens and Sparta? Who were the other enemies of Athens? By whom was she supported? What catastrophe caused the fall of Pericles? Had he founded a system which left to Athens wise and stable leadership? Give some account of Alcibiades. What kind of leadership did Athens now receive? Give an example. What was the result of ten years of war?

What spirit had pervaded the struggle? Why did the peace of Nicias fail? Who brought on war again? Tell the story of the Sicilian expedition. What did Sparta do after the destruction of the Sicilian expedition? Give an account of the Decelean War. What kind of leadership did the Athenian democracy furnish in this war? What was the outcome? What became of the Athenian Empire?

**Section 32.** In what condition was the higher life of Athens after the death of Pericles? What was the purpose of the history

---

1 Where the city was still without walls (see Fig. 87 and explanation).
of Herodotus? To what causes does Herodotus trace events in the history of men? What happened to the old beliefs about the gods? What attitude did Aristophanes take toward the Sophists and Euripides? What was the attitude of the people? Tell something of the life of Socrates.

What was his method of teaching? What was his supreme interest? What did he teach? What were the realities to him? How did he believe they could be discerned? What was his purpose? Of what in particular was he the champion? How was he regarded in Athens and in Greece? Give an account of his last days. Did his teaching die with him? Where did the historian Thucydides find the causes for the events in the history of men?

Section 33. Describe Spartan methods of controlling the other Greek states. What were now the relations between the Greeks and Persia? How did the Spartan system affect her leading men? How did the study which we may call the science of government arise? Relate the career of Plato. Describe his ideal state. Wherein does it fail to be practical?

What kind of leadership did the Greeks fail to furnish? Could leadership in Plato's age be confined to a single city-state? What did practical men like Isocrates and Xenophon advise?

Section 34. How did Thebes gain the leadership of Greece? Who was her great commander? What was his clever military device? What was the cause of his successes? Did the western Greeks in Italy and Sicily succeed in furnishing leadership for all the Greeks and combining them into one nation? What was the final result of the long struggle among the Greek states?
CHAPTER IX

ALEXANDER THE GREAT AND THE HELLENISTIC AGE

SECTION 35. THE RISE OF MACEDONIA

The common danger which threatened all Greek states alike, the power of Persia, had failed to bring together the Greek cities and weld them into a nation, or even to unite them in a federation of any permanence. It was evident that the persistent local patriotism of such city-states, in some respects like the "sectionalism," which brought on the great Civil War in the United States, would not submit to the leadership of any one of their number. Exhausted by ceaseless wars among themselves, their union was now to be accomplished by a people whom the Greeks loftily classified among the "barbarians."

On the northern frontiers in the mountains of the Balkan Peninsula Greek civilization gradually faded and disappeared, merging into the barbarism which had descended from the Europe of the Stone Age. These backward northerners, such as the Thracians, spoke Indo-European tongues akin to Greek, but their Greek kindred of the south could not understand them. Nevertheless a veneer of Greek civilization began here and there to mask somewhat the otherwise rough and uncultivated life of the peasant population of Macedonia. The Macedonian kings began to cultivate Greek literature and art. The mother of Philip of Macedon was grateful that she had been able to learn to write in her old age.

Philip himself had enjoyed a Greek education, but when he gained the power over Macedonia in 360 B.C. he had by no means completely suppressed the barbarous instincts still throbbing in his blood. Many an unbridled orgy and drunken revel
betrayed his northern origin. But as a hostage at Thebes he had learned to manipulate an army under the eye of no less a master than Epaminondas, the conqueror of the Spartans, and his keen intelligence made him both a skillful commander and an able statesman. He completely transformed the Macedonians, organized them chiefly on Greek methods into an unconquerable army, and steadily expanded the territory of his kingdom eastward and northward until it reached the Danube and the Hellespont.

As he absorbed the Greek cities of the northern Aegean, he of course collided with the interests of the southern Greek states like Athens, where Demosthenes (Fig. 98) was now delivering those famous orations against Philip and the Macedonian policy, which have become traditional among us as "Philippics." ¹ After a long series of hostilities Philip defeated the Greek forces in a final battle at Chaeronea (346 B.C.), and firmly established his position as head of a league of all the Greek states except Sparta, which still held out against him. He had begun operations in Asia Minor for the freedom of the Greek cities there, when ten years after the battle of Chaeronea he was stabbed by conspirators during the revelries at the wedding of his daughter.

The power passed into the hands of his son Alexander, a youth of only twenty years. Fortunately Philip also left behind

¹ At the same time there was a sentiment in Greece, even in Athens, which favored Philip's imperial plans, and saw in him the uniter and savior of Greece. This sentiment found a voice in Isocrates, the Athenian pamphleteer, now an aged man, who had so long chided the Greeks for lack of unity in opposing Persia (see p. 211).
him in the Macedonians of his court a group of remarkable men, of imperial abilities such as no century of the ancient world had ever yet seen. They were devoted to the royal house, and Alexander's early successes were in no small measure due to them. But their very devotion, ability, and firmness of character, as we shall see, later brought the young king into a personal conflict which contained all the elements of a tremendous tragedy (see p. 228).

Section 36. Campaigns of Alexander the Great

When Alexander was thirteen years of age, his father had called to the Macedonian court the great philosopher Aristotle, a former pupil of Plato, to be the teacher of the young prince. Aristotle, the most gifted successor of Socrates and Plato, was treating every possible subject in learned essays and arranging the known facts and discoveries in all branches of science in a great series of treatises, which became the world's Encyclopaedia Britannica for nearly two thousand years. Under the instruction of this greatest of the living Greek thinkers, the lad learned to know and love the masterpieces of Greek literature, especially the Homeric songs. The deeds of the ancient heroes touched and kindled his youthful imagination and lent an heroic tinge to his whole character, while, as he grew and his mind ripened, his whole personality was imbued with the splendor of Greek genius and Hellenic culture. He came to believe absolutely in its power and superiority, and in its inevitable success as a civilizing influence.

When Thebes revolted against Macedonia for the second time after Philip's death, Alexander, knowing that he must take up the struggle with Persia, realized that it would not be safe for him to march into Asia without giving the Greek states a lesson which they would not forget. He therefore captured and completely destroyed the ancient city of Thebes, sparing only the house of the great poet Pindar. All Greece was thus taught to
fear and respect his power, but learned at the same time to recognize his reverence for Greek genius. Alexander already dreamed of world-wide conquests, and the Asiatic campaign which he now planned was to vindicate his position as the champion of Hellas against Asia.

He thought to lead the united Greeks against the Persian lord of Asia, as the Hellenes had once made common cause against Asiatic Troy. Leading his army of Macedonians and allied Greeks into Asia Minor, he therefore stopped at Troy and camped upon the plain (Fig. 58 and map, p. 146) where the Greek heroes of the Homeric songs had once fought. Here he worshiped in the temple of Athena, and prayed for the success of his cause against Persia. He thus contrived to throw around himself the heroic atmosphere of the Trojan War, till all Hellas beheld the dauntless figure of the Macedonian youth, as it were, against the background of that glorious age which in their belief had so long ago united Greek arms against Asia (p. 133).

The Persian satraps, with what troops they could gather, endeavored to bar his eastward progress, but at the river Granicus he had no difficulty in scattering their forces in a decisive action. Following the Macedonian custom the young king, then but twenty-two years of age, led his troops into the thick of the fray and exposed his royal person without hesitation. But for the timely support of Clitus, the brother of his childhood nurse, who bravely pushed in before him at a critical moment, the impetuous young king would have lost his life in the action on the Granicus. Marching southward he took the Greek cities one by one, and freed all western Asia Minor forever from the Persian yoke.

Meantime a huge Persian fleet dominated the Mediterranean. It was at this juncture that the young Macedonian, little more than a boy in years, began to display his mastery of a military situation which demanded the completest understanding of the art of war. It was a vast stage on which he was to dictate the course of the stirring world drama for the next ten years
(333–323 B.C.). Believing that his destruction of Thebes had furnished the Greeks such an evidence of the terrible consequences of revolt that not even a Persian fleet in the Ægean could arouse Hellas to hostility against him in his absence, Alexander pushed boldly eastward and rounded the northeast corner of the Mediterranean. Here was spread out before him the vast Asiatic world of forty million souls where the family of the Great King had been supreme for two hundred years.

At this important point, by the Gulf of Issus, Alexander met the main army of Persia, under the personal command of the Great King, Darius III, the last of the line. In a fierce battle the irresistible onset of Alexander and his Macedonians (Fig. 99), combined with the skillful disposition of his troops, swept the Asiatics from the field, and the disorderly retreat of Darius never stopped until it had crossed the Euphrates. The Great King then sent a letter to Alexander desiring terms of peace and offering to accept the Euphrates as a boundary between them, all Asia west of that river to be handed over to the Macedonians.

It is a dramatic picture, the figure of the young king, still only twenty-three years old, standing with this letter in his hand. As he ponders it he is surrounded by a group of the ablest Macedonian youth, who have grown up around him as his closest friends; but likewise by old and trusted counselors upon whom his father before him had leaned. The hazards of battle and of march, and the daily associations of camp and bivouac, have wrought the closest bonds of love and friendship and intimate influence between these loyal Macedonians and their ardent young king.

As he considers the letter of Darius therefore, his father’s old general Parmenio, who has commanded the Macedonian left wing in the battle just won, proffers him serious counsel. We can almost see the old man leaning familiarly over the shoulder of this imperious boy of twenty-three and pointing out across the Mediterranean, as he bids Alexander remember the Persian fleet operating there in his rear, and likely to stir up revolt against him
in Greece. He says too that with Darius behind the Euphrates, as proposed in the letter, Persia will be at a safe distance from Europe and the Greek world. The campaign against the Great King, he urges, has secured all that could reasonably be expected. Undoubtedly he adds that Philip himself, the young king’s father, had at the utmost no further plans against Persia than those already successfully carried out. There is nothing to do, says Parmenio, but to accept the terms offered by the Great King.

In this critical decision lay the parting of the ways. Before the kindling eyes of the young Alexander there rose a vision of world-empire dominated by Greek civilization—a vision to which the duller eyes about him were entirely closed. He waved aside his father’s old counselors and decided to press on in pursuit of the Persian king. In this far-reaching decision he disclosed at once the powerful personality which represented a new age. Thus arose the conflict which never ends—the

* The artist who designed this great work has selected the supreme moment when the Persians (at the right) are endeavoring to rescue their king from the onset of the Macedonians (at the left). Alexander, the bareheaded figure on horseback at the left, charges furiously against the Persian king (Darius III), who stands in his chariot (at the right). The Macedonian attack is so impetuous that the Persian king’s life is endangered. A Persian noble dismounts and offers his riderless horse, that the king may quickly mount and escape. Devoted Persian nobles heroically ride in between their king and the Macedonian onset, to give Darius an opportunity to mount. But Alexander’s spear has passed entirely through the body of one of these Persian nobles, who has thus given his life for his king. Darius throws out his hand in grief and horror at the awful death of his noble friend. The driver of the royal chariot (behind the king) lashes his three horses, endeavoring to carry Darius from the field in flight (p. 219). This magnificent battle scene is put together from bits of colored glass (mosaic) forming a floor pavement, discovered in 1831 at the Roman town of Pompeii (Fig. 128). It has been injured in places, especially at the left, where parts of the figures of Alexander and his horse have disappeared. It is a Roman copy of an older Hellenistic work, probably a painting done at Alexandria (p. 233). It is one of the greatest scenes of heroism in battle ever painted, and illustrates the splendor of Hellenistic art.
Fig. 99. Alexander the Great Charging the Bodyguard and Officers of the Persian King at the Battle of Issus.
conflict between the new age and the old. Never has it been more dramatically staged than as we find it here in the daily growing friction between Alexander and that group of devoted, if less gifted, Macedonians who were now drawn by him into the labors of Heracles—the conquest of the world.

The danger from the Persian fleet was now carefully and deliberately met by a march southward along the eastern end of the Mediterranean. All the Phoenician seaports on the way were captured, and disorganized Egypt fell an easy prey to the Macedonian arms. The Persian fleet, thus deprived of all its home harbors and cut off from its home government, soon scattered and disappeared. Having freed himself in this way from the danger of an enemy in his rear, Alexander then returned from Egypt to Asia, crossed the Euphrates, and marched to the Tigris, where, near Arbela, the Great King had gathered his forces for a last stand.

Parmenio advised a surprise by night attack, but Alexander characteristically disregarded the old general’s suggestions, and in a battle planned by himself crushed the Persian army and forced the Great King into ignominious flight. In a few days Alexander was established in the winter palace of Persia, in Babylon. As Darius fled into the eastern mountains he was stabbed by his own treacherous attendants (330 B.C.). Alexander rode up with a few of his officers in time to look upon the body of the last of the Persian emperors, the lord of Asia, whose vast realm had now passed into his hands. He punished the murderers and sent the body with all respect to the fallen ruler’s mother and sister, to whom he had extended protection and hospitality. Thus at last both the valley of the Nile and the “fertile crescent” (see p. 56), the two earliest homes of those hoary oriental civilizations, whose long careers we have already sketched (see Chapters II–III), were now in the hands of a European power and under the control of a newer and higher civilization. Only five years had passed since the young Macedonian had entered Asia.
Although the Macedonians had nothing more to fear from the Persian arms, there still remained much for Alexander to do in order to establish his empire in Asia. On he marched through the original little kingdom of the Persian kings, whence Cyrus, the founder of the Persian Empire, had victoriously issued over two hundred years before (see pp. 96–97). He stopped at Susa, one of the most important of the royal Persian residences, and then passed on to Persepolis, where he gave a dramatic exhibition of his supremacy in Asia by setting fire to the Persian palace (Fig. 52) with his own hand, as the Persians had once done to Miletus and to the temples on the Athenian Acropolis. It was but a symbolical act, and Alexander ordered the flames extinguished before serious damage was done.

After touching Ecbatana in the north, and leaving behind the trusted Parmenio in charge of the enormous treasure of gold and silver, accumulated for generations by the Persian kings, Alexander again moved eastward. In the course of the next five years, while the Greek world looked on in amazement, the young Macedonian seemed to disappear in the mists on the far-off fringes of the known world. He marched his army in one vast loop after another through the heart of the Iranian plateau (see map, p. 80), northward across the Oxus and the Jaxartes rivers, southward across the Indus and the frontiers of India, into the valley of the Ganges, where at last the murmurs of his intrepid army forced him to turn back.

He descended the Indus, and even sailed the waters of the Indian Ocean. Then he began his westward march again along the shores of the Indian Ocean, accompanied by a fleet which he had built on the Indus. The return march through desert wastes cost many lives as the thirsty and ill-provisioned troops dropped by the way. Over seven years after he had left the great city of Babylon, Alexander entered it again. He had been eleven years in Asia, and he had carried Greek civilization into the very heart of the continent. At important points along his line of march he had founded Greek cities bearing his name,
and had set up kingdoms which were to be centers of Greek influence on the frontiers of India. From such centers Greek art entered India, to become the source of the art which still survives there; and the Greek works of art from Alexander’s communities in these remote regions of the east penetrated even to China, to contribute to the later art of China and Japan. Never before had East and West so interpenetrated as in these amazing marches and campaigns of Alexander.

Section 37. International Policy of Alexander: its Personal Consequences

During all these unparalleled achievements the mind of this young Heracles never ceased to busy itself with a thousand problems on every side. He dispatched an exploring expedition up the Nile to ascertain the causes of the annual overflow of the river, and another to the shores of the Caspian Sea to build a fleet and circumnavigate that sea, the northern end of which was still unknown. He brought a number of scientific men with him from Greece, and with their aid he sent hundreds of natural-history specimens home to Greece to his old teacher Aristotle, then teaching in Athens.

Meantime he applied himself with diligence to the organization and administration of his vast conquests. Such problems must have kept him tediously bending over many a huge pile of state papers, or dictating his great plans to his secretaries and officers. He believed implicitly in the power and superiority of Greek culture. He was determined to Hellenize the world and to merge Asia with Europe by transplanting colonies of Greeks and Macedonians. In his army, Macedonian, Greek, and Asiatic stood side by side. He himself felt that he could not rule the world as a Macedonian, but must make concessions to the Persian world (Plate V, p. 224). He married Roxana, an Asiatic princess, and at a gorgeous wedding festival he obliged his officers and friends also to marry the daughters of Asiatic
Plate V. Greeks and Persians hunting Lions with Alexander the Great

Alexander is out of range at the left. A Greek on horseback endeavors to pierce the wounded lion with his spear. A Persian on foot wields an ax. Relief scene on a marble sarcophagus found at Sidon in 1881; the colors are exactly as on the original, now in the Museum at Constantinople. It was made not long after Alexander’s death, and is one of the greatest works of Hellenistic art (p. 235). (After Winter, Alexandermosaik)
nobles. Thousands of Macedonians in the army followed the example of their royal lord and took Asiatic wives. He appointed Persians to high offices and set them over provinces as satraps. He even adopted Persian raiment in part.

Amid all this he carefully worked out a complete plan of campaign for the conquest of the western Mediterranean, including instructions for the building of a fleet of a thousand battleships with which to subdue Italy, Sicily, and Carthage, and a vast roadway along the northern coast of Africa, to be built at an appalling expense and to furnish a highway for his army from Egypt to Carthage and the Pillars of Hercules (Gibraltar). It is here that Alexander's statesmanship may be criticized. If he had spent less time on the remote frontiers in the far east, and gone earlier to the west, he would have saved himself and Hellas incalculable losses.

What was to be his own position in this colossal world-state of which he dreamed? That question he had settled seven years before in Egypt. When he entered Asia he was king of Macedonia, duke of Thessaly, and general and head of a league or federation of the Greek states, finally including also Sparta, which had defied his father. Many a great Greek had come to be recognized as a god, and there was in Greek belief no sharp line dividing gods from men. Moreover, after a long struggle, the Greeks had come to believe that their gods had all once been human beings of power and influence during their lives. The will of a god, in so far as a Greek might believe in him at all, was still a thing to which he bowed without question and with no feeling that he was being subjected to tyranny. Alexander found in this attitude of the Greek mind the solution of the question of his own position. He would have himself lifted to the realm of the gods, where he might impose his will upon the Greek cities without offense. This solution was the more easy because it had for ages been customary to regard the king as divine in Egypt, where he was a son of the sun-god, and it was a common idea in the Orient.
In Egypt therefore he had deliberately taken the time, while a still unconquered Persian army was awaiting him in Asia, to march with a small following far out into the Sahara Desert to the Oasis of Siwa (see map, p. 80, and Fig. 100), where there was a shrine of the Egyptian god Amon. Amon had been identified with Zeus, and the oracles of Zeus-Amon at Siwa enjoyed the respect of the whole Greek world. Here in the vast solitude Alexander entered the holy place alone. No one knew what took place there; but when he issued again he was greeted by the high priest of the temple as the son of Zeus. Alexander took good care that all Greece should hear of this remarkable occurrence, but the Hellenes had to wait some years before they learned what it all meant.
Four years later the young king found that this divinity which he claimed lacked outward and visible manifestations. There must go with it some outward observances which would vividly suggest his character as a god to the minds of the world which he ruled. He adopted oriental usages, among which was the demand that all who approached him on official occasions should bow down to the earth and kiss his feet. He also sent formal notification to all the Greek cities that the league of which he had been head was dissolved, that he was henceforth to be officially numbered among the gods of each city, and that as such he was to receive the state offerings which each city presented.

Thus were introduced into Europe absolute monarchy and the divine right of kings. Indeed, through Alexander there was transferred to Europe much of the spirit of that Orient which had been repulsed at Marathon and Salamis. But these measures of Alexander were not the efforts of a weak mind to gratify a vanity so drunk with power that it could be satisfied only with superhuman honors. They were carefully devised political measures dictated by state policy, and systematically developed step by step for years.

This superhuman station, investing with divine power the throne of the world-king Alexander, was gained at tragic cost to Alexander the Macedonian youth and to the group of friends and followers about him (p. 219). Beneath the Persian robes of the State-god Alexander beat the warm heart of a young Macedonian. He had lifted himself to an exalted and lonely eminence whither those devoted friends who had followed him to the ends of the earth could follow him no longer. Neither could they comprehend the necessity for measures which thus strained or snapped entirely those bonds of friendship which linked together comrades in arms. And then there were the Persian intruders treated like the equals of his personal friends (Plate V, p. 224), or even placed over them! The tragic consequences of such a situation were inevitable.
Early in those tremendous marches eastward, after Darius's death, Philotas, son of Parmenio, had learned of a conspiracy against Alexander's life, but his bitterness and estrangement were such that he failed to report his guilty knowledge to the king. The conspirators were all given a fair and legal trial, and Alexander himself suffered the bitterness of seeing a whole group of his former friends and companions, including Philotas, condemned and executed in the presence of the army. The trusted Parmenio, father of Philotas, still guarding the Persian treasure at Ecbatana, was also implicated, and a messenger was sent back with orders for the old general's immediate execution. This was but the beginning of the ordeal through which the man Alexander was to pass, in order that the world-king Alexander might mount the throne of a god.

Clitus also, who had saved his life at Granicus, was filled with grief and indignation at Alexander's political course. At a royal feast, where these matters intruded upon the conversation, Clitus was guilty of unguarded criticisms of his lord and then, entirely losing his self-mastery, he finally heaped such unbridled reproaches upon the king that Alexander, rising in uncontrollable rage, seized a spear from a guard and thrust it through the bosom of the man to whom he owed his life. As we see him thereupon sitting for three days in his tent, speechless with grief and remorse, refusing all food, and prevented only by his officers from taking his own life, we gather some slight impression of the terrible personal cost of Alexander’s state policy.

Similarly the demand that all should prostrate themselves and kiss his feet on entering his presence cost him the friendship of the historian Callisthenes. For, not long after, this friend was likewise found criminally guilty toward the king in connection with a conspiracy of the noble Macedonian pages who served Alexander. Trusted and admired as he had been by Alexander, Callisthenes too lost his life. He was a nephew of the king's old teacher, Aristotle, and thus the friendship between master and royal pupil was transformed into bitter enmity.
On his return to Babylon, Alexander was overcome with grief at the loss of his dearest friend Hephaestion, who had just died. He arranged for his dead friend one of the most magnificent funerals ever celebrated. Then, as he was preparing for a campaign to subjugate the Arabian peninsula and leave him free to carry out his great plans for the conquest of the western Mediterranean, Alexander himself fell sick, and after a few days died (323 B.C.). He was thirty-three years of age and had reigned thirteen years.

**Section 38. The Heirs of Alexander’s Empire**

Alexander has been well termed “the Great.” Few men of genius if any, and certainly none in so brief a career as his, have left so indelible a mark upon the course of human affairs. His death in the midst of his colossal designs was a fearful calamity, for it made impossible forever the unification of Hellas and of the world by the power of that gifted race which was now civilizing the world. Fabulous tales of Alexander’s heroic career grew up on every hand, as men looked back upon the wondrous life of the world-hero. But such visions could not bring back the man himself, and there was none to take his place. Of his line there remained in Macedonia a demented half brother and, ere long, the son of Roxana, born in Asia after Alexander’s death. Conflicts among the leaders at home swept away all Alexander’s family, even including his mother.

His generals in Babylonia found the plans of his great western campaign lying among his papers, but no man possessed the genius or the will to carry them out, nor could there be any unity among leaders feeling no authority above them which they would long recognize. These able Macedonian commanders were soon involved among themselves in a long struggle, which slumbered only to break out anew. After a generation of conflict we find Alexander’s empire in three parts, corresponding to Europe, Asia, and Africa, with one of his generals at the
head of each. In Europe, Macedonia is in the hands of Antigonus, who endeavors to maintain control of Greece; in Asia we find the territory of the former Persian Empire under the rule of Seleucus; while in Africa, Egypt, a clearly demarked region by itself, is held by Ptolemy.

But the boundaries between these states were not constant. Ptolemy found it impossible to maintain his power with native Egyptian troops. He was obliged constantly to draw upon Greece. He made his capital Alexandria the greatest port on the Mediterranean. With statesmanlike judgment he built up a fleet which gave him the mastery of the Mediterranean, with the control of Cyprus and the Phoenician ports, the Aegean and parts of southern Greece, and at times also of various points along the coasts of Asia Minor. Indeed, for a century (roughly the third century B.C.) the eastern Mediterranean was an Egyptian sea. To make his frontier toward Asia safer against his Asiatic rival he finally took possession of Palestine and southern Syria. Such an aggressive policy maintained the power of the Ptolemies for over a hundred years. But after 200 B.C. they allowed their navy to decay and their army to decline. Then Egypt became the cat's-paw of Rome.

In Asia the Seleucids selected the northeast corner of the Mediterranean as their home, and here they endeavored to build up another Macedonia in the valley of the lower Orontes and the plain between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean. Here they founded the great city of Antioch as their capital. Without the hardy peasantry of the Macedonian homeland, from which to recruit their armies, the Seleucids found it almost impossible to hold together their vast empire of western Asia. Forced out of Asia Minor by the Romans, they lost also much of their eastern territory at the hands of the Parthians, kinsmen of the Persians, who energetically pushed their boundary westward even to the Euphrates. As a result there arose on the east of the Seleucid empire a new Persian state which not even the power

---

1 The descendants of Seleucus.
of Rome was able to thrust back permanently from the Euphrates. Behind the Parthians other Indo-European tribes absorbed the easternmost dominions of the Seleucids to the frontiers of

**Fig. 101. Restoration of the Public Buildings of Pergamum, a Hellenistic City of Asia Minor. (After Thiersch)**

Pergamum, on the west coast of Asia Minor (see map, p. 80), became a flourishing city-kingdom in the third century B.C. under the successors of Alexander the Great (p. 229). The dwellings of the citizens were all lower down, in front of the group of buildings shown here. These public buildings stand on three terraces — lower, middle, and upper. The large lower terrace, where we see the groups of people, was the main market place, adorned with a vast square marble altar of Zeus, having colonnades on three sides, beneath which was a long sculptured band (frieze) of warring gods and giants (Fig. 112). The middle terrace (at the right) contained a temple of Athena, and the colonnades behind it adorned the famous library of Pergamum, where the stone bases of library shelves still survive. The upper terrace once contained the palace of the king; the temple now there (directly above the Athena temple) was built by the Roman Emperor Trajan in the first century A.D.

India. Thus the Seleucid empire shrank to the region between the Taurus and the Euphrates, commonly called Syria.

At the same time the Antigonids, the kings of Macedon, found it difficult to maintain their control of Greece, as the fleet of the Ptolemies pushed into the Ægean. In war after war the three
states of Macedonia, Syria, and Egypt devoured one another. Mere playthings of these great powers, the unhappy Greek cities steadily declined, and commercial leadership passed eastward to Antioch and Alexandria (Fig. 102). At length, as the strength of Egypt declined, the other two plotted to divide her possessions between them, at the very time when they all should have combined to crush the growing power of Rome in the west, then in the throes of a deadly struggle with Carthage (pp. 258 ff.). The result of the failure of Macedon, Syria, and Egypt to combine against Rome was their submission to the rising city of the West. Rome gradually extended her power through the eastern Mediterranean, till, with the seizure of Egypt about a generation before Christ and about three hundred years after the death of Alexander, she was supreme from the Euphrates to the Pillars of Hercules (p. 263).

Section 39. The Civilization of the Hellenistic Age

The three centuries following the death of Alexander we call the Hellenistic Age, meaning the period in which Greek civilization spread throughout the ancient world, and was itself much modified by the culture of the Orient. While Greek culture had greatly influenced the world outside Greece long before Alexander, his conquests placed Asia and Egypt in the hands of Macedonian rulers who were in civilization essentially Greek. Their language was the Greek spoken in Attica. The business of government was carried on in this language, and, together with Greek commerce and Greek literature, it made Greek the international language of the civilized world, the tongue of which every man of education must be master. Thus the strong Jewish community now living in Alexandria found it necessary to translate the books of the Old Testament from Hebrew into Greek, in order that their educated men might read them. While the native peasants in the thickly populated portions of the East
Alexander the Great and the Hellenistic Age 233

might learn it but indifferently, Greek became, nevertheless, the daily language of the great cities and of an enormous world throughout the Mediterranean and the East (Fig. 115).

![Fig. 102. The Lighthouse of the Harbor of Alexandria in the Hellenistic Age. (After Thiersch)](image)

The harbor of Alexandria (see map in corner above) was protected by an island called Pharos, which was connected with the city by a causeway of stone. On the island and bearing its name (Pháros) was built (after 300 B.C.) a vast stone lighthouse, some three hundred and seventy feet high (that is, over thirty stories, like those of a modern skyscraper). It shows how vast was the commerce and wealth of Alexandria only a generation after it was founded by Alexander the Great, when it became the New York or Liverpool of the ancient world, the greatest port on the Mediterranean (p. 232). The Pharos tower, the first of its kind, was influenced in design by oriental architecture, and in its turn it furnished the model for the earliest church spires, and also for the minarets of the Mohammedan mosques. It stood for about sixteen hundred years, the greatest lighthouse in the world, and did not fall until 1326 A.D.

In a large city like Alexandria, founded as its name suggests by Alexander, in the western corner of the Nile Delta, a Greek of the Hellenistic Age felt very much at home. He heard his own language in every street and market. Just as in the
homeland, he could go to the theater, could wander into the Odeon to listen to the music, or spend an agreeable hour in conversation with the idlers around the gymnasium. At the same time he could watch the practice in the manly sports and the use of weapons, in which the youth were still well exercised, or, if so inclined as the afternoon wore on, he could listen to a lecture by a philosopher or an address by a rhetorician in one of the courts or halls of the gymnasium—all in Greek. To the elementary branches, like reading and writing, which had been learned at the primary school, a young Greek might here add much. But if the youth wished to take up higher education seriously he might go to Athens, still a great center of learning and venerated by the whole ancient world for her noble history.

The first university that was established by a government, however, was the institution which flourished in Alexandria under the patronage of the Ptolemies, known as the Museum, the home of the Muses. Here the greatest philosophers and
scientists of the world carried on their studies and researches, combined with some lecturing and teaching. The first great library of the Greek world containing many thousand rolls was attached to this institution. Under the direction of a pupil of Aristotle, an astronomical observatory was erected, though as yet without telescopes, which were unknown to the ancient world. Thus supported and encouraged, science reached a level not again attained until modern times, two thousand years later. Greek thought, which culminated in the teaching of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, had now developed into four systems, or "schools of philosophy" as they are called,¹ which continued for a time to make some progress in original thought. Of all this the educated man of the time learned something, and two classes were now clearly distinguished — the educated and the uneducated.

The real current of civilized life, as Aristotle taught, was in the cities. To be sure there were many differences between the cities of Egypt, Asia, Greece, and Macedonia in this age. In Egypt there were no free cities and no communities enjoying local self-government in the old Greek sense. On the other hand, the Antigonids granted to the cities of Hellas their old self-government in local affairs, and in Asia the numerous new cities founded by the Seleucids, as well as the older communities, were given the same liberal privileges. The result was the greatest stimulation of productive activity in all the avenues of life, especially commercial and intellectual life. The cities of Asia continued to produce great names in the history of thought and art² (Plate V, p. 224, and Figs. 99, 112), but such names were noticeably fewer in Egypt.

Life in such cities was more comfortably furnished and equipped than ever before. There were roomy market places (Fig. 101), tree-shaded gardens around the temples, and stately

¹ The four schools are: the Academy, Peripatetic, Stoic, and Epicurean.
² A noble work of Hellenistic art will be found in the figure of the dying Gaul at the end of Chapter VIII (p. 214).
buildings to accommodate the public offices and departments of government. Along the sea and in the harbors were wide quays and far-reaching moles, where the traffic with distant lands passed in and out. At Alexandria a vast lighthouse tower (Fig. 102), one of the wonders of the world, shed its beams far across the sea to guide the mariner into the harbor.

A public clock, either a shadow dial, such as the well-to-do Egyptian had had in his house for over a thousand years, or a water clock of Greek invention (Fig. 103), stood in the market place and furnished all the good townspeople with the hour of the day. The calendar used by the government offices employed the inconvenient moon month of Macedonia, and that of the Greeks was no better. The Ptolemies or the priests under them attempted to improve the practical and convenient Egyptian calendar of twelve thirty-day months (see p. 23) by the insertion every four years of a leap year with an additional day, but the people could not be gotten out of the rut into which usage had fallen, and they continued to use the inconvenient moon month of the Greeks. There was no system for the numbering of the years anywhere but in Syria, where the Seleucids gave each year a number reckoned from the beginning of their sway. In Egypt at least, there was a postal service which carried all royal communications.

The soil of the Nile valley is still yielding to the modern excavator enormous quantities of office documents and household papers (Fig. 104) written chiefly in Greek, which disclose to us the way in which the business of government and of private citizens was then conducted. These masses of papers form one of the most interesting revelations of ancient life which modern discovery has furnished us. Indeed, the grave of a member of the Greek community in Memphis has preserved to us the oldest-surviving Greek book.

It is in such papers that we discern how Greek and oriental life were interfused in these Hellenistic states. While this was true of the whole fabric of life, in art and literature, in customs,
government, and language, it was true especially of religion. National boundaries were gradually wiped out in such matters, and even before Alexander's day the Athenians had a ship engaged in carrying Greeks across the Mediterranean, that they might land at Cyrene, penetrate the Sahara, and consult the Egyptian Amon in his desert shrine (see map, p. 80, and Fig. 100). Men thus grew accustomed to strange gods and no longer looked askance at foreign usages in religion. It was only in such a world that Christianity was later able to pass as a foreign religion from land to land. There was now complete freedom of conscience — far more freedom, indeed, than the later Christian rulers of Europe granted their subjects. The teachings of

Socrates would no longer have incurred his condemnation by his Athenian neighbors. From Babylonia the mysterious lore of the Chaldean astrologers was spreading widely through the Mediterranean. It was received and accepted in Egypt, and even Greek science did not escape its influence.

In this connection let us not misunderstand the meaning of the Greek repulse of Persia. Marathon and Salamis were of incalculable importance in quickening the life of Greece and especially of Athens, and in arousing it to a development which resulted in the highest fruition of Greek genius (see pp. 184–194). But it is a great mistake to suppose that Marathon and Salamis once and for all banished the influence of the Orient from the Mediterranean, as an impenetrable dam keeps back a body of water. The great fabric of oriental life in Asia and
Egypt continued to be a permanent force exerting a steady pressure upon the life of the Mediterranean world, in commerce, in forms of government, in customs and usages, in art, literature, and religion. This pressure resulted in many ways in the slow orientalization of the Mediterranean world. When Christianity issued from Palestine, therefore, as we shall see (see p. 300), it found itself but one among many other influences from the Orient which were passing westward. Thus while Greek civilization, with its language, its art, its literature, its theaters and gymnasiaums, was Hellenizing the Orient, the Orient in the same way was exercising a powerful influence on the West and was orientalizing the Mediterranean world.

In this process let us not fail to notice that the Hellenic civilization was on the whole the loser. In the Hellenistic states of the East there was no such thing as national citizenship. Herein they resembled the earlier Orient. Where citizenship existed it was that of a city-state, and implied no rights of the city-citizen in the affairs of the great nation or empire of which the city-state was a part. It was as if a citizen of Chicago might vote at the election of a mayor of the city but had no right to vote at the election of a President of the United States. There was not even a name for the empire of the Seleucids, and their subjects, wherever they went, bore the names of their home cities or countries. The conception of "native land" in the national sense was wanting, and patriotism did not exist. The citizen-soldier who defended his fatherland had long ago given way, even in Greece, to the professional soldier who came from abroad and fought for hire. The Greek no longer stood weapon in hand ready to defend his home and his community against every assault. The patriotic sense of responsibility for the welfare of the state which he loved, and the fine moral earnestness which this responsibility roused, no longer animated the Greek mind nor quickened it to the loftiest achievements in politics, in art, in architecture, in literature, and in original thought.

1 It was as if the citizens of the United States were termed Bostonians, New Yorkers, Philadelphians, Chicagoans, etc.
Indeed, in many Greek cities only a discouraged remnant of the citizens was left after the emigration to Asia. The cattle often browsed on the grass growing in the public square before the town hall in such cities. To be sure, Ætolia, of little fame in Greek history, stood forth in these declining days of Hellas and devised a form of federation for the union of the Greek states probably better than any before known. But alas, it was too late; no lasting union ensued.

The sumptuous buildings' and the pretentious home of science in Alexandria (p. 234) represented little more than the high aims of the Macedonian kings of Egypt. They were no indication of widespread productive power still active in the Greek race as a whole. For when such state support failed, with its salaries and pensions to scientists and philosophers, the line of scientists failed too, and we see at once how largely science in the Hellenistic Age was rooted in the treasuries of the Hellenistic kings, rather than in the minds of the Greek race, as it had been of old. Add to this the extortions and robberies of the Roman tax gatherer under the last century of the Roman Republic (see p. 277); the criminal failure of Rome to protect her eastern dependencies of the Greek world from piracy and pillage (p. 277); the hopeless outlook for the liberties and the commercial prosperity of Hellas, and we have reasons enough for the tragic decline of Greek civilization which set in during the last two of the three centuries of the Hellenistic Age.

The Greeks had brought the world to a higher level of civilization than men had ever seen before, but they had not been able to unite and organize it. Not even their own Hellas was a unified nation. The world which the Greeks, as successors of the Orient, had civilized was now to be organized and unified by a much less gifted but more practical race, whose city on the Tiber was destined to become the mistress of an enduring world empire.
QUESTIONS

SECTION 35. Give an account of the northern Greeks and their kindred in the north. What was the policy of Philip of Macedon? Give an account of his career and its effects in Greece.

SECTION 36. Give an account of the youth of Alexander. Describe his early dealings with the Greeks. How did he desire to be regarded? Describe his conquest of Asia Minor. What was his great purpose thereafter? What did his father’s counselors think of it?

What was the result? How was the danger from the Persian fleet removed? What conquest was gained at the same time? What move in Asia did Alexander now make? Describe the end of the Persian Empire. How long had it lasted (p. 108)? What extraordinary campaigns did Alexander then carry out? What results followed?

SECTION 37. Describe Alexander’s efforts on behalf of science. What organization of the world he ruled did he undertake? What was to be the relation of Europe and Asia? What other conquests had he in mind?

What necessary position was he himself to occupy in the new world empire? Recount his visit to the oracle at the oasis of Siwa and its purpose. What were the Greek cities now asked to do? What personal consequences did Alexander suffer? What was the date of his death?

SECTION 38. What were the consequences of Alexander’s death? What became of his royal line? What great divisions of his empire finally emerged? Who were the rulers of these? Give an account of each of these realms. What western influence succeeded them?

SECTION 39. What do we mean by the Hellenistic Age? What is the leading language of the Hellenistic Age? Describe Alexandria and its great institutions. What was the result for science? Describe the other cities. What practical conveniences for measuring time were now common? Tell something of the Greek papyri in Egypt.

Describe the commingling of Greek and oriental life. Did the Greek victories at Marathon and Salamis banish oriental influences from Greece and the Mediterranean? Did citizenship improve and develop? Did civilization continue to advance under these conditions? What other influences brought on the final decline of Greek civilization?
CHAPTER X

THE WESTERN WORLD AND ROME TO THE FALL OF THE REPUBLIC

SECTION 40. THE WESTERN MEDITERRANEAN WORLD AND EARLY ITALY

The western Mediterranean forms a large detached basin, marked off from the eastern Mediterranean by the Italian peninsula and the Island of Sicily. There is no geographical name for this western basin, but with its islands and surrounding countries we may call it the western Mediterranean world. The most important land in the western Mediterranean world in early times was Italy.

Italy¹ is not only four times as large as Greece, but, unlike Greece, it is not cut up by a tangle of mountains into tortuous valleys and tiny plains. The main chain of the Apennines, though crossing the peninsula obliquely in the north, is nearly parallel with the coasts and many of its outlying ridges are quite so. There are larger plains than we find anywhere in Greece; at the same time there is much more room for upland

¹ The area of Italy is about 110,000 square miles, roughly equaling the area of the state of Nevada, and not quite four times the area of South Carolina.
pasturage and there are more forests. This last fact is due to the latitude of Italy; as a whole, it lies well north of Greece and hence enjoys more of the northern rains. There are far better opportunities for agriculture and livestock in Italy than in Greece, and a considerably larger population can be supported in the plains. At the same time the coast is not so cut up and indented as in Greece; there are fewer good harbors. Hence agriculture and livestock developed much earlier than trade. Italy slopes westward, in the main; it faces and belongs to the western Mediterranean world. Three great islands lie before the peninsula and tempt to expansion thither.

Italy and the western Mediterranean world were further removed from the Orient than the Ægean. Living as they did on the threshold of the Orient, the peoples of the Ægean had responded quickly to the civilizing influences of the East; but while the Ægeans

---

**Fig. 105. Ground Plan of a Prehistoric Pile Village in Italy**

The settlement was surrounded by a moat (A) nearly one hundred feet across, filled with water from a connected river (C). Inside the moat was an earth wall (B) about fifty feet thick at the base. The village thus inclosed was about two thousand feet long; that is, four city blocks. The whole village, being in the marshes of the Po valley, was supported on piles, like the lake-villages (Fig. 5). The plan and arrangement of streets are exactly those of the Roman military camp later derived from it.
and the Greeks were making the most wonderful progress, the peoples of the western Mediterranean world had lagged far behind and had made little advance in civilization since the days of the Swiss lake-dwellers.¹

Some movements among these early westerners had occurred. The lake-dwellers of Switzerland (p. 11) had pushed southward through the Alpine passes and occupied the lakes of northern Italy. The remains of over a hundred of their pile-supported settlements (Fig. 105) have also been found under the soil of the Po Valley, once a vast morass; and the city of Venice, still standing on piles, is a surviving example of their methods of building in this region. They had their influence

¹ The student should here reread pp. 10–16.
on the later Romans, whose military camp exactly reproduced the plan of the Po valley pile settlement (Fig. 105).

We do not know the race of these people of the pile villages, but in the Po Valley they entered the area of more direct influence from the eastern Mediterranean. Articles wrought by the craftsmen of Egypt (see cut, p. 16) and of Cnos- sus were then finding their way into these regions, and the westerners who received them were beginning to appear in the eastern Mediterranean. Some of these early westerners, the descendants of Stone Age Europe, who lived on the island of Sardinia, took service as hired soldiers in the army of the declining Egyptian Empire (p. 53), and we find them pictured on the Egyptian monu-

ments, bearing huge bronze swords and heavy round shields (Fig. 106). They mark the earliest appearance of the men of the West in the arena of history yet to be dominated by them.

At the same time, the northern coast of Italy opposite Corsica was occupied by a powerful group of sea rovers like the
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Sardinians. We call them Etruscans. They were a people whose origin is still uncertain; they probably had an earlier home in western Asia Minor,\(^1\) and the Egyptian monuments tell us of their sea raids on the coast of the Delta as far back as the thirteenth century B.C., at a time when they were perhaps leaving Asia Minor in search of a new home in Italy. Here the Etruscans fast developed into the most civilized and powerful people north of the Greek colonies of Sicily and southern Italy (p. 147). Greek religion and arts found easy entrance among them; they mined copper and became masters in metal work (Fig. 107). Their utensils of bronze found a ready market even in Greece (p. 149). They learned to write with Greek letters, and they have left behind thousands of inscriptions, which unfortunately we cannot yet read. The west coast of Italy from the Bay of Naples almost to Genoa, including the inland country as far as the Apennines, was finally held by the Etruscans. They seemed destined to become the final lords of Italy, and they continued as an important people of the West far down into Roman history.

But the Etruscans were not the only immigrants who sought an early home in Italy. The tribes forming the western end of the Indo-European migration (pp. 86–91) early felt the attractiveness of this warm, sunny, and fertile peninsula.\(^2\) Probably not long after the Greeks pushed into the Greek peninsula (p. 124), the western tribes of Indo-European blood had threaded the Alpine passes from the north and entered the beautiful Mediterranean world into which the Italian peninsula extends. They took possession of the main portion of the peninsula, where we call them “Italic” peoples. In Italy their dialects so differed among themselves that hardly a tribe of the Italic peoples was able to understand its kindred of the next group of tribes.

\(^1\) They do not belong to the Indo-European line (Fig. 49).
\(^2\) Whether the lake-dwellers represent a western migration of the Indo-European peoples or not we do not know.
Section 41. Earliest Rome

On the south or east banks of the Tiber, which flows into the sea in the middle of the west coast of Italy (see map, p. 245), there was a group of Italic tribes known as the Latins. They occupied a plain (Fig. 108), less than thirty by forty miles,¹ that is smaller than many an American county. They called it "Latium," whence their own name, "Latins." Like all their Italic neighbors they lived scattered in small communities cultivating grain and maintaining flocks on the upland. Their land was not very fertile, and the battle for existence developed hardy and tenacious children of the soil. They had little to do with their neighbors.

¹ Latium probably contained something over seven hundred square miles.
Outlines of European History

Once a year, however, they went up to the Alban Mount (Fig. 109), where all the Latin tribes united in a feast of their chief god, Jupiter, whose rude mud-brick sanctuary was on the Mount.

**Fig. 109. Ruins of the Roman Forum**

The scene is taken from the Capitol Hill (see plan, p. 250) looking southeastward along the Forum to the distant Alban Mount on the horizon (p. 248). The steep elevation at the right is the Palatine Hill, where the palace of the Roman emperors stood. The long lines of bases of columns on the right belonged to a basilica built by Julius Caesar (Fig. 113); on the left of these was the open market place of the Forum (p. 249); the columns in the foreground belong to the Temple of Saturn (Fig. 113), which was used as a treasury by the Roman government.

Sometimes, too, they were forced to unite with the other communities to defend themselves against their neighbors, especially the Samnites, a powerful group of mountain tribes in the south.

It was at such times that the peasant was obliged to make the day’s journey up to the town to purchase weapons for his son, when he reached fighting age. These — the spear, the short
sword, and the shield — he has adopted from the Samnites. His fathers could find them in the market made only of bronze, but now they were to be had of iron, and a bronze sword was a rarity. The market was at a ford in the Tiber just above the coast marshes, which extend some ten or twelve miles inland from its mouth. At this ford the Etruscan merchants from the north side crossed over with their wares to find a market among the Latin peasants. The traffic resulted in a settlement on a hill known as the Palatine¹ (Fig. 109). The settlement had long been there and a line of Etruscan nobles had once succeeded in gaining control of the place as its kings. Several other hills close by, seven of them in all, bore straggling settlements which gradually merged into a considerable city, indeed the largest of middle Italy. It was called Rome. The peasant could recall the tradition which told how the townsmen, as they increased in wealth and power, rose against their Etruscan lords and expelled them.

As he reaches the market place, the "forum" (Fig. 109, and plan, p. 250), which lies beside the Palatine and another hill known as the Capitol, he looks down the valley toward the river. There lies a group of ships from the great Mediterranean world outside, of which the peasant knows so little. Some of them are from the Greek cities of the south (cut, p. 166) and some from the Etruscan ports along the northern coast. There are no Roman ships among them. The peasant goes down to the dock. Here he finds a Roman mechanic building a ship constructed exactly like the Greek and Etruscan ships beside it.

The Greek merchants bring written invoices and bills. The Romans, entirely unable to read them at first, are slowly

¹ The traditional date for the foundation of Rome — namely, the middle of the eighth century B.C. (often 753 B.C.) — has come to us from the ancient Roman historians and is worthless. There was a settlement of men at this important place on the Tiber as early as the Late Stone Age. In later times the Roman folk told fabulous tales about the foundation of the city by two brothers, Romulus and Remus, and these tales were long accepted as narratives of fact, though it is evident that they are purely fanciful. The headpiece of this chapter (p. 241) shows the two brothers as infants suckled by a wolf, according to the tradition.
learning to spell them out, and thus finally to recognize a Greek word here and there. Ere long they are scribbling memoranda of their own transactions in these Greek letters, which in this way become likewise the Roman alphabet, slightly changed of course to suit the Latin language used in Rome. It is this alphabet which descended from the Orient through Rome to us.

The Greek merchant on the dock has a sack full of copper coins and a smaller purse filled with silver ones. These too the Roman tradesman learns to use, against the day when his own city shall begin to coin them. He is obliged to accept also the measures of bulk and of length with which the Greek measures out to him the things he buys. The peasant hears the merchants
on the dock speaking Greek. He too learns the Greek words for the clothing offered for sale, for household utensils and pottery and other things connected with traffic. These words become part of the daily fund of Roman speech.

The Latin peasant looks on with wonderment at all this world of civilized life of which he knows so little—a world in which these clever Greeks seem so much at home. Indeed, they bring into things which cannot be weighed and measured like produce, from a realm of which the Roman is but beginning to catch fleeting glimpses. For the peasant hears of strange gods of the Greeks, and he is told that they are the counterparts or the originals of his own gods. For him there is a god over each realm in nature and each field of human life: Jupiter is the great sky-god and king of all the gods; Mars, the patron of all warriors; Venus, the queen of love; Vesta presides over the household life, with its hearth fire surviving from the nomad days of the fathers on the Asiatic steppe a thousand years before (p. 91); Ceres is the goddess who maintains the fruitfulness of the earth, and especially the grain fields (compare English "cereal"); and Mercury is the messenger of the gods who protects intercourse and merchandising, as his name shows. The streets are full of stories which the townsmen have learned from the Greeks, regarding the heroic adventures of these divinities when they were on earth. The peasant learns that Venus is the Greek Aphrodite, Mars is Apollo, Ceres is Demeter, and so on.

The oracles delivered by the Greek Sibyl, the prophetess of Apollo of Delphi (Fig. 82), are deeply reverenced in Italy; gathered in the Sibylline Books, they are regarded by the Roman townsmen as mysterious revelations of the future. There are also other means of piercing the veil of the future, for the townsmen tell the peasant how the Etruscans are able to discover in the liver or the entrails of a sheep killed for sacrifice hints and signs of the outcome of the next war; but the peasant does not know as we do that this art was received by the Etruscans.
from the Babylonians by way of Asia Minor, whence the Etruscans have brought it to the Romans.

An art like this appealed to the rather coldly calculating mind of the Roman. To such a mind, lacking a warm and vivid imagination, the Greek myths opened a new world. To such a mind the gods required only the fulfillment of all formal ceremonies, and if these were carried out with legal exactness, all would be well. As the Roman looked toward his gods he felt no doubts or problems, like those which troubled the spirit of Euripides (p. 190). The Roman saw only a list of mechanical duties easily fulfilled. Hence he was fitted for great achievement in political and legal organization, but not for new and original developments in religion, art, literature, or even science.

When the city on the Tiber had rid itself of its Etruscan kings (p. 249) it was ruled by a body of nobles called "patriarchs." It began a political development much like that which we have met in the Greek cities. By the middle of the fifth century B.C. the people had secured protection from the whim of the judge by a written code of laws, engraved on twelve tables of bronze. Public affairs were largely controlled by a council of old men known as the Senate (a word connected with senex, meaning "an old man"). At the head of the government were two elective magistrates of the same powers, called "consuls." The peasantry, or "multitude" (plebs, compare "plebeian"), of the district immediately surrounding the city made up an assembly of the people, which struggled for greater power in government.

It was a struggle for the rights of the lower classes like that which we have seen in Egypt (p. 42), in Palestine (p. 105), and in Greece (p. 132). In Greece and Rome, however, as contrasted with the Orient, there was the important difference that the struggle resulted not in monarchy, but in a republican form of government, giving the people a share in its control. In Rome the peasant's demand for a vote and voice in government was heeded. He finally gained the right to election as
consul (366 B.C.) and to representation in the Senate. But here the fine political insight of the Roman demonstrates his superiority to the Greek in such matters.

The patricians, or aristocrats, continued to hold the leadership, and they contrived so to control the power of the popular assembly as not to expose public affairs to the passing humors of a changeable city multitude like that of Athens. This stable leadership of a group of seasoned councilors in the Roman Senate was the chief reason for the success of Roman government, and saved the Romans from the fate of Athens after the death of Pericles (p. 197). Rome was thus an "aristocratic republic"—more so than Athens.

At the same time the people were not without protection from injustice at the hands of the aristocrats. They gained the right to elect tribunes as their magistrates, who enjoyed great power to shield any citizen from oppression by the State. One of the tribunes named Licinius secured the passage of a law intended to relieve the peasantry from financial oppression by large landholders, and limiting the amount of land which could be held by a rich man. In times of great danger to the State, it was possible to appoint a "Dictator" with absolute power to rule as the crisis might require. The presence of the Greek cities in the south had exerted a great influence in leading the Romans to a city form of state, but the native genius of the Roman for government saved him from the political mistakes of the Greeks. Similarly the exaction of military service from every landholding peasant and the census arrangements suggest Greek customs. These developments in government were a slow process occupying centuries. Meantime the Roman republic was continually expanding and to this steady growth we must now turn our attention.

Such abuses had become a great evil, as in Greece (p. 153). The date of the Licinian law is uncertain, though commonly placed in 367 B.C. See, however, p. 263, for the later conditions calling for such laws.

These were controlled by "censors," a word which has descended to us from the Romans like so many other of our terms of government.
Section 42. The Expansion of the Roman Republic

The motive power which brought about the expansion of Rome beyond the limits of the city was largely the necessity of defense against the intrusion of neighboring tribes living outside Latium, especially the Samnites and their kinsmen, who endeavored to seize the territory of the Latin tribes. The Latins found the leadership and the protection of the city invaluable under such circumstances, and a permanent league naturally developed uniting the tribes of Latium under the leadership of the city of Rome. The obligation to bear arms, if they owned land, gave to the peasants of Latium the right to demand citizenship, and the men of all the straggling Latin communities, over thirty in number, were at length received as Roman citizens. It was herein that the Roman Senate displayed a sagacity which cannot be too much admired. While the Greek city always jealously guarded its citizenship and would not grant it to any one born outside its borders, the Roman Senate conferred citizenship as a means of expansion and increased power.

As their intruding neighbors, like the Samnites or the Volscians, were thrust back and new territory was thus gained, the Romans planted colonies of citizens in the new lands conquered, or ultimately granted citizenship to the absorbed population. Roman peasants, obligated to bear Roman arms and having a voice in government, thus pushed out into the expanding borders of Roman territory. This policy of agricultural expansion steadily and consistently followed by the Senate finally made Rome mistress of Italy. It was a policy which knit together into an invincible structure of government the city and the outlying communities of its weapon-bearing peasants. It gave to Rome an ever increasing body of citizen-soldiers, greater at last than any other state could muster, in the whole ancient world. Curiously enough this nation which was about to include the territory of all Italy remained a city-state, adding distant regions of Italy as if they were new wards of the
city. But the citizens of these distant wards lost their votes rather than take the trouble to go up to the city to vote.

While this steady expansion of Rome was going on, a tremendous migration of Gauls inundated southern Europe. The Gauls were a vast group of Indo-European tribes extending across what is now France, from the English Channel to the Po valley in Italy. Their eastern tribes entered the Balkan Peninsula and even pushed into Asia Minor. At one time they seemed about to overwhelm the nations on the north of the Mediterranean, as the Germans later did (p. 305). These invasions by the Gauls swept over the city of Rome after 400 B.C. and almost submerged it. Nevertheless the hardy city survived.

The rivalry with the Samnites continued. These enemies in the south might win more than one battle, but they could not break down the stability of the State which the sagacious Roman Senate had welded together. Rival peoples, like the Samnites, lacked such a system, and furthermore they lacked such a city as Rome to serve as a nucleus and center of union. By 300 B.C. the lands absorbed by the Romans had quite enveloped the Samnites on east and west, and in the north likewise had carried the Roman boundaries far into Etruscan territory and well up the Tiber. Hence not even the combined assaults of Etruscan, Samnite, and Gaul could exhaust the resources of the Roman State. When the Roman legions met the Gauls at Sentinum and overwhelmingly defeated them (295 B.C.), they won the supremacy of Italy for the city on the Tiber. Henceforth, unchallenged, Roman dominion in Italy was a matter of a short time. While the eastern empire of Alexander the Great was being cut up and parceled out by his Macedonian generals (p. 229), Italy was undergoing a process of stable consolidation which brought even the Greek cities in the south of the peninsula (see cut, p. 166) under Roman rule (272 B.C.).

1 The figure of the dying Gaul (see end of Chapter VIII, p. 214), once set up in Pergamum in Asia Minor (Fig. 101), represents one of the Gauls who invaded Asia Minor.
Meantime the city itself had greatly grown. The seven hills had long before been covered with buildings, and the capture of the town by the Gauls had taught the Romans to surround the place with a wall. While the wall was of massive stone, the buildings within were chiefly of wood and sun-baked brick. They were simple and unpretentious, and there was hardly a building of monumental architecture in the city. A fine paved road, leading southward to the city of Capua in the region of Naples (see map, p. 245), was the first of the famous Roman military roads, and it was called the Via Appia, after the consul Appius Claudius.

Traffic with the Greek ships at the docks at length forced the Romans to begin the issue of copper coins, — "aes" they called them, — and in their bills the values of goods were given in copper coins; hence our word "estimate" (Roman "aestimare"). But transactions soon grew too large for such small copper change, and the government was obliged to begin the coinage of silver, with Attic weights as a basis of the different-sized coins. Money began to be a power in the city.

Heretofore the interests of the farmer had been supreme, and his settlement on conquered land had dictated the government's policy of expansion. The farmer looked no further than the shores of Italy. But the transactions of the Roman merchant reached out beyond those shores, especially to Sicily and the south. Here he was hampered by competition from Carthage. While his foreign interests were still small he had been willing that the Senate should make a commercial treaty with Carthage, agreeing that Rome would not intrude in Sicily, provided that Carthage on her part would keep aloof from Italy. Now, however, the Roman merchant chafed under such restrictions; the more so because the Greeks of Sicily and Italy (Fig. 74 and cut, p. 166) had as usual failed to unite,¹ and had

¹ Such a union seemed at one time about to take place under King Pyrrhus of Epirus (on the Greek mainland), as a result of his invasion of these regions (280 B.C.). Rome herself regarded him as dangerous to her power in Italy,
thus left Sicily more than ever open to Carthaginian control. The resulting supremacy of the Carthaginian merchants in Sicily was a source of aggravation to the merchants of Rome.

Carthage\textsuperscript{1} was governed by an aristocracy of wealthy merchants. The mercantile instinct, which still makes their race a line of merchant princes at the present day, was strong in the blood of the Semitic Carthaginians. In their veins flowed the blood of those hardy desert mariners of Arabia, the Semitic caravaneers (p. 59) who had made the market places of Babylon the center of ancient eastern trade two thousand years before Rome ever owned a ship (p. 67). The fleets of their Phoenician ancestors had cours ed the Mediterranean in the days when the Stone Age barbarians of Italy were eagerly looking for the merchant of the East and his metal implements (p. 244). Now Rome had gained the supremacy in Italy only to find that the merchant princes of Carthage had made the western Mediterranean a Carthaginian sea. They ruled the northern coast of Africa from the frontiers of the Greek city of Cyrene westward to the Atlantic. They controlled southern Spain, they had absorbed the islands of the west, large and small, including Sardinia and Corsica, and only the Greek cities of Sicily had prevented them from appropriating the whole of this island long ago. Thus they formed the extreme left or western wing of the great Semitic line (Fig. 49).\textsuperscript{2} We are now to witness the continuation of the old struggle of Semite and Indo-European, which has reached its final phase on the Semitic left wing, where the areas of Roman and Carthaginian trade have overlapped and brought on the contest.

fought him, and, although at first defeated, finally forced him to retire to Epirus again. This new failure of the southern Greeks to unite was of course another example of that local independence of which we have seen so much in Hellas.

\textsuperscript{1} The student should here reread pp. 59-60, 67, 137-139.

\textsuperscript{2} We have followed Europe and Asia in a long struggle for the possession of the eastern Mediterranean; we now behold Europe and Asia, as represented by Carthage, again facing each other, but this time across the western Mediterranean, for the control of which they are fighting.
Section 43. The Carthaginian Wars

The Senate needed little persuasion from the wealthy merchants of Rome to intervene in Sicilian affairs, as the Greeks completely lost control in Sicily. The inevitable war\(^1\) saw the Roman legions steadily thrusting back the Carthaginian frontier in Sicily by 265 B.C. Carthage, as a wealthy commercial syndicate, having no agricultural population to furnish its soldiers, was forced to engage its troops for hire from abroad. Such troops were no match for the Roman legions, and the Carthaginians steadily lost ground.

One great advantage, however, enabled them to defend themselves in a last stronghold at the western end of Sicily. They were masters of the sea, while Rome had no war fleet. The Senate, like Themistocles in Athens (p. 170), at length perceived the difficulty. The forests of Italy furnished abundant raw material, and Roman builders were soon able to master the art of building warships. Gradually the new Roman fleet gained experience, and the outcome was the complete destruction of Carthaginian sea power. After twenty-four years of fighting Carthage was forced to make peace, leaving Rome in undisturbed possession of all Sicily (241 B.C.). For the first time Rome held territory outside of Italy, an epoch-making step from which she was never able to draw back—a step which has been compared with the act of the United States in taking Porto Rico and the Philippines.

Peace between two such rivals could only be temporary, for the constant expansion of Roman power was a daily menace to Carthage. She looked in vain for some adversary who might humble her proud rival on the Tiber. But she was forced to see the Roman arms again triumphant as they crushed the Gauls of northern Italy, who had taken possession of the valley of the Po. Thenceforth the entire Italian peninsula to the foot

\(^1\) Commonly called the "First Punic War." "Punic" is a Latin form of the word "Phoenician," to which race the Carthaginians belonged.
of the Alps was under Roman sovereignty. There were, to be sure, many cities bound to Rome only by treaty, whose citizens were not at first received into Roman citizenship. But in spite of the fact that there was no uniform language common to the Roman citizens and the allies who made up the population of the peninsula, a national feeling arose and Italy as a whole was slowly becoming a nation.

In defiance of the treaty of peace with Carthage, Rome had no hesitation in seizing the island of Sardinia, a Carthaginian possession. A counter move by Carthage was necessary. While the Roman war with the Gauls was going on, the Carthaginians therefore took advantage of the situation to seize additional territory in southern Spain. Here they acquired silver mines of immense value, and at the same time the native population of Spain furnished excellent troops for the Carthaginian army. Thus they were equipped with both money and men for another war. Nevertheless, the Carthaginian merchants had not forgotten their losses in the Sicilian war and had no desire to repeat the experience.

The Roman Senate, however, could not allow all Spain to be acquired by Carthage. They ordered a few legions to cross the Pyrenees and to seize northern Spain for Rome as far as the Ebro River. Here a young Carthaginian named Hannibal, whose father had been the soul of the Carthaginian defense of Sicily, now organized a formidable army. He intentionally became involved in trouble with the Romans on the Spanish frontier and thus forced the peace party at home into war. He was but twenty-four years of age when he began his Spanish operations, and at twenty-seven he was beginning a plan of campaign of such boldness and genius that he took the Romans completely by surprise.

The Senate had determined to carry the war into Africa to the very walls of Carthage, when in the autumn of 218 B.C. Hannibal suddenly appeared with his army issuing from the

1 Commonly called the "Second Punic War."
passes on the Italian slopes of the Alps and taking possession of the valley of the Po. This unexpected march through southern France, over the Alps and into Italy, at once threw Rome on the defensive. The army, which they had hurriedly gotten together to meet Hannibal beyond the Alps, had been cleverly evaded by that general, and the Roman force went on into Spain. Then this young commander of twenty-eight, showing himself a master of military science (like Napoleon, who at about the same age won his first Italian victories in this very region), at once advanced with his Spanish veterans and many Gauls and defeated one Roman army after another.

Pushing far southward into the old territory of the Greek cities of Italy, Hannibal succeeded in detaching many of the southern cities from their alliance with Rome, and finally all Sicily went over to his cause. But the nucleus of the states in central Italy, which Rome had gathered about her and linked to herself by bonds of citizenship, could not be detached. They stood fast. Meantime Carthage was unable to send reënforcements to its army in Italy, for the Romans commanded the sea with their fleet. After the first defeats the Senate was more careful in picking its commanders, and these new men were more successful. Among them it was now especially Fabius, who made himself famous by a policy of defensive waiting and avoiding battle with the clever Hannibal, foreseeing that the Carthaginian forces, if not reënforced from home, must slowly melt away.

Hannibal sent to Macedonia urging alliance and seeking aid, and there was a futile effort to respond. Had the descendants of the Macedonian rulers who divided Alexander’s empire in the East now discerned the character of this battle of giants which was going on in Italy, they might have changed the history of the world. For this struggle of the Romans with Hannibal was the decisive turning point in the history of the ancient world. Roman victory in this contest meant the supremacy of Rome not only in the western Mediterranean but in the whole
Mediterranean world.\textsuperscript{1} Meantime the Roman forces besieged and slowly recovered the unfaithful cities one by one, until Sicily was in their hands again.

Hannibal's brother endeavors to push in with reinforcements from Spain, where he has been obliged to leave the Romans in possession. But he is intercepted, defeated, and slain. Finally, when Hannibal has been thirteen years in Italy, the Senate organizes an expedition against Carthage itself. Not even the recall of Hannibal to Carthage can now stay the victorious Romans, and in 202 B.C. the merchant princes of Carthage are compelled to accept an ignominious peace. Their power is forever broken, and they are never again a source of anxiety to the Roman Senate. Rome thus becomes mistress of the western Mediterranean, and her power so far exceeds that of all other states that the rivalry between nations, which makes up so large a part of the career of the ancient world, is soon to cease, because there is no one who dares to challenge the power of Rome.

For over fifty years more the merchants of Carthage were permitted to traffic in the western Mediterranean, and then the iron hand of Rome was laid upon the doomed city for the last time. It was completely destroyed, and the only formidable rival of Rome in the West disappeared (146 B.C.).\textsuperscript{2}

\textbf{Section 44. World Dominion and Civil War}

The third century B.C., which gave to Rome the naval and military supremacy in the Mediterranean, nevertheless saw Rome herself conquered by Greek civilization. Greek slaves and captives of war from the Greek cities in Italy and Sicily, now ruled by Rome, begin to be common in Roman households. Greek

\textsuperscript{1} The Egyptian navy of the Ptolemies (p. 230), after a century of supremacy in the Mediterranean, was at this time on the decline. The armies of the Hellenistic kings also were declining. They were no match for those of Rome.

\textsuperscript{2} As the result of a three years' war, commonly called the "Third Punic War," the Semitic left wing was thus annihilated by the western end of the Indo-European line (Fig. 49), and Europe again triumphed over Asia.
merchants multiply in the Roman Forum and along the river front. Amid the hum of voices on street or in market the sound of Greek becomes more and more familiar to Roman ears. Here and there a household possesses a Greek slave of education, and the parents are glad to have their children follow him about the house, picking up verses from Homer, or sit at his elbow learning to read.

Among the Greek slaves from southern Italy in Rome at this time is a young man named Andronicus. Just after the Sicilian war with Carthage he is given his liberty by his lord, and seeing the interest of the Romans in Greek literature, he translates the Homeric Odyssey (p. 142) into Latin as a school book for Roman children. For their elders he likewise renders into Latin the classic tragedies which we have seen in Athens (p. 190), and also a number of Attic comedies (p. 204). These the Romans attend with great delight as they are presented on the stage at the various feasts. Thus the materials and the forms of Greek literature enter Roman life.

To be sure, the Latins, like all peasant peoples, have had their folk songs and their simple forms of verse, but these natural products of the soil of Latium now disappear as the men of Latin speech feel the influence of an already highly finished literature. Latin literature, therefore, did not develop along its own lines from native beginnings, as did Greek literature, but it grew up on the basis of a great inheritance from abroad. Indeed, we now see, as the poet Horace said, that Rome, the conqueror, was being conquered by the civilization of the Greeks, into whose world Roman power was now pushing out. For books, music, works of art, architecture, and all those things which belong to the more refined and the higher side of life, the Roman was at first dependent entirely upon the Greek. What the Romans were furnishing of their own was a more stable and powerful organization than any devised by the Greeks.

These triumphs of Greek civilization in Rome were being achieved at the very time when Roman political and military
power was laying a heavy hand on the old Greek cities and the entire Hellenistic world of the eastern Mediterranean. Immediately after the close of the war with Hannibal the Senate determined to punish Macedonia for its attempt to support Hannibal (p. 260). At last the long-irresistible phalanx of the Greeks was confronted by the Roman legion. Before the victorious legion Macedonia and Greece fell under Roman control, though the Roman Senate proclaimed the Greek cities free. The object of Rome was not the conquest of the East, but such a control of the eastern states as would prevent the rise of a great power dangerous to Rome.

Such a control, however, unavoidably developed into more, and finally became Roman sovereignty. When the Seleucids (p. 230) interfered in Greek affairs a Roman army marched for the first time into Asia, and the Seleucid army received a crushing defeat. The last great power that confronted Rome was thus permanently crippled, and, although they did not yet take possession of it all, the Romans were masters of the civilized world (190 B.C.). A generation later the helpless Greeks were given a vivid example of what revolt would bring upon them, as they beheld the Roman destruction of Corinth in the same year (146 B.C.) which saw the annihilation of Carthage.

The Rome which thus gained the dominion of the world had hitherto been a republic of farmers, led by a body of aristocrats making up the majority of the Roman Senate. The long wars and the resulting vast conquests inevitably produced great changes as the wealth of the conquered states flowed into the Roman treasury, and Roman officials were enriched at the expense of the provinces. In these changes the farmer was the sufferer. He had kept his post in the legion for years, in Spain, in Africa, in Macedonia, or in Italy facing Hannibal. There had been no one to work his lands in his absence. When he returned he found that his neighbors all around him had disappeared, and their lands had been bought up by the wealthy men of Rome, who had combined them into huge estates.
These lands were now being worked by slaves, the captives, of whom the Romans had taken great numbers in their wars. Such captives of war were usually sold into slavery. Pirates now in control of the eastern Mediterranean also brought in multitudes of captives, whom they sold as slaves to wealthy buyers. As a result great hosts of such slaves were working the lands of Italy, and a single large landholder might possess thousands of them. The farmer is unable to compete with slave labor; he falls into debt, loses his scanty lands, and goes up to the city. On the way thither he finds all Italy stripped of its hardy farmers by the wars, and their lands in the possession of Roman capitalists, who have equipped them with foreign slaves. He finds the city filled with a great multitude of former citizens, now penniless like himself, who have lost their citizenship with their property. All Italy is thus seething with discontent.

What matters it to the landless peasant who has fought the battles of Rome and won her dominion over the whole civilized world — what matters it to him that the city is now being adorned with splendid public buildings, such as have never been seen in the West before, outside of the Greek cities. He sees the gardens and villas of the rich filled with sculpture from the cities of Hellas and Asia; he sees a network of new military roads spreading in all directions from the city; he finds the houses of the Roman nobles in the city filled with foreign slaves; he hears his old commanders speaking Greek and sees them reading Greek books; he knows that they send their sons to Athens to receive a Greek education.

He knows, moreover, that while these Roman lords are drinking thus deeply at the fountains of Greek life, they are likewise appropriating the wealth of all this great world, where Greek culture is everywhere. This wealth and the leadership of the vast dominions that contribute it, have made the Roman Senate powerful beyond the uttermost dreams of the fathers of old, and in this new power and wealth the Roman multitude have no share. What is worse they have lost their own property
at home. To be sure many of them have no higher desire than the opportunity of plundering the provinces themselves, but the landless condition of Rome's citizen-soldiers is destroying the very foundation of Roman power.

Two men of the noble class, Tiberius Gracchus and his brother Gaius, patriots with the welfare of the State in view, now (133-122 B.C.) endeavored to better the situation by laws which would redistribute the lands among the citizens and weaken the power of the selfish aristocrats in the Senate. Both men lost their lives in the struggle. The proud and powerful Senate was no longer willing to make concessions to the people as of old. A revolution began, with intermittent civil war which lasted for a century (ending 31 B.C.) (p. 273). As it went on, and the legions were turned against each other, some of the greatest battles in the history of the ancient world were fought between Roman armies. At the same time multitudes of slaves seized arms and terrorized southern Italy and Sicily for years.

As we watch the further course of this century of civil war, we see that the statesman in the Senate more than once found himself confronted by the general from the field backed by Roman legions. Such a commander with a loyal army behind him could force Rome to elect him dictator. He might not abolish the institutions and the outward forms of the republic, but he controlled the State like an absolute monarch. He crushed his enemies, he appropriated their property, and the streets of the city were stained with the blood of her own citizens. Military power was undermining Roman institutions.

Such were the methods of Marius and Sulla — Marius on behalf of the people and redistribution of lands; Sulla in defense of the Senate and the wealthy of Rome (81-79 B.C.). Sulla and the Senate triumphed, though Rome was compelled to grant citizenship to the rebellious Italian cities. At Sulla's death the struggle broke out anew. More than one man plotted for the complete overthrow of the Republic, and the gifted orator and literary man Cicero, elected consul in 63 B.C., saved the State
from seizure, and Rome, as he claimed, from fire and sword, at the hands of the notorious Catiline and his associates. But the aims of such lawless leaders as Catiline may perhaps have been more laudable service on behalf of the people than the famous speeches of Cicero would lead us to believe.

Thus military leadership became the controlling power in the Roman world, and it was evident to the practical statesman that the old machinery of the Republic could never again restore order and stable government in Italy. The situation absolutely demanded an able and patriotic military commander with an army behind him, who should make himself undisputed and permanent master of Italy. Convinced of this, the young patrician politician Julius Caesar (Fig. 110), steadily aiming to gather the reins of power in his own hands, adopted the cause of the people against the Senate. Rising through the consulship, he secured appointment as governor of Gaul, the ancient region corresponding to modern France (58 B.C.). This gave him the desired military opportunity. He organized a powerful army, and in the use of it he displayed a military skill which placed him among the world's greatest masters of the art of war.

In eight years of march and battle he subdued the Gauls and conquered their territory from the ocean and the English Channel eastward to the Rhine. He even crossed the Channel and landed in Britain. He added a vast dominion to the
territory of Rome, and we should not forget that his conquests brought Latin into France, as the ancestor from which French speech has descended. In the midst of these great operations Cæsar nevertheless found time to write the story of his conquest of Gaul. The tale is narrated with the most unpretentious simplicity, but it was intended to convey to the Roman people an indelible impression of the services which they owed to their governor in Gaul. It did not fail of its purpose.

When Cæsar's term as governor of Gaul expired and the Senatorial party prevented his re-election as consul, the victorious general was at no loss what to do. The veterans of his Gallic campaigns were devoted to him, and they followed him into Italy without hesitation. There was no army south of the Alps capable of meeting them in battle. Pompey, the other leading commander of the time, once a political colleague of Cæsar and enemy of the Senate, had now adopted the cause of the Senatorial party. Crossing to Greece with his army, in order to gain time and to give his troops the needed organization, Pompey was at length confronted by Cæsar at Pharsalus in Thessaly. Roman again met Roman, but the seasoned veterans of the Gallic wars, led by the greatest commander of the age, inevitably drove their countrymen from the field. From this day (Aug. 9, 48 B.C.) the Roman Republic was doomed, and the rule of a military leader was inevitable.

Pompey, fleeing to Egypt, was murdered there. The beautiful Cleopatra, the last of the Ptolemies (p. 230), found that her charms and the political advantages of her friendship met a ready response on the part of the victorious Cæsar as he disembarked and entered the oldest seat of civilization on the Mediterranean. In a single battle he gained Asia Minor and then turned his attention to the far west. The subjugation of the African province behind Carthage and serious opposition in Spain formed the only obstacles to Cæsar's complete control of the empire of the world. These troubles were all disposed of by March, 45 B.C.
There was now no one in Rome to gainsay this mightiest of the Romans. He made no attempt to abolish the outward forms of the Republic. For this he was too wise. He caused himself to be appointed Dictator for life, consul for ten years, and gathered the powers of all other important offices into his hands. He filled the Senate with his own supporters and appointees till it was ready at any time to do his bidding. He began extensive reforms of the corrupt Roman administration. He put an end to centuries of vexation with the Græco-Roman moon calendar (p. 193) by introducing the practical Egyptian calendar (p. 23), which we are all still using. Divine honors were now paid to this tremendous Roman who had lifted himself to the throne of the world. He planned far-reaching conquests into new lands beyond the frontiers, like the subjugation of the Germans beyond the Rhine. Had he carried out these plans, the language of the Germans to-day would be a descendant of Latin, like the speech of the French and the Spanish.

But there were still men in Rome who were not ready to submit to the rule of one man. On the fifteenth of March, 44 B.C., only a year after Cæsar had quelled the last disturbance in Spain, these men struck down the greatest of the Romans. If some of his murderers fancied themselves patriots overthrowing a tyrant, they little understood how vain were all such efforts to restore the ancient Republic. World dominion and its military power had forever demolished the Roman Republic, and the murder of Cæsar again plunged Italy and the Empire into civil war.

QUESTIONS

SECTION 40. Define the western Mediterranean world. Discuss the geography and climate of Italy. Did the peoples of the Late Stone Age in the West advance in civilization as fast as the Ægean people? Do you think their distance from the Orient had anything

1 Unfortunately the Romans altered the convenient Egyptian calendar with its twelve thirty-day months and five holidays at the end; hence the varying length of our months.
to do with this? What early movement can we discern in north Italy? What happened in the Po valley? What westerners appeared as mercenaries in thirteenth-century Egypt (Fig. 106)?

Give an account of the Etruscans. What civilization did they absorb? Whence came the Indo-European tribes of Italy? Did they possess a common language like the Greeks or were their tribes unable to understand each other?

SECTION 41. Give an account of the Latins and their plain of Latium. Describe the probable causes and course of the foundation of Rome. Who were its foreign kings? What happened to them? What foreign traffic went on at the Roman docks? What Greek matters passed into Roman life here? Discuss Roman religion. Mention the Greek influences noticeable in Roman religion. What Etruscan practice was found in Roman religion?

What was the prevailing character of Roman religion? What kind of a state emerged when the Romans had expelled the kings? How does it compare with the Greek states? How does it contrast with the oriental states? What do we mean when we call Rome an aristocratic republic? Who were the consuls? the tribunes? What was the Senate? the Assembly?

SECTION 42. Describe the Latin League and its origin. What was the Roman policy as to expansion? Outline the course of Roman absorption of Italy. Describe the growth of the city. Discuss its commercial expansion. What troublesome competitor did the Roman merchant find in the south?

What position in this competition was occupied by the Greek cities of Sicily and southern Italy? Sketch the story of early Carthage. What racial situation did Rome and Carthage illustrate?

SECTION 43. Sketch the Sicilian war with Carthage. What was the result? Sketch the war with Hannibal. Who should have endeavored to interfere at this point? What was the result of this war? Where did these campaigns place Rome? What finally happened to Carthage?

SECTION 44. Describe the introduction of Greek literature into Rome. What schoolbook did the Roman boy now gain? What literature did his parents receive? What civilization underlay Roman progress? Give some examples. Describe the advance of Rome into Macedonia and Asia. Describe the decline of the independent farmers of Italy. What part had slavery in the situation? How did men of wealth influence the situation?
What happened to the peasant farmer? Who now ruled? Tell the story of the Gracchi. Describe the resulting civil war and the methods of Marius and Sulla. Could the Republic survive after the introduction of such methods? Narrate the early career of Julius Cæsar. Who was his most dangerous opponent? What was the result of their rivalry? What was Cæsar's aim? What were the consequences of his murder?
CHAPTER XI

THE ROMAN EMPIRE TO THE TRIUMPH OF CHRISTIANITY

Section 45. The Reign of Augustus

The death of Alexander the Great interrupted in mid-career the conquest of a world empire stretching from the frontiers of India to the Atlantic Ocean. The bloody deed of the Ides of March, 44 B.C., stopped a similar conquest by Julius Cæsar—a conquest which would have subjected Orient and Occident to the rule of a single sovereign. A like opportunity never rose again, and Cæsar’s successor had no such aims. Over in Illyria the terrible news from Rome found the murdered statesman’s grand-nephew Octavian (Fig. 111), a youth of eighteen, quietly pursuing his studies. His mother’s letter brought by a secret messenger bade him flee far away eastward without delay, in order to escape all danger at the hands of his uncle’s murderers. The youth’s reply was to proceed without a moment’s hesitation to Rome. This statesmanlike decision of character reveals the quality of the young man both as he then showed it and for years to follow.

On his arrival in Rome Octavian learned that he had been legally adopted by Cæsar and also made his sole heir. His bold claim to his legal rights was met with refusal by Mark Antony, who had taken possession of Cæsar’s fortune and gained election to the consulship. By such men Octavian was treated with patronizing indulgence at first—a fact to which he owed his life. He was too young to be regarded as dangerous. But his young shoulders carried a very old head. He slowly gathered the threads of the tangled situation in his clever fingers, not forgetting the lessons of his adoptive father’s career. The most
obvious lesson was the necessity of military power. He therefore rallied a force of Cæsar’s veterans, and two legions of Antony’s troops also came over to him. Then playing the game of politics, with military power at his back and with none too scrupulous a conscience, he showed himself a statesman no longer to be ignored.

Thus the death of Cæsar reopened the long and weary civil war. Year after year Octavian met the difficulties of his situation with an ever surer hand as his experience increased. One after another his rivals and opponents were overcome, and the murderers of his adoptive father were punished. Within ten years after Cæsar’s assassination this youth of twenty-eight had gained complete control of Italy and the West.

Meantime he had early been obliged to enter a political alliance with his most serious rival, Antony, who was now living in Alexandria, where he ruled the East as far as the Euphrates like an oriental sovereign. With Cleopatra as his queen, Antony maintained a court of sumptuous splendor like that of the Persian kings in the days of their Empire.

The tales of all this made their way to Rome and did not help Antony’s cause in the eyes of the Roman Senate. Octavian easily induced the Senate for this and other reasons to declare war on Cleopatra, and thus he was able to advance against Antony. As the legions of Cæsar and Pompey, representing the East and the West, had once before faced each other on a battle field in Greece (p. 267), so now Octavian and Antony, the leaders of the East
Fig. 112. Conflict between Gods and Giants

A monument of Hellenistic art—part of the great frieze around the colossal altar of Zeus at Pergamum (Fig. 101). A giant at the left, whose limbs end in serpents, raises over his head a great stone to hurl it at the goddess on the right. Note the vigorous action evident in the agitation of her drapery.
Fig. 113. The Roman Forum and its Public Buildings in the Early Empire. (After Luckenbach)

Below, at the left, is the tiny circular temple of Vesta, with its never-quenched sacred fire (p. 251); just beyond it is the triumphal arch (like Fig. 124) of Augustus, through which one gains access to the Forum beyond. The large building on the left, with a row of triumphal columns in front, is the Basilica of Julius Caesar; note the clerestory windows in the roof and compare Fig. 28. At the further end of the Forum, beside a triumphal arch, is the rostrum, or speakers' platform, where the orator stood in addressing the Roman people. Behind the rising group of temples beyond, is the Capitol hill crowned by the temple of Jupiter.
and the West, met at Actium on the west coast of Greece. The battle was fought both by land and by sea, and the outcome was a sweeping victory for the heir of Cæsar. Antony and Cleopatra took their own lives.

To the West, which he already controlled, Octavian now added also the East. Thus at last the unity of the Roman dominions was restored and an entire century of civil war, which had begun in the days of the Gracchi, was ended (31 B.C.). The next year Octavian landed in Egypt without resistance and took possession of the ancient land, as the successor of Cleopatra, the last of the Ptolemies. The lands under his control girdled the Mediterranean, and the entire Mediterranean world was under the power of a single ruler.

When Octavian returned to Italy he was received with the greatest enthusiasm. A veritable hymn of thanksgiving arose among all classes at the termination of a century of civil war and devastation. With few exceptions, all now felt also that the supremacy of an individual ruler was necessary for the control of the vast Roman dominions. It would have been easy for Octavian to make himself absolute monarch as his adoptive father was doing when the dagger cut short his plans. But Octavian was a man of qualities totally different from those of Cæsar. On the one hand, he was not trained as a soldier and had no desire for a career of military conquest; on the other hand, he felt a sincere respect for the institutions of the Roman Republic and did not wish to destroy them nor to gain for himself the throne of an oriental sovereign. During his struggle for the mastery heretofore he had preserved the forms of the Republic and had been duly elected to his position of power.

On returning to Rome, therefore, Octavian did not disturb the Senate, but did much to strengthen it and improve its membership. Indeed, he voluntarily handed over his powers to the Senate in January, 27 B.C. The Senate thereupon, realizing by past experience that it did not possess the ability nor the organization for ruling the great Roman world successfully, gave him
officially the command of the army and the control of the leading frontier provinces. At the same time they conferred upon him the title of "Augustus," that is, "the august." He had many other important powers, and the chief name of his office was "Princeps," that is, "the First," meaning the first of the citizens. Another title given the head of the Roman Empire was an old word for director or commander, namely "Imperator," from which our word "Emperor" is derived. Augustus, as we may now call him, regarded his position as that of an official of the Roman Republic, to which he was appointed by the Senate representing the government of the Republic. Indeed, his appointment was not permanent, but for a term of years, after which he was reappointed.

The Roman Empire which here emerges was thus under a dual government of the Senate and of the Princeps, whom we commonly call the Emperor. While Augustus devised no legally established method for electing his successors and continuing the office, there was little danger that the position of Emperor would lapse. This dual state in which Augustus endeavored to preserve the old Republic was not well balanced. The Princeps held too much power to remain a mere appointive official. His powers were more than once increased by the Senate during the life of Augustus; not on his demand, for he always showed the Senate the most ceremonious respect, but because the Senate could not dispense with his assistance.

Furthermore, the old powers of the Senate could not be maintained reign after reign, when the Senate controlled no army. This was an obvious fact already discerned by Cæsar, who made no pretext of preserving the mere appearance of senatorial power. The legions were behind the Princeps, and the so-called republican State created by Augustus tended to become a military monarchy, as we shall see. All the influences from the

1 The German and Russian words for Emperor, "Kaiser" and "Czar," are derived from "Cæsar."

2 The citizens, or the Assembly, seem to have had no voice in the creation of the office of princeps and its powers, though some scholars think otherwise.
Orient were in the same direction. Egypt was in no way controlled by the Senate, but remained a private domain of the Emperor. In this the oldest State on the Mediterranean the Emperor was king, in the oriental sense. He collected its huge revenues and ruled there as the Pharaohs had done. His position as absolute monarch in Egypt influenced his position as Emperor and his methods of government everywhere. Indeed, the East as a whole could only understand the position of

Augustus as that of a king, and this title they at once applied to him. This also had its influence in the West.

The Empire which Rome now ruled consisted of the entire Mediterranean world, or a fringe of states extending entirely around the Mediterranean and including all its shores.¹ There was a natural boundary in the south, the Sahara, and also in the west, the Atlantic; but on the north and east further conquests

¹ On the extent of the Mediterranean, see p. 111.
might be made. Augustus adopted the policy of organizing and consolidating the Empire as he found it, without making further conquests. In the east his boundary thus became the Euphrates, and in the north the Danube and the Rhine. The angle made by the Rhine and the Danube was not a favorable one for defense of the border (Fig. 114), and an effort was later made to push forward to the Elbe (see map of Roman Empire); but the Roman army was disastrously defeated by the barbarous German tribes and the attempt was abandoned. Thus the bulk of what we now call Germany never was conquered by the Romans, and the speech of the German tribes was not Latinized like that of France and Spain.¹

For the maintenance of these vast frontiers Augustus organized an enormous standing army. Such was the extent of the exposed borders that it taxed the powers of the great Empire to the utmost to furnish enough troops for the purpose. Since the time of Marius the Italian farmers who made up the Roman army had been slowly giving way to professional soldiers having no home but the camp of the legion. Now the army was recruited from the provinces, and the soldier who entered the legion received citizenship in return for his service. Thus the fiction that the army was made up of citizens was maintained.

The population of this vast Empire, which girdled the Mediterranean, including France and England, was made up of the most diverse peoples and races. Egyptians, Arabs, Jews, Greeks, Italians, Gauls, Britons, Iberians (Spaniards)—all alike were under the sovereign rule of Rome. One great State embraced the nomad shepherds who spread their tents on the borders of the Sahara, the mountaineers in the fastnesses of Wales, and the citizens of Athens, Alexandria, and Rome, heirs to all the luxury and learning of the ages. Whether one lived in York or Jerusalem, Memphis or Vienna, he paid his taxes into the same

¹ The vast hordes of Germans in the unconquered north remained a constant menace to the Roman Empire. They finally overwhelmed a large part of it and caused the downfall of the Roman Empire in the West (see below, Chapter XII).
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treasury, he was tried by the same law, and looked to the same armies for protection.

At the accession of Augustus the Roman Empire from Rome outward to the very frontiers of the provinces was sadly in need of restoration and opportunity to recuperate. The eastern domains, especially Greece, where the most important fighting of the long civil war had occurred, had suffered severely. All the provinces had been oppressed and excessively overtaxed or even tacitly plundered under the Republic (p. 239). Barbarian invaders had seized the undefended cities of the provinces and even established robber-states for plundering purposes. Greece herself never recovered from the wounds then suffered, and in general the eastern Mediterranean had been greatly demoralized. It was not until Cæsar's time that Pompey cleared it of the pirates, who had almost taken possession of it. The cost of the century of civil war had been borne by the provinces. The civilized world was longing for peace. Augustus now succeeded brilliantly in restoring order and in establishing those stable conditions out of which prosperity grows.

In Italy the policy of Augustus was in all directions governed by that respect for the traditions of older Rome which he had displayed in organizing the new State. Everywhere he endeavored to restore the old days, the good old Roman customs, the beliefs of the fathers. The state temples, which had frequently fallen into decay, were repaired; new ones were built, especially in Rome; and the services and usages of Roman state religion were revived. The people were urged to awaken their declining interest in the religion of their fathers, and the old religious feasts were celebrated with increased splendor and impressiveness. The purpose of Augustus in reviving old Rome as far as possible was evidently to nationalize Italy, and to establish there a Roman nation forming a stable nucleus within the Roman Empire.

1 Had it been possible for Augustus to know the history of the Orient for six centuries before his own time, he would have discerned how vain is any attempt of authority to turn back the hand of time and restore old conditions (see p. 84).
Fig. 115. Scribblings of Sicilian Schoolboys on a Brick in the Days of the Roman Empire

In passing a brickyard these schoolboys of seventeen hundred years ago amused themselves in scribbling school exercises in Greek on the soft clay bricks before they were baked. At the top a little boy who was still making capitals carefully wrote the capital letter $S$ (Greek $Σ$) ten times, and under it the similar letter $Λ$, also ten times. These he followed by the words “turtle” (ΧΕΛΩΝΑ), “mill” (ΜΥΛΑ), and “pail” (ΚΑΔΩΣ), all in capitals. Then an older boy, who could do more than write capitals, has pushed the little chap aside and proudly demonstrated his superiority by writing in two lines an exercise in tongue gymnastics (like “Peter Piper picked a peck of pickled peppers,” etc.), which in our letters is as follows:

Nai neai nea naia neoi temon, hōs neoi ha naus

This means: “Boys cut new planks for a new ship, that the ship might float.” A third boy then added two lines at the bottom. The brick illustrates the spread of Greek (p. 232) as well as provincial education under the Roman Empire (p. 282)

Much as Athens in the days of greatest Athenian power, so the vision of the greatness of the Roman State stirred the imagination of the time. Roman literature now reached its highest level. Cicero, the most cultivated man Rome ever produced (p. 265), had perished at the hands of Antony’s brutal soldiers as one of the last sacrifices of the long civil war. He had drunk deep at the fountains of Greek culture. There were many educated men in Rome who had enjoyed similar opportunities, and, like Cicero too, had been shaken by the terrible ordeal of the death struggles of the Republic.

Horace, the greatest poet of the time, had fraternized with the assassins of Cæsar, and in the ensuing struggle had faced the future Augustus on the field
of battle. Like the old Greek lyric poets (p. 159) he had been caught in the dangerous current of his time, and, as he was swept along in the violent stream of civil war, he had with difficulty struggled ashore and at last found secure footing in the general peace. From the vantage ground of the Emperor's

![Roman Amphitheater at Pola, Dalmatia](image)

**Fig. 116. Roman Amphitheater at Pola, Dalmatia**

Every large Roman town had a vast arena, or amphitheater, in which thousands of spectators could be seated to watch the public fights between professional swordsmen (gladiators) and between men and wild beasts. The emperors and rich men paid the expenses of these combats. The greatest of these arenas was the Colosseum at Rome. The one here represented is at Pola, in Dalmatia, and shows that a Roman town of perhaps forty thousand inhabitants was supplied with an amphitheater, holding no less than twenty thousand spectators, who must have assembled from all the region around. The seats have disappeared and only the outside of the building remains.

forgiveness and favor he quietly watched events as the tide swept past him, and then finding his voice he interpreted the men and the life of his time in a body of verse, which forms for us an undying picture of the Romans in the age of Augustus. The poems of Horace will always remain one of the greatest legacies from the ancient world, a treasury of human life as
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picted by a ripe and cultivated mind, unsurpassed even in the highly developed literature of the Greeks.

The other great literary name of the epoch is that of Virgil, the friend of Horace. Hardly so penetrating a mind as Horace, Virgil nevertheless remains one of the great interpreters of the age in which he lived. Moreover, his command of Latin verse

FIG. 117. RUINS OF THE ROMAN TEMPLES AT BAALBEK, SYRIA

The Roman temples of the Sun-god at this place are among the greatest buildings ever erected (p. 284). The huge block in the foreground belongs to an inclosure wall; this block is about sixty-one feet long, thirteen feet wide, and nearly ten feet thick

is supreme. He has reflected to us in all its poetic beauty the rustic life of his time on the green hillsides of Italy, but he is better known to the modern world at large by his great epic, the Æneid. Unlike the Homeric songs, the epic of Virgil is not the expression of a heroic age (p. 142). It is the product of a self-conscious, literary age — the highly finished work of a literary artist. He takes his materials largely from the early Greek stories of the Trojan cycle, but he feels the inspiration
of the great State under which he lives, and the motive of the poem is to trace the origin of the house of Augustus from the Trojan heroes of old. Deeply admired by the age which produced it, the *Aeneid* has had an abiding influence on the literature of the later world. These two names, Horace and Virgil, far outshine the numerous lesser lights of the Augustan Age, of whom there were later but too few.

The Romans who enjoyed such writings as these had also begun to read Greek philosophy. Once obliged to read it in Greek, they could now peruse the essays and treatises of Cicero, in which Greek philosophy is set forth in Latin. Greek thought had now taken a practical turn, and endeavored to furnish the thinking man with rules of life by which he might shape his character and order his conduct. The two later schools of Greek philosophy, the Stoic and the Epicurean, are in this respect practically religions—systems of thought which furnish a reasonable basis for right conduct. The educated Roman has now usually abandoned his beliefs in the old gods of Rome and has become a Stoic or an Epicurean. Such men came to find their gospel in the writings of Seneca, who wrote on the Stoic manner of life after Augustus’s time.

At the same time men of the greatest gifts were beginning to expand the narrow *city*-law of Rome, that it might meet the
needs of a great *empire*. They laid the foundations of a vast imperial code of law, a great work of Roman genius. Its purpose was that as there was one government, so there should be one law for all the civilized world. The same principles of reason, justice, and humanity were believed to hold whether the Roman citizen lived upon the Euphrates or the Thames. The law of the Roman Empire is its chief legacy to posterity. Its provisions are still in force in many of the states of Europe to-day, and it is one of the subjects of study in our American universities. Wives and children were protected from the cruelty of the head of the house, who, in earlier centuries, had been privileged to treat the members of his family as slaves. The law held that it was better that a guilty person should escape than that an innocent person should be condemned. It conceived mankind not as a group of nations and tribes, each with its own laws, but as one people included in one great empire and subject to a single system of law based upon fairness and reason.

**Section 46. Civilization after Augustus and its Decline**

Such organization created a vast Mediterranean world, in the midst of which men of all nations lost their nationality. In spite of the efforts of Augustus, even the men of Italy soon felt themselves to be citizens of the great Roman *world* — a world everywhere more and more inwrought with Greek civilization. The government encouraged education by supporting at least three teachers in every town of any considerable importance (Fig. 115). They taught rhetoric and oratory and explained the works of the great Greek and Latin writers. A reading public for the first time fringed the entire Mediterranean, and an educated man was sure to find, even in the outlying parts of the great Empire, other educated men with much the same interests and ideas as his own. Travel was so common that wide acquaintance with the world was not unusual.
The cultivated Roman gentleman now makes his tour of the Mediterranean much as does the modern man of means. In the writings of the Empire we may follow the Roman tourist as he wanders along the foot of the Acropolis of Athens (Plate III, p. 180) and catches a vision of vanished greatness as it was in the days of Themistocles and Pericles. He strolls through the porch of the Stoics, where Stoic philosophy was first taught, and he renews pleasant memories of student days when as a youth he studied here. He remembers also how he went occasionally over to the Academy (p. 210), where he heard the teaching of Plato’s successors.

If his journey takes him to Delphi (Fig. 82), he finds it still a vivid story of the victories of Hellas in the days of her greatness.
a story told in marble treasuries and in votive monuments (Fig. 82) donated to Apollo by all the Greek states in thanksgiving for the triumphs he has granted. As he stands amid these thickly clustered monuments, the Roman notices many an empty pedestal, and he recalls how the villas of his friends at home, across the hills from his own estates, are adorned in court and porch and garden vista with the bronze and marble statues which once occupied these empty pedestals, but have now been carried to Italy by Roman power. It is a vivid illustration of how the best things in Greek civilization have been appropriated by the Romans. The Greek cities which brought forth these things are all now politically helpless under the sovereignty of Rome, and the Romans have become the heirs of the great past of Greece.

As the Roman traveler passes through the cities of Asia Minor (Fig. 101) and Syria, his national pride is quickened to see what Roman rule is doing for these undeveloped lands to the very borders of the Arabian desert. Fine military roads paved with smooth stone blocks link city to city and furnish what is for the ancient world rapid transit for the speedy movement of government messengers or the urgent transfer of the never-failing legions. Long aqueducts conduct the waters from the mountain heights down into the city fountains for public use. Imposing public buildings and monuments are rising on every hand (Fig. 117). Where once the barracks sheltered the mercenaries of the local tyrant of former days, there now stands a schoolhouse. Men are everywhere rejoicing in the universal peace and realize fully that it is the gift of Rome. The advantages of Roman citizenship are constantly before their eyes in the ever-increasing number of Roman citizens in the eastern cities, where they are settled as merchants even on the banks of the Euphrates. Tranquillity and safe transport, guaranteed by the Roman legions, have filled the highways with merchants and travelers. As the Roman looks out over the eastern harbors (Fig. 102) he sees the distant horizon whitened with the sails of
Mediterranean commerce in Roman ships. They carry Roman coins, weights, and measures throughout the Mediterranean.

If he takes one of these huge Roman galleys and lands in the Nile delta, he finds this land of ancient wonders filled as of old with flocks and herds and vast stretches of luxuriant grain fields. It has become the granary of Rome and a mine of wealth for the Emperor's private purse. The splendid buildings of Alexandria remind the traveler of Greece; but as he sails up the river, he is at once in the midst of the ancient East, and all about him are buildings which were old long before Rome was founded. These attract numerous wealthy Greek and Roman tourists. Such Romans feel themselves lords of the world (Fig. 118).
Like our own modern fellow citizens in the same land, their clothing betrays every touch of the latest mode. They berate the slow mails, languidly discuss the latest news from Rome while with indolent curiosity they visit the Pyramids of Gizeh (Plate I), or spend a lazy afternoon carving their names on the colossal statues which overshadow the mighty plain of Egyptian Thebes (Fig. 29). On these monuments we find their scribblings at the present day. Everywhere throughout the eastern Mediterranean the Roman hears Greek and speaks it with his friends. As he moves westward again, however, he begins to hear more Latin.

Seneca, one of the wisest of the Romans, said, "Wherever a Roman has conquered, there he also lives." This was true to some extent everywhere, but especially in the West. Colonies were sent out to the confines of the Empire, and the remains of great public buildings, of theaters and bridges, of sumptuous villas and baths at places like Treves (Trier), Cologne, Bath, and Salzburg, indicate how thoroughly the influence and civilization of Rome penetrated to the utmost parts of the territory

Fig. 121. Roman Bridge at St. Chamas in Southern France

This Roman bridge with its handsome portals was built in the time of the Emperor Augustus; that is, about the beginning of the Christian era.
subject to her rule. The illustrations in this chapter will show
the reader what wonderfully fine towns the Roman colonies were
(see Figs. 116, 117, 119-124).

The remarkable development of such splendid cities in the
Roman provinces would indicate great advances in civilization.
This was without doubt true of certain localities. But this out-
ward splendor of the colonies and provinces was no indication

The picture represents a model of a part
of the ruins. To the right is a great quadrangular pool, eighty-three by
forty feet in size, and to the left a circular bath. Over the whole a fine
hall was built, with recesses on either side of the big pool where one
might sit and talk with his friends

FIG. 122. RUINS OF ROMAN BATHS AT BATH, ENGLAND

There are hot springs at Bath, England, and here the Roman colonists
in Britain developed a fashionable watering place. In recent years
the soil and rubbish which, through the centuries, had collected over
the old Roman buildings have been removed, and we can get some idea
of how they were arranged. The picture represents a model of a part
of the ruins. To the right is a great quadrangular pool, eighty-three by
forty feet in size, and to the left a circular bath. Over the whole a fine
hall was built, with recesses on either side of the big pool where one
might sit and talk with his friends

of the tendency of civilization in the Roman world as a whole.
The triumph of Augustus had ushered in two centuries of peace,
little affected by the frequent disturbances and the often serious
wars on the frontiers. During these two centuries the most pro-
found changes went on within the Roman Empire—changes
which betray the slow decline and lead to the fall of the great
structure of civilization which had risen to dominate the Medi-
terranean world. The effort of Augustus to restore the simple
wholesomeness and the sturdy virtues of the old Roman life
had failed. Beneath the surface tendencies which no ruler can control were in motion.

In the first place, the people were losing their voice in government. Responsible citizenship, which does so much to develop the best among the citizens of any community, passed away and the world became indifferent to public questions. Men no longer enjoyed the educative influence of an interest in the welfare and the problems of the community. As the comparatively small percentage of highly educated men thus yielded to passive indifference they lost public leadership, and it passed into the hands of the corrupt and untrained masses.

This loss of regard for the duties of citizenship had a serious effect on the army, once the greatest organization in the Roman Empire. By the end of the first century A.D. the Romans of Italy had ceased to enlist in the rank and file of the army. Recruits for the defense of the frontiers were then levied exclusively in the provincial districts. We recall that the sword which such a recruit received from the hands of the centurion, as he stepped into the ranks for the first time, eventually brought him Roman citizenship. But such a recruit had never seen Rome nor ever enjoyed the influences of civilized life. He knew nothing of Roman citizenship in the old sense. He and his comrades lived in frontier barracks (Fig. 125), far from refining contact with civilization. As it became more and more difficult to raise the legions, even the German barbarians of the north were permitted to cross the border (Fig. 114) and enlist. In the end the army degenerated into unruly and turbulent hordes of military frontiersmen, feeling none of the responsibilities of a citizen bearing arms, and often much resembling the revolutionary bands which devastate Mexico or the South American republics.

The Romans of Italy, who thus yielded the sword to provincials and foreigners, either succumbed to poverty on the one hand or, on the other, improving the opportunities of the age for self-enrichment, the fortunate few were leading a life of idle luxury (Fig. 129). It was unlawful for a Roman of senatorial rank to
engage in merchandising. Hence land was the most highly esteemed form of wealth in the Roman Empire, in spite of the heavy taxes imposed upon it. Without large holdings of land no one could hope to enjoy a high social position or an honorable office under the government. Consequently the land came gradually into the hands of the rich and ambitious. This change which

Fig. 123. Fortified Gate of the City of Trier in Western Germany

Colonia Augusta Treverorum (now called Trier or Treves) was one of the chief Roman colonies on the German boundaries of the Empire. The Roman emperors often resided there, and the remains of their palace are still to be seen. The great gate here represented was designed to protect the entrance of the town, which was surrounded with a wall, for the Romans were in constant danger of attack from the neighboring German tribes. One can also see at Treves the remains of a vast amphitheater in which on two occasions Constantine had several thousand German prisoners cast to be killed by wild animals for the amusement of the spectators (see Fig. 116)
had already destroyed the small farmer in Italy (p. 264) now blighted the prosperity of the provinces also. Great estates called villas covered not only Italy but also Gaul and Britain. Half of the great province behind Carthage, called "Africa,"¹ was in the hands of six such villa owners. The lord of such kingly domains lived like a prince, with a great household of personal attendant slaves who cooked the food, waited on the proprietor, wrote his letters, read to him, and entertained him in other ways. Such household slaves led a not undesirable life and were often on terms of the greatest intimacy with their owners. Household slavery had never been so great an evil as the industrial and agricultural slavery which had brought such social and economic ruin during the last two centuries of the Republic, when the work in the factories and the fields of Italy was done by multitudes of slaves (p. 264). The long wars had furnished these vast hordes of slaves; but after the great wars of conquest were over, this source of supply ceased, for there were no prisoners of war to be sold as slaves. The hosts of foreign slaves who accomplished the ruin of the Italian farmers and craftsmen after 200 B.C. (p. 264) had therefore greatly decreased under the Empire, when the number of slaves was steadily diminishing, and the villas were worked by the coloni (see p. 292). The condition, even of industrial and agricultural slaves moreover, had much improved. Their owners abandoned the horrible subterranean prisons in which the farm hands had once been miserably huddled at night. The law, moreover, protected the slave from some of the worst forms of abuse; first and foremost it deprived his master of the right to kill him. Although a villa might be as extensive as a large village, its members were under the absolute control of the proprietor of the estate.

Another cause of the decreasing number of slaves was the fact that masters now began to free their slaves on a large scale—

¹ This word did not, of course, designate the whole continent of Africa as it does now. Under Rome it applied to a province extending only to the borders of the Sahara.
Fig. 124. Roman Triumphant Arch at Orange, France

A, the arch as it now looks; B, original appearance of arch. The Romans were accustomed to build huge and handsome arches to commemorate important victories. There were a number at Rome naturally (see Fig. 117); of those built in the chief cities of the Empire, several still remain. The one pictured above was built at the Roman colony of Arausio (now called Orange), on the river Rhone, to celebrate a victory over the Gauls in 21 A.D. Modern cities have erected similar arches; for example, Paris, Berlin, London, and New York.
for what reasons we do not know. When a slave was freed he was called a freedman, but he was by no means in the position of one who had been born free. It was true that he was no longer a mere thing that could be bought and sold, but he had still to serve his former master—who had now become his patron—for a certain number of days in the year. He was obliged to pay him a part of his earnings and could not marry without his patron's consent.

But as the condition of the slaves improved and many of them became freedmen, the state of the poor free man only became worse. In the towns (Fig. 128), if he tried to earn his living, he was forced to mingle with those slaves who were permitted to work for wages and with the freedman, but he naturally tended to sink to their level.

In the country the small farmer and the free laborer for hire could not survive long in competition with the great villas. As the burden of taxes became unbearable the farmer finally gave up the struggle. He entered upon an arrangement which made him the colonus of some wealthy landholder. As such the farmer and his descendants were forever attached to the land they worked, and passed with it from owner to owner when it changed hands. While not actually slaves, they were not free to leave or go where they pleased, and they were hardly as favorably situated as many slaves. Like the medieval serf, they could not be deprived of their fields so long as they paid the owner a certain part of their crop and worked for him during a period fixed by the customs of the estate upon which they lived. This system made it impossible for the farmer to become really independent, or for his son to become better off than he. The great villas once worked by slaves were now cultivated chiefly by these coloni.

Multitudes turned to the city for relief, just as at the present day in Europe and America there is a large and steady movement of country population toward the cities. The large families,

1 See below, section 67.
which country life favors, were no longer reared, the number of marriages decreased, and the population of the Empire steadily shrank. The rapid decline of agriculture, which had long before overtaken Greece, and then Italy (p. 264), having now reached the provinces also, there were vast stretches of unworked fields which were slowly absorbed by forest wilds. As the amount of

**Fig. 125. Glimpses of a Roman Frontier Stronghold**

(Restored after Waltze-Schulze)

Above, at the left, the main gate of the fort; the other three views show the barracks (compare Fig. 114)

land under cultivation steadily decreased, the ancient world was no longer raising enough food to feed itself properly. The scarcity was felt most severely in the great centers of population, like Rome, where prices at once began to go up. Our generation, afflicted in the same way, is not the first to complain of "the high cost of living." Industrial prosperity and the growth of manufactures in the cities could not avail to offset the decay of agriculture.
The country people who yielded to the attractions of the city were only debased by the life they entered there. At Rome the newcomer found a city of sumptuous marble where once there was little but brick. Noble architecture enveloped the Forum

Fig. 126. The Vast Flavian Amphitheater at Rome now called the Colosseum. (After Luckenbach)

This enormous building, one of the greatest in the world, was an oval arena surrounded by rising tiers of seats, accommodating nearly fifty thousand people. We see here only the outside wall, as restored. It was built by the emperors Vespasian and Titus, and was completed in 80 A.D. as a place for spectacular combats. Athletic games and contests of strength had long accompanied the funerals of great men in Greece and Rome. The Romans then continued such combats for their own sake, and the combatants, called gladiators (meaning "swordsmen"), often took each other's lives (compare Fig. 116)

and crowned the Seven Hills (Figs. 113, 127). Outward prosperity, luxury and splendor, chariot races, bloody games and spectacles (Fig. 126), free distribution of bread, wine, and meat to all needy citizens at the cost of the State—these things completely concealed from the discernment of the mob the currents beneath the surface which were setting so steadily toward ruin. The city of Rome thus became a great hive of shiftless
population supported by the State with means for which the struggling agriculturist was taxed.

Meantime the great city was rife with increasing luxury and display. The discovery of the seasonal winds in the Indian Ocean resulted in great commerce, through the Red Sea with India, such as the world had never known before. At the same

![A Street of Tombs outside Rome, on the Appian Way](image)

Fig. 127. A Street of Tombs outside Rome, on the Appian Way

These tombs lined both sides of the Appian Way (p. 256) for some distance from Rome. They illustrate the more showy and sumptuous architecture of the Romans as contrasted with the simpler style of the Greeks (compare the Athenian street of tombs, Fig. 97)

time there was overland connection further north with China. All the luxuries of the East began to flow into the Mediterranean — many of them luxuries which the Romans never had seen before. Roman ladies were decked with diamonds, pearls, and rubies from India, and they robed themselves in shining silks from China. The tables of the rich were bright with peaches and apricots, now appearing for the first time in the Roman world. Roman cooks learned to prepare rice, formerly
only prescribed by physicians as a delicacy for convalescents. Instead of sweetening their dishes with honey, as formerly, Roman households began to find a new product in the market place known as “sakari,” as the report of a venturesome oriental sailor of the first century A.D. calls the sirup of sugar cane, which he brought by water from India into the Mediterranean for the first time. This is the earliest mention of sugar in history. These new things in the Roman world remind one of the potatoes, coffee, tobacco, and Indian corn of America as they found their way to Europe after the voyages of Columbus.

Section 47. Popularity of Oriental Religions and the Spread of Early Christianity

These things are tangible evidence of the tide that was setting into the Mediterranean from the Orient. This tide brought with it other things less easily traced, but much more important in their influence on the declining Roman world. Intellectual life was steadily ebbing; there was not a really great name in Roman literature after Horace and Virgil. Philosophy was no longer occupied with new thoughts and the discovery of new truths. In its place, as we have seen, appeared the semireligious systems of living, taught by the Stoics and Epicureans. But such teaching was only for the highly educated and the intellectual class—a class constantly decreasing. Even such men frequently yielded to the tendency of the multitude and sought refuge in the oriental religions which the incoming life of the East was bringing in.

Even in Augustus’s day the Roman poet Tibullus, absent on a military campaign which sickness had interrupted, wrote to his fiancée Delia then in Rome: “What does your Isis for me now, Delia? What avail me those brazen sistra of hers, so often shaken by your hand? . . . Now, now, goddess, help me;

1 Horace amusingly pictures the distress of a miserly Roman at the price of a dish of rice prescribed by a physician. It was still a luxury in his time.

2 Musical instruments played by shaking in the hand.
The Roman Empire to the Triumph of Christianity

for that man may be healed by thee is proved by many a picture in thy temples.” Tibullus and his fiancée belonged to the most cultivated class, but they had taken refuge in the faith of the Egyptian Isis. What these two had done, was being done under

![Fig. 128. A View across the Forum of Pompeii to Vesuvius](image)

The little provincial city of Pompeii near Naples, having twenty thousand to thirty thousand inhabitants, was destroyed by fire and overwhelmed with showers of ashes from the neighboring volcano of Vesuvius in 79 A.D. Some two thousand of the inhabitants perished. At present the accumulations from successive eruptions are about twenty feet deep. The excavation of the town is still going on, and will probably continue some twenty-five years longer before the whole place is uncovered. The place is a great treasure house of Roman life in the smaller cities under the early Empire, for all the streets and the first floors of the houses are preserved, often with many things of value which they contained (see Figs. 99 and 129)

the early Empire by multitudes, and the temples of Isis were to be found in all the larger cities. The Isis temple at Pompeii (Fig. 128) has survived to illustrate the power of the foreign goddess and Osiris her husband (p. 27), who were now displacing the gods of the Greeks and Romans.
Isis and Osiris were not without oriental competitors, for the Great Mother goddess of Asia Minor, with her consort Attis, gained the devotion of many Romans also. In the army the Persian god Mithras (p. 100), a god of light, who slew his enemy the bull, was a great favorite, and many a legion had its underground chapel where its members celebrated his triumph. All these faiths had their "mysteries," consisting chiefly of dramatic presentations of the career of the god. In the Egyptian religion and that of the Great Mother, his submission to death, his triumph over it, and ascent to everlasting life made
a deep impression. It was believed that to witness these things and to submit to certain holy ceremonies of initiation would bring to the initiated deliverance from evil, the power to share in the endless life of the god, and to dwell with him forever.

The old Roman faith had little to do with conduct and held out to the worshiper no such hopes as these. Little wonder that the Roman multitude found the attraction of these oriental faiths and the blessed future insured by their "mysteries" irresistible. At the same time it was possible to learn the future of every individual, as all believed, by the use of Babylonian astrology (p. 84), and its mysterious practices were everywhere. The orientals who practiced it were called Chaldeans (p. 84) or Magi.

The Jews too, now that their temple in Jerusalem (p. 108) had been destroyed by the Romans, were to be found in increasing numbers in the larger cities. Strabo, a geographer of the early Empire, says of them, "This people has already made its way into every city, and it would be hard to find a place in the habitable world which has not admitted this race and been dominated by it." The Roman world was becoming accustomed to their synagogues; but the Jews refused to acknowledge any other gods, and their exclusiveness brought them disfavor and trouble with the government.

All subjects of the Empire were required to recognize the divinity of the Emperor. He had now become a sun-god like the kings of Egypt and he was known as the "Invincible Sun" (Fig. 117). As a god he stood for the majesty and glory of the Roman dominion. The inhabitants of each province might revere their particular gods, undisturbed by the government, but all were obliged, as good citizens, to join in the official sacrifices to the head of the State, as a god. His birthday was on the twenty-fifth of December.

1 See the account of the resurrection of Osiris, p. 27.
2 The Magi were originally an order of oriental priests. Our word "magic" is derived from this name.
Among all these faiths of the East that were displacing the old religion of Rome, the common people were more and more inclining toward one of which we have not yet spoken. It too came out of the East. Its teachers told how their Master, Jesus, was born in Palestine, the land of the Jews, in the days of Augustus, and how he had caught a vision of human brotherhood and of divine fatherhood, surpassing that which the Hebrew prophets had once discerned (p. 106). This faith he preached for a few years—till he incurred the hatred of his countrymen and they put him to death.

A Jewish tent-maker named Paul, a man gifted with passionate eloquence and unquenchable love for his Master, passed far and wide through the cities of Asia Minor and Greece, and even to Rome, proclaiming his Master’s teaching. He left behind him a line of devoted communities stretching from Palestine to Rome. A group of letters which he wrote to his followers were circulating widely among them and were read with eagerness. They are preserved to us in the New Testament. The slave and the freedman, the artizan and craftsman, the humble and the despised in the huge barracks which sheltered the poor in Rome, listened to this new “mystery” from the East, as they thought it to be, and, as time passed, multitudes accepted it and found joy in the hopes which it awakened.

Thus was Christianity launched upon the great tide of Roman life. The officers of government often found these early converts not only refusing to acknowledge the divinity of the Emperor and to sacrifice to him, but also openly prophesying the downfall of the Roman State. They were therefore more than once called upon to endure cruel persecution. Their religion seemed incompatible with good citizenship, since it forbade them to show the usual respect for the government. Nevertheless their numbers steadily grew.
Section 48. Internal Revolution and the Collapse of Ancient Civilization

Meantime there was steady decline in the prosperity of the Empire as more and more farm lands lay idle; population decreased and the burden of taxes on those who remained grew heavier. The able rule of Marcus Aurelius, who began to reign in 161 A.D., marked the end of two centuries of internal peace (p. 287) which contrast sharply with the age that followed him. He found a great scarcity of money among the people, and it was increasingly difficult to collect the taxes necessary to maintain the State and support the army with which he was struggling to keep back the incoming hordes of barbarian invasion on the northern frontiers (Fig. 114).

Yet he found time amid the growing anxieties of his position, even as he sat in his tent on a dangerous campaign in the heart of the barbarous north, to record his thoughts and leave the world a little volume of meditations which are among the most precious legacies of the past. His ability and enlightened statesmanship were only equaled by the purity and beauty of his personal life. He granted salaries of six hundred gold pieces (about $1600) to the heads of the four schools of philosophy at Athens. This was the first state support received by this "university" of Athens, and marked another effort to maintain the old Greek culture against the oriental religions. Marcus Aurelius was the finest spirit among all the Roman emperors, and there was never another like him on the imperial throne.

Commodus, the son of Marcus Aurelius, was one of the most detestable in the long list of Roman emperors, and as we enter the third century A.D. one such worthless ruler after another was set up by the army; for unfortunately no satisfactory means of selecting an emperor had ever been devised, and whenever they wished, the army elected a new emperor. Such an appointee of the army in one province often found himself confronted by a rival in another province. We have already seen...
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Diocletian; the Roman Empire becomes an oriental despotism (284-305 A.D.)

how degenerate the army became (p. 288), and it was chiefly from such a class as these military frontiersmen that the Roman Empire received eighty rulers in ninety years after the death of the son of Marcus Aurelius. In order to gain additional opportunity for taxation, one of them gave Roman citizenship to all free men dwelling in any community ruled by Rome (212 A.D.). All distinction between Roman and non-Roman passed away. Citizenship however meant nothing which could better the situation, as the troops tossed the scepter of Rome from one ignorant soldier-emperor to another.

While tumult and fighting between rival emperors hastened economic decay and national bankruptcy, the affairs of the nation passed from bad to worse. For fifty years there was no public order. Life and property were nowhere safe. Turbulence, robbery, and murder were everywhere. While no Roman subject attempted to overthrow the Empire, and all men revered it as eternal, nevertheless in this tempest of anarchy during the third century A.D. the civilization of the ancient world suffered final collapse. The supremacy of mind and of scientific knowledge won by the Greeks in the third century B.C. yielded to the reign of ignorance and superstition in these social disasters of the third century A.D.

The world which issued from these disasters toward 300 A.D. under Diocletian, was a totally different one from that which Augustus and the Roman Senate had ruled three centuries before. When Diocletian succeeded in restoring order, he deprived the shadowy Senate of all power, except for the municipal government of the city of Rome. The Roman Emperor thus became for the whole Roman world, what he had always been in Egypt, an absolute monarch with none to limit his power. The State had been completely militarized and orientalized. With the unlimited power of the oriental despot the Emperor now assumed also its outward symbols — the diadem, the gorgeous robe embroidered with pearls and precious stones, the throne and footstool, at which all who came into his presence must bow down
to the dust. Thus ended the long struggle of democracy which we have followed through so many centuries of the career of man in the ancient world.

As far back as the days of Marcus Aurelius, it had proved difficult for the Roman government to raise enough by taxation to maintain itself. The situation in the reign of Diocletian was far worse. The business of the State was now in the hands of a vast number of local officials graded into many ranks and classes. This multitude and the huge army had all to be paid and supported. It required a great deal of money also to maintain the luxurious court of the Emperor surrounded by his innumerable palace officials and servants, and to supply "bread and circuses" for the populace of the towns (p. 294). All sorts of taxes and exactions were consequently devised by ingenious officials to make up the necessary revenue.

When the scarcity of coin made it impossible to collect the land tax in money, the deficit was taken in grain or produce from the granary of the delinquent tax payer. As this collection of produce increased, the tax tended to become a mere share in the yield of the lands, and thus the Roman Empire sank to a primitive system of taxation already thousands of years old in the Orient (p. 29). The crushing burden of this great land tax, the Emperor's chief source of income, was much increased by the bad way in which it was collected. The government made a group of the richer citizens in each of the towns permanently responsible for the whole amount due each year from all the landowners within their district. It was their business to collect the taxes and make up any deficiency, it mattered not from what cause.

This responsibility, together with the weight of the taxes themselves, ruined so many landowners that the government was forced to decree that no one should desert his estates in order to escape the exactions. Only the very rich could stand the drain on their resources and even wealthy families were impoverished. The middle class sank into poverty and despair and
many a worthy man secretly fled from his lands to become a wandering beggar, or even to take up a life of robbery and violence. In this way the Empire lost just that prosperous class of citizens who should have been the leaders in business enterprises.

Under this oriental despotism the liberty for which men had striven so long disappeared in Europe, and the once free Roman citizen had no independent life of his own. Even his wages and the prices of the goods he bought or sold were as far as possible fixed for him by the Emperor. For the will of the Emperor had now become law, and his decrees were dispatched throughout the length and breadth of the Roman dominions. His innumerable officials kept an eye upon even the humblest citizen. They watched the grain dealers, butchers, and bakers, and saw to it that they properly supplied the public and never deserted their occupation. If the government could have had its way, it would have had every one belong to a definite class of society, and his children after him. In some cases it forced the son to follow the profession of his father. It kept the unruly poor in the towns quiet by furnishing them with bread; and sometimes with wine, meat, and clothes. It continued to provide amusement for them by expensive entertainments, such as races and gladiatorial combats. In a word, the Roman government now attempted to regulate almost every interest in life.

Staggering under his crushing burden of taxes, in a state which was practically bankrupt, the citizen of every class had now become a mere cog in the vast machinery of the government. He had no other function than to toil for the State, which exacted so much of the fruit of his labor that he was fortunate if it proved barely possible for him to survive on the balance. As a mere toiler for the State, he was finally where the peasant on the Nile had been for thousands of years. The Emperor had become a Pharaoh, and the Roman Empire a colossal Egypt of ancient days.

Such a complete transformation of State and society in the Roman Empire was accomplished only by unlimited application
of the most brutal force. Diocletian increased the size of the army fourfold in spite of the additional expense and the increased burden of taxation. A vicious circle was thus set up. More troops cost more money, but they also meant greater ability to suppress disorders and collect taxes. The decreasing population of the Empire was insufficient to furnish the troops for the increased army. Diocletian was obliged to allow whole tribes of German barbarians to cross the border as military colonies furnishing troops for his great army. Thus the barbarians were enlisted in the Roman legions to help keep out their fellow Germans. Julius Caesar was the first to give them a place among his soldiers. This custom became more and more common, until, finally, whole armies were German, entire tribes being enlisted under their own chiefs. Some of the Germans rose to be distinguished generals; others attained important positions as officials of the government.

In order to replenish the shrinking population likewise, great numbers of the German tribes were encouraged to settle within the Empire, where they became coloni. Constantine (306–337 A.D.) is said to have called in three hundred thousand of a single people. In this way it came about that a great many of the inhabitants of the Roman Empire were Germans before the great invasions, and the line dividing the citizens of the Roman Empire from the barbarians was already growing indistinct.

As the Empire declined in strength and prosperity and was gradually permeated by the barbarians, its art and literature rapidly degenerated. The buildings and monuments of Rome after Marcus Aurelius incline toward tawdry vulgarity in design and barbarous crudity in execution. The writings of the decadent Romans of this age fell far below the standard of the great literary men of the golden age of Augustus. Nor did the readers of the time demand anything better. The distinction of Cicero's clear style lost its charm for the readers of the fourth and fifth centuries, and a flowery kind of rhetoric took its place. No
more great men of letters arose. Few of those who understand and enjoy Latin literature to-day would think of reading for pleasure any of the poetry or prose written in the later centuries of the Roman Empire.

During the three hundred years before the barbarian invasions those who studied at all did not ordinarily take the trouble to read the best books of the earlier Greek and Roman writers, but relied upon mere collections of quotations, and got their information from textbooks put together by often ignorant compilers. These textbooks the Middle Ages inherited and continued to use. The great Greek writers were forgotten altogether, and only a few of the better known Latin authors like Cicero, Horace, and Virgil continued to be copied and read.

Section 49. The Triumph of Christianity

Like so many of the emperors of his time Diocletian had risen from the ranks of provincial troops and felt little attachment for the city of Rome. The pressure of dangerous enemies on the oriental frontier and the threatening flood of German barbarians along the lower Danube kept him much in the East, and still further detached him from Rome. Similar conditions led Constantine to forsake Rome altogether, to shift his residence eastward, and to establish a new seat of government on the Bosporus at the old Greek city of Byzantium (see map, p. 146). The Emperor stripped many an ancient city of its great monuments in order to secure materials for the beautification of his splendid residence. Some of these monuments from older places still stand in Constantinople (Fig. 130). By 330 A.D. the new capital on the Bosporus was a magnificent monumental city, whence the Emperor might overlook both Europe and Asia.

Meantime one of the most important changes in the whole career of man was slowly taking place within the Roman Empire. The long struggle of Christianity among the older religions of the Mediterranean and the Orient (p. 300) had steadily
continued. The first Christians looked for the speedy return of Christ before their own generation should pass away. Since all were filled with enthusiasm for the Gospel and eagerly awaited

![Fig. 130. Ancient Monuments in Constantinople](image)

The obelisk in the foreground (nearly one hundred feet high) was first set up in Thebes, Egypt, by the conqueror Thutmose III (p. 46); it was erected here by the Roman Emperor Theodosius (p. 309). The small spiral column at the right is the base of a bronze tripod set up by the Greeks at Delphi (Fig. 82) in commemoration of their victory over the Persians at Platea (p. 177). The names of thirty-one Greek cities which took part in the battle are still to be read, engraved on this base. These monuments of ancient oriental and Greek supremacy stand in what was the Roman horse-race course when the earlier Greek city of Byzantium became the eastern capital of Rome (p. 306). Finally, the great mosque behind the obelisk, with its slender minarets, represents the triumph of Islam under the Turks, who took the city in 1453 A.D.

the last day, they did not feel the need for much organization. But as time went on the Christian communities greatly increased in size, and many persons joined them who had little or none of the original earnestness and devotion. It became necessary to develop a regular system of church government in order to
control the sinful and expel those who brought disgrace upon their religion by notoriously bad conduct.

Gradually the followers of Christ came to believe in a "Catholic"—that is, a universal—church which embraced all the groups of true believers in Christ, wherever they might be. To this one universal church all must belong who hoped to be saved.\(^1\) A sharp distinction was already made between the officers of the Church, who were called the clergy, and the people, or laity. To the clergy was committed the government of the Church, as well as the teaching of its members. In each of the Roman cities was a bishop, and at the head of each of the country communities a priest, who had derived his name from the original elders mentioned in the New Testament.\(^2\) It was not unnatural that the bishops in the chief towns of the Roman provinces should be especially influential in church affairs. They came to be called archbishops, and might summon the bishops of the province to a council to decide important matters.

Thus Christianity, once the faith of the weak and the despised, gained a strong organization and became politically powerful. The result was that in 311 the Roman Emperor Galerius\(^3\) issued a decree placing the Christian religion upon the same legal footing as the worship of the Roman gods. Constantine, the first Christian emperor, strictly enforced this edict. His successors soon began to issue laws which gave the Christian clergy important privileges and forbade the worship of the old pagan gods. The splendid temples of the gods, which fringed the Mediterranean (cut, p. 166) and extended far up the Nile into inner Africa, were then closed and deserted, as they are to-day (Fig. 28, Plate III, p. 180).

---

1 "Whoever separates himself from the Church," writes St. Cyprian (died 258) "is separated from the promises of the Church... He is an alien, he is profane, he is an enemy; he can no longer have God for his father who has not the Church for his mother. If any one could escape who was outside the Ark of Noah, so also may he escape who shall be outside the bounds of the Church." See Readings in European History, chap. ii.
2 Our word "priest" comes from the Greek word presbyter, meaning "elder."
3 One of the emperors ruling jointly with Constantine,
In the last book of the Theodosian Code — a great collection of the laws of the Empire, which was completed in 438 — all the emperors' decrees are to be found which relate to the Christian Church and the clergy. We find that the clergy, in view of their holy duties, were exempted from certain burdensome government offices and from some of the taxes which the laity had to pay. They were also permitted to receive bequests. The emperors themselves built churches and helped the Church in many ways (see below, section 52). Their example was followed by rulers and private individuals all through the Middle Ages, so that the Church became incredibly wealthy and enjoyed a far greater income than any state of Europe. The clergy were permitted to try certain law cases, and they themselves had the privilege of being tried in their own church courts for minor criminal offenses.

The Theodosian Code makes it unlawful for any one to differ from the beliefs of the Catholic Church. Those who dared to disagree with the teachings of the Church were called heretics. If heretics ventured to come together, their meetings were to be broken up and the teachers heavily fined. Houses in which the doctrines of the heretics were taught were to be confiscated by the government. The books containing their teachings were to be sought out with the utmost care and burned under the eyes of the magistrate; and if any one was convicted of concealing a heretical book, he was to suffer capital punishment.

It is clear, then, that very soon after the Christian Church was recognized by the Roman government, it induced the emperors to grant the clergy particular favors, to destroy the pagan temples and prohibit pagan worship, and, finally, to persecute all those who ventured to disagree with the orthodox teachings of the Church.

We shall find that the governments in the Middle Ages, following the example of the Roman emperors, continued to grant the clergy special privileges and to persecute heretics, often in a very cruel manner (see below, section 82).
In these provisions of the Theodosian Code the later medieval Church is clearly foreshadowed. The imperial government in the West was soon overthrown by the barbarian conquerors, but the Catholic Church converted and ruled these conquerors. When the officers of the Empire deserted their posts, the bishops stayed to meet the oncoming invader. They continued to represent the old civilization and ideas of order. It was the Church that kept the Latin language alive among those who knew only a rude German dialect. It was the Church that maintained some little education even in the times of greatest ignorance, for without the ability to read Latin the priests could not have performed the religious services and the bishops could not have carried on their correspondence with one another.

Section 50. Retrospect

As we stand here at the close of the career of ancient civilization, we may look back for a moment and glance over the vast vista traversed by early man. For some fifty thousand years he struggled upward through the Stone Age, from which he emerged into civilized life for the first time in the Orient. There we found the first home of civilization in the valley of the Nile, where it arose over five thousand years ago, appearing later also along the lower Euphrates. From these early homes it contributed for ages to the civilization of the Mediterranean world, till Greek genius arose to assert its own independent individuality and the supremacy of mind. At Salamis and Marathon Hellas repulsed the sovereignty of the East and of eastern ideals of government and thought. That victory was not in vain, for it stirred free Athens, as we have seen, to the greatest intellectual achievements in her history. But we have said before that the repulse of Persia was not final (p. 237).

The tide from the East could not be stayed by a successful battle or two. It swept through the Mediterranean with increasing power, till Rome, the last great state of the ancient
world, was conquered by the civilization of that Orient which she despised. Her ruler became an oriental sultan; his methods of government and administration were orientalized; oriental religion and methods of thought were supreme; and at Constantinople life and art were also oriental. By Rome oriental monarchy was introduced into Europe, where it later so profoundly affected the history of our ancestors, and in the Roman Empire free citizenship perished. Thus the final organization of Rome (in spite of the Republic out of which it grew) has proved one of the great links between the world to which we belong and the despotism of the early Orient behind Rome.

One leading element in the organization of Rome always remained her own, and this was law. In Roman law, still a power in modern government, we have the great creation of Roman genius, which has more profoundly affected the later world than any other Roman institution. Another great office of Rome was the universal spread of that international civilization which had been brought forth by Greece in contact with the Orient. She gave to that civilization the far-reaching organization which under the Greeks it had lacked. That organization, though completely transformed into oriental despotism, endured for five centuries and withstood the tide of barbarian invasion from the grasslands of the north (p. 86), which would otherwise have overwhelmed the disorganized Greek world long before. Herein lies much of the significance of Rome. The Roman State was the last bulwark of civilization intrenched on the Mediterranean against the Indo-European hordes pouring in from those same northern pastures, where the ancestors of Greek and Roman alike had once fed their flocks. But the bulwark, though shaken, did not fall because of hostile assaults from without. It fell because of decay within, and because it could not keep itself impervious to the tide of life from the East.

After the foundation of Constantinople the Roman Empire for a time remained one in law, government, and culture. Even
before the death of Diocletian, however, there was a tendency for the eastern and western portions to drift apart. Constantine had established his sole supremacy only after a long struggle with his rivals. Thereafter there were often two emperors, one in the west and one in the east, but they were supposed to govern one empire conjointly and in "unanimity." New laws were to be accepted by both. The writers of the time do not speak of two states but continue to refer to "the Empire," as if the administration were still in the hands of one ruler. Indeed, the idea of one government for all civilized mankind did not disappear but continued to influence men during the whole of the Middle Ages.

The foundation of Constantinople and the establishment of a western emperor at Rome left the venerable city dangerously isolated; it was a fatal step toward the surrender of Rome and the West to the barbarians, who were already gaining possession of the Empire by peaceable migration (p. 305). From the barbarism which engulfed it in the fifth century A.D. the Roman west did not emerge for centuries. The Roman Empire surviving at Constantinople belonged, as we have seen, to the East and was essentially an oriental state. This was the outcome of the long struggle of civilization in the Mediterranean. Its finest fruits—democracy, free citizenship, creative art, and independent thought unshackled by theology—had perished.

Although it was in the eastern part of the Empire that the barbarians first got a permanent foothold, the emperors at Constantinople were able to keep a portion of the old possessions of the Empire under their rule for centuries after the Germans had completely conquered the West. When at last the eastern capital of the Empire fell, it was not into the hands of the Germans, but into those of the Turks, who have held it ever since 1453 (Fig. 130).

There will be no room in this volume to follow the history of the Eastern Empire, although it cannot be entirely ignored in studying western Europe. Its language and civilization had
always been Greek, and owing to this and the influence of the Orient, its civilization offers a marked contrast to that of the Latin West, which was adopted by the Germans. Learning of a mechanical type never died out in the East as it did in the West, nor did art reach so low an ebb. For some centuries after the break-up of the Roman Empire in the West, the capital of the Eastern Empire enjoyed the distinction of being the largest and most wealthy city of Europe. Within its walls could be found a refinement and civilization which had almost disappeared in the West, and its beautiful buildings, its parks, and paved streets filled travelers from the West with astonishment.

**QUESTIONS**

**SECTION 45.** Recount the career of Octavian. Did he wish to destroy the Republic? Describe the office which he wished to hold under it. What kind of an adjustment of power resulted? Could it be permanent? What was the foreign policy of Augustus? Define the extent of the Empire and name some of the peoples it included.

What is the distance from the Atlantic coast of Spain to the Euphrates, and how far would a line of this length reach across the United States? Describe the condition of the army at this time; of the Empire as a whole. What did Augustus attempt to restore? Give some account of Horace and Virgil. Contrast Greek and Roman literature. Discuss philosophy in Augustan Rome. Give some account of Roman law.

**SECTION 46.** What conditions did a wealthy Roman traveler find during the first century of the Roman Empire? in Hellas? in the East? in Egypt? in the West? How long did the peace established by Augustus last? Mention the chief causes of decline during this period.

Describe a Roman villa. Discuss slavery. Define *coloni*, and compare them with slaves. What was happening to the population of the Empire as a whole? Describe city life. What oriental influences are discernible?

**SECTION 47.** Discuss the oriental religions in the Mediterranean. Describe the spread of Christianity.

**SECTION 48.** Whose reign marked the end of the two centuries of peace? Give an account of this reign. What followed? Describe Constanti-
the revolution of the third century A.D. What happened to the highest civilization? What kind of a Roman state issued from this revolution?

Who organized it? What was now the character of taxation? What was the result? Describe the army under Diocletian and later. Discuss literature and art under the declining Roman Empire.

SECTION 49. Where was the Emperor's new residence and who founded it? Tell what religion now triumphed and how it came about. How was the Christian Church organized and what were bishops and archbishops?

What privileges are granted to the Christian clergy in the Theodosian Code? Define heresy. How were heretics treated according to Roman law?

SECTION 50. Sketch the career of man to the fall of ancient civilization. What influences were the leading ones in the Eastern Empire? What were the greatest offices of Rome? Discuss the unity of the Empire after the founding of Constantinople. What happened to Rome and the West? How long did the Eastern Empire survive, and what was it like?
CHAPTER XII

THE GERMAN INVASIONS AND THE BREAK-UP OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

SECTIO 51. FOUNING OF KINGDOMS BY BARBARIAN CHIEFS

It is impossible to divide the past into distinct, clearly defined periods and prove that one age ended and another began in a particular year, such as 333 B.C., or 1453 A.D., or 1789. Men do not and cannot change their habits and ways of doing things all at once, no matter what happens. It is true that a single event, such as an important battle which results in the loss of a nation's independence, may produce an abrupt change in the government. This in turn may either encourage or discourage trade and manufactures, and modify the language and alter the interests of a people. But these deeper changes take place only very gradually. After a battle or a revolution the farmer will sow and reap in his old way; the artisan will take up his familiar tasks, and the merchant his buying and selling. The scholar will study and write as he formerly did, and the household will go on under the new government just as it did under the old.
So a change in government affects the habits of a people but slowly in any case, and it may leave them quite unaltered.

This tendency of mankind to do, in general, this year what it did last, in spite of changes in some one department of life,—such as substituting a president for a king, traveling by rail instead of on horseback, or getting the news from a newspaper instead of from a neighbor,—results in what is called the unity or continuity of history. The truth that no sudden change has ever taken place in all the customs of a people, and that it cannot, in the nature of things, take place, is perhaps the most fundamental lesson that history teaches.

Historians sometimes seem to forget this principle, when they undertake to begin and end their books at precise dates. We find histories of Europe from 476 to 918, from 1270 to 1492, as if the accession of a capable German king in 918, or the death of a famous French king in 1270, or the discovery of America in 1492, marked a general change in European affairs. In reality, however, no general change took place at these dates or in any other single year.

We cannot, therefore, hope to fix any year or event which may properly be taken as the beginning of that long period which followed the break-up of the Roman Empire in western Europe and which is commonly called the Middle Ages. Beyond the northern and eastern boundaries of the Roman Empire, which embraced the whole civilized world from the Euphrates to Britain, mysterious peoples moved about whose history before they came into occasional contact with the Romans is practically unknown.

These Germans, or “Barbarians” as the Romans called them, belonged to the same great group of peoples to which the Persians, Greeks, and Romans belonged — the Indo-European race (see above, pp. 86 ff.). They were destined, as their relatives had earlier done, to take possession of the lands of others and help build up a different civilization from that they found. They had first begun to make trouble about a hundred years before Christ, when a great army of them was defeated by the Roman
general Marius. Julius Caesar narrates in polished Latin how fifty years later he drove back other bands. Five hundred years elapsed, however, before German chieftains succeeded in founding kingdoms within the boundaries of the Empire. With their establishment the Roman government in western Europe may be said to have come to an end and the Middle Ages to have begun.

Yet it would be a great mistake to suppose that this means that the Roman civilization suddenly disappeared at this time. Long before the German conquest, art and literature had begun to decline toward the level that they reached in the Middle Ages. Many of the ideas and conditions which prevailed after the coming of the barbarians were common enough before. Even the ignorance and strange ideas which we associate particularly with the Middle Ages are to be found in the later Roman Empire.

The term "Middle Ages" will be used in this volume to mean, roughly speaking, the period of over a thousand years that elapsed between the fifth century, when the disorder of the barbarian invasions was becoming general, and the opening of the sixteenth century, when Europe was well on its way to recover all that had been lost since the break-up of the Roman Empire.

Previous to the year 375 the attempts of the Germans to penetrate into the Roman Empire appear to have been due to their love of adventure, their hope of plundering their civilized neighbors, or the need of new lands for their increasing numbers. And the Romans, by means of their armies, their walls, and their guards, had up to this time succeeded in preventing the barbarians from violently occupying Roman territory. But suddenly a new force appeared in the rear of the Germans which thrust some of them across the northern boundary of the Empire. The Huns, a Mongolian folk from central Asia, swept down upon the Goths, who were a German tribe settled upon the Danube, and forced a part of them to seek shelter across the river, within the limits of the Empire.

Here they soon fell out with the Roman officials, and a great battle was fought at Adrianople in 378 in which the Goths
defeated and slew the Roman emperor, Valens. The Germans had now not only broken through the boundaries of the Empire, but they had also learned that they could defeat the Roman legions. The battle of Adrianople may therefore be said to mark the beginning of the conquest of the western part of the Empire by the Germans. For some years, however, after the battle of Adrianople the various bands of West Goths—or Visigoths, as they are often called—were induced to accept the terms of peace offered by the emperor's officials, and some of the Goths agreed to serve as soldiers in the Roman armies.

Among the Germans who succeeded in getting an important position in the Roman army was Alaric, but he appears to have become dissatisfied with the treatment he received from the Emperor. He therefore collected an army, of which his countrymen, the West Goths, formed a considerable part, and set out for Italy, and finally decided to march on Rome itself. The Eternal City fell into his hands in 410 and was plundered by his followers.

Although Alaric did not destroy the city, or even seriously damage it, the fact that Rome had fallen into the hands of an invading army was a notable disaster. The pagans explained it on the ground that the old gods were angry because so many people had deserted them and become Christians. St. Augustine, in his famous book, *The City of God*, took much pains to prove that the Roman gods had never been able on previous occasions to prevent disaster to their worshipers, and that Christianity could not be held responsible for the troubles of the time.

Alaric died before he could find a satisfactory spot for his people to settle upon permanently. After his death the West Goths wandered into Gaul, and then into Spain. Here they came upon the Vandals, another German tribe, who had crossed the Rhine four years before Alaric had captured Rome. For three years they had devastated Gaul and then had moved down into Spain. For a time after the arrival in Spain of the West Goths, there was war between them and the Vandals. The West Goths seem to have got the best of their rivals, for
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the Vandals determined to move on across the Strait of Gibraltar into northern Africa, where they established a kingdom and conquered the neighboring islands in the Mediterranean (see map, p. 323).

Having rid themselves of the Vandals, the West Goths took possession of a great part of the Spanish peninsula, and this they added to their conquests across the Pyrenees in Gaul, so that their kingdom extended from the river Loire to the Strait of Gibraltar.

It is unnecessary to follow the confused history of the movements of the innumerable bands of restless barbarians who wandered about Europe during the fifth century. Scarcely any part of western Europe was left unmolested; even Britain was conquered by German tribes, the Angles and Saxons.

**Fig. 131. Roman Mausoleum at St.-Rémy**

The Roman town of Glanum (now called St.-Rémy) in southern France was destroyed by the West Goths in 480. Little remains of the town except a triumphal arch and the great monument pictured here. Above the main arches is the inscription, SEX. L. M. IVLIEI. C. F. PARENTIBUS. SVEIS, which seems to mean, "Sextus Julius and [his brothers] Lucius and Marcus, sons of Gaius, to their parents"
To add to the universal confusion caused by the influx of the German tribes, the Huns (the Mongolian people who had first pushed the West Goths into the Empire) now began to fill all western Europe with terror. Under their chief, Attila, this savage people invaded Gaul. But the Romans and the German inhabitants joined together against the invaders and defeated them in the battle of Châlons, in 451. After this rebuff in Gaul, Attila turned to Italy. But the danger there was averted by a Roman embassy, headed by Pope Leo the Great, who induced Attila to give up his plan of marching upon Rome. Within a year he died and with him perished the power of the Huns, who never troubled Europe again.

The year 476 has commonly been taken as the date of the "fall" of the Western Empire and of the beginning of the Middle Ages. What happened in that year was this. Most of the Roman emperors in the West had proved weak and indolent rulers. So the barbarians wandered hither and thither pretty much at their pleasure, and the German troops in the service of the Empire became accustomed to set up and depose emperors to suit their own special interest, very much in the same way that a boss in an American city often succeeds in securing the election of a mayor who will carry out his wishes. Finally in 476, Odoacer, the most powerful among the rival German generals in Italy, declared himself king and banished the last of the emperors of the West.\footnote{The common misapprehensions in regard to the events of 476 are discussed by the author in \textit{The New History}, pp. 154 ff.}

It was not, however, given to Odoacer to establish an enduring German kingdom on Italian soil, for he was conquered by the great Theodoric, the king of the East Goths (or Ostrogoths). Theodoric had spent ten years of his early youth in Constantinople and had thus become familiar with Roman life and was on friendly terms with the Emperor of the East.

The struggle between Theodoric and Odoacer lasted for several years, but Odoacer was finally shut up in Ravenna and
The invaders took one third of the land for themselves, but this seems to have been done without causing any serious disorder. Theodoric greatly admired the Roman laws and institutions and did his best to preserve them. The old offices and titles were retained, and Goth and Roman lived under the same Roman law. Order was maintained and learning encouraged. In
Ravenna, which Theodoric chose for his capital, beautiful buildings still exist that date from his reign.\(^1\)

While Theodoric had been establishing his kingdom in Italy in this enlightened way, Gaul, which we now call France, was coming under the control of the most powerful of all the barbarian peoples, the Franks, who were to play a more important rôle in the formation of modern Europe than any of the other German races (see next section).

Besides the kingdom of the East Goths in Italy and of the Franks in Gaul, the West Goths had their kingdom in Spain, the Burgundians had established themselves on the Rhone River, and the Vandals in Africa. Royal alliances were concluded between the various reigning houses, and for the first time in the history of Europe we see something like a family of nations, living each within its own boundaries and dealing with one another as independent powers (see map). It seemed for a few years as if the new German kings who had divided up the western portion of the Empire among themselves would succeed in keeping order and in preventing the loss of such civilization as remained.

But no such good fortune was in store for Europe, which was now only at the beginning of the turmoil which was to leave it almost completely barbarized, for there was little to encourage the reading or writing of books, the study of science, or attention to art, in a time of constant warfare and danger.

Theodoric had a distinguished Roman counselor named Cassiodorus (d. 575), to whose letters we owe a great part of our knowledge of this period, and who busied himself in his old age

\(^{1}\) The headpiece of this chapter represents the tomb of Theodoric. Emperors and rich men were accustomed in Roman times to build handsome tombs for themselves (see Fig. 131). Theodoric followed their example and erected this two-storied building at Ravenna to serve as his mausoleum. The dome consists of a single great piece of rock 36 feet in diameter, weighing 500 tons, brought from across the Adriatic. Theodoric was a heretic in the eyes of the Catholic Church, and not long after his death his remains were taken out of his tomb and scattered to the winds, and the building converted into a church. The picture represents the tomb as it probably looked originally; it has been somewhat altered in modern times, but is well preserved.
MAP OF EUROPE IN THE TIME OF THEODORIC

It will be noticed that Theodoric's kingdom of the East Goths included a considerable part of what we call Austria to-day, and that the West Gothic kingdom extended into southern France. The Vandals held northern Africa and the adjacent islands. The Burgundians lay in between the East Goths and the Franks. The Lombards, who were later to move down into Italy, were in Theodoric's time east of the Bavarians, after whom modern Bavaria is named. Some of the Saxons invaded England, but many remained in Germany, as indicated on the map. The Eastern Empire, which was all that remained of the Roman Empire, included the Balkan Peninsula, Asia Minor, and the eastern portion of the Mediterranean. The Britons in Wales, the Picts in Scotland, and the Scots in Ireland were Celts, consequently modern Welsh, Gaelic, and Irish are closely related and belong to the Celtic group of languages.
in preparing textbooks of the "liberal" arts and sciences,—
grammar, arithmetic, logic, geometry, rhetoric, music, and astra-
tonomy. His treatment of these seven important subjects, to
which he devotes a few pages each, seems to us very silly and
absurd and enables us to estimate the low plane to which learn-
ing had fallen in Italy in the sixth century. Yet these and similar
works were regarded as standard treatises and used as textbooks
all through the Middle Ages, while the really great Greek and
Roman writers of the earlier period were forgotten.

Between the time of Theodoric and that of Charlemagne
three hundred years elapsed, during which scarcely a person
was to be found who could write out, even in the worst of
Latin, an account of the events of his day. Everything con-
spired to discourage education. The great centers of learning—
Carthage, Rome, Alexandria, Milan—had all been partially
destroyed by the invaders. The libraries which had been kept
in the temples of the pagan gods were often burned, along
with the temples themselves, by Christian enthusiasts, who
were not sorry to see the heathen books disappear with the
heathen religion. Shortly after Theodoric's death the Emperor
at Constantinople withdrew the support which the Roman gov-
ernment had been accustomed to grant to public teachers, and
closed the great school at Athens. The only important historian
of the sixth century was the half-illiterate Gregory, bishop of
Tours (d. 594), whose whole work is evidence of the sad state
of affairs. He at least heartily appreciated his own ignorance
and exclaims, in bad Latin, "Woe to our time, for the study of
books has perished from among us."

The year after Theodoric's death one of the greatest of the
emperors of the East, Justinian (527-565), came to the throne
at Constantinople. He undertook to regain for the Empire the
provinces in Africa and Italy that had been occupied by the
Vandals and East Goths. His general, Belisarius, overthrew

1 See Robinson, Readings in European History, I, chap. iii (end), for historical
writings of this period.
the Vandal kingdom in northern Africa in 534, but it was a more difficult task to destroy the Gothic rule in Italy. However, in spite of a brave resistance, the Goths were so completely defeated in 553 that they agreed to leave Italy with all their movable possessions. What became of the remnants of the race we do not know.

The destruction of the Gothic kingdom was a disaster for Italy, for the Goths would have helped defend it against later and far more barbarous invaders. Immediately after the death of Justinian the country was overrun by the Lombards, the last of the great German peoples to establish themselves within the bounds of the former Empire. They were a savage race, a considerable part of which was still pagan. The newcomers first occupied the region north of the Po, which has ever since been called "Lombardy" after them, and then extended their conquests southward. Instead of settling themselves with the moderation and wise statesmanship of the East Goths, the Lombards moved about the peninsula pillaging and massacring. Such of the inhabitants as could, fled to the islands off the coast. The Lombards were unable, however, to conquer all of Italy. Rome, Ravenna, and southern Italy continued to be held by the emperors who succeeded Justinian at Constantinople. As time went on, the Lombards lost their wildness and adopted the habits and religion of the people among whom they lived. Their kingdom lasted over two hundred years, until it was conquered by Charlemagne (see below, p. 374).

Section 52. Kingdom of the Franks

The various kingdoms established by the German chieftains were not very permanent, as we have seen. The Franks, however, succeeded in conquering more territory than any other people and in founding an empire far more important than the kingdoms of the West and East Goths, the Vandals, or the Lombards. We must now see how this was accomplished.
When the Franks are first heard of in history they were settled along the lower Rhine, from Cologne to the North Sea. Their method of getting a foothold in the Empire was essentially different from that which the Goths, Lombards, and Vandals had adopted. Instead of severing their connection with Germany and becoming an island in the sea of the Empire, they conquered by degrees the territory about them. However far they might extend their control, they remained in constant touch with their fellow barbarians behind them. In this way they retained the warlike vigor that was lost by the races who were completely surrounded by the luxuries of Roman civilization.

In the early part of the fifth century they had occupied the district which forms to-day the kingdom of Belgium, as well as the regions east of it. In 486, seven years before Theodoric founded his Italian kingdom, they went forth under their great king, Clovis (a name that later grew into Louis), and defeated the Roman general who opposed them. They extended their control over Gaul as far south as the Loire, which at that time formed the northern boundary of the kingdom of the West Goths.
Clovis next enlarged his empire on the east by the conquest of the Alemanni, a German people living in the region of the Black Forest.

The battle in which the Alemanni were defeated (496) is in one respect important above all the other battles of Clovis. Although still a pagan himself, his wife had been converted to Christianity. In the midst of the battle, seeing his troops giving way, he called upon Jesus Christ and pledged himself to be baptized in his name if he would help the Franks to victory over their enemies. When he won the battle he kept his word and was baptized, together with three thousand of his warriors. It is from Bishop Gregory of Tours, mentioned above, that most of our knowledge of Clovis and his successors is derived. In Gregory’s famous History of the Franks the cruel and unscrupulous Clovis appears as God’s chosen instrument for the support of the Christian faith. Certainly Clovis quickly learned to combine his own interests with those of the Church, and, later, an alliance between the Pope and the Frankish kings was destined to have a great influence upon the history of western Europe.

To the south of Clovis’s new possessions in Gaul lay the kingdom of the West Goths; to the southeast that of another German people, the Burgundians. Clovis speedily extended his power to the Pyrenees, and forced the West Goths to confine themselves to the Spanish portion of their realm, while the Burgundians soon fell completely under the rule of the Franks. Then Clovis, by a series of murders, brought portions of the Frankish nation itself, which had previously been independent of him, under his scepter.

When Clovis died in 511 at Paris, which he had made his residence, his four sons divided his possessions among them. Wars between rival brothers, interspersed with the most horrible murders, fill the annals of the Frankish kingdom for over a hundred years after the death of Clovis. Yet the nation continued to develop in spite of the unscrupulous deeds of its rulers.

1 See Readings, chap. iii, for passages from Gregory of Tours.
The Frankish kings who followed Clovis succeeded in extending their power over pretty nearly all the territory that is included to-day in France, Belgium, and the Netherlands, as well as over a goodly portion of western Germany. Half a century after the death of Clovis, their dominions extended from the Bay of Biscay on the west to a point east of Salzburg.

The Dominions of the Franks under the Merovingians

This map shows how the Frankish kingdom grew up. Clovis while still a young man defeated the Roman general Syagrius in 486, near Soissons, and so added the region around Paris to his possessions. He added Alemannia on the east in 496. In 507 he made Paris his capital and conquered Aquitania, previously held by the West Goths. He also made a beginning in adding the kingdom of the Burgundians to his realms. He died in 511. His successors in the next half century completed the conquest of Burgundy and added Provencia, Bavaria, and Gascony. There were many divisions of the Frankish realms after the time of Clovis, and the eastern and western portions, called Austrasia and Neustria, were often ruled by different branches of the Merovingians, as Clovis's family was called.
Section 53. Results of the Barbarian Invasions

As one looks back over the German invasions it is natural to ask upon what terms the newcomers lived among the old inhabitants of the Empire, how far they adopted the customs of those among whom they settled, and how far they clung to their old habits? These questions cannot be answered very satisfactorily. So little is known of the confused period of which we have been speaking that it is impossible to follow closely the mixing of the two races.

Yet a few things are tolerably clear. In the first place, we must be on our guard against exaggerating the numbers in the various bodies of invaders. The writers of the time indicate that the West Goths, when they were first admitted to the Empire before the battle of Adrianople, amounted to four or five hundred thousand persons, including men, women, and children. This is the largest band reported, and it must have been greatly reduced before the West Goths, after long wanderings and many battles, finally settled in Spain and southern Gaul. The Burgundians, when they appear for the first time on the banks of the Rhine, are reported to have had eighty thousand warriors among them. When Clovis and his army were baptized, Gregory of Tours speaks of “over three thousand” soldiers who became Christians upon that occasion. This would seem to indicate that this was the entire army of the Frankish king at this time.

Undoubtedly these figures are very meager and unreliable. But the readiness with which the Germans appear to have adopted the language and customs of the Romans would tend to prove that the invaders formed but a small minority of the population. Since hundreds of thousands of barbarians had been absorbed during the previous five centuries, the invasions of the fifth century can hardly have made an abrupt change in the character of the population.

The barbarians within the old Empire were soon speaking the same conversational Latin which was everywhere used by the
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Romans about them. This was much simpler than the elaborate and complicated language used in books, which we find so much difficulty in learning nowadays. The speech of the common people was gradually diverging more and more, in the various countries of southern Europe, from the written Latin, and finally grew into French, Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese. But the barbarians did not produce this change, for it had begun before they came and would have gone on without them. They did no more than contribute a few convenient words to the new languages.

The northern Franks, who did not penetrate far into the Empire, and the Germans who remained in what is now Germany and in Scandinavia, had of course no reason for giving up their native tongues; the Angles and Saxons in Britain also kept theirs. These Germanic languages in time became Dutch, English, German, Danish, Swedish, etc. Of this matter something will be said later (see below, section 92).

The Germans and the older inhabitants of the Roman Empire appear to have had no dislike for one another, except when there was a difference in religion. Where there was no religious barrier the two races intermarried freely from the first. The Frankish kings did not hesitate to appoint Romans to important positions in the government and in the army, just as the Romans had long been in the habit of employing the barbarians as generals and officials. In only one respect were the two races distinguished for a time — each had its particular law.

The West Goths were probably the first to write down their ancient laws, using the Latin language for the purpose. Their example was followed by the Franks, the Burgundians, and later by the Lombards and other peoples. These codes make up the "Laws of the Barbarians," which form our most important source of knowledge of the habits and ideas of the Germans at the time of the invasions. For several centuries following the

---

1 The West and East Goths and the Burgundians were heretics in the eyes of the Catholic Church, for they had been taught their Christianity by missionaries who disagreed with the Catholic Church on certain points.
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barbarian conquests, the members of the various German tribes appear to have been judged by the laws of the particular people to which they belonged. The older inhabitants of the Empire, on the contrary, continued to have their lawsuits decided according to the Roman law.

The German laws did not provide for trials, either in the Roman or the modern sense of the word. There was no attempt to gather and weigh evidence and base the decision upon it. Such a mode of procedure was far too elaborate for the simple-minded Germans. Instead of a regular trial, one of the parties to the case was designated to prove that his side of the case was true by one of the following methods:

1. He might solemnly swear that he was telling the truth and get as many other persons of his own class as the court required, to swear that they believed that he was telling the truth. This was called compurgation. It was believed that God would punish those who swore falsely.

2. On the other hand, the parties to the case, or persons representing them, might meet in combat, on the supposition that Heaven would grant victory to the right. This was the so-called wager of battle.

3. Lastly, one or other of the parties might be required to submit to the ordeal in one of its various forms: He might plunge his arm into hot water, or carry a bit of hot iron for some distance, and if at the end of three days he showed no ill effects, the case was decided in his favor. Or he might be ordered to walk over hot plowshares, and if he was not burned, it was assumed that God had intervened by a miracle to establish the right.¹ This method of trial is but one example of the rude civilization which displaced the refined and elaborate organization of the Romans.

The account which has been given of the conditions in the Roman Empire, and of the manner in which the barbarians

¹ Professor Emerton gives an excellent account of the Germanic ideas of law in his Introduction to the Middle Ages, pp. 73-91.
occupied its western part, serve to explain why the following centuries — known as the early Middle Ages — were a time of ignorance and disorder. The Germans, no doubt, varied a good deal in their habits and character. The Goths differed from the Lombards, and the Franks from the Vandals; but they all agreed in knowing nothing of the art, literature, and science which had been developed by the Greeks and adopted by the Romans. The invaders were ignorant, simple, vigorous people, with no taste for anything except fighting, eating, and drinking. Such was the disorder that their coming produced that the declining civilization of the Empire was pretty nearly submerged. The libraries, buildings, and works of art were destroyed or neglected, and there was no one to see that they were restored. So the western world fell back into a condition similar to that in which it had been before the Romans conquered and civilized it.

The loss was, however, temporary. The great heritage of skill and invention which had been slowly accumulated in Egypt and Greece, and which formed a part of the civilization which the Romans had adopted and spread abroad throughout their great Empire, did not wholly perish.

It is true that the break-up of the Roman Empire and the centuries of turmoil which followed set everything back, but we shall see how the barbarian nations gradually developed into our modern European states, how universities were established in which the books of the Greeks and Romans were studied. Architects arose in time to imitate the old buildings and build a new kind of their own quite as imposing as those of the Romans, and men of science carried discoveries far beyond anything known to the wisest of the Greeks and Romans.

QUESTIONs

Section 51. How did the Germans first come into the Roman Empire, and for what reasons? What is meant by the barbarian invasions? Give some examples. Trace the history of the West Goths. Where did they finally establish their kingdom? Why has the
year 476 been regarded as the date of the fall of the Roman Empire? Tell what you can of Theodoric and his kingdom. Contrast the Lombard invaders of Italy with the East Goths.

Section 52. Who were the Franks, and how did their invasion differ from that of the other German peoples? What did Clovis accomplish, and what was the extent of the kingdom of the Franks under his successors? Compare the numbers of the barbarians who seem to have entered the Empire with the number of people in our large cities to-day.

Section 53. On what terms do the Germans seem to have lived with the people of the Roman Empire? Why are the “Laws of the Barbarians” useful to the historian? Compare the ways in which the Germans tried law cases with those we use to-day in the United States. Tell as clearly as possible why the Middle Ages were centuries of disorder and ignorance as compared with the earlier period.
CHAPTER XIII

THE RISE OF THE PAPACY

SECTION 54. THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

Besides the emperors at Constantinople and the various German kings, there grew up in Europe a line of rulers far more powerful than any of these, namely, the popes. We must now consider the Christian Church and see how the popes gained their great influence.

We have already seen how marvelously the Christian communities founded by the apostles and their fellow missionaries multiplied until, by the middle of the third century, writers like St. Cyprian came to conceive of a “Catholic,” or all-embracing, Church. We have seen how Emperor Constantine favored Christianity, and how his successors worked in the interest of the new religion; how carefully the Theodosian Code safeguarded the Church and the Christian clergy, and how harshly those were treated who ventured to hold another view of Christianity from that sanctioned by the government.¹

¹ See above, section 49.
We must now follow this most powerful and permanent of all the institutions of the later Roman Empire into the Middle Ages. We must stop first to consider how the Western, or Latin, portion of Christendom, which gradually fell apart from the Eastern, or Greek, region, came to form a separate institution under the popes, the longest and mightiest line of rulers that the world has ever seen. We shall see how a peculiar class of Christians, the monks, appeared; how they joined hands with the clergy; how the monks and the clergy met the barbarians, subdued and civilized them, and then ruled them for centuries.

One great source of the Church's strength lay in the general fear of death and judgment to come, which Christianity had brought with it. The educated Greeks and Romans of the classical period usually thought of the next life, when they thought of it at all, as a very uninteresting existence compared with that on this earth. One who committed some great crime might suffer for it after death with pains similar to those of the hell in which the Christians believed. But the great part of humanity were supposed to lead in the next world a shadowy existence, neither sad nor glad. Religion, even to the devout pagan, was, as we have seen, mainly an affair of this life; the gods were worshiped with a view to securing happiness and success in this world.

Since no great satisfaction could be expected in the next life, according to pagan ideas, it was naturally thought wise to make the most of this one. The possibility of pleasure ends—so the Roman poet Horace urges—when we join the shades below, as we all must do soon. Let us, therefore, take advantage of every harmless pleasure and improve our brief opportunity to enjoy the good things of earth. We should, however, be reasonable and temperate, avoiding all excess, for that endangers happiness. Above all, we should not worry uselessly about the future, which is in the hands of the gods and beyond our control. Such were the convictions of the majority of thoughtful pagans.
Christianity opposed this view of life with an entirely different one. It constantly emphasized man's existence after death, which it declared to be infinitely more important than his brief sojourn on earth. Under the influence of the Church this conception of life gradually supplanted the pagan one in the Roman world, and it was taught to the barbarians.

The "other-worldliness" became so intense that thousands gave up their ordinary occupations altogether and devoted their entire attention to preparation for the next life. They shut themselves in lonely cells; and, not satisfied with giving up most of their natural pleasures, they inflicted bodily suffering upon themselves by hunger, cold, and other discomforts. They trusted that in this way they might avoid some of the sins into which they were apt to fall, and that, by self-inflicted punishment in this world, they might perchance escape some of that reserved for them in the next.

The barbarians were taught that their fate in the next world depended largely upon the Church. Its ministers never wearied of presenting the alternative which faced every man so soon as this short earthly existence should be over — the alternative between eternal bliss in heaven and perpetual, unspeakable torment in hell. Only those who had been duly baptized could hope to reach heaven; but baptism washed away only past sins and did not prevent constant relapse into new ones. These, unless their guilt was removed through the Church, would surely drag the soul down to hell.

The divine power of the Church was, furthermore, established in the eyes of the people by the wonderful works which Christian saints were constantly performing. They healed the sick, made the blind to see and the lame to walk. They called down God's wrath upon those who opposed the Church and invoked terrible punishments upon those who treated her holy rites with contempt. To the reader of to-day the frequency of the miracles narrated by medieval writers seems astonishing. The lives of the saints, of which hundreds and hundreds have
been preserved, contain little else than accounts of them, and no one appears to have doubted their everyday occurrence.\(^1\)

A word should be said of the early Christian church buildings. The Romans were accustomed to build near their market places a species of public hall, in which townspeople could meet one another to transact business, and in which judges could hear cases, and public officials attend to their duties. These buildings were called *basilicas*. There were several magnificent ones in Rome itself, and there was doubtless at least one to be found in every town of considerable size. The roofs of these spacious halls were usually supported by long rows of columns; sometimes there were two rows on each side, forming aisles. When, after Constantine had given his approval to Christianity, large, fine churches began to be built they were constructed like these familiar public halls and, like them, were called basilicas.

During the sixteen hundred years that have passed since Constantine's time naturally almost all the churches of his day have disappeared or been greatly altered. But the beautiful church of Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome (Fig. 134) was built only a hundred years later, and gives us an excellent notion of a Christian basilica with its fine rows of columns and its handsome mosaic decorations. In general, the churches were plain and unattractive on the outside. A later chapter will explain how the basilica grew into the Gothic cathedral, which was as beautiful outside as inside.

The chief importance of the Church for the student of medieval history does not lie, however, in its religious functions, vital as they were, but rather in its remarkable relations to the government. From the days of Constantine on, the Catholic Church had usually enjoyed the hearty support and protection of the government. But so long as the Roman Empire remained strong and active there was no chance for the clergy to free themselves from the control of the Emperor, even if they had been disposed to do so. He made such laws for

\(^{1}\) For reports of miracles, see *Readings*, especially chaps. v, xvi.
the Church as he saw fit, and the clergy did not complain. The government was, indeed, indispensable to them. It undertook to root out paganism by destroying the heathen shrines and preventing heathen sacrifices, and it punished severely those who refused to accept the teachings sanctioned by the Church.

Fig. 134. SANTA MARIA MAGGIORE

This beautiful church at Rome was built shortly after Constantine's time, and the interior, here shown, with its stately columns, above which are fine mosaics, is still nearly as it was in the time of St. Augustine, fifteen hundred years ago. The ceiling is of the sixteenth century

But as the great Empire began to fall apart, there was a growing tendency among the churchmen in the West to resent the interference of the new rulers whom they did not respect. Consequently they managed gradually to free themselves in large part from the control of the government. They then proceeded to assume themselves many of the duties of government, which the weak and disorderly states into which the Roman Empire fell were unable to perform properly.

One of the bishops of Rome (Pope Gelasius I, d. 496) briefly stated the principle upon which the Church rested its claims, as
follows: "Two powers govern the world, the priestly and the
kingly. The first is assuredly the superior, for the priest is
responsible to God for the conduct of even the emperors them-
selves." Since no one denied that the eternal interests of man-
kind, which were under the care of the Church, were infinitely
more important than those merely worldly matters which the
State regulated, it was natural for the clergy to hold that, in
case of conflict, the Church and its officers, rather than the
king, should have the last word.

Gradually, as we have said, the Church began to undertake
the duties which the Roman government had previously per-
formed and which our governments perform to-day, such as
keeping order, the management of public education, the trial of
lawsuits, etc. There were no well-organized states in western
Europe for many centuries after the final destruction of the
Roman Empire. The authority of the various barbarian kings
was seldom sufficient to keep their realms in order. There
were always many powerful landholders scattered throughout
the kingdom who did pretty much what they pleased and set-
tled their grudges against their fellows by neighborhood wars.
Fighting was the main business as well as the chief amusement
of this class. The king was unable to maintain peace and
protect the oppressed, however anxious he may have been
to do so.

Under these circumstances it naturally fell to the Church to
keep order, when it could, by either threats or persuasion; to
see that contracts were kept, the wills of the dead carried out,
and marriage obligations observed. It took the defenseless
widow and orphan under its protection and dispensed charity;
it promoted education at a time when few laymen, however rich
and noble, were able even to read. These conditions serve to
explain why the Church was finally able so greatly to extend
the powers which it had enjoyed under the Roman Empire,
and why it undertook duties which seem to us to belong to the
State rather than to a religious organization.
Section 55. Origin of the Power of the Popes

We must now turn to a consideration of the origin and growth of the supremacy of the popes, who, by raising themselves to the head of the Western Church, became in many respects more powerful than any of the kings and princes with whom they frequently found themselves in bitter conflict.

While we cannot discover in the Theodosian Code any recognition of the supreme headship of the bishop of Rome, there is little doubt that he and his flock had almost from the very first enjoyed a leading place among the Christian communities. The Roman church was the only one in the West which could claim the distinction of having been founded by the immediate followers of Christ — the "two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul."

The New Testament speaks repeatedly of Paul's presence in Rome. As for Peter, there had always been an unquestioned tradition, accepted throughout the Christian Church, that he was the first bishop of Rome. This belief appears to have been generally accepted at least as early as the middle of the second century. There is, certainly, no conflicting tradition, no rival claimant. The belief itself, whether or not it corresponds with actual events, is a fact of the greatest historical importance. Peter enjoyed a preëminence among the other apostles and was singled out by Christ upon several occasions. In a passage of the New Testament which has affected history more profoundly than the edicts of the most powerful monarch, Christ says: "And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." ¹

¹ Matt. xvi, 18–19. Two other passages in the New Testament were held to substantiate the divinely ordained headship of Peter and his successors: Luke xxii, 32, where Christ says to Peter, "Strengthen thy brethren," and John xxi, 15–17, where Jesus said to him, "Feed my sheep." See Readings, chap. iv. The keys always appear in the papal arms (see headpiece of this chapter, p. 334).
When Constantine became a Christian he turned over to the Roman bishops a great palace which had formerly belonged to the wealthy Roman family of the Laterani, hence the name Lateran, applied to both the palace and to the church which Constantine built for the popes close to the palace. Here the popes carried on their business for a thousand years, but during the past few centuries they have resided in the Vatican (see legend under Fig. 136). The church of the Lateran claims to be “the mother and head of all the churches of Rome and of the world” — *Omnium urbis et orbis ecclesiarum mater et caput*, as the Latin inscription runs on the present church. An earthquake, successive fires, and great alterations have left little or nothing of the original structure.
Thus it was natural that the Roman church should early have been looked upon as the "mother church" in the West. Its doctrines were considered the purest, since they had been handed down from its exalted founders. When there was a difference of opinion in regard to the truth of a particular teaching, it was natural that all should turn to the bishop of Rome for his view. Moreover, the majesty of Rome, the capital of the world, helped to exalt its bishop above his fellows. It was long, however, before all the other bishops, especially those in the large cities, were ready to accept unconditionally the authority of the bishop of Rome, although they acknowledged his leading position and that of the Roman community.

We know comparatively little of the bishops of Rome during the first three or four centuries of the Church's existence. It is only with the accession of Leo the Great (440–461) that the history of the papacy may, in one sense, be said to have begun. At his suggestion, Valentinian III, the Emperor in the West, issued a decree in 445 declaring the power of the bishop of Rome supreme, by reason of Peter's headship, and the majesty of the city of Rome. He commanded that the bishops throughout the West should receive as law all that the bishop of Rome approved, and that any bishop refusing to answer a summons to Rome should be forced to obey by the imperial governor.

But a council at Chalcedon, six years later, declared that new Rome on the Bosporus (Constantinople) should have the same power in the government of the Church as old Rome on the Tiber. This decree was, however, never accepted in the Western, or Latin, Church, which was gradually separating from the Eastern, or Greek, Church, whose natural head was at Constantinople. Although there were times of trouble to come, when for years the claims of Pope Leo appeared an empty boast, still his emphatic assertion of the supremacy of the Roman bishop was a great step toward bringing the Western Church under a single head.¹

¹ See Readings, chap. iv, for development of the Pope's power.
The name "pope" (Latin *papa*, "father") was originally and quite naturally given to all bishops, and even to priests. It began to be especially applied to the bishops of Rome, perhaps as early as the sixth century, but was not apparently confined to them until two or three hundred years later. Gregory VII

**Fig. 136. The Ancient Basilica of St. Peter**

Of the churches built by Constantine in Rome that in honor of St. Peter was, next to the Lateran, the most important. It was constructed on the site of Nero's circus, where St. Peter was believed to have been crucified. It retained its original appearance, as here represented, for twelve hundred years, and then the popes (who had given up the Lateran as their residence and come to live in the Vatican palace close to St. Peter's) determined to build the new and grander church one sees to-day (see section 90, below). Constantine and the popes made constant use in their buildings of columns and stones taken from the older Roman buildings, which were in this way demolished (d. 1085; see section 75, below) was the first to declare explicitly that the title should be used only for the bishop of Rome.

Not long after the death of Leo the Great, Odoacer put an end to the Western line of emperors. Then, as we know, Theodoric and his East Goths settled in Italy, only to be
followed by still less desirable intruders, the Lombards. During this tumultuous period the people of Rome, and even of all Italy, came to regard the Pope as their natural leader. The Eastern Emperor was far away, and his officers, who managed to hold a portion of central Italy around Rome and Ravenna, were glad to accept the aid and counsel of the Pope. In Rome the Pope watched over the elections of the city officials and directed the manner the public money should be spent. He had to manage and defend the great tracts of land in different parts of Italy which from time to time had been given to the bishopric of Rome. He negotiated with the Germans and even gave orders to the generals sent against them.

The pontificate of Gregory the Great, one of the half dozen most distinguished heads that the Church has ever had, shows how great a part the papacy could play. Gregory, who was the son of a rich Roman senator, had been appointed by the Emperor to the honorable office of prefect. He began to fear, however, that his proud position and fine clothes were making him vain and worldly. His pious mother and his study of the writings of Augustine and the other great Christian writers led him, upon the death of his father, to spend all his handsome fortune in founding seven monasteries. One of these he established in his own house and subjected himself to such severe discipline that his health never entirely recovered from it.

When Gregory was chosen pope (in 590) and most reluctantly left his monastery, ancient Rome, the capital of the Empire, was already transforming itself into medieval Rome, the capital of Christendom. The temples of the gods had furnished materials for the many Christian churches. The tombs of the apostles Peter and Paul were soon to become the center of religious attraction and the goal of pilgrimages from every part of western Europe. Just as Gregory assumed office a great plague was raging in the city. In true medieval fashion he arranged a solemn procession in order to obtain from heaven a
cessation of the pest. Then the archangel Michael was seen over the tomb of Hadrian (Fig. 137) sheathing his fiery sword as a sign that the wrath of the Lord had been turned away. With Gregory we leave behind us the Rome of Cæsar and Trajan and enter upon that of the popes.

**Fig. 137. Hadrian's Tomb**

The Roman Emperor Hadrian (d. 138) built a great circular tomb at Rome, on the west bank of the Tiber, for himself and his successors. It was 240 feet across, perhaps 165 feet high, covered with marble and adorned with statues. When Rome was besieged by the Germans in 537, the inhabitants used the tomb for a fortress and threw down the statues on the heads of the barbarians. Since the time when Gregory the Great saw the archangel Michael sheathing his sword over Hadrian's tomb it has been called the Castle of the Holy Angel

Gregory enjoyed an unrivaled reputation during the Middle Ages as a writer. His works show, however, how much less cultivated his period was than that of his predecessors. His most popular book was his *Dialogues*, a collection of accounts of miracles and popular legends. It is hard to believe that it
could have been composed by the greatest man of the time and that it was written for adults.\(^{1}\) In his commentary on Job, Gregory warns the reader that he need not be surprised to find mistakes in Latin grammar, since in dealing with so holy a work as the Bible a writer should not stop to make sure whether his cases and tenses are right.

Gregory’s letters show clearly what the papacy was coming to mean for Europe when in the hands of a really great man. While he assumed the humble title of “Servant of the servants of God,” which the popes still use, Gregory was a statesman whose influence extended far and wide. It devolved upon him to govern the city of Rome,—as it did upon his successors down to the year 1870,—for the Eastern Emperor’s control had become merely nominal. He had also to keep the Lombards out of central Italy, which they failed to conquer largely on account of the valiant defense of the popes. These duties were functions of the State, and in assuming them Gregory may be said to have founded the “temporal” power of the popes.

Beyond the borders of Italy, Gregory was in constant communication with the Emperor and the Frankish and Burgundian rulers. Everywhere he used his influence to have good clergy-men chosen as bishops, and everywhere he watched over the interests of the monasteries. But his chief importance in the history of the papacy is due to the missionary enterprises he undertook, through which the great countries that were one day to be called England, France, and Germany were brought under the sway of the Roman Church and its head, the Pope.

As Gregory had himself been a devoted monk it was natural that he should rely chiefly upon the monks in his great work of converting the heathen. Consequently, before considering his missionary achievements, we must glance at the origin and character of the monks, who are so conspicuous throughout the Middle Ages.

\(^{1}\) He is reckoned, along with Augustine, Ambrose, and Jerome, as one of the four great Latin “fathers” of the Church. For extracts from Gregory’s writings, see Readings, chap. iv.
QUESTIONS

Section 54. Why is it essential to know about the history of the Church in order to understand the Middle Ages? Compare the Christian idea of the importance of life in this world and the next with the pagan views. Describe a basilica. Mention some governmental duties that were assumed by the Church. Give the reasons why the Church became such a great power in the Middle Ages.

Section 55. Why was the Roman church the most important of all the Christian churches? On what grounds did the bishop of Rome claim to be the head of the whole Church? Did the Christians in the eastern portion of the Roman Empire accept the bishop of Rome as their head? Why did the popes become influential in the governing not only of Rome but of Italy? Tell what you can of Gregory the Great.
It would be difficult to overestimate the influence that the monks exercised for centuries in Europe. The proud annals of the Benedictines, Franciscans, Dominicans, and Jesuits contain many a distinguished name. The most eminent philosophers, scientists, historians, artists, poets, and statesmen may be found in their ranks. Among those whose achievements we shall mention later are “The Venerable Bede,” Boniface, Thomas Aquinas, Roger Bacon, Fra Angelico, Luther, Erasmus — all these, and many others who have been leaders in various branches of human activity, were monks.

The life in a monastery appealed to many different kinds of people. The monastic life was safe and peaceful, as well as holy. The monastery was the natural refuge not only of the religiously minded, but of those of a studious or thoughtful disposition who disliked the career of a soldier and were disinclined to face the dangers and uncertainties of the times. Even the
rude and unscrupulous warriors hesitated to destroy the property or disturb the life of those who were believed to enjoy God's special favor. The monastery furnished, too, a refuge for the friendless, an asylum for the disgraced, and food and shelter for the indolent, who would otherwise have had to earn their living. There were, therefore, many different motives which led people to enter monasteries. Kings and nobles, for the good of their souls, readily gave land upon which to found colonies of monks, and there were plenty of remote spots in the mountains and forests to invite those who wished to escape from the world and its temptations, its dangers or its cares.

Monastic communities first developed on a large scale in Egypt in the fourth century. The idea, however, was quickly taken up in Europe. At the time that the Germans were winning their first great victory at Adrianople, St. Jerome was busily engaged in writing letters to men and women whom he hoped to induce to become monks or hermits. In the sixth century monasteries multiplied so rapidly in western Europe that it became necessary to establish definite rules for these communities which proposed to desert the ordinary ways of the world and lead a holy life apart. Accordingly St. Benedict drew up, about the year 526, a sort of constitution for the monastery of Monte Cassino, in southern Italy, of which he was the head. This was so sagacious, and so well met the needs of the monastic life, that it was rapidly accepted by the other monasteries and gradually became the "rule" according to which all the Western monks lived.

1 The illustration on page 348 shows the monastery of Monte Cassino. It is situated on a lofty hill, lying some ninety miles south of Rome. Benedict selected a site formerly occupied by a temple to Apollo, of which the columns may still be seen in one of the courts of the present building. The monastery was destroyed by the Lombards not long after its foundation and later by the Mohammedans, so none of the present buildings go back to the time of Benedict.

2 Benedict did not introduce monasticism in the West, as is sometimes supposed, nor did he even found an order in the proper sense of the word, under a single head, like the later Franciscans and Dominicans. Nevertheless, the monks who lived under his rule are ordinarily spoken of as belonging to the Benedictine order. A translation of the Benedictine Rule may be found in Henderson, Historical Documents, pp. 274–314.
The Rule of St. Benedict is as important as any constitution that was ever drawn up for a state. It is for the most part very wise and sensible. It provided that, since every one is not fitted for the monk’s life, the candidate for admission to the monastery should pass through a period of probation, called the novitiate, before he was permitted to take the solemn, final vows. The brethren were to elect the head of the monastery, the abbot, as he was called. Along with frequent prayer and meditation, the monks were to do the necessary cooking and washing for the monastery and raise the necessary vegetables and grain. They were also to read and teach. Those who were incapacitated for outdoor work were assigned lighter tasks, such as copying books.

The monk had to take the three vows of obedience, poverty, and chastity. He was to obey the abbot without question in all matters that did not involve his committing a sin. He pledged himself to perpetual and absolute poverty, and everything he used was the property of the convent. He was not permitted to own anything whatsoever — not even a book or a pen. Along with the vows of obedience and poverty, he was also required to pledge himself never to marry; for not only was the single life considered more holy than the married, but the monastic organization would have been impossible unless the monks remained single. Aside from these restrictions, the monks were commanded to live reasonable and natural lives and not to destroy their health, as some earlier ones had done, by undue fasting in the supposed interest of their souls.

The influence of the Benedictine monks upon Europe is incalculable. From their numbers no less than twenty-four popes and forty-six hundred bishops and archbishops have been chosen. They boast almost sixteen thousand writers, some of great distinction. Their monasteries furnished retreats during the Middle Ages, where the scholar might study and write in spite of the prevailing disorder of the times.

The copying of books, as has been said, was a natural occupation of the monks. Doubtless their work was often done
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carelessly, with little heart and less understanding. But, with the
great loss of manuscripts due to the destruction of libraries and
the general lack of interest in books, it was most essential that
new copies should be made. Even poor and incorrect ones were
better than none. Almost all the books written by the Romans
disappeared altogether during the Middle Ages, but from time to
time a monk would copy out the poems of Virgil, Horace, or Ovid,
or the speeches of Cicero. In this way some of the chief works of
the Latin writers have continued to exist down to the present day.

The monks regarded good hard work as a great aid to salva-
tion. They set the example of careful cultivation of the lands
about their monasteries and in this way introduced better farm-
ing methods into the regions where they settled. They enter-
tained travelers at a time when there were few or no inns and so
increased the intercourse between the various parts of Europe.

The Benedictine monks were ardent and faithful supporters
of the papacy. The Church, which owes much to them, ex-
tended to them many of the privileges enjoyed by the clergy.
Indeed, the monks were reckoned as clergymen and were called
the “regular” clergy, because they lived according to a regula,
or rule, to distinguish them from the “secular” clergy, who con-
tinued to live in the world (saeculum) and did not take the
monastic vows described above.

The home which the monks constructed for themselves was
called a monastery or abbey. This was arranged to meet their
particular needs and was usually at a considerable distance from
any town, in order to insure solitude and quiet.\(^1\) It was mod-
eled upon the general plan of the Roman country house. The
buildings were arranged around a court, called the cloister. On
all four sides of this was a covered walk, which made it possible
to reach all the buildings without exposing one’s self to either the
rain or the hot sun. Not only the Benedictines but all the orders
which sprang up in later centuries arranged their homes in
much the same way.

\(^1\) Later monasteries were sometimes built in towns, or just outside the walls.
On the north side of the cloister was the *church*, which always faced west. As time went on and certain groups of monks were given a great deal of property, they constructed very beautiful churches for their monasteries. Westminster Abbey was originally the church of a monastery lying outside the city of London, and there are in Great Britain many picturesque remains of ruined abbey churches which attract the attention of every traveler.

On the west side of the cloister were storerooms for provisions; on the south side, opposite the church, was the "refectory," or dining room, and a sitting room that could be warmed in cold weather. In the cloister near the dining room was a "lavatory" where the monk could wash his hands before meals. To the east of the cloister was the "dormitory," where the monks slept. This always adjoined the church, for the Rule required that the monks should hold services seven times a day.

**Fig. 138. Cloisters of Heiligenkreuz**

This picture of the cloister in the German monastery of Heiligenkreuz is chosen to show how the more ordinary monastery courts looked, with their pleasant sunny gardens.
One of these services, called vigils, came well before daybreak, and it was convenient when you were summoned in the darkness out of your warm bed to be able to go down a short passage that led from the dormitory into the choir of the church, where the service was held.

The Benedictine Rule provided that the monks should so far as possible have everything for their support on their own land.

**FIG. 139. MONASTERY OF VAL DI CRISTO**

This monastery in southern Spain has two cloisters, the main one lying to the left. One can see how the buildings were surrounded by vegetable gardens and an orchard which supplied the monks with food. Compare picture of another monastery (Fig. 151, below)

So outside the group of buildings around the cloister would be found the garden, the orchard, the mill, a fish pond, and fields for raising grain. There were also a hospital for the sick and a guest house for pilgrims or poor people who happened to come along. In the greater monasteries there were also quarters where a king or nobleman might spend a few nights in comfort.
Fig. 140. Melrose Abbey

The monastery at Melrose, Scotland, was founded in the eleventh century, but the church of which we here see the ruins was not built until about 1450. Sir Walter Scott in one of his well-known novels, The Monastery, describes his impressions of the way in which the monks lived.
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Section 57. Missionary Work of the Monks

The first great undertaking of the monks was the conversion of those German peoples who had not yet been won over to Christianity. These the monks made not merely Christians, but also dutiful subjects of the Pope. In this way the strength of the Roman Catholic Church was greatly increased. The first people to engage the attention of the monks were the heathen German tribes who had conquered the once Christian Britain.

The islands which are now known as the kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland were, at the opening of the Christian era, occupied by several Celtic peoples of whose customs and religion we know almost nothing. Julius Caesar commenced the conquest of the islands (55 B.C.); but the Romans never succeeded in establishing their power beyond the wall which they built, from the Clyde to the Firth of Forth, to keep out the wild tribes of the North. Even south of the wall the country was not completely Romanized, and the Celtic tongue has actually survived down to the present day in Wales (see p. 323, above).

At the opening of the fifth century the barbarian invasions forced Rome to withdraw its legions from Britain in order to protect its frontiers on the Continent. The island was thus left to be conquered gradually by the Germans, mainly Saxons and Angles, who came across the North Sea from the region south of Denmark. Almost all record of what went on during the two centuries following the departure of the Romans has disappeared. No one knows the fate of the original Celtic inhabitants of England. It was formerly supposed that they were all killed or driven to the mountain districts of Wales, but this seems unlikely. More probably they were gradually lost among the dominating Germans with whom they merged into one people. The Saxon and Angle chieftains established small kingdoms, of which there were seven or eight at the time when Gregory the Great became pope.
Gregory, while still a simple monk, had been struck with the beauty of some Angles whom he saw one day in the slave market at Rome. When he learned who they were he was grieved that such handsome beings should still belong to the kingdom of the Prince of Darkness, and he wished to go as a missionary to their people, but permission was refused him. So when he became Pope he sent forty monks to England under the leadership of a prior, named Augustine (who must not be confused with the church father of that name). The heathen king of Kent, in whose territory Augustine and his monks landed with fear and trembling (597), had a Christian wife, the daughter of a Frankish king. Through her influence the monks were kindly received and were given an ancient church at Canterbury, dating from the Roman occupation before the German invasions. Here they
established a monastery, and from this center the conversion, first of Kent and then of the whole island, was gradually accomplished. Canterbury has always maintained its early preëminence and may still be considered the religious capital of England.

England thus became a part of the ever-growing territory embraced in the Roman Catholic Church and remained for nearly a thousand years as faithful to the Pope as any other Catholic country.

The conversion of England by the missionaries from Rome was followed by a period of general enthusiasm for Rome and its literature and culture. The English monasteries became centers of learning unrivaled perhaps in the rest of Europe. A constant intercourse was maintained with Rome. Masons and glass-makers were brought across the Channel to replace the wooden churches of Britain by stone edifices in the style of the Romans. The young English clergy were taught Latin and sometimes Greek. Copies of the ancient classics were brought from the Continent and copied. The most distinguished writer of the seventh and early eighth centuries in Europe was the English monk Bæda (often called "The Venerable Bede," 673–735), from whose admirable history of the Church in England most of our information about the period is derived.

In 718 St. Boniface, an English monk, was sent by the Pope as a missionary to the Germans. After four years spent in reconnoitering the field of his future labors, he visited Rome and was made a missionary bishop, taking the same oath of obedience to the Pope that the bishops in the immediate vicinity of Rome were accustomed to take. Indeed, absolute subordination to the Pope was a part of his religion, and he became a powerful agent in extending the papal power.

Boniface succeeded in converting many of the more remote German tribes who still clung to their old pagan beliefs. His energetic methods are illustrated by the story of how he cut

1 See Readings, chap. v, for Gregory's instructions to his missionaries.
2 See Readings, chap. v.
down the sacred oak of the old German god Odin, at Fritzlar, in Hesse, and used the wood to build a chapel, around which a monastery soon grew up. In 732 Boniface was raised to the dignity of Archbishop of Mayence and proceeded to establish in the newly converted region a number of German bishoprics, Salzburg, Regensburg, Würzburg, and others; this gives us some idea of the geographical extent of his labors.

Section 58. Mohammed and his Religion

Just at the time that Gregory the Great was doing so much to strengthen the power and influence of the popes in Rome, a young Arab camel driver in far-away Mecca was meditating upon the mysteries of life and devising a religion which was destined to spread with astounding rapidity into Asia, Africa, and Europe and to become a great rival of Christianity. And to-day the millions who believe in Mohammed as God's greatest prophet are probably equal in number to those who are faithful to the Pope, as the head of the Catholic Church.

Before the time of Mohammed the Arabs (a branch of the great Semitic people) had played no great part in the world's history. The scattered tribes were constantly at war with one another, and each tribe worshiped its own gods, when it worshiped at all. Mecca was considered a sacred spot, however, and the fighting was stopped four months each year so that all could peacefully visit the Kaaba, a sort of temple full of idols and containing in particular a black stone, about as long as a man's hand, which was regarded as specially worthy of reverence.

Mohammed was poor and earned a living by conducting caravans across the desert. He was so fortunate as to find a rich widow in Mecca, named Kadijah, who gave him employment and later fell in love with him and became his wife. She was his first convert and kept up his courage when few of his fellow townsmen in Mecca were inclined to pay any attention to his new religious teachings.
As Mohammed traveled back and forth across the desert with his trains of camels heavily laden with merchandise he had plenty of time to think, and he became convinced that God was sending him messages which it was his duty to reveal to mankind. He met many Jews and Christians, of whom there were great numbers in Arabia, and from them he got some ideas of the Old and New Testaments. But when he tried to convince people that he was God's prophet, and that the Angel Gabriel had appeared to him in his dreams and told him of a new religion, he was treated with scorn. Finally, he discovered that his enemies in Mecca were planning to kill him, and he fled to the neighboring town of Medina, where he had friends. His flight, which took place in the year 622, is called the Hejira by the Arabs. It was taken by his followers as the beginning of a new era—the year One, as the Mohammedans reckon time.

A war followed between the people of Mecca and those who had joined Mohammed in and about Medina. It was eight years before his followers became numerous enough to enable him to march upon Mecca and take it with a victorious army. Before his death in 632 he had gained the support of all the Arab chiefs, and his new religion, which he called Islam (submission to God), was accepted throughout the whole Arabian peninsula.

Mohammed could probably neither write nor read well, but when he fell into trances from time to time he would repeat to his eager listeners the words which he heard from heaven, and they in turn wrote them down. These sayings, which were collected into a volume shortly after his death, form the Koran, the Mohammedan Bible. This contains the chief beliefs of the new religion as well as the laws under which all good Mohammedans were to live. It has been translated into English several times. Parts of it are very beautiful and interesting, while other portions are dull and stupid to a modern reader.

The Koran follows the Jewish and Christian religions in proclaiming one God, "the Lord of the worlds, the merciful and
Mohammed believed that there had been great prophets before him, — Abraham, Moses, and Jesus among others, — but that he himself was the last and greatest of God’s messengers, who brought the final and highest form of religion to mankind. He destroyed all the idols in the Kaaba at Mecca and forbade his followers to make any images whatsoever — but he left the black stone.

Besides serving the one God, the Mohammedan was to honor his parents, aid the poor, protect the orphan, keep his contracts, give full measure, and weigh with a just balance. He was not to walk proudly on the earth, or to be wasteful, “for the wasteful were ever the devil’s brothers.” He was to avoid, moreover, all strong drink, and this command has saved Mohammed’s faithful followers from the terrible degradation which alcohol has made so common in our Western world.

Besides obeying these and other commands the Mohammedan who would be saved must do five things: First, he must recite daily the simple creed, “There is no god but God, and
Mohammed is his prophet." Secondly, he must pray five times a day — just before sunrise, just after noon, before and after sunset, and when the day has closed. It is not uncommon to see in well-furnished houses in this country the so-called "prayer rugs" brought from Mohammedan countries. These are spread down on the ground or the flat roof of the oriental house, and on them the worshiper kneels to pray, turning his face toward Mecca and bowing his head to the ground. The pattern on the rug indicates the place where the bowed head is to be placed.

Thirdly, the Mohammedan must fast during the whole month of *ramadan*; he may neither eat nor drink from sunrise to sunset, for this is the month in which God sent Gabriel down from the seventh heaven to bring the Koran, which he revealed, paragraph by paragraph, to Mohammed.

Fourthly, the Mohammedan must give alms to the poor, and, fifthly, he must, if he can, make a pilgrimage to Mecca at least once during his lifetime. Tens of thousands of pilgrims flock to Mecca every year. They enter the great courtyard surrounding the Kaaba, which is a plain, almost cubical, building, supposed to have been built in the first place by Abraham. The sacred black stone is fixed in the outside wall at the southeast corner, and the pilgrims must circle the building seven times, kissing the black stone each time as they pass it (Fig. 144).
Mecca is situated in a barren, rocky region. The sacred building, called the Kaaba, lies in a vast court surrounded by a colonnade with minarets. Into the court the pilgrims are making their way to walk around the Kaaba seven times and kiss the black stone, embedded in the corner of the building, to the left, as we see it. The Kaaba is covered with a great cloth sent each year by the Egyptian government. The old weather-beaten cover is torn up and sold to the pilgrims for relics. The only entrance to the Kaaba is a little door seven feet from the ground, just under the edge of the cloth.
PLATE VI. STREET SCENE IN CAIRO
The Koran announces a day of judgment when the heavens shall be opened and the mountains be powdered and become like flying dust. Then all men shall receive their reward. Those who have refused to accept Islam shall be banished to hell to be burned and tormented forever. “They shall not taste therein coolness or drink, save scalding water and running sores,” and the scalding water they shall drink like thirsty camels.

Those, on the other hand, who have obeyed the Koran, especially those who die fighting for Islam, shall find themselves in a garden of delight. They shall recline in rich brocades upon soft cushions and rugs and be served by surpassingly beautiful maidens, with eyes like hidden pearls. Wine may be drunk there, but “their heads shall not ache with it, neither shall they be confused.” They shall be content with their past life and shall hear no foolish words; and there shall be no sin but only the greeting, “Peace, peace.”

The religion of Mohammed was much simpler than that of the medieval Christian Church; it did not provide for a priesthood or for any great number of ceremonies. The Mohammedan mosque, or temple, is a house of prayer and a place for reading the Koran; no altars or images or pictures of any kind are permitted in it. The mosques are often very beautiful buildings, especially in great Mohammedan cities, such as Jerusalem, Damascus, Cairo, and Constantinople. They have great courts surrounded by covered colonnades and are adorned with beautiful marbles and mosaics and delightful windows with bright stained glass. The walls are adorned with passages from the Koran, and the floors covered with rich rugs. They have one or more minarets from which the call to prayer is heard five times a day.

The Mohammedans, like other Eastern peoples, are very particular to keep the women by themselves in a separate part of the house, called the harem, or women’s quarters. They may not go out without the master’s permission and even then not without wearing a veil; no man must ever see a respectable woman’s face, except her father, brother, or husband. The Koran
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permits a man to have as many as four wives, but in practice only the men of the richer classes have more than one. For a woman to attempt to escape from the harem is a crime punishable with death. Sometimes the women seem to lead pleasant lives, but, for the most part, their existence is very monotonous.¹

Slaves are very common in Mohammedan countries, but once they are freed they are as good as any one else and may then hold the highest places in the government.

Section 59. Conquests of the Mohammedans; the Caliphate

Mohammed had occupied the position of pope and king combined, and his successors, who took the title of caliph (which means "successor" or "representative"), were regarded as the absolute rulers of the Mohammedans. Their word was law in both religious and worldly matters. Mohammed's father-in-law was the first caliph. His successor, Omar (634–644), led the Arabs forth to conquer Syria, Egypt, and the great empire of Persia. The capital of the caliphate was then transferred from Medina to Damascus, which occupied a far better position for governing the new realms. Although the Mohammedans were constantly fighting among themselves, they succeeded in extending their territory so as to include Asia Minor and the northern coast of Africa. A great part of the people whom they conquered accepted the new religion of the prophet.

Something over a hundred years after Mohammed's death a new line of caliphs came into power and established (762) a new capital on the river Tigris near the site of ancient Babylon. This new city of Bagdad became famous for its wealth, magnificence, and learning. It was five miles across and at one time is supposed to have had two millions of inhabitants. In the

¹ The colored plate (opp. p. 362) shows the minarets of a great mosque in Cairo. One can also see the gratings of the upper stories of the houses, through which the women can look out of their harem without being seen from the street.
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The ninth century it was probably the richest and most splendid city in the world.

The most entertaining example of Arabic literature which has been translated into English is the "Thousand and One Nights," or "The Arabian Nights' Entertainments," as it is commonly called. These include the story of "Sindbad the Sailor," "Aladdin and the Lamp," "Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves," and other famous tales. The great collection was got together in Egypt, perhaps in the fifteenth century, but many of the stories are very much older and were translated by the Arabs from the Persian, when the caliphs of Bagdad were at the height of their power. Some of these stories give one a lively idea of Mohammedan manners and customs.

The Mohammedans made two or three attempts to cross over from Asia into Europe and take Constantinople, the capital of the Eastern Empire, but failed. It was more than eight hundred years after Mohammed's death that the Turks, a Mohammedan people, succeeded in this, and Constantinople is now a Mohammedan city and the Sultan of Turkey is the nominal head of Islam. Long before the Turks captured Constantinople, however, the Arabs at the other end of the caliph's empire had succeeded in crossing the Strait of Gibraltar from Africa and possessing themselves of Spain.

The kingdom of the West Goths was in no condition to defend itself when a few Arabs and a much larger number of Berbers, inhabitants of northern Africa, ventured to invade Spain. Some of the Spanish towns held out for a time, but the invaders found allies in the numerous Jews, who had been shamefully treated by their Christian countrymen. As for the innumerable serfs who worked on the great estates of the aristocracy, a change of landlords made very little difference to them. In 711 the Arabs and Berbers gained a great battle, and the peninsula was gradually overrun by new immigrants from Africa.

In seven years the Mohammedans were masters of almost the whole region south of the Pyrenees. They then began to
cross into Gaul. For some years the Duke of Aquitaine kept them in check; but in 732 they collected a large army, defeated the duke near Bordeaux, advanced to Poitiers, and then set out for Tours.

Here they met the army of the Franks which Charles the Hammer (Martel), the king's chief minister, had brought together to meet the new danger. We know very little indeed of this famous battle of Tours, except that the Mohammedans were repulsed, and that they never again made any serious attempt to conquer western Europe beyond the Pyrenees. They retired to Spain and there developed a great and prosperous kingdom, far in advance of the Christian kingdoms to the north of them.

Some of the buildings which they erected soon after their arrival still stand. Among these is the mosque at Cordova with its forest of columns and arches. They also erected a great tower at Seville (Fig. 147). This has been copied by the architects of

1 The great mosque, which the Mohammedan rulers built at Cordova (Fig. 145) on the site of a Christian church of the West Goths, was second in size only

**Fig. 147. Giralda**

This tower, called the Giralda, was originally the great minaret of the chief mosque at Seville. It was built (1184–1196) out of Roman and West Gothic materials, and many Roman inscriptions are to be seen on the stones used for the walls. Originally the tower was lower than it now is. All the upper part, including the story where the bells hang, was rebuilt by the Christians after they drove the Moors out of the city.
Madison Square Garden in New York. The Mohammedans built beautiful palaces and laid out charming gardens. One of these palaces, the Alhambra, built at Granada some centuries after their arrival in Spain, is a marvel of lovely detail (Fig. 146). They also founded a great university at Cordova, to which Christians from the North sometimes went in search of knowledge.

Historians commonly regard it as a matter of great good luck that Charles the Hammer and his barbarous soldiers succeeded in defeating and driving back the Mohammedans at Tours. But had they been permitted to settle in southern France they might have developed science and art far more rapidly than did the Franks. It is difficult to say whether it was a good thing or a bad thing that the Moors, as the Mohammedans in Spain were called, did not get control of a portion of Gaul.

QUESTIONS

SECTION 56. What various reasons led men to enter monasteries? When and where did Christian monasteries originate? Give some of the chief provisions of St. Benedict's Rule. What is meant by the "regular" and the "secular" clergy? Why did the monks sometimes devote part of their time to copying books? Describe the general plan of a monastery.

SECTION 57. Tell about the conversion of the king of Kent. Did England become a part of the medieval Catholic Church?


SECTION 59. What countries did the Mohammedans conquer during the century following Mohammed's death? Where is Mecca, Bagdad, Damascus, Cordova? Tell what you can of the Moorish buildings in Spain.

to the Kaaba at Mecca (Fig. 144). It was begun about 785 and gradually enlarged and beautified during the following two centuries, with the hope that it would rival Mecca as a place of pilgrimage. The part represented in the illustration was built by Caliph Al-Hakim, who came to the throne in 961. The beautiful holy of holies (the entrance of which may be seen in the background) is richly adorned with magnificent mosaics. The whole mosque is 570 by 425 feet; that is, about the size of St. Peter's in Rome.
CHAPTER XV

CHARLEMAGNE AND HIS EMPIRE

Section 60. Conquests of Charlemagne

We have seen how the kings of the Franks, Clovis and his successors, conquered a large territory, including western Germany and what is called France to-day. As time went on, the king’s chief minister, who was called the Mayor of the Palace, got almost all the power into his hands and really ruled in the place of the king. Charles Martel, who defeated the Mohammedans at Tours in 732, was the Mayor of the Palace of the western Frankish king. His son, Pippin the Short, finally determined to do away altogether with the old line of kings and put himself in their place. Before taking the decisive step, however, he consulted the Pope. To Pippin’s question whether it was right that the old line of kings should continue to reign when they no longer had any power, the Pope replied: “It seems better that he who has the power in the State should be king, and be called king, rather than he who is falsely called king.” With this sanction, then (752), the Frankish counts and dukes, in accordance with the old German ceremony, raised Pippin on their shields, in somewhat the way college boys nowadays carry off a successful football player on their shoulders. He was then anointed king by St. Boniface, the apostle to the Germans, of whom we have spoken, and received the blessing of the Pope.¹

It would hardly be necessary to mention this change of dynasty in so short a history as this, were it not that the calling in of the

¹ The old line of kings which was displaced by Pippin is known as the Merovingian line. Pippin and his successors are called the Carolingian line.
Pope brought about a revolution in the ideas of kingship. The kings of the German tribes had hitherto usually been successful warriors who held their office with the consent of the people, or at least of the nobles. Their election was not a matter that concerned the Church at all. But when, after asking the Pope’s opinion, Pippin had the holy oil poured on his head,—in accordance with an ancient religious custom of the Jews,—first by Bishop Boniface and later by the Pope himself, he seemed to ask the Church to approve his usurpation. As the historian Gibbon puts it, “A German chieftain was transformed into the Lord’s anointed.” The Pope threatened with God’s anger any one who should attempt to supplant the consecrated family of Pippin.

It thus became a religious duty to obey the king and his successors. He came to be regarded by the Church, when he had received its approval, as God’s representative on earth. Here we have the beginning of the later theory of kings “by the grace of God,” against whom it was a sin to revolt, however bad they might be. We shall see presently how Pippin’s famous son Charlemagne received his crown from the hands of the Pope.

Charlemagne, who became king of all the Frankish realms in 771, is the first historical personage among the German peoples of whom we have any satisfactory knowledge.\(^1\) Compared with

\(^1\) “Charlemagne” is the French form for the Latin Carolus Magnus (Charles the Great). We must never forget, however, that Charlemagne was a German, that he talked a German language, namely Frankish, and that his favorite palaces at Aix-la-Chapelle, Ingelheim, and Nimwegen were in German regions.
him, Theodoric, Clovis, Charles Martel, Pippin, and the rest are but shadowy figures. The chronicles tell us something of their deeds, but we can make only the vaguest inferences in regard to their appearance or character.

Charlemagne's looks, as described by his secretary, so exactly correspond with the character of the king as exhibited in his reign that they are worthy of attention. He was tall and stoutly built; his face was round, his eyes were large and keen, his nose somewhat above the common size, his expression bright and cheerful. The good proportions and grace of his body prevented the observer from noticing that his neck was rather short and his person somewhat too stout. His voice was clear, but rather weak for his big body. He delighted in riding and hunting, and was an expert swimmer. His excellent health and his physical endurance can alone explain the astonishing swiftness with which he moved about his vast realm and conducted innumerable campaigns against his enemies in widely distant regions in rapid succession.
Charles was an educated man for his time, and one who knew how to appreciate and encourage scholarship. While at dinner he had some one read to him; he delighted especially in history, and in St. Augustine's *City of God*. He tried to learn writing, which was an unusual accomplishment at that time for any but churchmen, but began too late in life and got no farther than signing his name. He called learned men to his court and did much toward re-establishing a regular system of schools. He was also constantly occupied with buildings and other public works calculated to adorn his kingdom. He himself planned the remarkable cathedral at Aix-la-Chapelle and showed the greatest interest in its furnishings. He commenced two palaces, one near Mayence and the other at Nimwegen, in Holland, and had a long bridge constructed across the Rhine at Mayence.

The impression which his reign made upon men's minds continued to grow even after his death. He became the hero of a whole series of romantic adventures which were as firmly believed for centuries as his real deeds. In the fancy of an old monk in the monastery of St. Gall,1 writing of Charlemagne not long after his death, the king of the Franks swept over Europe surrounded by countless legions of soldiers who formed a very sea of bristling steel. Knights of superhuman valor formed his court and became the models of knighthood for the following centuries. Distorted but imposing, the Charlemagne of poetry meets us all through the Middle Ages.

A study of Charlemagne's reign will make clear that he was a truly remarkable person, one of the greatest figures in the world's records and deservedly the hero of the Middle Ages.

It was Charlemagne's ideal to bring all the German peoples together into one great Christian empire, and he was wonderfully successful in attaining his end. Only a small portion of what is now called Germany was included in the kingdom ruled

---

1 Professor Emerton (*Introduction*, pp. 183-185) gives an example of the style and spirit of the monk of St. Gall, who was formerly much relied upon for knowledge of Charlemagne.
over by Charlemagne's father, Pippin the Short. Frisia and Bavaria had been Christianized, and their rulers had been induced by the efforts of Charlemagne's predecessors and of the missionaries, especially Boniface, to recognize the overlordship of the Franks. Between these two half-independent countries lay the unconquered Saxons. They were as yet pagans and appear still to have clung to much the same institutions as those under which they had lived when the Roman historian Tacitus described them seven centuries earlier.

The Saxons occupied the region beginning somewhat east of Cologne and extending to the Elbe, and north to where the great cities of Bremen and Hamburg are now situated. They had no towns or roads and were consequently very difficult to conquer, as they could retreat, with their few possessions, into the forests or swamps as soon as they found themselves unable to meet an invader in the open field. Yet so long as they remained unconquered they constantly threatened the Frankish kingdom, and their country was necessary to the rounding out of its boundaries. Charlemagne never undertook, during his long military career, any other task half so serious as the subjugation of the Saxons, which occupied many years.

Nowhere do we find a more striking example of the influence of the Church than in the reliance that Charlemagne placed upon it in his dealings with the Saxons. He deemed it quite as essential that after a rebellion they should promise to honor the Church and be baptized, as that they should pledge themselves to remain true and faithful subjects of the king. He was in quite as much haste to found bishoprics and monasteries as to build fortresses. The law for the newly conquered Saxon lands issued some time between 775 and 790 provides the same death penalty for him who "shall have shown himself unfaithful to the lord king" and him who "shall scorn to come to baptism and shall wish to remain a pagan."

Charlemagne believed the Christianizing of the Saxons so important a part of his duty that he decreed that any one should
suffer death who broke into a church and carried off anything by force. No one, under penalty of heavy fines, was to make vows, in the pagan fashion, at trees or springs, or partake of any heathen feasts in honor of the demons (as the Christians termed the heathen gods), or fail to present infants for baptism before they were a year old.

These provisions are characteristic of the theory of the Middle Ages according to which the government and the Church went hand in hand in ordering and governing the life of the people. Disloyalty to the Church was regarded by the State as quite as serious a crime as treason against itself. While the claims of the two institutions sometimes conflicted, there was no question in the minds either of the king’s officials or of the clergy that both the civil and ecclesiastical governments were absolutely necessary; neither of them ever dreamed that they could get along without the other.

Before the Frankish conquest the Saxons had no towns. Now, around the seat of the bishop, or about a monastery, men began to collect, and towns and cities grew up. Of these the chief was Bremen, which is still one of the most important ports of Germany.

Summoned by the Pope to protect him from his old enemies the Lombards, Charlemagne invaded Lombardy in 773 with a great army and took Pavia, the capital, after a long siege. The Lombard king was forced to become a monk, and his treasure was divided among the Frankish soldiers. Charlemagne then took the extremely important step, in 774, of having himself recognized by all the Lombard dukes and counts as king of the Lombards.

So far we have spoken only of the relations of Charlemagne with the Germans, for even the Lombard kingdom was established by the Germans. He had, however, other peoples to deal with, especially the Slavs on the east (who were one day to build up the kingdoms of Poland and Bohemia and the vast Russian empire) and, on the opposite boundary of his dominion, the
Moors in Spain. Against these it was necessary to protect his realms, and the second part of Charlemagne’s reign was devoted to what may be called his foreign policy. A single campaign in 789 seems to have sufficed to subdue the Slavs, who lay to the north and east of the Saxons, and to force the Bohemians to acknowledge the supremacy of the Frankish king and pay tribute to him.

The necessity of protecting the Frankish realms against any new uprising of these non-German nations led to the establishment, on the confines of the kingdom, of marches, that is, districts under the military control of counts of the march, or margraves. Their business was to prevent any invasion of the interior of the kingdom. Much depended upon the efficiency of these men; in many cases they founded powerful families and later helped to break up the empire by establishing themselves as practically independent rulers.

At an assembly that Charlemagne held in 777, ambassadors appeared before him from certain dissatisfied Mohammedans in Spain. They had fallen out with the emir of Cordova and now offered to become the faithful subjects of Charlemagne if he would come to their aid. In consequence of this embassy he undertook his first expedition to Spain in the following year. After some years of war the district north of the Ebro was conquered by the Franks, and Charlemagne established there the Spanish march. In this way he began that gradual expulsion of the Mohammedans from the peninsula, which was to be carried on by slowly extending conquests until 1492, when Granada, the last Mohammedan stronghold, fell.

1 The king of Prussia still has, among other titles, that of Margrave of Brandenburg. The German word Mark is often used for “march” on maps of Germany.

2 The Mohammedan caliphate broke up in the eighth century, and the ruler of Spain first assumed the title of emir (about 756) and later (929) that of caliph. The latter title had originally been enjoyed only by the head of the whole Arab empire, who had his capital at Damascus, and later at Bagdad (see above, p. 364).
Section 61. Establishment of a Line of Emperors in the West

But the most famous of all the achievements of Charlemagne was his reëstablishment of the Western Empire in the year 800. It came about in this wise. Charlemagne went to Rome in that year to settle a dispute between Pope Leo III and his enemies. To celebrate the satisfactory settlement of the dispute, the Pope held a solemn service on Christmas Day in St. Peter's. As Charlemagne was kneeling before the altar during this service, the Pope approached him and set a crown upon his head, saluting him, amid the acclamations of those present, as "Emperor of the Romans."

The reasons for this extraordinary act, which Charlemagne insisted took him completely by surprise, are given in one of the Frankish histories, the Chronicles of Lorsch, as follows: "The name of Emperor had ceased among the Greeks, for they were under the reign of a woman [the Empress Irene], wherefore it seemed good both to Leo, the apostolic pope, and to the bishops who were in council with him, and to all Christian men, that they should name Charles, king of the Franks, as Emperor. For he held Rome itself, where the ancient Caesars had always dwelt, in addition to all his other possessions in Italy, Gaul, and Germany. Wherefore, as God had granted him all these dominions, it seemed just to all that he should take the title of Emperor, too, when it was offered to him at the wish of all Christendom."

Charlemagne appears to have accepted gracefully the honor thus thrust upon him. Even if he had no right to the imperial title, it was obviously proper and wise to grant it to him under the circumstances. Before his coronation by the Pope he was only king of the Franks and of the Lombards; but his conquests seemed to give him a right to a higher title which should include all his outlying realms.

The empire thus reëstablished in the West was considered to be a continuation of the Roman Empire founded by Augustus.
Charlemagne was reckoned the immediate successor of the Emperor at Constantinople, Constantine VI, whom Irene had deposed and blinded. Yet, it is hardly necessary to say that the position of the new Emperor had little in common with that of Augustus or Constantine. In the first place, the eastern emperors continued to reign in Constantinople for centuries, quite regardless of Charlemagne and his successors. In the second place, the German kings who wore the imperial crown after Charlemagne were generally too weak really to rule over Germany and northern Italy, to say nothing of the rest of western Europe. Nevertheless, the Western Empire, which in the twelfth century came to be called the Holy Roman Empire, endured for over a thousand years. It came to an end only in 1806, when the last of the emperors, wearied of his empty if venerable title, laid down the crown.

The assumption of the title of Emperor was destined to make the German rulers a great deal of trouble. It constantly led them into unsuccessful efforts to keep control over Italy, which really lay outside their natural boundaries. Then the circumstances under which Charlemagne was crowned made it possible for the popes to claim, later, that it was they who had transferred the imperial power from the old eastern line of emperors to Charlemagne and his family, and that this was a proof of their right to dispose of the crown as they pleased. The difficulties which arose necessitated many a weary journey to Rome for the emperors, and many unfortunate conflicts between them and the popes.

Section 62. How Charlemagne carried on his Government

The task of governing his vast dominions taxed even the highly gifted and untiring Charlemagne; it was quite beyond the power of his successors. The same difficulties continued to exist that had confronted Charles Martel and Pippin — above all, a scanty royal revenue and overpowerful officials, who were apt to neglect the interests and commands of their sovereign.
Charlemagne's income, like that of all medieval rulers, came chiefly from his royal estates, as there was no system of general taxation such as had existed under the Roman Empire. He consequently took the greatest care that his numerous plantations should be well cultivated, and that not even a turnip or an egg which was due him should be withheld. An elaborate set of regulations for his farms is preserved, which sheds much light upon the times.¹

The officials upon whom the Frankish kings were forced to rely chiefly were the counts, the "hand and voice of the king" wherever he could not be in person. They were expected to maintain order, see that justice was done in their district, and raise troops when the king needed them. On the frontier were the counts of the march, or margraves (marquises), already mentioned. These titles, together with that of duke, still exist as titles of nobility in Europe, although they are no longer associated with any governmental duties except in cases where their holders have the right to sit in the upper House of Parliament.

Charlemagne held assemblies of the nobles and bishops of his realm each spring or summer, at which the interests of the Empire were considered. With the sanction of his advisers he issued an extraordinary series of laws, called capitularies, a number of which have been preserved. With the bishops and abbots he discussed the needs of the Church, and, above all, the necessity of better schools for both the clergy and laity. The reforms which he sought to introduce give us an opportunity of learning the condition in which Europe found itself after four hundred years of disorder.

Charlemagne was the first important king since Theodoric to pay any attention to book learning. About 650 the supply of papyrus — the kind of paper that the Greeks and Romans used — had been cut off, owing to the conquest of Egypt by the Arabs, and as our kind of paper had not yet been invented,

¹ See extracts from these regulations, and an account of one of Charlemagne's farms, in Readings, chap. vii.
there was only the very expensive parchment to write upon. While this had the advantage of being more durable than papyrus, its high cost discouraged the copying of books. The eighth century—that immediately preceding Charlemagne's coronation—is commonly regarded as the most ignorant, the darkest, and the most barbarous period of the Middle Ages.

Yet, in spite of this dark picture, there was promise for the future. It was evident, even before Charlemagne's time, that Europe was not to continue indefinitely in the path of ignorance. Latin could not be forgotten, for that was the language of the Church, and all its official communications were in that tongue. Consequently it was absolutely necessary that the Church should maintain some sort of education in order that there might be persons who knew enough to write a Latin letter and conduct the church services. Some of those who learned Latin must have used it to read the old books written by the Romans. Then the textbooks of the later Roman Empire continued to be used, and these, poor as they were, contained something about grammar, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and other subjects.

It seemed to Charlemagne that it was the duty of the Church not only to look after the education of its own officers but to provide the opportunity of at least an elementary education for the people at large. In accordance with this conviction, he issued (789) an order to the clergy to gather together the children of both freemen and serfs in their neighborhood and establish schools "in which the boys may learn to read." 2

It would be impossible to say how many of the abbots and bishops established schools in accordance with Charlemagne's recommendations. It is certain that famous centers of learning existed at Tours, Fulda, Corbie, Orleans, and other places during his reign. Charlemagne further promoted the cause of education by the establishment of the famous "School of the palace" for the instruction of his own children and the sons of his nobles. He placed the Englishman Alcuin at the head of the school,
and called distinguished men from Italy and elsewhere as teachers. The best known of these was the historian Paulus Diaconus, who wrote a history of the Lombards, to which we owe most of what we know about them.

Charlemagne appears to have been particularly interested in the constant danger of mistakes in copying books, a task frequently turned over to ignorant and careless persons. He thought it very important that the religious books should be carefully copied. It should be noted that he made no attempt to revive the learning of Greece and Rome. He deemed it quite sufficient if the churchmen would learn their Latin well enough to read the church services and the Bible intelligently.

The hopeful beginning that was made under Charlemagne in the revival of education was destined to prove disappointing in its immediate results. It is true that the ninth century produced a few noteworthy men who have left works which indicate acuteness and mental training. But the break-up of Charlemagne's empire, the struggles between his descendants, the coming of new barbarians, and the disorder caused by the unruly feudal lords, who were not inclined to recognize any master, all combined to keep Europe back for at least two centuries more. Indeed, the tenth and the first half of the eleventh century seem, at first sight, little better than the seventh and the eighth. Yet ignorance and disorder never were quite so prevalent after, as they were before, Charlemagne.

QUESTIONS

**Section 60.** Explain the importance of the coronation of Pippin. Describe Charlemagne's appearance and character. How did the Church cooperate with Charlemagne in his efforts to incorporate the Saxons in his empire?

**Section 61.** What led to Charlemagne's becoming Emperor? What modern countries did his empire include?

**Section 62.** What were the chief sources of Charlemagne's revenue? How did titles of nobility originate in medieval Europe? What did Charlemagne do for education?
CHAPTER XVI

THE AGE OF DISORDER; FEUDALISM

Section 63. The Disruption of Charlemagne's Empire

It was a matter of great importance to Europe whether Charlemagne's extensive empire held together or fell apart after his death in 814. He does not seem to have had any expectation that it would hold together, because some years before his death he arranged that it should be divided among his three sons. But as two of these died before he did, it fell into the hands of the only surviving son, Louis, who succeeded his august father as king of all the various parts of the Frankish domains and was later crowned Emperor.

Louis, called "the pious," proved a feeble ruler. He tried all sorts of ways of dividing the Empire peaceably among his rebellious and unruly sons, but he did not succeed, and after his death they, and their sons as well, continued to fight over the question of how much each should have. It is not necessary to speak of the various temporary arrangements that were made. Finally, it was agreed in 870, by the Treaty of Mersen,
that there should be three states, a West Frankish kingdom, an East Frankish kingdom, and a kingdom of Italy. The West Frankish realm corresponded roughly with the present boundaries of France and Belgium. Its people talked dialects derived from the spoken Latin, which the Romans had introduced after their army, under the command of Julius Caesar, conquered Gaul. The East Frankish kingdom included the rest of Charlemagne’s empire outside of Italy and was German in language.

MAP OF TREATY OF Mersen

This map shows the division of Charlemagne’s empire made in 870 by his descendants in the Treaty of Mersen

Each of the three realms established by the Treaty of Mersen was destined finally to grow into one of the powerful modern states which we see on the map of Europe to-day, but hundreds of years elapsed before the kings grew strong enough to control their subjects, and the Treaty of Mersen was followed by several centuries of constant disorder and local warfare. Let us consider the difficulties which stood in the way of peace.
In the first place, a king found it very hard to get rapidly from one part of his realms to another in order to put down rebellions, for the remarkable roads which the Romans had so carefully constructed to enable their armies to move about had fallen into disrepair.

To have good roads one must be constantly working on them, for the rains wash them out and the floods carry away the bridges. As there was no longer a body of engineers employed by the government to keep up the roads and repair the bridges, they often became impassable. In the East Frankish kingdom matters must have been worse than in the West Frankish realm, for the Romans had never conquered Germany and consequently no good roads had ever been constructed there.

Besides the difficulty of getting about quickly and easily, the king had very little money. This was one of the chief troubles of the Middle Ages. There are not many gold or silver mines in western Europe, and there was no supply of precious metals from outside, for commerce had largely died out. So the king had no treasury from which to pay the many officials which an efficient government finds it necessary to employ to do its business and to keep order. As we have seen, he had to give his officers, the counts and margraves, land instead of money, and their land was so extensive that they tended to become rulers themselves within their own possessions.

Of course the king had not money enough to support a standing army, which would have enabled him to put down the constant rebellions of his distant officers and of the powerful and restless nobility, whose chief interest in life consisted in fighting.

In addition to the weakness and poverty of the kings there was another trouble,—and that the worst of all,—namely, the constant new invasions from all directions which kept all three parts of Charlemagne’s empire, and England besides, in a constant state of terror and disaster. These invasions were almost as bad as those which had occurred before Charlemagne’s time; they prevented western Europe from becoming peaceful and
prosperous and serve to explain the dark period of two hundred years which followed the break-up of Charlemagne’s empire.

We know how the Mohammedans had got possession of northern Africa and then conquered Spain, and how Charles Martel had frustrated their attempt to add Gaul to their possessions. But this rebuff did not end their attacks on southern Europe. They got control of the Island of Sicily shortly after

![Amphitheater at Arles in the Middle Ages](image)

**Fig. 150. Amphitheater at Arles in the Middle Ages**

The great Roman amphitheater at Arles (built probably in the first or second century) is about fifteen hundred feet in circumference. During the eighth century, when the Mohammedans were invading southern France, it was converted into a fortress. Many of the inhabitants settled inside its walls, and towers were constructed, which still stand. The picture shows it before the dwellings were removed, about 1830.

Charlemagne’s death, and then began to terrorize Italy and southern France. Even Rome itself suffered from them. The accompanying picture shows how the people of Arles, in southern France, built their houses inside the old Roman amphitheater in order to protect themselves from these Mohammedan invaders.

On the east the German rulers had constantly to contend with the Slavs. Charlemagne had defeated them in his time, as
This famous monastery, now in the midst of Paris, was formerly outside of the walls when the town was much smaller, and was fortified, as shown in the picture, with a moat (C) and drawbridge (D). One can see the abbey church (A), which still stands; the cloister (E); the refectory, or dining room (E); and the long dormitory (G). It was common in the age of disorder to fortify monasteries and sometimes even churches, as nothing was so sacred as to protect it from the danger of attack.
mentioned above, but they continued to make much trouble for two centuries at least. Then there were also the Hungarians, a savage race from Asia, who ravaged Germany and northern Italy and whose wild horsemen penetrated even into the West Frankish kingdom. Finally, they were driven back eastward and settled in the country now named after them — Hungary.

And lastly there came the Northmen, bold and adventurous pirates from the shores of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. These skillful and daring seamen not only attacked the towns on the coast of the West Frankish kingdom but made their way up the rivers, plundering and burning the villages and towns as far inland as Paris. In England we shall find them, under the name of Danes, invading the country and forcing Alfred the Great to recognize them as the masters of northern England.¹

So there was danger always and everywhere. If rival nobles were not fighting one another, there were foreign invaders of some kind devastating the country, bent on robbing, maltreating, and enslaving the people whom they found in towns and villages and monasteries. No wonder that strong castles had to be built and the towns surrounded by walls; even the monasteries, which were not of course respected by pagan invaders, were in some cases protected by fortifications.

In the absence of a powerful king with a well-organized army at his back, each district was left to look out for itself. Doubtless many counts, margraves, bishops, and other great landed proprietors, who were gradually becoming independent princes, earned the loyalty of the people about them by taking the lead in defending the country against its invaders and by establishing fortresses as places of refuge when the community was hard pressed. These conditions serve to explain why such government as continued to exist during the centuries following the death of Charlemagne was necessarily carried on mainly, not by the king and his officers, but by the great landholders.

¹ These Scandinavian pirates are often called vikings, from their habit of leaving their long boats in the vik, which meant, in their language, "bay" or "inlet."
Section 64. The Medieval Castle

As one travels through England, France, or Germany today he often comes upon the picturesque ruins of a medieval castle perched upon some rocky cliff and overlooking the surrounding country for miles. As he looks at the thick walls often surrounded by a deep, wide trench once filled with water,

![Fig. 152. A Medieval Castle near Klagenfurt, Austria](image)

It was not uncommon in mountainous regions to have fortresses perched so high on rocky eminences that it was practically impossible to capture them

and observes the great towers with their tiny windows, he cannot but wonder why so many of these forts were built, and why people lived in them. It is clear that they were never intended to be dwelling places for the peaceful households of private citizens; they look rather like the fortified palace of a ruler.

Obviously, whoever lived there was in constant expectation of being attacked by an army, for otherwise he would never have
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gone to the trouble and expense of shutting himself up in those dreary, cold, stone rooms, behind walls from ten to twenty feet thick. We can picture the great hall of the castle crowded with the armed followers of the master of the house, ready to fight for him when he wished to make war on a neighbor; or if he himself were attacked, they would rush to the little windows and shoot arrows at those who tried to approach, or

**Fig. 153. Machine for Hurling Stones**

This was a medieval device for throwing stones and bolts of iron, which were often heated red hot before they were fired. It consisted of a great bow (A) and the beam (B), which was drawn back by the windlass (C) turned by a crank applied at the point (D). Then a stone was put in the pocket (F) and the trigger pulled by means of the string (E). This let the beam fly up with a bang against the bumper, and the missile went sailing against the wall or over it among the defenders of the castle

pour lighted pitch or melted lead down on their enemies if they were so bold as to get close enough to the walls.

The Romans had been accustomed to build walls around their camps, and a walled camp was called *castrum*; and in such names as Rochester, Winchester, Gloucester, Worcester, we have reminders of the fact that these towns were once fortresses. These camps, however, were all *government* fortifications and did not belong to private individuals.
But as the Roman Empire grew weaker and the disorder caused by the incoming barbarians became greater, the various counts and dukes and even other large landowners began to build forts for themselves, usually nothing more than a great round mound of earth surrounded by a deep ditch and a wall made of stakes interwoven with twigs. On the top of the mound was a wooden fortress, surrounded by a fence or palisade.

**FIG. 154. MEDIEVAL BATTERING-RAM**

This is a simple kind of battering-ram, which was trundled up to the walls of a besieged castle and then swung back and forth by a group of soldiers, with the hope of making a breach. The men were often protected by a covering over the ram similar to the one at the foot of the mound. This was the type of "castle" that prevailed for several centuries after Charlemagne's death. There are no remains of these wooden castles in existence, for they were not the kind of thing to last very long, and those that escaped being burned or otherwise destroyed, rotted away in time.

About the year 1100 these wooden buildings began to be replaced by great square stone towers. This was due to the fact that the methods of attacking castles had so changed that wood was no longer a sufficient protection. The Romans when they besieged a walled town were accustomed to hurl great stones and heavy-pointed stakes at the walls and over them. They had ingenious machines for this purpose, and they also had ways of...
This attacking tower was rolled up to the wall of the besieged town after the moat had been filled up at the proper point. The soldiers then swarmed up the outside and over a bridge onto the wall. Skins of animals were hung on the side to prevent the tower from being set on fire.
protecting their soldiers when they crept up to the walls with their battering-rams and pickaxes in the hope of making a breach and so getting into the town. But the German barbarians who overran the Roman Empire were unaccustomed to these machines, which therefore had fallen into disuse. But the practice of taking towns by means of them was kept up in the Eastern Empire, and during the Crusades, which, as we shall see, began about 1100 (see Chapter XIX, below), they were introduced once more into western Europe, and this is the reason why stone castles began to be built about that time.

A square tower (Fig. 156) can, however, be more easily attacked than a round tower, which has no corners, so a century later round towers became the rule and continued to be used until about the year 1500, when gunpowder and cannon had become so common that even the strongest castle could no longer be defended.

**Fig. 156. Tower of Beaugency**

This square donjon not far from Orléans, France, is one of the very earliest square towers that survive. It is a translation into stone of the wooden donjons that prevailed up to that time. It was built about 1100, just after the beginning of the First Crusade. It is about 76 by 66 feet in size and 115 feet high.
for it could not withstand the force of cannon balls. The accompanying pictures give an idea of the stone castles built from about 1100 to 1450 or 1500. They also show how a stone-throwing machine, such as was used before the invention of cannon, was constructed (Fig. 153).

As we have no remains or good pictures of the early wooden castles on a mound, we must get our notions of the arrangement of a castle from the later stone fortresses, many of which can still be found in Europe. When the castle was not on a steep rocky hill, which made it very hard to approach, a deep ditch was constructed outside the walls, called the moat. This was filled with water and crossed by a bridge, which could be drawn up when the castle was attacked, leaving no way of getting across. The doorway was further protected by a grating of heavy planks, called the portcullis, which could be quickly dropped down to close the entrance (Fig. 157). Inside the castle walls was the great donjon, or chief tower, which had several stories, although one would not suspect it from its plain exterior. There was sometimes also a fine hall, as at Coucy (Fig. 158), and handsome rooms for the use of the lord and his family, but sometimes they lived in the donjon. There were buildings for storing supplies and arms, and usually a chapel.
This castle of Coucy-le-Château was built by a vassal of the king of France in the thirteenth century. It is at the end of a hill and protected on all sides but one by steep cliffs. One can see the moat ($A$) and the double drawbridge and towers which protected the portal. The round donjon ($B$) is probably the largest in the world, 100 feet in diameter and 210 feet high. At the base its walls are 34 feet thick. At the end of the inner court ($C$) was the residence of the lord ($D$). To the left of the court was a great hall, and to the right were the quarters of the garrison.
Section 65. The Serfs and the Manor

Obviously the owner of the castle had to obtain supplies to support his family and servants and armed men. He could not have done this had he not possessed extensive tracts of land. A great part of western Europe in the time of Charlemagne appears to have been divided into great estates or plantations.

These medieval estates were called *vil* or *manors*, and closely resembled the Roman villas described in an earlier chapter. The peasants who tilled the soil were called *villains*, a word derived from *vil*. A portion of the estate was reserved by the lord for his own use; the rest of it was divided up among the peasants, usually in long strips, of which each peasant had several scattered about the manor.

The peasants were generally serfs, who did not own their fields, but could not, on the other hand, be deprived of them so long as they worked for the lord and paid him certain dues. They were attached to the land and went with it when it changed hands. The serfs were required to till those fields which the lord reserved for himself and to gather in his crops. They might not marry without their lord's permission. Their wives and daughters helped with the indoor work of the manor house. In the women's buildings the women serfs engaged in spinning, weaving, sewing, baking, and brewing, thus producing clothes, food, and drink for the whole community.

We get our clearest ideas of the position of the serfs from the ancient descriptions of manors, which give an exact account of what each member of a particular community owed to the lord. For example, we find that the abbot of Peterborough held a manor upon which Hugh Miller and seventeen other serfs, mentioned by name, were required to work for him three days in each week during the whole year, except one week at Christmas, one at Easter, and one at Whitsuntide. Each serf was to give the lord abbot one bushel of wheat and eighteen

---

1 See above, p. 290.
sheaves of oats, three hens, and one cock yearly, and five eggs at Easter. If he sold his horse for more than ten shillings, he was to give the said abbot fourpence. Five other serfs, mentioned by name, held but half as much land as Hugh and his companions, by paying and doing in all respects half as much service.

One of the most remarkable characteristics of the manor was its independence of the rest of the world. It produced nearly

![Fig. 159. Pierrefonds](image)

This castle of Pierrefonds, not very far from Paris, was built by the brother of the king of France, about 1400. It has been very carefully restored in modern times and gives one a good idea of the way in which the feudal lords of that period lived. Within the walls are a handsome central courtyard and magnificent apartments

everything that its members needed, and might almost have continued to exist indefinitely without communication with those who lived beyond its bounds. Little or no money was necessary, for the peasants paid what was due to the lord in the form of labor and farm products. They also rendered the needful help to one another and found little occasion for buying and selling.
There was almost no opportunity to better one's condition, and life must have gone on for generation after generation in a weary routine. And the life was not merely monotonous, it was wretched. The food was coarse and there was little variety, as the peasants did not even take pains to raise fresh vegetables. The houses usually had but one room, which was ill-lighted by a single little window and had no chimney.

The increased use of money in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, which came with the awakening trade and industry, tended to break up the manor. The old habit of trading one thing for another without the intervention of money began to disappear. As time went on, neither the lord nor the serf was satisfied with the old system, which had answered well enough in the time of Charlemagne. The serfs, on the one hand, began to obtain money by the sale of their products in the markets of neighboring towns. They soon found it more profitable to pay the lord a certain sum instead of working for him, for they could then turn their whole attention to their own farms.

The landlords, on the other hand, found it to their advantage to accept money in place of the services of their tenants. With this money the landlord could hire laborers to cultivate his fields and could buy the luxuries which were brought to his notice as commerce increased. So it came about that the lords gradually gave up their control over the peasants, and there was no longer very much difference between the serf and the freeman who paid a regular rent for his land. A serf might also gain his liberty by running away from his manor to a town. If he remained undiscovered, or was unclaimed by his lord, for a year and a day, he became a freeman.\(^1\)

\(^1\) The slow extinction of serfdom in western Europe appears to have begun as early as the twelfth century. A very general emancipation had taken place in France by the end of the thirteenth century, though there were still some serfs in France when the Revolution came in 1789. Germany was far more backward in this respect. We find the peasants revolting against their hard lot in Luther's time (1524–1525), and it was not until the beginning of the nineteenth century that the serfs were freed in Prussia.
These manors served to support their lords and left them free to busy themselves fighting with other landowners in the same position as themselves.

**Section 66. Feudal System**

Landholders who had large estates and could spare a portion of them were accustomed to grant some of their manors to another person on condition that the one receiving the land would swear to be true to the giver, should fight for him on certain occasions, and should lend him aid when particular difficulties arose. It was in this way that the relation of lord and vassal originated. The vassal who received the land pledged himself to be true to his lord, and the lord, on the other hand, not only let his vassal have the land but agreed to protect him when it was necessary. These arrangements between vassals and lords constituted what is called the feudal system.

The feudal system, or feudalism, was not established by any decree of a king or in virtue of any general agreement between all the landowners. It grew up gradually and irregularly without any conscious plan on any one's part, simply because it seemed convenient and natural under the circumstances. The owner of vast estates found it to his advantage to parcel them out among vassals, that is to say, men who agreed to accompany him to war, guard his castle upon occasion, and assist him when he was put to any unusually great expense. Land granted upon the terms mentioned was called a fief. One who held a fief might himself become a lord by granting a portion of his fief to a vassal upon terms similar to those upon which he held his lands of his lord, or suzerain.

The vassal of a vassal was called a subvassal. There was still another way in which the number of vassals was increased. The owners of small estates were usually in a defenseless condition, unable to protect themselves against the attacks of the great nobles. They consequently often deemed it wise to put
their land into the hands of a neighboring lord and receive it back from him as a fief. They thus became his vassals and could call upon him for protection.

The one proposing to become a vassal knelt before the lord and rendered him homage\(^1\) by placing his hands between those of the lord and declaring himself the lord’s “man” for such and such a fief. Thereupon the lord gave his vassal the kiss of peace and raised him from his kneeling posture. Then the vassal swore an oath of fidelity upon the Bible, or some holy relic, solemnly binding himself to fulfill all his duties toward his lord. This act of rendering homage by placing the hands in those of the lord and taking the oath of fidelity was the first and most essential duty of the vassal (Fig. 160). For a vassal to refuse to do homage for his fief when it changed hands amounted to a declaration of revolt and independence.

The obligations of the vassal varied greatly.\(^2\) He was expected to join his lord when there was a military expedition on foot, although it was generally the case that the vassal need not serve at his own expense for more than forty days. The rules in regard to the length of time during which a vassal might be called upon to guard the castle of his lord varied almost infinitely.

Besides the military service due from the vassal to his lord, he was expected to attend the lord’s court when summoned. There he sat with other vassals to hear and pronounce upon those cases in which his fellow vassals were involved. Moreover,

\(^1\) “Homage” is derived from the Latin word *homo*, meaning “man.”

\(^2\) The conditions upon which fiefs were granted might be dictated either by interest or by mere fancy. Sometimes the most fantastic and seemingly absurd obligations were imposed. We hear of vassals holding on condition of attending the lord at supper with a tall candle, or furnishing him with a great yule log at Christmas. Perhaps the most extraordinary instance upon record is that of a lord in Guienne who solemnly declared upon oath, when questioned by the commissioners of Edward I, that he held his fief of the king upon the following terms: When the lord king came through his estate he was to accompany him to a certain oak. There he must have waiting a cart loaded with wood and drawn by two cows without any tails. When the oak was reached, fire was to be applied to the cart and the whole burned up, “unless mayhap the cows make their escape.”
he had to give the lord the benefit of his advice when required, and attend him upon solemn occasions.

Under certain circumstances vassals had to make money payments to their lord; as, for instance, when the lord was put to extra expense by the necessity of knighting his eldest son or providing a dowry for his daughter, or when he was captured by an enemy and was held for ransom. Lastly, the vassal might have to entertain his lord should he be passing his castle. There are amusingly detailed accounts in some of the feudal contracts of exactly how often the lord might come, how many followers he might bring, and what he should have to eat.

There were fiefs of all kinds and of all grades of importance, from that of a duke or count, who held directly of the king and exercised the powers of a practically independent prince, down to the holding of the simple knight, whose bit of land, cultivated by peasants or serfs, was barely sufficient to enable him to support himself and provide the horse upon which he rode to perform his military service for his lord.

It is essential to observe that the fief was not granted for a certain number of years, or simply for the life of the grantee, to go back at his death to the owner. On the contrary, it became

*Fig. 160. Ceremony of Homage.*

This is a modern picture of the way in which the ceremony of homage took place. The new vassal is putting his hands between those of his lord. To the left are retainers in their chain armor, and back of the lord and his lady is the jester, or court fool, whose business it is to amuse his master when he needs entertainment.
The hereditary character of fiefs and its consequences

hereditary in the family of the vassal and passed down to the eldest son from one generation to another. So long as the vassal remained faithful to his lord and performed the stipulated services, and his successors did homage and continued to meet the conditions upon which the fief had originally been granted, neither the lord nor his heirs could rightfully regain possession of the land.

The result was that little was left to the original owner of the fief except the services and dues to which the practical owner, the vassal, had agreed in receiving it. In short, the fief came really to belong to the vassal, and only the shadow of ownership remained in the hands of the lord. Nowadays the owner of land either makes some use of it himself or leases it for a definite period at a fixed money rent. But in the Middle Ages most of the land was held by those who neither really owned it nor paid a regular rent for it, and yet who could not be deprived of it by the nominal owner or his successors.

Obviously the great vassals who held directly of the king became almost independent of him as soon as their fiefs were granted to them and their descendants. Their vassals, since they had not done homage to the king himself, often paid little attention to his commands. From the ninth to the thirteenth century, the king of France or the king of Germany did not rule over a great realm occupied by subjects who owed him obedience as their lawful sovereign, paid him taxes, and were bound to fight under his banner as the head of the State. As a feudal landlord himself, the king had a right to demand fidelity and certain services from those who were his vassals. But the great mass of the people over whom he nominally ruled, whether they belonged to the nobility or not, owed little to the king directly, because they lived upon the lands of other feudal lords more or less independent of him.
Section 67. Neighborhood Warfare in the Middle Ages

One has only to read a chronicle of the time to discover that brute force governed almost everything outside of the Church. The feudal obligations were not fulfilled except when the lord was sufficiently powerful to enforce them. The oath of fidelity was constantly broken, and faith was violated by both vassal and lord.

It often happened that a vassal was discontented with his lord and transferred his allegiance to another. This he had a right to do under certain circumstances, as, for instance, when his lord refused to see that justice was done him in his court. But such changes were generally made merely for the sake of the advantages which the faithless vassal hoped to gain. The records of the time are full of accounts of refusal to do homage, which was the commonest way in which a vassal revolted from his lord. So soon as a vassal felt himself strong enough to face his lord’s displeasure, or when the lord was a helpless child, the vassal was apt to declare his independence by refusing to recognize as his lord the one from whom he had received his land.

We may say that war, in all its forms, was the law of the feudal world. War formed the chief occupation of the restless nobles who held the land and were supposed to govern it. An enterprising vassal was likely to make war upon each of the lords to whom he had done homage; secondly, upon the bishops and abbots with whom he was brought into contact, and whose control he particularly disliked; thirdly, upon his fellow vassals; and lastly, upon his own vassals. The feudal bonds, instead of offering a guarantee of peace and concord, appear to have been a constant cause of violent conflict. Every one was bent upon profiting by the permanent or temporary weakness of his neighbor. This chronic fighting extended even to members of the same family; the son, anxious to enjoy a part of his heritage immediately, warred against his father, younger brothers against
older, and nephews against uncles who might seek to deprive them of their rights.

In theory, the lord could force his vassals to settle their disputes in an orderly manner before his court; but often he was neither able nor inclined to bring about a peaceful adjustment, and he would frequently have found it hard to enforce the decisions of his own court. So the vassals were left to fight out their quarrels among themselves, and they found their chief interest in life in so doing. War was practically sanctioned by law. This is shown by two striking examples. The great French code of laws of the thirteenth century and the Golden Bull, a most important body of law drawn up for Germany in 1356, did not prohibit neighborhood war, but merely provided that it should be conducted in what was considered a decent and gentlemanly way.

Justs and tourneys were military exercises — play wars — to fill out the tiresome periods which occasionally intervened between real wars. They were, in fact, diminutive battles in which whole troops of hostile nobles sometimes took part. These rough plays called down the condemnation of the popes and even of the kings. The latter, however, were much too fond of the sport themselves not to forget promptly their own prohibitions.

The horrors of this constant fighting led the Church to try to check it. About the year 1000 several Church councils in southern France decreed that the fighters were not to attack churches or monasteries, churchmen, pilgrims, merchants, and women, and that they must leave the peasant and his cattle and plow alone. Then Church councils began to issue what was known as the "Truce of God," which provided that all warfare was to stop during Lent and various other holy days as well as on Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday of every week. During the truce no one was to attack any one else. Those besieging castles were to refrain from any assaults during the period of peace, and people were to be allowed to go quietly to and fro on their business without being disturbed by soldiers.
If any one failed to observe the truce, he was to be excommunicated by the Church—if he fell sick no Christian should dare to visit him, and on his deathbed he was not to receive the comfort of a priest, and his soul was consigned to hell if he had refused to repent and mend his ways. It is hard to say how much good the Truce of God accomplished. Some of the bishops and even the heads of great monasteries liked fighting pretty well themselves. It is certain that many disorderly lords paid little attention to the truce, and found three days a week altogether too short a time for plaguing their neighbors.

Yet we must not infer that the State ceased to exist altogether during the centuries of confusion that followed the break-up of Charlemagne’s empire, or that it fell entirely apart into little local governments independent of each other. In the first place, a king always retained some of his ancient majesty. He might be weak and without the means to enforce his rights and to compel his more powerful subjects to meet their obligations toward him. Yet he was, after all, the king, solemnly anointed by the Church as God’s representative on earth. He was always something more than a feudal lord. The kings were destined to get the upper hand before many centuries in England, France, and Spain, and finally in Italy and Germany, and to destroy the castles behind whose walls their haughty nobles had long defied the royal power.

QUESTIONS

Section 63. What led to the breaking up of Charlemagne’s empire? What is the importance of the Treaty of Mersen? What were the chief obstacles that prevented a king in the early Middle Ages from really controlling an extensive realm? What invasions occurred in western Europe after Charlemagne’s time? Tell what you can of the Northmen.

Section 64. Describe the changes that took place during the Middle Ages in the method of constructing castles. Describe the arrangement of a castle.
Section 65. What was a manor, and what Roman institution did it resemble? What was a serf? What were the chief services that a serf owed to his master? What effect did the increased use of money have upon serfdom?

Section 66. Define "lord," "vassal," "fief," "homage," "feudalism." What services did a vassal owe to his lord? What effects did feudalism have upon the power of the kings?

Section 67. What is meant by neighborhood warfare? Why was it very common in the Middle Ages? What was the Truce of God?
CHAPTER XVII

ENGLAND IN THE MIDDLE AGES

Section 68. The Norman Conquest

The country of western Europe whose history is of greatest interest to English-speaking peoples is, of course, England. From England the United States and the vast English colonies have inherited their language and habits of thought, much of their literature, and many of their laws and institutions. In this volume it will not, however, be possible to study England except in so far as it has played a part in the general development of Europe. This it has greatly influenced by its commerce and industry and colonies, as well as by the example it was the first to set in modern times of permitting the people to share with the king in the government.

The conquest of the island of Britain by the German Angles and Saxons has already been spoken of, as well as the conversion of these pagans to Christianity by Augustine and his monks. The several kingdoms founded by the German invaders were brought under the overlordship of the southern kingdom of Wessex by Egbert, a contemporary of Charlemagne.

But no sooner had the long-continued invasions of the Germans come to an end and the country been partially unified than the Northmen (or Danes, as the English called them), who were ravaging France (see above, p. 386), began to make incursions into England. Before long they had conquered a large district north of the Thames and were making permanent settlements. They were defeated, however, in a great battle by Alfred the Great, the first English king of whom we have any

1 See above, pp. 355 f.
satisfactory knowledge. He forced the Danes to accept Christianity, and established, as the boundary between their settlements and his own kingdom of Wessex, a line running from London across the island to Chester.

But more Danes kept coming, and the Danish invasions continued for more than a century after Alfred's death (901). Sometimes they were bought off by a money payment called the *Dane geld*, which was levied on the people of England like any other tax. But finally a Danish king (Cnut) succeeded in making himself king of England in 1017. This Danish dynasty maintained itself, however, for only a few years. Then a last weak Saxon king, Edward the Confessor, reigned for twenty years.

Upon his death one of the greatest events in all English history occurred. The most powerful of the vassals of the king of France crossed the English Channel, conquered England, and made himself king. This was William, Duke of Normandy.

We have seen how Charlemagne's empire broke up, and how the feudal lords became so powerful that it was difficult for the king to control them. The West Frankish kingdom, which we shall hereafter call France, was divided up among a great many dukes and counts, who built strong castles, gathered armies and fought against one another, and were the terror alike of priest, merchant, and laborer. (See above, sections 63 and 67.)

In the tenth century certain great fiefs, like Normandy, Brittany, Flanders, and Burgundy, developed into little nations, each under its line of able rulers. Each had its own particular customs and culture, some traces of which may still be noted by the traveler in France. These little feudal states were created by certain families of nobles who possessed exceptional energy or statesmanship. By conquest, purchase, or marriage they increased the number of their fiefs, and they insured their control over their vassals by promptly destroying the castles of those who refused to meet their obligations.

Of these subnations none was more important or interesting than Normandy. The Northmen had been the scourge of those
who lived near the North Sea for many years before one of their leaders, Rollo (or Hrolf), agreed in 911 to accept from the West Frankish king a district on the coast, north of Brittany, where he and his followers might peacefully settle. Rollo assumed the title of Duke of the Normans, and introduced the Christian religion among his people. For a considerable time the newcomers kept up their Scandinavian habits and language. Gradually, however, they appropriated such culture as their neighbors possessed, and by the twelfth century their capital, Rouen, was one of the most enlightened cities of Europe. Normandy became a source of infinite perplexity to the French kings when, in 1066, Duke William added England to his possessions and the title of "the Conqueror" to his name; for he thereby became so powerful that his overlord, the king of France, could hardly hope to control the Norman dukes any longer.

William of Normandy claimed that he was entitled to the English crown, but we are somewhat in the dark as to the basis of his claim. There is a story that he had visited the court of Edward the Confessor and had become his vassal on condition that, should Edward die childless, he was to declare William his successor. However this may be, Harold of Wessex assumed the crown upon Edward's death and paid no attention to William's demand that he should surrender it.

William thereupon appealed to the Pope, promising that if he came into possession of England, he would see that the English clergy submitted to the authority of the Roman bishop. Consequently the Pope, Alexander II, condemned Harold and blessed in advance any expedition that William might undertake to secure his rights. The conquest of England therefore took on the character of a sort of holy war, and as the expedition had been well advertised, many adventurers flocked to William's standard. During the spring and summer of 1066 ships were building in the various Norman harbors for the purpose of carrying William's army across the Channel.
Harold, the English king, was in a very unfavorable position to defend his crown. In the first place, while he was expecting William’s coming, he was called to the north of England to repel a last invasion of the fierce Northmen, who had again landed in England and were devastating the coast towns. He was able to put them to flight, but as he was celebrating his victory by a banquet, news reached him that William had actually landed with his Normans in southern England. It was autumn now and the peasants, who formed a large part of Harold’s forces, had gone home to harvest their crops, so he had to hurry south with an insufficient army.

The English occupied the hill of Senlac, west of Hastings, and
awaited the coming of the enemy. They had few horses and fought on foot with their battle-axes. The Normans had horses, which they had brought across in their ships, and were supplied with bows and arrows. The English fought bravely and repulsed the Normans as they tried to press up the hillside. But at last they were thrown into confusion, and King Harold was killed by a Norman arrow which pierced his eye.

William thus destroyed the English army in this famous battle of Hastings, and the rightful English king was dead. But the Norman duke was not satisfied to take possession of England as a conqueror merely. In a few weeks he managed to induce a number of influential nobles and several bishops to agree to accept him as king, and London opened its gates to him. On Christmas Day, 1066, he was chosen king by an assembly in Westminster Abbey (where Harold had been elected a year before) and was duly crowned.

In the Norman town of Bayeux a strip of embroidery is preserved some two hundred and thirty feet long and eighteen inches wide. If it was not made by Queen Matilda, William's wife, and her ladies, as some have supposed, it belongs at any rate to the time of the Norman conquest of England, which it pictures with much detail. The accompanying colored reproduction of two scenes shows the Normans landing with their horses from their ships on the English coast and starting for the battle field of Hastings, and, in the second scene, the battle in actual progress; the English are on their hill, trying to drive back the invaders. While the ladies could not draw very well, historians are able to get some ideas of the time from their embroidery.

We cannot trace the history of the opposition and the revolts of the great nobles which William had to meet within the next few years. His position was rendered doubly difficult by troubles which he encountered on the Continent as Duke of Normandy. Suffice it to say, that he succeeded in maintaining himself against all his enemies.
William’s policy in England exhibited profound statesmanship. He introduced the Norman feudalism to which he was accustomed, but took good care that it should not weaken his power. The English, who had refused to join him before the battle of Hastings, were declared to have forfeited their lands, but were permitted to keep them upon condition of receiving them back from the king as his vassals. The lands of those who actually fought against him at Hastings, or in later rebellions, including the great estates of Harold’s family, were seized and distributed among his faithful followers, both Norman and English, though naturally the Normans among them far outnumbered the English.

William declared that he did not propose to change the English customs, but to govern as Edward the Confessor, the last Saxon king, had done. He maintained the Witenagemot, a council made up of bishops and nobles, whose advice the Saxon kings had sought in all important matters. But he was a man of too much force to submit to the control of his people. He avoided giving to any one person a great many estates in a single region, so that no one should become inconveniently powerful. Finally, in order to secure the support of the smaller landholders and to prevent combinations against him among the greater ones, he required every landowner in England to take an oath of fidelity directly to him, instead of having only a few great landowners as vassals who had their own subvassals under their own control, as in France.

We read in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (1086): “He came, on the first day of August, to Salisbury, and there came to him his wise men (that is, counselors), and all the land-owning men of property there were over all England, whosoever men they were; and all bowed down to him and became his men, and swore oaths of fealty to him that they would be faithful to him against all other men.”

It is clear that the Norman Conquest was not a simple change of kings, but that a new element was added to the English
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people. We cannot tell how many Normans actually emigrated across the Channel, but they evidently came in considerable numbers, and their influence upon the English habits and government was very great. A century after William's conquest the whole body of the nobility, the bishops, abbots, and government officials, had become practically all Norman. Besides these, the architects who built the castles and fortresses, the cathedrals and abbeys, came from Normandy. Merchants from the Norman cities of Rouen and Caen settled in London and other English cities, and weavers from Flanders in various towns and even in the country. For a short time these newcomers remained a separate people, but by the year 1200 they had become for the most part indistinguishable from the great mass of English people amongst whom they had come. They had nevertheless made the people of England more energetic, active-minded, and varied in their occupations and interests than they had been before the conquest.

Section 69. Henry II and the Plantagenets

William the Conqueror was followed by his sons, William Rufus and Henry I. Upon the death of the latter the country went through a terrible period of civil war, for some of the nobility supported the Conqueror's grandson Stephen, and some his granddaughter Matilda. After the death of Stephen, when Henry II, Matilda's son, was finally recognized in 1154 by all as king, he found the kingdom in a melancholy state. The nobles had taken advantage of the prevalent disorder to erect castles without royal permission and to establish themselves as independent rulers, and many disorderly hired soldiers had been brought over from the Continent to support the rivals for the throne.

Henry II at once adopted vigorous measures. He destroyed the illegally erected fortresses, sent off the foreign soldiers, and

1 See genealogical table below, p. 416.
Henry's difficulties and his success in meeting them deprived many earls who had been created by Stephen and Matilda of their titles. Henry's task was a difficult one. He had need of all his tireless energy and quickness of mind to restore order in England and at the same time rule the wide realms on the Continent which he had either inherited or gained through his marriage with a French heiress.

In order to avoid all excuse for the private warfare which was such a persistent evil on the Continent, he undertook to improve and reform the law courts. He arranged that his judges should make regular circuits throughout the country, so that they might try cases on the spot at least once a year. We find, too, the beginning of our grand jury in a body of men in each neighborhood who were to be duly sworn in, from time to time, and should then bring accusations against such malefactors as had come to their knowledge.

As for the "petty," or smaller, jury of twelve, which actually tried the accused, its origin and history are obscure. It did not originate with Henry II, but he systematized trial by jury and made it a settled law of the land instead of an exceptional favor. The plan of delegating to twelve men the duty of deciding on the guilt or innocence of a suspected person was very
different from the earlier systems. It resembled neither the Roman trial, where the judges made the decision, nor the medieval compurgation and ordeals (see above, p. 331), where God was supposed to pronounce the verdict. In all legal matters the decisions of Henry's judges were so wise that they became the basis of the common law which is still used in all English-speaking countries.

Henry's reign was embittered by the famous struggle with Thomas Becket, which illustrates admirably the peculiar dependence of the monarchs of his day upon the churchmen. Becket was born in London and became a churchman, but he grew up in the service of the king and was able to aid Henry in gaining the throne. Thereupon the new king made him his chancellor. Becket proved an excellent

**FIG. 163. CHOIR OF CANTERBURY CATHEDRAL**

The choir of Canterbury Cathedral was destroyed by fire four years after Thomas Becket was murdered there. The picture shows how it was rebuilt under Henry II during the years 1175–1184. The two lower rows of arches are the round kind that had been used up to that time, while the upper row shows how the pointed arch was coming in (see below, section 89)
minister and defended the king’s interest even against the Church. He was fond of hunting and of war and maintained a brilliant court from the revenues of the numerous church positions which he held. It appeared to Henry that there could be no better head for the English clergy than his sagacious and worldly chancellor. He therefore determined to make him Archbishop of Canterbury.

In securing the election of Becket as Archbishop of Canterbury, Henry intended to insure his own complete control of the Church. He proposed to punish churchmen who committed crimes, like other offenders, to make the bishops meet all the feudal obligations, and to prevent appeals to the Pope. Becket, however, immediately gave up his gay life and opposed every effort of the king to reduce the independence of the Church. After a haughty assertion of the supremacy of the Church over the king’s government,\(^1\) Thomas fled from the wrathful and disappointed monarch to France and the protection of the Pope.

In spite of a patched-up reconciliation with the king, Becket proceeded to excommunicate some of the great English prelates and, as Henry believed, was conspiring to rob his son of the crown. In a fit of anger, Henry exclaimed among his followers, “Is there no one to avenge me of this miserable churchman?” Unfortunately certain knights took the rash expression literally, and Becket was murdered in his own cathedral of Canterbury, whither he had returned. The king really had no wish to resort to violence, and his sorrow and remorse when he heard of the dreadful deed, and his terror at the consequences, were most genuine. The Pope proposed to excommunicate him. Henry, however, made peace with the papal legates by the solemn assertion that he had never wished the death of Thomas and by promising to return to Canterbury all the property which he had confiscated, to send money to aid in the capture of the Holy Sepulcher at Jerusalem, and to undertake a crusade himself.

\(^1\) See below, section 75.
Although Henry II was one of the most important kings in English history, he spent a great part of his time across the Channel in his French possessions. A glance at the accompanying map will show that rather more than half of his realms lay to the south of the English Channel. He controlled more territory in France than the French king himself. As great-grandson of William the Conqueror, he inherited the duchy of Normandy and the suzerainty over Brittany. His mother, Matilda, had married the count of Anjou and Maine, so that Henry II inherited these fiefs along with those which had belonged to William the Conqueror. Lastly, he had himself married Eleanor, heiress of the dukes of Guienne, and in this way doubled the extent of his French lands.¹ Henry II and his successors are known as the Plantagenets, owing to the habit that his father, the count of Anjou, had of wearing a bit of broom (Latin planta genista) in his helmet.

So it came about that the French kings beheld a new State, under an able and energetic ruler, developing within their borders and including more than half the territory over which they were supposed to rule. A few years before Henry II died, an ambitious monarch, Philip Augustus, ascended the French throne, and made it the chief business of his life to get control of his feudal vassals, above all, the Plantagenets.

¹ William the Conqueror, king of England (1066-1087)

- William II (Rufus) (1087-1100)
  - Henry I (1100-1135), m. Matilda, daughter of Malcolm, king of Scotland
    - Matilda (d. 1167), m. Geoffrey Plantagenet, count of Anjou
      - Henry II (1154-1189), the first Plantagenet king, m. Eleanor of Aquitaine
- Adela, m. Stephen, count of Blois
  - Stephen (1135-1154)

- Richard (1189-1199)
  - Geoffrey
    - Arthur
- John (1199-1216)
  - Henry III (1216-1272)
Henry divided his French possessions among his three sons, Geoffrey, Richard, and John; but father and sons were engaged in constant disputes with one another, as none of them were easy people to get along with. Philip Augustus took advantage of these constant quarrels of the brothers among themselves and with their father. These quarrels were most fortunate for the French king, for had the Plantagenets held together they might have annihilated the royal house of France, whose narrow dominions their own possessions closed in on the west and south.

So long as Henry II lived there was little chance of expelling the Plantagenets from France; but with the accession of his reckless son, Richard the Lion-Hearted,¹ the prospects of the French king brightened wonderfully. Richard is one of the most famous of medieval knights, but he was a very poor ruler. He left his kingdom to take care of itself while he went upon a crusade to the Holy Land (see below, p. 471). He persuaded Philip Augustus to join him; but Richard was too overbearing and masterful, and Philip too ambitious, to make it possible for them to agree for long. The king of France, who was physically delicate, was taken ill on the way and was glad of the excuse to return home and brew trouble for his powerful vassal. When Richard himself returned, after several years of romantic but fruitless adventure, he found himself involved in a war with Philip Augustus, in the midst of which he died.

Richard's younger brother John, who enjoys the reputation of being the most despicable of English kings, speedily gave Philip a good excuse for seizing a great part of the Plantagenet lands. John was suspected of conniving at the brutal murder of his nephew Arthur (the son of Geoffrey). He was also guilty of the less serious offense of carrying off and marrying a lady betrothed to one of his own vassals. Philip Augustus, as John's suzerain, summoned him to appear at the French court to answer the latter charge. Upon John's refusal to appear or to do

¹ Geoffrey, the eldest of the three sons of Henry II mentioned above, died before his father.

Quarrels in Henry's family
Richard the Lion-Hearted
John loses the French possessions of his house
homage for his continental possessions, Philip caused his court to issue a decree confiscating almost all of the Plantagenet lands, leaving to the English king only the southwest corner of France.

Philip found little difficulty in possessing himself of Normandy itself, which showed no disinclination to accept him in place of the Plantagenets. Six years after Richard's death the English kings had lost all their continental fiefs except Guienne. It should be observed that Philip, unlike his ancestors, was no longer merely *suzerain* of the new conquests, but was himself duke of Normandy, and count of Anjou, of Maine, etc. The boundaries of his domain—that is, the lands which he himself controlled directly as feudal lord—now extended to the sea.

St. Louis, Philip's successor, arranged with John's successor in 1258 that the English king should do him homage for Guienne, Gascony, and Poitou, and should surrender every claim on all the rest of the former possessions of the Plantagenets. So it came about that the English kings continued to hold a portion of France for several hundred years.

John not only lost Normandy and other territories which had belonged to the earlier Norman kings but he actually consented to become the Pope's vassal, receive England as a fief from the papacy, and pay tribute to Rome. This strange proceeding came about in this wise: The monks of Canterbury had (1205) ventured to choose an archbishop—who was at the same time their abbot¹—without consulting King John. Their appointee hastened off to Rome to gain the Pope's confirmation, while the irritated John forced the monks to hold another election and make his treasurer archbishop. The Pope at that time was no less a person than Innocent III, one of the greatest of medieval rulers.² Innocent rejected both the men who had been elected, sent for a new deputation of monks from Canterbury, and bade them choose Stephen Langton, a man of great ability. John then angrily drove the monks of Canterbury out of the kingdom.

¹ See above, p. 357. ² See below, p. 457.
Innocent replied by placing England under the *interdict*; that is to say, he ordered the clergy to close all the churches and suspend all public services—a very terrible thing to the people of the time. John was excommunicated, and the Pope threatened that unless the king submitted to his wishes he would depose him and give his crown to Philip Augustus of France. As Philip made haste to collect an army for the conquest of England, John humbly submitted to the Pope in 1213. He went so far as to hand England over to Innocent III and receive it back as a fief, thus becoming the vassal of the Pope. He agreed also to send a yearly tribute to Rome.

**Section 70. The Great Charter and the Beginnings of Parliament**

We must now turn to the most important event in John's reign—the drawing up of the Great Charter of English liberties.

When, in 1213, John proposed to lead his English vassals across the water in order to attempt to reconquer his lost possessions in France, they refused to accompany him on the ground that their feudal obligations did not bind them to fight outside of their country. Moreover, they showed a lively discontent with John's tyranny and his neglect of those limits of the kingly power which several of the earlier Norman kings had solemnly recognized. In 1214 a number of the barons met and took a solemn oath that they would compel the king, by arms if necessary, to sign a charter containing the things which, according to English traditions, a king might *not* do. As John would not agree to do this, it proved necessary to get together an army and march against him. The insurgent nobles met him at Runnymede, not far from London. Here on the 15th of June, 1215, they forced him to swear to observe what they believed to be the rights of his subjects, which they had carefully written out.
The Great Charter is perhaps the most famous document in the history of government;¹ its provisions furnish a brief and comprehensive statement of the burning governmental questions of that period. It was really the whole nation, not merely the nobles, who concluded this great treaty with a tyrannous ruler, for the rights of the commoner were guarded as well as those of the noble. The king promises to observe the rights of his vassals and not to abuse his feudal prerogatives, and the vassals in turn agree to observe the rights of their men. The merchant is not to be deprived of his goods for small offenses, nor the farmer of his wagon and implements. The king is to impose no tax, besides the three stated feudal aids,² except with the consent of the great council of the nation. This is to include the prelates and greater barons and all who hold directly of the king.

There is no more notable clause in the Charter than that which provides that no one is to be arrested, or imprisoned, or deprived of his property, unless he be immediately sent before a court of his peers for trial. To realize the importance of this, we must recollect that in France, down to 1789,—nearly six hundred years later,—the king exercised such unlimited powers that he could order the arrest of any one he pleased, and could imprison him for any length of time without bringing him to trial or even informing him of the nature of his offense. The Great Charter provided further that the king should permit merchants to move about freely and should observe the privileges of the various towns; nor were his officers longer to be allowed to exercise despotic powers over those under them.

In spite of his solemn confirmation of the Charter, John, with his accustomed treachery, made an unsuccessful attempt to break his promises in the Charter; but neither he nor his successors ever succeeded in getting rid of the document. Later there were times when the English kings evaded its provisions

¹ Extracts from the Great Charter are given in the Readings, chap. xi.
² These were payments made when the lord knighted his eldest son, gave his eldest daughter in marriage, or had been captured and was waiting to be ransomed.
and tried to rule as absolute monarchs. But the people always sooner or later bethought them of the Charter, which thus continued to form a barrier against permanent despotism in England.

During the long reign of John's son, Henry III, England began to construct her Parliament, an institution which has not only played a most important rôle in English history, but has also served as the model for similar bodies in almost every civilized state in the world.

The Great Council of the Norman kings, like the older Witenagemot of Saxon times, was a meeting of nobles, bishops, and abbots, which the king summoned from time to time to give him advice and aid, and to sanction important governmental undertakings. During Henry's reign its meetings became more frequent and its discussions more vigorous than before, and the name Parliament began to be applied to it.

In 1265 a famous Parliament was held, where a most important new class of members — the commons — were present, who were destined to give it its future greatness. In addition to the nobles and prelates, two simple knights were summoned from each county and two citizens from each of the more flourishing towns to attend and take part in the discussions.

Edward I, the next king, definitely adopted this innovation. He doubtless called in the representatives of the towns because the townspeople were becoming rich and he wished to have an opportunity to ask them to make grants of money to meet the expenses of the government. He also wished to obtain the approval of all classes when he determined upon important measures affecting the whole realm. Ever since the so-called "Model Parliament" of 1295, the commons, or representatives of the people, have always been included along with the clergy and nobility when the national assembly of England has been summoned.

The Parliament early took the stand that the king must agree to "redress of grievances" before they would grant him any money. This meant that the king had to promise to remedy any
acts of himself or his officials of which Parliament complained before it would agree to let him raise the taxes. Instead of following the king about and meeting wherever he might happen to be, the parliament from the time of Edward I began to hold its sessions in the city of Westminster, now a part of London, where it still continues to meet.

Under Edward's successor, Edward II, Parliament solemnly declared in 1322 that important matters relating to the king and his heirs, the state of the realm and of the people should be considered and determined upon by the king "with the assent of the prelates, earls and barons, and the commonalty (that is, commons) of the realm." Five years later Parliament showed its power by deposing the inefficient king, Edward II, and declared his son, Edward III, the rightful ruler of England.

The new king, who was carrying on an expensive war with France, needed much money and consequently summoned Parliament every year, and, in order to encourage its members to grant him money, he gratified Parliament by asking their advice and listening to their petitions. He passed no new law without adding "by and with the advice and consent of the lords spiritual and temporal and of the commons."

At this time the separation of the two houses of Parliament took place, and ever since the "lords spiritual and temporal" — that is, the bishops and higher nobles — have sat by themselves in the House of Lords, and a House of Commons, including the country gentlemen (knights) and the representatives elected by the more important towns, have met by themselves. Parliament thus made up is really a modern, not a medieval, institution, and we shall hear much of it later.

**Section 71. Wales and Scotland**

The English kings who preceded Edward I had ruled over only a portion of the island of Great Britain. To the west of their kingdom lay the mountainous district of Wales, inhabited by that remnant of the original Britons which the
German invaders had been unable to conquer. To the north of England was the kingdom of Scotland, which was quite independent except for an occasional recognition by the Scotch kings of the English kings as their feudal superiors. Edward I, however, succeeded in conquering Wales permanently and Scotland temporarily.

For centuries a border warfare had been carried on between the English and the Welsh. William the Conqueror had found it necessary to establish a chain of fortresses on the Welsh frontier, and Chester, Shrewsbury, and Monmouth became the outposts of the Normans. While the raids of the Welsh constantly provoked the English kings to invade Wales, no permanent conquest was possible, for the enemy retreated into the mountains about Snowdon, and the English soldiers were left to starve in the wild regions into which they had ventured. The Welsh were encouraged in their long and successful resistance against the English by the songs of their bards, who promised that their people would sometime reconquer the whole of England, which they had possessed before the coming of the Angles and Saxons.

When Edward I came to the throne he demanded that Llewellyn, prince of Wales, as the head of the Welsh clans was called, should do him homage. Llewellyn, who was a man of ability and energy, refused the king's summons, and Edward marched into Wales. Two campaigns were necessary before the Welsh finally succumbed. Llewellyn was killed (1282), and with him expired the independence of the Welsh people. Edward divided the country into shires and introduced English laws and customs, and his policy of conciliation was so successful that there was but a single rising in the country for a whole century. He later presented his son to the Welsh as their prince, and from that time down to the present the title of "Prince of Wales" has usually been conferred upon the heir to the English throne.

The conquest of Scotland proved a far more difficult matter than that of Wales.
When the German peoples — the Angles and Saxons — conquered Britain, some of them wandered north as far as the Firth of Forth and occupied the so-called Lowlands of Scotland. The mountainous region to the north, known as the Highlands, continued to be held by wild tribes related to the Welsh and Irish and talking a language similar to theirs, namely, Gaelic. There was constant warfare between the older inhabitants themselves and between them and the newcomers from Germany, but both Highlands and Lowlands were finally united under a line of

Scottish kings, who moved their residence down to Edinburgh, which, with its fortress, became their chief town.

It was natural that the language of the Scotch Lowlands should be English, but in the mountains the Highlanders to this day continue to talk the ancient Gaelic of their forefathers.

It was not until the time of Edward I that the long series of troubles between England and Scotland began. The dying out of the old line of Scotch kings in 1290 was followed by the appearance of a number of claimants to the crown. In order
to avoid civil war, Edward was asked to decide who should be king. He agreed to make the decision on condition that the one whom he selected should hold Scotland as a fief from the English king. This arrangement was adopted, and the crown was given to John Baliol. But Edward unwisely made demands upon the Scots which aroused their anger, and their king renounced his homage to the king of England. The Scotch, moreover, formed an alliance with Edward’s enemy, Philip the Fair of France; thenceforth, in all the difficulties between England and France, the English kings had always to reckon with the disaffected Scotch, who were glad to aid England’s enemies.

Edward marched in person against the Scotch (1296) and speedily put down what he regarded as a rebellion. He declared that Baliol had forfeited his fief through treason, and that consequently the English king had become the real ruler of Scotland. He emphasized his claim by carrying off the famous Stone of Scone (now in Westminster Abbey), upon which the kings of Scotland had been crowned for ages. Continued resistance led Edward to attempt to incorporate Scotland with England in the same way that he had treated Wales. This was the beginning of three hundred years of intermittent war between England and Scotland, which ended only when a Scotch king, James VI, succeeded to the English throne in 1603 as James I.

That Scotland was able to maintain her independence was mainly due to Robert Bruce, a national hero who succeeded in bringing both the nobility and the people under his leadership. Edward I died, old and worn out, in 1307, when on his way north to put down a rising under Bruce, and left the task of dealing with the Scotch to his incompetent son, Edward II. The Scotch acknowledged Bruce as their king and decisively defeated Edward II in the great battle of Bannockburn, the most famous conflict in Scottish history. Nevertheless, the English refused to acknowledge the independence of Scotland until forced to do so in 1328.
In the course of their struggles with England the Scotch people of the Lowlands had become more closely welded together, and the independence of Scotland, although it caused much bloodshed, first and last, served to develop certain permanent differences between the little Scotch nation and the rest of the English race. No Scotchman to the present day likes to be mistaken for an Englishman. The peculiarities of the language and habits of the people north of the Tweed have been made familiar to all readers of good literature by the novels of Sir Walter Scott and Robert L. Stevenson and by the poems of Robert Burns.

Section 72. The Hundred Years' War

England and France were both becoming strong states in the early fourteenth century. The king in both of these countries had got the better of the feudal lords, and a parliament had been established in France as well as in England, in which the townspeople as well as the clergy and nobility were represented. But both countries were set back by a long series of conflicts known as the Hundred Years’ War, which was especially disastrous to France. The trouble arose as follows:

It will be remembered that King John of England had lost all the French possessions of the Plantagenets except the duchy of Guienne (see above, pp. 417–418). For this he had to do homage to the king of France and become his vassal. This arrangement lasted for many years, but in the times of Edward III the old French line of kings died out, and Edward declared that he himself was the rightful ruler of all France because his mother, Isabella, was a sister of the last king of the old line (see table on the next page).

The French lawyers, however, decided that Edward had no claim to the French throne and that a very distant relative of the last king was the rightful heir to the crown (Philip VI). Edward, nevertheless, maintained that he was rightfully king of
France. He added the French emblem of the lilies (fleur-de-lis) to the lions on the English coat of arms (Fig. 165). In 1346 he landed in Normandy with an English army, devastated the country and marched up the Seine toward Paris. He met the troops of Philip at Crécy, where a celebrated battle was fought, in which the English with their long bows and well-directed arrows put to rout the French knights. Ten years later the English made another incursion into France and again defeated the French cavalry. The French king (John II) was himself captured and carried off to London.

The French Parliament, commonly called the Estates General, came together to consider the unhappy state of affairs. The members from the towns were more numerous than the representatives of the clergy and nobility. A great list of

1 The French kings during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries:

Louis IX (St. Louis) (1226–1270)

Philip III (1270–1285)

Philip IV, the Fair (1285–1314)

Charles of Valois, ancestor of the house of Valois

Louis X (1314–1316)

Isabella, m. Edward II (1316–1322)

Philip V (1322–1328)

Charles IV (1328–1350)

Edward III of England

daughters

Philip VI (1350–1364)

John II (1364–1380)

Charles V, Philip, founder of the powerful house of Burgundy

Charles VI (1380–1422)

Charles VII (1422–1461)

Louis XI (1461–1483)

Charles VIII (1483–1498)
reforms was drawn up. These provided among other things that the Estates General should meet regularly even when the king failed to summon them, and that the collection and expenditure of the public revenue should be no longer entirely under the control of the king but should be supervised by the representatives of the people. The city of Paris rose in support of the revolutionary Estates, but the violence of its allies discredited rather than helped the movement, and France was soon glad to accept the unrestricted rule of its king once more.

The history of the Estates General forms a curious contrast to that of the English Parliament, which was laying the foundation of its later power during this very period. While the French king occasionally summoned the Estates when he needed money, he did so only in order that their approbation of new taxes might make it easier to collect them. He never admitted that he had not the right to levy taxes if he wished without consulting his subjects.

In England, on the other hand, the kings ever since the time of Edward I had repeatedly agreed that no new taxes should be imposed without the consent of Parliament. Edward II, as we have seen, had gone farther and accepted the representatives of the people as his advisers in all important matters touching the welfare of the realm. While the French Estates gradually sank into insignificance, the English Parliament soon learned to grant no money until the king had redressed the grievances which it pointed out, and thus it insured its influence over the king's policy.
Edward III found it impossible, however, to conquer France, and the successor of the French King, John II, managed before Edward died in 1377 to get back almost all the lands that the English had occupied.

For a generation after the death of Edward III the war with France was almost discontinued. France had suffered a great deal more than England. In the first place, all the fighting had been done on her side of the Channel, and in the second place, the soldiers, who found themselves without occupation, wandered about in bands maltreating and plundering the people. The famous Italian scholar, Petrarch, who visited France at this period, tells us that he could not believe that this was the same kingdom which he had once seen so rich and flourishing. “Nothing presented itself to my eyes but fearful solitude and extreme poverty, uncultivated land and houses in ruins. Even about Paris there were everywhere signs of fire and destruction. The streets were deserted, the roads overgrown with weeds.”

The horrors of war had been increased by the deadly bubonic plague which appeared in Europe early in 1348. In April it had reached Florence; by August it was devastating France and Germany; it then spread over England from the southwest northward, attacking every part of the country during the year 1349. This disease, like other terrible epidemics, such as smallpox and cholera, came from Asia. Those who were stricken with it usually died in two or three days. It is impossible to tell what proportion of the population perished. Reports of the time say that in one part of France but one tenth of the people survived, in another but one sixteenth; and that for a long time five hundred bodies were carried from the great hospital of Paris every day. A careful estimate shows that in England toward one half of the population died. At the Abbey of Newenham only the abbot and two monks were left alive out of twenty-six. There were constant complaints that certain lands were no longer of any value to their lords because the tenants were all dead.

Edward III found it impossible to conquer France.

Miserable condition of France.

The bubonic plague of 1348–1349, commonly called the black death.
In England the growing discontent among the farming classes may be ascribed partly to the results of the great pestilence and partly to the new taxes which were levied in order to prolong the disastrous war with France. Up to this time the majority of those who cultivated the land belonged to some particular manor, paid stated dues to their lord, and performed definite services for him. Hitherto there had been relatively few farm hands who might be hired and who sought employment anywhere that they could get it. The black death, by greatly decreasing the number of laborers, raised wages and served to increase the importance of the unattached laborer. Consequently he not only demanded higher wages than ever before but readily deserted one employer when another offered him more money.

This appeared very shocking to those who were accustomed to the traditional rates of payment; and the government undertook to keep down wages by prohibiting laborers from asking more than had been customary during the years that preceded the pestilence. Every laborer, when offered work at the established wages, was ordered to accept it on pain of imprisonment. The first “Statute of Laborers” was issued in 1351; but apparently it was not obeyed, and similar laws were enacted from time to time for a century.

The old manor system was breaking up. Many of the laboring class in the country no longer held land as serfs but moved from place to place and made a living by working for wages. The villain, as the serf was called in England, began to regard the dues which he had been accustomed to pay to his lord as unjust. A petition to Parliament in 1377 asserts that the villains are refusing to pay their customary services to their lords or to acknowledge the obligations which they owe as serfs.

In 1381 the peasants rose in revolt against the taxes levied on them to carry on the hopeless war with France. They burned some of the houses of the nobles and of the rich ecclesiastics, and took particular pains to see that the registers were destroyed.
which were kept by the various lords enumerating the obligations of their serfs.

Although the peasants met with little success, serfdom decayed rapidly. It became more and more common for the serf to pay his dues to the lord in money instead of working for him, and in this way he lost one of the chief characteristics of a serf. The landlord then either hired men to cultivate the fields which he reserved for his own use, or rented the land to tenants. These tenants were not in a position to force their fellow tenants on the manor to pay the full dues which had formerly been exacted by the lord. Sixty or seventy years after the Peasants' War the English rural population had in one way or another become free men, and serfs had practically disappeared.

The war between England and France almost ceased for nearly forty years after the death of Edward III. It was renewed in 1415, and the English king won another great victory at Agincourt, similar to that won at Crécy. Once more the English bowmen slaughtered great numbers of French knights. Fifteen years later the English had succeeded in conquering all of France north of the Loire River; but a considerable region to the south still continued to be held by King Charles VII of France. He was weak and indolent and was doing nothing to check the English victories. The English were engaged in besieging the great town of Orléans when help and encouragement came to the French from a most unexpected quarter. A peasant girl put on a soldier's armor, mounted a horse, and led the faint-hearted French troops to victory.

To her family and her companions Joan of Arc seemed only "a good girl, simple and pleasant in her ways," but she brooded much over the disasters that had overtaken her country, and a "great pity on the fair realm of France" filled her heart. She saw visions and heard voices that bade her go forth to the help of the king and lead him to Rheims to be crowned.

It was with the greatest difficulty that she got anybody to believe in her mission or to help her to get an audience with
her sovereign. But her own firm faith in her divine guidance triumphed over all doubts and obstacles. She was at last accepted as a God-sent champion and placed at the head of some troops dispatched to the relief of Orléans. This city, which was the key to southern France, had been besieged by the English for some months and was on the point of surrender. Joan, who rode at the head of her troops, clothed in armor like a man, had now become the idol of the soldiers and of the people. Under the guidance and inspiration of her courage, sound sense, and burning enthusiasm, Orléans was relieved and the English completely routed. The Maid of Orléans, as she was henceforth called, was now free to conduct the king to Rheims, where he was crowned in the cathedral (July 17, 1429).

The Maid now felt that her mission was accomplished and begged permission to return to her home and her brothers and sisters. To this the king would not consent, and she continued to fight his battles with success. But the other leaders were jealous of her, and even her friends, the soldiers, were sensitive to the taunt of being led by a woman. During the defense of Compiègne in May, 1430, she was allowed to fall into the hands of the Duke of Burgundy, who sold her to the English. They were not satisfied with simply holding as prisoner that strange maiden who had so discomfited them; they wished to discredit everything that she had done, and so declared, and undoubtedly believed, that she was a witch who had been helped by the devil. She was tried by a court of clergymen, found guilty, and burned at Rouen in 1431. Her bravery and noble constancy affected even her executioners, and an English soldier who had come to triumph over her death was heard to exclaim, "We are lost—we have burned a saint." The English cause in France was indeed lost, for her spirit and example had given new courage and vigor to the French armies.

The English Parliament became more and more reluctant to grant funds when there were no more victories gained. From this time on the English lost ground steadily. They were
expelled from Normandy in 1450. Three years later, the last vestige of their possessions in southern France passed into the hands of the French king. The Hundred Years' War was over, and although England still retained Calais, the great question whether she should extend her sway upon the Continent was finally settled.

The close of the Hundred Years' War was followed in England by the Wars of the Roses, between the rival houses which were struggling for the crown. The badge of the house of Lancaster was a red rose, and that of York was a white one. Each party was supported by a group of the wealthy and powerful nobles whose conspiracies, treasons, murders, and executions fill the annals of England during the period which we have been discussing.

The nobles no longer owed their power as they had in previous centuries to vassals who were bound to follow them to war. Like the king, they relied upon hired soldiers. It was easy to find plenty of restless fellows who were willing to become the retainers of a nobleman if he would agree to clothe them and keep open house, where they might eat and drink their fill. Their master was to help them when they got into trouble, and

1 Descent of the rival houses of Lancaster and York:

```
Edward III (1327–1377)

Edward, the Black Prince (d. 1376)

Richard II (1377–1399)

Henry IV (1399–1413) John Beaufort

Henry V (1413–1422) John Beaufort

Henry VI (1422–1461)

Edward IV (1461–1483) Richard III (1483–1485)

Edmund Tudor, m. Margaret

Henry VII, m. Elizabeth of York Edward V, murdered in the Tower, 1483

(first of the Tudor kings)
```
they on their part were expected to intimidate, misuse, and even murder at need those who opposed the interests of their chief.

It is needless to speak of the several battles and the many skirmishes of the miserable Wars of the Roses. These lasted from 1455, when the Duke of York set seriously to work to displace the weak-minded Lancastrian king (Henry VI), until the accession of Henry VII, of the house of Tudor, thirty years later. (See table on page 433.)

The Wars of the Roses had important results. Nearly all the powerful families of England had been drawn into the war, and a great part of the nobility, whom the kings had formerly feared, had perished on the battle field or lost their heads in the ruthless executions carried out by each party after it gained a victory. This left the king far more powerful than ever before. He could now control Parliament, even if he could not do away with it. For a century and more after the accession of Henry VII the Tudor kings enjoyed almost despotic power. England ceased for a time to enjoy the free government for which the foundations had been laid under the Edwards, whose embarrassments at home and abroad had made them constantly dependent upon the aid of the nation.

In France the closing years of the Hundred Years’ War had witnessed a great increase of the king’s power through the establishment of a well-organized standing army. The feudal
army had long since disappeared. Even before the opening of the war the nobles had begun to be paid for their military services and no longer furnished troops as a condition of holding fiefs. But the companies of soldiers found their pay very uncertain, and plundered their countrymen as well as the enemy.

As the war drew to a close, the lawless troopers became a terrible scourge to the country and were known as *flayers*, on account of the horrible way in which they tortured the peasants in the hope of extracting money from them. In 1439 the Estates General approved a plan devised by the king, for putting an end to this evil. Thereafter no one was to raise a company without the permission of the king, who was to name the captains and fix the number of the soldiers.

The Estates agreed that the king should use a certain tax, called the *taille*, to support the troops necessary for the protection of the frontier. This was a fatal concession, for the king now had an army and the right to collect what he chose to consider a permanent tax, the amount of which he later greatly increased; he was not dependent, as was the English king, upon the grants made for brief periods by the representatives of the nation.

Before the king of France could hope to establish a compact, well-organized state it was necessary for him to reduce the power of his vassals, some of whom were almost his equals in strength. The older feudal families had many of them succumbed to the attacks and the diplomacy of the kings of the thirteenth century, especially of St. Louis. But he and his successors had raised up fresh rivals by granting whole provinces to their younger sons. In this way new and powerful lines of feudal nobles were established, such, for example, as the houses of Orléans, Anjou, Bourbon, and, above all, Burgundy. The process of reducing the power of the nobles had, it is true, been begun. They had been forbidden to coin money, to maintain armies, and to tax their subjects, and the powers of the king’s judges had been
extended over all the realm. But the task of consolidating France was reserved for the son of Charles VII, the shrewd and treacherous Louis XI (1461–1483).

The most powerful and dangerous of Louis XI's vassals were the dukes of Burgundy, and they gave him a great deal of trouble. Of Burgundy something will be said in later chapters. Louis XI had himself made heir to a number of provinces in central and southern France,— Anjou, Maine, Provence, etc.,— which by the death of their possessors came under the king's immediate control (1481). He humiliated in various ways the vassals who in his early days had combined against him. The Duke of Alençon he imprisoned; the rebellious Duke of Nemours he caused to be executed in the most cruel manner. Louis's aims were worthy, but his means were generally despicable. It sometimes seemed as if he gloried in being the most rascally among rascals, the most treacherous among the traitors.

Both England and France emerged from the troubles and desolations of the Hundred Years' War stronger than ever before. In both countries the kings had overcome the menace of feudalism by destroying the power of the great families. The royal government was becoming constantly more powerful. Commerce and industry increased the people's wealth and supplied the monarchs with the revenue necessary to maintain government officials and a sufficient army to keep order throughout their realms. They were no longer forced to rely upon the uncertain fidelity of their vassals. In short, England and France were both becoming modern states.
QUESTIONS

SECTION 68. Tell what you can about England before the Norman Conquest. How did Normandy come into existence? How did William of Normandy get possession of England? What was William's policy after he conquered England?

SECTION 69. Mention some of the reforms of Henry II. Describe Henry's troubles with Thomas Becket. What was the extent of the possessions of the Plantagenets in France? In what way did the French king succeed in getting a considerable part of the Plantagenet possessions into his own hands? Describe the chief events in the reign of King John of England.

SECTION 70. How was the Great Charter granted, and what were some of its main provisions? What is the English Parliament? When was it formed? What were its powers?

SECTION 71. When was Wales conquered by the English kings? What are the Highlands and the Lowlands of Scotland? Tell of the attempts of Edward I to get possession of Scotland.

SECTION 72. Give the origin and general course of the Hundred Years' War under Edward III. Why did not the Estates General become as powerful as the English Parliament? Tell about the black death. What led to the disappearance of serfdom in England? Give an account of Joan of Arc. What were the great causes of disorder in England during the generation before the accession of Henry VII? Why did feudalism revive in France? What was accomplished by Louis XI?
CHAPTER XVIII

POPE'S AND EMPERORS

SECTION 73. ORIGIN OF THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE

Charlemagne's successors in the German part of his empire found it quite as hard as did the kings of the western, or French, kingdom to keep control of their vassals. Germany, like France, was divided up into big and little fiefs, and the dukes and counts were continually waging war upon each other and upon their king. The general causes of this chronic disorder in the Middle Ages have been described in a previous chapter.

The first German ruler whom we need to notice here was Otto the Great, who came to the throne in the year 936. He got as many of the great fiefs as possible into the hands of his relatives in the hope that they would be faithful to him. He put an end forever to the invasions of the Hungarians who had been ravaging Germany. He defeated them in a great battle near Augsburg and drove them out of his realms. As has already been said (see above, p. 386), they finally settled in eastern Europe and laid the foundations of what is now the important state of Hungary.
But the most noteworthy of Otto's acts was his interference in Italian affairs, which led to his winning for the German kings the imperial crown that Charlemagne had worn. We have seen how Charlemagne's successors divided up his realms into three parts by the Treaty of Mersen in 870 (see above, p. 382). One of these parts was the kingdom of Italy. We know but little of what went on in Italy for some time after the Treaty of Mersen. There was incessant warfare, and the disorder was increased by the attacks of the Mohammedans. Various powerful nobles were able to win the crown for short periods. Three at least of these Italian kings were crowned Emperor by the Pope. Then for a generation there was no Emperor in the west, until Otto the Great again secured the title.

It would seem as if Otto had quite enough trouble at home, but he thought that it would make him and his reign more glorious if he added northern Italy to his realms. So in 951 he crossed the Alps, married the widow of one of the Italian kings, and, without being formally crowned, was generally acknowledged as king of Italy. He had to hasten back to Germany to put down a revolt organized by his own son, but ten years later he was called to Rome by the Pope to protect him from the attacks of his enemies. Otto accepted the invitation, and the grateful Pope in return crowned him Emperor, as Charlemagne's successor (962).

The coronation of Otto was a very important event in German history; for, from this time on, the German kings, instead of confining their attention to keeping their own kingdom in order, were constantly distracted by the necessity of keeping hold on their Italian kingdom, which lay on the other side of a great range of mountains. Worse than that, they felt that they must see to it that a Pope friendly to them was elected, and this greatly added to their troubles.

The succeeding German emperors had usually to make several costly and troublesome journeys to Rome, — a first one to be crowned, and then others either to depose a hostile Pope or
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to protect a friendly one from the oppression of neighboring lords. These excursions were very distracting, especially to a ruler who left behind him in Germany a rebellious nobility that always took advantage of his absence to revolt.

Otto's successors dropped their old title of king of the East Franks as soon as they had been duly crowned by the Pope at Rome, and assumed the magnificent and all-embracing designation, "Emperor Ever August of the Romans." Their "Holy Roman Empire," as it came to be called later, which was to endure, in name at least, for more than eight centuries, was obviously even less like that of the ancient Romans than was Charlemagne's. As kings of Germany and Italy they had practically all the powers that they enjoyed as emperors. The title of Emperor was of course a proud one, but it gave the German kings no additional power except the fatal right that they claimed of taking part in the election of the Pope. We shall find that, instead of making themselves feared at home and building up a great state, the German emperors wasted their strength in a long struggle with the popes, who proved themselves in the end far stronger, and eventually reduced the Empire to a mere shadow.

Section 74. The Church and Its Property

In order to understand the long struggle between the emperors and the popes, we must stop a moment to consider the condition of the Church in the early Middle Ages. It seemed to be losing all its strength and dignity and to be falling apart, just as Charlemagne's empire had dissolved into feudal bits. This was chiefly due to the vast estates of the clergy. Kings, princes, and rich landowners had long considered it meritorious to make donations to bishoprics and

1 Henry II (1002–1024) and his successors, not venturing to assume the title of Emperor till crowned at Rome, but anxious to claim Rome as attached to the German crown, began to call themselves, before their coronation, "King of the Romans."
monasteries, so that a very considerable portion of the land in western Europe had come into the hands of churchmen.

A king, or other landed proprietor, might grant fiefs to churchmen as well as to laymen. The bishops became the vassals of the king or of other feudal lords by doing homage for a fief and swearing fidelity, just as any other vassal would do. An abbot would sometimes secure for his monastery the protection of a neighboring lord by giving up his land and receiving it back again as a fief.

One great difference, however, existed between the Church lands and the ordinary fiefs. According to the law of the Church, the bishops and abbots could not marry and so could have no children to whom they might transmit their property. Consequently, when a landholding churchman died, some one had to be chosen in his place who should enjoy his property and perform his duties. The rule of the Church had been, from time immemorial, that the clergy of the diocese should choose the bishop, their choice being ratified by the people. As for the abbots, they were, according to the Rule of St. Benedict, to be chosen by the members of the monastery.

In spite of these rules, the bishops and abbots had come, in the tenth and eleventh centuries, to be selected, to all intents and purposes, by the various kings and feudal lords. It is true that the outward forms of a regular election were usually permitted; but the feudal lord made it clear whom he wished chosen, and if the wrong person was elected, he simply refused to hand over to him the lands attached to the bishopric or abbey. The lord could in this way control the choice of the prelates, for in order to become a real bishop or abbot, one had not only to be elected, he had also to be solemnly "invested" with the appropriate powers of a bishop or abbot and with his lands.

When a bishop or abbot had been duly chosen, the feudal lord proceeded to the investiture. The new bishop or abbot first became the "man" of the lord by doing him homage, and then
the lord transferred to him the lands and rights attached to the office. No careful distinction appears to have been made between the property and the religious powers. The lord often conferred both by bestowing upon a bishop the ring and the crosier (see headpiece to Chapter XX, p. 475), the emblems of religious authority. It seemed shocking enough that the lord, who was often a rough soldier, should dictate the selection of the bishops; but it was still more shocking that he should assume to confer religious powers with religious emblems. Yet even worse things might happen, since sometimes the lord, for his greater convenience, had himself made bishop.

The Church itself naturally looked at the property attached to a church office as a mere incident and considered the religious prerogatives the main thing. And since the clergy alone could rightly confer these, it was natural that they should claim the right to bestow the lands ("temporalities") attached to them upon whomsoever they pleased without consulting any layman whatever.

Against this claim the king might urge that a simple minister of the Gospel, or a holy monk, was by no means necessarily fitted to manage the interests of a feudal state, such as the great archbishoprics and bishoprics, and even the abbeys, had become in Germany and elsewhere in the eleventh century.

In short, the situation in which the bishops found themselves was very complicated. (1) As an officer of the Church, the bishop saw to it that parish priests were properly selected and ordained, he tried certain cases in his court, and performed the church ceremonies. (2) He managed the lands which belonged to the bishopric, which might, or might not, be fiefs. (3) As a vassal of those who had granted lands to the bishopric upon feudal terms, he owed the usual feudal dues, including the duty of furnishing troops, to his lord. (4) Lastly, in Germany, the king had found it convenient, from about the beginning of the eleventh century, to confer upon the bishops in many cases the authority of a count in the districts about them. In this
way they might have the right to collect tolls, coin money, and perform other important governmental duties. When a prelate took office he was invested with all these various functions at once, both spiritual and governmental.

To forbid the king to take part in the investiture was, consequently, to rob him not only of his feudal rights but also of his authority over many of his government officials, since bishops, and sometimes even abbots, were often counts in all but name. He therefore found it necessary to take care who got possession of the important church offices.

Still another danger threatened the wealth and resources of the Church. During the tenth and eleventh centuries the rule of the Church prohibiting the clergy from marrying appears to have been widely neglected in Italy, Germany, France, and England. To the stricter people of the time this appeared a terrible degradation of the clergy, who, they felt, should be unencumbered by family cares and should devote themselves wholly to the service of God. The question, too, had another side. It was obvious that the property of the Church would soon be dispersed if the clergy were allowed to marry, since they would wish to provide for their children. Just as the feudal lands had become hereditary, so the church lands would become hereditary unless the clergy were forced to remain unmarried.

Besides the feudalizing of its property and the marriage of the clergy, there was a third great and constant source of weakness and corruption in the Church, at this period, namely, the temptation to buy and sell church offices. Had the duties and responsibilities of the bishops, abbots, and priests always been heavy, and their income slight, there would have been little tendency to bribe those who could bestow the offices. But the incomes of bishoprics and abbeys were usually considerable, and sometimes very great, while the duties attached to the office of bishop or abbot, however serious in the eyes of the right-minded, might easily be neglected by the unscrupulous.
The revenue from a great landed estate and the high rank that went with the office were enough to induce the members of the noblest families to vie with each other in securing church positions. The king or prince who possessed the right of investiture was sure of finding some one willing to pay something for important benefices.

The sin of buying or selling church offices was recognized as a most serious one. It was called "simony,"¹ a name derived from Simon the Magician, who, according to the account in the Acts of the Apostles, offered money to the Apostle Peter if he would give him the power of conferring the Holy Spirit upon those upon whom he should lay his hands. As the apostle denounced this first simonist,—"Thy silver perish with thee, because thou hast thought to obtain the gift of God with money" (Acts viii, 20),—so the Church has continued ever since to denounce those who propose to purchase its sacred powers.

Doubtless very few bought positions in the Church with the view of obtaining the "gift of God," that is to say, the religious office. It was the revenue and the honor that were chiefly coveted. Moreover, when a king or lord accepted a gift from one for whom he procured a benefice, he did not regard himself as selling the office; he merely shared its advantages. No transaction took place in the Middle Ages without accompanying gifts and fees of various kinds.

The evil of simony was, nevertheless, very demoralizing, for it spread downward and infected the whole body of the clergy. A bishop who had made a large outlay in obtaining his office naturally expected something from the priests, whom it was his duty to appoint. Then the priest, in turn, was tempted to exact too much for baptizing and marrying his parishioners, and for burying the dead.

So it seemed, at the opening of the eleventh century, as if the Church was to be dragged down by its property into the anarchy of feudalism described in a preceding chapter.

¹ Pronounced sim'ə-ny.
The popes had, therefore, many difficulties to overcome in the gigantic task which they undertook of making the Church a great international monarchy, like the Roman Empire, with its capital at Rome. The control exercised by kings and feudal lords in the selection of Church officials had to be done away with. Simony with its degrading effects had to be abolished. The marriage of the clergy had to be checked, for fear that the property and wealth of the Church would go to their families and so be lost to the Church.

The first great step toward the freeing of the Church from the control of the kings and feudal lords was taken by Pope Nicholas II. In 1059 he issued a remarkable decree which took the election of the head of the Church once for all out of the hands of both the Emperor and the people of Rome, and placed it definitely and forever in the hands of the cardinals, who represented the Roman clergy.1 Obviously the object of this decree was to prevent all interference, whether of the distant Emperor, of the local nobility, or of the Roman mob. The college of cardinals still exists and still elects the Pope.

The reform party which directed the policy of the popes had, it hoped, freed the head of the Church from the control of worldly men by putting his election in the hands of the Roman clergy. It now proposed to emancipate the Church as a whole from the base entanglements of earth: first, by strictly forbidding the married clergy to perform religious functions and by exhorting their flocks to refuse to attend their ministrations; and secondly, by depriving the kings and feudal lords of their influence over the choice of the bishops and abbots, since this

1 The word “cardinal” (Latin cardinalis, “principal”) was applied to the priests of the various parishes in Rome, to the several deacons connected with the Lateran,—which was the cathedral church of the Roman bishopric,—and, lastly, to six or seven suburban bishops who officiated in turn in the Lateran. The title became a very distinguished one and was sought by ambitious foreign prelates and ecclesiastical statesmen, like Wolsey, Richelieu, and Mazarin. If their official titles were examined, it would be found that each was nominally a cardinal bishop, priest, or deacon of some Roman Church. The number of cardinals varied until fixed, in 1586, at six bishops, fifty priests, and fourteen deacons.
influence was deemed the chief cause of worldliness among the prelates. Naturally these last measures met with far more general opposition than the new way of electing the Pope. The magnitude of the task which the popes had undertaken first became fully apparent when the celebrated Gregory VII ascended the papal throne, in 1073.

Section 75. Powers claimed by the Popes

Among the writings of Gregory VII there is a very brief statement, called the Dictatus, of the powers which he believed the popes to possess. Its chief claims are the following: The Pope enjoys a unique title; he is the only universal bishop and may depose and reinstate other bishops or transfer them from place to place. No council of the Church may be regarded as speaking for Christendom without his consent. The Roman Church has never erred, nor will it err to all eternity. No one may be considered a Catholic Christian who does not agree with the Roman Church. No book is authoritative unless it has received the papal sanction.

Gregory does not stop with asserting the Pope’s complete supremacy over the Church. He says that “the Pope is the only person whose feet are kissed by all princes”; that he may depose emperors and “absolve subjects from allegiance to an unjust ruler.” No one shall dare to condemn one who appeals to the Pope. No one may annul a decree of the Pope, though the Pope may declare null and void the decrees of all other earthly powers; and no one may pass judgment upon his acts.

Immediately upon his election as Pope, Gregory began to put into practice his high conception of the rôle that the religious head of Christendom should play. He dispatched legates throughout Europe, and from this time on these legates became a powerful instrument of the Church’s government. He warned the kings of France and England and the youthful German ruler, Henry IV, to forsake their evil ways, to be upright and
just, and to obey his admonitions. He explained, kindly but firmly, to William the Conqueror that the papal and kingly powers are both established by God as the greatest among the authorities of the world, just as the sun and moon are the greatest of the heavenly bodies. But the papal power is obviously superior to the kingly, for it is responsible for it; at the Last Day, Gregory would have, he urged, to render an account of the king as one of the flock intrusted to his care. The king of France was warned to give up his practice of simony, lest he be excommunicated and his subjects freed from their oath of allegiance. All these acts of Gregory appear to have been dictated not by worldly ambition but by a fervent conviction of their righteousness and of his heavy responsibility toward all men.

Section 76. Gregory VII and Emperor Henry IV

Obviously Gregory's plan of reform included all the states of western Europe, but conditions were such that the most striking conflict took place between him and the Emperor. The trouble came about in this way. Henry IV's father had died in 1056, leaving only his good wife Agnes and their little son of six years to maintain the hard-fought prerogatives of the German king in the midst of ambitious vassals, whom even the strong Otto the Great had found it difficult to control.

In 1065 the fifteen-year-old lad, Henry IV, was declared of age, and his lifelong difficulties began with a great rebellion of the Saxons. They accused the young king of having built castles in their land and of filling them with rough soldiers who preyed upon the people. Pope Gregory felt it his duty to interfere. To him the Saxons appeared a people oppressed by a heedless youth guided by evil counselors. But Henry continued to associate with counselors whom the Pope had excommunicated and went on filling important bishoprics in Germany and Italy, regardless of the Pope's prohibitions.
The popes who immediately preceded Gregory had more than once forbidden the churchmen to receive investiture from laymen. Gregory reissued this prohibition in 1075, just as the trouble with Henry had begun. Investiture was, as we have seen (see above, p. 441), the legal transfer by the king or other lord, to a newly chosen church official, of the lands and rights attached to the office. In forbidding lay investiture Gregory attempted nothing less than a revolution. The bishops and abbots were often officers of government, exercising in Germany and Italy powers similar in all respects to those of the counts. The king not only relied upon them for advice and assistance in carrying on his government, but they were among his chief allies in his constant struggles with his vassals.

Gregory dispatched three envoys to Henry (end of 1075) with a fatherly letter 1 in which he reproached the king for his wicked conduct. But he evidently had little expectation that mere expostulation would have any effect upon Henry, for he gave his legates instructions to use threats if necessary. The legates were to tell the king that his crimes were so numerous, so horrible, and so well known, that he merited not only excommunication but the permanent loss of all his royal honors.

The violence of the legates' language not only kindled the wrath of the king but also gained for him friends among the bishops. A council which Henry summoned at Worms (in 1076) was attended by more than two thirds of all the German bishops. Here Gregory was declared deposed, and many terrible charges of immorality were brought against him. The bishops publicly proclaimed that he had ceased to be their Pope. It appears very surprising, at first sight, that the king should have received the prompt support of the German churchmen against the head of the Church. But it must be remembered that the prelates really owed their offices to the king and not to the Pope.

Gregory's reply to Henry and the German bishops who had deposed him was speedy and decisive. "Incline thine ear to

1 To be found in the Readings, chap. xiii.
us, O Peter, chief of the Apostles. As thy representative and by thy favor has the power been granted especially to me by God of binding and loosing in heaven and earth. On the strength of this, for the honor and glory of thy Church, in the name of Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I withdraw, through thy power and authority, from Henry the King, son of Henry the Emperor, who has risen against thy Church with unheard-of insolence, the rule over the whole kingdom of the Germans and over Italy. I absolve all Christians from the bonds of the oath which they have sworn, or may swear, to him; and I forbid anyone to serve him as king.”

For a time after the Pope had deposed him everything went against Henry. Instead of resenting the Pope’s interference, the discontented Saxons, and many other of Henry’s vassals, believed that there was now an excellent opportunity to get rid of Henry and choose a more agreeable ruler. The Pope was even invited to come to Augsburg to consult with the princes as to whether Henry should continue to be king or another ruler should be chosen in his stead. It looked as if the Pope was, in truth, to control the civil government.

Henry decided to anticipate the arrival of the Pope. He hastened across the Alps in midwinter and appeared as an humble suppliant before the castle of Canossa, whither the pope had come on his way to Augsburg. For three days the German king presented himself before the closed door, barefoot and in the coarse garments of a pilgrim and a penitent, and even then Gregory was induced only by the expostulations of his influential companions to admit the humiliated ruler. The spectacle of this mighty prince of distinguished appearance, humiliated and in tears before the little man who humbly styled himself the

1 Gregory’s deposition and excommunication of Henry may be found in the Readings, chap. xiii.

2 The castle of Canossa belonged to Gregory VII’s ally and admirer, the Countess of Tuscany. It was destroyed by the neighboring town of Reggio about two centuries after Gregory’s time, and only the ivy-clad ruins, represented in the headpiece of this chapter, remain.
“servant of the servants of God,” has always been regarded as most completely typifying the power of the Church and the potency of her curses, against which even the most exalted of the earth found no weapon of defense except abject penitence.¹

The pardon which Henry received at Canossa did not satisfy the German princes. They therefore proceeded to elect another ruler, and the next three or four years was a period of bloody struggles between the adherents of the rival kings. Gregory remained neutral until 1080, when he again “bound with the chain of anathema” Henry, “the so-called king,” and all his followers. He declared him deprived of his royal power and dignity and forbade all Christians to obey him.

The new excommunication had precisely the opposite effect to the first one; it seemed to increase rather than decrease Henry’s friends. The German clergy again deposed Gregory VII. Henry’s rival for the throne fell in battle, and Henry be-took himself to Italy with the double purpose of installing a Pope of his own choice and winning the imperial crown. Gregory held out for no less than two years; but at last Rome fell into Henry’s hands, and Gregory withdrew and soon after died. His last words were, “I have loved justice and hated iniquity, therefore I die an exile,” and the fair-minded historical student will not question their truth.

The death of Gregory did not, however, put an end to Henry’s difficulties. He spent the remaining twenty years of his life in trying to maintain his rights as king of Germany and Italy against his rebellious subjects on both sides of the Alps. In Germany his chief enemies were the Saxons and his discontented vassals. In Italy the Pope was now actively engaged as a temporal ruler, in building up a little state of his own, and he was always ready to encourage the Lombard cities in their opposition to the German emperors.

All his life long Henry was turning from one enemy to another. Finally, his discontented German vassals induced his

¹ For Gregory’s own account of the affair at Canossa, see Readings, chap. xiii.
son, whom he had had crowned as his successor, to revolt against his father. Thereupon followed more civil war, more treason, and a miserable abdication. In 1106 death put an end to perhaps the saddest reign that history records.

The achievement of the reign of Henry IV's son, Henry V, which chiefly interests us was the adjustment of the question of investitures. Pope Paschal II, while willing to recognize those bishops already chosen by the king, provided they were good men, proposed that thereafter Gregory's decrees against investiture by laymen should be carried out. The clergy should no longer do homage by laying their hands, consecrated to the service of the altar, in the bloodstained hands of the nobles. Henry V, on the other hand, declared that unless the clergy took the oath of fealty the bishops would not be given the lands, towns, castles, tolls, and privileges attached to the bishoprics.

After a succession of troubles a compromise was at last reached in the Concordat of Worms (1122), which put an end
to the controversy over investitures in Germany. The Emperor promised to permit the Church freely to elect the bishops and abbots and renounced his old claim to invest with the religious emblems of the ring and the crosier. But the elections were to be held in the presence of the king, and he was permitted, in a separate ceremony, to invest the new bishop or abbot with his fiefs and his governmental powers by a touch of the scepter. In this way the religious powers of the bishops were obviously conferred by the churchmen who elected them; and although the king might still practically invalidate an election by refusing to hand over the lands, nevertheless the direct appointment of the bishops and abbots was taken out of his hands. As for the Emperor's control over the papacy, too many popes, since the advent of Henry IV, had been generally recognized as properly elected without the sanction of the Emperor, for any one to believe any longer that his sanction was necessary.

Section 77. The Hohenstaufen Emperors and the Popes

A generation after the matter of investitures had been arranged by the Concordat of Worms the most famous of German emperors, next to Charlemagne, came to the throne. This was Frederick I, commonly called Barbarossa, from his red beard. He belonged to the family of Hohenstaufen, so called from their castle in southern Germany. Frederick's ambition was to restore the Roman Empire to its old glory and influence. He regarded himself as the successor of the Caesars, as well as of Charlemagne and Otto the Great. He believed his office to be quite as truly established by God himself as the papacy. When he informed the Pope that he had been recognized as Emperor by the German nobles, he too took occasion to state quite clearly that the headship of the Empire had been "bestowed upon him by God," and he did not ask the Pope's sanction as his predecessors had done.

1 See Readings, chap. xiii.
In his lifelong attempt to maintain what he thought to be his rights as Emperor he met, quite naturally, with the three old difficulties. He had constantly to be fighting his rivals and rebellious vassals in Germany; he had to face the opposition of the popes, who never forgot the claims that Gregory VII had made to control the Emperor as well as other rulers. Lastly,
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**Fig. 169. Ruins of Barbarossa's Palace at Gelnhausen**

Frederick Barbarossa erected a handsome palace at Gelnhausen (not far east of Frankfort). It was destroyed by the Swedes during the Thirty Years' War (see below, section 113), but even what now remains is imposing, especially the arcade represented in the picture in trying to keep hold of northern Italy, which he believed to belong to his empire, he spent a great deal of time with but slight results.

One of the greatest differences between the early Middle Ages and Frederick's time was the development of town life. Up to this period we have heard only of popes, emperors, kings, bishops, and feudal lords. From now on we shall have to take the towns and their citizens into account. No nation makes much progress
without towns; for only when people get together in considerable numbers do they begin to build fine buildings, establish universities and libraries, make inventions and carry on trade, which brings them into contact with other people in their own country and in foreign lands. (See below, Chapter XXI, for town life.)

The towns had never decayed altogether in Italy, and by the time of Frederick Barbarossa they had begun to flourish once more, especially in Lombardy. Such towns as Milan, Verona, and Cremona were practically independent states. Their government was in the hands of the richer citizens, and the poorer people were not given any voice in city affairs. Compared with
Fig. 170. Cathedral, Baptistry, and Leaning Tower at Pisa

Pisa was once a Roman colony with handsome buildings, all of which have disappeared. In the eleventh century it became an important commercial city. It took a considerable part in the Crusades, and its inhabitants were enriched by trade. The cathedral is a basilica, erected after the Pisans won a great naval battle over the Mohammedans in 1063. It was consecrated in 1118, not long before the time of Frederick Barbarossa. The circular baptistry in the foreground was begun in 1153, but was not completed for more than a century. The bell tower, which, owing to the sinking of the foundations, has become celebrated as the Leaning Tower, was begun in 1174, although not completed until much later
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a modern city they were very disorderly, for sometimes the poor revolted against the rich, and often the nobles, who had moved in from the country and built fortified palaces in the towns, fought among themselves. And then the various towns were always fighting one another.

But in spite of all the warfare and disorder, the Italian cities became wealthy and, as we shall see later, were centers of learning and art similar to the ancient cities of Greece, such as Athens and Corinth. They were able to combine in a union known as the Lombard League to oppose Frederick, for they hated the idea of paying taxes to a German king from across the Alps. Frederick made several expeditions to Italy, but he only succeeded, after a vast amount of trouble, in getting them to recognize him as a sort of overlord. He was forced to leave them to manage their own affairs and go their own way. They could, of course, always rely upon the Pope when it came to fighting the Emperor, for he was quite as anxious as the towns to keep Frederick out of Italy.

So Frederick failed in his great plans for restoring the Roman Empire; he only succeeded in adding a new difficulty for his descendants. In spite of his lack of success in conquering the Lombard cities, Frederick tried to secure southern Italy for his descendants. He arranged that his son should marry Constance, the heiress of Naples and Sicily. This made fresh trouble for the Hohenstaufen rulers, because the Pope, as feudal lord of Naples and Sicily, was horrified at the idea of the Emperor's controlling the territory to the south of the papal possessions as well as that to the north.

After some forty years of fighting in Germany and Italy Frederick Barbarossa decided to undertake a crusade to the Holy Land, and lost his life on the way thither. His son was carried off by Italian fever while trying to put down a rebellion in southern Italy, leaving the fate of the Hohenstaufen family in the hands of his infant son and heir, the famous Frederick II. It would take much too long to try to tell of all the attempts of
rival German princes to get themselves made king of Germany and of the constant interference of the popes who sided now with this one and now with that. It happened that one of the greatest of all the popes, Innocent III, was ruling during Frederick II's early years. After trying to settle the terrible disorder in Germany he decided that Frederick should be made Emperor, hoping to control him so that he would not become the dangerous enemy of the papacy that his father and grandfather had been. As a young man Frederick made all the promises that Innocent demanded, but he caused later popes infinite anxiety.

Frederick II was nearsighted, bald, and wholly insignificant in person; but he exhibited the most extraordinary energy and ability in the organization of his kingdom of Sicily, in which he was far more interested than in Germany. He drew up an elaborate code of laws for his southern realms and may be said to have founded the first modern well-regulated state, in which the king was indisputably supreme. He had been brought up in Sicily and was much influenced by the Mohammedan culture which prevailed there. He appears to have rejected many of the opinions of the time. His enemies asserted that he was not even a Christian, and that he declared that Moses, Christ, and Mohammed were all alike impostors.

We cannot stop to relate the romantic and absorbing story of his long struggle with the popes. They speedily discovered that he was bent upon establishing a powerful state to the south of them, and upon extending his control over the Lombard cities in such a manner that the papal possessions would be held as in a vise. This, they felt, must never be permitted. Consequently almost every measure that Frederick adopted aroused their suspicion and opposition, and they made every effort to destroy him and his house.

His chance of success in the conflict with the head of the Church was gravely affected by the promise which he had made before Innocent III's death to undertake a crusade. He was so busily engaged with his endless enterprises that he
kept deferring the expedition, in spite of the papal admonitions, until at last the Pope lost patience and excommunicated him. While excommunicated, he at last started for the East. He met with signal success and actually brought Jerusalem, the Holy City, once more into Christian hands, and was himself recognized as king of Jerusalem.

Frederick’s conduct continued, however, to give offense to the popes. He was denounced in solemn councils, and at last deposed by one of the popes. After Frederick died (1250) his sons maintained themselves for a few years in the Sicilian kingdom; but they finally gave way before a French army, led by the brother of St. Louis, Charles of Anjou, upon whom the Pope bestowed the southern realms of the Hohenstaufens.1

With Frederick’s death the medieval Empire may be said to have come to an end. It is true that after a period of “fist law,” as the Germans call it, a new king, Rudolf of Hapsburg, was elected in Germany in 1273. The German kings continued to call themselves emperors. Few of them, however, took the trouble to go to Rome to be crowned by the Pope. No serious effort was ever made to reconquer the Italian territory for which Otto the Great, Frederick Barbarossa, and his son and grandson had made such serious sacrifices. Germany was hopelessly divided and its king was no real king. He had no capital and no well-organized government.

By the middle of the thirteenth century it becomes apparent that neither Germany nor Italy was to be converted into a strong single kingdom like England and France. The map of Germany shows a confused group of duchies, counties, archbishoprics, bishoprics, abbeys, and free towns, each one of which asserted its practical independence of the weak king and Emperor.

In northern Italy each town, including a certain district about its walls, had become an independent state, dealing with its

1 An excellent account of Frederick’s life is given by Henderson, Germany in the Middle Ages, pp. 349-397.
neighbors as with independent powers. The Italian towns were destined to become the birthplace of our modern culture during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Venice and Florence, in spite of their small size, came to be reckoned among the most important states of Europe (see section 90, below). In the central part of the peninsula the Pope maintained more or less control over his possessions, but he often failed to subdue the towns within his realms. To the south Naples remained for some time under the French dynasty, which the Pope had called in, while the island of Sicily drifted into Spanish hands.

**QUESTIONS**

Section 73. Describe the way in which the German kings gained the title of Emperor. Why did they think that they ought to control the election of the Pope? What do you understand by the Holy Roman Empire?

Section 74. What were the sources of wealth of the Church? What was the effect of the vast landholdings of the Church? What was investiture, and why did it raise difficulties between the popes and emperors? Why did the Pope oppose the marriage of the clergy? How is the Pope elected? What is a cardinal?

Section 75. What was the Dictatus, and what claims did it make?

Section 76. Describe the conflict between Henry IV and Gregory VII. What were the provisions of the Concordat of Worms?

Section 77. What new enemies did Frederick Barbarossa find in northern Italy? How did the German kings establish a claim to southern Italy? Give some facts about Innocent III. Narrate the struggle between Frederick II and the popes and its outcome. How many years elapsed between the death of Otto the Great and the accession of Henry IV? between the death of Henry IV and that of Frederick Barbarossa? between the death of Barbarossa and that of Frederick II?
CHAPTER XIX

THE CRUSADES

Section 78. Origin of the Crusades

Of all the events of the Middle Ages, the most romantic and fascinating are the Crusades, the adventurous expeditions to Syria and Palestine, undertaken by devout and warlike kings and knights with the hope of permanently reclaiming the Holy Land from the infidel Turks. All through the twelfth and thirteenth centuries each generation beheld at least one great army of crusaders gathering from all parts of the West and starting toward the Orient. Each year witnessed the departure of small bands of pilgrims or of solitary soldiers of the cross.

For two hundred years there was a continuous stream of Europeans of every rank and station—kings and princes, powerful nobles, simple knights, common soldiers, ecclesiastics, monks, townspeople, and even peasants—from England, France, Germany, Spain, and Italy, making their way into western Asia. If they escaped the countless dangers which beset them on the journey, they either settled in this distant land and devoted themselves to war or commerce, or returned home, bringing with them tales of great cities and new peoples, of skill, knowledge, and luxury unknown in the West.
Our sources of information in regard to the Crusades are so abundant and so rich in picturesque incidents that writers have often yielded to the temptation to give more space to these expeditions than their consequences really justify. They were, after all, only one of the great foreign enterprises which have been undertaken from time to time by the European peoples. While their influence upon the European countries was doubtless very important,—like that of the later conquest of India by the English and the colonization of America,—the details of the campaigns in the East scarcely belong to the history of western Europe.

Syria had been overrun by the Arabs in the seventh century, shortly after the death of Mohammed, and the Holy City of Jerusalem had fallen into the hands of the infidels. The Arab, however, shared the veneration of the Christian for the places associated with the life of Christ and, in general, permitted the Christian pilgrims who found their way thither to worship unmolested. But with the coming of a new and ruder people, the Seljuk Turks, in the eleventh century, the pilgrims began to bring home news of great hardships. Moreover, the eastern Emperor was defeated by the Turks in 1071 and lost Asia Minor. The presence of the Turks, who had taken possession of the fortress of Nicæa, just across from Constantinople, was of course a standing menace to the Eastern Empire. When the energetic Emperor Alexius (1081–1118) ascended the throne he endeavored to expel the infidel. Finding himself unequal to the task, he appealed for assistance to the head of Christendom, Pope Urban II. The first great impetus to the Crusades was the call issued by Urban at the celebrated church council which met in 1095 at Clermont in France.

In an address which produced more remarkable immediate results than any other which history records, the Pope exhorted knights and soldiers of all ranks to give up their usual wicked business of destroying their Christian brethren in private warfare (see above, section 67) and turn, instead, to the succor
of their fellow Christians in the East. He warned them that the insolent Turks would, if unchecked, extend their sway still more widely over the faithful servants of the Lord. Urban urged, besides, that France was too poor to support all its people, while the Holy Land flowed with milk and honey. "Enter upon the road to the Holy Sepulcher; wrest the land from the wicked race and subject it to yourselves." When the Pope had finished, all who were present exclaimed, with one accord, "It is the will of God." This, the Pope declared, should be the rallying cry of the crusaders, who were to wear a cross upon their bosoms as they went forth, and upon their backs as they returned, as a holy sign of their sacred mission.¹

The Crusades are ordinarily represented as the most striking examples of the simple faith and religious enthusiasm of the Middle Ages. They appealed, however, to many different kinds of men. The devout, the romantic, and the adventurous were by no means the only classes that were attracted. Syria held out inducements to the discontented noble who might hope to gain a principality in the East, to the merchant who was looking for new enterprises, to the merely restless who wished to avoid his responsibilities at home, and even to the criminal who enlisted with a view of escaping the results of his past offenses.

It is noteworthy that Urban appeals especially to those who had been "contending against their brethren and relatives," and urges those "who have hitherto been robbers now to become soldiers of Christ." And the conduct of many of the crusaders indicates that the Pope found a ready hearing among this class. Yet higher motives than a love of adventure and the hope of conquest impelled many who took their way eastward. Great numbers, doubtless, went to Jerusalem "through devotion alone, and not for the sake of honor or gain," with the sole object of freeing the Holy Sepulcher from the hands of the infidel.

To such as these the Pope promised that the journey itself should take the place of all penance for sin. The faithful

¹ For the speech of Urban, see Readings, chap. xv.
crusader, like the faithful Mohammedan, was assured of immediate entrance into heaven if he died repentant. Later, the Church exhibited its extraordinary authority by what would seem to us an unjust interference with business contracts. It freed those who "with a pure heart" entered upon the journey from the payment of interest upon their debts, and permitted them to mortgage property against the wishes of their feudal lords. The crusaders' wives and children and property were taken under the immediate protection of the Church, and he who troubled them incurred excommunication. These various considerations help to explain the great popularity of undertakings that, at first sight, would seem to have promised only hardships and disappointment.

The Council of Clermont met in November. Before spring (1096) those who set forth to preach the Crusade, — above all, the famous Peter the Hermit, who was formerly given credit for having begun the whole crusading movement, — had collected, in France and along the Rhine, an extraordinary army of the common folk. Peasants, workmen, vagabonds, and even women and children answered the summons, all blindly intent upon rescuing the Holy Sepulcher, two thousand miles away. They were confident that the Lord would sustain them during the weary leagues of the journey, and that, when they reached the Holy Land, he would grant them a prompt victory over the infidel.

This great host was got under way in several divisions under the leadership of Peter the Hermit, and of Walter the Penniless and other humble knights. Many of the crusaders were slaughtered by the Hungarians, who rose to protect themselves from the depredations of this motley horde in its passage through their country. Part of them got as far as Nicæa, only to be slaughtered by the Turks. This is but an example, on a large scale, of what was going on continually for a century or so after this first great catastrophe. Individual pilgrims and adventurers, and sometimes considerable bodies of crusaders,
were constantly falling a prey to every form of disaster—starvation, slavery, disease, and death—in their persistent endeavors to reach the far-away Holy Land.

**Section 79. The First Crusade**

The most conspicuous figures of the long period of the Crusades are not, however, to be found among the lowly followers of Peter the Hermit, but are the knights, in their long coats of flexible armor. A year after the summons issued at Clermont great armies of fighting men had been collected in the West under distinguished leaders—the Pope speaks of three hundred thousand soldiers. Of the various divisions which were to meet in Constantinople, the following were the most important: the volunteers from Provence under the papal legate and Count Raymond of Toulouse; inhabitants of Germany, particularly of Lorraine, under Godfrey of Bouillon and his brother Baldwin, both destined to be rulers of Jerusalem; and lastly, an army of French and of the Normans of southern Italy under Bohemond and Tancred.¹

The distinguished noblemen who have been mentioned were not actually in command of real armies. Each crusader undertook the expedition on his own account and was only obedient to any one's orders so long as he pleased. The knights and men naturally grouped themselves around the more noted leaders, but considered themselves free to change chiefs when they pleased. The leaders themselves reserved the right to look out for their own special interests rather than sacrifice themselves to the good of the expedition.

Upon the arrival of the crusaders at Constantinople it quickly became clear that they had not much more in common with the "Greeks" ² than with the Turks. Emperor Alexius ordered

¹ For the routes taken by the different crusading armies, see the accompanying map.
² The people of the Eastern Empire were called Greeks because the Greek language continued to be used in Constantinople.
his soldiers to attack Godfrey's army, encamped in the suburbs of his capital, because their chief at first refused to take the oath of feudal homage to him. The Emperor's daughter Anna, in her history of the times, gives a sad picture of the outrageous conduct of the crusaders. They, on the other hand, denounced the Greeks as traitors, cowards, and liars.

The eastern Emperor had hoped to use his western allies to reconquer Asia Minor and force back the Turks. The leading knights, on the contrary, dreamed of carving out principalities for themselves in the former dominions of the Emperor, and proposed to control them by right of conquest. Later we find both Greeks and western Christians shamelessly allying themselves with the Mohammedans against each other. The relations of the eastern and western enemies of the Turks were well illustrated when the crusaders besieged their first town, Nicæa. When it was just ready to surrender, the Greeks arranged with the enemy to have their troops admitted first. They then closed the gates against their western confederates and invited them to move on.

The first real allies that the crusaders met with were the Christian Armenians, who gave them aid after their terrible march through Asia Minor. With their help Baldwin got possession of Edessa, of which he made himself prince. The chiefs induced the great body of the crusaders to postpone the march on Jerusalem, and a year was spent in taking the

FIG. 171. KNIGHT OF THE FIRST CRUSADE

In the time of the Crusades knights wore a coat of interwoven iron rings, called a hauberk, to protect themselves. The habit of using the rigid iron plates, of which later armor was constructed, did not come in until the Crusades were over.

Dissension among the leaders of the crusaders
rich and important city of Antioch. A bitter strife then broke out, especially between the Norman Bohemond and the count of Toulouse, as to who should have the conquered town. After the most unworthy conduct on both sides, Bohemond won, and Raymond was forced to set to work to conquer another principality for himself on the coast about Tripoli.

In the spring of 1099 about twenty thousand warriors were at last able to move upon Jerusalem. They found the city well walled, in the midst of a desolate region where neither food nor water nor the materials to construct the apparatus necessary for the capture of the town were to be found.

However, the opportune arrival at Jaffa of galleys from Genoa furnished the besiegers with supplies, and, in spite of all the difficulties, the place was taken in a couple of months. The crusaders, with shocking barbarity, massacred the inhabitants. Godfrey of Bouillon was chosen ruler of Jerusalem and took the modest title of "Defender of the Holy Sepulcher." He soon
died and was succeeded by his brother Baldwin, who left Edessa in 1100 to take up the task of extending the bounds of the kingdom of Jerusalem.

It will be observed that the "Franks," as the Mohammedans called all the western folk, had established the centers of four principalities. These were Edessa, Antioch, the region about Tripoli conquered by Raymond, and the kingdom of Jerusalem. The last was speedily increased by Baldwin; with the help of the mariners from Venice and Genoa, he succeeded in getting possession of Acre, Sidon, and a number of other less important coast towns.

The news of these Christian victories quickly reached the West, and in 1101 tens of thousands of new crusaders started eastward. Most of them were lost or dispersed in passing through Asia Minor, and few reached their destination. The original conquerors were consequently left to hold the land against the Saracens and to organize their conquests as best they could. This was a very difficult task — too difficult to accomplish under the circumstances.

The permanent hold of the Franks upon the eastern borders of the Mediterranean depended upon the strength of the colonies which their various princes were able to establish. It is impossible to learn how many pilgrims from the West made their permanent homes in the new Latin principalities. Certainly the greater part of those who visited Palestine returned home after fulfilling the vow they had made — to kneel at the Holy Sepulcher.

Still the princes could rely upon a certain number of soldiers who would be willing to stay and fight the Mohammedans. The Turks, moreover, were so busy fighting one another that they showed less energy than might have been expected in attempting to drive the Franks from the narrow strip of territory — some five hundred miles long and fifty wide — which they had conquered. The map on the opposite page shows the extent and situation of the crusaders' states.
Section 80. The Religious Orders of the Hospitalers and Templars

A noteworthy outcome of the crusading movement was the foundation of several curious orders, of which the Hospitalers and the Templars were the most important. These orders combined the two dominant interests of the time, those of the monk and of the soldier. They permitted a man to be both at once; the knight might wear a monkish cowl over his coat of armor.

The Hospitalers grew out of a monastic association that was formed before the First Crusade for the succor of the poor and sick among the pilgrims. Later the society admitted noble knights to its membership and became a military order, at the same time continuing its care for the sick. This charitable association, like the earlier monasteries, received generous gifts of land in western Europe and built and controlled many fortified monasteries in the Holy Land itself. After the evacuation of Syria in the thirteenth century, the Hospitalers moved their headquarters to the Island of Rhodes, and later to Malta. The order still exists, and it is considered a distinction to this day to have the privilege of wearing its emblem, the cross of Malta.

Before the Hospitalers were transformed into a military order, a little group of French knights banded together in 1119.

Fig. 172. Costume of the Hospitalers

The Hospitaler here represented bears the peculiar Maltese cross on his bosom. His crucifix indicates his religious character, but his sword and the armor which he wears beneath his long gown enabled him to fight as well as pray, and to succor the wounded.
to defend pilgrims on their way to Jerusalem from the attacks of the infidel. They were assigned quarters in the king’s palace at Jerusalem, on the site of the former Temple of Solomon; hence the name “Templars,” which they were destined to render famous. The “poor soldiers of the Temple” were enthusiastically approved by the Church. They wore a white cloak adorned with a red cross, and were under a very strict monastic rule which bound them by the vows of obedience, poverty, and celibacy. The fame of the order spread throughout Europe, and the most exalted, even dukes and princes, were ready to renounce the world and serve Christ under its black and white banner, with the legend Non nobis, Domine.

The order was aristocratic from the first, and it soon became incredibly rich and independent. It had its collectors in all parts of Europe, who dispatched the “alms” they received to the Grand Master at Jerusalem. Towns, churches, and estates were given to the order, as well as vast sums of money. The king of Aragon proposed to bestow upon it a third of his kingdom. The Pope showered privileges upon the Templars. They were exempted from tithes and taxes and were brought under his immediate jurisdiction; they were released from feudal obligations, and bishops were forbidden to excommunicate them for any cause.

No wonder they grew insolent and aroused the jealousy and hate of princes and prelates alike. Even Innocent III violently upbraided them for admitting to their order wicked men who then enjoyed all the privileges of churchmen. Early in the fourteenth century, through the combined efforts of the Pope and Philip the Fair of France, the order was brought to a terrible end. Its members were accused of the most abominable practices,—such as heresy, the worship of idols, and the systematic insulting of Christ and his religion. Many distinguished Templars were burned for heresy; others perished miserably in dungeons. The once powerful order was abolished and its property confiscated.
SECTION 81. THE SECOND AND LATER CRUSADES

Fifty years after the preaching of the First Crusade, the fall of Edessa (1144), an important outpost of the Christians in the East, led to a second great expedition. This was forwarded by no less a person than St. Bernard, who went about using his unrivaled eloquence to induce volunteers to take the cross.

![Krak-des-Chevaliers, restored](image)

**Fig. 173. Krak-des-Chevaliers, restored**

This is an example of the strong castles that the crusaders built in Syria. It was completed in the form here represented about the year 1200 and lies halfway between Antioch and Damascus. It will be noticed that there was a fortress within a fortress. The castle is now in ruins (see headpiece of this chapter).

In a fierce hymn of battle he cried to the Knights Templars: “The Christian who slays the unbeliever in the Holy War is sure of his reward, the more sure if he himself be slain. The Christian glories in the death of the infidel, because Christ is glorified.” The king of France readily consented to take the cross, but the Emperor, Conrad III, appears to have yielded only after St. Bernard had preached before him and given a vivid picture of the terrors of the Judgment Day.
In regard to the less distinguished recruits, a historian of the time tells us that so many thieves and robbers hastened to take the cross that every one felt that such enthusiasm could only be the work of God himself. St. Bernard himself, the chief promoter of the expedition, gives a most unflattering description of the "soldiers of Christ." "In that countless multitude you will find few except the utterly wicked and impious, the sacrilegious, homicides, and perjurers, whose departure is a double gain. Europe rejoices to lose them and Palestine to gain them; they are useful in both ways, in their absence from here and their presence there." It is unnecessary to describe the movements and fate of these crusaders; suffice it to say that, from a military standpoint, the so-called Second Crusade was a miserable failure.

In the year 1187, forty years later, Jerusalem was recaptured by Saladin, the most heroic and distinguished of all the Mohammedan rulers of that period. The loss of the Holy City led to the most famous of all the military expeditions to the Holy Land, in which Frederick Barbarossa, Richard the Lion-Hearted of England, and his political rival, Philip Augustus of France, all took part (see above, p. 417). The accounts of the enterprise show that while the several Christian leaders hated one another heartily enough, the Christians and Mohammedans were coming to respect one another. We find examples of the most courtly
The Fourth and subsequent Crusades

In 1192 Richard concluded a truce with Saladin, by the terms of which the Christian pilgrims were allowed to visit the holy places in safety and comfort.

In the thirteenth century the crusaders began to direct their expeditions toward Egypt as the center of the Mohammedan power. The first of these was diverted in an extraordinary manner by the Venetians, who induced the crusaders to conquer Constantinople for their benefit. The further expeditions of Frederick II (see above, p. 457) and St. Louis need not be described. Jerusalem was irrevocably lost in 1244, and although the possibility of recovering the city was long considered, the Crusades may be said to have come to a close before the end of the thirteenth century.

Section 82. Chief Results of the Crusades

For one class, at least, the Holy Land had great and permanent charms, namely, the Italian merchants, especially those from Genoa, Venice, and Pisa. It was through their early interest and by means of supplies from their ships, that the conquest of the Holy Land had been rendered possible. The merchants always made sure that they were well paid for their services. When they aided in the successful siege of a town they arranged that a definite quarter should be assigned to them in the captured place, where they might have their market, docks, church, and all that was necessary for a permanent center for their commerce. This district belonged to the town from which the merchants came. Venice even sent governors to live in the quarters assigned to its citizens in the kingdom of Jerusalem. Marseilles also had independent quarters in Jerusalem, and Genoa had its share in the county of Tripoli.

This new commerce had a most important influence in bringing the West into permanent relations with the Orient. Eastern products from India and elsewhere—silks, spices, camphor,
musk, pearls, and ivory—were brought by the Mohammedans from the East to the commercial towns of Palestine and Syria; then, through the Italian merchants, they found their way into France and Germany, suggesting ideas of luxury hitherto scarcely dreamed of by the still half-barbarous Franks.

Moreover, the Crusades had a great effect upon the methods of warfare, for the soldiers from the West learned from the Greeks about the old Roman methods of constructing machines for attacking castles and walled towns. This led, as has been pointed out in a previous chapter (see section 64), to the construction in western Europe of stone castles, first with square towers and later with round ones, the remains of which are so common in Germany, France, and England. The Crusades also produced heraldry, or the science of coats of arms. These were the badges that single knights or groups of knights adopted in order to distinguish themselves from other people.

Some of the results of the Crusades upon western Europe must already be obvious, even from this very brief account. Thousands and thousands of Frenchmen, Germans, and Englishmen had traveled to the Orient by land and by sea. Most of them came from hamlets or castles where they could never have learned much of the great world beyond the confines of their native village or province. They suddenly found themselves in great cities and in the midst of unfamiliar peoples and customs. This could not fail to make them think and give them new ideas to carry home. The Crusade took the place of a liberal education. The crusaders came into contact with those who knew more than they did, above all the Arabs, and brought back with them new notions of comfort and luxury.

Yet in attempting to estimate the debt of the West to the Crusades it should be remembered that many of the new things may well have come from Constantinople, or through the Mohammedans of Sicily and Spain,1 quite independently of the

1 The western Europeans derived many important ideas from the Mohammedans in Spain, as Arabic numerals, alchemy, algebra, and the use of paper.
armed incursions into Syria. Moreover, during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries towns were rapidly growing up in Europe, trade and manufactures were extending, and the universities were being founded. It would be absurd to suppose that without the Crusades this progress would not have taken place. So we may conclude that the distant expeditions and the contact with strange and more highly civilized peoples did no more than hasten the improvement which was already perceptible before Urban made his ever-memorable address at Clermont.

QUESTIONS

Section 78. What led to the Crusades? Describe Urban's speech. What was the character of Peter the Hermit's expedition?

Section 79. Who were the leaders of the First Crusade? Describe the capture of Jerusalem by the Crusaders.

Section 80. Who were the Hospitalers? What was the order of the Temple and what became of the Templars?

Section 81. What was the Second Crusade? Give some particulars in regard to the Third Crusade and its leaders.

Section 82. Give as complete an account as you can of the chief results of the Crusades.
CHAPTER XX

THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH AT ITS HEIGHT

Section 83. Organization and Powers of the Church

In the preceding pages it has been necessary to refer constantly to the Church and the clergy. Indeed, without them medieval history would become almost a blank, for the Church was incomparably the most important institution of the time, and its officers were the soul of nearly every great enterprise. We have already learned something of the rise of the Church and of its head, the Pope, as well as the mode of life and the work of the monks as they spread over Europe. We have also watched the long struggle between the emperors and the popes, in which the emperors were finally worsted. We must now consider the Medieval Church as a completed institution at the height of its power in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.
We have already had abundant proofs that the Medieval Church was very different from our modern churches, whether Catholic or Protestant.

1. In the first place, every one was required to belong to it, just as we all must belong to some country to-day. One was not born into the Church, it is true, but he was ordinarily baptized into it when he was a mere infant. All western Europe formed a single religious association, from which it was a crime to revolt. To refuse allegiance to the Church, or to question its authority or teachings, was regarded as treason against God and was punishable with death.

2. The Medieval Church did not rely for its support, as churches usually must to-day, upon the voluntary contributions of its members. It enjoyed, in addition to the revenue from its vast tracts of lands and a great variety of fees, the income from a regular tax, the tithe. Those upon whom this fell were forced to pay it, just as we all must now pay taxes imposed by the government.

3. It is clear, moreover, that the Medieval Church was not merely a religious body, as churches are to-day. Of course it maintained places of worship, conducted devotional exercises, and cultivated the religious life; but it did far more. It was, in a way, a State, for it had an elaborate system of law, and its own courts, in which it tried many cases which are now settled in our ordinary courts. One may get some idea of the business of the church courts from the fact that the Church claimed the right to try all cases in which a clergyman was involved, or any one connected with the Church or under its special protection, such as monks, students, crusaders, widows, orphans, and the helpless. Then all cases where the rites of the Church, or its prohibitions, were involved came ordinarily before the church courts, as, for example, those concerning marriage, wills, sworn

1 The law of the Church was known as the canon law. It was taught in most of the universities and practiced by a great number of lawyers. It was based upon the acts of the various church councils, from that of Nicaea (325 A.D.) down, and, above all, upon the decrees and decisions of the popes.
contracts, usury, blasphemy, sorcery, heresy, and so forth. The Church even had its prisons, to which it might sentence offenders for life.

4. The Church not only performed the functions of a State; it had the organization of a State. Unlike the Protestant ministers of to-day, all churchmen and religious associations of medieval Europe were under one supreme head, the Pope, who made laws for all and controlled every church officer, wherever he might be, whether in Italy or Germany, Spain or Ireland. The whole Church had one official language, Latin, in which all communications were written and in which its services were everywhere conducted.

The Medieval Church may therefore properly be called a monarchy in its government. The Pope was its all-powerful and absolute head. He was the supreme lawgiver. He might set aside or repeal any law of the Church, no matter how ancient, so long as he did not believe it to be ordained by the Scriptures or by Nature. He might, for good reasons, make exceptions to all merely human laws; as, for instance, permit cousins to marry, or free a monk from his vows. Such exceptions were known as dispensations.

The Pope was not merely the supreme lawgiver; he was the supreme judge. Any one, whether clergyman or layman, in any part of Europe could appeal to him at any stage in the trial of a large class of cases. Obviously this system had serious drawbacks. Grave injustice might be done by carrying to Rome a case which ought to have been settled in Edinburgh or Cologne, where the facts were best known. The rich, moreover, always had the advantage, as they alone could afford to bring suits before so distant a court.

The control of the Pope over all parts of the Christian Church was exercised by his legates. These papal ambassadors were intrusted with great powers. Their haughty mien sometimes offended the prelates and rulers to whom they brought home the authority of the pope,—as, for instance, when the legate...
Pandulf grandly absolved all the subjects of King John of England, before his very face, from their oath of fealty to him (see above, p. 419).

The task assumed by the Pope of governing the whole western world naturally made it necessary to create a large body of officials at Rome in order to transact all the multiform business and prepare and transmit the innumerable legal documents. The cardinals and the Pope's officials constituted what was called the papal curia, or court.

To carry on his government and meet the expenses of palace and retinue, the Pope had need of a vast income. This he secured from various sources. Heavy fees were exacted from those who brought suits to his court for decision. The archbishops, bishops, and abbots were expected to make generous contributions when the Pope confirmed their election. In the thirteenth century the Pope himself began to fill many benefices throughout Europe, and customarily received half the first year's revenues from those whom he appointed. For several centuries before the Protestants finally threw off their allegiance to the popes, there was widespread complaint on the part of both clergy and laymen that the fees and taxes levied by the curia were excessive.

Next in order below the head of the Church were the archbishops and bishops. An archbishop was a bishop whose power extended beyond the boundaries of his own diocese and who exercised a certain control over all the bishops within his province.

There is perhaps no class of persons in medieval times whose position it is so necessary to understand as that of the bishops. They were regarded as the successors of the apostles, whose powers were held to be divinely transmitted to them. They represented the Church Universal in their respective dioceses, under the supreme headship of their "elder brother," the

1 Many of the edicts, decisions, and orders of the popes were called bulls, from the seal (Latin bulla) attached to them.
bishop of Rome, the successor of the chief of the apostles. Their insignia of office, the miter and crosier, are familiar to every one. Each bishop had his especial church, which was called a cathedral, and usually surpassed the other churches of the diocese in size and beauty.

![Canterbury Cathedral](image)

**Fig. 175. Canterbury Cathedral**

The bishop's church was called a cathedral, because in it stood the bishop's chair, or throne (Latin *cathedra*). It was therefore much more imposing ordinarily than the parish churches, although sometimes the abbey churches belonging to rich monasteries vied with the bishop's church in beauty (see below, section 89).

In addition to the oversight of his diocese, it was the bishop's business to look after the lands and other possessions which belonged to the bishopric. Lastly, the bishop was usually a feudal lord, with the obligations which that implied. He might have vassals and subvassals, and often was himself a vassal, not only of the king but also of some neighboring lord.

1 The headpiece of this chapter represents an English bishop ordaining a priest and is taken from a manuscript of Henry II's time. The bishop is wearing his miter and holds his pastoral staff, the crosier, in his left hand while he raises his right, in blessing, over the priest's head.
The parish priest and his duties

The lowest division of the Church was the parish. At the head of the parish was the parish priest, who conducted services in the parish church and absolved, baptized, married, and buried his parishioners. The priests were supposed to be supported by the lands belonging to the parish church and by the tithes. But both of these sources of income were often in the hands of laymen or of a neighboring monastery, while the poor priest received the merest pittance, scarcely sufficient to keep soul and body together.

The exalted position of the clergy

The clergy were set apart from the laity in several ways. The higher orders — bishop, priest, deacon, and subdeacon — were required to remain unmarried, and in this way were freed from the cares and interests of family life. The Church held, moreover, that the higher clergy, when they had been properly ordained, received through their ordination a mysterious imprint, the "indelible character," so that they could never become simple laymen again, even if they ceased to perform their duties altogether. Above all, the clergy alone could administer the sacraments upon which it was believed the salvation of every individual soul depended.

Nature of penance

The punishment for sin imposed by the priest was called penance. This took a great variety of forms. It might consist in fasting, repeating prayers, visiting holy places, or abstaining from one's ordinary amusements. A journey to the Holy Land was regarded as taking the place of all other penance. Instead, however, of requiring the penitent actually to perform the fasts, pilgrimages, or other sacrifices imposed as penance by the priest, the Church early began to permit him to change his penance into a contribution, to be applied to some pious enterprise, like building a church or bridge, or caring for the poor and sick.

Only clergy-men ordinarily knew how to read and write

The influence of the clergy was greatly increased by the fact that they alone were educated. For six or seven centuries after the overthrow of the Roman government in the West, very few outside of the clergy ever dreamed of studying, or even of learning to read and write. Even in the thirteenth century an offender
who wished to prove that he belonged to the clergy, in order that he might be tried by a church court, had only to show that he could read a single line; for it was assumed by the judges that no one unconnected with the Church could read at all.

It was therefore inevitable that all the teachers were clergy-men, that almost all the books were written by priests and monks, and that the clergy was the ruling power in all intellectual, artistic, and literary matters — the chief guardians and promoters of civilization. Moreover, the civil government was forced to rely upon churchmen to write out the public documents and proclamations. The priests and monks held the pen for the king. Representatives of the clergy sat in the king’s councils and acted as his ministers; in fact, the conduct of the government largely devolved upon them.

The offices in the Church were open to all ranks of men, and many of the popes themselves sprang from the humblest classes. The Church thus constantly recruited its ranks with fresh blood. No one held an office simply because his father had held it before him, as was the case in the civil government.

No wonder that the churchmen were by far the most powerful class in the Middle Ages. They controlled great wealth; they alone were educated; they held the keys of the kingdom of heaven and without their aid no one could hope to enter in. By excommunication they could cast out the enemies of the Church and could forbid all men to associate with them, since they were accursed. By means of the interdict they could suspend all religious ceremonies in a whole city or country by closing the church doors and prohibiting all public services.

Section 84. The Heretics and the Inquisition

Nevertheless, in spite of the power and wonderful organization of the Church, a few people began to revolt against it as early as the time of Gregory VII; and the number of these rebels continued to increase as time went on. Popular leaders
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arose who declared that no one ought any longer to rely upon the Church for his salvation; that all its elaborate ceremonies were worse than useless; that its Masses, holy water, and relics were mere money-getting devices of a sinful priesthood and helped no one to heaven.

Those who questioned the teachings of the Church and proposed to cast off its authority were, according to the accepted view of the time, guilty of the supreme crime of heresy. Heretics were of two sorts. One class merely rejected the practices and some of the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church while they remained Christians and endeavored to imitate as nearly as possible the simple life of Christ and the apostles.

Among those who continued to accept the Christian faith but refused to obey the clergy, the most important sect was that of the Waldensians, which took its rise about 1175. These were followers of Peter Waldo of Lyons, who gave up all their property and lived a life of apostolic poverty. They went about preaching the Gospel and explaining the Scriptures, which they translated from Latin into the language of the people. They made many converts, and before the end of the twelfth century there were great numbers of them scattered throughout western Europe.

On the other hand, there were popular leaders who taught that the Christian religion itself was false. They held that there were two principles in the universe, the good and the evil, which were forever fighting for the victory. They asserted that the Jehovah of the Old Testament was really the evil power, and that it was, therefore, the evil power whom the Catholic Church worshiped. These heretics were commonly called Albigensians, a name derived from the town of Albi in southern France, where they were very numerous.

It is very difficult for us who live in a tolerant age to understand the universal and deep-rooted horror of heresy which long prevailed in Europe. But we must recollect that to the orthodox
believer in the Church nothing could exceed the guilt of one who committed treason against God by rejecting the religion which had been handed down in the Roman Church from the immediate followers of his Son. Moreover, doubt and unbelief were not merely sin; they were revolt against the most powerful social institution of the time, which, in spite of the sins of some of its officials, continued to be venerated by people at large throughout western Europe. The story of the Albigensians and Waldensians, and the efforts of the Church to suppress them by persuasion, by fire and sword, and by the stern court of the Inquisition, form a strange and terrible chapter in medieval history.

In southern France there were many adherents of both the Albigensians and the Waldensians, especially in the county of Toulouse. At the beginning of the thirteenth century there was in this region an open contempt for the Church, and bold heretical teachings were heard even among the higher classes.

Against the people of this flourishing land Innocent III preached a crusade in 1208. An army marched from northern France into the doomed region and, after one of the most atrocious and bloody wars upon record, suppressed the heresy by wholesale slaughter. At the same time, the war checked the civilization and destroyed the prosperity of the most enlightened portion of France.

The most permanent defense of the Church against heresy was the establishment, under the headship of the Pope, of a system of courts designed to ferret out secret cases of unbelief and bring the offenders to punishment. These courts, which devoted their whole attention to the discovery and conviction of heretics, were called the Holy Inquisition, which gradually took form after the Albigensian crusade. The unfairness of the trials and the cruel treatment to which those suspected of heresy were subjected, through long imprisonment or torture,—inflicted with the hope of forcing them to confess their crime or to implicate others,—have rendered the name of the Inquisition infamous.
Without by any means attempting to defend the methods employed, it may be remarked that the inquisitors were often earnest and upright men, and the methods of procedure of the Inquisition were not more cruel than those used in the secular courts of the period.

The assertion of the suspected person that he was not a heretic did not receive any attention, for it was assumed that he would naturally deny his guilt, as would any other criminal. A person's belief had, therefore, to be judged by outward acts. Consequently one might fall into the hands of the Inquisition by mere accidental conversation with a heretic, by some unintentional neglect to show due respect toward the Church rites, or by the malicious testimony of one's neighbors. This is really the most terrible aspect of the Inquisition and its procedure.

If the suspected person confessed his guilt and abjured his heresy, he was forgiven and received back into the Church; but a penance of life imprisonment was imposed upon him as a fitting means of wiping away the unspeakable sin of which he had been guilty. If he persisted in his heresy, he was "relaxed to the secular arm"; that is to say, the Church, whose law forbade it to shed blood, handed over the convicted person to the civil power, which burned him alive without further trial.

Section 85. The Franciscans and Dominicans

We may now turn to that far more cheerful and effective method of meeting the opponents of the Church, which may be said to have been discovered by St. Francis of Assisi. His teachings and the example of his beautiful life probably did far more to secure continued allegiance to the Church than all the harsh devices of the Inquisition.

We have seen how the Waldensians tried to better the world by living simple lives and preaching the Gospel. Owing to the disfavor of the Church authorities, who declared their teachings erroneous and dangerous, they were prevented from
publicly carrying on their missionary work. Yet all conscientious
men agreed with the Waldensians that the world was in a sad
plight, owing to the negligence and the misdeeds of the clergy.
St. Francis and St. Dominic strove to meet the needs of their
time by inventing a new kind ofclergyman, the begging brother,
or "mendicant friar" (from the Latin frater, "brother"). He was
to do just what the bishops and parish priests often failed to do
— namely, lead a holy life of self-sacrifice, defend the Church’s
beliefs against the attacks of the heretics, and awaken the people
to a new religious life. The founding of the mendicant orders
is one of the most interesting events of the Middle Ages.

There is no more lovely and fascinating figure in all history
than St. Francis. He was born (probably in 1182) at Assisi, a
little town in central Italy. He was the son of a well-to-do
merchant, and during his early youth he lived a very gay life,
spending his father’s money freely. He read the French
romances of the time and dreamed of imitating the brave
knights whose adventures they described. Although his com-
panions were wild and reckless, there was a delicacy and chivalry
in Francis’s own make-up which made him hate all things coarse
and heartless. When later he voluntarily became a beggar, his
ragged cloak still covered a true poet and knight.

The contrast between his own life of luxury and the sad state
of the poor early afflicted him. When he was about twenty,
after a long and serious illness which made a break in his gay
life and gave him time to think, he suddenly lost his love for the
old pleasures and began to consort with the destitute, above all
with lepers. His father does not appear to have had any fond-
ness whatever for beggars, and the relations between him and
his son grew more and more strained. When finally he threatened
to disinherit the young man, Francis cheerfully agreed to sur-
render all right to his inheritance. Stripping off his clothes and
giving them back to his father, he accepted the worn-out garment
of a gardener and became a homeless hermit, busying himself
in repairing the dilapidated chapels near Assisi.
He soon began to preach in a simple way, and before long a rich fellow townsman resolved to follow Francis's example—sell his all and give to the poor. Others soon joined them, and these joyous converts, free of worldly burdens, went barefoot and penniless about central Italy preaching the Gospel instead of shutting themselves up in a monastery.

When, with a dozen followers, Francis appealed to the Pope in 1210 for his approval, Innocent III hesitated. He did not believe that any one could lead a life of absolute poverty. Then might not these ragged, ill-kempt vagabonds appear to condemn the Church by adopting a life so different from that of the rich and comfortable clergy? Yet if he disapproved the friars, he would seem to disapprove at the same time Christ's directions to his apostles. He finally decided to authorize the brethren to continue their missions.

Seven years later, when Francis's followers had greatly increased in numbers, missionary work was begun on a large scale, and brethren were dispatched to Germany, Hungary, France, Spain, and even to Syria. It was not long before an English chronicler was telling with wonder of the arrival in his country of these barefoot men, in their patched gowns and with ropes about their waists, who, with Christian faith, took no thought for the morrow, believing that their Heavenly Father knew what things they had need of.

As time went on, the success of their missionary work led the Pope to bestow many privileges upon them. It grieved Francis, however, to think of his little band of companions being converted into a great and powerful order. He foresaw that they would soon cease to lead their simple, holy life, and would become ambitious and perhaps rich. "I, little Brother Francis," he writes, "desire to follow the life and the poverty of Jesus Christ, persevering therein until the end; and I beg you all and exhort you to persevere always in this most holy life of poverty, and take good care never to depart from it upon the advice and teachings of any one whomsoever."
After the death of St. Francis (1226) many of the order, which now numbered several thousand members, wished to maintain the simple rule of absolute poverty; others, including the new head of the order, believed that much good might be done with the wealth which people were anxious to give them.

Fig. 176. Church of St. Francis at Assisi

Assisi is situated on a high hill, and the monastery of the Franciscans is built out on a promontory. The monastery has two churches, one above the other. The lower church, in which are the remains of St. Francis, was begun in 1228 and contains pictures of the life and miracles of the saint. To reach the upper church (completed 1253) one can go up by the stairs, seen to the right of the entrance to the lower church, to the higher level upon which the upper church faces.

They argued that the individual friars might still remain absolutely possessionless, even if the order had beautiful churches and comfortable monasteries. So a stately church was immediately constructed at Assisi (Fig. 176) to receive the remains of their humble founder, who in his lifetime had chosen a deserted...
hovel for his home; and a great chest was set up in the church to receive the offerings of those who desired to give.

St. Dominic (b. 1170), the Spanish founder of the other great mendicant order, was not a simple layman like Francis. He was a churchman and took a regular course of instruction in theology for ten years in a Spanish university. He then (1208) accompanied his bishop to southern France on the eve of the Albigensian crusade and was deeply shocked to see the prevalence of heresy. His host at Toulouse happened to be an Albigensian, and Dominic spent the night in converting him. He then and there determined to devote his life to fighting heresy.

By 1214 a few sympathetic spirits from various parts of Europe had joined Dominic, and they asked Innocent III to sanction their new order. The Pope again hesitated, but is said to have dreamed a dream in which he saw the great Roman Church of the Lateran tottering and ready to fall had not Dominic supported it on his shoulders. He interpreted this as meaning that the new organization might sometime become a great aid to the papacy, and gave it his approval. As soon as possible Dominic sent forth his followers, of whom there were but sixteen, to evangelize the world, just as the Franciscans were undertaking their first missionary journeys. By 1221 the Dominican order was thoroughly organized and had sixty monasteries scattered over western Europe.

"Wandering on foot over the face of Europe, under burning suns or chilling blasts, rejecting alms in money but receiving thankfully whatever coarse food might be set before the wayfarer, enduring hunger in silent resignation, taking no thought for the morrow, but busied eternally in the work of snatching souls from Satan and lifting men up from the sordid cares of daily life"—in this way did the early Franciscans and Dominicans win the love and veneration of the people.

The Dominicans were called the "Preaching Friars" and were carefully trained in theology in order the better to refute the arguments of the heretics. The Pope delegated to them
especially the task of conducting the Inquisition. They early began to extend their influence over the universities, and the two most distinguished theologians and teachers of the thirteenth century, Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas, were Dominicans. Among the Franciscans, on the other hand, there was always a considerable party who were suspicious of learning and who showed a greater desire to remain absolutely poor than did the Dominicans. Yet as a whole the Franciscans, like the Dominicans, accepted the wealth that came to them, and they too contributed distinguished scholars to the universities.

Section 86. Church and State

We have seen that the Medieval Church was a single great institution with its head, the Pope, at Rome and its officers in all the countries of western Europe. It had its laws, law courts, taxes, and even prisons, just like the various kings and other rulers. In general, the kings were ready to punish every one who revolted against the Church. Indeed, the State depended upon the churchmen in many ways. It was the churchmen who wrote out the documents which the king required; they took care of the schools, aided the poor, and protected the weak. They tried, by issuing the Truce of God, to discourage neighborhood warfare, which the kings were unable to stop.

But as the period of disorder drew to an end and the kings and other rulers got the better of the feudal lords and established peace in their realms, they began to think that the Church had become too powerful and too rich. Certain difficulties arose of which the following were the most important:

1. Should the king or the Pope have the advantage of selecting the bishops and the abbots of rich monasteries? Naturally both were anxious to place their friends and supporters in these influential positions. Moreover, the Pope could claim a considerable contribution from those whom he appointed, and the king naturally grudged him the money.
2. How far might the king venture to tax the lands and other property of the Church? Was this vast amount of wealth to go on increasing and yet make no contribution to the support of the government? The churchmen usually maintained that they needed all their money to carry on the church services, keep up the churches and monasteries, take care of the schools, and aid the poor, for the State left them to bear all these necessary burdens. The law of the Church permitted the churchmen to make voluntary gifts to the king when there was urgent necessity.

3. Then there was trouble over the cases to be tried in the church courts and the claim of churchmen to be tried only by clergymen. Worst of all was the habit of appealing cases to Rome, for the Pope would often decide the matter in exactly the opposite way from which the king's court had decided it.

4. Lastly there was the question of how far the Pope as head of the Christian Church had a right to interfere with the government of a particular state, when he did not approve of the way in which a king was acting. The powers of the Pope were very great, every one admitted, but even the most devout Catholics differed somewhat as to just how great they were.

We have seen some illustrations of these troubles in the chapter on the Popes and Emperors. A famous conflict between the king of France, Philip the Fair, and Pope Boniface VIII, about the year 1300, had important results. Philip and Edward I of England, who were reigning at the same time, had got into the habit of taxing the churchmen as they did their other subjects.

It was natural after a monarch had squeezed all that he could out of the Jews and the towns, and had exacted every possible feudal due, that he should turn to the rich estates of the clergy, in spite of their claim that their property was dedicated to God and owed the king nothing. The extensive enterprises of Edward I (see above, pp. 422 ff.) led him in 1296 to demand one fifth of the personal property of the clergy. Philip the Fair exacted one hundredth and then one fiftieth of the possessions of clergy and laity alike.
Against this impartial system Boniface protested in the famous bull, *Clerici laicos* (1296). He claimed that the laity had always been exceedingly hostile to the clergy, and that the rulers were now exhibiting this hostility by imposing heavy burdens upon the Church, forgetting that they had no control over the clergy and their possessions. The Pope, therefore, forbade all churchmen, including the monks, to pay, without his consent, to a king or ruler any part of the Church's revenue or possessions upon any pretext whatsoever. He likewise forbade the kings and princes under pain of excommunication to presume to exact any such payments.

It happened that just as the Pope was prohibiting the clergy from contributing to the taxes, Philip the Fair had forbidden the exportation of all gold and silver from the country. In that way he cut off an important source of the Pope's revenue, for the Church of France could obviously no longer send anything to Rome. The Pope was forced to give up his extreme claims. He explained the following year that he had not meant to interfere with the payment on the clergy's part of customary feudal dues nor with their loans of money to the king.¹

In spite of this setback, the Pope never seemed more completely the recognized head of the western world than during the first great jubilee, in the year 1300, when Boniface called together all Christendom to celebrate the opening of the new century by a great religious festival at Rome. It is reported that two millions of people, coming from all parts of Europe, visited the churches of Rome, and that in spite of widening the streets, many were crushed in the crowd. So great was the influx of money into the papal treasury that two assistants were kept busy with rakes collecting the offerings which were deposited at the tomb of St. Peter.

Boniface was, however, very soon to realize that even if Christendom regarded Rome as its religious center, the nations would not accept him as their political head. When he

¹ See *Readings*, chap. xxi.
dispatched an obnoxious prelate to Philip the Fair, ordering him to free a certain nobleman whom he was holding prisoner, the king declared the harsh language of the papal envoy to be high treason and sent one of his lawyers to the Pope to demand that the messenger be punished.

Philip was surrounded by a body of lawyers, and it would seem that they, rather than the king, were the real rulers of France. They had, through their study of Roman law, learned to admire the absolute power exercised by the Roman Emperor. To them the civil government was supreme, and they urged the king to punish what they regarded as the insolent conduct of the Pope. Before taking any action against the head of the Church, Philip called together the Estates General, including not only the clergy and the nobility but the people of the towns as well. The Estates General, after hearing a statement of the case from one of Philip's lawyers, agreed to support their monarch.

Nogaret, one of the chief legal advisers of the king, undertook to face the Pope. He collected a little troop of soldiers in Italy and marched against Boniface, who was sojourning at Anagni, where his predecessors had excommunicated two emperors, Frederick Barbarossa and Frederick II. As Boniface, in his turn, was preparing solemnly to proclaim the king of France an outcast from the Church, Nogaret penetrated into the papal palace with his soldiers and heaped insults upon the helpless but defiant old man. The townspeople forced Nogaret to leave the next day, but Boniface's spirit was broken and he soon died at Rome.

King Philip now proposed to have no more trouble with popes. He arranged in 1305 to have the Archbishop of Bordeaux chosen head of the Church, with the understanding that he should transfer the papacy to France. The new Pope accordingly summoned the cardinals to meet him at Lyons, where he was crowned under the title of "Clement V." He remained in France during his whole pontificate, moving from one rich abbey to another.
At Philip’s command he reluctantly undertook a sort of trial of the deceased Boniface VIII, who was accused by the king’s lawyers of all sorts of abominable crimes. Then, to please the king, Clement brought the Templars to trial;\(^1\) the order was abolished, and its possessions in France, for which the king had longed, were confiscated. Obviously it proved very advantageous to the king to have a Pope within his realm. Clement V died in 1314.

His successors took up their residence in the town of Avignon, just outside the French frontier of those days. There they built a sumptuous palace in which successive popes lived in great splendor for sixty years.

The prolonged exile of the popes from Rome, lasting from 1305 to 1377, is commonly called the Babylonian Captivity\(^2\) of the Church, on account of the woes attributed to it. The popes of this period were for the most part good and earnest men; but they were all Frenchmen, and the proximity of their court to France led to the natural suspicion that they were controlled by the French kings. This, together with their luxurious court, brought them into discredit with the other nations.\(^3\)

At Avignon the popes were naturally deprived of some of the revenue which they had enjoyed from their Italian possessions when they lived at Rome. This deficiency had to be made up by increased taxation, especially as the expenses of the splendid papal court were very heavy. The papacy was, consequently, rendered unpopular by the methods employed to raise money.

The papal exactions met with the greatest opposition in England because the popes were thought to favor France, with which country the English were at war. A law was passed by Parliament in 1352, ordering that all who procured a church office from the Pope should be outlawed, since they were enemies of the king and his realm. This and similar laws failed,

\(^1\) See above, p. 469.
\(^2\) The name recalled, of course, the long exile of the Jews from their land.
\(^3\) See Readings, chap. xxi.
however, to prevent the Pope from filling English benefices. The English king was unable to keep the money of his realm

**Fig. 177. Page from Wycliffe’s Translation of the Bible**

This is the upper half of the first page of the Gospel according to Mark and contains verses 1-7 and 15-23. The scribe of the time made i, y, and ð in something the same way. The page begins: “The bigynninge of the gospel of ihusu crist, the sone of god. As it is written in isaiie, the prophete, Loo, I send myn aungel before thi face, that schal make thi weie redi before thee. The voice of one crying in deseert, make thee redi the weie of the lord, make thee his pathis ryghtful. Joon was in deseert baptizinge and prechinge the baptism of penaunce in to remissioun of sinnes.” While the spelling is somewhat different from ours it is clear that the language used by Wycliffe closely resembled that used in the familiar authorized version of the New Testament, made two centuries and a half later

from flowing to Avignon, and at the meeting of the English Parliament held in 1376 a report was made to the effect that the taxes levied by the Pope in England were five times those raised by the king.
The most famous and conspicuous critic of the Pope at this time was John Wycliffe, a teacher at Oxford. He was born about 1320, but we know little of him before 1366, when Urban V demanded that England should pay the tribute promised by King John when he became the Pope’s vassal.\(^1\) Parliament declared that John had no right to bind the people without their consent, and Wycliffe began his career of opposition to the papacy by trying to prove that John’s agreement was void. About ten years later we find the Pope issuing bulls against the teachings of Wycliffe, who had begun to assert that the State might appropriate the property of the Church, if it was misused, and that the Pope had no authority except as he acted according to the Gospels. Soon Wycliffe went further and boldly attacked the papacy itself, as well as many of the Church institutions.

Wycliffe’s anxiety to teach the people led him to have the Bible translated into English. He also prepared a great number of sermons and tracts in English. He is the father of English prose,\(^2\) for we have little in English before his time, except poetry.

Wycliffe and his “simple priests” were charged with encouraging the discontent and disorder which culminated in the Peasants’ Rebellion.\(^3\) Whether this charge was true or not, it caused many of his followers to fall away from him. But in spite of this and the denunciations of the Church, Wycliffe was not seriously interfered with and died peaceably in 1384. Wycliffe is remarkable as being the first distinguished scholar and reformer to repudiate the headship of the Pope and those practices of the Church of Rome which a hundred and fifty years after his death were attacked by Luther in his successful revolt against the Medieval Church. This will be discussed in a later chapter.

\(^1\) See above, p. 418.  
\(^2\) For extracts, see Readings, chap. xxi.  
\(^3\) See above, p. 430.
QUESTIONS

SECTION 83. In what ways did the Medieval Church differ from the modern churches with which we are familiar? In what ways did the Medieval Church resemble a State? What were the powers of the Pope? What were the duties of a bishop in the Middle Ages? Why was the clergy the most powerful class in the Middle Ages?

SECTION 84. What were the views of the Waldensians? of the Albigensians? What was the Inquisition?

SECTION 85. Narrate briefly the life of St. Francis. Did the Franciscan order continue to follow the wishes of its founder? Contrast the Dominicans with the Franciscans.

SECTION 86. What were the chief subjects of disagreement between the Church and the State? Describe the conflict between Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair. How did the Babylonian Captivity come about? What were some of the results of the sojourn of the popes at Avignon? What were the views of John Wycliffe?
CHAPTER XXI

MEDIEVAL TOWNS — THEIR BUSINESS AND BUILDINGS

SECTION 87. THE TOWNS AND GUILDS

In discussing the Middle Ages we have hitherto dealt mainly with kings and emperors, and with the popes and the Church of which they were the chief rulers; we have also described the monks and monasteries, the warlike feudal lords and their castles, and the hard-working serfs who farmed the manors; but nothing has been said about the people who lived in the towns.

Towns have, however, always been the chief centers of progress and enlightenment, for the simple reason that people must live close together in large numbers before they can develop business on a large scale, carry on trade with foreign countries, establish good schools and universities, erect noble public buildings, support libraries and museums and art galleries. One does not find these in the country, for the people outside the towns are too scattered and usually too poor to have the things that are common enough in large cities.

One of the chief peculiarities of the early Middle Ages, from the break-up of the Roman Empire to the time of William the Conqueror, was the absence of large and flourishing towns in western Europe, and this fact alone would serve to explain why there was so little progress.
The Roman towns were decreasing in population before the German inroads. The confusion which followed the invasions hastened their decline, and a great number of them disappeared altogether. Those which survived and such new towns as sprang up were, to judge from the chronicles, of very little importance during the early Middle Ages. We may assume, therefore, that during the long period from Theodoric to Frederick Barbarossa by far the greater part of the population of England, Germany, and northern and central France were living in the country, on the great estates belonging to the feudal lords, abbots, and bishops.¹

It is hardly necessary to point out that the gradual reappearance of town life in western Europe is of the greatest interest to the student of history. The cities had been the centers of Greek and Roman civilization, and in our own time they dominate the life, culture, and business enterprise of the world. Were they to disappear, our whole life, even in the country, would necessarily undergo a profound change and tend to become primitive again, like that of the age of Charlemagne.

A great part of the medieval towns, of which we begin to have some scanty records about the year 1000, appear to have originated on the manors of feudal lords or about a monastery or castle. The French name for town, ville, is derived from "vill," the name of the manor, and we use this old Roman word when we call a town Jacksonville or Harrisville. The need of protection was probably the usual reason for establishing a town with walls about it, so that the townspeople and the neighboring country people might find safety within it when attacked by neighboring feudal lords (Fig. 178).

The way in which a medieval town was built seems to justify this conclusion. It was generally crowded and compact compared with its more luxurious Roman predecessors. Aside from the market place there were few or no open spaces. There

¹ In Italy and southern France town life was doubtless more general than in northern Europe.
were no amphitheaters or public baths as in the Roman cities. The streets were often mere alleys over which the jutting stories of the high houses almost met. The high, thick wall that surrounded it prevented its extending easily and rapidly as our cities do nowadays (see headpiece and Figs. 179, 208).

Fig. 178. A Castle with a Village below it

A village was pretty sure to grow up near the castle of a powerful lord and might gradually become a large town.

All towns outside of Italy were small in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and, like the manors on which they had grown up, they had little commerce as yet with the outside world. They produced almost all that their inhabitants needed except the farm products which came from the neighboring country. There was likely to be little expansion as long as the
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town remained under the absolute control of the lord or monastery upon whose land it was situated. The townspeople were scarcely more than serfs, in spite of the fact that they lived within a wall and were traders and artisans instead of farmers. They had to pay irritating dues to their lord, just as if they still formed a farming community.

With the increase of trade (see following section) came the longing for greater freedom. For when new and attractive commodities began to be brought from the East and the South, the people of the towns were encouraged to make things which they could exchange at some neighboring fair for the products of distant lands. But no sooner did the townsmen begin to engage in manufacturing and to enter into relations with the outside world than they became conscious that they were subject to exactions and restrictions which rendered progress impossible.

Consequently, during the twelfth century there were many insurrections of the towns against their lords and a general demand that the lords should grant the townsmen charters in which the rights of both parties should be definitely stated. These charters were written contracts between the lord and the town government, which served at once as the certificate of birth of the town and as its constitution. The old dues and services which the townspeople owed as serfs (see above, section 65) were either abolished or changed into money payments.

As a visible sign of their freedom, many of the towns had a belfry, a high building with a watchtower, where a guard was kept day and night in order that the bell might be rung in case of approaching danger. It contained an assembly hall, where those who governed the town held their meetings, and a prison. In the fourteenth century the wonderful town halls began to be erected, which, with the exception of the cathedrals and other churches, are usually the most remarkable buildings which the traveler sees to-day in the old commercial cities of Europe.

1 At the beginning of this chapter there is a picture of the town of Siegen in Germany, as it formerly looked, with its walls and towers.
None of the streets in even the oldest European towns look just as they did in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but here and there, as in this town of Brittany, one can still get some idea of the narrow, cramped streets and overhanging houses and the beautiful cathedral crowded in among them.
The tradesmen in the medieval towns were at once manufacturers and merchants; that is, they made, as well as offered for sale, the articles which they kept in their shops. Those who belonged to a particular trade—the bakers, the butchers, the sword makers, the armorers, etc.—formed unions or guilds to protect their special interests. The oldest statutes of a guild in Paris are those of the candle makers, which go back to 1061. The number of trades differed greatly in different towns, but the guilds all had the same object—to prevent any one from practicing a trade who had not been duly admitted to the union.

A young man had to spend several years in learning his trade. During this time he lived in the house of a “master workman” as an “apprentice,” but received no remuneration. He then became a “journeyman” and could earn wages, although he was still allowed to work only for master workmen and not directly for the public. A simple trade might be learned in three years, but to become a goldsmith one must be an apprentice for ten years. The number of apprentices that a master workman might employ was strictly limited, in order that the journeymen might not become too numerous.

The way in which each trade was to be practiced was carefully regulated, as well as the time that should be spent in work each day. The system of guilds discouraged enterprise but maintained uniform standards everywhere. Had it not been for these unions, the defenseless, isolated workmen, serfs as they had formerly been, would have found it impossible to secure freedom and municipal independence from the feudal lords who had formerly been their masters.

Section 88. Business in the Later Middle Ages

The chief reason for the growth of the towns and their increasing prosperity was a great development of trade throughout western Europe. Commerce had pretty much disappeared with
the decline of the Roman roads and the general disorganization produced by the barbarian invasions. In the early Middle Ages there was no one to mend the ancient Roman roads. The great network of highways from Persia to Britain fell apart when independent nobles or poor local communities took the place of a world empire. All trade languished, for there was little demand for those articles of luxury which the Roman communities in the North had been accustomed to obtain from the South, and there was but little money to buy what we should consider the comforts of life; even the nobility lived uncomfortably enough in their dreary and rudely furnished castles.

In Italy, however, trade does not seem to have altogether ceased. Venice, Genoa, Amalfi, and other towns appear to have developed a considerable Mediterranean commerce even before the Crusades (see map above, p. 454). Their merchants, as we have seen, supplied the destitute crusaders with the material necessary for the conquest of Jerusalem (see above, p. 466). The passion for pilgrimages offered inducements to the Italian merchants for expeditions to the Orient, whither they transported the pilgrims and returned with the products of the East. The Italian cities established trading stations in the East and carried on a direct traffic with the caravans which brought to the shores of the Mediterranean the products of Arabia, Persia, India, and the Spice Islands. The southern French towns and Barcelona entered also into commercial relations with the Mohammedans in northern Africa.

This progress in the South could not but stir the lethargy of the rest of Europe. When commerce began to revive, it encouraged a revolution in industry. So long as the manor system prevailed and each man was occupied in producing only what he and the other people on the estate needed, there was nothing to send abroad and nothing to exchange for luxuries. But when merchants began to come with tempting articles, the members of a community were encouraged to produce a surplus of goods above what they themselves needed, and to sell or exchange this
surplus for commodities coming from a distance. Merchants and artisans gradually directed their energies toward the production of what others wished as well as what was needed by the little group to which they belonged.

The luxuries of the East were introduced into Europe. Some of the important commercial centers of the world had come into being, some of which are still among the great commercial towns of the world. Hamburg, Lübeck, and Bremen carried on active trade with the countries on the Baltic and with England. Augsburg and Nuremberg, in the south of Germany, became important on account of their situation on the line of trade between Italy and the North. Bruges and Ghent sent their manufactures everywhere. English commerce was relatively unimportant as yet compared with that of the great ports of the Mediterranean.

It was very difficult indeed to carry on business on a large scale in the Middle Ages, for various reasons. In the first place, as has been said, there was little money, and money is essential to buying and selling, unless people confine themselves merely to exchanging one article for another. There were few gold and silver mines in western Europe and consequently the kings and feudal lords could not supply enough coin. Moreover, the coins
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were crude, with such rough, irregular edges (Fig. 180) that many people yielded to the temptation to pare off a little of the precious metal before they passed the money on. "Clipping," as this was called, was harshly punished, but that did not stop the practice, which continued for hundreds of years. Nowadays our coins are perfectly round and often have "milled" edges, so that no one would think of trying to appropriate bits of them as they pass through his hands.

It was universally believed that everything had a "just" price, which was merely enough to cover the cost of the materials used in its manufacture and to remunerate the maker for the work he had put into it. It was considered outrageous to ask more than the just price, no matter how anxious the purchaser might be to obtain the article.

Every manufacturer was required to keep a shop in which he offered at retail all that he made. Those who lived near a town were permitted to sell their products in the market place within the walls on condition that they sold directly to the consumers. They might not dispose of their whole stock to one dealer, for fear that if he had all there was of a commodity he might raise
the price above the just one. These ideas made wholesale trade very difficult.

Akin to these prejudices against wholesale business was that against interest. Money was believed to be a dead and sterile thing, and no one had a right to demand any return for lending it. Interest was considered wicked, since it was exacted by those who took advantage of the embarrassments of others. "Usury," as the taking of even the most moderate and reasonable rate of interest was then called, was strenuously forbidden by the laws of the Church. We find church councils ordering that impenitent usurers should be refused Christian burial and have their wills annulled. So money lending, which is necessary to all great commercial and industrial undertakings, was left to the Jews, from whom Christian conduct was not expected.

This ill-starred people played a most important part in the economic development of Europe, but they were terribly maltreated by the Christians, who held them guilty of the supreme crime of putting Christ to death. The active persecution of the Jews did not, however, become common before the thirteenth century, when they first began to be required to wear a peculiar cap, or badge, which made them easily recognized and exposed them to constant insult. Later they were sometimes shut up in a particular quarter of the city, called the Jewry. As they were excluded from the guilds, they not unnaturally turned to the business of money lending, which no Christian might practice. Undoubtedly this occupation had much to do in causing their unpopularity. The kings permitted them to make loans, often at a most exorbitant rate; Philip Augustus allowed them to exact forty-six per cent, but reserved the right to extort their gains from them when the royal treasury was empty. In England the usual rate was a penny a pound for each week.

In the thirteenth century the Italians — Lombards, as the English called them — began to go into a sort of banking

1 There is a Lombard Street in the center of old London where one still finds banks.
business and greatly extended the employment of bills of exchange. They lent for nothing, but exacted damages for all delay in repayment. This appeared reasonable and right even to those who condemned ordinary interest.

Another serious disadvantage which the medieval merchant had to face was the payment of an infinite number of tolls and duties which were demanded by the lords through whose domains his road passed. Not only were duties exacted on the highways, bridges, and at the fords, but those barons who were so fortunate as to have castles on a navigable river blocked the stream in such a way that the merchant could not bring his vessel through without a payment for the privilege.

The charges were usually small, but the way in which they were collected and the repeated delays must have been a serious source of irritation and loss to the merchants. For example, a certain monastery lying between Paris and the sea required that those hastening to town with fresh fish should stop and let the monks pick out what they thought worth three pence, with little regard to the condition in which they left the goods. When a boat laden with wine passed up the Seine to Paris, the agent of the lord of Poissy could have three casks broached, and, after trying them all, he could take a measure from the one he liked best. At the markets all sorts of dues had to be paid, such, for example, as fees for using the lord’s scales or his measuring rod. Besides this, the great variety of coinage which existed in feudal Europe caused infinite perplexity and delay.

Commerce by sea had its own particular trials, by no means confined to the hazards of wind and wave, rock and shoal. Pirates were numerous in the North Sea. They were often organized and sometimes led by men of high rank, who appear to have regarded the business as no disgrace. The coasts were dangerous and lighthouses and beacons were few. Moreover, natural dangers were increased by false signals which wreckers used to lure ships to shore in order to plunder them.
With a view to mitigating these manifold perils, the towns early began to form unions for mutual defense. The most famous of these was that of the German cities, called the Hanseatic League. Lübeck was always the leader, but among the seventy towns which at one time and another were included in the confederation, we find Cologne, Brunswick, Danzig, and other centers of great importance. The union purchased and controlled settlements in London,—the so-called Steelyard near London Bridge,—at Wisby, Bergen, and the far-off Novgorod in Russia. They managed to monopolize nearly the whole trade on the Baltic and North Sea, either through treaties or the influence that they were able to bring to bear.\(^1\)

The League made war on the pirates and did much to reduce the dangers of traffic. Instead of dispatching separate and defenseless merchantmen, their ships sailed out in fleets under the protection of a man-of-war. On one occasion the League undertook a successful war against the king of Denmark, who had interfered with their interests. At another time it declared war on England and brought her to terms. For two hundred years before the discovery of America, the League played a great part in the commercial affairs of western Europe; but it had begun to decline even before the discovery of new routes to the East and West Indies revolutionized trade.

It should be observed that, during the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, trade was not carried on between *nations*, but by the various *towns*, like Venice, Lübeck, Ghent, Bruges, Cologne. A merchant did not act or trade as an independent individual but as a member of a particular merchant guild, and he enjoyed the protection of his town and of the treaties it arranged. If a merchant from a certain town failed to pay a debt, a fellow-townsman might be seized if found in the town where the debt was due. At the period of which we have been speaking, an inhabitant of London was considered as much of a foreigner in Bristol as was the merchant from Cologne or

\(^1\) The ships of the Hanseatic League were very small (see below, Fig. 233).
Antwerp. Only gradually did the towns merge into the nations to which their people belonged.

The increasing wealth of the merchants could not fail to raise them to a position of importance which earlier tradesmen had not enjoyed. They began to build fine houses and to buy the various comforts and luxuries which were finding their way into western Europe. They wanted their sons to be educated, and so it came about that other people besides clergymen began to learn how to read and write. As early as the fourteenth century many of the books appear to have been written with a view of meeting the tastes and needs of the business class.

Representatives of the towns were summoned to the councils of the kings — into the English Parliament and the French Estates General about the year 1300, for the monarch was obliged to ask their advice when he demanded their money to carry on his government and his wars (see above, p. 422). The rise of the business class alongside of the older orders of the clergy and nobility is one of the most momentous changes of the thirteenth century.

Section 89. Gothic Architecture

Almost all the medieval buildings have disappeared in the ancient towns of Europe. The stone town walls, no longer adequate in our times, have been removed, and their place taken by broad and handsome avenues. The old houses have been torn down in order to widen and straighten the streets and permit the construction of modern dwellings. Here and there one can still find a walled town, but they are few in number and are merely curiosities (see Fig. 208).

Of the buildings erected in towns during the Middle Ages only the churches remain, but these fill the beholder with wonder and admiration. It seems impossible that the cities of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, which were neither very large nor very rich, could possibly find money enough to pay for
them. It has been estimated that the bishop's church at Paris (Notre Dame) would cost at least five millions of dollars to reproduce, and there are a number of other cathedrals in France, England, Italy, Spain, and Germany which must have been almost as costly. No modern buildings equal them in beauty and grandeur, and they are the most striking memorial of the religious spirit and the town pride of the Middle Ages.

The construction of a cathedral sometimes extended over two or three centuries, and much of the money for it must have been gathered penny by penny. It should be remembered that every one belonged in those days to the one great Catholic Church, so that the building of a new church was a matter of
interest to the whole community — to men of every rank, from the bishop himself to the workman and the peasant.

Up to the twelfth century churches were built in what is called the Romanesque, or Roman-like, style because they resembled the solid old basilicas referred to in earlier chapters (see pp. 47 and 337 above). These Romanesque churches had stone ceilings (see Figs. 161, 163, 181), and it was necessary to make the walls very thick and solid to support them. There was a main aisle in the center, called the nave, and a narrower aisle on either side, separated from the nave by massive stone pillars, which helped hold up the heavy ceiling. These pillars were connected by round arches of stone above them. The tops of the windows were round, and the ceiling was constructed of round vaults, somewhat like a stone bridge, so the round arches form one of the striking features of the Romanesque style which distinguishes it from the Gothic style, that followed it. The windows had to be small in order that the walls should not be weakened, so the Romanesque churches are rather dark inside.

The architects of France were not satisfied, however, with this method of building, and in the twelfth century they invented a new and wonderful way of constructing churches and other buildings which enabled them to do away with the heavy walls
It will be noticed that there is a row of rather low windows opening under the roof of the aisle. These constitute the so-called triforium (E). Above them is the clerestory (F), the windows of which open between the flying buttresses. So it came about that the walls of a Gothic church were in fact mainly windows. The Egyptians were the first to invent the clerestory (see p. 4S and Fig. 28).

and put high, wide, graceful windows in their place. This new style of architecture is known as the Gothic,\(^1\) and its underlying principles can readily be understood from a little study of the accompanying diagram (Fig. 183), which shows how a Gothic cathedral is supported, not by heavy walls, but by buttresses.

The architects discovered in the first place that the concave stone ceiling, which is known as the vaulting (A), could be supported by ribs (B). These could in turn be brought together and supported on top of pillars which

\(^1\) The inappropriate name "Gothic" was given to the beautiful churches of the North by Italian architects of the sixteenth century, who did not like them and preferred to build in the style of the ancient Romans. The Italians with their "classical" tastes assumed that only German barbarians—whom they carelessly called Goths—could admire a Gothic cathedral.
Fig. 184. Façade of the Cathedral at Rheims (Thirteenth Century)
Fig. 185. Rose Window of Rheims Cathedral, nearly Forty Feet in Diameter, from the Inside
Fig. 186. Interior of Exeter Cathedral (Early Fourteenth Century)
Fig. 187. North Porch of Chartres Cathedral (Fourteenth Century)
rested on the floor of the church. So far so good! But the builders knew well enough that the pillars and ribs would be pushed over by the weight and outward "thrust" of the stone vaulting if they were not firmly supported from the outside. Instead of erecting heavy walls to insure this support they had recourse to buttresses (D), which they built quite outside the walls of the church, and connected them by means of "flying" buttresses (C) with the points where the pillars and ribs had the most tendency to push outward. In this way a vaulted stone ceiling could be supported without the use of a massive wall. This ingenious use of buttresses instead of walls is the fundamental principle of Gothic architecture, and it was discovered for the first time by the architects in the medieval towns.

The wall, no longer essential for supporting the ceiling, was used only to inclose the building, and windows could be built as high and wide as pleased the architect. By the use of pointed arch instead of round arches it was possible to give great variety to
the windows and vaulting. So pointed arches came into general use, and the Gothic is often called the "pointed" style on this account, although the use of the ribs and buttresses is the chief peculiarity of that form of architecture, not the pointed arch.

The light from the huge windows (those at Beauvais are fifty to fifty-five feet high) would have been too intense had it not been softened by the stained glass, set in exquisite stone tracery, with which they were filled (Fig. 185). The stained glass of the medieval cathedral, especially in France, where the glass workers brought their art to the greatest perfection, was one of its chief glories. By far the greater part of this old glass has of course been destroyed, but it is still so highly prized that every bit of it is now carefully preserved, for it has never since been equaled. A window set with odd bits of it pieced together like crazy patchwork is more beautiful, in its rich and jewel-like coloring, than the finest modern work.

Fig. 189. Grotesque Heads, Rheims Cathedral

Here and there about a Gothic cathedral the stone carvers were accustomed to place grotesque and comical figures and faces. During the process of restoring the cathedral at Rheims a number of these heads were brought together, and the photograph was taken upon which the illustration is based.
As the skill of the architects increased they became bolder and bolder and erected churches that were marvels of lightness and delicacy of ornament, without sacrificing dignity or beauty of proportion. The façade of Rheims cathedral (Fig. 184) is one of the most famous examples of the best work of the thirteenth century, with its multitudes of sculptured figures and its gigantic rose window (Fig. 185), filled with exquisite stained glass of great brilliancy. The interior of Exeter cathedral (Fig. 186), although by no means so spacious as a number of the French churches, affords an excellent example of the beauty and impressiveness of a Gothic interior. The porch before the north entrance of Chartres cathedral (Fig. 187) is a magnificent example of fourteenth-century work.

One of the charms of a Gothic building is the profusion of carving — statues of saints and rulers and scenes from the Bible, cut in stone. The same kind of stone was used for both constructing the building and making the statues, so they harmonize perfectly. A fine example of medieval carving is to be seen in Fig. 190. Here and there the Gothic stone carvers would introduce amusing faces or comical animals (see Figs. 182, 189).

In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries Gothic buildings other than churches were built. The most striking and important of these were the guild halls, erected by the rich corporations of merchants, and the town halls of important cities. But the Gothic style has always seemed specially appropriate for churches. Its lofty aisles and open floor spaces, its soaring
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arches leading the eye toward heaven, and its glowing windows suggesting the glories of paradise, may well have fostered the faith of the medieval Christian.

**Section 90. The Italian Cities of the Renaissance**

We have been speaking so far of the town life in northern Europe in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. We must now see how the Italian towns in the following two centuries reached a degree of prosperity and refinement undreamed of north of the Alps. Within their walls learning and art made such extraordinary progress that a special name is often given to the period when they flourished — the Renaissance, or new birth. The Italian towns, like those of ancient Greece, were each a little state with its own peculiar life and institutions. Some of them, like Rome, Milan, and Pisa, had been important in Roman times; others, like Venice, Florence, and Genoa, did not become conspicuous until about the time of the Crusades.

The map of Italy at the beginning of the fourteenth century was still divided into three zones, as it had been in the time of the Hohenstaufens. To the south lay the kingdom of Naples. Then came the states of the Church, extending diagonally across the peninsula. To the north and west lay the group of city-states to which we now turn our attention.

Of these none was more celebrated than Venice, which in the history of Europe ranks in importance with Paris and London. This singular town was built upon a group of sandy islets lying in the Adriatic Sea, about two miles from the mainland. It was protected from the waves by a long, narrow sand bar similar to those which fringe the Atlantic coast from New Jersey southward. Such a situation would not ordinarily have been deliberately chosen as the site of a great city; but it was a good

---

1 This word, although originally French, has come into such common use that it is quite permissible to pronounce it as if it were English, — ré-nâ'sens.

2 See map above, p. 454.
place for fishermen, and its very desolation and inaccessibility recommended it to those settlers who fled from their homes on the mainland during the barbarian invasions. As time went on, the location proved to have its advantages commercially, and even before the Crusades Venice had begun to engage in foreign trade. Its enterprises carried it eastward, and it early acquired possessions across the Adriatic and in the Orient. The influence of this intercourse with the East is plainly shown in the celebrated church of St. Mark, whose domes and decorations suggest Constantinople rather than Italy (Fig. 192).

It was not until early in the fifteenth century that Venice found it to her interest to extend her sway upon the Italian

Fig. 191. A Scene in Venice

Boats, called gondolas, take the place of carriages in Venice; one can reach any point in the city by some one of the numerous canals, which take the place of streets. There are also narrow lanes along the canals, crossing them here and there by bridges, so one can wander about the town on foot.
mainland. She doubtless believed it dangerous to permit her rival, Milan, to get possession of the Alpine passes through which her goods found their way north. It may be, too, that she preferred to draw her food supplies from the neighborhood instead of transporting them across the Adriatic from her eastern possessions. Moreover, all the Italian cities except Venice already controlled a larger or smaller area of country about them.

**Fig. 192. St. Mark's and the Doge's Palace in Venice**

One sees the façade of St. Mark's to the left, and that of the doge's palace beyond. The church, modeled after one in Constantinople, was planned before the First Crusade and is adorned with numerous colored marble columns and slabs brought from the East. The interior is covered with mosaics, some of which go back to the twelfth and the thirteenth century. The façade is also adorned with brilliant mosaics. St. Mark's "is unique among the buildings of the world in respect to its unparalleled richness of material and decoration." The doge's palace contained the government offices and the magnificent halls in which the senate and Council of Ten met. The palace was begun about 1300, and the façade we see in the picture was commenced about a hundred years later. It shows the influence of the Gothic style, which penetrated into northern Italy.
About the year 1400 Venice reached the height of its prosperity. It had a population of two hundred thousand, which was very large for those days. It had three hundred seagoing vessels which went to and fro in the Mediterranean, carrying wares from the East to the West. It had a war fleet of forty-five galleys, manned by eleven thousand marines ready to

Fig. 193. Senate Chamber in the Doge's Palace
This is an example of the magnificent decoration of the rooms used by the Venetian government. It was adorned by celebrated painters in the sixteenth century, when Venice became famous for its artists

fight the battles of the republic. But when Constantinople fell into the hands of the Turks (1453) and when, later, the route to India by sea was discovered (see next section), Venice could no longer keep control of the trade with the East, and while it remained an important city, it no longer enjoyed its former influence and power.

Although Venice was called a republic, it was really governed by a very small group of persons. In 1311, after a
rebellion, the famous Council of Ten was created as a sort of committee of public safety. The whole government, domestic and foreign, was placed in its hands, in conjunction with the senate and the doge (that is, duke), the nominal head of the republic. The government, thus concentrated in the hands of a very few, was carried on with great secrecy, so that public discussion, such as prevailed in Florence and led to innumerable revolutions there, was unheard of in Venice. The Venetian merchant was such a busy person that he was quite willing that the State should exercise its functions without his interference.

Venice often came to blows with other rival cities, especially Genoa, but its citizens lived quietly at home under the government of its senate, the Council of Ten, and the doge. The other Italian towns were not only fighting one another much of the time, but their government was often in the hands of despots, somewhat like the old Greek tyrants, who got control of towns and managed them in their own interest.

There are many stories of the incredible ferocity exhibited by the Italian despots. It must be remembered that they were very rarely legitimate rulers, but usurpers, who could only hope to retain their power so long as they could keep their subjects in check and defend themselves against equally illegitimate usurpers in the neighboring cities. This situation developed a high degree of sagacity, and many of the despots found it to their interest to govern well and even to give dignity to their rule by patronizing artists and men of letters. But the despot usually made many bitter enemies and was almost necessarily suspicious of treason on the part of those about him. He was ever conscious that at any moment he might fall a victim to the dagger or the poison cup.

The Italian towns carried on their wars among themselves largely by means of hired troops. When a military expedition was proposed, a bargain was made with one of the professional leaders (condottieri), who provided the necessary force. As the soldiers had no more interest in the conflict than did those whom
they opposed, who were likewise hired for the occasion, the fight was not usually very bloody; for the object of each side was to capture the other without unnecessarily rough treatment.

It sometimes happened that the leader who had conquered a town for his employer appropriated the fruits of the victory for himself. This occurred in the case of Milan in 1450. The old line of despots (the Visconti) having died out, the citizens hired a certain captain, named Francesco Sforza, to assist them in a war against Venice, whose possessions now extended almost to those of Milan. When Sforza had repelled the Venetians, the Milanese found it impossible to get rid of him, and he and his successors became rulers over the town.

fig. 194. tomb of an italian despot

The family of the Visconti maintained themselves many years as despots of Milan. Gian Galeazzo Visconti began in 1396 a magnificent Carthusian monastery not far from Milan, one of the most beautiful structures in Italy. Here, long after his death, a monument was erected to him as founder of the monastery. The monument was begun about 1500 but not completed for several decades.
An excellent notion of the position and policy of the Italian despots may be derived from a little treatise called *The Prince*, written by the distinguished Florentine historian, Machiavelli. The writer appears to have intended his book as a practical manual for the despots of his time. It is a cold-blooded discussion of the ways in which a usurper may best retain his control over a town after he has once got possession of it. The author even takes up the questions as to how far princes should consider their promises when it is inconvenient to keep them, and how many of the inhabitants the despot may wisely kill. Machiavelli concludes that the Italian princes who have not observed their engagements overscrupulously, and who have boldly put their political adversaries out of the way, have fared better than their more conscientious rivals.

The history of Florence, perhaps the most important of the Italian cities, differs in many ways from that of Venice and of the despotisms of which Milan was an example. Florence was a republic, and all classes claimed the right to interest themselves in the government. This led to constant changes in the constitution and frequent struggles between the different political parties. When one party got the upper hand it generally expelled its chief opponents from the city. Exile was a terrible punishment to a Florentine, for Florence was not merely his native city—it was his country, and loved and honored as such.

By the middle of the fifteenth century Florence had come under the control of the great family of the Medici, whose members played the rôle of very enlightened political bosses. By quietly watching the elections and secretly controlling the selection of city officials, they governed without letting it be suspected that the people had lost their power. The most distinguished member of the house of Medici was Lorenzo the Magnificent (d. 1492); under his rule Florence reached the height of its glory in art and literature.

As one wanders about Florence to-day, he is impressed with the contradictions of the Renaissance period. The streets are
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lined with the palaces of the noble families to whose rivalries much of the continual disturbance was due. The lower stories of these buildings are constructed of great stones, like fortresses, and their windows are barred like those of a prison (Fig. 195); yet within they were often furnished with the greatest taste and luxury. For in spite of the disorder, against which the rich protected themselves by making their houses half strongholds, the beautiful churches, noble public buildings, and works of art which now fill the museums indicate that mankind has never, perhaps, reached a higher degree of perfection in the arts of peace than amidst the turmoil of this restless town (see below, Figs. 203, 204).

Fig. 195. The Palace of the Medici in Florence

This was erected about 1435 by Cosimo dei Medici, and in it Lorenzo the Magnificent conducted the government of Florence, and entertained the men of letters and artists with whom he liked best to associate. It shows how fortresslike the lower portions of a Florentine palace were, in order to protect the owner from attack.
During the same period in which Venice and Florence became leaders in wealth and refinement, Rome, the capital of the popes, likewise underwent a great change. After the popes returned from their seventy years' residence in France and Avignon (see above, p. 493) they found the town in a dilapidated state. For years they were able to do little to restore it, as there was a long period during which the papacy was weakened by the existence of a rival line of popes who continued to live at Avignon. When the “great schism” was over, and all the European nations once more acknowledged the pope at Rome (1417), it became possible to improve the city and revive some of its ancient glory. Architects, painters, and men of letters were called in and handsomely paid by the popes to erect and adorn magnificent buildings and to collect a great library in the Vatican palace.

Fig. 196. Cathedral and Bell Tower at Florence

The church was begun in 1296 and completed in 1436. The great dome built by the architect Brunelleschi has made his name famous. It is 300 feet high. The façade is modern but after an old design. The bell tower, or campanile, was begun by the celebrated painter Giotto about 1335 and completed about fifty years later. It is richly adorned with sculpture and colored marbles and is considered the finest structure of the kind in the world.
The ancient basilica of St. Peter's (Fig. 136) no longer satisfied the aspirations of the popes. It was gradually torn down, and after many changes of plan the present celebrated church with its vast dome and imposing approach (Fig. 197) took its place. The old palace of the Lateran (Fig. 135), where the government of the popes had been carried on for a thousand years, had been deserted after the return from Avignon, and the new palace of the Vatican was gradually constructed to the right of St. Peter's. It has thousands of rooms great and small,
some of them adorned by the most distinguished of the Italian painters, and others filled with ancient statuary.

As one visits Venice, Florence, and Rome to-day he may still see, almost perfectly preserved, many of the finest of the buildings, paintings, and monuments which belong to the period we have been discussing.

Section 91. Early Geographical Discoveries

The business and commerce of the medieval towns was on what would seem to us a rather small scale. There were no great factories, such as have grown up in recent times with the use of steam and machinery, and the ships which sailed the Mediterranean and the North Sea were small and held only a very light cargo compared with modern merchant vessels. The gradual growth of a world commerce began with the sea voyages of the fifteenth century, which led to the exploration by Europeans of the whole globe, most of which was entirely unknown to the Venetian merchants and those who carried on the trade of the Hanseatic League. The Greeks and Romans knew little about the world beyond southern Europe, northern Africa, and western Asia, and much that they knew was forgotten during the Middle Ages. The Crusades took many Europeans as far east as Egypt and Syria. About 1260 two Venetian merchants, the Polo brothers, visited China and were kindly received at Pekin by the emperor of the Mongols. On a second journey they were accompanied by Marco Polo, the son of one of the brothers. When they got safely back to Venice in 1295, after a journey of twenty years, Marco gave an account of his experiences which filled his readers with wonder. Nothing stimulated the interest of the West more than his fabulous description of the abundance of gold in Zipangu (Japan)\(^1\) and of the spice markets of the Moluccas and Ceylon.

\(^1\) See below, p. 530.
About the year 1318 Venice and Genoa opened up direct communication by sea with the towns of the Netherlands. Their fleets, which touched at the port of Lisbon, aroused the commercial enterprise of the Portuguese, who soon began to undertake extended maritime expeditions. By the middle of the fourteenth century they had discovered the Canary Islands, Madeira, and the Azores. Before this time no one had ventured along the coast of Africa beyond the arid region of Sahara. The country was forbidding, there were no ports, and mariners were, moreover, discouraged by the general belief that the torrid region was uninhabitable. In 1445, however, some adventurous sailors came within sight of a headland beyond the desert and, struck by its luxuriant growth of tropical trees, they called it Cape Verde (the green cape). Its discovery put an end once for all to the idea that there were only parched deserts to the south.

For a generation longer the Portuguese continued to venture farther and farther along the coast, in the hope of finding it coming to an end, so that they might make their way by sea to India. At last, in 1486, Díaz rounded the Cape of Good Hope. Twelve years later (1498) Vasco da Gama, spurred on by Columbus's great discovery, after sailing around the Cape of Good Hope and northward beyond Zanzibar, steered straight across the Indian Ocean and reached Calicut, in Hindustan, by sea.

Vasco da Gama and his fellow adventurers were looked upon with natural suspicion by the Mohammedan spice merchants, who knew very well that their object was to establish direct trade between the Spice Islands (Moluccas) and western Europe. Hitherto the Mohammedans had had the monopoly of the spice trade between the Moluccas and the eastern ports of the Mediterranean, where the products were handed over to Italian merchants. The Mohammedans were unable, however, to prevent the Portuguese from concluding treaties with the Indian princes and establishing trading stations at Goa and elsewhere. In 1512
a successor of Vasco da Gama reached Java and the Moluccas, where the Portuguese speedily built a fortress. By 1515 Portugal had become the greatest among sea powers; and spices reached Lisbon regularly without the intervention of theMohammedan merchants or the Italian towns, which, especially Venice, were mortally afflicted by the change (see above, p. 519).

The outline of the United States has been drawn in to make clear the vast extent of the region explored by the Portuguese at the opening of the sixteenth century. It is not far from 2000 miles from Ceylon to Malacca Strait, and as far from there on to the Spice Islands as from Denver to Richmond, Virginia.

There is no doubt that the desire to obtain spices was at this time the main reason for the exploration of the globe. This motive led European navigators to try in succession every possible way to reach the East — by going around Africa, by sailing west in the hope of reaching the Indies (before they knew of the existence of America), then, after America was discovered, by sailing around it to the north or south, and even sailing around Europe to the north.
It is hard for us to understand this enthusiasm for spices, for which we care much less nowadays. One former use of spices was to preserve food, which could not then as now be carried rapidly; while still fresh, from place to place; nor did our conveniences then exist for keeping it by the use of ice. Moreover, spice served to make even spoiled food more palatable than it would otherwise have been.

It inevitably occurred to thoughtful men that the East Indies could be reached by sailing westward. All intelligent people knew, all through the Middle Ages, that the earth was a globe. The chief authority upon the form and size of the earth continued to be the ancient astronomer Ptolemy, who had lived about 150 A.D. He had reckoned the earth to be about one sixth smaller than it is; and as Marco Polo had given an exaggerated idea of the distance which he and his companions had traveled eastward, and as no one suspected the existence of the American continents, it was supposed that it could not be a very long journey from Europe across the Atlantic to Japan.\(^1\)

In 1492, as we all know, a Genoese navigator, Columbus (b. 1451), who had had much experience on the sea, got together three little ships and undertook the journey westward to Zipangu, — the land of gold, — which he hoped to reach in five weeks. After thirty-two days from the time he left the Canary Islands he came upon land, the island of San Salvador, and believed himself to be in the East Indies. Going on from there he discovered the island of Cuba, which he believed to be the mainland of Asia, and then Haiti, which he mistook for the longed-for Zipangu (see p. 526). Although he made three later expeditions and sailed down the coast of South America as far as the Orinoco, he died without realizing that he had not been exploring the coast of Asia.

After the bold enterprises of Vasco da Gama and Columbus, an expedition headed by the Portuguese Magellan succeeded in circumnavigating the globe. There was now no reason why

\(^1\) See accompanying reproduction of Behaim's globe.
An Old Map of the Globe, showing the Conception of the World in the Time of Columbus
the new lands should not become more and more familiar to the European nations. The coast of North America was explored principally by English navigators, who for over a century pressed northward, still in the vain hope of finding a northwest passage to the Spice Islands.

Cortes began the Spanish conquests in the western world by undertaking the subjugation of the Aztec empire in Mexico in 1519. A few years later Pizarro established the Spanish power in Peru. Spain now superseded Portugal as a maritime power, and her importance in the sixteenth century is to be attributed largely to the wealth which came to her from her possessions in the New World.

By the end of the century the Spanish main — that is, the northern coast of South America — was much frequented by adventurous seamen, who combined in about equal parts the occupations of merchant, slaver, and pirate. Many of these hailed from English ports, and it is to them that England owes the beginning of her commercial greatness.

It is hardly necessary to say that Europeans exhibited an utter disregard for the rights of the people with whom they came in contact and often treated them with contemptuous cruelty. The exploration of the globe and the conquest by European nations of peoples beyond the sea led finally to the vast colonization of modern times, which has caused many wars but has served to spread European ideas throughout the world. This creation of a greater Europe will be discussed in the next volume of this work.

QUESTIONS

SECTION 87. Why are towns necessary to progress? How did the towns of the eleventh and twelfth centuries originate? What was the nature of a town charter? Describe the guild organization.

SECTION 88. Describe the revival and extending of commerce in the Middle Ages. What were some of the obstacles to business? Describe the Hanseatic League.
Section 89. What are the chief characteristics of Romanesque churches? What were the principles of construction which made it possible to build a Gothic church? Tell something about the decoration of a Gothic church.

Section 90. Describe the map of Italy in the fourteenth century. What are the peculiarities of Venice? Who were the Italian despots? What is the interest of Machiavelli's *Prince*? Contrast Florence with Venice.

Section 91. What geographical discoveries were made before 1500? How far is it by sea from Lisbon to Calicut around the Cape of Good Hope? What was the importance of the spice trade? What led Columbus to try to reach the Indies by sailing westward?
CHAPTER XXII

BOOKS AND SCIENCE IN THE MIDDLE AGES

Section 92. How the Modern Languages originated

We should leave the Middle Ages with a very imperfect notion of them if we did not now stop to consider what people were thinking about during that period, what they had to read, and what they believed about the world in which they lived.

To begin with, the Middle Ages differed from our own time in the very general use then made of Latin, in both writing and speaking. The language of the Roman Empire continued to be used in the thirteenth century, and long after; all books that made any claim to learning were written in Latin; the professors in the universities lectured in Latin, friends wrote to one another in Latin, and state papers, treaties, and legal documents were drawn up in the same language. The ability of every educated person to make use of Latin, as well as of his native tongue, was a great advantage at a time when there were many obstacles to intercourse among the various nations. It helps to explain, for example, the remarkable way in which the Pope kept in touch with all the clergymen of western Christendom, and the ease with which students, friars, and merchants could wander from one country to another. There is no more interesting or important revolution than that by which the languages of the people in the various European countries gradually pushed aside the ancient tongue and took its place, so that even scholars scarcely ever think now of writing books in Latin.

1 In Germany the books published annually in the German language did not exceed those in Latin until after 1690.
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In order to understand how it came about that two languages, the Latin and the native speech, were both commonly used in all the countries of western Europe all through the Middle Ages, we must glance at the origin of the modern languages. These all fall into two quite distinct groups, the Germanic and the Romance.

Those German peoples who had continued to live outside of the Roman Empire, or who, during the invasions, had not settled far enough within its bounds to be led, as were the Franks in Gaul, to adopt the tongue of those they had conquered, naturally adhered to the language they had always used; namely, the particular Germanic dialect which their forefathers had spoken for untold generations. From the various languages used by the German barbarians, modern German, English, Dutch, Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, and Icelandic are derived.

The second group of languages developed within the territory which had formed a part of the Roman Empire, and includes modern French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese. It has now been clearly proved, by a very minute study of the old forms of words, that these Romance languages were one and all derived from the spoken Latin, employed by the soldiers, merchants, and people at large. This differed considerably from the elaborate and elegant written Latin which was used, for example, by Cicero and Cæsar. It was undoubtedly much simpler in its grammar and varied a good deal in different regions; a Gaul, for instance, could not pronounce the words like a Roman. Moreover, in conversation people did not always use the same words as those employed in books. For example, a horse was commonly spoken of as caballus, whereas a writer would use the word equus; it is from caballus that the word for "horse" in Spanish, Italian, and French is derived (caballo, cavallo, cheval).

As time went on the spoken language diverged farther and farther from the written. Latin is a troublesome speech on account of its complicated inflections and grammatical rules,
which can be mastered only after a great deal of study. The people of the more remote Roman provinces and the incoming barbarians naturally paid very little attention to the niceties of syntax and found easy ways of saying what they wished.\(^1\)

Yet several centuries elapsed after the German invasions before there was anything written in the language used in conversation. So long as the uneducated could understand the correct Latin of the books when they heard it read or spoken, there was no necessity of writing anything in their familiar daily speech. But by the time Charlemagne came to the throne the gulf between the spoken and the written language had become so great that he advised that sermons should be given thereafter in the language of the people, who, apparently, could no longer follow the Latin.

Although little was written in any German language before Charlemagne's time, there is no doubt that the Germans possessed an unwritten literature, which was passed down by word of mouth for several centuries before any of it was written out.

The oldest form of English is commonly called Anglo-Saxon and is so different from the language which we use that, in order to be read, it must be learned like a foreign language. We hear of an English poet, as early as Bede's time, a century before Charlemagne. A manuscript of an Anglo-Saxon epic, called *Beowulf*, has been preserved which belongs perhaps to the close of the eighth century. The interest which King Alfred displayed in the English language has already been mentioned. This old form of our language prevailed until after the Norman Conquest; the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which does not close until 1154, is written in pure Anglo-Saxon. Here is an example:

"Here on thissum geare Willem cyng geaf Rodberde eorle thone eorldom on Northymbraland. Da komon tha landes menn

\(^1\) Even the monks and others who wrote Latin in the Middle Ages often did not know enough to follow strictly the rules of the language. Moreover, they introduced many new words to meet the new conditions and the needs of the time, such as *imprisonare*, "to imprison"; *utlagare*, "to outlaw"; *baptizare*, "to baptize"; *foresta*, "forest"; *feudum*, "fief," etc.
togeanes him & hine ofslogen, & ix hund manna mid him.”

In modern English this reads: “In this year King William gave the Earl Robert the earldom of Northumberland. Then came the men of the country against him and slew him, and nine hundred men with him.”

By the middle of the thirteenth century, two hundred years after the Norman Conquest, English begins to look somewhat familiar:

And Aaron held up his hand
To the water and the more lond;
Tho cam thor up schwilc froschkes here
The dede al folc Egipte dere;
Summe worn wilde, and summe tame,
And tho hem deden the moste schame;
In huse, in drinc, in metes, in bed,
It cropen and maden hem for-dred...

Chaucer (about 1340–1400) was the first great English writer whose works are now read with pleasure, although one is sometimes puzzled by his spelling and certain words which are no longer used. This is the way one of his tales opens:

A poure wydow somdel stope in age,
Was whilom dwellyng in a narwe cotage,

1 In writing Anglo-Saxon two old letters are used for th, one (b) for the sound in “thin” and the other (ð) for that in “father.” The use of these old letters serves to make the language look more different from that of to-day than it is.
Bisyde a grove, stondying in a dale.
This wydwe of wichh I telle yow my tale,
Syn thilke day that sche was last a wif,
In pacience ladde a ful symple lyf.

In the Middle Ages, however, French, not English, was the most important of the national languages of western Europe. In France a vast literature was produced in the language of the people during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries which profoundly affected the books written in Italy, Spain, Germany, and England.

Two quite different languages had gradually developed in France from the spoken Latin of the Roman Empire. To the north, French was spoken; to the south, Provençal.

Very little in the ancient French language written before the year 1100 has been preserved. The West Franks undoubtedly began much earlier to sing of their heroes, of the great deeds of Clovis and Charles Martel. These famous rulers were, however, completely overshadowed later by Charlemagne, who became the unrivaled hero of medieval poetry and romance. It was believed that he had reigned for a hundred and twenty-five years, and the most marvelous exploits were attributed to him and his knights. He was supposed, for instance, to have led a crusade to Jerusalem. Such themes as these—more legend than history—were woven into long epics, which were the first written literature of the Frankish people. These poems, combined with the stories of adventure, developed a spirit of patriotic enthusiasm among the French which made them regard "fair France" as the especial care of Providence.

The famous Song of Roland, the chief character of which was one of Charlemagne's captains, was written before the First

1 Of course there was no sharp line of demarcation between the people who used the one language or the other, nor was Provençal confined to southern France. The language of Catalonia, beyond the Pyrenees, was essentially the same as that of Provence. French was called langue d'oïl, and the southern language langue d'oc, each after the word used for "yes."
Crusade. In the latter part of the twelfth century the romances of King Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table begin to appear. These enjoyed great popularity in all western Europe for centuries, and they are by no means forgotten yet. Arthur, of whose historical existence no one can be quite sure, was supposed to have been king of Britain shortly after the Saxons gained a foothold in the island.¹

In other long poems of the time, Alexander the Great, Cæsar, and other ancient worthies appear as heroes. The absolute disregard of historical facts and the tendency to represent the warriors of Troy and Rome as medieval knights show the inability of the medieval mind to understand that the past could have been different from the present. All these romances are full of picturesque adventures and present a vivid picture of the valor and loyalty of the true knight, as well as of his ruthlessness and contempt for human life.

Besides the long and elaborate epics, like Roland, and the romances in verse and prose, there were numberless short stories in verse (the fabliaux), which usually dealt with the incidents of everyday life, especially with the comical ones. Then there were the fables, the most famous of which are the stories of Reynard the Fox, which were satires upon the customs of the time, particularly the weaknesses of the priests and monks.

**Section 93. The Troubadours and Chivalry**

Turning now to southern France, the beautiful songs of the troubadours, which were the glory of the Provençal tongue, reveal a gay and polished society at the courts of the numerous feudal princes. The rulers not merely protected and encouraged the poets — they aspired to be poets themselves and to enter the ranks of the troubadours, as the composers of these elegant

¹ Malory's *Mort d'Arthur*, a collection of the stories of the Round Table made in the fifteenth century for English readers, is the best place to turn for these famous stories.
verses were called. These songs were always sung to an accompaniment on some instrument, usually the lute. The troubadours traveled from court to court, not only in France, but north into Germany and south into Italy, carrying with them the southern French poetry and customs. We have few examples of Provençal before the year 1100, but from that time on, for two centuries, countless songs were written, and many of the troubadours enjoyed an international reputation. The terrible Albigensian crusade brought misery and death into the sprightly circles which had gathered about the Count of Toulouse and other rulers who had treated the heretics too leniently.

For the student of history, the chief interest of the long poems of northern France and the songs of the South lies in the insight that they give into the life and aspirations of this feudal period. These are usually summed up in the term chivalry, or knighthood, of which a word may properly be said here, since we should know little of it were it not for the literature of which we have been speaking. The knights play the chief rôle in all the medieval romances; and, since many of the troubadours belonged to the knightly class, they naturally have much to say of it in their songs.

Chivalry was not a formal institution established at any particular moment. Like feudalism, with which it was closely connected, it had no founder, but appeared spontaneously throughout western Europe to meet the needs and desires of the period. When the youth of good family had been carefully trained to ride his horse, use his sword, and manage his hawk in the hunt, he was made a knight by a ceremony in which the Church took part, although the knighthood was actually conferred by an older knight.

The knight was a Christian soldier, and he and his fellows were supposed to form, in a way, a separate order, with high ideals of the conduct befitting their class. Knighthood was not, however, membership in an association with officers and a definite constitution. It was an ideal, half-imaginary society
— a society to which even those who enjoyed the title of king or duke were proud to belong. One was not born a knight as he might be born a duke or count, and could become one only through the ceremony mentioned above. Although most knights belonged to the nobility, one might be a noble and still not belong to the knightly order, and, on the other hand, one who was baseborn might be raised to knighthood on account of some valorous deed.

The knight must, in the first place, be a Christian and must obey and defend the Church on all occasions. He must respect all forms of weakness and defend the helpless wherever he might find them. He must fight the infidel Mohammedans ceaselessly, pitilessly, and never give way before the enemy. He must perform all his feudal duties, be faithful in all things to his lord, never lie or violate his plighted word. He must be generous and give freely and ungrudgingly to the needy. He must be faithful to his lady and be ready to defend her and her honor at all costs. Everywhere he must be the champion of the right against injustice and oppression. In short, chivalry was the Christianized profession of arms.

In the stories of King Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table there is a beautiful picture of the ideal knight. The dead Lancelot is addressed by one of his sorrowing companions as follows: "Thou wert the courtliest knight that ever bare shield, and thou wert the truest friend to thy lover that ever bestrode horse, and thou wert the truest lover among sinful men that ever loved woman, and thou wert the kindest man that ever struck with sword, and thou wert the goodliest person that ever came among the crowd of knights, and thou wert the meekest man and the gentlest that ever ate in hall among ladies, and thou wert the sternest knight to thy mortal foe that ever put spear in breast."

The Germans also made their contribution to the literature of chivalry. The German poets of the thirteenth century are called minnesingers. Like the troubadours, whom they greatly
admired, they usually sang of love, hence their name (German, Minne). The most famous of the minnesingers was Walther von der Vogelweide (d. about 1228), whose songs are full of charm and of enthusiasm for his German fatherland. Wolfram von Eschenbach (d. about 1225) in his story of Parsifal gives the long and sad adventures of a knight in search of the Holy Grail— the sacred vessel which had held the blood of Christ, which only a person perfectly pure in thought, word, and deed could hope to behold.

Section 94. Medieval Science

So long as all books had to be copied by hand, there were, of course, but few of them compared with those of modern times. The literature of which we have been speaking was not in general read, but was only listened to, as it was sung or recited by those who made it their profession. Wherever the wandering troubadour or minnesinger appeared he was sure of a delighted audience for his songs and stories, both serious and light. People unfamiliar with Latin could, however, learn little of the past, for there were no translations of the great classics of Greece and Rome, of Homer, Plato, Cicero, or Livy. All that they could know of ancient history was derived from the fantastic romances referred to above, which had for their theme the quite preposterous deeds ascribed to Alexander the Great, Æneas, and Caesar. As for their own history, the epics relating to the earlier course of events in France and the rest of Europe were hopelessly confused. For example, the writers attributed to Charlemagne a great part of the acts of the Frankish kings from Clovis to Pippin.

Of what we should call scientific books there were practically none. It is true that there was a kind of encyclopedia in verse which gave a great deal of misinformation about things in general. Every one continued to believe, as the Greeks and Romans had done, in strange animals like the unicorn, the dragon, and the
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phenix, and in still stranger habits of real animals. A single example will suffice to show what passed for zoölogy in the thirteenth century.

"There is a little beast made like a lizard and such is its nature that it will extinguish fire should it fall into it. The beast is so cold and of such a quality that fire is not able to burn it, nor will trouble happen in the place where it shall be." This beast signifies the holy man who lives by faith, who "will never have hurt from fire nor will hell burn him... This beast we name also by another name, salamander. It is accustomed to mount into apple-trees, poisons the apples, and in a well where it falls it poisons the water."

"The eagle [we are told by a learned writer of the time of Henry II], on account of its great heat, mixeth very cold stones with its eggs when it sitteth on them, so that the heat shall not destroy them. In the same way our words, when we speak with undue heat, should later be tempered with discretion, so that we may conciliate in the end those whom we offended by the beginning of our speech."

It will be noticed that the habits of the animals were supposed to have some moral or religious meaning and carry with them a lesson for mankind. It may be added that this and similar stories were centuries old and are found in the encyclopedias of the Romans. The most improbable things were repeated from generation to generation without its occurring to any one to inquire if there was any truth in them. Even the most learned men of the time believed in astrology and in the miraculous virtues of herbs and gems. For instance, Albertus Magnus, one of the most distinguished thinkers of the thirteenth century, says that a sapphire will drive away boils and that the diamond can be softened in the blood of a stag, which will work best if the stag has been fed on wine and parsley.

From the Roman and early Christian writers the Middle Ages got the idea of strange races of men and manlike creatures of various kinds. We find the following in an encyclopedia of the
thirteenth century: “Satyrs be somewhat like men, and have crooked noses, and horns in the forehead, and are like to goats in their feet. St. Anthony saw such an one in the wilderness... These wonderful beasts be divers; for some of them be called Cynocephali, for they have heads as hounds, and seem beasts rather than men; and some be called Cyclops, and have that name because each of them hath but one eye, and that in the middle of the forehead; and some be all headless and noseless and their eyes be in the shoulders; and some have plain faces without nostrils, and the nether lips of them stretch so that they veil therewith their faces when they be in the heat of the sun. Also in Scythia be some with so great and large ears, that they spread their ears and cover all their bodies with them, and these be called Panchios. . . .”

“And others there be in Ethiopia, and each of them have only one foot, so great and so large that they beshadow themselves with the foot when they lie gasping on the ground in strong heat of the sun; and yet they be so swift that they be likened to hounds in swiftness of running, and therefore among the Greeks they be called Cynopodes. Also some have the soles of their feet turned backward behind the legs, and in each foot eight toes, and such go about and stare in the desert of Lybia.”

Two old subjects of study were revived and received great attention in Europe from the thirteenth century onwards until recent times. These were astrology and alchemy.

Astrology was based on the belief that the planets influence the make-up of men and consequently their fate. Following an idea of the Greek philosophers, especially Aristotle, it was believed that all things were compounded of “the four elements” earth, air, fire, and water. Each person was a particular mixture of these four elements, and the position of the planets at the time of his birth was supposed to influence his mixture or “temperament.”

By knowing a person’s temperament one could judge what he ought to do in order to be successful in life, and what he should
avoid. For example, if one were born under the influence of Venus he should be on his guard against violent love and should choose for a trade something connected with dress or adornment; if he were born under Mars he might make armor or horseshoes or become a successful soldier. Many common words are really astrological terms, such as "ill-starred," "disastrous," "jovial," "saturnine," "mercurial" (derived from the names of the planets). Astrology was taught in the universities because it was supposed to be necessary for physicians to choose times when the stars were favorable for particular kinds of medical treatment.

Alchemy was chemistry directed toward the discovery of a method of turning the baser metals, like lead and copper, into gold and silver. The alchemists, even if they did not succeed in their chief aim, learned a great deal incidentally in their laboratories, and finally our modern chemistry emerged from alchemy. Like astrology, alchemy goes back to ancient times, and the people of the thirteenth century got most of their ideas through the Mohammedans, who had in turn got theirs from the Greek books on the subjects.

Section 95. Medieval Universities and Studies

All European countries now have excellent schools, colleges, and universities. These had their beginning in the later Middle Ages. With the incoming of the barbarian Germans and the break-up of the Roman Empire, education largely disappeared and for hundreds of years there was nothing in western Europe, outside of Italy and Spain, corresponding to our universities and colleges. Some of the schools which the bishops and abbots had established in accordance with Charlemagne's commands (see above, p. 379) were, it is true, maintained all through the dark and disorderly times which followed his death. But the little that we know of the instruction offered in them would indicate that it was very elementary.
About the year 1100 an ardent young man named Abelard started out from his home in Brittany to visit all the places where he might hope to receive instruction in logic and philosophy, in which, like all his learned contemporaries, he was especially interested. He reports that he found teachers in several of the French towns, particularly in Paris, who were attracting large numbers of students to listen to their lectures upon logic, rhetoric, and theology. Abelard soon showed his superiority to his teachers by defeating them several times in debate. So he began lecturing on his own account, and such was his success that thousands of students flocked to hear him.

Abelard did not found the University of Paris, as has sometimes been supposed, but he did a great deal to make the discussions of theological problems popular, and by his attractive method of teaching he greatly increased the number of those who wished to study.

Before the end of the twelfth century the teachers had become so numerous in Paris that they formed a union, or guild, for the advancement of their interests. This union of professors was called by the usual name for corporations in the Middle Ages, universitas; hence our word "university." The king and the Pope both favored the university and granted the teachers and students many of the privileges of the clergy, a class to which they were regarded as belonging, because learning had for so many centuries been confined to the clergy.

About the time that we find the beginnings of a university or guild of professors at Paris, another great institution of learning was growing up at Bologna. Here the chief attention was given, not to theology, as at Paris, but to the study of the law, both Roman and church (canon) law. Students began to stream to Bologna in greater and greater numbers. In order to protect themselves in a town where they were regarded as strangers, they also organized themselves into unions, which became so powerful that they were able to force the professors to obey the rules which they laid down.
The University of Oxford was founded in the time of Henry II, probably by English students and masters who had become discontented at Paris for some reason. The University of Cambridge, as well as numerous universities in France, Italy, and Spain, were founded in the thirteenth century. The German universities, which are still so famous, were established somewhat later, most of them in the latter half of the fourteenth and in the fifteenth century. The northern institutions generally took the great mother university on the Seine as their model, while those in southern Europe usually adopted the methods of Bologna.

When, after some years of study, a student was examined by the professors, he was, if successful, admitted to the corporation of teachers and became a master himself. What we call a degree to-day was originally, in the medieval universities, nothing more than the right to teach; but in the thirteenth century many who did not care to become professors in our sense of the word began to desire the honorable title of master or doctor (which is only the Latin word for "teacher").

The students in the medieval universities were of all ages, from thirteen to forty, and even older. There were no university buildings, and in Paris the lectures were given in the Latin Quarter, in Straw Street, so called from the straw strewn on the floors of the hired rooms where the lecturer explained the textbook, with the students squatting on the floor before him. There were no laboratories, for there was no experimentation. All that was required was a copy of the textbook. This the lecturer explained sentence by sentence, and the students listened and sometimes took notes.

The most striking peculiarity of the instruction in the medieval university was the supreme deference paid to Aristotle. Most

---

1 The origin of the bachelor's degree, which comes at the end of our college course nowadays, may be explained as follows: The bachelor in the thirteenth century was a student who had passed part of his examinations in the course in "arts," as the college course was then called, and was permitted to teach certain elementary subjects before he became a full-fledged master. So the A.B. was inferior to the A.M. then as now.
of the courses of lectures were devoted to the explanation of
some one of his numerous treatises—his *Physics*, his *Meta-
physics*, his treatises on logic, his *Ethics*, his minor works
upon the soul, heaven and earth, etc. Only his *Logic* had been
known to Abelard, as all his other works had been forgotten.
But early in the thirteenth century all his comprehensive con-
tributions to science reached the West, either from Constantinople
or through the Arabs, who had brought them to Spain. The
Latin translations were bad and obscure, and the lecturer had
enough to do to give some meaning to them, to explain what the
Arab philosophers had said of them, and, finally, to reconcile
them to the teachings of Christianity.

Aristotle was, of course, a pagan. He was uncertain whether
the soul continued to exist after death; he had never heard of
the Bible and knew nothing of the salvation of man through
Christ. One would have supposed that he would have been
promptly rejected with horror by the ardent Christian believers
of the Middle Ages. But the teachers of the thirteenth cen-
tury were fascinated by his logic and astonished at his learn-
ing. The great theologians of the time, Albertus Magnus
(d. 1280) and Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274), did not hesitate to
prepare elaborate commentaries upon all his works. He was
called "The Philosopher"; and so fully were scholars convinced
that it had pleased God to permit Aristotle to say the last word
upon each and every branch of knowledge that they humbly
accepted him, along with the Bible, the church fathers, and the
canon and Roman law, as one of the unquestioned authorities
which together formed a complete guide for humanity in conduct
and in every branch of science.

The term "scholasticism" is commonly given to the beliefs and
method of discussion of the medieval professors. To those who
later outgrew the fondness for logic and the supreme respect for
Aristotle, scholasticism, with its neglect of Greek and Roman
literature, came to seem an arid and profitless plan of education.
Yet, if we turn over the pages of the wonderful works of
Thomas Aquinas, we see that the scholastic philosopher might be a person of extraordinary insight and learning, ready to recognize all the objections to his position, and able to express himself with great clearness and cogency.\(^1\) The training in logic, if it did not increase the sum of human knowledge, accustomed the student to make careful distinctions and present his arguments in an orderly way.

No attention was given to the great subject of history in the medieval universities, nor was Greek taught. Latin had to be learned in order to carry on the work at all, but little time was given to the Roman classics. The new modern languages were considered entirely unworthy of the learned. It must of course be remembered that none of the books which we consider the great classics in English, French, Italian, or Spanish had as yet been written.

Although the medieval professors paid the greatest respect to the Greek philosopher Aristotle and made Latin translations of his works the basis of the college course, very few of them could read any Greek and none of them knew much about Homer or Plato or the Greek tragedians and historians. In the fourteenth century Petrarch (1304-1374) set the example in Italy of carefully collecting all the writings of the Romans, which he greatly admired. He made an unsuccessful effort to learn Greek, for he found that Cicero and other Roman writers were constantly referring with enthusiasm to the Greek books to which they owed so much.

Petrarch had not the patience or opportunity to master Greek, but twenty years after his death a learned Greek prelate from Constantinople, named Chrysoloras, came to Florence and found pupils eager to learn his language so that they could read the Greek books. Soon Italian scholars were going to Constantinople to carry on their studies, just as the Romans in Cicero’s time had gone to Athens. They brought back copies of all the

\(^1\) An example of the scholastic method of reasoning of Thomas Aquinas may be found in *Translations and Reprints*, Vol. III, No. 6.
ancient writers that they could find, and by 1430 Greek books were once more known in the West, after a thousand years of neglect.

In this way western Europe caught up with ancient times; scholars could once more know all that the Greeks and Romans had known and could read in the original the works of Homer, Sophocles, Herodotus, Plato, Aristotle, Demosthenes, and other philosophers, historians, orators, and tragedians. Those who devoted their lives to a study of the literature of Greece and Rome were called Humanists. The name is derived from the Latin word humanitas, which means "culture." In time the colleges gave up the exclusive study of Aristotle and substituted a study of the Greek and Latin literature, and in this way what is known as our "classical" course of study originated.

SECTION 96. BEGINNINGS OF MODERN INVENTIONS

So long, however, as intellectual men confined themselves to studying the old books of Greece and Rome they were not likely to advance beyond what the Greeks and Romans had known. In order to explain modern discoveries and inventions we have to take account of those who began to suspect that Aristotle was ignorant and mistaken upon many important matters, and who set to work to examine things about them with the hope of finding out more than any one had ever known before.

Even in the thirteenth century there were a few scholars who criticized the habit of relying upon Aristotle for all knowledge. The most distinguished faultfinder was Roger Bacon, an English Franciscan monk (d. about 1290), who declared that even if Aristotle were very wise he had only planted the tree of knowledge and that this had "not as yet put forth all its branches nor produced all its fruits." "If we could continue to live for endless centuries we mortals could never hope to reach full and complete knowledge of all the things which are to be known. No one knows enough of nature completely to describe the
peculiarities of a single fly and give the reason for its color and why it has just so many feet, no more and no less.” Bacon held that truth could be reached a hundred thousand times better by experiments with real things than by poring over the bad Latin translations of Aristotle. “If I had my way,” he declared, “I should burn all the books of Aristotle, for the study of them can only lead to a loss of time, produce error and increase ignorance.”

Roger Bacon declared that if men would only study common things instead of reading the books of the ancients, science would outdo the wonders which people of his day thought could be produced by magic. He said that in time men would be able to fly, would have carriages which needed no horses to draw them and ships which would move swiftly without oars, and that bridges could be built without piers to support them.

All this and much more has come true, but inventors and modern scientists owe but little to the books of the Greeks and Romans, which the scholastic philosophers and the Humanists relied upon. Although the Greek philosophers devoted considerable attention to natural science, they were not much inclined to make long and careful experiments or to invent anything like the microscope or telescope to help them. They knew very little indeed about the laws of nature and were sadly mistaken upon many points. Aristotle thought that the sun and all the stars revolved about the earth and that the heavenly bodies were perfect and unchangeable. He believed that heavy bodies fell faster than light ones and that all earthly things were made of the four elements — earth, air, water, and fire. The Greeks and Romans knew nothing of the compass, or gunpowder, or the printing press, or the uses to which steam can be put. Indeed, they had scarcely anything that we should call a machine.

The thirteenth century witnessed certain absolutely new achievements in the history of mankind. The compass began to be utilized in a way to encourage bolder and bolder ventures out upon the ocean (see above, section 91). The properties of the lens were discovered, and before the end of the century
spectacles are mentioned. The lens made the later telescope, microscope, spectroscope, and camera possible, upon which so much of our modern science depends. The Arabic numerals began to take the place of the awkward Roman system of using letters. One cannot well divide XLVIII by VIII but he can easily divide 48 by 8. Roger Bacon knew of the explosive nature of a compound of sulphur, saltpeter, and charcoal, and a generation after his death gunpowder began to be used a little for guns and artillery. A document is still preserved referring to the making of brass cannon and balls in Florence in the year 1326. By 1350 powder works were in existence in at least three German towns, and French and English books refer now and then to its use.

At least a hundred and fifty years elapsed, however, before gunpowder really began to supplant the old ways of fighting with bows and arrows and axes and lances. By the year 1500 it was becoming clear that the old stone castles were insufficient protection against cannon, and a new type of unprotected castle began to be erected as residences of the kings and the nobility (see below, p. 570). Gunpowder has done away with armor, bows and arrows, spears and javelins, castles and walled towns.
It may be that sometime some such fearfully destructive compound may be discovered, that the nations may decide to give up war altogether as too dangerous and terrible a thing to resort to under any circumstances.

The inventions of the compass, of the lens, and of gunpowder have helped to revolutionize the world. To these may be added the printing press, which has so facilitated and encouraged reading that it is nowadays rare to find anybody who cannot read.

The Italian classical scholars of the fifteenth century succeeded, as we have seen (pp. 548–549, above), in arousing a new interest in the books of the Greeks as well as of the Romans. They carefully collected every ancient work that they could lay hands on, made copies of it, edited it, and if it was in Greek, translated it into Latin. While they were in the midst of this work certain patient experimenters in Germany and Holland were turning their attention to a new way of multiplying books rapidly and cheaply by the use of lead type and a press.

The Greeks and Romans and the people of the Middle Ages knew no other method of obtaining a new copy of a book except by writing it out laboriously by hand. The professional copyists were incredibly dexterous with their quills, as may be seen in Fig. 199 — a page from a Bible of the thirteenth century which is reproduced in its original size.\(^1\) The letters are

\(^1\) Figs. 199 and 200 are reproductions, exactly the size of the original, of two pages in a manuscript Bible of the thirteenth century (in Latin) belonging to the library of Columbia University. The first of the two was chosen to illustrate the minuteness and perfection of the best work; the second to show irregularities and mistakes due to negligence or lack of skill in the copyists.

The page represented in Fig. 199 is taken from 1 Maccabees i, 56–ii, 65 (a portion of the Scriptures not usually included in the Protestant Bibles). It begins, "... ditis fugitivorum locis. Die quindecimena mensis Caslev, quinto et quartagesimo et centesimo anno aedificavit rex Antiochus abominandum idolum desolationis super altare Dei; et per universas civitates Juda in circitu aedificaverunt aras et ante januas domorum, et in plateis incendebant thura, et sacrificabant et libros legis Dei com[bussent]." The scribes used a good many abbreviations, as was the custom of the time, and what is transcribed here fills five lines of the manuscript.

The second less perfect page here reproduced is from the prophet Amos, iii, 9–vii, 16. It begins, "vinearum vestrarum: oliveta vestra et ficeta vestra comedit eruca et non redistis ad me, dicit Dominus."
Plate VIII. Page from a Book of Hours, Fifteenth Century
(Original Size)
as clear, small, and almost as regular as if they had been printed. The whole volume containing the Old and New Testaments is about the size of this book. After the scribe had finished his work the volume was often turned over to the *illuminator*, who would put in gay illuminated initials and sometimes page borders, which were delightful in design and color. Books designed to be used in the church services were adorned with pictures as well as with ornamented initials and decorative borders. Plate VIII is a reproduction of a page from a *Book of Hours* in the library of Columbia University. It is the same size as the original.

The written books were, in short, often both compact and beautiful, but they were never cheap or easily produced in great numbers. When Cosimo, the father of Lorenzo the Magnificent, wished to form a library just before the invention of printing, he applied to a contractor who engaged forty-five copyists. By working hard for nearly two years they were able to produce only two hundred volumes for the new library.

Moreover, it was impossible before the invention of printing to have two copies of the same work exactly alike. Even with the greatest care a scribe could not avoid making some mistakes, and a careless copyist was sure to make a great many. The universities required their students to report immediately any mistakes discovered in their textbooks, in order that the error might not be reproduced in another copy and so lead to a misunderstanding of the author. With the invention of printing it became possible to produce in a short time a great many copies of a given book which were exactly alike. Consequently, if sufficient care was taken to see that the types were properly set, the whole edition, not simply a single copy, might be relied upon as correct.

1 The word "miniature," which is often applied to them, is derived from *minium*, that is, vermilion, which was one of the favorite colors. Later the word came to be applied to anything small.
Fig. 199. Page from a Copy of the Bible made in the Thirteenth Century, showing Perfection of the Best Work (see note p. 552)
Fig. 200. Another Page from the Same Volume from which the Page opposite is taken, showing Imperfections and Mistakes of Poor Copyists
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After the supply of papyrus—the paper of the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans—was cut off from Europe by the conquest of Egypt by the Mohammedans the people of the Middle Ages used parchment, made from the skin of lambs and goats. This was so expensive that printing would have been of but little use, even if it had been thought of, before paper was introduced into Europe by the Mohammedans.\(^1\) Paper began to become common in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and was already replacing parchment before the invention of printing.

The earliest book of any considerable size to be printed was the Bible, which appears to have been completed at Mayence in the year 1456. A year later the famous Mayence Psalter was finished, the first dated book (Fig. 201). There are, however, earlier

---

\(^1\) The Arabs seem to have derived their knowledge of paper-making from the Chinese.
examples of little books printed with engraved blocks and even with movable types. In the German towns, where the art spread rapidly, the printers adhered to the style of letters which the scribe had found it convenient to make with his quill — the so-called Gothic, or black letter. In Italy, however, where the first printing press was set up in 1466, a type was soon adopted which resembled the letters used in ancient Roman inscriptions. This was quite similar to the style of letter commonly used to-day. The Italians also invented the compressed italic type, which enabled them to get a great many words on a page. The early printers generally did their work conscientiously, and the very first book printed is in most respects as well done as any later book.

By the year 1500, after printing had been used less than half a century, there appear to have been at least forty printing presses to be found in various towns of Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, and England. These presses had, it is estimated, already printed eight millions of volumes. So there was no longer any danger of the old books being again lost, and the encouragement to write and publish new books was greatly increased. From that date our sources for history become far more voluminous.
than those which exist for the previous history of the world; we are much better informed in regard to events and conditions since 1500 than we ever can be respecting those of the earlier periods.

SECTION 97. THE ART OF THE RENAISSANCE

We have already described briefly the work of the medieval architects and referred to the beautiful carvings that adorned the Gothic cathedrals and to the pictures of saints and angels in stained glass which filled the great church windows. But in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries art developed in a most astonishing manner in Italy and set new standards for all of western Europe.

Florence was the great center of artistic activity during the fifteenth century. The greatest sculptors and almost all of the most famous painters and architects of the time either were natives of Florence or did their best work there. During the first half of the century sculpture again took the lead. The bronze doors of the baptistery at Florence by Ghiberti, which were completed in 1452, are among the finest products of Renaissance sculpture (Fig. 203).\(^1\)

Florence reached the height of its preëminence as an art center during the reign of Lorenzo the Magnificent, who was a devoted patron of all the arts. With his death (1492), this preëminence passed to Rome, which was fast becoming one of the great capitals of Europe. The art-loving popes, Julius II and Leo X, took pains to secure the services of the most distinguished artists and architects of the time in the building and adornment of St. Peter’s and the Vatican, that is, the papal church and palace (see above, p. 525).

\(^1\) Opposite the cathedral at Florence (Fig. 196) stands the ancient baptistery. Its northern bronze doors, with ten scenes from the Bible, surrounded by a very lovely border of foliage, birds, and animals, were completed by Lorenzo Ghiberti in 1452, after many years of labor. Michael Angelo declared them worthy to be the gates of heaven.
Fig. 203. Ghiberti’s Doors at Florence
Fig. 204. Holy Family by Andrea del Sarto
During the sixteenth century the art of the Renaissance reached its highest development. Among all the great artists of this period three stand out in heroic proportions—Leonardo da Vinci, Michael Angelo, and Raphael. The first two not only practiced, but achieved distinction in, the three arts of architecture, sculpture, and painting. It is impossible to give in a few lines any idea of the beauty and significance of the work of these great geniuses. Both Raphael and Michael Angelo left behind them so many and such magnificent frescoes and paintings, and in the case of Michael Angelo statues as well, that it is easy to appreciate their importance. Leonardo, on the other hand, left but little completed work. His influence on the art of his time, which was probably greater than that of either of the others, came from his many-sidedness, his originality, and his unflagging interest in the discovery and application of new methods. He was almost more experimenter than artist.

While Florence could no longer boast of being the art center of Italy, it still produced great artists, among whom Andrea del Sarto may be especially mentioned (Fig. 204). But the most important center of artistic activity outside of Rome in the sixteenth century was Venice. The distinguishing characteristic of the Venetian pictures is their glowing color. This is strikingly exemplified in the paintings of Titian, the most famous of all the Venetian painters.

It was natural that artists from the northern countries should be attracted by the renown of the Italian masters and, after learning all that Italy could teach them, should return home to practice their art in their own particular fashion. About a century after painting began to develop in Italy two Flemish brothers, Van Eyck by name, showed that they were not only able to paint quite as excellent pictures as the Italians of their day, but they also discovered a new way of mixing their colors superior to that employed in Italy. Later, when painting had reached its height in Italy, Albrecht Dürer and Hans Holbein the

1 Leonardo was engineer and inventor as well.  
2 See Fig. 205.
Younger\(^1\) in Germany vied with even Raphael and Michael
Angelo in the mastery of their art. Dürer is especially cele-
brated for his wonderful woodcuts and copperplate engravings,
in which field he has perhaps never been excelled.\(^2\)

When, in the seventeenth century, painting had declined south
of the Alps, Dutch and Flemish masters — above all, Rubens
and Rembrandt — developed a new and admirable school of
painting. To Van Dyck, another Flemish master, we owe many
noble portraits of historically important persons.\(^3\) Spain gave
to the world in the seventeenth century a painter whom some
would rank higher than even the greatest artists of Italy, namely,
Velasquez (1599–1660). His genius, like that of Van Dyck, is
especially conspicuous in his marvelous portraits.

**QUESTIONS**

Section 92. Why was Latin used by learned men, churchmen,
scholars, and lawyers in the Middle Ages? What is the origin of
the Germanic languages? of the Romance tongues? When does English
become sufficiently modern for us to read it easily without special study?
What is the character of the French romances of the Middle Ages?

Section 93. Who were the troubadours? Describe chivalry
and the ideal knight.

Section 94. Why did people know little of history in the Middle
Ages? Give some examples of the beliefs in regard to the habits of
animals and the existence of strange races of men. What value was
supposed to come from studying the habits of animals? Define
astrology. What words do we use that recall the beliefs of the
Middle Ages in regard to the influence of the stars on man? What
was alchemy?

Section 95. Who was Abelard? What was a "university" or-
iginally? Mention some early universities. What was the origin
of our degrees? What subjects were studied in a medieval univer-
sity? Why was Aristotle so venerated by the medieval scholars?
What was scholasticism? How and when were Greek books again
brought into western Europe? Who were the Humanists? Why did
not the Humanists make any discoveries?

\(^1\) See below, Fig. 209. \(^2\) See below, Fig. 211. \(^3\) See below, Figs. 226 and 227.
Section 96. Why did Roger Bacon criticize the enthusiasm for Aristotle? What great inventions did he foresee? What great new discoveries were made in the thirteenth century?

What effects did the introduction of gunpowder have? How were books made before the invention of printing? What are the disadvantages of a book copied by hand? What is the earliest large printed book? How rapidly did printing spread? What do you consider the chief effects of the introduction of printing?

Section 97. Say something of the chief artists of the Renaissance in Italy and their work. Name some of the artists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries who lived outside of Italy.
CHAPTER XXIII

EMPEROR CHARLES V AND HIS VAST REALMS

Section 98. Emperor Maximilian and the Hapsburg Marriages

In the year 1500 a baby was born in the town of Ghent who was destined before he reached the age of twenty to rule, as Emperor Charles V, over more of Europe than any one since Charlemagne. He owed his vast empire not to any conquests of his own but to an extraordinary series of royal marriages which made him heir to a great part of western Europe. These marriages had been arranged by his grandfather, Maximilian I, one of the most successful matchmakers that ever lived. Maximilian belonged to the House of Hapsburg, and in order to understand European history since 1500 we must learn something of Maximilian and the Hapsburg line.

The German kings had failed to create a strong kingdom such as those over which Louis XI of France and Henry VII of England ruled. Their fine title of emperor had made them a great deal of trouble and done them no good, as we have seen. Their attempts to keep Italy as well as Germany under their rule, and the alliance of the mighty bishop of Rome with their enemies had well-nigh ruined them. Their position was further weakened by the fact that their office was not strictly hereditary. Although the emperors were often succeeded by their sons, each new emperor had to be elected, and those great vassals who controlled the election naturally took care to bind the candidate by solemn promises not to interfere with their

1 See above, sections 61, 73-77.
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privileges and independence. The result was that, after the downfall of the Hohenstaufens, Germany fell apart into a great number of practically independent states, of which none were very large and some were extremely small.

After an interregnum, Rudolf of Hapsburg had been chosen emperor in 1273 (see above, p. 458). The original seat of the Hapsburgs, who were destined to play such a great part in European affairs, was in northern Switzerland, where the vestiges of their original castle may still be seen. Rudolf was the first prominent member of the family; he established its position and influence by seizing the duchies of Austria and Styria, which became, under his successors, the nucleus of the extensive Austrian possessions.

About a century and a half after the death of Rudolf the German princes began regularly to choose as their emperor the ruler of the Austrian possessions, so that the imperial title became, to all intents and purposes, hereditary in the Hapsburg line. The Hapsburgs were, however, far more interested in adding to their family domains than in advancing the interests of the German Empire as a whole. Indeed, the Holy Roman Empire was nearly defunct and, in the memorable words of Voltaire, it had ceased to be either holy, or Roman, or an empire.

Maximilian, while still a very young man, married Mary of Burgundy, the heiress to the Burgundian realms, which included what we now call Holland and Belgium and portions of eastern France. In this way the House of Austria got a hold on the shores of the North Sea. Mary died in 1482 and her lands were inherited by her infant son, Philip. Maximilian’s next matrimonial move was to arrange a marriage between his son Philip and Joanna, the heiress to the Spanish kingdoms, and this makes it necessary for us to turn a moment to Spain, of which little or nothing has been said since we saw how the kingdom of the Visigoths was overthrown by the Mohammedan invaders, over seven hundred years before Maximilian’s time (section 59).
The Mohammedan conquest served to make the history of Spain very different from that of the other states of Europe. One of its first and most important results was the conversion of a great part of the inhabitants to Mohammedanism. During the tenth century, which was so dark a period in the rest of Europe, the Arab civilization in Spain reached its highest development. The various elements in the population, Roman, Gothic, Arab, and Berber, appear to have been thoroughly amalgamated. Agriculture, industry, commerce, art, and the sciences made rapid progress. Cordova, with its half million of inhabitants, its stately palaces, its university, its three thousand mosques and three hundred public baths, was perhaps unrivaled at that period in the whole world. There were thousands of students at the University of Cordova at a time when, in the North, only clergymen had mastered even the simple arts of reading and writing. This brilliant civilization lasted, however, for hardly more than a hundred years. By the middle of the eleventh century the caliphate of Cordova had fallen to pieces, and shortly afterwards the country was overrun by new invaders from Africa.

But the Christians were destined to reconquer the peninsula. As early as the year 1000 several small Christian kingdoms — Castile, Aragon, and Navarre — had come into existence in the northern part of Spain. Castile, in particular, began to push back the Mohammedans and, in 1085, reconquered Toledo from them. Aragon also widened its bounds by incorporating Barcelona and conquering the territory watered by the Ebro. By 1250, the long war of the Christians against the Mohammedans, which fills the medieval annals of Spain, had been so successfully prosecuted that Castile extended to the south coast and included the great towns of Cordova and Seville. The Christian kingdom of Portugal was already as large as it is to-day.

The Moors, as the Spanish Mohammedans were called, maintained themselves for two centuries more in the mountainous

1 See map above, p. 440.
kingdom of Granada, in the southern part of the peninsula. During this period Castile, which was the largest of the Spanish kingdoms and embraced all the central part of the peninsula, was too much occupied by internal feuds and struggles over the crown to wage successful war against the Moorish kingdom to the south.

The first Spanish monarch whose name need be mentioned here was Queen Isabella of Castile, who, in 1469, concluded an all-important marriage with Ferdinand, the heir of the crown of Aragon. It is with this union of Castile and Aragon that the great importance of Spain in European history begins. For the next hundred years Spain was to enjoy more military power than any other European state.

Ferdinand and Isabella undertook to complete the conquest of the peninsula, and in 1492, after a long siege, the city of Granada fell into their hands, and therewith the last vestige of Moorish domination disappeared.¹

In the same year that the conquest of the peninsula was completed, the discoveries of Columbus, made under the auspices of Queen Isabella, opened up sources of undreamed-of wealth beyond the seas. The transient greatness of Spain in the sixteenth century is largely to be attributed to the riches which poured in from her American possessions. The shameless and cruel looting of the Mexican and Peruvian cities by Cortes and Pizarro (see above, p. 531), and the products of the silver mines of the New World, enabled Spain to assume, for a time, a position in Europe which her internal strength and normal resources would never have permitted.

Unfortunately, the most industrious, skillful, and thrifty among the inhabitants of Spain, that is, the Moors and the Jews, who well-nigh supported the whole kingdom with the products

¹ No one can gaze upon the great castle and palace of the Alhambra, which was built for the Moorish kings, without realizing what a high degree of culture the Moors had attained. Its beautiful and impressive arcades, its magnificent courts, and the delicate tracery of its arches represent the highest achievement of Arabic architecture (Fig. 146).
of their toil, were bitterly persecuted by the Christians. So anxious was Isabella to rid her kingdom of the infidels that she revived the court of the Inquisition. For several decades its tribunals arrested and condemned innumerable persons who were suspected of heresy, and thousands were burned at the stake during this period. These wholesale executions have served to associate Spain especially with the horrors of the Inquisition. Finally, in 1609, a century after Isabella’s death, the Moors were driven out of the country altogether. The persecution diminished or disheartened the most useful and enterprising portion of the Spanish people, and permanently crippled the country.

It was no wonder that the daughter and heiress of Ferdinand and Isabella seemed to Maximilian an admirable match for his son Philip. Philip died, however, in 1506. — six years after his eldest son Charles was born, — and his poor wife, Joanna, became insane with grief and was thus incapacitated for ruling. So Charles could look forward to an unprecedented accumulation of glorious titles as soon as his grandfathers, Maximilian of Austria and Ferdinand of Aragon, should pass away. He was soon to be duke of Brabant, margrave of Antwerp, count of Holland, archduke of Austria, count of Tyrol, king of Castile, Aragon, and Naples, and of the vast Spanish possessions in America — to mention a few of his more important titles.

1 See above, pp. 483-484.
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Naples and Sicily were in the hands of the king of Aragon at this time (p. 459).
Ferdinand died in 1516, and Charles, now a lad of sixteen, who had been born and reared in the Netherlands, was much bewildered when he first landed in his Spanish dominions. The Burgundian advisers whom he brought with him were distasteful to the haughty Spaniards, to whom, of course, they were foreigners; suspicion and opposition awaited him in each of his several Spanish kingdoms, for he found by no means a united Spain. Each kingdom demanded special recognition of its rights and proposed important reforms before it would acknowledge Charles as its king.
Charles elected Emperor, 1519

It seemed as if the boy would have his hands full in asserting his authority as the first "king of Spain"; nevertheless, a still more imposing title and still more perplexing responsibilities were to fall upon his shoulders before he was twenty years old. It had long been Maximilian's ambition that his grandson should succeed him upon the imperial throne. After his death in 1519 the electors finally chose Charles as Emperor—the fifth of that name—instead of the rival candidate, Francis I of France. By this election the king of Spain, who had not yet been in Germany and who never learned its language, became its ruler at a critical juncture, when the teachings of Luther (see next chapter) were adding a new kind of trouble to the old disorders.

Section 99. How Italy became the Battleground of the European Powers

In order to understand the Europe of Charles V and the constant wars which occupied him all his life, we must turn back and review the questions which had been engaging the attention of his fellow kings before he came to the throne. It is particularly necessary to see clearly how Italy had suddenly become the center of commotion—the battlefield for Spain, France, and Germany.

Charles VIII of France (1483-1498) possessed little of the practical sagacity of his father, Louis XI (pp. 435-436). He dreamed of a mighty expedition against the Turks and of the conquest of Constantinople. As the first step he determined to lead an army into Italy and assert his claim, inherited from his father, to the kingdom of Naples, which was in the hands of the House of Aragon.1 While Italy had everything to lose by

1 It will be remembered that the popes, in their long struggle with Frederick II and the Hohenstaufens, finally called in Charles of Anjou, the brother of St. Louis, and gave to him both Naples and Sicily (see above, pp. 456 ff.). Sicily revolted in 1282 and was united with the kingdom of Aragon, which still held it when
permitting a powerful foreign monarch to get a foothold in the South, there was no probability that the various little states into which the peninsula was divided would lay aside their animosities and combine against the invader. On the contrary, Charles VIII was urged by some of the Italians themselves to come.

Had Lorenzo the Magnificent still been alive, he might have organized a league to oppose the French king, but he had died in 1492, two years before Charles started. Lorenzo’s sons failed to maintain the influence over the people of Florence which their father had enjoyed; and the leadership of the city fell into the hands of the Dominican friar, Savonarola, whose fervid preaching attracted and held for a time the attention of the fickle Florentine populace. He believed himself to be a prophet, and proclaimed that God was about to scourge Italy for its iniquities.

When Savonarola heard of the French invasion, it appeared to him that this was indeed the looked-for scourge of God, which might afflict, but would also purify, the Church. As Charles approached Florence, the people rose in revolt against the Medici, sacked their palaces, and drove out the three sons of Lorenzo. Savonarola became the chief figure in the new republic which was established. Charles was admitted into Florence, but his ugly, insignificant figure disappointed the Florentines. They soon made it clear to him that they did not regard him in any sense as a conqueror, and would oppose a prolonged occupation by the French. So, after a week’s stay, the French army left Florence and proceeded on its southward journey.

Charles V came to the Spanish throne. Naples also was conquered by the king of Aragon, and was in his family when Charles VIII undertook his Italian expedition. Louis XI, although he claimed the right of the French to rule in Naples, had prudently refused to attempt to oust the Aragonese usurpers, as he had quite enough to do at home.

1 The fate of Savonarola was a tragic one. He lost the confidence of the Florentines and aroused the opposition of the Pope. Three years after Charles VIII’s visit he was accused of heresy and executed.
The next power with which Charles had to deal was the Pope, who ruled over the states of the Church. The Pope was greatly perturbed when he realized that the French army was upon him. He naturally dreaded to have a foreign power in control of southern Italy just as his predecessors had dreaded the efforts of the Hohenstaufen to add Naples to their empire. He was unable, however, to oppose the French and they proceeded on their way.

The success of the French king seemed marvelous, for even Naples speedily fell into his hands. But he and his troops were demoralized by the wines and other pleasures of the South, and meanwhile his enemies at last began to form a combination against him. Ferdinand of Aragon was fearful lest he might lose Sicily, and Emperor Maximilian objected to having the French control Italy. Charles’s situation became so dangerous that he may well have thought himself fortunate, at the close of 1495, to escape, with the loss of only a single battle, from the country he had hoped to conquer.

The results of Charles VIII’s expedition appear at first sight trivial; in reality they were momentous. In the first place, it was now clear to Europe that the Italians had no real national feeling, however much they might despise the “barbarians” who lived north of the Alps. From this time down to the latter half of the nineteenth century, Italy was dominated by foreign nations, especially Spain and Austria. In the second place, the French learned to admire the art and culture of Italy (section 97). The nobles began to change their feudal castles, which since the invention of gunpowder were no longer impregnable, into luxurious palaces and country houses. The new scholarship of Italy also took root and flourished not only in France but in England and Germany as well, and Greek began to be studied outside of Italy. Consequently, just as Italy was becoming, politically, the victim of foreign aggressions, it was also losing, never to regain, that intellectual leadership which it had enjoyed since the revival of interest in Latin and Greek literature.
It would be wearisome and unprofitable to follow the attempts of the French to get a foothold in Milan. Suffice it to say, that Charles VIII soon died and that his successor Louis XII laid claim to the duchy of Milan in the north as well as to Naples in the south. But he concluded to sell his claim to Naples to Ferdinand of Aragon and centered his attention on holding Milan, but did not succeed in his purpose, largely owing to the opposition of the Pope.

Francis I, who came to the French throne in 1515 at the age of twenty, is one of the most famous of the French kings. He was gracious and chivalrous in his ideas of conduct, and his proudest title was "the gentleman king." Like his contemporaries, Pope Leo X, son of Lorenzo de' Medici, and Henry VIII of England, he helped artists and men of letters and was interested in fine buildings (Fig. 207).
Francis opened his reign by a very astonishing victory. He led his troops into Italy over a pass which had hitherto been regarded as impracticable for cavalry and defeated the Swiss — who were in the Pope’s pay — at Marignano. He then occupied Milan and opened negotiations with Leo X, who was glad to make terms with the victorious young king. The Pope agreed that Francis should retain Milan, and Francis on his part acceded to Leo’s plan for turning over Florence once more to the Medici, of which family the Pope himself was a member. This was done, and some years later this wonderful republic

---

**FIG. 207. COURT OF THE PALACE AT BLOIS**

The expedition of Charles VIII to Italy called the attention of French architects to the beautiful Renaissance style used there. As cannon had by this time begun to render the old kind of castles with thick walls and towers useless as a means of defense, the French kings began to construct magnificent palaces of which several still exist. Charles VIII’s successor, Louis XII, began a handsome structure at Blois, on the Loire River, and Francis I added a wing, the inner side of which is here reproduced. Its magnificent open staircase and wide, high windows have little in common with the old donjons of feudal times.
became the grand duchy of Tuscany, governed by a line of petty princes under whom its former glories were never renewed.

Friendly relations existed at first between the two young sovereigns, Francis I and Charles V, but there were several circumstances which led to an almost incessant series of wars between them. France was clamped in between the northern and southern possessions of Charles, and had at that time no natural boundaries. Moreover, there was a standing dispute over portions of the Burgundian realms, for both Charles and Francis claimed the duchy of Burgundy and also the neighboring county of Burgundy—commonly called Franche-Comté (see accompanying map). Charles also believed that, through his grandfather, Maximilian, he was entitled to Milan, which the French kings had set their hearts upon retaining. For a generation the rivals fought over these and other matters, and the wars between Charles and Francis were but the prelude to a conflict lasting over two centuries between France and the overgrown power of the House of Hapsburg.

In the impending struggle it was natural that both monarchs should try to gain the aid of the king of England, whose friendship was of the greatest importance to each of them, and who was by no means loath to take a hand in European affairs. Henry VIII had succeeded his father, Henry VII, in 1509 at the age of eighteen. Like Francis, he was good-looking and graceful, and in his early years made a very happy impression upon those who came in contact with him. He gained much popularity by condemning to death the two men who had been most active in extorting the “benevolences” which his father had been wont to require of unwilling givers. With a small but important class, his learning brought him credit. He married, for his first wife, an aunt of Charles V, Catherine of Aragon, and chose as his chief adviser Thomas Wolsey, whose career and sudden downfall were to be strangely associated with the fate of the unfortunate Spanish princess.1

1 See below, pp. 609-611.
In 1520 Charles V started for Germany to receive the imperial crown at Aix-la-Chapelle. On his way he landed in England with the purpose of keeping Henry from forming an alliance with Francis. He judged the best means to be that of freely bribing Wolsey, who had been made a cardinal by Leo X, and who was all-powerful with Henry. Charles therefore bestowed on the cardinal a large annuity in addition to one which he had granted him somewhat earlier. He then set sail for the Netherlands, where he was duly crowned king of the Romans. From there he proceeded, for the first time, to Germany, where he summoned his first diet at Worms.

Section 100. Condition of Germany when Charles V became Emperor

To us to-day, Germany means the German Empire, one of the three or four best organized and most powerful of the European states. It is a compact federation, somewhat like that of the United States, made up of twenty-two monarchies and three little city-republics. Each member of the union manages its local affairs, but leaves all questions of national importance to be settled by the central government at Berlin. This federation is, however, less than half a century old.

In the time of Charles V there was no such Germany as this, but only what the French called the "Germanies"; that is, two or three hundred states, which differed greatly from one another in size and character. This one had a duke, that a count, at its head, while others were ruled over by archbishops, bishops, or abbots. There were many cities, like Nuremberg, Frankfort, and Cologne, which were just as independent as the great duchies of Bavaria, Württemberg, and Saxony. Lastly there were the knights, whose possessions might consist of no more than a single strong castle with a wretched village lying at its foot.

As for the Emperor, he no longer had any power to control his vassals. He could boast of unlimited pretensions and great
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traditions, but he had neither money nor soldiers. At the time of Luther's birth the poverty-stricken Frederick III (Maximilian's father) might have been seen picking up a free meal at a monastery or riding behind a slow but economical ox team. The real power in Germany lay in the hands of the more important vassals.

First and foremost among these were the seven electors, so called because, since the thirteenth century, they had enjoyed the right to elect the Emperor. Three of them were archbishops — kings in all but name of considerable territories on the Rhine, namely, the electorates of Mayence, Treves, and Cologne. Near them, to the south, was the region ruled over by the elector of the Palatinate; to the northeast were the territories of the electors of Brandenburg and of Saxony; the king of Bohemia made the seventh of the group.

Beside these states, the dominions of other rulers scarcely less important than the electors appear on the map. Some of these territories, like Württemberg, Bavaria, Hesse, and Baden, are familiar to us to-day as members

**Fig. 208. The Walls of Rothenburg**

One town in Germany, Rothenburg, on the little river Tauber, once a free imperial city, retains its old walls and towers intact and many of its old houses. It gives the visitor an excellent idea of how the smaller imperial towns looked two or three hundred years ago.
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The towns of the present German Empire, but all of them have been much enlarged since the sixteenth century by the absorption of the little states that formerly lay within and about them.

The towns, which had grown up since the great economic revolution that had brought in commerce and the use of money in the thirteenth century, were centers of culture in the north of Europe, just as those of Italy were in the south. Nuremberg, the most beautiful of the German cities, still possesses a great many of the extraordinary buildings and works of art which it produced in the sixteenth century. Some of the towns were immediate vassals of the Emperor and were consequently independent of the particular prince within whose territory they were situated. These were called *free*, or *imperial*, cities and must be reckoned among the states of Germany (Fig. 208).

The knights, who ruled over the smallest of the German territories, had earlier formed a very important class, but the introduction of gunpowder and new methods of fighting put them at a disadvantage, for they clung to their medieval traditions. Their tiny realms were often too small to support them, and they frequently turned to robbery for a living and proved a great nuisance to the merchants and townspeople whom they plundered now and then.

It is clear that these states, little and big, all tangled up with one another, would be sure to have disputes among themselves which would have to be settled in some way. The Emperor was not powerful enough to keep order, and the result was that each ruler had to defend himself if attacked. Neighborhood war was permitted by law if only some courteous preliminaries were observed. For instance, a prince or town was required to give warning three days in advance before attacking another member of the Empire (see above, section 67).

Germany had a national assembly, called the *diet*, which met at irregular intervals, now in one town and now in another, for Germany had no capital city. The towns were not permitted to send delegates until 1487, long after the townspeople were
represented in France and England. The restless knights and other minor nobles were not represented at all and consequently did not always consider the decisions of the diet binding upon them.

It was this diet that Charles V summoned to meet him on the Rhine, in the ancient town of Worms, when he made his first visit to Germany in 1520. The most important business of the assembly proved to be the consideration of the case of a university professor, Martin Luther, who was accused of writing heretical books, and who had in reality begun what proved to be the first successful revolt against the seemingly all-powerful Medieval Church.

QUESTIONS

SECTION 98. When and how did the House of Hapsburg become important? What marriages were arranged by Maximilian I which affected the history of Europe? How did Spain become a powerful kingdom? Over what countries did Ferdinand and Isabella rule? What was the extent of Charles V’s dominions?

SECTION 99. Describe the Italian expedition of Charles VIII. What were its results? What were the causes of trouble between the French kings and the Hapsburgs? What are your impressions of Francis I? of Henry VIII?

SECTION 100. Contrast Germany in Charles V’s time with the German Empire of to-day. Who were the knights? the electors? What was the German diet? Why was the Emperor unable to maintain order in Germany?
CHAPTER XXIV

MARTIN LUTHER AND THE REVOLT OF GERMANY AGAINST THE PAPACY

SECTION 101. THE QUESTION OF REFORMING THE CHurch: ERASMUS

By far the most important event during the reign of Charles V was the revolt of a considerable portion of western Europe against the popes. The Medieval Church, which was described in a previous chapter, was in this way broken up, and Protestant churches appeared in various European countries which declared themselves entirely independent of the Pope and rejected a number of the religious beliefs which every one had held previously.

With the exception of England all those countries that lay within the ancient bounds of the Roman Empire—Italy, France, Spain, Portugal, as well as southern Germany and Austria—continued to be faithful to the Pope and the Roman Catholic Church. On the other hand, the rulers of the northern German states, of England, Holland, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, sooner or later became Protestants. In this way Europe was divided into two great religious parties, and this led to terrible wars and cruel persecutions which fill the annals of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The revolt began in Germany. The Germans, while good Catholics, were suspicious of the popes, whom they regarded as Italians, bent upon getting as much money as possible out of the simple people north of the Alps. The revenue flowing to the popes from Germany was very large. The great German prelates, like the archbishops of Mayence, Treves, and Cologne,
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were each expected to contribute no less than ten thousand gold guldens to the papal treasury upon having their election confirmed by the church authorities at Rome. The Pope enjoyed the right to fill many important church offices in Germany, and frequently appointed Italians, who drew the revenue without performing the duties attached to the office. A single person frequently held several church offices. For example, early in the sixteenth century, the archbishop of Mayence was at the same time archbishop of Magdeburg and bishop of Halberstadt. There were instances in which a single person had accumulated over a score of benefices.

It is impossible to exaggerate the impression of widespread discontent with the condition of the Church which one meets in the writings of the early sixteenth century. The whole German people, from the rulers down to the humblest tiller of the fields, felt themselves unjustly used. The clergy were denounced as both immoral and inefficient. While the begging friars — the Franciscans, Dominicans, and Augustinians — were scorned by many, they, rather than the ordinary priests, appear to have carried on the real religious work.

At first, however, no one thought of withdrawing from the Church or of attempting to destroy the power of the Pope. All that the Germans wanted was that the money which flowed toward Rome should be kept at home, and that the clergy should be upright, earnest men who should conscientiously perform their religious duties.

Among the critics of the Church in the early days of Charles V’s reign the most famous and influential was Erasmus. He was a Dutchman by birth, but spent his life in various other countries — France, England, Italy, and Germany. He was a citizen of the world and in correspondence with literary men everywhere, so that his letters give us an excellent idea of the feeling of the times. He was greatly interested in the Greek

1 The Augustinian order, to which Luther belonged, was organized in the thirteenth century, a little later than the Dominican and the Franciscan.
and Latin authors, but his main purpose in life was to better the Church. He was well aware of the bad reputation of many of the clergymen of the time and he especially disliked the

Fig. 209. Portrait of Erasmus, by Holbein

This wonderful picture by Hans Holbein the Younger (1497-1543) hangs in the Louvre gallery at Paris. We have every reason to suppose that it is an excellent portrait, for Holbein lived in Basel a considerable part of his life and knew Erasmus well. The artist was, moreover, celebrated for his skill in catching the likeness when depicting the human face. He later painted several well-known Englishmen, including Henry VIII and his little son Edward VI (see Fig. 214)

monks, for when he was a boy he had been forced into a monastery, much against his will.

It seemed to Erasmus that if everybody could read the Bible, especially the New Testament, for themselves, it would bring about a great change for the better. He wanted to have the Gospels and the letters of Paul translated into the language
of the people so that men and women who did not know Latin could read them and be helped by them.

Erasmus believed that the two arch enemies of true religion were (1) paganism, into which many of the more enthusiastic Italian Humanists fell in their admiration for the Greek and Latin writers; and (2) the popular confidence in outward acts and ceremonies, like visiting the graves of saints, the mere repetition of prayers, and so forth. He claimed that the Church had become careless and had permitted the simple teachings of Christ to be buried under myriads of dogmas introduced by the theologians. "The essence of our religion," he says, "is peace and harmony. These can only exist where there are few dogmas and each individual is left to form his own opinion upon many matters."

In a little book called The Praise of Folly, Erasmus has much to say of the weaknesses of the monks and theologians, and of the foolish people who thought that religion consisted simply in pilgrimages, the worship of relics, and the procuring of indulgences. Scarcely one of the abuses which Luther later attacked escaped Erasmus' pen. The book is a mixture of the lightest humor and the bitterest earnestness. As one turns its pages one is sometimes tempted to think Luther half right when he declared Erasmus "a regular jester who makes sport of everything, even of religion and Christ himself."

Yet there was in this humorist a deep seriousness that cannot be ignored. Erasmus believed, however, that revolt from the Pope and the Church would produce a great disturbance and result in more harm than good. He preferred to trust in the slower but surer effects of education and knowledge. Superstitions and the undue regard for the outward forms of religion would, he argued, be outgrown and quietly disappear as mankind became more cultivated.

He believed, moreover, that the time was favorable for reform. As he looked about him he beheld intelligent rulers on the thrones of Europe, men interested in books and art and ready to help scholars and writers. There was Henry VIII of England
and Francis I of France. Then the Pope himself, Leo X, the son of Lorenzo the Magnificent, was a friend and admirer of Erasmus and doubtless sympathized with many of his views. The youthful Charles V had advisers who believed Erasmus to be quite right and were ready to work toward a reform of the Church. Charles was a devout Catholic, but he too agreed that there were many evils to be remedied. So it seemed to Erasmus that the prospects were excellent for a peaceful reform; but, instead of its coming, his latter years were embittered by Luther's revolt and all the ill-feelings and dissensions that it created.

**Section 102. How Martin Luther revolted against the Papacy**

Martin Luther was born in 1483. He was the son of a poor miner, and he often spoke in later life of the poverty and superstition in which his boyhood was spent. His father, however, was determined that his son should be a lawyer, and so Martin was sent to the University of Erfurt. After he finished his college course and was about to take up the study of the law he suddenly decided to become a monk. He summoned his college friends for a last evening together, and the next morning he led them to the gate of a monastery, bade them and the world farewell, and became a begging friar.

He was much worried about his soul and feared that nothing he could do would save him from hell. He finally found comfort in the thought that in order to be saved he had only to believe sincerely that God would save him, and that he could not possibly save himself by trying to be good. He gained the respect of the head of the monastery, and when Frederick the Wise of Saxony (Fig. 211) was looking about for teachers in his new university at Wittenberg, Luther was recommended as a good person to teach Aristotle; so he became a professor.

As time went on Luther began to be suspicious of some of the things that were taught in the university. He finally decided
None of the portraits of Luther are very satisfactory. His friend Cranach was not, like Holbein the Younger, a great portrait painter. This cut shows the reformer when his revolt against the Church was just beginning. He was thirty-seven years old and still in the dress of an Augustinian friar, which he soon abandoned.
that Aristotle was after all only an ancient heathen who knew nothing about Christianity and that the students had no business to study his works. He urged them to rely instead upon the Bible, especially the letters of St. Paul, and upon the writings of St. Augustine, who closely followed Paul in many respects.

Luther's main point was that man, through Adam's sin, had become so corrupt that he could, of himself, do nothing pleasing to God. He could only hope to be saved through faith in God's promise to save those who should repent. Consequently “good works,” such as attending church, going on pilgrimages, repeating prayers, and visiting relics of the saints, could do nothing for a sinner if he was not already “justified by faith,” that is, made acceptable to God by his faith in God's promises. If he was “justified,” then he might properly go about his daily duties, for they would be pleasing to God without what the Church was accustomed to regard as “good works.”

Luther's teachings did not attract much attention until the year 1517, when he was thirty-four years old. Then something occurred to give him considerable prominence.

The fact has already been mentioned that the popes had undertaken the rebuilding of St. Peter's, the great central church of Christendom (see above, p. 525). The cost of the enterprise was very great, and in order to collect contributions for the purpose, Pope Leo X arranged for an extensive distribution of indulgences in Germany.

In order to understand the nature of indulgences and Luther's opposition to them, we must consider the teaching of the Catholic Church in regard to the forgiveness of sin. The Church taught that if one died after committing a serious (“mortal”) sin of which he had not repented and confessed, his soul would certainly be lost. If he sincerely repented and confessed his sin to a priest, God would forgive him and his soul would be saved, but he would not thereby escape punishment. This punishment might consist in fasting, saying certain prayers, going on a pilgrimage, or doing some other “good work.” It was assumed,
however, that most men committed so many sins that even if they died repentant, they had to pass through a long period in purgatory, where they would be purified by suffering before they could enter heaven.

Now an indulgence was a pardon, issued usually by the Pope himself, which freed the person to whom it was granted from a part or all of his suffering in purgatory. It did not forgive his sins or in any way take the place of true repentance and confession; it only reduced the punishment which a truly contrite sinner would otherwise have had to endure, either in this world or in purgatory, before he could be admitted to heaven.\(^1\)

The contribution to the Church which was made in return for indulgences varied greatly; the rich were required to give a considerable sum, while the very poor were to receive these pardons gratis. The representatives of the Pope were naturally anxious to collect all the money possible, and did their best to induce every one to secure an indulgence, either for himself or for his deceased friends in purgatory. In their zeal they made many claims for the indulgences, to which no thoughtful churchman or even layman could listen without misgivings.

In October, 1517, Tetzel, a Dominican monk, began granting indulgences in the neighborhood of Wittenberg, and making claims for them which appeared to Luther wholly irreconcilable with the deepest truths of Christianity as he understood and taught them. He therefore, in accordance with the custom of the time, wrote out a series of ninety-five statements in regard to indulgences. These theses, as they were called, he posted on the church door and invited any one interested in the matter to enter into a discussion with him on the subject, which he believed was very ill understood.

\(^1\) It is a common mistake of Protestants to suppose that the indulgence was forgiveness granted beforehand for sins to be committed in the future. There is absolutely no foundation for this idea. A person proposing to sin could not possibly be contrite in the eyes of the Church, and even if he secured an indulgence, it would, according to the theologians, have been quite worthless.
Frederick the Wise, Elector of Saxony, was very proud of the university that he founded at Wittenberg, and, while he was a devout Catholic and seems hardly to have understood what Luther stood for, he protected his professor and did not propose to have him tried for heresy by the Church. The portrait is a fine example of the work of the artist who distinguished himself as both a painter and an engraver.

In posting these theses, Luther did not intend to attack the Church, and had no expectation of creating a sensation. The theses were in Latin and addressed, therefore, only to learned men. It turned out, however, that every one, high and low, learned and unlearned, was ready to discuss the perplexing theme of the
nature of indulgences. The theses were promptly translated into German, printed, and scattered abroad throughout the land. In these Ninety-five Theses Luther declared that the indulgence was very unimportant and that the poor man would better spend his money for the needs of his household. The truly repentant, he argued, do not flee punishment, but bear it willingly in sign of their sorrow. Faith in God, not the procuring of pardons, brings forgiveness, and every Christian who feels true sorrow for his sins will receive full remission of the punishment as well as of the guilt. Could the Pope know how his agents misled the people, he would rather have St. Peter’s burn to ashes than build it up with money gained under false pretenses. Then, Luther adds, there is danger that the common man will ask awkward questions. For example, “If the Pope releases souls from purgatory for money, why not for charity’s sake?” or, “Since the Pope is rich as Croesus, why does he not build St. Peter’s with his own money, instead of taking that of the poor man?”

Luther now began to read church history and reached the conclusion that the influence of the popes had not been very great until the times of Gregory VII (sections 75–76), and therefore that they had not enjoyed their supremacy over the Church for more than four hundred years before his own birth. He was mistaken in this conclusion, but he had hit upon an argument that has been constantly urged by Protestants ever since. They assert that the power of the Medieval Church and of the papacy developed gradually and that the apostles knew nothing of masses, indulgences, pilgrimages, purgatory, or the headship of the bishop of Rome.

The publication of Luther’s theses brought him many sympathizers in Germany. Some were attracted by his protests against the ways in which the popes raised money, and others liked him for attacking Aristotle and the scholastic theologians. Erasmus’ publisher at Basel agreed to publish Luther’s books, of which he sent copies to Italy, France, England, and Spain, and in this
way the Wittenberg monk began before long to be widely known outside of Germany as well as within it.

But Erasmus himself, the mighty sovereign of the men of letters, refused to take sides in the controversy. He asserted that he had not read more than a dozen pages of Luther's writings. Although he admitted that "the monarchy of the Roman high priest was, in its existing condition, the pest of Christendom," he believed that a direct attack upon it would do no good. Luther, he urged, would better be discreet and trust that as mankind became more intelligent they would outgrow their false ideas.

To Erasmus, man was capable of progress; cultivate him and extend his knowledge, and he would grow better and better. He was, moreover, a free agent, with, on the whole, upright tendencies. To Luther, on the other hand, man was utterly corrupt, and incapable of a single righteous wish or deed. His will was enslaved to evil, and his only hope lay in the recognition of his absolute inability to better himself, and in a humble reliance upon God's mercy. By faith only, not by conduct, could he be saved.

Erasmus was willing to wait until every one agreed that the Church should be reformed. Luther had no patience with an institution which seemed to him to be leading souls to destruction by inducing men to rely upon their good works. Both men realized that they could never agree. For a time they expressed respect for each other, but at last they became involved in a bitter controversy in which they gave up all pretense to friendship. Erasmus declared that Luther, by scorning good works and declaring that no one could do right, had made his followers indifferent to their conduct, and that those who accepted Luther's teachings straightway became pert, rude fellows, who would not take off their hats to him on the street.

By 1520, Luther, who gave way at times to his naturally violent disposition, had become threatening and abusive and suggested that the German rulers should punish the churchmen and force them to reform their conduct. "We punish
thieves with the gallows, bandits with the sword, heretics with fire; why should we not, with far greater propriety, attack with every kind of weapon these very masters of perdition, the cardinals and popes." "The die is cast," he writes to a friend; "I despise Rome's wrath as I do her favor; I will have no reconciliation or intercourse with her in all time to come. Let her condemn and burn my writings. I will, if fire can be found, publicly condemn and burn the whole papal law."

Luther had gained the support of a German knight named Ulrich von Hutten, who was an ardent enemy of the popes. He and Luther vied with one another during the year 1520 in attacking the Pope and his representatives. They both possessed a fine command of the German language, and they were fired by a common hatred of Rome. Hutten had little or none of Luther's religious fervor, but he was a born fighter and he could not find colors dark enough in which to picture to his countrymen the greed of the papal curia, which he described as a vast den, to which everything was dragged which could be filched from the Germans.

Of Luther's popular pamphlets, the first really famous one was his *Address to the German Nobility*, in which he calls upon the rulers of Germany, especially the knights, to reform the abuses themselves, since he believed that it was vain to wait for the Church to do so. He explains that there are three walls behind which the papacy had been wont to take refuge when any one proposed to remedy its abuses. There was, first, the claim that the clergy formed a separate class, superior even to the civil rulers, who were not permitted to punish a churchman, no matter how bad he was. Secondly, the Pope claimed to be superior even to the great general assemblies of the Church, called councils, so that even the representatives of the Church itself might not correct him. And, lastly, the Pope assumed the sole right, when questions of belief arose, to interpret with authority the meaning of the Scriptures; consequently he could not be refuted by arguments from the Bible.
Luther undertook to cast down these defenses by denying, to begin with, that there was anything especially sacred about a clergyman except the duties which he had been designated to perform. If he did not attend to his work, it should be possible to deprive him of his office at any moment, just as one would turn off an incompetent tailor or farmer, and in that case he should become a simple layman again. Luther claimed, moreover, that it was the right and duty of the civil government to punish a churchman who does wrong just as if he were the humblest layman. When this first wall was destroyed the others would fall easily enough, for the dominant position of the clergy was the very cornerstone of the Medieval Church.

The Address to the German Nobility closes with a long list of evils which must be done away with before Germany can become prosperous. Luther saw that his view of religion really implied a social revolution. He advocated reducing the monasteries to a tenth of their number and permitting those monks who were disappointed in the good they got from living in them freely to leave. He would not have the monasteries prisons, but hospitals and refuges for the soul-sick. He points out the evils of pilgrimages and of the numerous church holidays, which interfered with daily work. The clergy, he urged, should be permitted to marry and have families like other citizens. The universities should be reformed, and “the accursed heathen, Aristotle,” should be cast out from them.

It should be noted that Luther appeals to the authorities not in the name of religion chiefly, but in that of public order and prosperity. He says that the money of the Germans flies “feather-light” over the Alps to Italy, but it immediately becomes like lead when there is a question of its coming back. He showed himself a master of vigorous language, and his denunciations of the clergy and the Church resounded like a trumpet call in the ears of his countrymen.¹

¹ Luther had said little of the doctrines of the Church in his Address to the German Nobility, but within three or four months he issued a second work, in
Luther had long expected to be excommunicated. But it was not until late in 1520 that John Eck, a personal enemy of his, arrived in Germany with a papal bull (Fig. 212) condemning many of Luther’s assertions as heretical and giving him sixty days in which to recant. Should he fail to return to his senses within that time, he and all who adhered to or favored him were to be excommunicated, and any place which harbored him should fall under the interdict. Now, since the highest power in Christendom had pronounced Luther a heretic, he should unhesitatingly have been delivered up by the German authorities. But no one thought of arresting him.

The bull irritated the German princes; whether they liked Luther or not, they decidedly disliked to have the Pope issuing commands to them. Then it appeared to them very unfair that Luther’s personal enemy should have been intrusted with the publication of the bull. Even the princes and universities that were most friendly to the Pope published the bull with great reluctance. In many cases the bull was ignored altogether. Luther’s own sovereign, the elector of Saxony, while no convert to the new views, was anxious that Luther’s case should be fairly considered, and continued to protect him. One mighty prince, however, the young Emperor Charles V, promptly and willingly published the bull; not, however, as Emperor, but as ruler of the Austrian dominions and of the Netherlands. Luther’s works were publicly burned at Louvain, Mayence, and Cologne, the strongholds of the old theology.

The Wittenberg professor felt himself forced to oppose himself to both Pope and Emperor. “Hard it is,” he exclaimed, “to be forced to contradict all the prelates and princes, but there is no other way to escape hell and God’s anger.” Late which he sought to overthrow the whole system of the sacraments, as it had been taught by the theologians. Four of the seven sacraments—ordination, marriage, confirmation, and extreme unction—he rejected altogether. He revised the conception of the Mass, or the Lord’s Supper. The priest was, in his eyes, only a minister, in the Protestant sense of the word, one of whose chief functions was preaching.
in 1520 he summoned his students to witness what he called "a pious religious spectacle." He had a fire built outside the walls of Wittenberg and cast into it Leo X's bull condemning him,

**Bulla contra Errores Martini Lutherti et sequarium.**

Fig. 212. The Papal Bull directed against Luther, 1521

This is a much-reduced reproduction of the title-page of the Pope's bull "against the errors of Martin Luther and his followers" as it was printed and distributed in Germany. The coat of arms with its "balls" is that of the Medici family to which Leo X belonged and a copy of the Laws of the Church, together with a volume of scholastic theology which he specially disliked.

Yet Luther dreaded disorder. He was certainly sometimes reckless and violent in his writings and often said that bloodshed
could not be avoided when it should please God to visit his judgments upon the stiff-necked and perverse generation of “Romanists,” as the Germans contemptuously called the supporters of the Pope. Yet he always encouraged hasty reform. He was reluctant to make changes, except in belief. He held that so long as an institution did not actually mislead, it did no harm. He was, in short, no fanatic at heart.

Section 103. The Diet at Worms, 1520–1521

The Pope’s chief representative in Germany, named Alexander, wrote as follows to Leo X about this time: “I am pretty familiar with the history of this German nation. I know their past heresies, councils, and schisms, but never were affairs so serious before. Compared with present conditions, the struggle between Henry IV and Gregory VII was as violets and roses. . . . These mad dogs are now well equipped with knowledge and arms; they boast that they are no longer ignorant brutes like their predecessors; they claim that Italy has lost the monopoly of the sciences and that the Tiber now flows into the Rhine. Nine-tenths of the Germans are shouting ‘Luther,’ and the other tenth goes so far at least as ‘Death to the Roman curia.’”

Among the enemies of Luther and his supporters none was more important than the young Emperor. It was toward the end of the year 1520 that Charles came to Germany for the first time. After being crowned king of the Romans at Aix-la-Chapelle, he assumed, with the Pope’s consent, the title of Emperor elect, as his grandfather Maximilian had done. He then moved on to the town of Worms, where he was to hold his first diet and face the German situation.

Although scarcely more than a boy in years, Charles had already begun to take life very seriously. He had decided that Spain, not Germany, was to be the bulwark and citadel of all his realms. Like the more enlightened of his Spanish subjects, he realized the need of reforming the Church, but he had no
Luther summoned to the diet at Worms

Luther before the diet

sympathy whatever with any change of religious belief. He proposed to live and die a devout Catholic of the old type, such as his orthodox ancestors had been. He felt, moreover, that he must maintain the same religion in all parts of his heterogeneous dominions. If he should permit the Germans to declare their independence of the Church, the next step would be for them to claim that they had a right to regulate their government regardless of their Emperor.

Upon arriving at Worms the case of Luther was at once forced upon Charles's attention by Aleander, the papal representative, who was indefatigable in urging him to outlaw the heretic without further delay. While Charles seemed convinced of Luther's guilt, he could not proceed against him without serious danger. The monk had become a sort of national hero and had the support of the powerful elector of Saxony. Other princes, who had ordinarily no wish to protect a heretic, felt that Luther's denunciation of the evils in the Church and of the actions of the Pope was very gratifying. After much discussion it was finally arranged, to the great disgust of the zealous Aleander, that Luther should be summoned to Worms and be given an opportunity to face the German nation and the Emperor, and to declare plainly whether he was the author of the heretical books ascribed to him, and whether he still adhered to the doctrines which the Pope had condemned.

The Emperor accordingly wrote the "honorable and respected" Luther a very polite letter, desiring him to appear at Worms and granting him a safe-conduct thither.

It was not, however, proposed to give Luther an opportunity to defend his beliefs before the diet. When he appeared he was simply asked if a pile of his Latin and German works were really his, and, if so, whether he revoked what he had said in them. To the first question the monk replied in a low voice that he had written these and more. As to the second question, which involved the welfare of the soul and the Word of God, he asked that he might have a little while to consider.
The following day, in a Latin address which he repeated in German, he admitted that he had been overviolent in his attacks upon his opponents; but he said that no one could deny that, through the popes' decrees, the consciences of faithful Christians had been tormented, and their goods and possessions, especially in Germany, devoured. Should he recant those things which he had said against the popes' conduct, he would only strengthen the papal tyranny and give an opportunity for new usurpations. If, however, adequate arguments against his position could be found in the Scriptures, he would gladly and willingly recant.

There was now nothing for the Emperor to do but to outlaw Luther, who had denied the binding character of the commands of the head of the Church. Aleander was accordingly assigned the agreeable duty of drafting the famous Edict of Worms.

This document declared Luther an outlaw on the following grounds: that he questioned the recognized number and character of the sacraments, impeached the regulations in regard to the marriage of the clergy, scorned and vilified the Pope, despised the priesthood and stirred up the laity to dip their hands in the blood of the clergy, denied free will, taught licentiousness, despised authority, advocated a brutish existence, and was a menace to Church and State alike. Every one was forbidden to give the heretic food, drink, or shelter, and required to seize him and deliver him to the Emperor.

Moreover, the decree provides that "no one shall dare to buy, sell, read, preserve, copy, print, or cause to be copied or printed, any books of the aforesaid Martin Luther, condemned by our holy father the Pope, as aforesaid, or any other writings in German or Latin hitherto composed by him, since they are foul, noxious, suspected, and published by a notorious and stiff-necked heretic. Neither shall any one dare to affirm his opinions, or proclaim, defend, or advance them in any other way that human ingenuity can invent,— notwithstanding that he may have put some good into his writings in order to deceive the simple man."
“I am becoming ashamed of my fatherland,” Hutten cried when he read the Edict of Worms. So general was the disapproval of the edict that few were willing to pay any attention to it. Charles V immediately left Germany, and for nearly ten years was occupied outside it with the government of Spain and a succession of wars.

Section 104. The Revolt against the Papacy Begins in Germany

As Luther neared Eisenach upon his way home from Worms he was kidnaped by his friends and conducted to the Wartburg, a castle belonging to the elector of Saxony. Here he was concealed until any danger from the action of the Emperor or diet should pass by. His chief occupation during several months of hiding was to begin a new translation of the Bible into German. He had finished the New Testament before he left the Wartburg in March, 1522.

Up to this time, German editions of the Scriptures, while not uncommon, had been poor and obscure. Luther's task was a difficult one. He was anxious above all that the Bible should be put into language that would seem perfectly clear and natural to the common folk. So he went about asking the mothers and children and the laborers questions which might draw out the expression that he was looking for. It sometimes took him two or three weeks to find the right word. But so well did he do his work that his Bible may be regarded as a great landmark in the history of the German language. It was the first book of any importance written in modern German, and it has furnished an imperishable standard for the language.

Previous to 1518 there had been very few books or pamphlets printed in German. The translation of the Bible into language so simple that even the unlearned might read it was only one of the signs of a general effort to awaken the minds of the common people. Luther's friends and enemies also commenced
to write for the great German public in its own language. The common man began to raise his voice, to the scandal of the learned.

Hundreds of pamphlets, satires, and cartoons have come down to us which indicate that the religious and other questions of the day were often treated in somewhat the same spirit in which our comic papers deal with political problems and discussions now. We find, for instance, a correspondence between Leo X and the devil, and a witty dialogue between a well-known knight, Franz von Sickingen, and St. Peter at the gate of heaven.

Hitherto there had been a great deal of talk of reform, but as yet nothing had actually been done. There was no sharp line drawn between the different classes of reformers. All agreed that something should be done to better the Church; few realized how divergent were the real ends in view. The rulers listened to Luther because they were glad of an excuse to get control of the church property and keep money from flowing to Rome. The peasants listened because he put the Bible in their hands and they found nothing there that proved that they ought to go on paying the old dues to their lords.

While Luther was quietly living in the Wartburg, translating the Bible, people began to put his teachings into practice. The monks and nuns left their monasteries in his own town of Wittenberg. Some of them married, which seemed a very wicked thing to all those that held to the old beliefs. The students and citizens tore down the images of the saints in the churches and opposed the celebration of the Mass, the chief Catholic ceremony.

Luther did not approve of these sudden and violent changes and left his hiding place to protest. He preached a series of sermons in Wittenberg in which he urged that all alterations in religious services and practices should be introduced by the government and not by the people. He said, however, that those who wished might leave their monasteries and that those who
chose to stay should give up begging and earn their living like other people. He predicted that if no one gave any money to the Church, popes, bishops, monks, and nuns would in two years vanish away like smoke.

But his counsel was not heeded. First, the German knights organized a movement to put the new ideas in practice. Franz von Sickingen and Ulrich von Hutten, admirers of Luther, attacked the archbishop of Treves and proclaimed that they were going to free his subjects from "the heavy unchristian yoke of the 'parsons' and lead them to evangelical liberty." But the German princes sided with the archbishop and battered down Franz von Sickingen's castle with cannon, and Franz was fatally injured by a falling beam. Twenty other castles of the knights were destroyed and this put an end to their revolt; but Luther and his teachings were naturally blamed as the real reason for the uprising.

The conservative party, who were frankly afraid of Luther, received a new and terrible proof, as it seemed to them, of the noxious influence of his teachings. In 1525 the serfs rose, in the name of "God's justice," to avenge their wrongs and establish their rights. Luther was not responsible for the civil war which followed, though he had certainly helped to stir up discontent. He had asserted, for example, that the German feudal lords were hangmen, who knew only how to swindle the poor man. "Such fellows were formerly called rascals, but now must we call them 'Christian and revered princes.'" Yet in spite of his harsh talk about the princes, Luther really relied upon them to forward his movement, and he justly claimed that he had greatly increased their power by attacking the authority of the Pope and subjecting the clergy in all things to the government.

Some of the demands of the peasants were perfectly reasonable. The most popular expression of their needs was the dignified "Twelve Articles." ¹ In these they claimed that the

¹ The "Twelve Articles" may be found in Readings, Vol. II, No. 6.
Bible did not sanction any of the dues which the lords demanded of them, and that, since they were Christians like their lords, they should no longer be held as serfs. They were willing to pay all the old and well-established dues, but they asked to be properly remunerated for extra services demanded by the lord. They thought too that each community should have the right freely to choose its own pastor and to dismiss him if he proved negligent or inefficient.

There were, however, leaders who were more violent and who proposed to kill the "godless" priests and nobles. Hundreds of castles and monasteries were destroyed by the frantic peasantry, and some of the nobility were murdered with shocking cruelty. Luther tried to induce the peasants, with whom, as the son of a peasant, he was at first inclined to sympathize, to remain quiet; but when his warnings proved vain, he turned against them. He declared that they were guilty of the most fearful crimes, for which they deserved death of both body and soul many times over. They had broken their allegiance, they had wantonly plundered and robbed castles and monasteries, and lastly, they had tried to cloak their dreadful sins with excuses from the Gospels. He therefore urged the government to put down the insurrection without pity.

Luther's advice was followed with terrible literalness by the German rulers, and the nobility took fearful revenge on the peasants. In the summer of 1525 their chief leader was defeated and killed, and it is estimated that ten thousand peasants were put to death, many with the utmost cruelty. Few of the rulers or landlords introduced any reforms, and the misfortunes due to the destruction of property and to the despair of the peasants cannot be imagined. The people concluded that the new gospel was not for them, and talked of Luther as "Dr. Lügner," that is, liar. The old exactions of the lords of the manors were in no way lightened, and the situation of the serfs for centuries following the great revolt was worse rather than better.
Section 105. Division of Germany into Catholic and Protestant Countries

Charles V was occupied at this time by his quarrels with Francis I (see p. 573) and was in no position to return to Germany and undertake to enforce the Edict of Worms against Luther and his followers. Germany, as we have seen, was divided up into hundreds of practically independent countries, and the various electors, princes, towns, and knights naturally could not agree as to what would best be done in the matter of reforming the Church. It became apparent not long after the Peasant War that some of the rulers were going to accept Luther's idea that they need no longer obey the Pope but that they were free to proceed to regulate the property and affairs of the churchmen in their respective domains without regard to the Pope's wishes. Other princes and towns agreed that they would remain faithful to the Pope if certain reforms were introduced, especially if the papal taxation were reduced. Southern Germany decided for the Pope and remains Catholic down to the present day. Many of the northern rulers, on the other hand, adopted the new teachings, and finally all of them fell away from the papacy and became Protestant.

Since there was no one powerful enough to decide the great question for the whole of Germany, the diet which met at Speyer in 1526 determined that pending the summoning of a church council each ruler should "so live, reign, and conduct himself as he would be willing to answer before God and His Imperial Majesty." For the moment, then, the various German governments were left to determine the religion of their subjects.

Yet everybody still hoped that one religion might ultimately be agreed upon. Luther trusted that all Christians would sometime accept the new gospel. He was willing that the bishops should be retained, and even that the Pope should still be regarded as a sort of presiding officer in the Church. As for his enemies, they were equally confident that the heretics
would in time be suppressed, as they had always been in the past, and that harmony would thus be restored. Neither party was right; for the decision of the diet of Speyer was destined to become a permanent arrangement, and Germany remained divided between different religious faiths.

New sects opposed to the old Church had also begun to appear. Zwingli, a Swiss reformer, was gaining many followers, and the Anabaptists were rousing Luther's apprehensions by their radical plans for doing away with the Catholic religion altogether. The Emperor, finding himself again free for a time to attend to German affairs, commanded the diet, which again met at Speyer in 1529, to order the enforcement of the Edict of Worms against the heretics. No one was to preach against the Mass, and no one was to be prevented from attending it freely.

This meant that the "Evangelical" princes would be forced to restore the most characteristic of the Catholic ceremonies. As they formed only a minority in the diet, all that they could do was to draw up a protest, signed by John Frederick, elector of Saxony, Philip of Hesse, and fourteen of the imperial towns (Strassburg, Nuremberg, Ulm, etc.). In this they claimed that the majority had no right to abrogate the edict of the former diet of Speyer, which had been passed unanimously, and which all had solemnly pledged themselves to observe. They therefore appealed to the Emperor and a future council against the tyranny of the majority. Those who signed this appeal were called from their action Protestants. Thus originated the name which came to be generally applied to those who do not accept the rule and teachings of the Roman Catholic Church.

Ever since the diet at Worms the Emperor had resided in Spain, busied with a succession of wars carried on with the king of France. It will be remembered that both Charles and Francis claimed Milan and the duchy of Burgundy, and they sometimes drew the Pope into their conflicts. But in 1530 the Emperor found himself at peace for the moment and came to
Germany to hold a brilliant diet of his German subjects at Augsburg in the hope of settling the religious problem, which, however, he understood very imperfectly. He ordered the Protestants to draw up a statement of exactly what they believed, which should serve as a basis for discussion. Melanchthon, Luther's most famous friend and colleague, who was noted for his great learning and moderation, was intrusted with this delicate task.

The Augsburg Confession, as his declaration was called, is a historical document of great importance for the student of the Protestant revolt. Melanchthon's gentle disposition led him to make the differences between his belief and that of the old Church seem as few and slight as possible. He showed that both parties held the same fundamental views of Christianity. But he defended the Protestants’ rejection of a number of the practices of the Roman Catholics, such as the celibacy of the clergy and the observance of fast days. There was little or nothing in the Augsburg Confession concerning the organization of the Church.

Certain theologians who had been loud in their denunciations of Luther were ordered by the Emperor to prepare a refutation of the Protestant views. The statement of the Catholics admitted that a number of Melanchthon’s positions were perfectly orthodox; but the portion of the Augsburg Confession which dealt with the practical reforms introduced by the Protestants was rejected altogether.

Charles V declared the Catholic statement to be “Christian and judicious” and commanded the Protestants to accept it. They were to cease troubling the Catholics and were to give back all the monasteries and church property which they had seized. The Emperor agreed, however, to urge the Pope to call a council to meet within a year. This, he hoped, would be able

1 It is still accepted as the creed of the Lutheran Church. Copies of it in English may be procured from the Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia, for ten cents each.
to settle all differences and reform the Church according to the views of the Catholics.

It is unnecessary to follow in detail the progress of Protestantism in Germany during the quarter of a century succeeding the diet of Augsburg. Enough has been said to show the character of the revolt and the divergent views taken by the German princes and people. For ten years after the Emperor left Augsburg he was kept busy in southern Europe by new wars; and in order to secure the assistance of the Protestants, he was forced to let them go their own way. Meanwhile the number of rulers who accepted Luther's teachings gradually increased. Finally there was a brief war between Charles and the Protestant princes, but there was little fighting done. Charles V brought his Spanish soldiers into Germany and captured both John Frederick of Saxony and his ally, Philip of Hesse, the chief leaders of the Lutheran cause, whom he kept prisoners for several years.

This episode did not, however, check the progress of Protestantism. The king of France promised them help against his enemy, the Emperor, and Charles was forced to agree to a peace with the Protestants.

In 1555 the religious Peace of Augsburg was ratified. Its provisions are memorable. Each German prince and each town and knight immediately under the Emperor was to be at liberty to make a choice between the beliefs of the venerable Catholic Church and those embodied in the Augsburg Confession. If, however, an ecclesiastical prince—an archbishop, bishop, or abbot—declared himself a Protestant, he must surrender his possessions to the Church. Every German was either to conform to the religious practices of his particular state or emigrate from it. Every one was supposed to be either a Catholic or a Lutheran, and no provision was made for any other belief.

This religious peace in no way established freedom of conscience, except for the rulers. Their power, it must be noted, was greatly increased, inasmuch as they were given the control of religious as well as of secular matters. This arrangement
which permitted the ruler to determine the religion of his realm was more natural in those days than it would be in ours. The Church and the civil government had been closely associated with one another for centuries. No one as yet dreamed that every individual might safely be left quite free to believe what he would and to practice any religious rites which afforded him help and comfort.

QUESTIONS

SECTION 101. What were the sources of discontent with the Church in Germany? What were the views of Erasmus in regard to church reform?

SECTION 102. Tell something of Luther's life before he posted up his theses. What was an indulgence? Give some of Luther's views expressed in his Ninety-five Theses. Contrast the opinions of Erasmus and Luther. Who was Ulrich von Hutten? Discuss Luther's Address to the German Nobility. Why was Luther excommunicated? What was the fate of the papal bull directed against him?

SECTION 103. Why did Charles V summon Luther at Worms? What did Luther say to the diet? What were the chief provisions of the Edict of Worms?

SECTION 104. Describe Luther's translation of the Bible. What was the state of public opinion in Germany after the diet at Worms? What was Luther's attitude toward reform? Why did the German peasants revolt? What did the Twelve Articles contain? What effect did the peasant war have on Luther?

SECTION 105. What was the origin of the term "Protestant"? What was the Augsburg Confession? What were the results of the diet of Augsburg? What was the policy of Charles V in regard to the Protestants? What were the chief provisions of the Peace of Augsburg?
CHAPTER XXV

THE PROTESTANT REVOLT IN SWITZERLAND AND ENGLAND

Section 106. Zwingli and Calvin

For at least a century after Luther’s death the great issue between Catholics and Protestants dominates the history of all the countries with which we have to do, except Italy and Spain, where Protestantism never took permanent root. In Switzerland, England, France, and Holland the revolt against the Medieval Church produced discord, wars, and profound changes, which must be understood in order to follow the later development of these countries.

We turn first to Switzerland, lying in the midst of the great chain of the Alps which extends from the Mediterranean to Vienna. During the Middle Ages the region destined to be included in the Swiss Confederation formed a part of the Holy Roman Empire and was scarcely distinguishable from the rest of southern Germany. As early as the thirteenth century the three “forest” cantons on the shores of the winding lake of Lucerne formed a union to protect their liberties against the encroachments of their neighbors, the Hapsburgs. It was about this tiny nucleus that Switzerland gradually consolidated. Lucerne and the free towns of Zurich and Berne soon joined the Swiss league. By brave fighting the Swiss were able to frustrate the renewed efforts of the Hapsburgs to subjugate them.

Various districts in the neighborhood joined the Swiss union in succession, and even the region lying on the Italian slopes of the Alps was brought under its control. Gradually the bonds between the members of the union and the Empire were broken.
In 1499 they were finally freed from the jurisdiction of the Emperor and Switzerland became a practically independent country. Although the original union had been made up of German-speaking people, considerable districts had been annexed in which Italian or French was spoken. The Swiss did not, therefore, form a compact, well-defined nation, and consequently for some centuries their confederation was weak and ill-organized.

In Switzerland the first leader of the revolt against the Church was a young priest named Zwingli, who was a year younger.

1 This condition has not changed; all Swiss laws are still proclaimed in three languages.
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than Luther. He lived in the famous monastery of Einsiedeln, near the Lake of Zurich, which was the center of pilgrimages on account of a wonder-working image. "Here," he says, "I began to preach the Gospel of Christ in the year 1516, before any one in my locality had so much as heard the name of Luther."

Three years later he was called to an influential position as preacher in the cathedral of Zurich, and there his great work really commenced. He then began to denounce the abuses in the Church as well as the shameless traffic in soldiers, which he had long regarded as a blot upon his country's honor.\(^1\)

But the original cantons about the Lake of Lucerne, which feared that they might lose the great influence that, in spite of their small size, they had hitherto enjoyed, were ready to fight for the old faith. The first armed collision between the Swiss Protestants and Catholics took place at Kappel in 1531, and Zwingli fell in the battle. The various cantons and towns never came to an agreement in religious matters, and Switzerland is still part Catholic and part Protestant.

Far more important than Zwingli's teachings, especially for England and America, was the work of Calvin, which was carried on in the ancient city of Geneva, on the very outskirts of the Swiss confederation. It was Calvin who organized the Presbyterian Church and formulated its beliefs. He was born in northern France in 1509; he belonged, therefore, to the second generation of Protestants. He was early influenced by the Lutheran teachings, which had already found their way into France. A persecution of the Protestants under Francis I drove him out of the country and he settled for a time in Basel.

Here he issued the first edition of his great work, The Institutes of Christianity, which has been more widely discussed than any other Protestant theological treatise. It was the first orderly

\(^1\) Switzerland had made a business, ever since the time when Charles VIII of France invaded Italy, of supplying troops of mercenaries to fight for other countries, especially for France and the Pope. It was the Swiss who gained the battle of Marignano for Francis I, and Swiss guards may still be seen in the Pope's palace.
exposition of the principles of Christianity from a Protestant standpoint, and formed a convenient manual for study and discussion. The *Institutes* are based upon the infallibility of the Bible and reject the infallibility of the Church and the Pope. Calvin possessed a remarkably logical mind and a clear and admirable style. The French version of his great work is the first example of the successful use of that language in an argumentative treatise.

Calvin was called to Geneva about 1540 and intrusted with the task of reforming the town, which had secured its independence of the Duke of Savoy. He drew up a constitution and established an extraordinary government in which the Church and the civil government were as closely associated as they had ever been in any Catholic country. Calvin intrusted the management of church affairs to the ministers and the elders, or *presbyters*; hence the name "Presbyterian." The Protestantism which found its way into France was that of Calvin, not that of Luther, and the same may be said of Scotland (see below, pp. 640–641).

**SECTION 107. HOW ENGLAND FELL AWAY FROM THE PAPACY**

When Erasmus came to England about the year 1500 he was delighted with the people he met there. Henry VII was still alive. It will be remembered that it was he that brought order into England after the Wars of the Roses. His son, who was to become the famous Henry VIII, impressed Erasmus as a very promising boy. We may assume that the intelligent men whom Erasmus met in England agreed with him in regard to the situation in the Church and the necessity of reform. He was a good friend of Sir Thomas More, who is best known for his little book called *Utopia*, which means "Nowhere." In it More pictures the happy conditions in an undiscovered land where the government was perfect and all the evils that
he saw about him were done away. It was at More's house that Erasmus wrote his *Praise of Folly* and dedicated it to him.

Henry VIII came to the English throne when he was eighteen years old. His chief adviser, Cardinal Wolsey, deserves great credit for having constantly striven to discourage his sovereign's ambition to take part in the wars on the Continent. The cardinal's argument that England could become great by peace better than by war was a momentous discovery. Peace he felt would be best secured by maintaining the balance of power on the Continent, so that no ruler should become dangerous by unduly extending his sway. For example, he thought it good policy to side with Charles V when Francis I was successful, and then with Francis after his terrible defeat at Pavia (1525) when he fell into the hands of Charles. This idea of the balance of power came to be recognized later by the European countries as a very important consideration in determining their policy.
But Wolsey was not long to be permitted to put his enlightened ideas in practice. His fall and the progress of Protestantism in England are both closely associated with the notorious divorce case of Henry VIII.

It will be remembered that Henry had married Catherine of Aragon, the aunt of Charles V. Only one of their children, Mary, survived to grow up. As time went on Henry was very anxious to have a son and heir, for he was fearful lest a woman might not be permitted to succeed to the throne. Moreover, he had tired of Catherine, who was considerably older than he.

Catherine had first married Henry's older brother, who had died almost immediately after the marriage. Since it was a violation of the rule of the Church to marry a deceased brother's wife, Henry professed to fear that he was committing a sin by retaining Catherine as his wife and demanded to be divorced from her on the ground that his marriage had never been legal. His anxiety to rid himself of Catherine was greatly increased by the appearance at court of a black-eyed girl of sixteen, named Anne Boleyn, with whom the king fell in love.

Unfortunately for his case, his marriage with Catherine had been authorized by a dispensation from the Pope, so that Clement VII, to whom the king appealed to annul the marriage, could not, even if he had been willing to run the risk of angering the queen's nephew, Charles V, have granted Henry's request.

Wolsey's failure to induce the Pope to permit the divorce excited the king's anger, and with rank ingratitude for his minister's great services, Henry drove him from office (1529) and seized his property. From a life of wealth which was fairly regal, Wolsey was precipitated into extreme poverty. An imprudent but innocent act of his soon gave his enemies a pretext for charging him with treason; but the unhappy man died on his way to London and thus escaped being beheaded as a traitor.
Cardinal Wolsey had been the Pope’s representative in England. Henry VIII’s next move was to declare the whole clergy of England guilty in obeying Wolsey, since an old law forbade any papal agent to appear in England without the king’s consent. The king refused to forgive them until they had solemnly acknowledged him supreme head of the English Church. He then induced Parliament to cut off some of the Pope’s revenue from England; but, as this did not bring Clement VII to terms, Henry lost patience and secretly married Anne Boleyn, relying on getting a divorce from Catherine later.

His method was a simple one. He summoned an English church court which declared his marriage with Catherine null and void. He had persuaded Parliament to make a law providing that all lawsuits should be definitely decided within the realm and in this way cut off the possibility of the queen’s appealing to the Pope.

Parliament, which did whatever Henry VIII asked, also declared Henry’s marriage with Catherine unlawful and that with Anne Boleyn legal. Consequently it was decreed that Anne’s daughter Elizabeth, born in 1533, was to succeed her father on the English throne instead of Mary, the daughter of Catherine.

In 1534 the English Parliament completed the revolt of the English Church from the Pope by assigning to the king the right to appoint all the English prelates and to enjoy all the income which had formerly found its way to Rome. In the Act of Supremacy, Parliament declared the king to be “the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England,” and that he should enjoy all the powers which the title naturally carried with it.

Two years later every officer in the kingdom was required to swear to renounce the authority of the bishop of Rome.

1 Henry had, however, agreed that Wolsey should accept the office of papal legate.
2 The clergy only recognized the king as ”Head of the Church and Clergy so far as the law of Christ will allow.” They did not abjure the headship of the Pope over the whole Church.
Refusal to take this oath was to be adjudged high treason. Many were unwilling to deny the Pope's headship merely because king and Parliament renounced it, and this legislation led to a persecution in the name of treason which was even more horrible than that which had been carried on in the supposed interest of religion.

It must be carefully observed that Henry VIII was not a Protestant in the Lutheran sense of the word. He was led, it is true, by Clement VII's refusal to declare his first marriage illegal, to break the bond between the English and the Roman Church, and to induce the English clergy and Parliament to acknowledge the king as supreme head in the religious as well as in the worldly interests of the country. Important as this was, it did not lead Henry to accept the teachings of Protestant leaders, like Luther, Zwingli, or Calvin.

Henry was anxious to prove that he was orthodox, especially after he had seized the property of the monasteries and the gold and jewels which adorned the receptacles in which the relics of the saints were kept. He presided in person over the trial of one who accepted the opinions of Zwingli, and he quoted Scripture to prove the contrary. The prisoner was condemned and burned as a heretic. Henry also authorized a new translation of the Bible into English. A fine edition of this was printed (1539), and every parish was ordered to obtain a copy and place it in the parish church, where all the people could readily make use of it.

Henry VIII was heartless and despotic. With a barbarity not uncommon in those days, he allowed his old friend and adviser, Sir Thomas More, to be beheaded for refusing to pronounce the marriage with Catherine void. He caused numbers of monks to be executed for refusing to swear that his first marriage was illegal and for denying his title to supremacy in the Church. Others he permitted to die of starvation and disease in the filthy prisons of the time. Many Englishmen would doubtless have agreed with one of the friars who said
humbly. "I profess that it is not out of obstinate malice or a
mind of rebellion that I do disobey the king, but only for the
fear of God, that I offend not the Supreme Majesty; because
our Holy Mother, the Church, hath decreed and appointed
otherwise than the king and Parliament hath ordained."

Henry wanted money; some of the English abbeys were
rich, and the monks were quite unable to defend themselves
against the charges which were brought against them. The
king sent commissioners about to inquire into the state of the
monasteries. A large number of scandalous tales were easily
collected, some of which were undoubtedly true. The monks
were doubtless often indolent and sometimes wicked. Never-
theless they were kind landlords, hospitable to the stranger,
and good to the poor. The plundering of the smaller monas-
teries, with which the king began, led to a revolt, due to a
rumor that the king would next proceed to despoil the parish
churches as well.

This gave Henry an excuse for attacking the larger monas-
teries. The abbots and priors who had taken part in the revolt
were hanged and their monasteries confiscated. Other abbots,
panic-stricken, confessed that they and their monks had been
committing the most loathsome sins and asked to be permitted
to give up their monasteries to the king. The royal commis-
sioners then took possession, sold every article upon which they
could lay hands, including the bells and even the lead on the
roofs. The picturesque remains of some of the great abbey
churches are still among the chief objects of interest to the
sight-seer in England. The monastery lands were, of course,
appropriated by the king. They were sold for the benefit of
the government or given to nobles whose favor the king
wished to secure.

Along with the destruction of the monasteries went an
attack upon the shrines and images in the churches, which
were adorned with gold and jewels. The shrine of St. Thomas
of Canterbury was destroyed, and the bones of the saint were
burned. An old wooden figure which was revered in Wales was used to make a fire to burn an unfortunate friar who maintained that in religious matters the Pope rather than the king should be obeyed. These acts resembled the Protestant attacks on images which occurred in Germany, Switzerland, and the Netherlands. The main object of the king and his party was probably to get money, although the reason urged for the destruction was the superstitious veneration in which the relics and images were popularly held.

Henry’s family troubles by no means came to an end with his marriage to Anne Boleyn. Of her, too, he soon tired, and three years after their marriage he had her executed on a series of monstrous charges. The very next day he married his third wife, Jane Seymour, who was the mother of his son and successor, Edward VI. Jane died a few days after her son’s birth, and later Henry married in succession three other women who are historically unimportant since they left no children as claimants for the crown. Henry took care that his three children, all of whom were destined to reign, should be given their due place in the line of inheritance by act of Parliament.¹ His death in 1547 left the great problem of Protestantism and Catholicism to be settled by his son and daughters.

Section 108. England becomes Protestant

While the revolt of England against the papacy was carried through by the government at a time when the greater part of the nation was still Catholic, there was undoubtedly, under Henry VIII, an ever-increasing number of aggressive and ardent Protestants who applauded the change. During the six

¹ Henry VIII, m. (1) Catherine m. (2) Anne Boleyn, m. (3) Jane Seymour

Mary (1553-1558) Elizabeth (1558-1603) Edward VI (1547-1553)

It was arranged that the son was to succeed to the throne. In case he died without heirs, Mary and then Elizabeth were to follow.
years of the boy Edward's reign—he died in 1553 at the age of sixteen—those in charge of the government favored the Protestant party and did what they could to change the faith of all the people by bringing Protestant teachers from the Continent.

A general demolition of all the sacred images was ordered; even the beautiful stained glass, the glory of the cathedrals,

**Fig. 214. Edward VI, by Holbein**

This interesting sketch was made before Edward became king, and he could have been scarcely six years old, as Holbein died in 1543.

was destroyed, because it often represented saints and angels. The king was to appoint bishops without troubling to observe the old forms of election, and Protestants began to be put into the high offices of the Church. Parliament turned over to the king the funds which had been established for the purpose of having masses chanted for the dead, and decreed that thereafter the clergy should be free to marry.

A prayer book in English was prepared under the auspices of Parliament, not very unlike that used in the Church of
England to-day (see below, p. 639). Moreover, forty-two articles of faith were drawn up by the government, which were to be the standard of belief for the country. These, in the time of Queen Elizabeth, were revised and reduced to the famous

**Fig. 215. Queen Mary, by Antonio Moro**

This life-like portrait, in the Madrid collection, is by a favorite painter of Philip II, Mary’s husband (see Fig. 218). It was painted about 1554, and one gets the same impressions of Mary’s character from the portrait that one does from reading about her. Moro had Holbein’s skill in painting faces

“Thirty-Nine Articles,” which still constitute the creed of the Church of England.

The changes in the church services must have sadly shocked a great part of the English people, who had been accustomed to watch with awe and expectancy the various acts associated
with the many church ceremonies and festivals. Earnest men who deplored the misrule of those who conducted Edward's government in the name of Protestantism must have concluded that the reformers were chiefly intent upon advancing their own interests by plundering the Church. We get some idea of the desecrations of the time from the fact that Edward was forced to forbid "quarreling and shooting in churches" and "the bringing of horses and mules through the same, making God's house like a stable or common inn." Although many were heartily in favor of the recent changes, it is no wonder that after Edward's death there was a revulsion in favor of the old religion.

Edward VI was succeeded in 1553 by his half sister Mary, the daughter of Catherine, who had been brought up in the Catholic faith and held firmly to it. Her ardent hope of bringing her kingdom back once more to her religion did not seem altogether ill-founded, for the majority of the people were still Catholics at heart, and many who were not, disapproved of the policy of Edward's ministers, who had removed abuses "in the devil's own way, by breaking in pieces."

The Catholic cause appeared, moreover, to be strengthened by Mary's marriage with the Spanish prince, Philip II, the son of the orthodox Charles V. But although Philip later distinguished himself, as we shall see, by the merciless way in which he strove to put down heresy within his realms, he never gained any great influence in England. By his marriage with Mary he acquired the title of king, but the English took care that he should have no hand in the government nor be permitted to succeed his wife on the English throne.

Mary succeeded in bringing about a nominal reconciliation between England and the Roman Church. In 1554 the papal legate restored to the communion of the Catholic Church the "Kneeling" Parliament, which theoretically, of course, represented the nation.

During the last four years of Mary's reign the most serious religious persecution in English history occurred. No less than
277 persons were put to death for denying the teachings of the Roman Church. The majority of the victims were humble artisans and husbandmen. The two most notable sufferers were two bishops named Latimer and Ridley, who were burned in Oxford.

It was Mary's hope and belief that the heretics sent to the stake would furnish a terrible warning to the Protestants and check the spread of the new teachings, but Catholicism was not promoted; on the contrary, doubters were only convinced of the earnestness of the Protestants who could die with such constancy.\(^1\)

**QUESTIONS**

**SECTION 106.** How did the Swiss Confederation originate? Describe the reforms begun by Zwingli. Who was Calvin and what are his claims to distinction?

**SECTION 107.** Mention the chief contemporaries of Erasmus. What was the policy of Wolsey? Describe the divorce case of Henry VIII. In what way did Henry VIII break away from the papacy? What reforms did he introduce? What was the dissolution of the monasteries?

**SECTION 108.** What happened during the reign of Edward VI? What was the policy of Queen Mary?

\(^1\) The Catholics, it should be noted, later suffered serious persecution under Elizabeth and James I, the Protestant successors of Mary. Death was the penalty fixed in many cases for those who obstinately refused to recognize the monarch as the rightful head of the English Church, and heavy fines were imposed for the failure to attend Protestant worship. Two hundred Catholic priests are said to have been executed under Elizabeth, Mary's sister, who succeeded her on the throne; others were tortured or perished miserably in prison.
CHAPTER XXVI

THE WARS OF RELIGION

Section 109. The Council of Trent; the Jesuits

In the preceding chapters we have seen how northern Germany, England, and portions of Switzerland revolted from the papacy and established independent Protestant churches. A great part of western Europe, however, remained faithful to the Pope and to the old beliefs which had been accepted for so many centuries. In order to consider the great question of reforming the Catholic Church and to settle disputed questions of religious belief a great church council was summoned by the Pope to meet in Trent, on the confines of Germany and Italy, in the year 1545. Charles V hoped that the Protestants would come to the council and that their ideas might even yet be reconciled with those of the Catholics. But the Protestants did not come, for they were too suspicious of an assembly called by the Pope to have any confidence in its decisions.

The Council of Trent was interrupted after a few sessions and did not complete its work for nearly twenty years after it first met. It naturally condemned the Protestant beliefs so far as they differed from the views held by the Catholics, and it sanctioned those doctrines which the Catholic Church still holds. It accepted the Pope as the head of the Church; it declared accursed any one who, like Luther, believed that man would be saved by faith in God's promises alone; for the Church held that man, with God's help, could increase his hope of salvation by good works. It ratified all the seven sacraments, several of which the Protestants had rejected. The ancient Latin translation of the Bible — the Vulgate, as it is called — was proclaimed
the standard of belief, and no one was to publish any views about the Bible differing from those approved by the Church.

The Council suggested that the Pope’s officials should compile a list of dangerous books which faithful Catholics might not read for fear that their faith in the old Church would be disturbed. Accordingly, after the Council broke up, the Pope issued the first “Index,” or list of books which were not to be further printed or circulated on account of the false religious teachings they contained. Similar lists have since been printed from time to time. The establishment of this “Index of Prohibited Books” was one of the most famous of the Council’s acts. It was hoped that in this way the spread of heretical and immoral ideas through the printing press could be checked.

Although the Council of Trent would make no compromises with the Protestants, it took measures to do away with certain abuses of which both Protestants and devout Catholics complained. All clergymen were to attend strictly to their duties, and no one was to be appointed who merely wanted the income from his office. The bishops were ordered to preach regularly and to see that only good men were ordained priests. A great improvement actually took place—better men were placed in office and many practices which had formerly irritated the people were permanently abolished.

Among those who, during the final sessions of the Council, sturdily opposed every attempt to reduce in any way the exalted power of the Pope, was the head of a new religious society which was becoming the most powerful Catholic organization in Europe. The Jesuit order, or Society of Jesus, was founded by a Spaniard, Ignatius Loyola. He had been a soldier in his younger days, and while bravely fighting for his king, Charles V, had been wounded by a cannon ball (1521). Obliged to lie inactive for weeks, he occupied his time in reading the lives of the saints and became filled with a burning ambition to emulate their deeds. Upon recovering, he dedicated himself to the service of the Church, donned a beggar’s gown, and started on a pilgrimage
The Council held its meetings, with long interruptions, from 1545 to 1563, in the church of Santa Maria Maggiore at Trent. This engraving was made by a Venetian, just after the final adjournment of the Council. The legates of the Pope are sitting on the raised platform facing the assembly.
to Jerusalem. Once there he began to realize that he could do little without an education. So he returned to Spain and, although already thirty-three years old, took his place beside the boys who were learning the elements of Latin grammar. After two years he entered a Spanish university, and later went to Paris to carry on his theological studies.

In Paris he sought to influence his fellow students at the university, and finally, in 1534, seven of his companions agreed to follow him to Palestine or, if they were prevented from doing that, to devote themselves to the service of the Pope. On arriving in Venice they found that war had broken out between that republic and the Turks. They accordingly gave up their plan for converting the infidels in the Orient and began to preach in the neighboring towns. When asked to what order they belonged, they replied, “To the Society of Jesus.”

In 1538 Loyola summoned his followers to Rome, and there they worked out the principles of their order. When this had been done the Pope gave his sanction to the new society.¹ Loyola had been a soldier, and he laid great and constant stress upon absolute and unquestioning obedience. This he declared to be the mother of all virtue and happiness. Not only were all the members to obey the Pope as Christ’s representative on earth, and to undertake without hesitation any journey, no matter how distant or perilous, which he might command, but each was to obey his superiors in the order as if he were receiving directions from Christ in person. He must have no will or preference of his own, but must be as the staff which supports and aids its bearer in any way in which he sees fit to use it. This admirable organization and incomparable discipline were the great secret of the later influence of the Jesuits.

The object of the society was to cultivate piety and the love of God, especially through example. The members were to pledge themselves to lead a pure life of poverty and devotion. A great number of its members were priests, who went about

¹ See Readings, II, chap. xxviii.
preaching, hearing confession, and encouraging devotional exercises. But the Jesuits were teachers as well as preachers and confessors. They clearly perceived the advantage of bringing young people under their influence; they opened schools and seminaries and soon became the schoolmasters of Catholic Europe. So successful were their methods of instruction that even Protestants sometimes sent their children to them.

Before the death of Loyola over a thousand persons had joined the society. Under his successor the number was trebled, and it went on increasing for two centuries. The founder of the order had been, as we have seen, attracted to missionary work from the first, and the Jesuits rapidly spread not only over Europe but throughout the whole world. Francis Xavier,
one of Loyola's original little band, went to Hindustan, the Moluccas, and Japan. Brazil, Florida, Mexico, and Peru were soon fields of active missionary work at a time when Protestants as yet scarcely dreamed of carrying Christianity to the heathen. We owe to the Jesuits' reports much of our knowledge of the condition of America when white men first began to explore Canada and the Mississippi valley, for the followers of Loyola boldly penetrated into regions unknown to Europeans, and settled among the natives with the purpose of bringing the Gospel to them.

Dedicated as they were to the service of the Pope, the Jesuits early directed their energies against Protestantism. They sent their members into Germany and the Netherlands, and even made strenuous efforts to reclaim England. Their success was most apparent in southern Germany and Austria, where they became the confessors and confidential advisers of the rulers. They not only succeeded in checking the progress of Protestantism, but were able to reconquer for the Catholic Church some districts in which the old faith had been abandoned.

Protestants soon realized that the new order was their most powerful and dangerous enemy. Their apprehensions produced a bitter hatred which blinded them to the high purposes of the founders of the order and led them to attribute an evil purpose to every act of the Jesuits. The Jesuits' air of humility the Protestants declared to be mere hypocrisy under which they carried on their intrigues. They were popularly supposed to justify the most deceitful and immoral measures on the ground that the result would be "for the greater glory of God." The very obedience on which the Jesuits laid such stress was viewed by the hostile Protestant as one of their worst offenses, for he believed that the members of the order were the blind tools of their superiors and that they would not hesitate even to commit a crime if so ordered.¹

¹ As time went on the Jesuit order degenerated just as the earlier ones had done. In the eighteenth century it undertook great commercial enterprises, and for this and other reasons lost the confidence and respect of even the
The chief ally of the Pope and the Jesuits in their efforts to check Protestantism in the latter half of the sixteenth century was the son of Charles V, Philip II. Like the Jesuits he enjoys a most unenviable reputation among Protestants. Certain it is that they had no more terrible enemy among the rulers of the day than he. He eagerly forwarded every plan to attack England's Protestant queen, Elizabeth, and finally manned a mighty fleet with the purpose of overthrowing her (see below, p. 644). He resorted, moreover, to great cruelty in his attempts to bring back his possessions in the Netherlands to what he believed to be the true faith.

Charles V, crippled with the gout and old before his time, laid down the cares of government in 1555-1556. To his brother Ferdinand, who had acquired by marriage the kingdoms of Bohemia and Hungary, Charles had earlier transferred the German possessions of the Hapsburgs. To his son, Philip II (1556-1598), he gave Spain with its great American colonies, Milan, the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, and the Netherlands.\(^1\)

Catholics. The king of Portugal was the first to banish the Jesuits from his kingdom, and then France, where they had long been very unpopular with an influential party of the Catholics, expelled them in 1764. Convinced that the order had outgrown its usefulness, the Pope abolished it in 1773. It was, however, restored in 1814, and now again has thousands of members.

\(^1\) Division of the Hapsburg possessions between the Spanish and the German branches:

Maximilian I (d. 1519), m. Mary of Burgundy (d. 1482)

Philip (d. 1506), m. Joanna the Insane (d. 1555)

Charles V (d. 1558) \nEmperor, 1519-1556

Ferdinand (d. 1564), m. Anna, heiress to kingdoms
Emperor, 1556-1564 of Bohemia and Hungary

Philip II (d. 1559)

inherits Spain, the Netherlands, and the Italian possessions of the Hapsburgs

Maximilian II (d. 1576)

Emperor, and inherits Bohemia, Hungary, and the Austrian possessions of the Hapsburgs

The map of Europe in the sixteenth century (see above, p. 572) indicates the vast extent of the combined possessions of the Spanish and German Hapsburgs.
Charles had constantly striven to maintain the old religion within his dominions. He had never hesitated to use the Inquisition in Spain and the Netherlands, and it was the great disappointment of his life that a part of his empire had become Protestant. He was, nevertheless, no fanatic. Like many of the princes of the time, he was forced to take sides on the religious question without, perhaps, himself having any deep religious sentiments. The maintenance of the Catholic faith he believed to be necessary in order that he should keep his hold upon his scattered and diverse dominions.

On the other hand, the whole life and policy of his son Philip were guided by a fervent attachment to the old religion. He was willing to sacrifice both himself and his country in his long fight against the detested Protestants within and without his realms. And he had vast resources at his disposal, for Spain was a strong power, not only on account of her income from America, but also because her soldiers and their commanders were the best in Europe at this period.

The Netherlands, which were to cause Philip his first and greatest trouble, included seventeen provinces which Charles V had inherited from his grandmother, Mary of Burgundy. They occupied the position on the map where we now find the kingdoms of Holland and Belgium. Each of the provinces had its own government, but Charles V had grouped them together and arranged that the German Empire should protect them. In the north the hardy Germanic population had been able, by means of dikes which kept out the sea, to reclaim large tracts of lowlands. Here considerable cities had grown up — Harlem, Leyden, Amsterdam, and Rotterdam. To the south were the flourishing towns of Ghent, Bruges, Brussels, and Antwerp, which had for hundreds of years been centers of manufacture and trade.

Charles V, in spite of some very harsh measures, had retained the loyalty of the people of the Netherlands, for he was himself one of them, and they felt a patriotic pride in his achievements.
Toward Philip II their attitude was very different. His haughty manner made a disagreeable impression upon the people at Brussels when his father first introduced him to them as their future ruler. He was to them a Spaniard and a foreigner, and he ruled them as such after he returned to Spain.

Instead of attempting to win them by meeting their legitimate demands, he did everything to alienate all classes in his Burgundian realm and to increase their natural hatred and suspicion of the Spaniards. The people were forced to house Spanish soldiers whose insolence drove them nearly to desperation.

What was still worse, Philip proposed that the Inquisition (see above, p. 483) should carry on its work far more actively than hitherto and put an end to the heresy which appeared to
him to defile his fair realms. The Inquisition was no new thing to the provinces. Charles V had issued the most cruel edicts against the followers of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin. According to a law of 1550, heretics who persistently refused to recant were to be burned alive. Even those who confessed their errors and abjured their heresy were, if men, to lose their heads; if women, to be buried alive. In either case their property was to be confiscated. The lowest estimate of those who were executed in the Netherlands during Charles’s reign is fifty thousand. Although these terrible laws had not checked the growth of Protestantism, all of Charles’s decrees were solemnly re-enacted by Philip in the first month of his reign.

For ten years the people suffered Philip’s rule; nevertheless their king, instead of listening to the protests of their leaders, who were quite as earnest Catholics as himself, appeared to be bent on the destruction of the land. So in 1566 some five hundred of the nobles ventured to protest against Philip’s policy. Thereupon Philip took a step which led finally to the revolt of the Netherlands. He decided to dispatch to the low countries the remorseless Duke of Alva, whose conduct has made his name synonymous with blind and unmeasured cruelty.

The report that Alva was coming caused the flight of many of those who especially feared his approach. William of Orange, who was to be the leader in the approaching war against Spain, went to Germany. Thousands of Flemish weavers fled across the North Sea, and the products of their looms became before long an important article of export from England.

Alva brought with him a fine army of Spanish soldiers, ten thousand in number and superbly equipped. He appeared to think that the wisest and quickest way of pacifying the discontented provinces was to kill all those who ventured to criticize “the best of kings,” of whom he had the honor to be the faithful servant. He accordingly established a special court for the speedy trial and condemnation of all those whose fidelity to Philip was suspected. This was popularly known as
The Wars of Religion

The Council of Blood, for its aim was not justice but butchery. Alva's administration from 1567 to 1573 was a veritable reign of terror.

The Netherlands found a leader in William, Prince of Orange and Count of Nassau. He is a national hero whose career bears a striking resemblance to that of Washington. Like the American patriot, he undertook the seemingly hopeless task of freeing his people from the oppressive rule of a distant king. To the Spaniards he appeared to be only an impoverished nobleman at the head of a handful of armed peasants and fishermen, contending against the sovereign of the richest realm in the world.

William had been a faithful subject of Charles V and would gladly have continued to serve his son after him had the oppression and injustice of the Spanish dominion not become intolerable. But Alva's policy convinced him that it was useless to send any more complaints to Philip. He accordingly collected a little army in 1568 and opened the long struggle with Spain.

William found his main support in the northern provinces, of which Holland was the chief. The Dutch, who had very generally accepted Protestant teachings, were purely German in blood, while the people of the southern provinces, who adhered (as they still do) to the Roman Catholic faith, were more akin to the population of northern France.

The Spanish soldiers found little trouble in defeating the troops which William collected. Like Washington, again, he seemed to lose almost every battle and yet was never conquered. The first successes of the Dutch were gained by the mariners who captured Spanish ships and sold them in Protestant England. Encouraged by this, many of the towns in the northern provinces of Holland and Zealand ventured to choose William as their governor, although they did not throw off their allegiance to Philip. In this way these two provinces became the nucleus of the United Netherlands.
Both the northern and southern provinces combine against Spain, 1576

The "Spanish fury"

Alva recaptured a number of the revolted towns and treated their inhabitants with his customary cruelty; even women and children were slaughtered in cold blood. But instead of quenching the rebellion, he aroused the Catholic southern provinces to revolt.

After six years of this tyrannical and mistaken policy, Alva was recalled. His successor soon died and left matters worse than ever. The leaderless soldiers, trained in Alva’s school, indulged in wild orgies of robbery and murder; they plundered and partially reduced to ashes the rich city of Antwerp. The "Spanish fury," as this outbreak was called, together with the hated taxes, created such general indignation that representatives from all of Philip’s Burgundian provinces met at Ghent in 1576 with the purpose of combining to put an end to the Spanish tyranny.

This union was, however, only temporary. Wiser and more moderate governors were sent by Philip to the Netherlands, and they soon succeeded in again winning the confidence of the southern Catholic provinces. So the northern provinces went their own way. Guided by William the Silent, they refused to consider the idea of again recognizing Philip as their king. In 1579 seven provinces (Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht, Gelderland, Overyssel, Groningen, and Friesland, all lying north of the mouths of the Rhine and the Scheldt) formed the new and firmer Union of Utrecht. The articles of this union served as a constitution for the United Provinces which, two years later, at last formally declared themselves independent of Spain.

Philip realized that William was the soul of the revolt and that without him it might not improbably have been put down. The king therefore offered a patent of nobility and a large sum of money to any one who should make way with the Dutch patriot. After several unsuccessful attempts, William, who had been chosen hereditary governor of the United Provinces, was shot in his house at Delft, 1584. He died praying the Lord to have pity upon his soul and "on this poor people."
The Dutch had long hoped for aid from Queen Elizabeth or from the French, but had heretofore been disappointed. At last the English queen decided to send troops to their assistance. While the English rendered but little actual help, Elizabeth's policy so enraged Philip that he at last decided to attempt the conquest of England. The destruction of the "Armada," the great fleet which he equipped for that purpose, interfered with further attempts to subjugate the United Provinces, which might otherwise have failed to maintain their liberty. Moreover, Spain's resources were being rapidly exhausted, and the State was on the verge of bankruptcy in spite of the wealth which it had been drawing from across the sea. But even though Spain had to surrender the hope of winning back the lost provinces, which now became a small but important European power, she refused formally to acknowledge their independence until 1648 (Peace of Westphalia).

Section 111. The Huguenot Wars in France

The history of France during the latter part of the sixteenth century is little more than a chronicle of a long and bloody series of civil wars between the Catholics and Protestants.

Protestantism began in France in much the same way as in England. Those who had learned from the Italians to love the Greek language turned to the New Testament in the original and commenced to study it with new insight. Lefèvre, the most conspicuous of these Erasmus-like reformers, translated the Bible into French and began to preach justification by faith before he had ever heard of Luther.

The Sorbonne, the famous theological school at Paris, soon began to arouse the suspicions of Francis I against the new ideas. He had no special interest in religious matters, but he was shocked by an act of desecration ascribed to the Protestants, and in consequence forbade the circulation of Protestant books. About 1535 several adherents of the new faith were burned,

1 See below, p. 644.
and Calvin was forced to flee to Basel, where he prepared a
defense of his beliefs in his *Institutes of Christianity* (see above,
p. 607). This is prefaced by a letter to Francis in which he pleads
with him to protect the Protestants.¹ Francis, before his death,
became so intolerant that he ordered the massacre of three
thousand defenseless peasants who dwelt on the slopes of the
Alps, and whose only offense was adherence to the simple
teachings of the Waldensians.²

Francis’s son, Henry II (1547–1559), swore to extirpate the
Protestants, and hundreds of them were burned. Nevertheless,
Henry II’s religious convictions did not prevent him from will-
ingly aiding the German Protestants against his enemy Charles V,
especially when they agreed to hand over to him three bishop-
rics which lay on the French boundary—Metz, Verdun, and Toul.

Henry II was accidentally killed in a tourney and left his
kingdom to three weak sons, the last scions of the house of
Valois, who succeeded in turn to the throne during a period of
unprecedented civil war and public calamity. The eldest son,
Francis II, a boy of sixteen, followed his father. His chief im-
portance for France arose from his marriage with the daughter
of King James V of Scotland, Mary Stuart, who became famous
as Mary Queen of Scots. Her mother was the sister of two
very ambitious French nobles, the Duke of Guise and the cardinal
of Lorraine. Francis II was so young that Mary’s uncles, the
Guises, eagerly seized the opportunity to manage his affairs for
him. The duke put himself at the head of the army, and the
cardinal of the government. When the king died, after reigning
but a year, the Guises were naturally reluctant to surrender their
power, and many of the woes of France for the next forty years
were due to the machinations which they carried on in the name
of the Holy Catholic religion.

The new king, Charles IX (1560–1574), was but ten years
old, so that his mother, Catherine of Medici, of the famous

¹ See *Readings*, II, chap. xxviii. ² See above, p. 482.
Florentine family, claimed the right to conduct the government for her son until he reached manhood.

By this time the Protestants in France had become a powerful party. They were known as Huguenots and accepted the religious teachings of their fellow countryman, Calvin. Many of them, including their great leader Coligny, belonged to the nobility. They had a strong support in the king of the little realm of Navarre, on the southern boundary of France. He

1 The origin of this name is uncertain.
RELATIONS OF THE GUISES, MARY STUART, THE VALOIS, AND THE BOURBONS

Claude, duke of Guise (d. 1527)

Francis, duke of Guise (murdered 1563)

Mary, m. James V of Scotland, son of Henry VIII's sister

Mary Stuart, m. Francis II (d. 1560 without heirs)

Francis I (d. 1547)

Henry II (d. 1559), m. Catherine of Medici

Charles, cardinal of Lorraine

Charles IX (d. 1574 without heirs)

Henry III (d. 1589 without heirs)

Margaret, m. Henry IV (d. 1610), king of Navarre, a descendant through the younger, Bourbon, line from St. Louis

Henry, duke of Guise (killed 1588)

James VI of Scotland, I of England, by Mary's second marriage with Lord Darnley

James VI of Scotland

Louis XIII (d. 1643), by Henry's second marriage with Mary of Medici

Louis XIV (d. 1715)

Louis XV (d. 1774)

great grandson of Louis XIV
belonged to a side line of the French royal house, known as the Bourbons, who were later to occupy the French throne (see genealogical table, p. 634). It was inevitable that the Huguenots should try to get control of the government, and they consequently formed a political as well as a religious party and were often fighting, in the main, for worldly ends.

Catherine tried at first to conciliate both Catholics and Huguenots, and granted a Decree of Toleration (1562) suspending the former edicts against the Protestants and permitting them to assemble for worship during the daytime and outside of the towns. Even this restricted toleration of the Protestants appeared an abomination to the more fanatical Catholics, and a savage act of the Duke of Guise precipitated civil war.

As he was passing through the town of Vassy on a Sunday he found a thousand Huguenots assembled in a barn for worship. The duke's followers rudely interrupted the service, and a tumult arose in which the troops killed a considerable number of the defenseless multitude. The news of this massacre aroused the Huguenots and was the beginning of a war which continued, broken only by short truces, until the last weak descendant of the house of Valois ceased to reign. As in the other religious wars of the time, both sides exhibited the most inhuman cruelty. France was filled for a generation with burnings, pillage, and every form of barbarity. The leaders of both the Catholic and Protestant parties, as well as two of the French kings themselves, fell by the hands of assassins, and France renewed in civil war all the horrors of the English invasion in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

In 1570 a brief peace was concluded. The Huguenots were to be tolerated, and certain towns were assigned to them, where they might defend themselves in case of renewed attacks from the Catholics. For a time both Charles IX and his mother, Catherine of Medici, were on the friendliest terms with the Huguenot leader Coligny, who became a sort of prime minister. He was anxious that Catholics and Protestants should join in
a great national war against France’s old enemy, Spain. In this way the whole people of France might sink their religious differences in a patriotic effort to win Franche-Comté (see above, p. 575), which seemed naturally to belong to France rather than to Spain.

The strict Catholic party of the Guises frustrated this plan by a most fearful expedient. They easily induced Catherine of Medici to believe that she was being deceived by Coligny, and an assassin was engaged to put him out of the way; but the scoundrel missed his aim and only wounded his victim. Fearful lest the young king, who was faithful to Coligny, should discover her part in the attempted murder, Catherine invented a story of a great Huguenot conspiracy. The credulous king was deceived, and the Catholic leaders at Paris arranged that at a given signal not only Coligny, but all the Huguenots, who had gathered in great numbers in the city to witness the marriage of the king’s sister to the Protestant Henry of Navarre, should be massacred on the eve of St. Bartholomew’s Day (August 23, 1572).

The signal was duly given, and no less than two thousand persons were ruthlessly murdered in Paris before the end of the next day. The news of this attack spread into the provinces, and it is probable that, at the very least, ten thousand more Protestants were put to death outside of the capital. Civil war again broke out, and the Catholics formed the famous Holy League, under the leadership of Henry of Guise, for the advancement of their interests, the destruction of the Huguenots, and the extirpation of heresy.

Henry III (1574–1589), the last of the sons of Henry II, who succeeded Charles IX, had no heirs, and the great question of succession arose. The Huguenot Henry of Navarre was the nearest male relative, but the League could never consent to permit the throne of France to be sullied by heresy, especially as their leader, Henry of Guise, was himself anxious to become king.
Henry III was driven weakly from one party to the other, and it finally came to a war between the three Henrys—Henry III, Henry of Navarre, and Henry of Guise (1585-1589). It ended in a way characteristic of the times. Henry the king had Henry of Guise assassinated. The sympathizers of the League then assassinated Henry the king, which left the field to Henry of Navarre. He ascended the throne as Henry IV in 1589 and is an heroic figure in the line of French kings.

The new king had many enemies, and his kingdom was devastated and demoralized by years of war. He soon saw that he must accept the religion of the majority of his people if he wished to reign over them. He accordingly asked to be readmitted to the Catholic Church (1593), excusing himself on the
ground that "Paris was worth a mass." He did not forget his old friends, however, and in 1598 he issued the Edict of Nantes.

By this edict of toleration the Calvinists were permitted to hold services in all the towns and villages where they had previously held them, but in Paris and a number of other towns all Protestant services were prohibited. The Protestants were to enjoy the same political rights as Catholics, and to be eligible to government offices. A number of fortified towns were to remain in the hands of the Huguenots, particularly La Rochelle, Montauban, and Nimes. Henry's only mistake lay in granting the Huguenots the right to control fortified towns. In the next generation this privilege aroused the suspicion of the king's minister, Richelieu, who attacked the Huguenots, not so much on religious grounds as on account of their independent position in the state, which suggested that of the older feudal nobles.

Henry IV chose Sully, an upright and able Calvinist, for his chief minister. Sully set to work to reestablish the kingly power, which had suffered greatly under the last three brothers of the house of Valois. He undertook to lighten the tremendous burden of debt which weighed upon the country. He laid out new roads and canals, and encouraged agriculture and commerce; he dismissed the useless noblemen and officers whom the government was supporting without any advantage to itself. Had his administration not been prematurely interrupted, it might have brought France unprecedented power and prosperity; but religious fanaticism put an end to his reforms.

In 1610 Henry IV, like William the Silent, was assassinated just in the midst of his greatest usefulness to his country. Sully could not agree with the regent, Henry's widow, and so gave up his position and retired to private life.

Before many years Richelieu, perhaps the greatest minister France has ever had, rose to power, and from 1624 to his death in 1642 he governed France for Henry IV's son, Louis XIII (1610-1643). Something will be said of his policy in connection with the Thirty Years' War (see section 113).
Section 112. England under Queen Elizabeth

The long and disastrous civil war between Catholics and Protestants, which desolated France in the sixteenth century, had happily no counterpart in England. During her long reign Queen Elizabeth succeeded not only in maintaining peace at home, but in frustrating the conspiracies and attacks of Philip II, which threatened her realm from without. Moreover, by her interference in the Netherlands, she did much to secure their independence of Spain.

Upon the death of Catholic Mary and the accession of her sister Elizabeth in 1558, the English government became once more Protestant. The new queen had a new revised edition issued of the Book of Common Prayer which had been prepared in the time of her brother, Edward VI. This contained the services which the government ordered to be performed in all the churches of England. All her subjects were required to accept the queen’s views and to go to church, and ministers were to use nothing but the official prayer book. Elizabeth did not adopt the Presbyterian system advocated by Calvin but retained many features of the Catholic church, including the bishops and archbishops. So the Anglican church followed a middle path halfway between Lutherans and Calvinists on the one hand and Catholics on the other.

The Catholic churchmen who had held positions under Queen Mary were naturally dismissed and replaced by those who would obey Elizabeth and use her Book of Prayer. Her first Parliament gave the sovereign the powers of supreme head of the Church of England, although the title, which her father, Henry VIII, had assumed, was not revived.

The Church of England still exists in much the same form in which it was established in the first years of Elizabeth’s reign and the prayer book is still used, although Englishmen are no longer required to attend church and may hold any religious views they please without being interfered with by the government.
While England adopted a middle course in religious matters Scotland became Presbyterian, and this led to much trouble for Elizabeth. There, shortly after her accession, the ancient Catholic Church was abolished, for the nobles were anxious to get the lands of the bishops into their own hands and enjoy the revenue from them. John Knox, a veritable second Calvin in his stern energy, secured the introduction of the Presbyterian form of faith and church government which still prevail in Scotland.
In 1561 the Scotch queen, Mary Stuart, whose French husband, Francis II, had just died, landed at Leith. She was but nineteen years old, of great beauty and charm, and, by reason of her Catholic faith and French training, almost a foreigner to her subjects. Her grandmother was a sister of Henry VIII, and Mary claimed to be the rightful heiress to the English throne should Elizabeth die childless. Consequently the beautiful Queen of Scots became the hope of all those who wished to bring back England and Scotland to the Roman Catholic faith. Chief among these were Philip II of Spain and Mary's relatives the Guises in France.

Mary quickly discredited herself with both Protestants and Catholics by her conduct. After marrying her second cousin, Lord Darnley, she discovered that he was a dissolute scapegrace and came to despise him. She then formed an attachment for a reckless nobleman named Bothwell. The house near Edinburgh in which Darnley was lying ill was blown up one night with gunpowder, and he was killed. The public suspected that both Bothwell and the queen were implicated. How far Mary was responsible for her husband's death no one can be sure. It is certain that she later married Bothwell and that her indignant subjects thereupon deposed her as a murderess. After fruitless attempts to regain her power, she abdicated in favor of her infant son, James VI, and then fled to England to appeal to Elizabeth. While the prudent Elizabeth denied the right of the Scotch to depose their queen, she took good care to keep her rival practically a prisoner.

As time went on it became increasingly difficult for Elizabeth to adhere to her policy of moderation in the treatment of the Catholics. A rising in the north of England (1569) showed that there were many who would gladly reëstablish the Catholic faith by freeing Mary and placing her on the English throne. This was followed by the excommunication of Elizabeth by the Pope, who at the same time absolved her subjects from their allegiance to their heretical ruler. Happily for Elizabeth the
rebels could look for no help either from Philip II or the French king. The Spaniards had their hands full, for the war in the Netherlands had just begun; and Charles IX, who had accepted Coligny as his adviser, was at that moment in hearty accord with the Huguenots. The rising in the north was suppressed, but the English Catholics continued to look to Philip for help. They opened correspondence with Alva and invited him to come with six thousand Spanish troops to dethrone Elizabeth and make Mary Stuart queen of England in her stead. Alva hesitated, for he characteristically thought that it would be better to kill Elizabeth, or at least capture her. Meanwhile the plot was discovered and came to naught.

Although Philip found himself unable to harm England, the English mariners caused great loss to Spain. In spite of the fact that Spain and England were not openly at war, Elizabeth's seamen extended their operations as far as the West Indies, and seized Spanish treasure ships, with the firm conviction that in robbing Philip they were serving God. The daring Sir Francis Drake even ventured into the Pacific, where only the Spaniards had gone heretofore, and carried off much booty on his little vessel, the \textit{Pelican}. At last he took "a great vessel with jewels in plenty, thirteen chests of silver coin, eighty pounds weight of gold, and twenty-six tons of silver." He then sailed around the world, and on his return presented his jewels to Elizabeth, who paid little attention to the expostulations of the king of Spain.

One hope of the Catholics has not yet been mentioned, namely, Ireland, whose relations with England from very early times down to the present day form one of the most cheerless pages in the history of Europe. The population was divided into numerous clans, and their chieftains fought constantly with one another as well as with the English, who were vainly endeavoring to subjugate the island. Under Henry II and later kings England had conquered a district in the eastern part of Ireland, and here the English managed to maintain a foothold in spite of the anarchy outside. Henry VIII had
suppressed a revolt of the Irish and assumed the title of king of Ireland. Queen Mary of England had hoped to promote better relations by colonizing Kings County and Queens County with Englishmen. This led, however, to a long struggle which only ended when the colonists had killed all the natives in the district they occupied.

Elizabeth's interest in the perennial Irish question was stimulated by the probability that Ireland might become a basis for Catholic operations, since Protestantism had made little progress among its people. Her fears were realized. Several attempts were made by Catholic leaders to land troops in Ireland with the purpose of making the island the base for an attack on England. Elizabeth's officers were able to frustrate these enterprises, but the resulting disturbances greatly increased the misery of the Irish. In 1582 no less than thirty thousand people are said to have perished, chiefly from starvation.

As Philip's troops began to get the better of the opposition in the southern Netherlands, the prospect of sending a Spanish army to England grew brighter. Two Jesuits were sent to England in 1580 to strengthen the adherents of their faith and urge them to assist the foreign force against their queen when it should come. Parliament now grew more intolerant and ordered fines and imprisonment to be inflicted on those who said or heard mass, or who refused to attend the English services. One of the Jesuit emissaries was cruelly tortured and executed for treason, the other escaped to the Continent.

In the spring of 1582 the first attempt by the Catholics to assassinate the heretical queen was made at Philip's instigation. It was proposed that, when Elizabeth was out of the way, the Duke of Guise should see that an army was sent to England in the interest of the Catholics. But Guise was kept busy at home by the War of the Three Henrys, and Philip was left to undertake the invasion of England by himself.

Mary Queen of Scots did not live to witness the attempt. She became implicated in another plot for the assassination of
Elizabeth. Parliament now realized that as long as Mary lived, Elizabeth’s life was in constant danger; whereas, if Mary were out of the way, Philip II would have no interest in the death of Elizabeth, since Mary’s son, James VI of Scotland, who would succeed Elizabeth on the English throne, was a Protestant. Elizabeth was therefore reluctantly persuaded by her advisers to sign a warrant for Mary’s execution in 1587.

Philip II, however, by no means gave up his project of reclaiming Protestant England. In 1588 he brought together a great fleet, including his best and largest warships, which was proudly called by the Spaniards the “Invincible Armada” (that is, fleet). This was to sail through the English Channel to the Netherlands and bring over the Duke of Parma and his veterans, who, it was expected, would soon make an end of Elizabeth’s raw militia. The English ships were inferior to those of Spain in size although not in number, but they had trained commanders, such as Francis Drake and Hawkins.

These famous captains had long sailed the Spanish Main and knew how to use their cannon without getting near enough to the Spaniards to suffer from their short-range weapons. When the Armada approached, it was permitted by the English fleet to pass up the Channel before a strong wind, which later became a storm. The English ships then followed, and both fleets were driven past the coast of Flanders. Of the hundred and twenty Spanish ships, only fifty-four returned home; the rest had been destroyed by English valor or by the gale to which Elizabeth herself ascribed the victory. The defeat of the Armada put an end to the danger from Spain.

As we look back over the period covered by the reign of Philip II, it is clear that it was a most notable one in the history of the Catholic Church. When he ascended the throne in 1556 Germany, as well as Switzerland and the Netherlands, had become largely Protestant. England, however, under his Catholic wife, Mary, seemed to be turning back to the old religion, while
the French monarchs showed no inclination to tolerate the heretical Calvinists. Moreover, the new and enthusiastic order of the Jesuits promised to be a powerful agency in inducing the Protestants to accept once more the supremacy of the Pope and the doctrines of the Catholic Church as formulated by the Council of Trent. The tremendous power and apparently boundless resources of Spain itself, which were viewed by the rest of Europe with terror, Philip was prepared to dedicate to the destruction of Protestantism throughout western Europe.

But when Philip II died in 1598 all was changed. England was hopelessly Protestant: the "Invincible Armada" had been miserably wrecked and Philip's plan for bringing England once more within the fold of the Roman Catholic Church was forever frustrated. In France the terrible wars of religion were over, and a powerful king, lately a Protestant himself, was on the throne, who not only tolerated the Protestants but chose one of them for his chief minister and would brook no more meddling of Spain in French affairs. A new Protestant state, the United Netherlands, had actually appeared within the bounds of the realm bequeathed to Philip by his father. In spite of its small size this state was destined to play, from that time on, quite as important a part in European affairs as the harsh Spanish stepmother from whose control it had escaped.

Spain itself had suffered most of all from Philip's reign. His domestic policy and his expensive wars had sadly weakened the country. The income from across the sea was bound to decrease as the mines were exhausted. The final expulsion of the industrious Moors, shortly after Philip's death (see above, p. 566), left the indolent Spaniards to till their own fields, which rapidly declined in fertility under their careless cultivation. Some one once ventured to tell a Spanish king that "not gold and silver but sweat is the most precious metal, a coin which is always current and never depreciates"; but it was a rare form of currency in the Spanish peninsula. After Philip II's death Spain sank to the rank of a secondary European power.
The Thirty Years' War really a series of wars
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Section 113. The Thirty Years' War

The last great conflict caused by the differences between the Catholics and Protestants was fought out in Germany during the first half of the seventeenth century. It is generally known as the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648), but there was in reality a series of wars; and although the fighting was done upon German territory, Sweden, France, and Spain played quite as important a part in the struggle as the various German states.

Just before the abdication of Charles V, the Lutheran princes had forced the Emperor to acknowledge their right to their own religion and to the church property which they had appropriated. The religious Peace of Augsburg had, however, as we have seen, two great weaknesses. In the first place only those Protestants who held the Lutheran faith were to be tolerated. The Calvinists, who were increasing in numbers, were not included in the peace. In the second place the peace did not put a stop to the seizure of church property by the Protestant princes.

Protestantism, however, made rapid progress and invaded the Austrian possessions and, above all, Bohemia. So it looked for a time as if even the Catholic Hapsburgs were to see large portions of their territory falling away from the old Church. But the Catholics had in the Jesuits a band of active and efficient missionaries. They not only preached and founded schools, but also succeeded in gaining the confidence of some of the German princes, whose chief advisers they became. Conditions were very favorable, at the opening of the seventeenth century, for a renewal of the religious struggle.

The long war began in Bohemia in 1618. This portion of the Austrian possessions was strongly Protestant and decided that the best policy was to declare its independence of the Hapsburgs and set up a king of its own. It chose Frederick, the Elector of the Palatinate, a Calvinist who would, it was hoped,
enjoy the support of his father-in-law, King James I of England. So Frederick and his English wife moved from Heidelberg to Prague. But their stay there was brief, for the Hapsburg Emperor (Ferdinand I) with the aid of the ruler of Bavaria put to flight the poor "winter king," as Frederick was called on account of his reign of a single season.

This was regarded as a serious defeat by the Protestants, and the Protestant king of Denmark decided to intervene. He remained in Germany for four years but was so badly beaten by the Emperor's able general, Wallenstein, that he retired from the conflict in 1629.

The Emperor was encouraged by the successes of the Catholic armies in defeating the Bohemian and Danish Protestant armies to issue that same year an Edict of Restitution. In this he ordered the Protestants throughout Germany to give back all the church possessions which they had seized since the religious Peace of Augsburg (1555). These included two archbishoprics (Magdeburg and Bremen), nine bishoprics, about one hundred and twenty monasteries, and other church foundations. Moreover, he decreed that only the Lutherans might hold religious meetings; the other "sects," including the Calvinists, were to be broken up. As Wallenstein was preparing to execute this decree in his usual merciless fashion, the war took a new turn.

The Catholic League, which had been formed some time before, had become jealous of a general who threatened to become too powerful, and it accordingly joined in the complaints, which came from every side, of the terrible extortions and incredible cruelty practiced by Wallenstein's troops. The Emperor consented, therefore, to dismiss this most competent commander. Just as the Catholics were thus weakened, a new enemy arrived upon the scene who proved far more dangerous than any they had yet had to face, namely Gustavus Adolphus, king of Sweden.

1 James VI of Scotland who succeeded Queen Elizabeth in 1603.
We have had no occasion hitherto to speak of the Scandinavian kingdoms of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, which the northern German peoples had established about Charlemagne's time; but from now on they begin to take part in the affairs of central Europe. The Union of Calmar (1397) had brought these three kingdoms, previously separate, under a single ruler. About the time that the Protestant revolt began in Germany the union was broken by the withdrawal of Sweden, which became an independent kingdom. Gustavus Vasa, a Swedish noble, led the movement and was subsequently chosen king of Sweden (1523). In the same year Protestantism was introduced. Vasa confiscated the church lands, got the better of the aristocracy,—who had formerly made the kings a great deal of trouble,—and started Sweden on its way toward national greatness.

Gustavus Adolphus (1594–1632) was induced to invade Germany for two reasons. In the first place, he was a sincere and enthusiastic Protestant and by far the most generous and attractive figure of his time. He was genuinely afflicted by the misfortunes of his Protestant brethren and anxious to devote himself to their welfare. Secondly, he undoubtedly hoped by his invasion not only to free his fellow Protestants from the oppression of the Emperor and of the Catholic League, but to gain a strip of German territory for Sweden.

Gustavus was not received with much cordiality at first by the Protestant princes of the north, but they were brought to their senses by the awful destruction of Magdeburg by the troops of the Catholic League under General Tilly. Magdeburg was the most important town of northern Germany. When it finally succumbed after an obstinate and difficult siege, twenty thousand of its inhabitants were killed and the town burned to the ground. Although Tilly’s reputation for cruelty is quite equal to that of Wallenstein, he was probably not responsible for the fire. After Gustavus Adolphus had met Tilly near Leipsic and victoriously routed the army of the League, the Protestant princes began to look with more favor on the foreigner.
The next spring Gustavus entered Bavaria and once more defeated Tilly (who was mortally wounded in the battle) and forced Munich to surrender. There seemed now to be no reason why he should not continue his progress to Vienna. At this juncture the Emperor recalled Wallenstein, who collected a new army over which he was given absolute command. After some delay Gustavus met Wallenstein on the field of Lützen, in November, 1632, where, after a fierce struggle, the Swedes gained the victory. But they lost their leader and Protestantism its hero, for the Swedish king ventured too far into the lines of the enemy and was surrounded and killed.

The Swedes did not, however, retire from Germany, but continued to participate in the war, which now degenerated into a series of raids by leaders whose soldiers depopulated the land by their unspeakable atrocities. Wallenstein, who had long been detested by even the Catholics, was deserted by his soldiers and murdered (in 1634), to the great relief of all parties.

Just at this moment Richelieu decided that it would be to the interest of France to renew the old struggle with the Hapsburgs by sending troops against the Emperor. France was still shut in, as she had been since the time of Charles V, by the Hapsburg lands. Except on the side toward the ocean her boundaries were in the main artificial ones, and not those established by great rivers and mountains. She therefore longed to weaken her enemy and strengthen herself by winning Roussillon on the south, and so make the crest of the Pyrenees the line of demarcation between France and Spain. She dreamed, too, of extending her sway toward the Rhine by adding the county of Burgundy (that is, Franche-Comté) and a number of fortified towns which would afford protection against the Spanish Netherlands.

Richelieu declared war against Spain in May, 1635. He had already concluded an alliance with the chief enemies of the house of Austria. So the war was renewed, and French,

1 See above, p. 638.
Swedish, Spanish, and German soldiers ravaged an already exhausted country for a decade longer. The dearth of provisions was so great that the armies had to move quickly from place to place in order to avoid starvation. After a serious defeat by the Swedes, the Emperor (Ferdinand III, 1637–1657) sent a Dominican monk to expostulate with Cardinal Richelieu for his crime in aiding the German and Swedish heretics against Catholic Austria.

The cardinal had, however, just died (December, 1642), well content with the results of his diplomacy. The French were in possession of Roussillon and of Lorraine and Alsace. The military exploits of the French generals, especially Turenne and Condé, during the opening years of the reign of Louis XIV
The Wars of Religion (1643-1715), showed that a new period had begun in which the military and political supremacy of Spain was to give way to that of France (see Chapter XXVIII).

The participants in the war were now so numerous and their objects so various and conflicting that it is not strange that it required some years to arrange the conditions of peace, even after every one was ready for it. It was agreed (1644) that France and the Empire should negotiate at Münster, and the Emperor and the Swedes at Osnabrück — both of which towns lie in Westphalia. For four years the representatives of the several powers worked upon the difficult problem of satisfying every one, but at last the treaties of Westphalia were signed late in 1648.

The religious troubles in Germany were settled by extending the toleration of the Peace of Augsburg so as to include the Calvinists as well as the Lutherans. The Protestant princes were to retain the lands which they had in their possession in the year 1624, regardless of the Edict of Restitution, and each ruler was still to have the right to determine the religion of his state. The dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire was practically acknowledged by permitting the individual states to make treaties among themselves and with foreign powers; this was equivalent to recognizing the practical independence which they had, as a matter of fact, already long enjoyed. While portions of northern Germany were ceded to Sweden, this territory did not cease to form a part of the Empire, for Sweden was thereafter to have three votes in the German diet.

The Emperor also ceded to France three important towns — Metz, Verdun, and Toul — and all his rights in Alsace, although the city of Strassburg was to remain with the Empire. Lastly, the independence both of the United Netherlands and of Switzerland was acknowledged.

The accounts of the misery and depopulation of Germany caused by the Thirty Years’ War are well-nigh incredible. Thousands of villages were wiped out altogether; in some
regions the population was reduced by one half, in others to a third, or even less, of what it had been at the opening of the conflict. The flourishing city of Augsburg was left with but sixteen thousand souls instead of eighty thousand. The people were fearfully barbarized by privation and suffering and by the atrocities of the soldiers of all the various nations. Until the end of the eighteenth century Germany remained too exhausted and impoverished to make any considerable contribution to the culture of Europe.

**Section 114. The Beginnings of Our Scientific Age**

The battles of the Thirty Years’ War are now well-nigh forgot, and few people are interested in Tilly and Wallenstein and Gustavus Adolphus. It seems as if the war did little but destroy men’s lives and property, and that no great ends were accomplished by all the suffering it involved. But during the years that it raged certain men were quietly devoting themselves to scientific research which was to change the world more than all the battles that have ever been fought. These men adopted a new method. They perceived that the books of ancient writers, especially Aristotle, which were used as textbooks in the universities, were full of statements that could not be proved. They maintained that the only way to advance science was to set to work and try experiments, and by careful thought and investigation to determine the laws of nature without regard to what previous generations had thought.

The Polish astronomer Copernicus published a work in 1543 in which he refuted the old idea that the sun and all the stars revolved around the earth as a center, as was then taught in all the universities. He showed that, on the contrary, the sun was the center about which the earth and the rest of the planets revolved, and that the reason that the stars seem to go around the earth each day is because our globe revolves on its axis. Although Copernicus had been encouraged to write his
book by a cardinal and had dedicated it to the Pope, the Catholic as well as the Protestant theologians declared that the new theory did not correspond with the teachings of the Bible, and they therefore rejected it. But we know now that Copernicus was

right and the theologians and universities wrong. The earth is a mere speck in the universe and even the sun is a relatively small body compared with many of the stars, and so far as we know the universe as a whole has no center.

The Italian scientist Galileo (1564–1642), by the use of a Galileo little telescope he contrived, was able in 1610 to see the spots

**Fig. 223. Galileo**
on the sun; these indicated that the sun was not, as Aristotle had taught, a perfect, unchanging body, and showed also that it revolved on its axis, as Copernicus had guessed that the earth did. Galileo made careful experiments by dropping objects from the leaning tower of Pisa (Fig. 170), which proved that Aristotle was wrong in assuming that a body weighing a hundred pounds fell a hundred times as fast as a body weighing but one. To Galileo we owe, besides, many new ideas in the science of mechanics. He wrote in Italian as well as Latin, and this, too, gave offense to those who pinned their faith to Aristotle. They would
have forgiven Galileo if he had confined his discussions to the learned who could read Latin, but they thought it highly dangerous to have the new ideas set forth in such a way that the people at large might find out about them and so come to doubt what the theologians and universities were teaching. Galileo was finally summoned before the Inquisition and some of his theories condemned by the church authorities.

Just as theThirty Years' War was beginning, a young Frenchman by the name of Descartes had finished his education at a Jesuit college and decided to get some knowledge of the world by going into the war for a short time. He did much more thinking than fighting, however. Sitting by the stove during the winter lull in hostilities, deep in meditation, it occurred to him one day that he had no reason for believing anything. He saw that everything that he accepted had come to him on the authority of some one else, and he failed to see any reason why the old authorities should be right. So he boldly set to work to think out a wholly new philosophy that should be entirely the result of his own reasoning. He decided, in the first place, that one thing at least was true. He was thinking, and therefore he must exist. This he expressed in Latin in the famous phrase Cogito, ergo sum, "I think, therefore I am." He also decided that God must exist and that He had given men such good minds that, if they only used them carefully, they would not be deceived in the conclusions they reached. In short, Descartes held that clear thoughts must be true thoughts.

Descartes not only founded modern philosophy, he was also greatly interested in science and mathematics. He was impressed by the wonderful discovery of Harvey in regard to the circulation of the blood (see below, p. 661), which he thought well illustrated what scientific investigation might accomplish. His most famous book, called An Essay on Method, was written in French and addressed to intelligent men who did not know Latin. He says that those who use their own heads are much more likely to reach the truth than those who read old Latin books. Descartes
wrote clear textbooks on algebra and that branch of mathematics known as analytical geometry, of which he was the discoverer.

Francis Bacon, an English lawyer and government official, spent his spare hours explaining how men could increase their knowledge. He too wrote in his native tongue as well as in Latin. He was the most eloquent representative of the new science which renounced authority and relied upon experiment. "We are the ancients," he declared, not those who lived long ago when the world was young and men ignorant. Late in life he wrote a little book, which he never finished, called the
New Atlantis. It describes an imaginary state which some Europeans were supposed to have come upon in the Pacific Ocean. The chief institution was a "House of Solomon," a great laboratory for carrying on scientific investigation in the hope of discovering new facts and using them for bettering the condition of the inhabitants. This House of Solomon became a sort of model for the Royal Academy, which was established in London some fifty years after Bacon's death. It still exists and still publishes its proceedings regularly.

The earliest societies for scientific research grew up in Italy. Later the English Royal Society and the French Institute were established, as well as similar associations in Germany. These were the first things of the kind in the history of the world. Their object was not, like that of the old Greek schools of philosophy and the medieval universities, merely to hand down the knowledge derived from the past, but to find out what had never been known before.

We have seen how in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries new inventions were made, such as the compass, paper, spectacles, gunpowder, and, in the fifteenth century, the printing press. But in the seventeenth century progress began to be much more rapid, and an era of invention opened, in the midst of which we still live. The microscope and telescope made it possible to discover innumerable scientific truths that were hidden to the Greeks and Romans. In time this scientific advance produced a spirit of reform, also new in the world, and the first chapter of the following volume will be devoted to this.

QUESTIONS

SECTION 109. What were the chief results of the Council of Trent? Why did the Protestants refuse to take part in it? Give an account of the life of Loyola. What were the objects of the Jesuit order? What accusations did the Protestants bring against the society?

SECTION 110. What are your impressions of Philip II? How did it come about that the Netherlands belonged to Spain? Describe
Philip's policy in dealing with the Netherlands. How did the United Netherlands gain their independence?

Section 111. What were the religious conditions in France when Charles IX and Catherine of Medici came into power? What was the character of the Huguenot party? Describe the massacre of St. Bartholomew. How did Henry IV become king? What was the Edict of Nantes?

Section 112. What measures did Queen Elizabeth take in religious matters? How did the English Church originate? Tell the story of Mary Queen of Scots. What was the policy of Philip II in regard to Elizabeth? What were the general results of Philip II's reign?

Section 113. What was the origin of the Thirty Years' War? What led the Swedish king to intervene? What did the Swedes gain by the intervention? Why did Richelieu send troops to fight in the war? What were the chief provisions of the Treaty of Westphalia? What were the other results of the war?

Section 114. What is the difference between modern scientific research and the spirit of the medieval universities? Describe the discoveries of Copernicus. What did Galileo accomplish? Give the views of Descartes. What was the position of Francis Bacon in regard to scientific research? What was the "House of Solomon"?

What societies were established for scientific investigation? Can you think of some of the effects that modern science has had on the lives of mankind?
STRUGGLE IN ENGLAND BETWEEN KING AND PARLIAMENT

Section 115. James I and the Divine Right of Kings

On the death of Elizabeth in 1603, James I, the first of the Scotch family of Stuart, ascended the throne. It will be remembered that he was the son of Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, and through her a descendant of Henry VII (see table, p. 634). In Scotland he reigned as James VI; consequently the two kingdoms were now brought together under the same ruler. This did not, however, make the relations between the two countries much more cordial than they had been in the past.

The chief interest of the period of the Stuarts, which began with the accession of James I in 1603 and ended with the flight from England of his grandson, James II, eighty-five years later, is the long and bitter struggle between the kings and Parliament. The vital question was, Should the Stuart kings, who claimed to be God's representatives on earth, do as they thought fit, or should Parliament control them and the government of the country?

We have seen how the English Parliament originated in the time of Edward I and how his successors were forced to pay attention to its wishes (see above, pp. 421 ff.). Under the Tudors—that is, from the time of Henry VII to Elizabeth—the monarchs had been able to manage Parliament so that it did, in general, just what they wished. Henry VIII was a heartless tyrant, and his daughter Elizabeth, like her father, had ruled the nation in a high-handed manner, but neither of them had been accustomed to say much of their rights.
James I, on the other hand, had a very irritating way of discussing his claim to be the sole and supreme ruler of England. "It is atheism and blasphemy," he declared, "to dispute what God can do; . . . so it is presumption and high contempt in a subject to dispute what a king can do, or say that a king cannot do this or that." James was a learned man and fond of writing books. Among them he published a work on monarchs, in which he claimed that the king could make any law he pleased without consulting Parliament; that he was the master of every one of his subjects, high and low, and might put to death whom he pleased. A good king would act according to law, but is not bound to do so and has the power to change the law at any time to suit himself.
These theories seem strange and very unreasonable to us, but James was only trying to justify the powers which the Tudor monarchs had actually exercised and which the kings of France enjoyed down to the French Revolution of 1789. According to the theory of "the divine right of kings" it had pleased God to appoint the monarch the father of his people. People must obey him as they would God and ask no questions. The king was responsible to God alone, to whom he owed his powers, not to Parliament or the nation (see below, p. 682).

It is unnecessary to follow the troubles between James I and Parliament, for his reign only forms the preliminary to the fatal experiences of his son Charles I, who came to the throne in 1625.

The writers of James's reign constituted its chief glory. They outshone those of any other European country. Shakespeare is generally admitted to be the greatest dramatist that the world has produced. While he wrote many of his plays before the death of Elizabeth, some of his finest — *Othello*, *King Lear*, and *The Tempest*, for example — belong to the time of James I. During the same period Francis Bacon (see above, p. 656) was writing his *Advancement of Learning*, which he dedicated to James I in 1605 and in which he urged that men should cease to rely upon the old textbooks, like Aristotle, and turn to a careful examination of animals, plants, and chemicals, with a view of learning about them and using the knowledge thus gained to improve the condition of mankind. Bacon's ability to write English is equal to that of Shakespeare, but he chose to write prose, not verse. It was in James's reign that the authorized English translation of the Bible was made which is still used in all countries where English is spoken.

An English physician of this period, William Harvey, examined the workings of the human body more carefully than any previous investigator and made the great discovery of the manner in which the blood circulates from the heart through the arteries and capillaries and back through the veins — a matter which had previously been entirely misunderstood.
Section 116. How Charles I Got Along without Parliament

Charles I, James I's son and successor, was somewhat more dignified than his father, but he was quite as obstinately set upon having his own way and showed no more skill in winning the confidence of his subjects. He did nothing to remove the disagreeable impressions of his father's reign and began immediately to quarrel with Parliament. When that body refused to grant him any money, mainly because they thought that it was likely to be wasted by his favorite, the Duke of Buckingham, Charles formed the plan of winning their favor by a great military victory.

He hoped to gain popularity by prosecuting a war against Spain, whose king was energetically supporting the Catholic League in the Thirty Years' War. Accordingly, in spite of Parliament's refusal to grant him the necessary funds, he embarked in war. With only the money which he could raise by irregular means, Charles arranged an expedition to capture the Spanish treasure ships which arrived in Cadiz once a year from America, laden with gold and silver; but this expedition failed.

In his attempts to raise money without a regular grant from Parliament, Charles resorted to vexatious exactions. The law prohibited him from asking for gifts from his people, but it did not forbid his asking them to lend him money, however little prospect there might be of his ever repaying it. Five gentlemen who refused to pay such a forced loan were imprisoned by the mere order of the king. This raised the question of whether the king had the right to send to prison those whom he wished without any legal reasons for their arrest.

This and other attacks upon the rights of his subjects aroused Parliament. In 1628 that body drew up the celebrated Petition of Right, which is one of the most important documents in the history of the English Constitution. In it Parliament called the king's attention to his unlawful exactions, and to the acts of
his agents who had in sundry ways molested and disquieted the people of the realm. Parliament therefore "humbly prayed" the king that no man need thereafter "make or yield any gift, loan, benevolence, tax, or such like charge" without consent of Parliament; that no free man should be imprisoned or suffer any punishment except according to the laws and statutes of the realm as presented in the Great Charter; and that soldiers should not be quartered upon the people on any pretext whatever. Very reluctantly Charles consented to this restatement of the limitations which the English had always, in theory at least, placed upon the arbitrary power of their king.

The disagreement between Charles and Parliament was rendered much more serious by religious differences. The king had married a French Catholic princess, and the Catholic cause seemed to be gaining on the Continent. The king of Denmark had just been defeated by Wallenstein and Tilly (see above, p. 647), and Richelieu had succeeded in depriving the Huguenots of their cities of refuge. Both James I and Charles I had shown their readiness to enter into agreements with France and Spain to protect Catholics in England, and there was evidently a growing inclination in England to revert to the older ceremonies of the

**Fig. 227. Charles I of England**

This portrait is by one of the greatest painters of the time, Anthony Van Dyck, 1599–1641 (see Fig. 229)
Church, which shocked the more strongly Protestant members of the House of Commons. The communion table was again placed by many clergymen at the eastern end of the church and became fixed there as an altar, and portions of the service were once more chanted.

These "popish practices," as the Protestants called them, with which Charles was supposed to sympathize, served to widen the breach between him and the Commons, which had been caused by the king's attempt to raise taxes on his own account. The Parliament of 1629, after a stormy session, was dissolved by the king, who determined to rule thereafter by himself. For eleven years no new Parliament was summoned.

Charles was not well fitted by nature to run the government of England by himself. He had not the necessary tireless energy. Moreover, the methods resorted to by his ministers to raise money without recourse to Parliament rendered the king more and more unpopular and prepared the way for the triumphant return of Parliament. For example, Charles applied to his subjects for "ship money." He was anxious to equip a fleet, but instead of requiring the various ports to furnish ships, as was the ancient custom, he permitted them to buy themselves off by contributing money to the fitting out of large ships owned by himself. Even those living inland were asked for ship money. The king maintained that this was not a tax but simply a payment by which his subjects freed themselves from the duty of defending their country.

John Hampden, a squire of Buckinghamshire, made a bold stand against this illegal demand by refusing to pay twenty shillings of ship money which was levied upon him. The case was tried before the king's judges, and he was convicted, but by a bare majority. The trial made it tolerably clear that the country would not put up long with the king's despotic policy.

In 1633 Charles made William Laud archbishop of Canterbury. Laud believed that the English Church would strengthen
Struggle in England between King and Parliament 665

both itself and the government by following a middle course, which should lie between that of the Church of Rome and that of Calvinistic Geneva. He declared that it was the part of good citizenship to conform outwardly to the services of the

William Laud made archbishop of Canterbury

Fig. 228. John Hampden

state church, but that the State should not undertake to oppress the individual conscience, and that every one should be at liberty to make up his own mind in regard to the interpretation to be given to the Bible and to the church fathers. As soon as he became archbishop he began a series of visitations through his province. Every clergyman who refused to conform to the
prayer book, or opposed the placing of the communion table at the east end of the church, or declined to bow at the name of Jesus, was, if obstinate, to be brought before the king’s special Court of High Commission to be tried and, if convicted, to be deprived of his position.

Laud’s conduct was no doubt gratifying to the High Church party among the Protestants, that is, those who still clung to some of the ancient practices of the Roman Church, although they rejected the doctrine of the Mass and refused to regard the Pope as their head. The Low Church party, or Puritans, on the contrary, regarded Laud and his policy with aversion. While, unlike the Presbyterians, they did not urge the abolition of the bishops, they disliked all “superstitious usages,” as they called the wearing of the surplice by the clergy, the use of the sign of the cross at baptism, the kneeling posture in partaking of the communion, and so forth. The Presbyterians, who are often confused with the Puritans, agreed with them in many respects, but went farther and demanded the introduction of Calvin’s system of church government.

Lastly, there was an ever-increasing number of Separatists, or Independents. These rejected both the organization of the Church of England and that of the Presbyterians, and desired that each religious community should organize itself independently. The government had forbidden these Separatists to hold their little meetings, which they called conventicles, and about 1600 some of them fled to Holland. The community of them which established itself at Leyden dispatched the Mayflower, in 1620, with colonists — since known as the Pilgrim Fathers — to the New World across the sea. It was these colonists who laid the foundations of a New England which has proved a worthy offspring of the mother country. The form of worship which they established in their new home is still known as Congregational.

1 The name “Puritan,” it should be noted, was applied loosely to the English Protestants, whether Low Churchmen, Presbyterians, or Independents, who aroused the antagonism of their neighbors by advocating a godly life and opposing popular pastimes, especially on Sunday.
SECTION 117. HOW CHARLES I LOST HIS HEAD

In 1640 Charles found himself forced to summon Parliament, for he was involved in a war with Scotland which he could not carry on without money. There the Presbyterian system had been pretty generally introduced by John Knox in Elizabeth’s time (see above, p. 640). An attempt on the part of Charles to force the Scots to accept a modified form of the English prayer book led to the signing of the National Covenant in 1638. This pledged those who attached their names to it to reestablish the purity and liberty of the Gospel, which, to most of the Covenanter, meant Presbyterianism.

Charles thereupon undertook to coerce the Scots. Having no money, he bought on credit a large cargo of pepper, which had just arrived in the ships of the East India Company, and sold it cheap for ready cash. The soldiers, however, whom he got together showed little inclination to fight the Scots, with whom they were in tolerable agreement on religious matters. Charles was therefore at last obliged to summon a Parliament, which, owing to the length of time it remained in session, is known as the Long Parliament.

The Long Parliament began by imprisoning Archbishop Laud in the Tower of London. They declared him guilty of treason, and he was executed in 1645, in spite of Charles’s efforts to save him. Parliament also tried to strengthen its position by passing the Triennial Bill, which provided that it should meet at least once in three years, even if not summoned by the king. In fact, Charles’s whole system of government was abrogated. Parliament drew up a “Grand Remonstrance” in which all of Charles’s errors were enumerated and a demand was made that the king’s ministers should thereafter be responsible to Parliament. This document Parliament ordered to be printed and circulated throughout the country.

Exasperated at the conduct of the Commons. Charles attempted to intimidate the opposition by undertaking to arrest
Charles's attempts to arrest five members of the House of Commons

five of its most active leaders, whom he declared to be traitors. But when he entered the House of Commons and looked around for his enemies, he found that they had taken shelter in London, whose citizens later brought them back in triumph to Westminster, where Parliament held its meetings.

![Fig. 229. Children of Charles I](image)

This very interesting picture, by the Flemish artist Van Dyck, was painted in 1637. The boy with his hand on the dog's head was destined to become Charles II of England. Next on the left is the prince, who was later James II. The girl to the extreme left, the Princess Mary, married the governor of the United Netherlands, and her son became William III of England in 1688 (see below, p. 678). The two princesses on the right died in childhood.

Both Charles and Parliament now began to gather troops for the inevitable conflict, and England was plunged into civil war. Those who supported Charles were called *Cavaliers.* They included not only most of the aristocracy and the Catholic party, but also a number of members of the House of Commons who were fearful lest Presbyterianism should succeed in
doing away with the English Church. The parliamentary party was popularly known as the Roundheads, since some of them cropped their hair close because of their dislike for the long locks of their more aristocratic and worldly opponents.

The Roundheads soon found a distinguished leader in Oliver Cromwell (b. 1599), a country gentleman and member of Parliament, who was later to become the most powerful ruler of his time. Cromwell organized a compact army of God-fearing men, who were not permitted to indulge in profane words or light talk, as is the wont of soldiers, but advanced upon their enemies singing psalms. The king enjoyed the support of northern England, and also looked for help from Ireland, where the royal and Catholic causes were popular.

The war continued for several years, and a number of battles were fought which, after the first year, went in general against the Cavaliers. The most important of these were the battle of Marston Moor in 1644, and that of Naseby the next year, in which the king was disastrously defeated. The enemy came into possession of his correspondence, which showed them how their king had been endeavoring to bring armies from France and Ireland into England. This encouraged Parliament to prosecute the war with more energy than ever. The king, defeated on every hand, put himself in the hands of the Scotch army which had come to the aid of Parliament (1646), and the Scotch soon turned him over to Parliament. During the next two years Charles was held in captivity.

There were, however, many in the House of Commons who still sided with the king, and in December, 1648, that body declared for a reconciliation with the monarch, whom they had safely imprisoned in the Isle of Wight. The next day Colonel Pride, representing the army, — which constituted a party in itself and was opposed to all negotiations between the king and the Commons, — stood at the door of the House with a body of soldiers and excluded all the members who took the side of the king. This outrageous act is known in history as "Pride's Purge."
In this way the House of Commons was brought completely under the control of those most bitterly hostile to the king, whom they immediately proposed to bring to trial. They declared that the House of Commons, since it was chosen by the people, was supreme in England and the source of all just power, and that consequently neither king nor House of Lords was necessary. The mutilated House of Commons appointed a special High Court of Justice made up of Charles’s sternest opponents, who alone would consent to sit in judgment on him. They passed sentence upon him, and on January 30, 1649, Charles was beheaded in front of his palace of Whitehall, London. It must be clear from the above account that it was not the nation at large which demanded Charles’s death, but a very small group of extremists who claimed to be the representatives of the nation.

Section 118. Oliver Cromwell: England a Commonwealth

The “Rump Parliament,” as the remnant of the House of Commons was contemptuously called, proclaimed England to be thereafter a “commonwealth,” that is, a republic, without a king or House of Lords. But Cromwell, the head of the army, was nevertheless the real ruler of England. He derived his main support from the Independents; and it is very surprising that he was able to maintain himself so long, considering what a small portion of the English people was in sympathy with the religious ideas of that sect and with the abolition of kingship. Even the Presbyterians were on the side of Charles I’s son, Charles II, the legal heir to the throne. Cromwell was a vigorous and skillful administrator and had a well-organized army of fifty thousand men at his command, otherwise the republic could scarcely have lasted more than a few months.

Cromwell found himself confronted by every variety of difficulty. The three kingdoms had fallen apart. The nobles and Catholics in Ireland proclaimed Charles II as king, and Ormond,
a Protestant leader, formed an army of Irish Catholics and English royalist Protestants with a view of overthrowing the Commonwealth. Cromwell accordingly set out for Ireland, where, after taking Drogheda, he mercilessly slaughtered two thousand of the "barbarous wretches," as he called them. Town after town surrendered to Cromwell's army, and in 1652, after much cruelty, the island was once more conquered. A large part of it was confiscated for the benefit of the English, and the Catholic landowners were driven into the mountains. In the meantime (1650) Charles II, who had taken refuge in France, had landed in Scotland, and upon his agreeing to be a Presbyterian king, the whole Scotch nation was ready to support him. But Scotland was subdued by Cromwell even more promptly than Ireland had been.
So completely was the Scottish army destroyed that Cromwell found no need to draw the sword again in the British Isles.

**Fig. 231. Great Seal of England under the Commonwealth, 1651**

This seal is reduced considerably in the reproduction. It gives us an idea of the appearance of a session of the House of Commons when England was for a short period a republic. It is still to-day the custom for members to sit with their hats on, except when making a speech.

Although it would seem that Cromwell had enough to keep him busy at home, he had already engaged in a victorious foreign war against the Dutch, who had become dangerous commercial rivals of England. The ships which went out from
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Amsterdam and Rotterdam were the best merchant vessels in the world and had got control of the carrying trade between Europe and the colonies. In order to put an end to this, the English Parliament passed the Navigation Act (1651), which permitted only English vessels to bring goods to England, unless the goods came in vessels belonging to the country which had produced them. This led to a commercial war between Holland and England, and a series of battles was fought between the English and Dutch fleets, in which sometimes one and sometimes the other gained the upper hand. This war is notable as the first example of the commercial struggles which were thereafter to take the place of the religious conflicts of the preceding period.

Cromwell failed to get along with Parliament any better than Charles I had done. The Rump Parliament had become very unpopular, for its members, in spite of their boasted piety, accepted bribes and were zealous in the promotion of their relatives in the public service. At last Cromwell upbraided them angrily for their injustice and self-interest, which were injuring the public cause. On being interrupted by a member, he cried out, "Come, come, we have had enough of this! I'll put an end to this. It's not fit that you should sit here any longer," and calling in his soldiers he turned the members out of the House and sent them home. Having thus made an end of the Long Parliament (April, 1653), he summoned a Parliament of his own, made up of "God-fearing" men whom he and the officers of his army chose. This extraordinary body is known as Barebone's Parliament, from a distinguished member, a London merchant, with the characteristically Puritan name of Praisegod Barebone. Many of these godly men were unpractical and hard to deal with. A minority of the more sensible ones got up early one winter morning (December, 1653) and, before their opponents had a chance to protest, declared Parliament dissolved and placed the supreme authority in the hands of Cromwell.
For nearly five years Cromwell was, as Lord Protector,—a title equivalent to that of Regent,—practically king of England, although he refused actually to accept the royal insignia. He did not succeed in permanently organizing the government at home but showed remarkable ability in his foreign negotiations. He formed an alliance with France, and English troops aided the French in winning a great victory over Spain. England gained thereby Dunkirk, and the West Indian island of Jamaica.
The French king, Louis XIV, at first hesitated to address Cromwell, in the usual courteous way of monarchs, as "my cousin," but soon admitted that he would have even to call Cromwell "father" should he wish it, as the Protector was undoubtedly the most powerful person in Europe. Indeed, he found himself forced to play the part of a monarch, and it seemed to many persons that he was quite as despotic as James I and Charles I.

In May, 1658, Cromwell fell ill, and as a great storm passed over England at that time, the Cavaliers asserted that the devil had come to fetch home the soul of the usurper. Cromwell was dying, it is true, but he was no instrument of the devil. He closed a life of honest effort for his fellow beings with a last touching prayer to God, whom he had consistently sought to serve: "Thou hast made me, though very unworthy, a mean instrument to do Thy people some good and Thee service; and many of them have set too high a value upon me, though others wish and would be glad of my death. Pardon such as desire to trample upon the dust of a poor worm, for they are Thy people too: and pardon the folly of this short prayer, even for Jesus Christ's sake, and give us a good night, if it be Thy pleasure. Amen."
SECTION 119. THE RESTORATION

After Cromwell's death his son Richard, who succeeded him, found himself unable to carry on the government. He soon abdicated, and the remnants of the Long Parliament met once more. But the power was really in the hands of the soldiers. In 1660 George Monk, who was in command of the forces in Scotland, came to London with a view of putting an end to the anarchy. He soon concluded that no one cared to support the Rump, and that body peacefully disbanded of its own accord. Resistance would have been vain in any case with the army against it. The nation was glad to acknowledge Charles II, whom every one preferred to a government by soldiers. A new Parliament, composed of both houses, was assembled, which welcomed a messenger from the king and solemnly resolved that, "according to the ancient and fundamental laws of this kingdom, the government is, and ought to be, by king, lords, and commons." Thus the Puritan revolution and the short-lived republic was followed by the Restoration of the Stuarts.

Charles II was quite as fond as his father of having his own way, but he was a man of more ability. He disliked to be ruled by Parliament, but, unlike his father, he was too wise to arouse the nation against him. He did not propose to let anything happen which would send him on his travels again. He and his courtiers were fond of pleasure of a light-minded kind. The immoral dramas of the Restoration seem to indicate that those who had been forced by the Puritans to give up their legitimate pleasures now welcomed the opportunity to indulge in reckless gayety without regard to the bounds imposed by custom and decency.

Charles's first Parliament was a moderate body, but his second was made up almost wholly of Cavaliers, and it got along, on the whole, so well with the king that he did not dissolve it for eighteen years. It did not take up the old question, which was still unsettled, as to whether Parliament or the king was really
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It showed its hostility, however, to the Puritans by a series of intolerant acts, which are very important in English history. It ordered that no one should hold a town office who had not received the communion according to the rites of the Church of England. This was aimed at both the Presbyterians and the Independents. By the Act of Uniformity (1662) every clergyman who refused to accept everything contained in the Book of Common Prayer was to be excluded from holding his benefice. Two thousand clergymen thereupon resigned their positions for conscience’ sake.

These laws tended to throw all those Protestants who refused to conform to the Church of England into a single class, still known to-day as Dissenters. It included the Independents, the Presbyterians, and the newer bodies of the Baptists and the Society of Friends, commonly known as Quakers. These sects abandoned any idea of controlling the religion or politics of the country, and asked only that they might be permitted to worship in their own way outside of the English Church.

Toleration found an unexpected ally in the king, who, in spite of his dissolute habits, had interest enough in religion to have secret leanings toward Catholicism. He asked Parliament to permit him to moderate the rigor of the Act of Uniformity by making some exceptions. He even issued a declaration in the interest of toleration, with a view of bettering the position of the Catholics and Dissenters. Suspicion was, however, aroused lest this toleration might lead to the restoration of “popery,” — as the Protestants called the Catholic beliefs,— and Parliament passed the harsh Conventicle Act (1664).

Any adult attending a conventicle — that is to say, any religious meeting not held in accordance with the practice of the English Church — was liable to penalties which might culminate in transportation to some distant colony. Samuel Pepys, who saw some of the victims of this law upon their way to a terrible exile, notes in his famous diary: “They go like lambs without any resistance. I would to God that they would conform, or be
more wise and not be caught.” A few years later Charles II issued a declaration giving complete religious liberty to Roman Catholics as well as to Dissenters. Parliament not only forced him to withdraw this enlightened measure but passed the Test Act, which excluded every one from public office who did not accept the views of the English Church.

The old war with Holland, begun by Cromwell, was renewed under Charles II, who was earnestly desirous to increase English commerce and to found new colonies. The two nations were very evenly matched on the sea, but in 1664 the English seized some of the West Indian Islands from the Dutch and also their colony on Manhattan Island, which was re-named New York in honor of the king’s brother, the Duke of York. In 1667 a treaty was signed by England and Holland which confirmed these conquests.

**Section 120. The Revolution of 1688**

Upon Charles II’s death he was succeeded by his brother, James II, who was an avowed Catholic and had married, as his second wife, Mary of Modena, who was also a Catholic. He was ready to reëstablish Catholicism in England regardless of what it might cost him. Mary, James’s daughter by his first wife, had married her cousin, William III, Prince of Orange, the head of the United Netherlands. The nation might have tolerated James so long as they could look forward to the accession of his Protestant daughter. But when a son was born to his Catholic second wife, and James showed unmistakably his purpose of favoring the Catholics, messengers were dispatched by a group of Protestants to William of Orange, asking him to come and rule over them.

William landed in November, 1688, and marched upon London, where he received general support from all the English Protestants, regardless of party. James II started to oppose William, but his army refused to fight and his courtiers deserted
William was glad to forward James's flight to France, as he would hardly have known what to do with him had James insisted on remaining in the country. A new Parliament declared the throne vacant, on the ground that King James II, "by the advice of the Jesuits and other wicked persons, having violated the fundamental laws and withdrawn himself out of the kingdom, had abdicated the government."

A Bill of Rights was then drawn up, condemning James's violation of the constitution and appointing William and Mary joint sovereigns. The Bill of Rights, which is an important monument in English constitutional history, once more stated the fundamental rights of the English nation and the limitations which the Petition of Right and Magna Charta had placed upon the king. By this peaceful revolution of 1688 the English rid themselves of the Stuarts and their claims to rule by divine right, and once more declared themselves against the rule of the Pope.

A bill of toleration was passed by Parliament which freed Dissenters from all penalties for failing to attend services in Anglican churches and allowed them to have their own meetings. Even Catholics, while not included in the act of toleration, were permitted to hold services undisturbed by the government.

**QUESTIONS**

**Section 115.** What was the great issue during the period of the Stuarts? What were the views of kingship held by James I? Mention some of the books of his time.

**Section 116.** What policy did Charles I adopt in regard to Parliament? What was the Petition of Right? What were the chief
religious parties in England in the time of Charles I? Who was John Hampden? Mention some of the religious sects that date from that time which still exist in the United States.

Section 117. What measures did the Long Parliament take against the king? Describe the civil war. What led to the execution of Charles I?

Section 118. What were the chief events during Cromwell's administration? What are your impressions of Cromwell?

Section 119. What led to the restoration of the Stuarts? What was the attitude of Charles II toward the religious difficulties? Who were the Dissenters?

Section 120. Why was James II unpopular? Give an account of the revolution which put William and Mary on the English throne.
CHAPTER XXVIII
FRANCE UNDER LOUIS XIV

Section 121. Position and Character of Louis XIV

Under the despotic rule of Louis XIV (1643–1715) France enjoyed a commanding influence in European affairs. After the wars of religion were over, the royal authority had been reëstablished by the wise conduct of Henry IV. Later, Richelieu had solidified the monarchy by depriving the Huguenots of the exceptional privileges granted to them for their protection by Henry IV; he had also destroyed the fortified castles of the nobles, whose power had greatly increased during the turmoil of the Huguenot wars. His successor, Cardinal Mazarin, who conducted the government during Louis XIV’s boyhood, was able to put down a last rising of the discontented nobility.

When Mazarin died, in 1661, he left the young monarch with a kingdom such as no previous French king had enjoyed. The nobles, who for centuries had disputed the power with the king, were no longer feudal lords but only courtiers. The Huguenots, whose claim to a place in the State beside the Catholics had led to the terrible civil wars of the sixteenth century, were reduced in numbers and no longer held fortified towns from which they could defy the king’s officers. Richelieu and Mazarin had successfully taken a hand in the Thirty Years’ War, and France had come out of it with enlarged territory and increased importance in European affairs.

Louis XIV carried the work of these great ministers still farther. He gave that form to the French monarchy which it retained until the French Revolution. He made himself the very mirror of kingship. His marvelous court at Versailles became...
the model and the despair of other less opulent and powerful princes, who accepted his theory of the absolute power of kings but could not afford to imitate his luxury. By his incessant wars he kept Europe in turmoil for over half a century. The distinguished generals who led his newly organized troops, and the wily diplomats who arranged his alliances and negotiated his

Fig. 234. Louis XIV

treaties, made France feared and respected by even the most powerful of the other European states.

Louis XIV had the same idea of kingship that James I had tried in vain to induce the English people to accept. God had given kings to men, and it was His will that monarchs should be regarded as His lieutenants and that all those subject to them should obey them absolutely, without asking any questions or making any criticisms; for in submitting to their prince they were really submitting to God Himself. If the king were good
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and wise, his subjects should thank the Lord; if he proved foolish, cruel, or perverse, they must accept their evil ruler as a punishment which God had sent them for their sins. But in no case might they limit his power or rise against him.¹

Louis XIV had two great advantages over James I. In the first place, the English nation has always shown itself far more reluctant than France to place absolute power in the hands of its rulers. By its Parliament, its courts, and its various declarations of the nation’s rights, it had built up traditions which made it impossible for the Stuarts to establish their claim to be absolute rulers. In France, on the other hand, there was no Great Charter or Bill of Rights; the Estates General did not hold the purse strings, and the king was permitted to raise money without asking their permission or previously redressing the grievances which they chose to point out. They were therefore only summoned at irregular intervals. When Louis XIV took charge of the government, forty-seven years had passed without a meeting of the Estates General, and a century and a quarter was still to elapse before another call to the representatives of the nation was issued in 1789.

Moreover, the French people placed far more reliance upon a powerful king than the English, perhaps because they were not protected by the sea from their neighbors, as England was. On every side France had enemies ready to take advantage of any weakness or hesitation which might arise from dissension between a parliament and the king. So the French felt it best, on the whole, to leave all in the king’s hands, even if they suffered at times from his tyranny.

Louis had another great advantage over James. He was a handsome man, of elegant and courtly mien and the most exquisite perfection of manner; even when playing billiards he is said to have retained an air of world mastery. The first of

1 Louis XIV does not appear to have himself used the famous expression “I am the State,” usually attributed to him, but it exactly corresponds to his idea of the relation of the king and the State.
the Stuarts, on the contrary, was a very awkward man, whose slouching gait, intolerable manners, and pedantic conversation were utterly at variance with his lofty pretensions. Louis added, moreover, to his graceful exterior a sound judgment and quick apprehension. He said neither too much nor too little. He was, for a king, a hard worker and spent several hours a day attending to the business of government.

It requires, in fact, a great deal of energy and application to be a real despot. In order thoroughly to understand and to solve

![Facade of the Palace of Versailles](image)

**Fig. 235. Façade of the Palace of Versailles**

the problems which constantly face the ruler of a great state, a monarch must, like Frederick the Great or Napoleon, rise early and toil late. Louis XIV was greatly aided by the able ministers who sat in his council, but he always retained for himself the place of first minister. He would never have consented to be dominated by an adviser, as his father had been by Richelieu. "The profession of the king," he declared, "is great, noble, and delightful if one but feels equal to performing the duties which it involves," — and he never harbored a doubt that he himself was born for the business.
Section 122. How Louis encouraged Art and Literature

Louis XIV was careful that his surroundings should suit the grandeur of his office. His court was magnificent beyond anything that had been dreamed of in the West. He had an enormous palace constructed at Versailles, just outside of Paris, with interminable halls and apartments and a vast garden stretching away behind it. About this a town was laid out, where those who were privileged to be near his majesty or supply the wants of the royal court lived. This palace and its outlying buildings, including two or three less gorgeous residences for the king when he occasionally tired of the ceremony of Versailles, probably cost the nation about a hundred million dollars, in spite of the fact that thousands of peasants and soldiers were forced to turn to and work without pay. The furnishings and decorations were as rich and costly as the palace was splendid and still fill the visitor with wonder. For
over a century Versailles continued to be the home of the French kings and the seat of their government.

This splendor and luxury helped to attract the nobility, who no longer lived on their estates in well-fortified castles, planning how they might escape the royal control. They now dwelt in the effulgence of the king's countenance. They saw him to bed at night and in stately procession they greeted him in the morning. It was deemed a high honor to hand him his shirt as he was being dressed or, at dinner, to provide him with a fresh napkin. Only by living close to the king could the courtiers hope to gain favors, pensions, and lucrative offices for themselves and their friends, and perhaps occasionally to exercise some little influence upon the policy of the government. For they were now entirely dependent upon the good will of their monarch.

The reforms which Louis XIV carried out in the earlier part of his reign were largely the work of the great financier Colbert, to whom France still looks back with gratitude. He early
discovered that the king's officials were stealing and wasting vast sums. The offenders were arrested and forced to disgorge, and a new system of bookkeeping was introduced, similar to that employed by business men. He then turned his attention to increasing the manufactures of France by establishing new industries and seeing that the older ones kept to a high standard, which would make French goods sell readily in foreign markets. He argued justly that if foreigners could be induced to buy French goods, these sales would bring gold and silver into the country and so enrich it. He made rigid rules as to the width and quality of cloths which the manufacturers might produce and the dyes which they might use. He even reorganized the old medieval guilds; for through them the government could keep its eye on all the manufacturing that was done; this would have been far more difficult if every one had been free to carry on any trade which he might choose.

It was, however, as a patron of art and literature that Louis XIV gained much of his celebrity. Molière, who was at once a playwright and an actor, delighted the court with comedies in which he delicately satirized the foibles of his time. Corneille, who had gained renown by the great tragedy of The Cid in Richelieu's time, found a worthy successor in Racine, the most distinguished, perhaps, of French tragic poets. The charming letters of Madame de Sévigné are models of prose style and serve at the same time to give us a glimpse into the more refined life of the court circle. In the famous memoirs of Saint-Simon, the weaknesses of the king, as well as the numberless intrigues of the courtiers, are freely exposed with inimitable skill and wit.

Men of letters were generously aided by the king with pensions. Colbert encouraged the French Academy, which had been created by Richelieu. This body gave special attention to making the French tongue more eloquent and expressive by determining what words should be used. It is now the greatest honor that a Frenchman can obtain to be made one of the forty members of this association. A magazine which still exists,
the journal des Savants, was founded for the promotion of science at this time. Colbert had an astronomical observatory built at Paris; and the Royal Library, which only possessed about sixteen thousand volumes, began to grow into that great collection of two and a half million volumes—by far the largest in existence—which to-day attracts scholars to Paris from all parts of the world. In short, Louis XIV and his ministers believed one of the chief objects of any government to be the promotion of art, literature, and science, and the example they set has been followed by almost every modern state.

Section 123. LOUIS XIV ATTACKS HIS NEIGHBORS

Unfortunately for France, the king’s ambitions were by no means exclusively peaceful. Indeed, he regarded his wars as his chief glory. He employed a carefully reorganized army and the skill of his generals in a series of inexcusable attacks on his neighbors, in which he finally squandered all that Colbert’s economies had accumulated and led France to the edge of financial ruin.

Louis XIV’s predecessors had had, on the whole, little time to think of conquest. They had first to consolidate their realms and gain the mastery of their feudal dependents, who shared the power with them; then the claims of the English Edwards and Henrys had to be met, and the French provinces freed from their clutches; lastly, the great religious dispute was only settled after many years of disintegrating civil war. But Louis XIV was now at liberty to look about him and consider how he might best realize the dream of his ancestors and perhaps reëstablish the ancient boundaries which Cæsar reported that the Gauls had occupied. The “natural limits” of France appeared to be the Rhine on the north and east, the Jura Mountains and the Alps on the southeast, and to the south the Mediterranean and the Pyrenees. Richelieu had believed that it was the chief end of his ministry to restore to France the boundaries determined for it by nature. Mazarin had labored hard to win Savoy
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and Nice and to reach the Rhine on the north. Before his death France at least gained Alsace and reached the Pyrenees, “which,” as the treaty with Spain says (1659), “formerly divided the Gauls from Spain.”

Louis XIV first turned his attention to the conquest of the Spanish Netherlands, to which he laid claim through his wife, the elder sister of the Spanish king, Charles II (1665-1700). In 1667 he surprised Europe by publishing a little treatise in which he set forth his claims not only to the Spanish Netherlands, but even to the whole Spanish monarchy. By confounding the kingdom of France with the old empire of the Franks he could maintain that the people of the Netherlands were his subjects.

Louis placed himself at the head of the army which he had re-formed and reorganized, and announced that he was to undertake a “journey,” as if his invasion was only an expedition into another part of his undisputed realms. He easily took a number of towns on the border of the Netherlands and then turned south and completely conquered Franche-Comté. This was an outlying province of Spain, isolated from her other lands, and a most tempting morsel for the hungry king of France.¹

These conquests alarmed Europe, and especially Holland, which could not afford to have the barrier between it and France removed, for Louis XIV would be an uncomfortable neighbor. A Triple Alliance, composed of Holland, England, and Sweden, was accordingly organized to induce France to make peace with Spain. Louis contented himself for the moment with the dozen border towns that he had taken and which Spain ceded to him on condition that he would return Franche-Comté.

The success with which Holland had held her own against the navy of England and brought the proud king of France to a halt produced an elation on the part of that tiny country which was very aggravating to Louis XIV. He was thoroughly vexed that he should have been blocked by so trifling an obstacle as Dutch intervention. He consequently conceived a

¹ See above, pp. 573 and 649.
strong dislike for the United Provinces, which was increased by the protection that they afforded to writers who annoyed him with their attacks. He broke up the Triple Alliance by inducing Charles II of England to conclude a treaty which pledged England to help France in a new war against the Dutch.

Louis XIV then startled Europe again by seizing the duchy of Lorraine, which brought him to the border of Holland. At the head of a hundred thousand men he crossed the Rhine (1672) and easily conquered southern Holland. For the moment the Dutch cause appeared to be lost. But William of Orange showed the spirit of his great ancestor William the Silent; the sluices in the dikes were opened and the country flooded, so the French army was checked before it could take Amsterdam and advance into the north. The Emperor sent an army against Louis, and England deserted him and made peace with Holland.

When a general peace was concluded at the end of six years, the chief provisions were that Holland should be left intact, and that France should this time retain Franche-Comté, which had been conquered by Louis XIV in person. This bit of the Burgundian heritage thus became at last a part of France, after France and Spain had quarreled over it for a century and a half. For the ten years following there was no open war, but Louis seized the important free city of Strassburg and made many other less conspicuous but equally unwarranted additions to his territory. The Emperor was unable to do more than protest against these outrageous encroachments, for he was fully occupied with the Turks, who had just laid siege to Vienna.

Section 124. Louis XIV and His Protestant Subjects

Louis XIV exhibited as woeful a want of statesmanship in the treatment of his Protestant subjects as in the prosecution of disastrous wars. The Huguenots, deprived of their former military and political power, had turned to manufacture, trade,
and banking; "as rich as a Huguenot" had become a proverb in France. There were perhaps a million of them among fifteen million Frenchmen, and they undoubtedly formed by far the most thrifty and enterprising part of the nation. The Catholic clergy, however, did not cease to urge the complete suppression of heresy.

Louis XIV had scarcely taken the reins of government into his own hands before the perpetual nagging and injustice to which the Protestants had been subjected at all times took a more serious form. Upon one pretense or another their churches were demolished. Children were authorized to renounce Protestantism when they reached the age of seven. Rough dragoons were quartered upon the Huguenots with the hope that the insulting behavior of the soldiers might frighten the heretics into accepting the religion of the king.

At last Louis XIV was led by his officials to believe that practically all the Huguenots had been converted by these harsh measures. In 1685, therefore, he revoked the Edict of Nantes, and the Protestants thereby became outlaws and their ministers subject to the death penalty. Even liberal-minded Catholics, like the kindly writer of fables, La Fontaine, and the charming letter writer, Madame de Sévigné, hailed this re-establishment of "religious unity" with delight. They believed that only an insignificant and seditious remnant still clung to the beliefs of Calvin. But there could have been no more serious mistake. Thousands of the Huguenots succeeded in eluding the vigilance of the royal officials and fled, some to England, some to Prussia, some to America, carrying with them their skill and industry to strengthen France's rivals. This was the last great and terrible example in western Europe of that fierce religious intolerance which had produced the Albigensian Crusade, the Spanish Inquisition, and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew.

Louis XIV now set his heart upon conquering the Palatinate, a Protestant land, to which he easily discovered that he had a claim. The rumor of his intention and the indignation occasioned...
in Protestant countries by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes resulted in an alliance against the French king headed by William of Orange. Louis speedily justified the suspicions of Europe by a frightful devastation of the Palatinate, burning whole towns and destroying many castles, including the exceptionally beautiful one of the elector at Heidelberg. Ten years later, however, Louis agreed to a peace which put things back as they were before the struggle began. He was preparing for the final and most ambitious undertaking of his life, which precipitated the longest and bloodiest war of all his warlike reign.

Section 125. War of the Spanish Succession

The question of the Spanish succession

The king of Spain, Charles II, was childless and brotherless, and Europe had long been discussing what would become of his vast realms when his sickly existence should come to an end. Louis XIV had married one of his sisters, and the Emperor, Leopold I, another, and these two ambitious rulers had been considering for some time how they might divide the Spanish possessions between the Bourbons and the Hapsburgs. But when Charles II died, in 1700, it was discovered that he had left a will in which he made Louis's younger grandson, Philip, the heir to his twenty-two crowns, but on the condition that France and Spain should never be united.

It was a weighty question whether Louis XIV should permit his grandson to accept this hazardous honor. Should Philip become king of Spain, Louis and his family would control all of southwestern Europe from Holland to Sicily, as well as a great part of North and South America. This would mean the establishment of an empire more powerful than that of Charles V. It was clear that the disinherited Emperor and the ever watchful William of Orange, now king of England (see above, p. 678), would never permit this unprecedented extension of French influence. They had already shown themselves ready to make great sacrifices in order to check far less serious aggressions on
the part of the French king. Nevertheless, family pride and personal ambition led Louis criminally to risk the welfare of his country. He accepted the will and informed the Spanish ambassador at the French court that he might salute Philip V as his new king. The leading French newspaper of the time boldly proclaimed that the Pyrenees were no more.

King William soon succeeded in forming a new Grand Alliance (1701) in which Louis's old enemies, England, Holland, and the Emperor, were the most important members. William himself died just as hostilities were beginning, but the long War of the Spanish Succession was carried on vigorously by the great English general, the Duke of Marlborough, and the Austrian commander, Eugene of Savoy. The conflict was more general than the Thirty Years' War; even in America there was fighting between French and English colonists, which passes in American histories under the name of Queen Anne's War. All the more important battles went against the French, and after ten years of war, which was rapidly ruining the country by the destruction of its people and its wealth, Louis XIV was willing to consider some compromise, and after long discussion a peace was arranged in 1713.

The Treaty of Utrecht changed the map of Europe as no previous treaty had done, not even that of Westphalia. Each of the chief combatants got his share of the Spanish booty over which they had been fighting. The Bourbon Philip V was permitted to retain Spain and its colonies on condition that the Spanish and French crowns should never rest on the same head. To Austria fell the Spanish Netherlands, hereafter called the Austrian Netherlands, which continued to form a barrier between Holland and France. Holland received certain fortresses to make its position still more secure. The Spanish possessions in Italy, that is, Naples and Milan, were also given to Austria, and in this way Austria got the hold on Italy which it retained until 1866. From France, England acquired Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, and the Hudson Bay region, and so
began the expulsion of the French from North America. Besides these American provinces she received the rock and fortress of Gibraltar, which still gives her command of the narrow entrance to the Mediterranean.

The period of Louis XIV is remarkable for the development of international law. The incessant wars and great alliances embracing several powers made increasingly clear the need of well-defined rules governing states in their relations with one another both in peace and in war. It was of the utmost importance to determine, for instance, the rights of ambassadors and of the vessels of neutral powers not engaged in the war, and what should be considered fair conduct in warfare and in the treatment of prisoners.

The first great systematic treatise on international law was published by Grotius in 1625, when the horrors of the Thirty Years' War were impressing men's minds with the necessity of finding some means other than war of settling disputes between nations. While the rules laid down by Grotius and later writers have, as we must sadly admit, by no means put an end to war, they have prevented many conflicts by increasing the ways in which nations may come to an understanding with one another through their ambassadors without recourse to arms.

Louis XIV outlived his son and his grandson and left a sadly demoralized kingdom to his five-year-old great-grandson, Louis XV (1715–1774). The national treasury was depleted, the people were reduced in numbers and were in a miserable state, and the army, once the finest in Europe, was in no condition to gain further victories.

We have now reviewed the long history of western Europe from the remote period when the makers of the fist-hatchet wandered naked through the tropical jungles which then covered France to the days when Louis XIV and his elegant courtiers rolled in their splendid coaches amid the carefully tended gardens and sparkling fountains of Versailles. It is the story of
fifty thousand years. In the following volume we shall have but two hundred years to traverse—a moment only in the history of mankind, but fraught with such momentous changes that they seem almost to eclipse all those that occurred between the building of the pyramids and the erection of the palace of Versailles. The whole world has now been explored by Europeans and has become so closely united in interest that a war between two European powers endangers the happiness of people in the most distant portions of the globe. The science which began to flourish in the reign of Louis XIV has not only revolutionized our conception of the universe but it has, through modern inventions, so altered our lives and ideals that we seem to live in a different world from that of the early eighteenth century. It is the purpose of Part II of the Outlines to show the nature and progress of these changes, to put us in a position to understand the great problems which now face mankind, and to encourage us to do our part in solving them.

QUESTIONS

SECTION 121. What did Richelieu accomplish in strengthening the French monarchy? What were Louis XIV's ideas of kingship? Why did the French view the "divine right of kings" differently from the English? Contrast Louis XIV with James I.

SECTION 122. Describe the palace of Versailles. What were the chief reforms of Colbert? Mention some of the great writers of Louis XIV's time. How did the government aid scholarship and science?

SECTION 123. What led Louis XIV to attack his neighbors? What are the "natural" boundaries of France? What country did Louis first attack? What additions did he make to French territory?

SECTION 124. What was the policy of Louis XIV toward the Huguenots? Who were Louis XIV's chief enemies?

SECTION 125. What were the causes of the War of the Spanish Succession? What were the chief changes provided for in the Treaty of Utrecht?
BIBLIOGRAPHY

It is not the aim of this bibliography to mention all of even the important books in various languages that relate to the period in question. The writers are well aware that teachers are busy people and that high-school libraries and local public libraries usually furnish at best only a few historical works. It is therefore most important that those books should be given prominence in this list which the teacher has some chance of procuring and finding the time to use. It not infrequently happens that the best account of a particular period or topic is in a foreign language or in a rare publication, such as a doctor's dissertation, which could only be found in one of our largest libraries. All such titles, however valuable, are omitted from this list. They can be found mentioned in all the more scholarly works in the various fields.

PART I

EARLIEST MAN, THE ORIENT, GREECE AND ROME

The ancient world seems so remote and unreal to the young student who is taking it up for the first time that it is very necessary to emphasize strongly the reality of man's early career. This can be done in a number of ways, but most effectively by visualization. If a class of high-school boys and girls could be taken through the British Museum and shown the tools and implements used by early man, the letters dictated by Hammurapi to his secretary and written on clay in 2100 B.C., and the letters written by Roman citizens in the days when the apostles were preaching early Christianity; or if they could enter the National Museum at Cairo and look into the very flesh and blood faces of Egyptian kings who ruled the Orient centuries before Moses lived; or if our young people could visit the Berlin Museum and see there, cut in stone, relief pictures of the Egyptian ships which sailed the Mediterranean in the thirtieth century B.C., there would be little difficulty in impressing these visitors with the reality of the ancient world, and the importance of the inheritance which the early world has left us.
In lieu of such museum visits, or travels among ancient cities, the treatment of the ancient world in this book has been very plentifully sprinkled with illustrations to supplement the text. The fact cannot be too strongly emphasized that a careful study of the illustrations belongs to every lesson assigned. The explanatory matter under each figure should be thoroughly studied in connection with the accompanying text, and full discussion of every illustration and its description should regularly be required of the class. Outside illustrative matter ought also to be used. The best collection of such materials will be found in the Underwood stereoscopic views, to the various series of which, references will be found below in their proper places.

As a result of the difficulty of the subject and the very rapid progress of discovery and research, there are relatively few books on prehistoric man and the early Orient which are not either entirely out of date or quite unsuited for use by younger students, or even by their teachers. Especially in the important matter of chronology most of the current books are quite out of date. Let the teacher note particularly that the enormously remote dates for Babylonian history once current have been given up by all the leading Orientalists in view of recent conclusive evidence. Our oldest written documents in Babylonia are not older than the thirty-first century B.C. Fortunately interest in Bible study has brought forth a very useful group of books in Palestinian history; hence the larger number of titles in this department below. In Greek and Roman history too, where written sources are more plentiful and modern study of the subject has made further progress, the available books are better and far more numerous.

A small high-school library on the ancient world, of moderate cost, including a standard book or two on each main period or topic, has been indicated in the following list by a dagger (†) before each title to be included. All books with a star (*) are suited chiefly for the teacher, and are rather advanced for the student.

CHAPTER I

CHAPTER II


*Breasted, The Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt.

†Ermann, Life in Ancient Egypt.

Edwards, Pharaohs, Fellahs, and Explorers. Petrie, Ten Years' Digging in Egypt. Weigall, Treasury of the Nile. A quarterly journal begun in 1914, called Ancient Egypt, edited by Petrie, reports all discoveries as fast as made. ($2.00 a year; subscriptions taken by Dr. W. C. Winslow, 525 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.)


B. Art and archaeology

The Underwood & Underwood Series of Egyptian views, edited by Breasted, Egypt through the Stereoscope: a journey through the Land of the Pharaohs (100 views with explanatory volume and set of maps). See remarks above, p. 698. †(Selected views, with explanations printed on the backs, may be secured at moderate cost. The most useful fifteen on Egypt are Nos. 17, 27, 29, 30, 31, 42, 48, 52, 57, 60, 62, 69, 82, 89, 97.)

CHAPTER III

*King, History of Sumer and Akkad. †Goodspeed, History of the Babylonians and Assyrians. Recent discoveries have greatly altered the chronology. Later results will be found in †Johns, C. H. W., Ancient Babylon (Cambridge Manuals); †Johns, C. H. W., Ancient Assyria (Cambridge Manuals); *Hall, The Ancient History of the Near East, chaps. v, x, xii; *Olmstead, Sargon of Assyria; *Rogers, A History of Babylonia and Assyria.

There is no handbook corresponding to Maspero's Art in Egypt. *Handcock, Mesopotamian Archaeology. †Hall, The Ancient History of the Near East. †Goodspeed, History of the Babylonians and Assyrians (see index).

*Jastrow, Aspects of Religious Belief and Practice in Babylonia and Assyria.

†Sayce, Babylonian and Assyrian Life and Customs.

The most useful fifteen on Egypt are Nos. 17, 27, 29, 30, 31, 42, 48, 52, 57, 60, 62, 69, 82, 89, 97.)
Rogers, *A History of Babylonia and Assyria*, Vol. I. There is no journal exclusively devoted to reports of discoveries in Babylonia and Assyria (like *Ancient Egypt* above), but see the new journal of the American Archaeological Institute, called *Art and Archaeology* ($2.00 a year; subscriptions taken by The Macmillan Company, 64-66 Fifth Avenue, New York). This journal reports discovery in the whole field of ancient man.

*Harper, R. F.* (Editor), *Assyrian and Babylonian Literature.* †Botsford, *A Source Book of Ancient History*, chap. iii. *Sayce* (Editor), *Records of the Past*. First Series, 12 vols.; Second Series, 6 vols. †Johns, *Oldest Code of Laws in the World* (Laws of Hammurapi). *King, Letters of Hammurapi*. The buildings surviving in Babylonia and Assyria are in a state so ruinous that photographs of them would not be instructive to the young student (see pp. 63 f. and 82; cf. Fig. 47). Hence we give no references for the monuments as they are to-day.

**CHAPTER IV**

**I. Persian Empire**


†Jackson, *Persia, Past and Present*. This valuable book is the best introduction to the subject of Persia as a whole, and contains much information on all the above subjects. †Michaelis, *A Century of Archaeological Discovery*.

†Tolman, *The Behistun Inscription of King Darius*. The Persian monuments are not numerous, and this inscription of Behistun is the most important. A considerable part of it will be found quoted in Botsford, *A Source Book of Ancient History*, pp. 57-59. The Avesta will be found in the series called *Sacred Books of the East*.

**2. Palestine and the Hebrews**

Smith, George Adam, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*. The most valuable of the many books on Palestine, but a little advanced for high-school pupils. *Smith, Henry Preserved*, *Old Testament*
Hilprecht, Recent Research in Bible Lands. †Macalister, A History of Civilization in Palestine (Cambridge Manuals). Current reports will be found in Journal of the Palestine Exploration Fund, and in Art and Archaeology (see above).
Day, Social Life of the Hebrews.

CHAPTER V


CHAPTER VI

Short selections in †Botsford, Source Book of Ancient History, chaps. vii-xiv; †Fling, Source Book of Greek History; Davis, Readings in Ancient History, Vol. I, chaps. iv-v; Appleton, Greek Poets in English Verse; Perry, From the Garden of Hellas. †Homer, Iliad, translated by Lang, Leaf, and Myers (prose), and Bryant (verse). †Homer, Odyssey, translated by Butcher and Lang (prose), and Bryant (verse). Homeric Hymns, translated by Lang (prose). Hesiod and Theognis, translated by various authors in prose and verse in Bohn Library. †Herodotus, Histories, best translation by Rawlinson (Everyman's Library). Aristotle, Constitution of Athens, translated by Poste or Kenyon, chaps. i-xii. †Plutarch, Lives of Theseus, Solon, and Lycurgus. Xenophon, State of the Lacedaemonians.

CHAPTER VII

A. Histories
†Botsford, Orient and Greece, chaps. vi-ix; also all books given above under Chapter VI, A.

B. Sources and source selections

CHAPTER VIII

A. Histories
†Botsford, Orient and Greece, chaps. ix-xiv; also all books given above under Chapter VI, A.

B. Sources and source selections
CHAPTER IX

†BotSFORD, Orient and Greece, chaps. xv-xvi; also all books given above under Chapter VI, A.


A FEW ADDITIONAL REFERENCE WORKS ON ANCIENT GREECE AND THE HELLENISTIC AGE, ARRANGED TOPICALLY

A full list of such works will appear in the author’s History of the Early World, to be published in 1915.

†BURY, J. B., A History of Greece.
†FAIRBANKS, A., Handbook of Greek Religion. Fairbanks, A., Mythology of the Greeks and Romans.
†BAIKIE, J., Sea Kings of Crete. †TARBELL, History of Greek Art. Fowler and Wheeler, Greek Archaeology.
†JEBB, Greek Literature. †MURRAY, G., History of Ancient Greek Literature. †MARSHALL, Short History of Greek Philosophy.
Gulick, Life of the Ancient Greeks, chaps. xvii-xviii.
†MICHAELIS, A Century of Archaeological Discoveries. Periodic reports of current discoveries will be found in the magazine called Art and Archeology (see above, p. 700).

The Underwood & Underwood Series of Stereoscopic Photographs of Greece and its Monuments, edited by RICHARDSON, Greece through the Stereoscope (100 views with guidebook and maps; a short description is also printed on the back of each view). See remarks above, p. v. (A selection of fifteen of the most useful views comprises Nos. 1, 8, 21, 35, 39, 42, 48, 54, 62, 64, 77, 80, 87, 96, 97.)

CHAPTER X

Outlines of European History


Short extracts in †Botsford, Story of Rome, chaps. i–viii; †Munro, Source Book for Roman History, chaps. i–viii; Davis, Readings in Ancient History, Vol. II, pp. 1–166; †Botsford, Source Book of Ancient History, chaps. xxviii–xxxvii; Hardy, Six Roman Laws. Sources in †Livy, Histories (Everyman’s Library); Appian, History, translated by White; †Plutarch, Lives of Romulus, Numa, Pyrrhus, Sulla, Marius, Cæsar, translated by Clough (Everyman’s Library); Polybius, Histories, translated by Shuckburgh; Cicero, Letters, translated by Shuckburgh; †Cæsar, Commentaries (Bohn Library); Nepos, Lives (Bohn Library).

CHAPTER XI

A. Histories
†Botsford, Roman History, chaps. ix–xiii. Davis, Outline History of the Roman Empire. Jones, H. S., Story of the Roman Empire. Bury, Roman Empire (to 180 A.D.). Allcroft and Haydon, Early Principate. Also the books mentioned above under Chapter X, A.


A Few Additional Reference Works on Ancient Rome, arranged topically

A full list of such works will appear in the author’s History of the Early World.
†Bury, J. B., Roman Empire (to 180 A.D.). Jones, H. S., The Roman Empire to 476 A.D.
†Greenidge, A. H. J., Roman Public Life.
Bibliography

†Fairbanks, A., Mythology of Greece and Rome. †Granger, A., Worship of the Romans.
†Mau and Kelsey, Pompeii, its Life and Art. †Platner, Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome.
†Mackail, Latin Literature. Fowler, History of Roman Literature.
†Farrar, F. W., Seekers after God.
†Davis, W. S., Influence of Wealth in Imperial Rome. †Mattingly, Imperial Civil Service.
Michaelis, A Century of Archaeological Discoveries. Periodic reports from the field in the magazine called Art and Archaeology (see above, p. 700).

The Underwood & Underwood Series of Stereoscopic Photographs of Rome and Italy, edited by Ellison and Egbert, Italy through the Stereoscope (100 views with explanatory volume and set of maps). See above, p. v. (A selection of the most useful fifteen views comprises Nos. 21, 23, 25, 27, 30, 33, 34, 43, 45, 46, 47, 58, 60, 62, 91.)

PART II
FROM THE BREAK-UP OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE TO THE OPENING OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY
CHAPTER XII

The best short account of the barbarian invasions is Emerton, Introduction to the Middle Ages, chaps. i–vii. Oman, The Dark Ages, gives a somewhat fuller narrative of the events. Adams, G. B., Civilization during the Middle Ages, chaps. i, ii, iv, and v, discusses the general conditions and results.

The textbook and the collateral reading should always be supplemented by examples of contemporaneous material. Robinson, Readings in European History, Vol. I (from the barbarian invasions to the opening of the sixteenth century) and Vol. II (from the opening of the sixteenth century to the present day), arranged to accompany chapter by chapter the author's Introduction to the History of Western Europe, will be found especially useful in furnishing extracts which reenforce the narrative together with extensive bibliographies and topical references. This compilation will be referred to hereafter simply as Readings.

Constant use should be made of good historical atlases. By far the best and most convenient for the high school is Shepherd, Wm. R., Historical Atlas, 1911 (see maps 43, 45, 48, 50-52). Dow, Earle E., Atlas of European History, 1907, also furnishes clear maps of the chief changes.

Hodgkin, the author of an extensive work in eight volumes on Italy and Her Invaders, has written two small works, Dynasty of Theodosius and Theodoric the Goth. Sergeant, The Franks, may be recommended. Every historical student should gain some acquaintance with the celebrated historian Gibbon. Although his Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire was written about a century and a half ago, it is still of great interest and importance and is incomparable in its style. The best edition is published by The Macmillan Company, with corrections and additions by a competent modern historian, J. B. Bury. The Cambridge Medieval History, by various writers, now in course of publication, devotes its first volume to the period in question.

CHAPTER XIII

There are no very satisfactory short accounts of the development of the papacy. One must turn to the church histories, which are written by either Catholics or Protestants and so differ a good deal in their interpretation of events. One may refer to Fisher, History of the Christian Church (Protestant), or Alzog, Manual of Universal Church History (Catholic). Milman, History of Latin Christianity, although old, is scholarly and readable and to be found in many good libraries. Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. I, chaps. iv, vi. Newman, Manual of Church History, Vol. I (Protestant).


CHAPTER XIV

The church histories referred to above all have something to say of the monks. There is an excellent chapter on monasticism in Taylor, Henry O., Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages, chap. vii. See also a little book by the famous church historian Harnack, Monasticism.
Bibliography

Readings, chap. v. There is a Life of St. Columban, written by one of his companions, which, although short and simple in the extreme, furnishes a better idea of the Christian spirit of the sixth century than the longest treatise by a modern writer. This life may be found in Translations and Reprints, Vol. II, No. 7, translated by Professor Munro. The chief portions of the Benedictine Rule may be found in Henderson, E. F., Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages, pp. 74 ff. and in Thatcher and McNeal, A Source Book for Medieval History, pp. 432 ff. See map, pp. 46–47, in Shepherd, Historical Atlas, showing spread of Christianity in Europe.

Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. II, chap. xvi. The most complete history of the monks is by the French writer Montalembert, The Monks of the West from St. Benedict to St. Bernard, which has been translated into English (6 vols.). The writer’s enthusiasm and excellent style make the work very attractive.

For Mohammed and the Saracens, Thatcher and Schwill, Europe in the Middle Age, chap. xv. Gilman, The Saracens. Gibbon has a famous chapter on Mohammed and another on the conquests of the Arabs. These are the fiftieth and fifty-first of his great work. Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. II, chaps. x–xii.
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Cutts, Parish Priests and their People. The opening chapter of Lea, A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages, gives a remarkable account of the medieval Church and the abuses which prevailed. The first volume also contains chapters upon the origin of both the Franciscan and Dominican orders. For St. Francis the best work is Sabatier, St. Francis of Assisi. See also Gasquet, English Monastic Life; Jessopp, The Coming of the Friars, and Other Historic Essays; Creighton, History of the Papacy, introductory chapter.

CHAPTER XXI


CHAPTER XXII

Emerton, Mediæval Europe, chap. xiii. Rashdall, History of the Universities in the Middle Ages, introductory chapters.


CHAPTER XXIII


CHAPTER XXIV


CHAPTER XXV

Johnson, Europe in the Sixteenth Century, pp. 272 ff. See “Zwingli” and “Calvin,” in Encyclopædia Britannica. Chapters on the changes under Henry VIII and Edward VI will be found in all general histories of England; for example, Cheyney, Short History of England, chap. xii; Cross, A History of England, chaps. xx–xxii; Green, Short History of the English People, chaps. vi–vii.
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PERKINS, France under the Regency.
INDEX

Marked letters sound as in får, prudent, möve, French boñ

Abbeys, dissolution of, in England, 613
Ab'c lard, 545
Abraham, 105
Abu Sim'bel, Fig. 30 (op. p. 49), 243
Abusir (a bu sé'r), 122
A by'dos, 25
Ac a dé'mus, 210
Academy, Plato's, 235; French, 687
Academy, Plato's, 235; French, 687
Acrop'olis, 130, 137, 144, 174, 182, 185 ff., Plate III
Act of Supremacy, 611
Act of Uniformity, 677
Actium (ak'shi'um), 273
Ad'ri an o'ple, battle of, 317 f.
Ad'vencement of Learning, 661
Ægean (e jé'an), the, civilization of, 111; geography of, 116; influence of Orient on, 116 f.; peoples of the, 117 ff., 126 ff.
Æginá (e ji'na), 155, 183
Ægos pot'a mi, 203
Æneid (ë ne'i'd), the, 280 f.
Æ o'li ans, 127
Æsc'chy lus, 186, 189 ff.
Agincourt (aj'in court, Eng. pron.), battle of, 431
Agriculture, rise of, 12, 20, 33 f., 61, 90, 95 f.
Ahuramazda (ä hö'rá mäz'dä), 94, 100
Ak a man'tis, 185
Ak'käd, 64 ff.
Ak'ko, 138
Al'ar ic takes Rome, 318
Alban Mount, 248
Albertus Magnus, 489, 547
Al bi gen'sians, 482 f.
A l'che my, 544
Al ci bá'dés, 198 ff.
Al'cu in, 379
Alemanni, 327
Alexander the Great, 216 ff.; campaigns of, 217 ff.; international policy of, 224 f.
Alexander's Empire, 229 ff.
Alexandria, 88, 230. 233 ff., 236
Alexius, Emperor, 461, 464
Alfred the Great, 403 f.
Al ham'bora, the, 368
Ali Baba (ä'lë bâ'bâ), 50
Alphabet. See Writing
Alsace (al säs') and Lorraine, 650
Alva, Duke of, 628 f.
A'mon, 226, 237
Am'o rites, 59, 67
Amos, 106, 108
Am phic'ty on ies, 133
Anabaptists, 601
Anatomy, earliest, 44
Ancient civilization, collapse of, 302 ff., 312 f.
Andrea del Sarto (än dre'à del sär'to), 559
An dro ni'cus, 262
Angles in Britain, 355
Anglo-Saxon, 535
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 410
Ani (ä'në), 53
An jou (an'jö, Eng. pron.), 416, 418; house of, 435; Charles of, 458
An'shän, 96
An nig'o nids, 231 f.
An nig'o nus, 230
Antioch (an'ti ok), 230; Latin kingdom of, 467
Aphrodite (af ro dë'te), 144, 251
Apol'l'o, 133, 144, 159, 163, 180, 251
Ap'pi an Way, 295
A qu' nas, Thomas, 489, 547 f.
Arabia, 57 f., 86, 89
Arabian Nights' Entertainments, The, 50, 366
Arabic numerals, 551
Ar'abs, 57 ff.; condition of, before Mohammed, 358; conquests of, 366 ff., 461; civilization of, in Spain, 564
Aragon, 564
Ar a me'ans, 71, 79, 89, 103
Arausio (a râ'shi ô), 291
Ar be'la, 222
Arch. the, 62, 76, 81
Archbishops, powers of, 478
Architecture, medieval, 509 ff.; Renaissance, 521 f.
Ä'r'chon, 136
A rê op'a gus, 156, 173, 182, 186 ff., Plate III
Är'go lis, 174
Ar'gos, 124 f.
Ariana (ä ri ä'na), 9
Aristogiton (ar is to jî'ton), 156 f.
Ar is toph'a nês, 198, 204
Aristotle, 217; medieval veneration for, 547; revolt against, 652
Är mâ'da, 631, 644
Art, Middle Stone Age, 8 f.; Egyptian, 41, 48, 51 f.; Babylonian, 64 ff., 69; Assyrian, 75 ff.; Chaldean, 83; Cretan, 116 ff.; Greek, 141, 159, 186 ff.; Etruscan, 244 f.; Roman, 262
Artaxerxes (är ta zêrks'ez), 212
Är te mis'i um, 172
Aryans (är'yanz), 89, 91 ff.
Ash ur bâ'ni pâl, 78
Asia, western, geography of, 56 ff.; races of, 57 ff.
Assembly, Greek, 129, 132, 136, 198; place of, 182
Assur (äs'ör), 70, 72
Assyrian art and architecture, 72 ff., 76 f.
Assyrian civilization, 76 ff.
Assyrian literature, 78
Assyrian society, 78 f.
Assyrian state, 70, 73
Assyrian war, 70 ff., 75 f.
Astrology, 83 f., 299, 543
Astronomy, 44, 83 f., 193, 235
A the'na, 144, 188 ff., 195; temple of, 231
Athenian Empire, 166 ff.; rise of, 178 ff.; triumph of democracy in, 183; in age of Pericles, 185 ff.; destruction of, 196 ff.
Athens, 133; map and plan of, 173; and Sparta, 178, 183 f.; fall of, 186 ff., 203; after Pericles, 203 ff.

Athletic games. See Olympian games
A'thos (or Ath'os), Mount, 166
At'ti ca, 133, 166 f.
At'ti la, 320
At'tis, 298
Augsburg, battle of, 438, 449, 504; diet of, 601; confession of, 602; peace of, 603, 646
Augustan Age, the, 281
Augustine, bishop of Hippo, 318
Augustus. See Octavian
Au rë'li us, Marcus, 301 ff.
Austria, origin of, 563. See Hapsburgs
A ves'ta, 94
A ves'tan, 90
Avignon (äv â'n yo'n'), residence of popes at, 493
Axes and daggers, earliest, stone, 10; copper, 14, 114 f.
Ba'albek (bål'bek), 280
Babylon, 58, 80 ff., 97
Babylonian art and architecture, 62, 64 ff., 69
Babylonian captivity, 493
Babylonian law, 67 f.
Babylonian religion, 62 f.
Babylonian society, 63 f.
Babylonian state, 64, 67
Babylonian writing, 60, 62
Babylonians, earliest. See Sumerians
Bacon, Lord, 656 f., 661
Bacon, Roger, 549
Be'da. See Venerable Bede
Bagdad, 364
Balance of power, 609
Baldwin, king of Jerusalem, 464 f., 467
Bâlli ol, John, 425
Bannockburn, battle of, 425
Baptists, 677
“Barbarians” (in Greece), 133, 305. See Germans
Chaldean science, 83 ff.
Chaldean state, 80 f.
Chaldean war, 80
Chaldean writing, 83
Chaldeans, 69, 79, 80
Châlons (shâ lō̃'), battle of, 320
Charlemagne (shär'le mān), 369 ff.,
disruption of Empire of, 381
Charles I, 662 ff.
Charles II of England, 676 ff., 689
Charles V, Emperor, 562, 566 ff.,
593 f., 625
Charles VIII of France, Italian
invasion of, 568 ff.
Charles IX of France, 632 f.
Charles Martel defeats the Mo-
hammedans at Tours, 367, 369
Charter, Great, 419 f.
Charter, town, 500
Chartres (shartr), cathedral of, 515
Chaucer, 536
Cheops (kē'ops) (see Khufu), 25, 28
Chephren (kef'ren), frontispiece
Chilon (ki'lōn), 159
Chios (ki'ōs), 151
Chivalry, 538 f.
Christ. See Jesus
Christianity, promises of, 335;
contrast between ideas of, and
those of the pagans, 335 f.
Chrysoloras (krisō lō'ras), 548
Church, greatness of, 334; sources
of power of, 335 ff.; relation of,
to the civil government, 337;
beings to perform the functions
of the civil government, 338 f.;
in time of Charlemagne, 374,
379; property of, 440 ff.; char-
acter and organization of, 475 ff.;
relation of, to State, 489; break
up of, 578. See Clergy, Popes
Church of England, 611, 639
Cicero (sisē'ro), 265 f.
Cilicia (si lish'ī a), 146
Cimmerians (si mē'trī anz), 79
Cimon (si'mōn), 180 ff.
City-states, 64, 127 ff., 247, 516 ff.
Civil war in England, 668 f.
Claudius, 247
Clēō bū'lus, 159
Clē'o on the tanner, 198 f.
Clēō pā'tra, 267, 272 ff.
Clerestory, 47 f. and Figs. 113, 183,
188
Clergy, position of, in Middle Ages,
443 f., 480 ff.
Clerīcis laicos, 491
Clermont, Council of, 461
Clipping, 595
Clīs'the nēs, 157 f.
Clit'ī as, 149
Clī'tus, 228
Clocks, earliest, in Greece, 234;
in Egypt, 236
Cloister, 351
Clovis, conquers of, 326 f.; con-
version of, 327; number of sol-
diers of, 329; baptized, 329
Cnidus (ni'dus), 151
Cnossus (nos'us), 14, 116, 118 ff., 127
Cnut (knōt), 406
Codes of law, earliest written, 29,
67 f., 154, 252, 1191 f., 311 f.
Coinage, earliest, in Egypt, 38;
in Age of Hammurapi, 67; in
Medo-Persian Empire, 98; in
Greece, 151; in Rome, 250,
256; medieval, 505
Colbert (kol bär'), 686 f.
Coligny (ko lēn'yē), 635 f.
Coloni, the, 292 f.
Colonia Augusta Treverorum, 289
Colonnades, the earliest, 40, 46 ff.
Col os sē'um, 279, 294
Columbus, 530
Commerce in Middle Ages, 503 ff.
Com'mō dus, 301 f.
Common law, 413
Commons, House of. See Parlia-
ment
Compurgation, 331
Condottieri (kon dōt tyā'rē), 520 f.
Conscience, emergence of, 43, 53,
161 f.
Con'stan tfne, 289, 305 f., 308
Constantinople, 306 f., 312 f., 464,
472 f.
Continuity of history, 316
Conventicle Act, 677
Conventicles, 666
Conversion, of the Germans, 357 f.;
of the Saxons, 373 f.
Co per'ni cus, 652 f.
Index

Copper, 14, 24, 26, 28, 34 ff., 88, 114 f., 246
Cor'do va, mosque at, 367; university at, 368, 504
Cor'inth, 150 ff., 196 f.
Corinthian Gulf, 161
Coronation, religious ceremony, 370
Cotton, earliest, 77 f.
Council, Greek, 129 ff., 132; religious, 133
Covenant, National, 667
Crécy (kres' sy), battle of, 427
Cretan art and architecture, 116 ff.
Crete, 96 ff., 99
"Czar," 274
Dalmatia (dal mā' shi a), 279
Damascus, 71 f., 89, 103
Dane-geld, 406
Danes, invasion of England by, 405 ff.
Dá rí' us (Darius the Great), 98 ff., 166 ff., 219 ff.
Dark ages, 332, 379
David, 103
Decela (des e le'a), 201 ff.
Decelean War, 201 f.
Degrees, university, explained, 546 and note
Dé'li a, 296 f.
Delian League, 179 f., 184
Dé' li um, 199
Dé' los, 133
Del' phi, 133, 161, 163
Delta, the, 18
De me'ter, 144, 251
De mos'th e nēs, 216
Denmark, in Thirty Years' War, 647
Descartes (dā kärt'), 655 ff.
Dictator (in Rome), 253
Diet, of Germany, 576; at Worms, 593
Diocletian (di o klesh' a n), 302 f., 305 ff.
Di o ny' sus, 144 and Fig. 93
Dip' y lon Gate, 186
Discoveries, geographical, 526 ff.; of the Portuguese, 528 f.
Disorder, age of, 381
Dispensations, 477
Dissenters, 677
Divine right of kings, 370, 659 f., 682 ff.
Domestication of animals, 12, 34, 61, 90
Dominicans, 488
Don' jon, 392
Dō' rī ans, 126 f.
Dra'co (drā' kō), 155
Drainage systems, earliest known, 122, Fig. 66
Drake, Sir Francis, 642
Dürer, Albrecht, 559
Dutch. See Holland

Early Stone Age. See Stone Age
East, luxuries of, introduced into Europe, 295 f., 504
East, the Far, 223
East Frankish kingdom, 382
East Goths, 320 f., 324
Eastern Church. See Greek Church
Ecbatana (ek bat'a na), 98
Eck, John, 591
Edessa, 465, 467; fall of, 470
Edict of Nantes (nants), 638; revocation of, 691
Edict of Restitution, 647
Education, 379, 380, 541 ff.
Edward the Confessor, 406 f.
Edward I, 421, 423 f., 490
Edward II, 422, 425
Edward III, 422, 426
Edward VI, 614
Egbert, 405
Egypt, 17; geography of, 17 ff.; earliest inhabitants of, 20 ff.; earliest known writing in, 21 ff.; stone architecture in, 25 ff.; Pyramid Age of, 27 ff.; arts and crafts in, 34 ff., 51 ff.; Feudal Age of, 42 ff.; the Empire, 44 ff.; influence of, upon Rome, 275; during Roman Empire, 285 f.
Egyptian art and architecture, 25 ff., 33, 41, 46 ff., 50 ff.
Egyptian commerce, 31 ff., 36, 38
Egyptian industries, 34 ff.
Egyptian literature, 42 f., 53
Egyptian painting, 41
Egyptian religion, 27 f., 51 ff.
Egyptian science, 44
Egyptian ships, 30 f., 37
Egyptian society, 38 f., 42 f.
Egyptian state, 29 ff., 42 f., 46
Egyptian war, 46
Egyptian writing, 21 ff.
E'lam, 97
Electors in the Empire, 575
Eleusis (e lû'sis), 160, 162
Elizabeth, Queen, 611, 639 ff.
Elysian Fields, 114
Embalmment, 27, 46, 50
E mir'ate of Cordova, 375
Empire, the, in Egypt. See Egyptian Empire
Empire, Holy Roman, 376, 439 f., 452 ff., 458
England, reconversion of, 357; in the Middle Ages, 405 ff.; condition of labor in, 430 f.; relations with Scotland, 425; Protestant revolt in, 608 ff.; under Elizabeth, 639 ff.; Constitutional struggle in, 659 ff.
English Church, 664 f.
English language, 535 f.
E pam i non' das, 212 f.
Ep i cu re' ans, 235, 281
E pî' rus, 256 f.
Erasmus, 579 ff.; attitude of, toward Luther, 588, 608; Praise of Folly of, 669
Erechtheus (ê rek'thûs), 137
E rê'tri a, 166
Er go ti'mos, 149
En'il, 63
Estates General, 427 f., 435, 492, 683
Etruscan art, 244 f.
Etruscan bronzes, 149, 244, 246
Etruscan kings of Rome, 249, 252
E trus'cans, 244 ff., 249
Eu ae'ne tus, 185
Eubœa (û bê'a), 137, 166 f., 172
Eu pa'trîds, 130 ff.
Eu phrâ'tês River, 58
Eu rip'i dés, 190 ff.
Eurymedon (û rim'ê don) River, 181
Excommunication, 481
Exeter, cathedral of, 515
Exile, the (Hebrew), 106 ff.
Fâ'bi us, 260
Fabliaux (fâb lê'ô'), 538
Ferdinand, Emperor, 623 and note
Ferdinand of Aragon, 565
Festive Street in Babylon, 81 ff.
Feudal Age in Egypt, 42 ff.; tombs of, 42 ff.; civilization in, 42 ff.
Feudal system. See Feudalism
Feudalism, 397 ff.; warfare, 401 f.; introduction of, into England, 410; introduction of, into France, 435; relation of, to Church, 441
Fiefs. See Feudalism
First Cataract of the Nile, 18, 32
Flanders, 411, 504
Flavian amphitheater. See Colosseum
Flayers, 435
Fleur-de-lis (flûr'dê lê'), 427
Flint mines, earliest, 13
Florence, 459, 516, 522, 558, 569, 572
Forum, Roman, Fig. 113 and 248 f.
France, 429, 434 ff.; natural boundaries of, 649, 688; under Louis XIV, 681 ff.
Franche-Comté (frônish kö'n tâ'), 636, 649, 689
Francis I, 571; persecution under, 631
Francis II, 632 f.
Franciscans, 484 ff.
Franks, conquests of, 322, 325 f.; conversion of, 327, 369, 381
Frederick I, Emperor, 452 f., 456, 471
Frederick II, Emperor, 456 f.
Frederick, the "winter king," 646 f.
Frederick the Wise, 582, 591
French language, 537 and note
French medieval romances, 537
Fritzlar, sacred oak of Odin at, 358
Furniture, earliest wooden, 12, 37.
See Wood
Government, Hebrew, 103 f., 106
Gracchi (grak'hi), 265
Gra nā'da, the Alhambra at, 368; fall of, 375
Grand Remonstrance, 667
Gra nī'cus River, 218
"Great Greece," 147
Great King, 98 f., 219
Great Mother, 298
"Great schism," 524
Greek, study of, in the Middle Ages, 547 f.
Greek art and architecture, 141,
156, 159, 182, 186 ff., 231 and Fig. 112
Greek Church tends to separate from the Latin, 342
Greek colonization, 146 ff.
Greek commerce, 137, 146 ff., 155
Greek drama, 180 ff., 204
Greek education, 192, 234 f.
Greek history writing, 203 ff.
Greek industries, 148 f.
Greek law, 154
Greek literature, 142 ff., 155, 159 ff., 189 f., 192
Greek music, 159, 185
Greek oratory, 192, 216
Greek painting, 186
Greek philosophy. See Philosophy
Greek religion, 144, 236
Greek science, 162, 193, 234 f.
Greek sculpture, 189
Greek ships, 137, 152, 107 f.
Greek society, 127 f., 129, 143,
155 ff., 183, 217 ff., 238
Greek state, 129 f., 132 ff., 136 ff.,
155 ff., 181 f., 184, 216 f., 239
Greek theater, 145, 189 ff.
Greek war, 167 ff., 183 f., 196 ff.,
208 ff., 212 f.
Greek writing, 130, 139 f.
Gregory VII, Pope, 446 ff.
Gregory of Tours, 324, 327
Gregory the Great, 344 f.; writings of, 345; missionary work of,
346, 356
Grotius, 694
Guianne (gē en'), 416, 418
Index

Il lyr'ia, 271
Imperator, 274
Independents, 666
Index of prohibited books, 620
Indo-Europeans, 61; dispersion of, 86 ff., 261; their occupation of Italy, 246
Indulgences, 584 and note
Ink, earliest use of, 22
Innocent III, Pope, struggle of, with the Hohenstaufens, 456 ff.; 419, 469, 486, 488
Inquisition, 483 f.; in Spain, 566; in the Netherlands, 627 f.
Institute, French, 657
Interdict, 419, 481
Interest, attitude toward, in the Middle Ages, 506
International law, 694
Institutes of Christianity, Calvin's, 607 f., 632
Invasions, in the ninth and tenth centuries, 383 f.
Inventions, modern, 657
Investiture, 441 ff., 458; question of, settled, 452
I š'ni ans, 127, 137
Iran (ē raŋ'), 91 ff.
Iranians (i rāni anz), 91 ff.
Ireland, 642 f., 670 f.
Irene, Empress, 376
Iron, incoming of, 75
Irrigation, earliest known, 17 f., 61
Isaac, 105
Isabella, queen of Castile, 565
Išt'tār, Gate of, 81 ff.
I'sis, 296 ff.
Is'lam, 58, 359
Islands of the Blest, 144
I so'ra tēs, 211, 216
Israel, 140, 106 f.
Is'sus, battle of, 219 f.
Italian cities, trade of, with Orient, 503; of the Renaissance, 516 ff.
Italian despot's, 526
Italic peoples, 246 f.
Italy, geography and climate of, 241 ff.; earliest, 243 ff.; in the Middle Ages, 382, 516 ff.; art of, 558 ff.; becomes battleground of Europe, 568 ff.

Jacob, 105
James I, 659 ff., 683
James II, 678 f.
James VI of Scotland and I of England, 425
Jax ār'tēs, 88, 223
Je hō'vah, 104
Jericho, 102 f., 105
Jerome, St., advocate of the monastic life, 349
Jerusalem, 80, 103 f., 108, 461, 466, 471 f.; kingdom of, 467
Jesuits, 620 ff.; 646
Jesus, 300
Jews, economic importance of, 506; persecution of, 565 f.
Joan of Arc, 431 f.
John of England, 417 ff., 426
John Frederick of Saxony, 603
Joseph, 106
Journal des Savants (joor nāl'dā sav on'), 688
Jubilee of 1500, 491
Judah, 80, 104, 106 f.
Julius II, Pope, 558
Ju'pi ter, 84, 248, 251 and Fig. 113
Jury, trial by, 412
"Just" price, 305
Justinian, 324 f.
Justs and tourneys in the Middle Ages, 402

Kaaba (kā'bā), 358, 361
Kadijah (kā dé'ja), wife of Mohammed, 358
"Kaiser" (kī'zer), 274
"Kaldi" (kāl'dē), 79, 80
Kāl'ki, 66
Kar'nak, temple of, Fig. 24 and 44 ff.
Khafre (kāl'ray, Greek Chephren), 41 f. and frontispiece
Khatti (khat'tē). See Hittites
Khufu (kō'tō, Greek Cheops), 25, 28
King's Peace, 209
Kingship, origin of, 20 f., 29, 129; divine right of kings, 227
Kish, 60
Knighthood, 539 f.; knights in Germany, 576
Knox, John, 640
Kō rān', the, 359 f.
Laconica (Laconia), 132
Lake-dwellers, 9 ff., 35, 115, 243 f., 246
Lancaster, House of, 433 f.
Land, ownership of, 20 f., 34, 42, 64, 128 f., 153, 155, 263 f., 289 ff., 303 f.; in Middle Ages, 383, 386
Langton, Stephen, 418
Late Stone Age. See Stone Age
Lateran, palace of the, 525
Latin kingdoms, in Syria, 467
Latin language, 330, 533 ff.
Latin League, the, 254
Latin literature, extinction of, 324
Latin, 247 f.
Latium (lā’shi um), 247 f.
Laud, William, 664 f.
Law, earliest written codes of, 29, 67 f., 154, 252, 281 f., 311 f.
Laws of Hammurapi, 67 f.
Learning preserved by Church, 379
Leb’na non, 32
Legates, papal, 477
Leo the Great, 320, 342
Leo X, 558, 571, 582 ff.
Leonardo da Vinci (dā vin’chē), 559
Le on’i das, 171 f., 174
Libraries, earliest, of Feudal Age of Egypt, 42 ff.
Library of Ashurbanipal, 78; of Pergamum, 231; of Alexandria, 235
 Licinian laws, 253
Li cin’i us, 253
Lighthouse, earliest, 236
Lin’dus, 159
Lion Gate, 125
Llewellyn, 423
Lombard League, 456
Lombard towns, 454
Lombards, in Italy, 325; as bankers, 506
Lombardy conquered by Charlemagne, 374
Long Walls of Athens, 173, 183
Lord, medieval, 397
Lords, House of, 422
Lorenzo the Magnificent, 522, 558
Louis the Pious, 381
Louis XI of France, 436
Louis XIV of France, 681 ff.
Low Church party, 666
Lowlands of Scotland, 424
Lö‘yō’la, 620 ff.
Li’beck, 504, 508
Luther, Martin, 582 ff.
Lutheran revolt, 597 ff.
Lycabettus (lik a be’tus), Mount, Plate III
Ly’d’i a, 98
Ly’ san’der, 203, 208 f.
Ly sic’ra tēs, 185
Mac’e don (mas’e don), 213
Macedonia, rise of, 215 ff.
Machiavelli (mā’kyā vel’lē), The Prince, by, 522
Magdeburg, destruction of, 648
Ma gel’lan, expedition of, 530
Magi, 299
Maine, 416, 436, 480
Malta, 468
Man, earliest, 1 ff.; condition of, 2 f.; stone tools of, 3 f.
Manor, medieval, 394 ff.; break up of the, in England, 430
Man ti ne’ a, 213
Mar’a thon, 166 ff., 186; battle of, 169 f.
Marches, 375
Marco Polo, 526
Marduk (mār’dök), 81, 84
Margraves, 375
Marignano (mā rēn yā’nō), battle of, 572
Mā’ri us, 265 f.
Mark Antony, 271 ff.
Mars, 84, 251
Mars’ Hill, 173, 186 ff.
Marseille, 148, 472
Marston Moor, battle of, 669
Mary of Burgundy, 563
Mary of England, 611, 616 f.
Mary Queen of Scots, 632, 641 f.
Massilia (ma sil’i a) (Marseilles), 148
Mathematics, 44, 193
Matilda, 409, 411
Max i mil’ian I, Emperor, 562 f.
Mayence, elector of, 575; archbishop of, 579
Mayflower, 666
Index

Mayor of the Palace, 369
Mazarin (mā zā rañ'), 681
Mázda, 94
Máz'dā kā, 93
Mecca, 358, 359; pilgrimage to, 361
Medes, 80, 89, 92 f., 96 f.
Medes and Persians, 89, 92 f.
Medici (med'e chē), the, 522
Medicine, 44, 193
Medina, 359, 364
Mediterranean world, geography and products of, 111 ff.; the western, 241 ff.; in Roman Empire, 282 ff.; orientalization of, 310 ff.
Medo-Persian Empire, 86 ff.
Me dūm', 25
Meg'a ra, 155
Melanchthon (me langk'thon), 602
Memphis, 226
Mendicant orders, 484 f.
Menes (me'nez), 31
Mer'cu ry, 84, 251
Mer'sen, 381, 439
Metal, age of, 14, 24 ff.; in Europe, 114 ff.
Mé'ton, 193
Michael Angelo, (mi' kāl an'je lō), 559
Middle Ages, meaning of term, 316 f.; character of, 332
Middle Stone Age. See Stone Age
Mil'an, 454, 571, 572; despots of, 521
Mī lē'tus, 159, 167
Mīl tā a dē's, 168 f.
Minnesingers, 540 f.
Mysteries of Eleusis (e lū'sis), 160, 162
Mohammedans, 358 ff.; expelled from Spain, 375; in Sicily, 384
Monasteries, arrangement of, 351 ff.
Monasticism, attraction of, for many different classes, 348 f.
Money, lack of, in Middle Ages, 383; replaces barter, 396, 399
Monks, 336; origin and distinguished services of, 348 f.; missionary work of, 355 ff.
Mon'te Cassino (kās sē' nō), founding of, 349
Moors, 368, 564 f.; expelled from Spain, 566, 645
More, Sir Thomas, 608, 612
Moses, 102
Mosque, 363
Mye' a lē, 177
Mycē 'nē, 123
Mycē'naean Age, 123
Mysteries of Eleusis (e lū'sis), 160, 162
Nahum, 79
Nantes (nants), Edict of, 638
Naples, kingdom of, 568 note, 571
Napoleon of Egypt. See Thutmose III
Nā rām'-Sin, 65
Nā'se'by, battle of, 669
National Covenant, 667
Natural boundaries of France, 649, 688
Nau'cra tis, 146
Navarre, 633
Navigation Act, 672 f.
Ne ap'o lis, 147
Nebuchadnezzar, 69, 80 ff., 107
Neighborhood war in the Middle Ages, 401, 576
Ne mau'sus, 283
Ne nek hē ptaḥ', 41
Netherlands, revolt of the, 626 ff.; Louis XIV's invasion of the, 689
New Atlantis, 656 f.
New Testament, 300
New York, 678
Nicaea (nī sē'a), 461, 463, 465
Nicholas II, Pope, 445
Nicias (nīs' i as), 199 ff.
Nile, 18 ff.; Delta of, 18 ff.; First Cataract of, 18; historical value of, 26; voyage up, 42 ff.; Fourth Cataract of, 46; Nubian, Fig. 30
Nimes (ném), 283, 285
Nineveh (nin'e vej), 72, 77 ff.
Nobility, origin of titles of, 378
Nobles, age of, in Greece, 136 ff.; expansion in, 146 ff.
Nogaret, 492
Normandy, 406 f., 416, 418
Northmen, 386; invasion of England by, 405, 408
Notre Dame (nô'tr dâm), 46, 510
Nuremberg, 504
Oc tâ'vi an, 271 ff.
O dé'on, 234
O dô ã'cer, 320
Odysseus (ô dis'ús), 142
Od'yssey, 142 f.
Olympic Games, 133, 140
O lym'pus, 124 ff., 126
Oracles, 162, 251 f.
Orange, William of, 629 ff.
Ordeals, 331
Orient, Late Stone Age Europe and, 14 ff.; history of, 17–110; influence on Ægean world, 116 f.; influence on Mediterranean world, 236 f.; influence on Roman Empire, 275, 295 ff.; European relations with, 472 f., 503
Orléans, House of, 435; Maid of, 431 f.
O ron'tês, 230
O si'ris, 27, 52, 297 f.
Ostracism, 158, 180
Os'tro goths. See East Goths
Otto I, the Great, of Germany, 438 ff.
Oxford, University of, 546
Ox'us River, 223
Pæstum (pes'tum), 147
Palatinate, elector of the, 575; Rhenish, 601
Palatine Hill, 248 f.
Palestine, 57 ff., 89, 101 ff., 107 f.
Pan-Athenaean Festival, 185, 189 and Fig. 92
Papacy, origin of, 340 f. See Pope Papal States, 516
Paper and paper-making, 22 f., 37, 140; introduction of, in western Europe, 556
Pa py'r us, 22 f., 37, 140, 237, 378
Parchment, use of, 379
Paris, University of, 545
Parliament, English, 421 f., 494; "kneeling," 617; struggle of, with Stuarts, 659 f.; Long, 667
Pars, University of, 545
Pel'can, 219 f., 223, 228
Par nas'sus, Mount, 161
Parsifal, 541
Par'the, 137, 182, 186, 188 ff., Plate III, Plate IV
Par'thi ans, 230 f.
Pasargadæ (pa sär'ga de), 99
Paschal II, Pope, 451
Patricians, 252 f.
Paul, 300
Paulus Dî ac'ô nus, 380
Pau sâ'nî as, 177
Pavia (pâ vê'â), battle of, 609
Peasants, medieval, 394 ff.; revolt of, in England, 430, 495; revolt of, in Germany, 598 f.
Peasants' Rebellion, 430, 495
Pel ô pon nê'ssian War, 184, 196 ff.
Peloponnesus, 126
Penance, 480
Pens, earliest use of, 22 f.
Pen tel' ic marble, 186
Per'ga mum, 231, Fig. 112
Per i an'der, 159
Per'i clës, 181 ff., 188, 197 f.
Per i pâ tet'ics, 235
Persecution in England, 618 and note
Per sep'o lis, 97, 99
Persian Empire, the, 95 ff.
Persians, early, 87 ff., 95; literature, 91 f., 94; religion, 93 ff., 100 f.; war and weapons, 95 ff., 162 ff., 166 ff.; commerce, 98 ff.; state, 98; writing, 98; art and architecture, 99; civilization, 99; ships, 99 f.
Per'sis, 154
Peter the Hermit, 463
Peter, St., regarded as first bishop of Rome, 340
Petition of Right, 662 f.
Petrarch, 548
Phæstus (fē'stus), 121
Phalanx, rise of, 158
Phalerum (fā lē'rum), 174
Pharaoh (fā'rō), 29
Phâ'ros, 233
Phar sāl'us, 267
Phid'ı as, 188 f.; frieze of, Plate IV
Philip Augustus, 416 f., 471
Philip the Fair, 425, 469, 490 f.
Philip of Hesse, 603
Philip of Macedon, 215 ff.
Philip II of Spain, 617 ff., 642 f.
Philippics, 216
Philistines (fi lîs'tînz), 103, 127 f.
Philosophy, 162, 204 ff., 210 ff., 281
Phi lō'tas, 228
Phœnicia (fē nish'a), 31 f., 87, 89
Phœnicians, 30, 59 f., 89, 137 ff.
Phrygians (fri'jî ans), 89
File villages, 242 f. See Lake-dwellers
Pilgrim Fathers, 666
Pillars of Her'cu lēs, 225
Pin'dar, 217
Pippin the Short, 369
Pi ræ'us, 173, 175
Pirates in Middle Ages, 507
Pi sis'tra tus, 156 f., 167
Pi'thom, 101
Pî'ta cus, 159
Plantagenets, 416 ff.
Pla tæ'a, 168; battle of, 177
Pla'to, 205 ff.
Plato's ideal state, 210 f.
Plin'y, 163
Pnyx (nîks), the, 182 f., Plate III
Poitou (pô'wâ tô'), 418
Pô'la, 279
Pompeii (pom pā'yē), 220, 297 f.
Pompey (pom'pi), 267
Pon'tus, 146
Pope, 340; origin of the title of, 343; relations of, with Otto the Great, 439; position of, 477 f.
Popes, duties of the early, 343 f.; origin of the “temporal” power of, 346, 369; election of, 445; claims of, 446 f.; at Avignon, 493
Portcullis, 392
Portuguese discoveries, 528 f.
Poseidon (pō sî'don), 144, 189, 195
Postal systems, earliest, 98 f., 236
Potter’s furnace, earliest, 35 f.
Potters’ Quarter (Athens), 173, 186
Potter’s wheel, earliest, 35
Pottery, earliest, 11 f., 35 f., 117
Praise of Folly, by Erasmus, 581
Prax it’e lēs, Fig. 93
Prayer book, English, 615 f., 639
Prayer rugs, 361
Presbyterian Church, 607 f.
Pride’s Purge, 669
Při ě’ně, 159
Priest, duties of, 480
Prince of Wales, 423
Princeps, 274
Printing, invention of, 552, 556 f.
Protestant, origin of term, 601
Protestant revolt, in Germany, 582 ff.; in Switzerland, 605 ff.; in England, 608 ff.
Protestantism, progress of, 603
Provençal (prô von'sl’), 537
Provence (prô-von’s‘), 436
Psyttaleia (sit ta lē’ya), 175
Ptolomies (tōl’ē mez), 230 ff.
Punic Wars, 258 ff.
Puritans, 666 and note
Pyramid Age, the, 27 ff.; government in, 20 f.; length of, 30 f., 44; tomb-chapels in, and depiction of Egyptian-life in, 33 ff.; art in, 41 ff.
Pyramids, the, 25, 27 ff.; as royal tombs, 27 and Plate I; pyramid-temples, 40 and Plate I
Pyr’rhus, King, 256 f.
Quakers, 677
Ramadan (rä mā dān’), month of, 361
Ram’sēs II, 46 and Fig. 30, 243
Ramses III, 128
Raphael, 559
Ravenna, interior of a church at, 321; tomb of Theodoric at, 322
Raymond, Count, 464, 466
Re (ray), 27
Redress of grievances, 421
Reform, spirit of, 657
Regular clergy defined, 351
Rê ho bô'am, 104
Rembrandt, 560
Renaissance (re nà soñ's), cities of the, 516 ff.; buildings of, 522 f.; art of, 558 ff.
Restoration in England, 676 ff.
Retainers, 433
Revolution of 1688, 678 f.
Rheims (remz), 431, 432; cathedral of, 515
Rhodes, Island of, 468
Richard I, the Lion-Hearted, 417, 471
Richelieu, 638, 649 f.
Rising in the North, 641 f.
Roads, bad, in the Middle Ages,
383
Rollo, 407
Roman art and architecture, 262, 273 f., 279 f., 285 ff., 291, 293 ff., 305
Roman church, the mother church, 340 f.
Roman colonization, 254, 276, 282 ff., 286 ff.
Roman commerce, 249 f., 256 f., 284 f., 295
Roman education, 262, 282
Roman Empire, "fall" of, in the West, 320; relations of, with Church, 337; continuity of, 377
Roman law, 281 f., 321, 331
Roman literature, 261 f., 278 ff., 305 f.
Roman religion, 251 f., 296 ff., 308
Roman ships, 249, 258, 285
Roman society, 252, 263 ff., 276 f., 288 ff., 301 ff.
Roman war, 255, 258 ff., 263, 266 ff., 272
Roman writing, 249 f.
Romance languages, 534
Romances in Middle Ages, 537, 538
Romanesque architecture, 511
Rome, city of, in Middle Ages, 318, 344, 524 f., 558
Rom'u lus and Remus, 249
Rouen (rô oñ'), 407, 432
Roundheads, 669
Roussillon (rô sè yoñ'), 649 f.
Rox an'a, 224
Royal Society, English, 657
Rubens, 560
Rudolf of Hapsburg, 458, 563
Runnymede, 419
Sacred Way, 160, 207
Sahara Desert, 18, 19
Sahure (sah-roo'), 74
St. Bartholomew, Massacre of, 636
St. Benedict, Rule of, 441
St. Bernard, 470 f.
St. Boniface anoints Pippin, 369
St. Chamas (sañ-shâ mà''), 286
St. Dominic, 488
St. Francis, 484 f.
St. Peter's, rebuilding of, 584, 585
Saint-Simon (sañ-sè moh'), 687
Säk kâ' râ', 25
Sal'a din takes Jerusalem, 471
Sal'a mis, Island of, 155; battle of, 174 ff.
Samaria, 71, 104, 106
Sam'nite wars, 255
Samnites, 254 f.
Sâ'mos, Island of, 166
Sanskrit, 89 f., 92
Sappho (saf'fo), 160
Saracens, 467, 504
Sar din'i a, 259
Sardinians, prehistoric, 243 f.
Sar'dis, 96
Sar'gon I, 64 f.
Sargont II, 71 f.
Saronic (sa ron'ik), 150
Saturn, 84; temple of, 248
Saul, 103
Sâ vò nà ro'la, 569
Saxons settle in England, 355; conquest of, by Charlemagne, 373; rebellion of, 450
Saxony, elector of, 575
Schiemann, 112, 123, 131
Scholasticism, 547; attack of Roger Bacon on, 549
School of the palace, 379 f.
Science, medieval, 541 ff.; beginnings of modern, 652 ff.
Scone, Stone of, 425
Scotch nation, language of, 424; differs from England, 426
Scotland, 424 ff., 667, 671; Presbyterian Church in, 640
Scylax (ski'lax), 99
Scythians (sith'ianz), 79, 89
Secular clergy defined, 351
Seleucids (se lu'sids), 230 f.
Seleucus (se lu'kus), 230
Sel'juk Turks, 461
Semites (sem'its), 57 ff., 67 ff., 87, 89, 148, 176, 261
Semitic nomad, 57 ff.
Sen'e ca, 286
Senlac, 408
Sen nach'e rib, 72, 77 f.
Sen ti'num, 255
Separatists, 666
Serfdom, extinction of, 396 n.; in England, 431
Serfs, medieval, 394 ff.
Ses'tos, 177
Ses'ti, 50
Seven Hills (of Rome), 294
Seven Wise Men, 158 f.
Sev'ille, tower at (Giralda), 367, 564
Shakespeare, 661
Shields, earliest, 63, 243 f., 248 f.
Ship money, 664
Shires, 423
Sib'y, Greek, 251
Sibylline Books, 251
Sicilian expedition, 200
Sicilian war with Carthage, 258
Sicily, 457, 459, 473
Sidon, 137 f., 467
Simony (sim'o ny), 444
Sinai (si'ni), Peninsula of, 24
Sind'bad, 42
Siwa (se'wä), Oasis of, 226
Slavery, in Egypt, 38; in Greece, 149; in Rome, 264 f., 290, 292
Slavs, subdued by Charlemagne, 375; invasions of, 386
Snef'rū, 25
Society, Egyptian, 36f., 42 f.; Babylonian, 63 f.; Assyrian, 78 f.; Hebrew, 105 f.; Greek, 127 ff., 143, 155 ff., 183; Roman, 217 ff., 238
Soc'ra tēs, 204 ff.
Solomon, 104
So'lon, 153, 155 f., 157, 159
Song of Roland, 537
Sophists, 192 f.
Soph'ō clēs, 190 f.
Sorbonne, 631
Spain, 318, 375, 531, 564 f., 567; exhaustion of, 631, 644 f.
Spanish fury, 630
Spanish Inquisition, 566
Spanish main, 531
Spanish succession, war of, 692
Sparta, 132 f., 136, 178 ff.; military character of, 208 f.
Sparta and Athens, 178, 183 f.
Sparta and Thebes, 212 f.
Spartan League, 203
Spear, earliest use of the, 74 f., 95 f., 248 f.
Speyer, Diet of, 600
Sphinx, Great, 41 f. and Plate I
Spice trade in the Middle Ages, 528 ff.
Spinning wheels, earliest, 11 f.
Stained glass, medieval, 514
States of the Church. See Papal States
Statute of Provisors, 493
Statutes of Laborers, 430
Stephen, 411
Stesichorus (ste sik'o rus), 160 f.
Stoics, 235, 281, 283
Stone Age, the, 3; Early, 3 ff.; Middle, 6 ff.; Late, 10 ff., 14 ff.
Stone architecture, earliest, 12, 25, 27 ff., 44 ff., 118 ff., 124 ff., 131
Stone masonry, earliest appearance of, 25, 27 ff.
Stonehenge (stōn'henj), 115
Stories, oldest written, 42 f.
Strā'bō, 299
Strassburg, 690
Street of tombs (Athens), 207
Stuarts, 659 ff.
Subvassal, 397; not under control of king, 400
Sudan (sō dān'), 32
Sulla (sul'a), 265 f.
Sully, 638
Sumē'ri ans, 61 ff., 67 ff.
Sun, the Invincible. 299
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Sun-god, 27 f.; Roman temples of, 280; Roman Emperor as a, 299
Sus (sō'sa), 99, 223
Suzaerain, 397
Sweden, intervention of, in Thirty Years' War, 647 ff.
Swiss lake-dwellers. See Lake-dwellers
Switzerland, origin of, 605 f.; Protestant revolt in, 606 ff.; mercenaries, 607 note
Swords, earliest, 53, 243 f., 248 f.
Syracusan, 200 f.
Syracuse, 147 f.
Syria, 59, 89, 230 f., 460; Latin kingdoms in, 467
Tacitus, 373
Taille (tah'ye), 435
Tancred in First Crusade, 464
Taormina (tā or me'nā), 145
Tar tes'sus, 148
Tasmanians (taz mā'ni ans), 2 f., 115
Ta ro me'nī um, 145
Ta'rus, 231
Taxes, earliest, in E'gypt, 29 f.; in Assyria, 72 f.; in Greece, 129; in Rome, 277, 303 f.
Taxes, origin of, 20 f.
Templars, 468 f., 493
"Temporalities," 442
Test Act, 678
Tetzel, 585
Textbooks, 324, 379
Thā'lēs, 159, 162
Thebes (in Egypt), 44 ff.; cemetery of, 49 ff.
Thebës (in Greece), 212 f., 217
The mis'to clēs, 170 ff., 178, 180 ff., 186
The od'o ric, 320 ff.
Theodosia (ē o dō'shi an) Code, 309 f.
Theodosius (ē o dō'shi us), 307
Ther mop'y lēc, pass of, 171 ff.; battle of, 173
Thesaeus (ē'sūs), 186 ff. and Plate III
Thes'sa ly, 123, 125 f.
Thirteenth century, discoveries of, 55 f.
"Thirty-Nine Articles," 616
Thirty Years' War, 646 ff.
Thomas Aquinas, 489
Thomas of Canterbury, 613
Thrace (thrās), 166
Thū cyd'i dēs, 208
Thūt mo' se III, 46
Tī bē'ri us Gracchus (grak'us), 265
Ti bul'us, 296 f.
Tigris River, 60
Tilly, 648 f.
Tin, 34 f., 115
Tiryns (tīr'inz), 123 f. and Plate II
Tithe, 476
Titian, 559
Tī'tus, 294
To khār', 88, 89
Tolls in the Middle Ages, 507
Tomb, ancient, in Late Stone Age, 13; Egyptian royal, 27 ff. and Plate I; in Feudal Age in Egypt, 42 ff.; of Persian kings, 99 ff.; streets of (Athens), 207; streets of (Rome), 295
Tomb-temples and portrait statues, 46 ff.
Tourneys in the Middle Ages, 402
Tours, battle of, 367
"Tower of Babel," 63, 81
Tower of the Winds, 234
Trade, medieval, 500, 502 ff.; regulated by the towns, 508; spice, 528 ff.
Trā'jan, 231
Treaty of Mersen, 381
Trent, Council of, 619 ff.
Treves, elector of, 575; archbishop of, 508
Tribunes, 253
Trier (trēr), 289
Tripoli, 466, 467, 472
Trojan War, 112
Trojans, 117
Troubadours, 538 f.
Troy, 112, 117, 123, 131
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Truce of God, 402 f.
Tudor, House of, 434 f., 659
Turks, 460, 461, 467
Twelve Articles of peasants, 598
Tyrants, age of, 153 ff.; civilization in, 159 ff.; Greek thought in, 162 f.
Tyre, 137 f.
U'bil-Ish'tär, 66
Ulrich von Hutten, 589, 598
United Netherlands, 629 ff., 678
Unity of history, 316
Universities, medieval, 544 ff., 548
Upper Egypt, 46
Urban II, Pope, 401, 525
Usury, doctrine of, 506
Utrecht, Union of, 630; Treaty of, 693

Valentinian III, decree of, 342
Vandals, 318 f., 324
Van Dyck, 560
Van Eyck, the brothers, 559
Vaphio (va'fio), 121, 123
Vasa (va'sa), Gustavus, 648
Vassal, medieval, 397 ff.
Vassy, massacre of, 635
Vatican, 525
Vedas (va'daz), 92
Velasquez, 560
Venerable Bede, the, 348, 357
Venetian school of painting, 559
Venice, 459, 472, 503, 504, 516 ff.; government of, 519 f.
Venus, 84, 251
Versailles (ver sálz', Eng. pron.) palace of, 684 f.
Ves pa'sian, 294
Vesta, 251 and Fig. 113
Vesuvius, 297
Vikings (vi'kings), 386 note
Vil. See Manor, 394
Villains, 394
Ville, 498
Vir'gil, 280 f.
Visigoths. See West Goths
Vulgate, 619

Wager of battle, 331
Waldensians, 482
Waldo, Peter, 482

Wales, 422 ff.
Wallenstein, 647 f.
Walter the Penniless, 463
Walther von der Vogelweide, 541
Wangen (wang'en), 12
Wars of the Roses, 433 f.
Wartburg (värt'borg), translation of Bible at, by Luther, 596
Weapons, earliest, 10, 14, 53, 65, 74 f., 95 f., 243 f., 248 f.
Weaving, earliest, 10 ff., 20, 36 f.
Wedge-writing (Sumerian), 60, 62
Wessex, 405
Western mediterranean world, the, 241 ff.
West Frankish kingdom, 382, 406
West Goths, 318 f., 327, 329
Westminster Abbey, 409
Westminster, city of, 422
Westphalia, Treaty of, 651
Wheeled vehicles, earliest, 12, 61, 90
William the Conqueror, 407 ff.
William and Mary, 679
William of Orange, 678 f., 690
William Rufus, 411
William the Silent, 629 ff.
William III, 678 f.
Wit'e nä ge môt, 410
Wittenberg, 582, 585, 592
Wolfram von Eschenbach, 541
Wolsey, Thomas, Cardinal, 573, 609 f.
Wood, early use of, for tools, 3, 7; for dwellings, 9 f., 12; for furniture, 12, 37
Wooden dwellings, earliest. See House
Worms, 448; Concordat of, 451 f.; Diet at, 593; Edict of, 595
Writing, invention of, 21 ff.; Egyptian, 21 f.; Sumerian, 60, 62, 66; Babylonian, 62, 66; Chaldean, 83; Cretan, 117, 121, 123; Phoenician, 139 f.; Aramean, 71; Hebrew, 106; Greek, 130, 139 f.; Etruscan, 246; Roman, 249 ff.
Writing materials, earliest, 21 ff., 37, 62, 140
Wycliffe, John, 495
Xavier, Francis, 623
Xenophon (zen’o phon), 79, 211 f.
Xerxes (zerk’sez), 170, 174 ff.

Yahweh (yä’wē), 104, 107 f.
York, House of, 433 f.

Zā’gros Mountains, 99