



1990



HARMSWORTH
HISTORY
OF THE WORLD



ALEXANDER. THE WORLD-CONQUEROR



HARMSWORTH
HISTORY OF
THE WORLD

EDITORS
ARTHUR MEE
EDITOR OF HARMSWORTH SELF-EDUCATOR
AND THE CHILDREN'S ENCYCLOPEDIA

J. A. HAMMERTON

A. D. INNES, M.A.

FOURTH VOLUME

ANCIENT GREECE
AND ROME
MEDITERRANEAN
THE DAWN OF
CHRISTIANITY

PUBLISHED AT
CARMELITE HOUSE
LONDON

1908


BYZANTIUM
OTTOMAN EMPIRE
EASTERN EUROPE
TO THE FRENCH
REVOLUTION



CONTENTS OF THIS VOLUME

	PAGE
SIXTH GRAND DIVISION	
EUROPE	
The Continuity of Civilisation	2357
FIRST DIVISION—EUROPE TO THE FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE	
THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA	
Its Significance in World History	2371
The Dominance of Greece and Rome	2377
The Mediterranean in the Middle Ages	2387
THE EARLY PEOPLES OF SOUTH AND WESTERN EUROPE	
Peoples of the Main Balkan Peninsula	2399
The Ancient Peoples of Greece	2407
The Early Peoples of the Italian Peninsula	2411
The Kelts and their Characteristics	2425
Early Peoples of the Iberian Peninsula	2439
The Scythians, Cimmerians, and Sarmatians	2443
THE INFLUENCE OF GREECE ON THE WORLD	2451
THE STORY OF ANCIENT GREECE	
The Heroic or Legendary Age	2461
"The Glory that was Greece"	2473
The Political Development of Hellas	2481
The Acropolis During the Golden Age	2407 plate facing
The Golden Age of Athens	2407
Rivalry of the Greek States	2511
MACEDON	
The Earlier History of Macedon	2521
Philip of Macedon, and the Founding of the Empire	2529
Alexander the Great and the Making of His Empire	2541
Alexander's World Empire to the Death of the Great Conqueror	2555
The Macedonian Supremacy and the Last of Alexander's Empire	2573
The Passing of Ancient Greece	2585
Hellenism: A General Survey of Greek Civilisation	2589
THE SPIRIT OF ANCIENT ROME	2601
THE STORY OF ANCIENT ROME	
A Pageant of Ancient Rome (plates)	2609
The Beginnings of Ancient Rome	2617
The Struggle with Carthage	2637
The Decline of the Republic	2651
Pompey the Great and Julius Caesar	2661
Antony and Octavian, and the Dawn of the Augustan Age	2677
Rome in the Augustan Age	2691
Rome under Tiberius Caesar	2709
The Degradation of the Purple	2717
"The Grandeur that was Rome"	2729
Rome Under the Good Emperors	2737
The Prætorian Emperors	2763
The Reconstructed Empire; Constantine under the Banner of the Cross	2775
The Coming of the Goths	2787
Why Rome Fell	2801
THE SOCIAL FABRIC OF THE ANCIENT WORLD	
The Development of Slavery	2807
Slavery in the Ancient Empires	2813
Slavery Among the Greeks and Romans	2826
The Effects of the Slave System	2833
THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH	
The Dawn of the New Day	2837
The Apostolic Era	2847
The Spread of Christianity	2857
The Catholic Church in Being	2867
The Church Established	2881
SECOND DIVISION—EASTERN EUROPE TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION	
General Survey of the Period	2895
BYZANTIUM	
The Empress Theodora, plate facing	2907
Rise of the Byzantine Empire	2907
Civilisation of the Early Byzantine Empire	2919
The Days of the Image-Breakers	2935
Byzantium at its Zenith	2947
Byzantium on the Down Grade	2957
Fall of the Byzantine Empire	2963
The End of Byzantium	2970
OTTOMAN EMPIRE	
The Rise of the Turkish Power	2977
The Ottoman Conquest of Byzantium	2985
Life in a Turkish Harem, plate facing	2995
The Shining of the Crescent	2995
The Waning of the Crescent	3009
ARMENIA AND THE ARMENIANS	3024
THE HUNS	3027
THE BULGARIANS	
The Old Bulgarian Kingdom	3033
The Later Bulgarian Kingdom	3042
THE ROUMANIANS	
The Struggles of the Wallachian Kingdom	3051
The Moldavian People	3059
THE ALBANIANS	3064
THE SOUTHERN SLAVS	
The Southern Slav Peoples	3069
Croatia and its Warrior Race	3083
The Servian Era of Independence	3089
Under the Heel of the Turk	3097
THE STORY OF THE GIPSIES	3104

HARMSWORTH HISTORY
OF THE WORLD
SIXTH
GRAND DIVISION
EUROPE



SIXTH GRAND DIVISION EUROPE

Following the geographical scheme on which this history is based, we now reach the Grand Division of Europe. But here a difficulty arises. The history of Europe must itself occupy one-half of the entire work: so that it requires a separate scheme of subdivision for itself, while the nature of international relations precludes this from following simple geographical lines; the attempt would produce not lucidity but confusion.

Nevertheless, it is possible to discover certain main lines, a scheme of historical grouping, which will help to give us clear pictures: a grouping which corresponds to historical fact.


First, then, we observe that, in strong distinction from the East, the recorded history of organised communities in Europe does not begin till well within the last thousand years B.C. Even tradition carries us little further back; we have to rely only upon conjectural reconstructions of earlier communities based upon comparative archaeology. But from the moment that we find organised communities leading a settled existence in Greece development is rapid. Italy appears and takes definite shape while Greece is at its zenith; Rome gathers both the barbarian West and the Hellenised East under her shadow; Western Europe becomes historical precisely as it is brought into contact with the expansion of Rome; Europe is the Europe of the Roman Empire.

What lies outside is unknown: big with the future, but as yet formless. Then that outside world batters on the Roman ramparts, bursts through, rends it in twain, and deluges the western half. Thenceforth East and West work out each their own career in only partial contact. Here, then, we get our first dividing line. European history forms a unity till the time when the Roman Empire was sundered.

But here the river divides: the eastern and western streams flow separately for thirteen hundred years, when the forces which drive them towards unity receive an additional impulse from the Napoleonic struggles. In the east the Byzantine Empire carries on that of Rome, till its overthrow by the Turk; in the outer region the Naomic nationalities develop, and the Ugrian Magyars construct a state in Hungary.

Our second division, then, must be the history of Eastern Europe down to the Revolution epoch: meantime, the complexity of Western Europe history compels us to give it two divisions—the third and fourth, covering the same period—chronologically distinguished, but not otherwise, as Mediaeval and post-Reformation. Here the Celtic, Teutonic, and Latin elements blend or are differentiated anew into the western nations of modern Europe, developing into sharply defined states.

At this epoch European history again becomes a unity, treated in the fifth division, which brings us down to our own day; while the survey of Europe in our own time forms the sixth division. For the convenience of our readers we shall provide for each of these divisions a conspectus such as we have hitherto given only for the Grand Divisions.





EUROPE
FIRST DIVISION
TO THE SUNDERING OF
THE ROMAN EMPIRE

Until about the close of the fifth century of the Christian Era the history of Europe means in effect the history of just so much as fell within the ken of the Greeks and Romans. In other words, it is first the history of the development of the states of Greece, of that Hellenism which still remains the source of all intellectual life; secondly, the history of the rise and expansion of the Roman dominion which taught the world the meaning of Public Law; and, thirdly, the rise of the Christian Church as an organic body. Yet to follow the evolution of the Greeks and Romans we must first examine the ethnological and geographical conditions under which they developed—that is, the Early Peoples of South and West Europe. Thus our division falls into four clearly marked sections, to which are prefixed two essays: on the relation between European and other civilisations, and on characteristics of the Mediterranean Sea. Thus we shall see how the most brilliant of all civilisations—that of the Greeks—came into being, and how and why it failed to maintain—hardly, indeed, acquired—a real political predominance, though it remained a supreme intellectual influence. And next we shall see how an Italian city acquired first local leadership, then territorial dominion, and finally the lordship of the known world. Lastly, we shall see new barbaric forces crushing in upon it, and destroying its fabric; while another fabric of a new order—the Church—comes into being.

THE CONTINUITY OF CIVILISATION

By Professor Flinders Petrie

THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA

By Count Wilczek and Dr. H. F. Helmolt

EARLY PEOPLES OF SOUTH AND WEST EUROPE

By Dr. Karl G. Brandis, Professor C. Pauli, and Dr. Heinrich Schurtz

THE GREEKS

By Professor Ronald Burrows and Professor Rudolf von Scala

ROME



By Professor Julius Jung and W. Warde Fowler


THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

By Professor W. Walther

THE SOCIAL FABRIC OF THE ANCIENT WORLD

By W. Romaine Paterson





GENERAL MAP OF EUROPE, ILLUSTRATING THE SIXTH GRAND DIVISION OF THE HARMSWORTH HISTORY OF THE WORLD. The geographical scheme on which this history is based now brings us to the Grand Division of Europe, which must occupy one-half of the entire work, so that a separate scheme of subdivision is required. This cannot follow simple geographical lines as in previous Grand Divisions, in consequence of the complexity of international relations; but a scheme of historical groupings combining geographical features with historical fact has been devised. This plan of treatment, embracing six subdivisions for Europe, is elaborated on page 2354.

EUROPE'S DEBT TO THE PAST

A STUDY OF THE CONTINUITY OF CIVILISATION

BY PROFESSOR FLINDERS PETRIE

IN recent times the primitive instinct of the corporate life of the nation has begun to regain its proper position. In primitive states of society men will cling together to the death as a tribe, and will endure much to keep up the traditions and possessions that they have inherited from their ancestors.

The ascetic life imported from India to the west undoubtedly did much to break up this corporate feeling. Preparation for a future life became an obsession, which extinguished every interest in maintaining continuity with the life of this world. And the monastic corporations when they arose formed a new world in themselves which had little to do with surrounding life. Later than this influence the large increase in knowledge during the last three centuries has not only regained much that had slipped away, but has pushed forward until it seems as if it had lost contact with the

The View of Things a Century ago

simpler conditions of the past. The bald utilitarianism of a century ago was but another name for ignorance

and lack of sympathy. It would deny any value to aught but the purely material conditions of an animal existence. Every interest outside of those which are common to all countries and all planets alike was condemned as sentimental. Bentham and Mill led a school to live in the icy air of pure reason; and akin to this feeling was that of the French Revolution, denying all continuity, and uprooting everything for the pleasure of starting as if dropped from another planet.

The last two generations have seen an enormous change in the vision of life, wider and deeper than it has ever been comprehended before. And as our knowledge has grown, the narrow utilitarianism has shrivelled off us, and we see the use and value and nobility of lands and ages far outside of the scope of our forefathers. There are three causes which have led to this truer appreciation of the world, and

to the revival of the sense of continuity. First, we have learned far more about other existing civilisations. We do not look on them as wrong in differing from ourselves; we begin to understand that they are each adapted to the country and people to which they belong, and

The Enormous Change in the Vision of Life

we are not so certain that we can improve everybody by trying to make them imitate us. This has given us more insight to understand the differing civilisations of the past. Then, secondly, we have learned far more about what has gone before us; we no longer trifle with the few scraps of early history that have come down to us, and try to make some new sense of them, but we go direct to the remains and records of the time and read the history of Egypt and Babylonia, and Crete and Asia Minor, from the very things that were made and used in past ages. Lastly, another great influence has been that of unifying our ideas of living Nature, and regarding it as a whole, developing, growing into new forms and interacting in all its parts.

The modern view of life leads directly to a truer view of the past. We now realise the immense unity of all life, wrought into infinite diversity by the conditions and opportunities which surround it. Ever thrusting forward with a pressure of potential variety, life in one form or another finds its lodgment in every canny of the world. The lichen, the flower, the bacillus, the fish, the reptile, the bird, the quadruped, each fill some possible scope, each has a power of adaptability and of variation that fits it to

accept every variety of the openings for life that surround it. And every one of the countless varieties that we see has been led up to by an ancestry fitting itself to every chance, growing forward to every opportunity.

The Immense Unity of all Life

less varieties that we see has been led up to by an ancestry fitting itself to every chance, growing forward to every opportunity.

The realisation of this penetrating view of the unity and continuous development of Nature makes it impossible for any

reasoning man to dream of sweeping away the present basis of civilisation and starting afresh. He might as soon try to kill off all existing life and create a new set of organisms. All that can ever be done with success is to direct the growth of

**How We
May Help
Nature**

civilisation as a gardener directs the growth of new and improved varieties of fruit. He gives the best specimens the opportunity, and rejects the others. That is what Nature is constantly doing with mankind, and all we can do is, like the highest function of a physician, "to help Nature." When Nature lets a stock degenerate by bad living—high or low—let it disappear. And whenever a promising variety appears let it have every chance.

Just as the most real knowledge of Nature is gained by following out the variations of life, and tracing its changes, so the truest knowledge of man is in tracing how every variety of civilisation has grown from what it started as, and where it has paused, fallen back, or made fresh strides. There is no death, no legacy of a past; but an ever-flowing amount of life, handed on without break, without hesitation, ever changing and flowing in fresh channels. And at no point can be made a division that would not seem monstrous when we look at the age itself; whether it is the longer scale of the Saurians, the coal forests, and the silent seas of shell-fish and corals, or in the shorter scale of the stone-worker, the bronze-smelter, or the ironsmith, the chain of life knows no break in its ceaseless dependence on the past and production of the future. It is ever the result and the cause. Each age is but the trustee for the accumulated knowledge, powers, and facilities of life—called wealth—which are to be passed on—improved, if possible—to the future.

This continuity is not only in the important and great affairs, but also in the most trivial matters; not only in whole phases and styles, but in every little detail. The smallest point of character or of invention will continue to affect the detail of future things which may be quite different in nature and extent.

Two extreme instances of this may be given. The English gold coin was worth twenty shillings down to the Commonwealth. But as silver was the standard

of value—the pound-piece used to fluctuate from Charles II. to Anne's reign at any value between twenty and thirty shillings, but was generally at twenty-two. George I. fixed the exchange at twenty-one shillings, a mere accident of the time; and for a hundred years it continued at this value, until in 1817 the weight was reduced to fit the old value of twenty shillings. Here, an accident of exchange, and the inertia against changing the weight of the coin, has led to a guinea becoming fixed as the unit for all professional fees—except lawyers, who stick to the older "mark" of 13s. 4d.—all prices of articles of luxury—paintings, plate, carriages, jewellery—and all subscriptions.

Again, in the beginning of railways a carriage was built to hold so many people, the wheels were set on in the most convenient way, and there happened to be 4 ft. 8½ in. between them. The rails had to be laid down to fit them. More carriages and more rails were made, until now all Britain and much of the world elsewhere is tied to this mere accidental size of the experimental gauge. The strong attempt

**Decisive
Effect of
the Trivial** to get a 7 ft. gauge almost succeeded, but it could not overcome the original accident of size made by a man who never thought that he was controlling so much of the future.

How important these gauges are is little supposed. Two neighbouring Powers on the Continent had different gauges; A changed to the same as B. B in fright changed to another gauge, so that A could not overrun its lines. Then A made axles with sliding wheels to fit both gauges. The uniformity of a gauge may make or ruin the whole future of a nation. As the Japanese advanced into Manchuria with a narrower gauge than the Russians, they shifted the lines, and cut off the ends of all the sleepers, so that no Russian truck could run without entire renewal of the line.

It is impossible in private affairs to trace such distant causes of mere accidental events, of no apparent importance at the time; but in these great public results we see how continuous is the cause and its effects, and how impossible it is to get away from the results of acts which do not even depend on great or conscious decisions.

The fact that most marriages depend on very casual conditions of acquaintance

in their origin shows how the future of most people is conditioned by even small events. This view may seem to be somewhat fatalistic, as if all was hopelessly conditioned by the past. And so it is if we do not exercise foresight and judgment. With more foresight we should never have been troubled with guinea accounts and with irregular railway gauges. But just as circumstances offer infinite opportunities for favourable variations in organisms to succeed, so circumstances also offer full scope to will, exercised in foresight and judgment, to select the best, and by selection to rule and advance.

The wider and more intelligent view of the past has brought us to realise that we should not look at earlier forms of civilisation as blundering attempts to reach our present position and failures by just so much as they differ from our standards, but that we should look on each great institution as being the best solution that could be devised to meet the difficulties of its day. Each age has its own troubles and dangers to be met, just as we have; and each age is responsible for meeting those difficulties by applying and developing the various means that are at its hand. There is nothing in our conditions at present different in character from those of past times, and probably future times will look back on us as merely an indistinguishable stage of affairs.

When we look at the various institutions in our own history in England we can see how each of them was conditioned by the surrounding facts of life, and how each was the best solution which could be fitted to those facts. Given a very scattered population, living largely by hunting, with no central power, and continually in tribal wars, the conquered were mercifully treated by being made slaves instead of being killed off; slavery was in that stage the best solution, and in one stage of society it is almost essential to progress. Given a scattered population settled in pastoral life, in carefully reckoned families and clans; in order to check the habits of violence and to keep the peace, every injury up to murder was assessed at a given fine in cattle, and this fine was to be charged on all the guilty man's relations, out to minute fractions on fifth cousins. Thus, everybody was his brother's and his cousin's keeper, and

it was the business of everybody for his own sake to see that no violence occurred. Blood-money was the best solution for law in that stage.

When the headstrong northern nations came into touch with Roman civilisation and the Church, long discipline was needed to develop self-restraint. Here the severe penitential system and the strong legal power of the Church were of the highest service, and proved to be the right solution of the difficulty by appealing to what was best in the wild natures they had to bring into order. What that nature was—raiding, plundering, burning, and slaying, with very light hearts—is, perhaps, best seen in a tale of a party of Norsemen who had taken a batch of captives, and ordered them to sit in a row along a fallen tree while one went along with a sword to lop off their heads. One head fell, and another, and another, till one dropped off so absurdly that they all burst out laughing, and both sides enjoyed the joke so heartily that they really did not see why any more heads should be cut off, and so the survivors were let off and probably remained as serfs.

Without any general police force, and with a large number of strangers and "broken men" in the country, from both Welsh and Danish sources, it was essential that everyone should be answerable to a higher authority, just as now in the East every man must be under the authority of some head-man or sheikh. Hence, the stranger who could not produce any credentials was treated more severely than we now treat an actual thief. For a population living in scattered homesteads in the woods such law was the best solution. Not only had the stray outlaw to be dealt with, but the great danger from the immense hordes from the whole of Scandinavia and the Baltic had to be met. The old system, good enough against Welsh enemies, was entirely useless against the Danish host of ten thousand men well armed, who could break through Saxon England from side to side in great raiding marches at their pleasure.

The system of great castles was the only salvation of the land, centres so strong that only a long and regular siege could subdue them. A strong baronage and great castles were the best solution of


**Ours is But
A Stage
In Progress**

**Civilisation
and the
Wild Norsemen**

**Civilisation
Saved
By Castles**

the Norse affliction. These, however, in their turn, became a means of oppression, and required a check, and the greatest service of our Norman kings was in their control of the baronage. An unexampled line of strong men held the English throne, many wrong, but a l l strong — only one weak man in nine during more than two and a half centuries.

the Norse affliction. These, however, in their turn, became a means of oppression, and required a check, and the greatest service of our Norman kings was in their control of the baronage. An unexampled line of strong men held the English throne, many wrong, but a l l strong — only one weak man in nine during more than two and a half centuries.



THE SPLENDID WEAPONS OF
Every race has cried out on the ways of and the Saxon conquering Britain was coming civilisation; yet, he was better his weapons were really splendid, as battle-axes which were found in the peat-


This made England far more prosperous than any other land, and a powerful sovereign was a counterpoise to the baronage, while these two forms of authority formed the best government, in the absence of sufficient education in other classes to enable them to take part in affairs.

Coming later, the strength of the Church and of the baronage was injurious, and a strong king was needed to reduce them. The hosts of armed retainers which had been needed when the land was disturbed were a waste and a danger under a firm government, and Henry VII. abolished them by merciless fines. The absorption of men and money in monasticism was a waste and a moral injury, and for a century not a single endowment had been given for such purposes in London; Henry VIII. abolished the system, which had ceased to be useful. The strong Tudors were essential to England. But kingship of such a strength, having done its work, needed a counterpoise. The same power of compulsory rule was tried by a democracy under the Commonwealth, but proved an entire failure in government. A pause followed, and then a new solution was found and applied under William III., of toleration, bounded only by political necessity.

Barons and Monks Reduced

monasticism was a waste and a moral injury, and for a century not a single endowment had been given for such purposes in London; Henry VIII. abolished the system, which had ceased to be useful. The strong Tudors were essential to England. But kingship of such a strength, having done its work, needed a counterpoise. The same power of compulsory rule was tried by a democracy under the Commonwealth, but proved an entire failure in government. A pause followed, and then a new solution was found and applied under William III., of toleration, bounded only by political necessity.

To come nearer would lead us to questions of present politics and debate; but the principle that in each age the institutions have been the best working solution of the difficulties and conditions of the time is clearly seen in these examples.



THE SAVAGE SAXON
newcomers as barbarous, looked on as a savage over-armed than the Briton, and may be seen from these fine moss of Nydam in Sleswig.

There has been a continuous adaptation of means, without break or rest. The difficulties have been new, depending on changes in knowledge and in movements of races, but there has been a continual course of meeting them out of existing resources, step by step. We, too, have to deal with changes in transmission, both of persons and of news, and in the using of natural forces, which must result in immense remodelling of all the systems of life. We have faced much of it, and have even more yet to deal with. But the only road is that of continuous change, just as past times have met their new conditions. The one general lesson is that successful adaptation depends on incessant gradual movement, and that a jerky progress by fits and starts is the most damaging to the social machine.

The continuity of civilisation has been much obscured by the changes that it has undergone. What we have in general are very one-sided accounts, and naturally each race has cried out on the ways of newcomers as hateful, oppressive, and barbarous. It is difficult to realise at first that the people who are objected to as savages may be really on a higher plane in abilities, in knowledge, or in morals. Yet such has been the case. The Saxon conquered Britain, and is looked on as a savage overcoming civilisation. Yet he was better armed than the Briton, with beautifully made chain mail, and splendid weapons, while his handiwork in shipbuilding was of the best. Gildas, the British historian, calls the Saxon "fierce and

impious," yet he calls his own people cruel, false, luxurious, and licentious, laity and clergy alike. The fierce and impious Saxon was the better man in every way, as well as the more skilful and able. In spite of the high culture which the Saxon quickly developed, as we see in the great historian Bede, he soon corrupted, so that Alfred wrote: "So clean was learning fallen off among English folk, tha few there were on this side Humber that could understand the Service in English . . . so few that I cannot bethink me of one south of the Thames." The Dane was the remedy, another wave of the same sock and civilisation which had overflowed the Briton. He had far better organisation and governing power than the Saxon. The great Canute gave England a time of strong and good government, trusting entirely to English support, better than the country had ever known before.

Lastly came the finest race of all—the indomitable Northman, educated by the Roman civilisation of France, the Norhman who in Sicily founded the most splendid civilisation of tolerance and ability that had ever been seen in the world. In England, he made England what it is; and in no other two centuries has this land changed so much as between Edward the Confessor and Edward I. Thus, harsh as these great changes were, and however much our sympathy may be with the conquered in each case, it was the better man that won, and there was more throw-back by the degeneration in peace than there was by loss in war.

But a great lesson from this view is that no race or class can long continue that is not of the best ability and usefulness in the world. Without striving, there is stagnation, and stagnation inevitably means decay and disappearance. If man will not strive with Nature, he must strive with his fellow-man or pass away.

We must not look merely on only one idea of civilisation—there are many different lines. Each is a form of civilisa-

tion, but no people ever united them all together, and few have even been great in more than a single line. There is moral civilisation with a strong ethical sense, developing generally as a religious spirit. There is artistic civilisation,

splendid and attractive to all future ages. There is scientific civilisation, the knowledge of Nature and the power over it.


And there is the civilisation of luxury, display, and wealth. Each conduces to the ability for the communal life of man, the power of the *civis*, or citizen, which leads to being citizenised or civilised.

To make this more clear, let us notice a great and exclusive instance of each of these forms of civilisation. There was the moral force of the Puritan, who hated art, who despised science, and who ignored

wealth; yet he gave the force of character which made the Englishman's word trusted, and which moved most of the humanitarian improvements of modern times. There was the ancient Greek, supreme in the sense of the beautiful, who was grossly immoral, who knew very little of science, and who was a poor dweller in a barren land. There was the Jesuit, great in scientific skill and the advancement of know-

ledge, whose moral sense is a byword, who had no feeling for art, and who was vowed to poverty and self-denial. For wealth and luxury none could excel the later Imperial Roman; yet his morals were infamous, his science trivial, and his art detestable. Each of these peoples were truly and highly civilised, but each in only one direction.

We now turn to actual examples of continuity in various pursuits of life. In art there are many striking instances; indeed, it appears that each land has an artistic style which belongs to it through all ages and changes. In France there is a spray carved on bone by Palæolithic Man which might belong to an ivory carving of the Middle Ages [see page 151]. The style of the earliest Iron Age, as found at La Tène, is closely like the ironwork



BEAUTIFUL SAXON CHAIN-WORK

A specimen of the beautifully-made iron chain-mail of the conquering Saxon, from Denmark; the same excellence of workmanship is seen in the horse-bit.

**No Thriving
Except
by Striving**

designs on the church doors of the fourteenth century.

The lumpy curves in high relief of the late Keltic bronzework revived again in the Louis Quinze style, especially furniture. In Germany the bronze decoration of Roman times found on the Rhine might well be a piece of modern German work in its fulsome style: and the crowded design of the embossed gold plates of the great altar of Milan, made by a German a thousand years ago, recall the close packing of a Dürer wood engraving. In Italy, the old Etruscan style of figures, with staring eyes and coarse straight hair, was suppressed for four centuries by Greek influence, but revived in the age of Constantine. And the long, straight legs and stiff posture of the figures on Roman sarcophagi in North Italy reappear in the paintings of a thousand years later. The continuity of art and feeling appears to belong to the land itself, and to revive in each race that comes in and after each eclipse by an alien influence.

But this does not at all account for style as a whole. There is a strong influence of each age, widespread in all lands that are in touch with each other. Beside the direct influence due to actual immigration, such as the Roman work all round the Mediterranean Sea, or the modern European style which is spreading over all the world now, there is also a fashion of each age—as, for instance, the mediæval Arabic illuminations closely like French work of the same age.

The history of art, then, may be likened to a piece of woven stuff. The long lines of warp represent the continuing styles of each country, always reappearing; while the cross threads of woof are the fashion of each age, being threaded through the permanent warp and binding it all together. This analogy is not only true of art, but also of political thought, and perhaps of all branches of civilisation. History is the fabric woven of space and time, the abiding threads of each country being chequered by the times, now bright, now gloomy, which affect all countries alike. And the patterns that are woven in the loom of history depend upon



GERMAN ART 1,000 YEARS AGO



THE ART OF DÜRER, 500 YEARS LATER

Each land has an artistic style which belongs to it through all ages. Thus the crowded design of the gold plates of the great altar of Milan, made by a German 1,000 years ago, recalls the close packing of a Dürer engraving.

whether the thread of time or the thread of place is uppermost. We can see the threads of warp stretching into the future, and know that they will not change; the woof of the times shot across them is the only thing in man's power, and is what we cannot foresee, but can direct.

Religion is, perhaps, of all forms of thought that which shows most continuity; this is partly owing to a sense of sanctity, preventing change, and to its being not often challenged by ethics, and still more seldom by facts. We may take one example—the worship of the Great Mother goddess, supreme in

Mediterranean lands, "whom all Asia and the world worshipped." After the cruder early worships had died down, being withered by the theology of gods which came down into Greece from the north, then the spread from Egypt of

THE CONTINUITY OF CIVILISATION

the worship of Isis as the Great Mother covered all civilised lands. In York, in Germany, all through France, Switzerland, and Italy, in Africa and in Syria, Isis was the Queen of Heaven, the mother to whom all appealed.

Her service of tonsured priests in white, with litany and sacrifice, resounded in all lands. Isis and her son Horus had won the worship given to the Great Mother around the Mediterranean. And then a compromise with Christianity became inevitable. With an easy compliance the Syrian Maid Miriam, or Mary, became called the Queen of Heaven; and the Divine Teacher, the Man of Sorrows, was, with bold transformation, viewed as the infant Horus, a type new to Christianity. The substance of the old worship remained under altered names, and the Great Mother and her Infant are still the adored of Mediterranean lands. Again, Dr. Evans has found that in Crete some one or two thousand years before Christianity, the Greek cross was the object of worship in the form which still distinguishes the Greek Church. It is familiar how the so-called festivals of the Church were far older religious ceremonies which were adapted to the new doctrine. The celebrated letter of Pope Gregory in 601 A.D. gives the change in detail:

“The temples of the idols of the English ought not to be destroyed . . . let altars be erected and relics placed . . . and because they have been used to slaughter many oxen in the sacrifices to devils, some solemnity must be exchanged . . . as that on the day of dedication on the natiivities of the holy martyrs . . . for it is impossible to efface everything at once from their obdurate minds.”

In short, no beliefs can be expelled from a whole people; they can only be overlaid by other ideas, transformed and modified. What men now believe in

England is not only some formula of church or chapel, but a host of far older ideas of luck, of places and things and numbers, which have come down from untold ages.

How much has passed from very early times to our own common use is seldom understood. The ancient Babylonian chanted in sorrow :

“O my Lord! my sins are many, my trespasses are great ;
 And the wrath of the gods has plagued me with disease and with sickness and sorrow.
 I fainted but no one stretched out his hand ;
 I groaned, but no one drew nigh.
 I cried aloud, but no one heard.
 O Lord, do not abandon Thy servant.
 In the waters of the great storm hold Thou his hand.

The sins which he has committed, turn Thou to righteousness.”

So sang the penitent Jew long after him, so wept the Church all through the Middle Ages, and so echoes the chant in every cathedral to-day. The Book of Psalms is but little changed from the religious songs which rose from the Euphrates long before Moses; yet it formed the most important and all-present book of the Church for many centuries, recited through entirely every day by millions of men. Such is religious continuity.

In government there is not only continuity but continual repetition of the same idea age after age. The world gets no older. The steady growth of institutions, transformed in each age without a breach, is a ground-principle of English life.

In Rome we see the same idea, for, immense as was the change from the Republic to the Cæsars, and from the Cæsars to the later Empire, yet each change was grafted on what preceded it. Each emperor was a consul and a tribune; and the solemn farce of votes of power, as Tribune and



ART'S CONTINUITY IN ITALY
 The continuity of art was strikingly illustrated in Italy, where the old Etruscan style of figures with staring eyes and coarse hair was revived four centuries later in the age of Constantine, seen in the head from a medallion on the right.



CROSS BEFORE CHRISTIANITY
 Continuity in religion is well illustrated by the marble cross, found in Crete, used some thousand years before Christianity.

Pontiff for ten years at a time, which was begun in the second century, became most prominent in the fifth century, when it was farthest from any real meaning. Thus do forms of government survive by the clinging of man to continuity.

The various types of government have all been in use in different ages. Constitutions flourished in Greece as a political epidemic, so that the description of their varieties was a main part of political literature. Every obscure city was changing continually through the range of democracies, oligarchies, and tyrannies.

It may be thought that the latest phase of our own time is something new. Yet read this: "All ought to enjoy all things in common, and live upon the same amount of property; and not for one to be rich and another miserably poor. nor one to cultivate much land and another to have not even enough to be buried in. . . .

I will make one common subsistence for all, and that, too, equal." "But how then if any of us do not possess land, but silver and gold, personal property?" "He shall pay it in for public use . . . for it will be of no use to him at all." "Pray why?" "No one will do any wickedness through poverty, for all will be possessed of all things." "But if one lose a lawsuit, how will he pay damages?" "But there will not be any lawsuits." "Not if a man disputes his debts?" "No; for there could not be a lender unless he had stolen the money." "But in case of assault, where are the damages?" "Out of the man's food rations." "But will there be no thieves?" "No; for all shall have subsistence; and if anyone tries to steal a cloak it will be given up readily, because there is always another better to be had from the common stock." "But what sort of life shall we lead?" "Common to all. For I say I will make the city one single house, having broken up

**Socialism
at Work
in Greece**

all into one, also that they may go into each other's houses." Is this Mr. H. G. Wells? No; it is Aristophanes, with his tongue in his cheek at the visionaries of his day. And, seriously, much such a frame of life existed and was actually worked in a Greek state, which is more than can be said of any modern country. The production and training of children was a matter of the state, not left to any individual notions. Incessant

inspection and supervision left not a moment outside of state control, and training was incessant. Men dined together on precisely the same fare; and all servants, dogs, and horses were public property. Houses were of the plainest and simplest materials. Agriculture was the main industry, and commerce was prevented. Capital was so hardly dealt with that if any were acquired it was stored abroad in other states. Such was Sparta, the best and most successful example of a socialist state, where the public power was supreme, and no shirking of burdens was allowed. This was a more complete experiment than any that have been carried out since to such an end. The result was that advance was impossible, and not a single benefit, or improvement, or addition to knowledge, was made by the whole people. Later ages would never have missed them, and their neighbours would have been much happier without them. The past has sufficed to try the varieties of government, and we need only to look through what mankind has already found out if we wish to know

**The Far-back
Basis
of our Laws**

how various systems and checks practically work. The success of any particular type of government entirely depends on the character and abilities of the rulers and the ruled.

In laws there is the same continuity of civilisation. Much of the world is governed by Roman law, of which the changes may be followed in history from the primitive twelve tables of the Republic, gradually expanded to the Code of Justinian. That Code, fortified by a digest of illustrative decisions, has formed the legal groundwork of all Latin Europe for 1,300 years. England and the northern peoples, on the other hand, cling mainly to developments from the tribal laws of prehistoric ages. And all countries have been influenced, more or less, by the Canon Law of the Church, which is Semitic Hebrew law in its foundation, changed by western associations.

In all ages and countries some means have been found for adapting laws to new conditions without violating their continuity. It is easier to add a patch rather than make a new article—it does not clash with the feelings of people, and it avoids touching laws which often have acquired a religious sanctity. The easiest way of adapting a law is by a legal fiction,


by which difficulties are overcome without actually altering a law. For instance, a common transfer of shares at the present day requires the amount paid on the other side of the bargain to be stated, but as it is often a bequest or a gift, the amount could hardly be named; so a convenient custom of saying that five shillings has been given for perhaps thousands of pounds' worth of property, is a legal fiction to save trouble. The same document calls to witness the signatures and seals of the sellers and buyers, but their seals — which were so essential in the Middle Ages, as now in the East — are, by a legal fiction, represented by a row of little embossed red stamps exactly alike. And, further, the date of signing is supposed to be written before the signature, but is always left blank, so that no difficulty may arise about the document being handed in too long after signing. Here a form used thousands of times daily entirely rests in the most important particulars upon a series of fictions, in order to save trouble in altering the laws.

Another way out of the difficulty of continuity is by altering the law to meet the hardship of the individual case where it might work unjustly, a power reserved to the Crown through its high officials, under the name of Equity. The appeal for evading the consequences of the ordinary law may be made to the principles of the law, where the practical working of it is against those principles; or sometimes an appeal has been made to a so-called "Law of Nature," which merely means the average conscience of man, or those conditions which are necessary for any social life.


The continuity requires to be entirely broken in some cases, and a new law set up, and this is done by us in an Act of

Parliament; but this is very rarely the case, as most Acts deal only with the relative power of various parties already acting, and are but slight modifications of the conditions. In geography and astronomy our knowledge has been built up continuously on that of thousands of years ago. How far the Babylonian and Egyptian astronomers had gone we have not enough records to show. Certainly by 4,700 B.C. the Egyptian could fix the north point, or meridian, to within a minute of angle or less. We reach the complete treatise on geography and the positions of the stars in the grand work of Ptolemy, the astronomer of Alexandria about 150 A.D. When we consider that he had to build up his map out of all kinds of irregular material, we may be surprised that it is, on the whole, so true. There were no surveys of any extent, but he had only distances along a network of roads, records of voyages, and a few notes of the number of the hours in the day in summer or winter; and where these materials did not check each other, as in the scanty accounts of distant lands, it was no wonder that prominences — such as the Kentish foreland, the Egyptian Delta and India — were not understood. And it is not till within the lifetime of present people that we have exceeded the accuracy of Ptolemy in every respect, as his map of Central Africa was not bettered till the days of Speke. His astronomy, giving the places of over a thousand stars, all registered by latitudes and longitudes, was a grand work, which is still of value in some inquiries. Altogether, Ptolemy, by rescuing the earlier work of Hipparchus, and improving and extending it, made one of the greatest steps in the systematic knowledge of Nature. He did for geography and astronomy what


**How
Geography
Grew Up**



PLAN OF A MEDIÆVAL HOUSE
The mediæval house was a large hall with a fireplace at one end and two chambers, the master's bedroom, and a storeroom, behind it.



A SIXTEENTH CENTURY HOUSE
The 16th century house had two floors connected by a stair (e) from the general house (a and b) where there was a fireplace (d).



SAXON HOUSE ARRANGEMENT
In domestic architecture there has been entire continuity from the old style of Saxon house, with its cattle stalls (b, c) on both sides of a long hall (a), through its mediæval modifications to the two-floor 16th century building. From Addy's "Evolution of the English House."


**The Law
Saving its
Character**

the average conscience of man, or those conditions which are necessary for any social life.

Linnaeus did for botany, and Buffen for zoology. When we turn to the arts of life, the chief of them, architecture, seems so peculiar to each country that the continuous descent of it is not obvious over long periods. But one of the best fields for studying the growth of variation is in English buildings. Over some six centuries, 1000-1600 A.D., the unbroken descent of one form from another is beautifully continuous. And if the last three centuries have stopped the evolution, yet the other forms used have been entirely intentional

copies of older works, stepping back to pick up various designs which were the best of their times. And though in formal architecture on a large scale the chain of continuous descent has been dropped, yet in domestic building it has continued down to recent times.

The mediaval house was a large room or hall, with a fireplace at the upper end; and later it had two chambers behind this fire, with a door on each side of the fire. These were used for the master's bedroom and a store-room, while the servants slept on straw in the hall. Where cattle were kept for a farm, the old style of Saxon house had stalls down both sides of a long hall. The next type was formed by putting boards up on the tie-beams of the open roof to form a platform to sleep upon. Thus an upper floor was begun. Then the hall was encroached upon by more chambers being cut off around it, the ladder or stair still going up out of the hall, as before. The idea of a passage giving entrance to several rooms did not come into use till the eighteenth century; till then the



THE BLOUSE OF THE SAXONS
Which lasted down to our own days in the English smock-trock and the French blouse.

rooms merely led one out of the other even in palaces, as Hampton Court or the Louvre. Then a lengthening out of the hall took place, so as to give access to all the rooms separately, and our modern passages appear. The master's meals and living retreated from the hall to his own private room, and then the "servants' hall" remained. Lastly, the hall has shrunk to the modern entrance passage, only just wide enough to pass in, and we have the idea of the house as a group of chambers fitted together, with the least possible space wasted on passages for access. Thus in domestic architecture there has been entire continuity. Now the movement is to limit each family to one floor, and to construct flats. The next

stage may be to have kitchens in common, and order all food from a central supply; and the use of large reception-rooms, which are seldom wanted, may be enjoyed in rotation, as required.

When we look at earlier architecture, we see how very strong is the continuity of forms. In Egypt, where colossal stonework was built during thousands of years, the essential features were the slope of outer sides copied from brickwork, the roll extending down the corners copied from houses of palm-stick or maize stalk, and the overhanging cornice copied from the heads of the palm-sticks nodding over. In Greece, all the features of the marble architecture were copied from woodwork. the beams, the roofing boards, the nail-heads were all elaborately made in stone, like the modern cast-iron imitations of stonework. In Rome the system of coffered ceilings, which was entirely of



SAXON
TROUSERS

This example of one of the oldest garments of our forefathers, showing a continuity in the form of dress over probably 2,000 years, is from the peat-moss of Nydam, in Sleswig.

THE CONTINUITY OF CIVILISATION

woodwork design, was not only made in marble; but was copied in immense concrete castings. In every country and age we can see the strong effect of continuity in architecture after the real causes of form have passed away, and it has ceased to have a structural meaning.

When we turn to the more personal protection of man in clothing, we see the same continuity. The oldest garments of our forefathers that we can show are the smock or blouse and the trousers, found in the peat moss of Sleswig, and made two or three centuries before the Saxons moved

from those parts. Similar garments were used further east, in what is now Roumania; but there the blouse was rather longer, and tied with a girdle round the waist, while the trousers had no foot-piece, but were tucked into a leather shoe laced up the front. This type of dress lasted down to our own days, in the English smock-frock and the French blouse. It is the dress of Northern Europe, in contrast to the dress of the Mediterranean, which is more akin to the Eastern robe.

The jacket is an entirely different garment, probably belonging to Central and Eastern Europe. The trousers in the Sleswig example have a foot covering attached, like the hose of pages in the fifteenth century. They were held up by a girdle passing through loops round the top edge, a better form than the modern workman's loose sash round the waist. Thus there is a continuity in dress over probably a couple of thousand years. Though fashions are always changing, yet the variations are only in the details

of form, while the general shape remains much the same. The waistcoat has lengthened in the latter half of the seventeenth century, and then shortened again to its present size. The coat is sometimes fuller, sometimes plainer, but the forms practically continue.

Woman's dress has varied greatly in detail, but in its essential forms it has continued with hardly any alteration. The flounced skirts of the Cretans, over 3,000 years ago, might well be a modern fashion. The bodice, though so open, was almost rivalled by some a couple of cen-

turies ago, and is, in principle, a modern form. The ornamental additions are akin to those of modern days, and there has not been any new type permanently added to woman's dress since the prehistoric times. In the various crafts, different styles, when once started, are continued for ages as a basis for growth and variations. The characteristic clay and colouring of Greek pottery begins to be used as early as 5400 B.C., being found in the tombs of kings of the first Egyptian dyn-



MODERN FASHIONS 3,000 YEARS AGO

Woman's dress, in its essential forms, has continued with hardly alteration, as may be seen in the flounced skirts of these Cretan priestesses which, over 3,000 years old, might well be a modern fashion. From Dr. Evans' report on the excavations at Cnossos.

asty; and the patterns and forms begun then continue to develop onwards for 4,000 years. New ideas and types then came in; but yet the old colouring and clay, and family of forms went on down to the Roman Age, without any great break.

In shipbuilding the advance was great in the prehistoric ages. The large size of the vessels as far back as 6000-7000 B.C. proves the skill of the builders. The ships were at least 50 ft. long, or more probably over 100 ft., by the

proportion of the cabins built upon them. And the structure of a wooden vessel of this size must be fairly good to be seaworthy at all.


The first actual example of shipping that is preserved is that found at Nydam, in Sleswig, belonging to about 200 A.D., two or three centuries before our Saxon

Earliest Ship in Existence

ancestors left that land. This is a clincher-built boat, each plank being attached to the next with iron nails. The framing is elaborately made to give elasticity and play, useful both in strains of position and in changes of wetting and drying, as the vessels were hauled up in winter. In place of nailing the boards on to the ribs of bent timber, each board was worked down, leaving projecting

used by the Saxons before the use of copper, perhaps 4,000 years ago, the *ceosel*, or flint stone, passed through the mediæval *cisel* to the Middle English chisel; the Saxon *hamor* is supposed to mean originally the "stone," and this gave all the northern nations the word hammer.

The forms of modern tools have been almost unchanged for 2,000 or 3,000 years. From the Bronze Age in Italy at about 800 B.C. descend the various forms of chisel—the round stem with wide shoulder and square tang, the square stem, the octagonal stem, the wide smoothing chisel, the socket chisel, and the mortise chisel. These are all thoroughly well designed, with wide shoulders to prevent their being driven



THE EARLIEST SHIP NOW IN EXISTENCE: A SAXON BOAT OF 200 A.D.

A remarkable boat, preserved in the peat-moss of Nydam, elaborately built to give elasticity against great strains. Continuity in boat-building has been unbroken, and this design has not been departed from for 2,000 years.

lugs of wood to come on both sides of each rib. These pierced lugs were then lashed to the ribs by raw hide strips, leaving necessarily a good deal of play. Thus the boat was really an elastic shell of joined planks, which was kept from being crushed out of shape by lashing to a stiff frame inside. This, and other boats of the same class, are considered to be thoroughly adapted to the ocean-raiding work for which they were built. The design has not altered for nearly 2,000 years, and perhaps much longer, and continuity in boat-building has been unchanged, except in adaptation to larger forms and iron construction. Beside the continuity in works there is a similar continuity in the forms of tools. The very names cling to them long after they have been changed; the flint cutter

up into the wooden handle, and rings of thickening on the sockets to prevent their splitting. Gouges are also found of the same age, as well as curved knives with a socket handle.

Other modern forms are found in the earliest steel tools known, of about 670 B.C. made by the Assyrians. The chisels have not the wide, thin shoulder all round, but a stout projection on the under and upper surfaces, and none at the sides. There are very strong iron ferrules for the handles, showing that they were beaten. The forms are the stout cutting chisel, the mortise chisel and the smoothing chisel. A brace was also used, as some bits with square shanks show; the centre-bit has a middle pin, but scraped the way on both sides, instead of one side cutting the edge; the scoop bit

The First Tools Made of Steel

is an excellent form for hard wood. Two pieces of iron, which are probably parts of the brace, were found with these. An elementary file is formed like a very thick knife, hatched by chisel cuts on both sides and back; it is the original of the modern sawfish. The long rasp is exactly of the modern pattern, with points raised by punching.


Thus the main tools were well known 2,500 years ago; they have been improved in some cases, but others continue exactly as then used in the days of the Jewish kingdom.

When we come to Roman times, the rest of the modern tools appear. The grand quantity of tools from Pompeii, which were made about 70 A.D., are supplemented by various discoveries in Britain and other lands. The

ators all unity; so that $\frac{7}{8}$ was written $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8}$, or, $\frac{5}{6} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3}$, or, $\frac{11}{12} = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4}$. The Babylonian took a more complex, but in some ways a more convenient, system of 60 as a base, thus divisible by 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 15, 20, 30; and he dealt with fractions as multiples of smaller and smaller units. The hour was the time unit, and the

degree was the angle unit, both being divided into minutes and seconds. And this system seems now to have been stamped on the whole world for ever. We have seen how the alphabet of Europe has continuously developed from ownership marks, during about 8,000 or 9,000 years, until it has now spread over the world, and may perhaps drive out some of the other systems of Arabia, India, and China. A

Our Time is From Babylon



TOOLS IN MODERN USE, DESIGNED FROM 2,000 TO 3,000 YEARS AGO

The forms of modern tools have remained almost unchanged for 2,000 or 3,000 years. The group of bronze chisels on the right, made in Italy about 800 B.C., hardly differ from chisels now in use, and many modern tools—cutting and mortise chisels, centre-bits, file, and rasp—are seen in the group at the left of the earliest steel tools known, made by Assyrians about 670 B.C. The Romans produced the hammer, specimens made about 70 A.D., being seen in the centre.

Hammers are of several types—the heavy smoothing hammer for beating metal, the caulking hammer, with a square edge, the clawhammer, and various others. The axes are of many forms, most of which may be seen now in Italy. Picks for breaking stone and for picking up the ground, are usual. Knives are very varied, usually with a curve, like modern Italian forms. Lastly, we may look at the mode of record and notation. The Egyptian had developed a pure decimal system, with a different sign for each place of figures up to millions [see page 246], and this has lasted for over 8,000 years. He also invented a system of fractions with numer-

Decimals are Egyptian


similar growth is now going on in the use of mathematical and chemical notations, which are continually receiving fresh signs and conventions. These will last, with perhaps some simplifications, and be the vehicles of knowledge for future ages.

In every department of man's activities we see then the same continuity that belongs to life itself. A really new thought or invention is very rare; each step is conditioned by the past, and could not have been reached without the previous movements that led up to it. In every respect—physically, intellectually, and spiritually—man is "the heir of all the ages," and his future welfare lies in giving the fullest effect and expansion to his glorious inheritance.

W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE



Cartagena, a port of the Western Mediterranean, founded by the Phœnicians of Carthage.



The Rock of Gibraltar, one of the Pillars of Hercules, guarding the entrance to the Mediterranean.



The harbour of Corfu, an island gem of the Ionian Mediterranean.

TYPICAL SCENES ON THE SUNNY MEDITERRANEAN

EUROPE TO THE FALL OF



THE ROMAN EMPIRE

THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA

By Count Wilczek and Dr. H. F. Helmolt

ITS SIGNIFICANCE IN WORLD HISTORY

THE importance of the Mediterranean in the history of the world rests, in the first place, on its geographical position. Although of comparatively limited extent, it is enclosed by three parts of the earth which differ completely in their physical, geographical, and ethnological character. If we picture to ourselves the "Pillars of Hercules," through which the Atlantic Ocean penetrates deep into the heart of the various countries, as closed, and the whole basin of the Mediterranean, together with its extensions—the Sea of Marmora, the Black Sea, and the Sea of Azov—as dried up, then the continent of the Old World would appear a connected whole. Without any visible divisions, the lands would blend and form a terrestrial unit, which, in consequence of its enormous expanse, would exhibit climatic and meteorological conditions as unfavourable as Central Asia. But owing to this inflowing of the ocean, certain sharply defined parts have been formed, each of which is in itself large enough to constitute a clearly marked continent.

The contours of Europe, Asia, and Africa are therefore really formed and individualised by the Mediterranean, though the sharpness of the demarcation is accentuated by an arm of the Indian Ocean, the Red Sea. The eastern boundary between Europe and Asia alone remains undefined, since it lies beyond the formative and modifying influence of

the Mediterranean. As a result of the sharp separation between the three continents, these physical peculiarities, together with the whole attendant train of local phenomena, come far more prominently forward than could have been the case had there been only a gradual transition from land to land without the severing expanse of sea. The eastern border of Europe offers another striking proof of this. The Mediterranean determines not merely the external outline of the continents at their points of contact, but preserves for them in a most remarkable manner the peculiar stamp of their characteristics.

The effect, however, of this expanse of water is not only to separate and distinguish, but also to unify and assimilate. Above all else it extends the meteorological and climatic benefits of the ocean to the very heart of the land and gives it a share in those blessings which are denied to entirely enclosed continental tracts. Owing to the Mediterranean, the south of Europe and the west of Asia enjoy a climate as favourable, both for the development of useful forms of organic life and the conditions of human existence, as is to be found in any other spot on the earth's surface, even though the present state of the north coast of Africa seems a contradiction. The present sterility of the coast of the Syrtes, or even of Syria, does not alter the fact that the Mediterranean basin

shows all gradations of the typical peculiarities of the temperate zone, which is the most suitable and most beneficial to the nature of man. Notwithstanding the extraordinary difference of its separate branches, the Mediterranean basin must be regarded as a geographical whole. A sharply defined sea necessarily establishes

The Historical Focus of the Mediterranean

an intimate geographical connection between the coasts it washes. Every organism is most deeply influenced by the soil from which it sprang or into which it was transplanted, and from which it derives all the essential elements of its existence. There can be no doubt that where natural conditions are favourable, the effect on life of every kind will also be favourable, and vice versa. This favourable influence has, in point of fact, been found in the basin of the Mediterranean from the earliest times. The result is that this basin appears not merely as a geographical, but more as a historical whole, as a focus in which are concentrated the common efforts, conscious and unconscious, of a considerable fraction of mankind. Thus the Mediterranean supplies an excellent argument in favour of the fellowship of the entire human race.

When the first rays of Clío's torch began to illuminate the Mediterranean countries nations were already to be found differing in external appearance, mode of life, and social customs; the race character was clearly stamped on the separate groups. The coasts of the Mediterranean were, as we find in quite early times, inhabited by three distinct races, the Aryan, the Semitic, and the Berber. Roughly speaking, these three groups of peoples coincide with the three continents, since the European coasts were mostly inhabited by Aryans (Indo-Europeans), the Asiatic coasts mostly by Semites, and the African coasts mostly by Berbers. There were exceptions. In Asia

First Light of History on These Nations

Minor, for example, there was an Aryan and a pre-Aryan (Hittite) population, as well as the Semitic; Egypt was inhabited by people, possibly of mixed origin, which cannot with certainty be assigned to any one of the three ethnological groups; and there were indubitably pre-Aryan populations still holding their ground in Europe. There is no more difficult date to fix than that of the first appearance of the Aryan tribes, who inhabit the northern

border of the Mediterranean basin—that is, South Europe, the countries on the Black Sea, and Asia Minor. They have as rich a store of legendary gods and heroes as the inhabitants of India, originating probably in events which impressed themselves ineffaceably on the memory of later generations; yet these legends can only seldom be traced to facts and are still more seldom reconcilable with chronology.

At the dawn of history the Aryans of the Mediterranean appear as already having attained a comparatively high degree of civilisation; they have become settled peoples, dwelling in towns and carrying on agriculture. To some extent they already possess art and the skilled trades; the metal-working of the Etruscans in Upper Italy seems very old. The Pelasgians are the first to be named; yet this name does not designate a distinct people so much as the earliest stage of civilisation in that Aryan stock which afterwarde divided into Italic and Hellenic, and, besides that, left minor branches in the Thracians and Illyrians, which, like detached boulders of ethnography, are still distinguishable as Albanians.

Oldest Seats of Aryan Civilisation

The Pelasgians had fixed abodes from the earliest known times. Remains of their buildings are preserved in the Cyclopean walls at Tiryns and Mycenæ; they founded many towns, among which the name Larissa frequently recurs. Some slight aid to chronology is given by the mythical founding of a state on the island of Crete by Minos, perhaps about 1400 B.C.

With the name of Minos is connected a series of laws and institutions of public utility, marking the island of Crete as one of the oldest seats of a higher civilisation. Sarpedon, the brother of Minos, founded, so the legend runs, on the southern coast of Asia Minor the kingdom of the Lycians, who early distinguished themselves by their works of art. West of these lay the pirate-state of the Carians. About the same time Teucer is said to have founded the kingdom of the Dardani on the west coast of Asia Minor, whose capital became the famous Ilium, or Troy.

The heroic legends of the Greeks have great historical value when stripped of their poetical dress; thus, in the legend of Jason's voyage to Colchis, the expedition of the Argonauts, the record is preserved of the first naval undertakings of Greek tribes; and the exploits of

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA

Hercules, Theseus, Perseus, and other heroes point to the effective work of powerful rulers in the cause of civilisation.

The western shores of the Mediterranean remained the longest shrouded in darkness. The dates at which the half-mythical aborigines, after long wars, blended with the Kelts, who had immigrated in pre-historic times, and formed new nations cannot be approximately determined. The first historical light is thrown on the subject by the oldest settlements of the seafaring Phœnicians on the Spanish coasts, and the founding of Gades, or Cadiz, about 1100 B.C. About the same time the Phœnicians founded the colony of Utica on the north coast of Africa and thereby first revealed the southern coasts of the Mediterranean. The subsequent

points of contact between the three chief stocks of the basin of the Mediterranean—namely, the Aryan, the Semitic, and the Berber, and furthered their fusion into a Mediterranean race.

This Mediterranean race played a predominant part in the history of civilisation and influenced decisively the development of the human race. This is one result of the influence of the Mediterranean. We find the inhabitants of most of the countries on the Mediterranean—with the exception of the Egyptians—in a state of movement which extended both over the mainland and over the wide sea. When and from what centre the impulse was given which set nation after nation in motion, and what the im-

Unceasing March of the Nations



MAP SHOWING THE GEOGRAPHICAL CONNECTION OF THE MEDITERRANEAN COASTS

Were it not for the Mediterranean Sea the continent of the Old World would appear a connected whole, of such enormous expanse that its climatic conditions would be as unfavourable as those of Central Asia. Owing, however, to this inflowing of the Atlantic the climate is as favourable to human existence as is to be found in any spot on the earth's surface.

founding of Carthage, about 814 B.C., makes known incidentally the first step towards civilisation made by the autochthonous Berber states. Eventually Carthage shook herself free from the Phœnician mother country. The seafaring Phœnicians were followed by seafaring Greeks of various stocks, who also planted settlements first in South Italy and Sicily, then, continually pressing further westward, in Spain (Saguntum), in Africa (Cyrene, 631 B.C.), in Aquitania (Massilia, or Marseilles, 600 B.C.). These in turn became the centres of flourishing colonies, and in combination with the Phœnician settlements played an important part in the establishment of numerous

Light on the Western Shores

settlements first in South Italy and Sicily, then, continually pressing further westward, in Spain (Saguntum), in Africa (Cyrene, 631 B.C.), in Aquitania (Massilia, or Marseilles, 600 B.C.). These in turn became the centres of flourishing colonies, and in combination with the Phœnician settlements played an important part in the establishment of numerous

pelleng cause of it was—these are questions which only the primitive history of the nations can, and some day will, answer. It is enough for us to know that the stream of nations kept on moving throughout prehistoric times, and to notice how the waves rolled unceasingly from east to west, and only now and again took a backward course. We recognise further in the universal advance of the tide of nations from east to west that, as soon as it reaches the Mediterranean and splits into a northern and southern current, Aryans are predominant in the former and Semites in the latter; while over the surface of the sea itself both press on side by side. On the northern coasts of the Mediterranean the trace of ancient

migration is shown as if in geological layers, whence we can see that the intervals between the changes in the ownership of the soil were long enough for separate layers to be deposited. Over the Iberians, Armoricans, and Aquitanians is imposed a stratum of Kelts, and later, in consequence of their assimilation, one of

Fusion of the Races

Keltiberians and Gauls. Over the Pelasgians are superimposed strata of Italians and Hellenes, and over the old peoples of the Black Sea, Scythians and Sarmatians, a stratum of Armenians, etc. Already there loom up in the distance, continually pressing forward from the east, the indistinct outlines of new families of the great Aryan race, the Teutons and the Slavs, destined to play so important a part in transforming the world. We have already noticed on the southern coast of the Mediterranean Semitic peoples pushing towards the west, and at the same time we recognise in the return of the Hyksos and the Israelites to Asia an example of a returning national movement.

The importance of these movements fades into the background in comparison with the migration of the Semitic Babylonians and Assyrians to the very easterly end of the Mediterranean; after them press onward the Aryan Bactrians, Medes and Persians. In consequence of these events, which culminated in the conquest of Egypt by the Persians, Aryan life finally found a home on the eastern and southern coasts of the Mediterranean. The Semitic race, continually pressing westward, attained fresh vigour among the Carthaginians, and by conquest of Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, and Spain encroached on Europe itself.

However varied may be the character of the different national movements as typified in these separate instances, one common feature marked them all. They always reached their goal on the Mediterranean.

The Common Goal of the Nations

This singular fact can be quite naturally explained. The van of the great migrations which continued for thousands of years from east to west was bound to strike the Atlantic, which forbade all further advance. Since, however, the pressure of the rearguard never ceased, the vanguard, not to be driven into the ocean, had to give way laterally, and in part reached the shores of the Mediterranean. Here all further progress was

barred, and with what result? It was impossible to force the way back against the stream of onward-pressing nations, and the knowledge of their original home had meanwhile sunk into partial or complete oblivion. They had no alternative but to establish themselves permanently, and to resist as far as possible those who still pressed on. The determination to do this was strengthened by the smiling blue skies which arch the basin of the Mediterranean, by the pleasant climate, by the natural beauty of the sea-framed landscape, its luxuriant flora, its rich fauna, its bountiful store of every necessity of life.

All these combined to make the shores of the Mediterranean, especially the European shores, appear to the newcomer a desirable home, for the perpetual possession of which it was worth while to fight. Besides this, the unparalleled irregularity of the coast-line in the northern and eastern parts, with its great number of neighbouring and easily accessible islands, offered sufficient space in the future for expansion and the foundation of cities; and the sea itself afforded in its wide limits the never-failing assurance of an easy livelihood. It is surprising what mighty strides forward in civilisation are made by almost every people after the shores of the Mediterranean become its home.

The Home of Great Civilisations

Civilisation is in itself admittedly no special product of the Mediterranean alone. It had famous homes of vast antiquity in the Far East, in Chaldæa, in the highlands of Iran, in India and China; and certainly germs of Chaldæan and Iranian civilisation accompanied the Semitic and Aryan stocks on their wanderings and were not developed until they reached the Mediterranean shores. But even the development of these germs of civilisation assumes under the local influences of the Mediterranean (again excluding Egypt) a form quite different from that which they have in their eastern homes. In this typical peculiarity of intellectual development lies the bond of union which encircles the groups of nations in the basin of the Mediterranean and brings them into a firm and close connection, which is best expressed by designating them all as the "Mediterranean Race." We must emphasise the fact that this designation is to be understood in the historical and not in the

ethnographical sense. The settlement in close succession of variously divergent, but kindred peoples allows them to be easily amalgamated, and by repeated accessions promotes within these groups a more frequent change of language and nationality.

If we take Italy as an example, we perceive in the course of centuries a gradual transformation of the inhabitants without their complete expulsion or extermination. Without any violence the original settlers became differentiated into the numerous peoples of the Italian peninsula; these were united to the Romans, and from these eventually, by mixture with Lombards, Goths, Franks, Greeks, Normans, and Arabs, were formed the Italians. Similar changes occurred in Spain and France, and still greater variations in the east of the Mediterranean. This readiness to transmute their nationality forms a striking contrast to the stiff and almost unalterable customs of the East Asiatic peoples, whose development is cramped by the spirit of narrow exclusiveness, in this sense forming but barren offshoots of the universal life of civilisation. The Mediterranean nations are, on the

**Nations in
Ceaseless
Transformation**

other hand, in constant transformation. Ceaseless contact sharpens and rouses every side of their physical and intellectual activity, and keeps it in an unbroken ferment, which leads sometimes to progress, sometimes to retrogression, but always to the active expression of powerful vitality.

Of great importance to the nations on the Mediterranean was the fact that on their long journey from their primitive home to the shores which became their new abodes they had gradually freed themselves from the caste system, a burden which weighs heavily on the development of primitive nations. Caste is a primitive institution peculiar to no especial race; it is found in a pure form among the Aryans of India and the Semitic-Berber Egyptians. Even among the Redskins of America caste was traceable. Wherever this institution has appeared, it has always crippled the development of a people, checked its national expansion, stunted its political growth; and while it has restricted knowledge, education, prosperity, and power, and even the promotion of art and trade, to privileged classes, it has proved itself a clog on the intellect and an obstacle to civilisation. Thus it was a fortunate dispensation for the Aryan and Semitic stocks,

from which eventually the Mediterranean nations sprang, that during the prehistoric period of their wandering they had been forced to abandon all vestiges of any caste system they may have possessed. They appear as masses which are socially united, though severed as nations. Despite their universal barbarism they had the great advantage that their innate capacity for civilisation was not hampered by the internal check of a caste system. Every discovery, every invention, every higher intellectual intuition, perception, or innovation could redound to the benefit of the whole people, could penetrate all strata, and be discussed, judged, weighed, accepted, or rejected by all. Nourished by a many-sided and fruitful mental activity, by comparison, imitation, or contradiction, the existing seeds of civilisation yield a fuller development.

The peculiarity of the Mediterranean civilisation is contrasted with other civilisations, and the secret of its superiority stands out most sharply in its capacity for progress under favourable circumstances; and though Mediterranean civilisation has experienced fluctuations and periods of gloom, it has always emerged with inexhaustible vitality, more vigorous than before. For manifestly it is dominated by one ideal, which is wanting to all other nations, the ideal of humanity. This consciousness of the inner unity and of the common goal of universal mankind did not indeed arise all at once on the Mediterranean. But the separate steps in this weary path may be recognised with tolerable distinctness, and they lead by the shores of the Mediterranean. Here we come across the first ideals of national feeling, out of which the conception of humanity is gradually evolved. First of all comes the dependence of the individual on the minute band of those who speak the same language and inhabit the same country

**The Great Ideal
of Mediterranean
Civilisation**

as he. This relation of dependence declares the existence of an important altruistic feeling; it is the foundation of patriotism. Patriotism is a sentiment foreign to the great nations of the East, for these had no social feeling outside that of membership in the tribe and the family; and the peculiar conditions of civilisation in the Orient have prevented the evolution of this sentiment into the higher one of membership in a nation. The

small number of individuals in the peoples of the Mediterranean nations, with their countless subdivisions, and their almost universally hostile relations, furthered the impulse towards combination, since it made the individual a valuable member of the

Recognition of the Rights of the Individual whole. A second point is the conception, which is equally peculiar to the Mediterranean races, of the existence of personal rights, which marks out for the individual a wider sphere of action within his community; and a further result of this is the legal establishment of the social and political system.


This idea is also more or less foreign to the great peoples of the East; while fostering all other forms of intellectual culture, the old Oriental despotism has not allowed a distinct conception of rights to be formed, but lays down the will of the lord as the highest and only law, to which the good of the individual must be absolutely subordinated. The passive and even fatalistic character of most Oriental peoples has at all times been

reconciled to absolute government and the identification of the State with the person of the prince or with a ruling class.

The Mediterranean nations, on the contrary, if they ever possessed this characteristic, shed it during the era of migration. And although among them, too, a despotism is no rare phenomenon, yet it has assumed a stamp quite different from the Oriental form; it is no longer a natural thing, unalterable, and inflexible. On the contrary, we often notice among the Mediterranean nations, at an early period, an effort to extend the right of free activity from the individual to the community, to expand personal liberty into political

Foundations for the Rise of Humanity freedom. In the striving after liberty we recognise one of the most striking characteristics of the growth of civilisation on the

Mediterranean, such as is nowhere else to be found as a primordial element. National feeling, patriotism, the conception of rights, and the existence of political liberty were the foundations on which humanity found it possible to rise.



TYPES OF THE SHIPS WHICH SAILED THE MEDITERRANEAN IN ANCIENT TIMES

These illustrations of ancient Greek and Roman ships, from vases and sculptures, include the Greek galley of 600 B.C. (2), the Greek unime (1), the bireme (6), the merchant-ship (5) of 500 B.C. and two Roman galleys (3, 4) of about 100 A.D.



THE DOMINANCE OF GREECE & ROME

THE MEDITERRANEAN AT ITS HEIGHT

THE Hellenes, or Greeks, come before us as the most important nation of antiquity on the Mediterranean, and the one which exercises the most powerful influence on the far distant future. But the Hellenes do not appear to us as a compacted national entity. They break up into many separate tribes, and their state system presents a spectacle of disunion which finds a counterpart only in the petty states of mediæval Italy or Germany. Nevertheless, Greek life shows such a similarity in all its parts, so active a national consciousness of fellowship prevails, and such a community of purpose in their institutions, that the Greeks seem a united nation.

Never was any people more happily or splendidly endowed by Nature than the ancient Greeks. Disposed to cheerfulness and the light-hearted enjoyment of life, loving song, the dance, and manly exercises, the Greeks possessed also a

**Splendid
Endowment of
the Greeks**

keen and clear eye for Nature and her manifestations, a lively desire for knowledge, an active spirit, which, far removed from the profound subtleties of the Egyptian or Indian philosophers, set itself boldly to the task of investigating things from their appearance; they possessed also a highly-developed social impulse, and an unerring delicacy of feeling for beauty of form. This natural appreciation of beauty is characteristic of the Greeks and raises them at once to a higher level than any other people. Grace in outward appearance, beauty of form, symmetry of movement in joy as in grief, melodiousness in utterance, chastened elegance of expression, easy dignity in behaviour—these were the qualities the Greek prized highest; these ideals are expressed in the almost untranslatable *καλὸς κάγαθός*, which implies that beauty and goodness are in truth inseparable. Even among the Greeks of the Heroic Ages we have already the feeling of being in "good society." This

was the ultimate cause of the idealistic tendency of the national mind, of the worship of the Beautiful, which with no other people reached such universal and splendid perfection. This finds its expression in the national cultivation of poetry, music, the plastic arts, and to an equal degree in their religion, philosophy and science.

**Worship
of the
Beautiful**

In closest connection with this intellectual tendency stands the hitherto unparalleled degree of freedom and versatility in the development of the individual. Besides all this, the Greeks were physically hardy and strong, brave in battle, cunning and shrewd in commerce, adept in all mechanical crafts. And since they felt themselves drawn towards a seafaring life and navigation, they soon established their complete superiority over all their neighbours.

Hence came their national pride; what was not Greek was barbarous. This boastfulness was not like the dull indifference of the Egyptians, and still less like the bitter religious hatred which the Israelite bore against every stranger, but asserted itself in a sort of good-natured scorn, based on full consciousness of self. The Greeks liked, by means of intercourse, example, and instruction, to draw to themselves what was strange, in order to raise themselves; and without hesitation they appropriated whatever strange thing seemed worthy of imitation. Thus they acquired by observation from the Egyptians astronomical and mathematical knowledge, and from the Phœnicians the arts of shipbuilding and of navigation, of mining and iron-smelting. Hellenism offers the first historical instance of a conquest, which was effected not by war or commerce, but through intellectual superiority.

**The First
Intellectual
Conquest**

Compared with the significance of the Greek race in the history of civilisation, its political history sinks into the back-

ground. The universal disorganisation is originally based on the diversity of the tribes, which, it is true, spoke the same language, but established themselves on the Mediterranean at different times, coming from different sides. Whole tribes—Æolians, Dorians, Ionians—always sought out the coasts or their vicinity; the

**Political
Disunion
of Greece**

Greeks nowhere, Greece proper excepted, pressed into the heart of the country in large numbers. The only exception to this is presented by the Dorian Spartans of Lacedæmon, who could never reconcile themselves to maritime life; they also in another respect took up a separate position—they prided themselves not so much on morality as on a somewhat theatrically vainglorious exaltation of bodily strength and hardihood.

Varied and manifold as the tribes themselves were the communities founded by them and their forms of constitution. The original type, monarchy, came usually to an early end, or was preserved only in name, as at Sparta; yet a form of it persisted in the "Tyranny," which differed from monarchy only in its lack of hereditary title. The "Tyranny" was found in Greece proper as well as on the islands and in the Greek parts of Asia Minor, Lower Italy and Sicily; but for the most part it was of short duration, since it required a definite conspicuous personality, after whose death it became extinguished. The high standard of universal education, the wide scope conceded to individuals, and the small, easily surveyed extent of the separate communities, brought about the result that gradually more and more sections of the people desired and won a share in the conduct of public business.

Thus was established the extended republican form of constitution peculiar to the Hellenic race. It is strange that this thoroughly Greek conception of a republic should have found no Greek expression,

**The Greek
Form of
Government**

while the word democracy signifies for the Greeks merely a party or class government. According as wider or narrower circles of the people took part in public affairs—that is, in the government—distinction was made between Aristocracy, Oligarchy, and Democracy. These constitutional forms underwent constant change; a cycle is often observable which goes from Oligarchy through Tyranny to Democracy and then begins

afresh. Such frequent internal changes obviously could not proceed without civil dissensions and the conflict of antagonistic views; yet these internal struggles passed away, thanks to the mercurial temperament of the people, without any deep-seated disorders. Far from being a barrier to progress, they helped to rouse and stimulate their minds.

The mutual relations of the individual states to each other present the same features. They are almost continually at war in order to win the spiritual headship in national affairs, the hegemony, but without hatred or passion, as if engaged in a knightly exercise; with all this they do not lose the feeling of fellowship, which was always kept alive by the national sanctuaries—Dodona, Eleusis, Delphi, Olympia—the regular Olympian, Pythian, Isthmian and Nemean games, and the Amphictyonic League, as well as by a warm feeling for oratory, the stage, poetry and art, which showed itself stronger than petty local jealousies.

At the same time the Greeks did not neglect the practical side of life. The

**Flourishing
Commerce
of Greece**

poverty of Greece proper in productions of the soil made the necessity of ample imports early felt, and natural conditions pointed exclusively to the sea as the way by which these should be brought. The dense population of Hellas depended entirely on foreign countries for corn, wine, fruit, wool, leather, and timber, while it possessed valuable articles of export in the products of its mines and technical industries. Thus a flourishing maritime commerce was developed, which in the east of the Mediterranean put even that of the Phœnicians into the background. There was awakened among the Greeks, fostered by the extensive coast-line of Hellas and Asia Minor, and by the great number of densely-populated islands, a love and aptitude for sea-life which is almost unequalled. The Phœnicians carried on navigation for commercial ends; the Greeks devoted themselves to it as an amusement. From privateering, in which they also indulged, they were led to develop their shipping for warlike purposes, and so became the founders of a navy. At sea they showed themselves a match for a numerically superior enemy, as the Persian wars testify, in which the enormous fleets of Darius and Xerxes, mostly composed of Phœnician ships,

could not withstand those of the Greeks. The city-states of Athens, Argos, Ægina, and Corinth; the Ionian Islands; the islands of Crete, Rhodes, Cyprus, Samos, Chios, Paros, and Thera; in Asia Minor the towns of Phocæa, Ephesus, and Miletus; the colony of Naucratis in Lower Egypt; in Magna Græcia the towns of Tarentum, Rhegium, Locri, Neapolis, Syracuse, Messina, Leontini, and Catania—all these were maritime powers, and not less so were the colonies of Miletus on the Black Sea (Sinope and Trapezus), the Corinthian colonies in Illyria (Apollonia and Epidamnus), the Phocæan colonies in the west (Saguntum and Massilia), and the colony in Africa founded from the island of Thera—Cyrene, which afterwards, under the dynasty of the Battiadæ, and as a republic, developed into a flourishing power. While the Phœnicians from fear of competition were wont to make a secret of their voyages, the Greeks gave publicity to their own. A thirst for learning and a delight in travelling, both innate qualities of the people, induced not merely sailors and merchants, but men of far higher education to take part in these

Greeks the First Explorers

voyages, and their narratives and records widened men's knowledge of the Mediterranean. The Greeks were the first to concern themselves not only about their own nation, but about foreign nations and lands, and that not exclusively for political and commercial ends, but out of scientific interest. They studied these foreign lands, their natural peculiarities, their products and needs, the life and the history of their inhabitants. Similarly the Greeks were the first who made no national or caste-like secret of the fruits of their explorations, but willingly placed the results at the disposal of the whole world. While they in this way made the knowledge of geography, natural history, and past events accessible to wider circles, they became the founders of the exoteric or popular sciences, while the scientific efforts of all other civilised races became less profitable for the masses from their esoteric character. The spread of knowledge enables Hellenism, as much as its æsthetics, which are based on the pleasure felt in beauty and proportion of form, to exercise an educating and ennobling influence on its surroundings, and firmly cements all who are of kindred stock and spirit. The varied and comprehensive unfolding of Greek life,

drawing to itself the outside world, is bound up with a surprisingly rapid local expansion.

The formative influence of Greece on the entire Mediterranean region was fully exercised, not during a lengthy period of peace, but in the midst of internal and external disturbances. Greece was split

Greece Split up into Petty States

up into countless petty states, but experienced at first no danger from the fact, which rather had a beneficial result, since it gave scope to the capabilities of many individuals. We can thus understand the part which was played by Solon, Pisis-tratus, Pericles, and Alcibiades in Athens, by Lycurgus, Pausanias, and Lysander in Sparta, by Periander in Corinth, by Epami-nondas and Pelopidas in Thebes, by Poly-crates in Samos, and by Gelon and Diony-sius in Syracuse. Even hostile collisions between the individual states were, at least in earlier times, harmless; the winning and the losing party were alike Greeks. Then a violent storm gathering in the east came down on them. In the middle of the sixth century B.C. the nation of the Persians roused themselves under their king Cyrus, and so quickly extended their power in every direction that their newly-founded kingdom became at once the first Power in the ancient world. The annihilation of the Babylonian kingdom, the subjugation of the Armenians and Caucasian Scythians, and finally the conquest of the Lydian king Cræsus, who ruled over a mixed race, made Cyrus lord of Nearer Asia; even the Greeks of Asia Minor submitted to him, some willingly, some under compulsion.

When, however, Cyrus's successor, Darius I., began to extend his conquests to the regions of the lower Danube in Europe, they became concerned, and supported the attempted revolt of their tribal kinsmen in Asia Minor under the leadership of Miletus. Thus arose the fifty years war between Greece and Persia,

Fifty Years of War With Persia

which ended in the victory of the former, in so far as the Persians were forced to renounce all further attempts at conquest. Much ado has been made of the successful defence of tiny Greece against the enormous Persian realm. Considered more closely the matter is not so astonishing. The heroic deeds of a Miltiades, a Themis-tocles, and an Aristides, of a Leonidas, a Xantippus, and a Cimon, deserve all honour; but the true reasons for the

Persian failure lie deeper. Let us remember how weakened the apparently mighty world-empire of Spain emerged from the eighty years war against the diminutive Netherlands. Moral superiority, higher intelligence, and greater skill in seamanship had secured victory to the Greeks. Yet they had not gone through the war without internal loss. On the

Greece's Loss by Victory one hand, familiarity with Asiatic luxury, made inevitable by the war, exerted a disastrous influence. On the other hand the rivalry of the states and their internal factions were rendered keener by the political and diplomatic intrigues running parallel with the war. This led to mutual aggression and the infringements of rights, and finally to regular war between the two leading states, Athens and Sparta. The Peloponnesian war (431-404), so bitterly waged, undermined the political power of both. Almost all the Greek states, including the islands and Sicily, took part in it. The exhausted victors, however, soon afterwards submitted to the Thebans, who were ambitious of the hegemony. But they also were too weak to maintain the leadership. The result of the contest for supremacy was the enfeebling of all.

At this point began the political downfall of the Greek petty-state system, but at the same time there came a new and strange increase of the national greatness in another direction, a renaissance of Hellenism generally. While the smaller states were rending each other, the hegemony had been transferred to a stock which had until now been disregarded as comparatively backward in civilisation, but was nevertheless thoroughly vigorous and Greek—that of the Macedonians, who had early founded a kingdom in Thessaly and Thrace, and were ruled by a royal family which prided itself on its descent from Hercules. King

The Rise of a New Greatness Philip II. of Macedon (359-336), in consequence of the internal disorders of Greece, had formed the plan of making himself master of the whole country, and carried it out, partly by force, partly by diplomacy and bribery. While he used his victory with moderation and knew how to pose as the guardian of the rights of the separate states to self government, he managed so that the league of the Amphictyons nominated him commander of the league in

the aggressive war planned against the Persians. During the preparations for the war Philip was murdered, and was succeeded by his son Alexander, then a young man of twenty (336-323 B.C.). He not only carried out all his father's plans, but went far beyond them.

The gigantic apparition of Alexander the Great at the head of his Macedonian and Greek armies raged like a storm-cloud over Asia and Africa. An unprecedented idea had mastered the royal youth—the conquest of the entire known world, and its union under his sceptre into one single empire, in which Hellenic and Oriental culture should be blended. In an unparalleled series of victories Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, Phœnicia, Egypt, Cyrene, Media, Babylonia, Parthia, and Persia were conquered; the armies of the Persian king Darius were annihilated in decisive battles; and in the capital, Persepolis, the enfeebled Persian nation did homage to the conqueror. Then his progress was continued northward against the Scythians and eastward against the Indians. The valiant re-

The Gigantic Apparition of Alexander sistance offered by the ruler of the Punjab, King Porus, caused Alexander to interrupt his victorious career and to return to Babylon, in order thence to govern the mighty empire which his sword had won. Fate allowed him no time to carry out his great plan: overcome by excesses, Alexander died, and left a shattered and incompletely reconstructed world behind him.

The empire, which lacked any internal bond of union, was destined to break up, all the more after Alexander's death, since neither the question of succession to the throne nor the organisation of the empire had been settled. In the wars of the "Diadochi," able and great men among the Hellenes fought for the sovereignty of the world. The powerful Antigonus and his son Demetrius, the "Town Destroyer," claimed the title of "Kings of Asia." They found in Europe a counterpoise in Antipater and his son Cassander, who usurped lordship over Macedonia and Greece. Other generals joined one side or the other, and carried off as spoils whole provinces, a truly bewildering confusion. The battle of Ipsus first ended it; Antigonus fell, and with him his proud structure, the kingdom of Asia, crashed to the ground. Meanwhile

Hellenism had been playing a predominant part, and all the other nations looked on in silence. The conquerors divided among themselves the inheritance of Alexander. Cassander took Macedonia and Greece, Lysimachus took Thrace, Seleucus took the whole of Nearer Asia, and Ptolemy Egypt. But only the two latter succeeded in founding lasting dynasties. Cassander's dominions fell to the descendants of Antigonus, and the Thracian kingdom of Lysimachus sank into ruins. On the other hand, new Greek states arose.

Some fifty years after the death of Alexander, the divisions of his inheritance, from which the central Asiatic countries were severed, assumed a more lasting form, Mediterranean in character. This was the era of the Hellenistic monarchies. The preponderant influence in the political history and civilisation of Hellenism passes from Hellas proper, which gradually sinks into decay, to the border-lands. As such appear the kingdom of Macedonia under the descendants of Antigonus, the kingdom of Epirus under the Pyrrhidæ, the kingdom of Syria under the Seleucidæ,

**Greece
Sinks into
Decay**

the kingdom of Egypt under the Ptolemies, the town of Pergamus in Asia Minor under the Attalidæ, and the kingdom of Bithynia in Asia Minor, founded by Nicomedes. In a certain sense we may include the later kingdoms of Cappadocia, Pontus, and the Greater and Lesser Armenias, former parts of the Syrian empire of the Seleucidæ since their royal houses had been greatly influenced by the Greek spirit. So, too, many Greek islands regained their political independence: Crete became a dreaded nest of corsairs; Rhodes attained a high civilisation.

Hellas proper, divided into the Achæna and the Ætolian Leagues, sought a return to her former republican greatness, but could not release herself from the Macedonian power, and wasted her remaining strength in fighting against it, as well as in conflicts between the two leagues, so that finally it became an easy prey for the Romans. Hellenism meanwhile unfolded its most beautiful blossoms in the monarchies. Admittedly it lost more and more of its national character and became more markedly cœsmopolitan; but to the world at large this tendency was profitable. The houses of the Ptolemies, the Seleucidæ, and the Attalidæ especially, produced enlightened patrons of science

and art. The towns where their courts were, Alexandria, Antioch, and Pergamus, became capitals of vast splendour, size, and wealth, centres alike of intellectual culture and world commerce. They were adorned with magnificent buildings, temples and palaces, with academies, museums and libraries, with art treasures of every kind. They were filled with manufactories, stores of merchandise and warehouses. The ever active and eagerly creative spirit of the Greek people, from whom the weakening and distracting occupation of politics had been withdrawn by the monarchical form of government, threw itself with redoubled energy partly into scientific research and artistic production, partly into the industries, trade, and navigation: and in all these branches it achieved triumphs which were spread over every coast by the medium of the sea.

The age of the Hellenistic kingdoms, which comprises the last three centuries before the beginning of the new chronology, marks the zenith of Hellenistic culture; it is the period when the greater world, revealed by the conquests of Alexander, was explored by science and its value practically realised. To this period belong the delicate perfection of the Greek language, the rich literary productions in the departments of philosophy, mathematics, physical science, geography and history, and a great assiduity in collecting; all these laid the foundation of a real science. Then, also, trade and navigation were organised, not on the basis of a monopoly, but on that of free competition, and these drew the connecting bond still closer round the nations of the Mediterranean. But, above all, this age is that of the admitted supremacy of Greek life, that gentle power which irresistibly draws to itself all that is outside it, and assimilates it; that

**Zenith
of Greek
Culture**

power which has absorbed the Phœnician, Syrian, and Egyptian civilisation, and has not passed over the Jewish without leaving its trace. On the other hand, the invasion of many strange peoples could not but react ultimately on Hellenism. It lost its homogeneousness and the feeling of nationality, weakened already by independent political events. These causes, and the fact that it was the common possession of different states

continually at war with each other, eventually made Hellenism the foundation on which the Roman people built up the proud structure of their greatness.

Before the Romans began to influence powerfully the people on the Mediterranean, the Carthaginian nation, on the western shores of it, had already appeared on the stage of history. The Phœnician colony, in which the noblest families of proud Tyre had found a new home, soon broke off connection with the mother country, drew the remaining Phœnician settlements in Africa to itself, and formed with them one flourishing state, in which nothing, except their descent and their liking for the sea, reminds us of their original home. Even the nationality of the Carthaginians seems to have shown an independent stamp, owing to the influence of their surroundings, although their language remained Phœnician. The territory of the Carthaginian state, bounded on the east by Numidia, on the west by Mauretania, was soon covered with numerous towns, not only on the coast, but also in the interior, where agriculture could be carried on profitably. Colonisation spread from the coast towns as far as the Balearic Islands, Spain, the Atlantic coasts of Africa, and to the great Mediterranean islands, Corsica, Sardinia, and Sicily. On the last-named island Greek settlements already existed. Hence a long conflict broke out between Carthaginians and Greeks in Sicily for the possession of the island, in the western part of which the former, and in the eastern part the latter, maintained their supremacy. The army and fleet of the Carthaginian general Hamilcar were destroyed by the Syracusan leader Gelon, at Himera, in 480 B.C.

Though possessing considerable resources and great wealth, Carthage performed no especial services in the cause of civilisation. The oppressive rule of an aristocratic oligarchy at home, a religion which craved for human sacrifices, and a vein of cruelty peculiar to the whole people, characterised the Carthaginians. A civilising influence on their Berber neighbours can be inferred in so far as these nomads became partially settled, built cities (Iol and Tingis in Mauretania, Hippo and Zama in Numidia), and adopted a regular form of government in

the kingdoms of Mauretania and Numidia. The more the power of Carthage extended in the Mediterranean, the more often must she come into conflict with the power of Rome, which advanced at first only towards the west. Each of the two powers saw in the other the chief hindrance to its prosperity, a dangerous rival, with whom it was impossible to live in peace, and who must be annihilated at any cost. In Carthage, as in Rome, the consciousness of the necessity of a struggle for life and death had become an article of the national creed, and served to foster the bitterness between the two nations. The war broke out in 264 B.C. Sicily once more was the immediate cause of it. Owing to the tenacity and the military efficiency of both combatants, it lasted, with interruptions, until 146 B.C., after it had been waged in many places, in Sicily, Africa, Spain, Italy, and at sea. In the years 218–215 B.C. the war, owing to the bold march of the Carthaginian general Hannibal through Spain and Southern Gaul over the Alps into Italy, presented a surprisingly favourable prospect for Carthage, and brought Rome to the brink of ruin; but after the Romans had found a valuable ally in the Numidian king Masinissa the war ended definitely with the fall of Carthage. The town itself was destroyed, the country came as a province to Rome. The same fate befell the African kingdoms of Numidia and Mauretania. Julius Cæsar had Carthage rebuilt as a Roman town; as such, and later as the capital of the Vandal kingdom, it played in subsequent years a part in history. The Punic population as such preserved its identity up to the conquest of the Vandals and even to the invasion of the Arabs, and exercised great influence on Christianity through St. Jerome and other Fathers of the Church.

The ruins of the Carthaginian power formed the first stepping-stone for the world-empire of the Romans, the people in whom the "Mediterranean spirit" is most clearly seen. The Roman people, or, more correctly speaking, the Roman state, emerged from an obscure beginning through the consistent and successful prosecution of one leading idea. The development of the Romans struck out a path quite different from that of their kinsmen, the Greeks. With regard to the poetical embellishments of their origin,

**Carthage Did
Nothing For
Civilisation**

**Rome on
the Brink
of Ruin**

history has but followed the spirit of the times; but this much is clearly established, that a fragment of the old Italic people of the Latins, inhabiting Central Italy, founded Rome on the Tiber after their severance from their kinsfolk, and regarded it henceforth as the national centre. The national pride of the Romans, highly developed from the very outset, their military capacity, and their successful wars against their neighbours, soon raised the town to prosperity, greatness, and power, and made it a nucleus to which all the other peoples of Italy either voluntarily, or under compulsion, in time attached themselves.

This pre-eminence of Rome rested on a fundamental moral conception, precisely like the pre-eminence of the Hellenes over the east of the Mediterranean: but the morality of Rome was quite distinct from the Hellenic, and therefore had different effects. Roman life was developed from the idea of the state, the lofty conception and never failing manifestation of the indivisible unity, the majesty and omnipotence of the state in itself. The "Res Publica" was the highest ideal for the Roman. He felt himself not an individual, as the Greek

**The State
the Roman's
Highest Ideal**

did, but an inseparable element of the state, only thereby entitled to exist, but for that reason, too, of an exalted greatness. The common weal was the first law for him; to this all else—nationality, individuality, civilisation and religion—was subordinated. Not that he would have been intolerant of foreign nationality and civilisation, or foreign creeds; those were matters of indifference to him. He demanded of every man who obtained a share in the state an unqualified submission to the ideas of the state. Much narrower limits were, therefore, set to the assertion of individuality than among the Greeks. Personality counted for little in public life, in which all was concentrated, all tuned in a single key.

In consequence, an unshaken firmness was developed in the fabric of the state, an inexhaustible vitality, which, guided by a many-headed but single-voiced will, was always directed into such paths as led to the deepening and widening of the state-idea. Heterogeneous tendencies and internal struggles doubtless existed; there were radical changes of political plans and forms of government, transi-

tions from monarchy to an aristocratic and thence to a democratic republic, and thus to oligarchy and imperialism. Nevertheless, one common characteristic belongs to all factions and régimes—namely, the compacted structure of state-unity and state-omnipotence. The peculiar tendency of Roman life is displayed in an advance in civilisation, which influenced the nations on the Mediterranean and beyond to a degree no less than the Greeks did. The development of the ideal side of civilisation, as well as its material promotion by manufactures and trade, the two paths so successfully trodden by Hellenism, remain somewhat foreign to the Roman nature and are only followed after the example of others. But the Romans turn as pioneers to the social question, which stands in intimate connection with the development of the state. They are the first to make progress in this sphere and in a threefold direction.

In the first place they were early inclined to restrict all expression of public and private life to strict forms, to stereotype these by written laws, and equally to bind all members of the state, without exception, to their observance. By this means caprice and partiality in the judges were checked, the popular idea of justice was strengthened, and a strong respect for law was infused into every section of the people. This feeling was one of the firmest props of the authority of the state; the knowledge of law and jurisprudence was developed hand in hand with it into a science peculiar to the Romans.

Again, the Romans were the first people to recognise the danger which threatens a state in a large class of pauper citizens. They directed their efforts, therefore, towards establishing an equal division, as far as possible, of property, especially real property, by a classification of the citizens, by agrarian laws, by gratuitous division of state-lands among the poorer classes, and by a gradually improved adjustment of the conditions of tenure. The entire scheme failed, because of the growth of the state and the increasing complexity of its relations. Still, credit is due to the Romans for having recognised the importance of the question and for having attempted its solution.

**Dangers of
Pauperism
Recognised**

Thirdly, they assigned to woman an honourable position in the family and in society, and that from the very beginning. They recognised in the family the strongest foundation of society; therefore, they kept a strict watch over the sanctity of marriage and invested woman with the dignity and privileges of a citizen. Even the Greeks

Woman's High Position Under the Romans

themselves with all their striving after the ideal—to say nothing of the Semitic and Oriental peoples—misunderstood the position of woman, whom they treated as an inferior being and kept in slavish dependence; the influence which individual hetairæ, distinguished by beauty and wit, exercised, only marks the low position in which women were intentionally kept. The Romans, on the contrary, strongly insisted on modesty in their women, and they therefore showed them due respect; and though there was no social intercourse between the sexes in the present meaning of the word, women took with them a far higher position, both in public and private life, than with any other people of those times.

While the Romans perfected the most complete constitution which antiquity possessed on the Mediterranean, their state system, partly through successful wars with the other Italian nations, partly by alliances and voluntary accessions of territory, grew increasingly in extent. Rome began to exercise a spell, from which even the Greeks of Lower Italy could not withdraw themselves, and the Roman citizenship became a greatly prized privilege. Though national differences in Italy did not entirely disappear, the Latin branch maintained a distinct predominance over all others, and Latin became the prevailing language. From South Italy the Romans encroached upon much-coveted Sicily, and in so doing brought about the war with the Carthaginians, in consequence of which they were able to create the first province,

Beginning of Rome's Vast Empire

adding in the following years Sardinia and Corsica. From this point begins the vast and gradually increasing expansion of the Roman empire. Attacks from without furnished the immediate stimulus; the annoying piracy of the Illyrians and the continual unrest caused by the Celts of Cisalpine Gaul compelled interference. The Gauls were then in the course of a backward migration—that is, one from west to east. The terrible disaster of the year

390 B.C. was not yet forgotten, but a century and a half had not passed over the land in vain; the Roman state was already strong enough not only to repel the attack, but to subdue the country across the Po as far as the Alps. Then their task was to ward off the second and most violent attack of the Carthaginians. This Second Punic War, after many vicissitudes, added Spain, wrested from the Carthaginians, to the Roman provinces. Hannibal's plan of uniting the Hellenistic monarchies of the east against Rome was wrecked by the superior policy of the Romans, who shattered the alliance and conquered its most active member, King Philip III. of Macedon.

The war with Macedonia and the Achæan League permitted the Romans to join a firm footing in Greece also, where they already had an ally in the Ætolian League. Rome's lust for conquest only became greater; for the Hellenistic states, dazzled by the good fortune of Rome, were accustomed in all external and internal difficulties to turn to her as arbitrator. The greatest impulse to the irresistible expansion of the Roman power was given

Rome Conceives the Policy of a World-Dominion

when the Third Punic War had ended in the incorporation of the Carthaginian state as the Province of Africa in 146 B.C. The thought of a world dominion, up till now merely casual, and the natural consequence of favourable events, from this moment confronts us as a political motive clearly realised and carried out with iron resolution by means of the raising of immense armaments and astounding diplomatic skill. Almost simultaneously with Carthage the completely shattered Macedon was incorporated, and then came a rapid succession of new provinces—Greece (Achaia), Pergamus, left by King Attalus III. as an inheritance to the Romans (Asia propria), Transalpine Gaul, Cilicia, Cyrene, Bithynia, bequeathed to the Romans by King Nicomedes III., the island of Crete, the kingdom of Pontus on the Black Sea, wrested from the powerful Mithradates VI.; Syria, snatched from the Seleucidæ; the island of Cyprus, Numidia, Mauretania, Egypt, taken in the year 30 B.C. from the Ptolemies, and Galatia. Thus the Roman dominion had completely encircled the entire coast of the Mediterranean, and had penetrated deep into the interior of three continents. Then came a series of fresh provinces, some in Europe, some in Asia; only the

German races dwelling between the Rhine, Danube, and Elbe were able to protect themselves against that iron embrace.

This gigantic frame was held together by one single force—Rome, which administered the bewildering conglomeration of the most heterogeneous nations. The ruling people, the Romans, left to their subjects their language and nationality, religion and worship, manners and customs, trade and industries, unchanged; nothing was required of them but obedience, taxes, and soldiers. And the nations obeyed, paid taxes, furnished recruits, and were proud to be members of the mighty empire. This result would be incomprehensible, despite all the advantages of Rome, if the influence of the Phœnicians and Greeks had not prepared the way. The Phœnician and Greek nature had shot the varied warp of the national life of the Mediterranean nations and woven a stout fabric, from which the Romans skilfully cut their imperial mantle. The myriad relations which had been formed between the different members by their mediation could not fail to instil, at any rate in the upper strata,

All-Embracing Idea of the State

a homogeneity in mode of thought, feeling, and contemplation, which gradually deepened and revived the consciousness of the original and long since forgotten affinity.

The Roman world-sovereignty opened up the glad prospect for the different nations that, without being forced to renounce their national individuality, they might study the promotion of their own prosperity in peaceful contact. The place of the ideas of nationality, home and fatherland, which alone had been predominant until now, was taken by the all-embracing idea of the state, of a state which to some extent embodied mankind and took the welfare of all alike under its sheltering wings. This fabric appeared constructed for eternity. Nothing seemed able to shatter the solidity of its framework; neither the onslaught of external foes nor internal dissensions, nor finally the change in form of government—republic, dictatorship, triumvirate, empire. The state-idea was never lost from sight, even in the civil wars with their extermination of the noblest. In the genius of Cæsar, the divine Julius—whose name has become the title of the highest grade in monarchical rank—is found the most splendid embodiment of the Roman conception of the

state. And when his great-nephew Octavianus Augustus succeeded in attaining the highest dignity in the state without infringing the time-honoured system of administration, and in making the great office hereditary for some time, the proud edifice seemed to have received its coping-stone. The Roman empire of that age formed

The World of the Empire's Only Limit

a world-empire in a stricter sense of the word than that of Alexander the Great: it was no mere collection of discordant and divergent entities welded by the sword, but an organic living body, which had Rome for its head. The organising genius of the Romans had created a system whose threads met in one central point. The capital offered also, with its palaces, temples, theatres, race-courses, monuments and baths, with its processions, feasts, gladiatorial shows, and a thousand dissipations, an endless series of attractions. For the Romans there was but one city, the "Urbs Romana"; but one limit to the empire, that of the "world." The Roman spirit did not cling to its city: it spread over all provinces, not deeply penetrating and absorbing, like the Greek spirit, but commanding respect by its self-trust, calm earnestness, and systematic order. Thus the Roman ideals are a valuable supplement to the Hellenic civilisation. On every shore of the Mediterranean they come into contact, and by mutual interpenetration blend into that distinctive Mediterranean spirit which now begins to awaken to self-consciousness.

In the new order of things which had been created in the region of the Mediterranean by the enlargement of the Roman empire, the teachings of Christ produced a revolution in the intellectual world such as history has but seldom seen. The effect of this change was neither political nor national, but purely intellectual and social. Since all worldly ambition was

Effect of the Christian Revolution

wanting in the first adherents of the Christian religion, who were mostly "mean people" from the poorer and more ignorant classes, they exercised at first no immediately sensible influence on a public life unalterably cast into the flexible forms of imperial Rome. The first attack on them proceeded from Judaism, which was just then being annihilated as a political influence and as a nation; but the dispersion of the Jews contributed largely to the

spreading broadcast of the seed of Christianity. It was an equally important point that the Christian teaching at the very first broke down the narrow barriers of national Jewish thought, filled itself with the Greek spirit through the immense activity of Paul, who had received a Greek education, while he had been brought up by a

Ever-Widening Power of Monotheism

Pharisee, and was thereby enabled to enter into sympathy with all mankind. An ever-widening power belongs to monotheism. This power, freed from shackles of nationality, was the more effective from the union, in the Christian teaching of the belief in one God, with a moral code which, through its gentleness and its love, embracing all mankind without distinction, spoke to the hearts of all. For the first time the principle appeared that all men, without distinction, are the "children of God," all of equal spiritual worth, all called to the enjoyment of equal rights.

From the beginning of historical times every social organisation had been based on inequality; and although it was only among the Egyptians that this principle was carried out on the Mediterranean in its strictest form—that is, "caste"—yet in every nation a strict division of classes existed. The idea of a "people" comprised usually only a section of politically privileged citizens, more or less restricted in numbers, while under them a large population, without political rights or personal freedom, existed as slaves. Free labour was the exception. Then suddenly the Christians came forward and asserted that there was no distinction between high and low, bond and free, master and servant; that all men were equal, and had no other duty than to love and to help each other. The first Christians certainly made no attempt to introduce this doctrine into ordinary life; they emphatically declared that their kingdom was not of this world;

Christianity and the Social Life

and, waiting for the realisation of their hopes in the world to come, willingly adapted themselves to their appointed condition. But when such tenets penetrated the dense masses of ignorant bondmen, was not a mistaken interpretation of the question possible? Would not this part of the population be inclined to seek the promised equality and fraternity in this world rather than in the next? Would not the traditional order of society thus be

threatened, and the very existence of the state be endangered? A war of all against all seemed imminent.

We can estimate from this how the first appearance of Christianity with its unheard-of demands must have unfolded, uncompromising and threatening, the picture of the social question. The followers of Christianity were either to be ridiculed as unpractical enthusiasts or to be hated as dangerous innovators. The ideal core of Christianity, the manifestation of a pure humanity, was superior to the Jewish, Hellenic, and Roman nature. Mankind must first be educated to understand it. As long as that was not accomplished, the Roman state must offer resistance to the new teaching and strive to suppress it by force. Yet it was destined to, discover that the power of thought is greater than that of external violence. Notwithstanding all the heat of the conflict, it gradually was made clear that both pursued, although on different roads, the same end—namely, the establishment of the superiority of the universal to the individual. If Rome strove after political sovereignty

Christianity Reconciled With the State

strove after its spiritual union under one faith, one worship, one moral law. The close relationship between these two apparently dissimilar aims must lead finally to a mutual understanding—a compromise was made. The state abandoned all attempts to suppress by force a faith which had already penetrated the higher social strata and had lost its revolutionary appearance. Christianity, on the contrary, renounced its dreams of a millennium, and assumed an attitude of toleration towards the calls of earthly life.

In the end, both parties recognised that they could make good use of each other: the state recognised in a universal religion, which rested on a foundation of morality, a firm cement to bind together the loosening fabric of the empire; Christianity learnt to value in Roman life the power of strict organisation, and was busy in turning this power to the good of its own welfare. Then came reconciliation. The state became Christian—that is, Christianity became the religion of the predominant circles, while its opponents were confined, both in space and social influence, to continuously lessening classes. Christianity organised itself as a Church, after the model and in the spirit of the Roman state.



MEDITERRANEAN IN THE MIDDLE AGES

THE GROWTH OF THE EUROPEAN CONCEPTION

THE Roman empire, whose development and extension had placed it in a favourable position for uniting no inconsiderable portions of mankind, had long been the hammer; it was now destined to become the anvil. The "great fly-wheel of all history," the migration of nations, had stood comparatively still while the world-empire of Rome was being built; at least, the far-off effects of it had been less appreciable on the shores of the Mediterranean. Now the empire received a blow of tremendous violence, dealt by the Germanic tribes, under the shock of which the fabric of the world creaked. Many a strange rumbling had preceded the shock.

The first signs of the new movement go back to the onslaught of the Cimbrians and Teutons on the Roman power, some hundred years before the beginning of the Christian era, and are repeated at short intervals with increasing strength. The

The Fabric of the World Creaks

German tribes on the further side of the Rhine and the Danube became more and more restless; and though the Suevi in Roman Gaul were conquered by Cæsar, all attempts to extend the Roman sway beyond the two boundary rivers were in vain. Soon Rome saw herself restricted to the defensive, and even that position became more and more difficult. The Dacians on the Lower Danube were subdued only with difficulty and partially Romanised by numerous colonies. At the mouths of the Danube and on the coasts of the Black Sea the Goths established themselves, after dislodging and subduing the Scythians and Sarmatians, and thence overran in numerous predatory hordes the provinces of Thrace, Asia Minor and Greece; after occupying Dacia, which the Romans had given up, they founded a kingdom which stretched from the Black Sea to the Baltic.

Besides this, in the extreme east of Rome's Asiatic empire the renewed attacks of the Parthians gave cause to suspect that

the great reservoirs of population in Central Asia were once more about to be poured out. This outbreak occurred in full force at the precise moment when the Roman empire, which had already become rotten to the core, split under the burden of its own weight into two halves, a western and an eastern, with Rome and Constantinople as capitals. The

The Roman Empire in Halves

Huns, a numerous nation of horsemen, Mongolian in race, living in Central Asia, being hard pressed, began to move and drive everything steadily before them in their march westward. On the Volga the Huns came upon the Alans, also a nomad nation of horsemen, consisting of a mixture of Germans and Sarmatians, and hurried them on with them. Both together hurled themselves against the new kingdom of the Goths and shattered it. While the eastern portion of this people spread with the Huns and Alans into the Dacian-Pannonian lowlands, the western Goths threw their whole weight first against the eastern and then against the western Roman empire. Athaulf, Alaric's successor, led them out of Italy into Gaul and Spain.

In the meanwhile the impact of the Huns, which had destroyed the Gothic kingdom, had set in motion all the German tribes westward of the Vistula, and had caused their general advance towards the west and south; hence ensued a migration with women and children and all movable

A Migration that Flooded Europe

possessions which flooded Europe and did not break up or halt until the Mediterranean shores were reached. But before the equipoise of the nations, which were crowding on each other in storm and stress, could be restored, new masses kept rolling onwards. The Germanic tribes were followed by the Slavonic, who occupied the habitations which the former had left, and gradually began to spread over the broad stretch of

land between the Baltic and the Black Seas; and behind these more hordes of Mongolian origins kept the line moving westward.

The fate of the Roman empire was sealed. It could not withstand such pressure. Even that splendid system went down before the flood of rapacious barbarians. All in vain did the Romans take troop after troop of these barbarians into their own pay; in vain they conceded to them border state after border state as a bulwark; and when the western Roman government, in order to protect at least their ancestral Italy, recalled their own legions from the provinces, these were immediately inundated. Among "the first who knew nothing of the last," the Germans poured over the empire. At the beginning of the fifth century the Franks established themselves in northern, the Burgundians in eastern, Gaul; the Vandals marched to Spain, and, driven thence by the West Goths, who were vacating Italy, crossed into Roman Africa. Meantime, the West Goths settled in Spain and Aquitania.

But even Italy itself had not drained the cup of misery to the dregs when the bands of Alaric plundered her. Attila, "the scourge of God," dreaming of a world-empire, had led the hordes of horsemen from the kingdom of the Huns, Alans and Goths, against Western Europe. He encountered in Gaul the Roman commander Aëtius, under whom the Franks, Burgundians, West Goths, Gauls, and the remnants of the Romans had united in common defence. Attila, compelled on the plains of Châlons to retreat, swooped down on Upper Italy, where he destroyed the flourishing town of Aquila. He died, it is true, as early as 453; but Rome found in his place two dangerous enemies. The German Odoacer, who had been entrusted by the Romans with the protection of Italy, deposed the last Roman emperor and, without opposition, made Italy Germanic. Meantime the Byzantine emperor, Zeno, had shaken the threatening presence of the Pannonian East-Gothic kingdom from off his neck by prompting Theodoric to conquer Italy. The great East Goth succeeded not only in making himself king of Italy in the place of Odoacer, but in transmitting the sovereignty to his descendants. His chief aim was to abolish

the national differences between Romans and Goths. Unfortunately, the Goths, when they became Christians, had adopted the doctrine of Arius, which Church and State had rejected; and even if they adapted themselves to the Roman forms in government, the union was limited to the peaceful occupancy of a common territory.

During these changes in Italy new German kingdoms were rising in the former Roman provinces on the west and south. In Gaul the Salic Franks, under Chlodwig, or Clovis (486), had annihilated the last remnants of the Roman rule and had adopted the Christian doctrine sanctioned by Rome. From this germ grew the Frankish power, destined for such future greatness. In Spain, Athaulf had already laid the foundation of a West-Gothic sovereignty. Eurich and his successors ruled over this West-Gothic elective monarchy until 711. The amalgamation of Goths and Romans in Spain proceeded far more smoothly than in Italy, especially because King Reccared in 587 was converted from Arian to orthodox Christianity, and formed a legislature for both nations in common. Dislodged by the victorious West Goths, the Vandals

Vandals in Africa had already withdrawn to Roman Africa. Their king, Geiserich, had conquered the whole province in 439 and made Carthage the capital of a kingdom which was destined to live for nearly a century. The Vandals, who had become a considerable maritime power, then acquired Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, and the Balearic Islands, and were dreaded not only in Italy (where they sacked Rome in 455) but also in Byzantium. Yet the warm climate and the luxury of later Rome soon sapped the strength of the northerners. A blending with the Romans had been impracticable, since the Vandals, who, in contrast to the other Germans, were intolerant in religion, as zealous Arians relentlessly persecuted the adherents of the Roman Church.

At this time the East Roman empire took a fresh lease of life under Justinian. This prince, hard pressed in the north by the Bulgarians and in the east by the Persians, entertained the idea of restoring the unity and the greatness of the pristine Roman empire. The success and skill of his brave generals, Belisarius and Narses, made this goal seem actually attainable. After the annihilation of the disintegrating Vandal power, the southern coasts of West-

MEDITERRANEAN IN THE MIDDLE AGES

Gothic Spain were conquered and held for some time. Then the Byzantine armies turned to Italy, and after twenty years of fighting the power of the East Goths was ended.

But the times were unfavourable for a complete restoration; fresh hordes were following the main body of migrating eastern nations. The territories in Pannonia and Dacia, which had been abandoned by Theodoric, had been occupied by Langobardi (Lombards) and Gepidi. In the wars of extermination which had broken out between the two races the Langobardi won the day; but they had to yield to the pressure of the Tartaric Avars, and moved westward. In the year 568 the Langobardi, under Alboin, reached the borders of Italy. In a very brief period they had conquered almost the whole land.

The independent spirit of the Langobardi hardly tolerated the rule of their own kings, and each duke sought rather to become a ruler on his own account. Thus the first foundations were laid for the political disintegration of Italy. After King Authari in 589 had married the Bavarian Theodelinde, an adherent of the Roman faith, close relations arose between the conquerors and the conquered. Steady amalgamation made the German spirit retreat further and further into the background, until at last it was stifled by the Roman. In the struggle against powerful vassals, against the remnants of the Byzantine exarchate at Ravenna, and against the influence of the Bishop of Rome, the kingdom of the Langobardi gradually sank to ruin, until, in 774, a foreign invader gave it its death-blow.

The mighty movement in the north of the Mediterranean, outlines of which have been sketched in the preceding pages, has its counterpart in a later movement on the eastern and southern coasts. Here also a migration begins, not indeed from unknown regions, but starting from a definite local centre. It advanced not as a half-unknown natural force, but springing from one individual will. The south-eastern angle of the basin of the Mediterranean, the birth-place of monotheistic religions, once more produced an idea of the One God, which united in itself the obstinate zeal of the worship of Jehovah with the expansive power of the Christian religion. Islam, the doctrine taught by Mahomet, not only quickly took root in Arabia, its home, but

grew irresistibly greater. All nations on the face of the earth were to be converted to the belief in Allah and his Prophet, and by the sword if other means failed. Thus the previously isolated Arabian nation suddenly swept beyond its borders with overwhelming power, the leader in a second migration. The invasion of the Arabs did not drive the other peoples before it, as the German migration had done; it overwhelmed them. The successors of Mahomet, who as caliphs were the spiritual and temporal rulers of their people, immediately began an attack on the two great neighbouring powers. Omar deprived the Byzantines of Syria, Palestine, Phœnicia, Egypt, and the north coast of Africa. His successor, Othman, conquered Persia and destroyed the royal house of the Sassanides.

Hardly had the Arabs settled on the Mediterranean when they became inspired with the life of the Mediterranean spirit; and although the situation of their country, bounded by three seas, had in thousands of years never once caused them to turn their thoughts to navigation, they now became navigators. On the Phœnician coast, the classic cradle of maritime life, they created for themselves, as it were in a moment, powerful fleets, with which they not only ventured on a naval war with the Byzantines, but also seized the world's trade into their own hands. The influence of the Mediterranean asserted itself. Contact with the Græco-Roman civilisation aroused in them a spirit of research and a love for science.

At a time when Europe was retrograding intellectually and morally through the flood of barbarous nations and the subversion of all institutions, the Arabs became almost the only transmitters of culture. Under the caliphate of the Omayyads (661-750), who transferred their court to Damascus, the Arabian supremacy was extended still more widely.

While it spread in Asia as far as the Caucasus, the Caspian and Aral Seas, the Syr Daria and away towards India, it invaded Europe from Africa in a direction just opposite to the path of Vandal invasion. In the year 711 the Arabs put an end to the kingdom of the West Goths, swarmed over the Pyrenees into the kingdom of the Franks, and occupied the Balearic Islands, Corsica, Sardinia, Sicily and even Tarentum.

The Mighty Movement of Islam

German Spirit Stifled by the Roman

Culture Preserved by the Arabs

If we consider as a whole the movement of the nations, continuing from the middle of the fourth to the eighth century and beyond, we notice before everything else a predominant line of advance from east to west on both sides of the Mediterranean. In the north the movement begins earlier and penetrates deeper; in the south it is

**Circle of Nations
Round the
Mediterranean**

a deliberate course of action. In both cases it is brought to a halt by the Atlantic Ocean, and is

compelled to describe a right angle and to strike out into a new direction. Determined by the nature of the ground, their march leads the wanderers across the sea at the point where the continents are closest to each other, at the Straits of Gibraltar; here the two currents meet and join their waters. Thus the living strength of both is destroyed. The moving circle of nations round the Mediterranean is now completely closed. The whole movement must come to a stop, even if the pressure from behind continues, for it can no longer go forward; the two ends of the thread have been joined, and form a tangled skein, which prevents all progress. Now the problem for the nations is how to plant themselves firmly in the ground, to hold fast to the conquered territory as far as possible, and to keep off the next comers.

As for the basin of the Mediterranean itself, which again became the scene of events in the history of the world, it showed itself for the second time to be the mighty breakwater, or the great receiver in which the motley mixture of nations ferments and in the end is purified into more perfect forms. During the great storm, indeed, and immediately after it, there is more fermentation than purification to be observed on the Mediterranean. An old world has been shattered into fragments, and the new world knows not what is to be made out of the ruins. A lofty

**A Mighty
Breakwater
of Nations**

and eventually an over-refined civilisation has been trampled beneath the rude feet of barbaric nations exuberant with animal strength. It is not to be expected of times when "thousands slain unnoticed lie" that men should show any comprehension of intellectual development, of humanity, of law and order, of the ideal conception of life. The only things that gained respect were booty won by the sword, personal courage, and bodily

strength. "Life consists in defending one's self." In fact, all that the laborious work of civilisation had reared in many centuries was breaking up: not merely manuscripts and art treasures, temples and theatres, roads and bridges, aqueducts and marts, but ideals, plans and achievements, intellectual efforts—in fact, the entire sphere of thought and emotion in the ancient world.

And yet in this collapse of all existing things, in the helpless striving after a new, dimly-pictured order, the Mediterranean spirit, apparently crushed, stubbornly preserved its vitality and its supremacy. The close historical connection between the nations of the Mediterranean, which, though little apparent, was all the more close, expressed itself from that period onwards so vigorously that it irresistibly drew even foreign elements into its charmed circle. It is remarkable what little tenacity in the preservation of their own individuality was evinced by these foreigners, from the time of their becoming settled on the coasts of the Mediterranean. We can

**All-absorbing
Action of the
Mediterranean**

certainly trace in this the influence of the mild climate, the more effeminate way of living as compared with previous times, the charm of the southern women, the more frequent indulgence in wine. Again, the number of the immigrants may have been small in comparison with the original population. The broad fact remains that the conquerors, through trade, marriage and other intimate relations, soon experienced an ethnological change, as a result of which the Germanic elements sank into obscurity with astonishing rapidity.

On the other hand, the influence of the Roman civilisation developed irresistible strength in the mixture of races. This had appeared much earlier—we may recall the Romanising of Africa and Dacia by colonists and soldiers—and was especially remarkable now in Italy and the western countries. In the Pyrenæan peninsula, after the West Goths in the third century of their rule had changed their nationality by inter-marriage with the natives, the Spaniards arose, in whom, in spite of liberal mixture with Keltiberians, Greeks and Carthaginians, the Romance element was predominant. Similarly in the Apennine peninsula, the Lombards gradually were transformed into the Italians by mixture

with the Romans and the relics of the Gothic and Greek population. And even the strongest and most tenacious of the Germanic peoples that came into direct contact with the Romans, the Franks in Gaul, changed and blended with Romans and Gauls into the French, in whom the Keltic element was most prominent and after it the Romance, while the Germanic almost disappeared; only the eastern tribes of the Franks, through the support of the hardy Frisians, Saxons, and Bavarians, preserved their identity and developed it into a German nationality in combination with these tribes.

The feeble cohesion of the Germanic tribes, notwithstanding all their natural strength, is shown also by their almost sudden disappearance from the field of history; the East Goths after 555, the Gepidæ after 568, the Vandals after 534. They change their religion with a certain facility. With the exception of the orthodox Franks, all the Germanic tribes had adopted Arian Christianity; but as soon as they were settled among the Romans they mostly adopted the Roman religion. This fact presents a striking contrast to the Semites, Jews and Arabs, who preserved their native manners, customs and faith even in dispersion and under unaccustomed circumstances of life. We must, however, bear in mind that the Germanic tribes were in the position of advanced outposts, which shattered the old world like battering rams and were broken off from the parent stock by the violence of the impact.

A main reason why the Germanic races were at a disadvantage in the compounding of nations on the Mediterranean lies in the consideration that the conquered had at their command a well-developed literary language and a rich literature, while the conquerors were badly off in this respect. Writing, indeed, existed among them, but the knowledge of it was rare, and a written literature was entirely wanting. It is thus comprehensible that, as new conditions demanded a freer use of writing from the Germans, they found it more difficult to express themselves in their own tongue than in the foreign one, in the use of which they could obtain advice and help. Thus a foreign language was already in use for communication at a distance, and it was only a step further to employ it for oral

communication. He who neglects his mother-tongue has lost half his nationality. Superior civilisation proved more powerful than brute strength; and the succeeding generations employed the more developed ancient language all the sooner, as their own proved inadequate for the expression of a number of ideas, with which the Germans first became acquainted through the Romans. Again, the ancient language was the language of the Church, to whose care and protection all that was left of culture in those rude times had fled; and the Church began then to exert over the simple minds of the Germans a greater spiritual influence than it ever did over the native races of the Mediterranean. Again, language forms only a single link in the chain of influences which are at work in the amalgamation of nations.

Although the Græco-Roman civilisation was buried by the migration of the races under an avalanche of semi-barbarian débris, yet it was not stifled. Here and there, at first in isolated spots, then in numerous places, it again broke through with increasing strength and forced its way up to the surface. Naturally it became impregnated with much of the foreign element that covered it, yet it transmitted to them so many of its characteristics that their development in the direction of a single Mediterranean spirit was accelerated.

In the East Roman empire, which survived, though in a diminished form, the storms of the migrations the Græco-Roman culture was not exposed to the same destructive influences as in the western countries of the Mediterranean. At least the Balkan peninsula, with its capital, Constantinople, was able for a considerable time to ward off the invasion of the Avars, Bulgarians and Arabs. But it fell a victim to a peculiar internal disintegration. While in the west the crumbling civilisation had fertilised a fresh soil vigorous with life, the east remained externally quite unscathed; but internally, owing to the pressure of the Tartars and the Semites, it was confined to its own limits and broke up in isolation. The old Hellenism, deprived of air and light, had passed into Byzantinism. The change was characterised by a remarkable formulation of Christian doctrine, and by a perpetually growing

**Civilisation
Conquers the
Conquerors**

**Teutons Lose
Their
Mother-tongue**

**Hellenism
Decays to
Byzantinism**

opposition to Rome and the Roman Church, especially after the schism and the rise of a despotic form of government which had not previously existed. This development showed a complete divergence from the Mediterranean spirit, and its history is recorded in that of the Byzantine empire. Of the new state-

Rise of the Franks building races in the west, the Franks most completely apprehended the task that awaited them, in so far as this consisted not only in destruction, but in reconstruction.

The history of the Franks under the Merovingians, a long chronicle of outrages and excesses, offers indeed no attractive picture, and yet amidst all that is repugnant great features exist. The good always survives. After the sovereignty over the united Franks had passed to the race of Pepin, the might of Islam in Europe broke against their strength. For the second time in the course of the great race-movement it was Gaul which shattered the onslaught of Asiatic conquerors; as formerly Attila had been compelled on the plains of Châlons to retreat, so now the Arabs met the same fate at the field of Poitiers in the year 732.

Charles Martel and his Franks saved Europe from a defection from the Mediterranean spirit. For there is no doubt that, notwithstanding the high degree of culture already attained by Islam and its monotheistic principle, the Oriental religion could in no way have agreed with the western countries, steeped in the Roman spirit, but must have necessarily hindered their natural development. Just as France had already shown herself a strong rampart against the Arabs, so she showed herself now against the last offshoots of the race-movement which pressed on from the east. The Avars had taken nearly the whole of what is now Austria and Hungary, and thence harassed Italy and France by predatory incursions. They

How the Franks Saved Europe

found no opposition from the unwarlike Slavs of those parts, the Wends, Serbs, Czechs, for a great leader was wanting.

Then the Franks not only vigorously attacked them, but drove them back at the end of the eighth century behind the Theiss. There the Avars gradually lost themselves among the Slavs and Bulgarians.

With this ended the great race-movement, so far as it extended to the countries

of the Mediterranean. It is true that a century later a Ural tribe, the Magyars, immigrated into the eastern part of the former territory of the Huns and Avars. This people alone among all the earlier and later incomers of Tartaric stock willingly incorporated itself into the European group of nations by the adoption of Christian culture; in other respects they cannot be reckoned among the Mediterranean nations. Further, the devastating inroad of the Mongols in the thirteenth century forms only a passing incident without any effect. And, finally, in regard to the successful immigration of the Turks in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, nothing can be said here; it falls outside the scope of this treatise.

Thus we may venture to assert that it was to a large extent the vigorous efforts of the Franks which brought the race-movement to a standstill. Under the rule of the first four descendants of Pepin, they directed, as a united people, the forces of the migrating nations, which had mostly shown themselves destructive, or merely temporarily constructive, towards

Charlemagne's Great Task of Restoration

the creation of permanent institutions. The lion's share in this work fell to Charles the Great. Under him and through him the Frankish people became the forerunners of those nations in which the true Mediterranean spirit of morality and enlightenment was destined to reach the most perfect accomplishment. The bulk of Charlemagne's task of restoration fell in the Mediterranean countries. Italy offered him the means; there the dominion of the Lombards was approaching its end.

Before this, misunderstandings between the Lombard king, Aistulf, and Pope Stephen II, had caused the intervention of the Frankish king, Pepin. The father of Charles, siding with the Pope, had formerly presented to the chair of Peter the Exarchate of Ravenna, which had been taken from the Langobardia Lombards. When, therefore, during the reign of Charles, disputes broke out with renewed intensity between the Lombard king and the Pope, Charles made use of his right to interfere, dethroned Desiderius, and received the homage of the Lombards as king of Italy. Italy therefore received the Frankish form of government. Since the old spirit of Roman institutions was in accordance with these laws, written as they were in Latin, they quickly struck root

and helped to hasten the amalgamation of Lombard and Roman life, already begun. The Frankish spirit proved itself a powerful agent in the union of the nations. The Pope, confirmed by Charles in the possession of the gift of Pepin, saw in the Franks true sons and firm pillars of the Roman Church.

This mutual understanding promoted the revival of a great conception, which had been considered dead—that of the restoration of the Roman empire. Before his coronation as emperor at Rome, Charles had already devoted his efforts towards incorporating, if not all, at any rate the European, maritime countries of the Mediterranean into his realm, and towards organising the nations who inhabited them into a unity in the Frankish-Roman sense. He was most easily successful with the extension of his dominion over the coasts of the Mediterranean, partly by conquest (Spain), partly by treaties (Illyria). When Charles, who, on his accession, had possessed no part of these border-lands, except Aquitania, was crowned Roman emperor in the year

**Charlemagne
Becomes a
Roman Emperor**

800 by Pope Leo III., he was already lord of all the European shores of the Mediterranean from the mouth of the Ebro to Albania. And his plans extended still further towards the east. He was prevented from carrying them out by the tedious operations necessitated by the obstinate resistance of the Saxons, whose subjugation and conversion to Christianity he regarded as one of his chief duties. Nevertheless, the monarchy established by Charles formed an empire that comprised almost all of Western Europe from the North Sea and the Baltic, and can appropriately be called a Mediterranean empire.

Charles was less successful with the restoration of true unity; ecclesiastical unity was not sufficient to check the disintegrating force of national tendencies. As long as Charles lived, his mighty genius and his far-reaching personal influence kept the nations together under his sceptre, but soon after his death the empire was dissolved. The three larger kingdoms which grew out of the monarchy, France, Germany, and Italy, preserved for a considerable time the impression of the spirit with which Charles had stamped them. In particular, the newly awakened conception of empire was kept alive.

It sank deep into the minds of the nations and was for centuries one of the most powerful mainsprings of political activity. In estimating the part played by the Frankish monarchy, its most important service must be reckoned the restoration and strengthening, through intervention, of that intimate connection between the

**Franks Create
a New Field
for Culture**

nations on the Mediterranean which the migration had shattered. The ruins of the old civilisation were taken by the Franks and steeped in Germanic methods of thought and feeling. Thus a new field for culture was formed. And from it the Mediterranean spirit has been able to develop into a broader entity as the Western European spirit.

The other Germanic races that had been forced onward by the great movement of the nations, and from whom eventually the German people emerged, finally established themselves north of the Alps or continued their march further beyond the Baltic and the North Sea; this is not the place to discuss them.

The physical characteristics of that part of Middle Europe, which was occupied by the Teuton races who remained or became Germans, definitely determined their historical development in a different direction. These territories are separated from the Mediterranean by the boundary-wall of the Alps, and their great rivers, with one single exception, flow towards the North Sea and the Baltic, which are equally "Mediterranean" seas of sharply defined peculiarities in history, geography, and civilisation. The Germans linked themselves to the North European group.

Here they found the surroundings congenial; here they could establish a nucleus of power and develop on a national basis, while immediate contact with the Mediterranean was dangerous, as exemplified in the fate of the Goths, Vandals, and Lombards. On similar

**The
Peaceful
Slavs**

grounds the Slavs have no relations with the Mediterranean. This continental people, so conspicuously peaceful and agricultural, seemed diligently to avoid its shores. In one spot only, at the north-east corner of the Adriatic, members of the Slavonic family, the Chorvates, or Croates, have settled in a dense mass. These became, indeed, skilful seamen through mixture with the old Illyrians, but limited themselves to their own coasts; and as a

nation they were too few, and in their political development too independent, to exercise a predominant influence on the shaping of the life on the Mediterranean. Slavs, indeed, flooded Greece in great masses, but their nation was as little able to gain a firm footing there as the Germanic race in Spain and Italy. They

The Slavs soon were blended with the natives into the modern Greek nation, in which the Hellenic spirit prevailed, and with it they became the prey of the ever-narrowing Byzantinism. Nevertheless, a Teutonic race once more asserted its vigorous strength in the Mediterranean, at a time when national life had already begun to assume the fixed outlines of that form which has been maintained essentially up to the present day.

The appearance of the Normans is the more noteworthy in that they followed a path as yet untrodden by the migrating nations; that is, they came by sea and from the north. The Teutonic population of Scandinavia had, in consequence of the barrenness of their home, at an early period turned their attention to piracy, and thus became the pest of the north. The spirit of adventure, ambition, and the consciousness of physical strength made the Northmen no longer content with piracy, but sent them out, always in ships, on lasting conquests. Charles the Great had already been forced to defend his kingdom against their attacks; and towards the middle of the ninth century they had established themselves firmly in England and Northern France. Here, Charles III., the Simple, was compelled in 911 formally to surrender all Normandy to them.

In the Mediterranean the Northmen, sailing through the Straits of Gibraltar, had as early as the second half of the ninth century appeared as bold pirates, plundering the coasts as far as Greece; but the bold defence of the Arabs and Spaniards had hindered a permanent occupation then. Nevertheless, this enterprising race had by the sixth decade of the eleventh century succeeded in founding the Norman kingdom in Lower Italy and Sicily, which for a century and a half flourished exceedingly.

The founders of this kingdom had come from Normandy, where the Northmen had quickly become Christianised, had accepted French customs with the adaptability

characteristic of the Teutons, and had changed into the quite distinctive Norman nation. Civilisation could not take from them their love of liberty, their lust for adventure, and their eagerness for action; but since religion and custom forbade Christians to rob and murder, they sought a new field of activity.

This they found in the war against Islam. They gradually extended their campaigns so that they reached even the East and carried with them all the Christian nations of Europe. The movement of the Crusades, a tide of Western nations flowing back towards the East, did not originally start from the Normans, but is connected with the establishment of their supremacy in Lower Italy. This noteworthy people, in whom the pious enthusiasm and the calm determination of the North was united with the fiery fancy and emotional nature of the South, had on their reception of Christianity given it an enthusiastic and romantic direction. They yearned to visit the places where Christ had lived, taught, and suffered. When the news spread

Romance of the Crusades through Europe, chiefly from the Normans, that in those places, which the Mohammedans held, native Christians and Western pilgrims were being oppressed, a mood gradually took possession of them which fanned the religious ardour, the ambition, and the rapacity of the Western nations and ultimately brought about the long war of the Christian west with the Mohammedan east. This war, the theatre of which was exclusively the basin of the Mediterranean, and by which the inhabitants of that region were once more thrown into complete confusion, culminated at first in the reconquest of the Holy Land by Christendom and in the spread of Christianity over the known world.

But in time the purely religious and moral motives fell into the background to make room for political schemes of aggrandisement. Both these impulses show the power of the reanimated Mediterranean spirit, which, kept in ceaseless movement like waves of the sea, now pressed on from west to east. The most zealous promoters of the Crusades were the Normans, not as a united people, but as a continuous series of wandering knights and adventurers. Since these bold freelances were accustomed to make a stay in Lower Italy on their voyages to

Palestine and back, in order to have a passing encounter with the Arabs, they found ample opportunity there to mix in the various quarrels of the counts and barons, the former Lombard feudal lords, and the Greeks, and to place at their disposal their swords, which readily leapt from their scabbards. In this way they won much for themselves. First the Arabs were driven out; in 1030 Apulia with its capital, Aversa, appears already as a Norman possession. Soon afterwards the sons of Tancred de Hautville succeeded in uniting the small Norman lordships in Italy. In 1071 Robert Guiscard was recognised by the papal chair as Duke of Apulia and Calabria, while at the same time his brother Roger ended the Arab rule in Sicily and conquered the whole island.

Twenty-five years later the eastward migration of the Crusades had begun. Struck by the mighty impact of the western armies, the Mohammedan house of Seljuk, which had entered on the inheritance of the Arab caliphs, seemed ready to fall to ruins, as once the Roman empire under the shock of the barbarians. Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine were quickly conquered by the Crusaders, and western knights created eastern kingdoms for themselves. Godfrey de Bouillon of Lorraine became king of Jerusalem; the Norman Bohemund of Tarentum, son of Robert Guiscard, became prince of Antioch; the Provençal Raimond of Toulouse, prince of Tripoli. By the side of these secular principalities were organised the spiritual knightly orders, the Knights of St. John, the Templars, and the Teutonic order, independent bodies possessed of great wealth.

Yet Western civilisation found no favourable soil in the East because it adhered rigidly to its religious, romantic, and feudal character and was inclined to show little leniency towards the equally rigid racial and social forms of the East. It also found a malicious opponent in the Byzantinism of the Greek population, which opposed the "Latins" with outspoken hostility. Thus, in spite of the first dazzling success, the western system never took firm root, but was soon itself hard pressed after the Mohammedans had recovered from their first alarm and had found a vigorous ruler in the Sultan Saladin. It is remarkable that the very

same Normans, who in the East were the implacable foes of Islam, not only refrained from oppressing and persecuting their numerous Arabic subjects in their own kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, but treated them with actual consideration, being eager to effect an amalgamation of races. The Arabs of the east had at that time been crushed by Seljuks, Turks, and Kurds, or driven back to their original home. The Arabs of Spain and Sicily, on the contrary, had reached a stage of civilisation higher than that attained by almost any part of Europe. And since the fanaticism of these Arabs was not nearly so keen as that of their eastern co-religionists, their union with the rest of the motley population of Sicily did not seem at all impossible. In fact, it did come about to a certain degree; and if it was not completely successful, the reason lies in the early dissolution of the Norman power, which, after extraordinary prosperity, succumbed in the war of 1194 against the world-monarchy personified in the German Imperial House of Hohenstaufen.

From that time the Normans, who were always weak in numbers, disappeared from the Mediterranean without leaving any trace beyond a glorious memory. Their conquerors, the Staufer, as lords of Lower Italy and Sicily, showed consideration to the Arabs and made friendly advances to them; but they also sank into obscurity, and the French and Spanish, who succeeded to their rule in Naples and Sicily, were bent only on driving out the Saracens by force or exterminating them.

Islam wreaked vengeance on Christianity for this loss by preparing a speedy end for the western power in Asia. After Saladin, in 1187, had retaken Jerusalem, all attempts of the Christians to recover it proved fruitless. At the close of the twelfth century the Western powers had to abandon Asia. On the other hand, in the beginning of the thirteenth century a new attempt was made by them to expand in the east, this time at the expense of the Byzantine empire. Under the pretext of a Crusade, an expedition of Christian knights, whose moving spirit was the Doge of Venice, started straight for Constantinople by sea, captured it, placed a new emperor on the throne,

The Norman Power Succumbs

Kingdoms of the Knights

Vengeance of Islam on Christianity

merely to dethrone him at once, and finally availed themselves of the weakness of the Greeks to divide their territory among themselves. Count Baldwin of Flanders placed himself, in 1204, on the throne of Constantinople as "Latin emperor." Under him, just as had been the case a century before in Syria and

Western Knights Palestine, there arose a series of vassal states
Rule in under western knights—
Constantinople Boniface of Montserrat in the kingdom of Thessalonica, William of Champlitt in the principality of Achaia, Otto Delaroche in the duchy of Athens. The coasts were seized by the republic of Venice; Cyprus had been ruled since 1193 as a kingdom by the family of Lusignan when driven out from Jerusalem. In short, the Byzantine rule saw itself restricted in Europe to Epirus, and elsewhere to the north of Asia Minor.

But even then the West was not successful in creating permanent political fabrics; sharp dissensions between Latins and Greeks, internal and ecclesiastical disputes, pressure from the Bulgarians on the north and from some vigorous Comneni, caused the downfall, first of the kingdom of Thessalonica, then of the Latin empire. In 1261 the Byzantine empire was restored. The dukedoms of Achaia and Athens lasted, it is true, somewhat longer, since the first placed itself under the protection of the Neapolitan house of Anjou, the latter under that of the Sicilian royal house of Aragon. and was ruled by a band of Spanish freebooters, the Catalanian company; yet they only led a confused, shadowy existence until they became the spoil of the Turks. The possessions of Venice and those of Genoa, which were also acquired during the Crusades, were kept the longest and were the most powerful. These commercial republics were free from national, religious, and feudal arrogance

Decay of and from the insolence of the
Venice other Western conquerors, and
and Genoa knew how to maintain friendly relations with their Byzantine and eastern subjects. But after the Turks had finally shattered the Byzantine empire, and had shifted the centre of gravity of their power to Europe, Venice and Genoa, too, were obliged to quit the field.

The movement of nations occasioned by the Crusades, which is distinguished from the great migration of the peoples

only by the fact that it did not involve the total abandonment of home, but the removal only of a portion of the population capable of bearing arms, produced no lasting change in the political conditions of the inhabitants of the Mediterranean. The grouping of great nations, which was already assuming a permanent form, was not seriously disturbed by it.

Yet a wide-reaching importance attaches to it in many respects. It forms the conclusion, the last outburst, of those impelling forces which, springing partly from natural, partly from spiritual necessity, drove the masses one against the other, mingled them together, and out of the mixture caused new forms to be created. From this point the inner life of the nations of the Mediterranean comes more and more into a position of equilibrium and rest. The impulse towards expansion is quenched and gives place to one towards the internal improvement of all that concerns the nation, the state, and civilisation. After the struggle, lasting 200 years, between the two conflicting religions, Christianity and Islam, had ended in the

West and exhaustion of both, a silent
East Know understanding was arrived at.
Each Other The subsequent advance of the Turks into Europe presents another aspect; in this, religious reasons no longer play the chief part, and the invasion of the Turks ethnically exercised but little influence. The West and the East had learnt to know each other. Not only had the long sword of the knight crossed with the scimitar of the Saracen, not only had the Gospel matched itself against the Koran, but western and eastern life had come into contact. Thereafter many intellectual threads were spun backwards and forwards between the two, marking new paths of trade and commerce over the sea. A certain reciprocal appreciation of each other's strength, character, mental abilities, and nature began to assert itself—an appreciation of what each might learn, borrow, or buy from the other.

To this gradually dawning knowledge was joined the conviction that the forcible incorporation of the enemy's territory would be difficult, and, even if possible, would perhaps not conduce to the welfare of either. The long-continued hostility between the two halves of the Mediterranean had caused the building of large fleets upon it and had changed insignifi-

cant coast towns, such as Pisa, Genoa, Venice, into maritime powers; fleet and merchant navy both required occupation. After the great war had ended, only maritime trade and petty warfare were profitable. In fact, maritime trade on the Mediterranean, which had greatly diminished, owing to the migration of the nations, flourished so splendidly during and after the time of the Crusades that all previous results were eclipsed.

This prosperity was accompanied by a rapid growth of national wealth, the exchange of the productions peculiar to the different regions, a refinement in manners, an awakening of the desire for travel and of ardour for research, and a universal enlargement of knowledge. Familiarity with the East and its civilisation, which had almost been lost by the inhabitants of the Western Mediterranean, awoke a multitude of new thoughts which fructified and advanced the development of state, politics, society, and science. This mental

**Universal
Enlargement of
Knowledge**

change was greatly accelerated by the fact that the West in its new system was, in many ways, permeated with survivals of old Mediterranean ideas. On the other side a similar dispersion of Western elements was produced in the East through these causes. Partly as remnants of the Latin state system, partly as colonists and traders, Burgundians, Provençals, Spaniards, Southern Italians, Lombards, Genoese, Venetians, and Illyrians had spread in great numbers over the coasts of Syria, the Ægean and the Black Sea.

These outposts of the West were, of course, too weak to exert an ethnical influence on the life of the Eastern nations, yet were strong enough, in union with the native Græco-Slavs and the Turko-Tartars, who were streaming in from the Far East, to prevent the formation of marked nationalities. Thus they have contributed towards giving to the eastern basin of the Mediterranean the character which attaches to it at the present day—that of a mechanical medley of race fragments, showing no trace of chemical affinity, and therefore incapable of any of those

bonds which have made united nations out of the conglomerate populations of the West. It is the permanently incongruous character of the motley mosaic of races in the Eastern Mediterranean basin which created an Eastern Question in the remote past, an ethnographical problem unsolved even at the present day. The universal interests of mankind, formerly

**A Motley
Mosaic
of Races** put into the background, partly by the deafening din of arms and partly by a scholasticism which fettered the intellect, came gradually back to men's minds, occupied their thoughts, and found zealous supporters. That theory of life which had been born when the exploits of Alexander the Great widened the horizon of man, which had assumed a more lasting form under the Roman empire and, socially purified, had been established by triumphant Christianity upon the moral worth of man as a basis, once more arose.

Henceforth the Renaissance, embodying this conception, selects and brings together the best qualities of all previous manifestations in an intellectual new birth. Through this movement the Mediterranean spirit, whose sources had been many, and whose growth had been slow, becoming conscious of itself, was destined to attain unity. The peculiar nature of the Mediterranean spirit finds its purest expression in the Renaissance, which comprises in itself material, moral, and intellectual welfare, the beautiful and the useful, the rights of the State and the citizen, and the free unfolding of the individual. Rejoicing in the power of creation, it passed directly into the wider conception of European civilisation. This accounts for the su-

**Why European
Civilisation
is Supreme**

periority of European civilisation over the other civilisations of the world and for the triumphant manner in which, radiating from the Mediterranean, it has spread over the world. Its progress continues in our own day, and in perfect adaptation to time and place it has grown more ennobling, more enriching, more intense. EDWARD, COUNT WILCZEK

HANS F. HELMOLT





The snow-clad Rila Dagh mountain and the wild Devil's Valley, in the Balkans.



In the Dinaric Alps, the western range of the Peninsula, on the borders of Herzegovina.



A forest-clad mountain slope in the Balkans, the eastern range of the Balkan Peninsula.

MOUNTAINS WHICH SEAM THE BALKAN PENINSULA



THE EARLY PEOPLES OF SOUTH AND WEST EUROPE

PEOPLES OF THE MAIN BALKAN PENINSULA

By Dr. K. G. Brandis

SEAMED by high mountains which run in various directions and enclose sharply isolated valleys, the mass of the south-easternmost peninsula of Europe resembles in its physical characteristics the peninsula of Greece, which joins it to the south, but differs from it in being far less accessible by sea. The east coast is but little indented and is deficient in good harbours. The west coast is more irregular in outline and possesses numerous islands and harbours; lofty and precipitous mountains, however, run down to the shore and prevent brisk trade with the interior.

Only to the north, where the peninsula joins the continent, is it without any distinct boundary, and on that side the country is wholly exposed to foreign invasion. The vast area may be divided orographically into two regions—the western part, shut in by the Dinaric Mountains, which stretch from north to south, and the eastern part, which abounds in mountain ranges, running almost at right angles with the Dinaric chain. The ethnographic divisions correspond in general to the orographic; the Illyrians dwelt on the west, the Thracians on the east, and at a later period the Macedonians thrust in their way between the two to the south. Bordering on Epirus to the south,

Mountains of the Balkans

and having intercourse with the Hellenes, the Illyrians were, on the north, neighbours of the Kelts, with whom they came into contact in what is now Croatia. But exact boundaries can be as little specified on the north as on the side of the Thracians on the east; the frontiers were often uncertain and in the course of time were frequently altered. Prevented from extending north-

ward by the Kelts, who, since an early period, pressed down on them, and hemmed in by mountains on the east, the Illyrians continuously encroached upon the Hellenes on the south, and some bands of them even advanced into Greece;

Migrations of the Illyrians

but the great mass of wanderers, who left their old home on account of over-population and the consequent deficiency in food, or the pressure of neighbouring nations, or the desire for conquest, crossed the Adriatic and settled on the opposite Italian coast. Even in ancient times the Daunians, the Salentinians, the Pelignians, Iapygians, Messapians, and other tribes of Italy, were held to be Illyrians; and the correctness of this assumption has recently been confirmed by the close relationship of the present Albanian—a dialect spoken practically in the same district as that once occupied by the Illyrians, and considered to be the latest variety of one of the old Illyrian dialects—with the Messapian, preserved on inscriptions in Lower Italy.

Split up into many tribes, which preserved their peculiar habits and customs, separated as they were from each other by mountain ranges, and untouched by any foreign civilisation, the Illyrians never attained national unity, though renowned for their bravery and notorious for their rudeness and love of plunder. At the head of the tribes were the princes, who sought to extend their dominions at the expense of each other as well as by the invasion of foreign territory. West of the lake of Lychnitis some importance was attained by the monarchy of Bardylis and his son Clitus, who invaded Macedonia

and held in subjection part of that country until driven back by Philip and afterwards by Alexander. At a later period the kingdom of the Ardiaei existed on the lower course of the Naro. This nation, governed by such princes as Pleuratus and Agron, ruled the sea with their pirate fleet and menaced the Greek colonies on the fertile islands which fringe the coast as well as Greek towns on the mainland. All the Greeks on the Adriatic, with the exception of those of Issa, lost their independence. Issa invoked the help of Rome; and in the year 230 B.C. Rome first interfered in Illyrian affairs by liberating the Greek towns. Rome was forced to wage war repeatedly in Illyria before that country could be made a province. Then, for the first time, it became more accessible; roads were built and the beginning of progress made, while the Roman legions maintained peace and paved the way for trade and commerce.

We do not know when the Thracians entered the land which bears their name. From the few words which have been preserved—no records in the Thracian language exist—and from the proper names which have come down to us in large numbers, but above all from their geographic position among the Aryan nations—Greeks, Slavs, and Scythians—it has long been held that the Thracians also were Aryans and formed as distinct a branch of that great family as their southern neighbours, or as the Kelts, with whom they afterwards came into contact on the Danube. Thracian tribes spread beyond the Balkan peninsula itself and settled, the Getæ in Transylvania, the Dacians in what is now Roumania. And though in more recent, and particularly in Roman, times the term "Thrace" was applied to the country south of the Hæmus, between the Rhodope Mountains and the Black Sea, in antiquity this was not the case: then Thrace comprised all countries where Thracians dwelt, the vast regions extending from the slopes of the Carpathians to the Ægean and from the Black Sea westward to the frontiers of Illyria. Probably no one at present doubts that the Thracians originally came


from the north. But after the first occupation of the land to which they gave their name many important changes occurred; tribes long settled changed character with the arrival of new settlers or wandered from the old homes to new abodes. The Trojans and Phrygians, both Thracian tribes, left Europe, to find a new home in Asia; this event is said to have happened about 3000 B.C.—that is, in prehistoric times. Then came the migration into Asia of the Mysians, who set out thither from the valley of the Danube. Some of them were still settled there even in Roman days

under the name of Mæsians. The last great migration from the Balkan peninsula over the Bosphorus into Asia Minor, that of the Thynians and Bithynians, occurred after the close of prehistoric times. Of them, however, a part remained behind in Europe, as in the case of the Mysians. The chief cause of all the migrations was the inability of the tribes to resist the pressure of powerful nations behind them.

We do not know how often entire tribes, or at least considerable fractions of them, were thus annihilated or crushed; we may see only here and there the results of a long and important movement, without being able to follow more closely its origin and its course. Thus, we know that the Cimmerians of the South Russian steppe in the east were pushed westward by the advance of the Scythians, were driven against the Thracians, and, finally flying before the nomads, left their native land;

that they then proceeded through the Balkan peninsula over the Bosphorus into Asia Minor and there produced great revolutions. Some Thracian tribes, which had shared their campaigns in Asia Minor, were with them. Precisely the same

thing happened to the Thracians in the south-west, where the Pierians, Bottiæans, and Edonians held all the territory up to Olympus and the Thessalian frontier, where the Macedonians repelled every forward movement. Obviously the departure of the Thracians from those parts must have produced important revolutions or migrations among the kindred tribes,



HERMES
Worshipped by the
Thracian kings.

The superstitions of the Thracians, their forms of divine worship, and their religious conceptions were the object of zealous study among the Greeks; but many observances are found among them which had been borrowed from their southern neighbours and developed. According to Herodotus, the Thracians worshipped Ares, Dionysus, and Artemis; but their kings worshipped Hermes, whom they claimed as progenitor, a cult peculiar to them. The whole list of their gods is not, indeed, exhausted by these names; they certainly worshipped one other celestial being, who seems to have been called by some tribes Gebeleizis, by others Sbelthiurdus. In times of tempest they would entreat him, by discharging arrows in the air, to silence the thunder and keep back the lightning.

It is not surprising to find Ares, the god of war and of the din of arms, worshipped by so warlike a people. Thrace was for this reason called Areia, the land of Ares; from Thrace, according to Homer, he rushed forth to battle with his foes, and to Thrace he returned. But we know nothing of the manner in which he was worshipped.

On the other hand, the cult of Dionysus is tolerably well known. Supposing that Semele, who is universally considered to be his mother, is really the Thracio-Phrygian earth-goddess, then Dionysus may be accounted the son of the Earth and of the god of Heaven, a conclusion to which the first element in his name points. He brings blessings and fertility. Not merely the vine, but all the fruits of the fields and

gardens are under his protection; when the plants that cover the earth pass away lamentations are raised to him; when they awake once more he is greeted with shouts of joy. Utter licentiousness and the wildest abandon characterised the celebration of the resurrection of Dionysus. Men and women, the latter clad in flowing

many-coloured garments, joined in the rout. Garlanded with ivy and bearing the thyrsus, with flutes, cymbals, drums, and pipes, they rushed madly through the fields in search of the god, and the orgy was continued till his approach was announced by the ululation of men imitating the howling of beasts; the wildest enthusiasm was indulged in by all who took part when once the god was again among them. All this was reckoned, even in antiquity, as a distinctive feature of the festival of the Thracian Dionysus. In Greece any trace of such orgiastic festivals may be assigned to Thracian influences. Another aspect of the nature of Dionysus deserves to be noticed. He was a god of prophecy. North of Pangæum, in the wild Rhodian range, was found his oracle, over which the priestly race of the Bessi presided. A woman, inspired by the god, uttered in his name dark sayings, hardly more intelligible than those of her colleague at Delphi. This oracle of Dionysus maintained its importance for many centuries.

Orgiastic festivals with processions were held in honour of the goddess Bendis, who was identified with the Greek Artemis. The offerings brought her by the women



ARES, THE THRACIAN GOD OF WAR
Ares, known to the Romans as Mars, was the war god of the Thracians, and Thrace was, for this reason, called Areia. From a Paros sculpture, now at Munich.

were wrapped in wheat-stalks; the men organised a torchlight ride, and the whole festival was ended by a night of unrestrained revelry. Human beings were also sacrificed. Every four years a festival was held in honour of Salmoxis, at which a man, previously selected by lot to go to Salmoxis as ambassador and messenger, was seized by his hands and feet and thrown on the points of spears. If the chosen victim did not die therefrom, he was a wicked man, unworthy of the commission entrusted to him, and another was taken in his place. The favourite wife was often sacrificed on the new-made grave of her deceased husband and immediately buried by his side. Herodotus, it is true, relates this only of one

times alone, frequently in combination with various beasts of the chase, at which the horseman hurls his lance; often an altar was raised to him. The surviving members of the family did this in order that the spirit of the departed might be gracious and favourable to them. Herodotus was able to say of the Thracian tribe of the Getæ that, according to their religious conception, life did not end with death, but that after death a better and more happy life was to be expected; according to ordinary tradition, the sage Salmoxis had taught them this belief in immortality. Peculiar to them is the exalted station the wise man or priest occupied by the side of the king; as interpreter of the divine commands, and as mediator between gods




GREEK STATUE OF DIONYSUS



THE WORSHIP OF DIONYSUS AS ILLUSTRATED IN GREEK SCULPTURE

Spring, the time of the resurrection of Dionysus, the Thracian god of the fruits of the fields, was greeted by the Thracians with joy, and his festival celebrated with the wildest abandon and enthusiasm. From a Vatican relief.

Thracian tribe. But the sacrifice of widows was certainly a universal Thracian custom which found parallels among other Aryan nations in primitive times, and has only very recently been suppressed in India. At the time when Herodotus wrote this custom had begun to die out in Thrace. In more recent times no human victims were offered to the dead, but all kinds of objects were consecrated to the departed as a hero or a demigod. Small marble slabs were dedicated to him, which showed in relief the figure of a rider with fluttering cloak, some-



DIONYSUS ENTHRONED
From a wall-painting at Pompeii


and mortals he was the monarch's guide and counsellor. The Trausi, another Thracian tribe, lamented at the birth of a male child, as they reflected on the afflictions and sufferings awaiting him in life; but they buried the deceased with great rejoicing as one who had done with sorrow and had entered into everlasting happiness. It is not therefore astonishing that the piety of the Thracians was often praised in antiquity. In some cases also asceticism is noticeable among them: there were people who, in order to obtain a reputation for sanctity,

refrained from all flesh food and remained unmarried. We can doubtless see in the efforts of these few holy men a reaction against the prevailing habits of life; for in many other instances handed down to us the Thracians appear in a brutal light, indulging in polygamy, addicted to drink, and rough in their habits. Wives were bought for money from their parents and were strictly watched by their husbands, whereas maidens enjoyed great freedom of movement, and could form liaisons at pleasure. The sale of children also was prevalent. The Thracians were divided into numerous tribes, at the head of which stood princes. The inaccessibility of their mountains favoured their efforts to maintain independence. These mountain tribes lived mostly by hunting and cattle-breeding; brigandage and marauding were regarded as the most honourable pursuits. The state of affairs was different in the river-valleys, especially in the broad and fertile valley of the Hebrus. Here there was a higher civilisation: agriculture was carried on; wheat and millet were cultivated as well as hemp, from which cloth was made; barley, from which beer was extracted, and even vines. Here the inhabitants dwelt in fortified villages, and there were farms surrounded by palisades, since the owners always had to be prepared for the raids of the marauding mountain tribes. In the valley of the Hebrus, which was inhabited by various tribes, a kingdom was first constituted by the Ordysæ, who united several tribes under one rule. But before this could happen Thrace had to shake off the yoke of the Persians. When Darius marched through this land on his expedition against the Scythians in 513 B.C. its inhabitants either submitted to him or were forced, like the Getæ between the Hæmus and the Danube, to join his army. After the disaster to the

king, Megabazus remained behind in Thrace with 80,000 men in order completely to subdue the country. As a result, the districts on the Ægean coast and the valley of the Hebrus came under the Persian rule. They were made subject to tribute and were required to provide auxiliaries, while Persian garrisons were placed in the most important towns, such as Doriscus, Sestus, Byzantium, etc. The Persian supremacy in Thrace lasted up to the time of the Persian wars, when, after

**Persia
Driven from
Thrace**

the battles of Plataea and Mycale, the Greeks succeeded in bringing the straits of the Bosphorus once more into their power and driving the Persians completely out of Europe. In the following years Persian garrisons fell in rapid succession, last of all that of Doriscus, which was defended by the brave Mascames. Thus, the Persians were driven out of Thrace by the Greeks, chiefly owing to the Athenians. But far from welcoming their liberators gladly, the Thracians, on the contrary, offered a desperate resistance to the Athenians. They not only aided the Persian garrisons of Eion and Doriscus, but actually defeated the Athenians on several occasions when these, being now in possession of Eion, endeavoured to occupy and colonise Enneahodoi. This name, which means "nine ways," was given to a place on the Strymon in a most fertile region and at the intersection of the roads from the north to the Ægean Sea, and from Macedonia to the Hellespont and the Bosphorus; it was not until 436 B.C. that Amphipolis could be founded here. But Eion belonged to the Athenians, and after the revolt of Thasus his possessions on the mainland fell into their hands in 463 B.C. Thus, the Athenians firmly established themselves on the Thracian coast. The Thracian Chersonese had long been in their possession; and through the creation of the Attic maritime



DIONYSUS

The son of the Earth and the god of Heaven who brought blessings and fertility to the Thracians.

Mansell

**Thrace
Ruled by
Persia**

league—to which Abdera, Aenus, and Maronea of the Greek colonies situated in these parts, and Byzantium, Perinthus, and others of the Hellepontine towns belonged—they completely ruled the whole Thracian coast. The Chalcidian peninsula, which adjoins on the west, was also subjected to Athenian influence.

Almost contemporaneously with the establishment of the Athenian power on the coast, the Odrysæan Kingdom was founded in the valley of the Hebrus, succeeded in subduing the other native tribes and in founding a kingdom. Though Teres was not the founder of the Odrysæan kingdom, he was regarded as the one who did most to enhance its power and to extend its sway over the regions of Thrace. The whole territory between Rhodope, Mount Hæmus, the Black Sea, and the Hellespont was ruled over by the Odrysæan kings. Even beyond Mount Hæmus, the Getæ, who inhabited the coast between the mountain and the Danube, were subject to them, as were the Agriani, who dwelt in the mountains along the upper course of the Strymon; even a few Pæonian tribes recognised their supremacy. Sitalces, the son of Teres, reigned over the Odrysæan realm within these boundaries.

The monarchy was absolute. We are not told that the people were ever consulted or that any voice in the decision of public affairs was conceded them, or that the king in general was bound by laws or a constitution. In the event of war he summoned all men capable of bearing arms: at the end of the war they were dismissed. There was not the slightest trace of a standing army with its strict military organisation and efficient training. Next to the king there were dynasts, or local chiefs, whose power was naturally weaker when the king was strong, and stronger when the king was weak. The taxes which accrued to the king from the

country itself and from some Hellenic colonies on the sea coasts amounted, according to Thucydides, at their highest total to 400 talents of silver annually; but in addition to these he received presents of gold and silver, embroidered and plain stuffs and many other things, the value of which is said to have equalled the amount of the taxes. The Thracians thought it more blessed to receive than to give, and it was difficult for any one to

accomplish his object without distributing lavish presents. The more influential a man was, the more he favoured this custom; the king, naturally, obtained the most, and his wealth increased with his power. Obviously this was a great cause of official uncertainty, and under such circumstances there was no thought of an organised administration.

Nobles are mentioned among the Odrysæ. The court and immediate circle round the king were composed of them or they resided on their estates, ready to go to war as cavalry when necessary; and what Herodotus said of Thracians in general holds good of them—namely, that agriculture was regarded by them as dishonourable and disgraceful, and that only the life of the soldier and robber pleased them. By the side of these nobles there must naturally have been “commons,” for how else could the cultivation of the fields and gardens, for which the territory of the Odrysæ was famous, have been carried on? These commons, or peasants, composed the infantry in time of war. Sitalces, the son and successor of Teres,

had the command of a very considerable force; 150,000 men are spoken of. As an ally of Athens he interfered in the affairs of Macedonia and Chalcidice; we shall see later on why this expedition proved fruitless to him. A few years later, in 424 B.C., Sitalces fell in a campaign against the Triballi on the Danube. This shows that he was eager to extend his power over the Thracian tribes. But soon afterwards the Odrysæan kingdom broke up for lack of a firm basis. The various tribes that composed the kingdom submitted, indeed, to the iron hand of one who knew how to keep them together, but they always struggled for independence whenever that strict rule was relaxed.

Under Seuthes and Medocus, the successors of Sitalces, the power of the local chiefs was strengthened, and they became more and more independent of the superior king. In 383 B.C., one of these, Cotys, succeeded in overthrowing the hereditary dynasty and making himself sole monarch. Though he was sensual and fond of pleasure, he was capable and vigorous. He made it his object to conquer the Thracian Chersonese. When the Athenians recovered from the disastrous termination of the Peloponnesian war, and proceeded to reconquer the towns on the

Thracian Chersonese which had been lost to them, they came into collision with Cotys. In this war, which, with the exception of a successful campaign carried on by the capable Timotheus in 364 B.C., was conducted by Athens with inefficient commanders and slight resources, victory rested with the Thracian king. He conquered Sestus and other places, and about the year 360 B.C. Athens possessed only the two small places Crithotæ and Elaëus.

After the death of Cotys, in 359 B.C., his kingdom was divided. His son Cersebleptes held the territory east of the Hebrus, while Amadocus ruled over the territory between the Hebrus and Nestus, and Berisades, from Nestus to the Strymon. Simultaneously Philip came to the throne in the neighbouring state to the west, Macedonia, and was destined soon to interfere in the affairs of Thrace.

The land lying between the courses of the Axios and Haliacmon, which afterwards belonged to Macedonia, was, so far as the materials at our disposal allow us to trace its history backwards, at one time occupied by Thracian tribes. While a rich,

The Rose Gardens of Midas

fertile plain, encircled by mountains, lay between the lower courses of the Axios and the Haliacmon toward the sea, the upper stretches of these rivers enclosed a wild and partly inaccessible mountain district, which, inhabited by various nationalities, long preserved its independence. At a remote but fairly definite period there dwelt round Mount Bermius those Phrygian tribes which later crossed over to Asia Minor and subjugated and cultivated the land named after them. But the celebrated rose-gardens round Bermius, which were called in antiquity the gardens of Midas, on account of their luxuriance and the fragrant scent of their roses, preserved the remembrance of the Phrygians once settled there, whose kings were called alternately Midas and Gordius.

A remnant of these oldest inhabitants must, however, have remained there, for when Mardonius in the year 492 B.C. undertook at the orders of Darius an expedition against Greece, his army was attacked in Macedonia by the Brygians—that is, the Thracian Phrygians—and suffered severe losses. Still, as the main body of the Phrygians had left these regions, other Thracian tribes occupied them. Without being able to assign fixed limits, we may say that the Cordeans dwelt afterwards

on the Bermius range, the Pierians on the Haliacmon and southward to Olympus, the Edonians in Mygdonia east of Axios, and the Bottiæans to the west. It is an historical fact that even these nations did not remain in the same regions, but were all pushed further westward by the Macedonians, who pressed on victoriously and

The Coming of the Macedonians

gave to the whole country between Olympus and the Strymon their own name, Macedonia. It is not known when the Macedonians first appeared. They are considered rightly to be a people closely related to the Hellenes. When the Greeks migrated into Hellas the Macedonians remained behind somewhere in the Epirot Mountains, and then, driven out, doubtless, by the southward pressure of the Illyrian tribes, crossed the Pindus range and sought settlements on its eastern side.

The ancients were well aware that the Macedonians had migrated into the land afterwards called Macedonia. - The ancient legend connected the royal race of the Macedonians, the Argeadæ, with the Temenidæ in Argos. Three brothers of this race—Gauanes, Aëropus, and Perdiccas—fled from their home to Illyria, and thence came to Upper Macedonia; there they entered into the service of the king at first as common labourers. Dismissed and pursued by their master, they were saved from his horsemen by a swollen river. Subsequently they settled in a district of Lower Macedonia, and finally subdued the rest of Macedonia. This myth may serve to illustrate the connection of the Macedonians with the Hellenes, and to throw light on the bitterness of the struggle for the conquest of the land; but it does not solve the mystery which wraps the earliest history of the people.

The youngest of the three brothers, Perdiccas, is celebrated as the first king of the Macedonians. This princely race, which resided in Ægæe, succeeded not only

First King of the Macedonians

in founding a dominion in Lower Macedonia, but also in making their supremacy recognised among the neighbouring tribes of Upper Macedonia. Macedonian history is full of struggles of the central power against the suzerain border-chiefs, especially of the mountain districts of Lyncestis and Elimiotis, who were often rebellious until the strong arm of Philip reduced them to order.

K. G. BRANDIS



Salamis, one of the magnificent harbours which led the early peoples to take to the sea.



The mountainous country of Thessaly; a monastery on a mountain top.



A harbour-town on the ancient Gulf of Pagasæus, one of the finest Grecian harbours.

PHYSICAL FEATURES OF GREECE WHICH MODIFIED ITS HISTORY



THE ANCIENT PEOPLES OF GREECE

By Professor Rudolph von Scala

THE lower the stage of civilisation, the closer is the dependence of the human race upon the soil. The intelligence that masters the earth does not make its appearance until late, and even then it scarcely ever succeeds in severing all the ties by which man is joined to the earth from which he has sprung. The geological conformation of Greece, with its mountainous regions and its lack of plains, of easy land-routes, and of navigable rivers, led of itself to the separation of races into isolated groups and to their dependence upon the sea as the most favourable means of intercourse. The magnificent harbours formed by the Gulfs of Ambracia, Corinth, Argolis, Saronicus, and Pagasæus must at an early time have led men to take to the sea, a course in which they were greatly aided by the landmarks that are almost always visible to the mariner: Mount Athos, above

**Early
Mariners of
Greece** 6,000 feet in height, which may be seen from nearly every point in the Northern Ægean; the mountains of Eubœa, visible from most points in the Central Archipelago, and, highest of all, Mount Ida, in Crete, which serves as a guide for almost the entire Southern Ægean.

The climate of Greece is tempered by the sea to a far greater extent than one might suppose, considering the size of the peninsula. To be sure, there are important variations; for example, Messenia with its magnificent climate presents the most striking contrast to the mountainous regions of West Arcadia. In Athens, the point where the greatest differences in temperature are to be found, the mean temperature is 43° in January, and 82° in July. The influence which the climate, together with the beauty and brilliancy of the blue summer sky and the clear outlines of physical objects, had upon the development of the Greek love for beauty of form, and the effect of the mildness of temperature, and the rareness of tempests, upon architecture

and the development of household surroundings, have long been recognised. Thus the influence of geographical configuration on the history of Greece may be clearly seen; the development of the Greek races took the most varied forms, and through their very dissimilarities and varying interests the different tribes must in turn have had great influence on the intellectual activity of the people as a whole. All the defects and all the merits peculiar to individualism—or rather to the extreme self-concentration of small groups—are united in Greece; and from the combination of these defects and excellences arise great talents in individual men—and isolation in states.

The Balkan peninsula and the islands of the Ægean were the scene of the beginnings of European history. There, for the first time in the continent of Europe, inscribed stones spoke an intelligible language; and there, too, from the unscripted remains of ruined palaces, citadels, and sepulchres, modern investigation obtains testimony of centuries that passed away long before writing was invented. Fragments of pottery proclaim the connection of primeval settlements with definite spheres of civilisation; indeed, they even afford the possibility of arranging these spheres of civilisation chronologically; and comparative philology throws light upon the significance of obscure names of places, often proving them to be the last remains of races about whom tradition is silent, or at most in-

**Where the
History of
Europe Begins** distinct. Archæology and comparative philology do not, however, supplement each other perfectly. We

are not able to confirm with absolute certainty the hypotheses advanced by archæology regarding the connection of ancient remains with any one of the strata of populations to which they are referred by philological investigation. Probability that has almost become certainty upholds us in

calling the possessors of that early civilisation which we call Mycenaean. Greeks: and, again, it is probable that of the Greeks the Achæans, or the early Dorians, built and perfected the fortresses of Mycenæ and Tiryns. English excavations at Melos

**Greece
Before the
Greeks**

have revealed a prehistoric palace beneath a Mycenaean, and thus the Greek population of the continent is connected with the old pre-Grecian settlements and sanctuaries. The oldest population of the north-eastern part of the Balkan peninsula, the Phrygio-Thracian races, concerning whom important information has recently been obtained through the discovery of a grave-mound near Salonica, was hard pressed by the Greek peoples 4000-3000 B.C., and furnished many emigrants to Asia Minor, who repeatedly settled the hills of Hissarlik. Small excavations, each encompassed by four simple stone slabs, mark



MELOS: A SEAT OF ANCIENT GREEK CULTURE

their final resting-places. Implements of stone, such as axes, saws, and arrow-points, with chisels, awls, and needles of copper, later made of an alloy of copper and tin, were already in use. Beak-shaped vessels for pouring, and jugs with shapeless bodies, formed the household utensils of this Trojan civilisation, which spread far out over the islands, even to Amorgos. Strangest of all are the vessels displaying features of the human body, clumsily and fantastically imitated indeed, but showing that the first groping attempt at art of this people was to represent man. Coloured ornamentation was already employed in the form of awkward figures and lines drawn upon earthenware.

The wealth of Oriental art was inaccessible to the Trojans; they stood in connection with the West, where as far as Bosnia traces of related human aggregates may be followed out. There was

no intervening people to connect them with the civilisations of the East, already highly developed; only through the medium of the primitive inhabitants of the Troad were the lines of traffic drawn as far as Cyprus.

The oldest population of the southern part of the Balkan peninsula, as well as of a great number of the islands of the Ægean Sea, did not belong to the Aryan branch of the human race, but to a people of Asia Minor, which in time became divided into Carians, Lycians, Pisidians, and Western Cilicians. Not later than 3000 B.C. these tribes spread from Asia Minor over the Archipelago, where they established themselves in Cos, Crete, Paros, Patmos, Leros, Icaros, Delos, and Eubœa. Traces of their presence on the mainland have been left in the names Bœotia, Attica, and Argolis. The supposition that there was any connection between the migrations of the Phrygio-Thracians to Asia and of the tribes of Asia Minor to Europe becomes untenable if we remember that the Phrygio-Thracian migration to Asia Minor must have occurred earlier than the settlement of Greece by the Greeks, and that the latter must have taken place at an earlier period than that of the emigration of the tribes from Asia Minor to Europe. The worship of earth-spirits who dwelt in chambered caves was peculiar to the Asiatic tribes, as

is shown by the cult connected with the cave of Psycho in Crete; the name of the Carian god Labrandus has been preserved in "Labyrinthus." Thus, probably, the worship of other cave-gods rests upon the old cults of the inhabitants coming originally from Asia Minor; that of Palæmon on the Isthmus, of Hyacinthus in Amyclæ, and perhaps those of Python in Delphi and of Æsculapius in Epidaurus. Aside from what we have learned of them

from other discoveries—for example, the sacrificial altar of Zeus Dictæus—these earliest inhabitants were already possessed of an alphabetical writing in Crete at the time of the Mycenaean civilisation. This alphabet spread to other islands, but only a few letters, used as ornaments or as marks of ownership, penetrated to the Greeks of the mainland. Even earlier, between 2000 and 3000 B.C., a system of

picture writing resembling that of the Hittites was in use in the eastern part of Crete.

The Cretan civilisation of the races that came originally from Asia Minor was stimulated by a vigorous traffic carried on with the Grecian mainland and by constant contact with the products of Mycenaean art, and attained its highest phase of development at a period contemporary with the twelfth Egyptian dynasty. Communications were also carried on with Egypt, so that the identity with the Cretans of the peoples known to the Egyptians under the collective name of Keftiu is certain. The widespread dispersion of the inhabitants of this island is evidenced in the legend, founded perhaps upon fact, that the Philistines emigrated from Crete—Kefthor—to the coast of Syria.

The tribes of Asia Minor long remained upon the islands; even in historical times an inscription in their language—by Præsus—was written in Crete; and old sepulchres, discovered during the fifth century B.C., were, with just remembrance of the past, ascribed to the "Carians" of Asia Minor.

About 3000 B.C. the Greeks, or Hellenes, already differentiated into tribes or hordes, seem to have entered the Balkan peninsula. They must have remained stationary for a long time in the north, where prehistoric centres of civilisation arose about the Gulf of Janina, and where, no doubt, encouragement was whispered to them by the sacred oak, the oracle of Zeus at Dodona.

Afterwards the fertile Thessalian plain became a central point for the wandering hordes of the north; and with Thessaly the name of Pelasgians is associated. To the ancient Greeks the term Pelasgian originally served to bring back merely the memory of their primitive home; but as time passed it became the designation of a misty, pre-Grecian population, and for thousands of years it has been a cause of confusion.

**Greeks
Enter
Greece**

The hypothesis that Pelasgians never existed as a people is a creation of the most recent criticism. Through the subsequent invasion from the north-east by Thracian races, of which isolated branches

**The Constant
Invasion of
New Races**

penetrated far into Greece, and of Illyrian races from the north-west, pressing towards Epirus, Acarnania, and Ætolia, the southernmost branch of the Greek people was pushed over into the extreme southern part of the Balkan peninsula. This branch spoke a dialect akin to that which survived in later times in Arcadia,


in the eastern part of Laconia, in the names of single strongholds, in Helos, and on the island of Cyprus. It was closely allied to those races which in historical times were in possession of Thessaly, Bœotia, and Lesbos. Other tribes followed and settled in Attica. It is improbable that these Greeks were as yet strong enough to exterminate the original Carian-Asiatic population. A process of amalgamation, and of transmission of customs from race to race, is much more likely. At first they wandered not as tribes, but in great hordes, all of which worshipped a god of the heavens, the god of light, enthroned upon all mountain tops that are first struck by the beams of the rising sun. Personal property was not recognised; the hordes united for war and plunder. They became divided up into tribes, where the freemen in councils of war debated over questions of policy, meted out justice as




A BRONZE FROM MELOS
A statuette of Aphrodite from one of the most ancient sites in Greece.

the emanation of the divine will. The god of herds, who dwelt in the fold; Apellon, or Apollon, the god of shepherds; Hermes, the god of roads to whose glory, and for the benefit of later wanderers, heaps of stones and sometimes rude statues, Hermæ, were erected to point out roads and to mark boundaries—all of these appear in the primitive Greek mythology. A moral conception of the gods and the coarsest form of fetichism were strangely intermingled in prehistoric Greece.

RUDOLF VON SCALA



CHIUSI, THE ANCIENT CLUSIUM, A ROYAL CITY OF ETRURIA AND A CENTRE OF THE WONDERFUL ETRUSCAN CIVILISATION



THE PEOPLES OF THE ITALIAN PENINSULA

By Professor C. Pauli

BEFORE Roman civilisation transformed the Italian peninsula into an ever-green garden—a garden that, in spite of centuries of mismanagement, still remains—Italy was a land of immense and thick forests, and differed in few respects from the Germany of the early Teutonic races described by Tacitus. But wherever mountain forests merge into the woods of lowlands there is sure to be no lack of swamps, caused by excessive moisture, peculiar to thickly wooded countries; and that there were many marshes in the Italian peninsula is shown by the remains of the settlements of its earliest inhabitants. The entire plain of Lombardy was thickly covered with villages built upon piles, which were especially numerous at the southern edge of Lakes Maggiore and Garda and in the region south of the Po, from Piacenza to Bologna. The situation of these villages proves that the early settlements were located chiefly upon marsh-land; but to what race the inhabitants of the pile-dwellings belonged is not yet known with certainty. Opinions have differed as to who were the first peoples of Italy; Ligurians, Itali, Etruscans, and prehistoric men have all been mentioned, according to different theories. According to the most generally accepted view, the pile-dwellings fall into two distinct groups, which, although separated by a considerable space in time, certainly show but small differences from one another. These differences are most apparent in the remains of pottery. The more ancient of the two strata is ascribed to the Itali, of whom we shall speak later, and the more recent to the Etruscans.

**Italy in the
Days of the
Pile-dwellers**

We have no other information respecting the earliest times of the peninsula except that conveyed by some proper names which have been handed down to us by tradition. In the earliest Greek records Italy is designated by the name "Æno-tria," and its peoples are called autoch-

thonous, which merely means that nothing was known of any anterior races.

The first inhabitants of the peninsula with regard to whom we can claim definite historical knowledge are the Iberians. We are, indeed, unable to say with certainty whence they migrated, when they first settled in their European home, the peninsula of Spain. Of this event the writers of antiquity, naturally enough, knew nothing; and here, too, language, the means by which we are often enabled to trace the origin of a people, fails us completely. Neither the old Iberian names of places, whose rude sounds caused a certain displeasure to Roman ears, nor the daughter tongue of this people, the Basque of to-day, show relationship with any other language. Philologists, it is true, are said to have discovered similar sounds in the languages of the American Indians; but any definite historical connection between races so widely separated is almost inconceivable, and may be at once dismissed.

The most probable theory, indeed the one which has most general acceptance to-day, is that the Iberians came from Africa. Yet this conjecture involves many difficulties likewise; for, although the Berbers, according to geographical conditions, are the only people that may be considered related to the Iberians, they not only show a totally different physical type, but speak a language that is throughout unrelated to that of the Basques. There is also another theory, in accordance with which the Iberians of Spain are considered to be of the same race as the Iberians of the Caucasus, who dwell upon the River Kur, whence they are supposed to have migrated. But this theory can be based only on the likeness in name borne by two races. For here, too, the languages, which should be the chief ground for our assumption, show no traces of a common origin, as was long ago seen by Appian. There is, indeed,

**Whence
Came the
Iberians?**

a certain resemblance between the Basque and the languages of the Caucasus that form a group by themselves, yet the likenesses, similar to those between the Basque and the American Indian dialects, are concerned with general form alone, and are not sufficient to demonstrate a relationship between the two races. The similarity in the names proves nothing of itself, for such coincidences are of frequent occurrence.

Modern Descendants of the Iberians

The physiological structure of the Iberians furnishes us with as little information of their origin as does their language. The Basques of to-day, who are, beyond doubt, their direct descendants, exhibit the physical characteristics of the South European type. They are, for the most part, of medium size, slender, and well built, with small hands and feet, dark eyes and hair, and light-brown complexions. All this, as one may see, shows no wide departure from the type of Spaniards, Italians, and French. Even if light hair and eyes are occasionally to be found, especially in scattered regions, they are to be regarded as exceptional only. The form of skull was originally long, a shape that rules throughout the Basque race. The short skull is by no means of rare occurrence among the French Basques, but it is considered to be due to a mixture of races. Thus the origin of the Iberians is to this day enshrouded in mystery.

Ancient traditions tell us that Iberian tribes also took possession of certain portions of Italy. The Sicani in special are said to have been Iberians; and, according to Thucydides—Philistus of Syracuse furnishes us with like information—they occupied Sicily, then known as Trinacria, in consequence of having been crowded out of the peninsula by the Ligurians; and Sicily afterwards took the name Sicania from them. However, the Iberians seem not to have made their way to Italy directly over the sea, but to have journeyed by land through Gaul and Upper Italy and thence to the south, where they have been mentioned by a long series of ancient writers as the inhabitants of Latium. The Libui, too, who once occupied the region between Brescia and Verona, south of Lake Garda, as well as the Sordones, who dwelt in the eastern Pyrenees of Gaul, and seemed to have set out from that region to settle the island of Sardinia, were probably of Iberian stock.

Barbarian Migration into Italy

These tribes are, perhaps, the Rebu and Shardana mentioned in ancient Egyptian texts. From these accounts of old writers then, untrustworthy perhaps, so much, at least, can be gathered—that at one time Iberian tribes occupied certain portions of Italy.

The next migration into Italy was that of the Ligurians, who formed the vanguard of the great Aryan invasion of Europe. What we now call Liguria—the narrow strip of coast between the rivers Var and Magna on the one side, and the Apennines and the sea on the other, which at present includes both the provinces of Porto Maurizio and Genoa—is but the remnant of a once great and extensive Ligurian region. It extended westward beyond the Rhone, where the inhabitants mingled with the Iberians while the entire territory that lay between the Rhone and the western Alps was in their exclusive possession. At the time of Cæsar Augustus they occupied the valley of the Po to the mouth of the Ticino, and extended even farther north; for Turin and the surrounding country once formed

The Great Ligurian Country

part of their possessions. To the east the land was Ligurian as far as Veleia. But this region did not include all their territory; the names of places in many other parts of the peninsula prove that a Ligurian population once occupied other districts in addition. These territories, not including the portions that lay in France, comprised the cantons of Tessin, Graubünden, the Waadtland and Appenzell, and extended as far as Bavaria. In Italy, however, besides the districts which have already been mentioned, there were the provinces now known as Novara, Milan, Brescia, Cremona, Piacenza, Parma, Reggio, Como, Bergamo, and Sondrio. This Ligurian region extended, as may be seen on the map, eastward to the Mincio and to the south as far as Reggio.

What the political organisation of this vast region may have been, whether it formed a single great empire, perhaps with a king at the head of affairs, or a confederation of states, or a country of entirely independent tribes—we have no knowledge whatever. On the other hand, we have an excellent description, written by Posidonius, of their civilisation at a time when they were already confined to the strip of coast that forms the Liguria of to-day. According to this description,

their land was rugged and unproductive, covered with thick forests, and so stony that the agriculturist met with fragments of rock at almost every step, and, in spite of all industry, could obtain but a small harvest for his labour. It was necessary to eke out the meagre produce of the fields by hunting. A scanty yield of grapes was obtained on the coast, but the wine tasted like pitch. Their usual drink was beer. Miserable huts of wood or reeds, as well as natural caves, served them as dwellings. From the nature of the country they became practised mountaineers, and the hardships of such a life made them exceedingly strong and active.

The origin of the Ligurians has long been a controverted point, in so far as we are uncertain whether they were Aryans or were related to the Iberians, and thus non-Aryans. At the present day the weight of opinion seems to be in favour of the former view. Language, the chief means for deciding such questions, is, in general, lacking here. The language of the Ligurians has disappeared, but not so completely as to have left no traces

Traces of the Ligurian Language behind. It has left us a few remains, which, in spite of their scantiness, are sufficient to enable us to form a decision in respect to the disputed question of race. In the first place, we have a large number of names of places, not only in the Liguria of to-day, but disseminated within the broad boundaries of the ancient, Liguria. A great number of these geographical names are formed by means of the suffix *-asco* or *-asca*, and this we may look upon as a characteristic of Ligurian names of places. Such names are, for example, Aiarasca, Arnasco, Benasco. These words are, according to stem and termination, Indo-Germanic throughout.

And we have not only names of places, but also a number of inscriptions that are, perhaps, Ligurian. In the southern part of the canton Tessin, in Davesco, Viganello, Sorengo, Aranno—all of which are in the neighbourhood of Lugano—as well as in San Pietro di Stabio—which lies in the province of Mendrisio still further to the south—a number of inscriptions of doubtful origin, seven in all, have been discovered. We are not yet sure of the language to which they belong; but to look upon them as North Etruscan, as is usually done, is wholly wrong. True, the alphabet in which they are written is

North Etruscan, and the words may be spelled out without the slightest difficulty. But this only concerns the characters employed in the writing; the language is certainly not Etruscan. In former days the inscriptions were also called Lepontic, and the Lepontic language was looked upon as one allied to Gallic; but this hypothesis takes too many things for granted. It would be difficult to believe that the Lepontii, whose name is still retained in the Val Leventina, could ever have dwelt so far to the south. No inscriptions of this nature have been found in the Val Leventina and its vicinity. And, on the other hand, there is no reason for supposing that a distinct Lepontic language ever existed. The inscriptions are not Gallic, although they seem to present some resemblances to the Gallic language; but these likenesses are more of a general sort, and only go to prove that this language, like that of the Gauls, was, without doubt, Aryan. If the inscriptions are neither Etruscan nor Gallic, and if we are unable to accept the theory of a distinct Lepontic language, then there is nothing left but to accept them as Ligurian. If, however, these inscriptions are of the Ligurian language—and no other explanation seems possible—then the Ligurians were surely a branch of the Aryan race. For if we had no other remnant of language than this one inscription left to us from the Ligurians, it alone would suffice to prove beyond all doubt that Ligurian was an Indo-Germanic tongue.

The so-called Itali seem to have been the next Aryan people to enter Italy. They, too, appear to have come from the north by way of the lower part of the valley of the Po, so that their first settlements lay to the east of the Apennines—unless it be proved that the large number of *terremare*, or pile-buildings, in Emilia also belonged to them. In later

The Itali Come into Italy times they crossed the Apennines; and the Samnites, Volsci, Latini, Sabines, Umbrians, not to mention many minor tribes, occupied extensive regions to the west of the mountains. The Aryan Itali were subdivided into a large number of minor stocks, for which no collective name has come down to us; these separate tribes did not unite into a nation until the strong hand of the Romans welded them

into one people. For us they fall into two great branches.

The branch which first migrated into Italy was, without doubt, the Latini, for since the Aryan Itali came in from the north—and this is a fact established beyond question—naturally the oldest stock of this race must have been that which first crossed the Apennines, pushed forward by the tribes that followed. The branch that came after—that is, the second great division of the Itali—was made up of Umbrians and Sabelli; and of these the Umbrians seem to have been the earlier, for they settled to the west of the Apennines, as well as in the mountains. Their vanguard comprised the Volsci and tribes closely related—the Hernici, Æqui, and Æquiculi—who dwelt in the south and east of Latium as far as the land of the Sabines, whereas the true Umbrians, who lived further to the north, were separated from the vanguard by certain portions of Sabine territory. Judging from the situation of their country, the Sabines seem to have been the foremost of the Sabellian peoples, who, crowding behind, compelled the Sabines to turn to the west, where they thrust themselves in the form of a wedge between the Volscic-Umbrian nations.

The greater portion of the Sabellians remained east of the Apennines. These were the Samnites—that is, Sabinites—divided into Frentanii, Pentrii, Hirpini, and Caudinii, and to the north of the Samnites, the Marsii, Pæligni, Marracini, Vestinii, and Prætuttii. During historical times the Samnites penetrated still farther to the south, occupying Apulia, Campania, Lucania, and Bruttium, and finally crossed the Sicilian Straits into Sicily. We have no means for discovering how long a time it took for all these different peoples to settle down in Italy. If the inhabitants of Terremare were really the “Itali of the plain of the Po,” then the time could not have been very long, because the civilisations of Terremare and earliest Latium were substantially the same. Of all the Italian races only the Romans left a literature in the true sense of the word. This is not surprising; indeed, considering the development of the different tribes, it could not very well have been otherwise. Of the other races, we possess either no literary remains at all or only inscriptions.

Illyrian tribes, too, settled upon the soil of ancient Italy; and it appears that the different clans wandered into the peninsula independently of one another and at different times. The earliest of the Illyrian migrations seems to have taken the direction towards Central Italy, where we find their traces in Latium (Venetuli, Ardea, Praeneste, Laurentum, tribus Lemonia), in Picenum (Truentum), and in Umbria (the Iapuzkum numen of the Eugubian tablets), whither the peoples seem to have journeyed by ship, directly across the sea.

The second Illyrian migration appears more clear and distinct in the light of history. It was that of the Iapygii, of whom single tribes—that is, the Messapii, or Sallentinii, the Poedikulii, and the Daunii—occupied the west coast as far south as Mount Garganus; in other words, the Calabrian peninsula and Apulia. These tribes also appear to have travelled to Italy over the sea; their latest journeys occurred during the eighth century B.C. The third Illyrian migration into Italy was that of the Veneti. It can be proved from

traces left behind them that these were fixed in their later settlements about the middle of the seventh century B.C.

Beyond doubt, they entered Italy by the overland route through Aquilia. We have but little knowledge of the civilisation of the Illyrians who first migrated into Central Italy. That they were acquainted with the art of writing would be definitely proved if a number of very ancient inscriptions, which have been found in Picenum, and which are usually held to be old Sabellic, could be definitely ascribed to them. It is almost certain that the language of these inscriptions is Indo-Germanic. It can scarcely be a Sabellic dialect; the variation from later Sabellic is far too great, and the whole style of the writing too foreign. If the language is not Sabellic, then, from the very nature of the case, there remains scarcely any other possibility than that the language before us is Illyrian. That the alphabet of these inscriptions, the most ancient of all Italian alphabets, is a daughter of the Greek alphabet is indeed self-evident.

The second people of Illyrian origin, the Iapygii, at first inhabited Apulia. Their few remaining descendants, under the name of Messapii, long dwelt in the extreme south of the region once occupied

The First Latins

Illyrian Tribes in Italy

Roman the only Ancient Literature

by their forefathers and afterwards conquered by the Samnites, in which the Oscan language became the dominant speech. We know but little of their civilisation. This race, too, has left us a number of inscriptions, written in an alphabet borrowed apparently from the Epizephyric Locrians, and in a language that is clearly Aryan. They contain a great number of names of persons, which are repeated on the other side of the Adriatic Sea in the Latin inscriptions of the Illyrian districts. From this it is certain that the Iapygii were of Illyrian origin.

As to the civilisation of the Veneti, the third Illyrian people, we have far more information; and this knowledge has been obtained through the excavations in the neighbourhood of Este and Gurina in the valley of the Gail in Carinthia. The Este of to-day, the Ateste of ancient times, is situated in the midst of a group of cemeteries, in which five strata, belonging to as many different periods, may be recognised. The lowest of these strata is different in nature from the other

**Cemeteries
of Ancient
Italy**

four. It contains remains of flints, and seems to have belonged to a pre-Venetian population, mentioned by ancient writers as the Euganei. The other four strata belong to the Veneti and contain clusters of graves, upon which were erected pillars of hard trachyte, and in which large vessels, partly of clay, partly of bronze, have been found, filled with the remains of bones, ornaments, and small sepulchral urns. During the first of the four periods of the Veneti the graves were enclosed by stone slabs. The vessels of clay are similar to those which have been found in Bologna; all the ornaments are of bronze; iron is rarely found. The graves of the second period contain various articles of bronze, amber, and glass; clay vessels, too, which have been turned on the potter's wheel, and are of very fine workmanship, in the form of two truncated cones, joined together at their bases and decorated with winding patterns. During the third period the civilisation of the Veneti attained its highest point. It is characterised by many splendid objects of bronze; great vases, together with smaller vessels, ornaments, household utensils, and weapons. In the fourth period articles of silver and of glass have been found, and iron weapons that show

signs of Gallic and Roman influence. To this last period belongs also the temple, containing a large number of consecrated gifts, discovered in the Chiusura Baratela, near Este. Apparently, it was dedicated to a goddess called Relitiia.

We have also considerable knowledge of the civilisation of the Veneti in Carinthia. The discoveries there include the Hallstatter and La Tène abecedaria, bronze plates partially covered with inscriptions, figures of bronze, swords, knives, daggers, spear and arrow heads, as well as various utensils and tools. The relationship between the two civilisations, of Este and of Gurina, is as follows. The centre of culture of the Veneti lay, without doubt, in the neighbourhood of Este; and from this point the Veneti seem to have pressed forward to Carinthia in the north, and there to have gained, among other acquisitions of civilisation, knowledge of the alphabet. The fact that many of the remains which have been found at Este belong to an earlier period than those of Gurina does not interfere with this theory in the least. The Veneti of Carinthia could not possibly have been remnants of tribes left behind them during the migration to Italy, for the route taken by the Veneti—this is a certainty—was much further to the south, through the district of Aquilia. A large number of inscriptions have come down to us from Este as well as from Gurina. They are written in an alphabet that, of course, had its origin in Greece, and seems to be most closely connected with the writing employed in Elis. The inscriptions of Gurina are, in the case of a few single letters, more ancient than those of Este; however, the two alphabets are practically the same.

The great Ligurian empire was destroyed by the Etruscans. The latter came from the Far East, and, as it appears, were related to various races of Western Asia and the Balkan peninsula, but wholly unrelated to the Aryans or Semites.

They seem to have halted for a rather long time in Central Europe, and to have been neighbours of the Teutonic peoples, in whose legends their memory is retained under the name of Thursen. Later, they were driven from their homes—we know not under what conditions, nor why—and were forced to cross the Alps, wandering

to the south and occupying at first Rhætia, especially the Tyrol and Grisons. Thence they pressed forward to the south, and under the name of Euganei took possession of the country to the east of Verona.

Another of their tribes, Etruscans in a more limited sense of the term, settled in Atria, Spina, and in the neighbourhood of Bologna, which was at that time called Felsina, where their presence is still indicated by numerous burial-places, containing many inscriptions in their language. They travelled from Bologna across the Apennines, perhaps following the direction of the valley of Reno into Etruria proper, the Toscana of modern times; and from this country as a centre they spread over the plain of the Po, as well as over

Latium and Campania. The origin of the Etruscans has long been a much-debated point. During the Middle Ages men sought to derive their language from the Hebrew, the language of Paradise and original speech of mankind—an attempt that was repeated in 1858. Then came a period when scholars, especially Passeri and Lanzi, believed they had discovered in the Etrus-

cans near relatives of the peoples called Itali, of whom we have already spoken. This opinion, too, has found later adherents in Corssen and other Italian scholars; but it may now be deemed obsolete.

Attempts to derive Etruscan from Irish, Scandinavian, Old German, Slavonic, Armenian, Altaic-Finnic, Basque, Lithuanian, Libyan, etc., need only be considered as curiosities. This list, as one may see, is a variegated sample card of all possible languages; but it rests, naturally enough, upon a base no more

substantial than idle speculation. There are few chapters in the history of science that are at the same time so mortifying and so amusing as the chapter on the deciphering of the Etruscan inscriptions. The splitting up of indivisible word-forms, the joining of others that are absolutely heterogeneous, the acceptance of abbreviations of all sorts, and of phonetic theories that transcend even the wildest flights of imagination, were the means by which men hoped to force the poor Etruscan, stretched out on a Procrustean bed, as it were, to be derived from what ever language they preferred.

A sure foundation for the lingual and ethnographic position of the Etruscans did not exist until a few years ago, when two

French scholars discovered; two parallel texts cut into a gravestone on the island of Lemnos, written in a very ancient Greek alphabet, most nearly related to the Phrygian method of writing; but the language of the texts was not Greek. On further investigation it was found that this language was very closely related to the Etruscan. Now the classic writers tell us that the Pel-

lasgi dwelt in Lemnos before the time of the Greeks; moreover, they also say that the Etruscans were descendants of Tyrrhenic Pelasgi, who came from Lydia. The truth of this tradition is at once established by the discovery of the parallel texts. To what races of Western Asia the Etruscans and Pelasgi were related, and how closely they were related, has been during the last few years the subject of extensive investigations, which are not yet completed. That the Etruscans were descendants of the Pelasgi is the opinion



EARLY ETRUSCAN JEWELLERY

Two fine necklaces of gold beads in filagree work, with flint arrow-heads suspended as charms. One of the valuable discoveries made at Vulci

Mansell



THE BUDDING OF ETRUSCAN ART

Examples of the primitive periods of the mysterious Etruscan art before the influence of Greek art was felt. The extraordinary terra-cotta masks (1 and 3) were placed over the face of a corpse. The fine bronze helmet (2) is ornamented with a wreath of ivy in gold. A somewhat more advanced work is the bronze cista (5), with figures of sirens, horsemen and a goddess. The remaining bronzes represent a warrior (4), and a primitive goddess (6).

which obtains most credence at the present day. Wilhelm Deecke, who may be looked upon as the father of scientific Etruscology, has adopted it with certain limitations. After he had declared the Etruscans to be an entirely different race from the other Italians, speaking another language, thus agreeing with the opinion long ago expressed by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, he returned to the views of Corssen, already mentioned; but, finally, he came to look upon the Etruscans as a mixed people, made up of the native Raseni, whom he considered the Latin branch of the Itali, and Pelagic-Greek corsairs, who had come from the city of Tyrrha in Lydia. In this precise form his view is certainly untenable; however, it

approaches, at least, the correct theory in so far as it recognises the fact that there were two strata of races in Etruria; the older, Umbrian, as has been maintained by the writers of antiquity, and the later Etruscan, in a more restricted sense.

Not only their language teaches us that the Etruscans were not of Aryan origin; this fact is confirmed by their stature and appearance. The Roman authors described them as short and close-knit, with a predisposition to stoutness; and thus they appear plainly enough to us to-day in the hundreds of Etruscan figures on the covers of sarcophagi which have been discovered in the various cities of Etruria. Note the difference between these rotund forms and the spare figures of the


lean Itali; between the round skulls and countenances of the Etruscans and the long, narrow faces of the Aryans of Italy; between the flat, potato-shaped noses of the Etruscans and the finely-cut, straight, or slightly aquiline noses of the Romans. Such a physical type reminds us far more of the Huns, as described by writers of the Dark Ages, than of Aryans, whether the complexion be fair or brown.

Again, the mental constitution of the Etruscans distinguishes them from the Aryan races of the peninsula. Nothing shows more plainly that the Etruscans were not of Indo-Germanic origin than their mythology. While all is light-hearted and joyful with the Aryans—

introduced through an acquaintance with Greek art; but a mingling of religions, such as that which occurred in Rome, could scarcely have come to pass. That the names, however, at least of the Olympic gods, were known to the Etruscans is proved by the representations of such gods on vases, mirrors, etc., to which Greek names in Etruscan writing, expressed in the forms

Influence of Grecian Pantheon

of the Etruscan language, have been added. In later times the names of Roman deities also occur; and these, too, are naturally in Etruscan form. Thus, finally, an amalgamation of Etruscan with Italic divinities appears, an occurrence that took place in precisely the



A CURIOUS EXAMPLE OF THE PRIMITIVE ART OF THE ETRUSCANS

Mansell


An extraordinary bronze plate, which has fastened to it figures representing an Etruscan ploughing scene. This reproduction is about half the size of the original, which was found in Campania and is now in the British Museum.

Father Heaven and Mother Earth, the sun, the moon, rosy dawn and fire are the original divinities of a cult expressed in epic narratives and single great dramatic poems—on the other hand, all is dark and gloomy with the Etruscans. Among their religious sculptures we meet sullen demons of death and the lower world, almost bestial of countenance, with pointed ears, bristly hair, tusks for teeth, and serpents twined about their heads, necks, and arms.

All the benevolent deities that have been found seem to have been borrowed from other races. In later times knowledge of the Olympian pantheon was

same manner among the Italic races, especially the Romans.

But this is nothing more than a later development, beneath which the original mythology of the Etruscans is still plainly visible. Among the ancient gods of the Etruscans there were, for example, Fufuns, god of wine; Juran, goddess of love; Laran, god of war; Thesan, goddess of the dawn. There were also divinities in the service of the chief gods, such as the child of the gods, Maris; Lasa, Mlacuch, Mean, and others. The divinities of death and various other horrible phantoms showed an especially full development. Here we have the gorgon-like Tarsu; the goddess of death,



DEVELOPMENT OF ETRUSCAN ART: THE ARCHAIC PERIOD

The gloomy character of the Etruscan nature is particularly reflected in the art of the archaic period before Greek influence has full sway. Sepulchral objects occur frequently, especially the large stone sarcophagi ornamented with incised designs, sculptures, of which we give two examples (1 and 7). The fine bronze chair, incised with animal and pattern designs, sculptures, of which we give two examples (5 and 6), is another sepulchral object. The female figure (3) and the head of a youth (2) are also fine archaic bronzes. The remaining object, the amphora (4), was probably used to contain ashes of the dead.

Vanth; Leinth, Culsu, Tuchulcha, and others. They are shown to us as figures, intended to inspire terror, in the representations of death scenes on sarcophagi and funeral urns. These fantastic forms, creatures of a barbaric imagination, were in complete harmony with the rites of worship. Human sacrifices were in vogue

**Etruscan
Human
Sacrifices**

until a relatively recent period; and even as late as the time of the Romans the Tarquini were slaughtered, as sacrifices to their gods, three hundred Romans whom they had captured in battle. No joyful festivals relieved the gloom of their life; they were bound, fettered, as it were, to a dead ritual. Their lives from beginning to end were preordained by the inexorable will of the gods. The highest endeavour of their religious life was to discover in advance what this irresistible will of the gods might be. Thus developed the most extreme form of superstitious ritualism, the system of *haruspices* and *fulguratores*. The task of the former was to discover the designs of the gods and the fate of men from an examination of the entrails of sacrificial beasts, and that of the latter to seek for the same knowledge by observation of the lightning.

Much of this superstition was afterwards introduced into Rome, probably during the time when Latium was under the dominion of the Etruscans; but it was, from its very sources, a form of religion entirely foreign to the Aryan spirit. The religion of the Egyptians was more in harmony with this gloomy Etruscan cult. Richly decorated tombs and extensive cities of the dead are found in the neighbourhood of all Etruscan towns; especially magnificent are those at Volsinii, Perugia, and Tarquinii, as well as the sepulchres at Volterra, Cerveteri, and in the extensive region of Clusium. Such a highly developed worship of the dead is, likewise, unknown to Indo-Germanic peoples.

**Cities
of the
Dead**

Thus, after all has been said, the fact remains that the Etruscans were a foreign race, speaking a strange language, and altogether unrelated to the other inhabitants of the Apennine peninsula. This people, whose origin cannot be designated as less than semi-barbarian, attained the highest civilisation in Italy during pre-Roman times, and also, long before the time of the Romans, had made an attempt to extend their political

domination over wide areas of the peninsula, perhaps with the conscious intention of taking possession of the entire country. All this signifies a certain intellectual capability and power of action, although at the same time it likewise shows that the Etruscan mind was of a receptive rather than of a creative nature.

The Etruscans, then, were the first civilised, or at least semi-civilised, people of Italy proper; but only because they took other races as their models. And inasmuch as their civilisation extended over such a long period of time, they had sufficient opportunity for studying many different types. The first of these peoples were the Egyptians. Traces of them have been found in the sepulchre at Vulci, called the Isis Grotto, as well as in other graves, in the shape of objects bearing inscriptions in hieroglyphs of about the period 650-525 B.C. In later times the Mesopotamian races were the instructors of the Etruscans. Other signs of these races—articles finished according to their style and manner—have been discovered in Etruscan sepulchres; for example, in

the grave of Regulini-Galassi in Cerveteri. However, it is not to be understood from this that either Egyptians or Assyrians

exerted any direct influence on the Etruscans. Rather, the relationship came about through the mediation of the Phœnicians, as has been proved by a Phœnician inscription found in a sepulchre at Palestrina, together with objects of the same character as those which have been discovered in the previously mentioned Etruscan tombs at Cerveteri and Vulci. These objects belong to the same stage of civilisation as the greater part of the antiquities discovered in Cyprus.

The period that followed showed that the Etruscans were under the influence of the so-called Mycenaean civilisation, well-known to us from the explorations of Schliemann, which thrived not only at Mycenae, but also at Troy and at various other localities in Greece and its vicinity. Opinions are divided as to who brought this civilisation to Greece. Many scholars consider that the bearers were the Hellenes themselves of an early period; others believe that they were the Pelasgi. The latter view is the more probable; and an attempt completely to deny the existence of the Pelasgi, made a short time ago, has absolutely failed. That the principal



THE FLOWERING OF ETRUSCAN ART: THE FINEST PERIOD

The influence of Greece in Etruscan art is seen in the products of the finest period of that art which are illustrated here. Examples of metal-chasing and founding are the bronze mirror (1), chased with a representation of the betrothal of Menelaus and Helen, and the fine cast bronze situla (7). The same influence is shown in the beautiful gold objects from Vulci—a diadem (3), a brooch (4), the pendants (2 and 6), and the abecedarium (8). The remaining bronzes are a statuette of Demeter (9) on a rustic car, a statue of the Etruscan Mars, and a vase (10) with a sphinx handle.

instructors of the Etruscans in civilisation were Greeks is evident. The imitation of Greek art appears in many different regions which were once inhabited by the Etruscans. In architecture it is to be seen in the manner of building temples, where the influence of the Dorians' is plainly visible. But it is also apparent

**Etruscans
Taught
by Greeks**

in various other arts. Many vases which have been discovered, decorated in black as well as in bright colours, are not of Greek manufacture, but are copies made by Etruscan artists. That in later times metal-founding and metal-chasing were influenced by the Greeks is shown by the so-called Arringatore, now in the museum at Florence, which were discovered in Perugia. And the same thing is indicated by a large number of bronze mirrors, some of which are of great beauty, and by the specimens of the goldsmith's art of Vulci. A definite memory of this Greek influence seems to have been preserved in the Etruscan traditions, for Pliny relates that Demaratus, the refugee from Corinth, brought with him the sculptors Eucheir, Diopos, and Engrammos, who are said to have introduced the plastic arts into Italy.

We are able to form a fairly accurate and distinct picture of the civilisation of the Etruscans from the remains of these cities of the dead, in which have been preserved objects belonging to the different periods of civilisation, for these objects mirror the entire life of the people. The dead among the Etruscans were either buried or burned on funeral pyres. The former custom was in use chiefly in the north, the latter in the south. The dead were usually placed in great stone sarcophagi, ornamented with sculptures, of which many have been found, especially in the necropolis of Corneto and Viterbo. The ashes of bodies consumed by fire were preserved in small square ossuaries,

**How They
Buried
Their Dead**

differing in appearance according to locality. Those of Volterra are of alabaster, and are ornamented with very beautiful sculptures; in Perugia and Chiusi travertine was the material employed, also decorated with sculptures, but of a different style; and both Chiusi and Perugia have a particular shape of ossuary. Ossuaries of a still smaller size, and made of baked clay, have been discovered in Chiusi; and these, too, have a plastic ornamenta-

tion. The ashes of men of less consequence were preserved in round clay pots without decorations.

The different urns and boxes which contained the remains of the dead were then placed in graves of varied construction, which always lay without the limits of the towns, and formed the closed cities of the dead, or necropolises. The graves have been classified, according to their different peculiarities, and names have been given to the various forms. The oldest are those which are called *tombe a pozzo*. They consist of cylindrical or conical shafts, sunk into the chalk formation. Each has two partitions; the upper of greater, the lower of lesser diameter. The latter forms the grave proper, and now and then contains a great red clay pot. With this variation the grave is called a *tomba a ziro*. The next form is the *tomba a fossa*, a rectangular pit from $6\frac{1}{2}$ to 8 feet long; $3\frac{1}{4}$ to $4\frac{1}{2}$ feet broad, and 6 to 10 feet deep. Bodies were placed in these tombs, unconsumed by fire; the older forms still belonged to the period of funeral pyres. When the *tomba*

**Types of
Etruscan
Graves**

a *fossa* is constructed with a facing of stones within, it bears the name of *tomba a cassa*; and when the *tomba a fossa* is of a larger size than usual, and has a lid or cover, so that it cannot be approached from above, but only from one side, it is called *tomba a camera*; when the lid forms a vault, resembling the interior of a hollow cylinder, it bears the name *tomba con volta a botte*. If there is a narrow passageway, resembling a corridor, leading to a tomb, the name given is *tomba a corridoio*. The *tomba a buca* is a round pit about 9 feet in depth, having a circle of stones about its mouth. Whenever the *tomba a camera* is found to have greater dimensions than usual, forming at the same time, however, only a single chamber, it is called a *camera a cassone*. And this form of tomb, with the addition of side chambers, is the latest and most highly-developed type of Etruscan grave.

From these graves, often rich in collections of objects of bronze, iron, silver, gold and clay, we are enabled to obtain a conception of the entire course of development of Etruscan civilisation from the very earliest times, from the day, perhaps, when the race first descended the southern slopes of the Alps until the time arrived when Romans became their successors in

the civilised life of the Apennine peninsula. And just as the Etruscans were the predecessors of the Romans in civilisation, so were they also in political life. They were the earliest power in Italy, and mighty on both land and sea.

The ancient writers often spoke of the Tyrrhenians as a great maritime nation—also a nation of pirates, according to the testimony of men who were overcome by them—and so there was once a time when the Etruscans stood upon an equal plane with the Greeks and the Phœnicians as a seafaring race. Witness is borne to this by the treaty between Carthage and Etruria, by which a formal confederation was established; and this alliance consummated in the battle of Alalia, fought by Phœnicians and Etruscans against the Phocæans. The power of the Etruscans was not

and the foundation or occupation of the two cities above-mentioned occurred, according to the probably accurate account of Cato, about the year 602 B.C. In former days it was frequently stated that this conquest was effected from the sea; but since the Etruscan cities in Tuscany are situated upon rocky hills in the interior of the country there is very little reason to doubt that the Etruscans entered Italy by land. The same is true of their entrance into Campania, for Capua and Nola also lie inland, and at that time the coast of Campania was already in the hands of the Greek colonies.

If Campania was entered by the Etruscans from the inland side, it must follow that at one time Latium, which lies between Etruria and Campania—there is

Etruscan Conquest of Italy



CEREMONIAL BURNING OF THE DEAD IN ETRURIA

These paintings from Cerveteri, an Etruscan city of the dead, show the Etruscan custom of burning the dead.

limited to the sea; their dominion on land covered a wide area in Italy. The writers of classic times relate that they subjugated almost the entire peninsula; but at one time Latins, Umbrians, and Aurunci were all known under the name of Tyrrhenians. The Etruscans advanced to the south in Campania; and here, too, they established, it is reported, a confederation, consisting of twelve cities. The most powerful of these towns were Capua, called Voltturnum in Etruscan times, and Nola, which, perhaps, bore the name Urina. Numerous discoveries, partly of objects bearing inscriptions in Etruscan, proclaim the fact that the Etruscans once dwelt on the Campania. In later times the Greek colonies on the coast and the Oscans became heirs to their possessions. The conquest of Campania

no route from Campania to Etruria, except that which passes through Latium—must also have been under Etruscan domination. But if this was the case, then the fact is established beyond doubt that the future mistress of the world, Rome herself, was once subject to the Etruscans.

Echoes of this time are to be found in the tales of the last three kings of the house of Tarquin. The family name of the dynasty itself, as well as the date fixed by the Romans as the beginning of the Tarquinian rule—that is, the year 616 B.C.—points to the supremacy of the Etruscans. Since they occupied Campania in the year 602 B.C., the year 616 B.C. seems a very probable date for the conquest of Latium. It is comprehensible enough that the Roman historians of later times should have endeavoured to slur over the fact that Rome was once under Etruscan rule;

Etruria the Earliest Power in Italy

but, in spite of all attempts to veil the truth, the descriptions given by the Romans themselves of the later years of the monarchy betray the facts. Moreover, the memory of Etruscan supremacy was also preserved by the Etruscans; for example, we catch a last echo of it in a legend of two Etruscan soldiers, who

**Rome a
Subject
of Etruria**

led a Tuscan troop from Volsinii to Rome and settled upon the Cælian hill. The domination of the Etruscans over Rome is, to be sure, denied even to this day; but whoever carefully reads Livy's account of the battles that followed the expulsion of the Tarquins can have no doubt of it whatever. What we find in Livy is no historical description, but an old epic, the ancient verses of which may easily be traced out; and this epic describes, not the battles of classes or the introduction of a new form of government, but the struggles of the Romans to free themselves from the dominion of a foreign conqueror. In addition, a great mass of manners, customs, and institutions of Rome, which were of Etruscan origin and were retained for a long period, bear witness to the state of affairs described.

Thus we have, in the first place, matters pertaining to auguries, together with the form of temple peculiar to this belief, both of which were foreign to Rome. We have also the insignia of kingship, the *sella curulis*, the lictors with the *fasces*, and the garment edged with imperial purple. Moreover, there is the influence of the Etruscans on the Romans in metal-working and architecture, monetary

affairs, and the calendar. Not only the *cloaca maxima*, but also the Capitoline temple at Rome were examples of Etruscan work. What is usually termed the expulsion of the Tarquins was, in reality, a war of independence, waged by the Romans against the Etruscans.

But even after Rome had attained her freedom there still remained not only a great number of Etruscan customs and institutions, but also a large Etruscan population, which had settled in Latium and in Rome. Such was the case in Praeneste and Tusculum; such in Rome in the *vicus tuscus*, at the foot of the Palatine hill. And these Etruscans were not of the common people alone; they also comprised Roman patrician families—as, for example, the Tarquintii, Voltinii, Volumnii, Papirii, Cominii, and others; and even the liberators belonged to families of Etruscan origin. This was true not only of L. Tarquinius Collatinus, whose very name betrayed his origin, but also of many others. The Junia *gens* is mentioned in Etruscan inscriptions under the name *uni*; the Valerii appear as *velsi*;

**Etruscan
Patricians
of Rome**

even the Horatii seem to have been of Etruscan origin. Some deem it a fact proved by history that a mixture of blood produces races of high intellectual endowments and lasting vitality. It may be, then, that, owing to the mixture of Latin and Sabine and Etruscan blood in their veins, the Romans were enabled to develop at least some of the characteristics that fitted them first to become the heirs of the Etruscans, and afterwards to achieve world dominion.



RECONSTRUCTION OF A TEMPLE BUILT IN THE GREAT DAYS OF ETRUSCAN ART



THE KELTS AND THEIR CHARACTERISTICS

BESIDES the two great Aryan groups, the Hellenic and the Italic, who have played so important a part in creating European civilisation, a third Aryan group comes into contact with the stream of European history before the entry of the Teutons. These are the Kelts, a race of which we find branches even so far east as Asia Minor, but with whom we are concerned mainly as pre-Teutonic occupants of the Western territories—the British Isles, France, and the North of Italy.

Linguistic differences, so far as these can be discovered from documentary sources, divide the Kelts of the British Isles into two main groups of Brythonic and Gaelic.

The most important members of the Brythonic group are the Welsh of Wales, into the mountains of which country the Keltic population of Britain withdrew before the inexorable advance of the conquering Anglo-Saxons. Their language, known as Cymric, is spoken at the present day and cherished or stimulated by poetry, national festivals, and so forth. Belonging also to the Brythonic group, and closely allied to the Welsh, is the language of Cornwall, or Cornish, which disappeared about the year 1800. The Bretons of French Brittany are also Cornish. They crossed the channel in the fifth century when retiring before the Anglo-Saxons. Their Keltic dialect, which has been independently developed from the original Cornish language, is still in current use.

In addition to this Brythonic group, we have to consider the Gaels, whose dialects were spoken, and are still used to a limited extent, in Ireland, Scotland, and the adjacent islands. Scholars are still unable to agree whether the Kelts of the continent are more closely connected with the Brythons or with the Gaels. The word "Kelt," which has been adopted and popularised by science to express the entire group, is, in contrast to the word "Teuton," a national designation, bestowed by the people themselves. Hence, the Kelts possessed clearer

ideas of their ethnographical connection, a fact recognised if not by all the Kelts, yet by a very large proportion of them; so that, in contradistinction to that of the Teutons, of whom we shall hear at a later stage, Keltic nationalism was by no means confined to the political outlook of petty states.

**A Civilisation
that had
Great Ideas**

In fact the Druids represented a civilisation which facilitated the possibility of large ideas, and turned them to good account. The word "Kelt" contains the same root as the Latin *celsus*—that is to say, the "lofty," a meaning which coincides with the fact of national pride or with the national self-consciousness that struck the notice of foreign authors at an early date. "Galli," on the other hand, derived from a native root *gal*, is said to mean "warlike," and here again the interpretation is supported by the bravery and the warlike and military spirit which were characteristic of the Kelts.

The Greeks, who adopted the word "Kelt" at an early date, and first from Spain, also used the form *Galatae*, Galatians, which is in close correspondence with the Latin Galli. Here we may have an instance of the Keltic tendency to lengthen names by the addition of a syllable consisting of one vowel and the letter "t"—e.g., Helvii and Helvetii. Hence, problems arise, the solution of which may lie more nearly within the mutual relations of the names *Celtae*, and *Celti*, *Galatae* and *Galli*, than in the two above-mentioned derivations. It must also be said that wherever the Romans came in contact with the Kelts otherwise than through the medium of the

**"Kelt"
a National
Term**

Greeks, they immediately called them Galli; on the other hand, wherever Greek influence had already been operative upon the Kelts, or upon the Roman knowledge of them (as in Spain and about Massilia), they accepted the word *Celtae*. That the terms "Kelt" and "Galatian" were native and national designations is proved not only by their etymological derivation from Keltic roots, but also by


the occurrence of personal names with the initial syllable Kelt. Among the general characteristics of the Kelts were their stately carriage, their light complexions, their amiability, bravery, love of war, and liveliness, and intellect of a somewhat unpractical nature and inclined to pride, superficiality, and self-laudation; at the same time they had a sense of humour and love of oratory and grandiloquence, but also a strain of poetry and the true spirit of chivalry.

To translate the saying of Cato that the Gauls cultivated above all other things *rem militarem et argute loqui*, modern scholars have repeatedly used the words *gloire* and *esprit*; and a century later Cato's saying was enlarged and more closely examined by Cæsar. When the German Batavi stimulated their revolt with the imperialist dreams of vainglorious Gauls and Belgians, proposals to join the rebels were a daily occurrence in the councils of the Gauls, and in these the lack of reasons was concealed by the use of emotional appeals of a very modern character. It was no mere chance that after the second century A.D. Gaul became the headquarters of the Roman school of rhetoric; to the extensive influence of this teaching is to be ascribed primarily the bombastic features of mediæval style, and in a secondary degree, the modern exaggerations of ecclesiastical rhetoric. With their love of society, the Kelts possessed the three main alcoholic liquors which have appeared in the course of civilisation: beer—the

Latin or Roman name of which, *cervesia* or *cervisia*, was certainly borrowed from the Kelts—wine, and, finally, brandy.

The influence of these beverages is only too obvious in Keltic history. The modern Frenchman has long since conquered the inclination to alcoholic excess which characterised the beginnings of his nationality; on the other hand, the resistance of the Keltic Irish to the influence of alcohol has been noted by many writers. Gaul was the special country of the wine trade as long as it still depended upon Massilian and Italian importation; a slave was often given as the price of a jug of wine. Hence, the culture of the vine was adopted in the country at an early date and spread outwards from Massilia, and the wooden cask was invented in Gaul. It is to be supposed that in primeval times the advance of the Kelts proceeded through the centre of the continent entirely by land, without touching

either the Mediterranean or the Baltic. The problem of the populations whom they encountered does not concern us here. The Greeks regarded the Kelts as the earliest of the other civilised peoples they knew. Hence, they must have already occupied a large portion of Southern Germany and, perhaps, also of Central Germany and of France; they had even advanced into Spain, so that Herodotus and later writers considered this a Keltic country. The supposition that the Kelts, starting from France, reached Spain by sea, as there is no geographical connection between their settlements, is possible, but not



LATE KELTIC ART IN ENGLAND

Nowhere was the art of *champlevé* enamelling practised with greater success than in England by the Kelts of the early Iron Age, as may be understood from the very fine enamelled bronze horse-trappings here illustrated, from Keltic burials.



A GAULISH CHIEF'S INVASION AND CAPTURE OF ROME

The Gauls who migrated into Italy were never at rest, and one of their war-bands, under a nameless chief, made a raid on Rome in 390 B.C., occupied the city, besieging though not capturing the Capitol, and had to be bought off.

necessary. We cannot be surprised that the attention of the Greeks was first drawn to the Spanish Kelts as a special nationality. The Greeks were in commercial relations with Spain, and the overland routes of trade and commerce were far less popular in early times than those of the sea. Moreover, the Phœcean settlement of Massilia opened important communications with the Kelts of Gaul. This trade, like that with the Iberians, was concerned chiefly with the

products of mining and the transmission of tin from Britain. The earliest tin trade was in the hands of the Phœnicians and was carried on from Iberia; the Massiliots were in charge of the importation from Britain to Gaul, whence the commodity was transferred to the great trade routes.

The Keltic population was thickest in the north-east interior, whence it pushed forward to the west coast along the river valleys, running in that direction; with

this exception, Spain was inhabited by the non-Indo-Germanic Iberians. One theory assumes that the population consisted of pure Iberian, pure Keltic, and mixed "Keltiberian" races. Another theory regards the Greek name *Kelti-*

Migrations of the Keltic Race *beres* as a vague term of convenience and as a combination due to the ingenuity of geographers, while as a matter of fact the Keltic and Iberian elements avoided all fusion. Iberians, of whom scanty remnants survive under the name of Basques, were in any case settled north of the Pyrenees, and formerly held sway as far as the Garonne. Remarkable also is the fact that the earliest known line of demarcation between the *langue d'Oc* and Southern French coincided with the boundary dividing the Keltic settlements from that part of Gaul which they had not occupied.

Though as far as we know the Kelts never sailed the Baltic, they settled long stretches of the shores of the North Sea and crossed it or the English Channel to the greater or smaller islands of Great Britain. When this migration took place, and how long it lasted, are questions as yet unanswered; our knowledge of the former population of the islands is equally indefinite. The Cruithnigh of Scotland, as they were called in Gaelic—that is to say, the Picts, or the "painted ones," of Roman tradition—have been recently regarded as non-Kelts and non-Aryans. They or other related tribes may thus have inhabited not only Scotland, but also Britain before the Kelts. Modern England was occupied or conquered by the Kelts of the Brythonic group. The Belgæ existed as a nation about Portsmouth, Southampton, and on the Isle of Wight; the Atrebates, Brigantes, Menapii, and Parisii were to be found on both sides of the English Channel; the name "Britain" existed, moreover, and has been localised among the Belgæ; hence we may conclude that a close connection existed between these neighbours, the Gallic Belgæ and the Britons, who were divided only by the English Channel. It

is possible also that emigration to Britain was increased by a Teutonic invasion of Belgic territory. Apart, however, from the vagueness of our chronological information, the difficulty of these problems is increased by the possibility that Keltic emigrants may have made their way to Britain by sea from the same part of North-west Germany, from which the Gallic Belgæ advanced west and south-west beyond the Rhine, and from which, at a later date, Anglo-Frisian Teutons reached Britain.

It must also be remembered that the name "Britain" may be nothing more than a local name extended to include the whole, and used as a general appellation for those emigrants and their relatives. The name originally belonged to a nationality settled in historical times, and still remaining, on the Somme below Amiens. As we have said, the Brythonic immigration to England must be distinguished from the Gaelic migrations to Ireland and thence to Scotland. The continental separation of Gaelic Gauls and Brythonic Belgæ, as subordinate groups of the Kelts in Gaul, is even represented upon the islands, and these two nationalities have their separate spheres of interest and expansion within the British Islands. The Brythons of Britain were conquered by the Romans in 43 A.D. after Cæsar had made two previous voyages of exploration. The Roman power was not extended over West Scotland—Caledonia, or Britannia Barbara, as the Romans named the country, the latter being a somewhat vague appellation. These northern parts of Scotland were left in the hands of the Picts. Ireland was also left unoccupied and was certainly in the hands of the Gaelic,



KELTIC BRONZE FIGURES
Statuette, of a primitive character, of a Kelt with a boar, a favourite emblem among the Keltic peoples.

or Goidelic, nationality. The obviously native name "Ierne" appears at an early date in Greek authors, and is connected with Erin; Romans used the name "Ibernia," and the Anglo-Saxons at a later date the names "Ireland" and "Irish." The Scots, who were nothing else than Irish-Gaelic offshoots, left Ireland in the fourth century, shared in the attacks of the Picts upon Roman Britain,

which was then fortified by two parallel frontier lines, and established themselves in Caledonia, in the north-west.

They popularised the name "Scotland" for Caledonia, especially after the ninth century, when the Picts were incorporated in the Scottish kingdom. The earlier connection between these names is seen in the fact that the early middle ages generally speak of the Irish monks who were working on the continent as Scots. Conversely the Teutons of the Scottish lowlands called the Keltic Highlanders Irish. The name Alban, or Albion, for which reliable evidence is found in the sixth century, is of Keltic origin, and is used in its earliest meaning for Scotland, and to include the whole of Caledonia and the British Isles.

About 600 B.C. the Kelts advanced beyond the Alps into the fair and fruitful lands of Upper Italy, which they were never able to turn to full economic account, thus narrowing the boundaries of the Etruscan, Ligurian, Illyrian and afterwards of the Umbrian inhabitants. These wandering bodies are broken fragments of the Keltic peoples, which are known to us by the same names in different districts of Gaul, South Germany, or Bohemia, though we do not mean to say that at the time of their migration every one of these tribes was in possession of the settlements where their names are known to us. The occupation of Italy by the Gauls was not carried out as the result of one conquest, but was completed

in the course of centuries. The first settlements were made at the foot of the Alps and new arrivals then established themselves on the frontiers of their kinsmen. Hence the latest arrivals, the Senones, are found furthest south, where the Apennines reach the coast about Rimini and Sinigaglia, or Sena Gallica. To the north of them, about Ravenna and the lower branches of the Po, and

generally upon the right of this river valley, were settled the Lingones; between the Po and the Apennines were the Boii with their capital of Bologna; about Verona were the Cenomani; and about Milan the Insubres, the first arrivals. Even at the present day local names show Keltic traces, and Renuis (Reno) or Bologna are here to be found, just as north of the Alps we find the Rhine, Bonn, or Boulogne-sur-Mer.

The Gauls in Italy were never entirely at rest, and did not leave their neighbours in complete peace; even when new arrivals did not add to the disturbance, the warfare of the Gauls with one another or with their neighbours continued incessantly. Moreover, the war-bands, which were peculiar to them and to the Teutons, made considerable and desperate raids into the surrounding country, reaching as far as Apulia. One of these raids, an event of no lasting importance in itself, was conducted by a band of the Senones, who defeated the Romans on the Allia, under a certain nameless



THE COMMUNAL HOMESTEAD IN KELTIC BRITAIN
 Among the Gaelic, or Scotch and Irish, and the Brythonic, or Welsh and Cornish, Kelts arable land was held and farmed in common, and this type of communal homestead, from Bosnia, represents well the kind which existed in Britain during the Keltic period. It was made up as follows: 1, common dwelling house; 2, summer dwelling house; 3, granary; 4, common goose-house; 5, cow's and goats' house; 6, shed for making plum brandy; 7, well; 8, common oven; 9, stables; 10, swine stall; 11, loft for maize; 12, plow; 13, maize; 14, orchard.

"Brennus," which means "leader," in 390 B.C.; they occupied the city, besieged the Capitol, and were bought off with the money for which they had apparently come. Polybius gives a description of the war-bands of the North Italian Gauls which exactly resembled those to be found among the Gauls beyond the Alps.

**The Gaul
Raid
on Rome**

According to his report the Gauls in Italy were agriculturists; and in this fruitful land agriculture became comparatively more important than in Gaul at a later date, or in Briton and Ireland at an even more recent period. At the same time the cattle-breeding of these Cisalpine Gauls continued unchecked. Their wealth largely consisted in cattle, and large tracts of modern Lombardy, then covered with forest, were used for swine feeding.

With the Transalpine Gauls, those of Italy had little or no geographical connection, so far as we can see from our scanty knowledge

of their ethnographical affinity; none the less, the feeling of relationship remained alive. Violently as these neighbours quarrelled among themselves, and although they failed to combine in any unity under the pressure of Ligurians, Etruscans, Veneti, Umbrians, and afterwards Romans, yet when the Romans proceeded to attack them, they met with support from beyond the Alps.

Bands of Kelts entered this Balkan peninsula in search of land, as they had entered Italy. About 280 B.C. such a band appeared under another Brennus in Macedonia and Sicily, but were defeated in 279 B.C. at Delphi by the Ætoliens, Phocians, and Locrians, whereupon they retreated northwards. In Thrace the Keltic settlement maintained its ground for some time. Such bands also entered the service of King Nicomedes of Bithynia in 277 B.C. as mercenary troops, when he was struggling with his brother for the supremacy; upon the conclusion of the war they became a general plague to Asia Minor, and were finally settled in Greater Phrygia, where they soon became assim-

lated to the Greek nationality, though retaining the name of Galatians, which is known to us from the New Testament. They were composed of elements from Trocmi, Tolistoboi, and Tectosages.

In Transalpine Gaul—that is, in Gaul beyond the Alps as seen from Italy—the population before the primitive migrations of the Kelts was scattered in isolated settlements; it comprised, besides other elements, the two groups of the Iberians who were in the south-west, and of the Ligurians, who occupied the Rhone districts. The convenient valleys and passes of the Alps never prevented similar nationalities from settling in Gaul; such were the Ligurians, Rætians, Etruscans, Gauls, and Teutons. The more recent Keltic inhabitants of Roman Gaul at a later period were divided into Gauls, in the narrower significance of the term, and into Belgæ; these were divided from one another by the Seine and the Marne.




EXAMPLES OF KELTIC FUNERARY URNS
Drinking vessels of baked clay placed in Keltic graves, or barrows, for the refreshment of the dead during the journey to the next world.

Romance philology has shown that these Keltic divisions correspond to the more modern and purely geographical districts of the Norman and Picard dialects. In later prehistoric times foreign nation-

alities from beyond the Rhine entered the district of the Belgæ and provided a Teutonic element which strengthened and revived this nationality, and tended to separate it from the Gauls proper; these immigrants, however, learned to speak Keltic more or less rapidly, even as the conquering leader, Ariovistus, spoke the tongue of the Southern Gauls.

The number of the Gaulish clans has been calculated at three or four hundred; out of these the Romans afterwards made forty-six administrative districts grouped around the towns. The fortified character of Gallic settlements is reflected in the numerous Latinised local names ending in *-dunum* and *-briga*; the former is phonetically identical with *zaun* or "fence," which among the Teutons long denoted a low enclosure, while *briga* is a height or hill connected with the word *berg*, and also with the secondary form *burg*, the meaning of which was modified among the



THE ASTONISHING EXCELLENCE OF KELTIC ART IN EARLY BRITAIN

One of the earliest Keltic shields found in Britain is that from the Witham river (1), made in the 2nd century B.C. before the use of enamel. In the latter half of the first century B.C. Keltic art in Britain was marked with exuberant fancy and astonishing excellence, which is seen in the beautiful enamelled shield found in the Thames (4), in the remarkable enamels illustrated on page 2426, the bronze helmet found in the Thames (2), and the cruciform bronze mount for a breastplate (6). Other late Keltic objects are the Irish pin with ornamented head (3), the Scotch mirror (5), the bronze-mounted tankard from a Suffolk grave (7), the funerary bucket from Wiltshire (8), and the bronze caldron from West of Scotland (9).

Teutons, though it was originally identical with that of *berg*. This Gaulish ending *-briga* was so distinctive of towns that it was eventually applied to settlements which were not situated upon a height.

Apart from the political division of the Roman province of Gaul into Cisalpine and Transalpine, no ethnographical divergence seems to have separated the Kelts of Upper Italy and Gaul from those of Southern Germany, of the northern frontier of the Alps, and of the Keltic lands further eastward which extended to Hungary. The organisation of the provinces of Rhetia, Noricum, and Pannonia, under Augustus included the majority of these peoples, though omitting some few Keltic tribes settled to the north of the Danube.

Transalpine Gaul, the greater part of which was inhabited by many Keltic tribes, was regarded by the Romans as the main centre of the race. This indeed it was, by reason of its isolation and in view of the comparative antiquity of its Keltic population. Hence we can readily understand that later Roman authors instinctively regarded the other Kelts as emigrants from Gaul; they found also in Gaul the names of tribes which occurred among the emigrants in the North of Italy. The eastern Kelts, for the most part at least, formed, however, the rearguard of that general prehistoric movement of the groups from east to west. In the later Roman Rhetia the Kelts had driven the previous Rhetian population into the Alps and occupied primarily the outlying districts; in Noricum, which is so called from its capital, Noreia, and not after any special people, they formed the main element of the population. Further eastward they advanced more sporadically, settling among other races which preceded or followed them. The chief race in Western and Southern Germany, until the advance of the Teutons, were the Helvetii,

who spread northward to the lower Maine; east of them were the Boii, who were also in Bohemia, or Boiohænum; while to the south of the Upper Danube were settled the Vindelici, and in the eastern Alps the Taurisci inhabited the province of Noricum. In Hungary we hear of the Cotini and Teurisci—a later form of the Taurisci—and of others. The question remains undecided as to the original locality of the great nation of the Volcæ, with

whom the Teutons seem to have first come into contact, as their name under the form of "Welsh" became a general designation for the Kelts; their earliest settlements were probably in Silesia and Galicia.

During a period which is unfortunately too little known to us, but will certainly be illuminated by the unwritten records of the past, the Kelts obviously occupied a great portion of Central and North Germany, though without fully developing its economic resources. The whole course of the Rhine, even on its right bank, gives evidence, in its place-names, and in the names of its tributaries, of early Keltic inhabitants. They must, however, at an early period have been settled considerably further to the east, according to evidence which is philologically entirely trustworthy, though we need not agree with the remoteness of the dates which are proposed. All such attempts at chronological conjecture, even when based upon philological evidence, which is far more tangible than that of archæology, must be accepted with caution, as they

are dependent upon relations and conditions of extreme vagueness and complexity. In any case Keltic river names are found to extend from the Rhine district beyond the Weser up and to the Thuringian forest; they were accepted by the advancing Teutons, and modified by them to suit themselves. Even beyond these limits Keltic names are found as far as the Wipper, in the highlands of the Finns, and to the south of the Lower Unstrut; even the names of the Elbe and the Oder are regarded as Keltic, though the fact is not yet proved of their lower courses. Central and Eastern Lower Germany are void of all tangible Keltic evidence, as the Teutons were in occupation of it before the Kelts began their advance.

Our knowledge of Keltic institutions is founded upon evidence from Upper Italy, Gaul, Britain, Ireland, and Scotland; concerning the Kelts in modern Germany and Austro-Hungary we have no information in this respect. It is a surprising fact that Cæsar's description of the conditions prevailing in Gaul shows these to have been less primitive than those under which the Gaels of the Scotch Highlands lived until the middle of the eighteenth century. No doubt the

The Centre of the Keltic Race

Eastern Advance of the Kelts

Traces of the Kelts in Germany

political forms of the Kelts were subject to continual modifications and divergencies in earlier or later times, but the main features stand out distinctly. Much is to be explained by the fact that, though the Kelts were acquainted with agriculture, many of them pursued it carelessly, or neglected it entirely. Cattle-breeding was to them their main occupation, and was clearly given a preference to which it never attained among the Teutonic tribes.

Among the Kelts the political unit is entirely comprehended under the word "clan" or family. The word "clan" is exactly that which we require; it is often carelessly used to denote a congeries of peoples connected by federation; we

shall use it in its original and proper sense of political co-operation dictated by common origin. The political unit among the Kelts is thus an extended family. The Gaelic word "clan" means philologically the community existing between the descendants of a particular individual, a community which is properly based upon his name alone. Clan Aulay is thus the tribal family of one Aulay, and membership therein is denoted by the prefix Mac, as MacAulay. Mac is connected with the Germanic Magus, a boy, and with Maget, Maga. Maid. Personal distinction is then given to the various members of the Aulay clan by some additional title, which is derived from their personal appearance—the lame, the Black, the Short, the Long, and so on.

Members of individual clans were also to be recognised by a special form of dress. Among the later Gaelic tribes the brightly coloured check squares of the Scottish plaid or tartan served this purpose. The Keltic preference for brightly coloured clothing is evidenced also among the continental Kelts. We can hardly venture to speak of a Keltic dress as such; it is probable that their dress suffered numerous

changes and was perhaps influenced by the general advance of civilisation, though we find many cases of resistance. The Gaels until the most recent times have declined to wear trousers, a remarkable exception, in view of their climate, to the predominance of protective clothing throughout the North. The


The Keltic Dislike of Trousers

Gauls in Northern Italy adopted the Roman dress without trousers, or some imitation of it; hence the name Gallia Togata in antithesis to Gallia Bracata on the north or west of the Alps, where the Gauls, at any rate the Southern Gauls, wore the "braca." "Braca" and "camicia" are among the few words which the Kelts can be said with certainty to have given to the Latins, though it is probable that they themselves borrowed "braca" from the Teutons.

Among the Highland Scots arable land was held in common and there is no reason for assuming that the Irish proved an exception to this rule. Among the Scots three forms of procedure can be recognised, which may be enumerated in their order of succession: the communistic owner-

ship of the land and division of the harvest; common ploughing of the undivided land, and its partition before seed time; and partition of the undisturbed land before agricultural operations had begun. The portion of the land destined to agriculture in a particular year was divided into different allotments to be planted with one or another crop; in the second and third of the above-mentioned cases, individual families received their allotments from

the land. The annual share of the families was thus scattered about the common property, which constantly proved inadequate to their needs. Here we find a coincidence with the Teutonic institutions related by Tacitus; it is difficult to decide how far the Teutons may have learnt from their neighbours the



SHIELD OF A SCOTTISH KELT

A beautiful specimen of hammered bronze-work, of thin bronze with a central boss and concentric rings of studs.

Kelts, or how far they had advanced independently, on each side, towards individual agriculture from tribal communism. The general redistribution of land took place among the Highland Scots as a rule annually, though a more complicated procedure existed; for instance, every year only a third of the land reverted to the community, so that a complete redistribution was not effected until three years had passed. Local affairs were settled by an assembly of the heads of families under the guidance of a chosen village head, who corresponds to the Irish house-father.


A sentence of Dion Cassius also provides evidence of Brythonic communism. Other authorities enable us to conclude that the Brythons in the south were occupied chiefly with agriculture, in which case a series of transitions no doubt took place, as in the case of the Gaels and Teutons. Their houses were similar to those of the Gauls. Agriculture disappeared proportionately with distance from the south and the English Channel, and its place was

Chieftains of the Kelts

taken by cattle-breeding and extensive pasture-lands. The individual clans were governed by chieftains, which is practically the meaning of the Gaelic title *Ceann*. The chieftain was chosen from some traditionally privileged family in the clan, and was elected. The successor was often chosen during the lifetime of the chieftain, and was usually his eldest son. This successor was known as *Toisech*. The physically defective were excluded; it was a recommendation for the first-born to have proved his capacity by some bold raid at the head of his adherents.

The affairs of the clan were settled by an assembly, which at the time of our Highland records was formed, not of all the fathers of families in the clan, but of the village headmen under the guidance of the chieftain; it was the same more con-

venient limitation of the assembly for practical purposes by the appointment of a committee with which we shall meet in the political and judicial bodies of the Teutons. The clan meeting of these village leaders could depose the chieftain at any time if occasion should arise. We may also observe the expansion of



BREASTPLATE OF AN IRISH KELTIC KING

A finely chased gold breastplate belonging to an Irish king of the first decade A.D.; found in an Irish turf-bog.

the chieftain's powers and the manner of his aggrandisement. The chieftains placed over the several villages within their territory "*Maors*," who collected the taxes. Even as the Centenarius superseded the Thunginus of the German Hundred, so also the Maor absorbed the judicial power and superseded the elected headman of the village in the conduct of the business of the community. The Gaelic chieftain was responsible for a show of dignity

and for the care of the society over which he ruled. He supported old men, and one of a pair of twins was brought up at his cost. He paid the clan officials: the bard, who enlivened social entertainments and was the epic poet and genealogist of the clan; the piper, whose absence from assemblies or military musters was inconceivable; and the physician. The expense was recompensed not merely by a leading position and leading power, but also by gifts rendered in kind, which naturally developed into regular taxation. The chieftains also administered the untitled land of the clan. The chieftain, in virtue of his office, inhabited the "*dun*"—that is to say, the clan fortress, which only by exception formed the central point of the clan, and never among the Kelts sheltered a community exercising paramount political influence—and also had his own personal retinue.

Clans which could not maintain their independence bound themselves to pay taxes and to render military service to another, and thus became dependent upon a stronger clan under the supervision of its chief. Cases of this kind are met with both

THE KELTS AND THEIR CHARACTERISTICS

among the Gaels and on the Continent, and became highly important among the Gauls. There is only a general resemblance to the "laets" and "lites" of the Germans.

Thus the chieftain was originally rather a superior official and leader of the clan than its ruler. If the clan regarded him as the incarnation of itself, the chief had gained this personal position rather by birth than by personal aggrandisement.

To the new constitutional forms which arise upon the basis of early Gaelic institutions we can but briefly refer. Relations of the chieftains and the families of chieftains within the clan families which eventually lost sight of their genealogical connection as they expanded, became a noble class, from which the chieftain appointed the maor; they provided the official classes and the chieftain's retinue. Members of this clan nobility were then provided with special property from the untilled land. They were thus enabled either to endow a retinue of their own or to help adherents who had been expelled from other clans, and other out-laws of the kind, in



return for service or for payment of taxation. In these modifications of the old Gaelic institutions we have a parallel to the rise of the Gallic federations of vassals and dependents.

The members of a clan always went armed. Till recent times the Highland Scots retained their long sword, short dagger, and leather-covered round shield studded with brass nails, and regarded the firearm, when it was first introduced, as a merely practical innovation. When the clans went to war the Toisech held the command under the chieftain, and the levies of individual villages were led by the maors. As among the Teutons, the army was thus organised by kindreds, or, which is the same thing in an early stage of society, the tribal village was the military unit.

In course of time the clans were unable to avoid the impulse to federation which played so important a part among the Teutoas, though it ran a different course of development. Mutual dissension and the opposition of non-Keltic neighbours and invaders were bound to give an impulse to unity.



ONE OF THE MYSTERIOUS IRISH ROUND TOWERS
Its origin is uncertain, but it may be the grave monument of a Keltic warrior.



ONE OF THE REMARKABLE PICT TOWERS OF THE WEST OF SCOTLAND
General view and sectional sketches of one of these mysterious towers in the Isle of Lewis, perhaps a Druid work.

The federations thus produced were secured both by voluntary co-operation for purposes of defence and also by the influence of some compelling supremacy.


The 184 clans of the Irish were, according to the evidence of the Romans, united into five larger federations or tribes. When such federations become permanent, a theory of long-standing relationship and of common origin is easily evolved by the childlike thought of primitive peoples, who make blood relationship the guiding principle of life. The *connubium* is, in the case of the majority, a result of previous

reference to this higher unity the five were also known as *coiced*—that is to say, fifth parts.

Among the Highland Scots we find no such organisation, almost inviting criticism. Among them, however, federations appear, known as Tuath or Cinel under a Rig. As among the federations of the Alamanni, Franks, etc., we find cases in general wars of individual clans joining now one and now another party, the federal unity having grown weak in the meantime. The supreme command of the federation in the hands of a single clan chieftain most easily led to the predominance of himself and his clan. In Scotland a loosely connected monarchical kingdom was formed in the sixth century; and the union of the Scots and Picts under Kenneth MacAlpine in the year 844 laid the foundation of the general kingdom of Scotland, though individual clans, who received little consideration from a government thus recognised as supreme, might easily fall back into their primitive political state.

The conditions in Gaul are, in their main features, very similar to those Gaelic institutions which have survived until recently, and therefore represent the features of a general Keltic national constitution. In Gaul, however, more complex development had been attained at a much earlier period. There were full means of communication—roads, bridges, river and coast-line navigation, trade, and manufactures; metal-working was an especially flourishing industry. Under the influence of this early modification of the old communistic and pastoral simplicity, by the introduction of an advanced and complex civilisation, the social and political institutions of the country underwent a considerable transformation.

We find in Gaul the clan, though it is not known to the Romans under this name, provided with a chieftain, council of elders, and assembly of free men bearing arms, whose decisions are final. The towns with their wattled walls and wooden houses were of importance both for military and other purposes, but had not absorbed the political influence of the clan assemblies. The nobility were of the same origin as among the Gaels, and were derived from the members of the restricted chieftain class. The nobles actually became a territorial plutocracy,



CHARIOT BURIAL OF THE GAULS

Among the Gauls it was the custom for distinguished warriors to be buried with their chariots, some of the bronze harness-ornaments being shown on page 2437.

federation; the rising nobility is obliged to pass beyond the narrow limits of its own social rank. The later persistence of this *connubium* in no way prejudiced the involuntary conception of early tribal relationships.

As every clan had its chief, so the Irish clan federations had a common overlord, who appears with the title of Ri or Rig. The five Irish clan federations were reunited in a higher federation, which thus embraced the whole island, and held its assemblies at Temair, the modern Tara, the point where their five local divisions meet. In

and monopolised the economic life of the nation. Like the Gallic or Teutonic members of a chieftain or princely class, the Gallic nobles also had war bands, and often made an extended use of them. Among the Teutons, with whom these developments were completed at a much earlier date, the rule of the one prince gradually overcame the nobility of the leading kindred, the *Stirps Regia*, as Tacitus calls it, and secured the monopoly of the war-band; the Gallic aristocracy, on the other hand, was able to crush the individual chieftains. Hence in Gaul rivalry and jealousy were unending, and material was always ready to feed the flame. Public and political life in Gaul was marked by hostility, intrigue, partisanship, by attempts to secure a following or to form a group, which exercised a disruptive and disintegrating influence even upon individual villages and families.

The triumphs of the nobility over the chiefs made the system of war-band in Gaul a distinguishing mark of the aristocracy as a whole, and of all who could enter their class. The latinised Gallic term *vassus*—this is the old Cornish *was*




HUTS IN A VILLAGE OF GAUL

Two of the wooden houses of Gaul, from an Antonine column relief representing Romans setting fire to a village.

and the old Welsh or Cymric *guass*—means *puer, servus*, or youthful servant. Under the feudal system evolved in Merovingian and Carolingian Gaul this Gallic system of vassalage and the Teutonic system of retinues were eventually amalgamated, and a third new form was produced by this fusion.

The subordination of one clan under the protectorate of another, which we have observed among the Gaels, was fully developed among the Gauls; it played an important part in their development and in the attempts to secure supremacy which were made by the stronger clans. Preponderance was based upon momentary power, and clans occupying a leading position at one moment are found in opposition at another: the best known instance is the succession of the Arverni, Ædui, and Sequani. Before these political confusions and complex rivalries could be reduced to a settled system the violent despotism of Ariovistus began; it was followed by the conquest of Cæsar, which put an end to the ferment of native constitutional development, though the partisan tendency was not abolished. It was not merely the spirit of faction, but also the system of plutocratic landlordism which destroyed the equality of many who were socially independent, and facilitated the task of the conquering



EXAMPLES OF GAUL BRONZE-WORK

Among the Kelts of Gaul civilisation advanced much more quickly than in Britain, and metal-work flourished especially. These plates were found in a chariot burial.

Romans. If in the face of these divergencies the Gauls had a sense of national or ethnographical relationship, which they extended to include the other Kelts, and if there were any general assembly representing the whole of the Gallic nation, the initial formation of such an institution must be largely ascribed to the Druids. They are also found among the Gaels, though they reached their full importance only in Gaul. They were not a caste, but a privileged professional class, who combined the three callings of poet, teacher, and priest. The subdivision of political power, and the general partisan spirit which pervaded Gaul, allowed this class to attain an influence of which scarcely a trace can be recognised among the Gaels.


The Druids were exempt from all burdens of taxation or personal service. Apart from their professional occupations, they were the guardians and the transmitters of the "science" perpetuated by

oral tradition; that is to say, of the historical legends, the physical, medical, astronomical, and astrological knowledge of the nation, of law, of poetry, and of all superstition that might be turned to account. They exercised a spiritual and moral power of supervision and punishment, and this was developed into a judicial force, both criminal and civil, which could successfully rival the secular jurisdiction. The Druids had reached a point of organisation which was entirely unknown in the secular politics of Gaul. They were a uniform and coherent body with identical objects, under a hierarchical government, which made them a national society, far above the limits of clan or federation. This hierarchy culminated in the office of supreme arch-Druid, who was chosen for life. Their order maintained relations with Britain, and attempted to found a Pan-Keltic union based on religion and culture.

EDOUARD HEYCK



WARRIORS PRESENTING TO THE DRUID PRIESTS SPOILS TAKEN FROM THE ROMANS
One of the notable series of paintings by Professor Prell in the town hall of Hildesheim.



PEOPLES OF THE IBERIAN PENINSULA

UNLIKE its neighbour the Apennine peninsula, the vast mass projecting from South-western Europe gets its name, Pyrenæan, not from the mountains that traverse its interior, but from the mighty snow-capped barrier that separates it from the continent. The name may be purely accidental; and yet it is an accident not wholly devoid of interest and significance. The rampart of the Pyrenees cannot rival the vast Alpine ranges in height or extent; but it divides Spain from its neighbour, France, more sharply than the Alps divide the plains of Upper Italy from that country. It is the best and the most definite natural boundary in the whole of Europe. Moreover, the Pyrenæan peninsula is more isolated than Italy for another reason: only the smallest portion of its seaboard looks upon that highway of communication, the Mediterranean Sea. The other and the larger portion is bounded by the Atlantic Ocean, so solitary in early times, over whose foaming waves the

Isolation of Spain from Civilisation

Spanish ships at last found their way to the wonderland of America. Hence, a number of Spanish characteristics are due to the position of the country lying, as it does, upon the outskirts of European civilisation. It turns its back, as it were, upon other nations; and thereby it obliged its inhabitants to go their own way and to be sufficient to themselves, while other European peoples, stimulated by the interchange of the arts of civilisation, were forced to greater uniformity of thought and action. It is only at rare intervals that a migrating horde can pass the barriers on the north, and bring fresh life into the fixed seclusion of this country and its people.

Not only the geographical position of the country determines its isolation, but also its physical configuration, which is not inviting to strangers. Almost rectangular in form, it rises stern and massive from the waves, offering only small harbours, and stretching forth no sheltering peninsulas to welcome the mariner. The rivers of the country run low in summer, and are flooded in the

winter months; they offer no facilities for communication with the interior, and empty themselves for the most part into the Atlantic Ocean. A spirit of African rigidity and retirement broods over the land.

In fact, the country resembles Africa in more than this. Spain, like the huge continent to the south of it, is, broadly speaking, a high tableland, surrounded by mountains and separated here and there from the sea by fruitful strips of coast. With good reason may this tableland be compared both to the burning Sahara desert and to the colder regions of Europe. Rain falls but rarely on the thirsty soil; in summer the rivers become rivulets, and scorching heat quivers on the wide plains; in winter roaring storms from the north burst over the highlands and the mountain ranges grow white with snow. Where the land falls away to the sea-level, and the streams pouring down from the mountains provide sufficient moisture, tropical vegetation flourishes, as in the enchanting *Huerta* of Valencia or in blessed Andalusia. And just as Spain resembles the neighbouring coast of North Africa, both in climate and configuration, so it appears to turn a friendly face towards this region in particular. Only a narrow strait divides the Pillars of Hercules from one another, and the rich lands of Andalusia offer their treasures as reward to the adventurer who should pass this boundary. That allurements has not been presented in vain: there have been times when Spain seemed to be no longer a part of Europe, when its inhabitants

stood side by side with the peoples of North Africa against the Aryan race and the Christian faith, and it is a significant fact that this was the period when Spain played a part in the development of human civilisation such as it never equalled before or since.

Spain's Most Splendid Age Was African

The interior of the Pyrenæan peninsula displays the same unfriendly character. The mountain ranges which traverse the plateau and divide it into regions of

considerable strategic importance, notable in history, form no cheerful upland country with green pastures, shady woods and smiling valleys. They rise sheer above the plain; gorge and cleft impede the traveller's progress; and if ever the forests crowned

The Wild Iberian Mountains


the mountain tops, the woodman's axe throughout the centuries has laid them low. Above these ranges brood the memories of a wild and bloody past, and in their valleys were enacted the splendid deeds of the Spanish chivalry. Whoever was at enmity with the rulers of the fruitful lowland plains, but felt too weak to cope with them in open fight, fled to the mountains and turned bandit or guerrilla, became champion of Christendom or of Islam, patriot defender against the French invader, or Carlist, according to the circumstances and the time. Many a riddle of the Spanish character can be solved by taking into account this strange school of stubborn independence and self-reliance, which was always open as a last refuge to the unfettered son of the soil. The greatest conqueror of modern times made trial, to his sorrow, of the spirit thus evolved by the natural configuration of the country.

Stubborn independence is manifested not only in the individual, but also in the various nationalities inhabiting the peninsula. Their efforts were directed not towards union but towards division, and only the peculiar development of the country since the Middle Ages has brought about a unity which is rather apparent than real. Portugal stands gloomily aloof and jealously guards the complete independence of its political life; the Catalonians keep their own language and look upon the Spaniards proper as their worst enemies; while the Basques have opposed the complete incorporation of their territory and the destruction of their ancient rights in many a bloody battle. It was only because the old Castilians were the first to take up the struggle with the Moors, to drive them out and to colonise their territory, that their speech has gained preponderance and that they have been able to impress their peculiar char-

acteristics upon Spanish civilisation. The reserved and punctilious Spaniard, with his exaggerated idea of honour and his unbounded devotion to his prince, as foreigners are wont to imagine him, is in reality only to be found in the Castilian, the sun-burnt, storm-buffed inhabitant of the tablelands, whose character has little in common with the light-hearted Valencian, or the bluff and faithful inhabitant of Galicia. The Castilian is at once harder and prouder than these, but he it is who gained the ascendancy and created the Spaniard of modern times.

Many of the national characteristics of the Spaniard are thus to be traced to the physical peculiarities of the country; if these characteristics appear both in the earliest and the latest inhabitants of Spain, we must not on that account infer a close blood relationship. These natural influences could not but have made them selves felt upon immigrants from foreign countries. But the similarity is sufficiently remarkable. The Spaniard of Strabo is essentially the brother of the Spaniard of to-day; and, in fact, we may assume that the main stock of the people has remained the same to the present time, though it has experienced many additions and admixtures.

In the earliest antiquity we find Spain in the possession of a people of uniform character and language, the Iberians. In this, however, we have merely the result of a long period of development, carried on in isolation: we do not go back to the original condition of the country. Unfortunately, inquiry into early Spanish history has advanced far too slowly to be able to contribute any solution even of the most important problems. We may, however, conclude that, as everywhere in North Africa, South Europe, and Western Asia, so also in the Pyrenæan peninsula representatives existed of that short-skulled, dark-haired, and light-skinned race generally denoted by the name of Armenoid. The people finally known as Iberians were, however, in all probability a mixture of this old population with the long-skulled, light-haired,




KELTIC SWORDS FROM SPAIN

Relics of the advanced Iron Age, represented by the Celtic civilisation.


Iberian Peoples in Spain



In the mountains of Montserrat.



A mountain torrent near Archena.



A view in the great tableland of Spain, below the mountains of Archena.



Sebastian, one of the small Spanish harbours.



The Tagus in the mountains of Toledo.

NATURAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PYRENÆAN PENINSULA

Cro-Magnon race, which came down from the north and appears in France and North Africa, and whose entrance into the intermediate country of Spain we may therefore assume, even though no remnants of their civilisation are at hand to certify our assumption. The large proportion of light-haired people which,

**The Kelts
Enter
Into Spain**

contrary to the general opinion, is found in Spain and Portugal, may be traced back, perhaps, to those earliest migrations from the north, which were followed by two others in course of time. Possibly, the new races imposed their language upon the original inhabitants, and it may be that those Iberian traditions which speak of immigrations of ancestors from Gaul allude to the invasion of this light-haired population. Related to the Iberians were the Sicani and Siculi of South Italy, who also inhabited districts in the neighbourhood of North Africa.

The second immigration from the north, that of the Kelts, falls within the very earliest period of historical times, so that we know but little of the circumstances that preceded the event or of the event itself, and can specify only the results. It is impossible to decide definitely whether the entrance of the Kelts into Spain coincides chronologically with the great movements of the Keltic races towards Upper Italy and South Germany, movements which, in the case of smaller bands, went as far as Asia Minor and Greece. It is, at any rate, probable that these migrations were coincident. The Kelts brought a new civilisation into the country lying south of the Pyrenees, since they represent that more advanced Iron Age which succeeded the Age of Bronze. Agriculture was in its infancy before their arrival. The native Iberians, even in later times, continued to cling to the rude manners of the earlier era. They lived upon the produce of their flocks of goats, upon edible acorns from the mountain forests, and to some small extent upon grain grown in cultivated soil. Like most conquerors, the Kelts despised agri-

culture as being unworthy of a free man, but they forced their subjects to till the soil regularly and to deliver to their masters a share of the produce.

The wave of Keltic invasion flowed over only one part of the peninsula. A race, known later as Keltic, settled in the district in Central Guadiana of which the modern Badajoz is the central point. The Artebrians inhabited the north-west coast, and mingled very little with the natives. A numerous mixed race, known later as Keltiberians, existed in Old Castile and subdued the neighbouring Iberian races, both the agricultural and unwarlike, as well as the highlanders. It is not true that the Kelts ever had the whole peninsula under their power; and there was no permanent bond between the different Keltic races themselves. The highlanders, properly so-called, such

**Independent
Spanish
Highlanders**

as the Lusitanians on the west, the Asturians, the Cantabrians and Basques on the north, maintained their complete independence. Southern Spain, where a milder climate had in early times developed a more advanced civilisation, remained undisturbed by Keltic attacks; but other and more welcome strangers came to its coast—namely, the Phœnicians, who found there the fullest scope for their commercial activity. At any rate, the



AN ANCIENT REFUGE FROM PIRATES
One of the strange fortified places of refuge on the Spanish coast, which give dumb evidence of the extent of Mediterranean piracy in prehistoric times.

Phœnicians had been preceded in their visits to those coasts by other pirates and merchants. Etruscan commerce must have reached Spain. To what an extent piracy was prevalent in the Mediterranean in prehistoric times is evidenced by dumb but intelligible tokens, the Nurhags, those strange fortified towers which appear especially numerous upon the coasts of Sardinia, and must at one time have served as places of refuge for the people when threatened by a descent upon their coast. The only country which then possessed historical records, the Nile valley in Egypt, often saw these piratical bands upon its coasts. More than this we do not know of those early times.

HEINRICH SCHURTZ



THE OUTER TRIBES: SCYTHIANS, CIMMERIANS, AND SARMATIANS

NORTH of the Danube and east of the Elbe—which may be taken roughly as the European limits of the Roman empire—there were other races, with some of whom we shall come into contact in the latter part of our first European period. Of these, however, the Teutons, Slavs, and Huns may be more conveniently treated under our mediæval divisions; while of the Dacians our knowledge hardly enables us to say more than that their tribes belonged to the great Aryan stock.

More, however, may be related of the Scythians, of whom our account may conveniently be given in completeness in this section. We have met them already, when they poured into Western Asia, either under the general title of Scythians or the specific one of Cimmerians. The name of Scythian was indeed generally applied to nomadic barbarian hordes, and was sometimes given to tribes of Mongolian origin. But, in the main, that term is appropriated to nomads of Aryan stock, whose normal habitat may be vaguely described as the lands bordering on the Black Sea, from the Caspian Sea to the Danube.

Sometimes these peoples were called Sakæ, sometimes Massagetæ. The Chinese called them Sök, the Indians Saka, which is the same word as Sakæ. But however different and numerous the names which were given by the ancients to the nations who inhabit those vast regions, one feature is common to all—they were nomads, just as are now the Turkomans, Kirghiz, or whatever they may be called, who have succeeded them. And, further, it may be now noted as a universally established fact that all these nations of the steppes were Iranians—that is, they belonged to the same stock as the Persians and Medes in Iran proper.

The nomads of South Russia, called Scythians in the narrowest sense of the word, were formerly held to be Mongolians. The most important authority for this was

the description of the Greek physician Hippocrates, according to which their appearance was thick, and so fleshy that the joints were buried in fat, flabby and soft, while their complexion was ruddy. Hippocrates notices also in the Scythians

The Origin of the Scythians

what is often noticeable in nations of a low grade—they all looked much alike. But the life on the steppe stamps a certain similarity on all the nomad nations confined in them; outside of that the points of resemblance noted are not so characteristic that we must necessarily consider the Scythians to be Mongolians. The remains of the Scythian language bear rather an Aryan stamp, and show in their roots and endings a close relationship to that spoken in Iran. The close observation of the customs and habits of the steppe, which is shown in the lifelike Greek representations of Scythian life, is a guarantee to us that the men, no less than the animals and separate scenes, are accurate reproductions of careful studies of life. Their eastern neighbours, the Sarmatians, divided from them by the course of the Tanais, spoke a dialect allied to the Scythian, as Herodotus tells us; and the Sarmatians were undoubtedly Iranians—a fact which did not escape the ancients.

This great nation of Iranian origin, roaming from the Oxus and Jaxartes—the Amu Daria and Syr Daria—to the mouths of the Danube, was split into many tribes and hordes. The one which pushed farthest westward, the Skolotai, or Scythians in the narrower sense, is best known to us, because Herodotus, the

What Herodotus Says

father of history, made it the subject of a detailed description. The Greeks knew that the Scythians had not always lived in South Russia, but had immigrated thither from Asia. In their wanderings the Scythians came across the Cimmerians. They did not drive out this people all at once in one mighty onslaught, as Herodotus thought, but gradually and slowly

pushed them back. The effect of this pressure by the Scythians, who came from the east and pushed onward, is seen in the pressure of the Cimmerians on the Thracians of the Balkan peninsula, and in their driving a way for themselves through Thrace to new settlements in Asia Minor, whither they swept

A Migration Lasting Centuries many Thracian tribes with them. This movement in South Russia and on the Balkan peninsula lasted many centuries.

It is certain that a great part of the Cimmerians, owing to the pressing onward of the Scythians, left their land and sought new homes elsewhere. Another part was certainly subdued by the new people and fused with them, as happened later to the Scythians themselves, owing to the pressure of nations from the east.

A last remnant of the Cimmerians preserved their independence in the Crimea, protected by the mountains, which they either had previously inhabited or to which they had fled for refuge from the Scythians. These were the Tauri, in the mountains of the Southern Crimea, who in the accounts which have come down to us are always sharply marked off from the Scythians inhabiting the rest of the peninsula. They were notorious for their piracy, and their custom of sacrificing strangers who fell into their hands through shipwreck or in any other way. The story of Agamemnon's daughter Iphigenia is well known. She came to them by divine decree, and, being appointed priestess of Artemis among them, was confronted by the necessity of sacrificing her own brother, Orestes, and his friend, Pylades.

The migrations of the Cimmerians, their invasions of Asia Minor, and their final overthrow have already been related. On the other hand, the country originally inhabited by them, the Cimmerian Bosphorus, so called after them—the present straits of Kertch—and some

Relics of the Ancient Cimmerians fortifications which presumably owe their origin to them, and therefore were called by the ancients "Cimmerian,"

still preserve their memory. The Scythians then inhabited the whole of the Crimea, with the exception of the mountainous south, and the South Russian steppe from the Don to the Dniester. The district that owned their influence certainly extended so far. The "agricultural" Scythians in the districts watered

by the Dniester, Bug, and Dnieper were, indeed, from their occupation contrasted with the ruling nomad stock, the "royal" Scythians in the wide plain between the Dnieper and the Don, but in other respects were not different from them. And as farming was possible only in the immediate vicinity of the streams which flow through the steppes, we may well assume that it was not practised by all members of the tribe, but was restricted to some few sections, who, as inhabitants of fertile well-watered plains, and influenced by the neighbouring Greek colonies on the north coast of the Black Sea, had made the transition from nomad life to agriculture. Similarly, as the kingdom of Bosphorus expanded under efficient rulers, the Scythians on the east side of the Crimea became subject to them, and at the same time became agriculturists instead of nomad herdsmen.

But, with the exception of these "agricultural" Scythians, all the rest, and especially the ruling tribe of the "royal" Scythians, were, in consequence of the nature of the country in which they dwelt and roamed, nomads and herdsmen. They did not cultivate the land and did not live on the products of their labour.

They had no villages and towns, no citadels or fortified places, but were cattle-breeders and wandered with their cattle and their goods from one pasturage to another.

From this there soon resulted the division of the people into innumerable small sections, to each one of which was assigned a district, generally well defined, but without any hard-and-fast boundary-line in particular, on which they found pasture for their herds; and this district, the life of which centred, we may imagine, round the heap of brushwood with the iron sword planted on it, which we shall mention later, must have also been large enough to offer new pastures when those already discovered provided no more sustenance. We can surmise that disputes and strife were common, and that war often broke out when one section fed their cattle on the land apportioned to another. To change their abodes quickly and to protect themselves against the inclemency of the weather, the Scythians had learnt to construct tents, which, consisting of laths covered over with felt or skins of wild animals and placed on heavy, four-wheeled or

six-wheeled waggons, served them as a dwelling-place. These waggons afforded shelter against rain, snow, and storm, and, drawn by teams of oxen, were used to transport the women, children, and chattels on their wanderings, while the men and elder boys rode and drove the cattle. The chief wealth of the Scythians consisted in horses, cattle, and sheep. In war and in peace the men were for the most part of their life on horseback. The breeding, care, and taming of horses was their chief occupation; mare's milk, and cheese made from it, served them as food. The cattle and sheep supplied them with meat, and they used the skins for clothing or barter, as these were eagerly sought by the Greeks.

Their religious customs and ceremonies corresponded to the primitive state in which the Scythians evidently lived. The sky and its wife, the earth, who

In every tribal section a pile of brushwood was heaped up, which was replenished every year on account of the sinking caused by the weather; and on this brushwood-heap, which presented a flat surface at the top, was planted a sword, to which horses and cattle were annually sacrificed. In perusing Herodotus' description we are involuntarily reminded of the mounds of the American Indians. Even human sacrifices were not unknown to the Scythians. They sacrificed to their god of war one out of every hundred prisoners. After wine had been sprinkled upon his head, the victim was slaughtered in such a way that his blood was caught in a vessel. The corpse of the victim was left lying in the open after they had hewn off the right shoulder, which was thrown high into the air, while the blood which had been caught was taken up to the top of the pile of brushwood erected in honour of their



THE SACRIFICE OF ORESTES BY HIS SISTER IPHIGENIA

The Tauri, a remnant of the Cimmerians, were noteworthy for their custom of sacrificing strangers. Thus arose the story of Iphigenia, who, appointed priestess of Artemis among the Tauri, was confronted with the necessity of sacrificing her own brother Orestes and his friend Pylades, an incident depicted in this Grecian sarcophagus relief.

received from it the rain and sunshine necessary for her fruitfulness; fire and water, with some other natural phenomena which Herodotus identifies with Apollo, the celestial Aphrodite, and Heracles, without enabling us to arrive at their real signification—these were the objects of divine worship, to whom they offered sacrifices, and whom they invoked in their sacrifices. But to none of their deities did they erect temples and altars, any more than they fashioned images of them. They did not slaughter the sacrificial victim, but strangled it by a noose. After it had been skinned and the flesh stripped from the bones, the flesh was again fitted into the skin and cooked, the bones serving as fuel for the purpose.

Peculiar, too, was the worship paid to the sword as the noblest weapon of the Scythian, who lived always on a war footing, ready for defence or for attack.

god of war, and there poured over the upright sword of the god.

Characteristic also was the conduct of the soldier towards his slain enemy. The Scythian drank the blood of the first man whom he killed. But he severed the head of every enemy he killed from the body and brought it to his king, for only he who brought home the head of a slain enemy could share the booty. The more heads he possessed, the more respected he was among his countrymen. The severed head served not only as a title for him to a share of the spoil, but the skin was stripped off it, tanned, and hung as an ornament on the horse's bridle, or, sewn together with other human skins, was used as an article of dress. Human skin was esteemed not only as being thick and strong, but also extremely beautiful, white, and glossy. Besides this, the skull, stripped of the skin, was sawn in two and a drinking-cup made

of its upper portion, which was ordinarily covered outside with oxhide, while rich Scythians gilded it also inside. The Scythians scalped even their own countrymen, like enemies, if they had been at feud with them and, after a complaint, had vanquished them in the presence of the king. At the head of the tribes were chiefs ;

**Barbarous
Scythian
Customs**

at the head of the whole Scythian people a king. The government was despotic. We see that very clearly from the ceremonies at the burial of the kings. If an ordinary Scythian died, his corpse was carried round to all the neighbours for fourteen days, and every one gave a funeral feast. The embalmed body of the king was taken from tribe to tribe, in each of which the men inflicted cruel wounds on themselves and joined the funeral procession until it reached Gerrha ("the walls") in the territory of the "royal" Scythians, where the tombs of the kings were. Here the king was buried, and with him one of his wives, his cup-bearer, his cook, his groom, his lackey, his horses, and all sorts of gold and silver vessels.

A gigantic sepulchral mound was heaped up over all. On the first anniversary fifty more horses and fifty servants of the dead king were strangled; the horses were stuffed and fixed on stakes and the servants placed on them as guards for the dead man. Many such sepulchral mounds, usually called kurgans by the Turkomans, have been found in the vicinity of the Dnieper and opened. They held concealed in their chambers, besides the bones of men and animals, all sorts of implements, among which the works of Greek artists in gold and silver are conspicuous, and deserve special attention. They show, indeed, the friendly intercourse which must have existed on the north shores of the Black Sea between the Scythians and the flourishing Greek colonies.


The Greeks, and especially the vigorous and enterprising Ionians of the coast of Asia Minor, began very early to navigate the Black Sea, in order to procure for themselves the products of those parts and open up markets for their own goods.

They therefore sent out colonists to establish emporiums in suitable localities. Such settlements may have often been recalled, but very often prosperous and powerful towns grew up out of them. There were Greek colonies on the coast of South Russia, as Olbia at the mouth of the Hypanis; Tyras on the river of the same name in the Crimea; Panticapæum, or Bosphorus, now Kertch; Chersonesus, now Sebastopol, and Theodosia, founded by the kings of Bosphorus, now Feodosia, and finally Tanais on the Sea of Azov, near the mouth of the Don.

The oldest and originally the most flourishing of these was Olbia. From here ran a trade route over the Dnieper and the Don, through the territory of the Sarmatians and Budini, first up to the Volga, where lay the factory of Gelonus, founded by the Greeks on account of the fur trade, and then over the Ural and the Ilek, down into the heart of Asia. At a later period the Asiatic trade passed through Tanais, which flourished under the Roman emperors. Panticapæum deserves to be

**Greek
Colonial
Towns** mentioned with Olbia. From small beginnings it developed into an important commercial town and the capital of a kingdom which comprised the whole eastern peninsula of the Crimea and the peninsula of Taman, which lay opposite on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus.

We are told how the Greek colonists made themselves masters of the Scythian settlement of Panticapæum, and how they had to fight with the Scythians until they



A SUBTERRANEAN GREEK GRAVE
One of the extraordinary funeral chambers of Panticapæum, used by Greek colonists, following the custom of the Scythians.

gradually increased their territory, brought the neighbouring barbarians into subjection, and made peaceful agricultural citizens out of them, a process repeatedly followed by these Greek colonies. The barbarians did not willingly give up their territory; it had to be fought for, and only gradually were trade relations formed with them and put on a firm basis. Very often the Greeks had to draw the sword in order to repel the attacks of rapacious and plundering Scythians, until they at length were strong enough to keep them in check. So long as the citizens of



CONTEMPORARY PICTURES OF SCENES IN THE LIFE OF THE SCYTHIANS

In consequence of the nature of the country in which they dwelt and roamed, the Scythians were nomad herdsmen dwelling in tents and breeding cattle and horses. These scenes from Greek vases are accurate studies of their life.

Olbia, on the one side, and the kings of Bosphorus, on the other, understood this, their trade flourished. The Crimea was the chief granary for Athens; from here, as from the other Greek colonies, hides, furs, and fleeces were sent to the mother country. Everywhere on the coasts, especially on those of the Mæotis, or Sea of Azov, sprang up settlements for the numerous fishermen who followed their calling there, catching great quantities of fish, which, thanks to the abundance of salt to be found, they at once salted and sent away by ship.

Scythian slaves also were eagerly sought after, and in Athens the phylakes, or police, were mostly Scythians. In return the mother country exported, besides oil and wine, all sorts of fabrics, gold and silver ornaments, and other articles of luxury. The products of Greek manufacturers which are found in such quantities in the Scythian tombs show us that the Scythians were good customers for Greek wares. In return they furnished slaves, hides, wool and many like things.

The relations, therefore, between the Scythians and Greeks were varied. But even if so many germs of a higher culture reached the barbarians, making many

of them agriculturists, even if Scythian kings, like Ariapeithes and his son Scyles, had Greek wives, and were attached to Greek customs, the Scythian nation, as a whole, remained on a low plane of civilisation and resisted Greek influences.

Scythians at War With Persia

Scyles, for instance, was expelled on account of his frequent visits to Olbia and his taking part in the Bacchic revels. They remained a warlike, nomad people, trained to arms, but not strong enough to withstand the shock and the pressure of the nations pushing forwards from the east.

Our earliest knowledge of the Scythians is the record of the greatest danger which they ever faced. In the year 513 B.C. Darius of Persia went against them with 700,000 men and 600 ships. The nature of their country stood the Scythians in good stead. When Darius led his army over the Danube on a bridge and marched forward, the Scythians retreated before him, avoiding every pitched battle, filled up the watering-places and laid waste the pasture-lands. Thus the Persian king was enticed into a desert, and the Scythians appeared at once on his rear and his front. Darius had to turn back, after suffering heavy loss, to save his army

Barbarian Commerce With Greece

which are found in such quantities in the Scythian tombs show us that the Scythians were good customers for Greek wares. In return they furnished slaves, hides, wool and many like things.

from perishing miserably from thirst. As a set-off to this expedition of Darius, the Scythians undertook some years later, in 405 B.C., a raid through Thracia into the Thracian Chersonese. It is said, indeed, that they had intended to cross into Asia Minor, but they did not get so

**Miserable
Failure
of Darius**

far. For a long time after we hear nothing of the Scythians. But if it is certain that no Attila or Timur arose among them, as among the other nomad peoples of Asia, and that they did not become formidable to the world through a triumphant invasion, yet an uninterrupted movement must have taken place among the nations of Southern Russia; naturally not such as is incongruous with nomad life, but a movement rather marked by the intrusion of one tribe into the territory of another, the transfer of power from the conquered to the victorious people, and the occupation of the land left vacant by the victors by another people still.

According to Herodotus, in the fifth century B.C. the Scythians, or Skolotai, were the ruling nation between the Bug and the Don, and their neighbours on the east were the Sarmatians; the boundary between the two was formed by the Tanais, or Don. By the third or second century the state of affairs had changed. The Tanais no longer divided the two nations, but the Sarmatians ruled the greater part of the steppe westward of the Don; and where formerly the "royal" Scythians dwelt the Sarmatian tribe of the Rhoxolani were now settled. Before this result was attained many a battle must have been fought and the blood of many a nomad have been shed. Of this we hear nothing; but it is certain that in the long wars by which the Sarmatians became the masters of the steppe of Southern Russia the Scythians were by no means exterminated. An isolated record of their long struggles and counter-struggles may have been preserved for us in the story of the Scythian king, Ateas. About the middle of the fourth century B.C. we find him to the south of the Danube and actually at war with the Greek colony of Istrus in the Dobrudzha, having already fought and defeated the Triballi, who lived to the south of the Danube. Pressed hard by the king of Istrus, he asked help of King Philip of Macedon, promising in return to appoint him his heir.

Soon afterwards, however, when the king of Istrus died, Ateas sent back the Macedonian auxiliaries, with whom he could now dispense, and returned a flat refusal to Philip's request that in compensation he would defray a part of the cost of the siege of Byzantium. After the raising of the siege Philip began war with the Scythians, marched to the Danube, and won a complete victory over them. Ateas himself was killed, and many women and children and countless herds—it is reckoned that twenty thousand mares alone were brought back to Macedon—fell into the hands of the victor. If Ateas could be reduced to such straits by one small Greek town as to be forced to seek foreign assistance, we cannot believe that he invaded a foreign country at the head of a powerful force with a view to conquest; but we are more inclined to assume that, being himself hard pressed by more powerful nations in the east, he hoped to find new permanent settlements



A MASTERPIECE OF GREEK COLONIAL ART
A beautiful vase, overlaid with gold and silver, found in a tomb at Panticapæum in the Cimmerian Bosphorus.



THE HEAD OF CYRUS PRESENTED TO THE BARBARIAN SCYTHIAN QUEEN

The custom followed by the Scythians of severing the head of every enemy killed and presenting it to the king is exemplified in this incident depicted by Rubens of the presentation of the head of Cyrus, the great king of Persia, who was killed in an invasion of Scythia, to the Scythian queen Thomyris, who orders it to be dipped in a bowl of blood.

south of the Danube—a prelude, as it were, to the movements of the German races in the third and fourth centuries A.D. Another part of the Scythians remained in their old homes, in the Crimea and in the immediately adjoining districts of the South Russian steppe. Towards the end of the second century B.C., when the Rhozolani were already settled between the Don and the Dnieper, a Scythian king, Scilurus, attained such power as to threaten the Greek towns of

Chersonesus and Bosporus. Energetic and powerful kings no longer, indeed, ruled in Bosporus as formerly, and even in Chersonesus the old rigour seemed to have relaxed and to have given place to a certain effeminacy and weakness. In any case, these towns no longer held the Scythians in check. Scilurus pressed them hard, demanded and obtained payment of tribute to ensure their immunity from invasion, and brought them to such a condition that they began to look

round for foreign help. Mithradates the Great, the king of Pontus, the mighty and dangerous opponent of Rome, sent his general, Diophantus, who defeated the Scythians under Scilurus in several campaigns and forced them to refrain from further attacks on the territory of the Greek cities. Bosphorus and Chersonesus paid a high price for the service rendered to them; they had to give up their independence and became Pontic towns.

After the death of Mithradates and the end of his dynasty, Rome assumed the foremost and leading position in the Crimea. Although in Bosphorus the royal line which had been established by Rome still nominally ruled, and even in the time of the emperors successfully kept guard on this farthest frontier of the empire against the nomad barbarians of the South Russian steppe, just as had formerly the Leuconidæ, yet in reality Rome was here, as everywhere, the supreme power, setting up or deposing monarchs and sending her troops to ensure peace. In the first half of the first century of the Christian era a Roman general liberated the town of Chersonesus from a siege by the Scythians. These were the same Scythians of the

northern half of the Crimea and the adjoining parts of the steppe who formerly had been repulsed by Diophantus. That is the last time that we meet the Scythians here. In the broad steppes of the Don and the Dniester the Sarmatians, and especially the Roxolani, were predominant; and the last Scythians must have been absorbed and subdued by them.

Like Bosphorus and Chersonesus, Olbia, that once flourishing and powerful town on the north shore of the Black Sea, declined in importance. About the time when Diophantus brought help to the Greek towns on the Crimea, or perhaps a little earlier, Olbia was also hard pressed on all sides; and, although the public treasury was drained and the help of solvent citizens had to be called into requisition, it was compelled to pay tribute or give gifts of money to the numerous chieftains of the neighbouring tribes, in order to secure their good-will and to keep them from taking actively hostile measures. But distress reached its culminating point when the Gauls and the German Sciri, who joined them, advanced from the district of the Vistula and seemed to threaten the town; and though that was avoided, and the united army of the Gauls and Sciri seems to have withdrawn, Olbia soon afterwards had to fight against new enemies, for, some twenty or thirty years later, the town was taken and destroyed by the Getæ, who dwelt on the Danube, and under an energetic ruler had become a great power. Olbia, it is true, was rebuilt; but, involved in continual wars against the neighbouring barbarians, it never regained its former prosperity.

These plundering expeditions, first of the Gauls and Sciri, then of the Getæ, are, as it were, a prelude to the scenes that were to be acted on the Southern Russian steppe in the succeeding centuries; that is, in the uninterrupted flow and crush of nation upon nation. After the kingdom of the Getæ had broken up, the Sarmatian Iazyges advanced over the Danube and pressed hard on the Greek colonies there until they took possession of the country between the Theiss and the Danube; here they were settled during the entire period of the empire, and often proved dangerous enemies to the Romans.

HEINRICH SCHURTZ



A GROUP OF SARMATIANS

The Sarmatians were a Black Sea nomad race of Iranian origin, who practically exterminated the whole Scythian race.



THE INFLUENCE OF GREECE ON THE WORLD

BY PROFESSOR RONALD M. BURROWS

SOME day, perhaps, when a new History of the World is being written for a thirtieth century Japan, it will contain a chapter with a title something like the present one, only with the word "Europe" instead of "Greece."

The historian will tell how before the Armageddon that broke up the twentieth century world Japan was faced by a homogeneous civilisation, which went by the name of European. This civilisation, he would explain, was a unity, not merely so far as an observer could generalise about it after the event, but as it struck its contemporaries. Dress, food, houses, government, religion were curiously uniform. It mattered not at all to young Japan whether it was a German or an English professor that it brought over for its literature or its engineering; they had all the same way of looking at things. It was the similarity of point of view that made the difference of dialect of such minor importance; Shakespeare was almost as much a German as an Englishman, and Ibsen much more of an Englishman than a Norwegian. The historian would add, however, that, in spite of this essential unity, it was important to notice

How Japan Will View Europe


that there were real differences in detail. It was unscientific, for instance, to use the word English or British instead of European; nor should the great alliance against the yellow races, that dominated the latter part of the twentieth century, blind the

reader's eyes to the fact that Europe consisted of a number of independent states of varying size, each one of which constituted a political unit.

This is probably the safest point of view from which Greek history can be approached by those who come to it fresh from the study of modern life. To the barbarians, or "stammerers," among whom they lived—for the word denotes wildness of tongue and not of morals—all Greeks must have seemed the same kind of people, whatever state they hailed from.

It would be a refinement of personal observation or political knowledge to know an Athenian from a Corinthian or an Argive. And the Hellenes themselves—for Greek, like German or Allemand, is not a native word, but a name given by one nation to another—realised their spiritual unity in face of the barbarian world. The difference between their dialects was not great enough to make them unintelligible to each other. Megarians and Bœotians could be brought upon the comic stage at Athens not merely for a few short sentences, to amuse by the unintelligible, but for long scenes, where unintelligibility would have been a poor joke. In the sixth or fifth centuries B.C. the analogy for the Greek dialects is not so much English, French, and German, as Aberdeen, Lancashire, and Somerset, with living literatures of their own. Just, too, as we can imagine that behind such living dialectical literatures the language of the

True Point of View for Greek History



PLUTARCH

Whose "Parallel Lives," written to foster public spirit in Greece, is perhaps the finest political tract ever written.

authorised version of the Bible would represent a unifying force, so in classical Greece the epic saga, themselves the result of a long compromise between different dialects and a record of their life-history, served, when once formed, as a common basis for literary expression. Though, again, the outward forms, or ritual, of religion varied more in the Greek than in the Christian world, they were made unimportant by an attitude of mind determined to harmonise and reconcile them. The Hebraic "Thou shalt have none other gods but me," which survives so markedly in the Christian attitude to detail, was alien to the Greek mind. The Hellenic First Commandment was rather, "Thou shalt see me in every god, and find acceptance with me in every act of worship." That is the secret of Greek religion, with its strange mixture of polytheistic, pantheistic, and monotheistic elements. Even politically Greece was capable at times of common action in face of a common danger. The "alliance against the Medes," which marked the beginning of the fifth century B.C., meant a greater sinking of political differences than anything that Europe has done since the days of the Crusades.

The really difficult thing for us to remember is that these political differences existed. From the earliest settlement of the Hellenes in the Eastern Mediterranean down to the end of the fourth century B.C.


their world consisted of a vast number of small city states. Grouped and regrouped in leagues and alliances, they not only fostered to the end a passionate ideal of independence, but in the great majority of cases attained it. Local patriotism means local characteristics, and a German is no more like a Frenchman than a Spartan was like an Athenian. The instance, indeed, suggests that for great sections of the Greek world other influences have to be allowed for besides political independence. The Greeks were a mixed people, a blend of northern and southern elements, and the blend was



SOPHOCLES, THE CLASSIC TRAGEDIAN

Sophocles is the only one of the three great Greek tragedians who represents the classic spirit in Greek tragedy. From the statue in the Lateran Museum at Rome.

different in different places. The southern element was almost as completely under control at Sparta as the Northern was at Athens. In attempting, therefore, to estimate Greek influence as a whole we must remember that we are dealing with a complex civilisation and a long life-history. We need not, of course, attempt to get a composite photograph of what a Greek was like by eliminating differences and emphasising the residuum. Influence depends upon dominant characteristics, not upon average ones, and it is partly because of the variety in Greek life and the range of Greek thought that they have loomed



ÆSCHYLUS

The earliest of the three great Athenian tragedians, Sophocles, Æschylus and Euripides. He was not a classicist, but is as full of romance as Shakespeare.

so large in the history of the later world. Just as each age has its own translation of Homer, bringing out the essence of the poetry in terms of its own poetical style, so Greek life as a whole means something different to every generation. To the Romans of the later republic Greece stood for the refining influence of art and literature. On this side the Romans owed more to Greece than any nation since has ever done.

How great the debt was in direct borrowing and imitation we cannot fully estimate, as only a fragment of the Greek writings that appealed to them most is preserved to us. We are content to judge by the frank acknowledgment of the Romans themselves. Even the freshest of their poets, Lucretius and Catullus, bear the stamp of Greek inspiration. Greek culture was assimilated by the nation as a whole, and not only by a few individuals. By the Augustan Age the process is complete, and the resultant type, the Hellenised Roman, is normal; the poems of Virgil and Horace give a supreme expression to the meaning and value of the new civilisation, but they do not themselves create it.

Culture, however, is a limited word, and the Hellenised Roman of this central period of Roman history, the first century B.C. and the first century A.D., is at pains to show that he owed nothing at all to Greek character. This was partly due to a real superiority of Roman over Greek in the qualities that make for government,



EURIPIDES

One of the three great Greek tragic poets, who is as full of problems as Ibsen, though tradition makes us regard all Greek poets as classicists. From the Vatican statue.

strength of purpose, and grit and staying power. It was true, as Virgil said, that

"Others may beat the bronze as soft as flesh,
And mould the marble to the living face,
Plead causes better, pencil out the heavens,
And tell the story of the rising stars.
To rule the world—that is thy mission, Roman,
Thy art is to lay down the law of peace,
Sparing the conquered, trampling on the proud."

There was something else, however, besides this. Virgil and his world judged

**Rome Denies
her Debt
to Greece**

Greek character by the Greeks they saw around them. The detractor of the modern Greek can at least shelter himself

behind Fallmerayer, and plead mixture of race, when he is tempted to judge the past by the present. Virgil's contemporaries were, without doubt, the actual descendants of the Heroes. Their weakness of moral fibre, their very cleverness and versatility, damaged their ancestors. The typical Greek was taken to be a kind of Themistocles, at his worst, and as his enemies thought of him.

Hardly two centuries passed before there was a change. A drought-wave was passing over the steppes of Central Asia, and the means of subsistence began to fail throughout that huge area. There was a shifting of the population westward, just as, thousands of years before, a similar pulse of climate had driven the first Indo-Europeans into South Russia and Central Europe. A pressure was felt on the eastern frontiers of the Roman empire, and it was the Hellenised East that stood in the way of invasion. How was it that the Greeks were equal to the emergency, and that though the pressure came from the east, it had to pass westwards along the northern front of the empire to find the line of least resistance? The answer is that the Greek conquest of Asia Minor and Syria under Alexander was more thorough and permanent than the Roman conquest over his successors. The assimilation by these

**Greece a
Bulwark of
Civilisation**

countries of Greek civilisation, and the evolution of what was practically a new racial type,

had gone on quietly and unchecked during the centuries of war which brought them within the Roman empire. Christianity may be said to have been primarily the religion of this new race, a religion half Greek, half Oriental, fitted to strengthen its character, and to brace it for life. When the danger came, the very responsibilities of the situation,

the fact that once again, as at Marathon and Salamis, they were the acknowledged bulwark of civilisation against barbarism, helped the Greeks to realise their new political importance. The mainland of Greece had itself already done something to foster energy and public spirit. Plutarch's book of "Parallel Lives," written at the beginning of the second century A.D., is the finest political tract ever written. On the one side he justified the character, the political capacity, of the ancient Greeks, forgotten in the course of the centuries. He set the two races, Greek and Roman, man for man, one over against the other, and showed that Greeks too could fight and govern. On the other side he made his countrymen feel that there was glory to be won in adapting themselves to new conditions and taking their share in the government of the Cosmopolitan Empire. He saw well enough, as Christ saw for the Jews, that nothing was to be won by impracticable aspirations for national independence.


Even our best historians are apt to smile pityingly at Plutarch, and sneer at the

**Plutarch's
Call for a
Man of Fire**

vapidity and pettiness of the life of municipal activity which he counsels. "The world," says Mommsen, be-

longs not to reason but to passion." But it is just the passion which Plutarch throws into the limits of his narrower fate, his search for "a man of fire" to prove equal to it, that turns the edge of all such criticisms. "For before now a great suit well judged, and a steadfast advocacy of a weak man against a mighty, and a fearless speech to a wicked governor on behalf of justice, has been the beginning to some men of a glorious public life." If this is bathos, was there ever in the world's history a nobler protest against fortune? In point of fact, there is no bathos, and we may find a truth in Plutarch's words deeper than he dreamed of. Before a century was out Greek officers were commanding Roman troops in a border war, and a Greek was governor of a province. It was this deep-seated and indomitable public spirit that made possible the long history of the Byzantine empire, Roman in organisation, Christian in religion, Greek in language.

Meanwhile, throughout the ages which were therefore dark, Western Europe had to do without Greece. In Italy alone there was some contact with contemporary



THE MAGNIFICENT SARCOPHAGUS OF ALEXANDER, ONE OF THE MASTERPIECES OF GREEK ART

Modern Europe has made great contributions to the interpretation of the Greek spirit, and it was not until the nineteenth century that the originals of the great periods of Greek art were discovered. This so-called sarcophagus of Alexander is the most intact of all the Greek masterpieces, both as regards the modelling and the delicate charm of the colouring.

Greek civilisation. The influence of Byzantium on the earliest Italian art was a real one; but it was not till the spirit of renaissance had touched literature as well as art that there was a return to Ancient Greece. It was in Tuscany that the spark caught fire—just that part of Italy where the artistic temperament of the old Mediterranean stock had been reinforced by kindred Etruscan blood. When once it caught, it spread through Europe with a freshness and a mastery that meant a new world and a new delight in life. Wordsworth's line

“The senselessness of joy was then sublime,” could have been applied as truly to the Renaissance as to the French Revolution. Robert Browning's “Grammarian's Funeral” is no exaggeration. For the men of that day, Greek stood for more than what we ordinarily mean by culture and art. Knowledge and truth are words that better represent the sum total of its worth to them. The cry of Ajax in the Iliad:

“Slay me, Lord, if thou wilt,
Let it but be in the light,”

appealed to them as the typical utterance of the Greek spirit; and it was the attitude in which they themselves were ready to face life. The painting of pictures, and the singing of poetry, and the laborious study of the shades of meaning of a particle were accepted without surprise as aspects of the same love of truth.

“He was a man born with thy face and throat,
Lyric Apollo!”

was the natural thing for his scholars to say of a Grammarian. That is why the re-discovery of Greek contributed to movements like the Protestant Reformation, which is not an obvious product of an artistic revival. The quickening spirit, once roused, filled all the avenues of

**Greece the
Inspirer of
Reformations**

thought. It would be interesting to discuss how far, from that day to this, movements that have made for light have been inspired by Greece. We should find early in our inquiry that we must not confuse Greek with classical. The classical spirit, in literature and art and life, with its canons of dignity and order, and its shrinking from waywardness and eccentricity, is only accidentally associated with Greece. We can find it there, as we

can find most things, in a civilisation so full and many-sided, but it cannot be said to be dominant. A name like Sophocles naturally occurs to us as representing it at its best, and the example is a fair one and illustrates the point. Of the three great tragedians he is the only one who can be quoted on the classical side. Æschylus and Euripides are as romantic as Shakespeare and as full of problems as Ibsen. The fact is that European tradition makes us study Greek along with Latin, and that we are in danger of applying to one literature what is true only of the other. There are exceptions, of course, even in Latin; Lucretius and Catullus in early days caught the breath of Greek romance, and men like Apuleius found it again centuries later.

In the main, however, it is true that the Romans were a nation of classicists; to point out, as has often been done, that their dominant quality was “gravitas” is but to say the same thing in Latin. In the first flush of the Renaissance there was no confusion; the world was near enough to the remains of Roman civilisation to

**The Danger
that Came when
Men Forgot**

realise what a new and different thing this was, this return to Greece. The danger came when men forgot that the return was for inspiration, and began to hold up Greek and Roman styles in art or literature for mechanical imitation. This was peculiarly fatal in regard to architecture. The Greek temple, beautiful as it is in its own environment, is, at its best, limited in range, and is little fitted for the climate of western Europe and the needs of its public worship. Architecture was, indeed, the one department in which the natural evolution of Greek art had never been broken. The Gothic cathedral, far from being a barbarism, as some of the Renaissance builders held, had the bluest blood in its veins. It traced its pedigree back through Romanesque and Byzantine, not merely to the Roman basilica, but to the Hall of Judgment of the king-archon at Athens, and the Pillar Hall of the Minoan priest-king in the Royal Villa at Cnossus. Though individual details of Greek temple ornament could be, and have been, used with charming effect in every departure of architecture, slavish reproduction of the general style has led to lamentable results.

The same is largely true of literature. In the ever recurring battle between the



THE ARCHAIC PERIOD: SCULPTURES OF THE TEMPLE AT ÆGINA



THE HERMES OF PRAXITELES



THE DELPHI CHARIOTEER

The modern discovery of the originals of Greek masterpieces has given us a great insight into the development of Greek art, an idea of which may be gained from the reproductions illustrating this chapter. One of the best examples of the archaic period, the Ægina sculptures, is reproduced at the top of the page. At the bottom are examples of what was, perhaps, the finest period—the famous Hermes by Praxiteles, the beauty of the execution of which no photograph can give an adequate idea, and the charioteer, lately found by the French at Delphi.

classicists and the romanticists the former have often claimed, and claimed with sincerity, that the Greeks were on their side. In reality they were looking at Greece through Roman spectacles. When Sir Philip Sidney and Corneille wished to argue for the observance of the unities of time and place, they appealed

The Spirit of Greece and English Drama

to Aristotle's "Essay on Poetry." But it is significant that they were obliged to misquote him. In point of

fact he does not mention the unity of place, and lays down nothing that could fairly be called a "precept" about the unity of time. The Elizabethan drama was itself the true child of the Renaissance, as Sidney's own lyrics were, and its earliest masters acknowledged the debt. Marlowe saw well enough that it was just because he had "made blind Homer sing to him," and was "immortal with Helen's kiss," that his poetry was free and daring. The drama, happy for England, developed there while the spirit of Greece was still fresh in the world, and had not been Latinised away.

When, again, the classicist tyranny fell at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century it was realised by not a few of the romanticists that a return to Nature must in Europe inevitably mean a return to Greece. Winckelmann's re-discovery of Greek sculpture, and his passionate enthusiasm for it, were limited by half-knowledge and the still dominant influence of classicist conventions; but it was the Greek in him that inspired Goethe. In the group of men who worked round Victor Hugo and stormed that last stronghold of formalism, the French drama, we find the same feeling. When they rebelled against "les grisâtres," the grey men, the colourless element in literature and life, and asked for light and movement and audacity, they were conscious, so Théophile Gautier tells us, that they were returning to "the great periods of the Renaissance, and the true ancient world."

The Revolt from Classicism

Byron, indeed, was one of the few romanticists who realised that the revolt from classicism, necessary as it was, had a danger in it, with its go-as-you-please tendency, and its contempt for form and rule. There was a certain sense in which Pope was more Greek than Scott, or Wordsworth, or Byron himself, and Byron was not inapt when he compared Pope to a

Greek temple. In Greek poetry, too, there was the temple element, and it is the lack of it which is the weak point of movements that issue from a conscious revolt against formalism.

Byron's attitude to Greece suggests a further point. For both him and Shelley, Greece stands for political as well as for intellectual freedom. Contemporary Greece has come once more on the scene, as it did in Roman days, to interpret its ancestor. The struggle for liberty, which began in 1790, and went on intermittently throughout Byron's life, had a profound influence on western Europe, and brought into prominence the political and moral side of ancient Greek civilisation. Greece was still the land—

"Where burning Sappho loved and sung ;"
but, beyond all that, it was the home of "Lacedæmon's hardihood," the ground where

"Standing on the Persians' grave,
I could not deem myself a slave."

It is no slight tribute to modern Greece that it inspired such thoughts. It is true that it met with plenty of trenchant criticism in Byron's earlier writings;

The Finest Thing that Byron did

yet, even in 1810, when he prophesied in "Childe Harold" that freedom would come only

"when Grecian mothers shall give birth to men," he never doubted that the time was coming. His "Thoughts on the Present State of Greece," published at the same period, show that his criticism is from the inside, not the outside, and that it made for encouragement and inspiration, not for despair. When the War of Independence definitely broke out, in 1820, only a year after the publication of "The Isles of Greece," Shelley eloquently defended the insurgents in the preface to "Hellas," while Byron was aroused by his enthusiasm to a personal self-devotion that was the finest thing in his life. The last lines that he wrote on Greece before he died for her are not critical:

"The sword, the banner, and the field,
Glory and Greece, around me see!
The Spartan, borne upon his shield
Was not more free."

Nor must we forget that this ideal of ancient Greek freedom has from first to last been the inspiration of the modern Greeks themselves. In no country has the past a stronger hold. One can only hope that Greece will take warning from

western Europe, and not let tradition stiffen into classicism. There will never be a great modern Greek literature until the false antithesis between the spoken and the written word is dropped, and a national language allowed to evolve freely and naturally by interaction and competition between popular dialects.

When we turn from modern Greece to modern Europe as a whole, we find that we, too, have made our contributions to the interpreting of the Greek spirit. This is largely due to the fact that we know more about it than any generation has known for 1,500 years. Winckelmann and Lessing had to judge Greek art mainly from Roman copies, and the originals to which they had access were of the decadence. It was the nine-

teenth century that rediscovered the originals of the great periods. First there were those that were still above ground, the sculptures of the Parthenon and of Ægina; then the results of excavation, the Hermes of Praxiteles from Olympia, the grave reliefs from Athens, the sarcophagi from Sidon, the Charioteer from Delphi. With the insight thus gained into the development of Greek sculpture and the methods of its various schools, we have turned with new eyes to the statues already contained

in the museums of Europe. One of the most fascinating chapters in art criticism has been the mental reconstruction of lost masterpieces from the study of Roman copies and the use of the comparative method. More than once, too, we have been able to distinguish actual originals,

Our Discoveries in Greek Art

such as the Leconfield head of Aphrodite, or the Bologna head of Athena, from the mass of later work in which they had lain unnoticed. In literature our discoveries have also been considerable, though not as epoch-making as they have been in art. It is partly that we have less way to make. Many of the greatest things the Greeks wrote have been known to us since the Renaissance. Homer and Thucydides,

Herodotus and Plato, have always been with us, and the same is true of at least some of the best fifth century tragedies.

We have never been ignorant in literature, as we were till lately in art, of the heights to which the Greeks could rise. Our last instance, however, shows how woefully fragmentary our records are. Of perhaps

nearly 300 plays written by Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, we have but thirty-three, most of them selected

by no finer canon of taste than the need of a safe text-book for a Byzantine schoolboy. Of their minor contemporaries we have not a single play, while detached verses, quoted by later writers, are all that remain of the brilliant group of comedians who competed with Aristophanes.

Of the early lyric poets, the pre-Socratic philosophers, and the fourth century historians, we have mere fragments. Excavation has in this matter rather whetted our appetite than satisfied it. It is a long time since we have had any considerable find of vellum manuscripts. We depend on the unearthing of papyri in Egyptian tombs or on Egyptian rubbish-heaps. From one point of view the change is for the better. Instead of late mediæval transcripts, many times removed from the truth, we have the

actual products of the ancient book-trade, written by and for men who spoke the language as their mother tongue.

Many of the papyri we have found were written in the first or second century B.C., some in the third. In the case of a fourth century lyric poem of Timotheos, the copy we possess may actually have been carried in the pocket of one of Alexander the Great's soldiers, whose father may have met the poet. The light that is thrown on the text of authors whose works we already possess in mediæval copies is considerable, even if the papyrus is but a fragment. We realise, for instance, that the order of lines, and perhaps of incidents, in the Iliad and the Odyssey, was far less fixed in ancient times than the uniformity of our later manu-



THE BOLOGNA HEAD OF ATHENA
This head is believed by some to be an original work of the best period of Greek sculpture

scripts would lead us to suppose; while, on the other hand, we get unexpected confirmation for the received text of Thucydides. Though papyri have been of great importance from this scientific point of view, not even the dryness of the Egyptian air could save such delicate material

**Greek
Poetry Found
in Egypt**

from damage when buried for 2,000 years, and, at the start, perhaps thrown away as rubbish. They are terribly torn, and hardly a single new work that they offer us is intact. The lyric poems of Bacchylides, and a tract on the constitution of Athens, written for Aristotle by his pupils, have been, up till this last year, their chief contribution to Greek literature. These have now been challenged by some poems of Pindar, fragments of a new historian, Theopompus, perhaps, or Cratippus, dealing with the events of the first years of the fourth century, and about 1,200 lines of Menander. The last is poor stuff, and justifies the worst that has been thought of him from the half-translations, half-imitations of Terence.

We have spoken of discoveries made last year. Here we have another side on which Greek is of interest to the modern world. Greek studies are alive and progressive, and touch the scientific as well as the literary spirit of the age. Whole new regions of history are being opened up. Egypt under the Ptolemies, Sparta in the sixth century B.C., Crete in the sixteenth, are all having a flood of light thrown on them by British scholars, indifferently supported, it is sad to say, by British money.

It is not only that our knowledge of Greek evolves under our hands and is a fitting subject for scientific research. The Greeks themselves were the pioneers of the scientific spirit, and invented nearly everything. Their speculations cover physics, mathematics, and medicine. They are the parents of practically all known forms of literature, tragedy and farce, epic and drinking song, history and novel. Our

metaphysics, our ethics, our politics, are still written in terms of their philosophy, and new schools of thought succeed mainly in bringing into prominence some aspect of it that their predecessors had ignored. The stage owes to Greece its existence, and has acknowledged the debt by borrowing from it all its technical terms. Drama, theatre, tragedy, comedy, scene, proscenium, orchestra, chorus, choir, music, poetry—all are Greek words.

But it is not only the student of origins who is affected. There is so much in Greek thought that impresses us all as modern. There are no adequate discussions of socialism, for instance, or the woman question, between Greek times and our own. For the attitude of a higher civilisation to a lower, the duty of an empire to its subject races, we can find no nearer parallels, or warnings, than in Greek history. Above all, the problem as to how a democracy is to govern an empire and yet remain true to its humanitarian ideals has never been put, except in fifth century Athens and in Britain to-day.

Even so significant a trait as love of animals has to jump the centuries. Except, perhaps, under the inspiration of St. Francis of Assisi, how little we have of it in European literature till quite modern times! Where have we another Argos, the hound whom Odysseus had hunted with in his youth before he went to Troy? When Odysseus came back in disguise as a beggar no one knew him but his dog. Argos was lying on a dung-heap, past his work, and full of vermin; he had no master, and no one cared.

When he caught sight of his master, he wagged his tail and let both his ears fall, but was not strong enough to get nearer. Nor did Odysseus dare go near either, but asked questions about the dog, hoping that the others would not notice the tears in his eyes. But Argos died—"the fate of black death overtook him, even in the hour that he looked on Odysseus in the twentieth year."

RONALD M. BURROWS



THE GREEK'S LOVE FOR A DOG
As expressed in Greek art.



THE STORY OF ANCIENT GREECE

By Professor Rudolph von Scala

IN THE HEROIC OR LEGENDARY AGE

THE Mycenæan civilisation, which has become known to us through recent excavations, is on a plane higher than that of the culture attained by the early hordes of the North, and its development may be most easily explained by the intercourse between the Greek tribes of the Southern and Central Balkan peninsula and the peoples of Asia Minor. The latter brought to the Greeks the civilisation of Egypt and the East; the Greeks developed this culture on lines of their own, and in some respects improved on it.

The civilisation of this period takes its name from Mycenæ. In addition to Mycenæ, its chief centres were Tiryns, Orchomenus, the citadel of Gulas at Lake Copais, the early acropolis of Athens, and the sixth stratum, or city, of Troy. Other districts also have demonstrated the wide diffusion of Mycenæan culture: Nauplia, Vaphio in Laconia, and Campus in Messenia, Spata, Menidi, Halyce, Thoricus, Aphidna, Eleusis in Attica, Salamis, Ægina, Goura in Phthiotis, Delphi, Demini in Thessalia, Thera, Therasia, Calymnus, Melos, Crete, Rhodes. Both the Greeks and the peoples of Asia Minor had acquired at that time a uniform civilisation; the vast development of culture led to an increase of population and an increased need for land, and, consequently, to a great wave of emigration over the sea. The Æolian and partly Ionian conquest of Asia Minor, the invasions of Egypt by the "nations from the north," and the spread of Mycenæan civilisation over Sicily and Egypt,

are the natural offshoots of the Mycenæan culture at its height. In consequence of recent excavations at Mycenæ and Tiryns, it is no longer a matter of great difficulty to obtain a fair idea of the life of that time. Although it rises no higher than from forty to sixty feet above the plain, the citadel of Tiryns, with its massive walls and prominent towers, gives an impression of great strength and magnificence. The walls themselves were to the Greeks mysterious tokens of a long-forgotten past, and were attributed by them to the Cyclops.

Some of the gigantic blocks of stone are hewn into complex forms, and others are covered with ornamentation. Along the approach, past the lower citadel, we may walk between the walls of the ancient town and the fortress to the main entrance of the upper citadel, or acropolis, where the walls reach the astonishing thickness of fifty-seven feet. Arches or casemates are built into them, such as have been discovered in the ruins of Phœnician cities. Indeed, the same proportion between length and breadth is to be seen here as in far-distant Carthage and in other ancient towns of Northern Africa. Passing through the doorway, the propylæa, ornamented with pillars, and proceeding over the fine lime floor of the great court, in which an altar to "Zeus of the enclosure" once stood, and, finally, through a vestibule and ante-room, we reach the great court of the men, the megaron, in which there was once a fireplace thirty-eight feet nine inches long and thirty-two feet two inches wide

**Birthplaces
of Greek
Civilisation**

**Massive
Citadel of
Tiryns**

This hall was lighted from above, and was built at a higher level than the neighbouring apartments, just as the central hall of the Temple of Solomon was raised above the surrounding rooms, and, later, the halls of Roman dwellings and the naves of mediæval churches. The walls were brightly painted with rosettes, blossoms,

**Palaces
of Ancient
Greece**

pictures of pastoral life, and conventional designs, such as we now see in Oriental rugs. Such a pattern in red and blue was

traced on the lime plastering of the floor. Doors with one and two wings, in part hung with curtains, led to the women's quarters, consisting of rectangular courts with columns and porches, a great main hall, and corridors and passages of great length, all copied from the palaces of Egypt and Syria.

At Mycenæ a street eleven and a half feet wide, hewn out of the cliff and supported by cyclopean rocks, passing over stone bridges pierced for the flow of water, led to the walls of the citadel. The entrance was the Lion Gate, so called on account of the two lions standing opposite one another with their forepaws resting on an altar, in the middle of which a column is erected. The upper classes of the Mycenæans, judging from pictures on vases and remains discovered in the tombs, were in the habit of wearing pointed beards and their upper lips shaved. Ornaments of gold-plate with palm leaf and lotus designs glittered upon their clothing.

They carried sword or dagger, richly inlaid with metal in various patterns; the handles terminated in fantastically shaped knobs, of which one example is a dragon's head in gold with glistening eyes of cut rock-crystal. The blade of one dagger recently discovered is ornamented with a representation of lions pursuing antelopes; another shows four men, protected by shields, setting forth on a lion hunt: on a third are represented

**Personal
Magnificence
in Mycenæ**

ichneumons in chase of water-fowl in a papyrus landscape. Heavy gold signet-rings were also worn. The inner walls of the houses were inlaid with precious metals and amber, as in later times were the walls of the Temple of Solomon. Articles of furniture were in part covered with thin gold as well as with plates of artificial lapis lazuli. Amber beads have been found in the ruins, as well as a gigantic ostrich egg. Women of the nobility and ruling classes wore

many gold ornaments; their upper garments were somewhat scant, the breast being partially uncovered; their hair strayed in ringlets over the forehead from beneath a low round turban, and was allowed to fall behind in a thick braid, the end of which was turned outwards and enclosed in a spiral of gold. A diadem of thin gold ornamented the forehead. Large, golden breast-pendants, and neck-chains, earrings, bracelets, and finger rings, and the tight-fitting garment pleated in horizontal folds below the waist and decorated with gold, contributed to an appearance less pleasing than showy. It is hard to conceive this people as Greek, or as living upon the soil of Greece, for their civilisation was so deeply influenced by the customs and artistic genius of the East that not only their appearance, but also their manners and customs were almost wholly Oriental.

Chariots, both in battle and in hunting expeditions, were used in the same manner by the Mycenæans as by the races of Western Asia. The fallen warriors were embalmed in honey, according to the


**Oriental
Customs of
Mycenæ**

primitive Babylonian custom; their faces were covered by masks of gold, and in their hands were placed double-edged axes,

exactly similar to those which we may now see pictured in Assyrian bas-reliefs.

Belief in the power and influence of the soul led at an early age to the worship of the dead. Members of royal houses, heavily laden with ornaments, were laid on the ashes of the burnt sacrifice which had been offered up to them, in the same manner as the deceased are found to have been placed in the barrows and *tumuli* of the North. Sacrifices were offered because of the general belief in the power of the dead; and for the same reason the movable possessions of men were laid in the graves at their sides.

Such sacrifices were made not only at the time of burial but also afterwards. Above the fourth burial pit at Mycenæ a round altar, hollow in the middle, has been discovered; and through this altar, as through a tube, the blood of the sacrificed animal flowed directly down to the dead. Thus it was a permanent funeral altar, pointing to the permanent worship of souls, for the residence of which in the later sepulchres the entire chamber was designed. The so-called dome tombs, which are evidently family sepulchres, have an



MYCENÆ, THE CENTRE OF THE EARLY GREEK CULTURE, AS IT APPEARED IN THE HEROIC AGE



GREEK ANTIQUITIES OF THE MYCENÆAN AND HOMERIC AGES

In spite of the Oriental love of splendour which was evident in the life of the Mycenaean Greeks, the Greek genius prevailed in their art, as may be seen in these beautiful relics from Mycenaean tombs. The keen observation of Nature is shown in the conventionalised designs of the gold plates which decorated their clothing (1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8), and in the dagger-blade (6 and 11) representing an ichneumon chasing waterfowl. Homeric warriors are shown in the fragments of a vase (3) and of a silver goblet (9). Very beautiful is the double-handled goblet (10) from Mycenaæ.

approach sometimes 115 feet in length and twenty feet in breadth, consisting in part of carefully laid hewn stones. There is also a short entrance or vestibule, with richly ornamented walls—slabs of red, green, or white marble; slender, embedded columns of dark grey alabaster, and pieces of red porphyry—and a beehive-shaped dome upwards of fifty feet in height. One of these domes is constructed of thirty-two superimposed circles, each smaller than the one below, and is ornamented with bronze rosettes, fastened with nails of bronze to blocks of bluish marble. The great development of technique is shown by the fact that in one tomb a stone weighing 240,000 pounds was let into the wall for the support of the lintel of the inner door; the floor of the baths at Tiryns consisted of one slab weighing 40,000 pounds.

Many treasures have been brought to light in the domed sepulchres; finger-rings, silver ladles, and bowls, swords with gold nails and gold ornaments, necklaces with richly decorated clasps, and, finally, two golden goblets, discovered at Amyclæ. These cups are made of two layers of gold-

plate, the inner smooth, and the outer, to which the handles are attached, ornamented. The decoration is artistic, and consists of a representation of shepherds in pursuit of wild African cattle, amid a landscape of tall palms and olive trees with knotted trunks. The shepherds are naked, except for the loin-cloth and girle with hanging ends; their feet are encased in Syrian sandals with sharp toes; their faces are smooth shaven after the Syrian fashion, and, notwithstanding an unmistakable Semitic trace, are Egyptian in cast, with prominent pupils of the eyes.

In Mycenaæ the age of bronze attained its highest development—a development that could not have been reached except through the instrumentality of a powerful centralised government. The excellence of the art and the difficulties overcome in building can but lead to the conclusion that a division of the population into classes had already taken place. Such tremendous results are attained, in primitive societies possessed of but few mechanical appliances, only by the enslavement of workers through the power of a supreme ruler. Social inequalities must

Tremendous Achievements in Mycenaæ

THE HEROIC AGE IN ANCIENT GREECE


have developed spontaneously; and, as may be seen from an examination of the numerous sepulchres of the ruling classes, not only were the princes and chieftains of higher station than the mass of the population, but there must also have been many men of lower rank—a numerous class of nobles who already resided in the town, and who no longer merely lived in the country upon their estates.

Differences in the extent of possessions brought with them economic inequality, a condition that must even at an early time have led to inequality of rights. The possession of landed property conferred certain privileges, and these privileges led to territorial dominion. Together with the magnificence of the daily life of the nobles, the monuments and antiquities also show us the political form of a society ruled by a powerful kingship. It is possible that the earlier inhabitants, when conquered, were enslaved; at any rate, it is certain that slaves stood at the command of the sovereign and nobility, or, at least, that the majority of the population was socially far removed from the minority, and

recognise the Greek type: regular features, finely cut noses, and smoothly arched brows, in the very midst of an environment foreign to the Greek spirit. Even in the external forms of life, which Oriental influence had so largely pervaded, certain



THE ANCIENT GALLERIES OF TIRYNS
A view inside the cyclopean walls of the citadel of Tiryns, which reach the astonishing thickness of fifty-seven feet.



THE FAMOUS LION GATEWAY OF MYCENÆ
The entrance to the great citadel of Mycenæ was by a gate with two lions resting their forepaws on an altar.

ministered to the love of ostentation and display of the sovereign and nobility.

Nevertheless, the Greek genius prevailed over this Oriental love of splendour. From the primitive gold masks moulded from the features of the dead one can

characteristic Greek traits survived. Although the rulers resided in palaces, built after Asiatic models, the rest of the Mycenæans lived, not under flat Asiatic roofs, but under European pitched roofs with gables. Vases of Mycenæ, the earlier ones with glossy surfaces, the later with dull surfaces, predominated in the entire basin of the Mediterranean. The early, as well as the later, Greeks made use of the fabulous animals of the East in ornamentation; but, on the other hand, their observation of the life of the sea is truly Western. Shells, starfish, corals, cuttlefish, and argonauts, drawn upon the vases, prove at what an early time the manifold life about and in the sea was observed by Mycenæan eyes. Butterflies were modelled in gold; plant life, too, was accurately observed and imitated. Designs of tendrils and leaves drawn after Nature and not conventionalised appeared for the first time on Mycenæan vases. The continuous as well as the interrupted designs so familiar in friezes, and put to so many decorative uses by the Greek artists, had their origin in the Heroic Age.

The high plane of development indicated by the style of the Mycenaean vases was coincident with the culminating point of Mycenaean culture; and from this fact we are enabled approximately to fix the date of a civilisation that otherwise, so far as time is concerned, would remain indefinite. Some years ago the discovery in the lower city of a porcelain ivory of an Egyptian scarabæus bearing the name of an Egyptian king of the fifteenth century B.C., coupled with the finding in the acropolis of Mycenæ of another scarabæus, inscribed with the name of the wife of this king, tended to determine the date of Mycenaean civilisation: Nevertheless, there is still the objection that the scarabs may have been dropped there by a trader or collector at a much later period; although, strangely enough, a similar scarab, bearing an inscription written during the reign of the same king, has been found in similar Mycenaean strata on the island of Rhodes. It has also been determined that the princely gifts which were brought to another Egyptian king by the inhabitants of "The Islands of the Great Sea" are similar in every respect to the antiquities—small ornamental goblets, and silver cows' heads—that have been found in Mycenæ. Thus the heroic civilisation must have spread over the Grecian Archipelago and, above all, over Crete. Finally, conclusive evidence has been established by the discovery of Mycenaean vases and goblets in Gurob, an Egyptian town, which was destroyed during the fifteenth century B.C. We do not go so far as to determine the nationality of the settlers in this town from the signs scratched in various metal objects which have been found, but so much is certain: they possessed the Mycenaean civilisation, and must have penetrated into Egypt as early as the fifteenth century B.C.

Antiquities and remains have borne their testimony; let us now hear what

men have to say. The utterances of Mycenaean kings are audible to us only as a faint murmur echoing in the stories of tradition: for this people had no written language, and have left to us no written records. But the historical documents discovered in Egypt speak for them. During the days of King Rameses I. warriors whose dress was European appeared in the Syrian army; they were Javans—that is, Ionians—and they wore the feather plume that has served as a distinctive mark of the Asiatic



ACHILLES, HERO OF GREECE

The greatest of the heroes of the Iliad of Homer, the embodiment of impetuous strength of the Greeks.

Greeks. During the reigns of Menepthah and of Rameses III. there were invasions of "men from the north," as we are told by Egyptian inscriptions, and the weapons of these wanderers were those of the races of Europe and Asia Minor. On water and on land, in ships and in ox-carts, bringing their wives and children with them, hordes of northern peoples, against whom the native forces could defend themselves only with the greatest difficulty, burst like a storm over Egypt. The names of these peoples, the Aquai-vasha and Danauna, but half conceal the words Achæans and Danaans.

The development of the Mycenaean civilisation must have led to a great increase in the populations of the oldest centres of culture, and have given the people occasion to embark on expeditions for the conquest of new territory. Since the coasts of Asia Minor and the

islands of the Archipelago were settled by the Greeks as early as the year 1000 B.C., it follows that the earliest of these Greek settlements, those of the Æolians, must have taken place during the Heroic Age, the age of the Mycenaean civilisation. The entire process of the Æolian settlement, and perhaps of a part of the Ionian, is connected with the teeming population and the high phase of culture of the Heroic Age. The many islands formed bridges, as it were, from one people to another, and joined them all together in close union with the Asiatic mainland.

THE HEROIC AGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

The first settlement was made by the Æolians, whose dialect was spoken in Thessaly, Bœotia, and Lesbos, and was nearly related to the languages in use in Arcadia and Cyprus. The Æolians were closely connected with those inhabitants of Attica and Eubœa who gradually detached themselves from Bœotia and later developed into the Ionian race of Asia Minor, where they came to forget their earlier relationship to the Bœotians. The North-western Greeks, usually known by the name of one stock, the Doric, included even in historic times the Epirots, Ætolians,

chieftains, assisted by the princes of Mycenæ, to Asia Minor, where they burnt the city of Troy, for the sixth city upon the acropolis in Hissarlik, constructed in complete harmony with the Mycenæan style of architecture and provided with flying buttresses in the same manner as the citadel of Gulas at Lake Copais, was sacked and destroyed by fire, as we have learned from recent excavations. Thus, traditions come to life again after a lapse of thousands of years. It would be too much, however, to claim the possibility of extracting historical details from



HELEN AND MENELAUS

From a Greek vase painting representing Menelaus leading his wife Helen, the cause of the Trojan war, back to Sparta.



THE FINAL TRAGEDY OF THE ILIAD OF HOMER: THE DEATH OF PRIAM

Priam, the aged father of Hector, the great Trojan hero of the Iliad, was killed by Pyrrhus at the fall of Troy after attempting to revenge the death of his son Polites. From one of the famous Polygnotus vase paintings.

and Acarnanians, the inhabitants of Phthiotis, the Phocians, Locrians, and peoples of Achæa. To the Æolians belonged the inhabitants of the towns of Mycenæ and Tiryns, and also the tribes that emigrated into North-west Asia Minor and Cyprus, and there engaged in long wars with the original inhabitants. The Trojan War must be looked upon today as a great military expedition of Greek

Homer; that would be equivalent to reading the minor events of the wars against Attila the Hun out of the Niebelungenlied.



THE FLIGHT OF ÆNEAS

Another Greek representation of incidents from the greatest of Greek poems. Here are seen the flight of Æneas after the fall of Troy, and Ajax, the Locrian, and Cassandra in the temple of Minerva at Troy.

The second group of Greek races, the Ionian, settled the greater portion of the western coast of Asia Minor, where they established large city colonies. It was there that the Ionian stock developed its versatility, freedom of spirit, and rich and manifold interests. Composed as it was of various sections of

the Greek people, it also absorbed elements from Asia Minor and transmuted the Asiatic civilisation into Greek culture. Thus, the Ionians gave a higher dignity to the old hero epics, and made the beginnings of Greek science. Finally, the third group,

Beginnings of Greek Science

the North-western Greeks, continued to live in their northern home in single tribes, and indeed remained longer than any other

Greek race in connection with the Italian stocks; whence the curious resemblance between Doric and Roman towns and town government observable in the three gateways and the doubling of officials.

A portion of this group, the Dorians, soon settled in Central Greece, then crossed the Bay of Corinth at its narrowest point, and colonised the northern portion of the Peloponnesus. As their progress was obstructed by the mountains of Arcadia, they swung off partly to the west, occupying Elis, and partly to the east, where the inhabitants of Argolis, with

a highly developed but decadent civilisation, were forced to yield to their greater vitality and superiority in arms, sinking, in a great measure, to the position of serfs, but leaving the greater part of their civilisation to the conquerors. Thus, the power of the primitive inhabitants fell. Of the fortresses at Mycenæ and Tiryns nothing but ruins remained; and not until the seventh century B.C. were temples again erected there to the worship of the gods. The wave of Dorian invasion now flowed out over Crete, Melos, Thera, Rhodes, and Cos, where faint traces of an earlier Æolian substratum are still to be

recognised, forced its way as far as Pamphylia, and finally penetrated to the south-eastern part of the Peloponnesus. Legends have adorned the Doric migration with a thousand details; not only the folk-sagas, that tell us of the deeds of heroes, but also the traditions of historians, who endeavoured to explain how each tribe wandered into its ultimate territory. The fact of the Doric migration is not to be

disputed; but all details regarding it are worthless, and, not being supported by later discoveries, must be cast aside as of no historical value.

The Æolian settlers took with them to Asia Minor the remembrance of their daring voyages, of their advance towards the East, of the centuries of battle and foray, and of their earlier domination over golden Mycenæ.

Even in the Homeric poems there is still an echo of the great migrations. "As on days of sunshine masses of cloud follow the mountain ridges, but seldom take their form," so have myths and


The Homeric Epics

legends followed the general course of history; but they have covered it over with clouds of the imagination. The traditions

of wars on the soil of Asia Minor have been perpetuated in the epic poems, the sublime productions of the next age. How did poetry, how did the Homeric epics, arise? As a rule, the speech of men flows

along quietly and without method; but when the soul is shaken with emotion, when the heart is uplifted in happiness or oppressed by pain, when men are overwhelmed with an emotion of reverence for the gods, when joyful events lead to outbursts of delight, then utterance becomes rhythmic. Songs are transmitted from mouth to mouth; their subjects are supplied by the remembrance of great days and of great battles; they are filled with recollections of the shining forms of the heroes of olden times. At first men of high birth themselves sing in alternating verse, as did Achilles and Patroclus; and, later,

with the increasing tendency to form classes in society, and with the introduction of the division of labour, a poet caste comes into being. In particular, men who are blind take to the minstrel's art; to them the joy of combat and the glory of war are closed, and, lyre in hand, they wander from court to court, spreading abroad the fame of heroes in song. Such a minstrel was the blind Demodocus, who,



HOMER, THE FATHER OF POETRY
The traditional author of the great heroic epics. From the bust found at Herculaneum.



THE APOTHEOSIS OF HOMER: THE HOMAGE OF POETS OF ALL AGES

From the picture by Ingres in the Louvre, representing the homage of poets of all times to the great blind father of song.

in the *Odyssey*, sang to the Phæacians; such men were the blind gleemen of Chios, who figures in the Homeric hymns; Bernlef, the blind Frisian, and the blind bards of the Slavs, among whom the word "blind" (*sliepak*) became a generic name for minstrels, even when they did not happen to be blind at all. Thus to Homer, the traditional author of the heroic epics, blindness was attributed.

These poems, which first came into being among the *Æolians*, and were inherited and enlarged by the *Ionians*, required hundreds of years for their growth, developing from short and simple compositions, treating of the wrath of Achilles, into vast heroic epics, celebrating the glory not only of single heroes, but also of entire races. Hundreds of minstrels, journeying from palace to palace, co-operated, and although hampered by the limitations of a set form, were, nevertheless, skilled in the art of improvisation. They delved into the life of the people and into the wealth of stored-up legends, reciting for the pleasure of the ruling nobility, adding new songs to old in honour of single families and in praise of

the model aristocratic state. Thus they composed songs which reflect the knightly lives, the philosophy, and the highest thoughts of the greatest men of their time.

Whether these older forms were merely edited into the connected shape of the two great epics, known to us as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, or were reconstructed by a few great artists whose work was then so re-edited, or were but the sources from which one master-mind drew his glorious inspiration, remains an open question among scholars to this day. It is claimed that the pre-eminent artistic abilities of several individuals are plainly visible, and that the greater creations of particular minstrels may be separated from the mass of inferior work. It is also claimed that the work of a single triumphant genius is manifestly dominant throughout. In any case, the Homeric poems had their beginnings in Mycenaean times, when there had already developed a universally understood literary language that reached its zenith in the ninth or eighth century B.C. The youthful strength of heroes and their resourceful wisdom, the entire scale

of emotion, from the gentle stirring of sentiment in the love-dream of the young princess to the sad farewell of wife to hero, and the melancholy compassion of the victor for the aged father of his fallen enemy—all th's we find in the Homeric

Nature in the Songs of Homer

songs. Nothing could be more touching than the lines in which Hector takes off his shining helmet to soothe the fear of his babe and bids farewell to all, or those in which Odysseus is recognised by his faithful dog. With his last breath the poor animal greets his master, wags his tail, and dies.

All Nature lives in these poems—the changing moods of the sea in storm and in sunshine; the fire that roars through the forest; the lightning that shatters the strongest oak into fragments; the leaves of the forest which put forth and grow and fall before the wind, as races of men increase and wither and disappear in the storm of life; the cranes that fly through the air in compact ranks; the lion with flaming eye and lashing tail; the bird which perishes of hunger that its unfledged young may eat—all this lives in the pages of Homer. The character of the human race, at a time when the individual is as yet unborn and only the class exists, is drawn with the most affecting simplicity. Here are those great, restful outlines which move us so deeply in the works of the Italian masters. Whether it be a knightly combat, undertaken in a spirit of chivalric daring, or the quiet, domestic life of the housewife that is represented, the imagination is free to wander whithersoever it will, and movements and actions are deprived of none of their natural and living charm.

In those parts of the Iliad which had their origin in Æolia, Achilles, the greatest of the heroes, is represented as the em-

bodiment of impetuous strength, a composite figure that, in truth, portrays all the unrestrained emotional changes of an uncivilised people. The art of writing was still regarded as a kind of evil enchantment, to be mastered only by the few. Not until later, when the legend of Odysseus, the Odyssey, was developed, does the conception of a cultured society, the Phæacians, arise, a community of harmoniously developed, serene, almost ideal beings, where woman, like man, is allowed to attain to complete intellectual development. In Odysseus, the archetype of sagacity, skilled in handicraft, in music,

Greek Ideal of the Free and Perfect Man


and gymnastics, a man who excels all minstrels in harmony, and all masters in artistic narration, in whom there is a union of calm lucidity and quiet renunciation, the Greek spirit had already created the lofty conception of the free and perfect man. In later times philosophy developed this ideal in masterly fashion. The problem of right living and the careful development of personality, in other words, the relation of the individual to the race, has never been more wisely treated than by the Greek philosophers.

The degree of civilisation attained is clearly reflected in the various sections of the epics. An entirely different world meets us in the oldest poems, which treat of "The Wrath of Achilles" (a portion of the Iliad), in all probability products of the tenth century, from that pictured in the Telemachiad (a portion of the Odyssey), which came into being perhaps as late as the seventh century. The finest portions of the Odyssey belong to the eighth century B.C. Tradition, religious myths, and stories that read like fairy-tales are ming'ed together in ever-varying form.

The age that is described to us in the



THE CHIEF OF THE GREEK GODS
Zeus, father of the gods, under whose care and protection the Homeric monarch ruled and from whom his power was derived.



THE GLORIFICATION OF THE FATHER OF POETRY BY THE ANCIENT WORLD

In the beginnings of poetry, after speech became rhythmic and songs were passed from mouth to mouth, a poet caste came into being, largely drawn from the blind, among whom the early simple compositions dealing with the wrath of Achilles developed into vast heroic epics celebrating the glory of entire races. Whether these older forms were edited into the two great epics of the Iliad and the Odyssey or were the sources from which one master mind drew his glorious inspiration remains an open question. From a sculpture attributed to Archælaus of Priene found in the Appian Way.

Homeric poems is no longer affected by the pomp and display of the Mycenæans. The towering fortresses with their Cyclopean rocks have yielded to smooth walls of brick and earthen embankments with wooden bulwarks. The interior arrangements of palaces have become greatly simplified, and of the intricate network

Homeric Age of Simplicity of courts and corridors, ante-chambers and halls, only the most necessary parts remain in the homes of Homeric kings.

The walls are no longer covered with bright paintings, but with a simple coating of lime; the gaily decorated plaster floors, too, have disappeared, and their place has been taken by floors of smooth-beaten clay. Instead of burying the dead in enormous domed sepulchres—in the latest tombs the use of masks for the dead had gradually been given up—men hoped by burning the body to banish the spirit for ever. Simple graves conceal the ashes of Homeric heroes.

The despotic kingship, which plays a prominent part in the older portions of the Homeric poems, gradually declines in power, and disappears as the strength of the nobility increases. To be sure, the Homeric ruler is always a powerful, hereditary monarch, whose power came from Zeus, father of the gods, under whose care and protection he stood. But advisers were always by the side of the king, and upon their decisions great weight was laid. The council of nobles became stronger with time; the upper classes were differentiated from the masses. The former were distinguished from the latter by the fact that, after chariots fell into disuse, they fought on horseback. The connection between large estates, aristocratic government, and knight service, is ever inseparable. In the Homeric poems the power of the nobility becomes more and more evident, until, finally, the king appears as only the first among his peers, who, like

Decrease of the Kingly Power him, levy tribute, meet in council at their own initiative, and invite the king to attend.

The council seems constantly to have increased in power until it finally put aside all prerogatives of the sovereign, leaving him only his name and his office of high priest. To perform the real duties of kingship, a number of high officials were chosen. Thus the Oriental influence constantly decreased, and, naturally, the more representative rule of the

nobility was less despotic. In spite of this, however, it would be a great mistake to look upon the Homeric Age—the age in which the germ of elevated intellectual life first began to develop—as one in which the genuine Greek spirit was nationally personified. Oriental influence still played the chief part.


Were we to reproduce that charming scene from the Iliad of Helen and the old men at the gate after the model of the Age of Pericles, we should absolutely destroy the picture that appeared before the mind of the poet. As the poet must have pictured it, Priam and the aged Trojans were dressed in close-fitting garments that extended to their feet; the folds were stiff; there was nothing loose or flowing; the red cloaks fitted smoothly over the under-garments, and were in part richly decorated in bright colours. Even Helen would have resembled a Greek woman but little. According to the poet, she would have been dressed in a tight-fitting, gay-coloured, intricately-patterned robe, fastened by clasps and by a girdle, adorned with tassels and knots, according

A Woman's Dress in the Homeric Age of Greece to the Oriental fashion. Her arms were free; the peplos, or mantle, was looser than in Mycenaean costume, covering a greater portion of the body, as more adapted to the climate of the Ægean Sea. The veil used in the Orient to conceal the countenance hung down over both cheeks; a cloth worn with a hood, and fastened in front by a glistening diadem, covered the far-famed head.


Religion attained to an extraordinary development during the Homeric Age. In the epics the gods were endowed with human qualities, and were supposed to have endured all the hardships and trials of humanity. The entire pantheon of later times was popularised through the epics. The Homeric minstrels made a place for even the various tutelary deities of cities in their poems, and thus contributed to the formation of the Greek mythology. Demi-gods also came into being through the epics, as a result of the poetical custom of conferring the highest rewards on heroes after death, and allowing them to approach the rank of deities. The gods were worshipped by means of altars under the open sky or in temples set aside for the purpose, and they were represented in the form of men—a great advance on the fetichism of earlier times.

“THE GLORY THAT WAS GREECE”


ILLUSTRATED IN A SERIES OF REMARKABLE RECONSTRUCTIONS OF HER MOST FAMOUS MONUMENTS




THE GREAT IVORY AND GOLD STATUE OF ATHENA IN THE PARTHENON




EXTERIOR OF THE PARTHENON AT ATHENS IN THE TIME OF ITS BUILDERS




INTERIOR OF THE SPLENDID TEMPLE OF ZEUS IN OLYMPIA




THE ERECHTHEION, A FAMOUS TEMPLE AT ATHENS TO THE HERO ERECTHEIOS




* AN EARLY DORIC TEMPLE: THE SANCTUARY OF POSEIDON AT PÆSTUM




THE SACRED ENCLOSURE AT OLYMPIA THE GREAT RELIGIOUS AND ATHLETIC CENTRE OF ANCIENT GREECE




RESTORATION OF THE ARCHITECTURE OF ATHENS, SHOWING THE CITY AT THE HEIGHT OF ITS GLORY




THE TEMPLE OF DEMETER, THE FAMOUS SANCTUARY OF THE SACRED MYSTERIES OF ELEUSIS



THE CENTRE OF GREEK DRAMA: THE THEATRE OF DIONYSUS AT ATHENS, WHERE THE GREAT TRAGEDIES WERE FIRST PERFORMED



THE ENTRANCE TO A NOBLEMAN'S HOUSE IN ATHENS



INTERIOR COURT OF A GREEK HOUSE WITH A STATUE OF THE GODDESS HESTIA



GREEK STATES IN THE MAKING THE POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT OF HELLAS

SOcial conditions led to a second migration of the Greek races, which took place at the time the later epics were written, from the middle of the eighth to the middle of the seventh century B.C.

A rapid increase of population gave rise to emigration. Political dissatisfaction occasioned a centrifugal movement, and a surplus of energy led to new enterprises. Religious feeling consecrated the new settlements, and even before the habitations of the new town, located and planned under divine guidance, were built, the altar to Apollo was erected. Thus, the colonies of the Greeks—whether on the rivers that water the Russian steppes, or on the coasts of Africa, on the lava-covered slopes of Ætna, or on the fruitful plains of Southern France—remained parts of one people, honouring the same gods, speaking the same language, and applauding the same poets; the Athenian, far away in

Overseas Spread of the Greeks

Italy, among the Etruscans, felt himself to be one with his countryman who had been born and brought up in Cumæ. Thus, the necessity arose for designating all the members of the race by one name. The word Hellene was taken from the small tribe that Achilles had governed in Thessaly, whose name went back to the time of their halt at the Gulf of Janina. In the fifth century B.C. this term was applied to the entire Grecian people. The name Greek, or Graeci, on the other hand, a latinisation of the tribal name of the Graei, who dwelt on the Euripus, and who once lived in the north-west, was first introduced into Greece from Italy during the days of Aristotle, as shown by the Latin termination.

Miletus, Corinth, Megara, Chalcis and Eretria took the lead in the great movement. Miletus became queen of the sea, the mother of more than eighty city colonies. The entrance and the coasts of the Black Sea, Sicily and the southern

part of Italy were all colonised. And as the Ægean Sea formerly, so now the Mediterranean, became an inland sea of Greece through the activity of this enterprising age. All these colonies flourished, whether they were trade depots, like the

An Age of Colonial Prosperity

towns on the Black Sea, or agricultural settlements, as in Sicily and Southern Italy, or centres for cattle-breeding, as in Cyrene. In colonies there is a beneficial union of economic conditions seldom found together elsewhere. In lower stages of civilisation we find a superabundance of land, but a great lack of labour and capital. In higher stages the opposite is true. But when highly developed races settle down on virgin soil all three necessary conditions are present. The immigrants bring with them capital, and occupy the land; the original inhabitants of the country supply the labour. Hence comes the wealth of all city colonies.

According to Thucydides, the Chians were the richest of the Hellenes. The inhabitants of Cyrene were envied because of their "costly rings," worn by everybody; and it was said of the inhabitants of Agrigentum that they built as if they hoped to live for ever, and dined as if they expected to die the next day. A modern parallel, that may give some idea of the financial prosperity of the colonies of Greece, is the development of North America, where, with an increase of thirty-three per cent. in population in ten years, there was an increase of eighty-two per cent. in the quantity of specie. Even bodily stature

Growth of Colonial Independence

and strength become greater, as shown by the giants of West Virginia, for example, compared with the dwarfed inhabitants of Southern Italy to-day. To be sure, the strength and freedom of thriving colonies do not always find the most agreeable forms of expression. Colonies are conscious that the basis of their power lies only in themselves; and enthusiasm

for the mother country, historical gratitude, as it were, is known as little to America as it was to the Greeks of Sicily, who regarded the mother country with contempt, conscious of their own superiority in the useful arts. The insolence of the Sicilian Greeks was almost incredible; they wrote parodies on the poetical masterpieces of the mother country. It is characteristic that after the first sea-fight of the Greeks, when Corcyra broke loose from Corinth, a description of which event has come down to us in the shape of a very primitive chronicle, the daughter town entirely ceased to fulfil any of the so-called duties of piety to the mother town. What Turgot said to Louis XVI. applies to the history of the colonies of Greece and to the gratitude they showed towards their founders: "Les colonies sont comme les fruits qui ne tiennent à l'arbre que jusqu'à leur maturité; devenues suffisantes à elles-mêmes, elles feront ce que fit depuis Carthage, ce que fera un jour l'Amérique."

"Colonies are like fruit, which cling to the tree only until their maturity; once become self-sufficient, they do what Carthage once did, what America some day will do."

Owing to the process of colonisation which began in the eighth century, the agricultural inhabitants of Greece developed into a trading and manufacturing race. In earlier times manufacture had supplied only local necessities; and not very long before, the importation of



Underwood
RUINS ON THE SITE OF ANCIENT CORINTH
 Remains of a temple of old Corinth, one of the oldest Doric structures of Greece. Modern Corinth is about four miles distant.

goods from the East had been general. Now, however, the colonists in distant countries had even a greater need for weapons and other metal implements, for woven materials and pottery, than the Greeks who stayed at home. The barbarians of the inland regions had been made acquainted with such products and had grown accustomed to their use.

Thus, an increase in commerce led to a heightened activity in manufacturing. The Greeks of the colonies soon needed new and trained labour, and this was supplied from without. Slave labour began to a great extent in Chios, and increased with such rapidity that finally some states found it necessary to legislate against it. As early as the time of the Odyssey we hear of iron being exported; the manufacture of metals was carried on



MILETUS, QUEEN OF THE SEA IN ANCIENT GREECE
 In the great colonising movement which began in Greece in the eighth century B.C. Miletus took the lead and became queen of the sea, the mother of eighty city colonies.

in the mother country at Chalcis and Corinth, and cloth-weaving at Megara. Pottery was made at Corinth and at Athens, where a potters' quarter was established. The resources of the East were exploited. Greek commerce became dominant in the north-east of Spain, in Egypt, and on the Adriatic and Black Seas, in spite of the

Dominance of Greek Commerce

fact that Greek ships were still of the old fifty-oared type, and that mariners were so exceedingly cautious as to suspend all traffic during the winter months. Only such cities as were able to carry on trade came to the front. Towns in the interior lost their prosperity. Suburbs, in which all sorts of trades were carried on, arose everywhere about the seaports, the original town often being transformed into a citadel. In this way the great cities, great according to the ideas of the time—we must remember that we are speaking of the very beginnings of Greek history—such as Miletus, Corinth, and Sybaris, grew until their populations numbered from 20,000 to 25,000. Everywhere the country was tranquil; peaceful occupations were the rule, and men of various countries were

appointed in towns to act as hosts and protectors to strangers of their own nation. It is true that the Greeks did not give up piracy so readily, for this was carried on vigorously until the middle of the fifth century.

The Babylonian system of weights was adopted, with some alterations, 1 talent equalling 50 shekels, or 100 half shekels or drachmas. And, as in earlier times cattle and metal had been used as a medium of exchange, men now employed uncoined bars of iron or copper in trade. These rods of iron were called *obeloi* (spears); and six, the number that could be grasped in the hand at once, were equal to one drachma. The actual striking of standard coins arose first in Lydia [see page 1799] and afterwards in Phocia. An alloy of gold and silver—*electrum*—was coined in the early

days, and, later, gold. From this time on, the ratio of gold to silver, 1 to 15½, continued constant. Two standards of value were in use in Greece, that of Ægina and that of Eubœa. The western countries did not as yet require minted coins, for they had not passed beyond the stage of barter. Field labourers were still paid in products of the soil.

It was with difficulty that agriculture maintained its place as an industry during this total revolution of economic conditions. The small farmers of Southern Greece were unable to compete, products flowing in from the wonderfully fertile regions of Southern Russia. The greater number of farms in Greece were divided upon the owner's death among his sons, degenerating into mere kitchen-gardens, and becoming so heavily burdened with debts that 18 per cent. was looked upon as a low rate of interest. Piles of rocks,

showing the amount of the mortgage, rose about the land like gravestones of prosperity. In the meanwhile, however, a change of the utmost importance for the Greeks had come about. In some regions—we are not positive in which, but, at




ARGUS BUILDING THE ARGOS

In the expansion of culture in Greece following the introduction of writing the intellectual horizon was greatly broadened, the extended range of the legend of the Argonauts being an indication of this change.

any rate, in several places at the same time—the Phœnician-Syrian alphabet was adapted to the Greek language. The Semitic alphabet, owing to its method of designating consonants only, was syllabic; and thus, although much more convenient than the primitive Cretan hieroglyphic, or picture, writing, was still very imperfect. The Greeks, however, introduced improvements, changing the Semitic aspirates to the vowels *a, e, i, o*, and creating a new sign for *y*, so that there were now twenty-three symbols, or letters. In later times the Greek alphabet developed into the most varied forms, and not until the fifth century did it become uniform, through the general adoption of the Ionian letters.

The enormous transformation brought about in the intellectual life of Greece through the introduction of writing found



WHERE THE GREEKS FIRST LEARNED TO STRIVE FOR AN IDEAL: THE NATIONAL GAMES AT OLYMPIA
In the contests of the famous games at Olympia, for the wreath of olive, the Greeks learned to strive for the ideal "that possession was nothing, meritorious acquisition everything."

expression, first of all, in matters pertaining to legislation. The day of the Homeric nobility, when writing was unknown, was gone forever, and with it had disappeared to a great extent the conception of unequal rights and privileges. Written law protected all citizens alike. The old tribal organisation had become too

Effect of the Written Law

weak to protect the members of the tribe, and there was need of a power to watch directly over the safety of the individual. Thus the age of individualism in this case coincided with the expansion of governmental power. It is quite evident that the city colonies were as advanced in their development in this respect as was the mother country, for the fact that, together with Corinth and Thebes, Locri and Catana also appear among the cities which adopted a written law is no less well established than the backwardness of Sparta, where the introduction of any law other than traditional was resisted on principle. The new codes were compilations of old customs. In part they were strictly conservative; but they were also favourable to progress, and endeavoured to secure the results of previous development. The written law protected the lives and the property of all citizens, subjected the blood-feud at least to the regulations of the state, determined penalties, and sought to influence public morality by numerous commands and precepts.

The attempt to effect an improvement in the calendar is closely connected with the introduction of writing and the written law. Time was reckoned according to periods of eight years (*octaeteris*), divided into five years of twelve months each, equal to 354 days, and three years of thirteen months each, equal to 384 days, so that the count became wrong by one month at the end of every 160 years.

Intellectual Horizon Broadened

Finally, the century had the effect of broadening the intellectual horizon of the Greeks. This can be seen from the legend of the Argonauts, which was born of Milesian discoveries in the Black Sea region, and from the removal of the gates of Hades from the western coast of the Peloponnesus, which had sufficed for the narrower views of earlier times, to the extreme end of the greater Syrtis, and later to Iberia, the Islands of the Blest lying somewhere beyond in Oceanus.



Underwood


RUINS OF THE TEMPLE OF ZEUS AT OLYMPIA
This great temple abounded in statues of ivory and gold.

From the extreme north-east of the Greek sphere of civilisation, from the city of Olbia, which lay among salt lakes and swamps, knowledge finally came to the Greeks of the ancient caravan road that led to Central Asia. This road ran from the mouth of the Danube, near the swamps of the Bielosero, through the wooded plains of Kama to the Thyssagate—perhaps the Tschussawaia of modern times—crossing the Ural Mountains between Nisse, Tagilsk, and Ekaterinburg. Thence it dropped into the region between the Irtish and the Obi, where the Iruks, the ancestors of the Magyars, dwelt; following the Irtish, past



Underwood

RELIGIOUS CENTRE OF ANCIENT GREECE
All that remains to-day of the sacred precincts at Olympia.



Underwood

WHERE GREEK POETS WERE INSPIRED
Remains of ancient fountain at Delphi, sacred to the Muses.

the Semipalatinsk of to-day, and ending on the other side of the Aitai. At that early time information had already come to the Greeks of the Turkish races, the Arimaspi, or Huns, as well as of the Chinese, as is shown by Aristeas, the author of the epic of the Arimaspi.

The Greek community had developed in a surprisingly short time from a feudal into a manufacturing and trading state. The kingship lost its leading position in the greater number of towns, and a powerful nobility had been evolved, whose strength in time of peace consisted in great landed possessions, and in time of

war in military service. But the course of development pressed onwards irresistibly without stop or stay. With the rise of trade and manufacture and the creation of an enormous sphere of commerce through the agency of the colonial centres, with the introduction of new intellectual ideals and standards through the art of writing, and of new material values through a minted coinage, a new and flourishing town population, rich in personal property and spurred on to activity by a full knowledge of the world, arose in place of the old inhabitants, divided into tribe and clan. Personal property won an important position in the Greek state.

Greece, with the exception of some of the mountain stocks of Ætoliens and Acarnanians, passed at one step from the obscurity of her mediæval age into the clear light of history. Instead of landed property or cattle and metal bars, the ancient mediums of exchange, money became the measure of wealth, and by destroying ancient restrictions and creating new lines of action, furthered the growth of states. The spirit of economic activity, which had arisen on all sides, supplying work for thousands of hands, had one great effect in knitting men closely together. The necessity of co-operation, of finding helpers among one's fellow-beings, brought with it the need for joining still closer together those who already possessed common ties of family, language, and environment, and a common past. The city, which by reason of its vast influence, drew all the forces of the country to itself, assumed the position of leader; and towns, which, owing to their favourable situation for commerce, promised greater comfort in life to the dwellers in the country, increased in size and in prosperity to a far greater degree than their less favoured neighbours. Countries became more or less closely knit together internally, according to the degree of pre-eminence enjoyed by the chief centre. The impulse towards union was felt far beyond the confines of the district or canton.

A flood of religious conceptions, preserved from time immemorial, lent its aid to the general movement towards consolidation. To pray to the gods in common, in the same manner as fathers and forefathers had worshipped together, to consult the oracles, not only in reference to political matters, but also for the



Underwood

RUINS OF ANCIENT DELPHI
A view of the theatre and the famous temple of the oracle.

ordinary purposes of daily life, such as to discover a thief or to find out whether or not a journey should be undertaken—these were customs absolutely necessary to the Greek character. About the oracles and centres of cults new communities ever tended to grow up. The ancient religious centre, Olympia, in the country

of Elis, had long played a prominent part in the gradual drawing together of all Greeks, of the mainland, of the islands, and of the west. In a quiet valley, far removed from the world, where the Alpheus, the tributary of the Cladeus, and the pine-clad hills formed a natural amphitheatre, the people of Greece, united in the exercise of body and of mind, learned that "possession was nothing, and meritorious acquisition everything." The Greek people, whose foremost representatives competed here for the wreath of olive, and, returning victors to their homes, received extraordinary honours, here learned to strive towards an ideal. Weapons were at rest throughout the whole of Greece when the games began, and the peace of the gods accompanied the pilgrims to Olympia. A common method of reckoning time, according to Olympiads, beginning with the year 776, was adopted. To be a competitor in the games it was necessary to be a pure-blooded Greek and a descendant of freemen. Moreover, it was taken for granted that no blood-feud, guilt of sacrilege, or the crime of refusing to fight for his country, rested upon a man who entered the lists. The contests were in leaping, throwing the discus, spear-casting, running (600 Olympic feet equal 210 yards) and wrestling; and in the chariot races (2·79 miles) an idea could be obtained of the progress of Greek horse-breeding.

During this period the art of sculpture advanced rapidly; and, instead of the rude, wooden figures of gods, familiar to us from the designs stamped on coins, images were made in bronze, and sculptors sought to obtain a true likeness in their statues of the victors in the Olympic games. The Heræum and the temple of Zeus Olympus abounded in statues of ivory and gold; and the treasure-houses of Byzantium, Sybaris, Cyrene, Selinus, Megara and Metapontum prove the close connection of all the regions of Greece with Olympia.

Beginnings of Sculpture


Delphi, the ancient seat of the oracle of Apollo and centre of the Amphictyonic League, was the most important of all the towns of Central Greece. Through the medium of the Amphictyonic League, international laws were introduced, thereby rendering war less cruel. The water supply of besieged cities, for instance, was not to be cut off, and no town, being a member of the league, was ever to be destroyed. Soon roads were built, leading to the mountain valley, far from the bustle of the world, from which as a centre the influence of the priests of Apollo went out over the whole of Greece through their oracle. It was in the sixth century that competitions in poetical composition and improvisation were introduced at the autumn meetings of the Amphictyony.

Centres of local interest sprang up on the isthmus of Corinth, in Nemea, and in Delos, where the inhabitants of the countryside united at the festivals, fairs, and games in honour of Poseidon, Zeus, and Apollo; and here, too, various competitions were introduced.

The feeling of the unity of all Greeks was furthered by common rites of worship, common aims, and common customs. At the same time, however, the different states increased in strength; and among them two were especially distinguished as being the most perfect embodiments of the Doric and Ionian races: the military state of Sparta and the commonwealth of Athens.

The Doric race developed its peculiar form of state in the valley of the Eurotas, beneath the snow-caps of the Taygetus Mountains. Its character might be found expressed in the athletic competitions at the various festivals, the development of bodily strength and of will power. Whoever examines philosophically the form of the Spartan state as an aristocratic and despotic oligarchy imposed upon a conquered population of different race—the various gradations of the people remind one of the various relations of the population of England according to the Domesday Book—will at once recognise that it was the result of years of steady development; that it could not have been the outcome of that single lawgiver, the mythical Lycurgus, to whom it was attributed by tradition.

The unique characteristic of the Spartan polity was the dual kingship, which



THE ANCIENTS AND THE SECRETS OF THE GODS: CONSULTING THE ORACLE. In all ages man has demanded of the future its secrets, the most famous of the ancient oracles being that of Delphi. Reduced, by permission, from a painting by J. W. Waterhouse, R.A.

suggests the dual consulship of Rome, doubtless originally a device to render despotism more difficult of achievement.

The kings were the high priests of the nation and the supreme commanders of the army. The ephors, who had the power of summoning even the king before their tribunal, stood as the embodiment

The Dual Kings of Sparta

of the people of Sparta, the ruling clan of the Spartiatae. The council of the elders (*gerusia*), consisting of twenty-eight citizens of sixty years and over but including the kings, wrested the supreme judicial power from the ephors. In the Apella the free Spartans had the privilege of voting for councillors, ephors, and other functionaries, as well as of deciding political questions, such as alliances, declarations of war, and negotiations for peace.

The land was probably at first portioned out into equal lots; but in historical times it was divided among such citizens as were possessed of full rights, the Spartiatae, who dined in common, each furnishing a certain fixed contribution. This practice was entitled *syssitia*. In case of any member being unable to supply his quota, he was thrust out of the circle, and reduced to the rank of a man possessed of fewer political privileges. The pre-Doric towns, which had been peaceably won, were inhabited by *perioeci*, or small farmers, who paid tribute and rendered service in war. The conquered in battle became state slaves (*helots*), whose task was to cultivate the land of their masters. The Spartan education, which began so early and was devoted to producing a harsh, inflexible character, supported by the custom of dining in common, completely destroyed all possibility of family life. Men were wont to forget even their own parentage. But this disciplinary education meant everything to the Spartans. The diffusion of the Spartans over the fertile plain of

Destruction of Spartan Family Life Messenia and the subjection of the pre-Doric population was a result of the two Messenian wars, of which the poet

Tyrtæus, who himself played an important part in the Spartan development by means of his spirited battle-songs, composed during the second war, furnishes the best description. Owing to the spread of her power over the southern part of the peninsula Sparta drew other states within her sphere of influence, and with the assistance


of Corinth and Sicyon formed the Peloponnesian League, the fame of which—owing to the fact that two-thirds of the allied forces were placed at the disposal of Sparta, and to the splendid training of the warriors of that state, which assumed the leadership with unlimited power—penetrated as far as Asia, and procured an alliance with Croesus, king of Lydia. Even an unfortunate campaign against Polycrates of Samos had but little effect on the renown of the Spartan people in battle; and the results of the Persian wars only proved what a tremendous advantage Sparta possessed over Athens—at least, as a military state.

The Ionians were characterised by remarkable versatility and the capacity of developing all their intellectual powers, thus standing in strong contrast to the Spartans, with their one-sided development of muscular power and of will alone. As Odysseus was to Heracles—the hero of the happy and serene mind and most varied of talents to the man of gigantic physical strength and iron will, who took all possible labours upon his own shoulders—so were the Ionians to the Dorians, ex-

Versatility of the Ionians

cepting only that the individual of the latter race first laboured for the benefit of the community, and only later in the interest of his own person. Athens was at first a tribal state under the rule of hereditary kings; later, the royal office was distributed among three “archons,” chosen every ten years. Finally, nine officials were elected each year—six *thesmothetæ*, in addition to the three already named—who, upon expiration of their term of office entered the state council, or Areopagus, which exercised the highest duties of supervision. Eligibility to office was restricted to members of the old tribes, who formed their own associations for worship, and upon whom during the very earliest times the right of ownership of the entire land of the state had devolved.

The first important alteration in the form of the original tribal state took place, perhaps, in the seventh century—the exact date is uncertain—and was occasioned by financial and maritime considerations. Those propertied families, or tribes, which were not noble, although they had their own associations for worship, were now to all intents and purposes recognised as belonging to the nobility, and were united with the old aristocratic tribes



THE SOURCE OF SPARTA'S MILITARY POWER: THE DROMOS, OR RACECOURSE, AND GYMNASIA

The great expansion of Spartan power was largely attained by the disciplinary education of the Spartan youth, which, though it destroyed the possibility of family life, so that men were wont to forget even their own parentage, produced the harsh and inflexible character of the splendidly trained warrior to whom the military supremacy of Sparta was due.

in forty-eight revenue districts, called *naucrarix* (from *naus*, a ship), on account of their maritime importance. Among these districts, the 360 tribes—divided, respectively, into four phylæ of three phratræ each—were distributed, eight tribes to each of twenty-four districts and seven tribes to each of the other twenty-

**Reforming
the Greek
Government**

four. In the distribution of tribes, the original homes of the various families were taken into consideration. The extreme wing of the old nobility endeavoured to prevent this breach in the ancient form of government, and, under the leadership of Cylon, rebelled, assisted by Megara, but without success.

The introduction of written law in the codification of the old traditional penal regulations by Draco indicated a further step in development. It is said that Draco, in addition to being a law-giver, was also a political reformer; he determined that political rights should be extended to all men who were able to produce a complete equipment for war, while the possession of a certain definite income was necessary in order that a citizen might be eligible to hold office. The account of Draco's reforms has come down to us from partisans of the oligarchy who lived in the fifth century, and thus may, indeed, have been invented at that time.

The adoption of a financial system during the seventh century, and the attendant transformation of economic conditions, caused a great disturbance in domestic affairs. It occasioned much dissatisfaction among the smaller landholders of Attica. The poor were the debtors of the rich, and cultivated their land almost entirely for the benefit of the wealthier classes; the yield of the greater part of the land belonging to the *hectemori*—so called on account of their being permitted to keep but a sixth part of the harvest for themselves—fell into the hands of creditors.

**A Land
of Hopeless
Debtors**

"Many a man, having lost all hope, fled from his creditors, and wandered far away, from land to land," said Solon; and others were sold as debtors "into foreign servitude."

Solon, the first really clear-cut personality of Athenian history, was elected to the office of arbiter and archon in 594, and endeavoured to remedy the evil. From him emanated a truly refreshing breath of idealism; his elegies—addresses to the


people in verse—show him to have had a luminous practical mind, and to have been aware of the needs of all classes: "Never have I allowed injustice to win the day."

The *seisachtheia*, emancipation from burdens, a sort of "encumbered estates act," freed debtors from the necessity of supplying their creditors with produce from the mortgaged estates. Borrowing money on the security of one's person was forbidden; and as this law brought with it the impossibility of any further borrowing, it is probable that Solon must have abrogated the law of tribal rights in property, and have made land the transferable possession of the individual. A limit was set to the quantity of ground that could be owned by any one man, in order to prevent the bulk of the property from falling into the hands of a few large owners. The enormous prices to which foodstuffs had arisen, owing to their free exportation—oil alone excepted—were reduced through a general law forbidding the exportation of food products; and, through the adoption of the Eubæan system of coinage, weights and measures, relations were established with the great

**Solon's
Great
Reforms**

commercial powers, Chalcis and Eretria. Political rights were divided proportionately among four classes, according to their incomes—500, 300, 200 measures of grain and less—and thus the classes of society were made up of wealthy men, leaders in politics or war, small landowners, and labourers. From the first class the highest state officials, archons and treasurers, were chosen; the fourth class was excluded from all office, but formed part of the popular assembly and the courts. The three upper classes were drawn upon for the heavy-armed soldiers; the fourth class composed the light infantry and also furnished the seamen. The council of the Four Hundred, to which citizens of the three upper classes were elected, was subordinate to the Areopagus, which now acted as the official censor and protector of the constitution. The privilege of appeal from the decision of any magistrate to the popular tribunals tended to increase the rights of the people. Officials were chosen by lot from a list of candidates.

In spite of its good intentions, the body of laws instituted by Solon was unsatisfactory to the various classes—to the inhabitants of the coasts (*paralii*), who,



THE MATCHLESS ORNAMENTED POTTERY OF ANCIENT GREECE

The period of the consolidation of the Hellenic states was marked by great intellectual activity, and Athenian commerce, especially the trade in the matchless ornamented pottery of which some beautiful examples are given, prospered as never before. The earliest examples (1 and 9) were made in the 7th century B.C. The three beautiful amphoræ (3, 4 and 5) were made about 650 B.C., as were also the fine wine-bowl (8) and the water-jar (7). The situla from Daphnæ (6) was made about 620 B.C., and the vase from Cameiros (2) about 500 B.C.

for the greater part, were members of the middle class and possessed the largest industrial interests, to the landowners of the plains (*pediaci*), who were not prepared to support measures designed for the amelioration of the position of the lower classes, and, to the radically inclined mountain dwellers (*diacrii*), who pursued all sorts of miscellaneous callings.

It was owing chiefly to the support of the *diacrii* that Pisistratus was enabled to found his tyranny, which, twice interrupted, in 536 and 527 B.C., continued after the second date undisturbed until his death. Improvement in the administration of justice, internal colonisation, the establishment of external relations with Thessaly and Naxos, and a personal supervision of affairs, characterised the rule of Pisistratus. It must be remembered that the words Tyranny and Tyrant, in the Greek, refer to all forms of monarchy established by unconstitutional methods, and buttressed by mercenary forces. The period was marked by great intellectual and economic activity, by the unification of the inhabitants through a gradual reconciliation of class differences, and by an outburst of profound religious thought. Temples and aqueducts were built in Athens and Eleusis. Now for the first time solemn


processions, in which representatives from Athenians dwelling in foreign countries—later, of all the citizen colonies—participated, ascended the acropolis in honour of Athena, and celebrated the pan-Athenian festival. A religious state, almost, arose from the national religion.

It was characteristic of the wise rule of Pisistratus that both the rural cult of Dionysus and the performance of tragedies, which were linked with it, were furthered and promoted. Athenian commerce, and especially the trade in the matchless ornamented pottery produced by Athenian masters, prospered as never before; and, together with external splendour, there came about a great refinement in character.

Not without the assistance of the followers of Pisistratus was the worship of Orpheus carried on, and directly by their aid the Eleusinian cult of Demeter was raised to one of the most ardently cherished religions of the state.

Of the two sons of Pisistratus, one was murdered, and the other finally had to yield to the Alcæonidæ, a family that had been banished to Sparta, and had there won the favour of the priests of the oracle at Delphi. The troubles that followed were ended by Clisthenes, who, as representative of the people, enabled Athens to take the greatest step yet attempted on the road towards a complete commonwealth. The tribal state of Athens was transformed into the Attic democracy.

The whole country was divided up into *demes*, or townships, varying in population, each governed by its own demarch, who watched over the office-holders of his deme, and whose duty it was to convoke the assemblies of the citizens of the district. Every deme chose its own candidates for the council; and their number corresponded to the number of inhabitants, an entirely modern idea. The candidates were elected by lot. All demes of the coast, as well as the demes of the interior, and the city of Athens and its surroundings,



TYRTÆUS, A SPARTAN POET

The best description of the Messenian wars of Sparta is furnished by the spirited battle-songs of the poet Tyrtæus, who was also a warrior.

were united into ten districts (*trittyes*). Every district of the coast was joined to a district of the interior and to one of the city, thus forming a *phylæ*, with the result that the ten newly created *phylæ* were not made up by the union of noble families, as had formerly been the case, but constituted mere electoral districts, and became the foundation of the new territorial military system, according to which each of the ten *phylæ* was pledged to supply a regiment of foot and a squadron of horse.

At the head of the Athenian state stood the Council of Five Hundred, elected by the tribes, and entrusted with the duty of considering in advance all measures to be

THE POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT OF HELLAS

laid before the popular assembly. The Five Hundred succeeded in narrowing the sphere of activity of the archons, in the same manner as the Roman senate later restricted the authority of the consuls. The minor affairs of the Council were administered by a committee of fifty, the *prytany*, and the rotation of these committees, ten in number, led to the adoption of a new calendar, by which the year of three hundred and sixty days was divided into ten prytanies of thirty-six days each (leap year, three hundred and ninety days). The preservation of the constitution was entrusted to the care of all citizens: for, by the institution known as "ostracism," any person deemed dangerous to the commonwealth might be banished from Athens for a period of ten years by popular vote. Athens vindicated its new constitution in two successful battles against Thebes and Chalcis.

A brazen quadriga, portions of whose pedestal we still possess, and the fetters of the Chalcidians, which Herodotus saw in the citadel at Athens, testify to that happy war, in which Athens, freed from all fear of her Peloponnesian enemies by the refusal of Corinth to join them, defeated the Bceotians, and after a second victory over the Chalcidians, divided the land of Chalcis among its poor citizens (the first *cleruchia*).

According to this military and economic institution of the cleruchia, individuals to whom land was granted retained their citizenship, but did not possess the right to transfer the newly acquired property. They were not permitted to rent out the land, but were obliged to cultivate it themselves. They did not have the right to coin money; and this, together with the fact that they sent sacrificial animals to the Athenian festivals, demonstrated their dependence upon the mother country. We still possess the fragmentary remains of a

popular decree respecting the despatch of cleruchs to Salamis. Their standing before the law was regulated by what became later the cleruchian canon.

Thus, in the sixth century B.C., Athens, proceeding in a very different manner from that adopted by Sparta, succeeded in utilising all the forces of the different classes of her population; and, by giving a broad foundation to her political system, ensured the utmost elasticity and endurance to her political and military life.

The work of civilisation, begun in the seventh century, was actively continued during the succeeding period of a hundred years. The striving after a moral ideal became general in the people; and their lives were influenced by the homely wisdom contained in the pregnant maxims of great men, "the Seven Sages," about whom tradition spun a circle of legends, just as it did about the heroes of the age. The idea that moral wrong is the foundation of misfortune became firmly fixed in the minds of men. Nowhere was the demand for purity in life more deeply grounded than in the teachings of Pythagoras, who founded his school in Crotona. There the youths of

the upper classes listened to the doctrine of the transmigration of souls as well as to the explanations of mathematical principles. They learned that sounds imperceptible to sense could be explained and measured by means of the relations of numbers; and thus, finally, according to this primitive philosophy, numbers came to be looked upon as the elementary principle of the world of sensation. It was already known that the earth, like the other heavenly bodies, was a globe, revolving about a central point, which—according to Pythagoras—was the invisible eternal fire. In contrast to the mathematical exactitude of the Pythagorean teachings stood



SOLON

A great law-maker and the first clearly-cut personality in Athenian history.



STESICHORUS AND ALCÆUS

Two great poets of the period of Hellenic intellectual expansion.



PYTHAGORAS

In whose teachings the demand for purity in life was most deeply grounded.

the doctrines of Xenophanes, who seems to have been a complete sceptic. He would admit only the *probability* of human knowledge, and with special emphasis denied the pantheon of the epic poets, accepting but one deity.

A multitude of new conceptions arose in the minds of this people, which ever endeavoured to fathom the secrets of the universe, and struggled on towards the discovery of universal laws.

The Ionians were especially distinguished as investigators and students; and, as a result of their fruitful activity, not only laid the foundations of philosophy, but made the beginnings of natural science and of the knowledge of different lands and races. By methods first employed in Babylonia, Thales was enabled to foretell the eclipse of May 25th, 585 B.C. Anaximander, by collecting and arranging statements made by seamen, traders, and colonists, endeavoured to construct the first map. He emphasised the contrast between the manifoldness of the world and the unity of the eternal infinite substance that lies at the base of all things.

Knowledge of human character was extended further and further. Passion and longing ring in the songs of Sappho and Alcæus, and, with increasing independence, poets ventured to tear



SAPPHO


The passion of whose songs extended the knowledge of human character in the early days of Greek intellectual development.

the old legends from their epic frames, working them up singly, in the full exercise of their own imagination, as did Stesichorus of Himera. The artistic genius of men was unweariedly employed, striving to free itself from Oriental tradition and from the old wooden technique. Powerful attempts at the delineation of facial expression and at the representation of muscular play were presented in the statue of Artemis in Ephesus, and also in the naked figures of youths — the so-called Apollo — of Tenea and Andros. Contemporary with this assertion of individuality, and with the escape from the

fetters of tradition and untrained observation, was the tendency towards the unity of all the Greek races. In worship, custom, language, writing, poetry, and the plastic arts, the influences of the different tribes developed into a system of ramifications extending from country to country. The feeling of unity increased with knowledge of life. The moment came when it seemed that the danger of a great and common catastrophe to all the Hellenes might produce a united and consolidated Greek nation; but this was not to be. The wars with Persia, which was ever the enemy of Hellas, were the making of an Athenian empire, but not of a Hellenic state.



ARTEMIS OF EPHESUS



TENEA APOLLO

The artistic genius of the Greeks in the 7th and 6th centuries B.C. was unweariedly employed in freeing itself from Oriental tradition and the old wooden technique. Powerful attempts at the delineation of facial expression were presented in the statue of Artemis in Ephesus and the Apollo of Tenea.



THE ACROPOLIS OF ATHENS AS IT APPEARED DURING THE CITY'S GOLDEN AGE

Percles, Athens' greatest ruler, and Phidias, her greatest sculptor, raised the city to the zenith of its splendour, and made the Acropolis a mass of harmoniously arranged architecture. From the restoration by Richard Doyle



THE GOLDEN AGE OF ATHENS AND HER SPLENDOUR UNDER PERICLES

AT the close of the sixth century B.C. the Spartan oligarchy was universally recognised as the leading military power among the Greek states, while Athens had vindicated her own claim to stand foremost among the cities whose polity rested upon free institutions and popular government. In the meanwhile, events had been taking place in Asia which were leading up to the grand dramatic struggle between Orientalism and Occidentalism, of which the first act was to be the Persian wars. During the last fifty years of the century, Cyrus the Persian and his son Cambyses had not only overthrown and taken possession of the ancient empires of Babylonia and Egypt, but had also brought under their sway the Hellenic and kindred Phrygian states of Asia Minor. Such empires must expand by continuous conquest, or fall into a state of disruption. Darius occupied himself not only with the organisation of his huge domain, but also, a few years before the century closed, in an unsuccessful attempt to bring into subjection the Scythian tribes on the west of the Black Sea. In the normal course of events, it was certain that sooner or later a serious effort would be made to include European lands within Persian boundaries.

Sooner or later, then, the "great king" would assuredly have summoned Sparta, Athens, and the minor states to acknowledge his overlordship, and pay tribute. Submission would have meant the appointment of Persian satraps, and the disappearance of free institutions, even as Sparta understood freedom. The event was hastened first by the appeal of the Pisistratid Hippias for the recovery of the "tyranny" in Athens; secondly, by the revolt of the Ionic cities of Asia Minor, which ejected, or tried to eject, the rulers who found favour with the satrap, and to recover free institutions. In their revolt temporary assistance was lent by Athens,

which had already openly defied the Persian monarch; and Athenian troops were present when Sardis was seized and accidentally fired. The Ionic revolt was completely suppressed in the course of five years. Darius then found leisure to contemplate the subjection of Hellas. The first move was made by Mardonius, who took command of a great expedition, which collapsed disastrously, the fleet being shattered by tempests off Mount Athos, while the army was roughly handled by Thracian tribes. Then the king sent to the cities of Hellas to demand "earth and water," the tokens of submission. The demand was at first generally obeyed among the islands, but Athens and Sparta took the lead in rejecting it with ignominy. Then Darius resolved to crush their presumption; and a great invading force was despatched by sea to Attica, commanded by Datis and Artaphernes, who were assisted by the exiled Hippias. After the punishment of the recalcitrant Eretria in Eubœa, Athens was the avowed objective. The plain of Marathon, well adapted for manœuvring a large force, was selected for the landing.

First Act of the Persian War

The jealousies which never ceased to hamper any concerted action on the part of the Greek states came into full play. Sparta, in her own eyes and in those of the world at large, the head of them all, promised help, but would not move a man till the full moon. Others took their cue from Sparta. Yet there was one little city which staked all for the sake of Athens. On the field of Marathon, in 490 B.C., the Athenians were joined by the whole force of the Plateans, who shared with them the imperishable glory of their triumph, and won a glory of their own to boot—for they had nothing to gain and all to lose by plunging into the contest. Legends gathered about the story of that

The Athenian Triumph at Marathon

The Athenian Triumph at Marathon

which staked all for the sake of Athens. On the field of Marathon, in 490 B.C., the Athenians were joined by the whole force of the Plateans, who shared with them the imperishable glory of their triumph, and won a glory of their own to boot—for they had nothing to gain and all to lose by plunging into the contest. Legends gathered about the story of that

great fight. This much of fact is clear. On the day of battle the mail-clad Athenians charged across the plain against the more lightly armed Persians, in extended line, with their strength on the two wings. Their centre was forced back ; but

The Persian Rout

Persians in rout, and then enveloped the Persian centre. The rout became a *saue qui peut*.

The barbarians were cut down in numbers as they endeavoured to embark; even of their ships seven were destroyed. The shattered armament sailed away to Asia. Such a repulse could be only the prelude to a more terrific onslaught, which was duly organised, not by Darius, but by his son and successor, Xerxes. Something again of legendary mist gathers about this

with the fact that troops under British discipline have repeatedly shattered Oriental armies of ten times their numbers, though composed of excellent military material, the victory of the Hellenes passes out of the realm of the miraculous. But, before the fight was fought out, successful resistance must have seemed as nearly impossible as the establishment of the East India Company's supremacy in India before Plassey.

Shorn of the accessories attached to it by the religious imagination and by patriotic exaltation, the story stands beyond challenge as one of the most heroic on record ; and again it is Athens which claims the greatest measure of praise. This time, however, she did not stand alone. The mighty hosts of the "great king" were



THE PLAIN OF MARATHON, THE ATHENIAN FIELD OF TRIUMPH

After the shattering of the Persian fleet in 492 B.C., the first scene in the great struggle was the battle of Marathon, where Athens and Plataea won imperishable glory, repulsing the Persian host and shattering their armament.

story, as we have it in the prose epic of Herodotus. To Herodotus, Xerxes is the archetype of what the Greeks called *Hybris*, the supreme arrogance which forgets, ignores, or defies the justice of the gods ; which the gods visit with that blindness which prevents the insolent one from seeing that he is rushing headlong to his doom, the *nemesis* which awaits him.

Hence we may fairly discount the frantic folly which is attributed to Xerxes without derogating from the splendour of the Greek triumph. On the other hand, we must modify the millions affirmed to have shared the Persian march—if for no other reason, because no possible organisation could have managed the problem of the commissariat. Thus, familiar as we are

directed not only against her specifically, but against all Hellas ; the danger was common, and Sparta herself dared not stand aloof. By sea and land the invaders came, their thousand ships manned by Ionian and Phœnician sailors, the best mariners of the time, their motley hosts assembled from the vast regions where the "great king" ruled, and having at least a powerful nucleus in the warriors who had carried the Persian arms successfully over all Western Asia. In the meantime a development of singular importance had been taking place at Athens. Urged on by Themistocles, the Athenians had been devoting an extraordinary proportion of their revenue to the

Greek Joins Greek Against the Persians

the "great king" ruled, and having at least a powerful nucleus in the warriors who had carried the Persian arms successfully over all Western Asia. In the meantime a development of singular importance had been taking place at Athens. Urged on by Themistocles, the Athenians had been devoting an extraordinary proportion of their revenue to the



GENERAL VIEW OF ATHENS AND THE ACROPOLIS FROM THE SOUTH



RUINS OF THE PARTHENON, THE WORLD'S NOBLEST BUILDING



THE HILL OF THE CITADEL OF ANCIENT ATHENS FROM THE EAST

These photographs show what now remains of the glory of ancient Athens. The general view of the Acropolis, given at the top of the page, should be compared with the reconstruction facing page 2497. Note in this photograph the ruins of a great aqueduct. The ruins of the Parthenon, of which reconstructions are given on pages 2473 and 2474, are seen in the middle, and another view of the Acropolis at the bottom.

creation of a large and powerful fleet, and had realised that for them the way to ascendancy lay in naval expansion. Their seamanship was already of a high order. In spite of a conviction among the Peloponnesian states that they would be

**The Immortal
Defence of
Thermopylæ**

exempt from a naval attack, and could secure their own safety by making the isthmus of Corinth impregnable, it was recognised that some attempt must be made to protect the more northern territories. The first line of defence at the vale of Tempe was found to be untenable, after it had already been occupied; and a force was stationed at the pass of Thermopylæ, under the Spartan king, Leonidas.


Though some of the details of the current accounts are evidently incorrect, the main facts appear clear. Thermopylæ could be held by a small, well-armed force against enormous odds, unless it could be taken in the rear by a turning movement. The defenders themselves were at first unaware that such a movement was possible for a large force. When the fact became known, it was also clear that nothing could save the holders of the pass from destruction except the arrival of large reinforcements to secure the upper pass, or an immediate retreat. Leonidas dismissed a part of his force, but resolved himself to die at his post, with his three hundred Spartans, in whose immortal exploit the share of the seven hundred valiant Thespians, who fought at their side, is apt to be overlooked. As a strategic operation, Thermopylæ was as futile as the last fight of Richard Grenville on the Revenge, or the charge of Balaclava. But the moral effect for all time has been past all measuring.

Meanwhile the Greek fleet twice challenged the Persian armada off Artemisium, and both times had the better of the contest. But the news that Thermopylæ was lost meant in effect that all Northern Greece was at the mercy of the invaders, and the fleet fell back. Athens was doomed, but with her there was no thought of submission. The city became the fleet, and Themistocles persuaded the other

allied states of the wisdom of preparing for a decisive engagement by sea, with the forcible argument that otherwise the Athenians must regard themselves as abandoned, and would seek a new home over seas. The story runs that, confident of victory, the Athenian leader deliberately arranged that retreat should be cut off while the allies were still hesitating whether they should retire.

The result was the battle of Salamis, which annihilated the Persian fleet, and vindicated the Athenian naval theory precisely as the overthrow of the Spanish Armada, two thousand years afterwards, vindicated the identical English theory—that the battleship should be employed not as a floating fortress for soldiers,

but as an engine of war controlled by mariners. The effect was twofold. First, the morale of the Greeks was restored and raised to a far higher pitch than before; they were now filled with confidence of victory, and fought to win, while their adversaries were correspondingly demoralised. Secondly, the complete transference of the dominion of the seas to the Greeks left the bridge of boats over the Hellespont as the sole route of communication between the Persian host and its base in Asia, while the Persian army was in a hostile country which had suddenly recovered a lively hope of winning back its freedom. But the end was not yet.




MILTIADES

Who led the Athenian troops in the rout of the Persians at Marathon.

Xerxes retired with the bulk of his army, but he left behind him more than a quarter of a million picked troops under Mardonius to complete the subjugation of Hellas. With a force no longer unwieldy from sheer magnitude, and freed of encumbrance, the Persian leader was sanguine of success, and to attain it he was now ready to make extremely favourable terms with the state to which Greeks and barbarians alike now attributed the change which had come over the whole situation. Happily for the western world Athens rejected all overtures; she chose rather to let the Persian reoccupy the "City of the Violet Crown" than to betray the cause for which she had fought

**Athens
Rejects Peace
Overtures**

the state to which Greeks and barbarians alike now attributed the change which had come over the whole situation. Happily for the western world Athens rejected all overtures; she chose rather to let the Persian reoccupy the "City of the Violet Crown" than to betray the cause for which she had fought



THE DEFENCE OF THERMOPYLÆ: THE IMMORTAL EXPLOIT OF LEONIDAS OF SPARTA

The terrific onslaught on the Hellenic states, organised by Xerxes after the repulse of Darius at Marathon, was begun by the attack on the Pass of Thermopylæ, protecting the northern territories of the Peloponnesian states, where Leonidas with 300 Spartans and 700 Thespians kept a mighty host at bay for two days, dying to a man. From the painting by David.

so stoutly. Despite the dilatoriness of her methods, Sparta in the following year, 479 B.C., headed the advance of the Greeks to their final struggle with Mardonius in Bœotia. Meanwhile, the Greek fleet under Leotychides was taking the offensive

The Final Struggle

by sea, and sailed for Samos, where the Persian admiral disembarked his forces at Mycale and prepared to do battle by land. On the same day, says tradition, the decisive battle was fought in Greece, in the neighbourhood of Platæa, and another decisive victory was won at Mycale. The army of Mardonius was outmanœuvred, out-fought, and in effect so completely cut to pieces that only a few thousands out of the whole number are said to have escaped alive from the field.

At any rate, the fundamental fact remained—the great invasion was irretrievably ruined. Henceforth, Persia was practically powerless for aggression; the Greeks became and remained the attacking party, though it was not till the time of Alexander that an invasion of the East by the West was organised. As the antagonist of Persia, Sparta

yielded the leadership without regret to Athens, since it was to the Athenians—both as kinsmen and as sea-lords—that the Ionian cities and the islanders looked for aid. The confederacy of Delos was formed, with Athens at its head.

All the states which joined made themselves liable to supply their quota of men and money and ships to carry on the war. But this was no longer waged on the great dramatic scale of the struggle for liberty. Its most notable event was the great double victory by land and sea at the Eurymedon, won by Cimon, the son of Miltiades, the victor of Marathon, in the year 466 B.C. The struggle terminated at length with the so-called peace of Callias in 448, when Persia practically surrendered all claim on the islands.

Matters were in the meanwhile working up to the point when Athens and Sparta were to enter on internecine struggles for the leadership of the states of Hellas, for the maritime “hegemony” of Athens, the natural outcome of the part played in the Persian War, was converted into a kind of empire when the members of the Delian League took to substituting money payments for the supply of ships and men. That empire did not produce unification; Athens did not adopt the Roman plan of absorbing allies into the ranks of her own citizens. Instead of combining as a great nation, the states of Hellas remained individual and distinct. But of these developments we shall speak later.

But the years which passed between the defeat of the Persians and the struggle between Athens and Sparta were years of splendid intellectual advance. The theatrical displays, originally choral celebrations, in honour of the god Dionysus had become broader in scope, first one and then a second and a third individual representing separate characters, while separate spokesmen for the chorus itself were evolved. Citizens vied with one



THE PERSIAN EMBASSY TO ATHENS
Mardonius, left by Xerxes to complete the subjugation of Hellas, sent an embassy to make terms with Athens, the only state which stood in the way of his success. Happily Athens rejected all overtures.

another in improving the equipment of the choruses in which they took part, and there was a general rise in the elaborateness and richness of stage properties. In “The Persians” Æschylus (525-456 B.C.) depicted the period of the recent Persian War, giving full expression to the religio-mythic tendencies of the Athenians; the same play was performed, under the patronage of Pericles, at the opening of the new Dionysus theatre in 472 B.C. Through the introduction of the second player in his dramas, Æschylus gained greater freedom, and in his works the old myths came to life once more. According to his philosophy of life, an inexorable law of the universe governed both gods and men; but it was a just law, and the unwavering faith in the Supreme



THE ATHENIAN REJOICINGS AFTER THE GREAT NAVAL VICTORY OF SALAMIS

After the loss of Thermopylae, all Northern Greece was at the mercy of the Persian invaders, but the annihilation of the Persian fleet at Salamis transferred the command of the seas to the Greeks, filled them with confidence of victory, and rendered possible the expulsion of the Persians from Greece. From the picture by Ferdinand Cormon in the Luxembourg.

Power that we find in the dramas of Æschylus seems to have been an inheritance from the deeply religious age of Pisistratus. Never was a dramatist an educator of the people to such an extent as Æschylus.

Apart from Æschylus, this great period found its expression in Polygnotus. In the works of the great master of painting, who impressed the stamp of his genius on the art of his time, we find, closely connected with a deeply religious feeling, the glorification of Athens as leader in the struggle against barbarism, and the representation of every phase of human emotion and passion. We are able to study his influence in the drawings upon the red and black figured vases, which now became broader and firmer in touch, and to recognise traces of it in the delineation of womanly beauty, in the soft, clinging draperies, which permitted portions of the body to shimmer through, and, lastly, in the representation of passion and pain [see page 2467]. The splendid exultation of the Athenians in their victory was embodied in his pictures, which hung in the decorated hall of the Parthenon; the fall of Troy and the battle of Theseus with the Amazons were companion pieces to the triumph of the Greeks over the Persians at Marathon. The vigorous representation of the destruction of the wooers of Penelope by Odysseus, found in a sepulchre in Lycia, in which the influence of an original by Polygnotus that was once to be seen in the temple of Athene at Platea can be clearly perceived, furnishes us a clear conception of the greatness of his art. But both he and his school chose scenes of daily life for their subjects, which later were to be found in a thousand varieties in the vase paintings. Never, up to the present day, has the passion for beauty in household furniture and utensils penetrated to such a wide circle as then; never has art been so popular as

it was then, as shown by the paintings on the vases, to which even the greatest masters contributed models and drawings.

The fascination which the Athens of Pericles has ever exercised upon the minds of men does not spring from a sentimental spirit of glorification, but from the appreciation of the many-sided and rich development of personality which we are accustomed to call culture, and which reached such a marvellous state of perfection at that time. The words placed by Thucydides in the mouth of Pericles are singularly true, and particularly applicable to the golden age of Athens: "Great men have all lands for their sepulchres; their glory and memory are not confined to the inscriptions and monuments in their native lands, but live without the aid of written words, preserved even in distant regions, not in memorials of stone and brass, but in the hearts of men." To accuse the age of which Thucydides wrote: "We



PERICLES
Was ruler of Athens in its golden age, when Greek culture reached a marvellous state of perfection.

pursue Beauty, but not unthriftilly; and Knowledge, but not unhealthy," of a one-sided æstheticism is no less incorrect than to accept without reserve the gossip and the jests of comedies as historical testimony; and this, strangely enough, has happened with the writers of to-day who follow the example of the historian Ephorus.



THUCYDIDES
The great historian of the Greek golden age, who has never been surpassed as a writer of history.

as well as of the council, was opened to all by the payment of salaries to judges and councillors. The same object, the aid of the poorer classes in the exercise of their political rights and duties, was aimed at in the introduction of payment for the troops and for the support of the chief officials.

The position of archon, to which shortly before citizens of the second class had been made eligible, was now opened to the third class, the small landowners. An opportunity to taste of the highest kind of pleasure the Athenians could enjoy was afforded to all when the theatre was thrown open to the people during the three days of the representation.

In view of participation in the government by the Athenian citizens, the necessity arose for investigating whether individuals were full-blooded Athenians; and on the proposal of Pericles himself the right of citizenship was limited to the children of citizens. The council was still to be consulted as to all questions that arose in the popular assembly; but an appeal from its judgment of any public official or candidate for office could be lodged with the popular tribunals; and the supervision of all public authorities, which had already been transferred from the Areopagus to the council, fell, in the course of development, into the hands of the popular assembly.

A change also took place in the foreign relations of Athens. The Confederacy of Delos, owing to the unwarlike disposition of its members, who became more and more inclined to offer cash subsidies in lieu of specific services, gradually developed into an empire, whose head, Athens, drew tribute from all territories. The last remnant of the old league disappeared with the removal of the treasury from Delos to Athens in 454 B.C., by which the latter town obtained the unconditioned disposal of the funds of the confederacy. Finally, governmental districts, or provinces, for the collection of tribute were established. The Hellespontine, Thracian, Ionian, Carian, and island districts included all the cities liable to taxation. The closer union of the separate parts of the empire with Athens as a centre was brought about by means of the cleruchian policy of Pericles. By the formation of colonies of citizens, the poorer classes were cared for, and the capital was rid of its restless

Growth of the Empire of Athens

unemployed. A mandate of the popular assembly, which has been preserved to the present day, respecting the emigration of citizens to Brea in Thrace, shows that the emigrants were taken entirely from the third and fourth classes. Such colonies were formed in Thrace, on the islands, even on the coasts of the Black Sea. The paternal government succeeded—at least in its teachings, if not in practical life—in lessening the prejudice against labour: "It is not poverty that is looked upon with contempt, but the spirit of idleness that refuses to defend itself against poverty," said Pericles. The enormous territorial expansion of Athens increased the contrast to Sparta. The growth of Athenian commerce, and the occupation of Megara and Achæa, rendered even greater the difference between Athens and the Peloponnesian commercial states, especially Corinth and Ægina. When the latter, as well as Bœotia, Phocis, and Locris, became parts of the empire, Athens stood at the summit of her power. A better idea of her imperial policy can be obtained from a glance through the list of losses sustained by one tribe of Erechtheis during a single year (459-58 B.C.) on the battle-

fields of Cyprus, Egypt, Phœnicia, Haleis, and Ægina, than from words. The victory at Salamis in Cyprus, in 449 B.C., was the last battle of the Persian War in which Cimon was leader; and it was the occasion of a much-disputed, so-called Cimonic treaty between Athens and Persia, in which limits are supposed to have been set to the territories of the two empires. The defection of Bœotia, Locris, and Phocis from the confederacy was, in a measure, retrieved by the acquisition of Eubœa as an Athenian colony; but as early as 445 B.C. Athens, in the Thirty Years Truce, resigned her possessions in the Peloponnesus.

Pericles was not entirely successful in his domestic policy; his great attempt to extend maritime commerce, through a national congress of all the states of Greece, and his scheme for a common memorial of the Persian wars, through

unemployed. A mandate of the popular assembly, which has been preserved to the present day, respecting the emigration of citizens to Brea in Thrace, shows that the emigrants were taken entirely from the third and fourth classes. Such colonies were formed in Thrace, on the islands, even on the coasts of the Black Sea. The paternal government succeeded—at least in its teachings, if not in practical life—in lessening the prejudice against labour: "It is not poverty that is looked upon with contempt, but the spirit of idleness that refuses to defend itself against poverty," said Pericles. The enormous territorial expansion of Athens increased the contrast to Sparta. The growth of Athenian commerce, and the occupation of Megara and Achæa, rendered even greater the difference between Athens and the Peloponnesian commercial states, especially Corinth and Ægina. When the latter, as well as Bœotia, Phocis, and Locris, became parts of the empire, Athens stood at the summit of her power. A better idea of her imperial policy can be obtained from a glance through the list of losses sustained by one tribe of Erechtheis during a single year (459-58 B.C.) on the battle-

fields of Cyprus, Egypt, Phœnicia, Haleis, and Ægina, than from words. The victory at Salamis in Cyprus, in 449 B.C., was the last battle of the Persian War in which Cimon was leader; and it was the occasion of a much-disputed, so-called Cimonic treaty between Athens and Persia, in which limits are supposed to have been set to the territories of the two empires. The defection of Bœotia, Locris, and Phocis from the confederacy was, in a measure, retrieved by the acquisition of Eubœa as an Athenian colony; but as early as 445 B.C. Athens, in the Thirty Years Truce, resigned her possessions in the Peloponnesus.

Pericles was not entirely successful in his domestic policy; his great attempt to extend maritime commerce, through a national congress of all the states of Greece, and his scheme for a common memorial of the Persian wars, through

A Wise Colonial Policy



THEMISTOCLES

Athens' greatest statesman during the Persian War and the far-sighted founder of her naval power.



ZEUS OLYMPUS

A coin copy of the head of the great statue by Phidias.

the reconstruction of all the temples that had been destroyed, failed completely. Many steps in the development of the power of the Athenian democracy have wrongly been traced back to the influence which he exercised by virtue of his office as strategus and commissioner of public works, the highest position in the state. In spite of this, however, he

appears to us as the incarnation of the great era in which he lived. Themistocles, far away in Magnesia on the Mæander, set up the statue of the "Demos," the ideal of the people, corporalised, as it had been set up in his own home; and it may seem to us to-day as if the features of the "Demos" of Athens, in spite of its being above the law, and in spite of its autocracy, were those of Pericles.

And even if the close intimacy between Pericles and the great artists and scholars of his time—Phidias, Sophocles, and Anaxagoras, for example—is in part mythical, the productions of that age needed that there should be at least the atmosphere of the Athens of Pericles; the financial contributions supplied by the subjected members of the confederacy; the patronage of the well-to-do citizens, who prospered owing to the flourishing Black Sea trade which had followed the undertakings of the great statesman; and the intellectual consciousness that endowed the old state religion with a new significance and directed the heightened activity following upon successful war towards the development of a higher moral life.

During this period the works of Phidias attained to perfection. His Athene Lemnia is the most noble of all representations of the goddess. The Bologna head [see page 2459], belonging to the statue now at Dresden, has a most charming expression of mild severity, blended with kindness. The lines of the slightly oval face are so delicate, the nose so finely cut,

the thick, waving hair so beautiful, the mouth so powerful, that, in spite of the lips, which are a trifle heavy, we recognise in the perfect features of this masterpiece an image of ideal beauty. Although in this particular statue the spirit rather of the inner life of Athens is incorporated, the Athene Parthenos, forty feet in height, made of wood, covered with ivory and gold, must have represented to the full the warlike, victorious self-confidence of the Attic people. The deep-set eyes, formed of precious stones, looked far off into the distance; the nostrils were distended in the joy of the play of life; over the transfigured lips flitted a smile of ineffable wisdom, and hair of gold flowed down beneath the helmet.

The proud spirit of self-consciousness rested on the memory of the deeds of a glorious past; her left hand was supported by her shield; in her right glistened a golden goddess of victory, representing a people now at rest, harvesting the fruits of what they had won in former days. In the ornamentation of the shield in relief, Pericles is to be recognised as one of the foremost in a battle with the Amazons. Although we may behold the Athene



THE BEAUTIFUL ATHENE PARTHENOS

The replica of the glorious statue that stood in the Parthenon, forty feet high, covered with ivory and gold.

her right glistened a golden goddess of victory, representing a people now at rest, harvesting the fruits of what they had won in former days. In the ornamentation of the shield in relief, Pericles is to be recognised as one of the foremost in a battle with the Amazons. Although we may behold the Athene

THE GOLDEN AGE OF ATHENS

Lemnia in the original, and the Athene Parthenos in replica, our knowledge of the Olympian Zeus is gained only from descriptions and copies on coins. But it is certain that equal perfection was attained by Phidias in this work also; that only a purified conception of the god would have been possible to him, such only as would come to the mind of a man who himself had struggled to approach the perfection which belongs to the gods.

The frieze of the Parthenon, in which the pan-Athenians are portrayed for us with the most powerful versatility and the utmost perfection of technique—shown in the play of light and shade and in the matchless drapery—appears to us a symbolic representation of imperial Athens. The noble and beautiful youths, the rulers, soldiers, priests and priestesses, the sacrificial animals, brought from all parts of the empire, the dancing girls and flute players—all pass before us in procession, expressed, as they only could be, by a self-conscious and powerful community. Even though the friezes and gables of the Parthenon are not of Phidias's own handiwork, but were fashioned according to his plans and sketches by skilled masters, nevertheless, the least of their figures breathes of the spirit of the age. The birth of Athene, and the guardianship exercised over the city by Athene and Poseidon, the national deities, are especially appropriate to this period, which also saw the supremacy of Athens established on the sea. Thus Phidias was the artistic em-

bodiment of the age of Pericles: and, in a certain sense, Cresilas, the sculptor who carved the "soul-entrancing" Pericles, and sounded the depths of art in his representation of the wounded amazon, may, as a master of portraiture and genre, be looked upon as a complement to the greater artist. This was the time when Ictinus drew his plans for the Parthenon,

the temple of Athene, goddess of the city. The difficulties caused by the differences of elevation in the slope of the Acropolis were splendidly overcome by the propylæa: a wall pierced by five doors, with six Doric columns, resting upon four steps and enclosing a roofed court, which was divided into three wings by six Ionic columns. Passing through the doors, one reached a court of somewhat higher level, and from its further end arrived at the highest point of the Acropolis. This highest point is crowned by Ictinus's Parthenon, built upon old foundations, ascribed to Themistocles. It is a building pervaded with mysterious life; an indescribable enchantment is called forth by its marvellous proportions. The steps are slightly arched in the middle; the walls and entablature curve inwards, the cornices and antefix outwardly; lightness obtained by the swelling of the corner columns, and the regular fluting of all, which gradually taper upwards towards their capitals. The colouring, too, was extraordinarily rich and magnificent, the blue of the triglyphs of the frieze contrasting with the red ground of the metopes—a song



THE WOUNDED AMAZON OF CRESILAS

A work of Cresilas, who carved the "soul-entrancing" Pericles, and in this statue sounded the depths of art.

and grace are


rich and magnificent, the blue of the triglyphs of the frieze contrasting with the red ground of the metopes—a song

of triumph, as it were, of the Athenian spirit, which was also given expression in the Eumenides of Æschylus: "But I, in the glorious competition of battle, will jealously grant to this city victory over every other city on earth." And Sophocles, the great dramatist of the age of Pericles, in his prayer for Athens, "May it be blessed with all that leads to triumph and victory," expresses the poetic apotheosis of his land.

The apt choice of material from the myths of Attica, the rich experience in life and of men, the deep insight into Nature, the splendid development of the plot, and the profound grasp of the immutable laws of the universe, with which the vicissitudes

all, the knowledge of languages—did not yet correspond with the demands of a riper age. In spite of this, the descriptions of battles between the ancient Orient move us to-day even as they once moved the Athens of Pericles, where the populace received with acclamation the accounts of the great historian.

Anaxagoras, the friend of Pericles, was the first to conjecture that the universe was composed of a multitude of primal elements; and, reasoning in a dualistic sense, he considered these primitive forms of matter, at least in the beginning, to have been set in motion by intelligence. This motion then continued according to mechanical laws; sun, moon,



THE PIRÆUS, THE SEAPORT OF ATHENS, AS IT WAS IN THE GOLDEN AGE

of human fate are skilfully contrasted, lend an imperishable value to the dramas of Sophocles.

Herodotus [see page 9], born in Halicarnassus in 484 B.C. under Persian rule, increased men's knowledge of the world by his many journeys. Greatly influenced by the enthusiasm of his age, he has described for us the battles of the Greeks with the barbarians. His history breathes the passionate devotion of the war for independence. Herodotus was not, perhaps, the most acute of critics. His powers of discrimination were not so developed that he could invariably distinguish the true from the false or the probable in myths and traditions: his faith was still, for the most part, fatalistic, and knowledge—above

and stars, were hurled from one another by centrifugal force, a rapid rotation holding the heavenly bodies far from the earth, though occasionally messengers from the former, in the shape of meteors, fall to the latter. His meteorological explanation of the Nile floods as occasioned by the melting of snow on the mountains, and of the winds as caused by differences in temperature and in the density of the atmosphere, have received due recognition only in recent times. The builder of the Piræus, the astronomer, meteorologist, and engineer, Meton, who conducted investigations as to the altitudes of mountains, and placed a sun-dial upon the Pnyx, also endeavoured to harmonise solar and lunar time—the metonic cycle



A BEAUTIFUL SCULPTURE FROM THE PARTHENON FRIEZE

Mansell

The friezes of the Parthenon, in which the pan-Athenians are portrayed with powerful versatility and perfection of technique, are symbolic representations of imperial Athens and an artistic embodiment of the age of Pericles.

of nineteen years. Thus development of the very lowest class of citizens in the went on in every line of human activity government, were all entirely successful. during the age of Pericles, and the importance of Athens was established for all time. At no period has the conservative element in the character of a people been so harmonised with the impulse towards progress that rules in men of genius. The glorification of the religion of the people in art, the poetic purification of the great treasure-



A BEAUTIFUL TERRA-COTTA OF THE 5TH CENTURY
One of the famous Tanagra terra-cottas found in Asia Minor.

stores of myths, the representations of the great war, and, finally, the participation

of the very lowest class of citizens in the government, were all entirely successful. This city of the fifth century B.C. was like a great theatre of the sublime and beautiful, even though her people were unable to follow the boldest thinkers of their time, and accorded to Anaxagoras a very similar fate to that which in later days fell to Galileo. To conceive of genesis as the mere combination, and of death as the resolution, of elements, was to think thousands of years ahead of the time.



MATCHLESS SCULPTURES FROM THE PARTHENON FRIEZE

Mansell

Though not the actual handiwork of Phidias, the Parthenon friezes were fashioned according to his plans and sketches



THE DEATH OF SOCRATES, THE GREEK PHILOSOPHER, SURROUNDED BY HIS SORROWING DISCIPLES

The criticism of Socrates being adverse to many of the cherished ideas of the Athenians he was held guilty of impiety to the gods and condemned to death by drinking hemlock.



RIVALRY OF THE GREEK STATES

THE Ionian race had come to maturity ; the development of the Doric people, which had taken place in comparative isolation, was also completed. The commonwealth of Athens was distinguished by the free artistic activity of the individual and by a pronounced tendency towards the equality of all men ; the military state of Sparta was pre-eminent for discipline, conservatism, and the illiberal restriction of political rights to the upper classes. Here, ruggedness finally changed to barbarity, and mean ends and interests led to a narrow-mindedness and pettiness, of which nothing is more characteristic than Sparta's

The Ionian Race at Maturity

advice to the Asiatic Ionians to abandon their country. Attica, surrounded by the sea, which afforded an extensive sphere of activity, soon lost all local narrowness. The influence of the spirit that urged the people forward to a united Greece was everywhere apparent, not only in the wars against the Persians, but even in the internal disputes of Sparta. The Ionians and the Dorians stood opposed to one another, as a many-sided Odysseus against a towering Heracles—a Heracles, however, who had long ceased to labour for the common good—or as the fulness of spiritual life and passion in the works of Polygnotus, Phidias and Cresilas is contrasted with the magnificent development of muscle and the complete lack of intellectuality in the statues of the youths and athletes by Polyclitus.

But Athens soon underwent a transformation, the effect of which was greatly to weaken the powerful state that had been created by Pericles and his predecessors. It was a change in the disposition of the Athenian people, and it led to the destruction of the unity of aim and of consciousness that had for so long been a

distinguishing feature of Attic life. With the active participation of every citizen in governmental affairs, it was naturally considered indispensable by every man to acquire the necessary means for

gaining influence and power—the capacity, namely, of rapid thinking and ready speech.

Rise of the Sophists Since public instruction did not extend as far as this, men began to look upon a special technical training beyond that of the schools as necessary ; and the sophists took it upon themselves to make good the deficiency. They awoke in their pupils—not only through exercises in logic, but also through admonitions in regard to a moral life—the consciousness of a higher perfection, of a higher value of the individual ; it was Protagoras himself who uttered the proposition : “ Man is the measure of all things.” This individualistic conception, carried to the extreme, would mean that a man was free from all considerations of justice and morality, which he might look upon as an invention



ALCIBIADES

Who adopted as a guide in life the teaching that man is free from considerations of justice and morality.

of the weaker against the stronger, as pretexts, according to which natural rights, which granted a full life only to the “ overman,” were completely destroyed. No one adopted this teaching as a guide in life with more unscrupulousness, attended by more serious consequences, than did Alcibiades. The destruction of the balance and harmony of the old teaching, together with new developments, taxed the powers of resistance of Athens to the uttermost, and finally succeeded in undermining the state itself. The Athenian empire was based

too exclusively upon wealth for it to be able to persist with impunity in its unprincipled treatment of its dependencies ; for the same theory of the natural right of the individual was also apparent in the conduct of Athens

towards the other members of the confederacy, justice being simply the right of the stronger. Pericles was forced to run that gauntlet of vituperation of gutter politicians so familiar in the affairs of the modern state before kindly fate removed him from the scene of struggle. He died of the plague in the year 429 B.C.

Nevertheless, Athens still showed herself equal to Sparta during the first period of the Peloponnesian struggle. Cleon, the very type of obstinate narrow-mindedness, who had arisen to popularity through his powers of eloquence, but who had not sufficient ability for the conduct of great issues, and, like the venturesome and boastful Euthydemus of Plato, refused the advice of all men, strained the powers of the empire to the very breaking point by doubling the tribute imposed on the members of the confederacy. The first period of the war ended with the truce of Nicias, concluded for fifty years, in remembrance of which the temple of Nike was built. But peace cannot long be maintained when preceded by an indecisive struggle. New expedients were tried and new allies sought; first of all, the

Athenians won the alliance of Argos, advocated by Euripides in his dramas, as well as by Alcibiades in political life, but the battle of Mantinea dissolved the union. Then a stupendous plan was unfolded. Already planted in Italy, perhaps even dominating Carthage, Athens sought to invade the Peloponnesus and to take possession of it. The idea was contagious. Alcibiades was father to the scheme, which proved the chief cause of Athens' ruin; and all that had been left undone

The Ruin of Athens

of the general destruction he completed when he deserted his country and went over to the side of Sparta. The advice for Sparta to invade Sicily, occupy Decelea, and employ Persian resources for carrying on the war, came from Lysander, who thus prepared the way for ending the struggle.

Lysander was an unbridled tyrant, possessed of an unbounded vanity that could be satisfied only by statues and songs of praise. He resembled in many ways the type of the foremost men of the Renaissance, but without any of the redeeming qualities of the latter; a man



HIPPOCRATES, GREEK TYRANT IN SICILY, REFUSING THE PRESENTS OF ARTAXERXES
An incident, painted by Girodet, in the efforts of the Persian king to obtain the dominance over the Greeks, which he achieved in part by the shameful peace of Antalcidas with Sparta, securing Persian control of the Greeks in Asia Minor.



SOCRATES AT THE BATTLE OF POTIDIÆ

The great philosopher distinguished himself in several Athenian campaigns, particularly in this battle of the Peloponnesian War, where he saved the life of his pupil, Alcibiades. From the painting by Carstens at Weimar.

who planned to destroy the Spartan constitution for his own benefit, who looked upon morality as madness, and who had no affection whatever, sentimental or otherwise, no consideration even for Athens' former greatness and merit. The terms of the peace of 404 B.C. were, without doubt, his work, although they were formally issued as a decree of the ephors. The Athenian fleet went up in flames, and the walls of the city were torn down to the sound of flutes. Athens was

The Walls of Athens Torn Down

allowed to retain Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros alone of all her former possessions. Thus the way was opened for the rise of the northern empire of Macedon, which had already been developing in peace for many years; neither Sparta nor Thebes was able to prevent its progress.

In Thucydides (460-400 B.C.) the Peloponnesian War possessed a contemporary historian such as no other decisive struggle before or since ever had. The genius of the Greeks for purity of form fairly culminates in his writing. The bold, broad method of Athenian criticism becomes elevated to a scientific examination of

facts, the dispassionate accuracy of which henceforth becomes the type of the highest kind of historical writing. In contrast to the sunny charm of the Ionian Herodotus, who was inspired by victory and the glory of Athenian civilisation, and wrote of the splendours of the Athens of Pericles, we have the melancholy of a man sorrowing for the downfall of his country, who speaks so touchingly of the great past in the celebrated funeral oration delivered at the death of Pericles, and who paints the gloomy present in such dark colours in his description of the Sicilian catastrophe. No ancient writer ever succeeded in giving expression so effectively to the composite character of his time. Single individuals appear on the pages of Thucydides as the living embodiments of universal conceptions and forces.

During the same age a philosopher taught, who, although he created no system and wrote no book, spread abroad nevertheless the most fruitful ideas, and deeply influenced not only youths like Alcibiades, but also men such as Plato, who in the near future were to distinguish themselves in the realms of thought.

Socrates arose from the people; and for the people he lived and taught, seeking not for the unknown and obscure source of Being, but striving to penetrate the mysteries of the human heart, and to show

**Socrates
Rises from
the People**

men how to live according to the fundamental principles of the moral life. Knowledge of the good was to be gained by the unwearied exercise of thought, and necessarily carried with it the desire for right living; knowledge and will were one. All the thoughts and endeavours of Socrates were devoted to the development of the individual man, and thus his teaching may well have appeared revolutionary egoism to his contemporaries. But the respect for the common conceptions of truth and morality which he demanded of all unites men far more firmly than the social instinct; and Socrates never desired a separation from the state religion.

Euripides (480-406 B.C.) embodied the restlessness of the age in his works, a dissatisfaction that had arisen with the destruction of the old ancestral beliefs by, the sophists, who attempted to substitute nothing in their place. He looked upon man, and he despaired; he looked upon the gods that man had created, and scorned them. Freedom in the treatment of material was prominent in Euripides; he looked upon life from a broad point of view, and won a keen insight into the human soul. Above all, he introduced women, with all their varied feelings and emotions, into the drama; but the effect of his writings is much injured by reason of the inexhaustible bitterness which internal struggles and the lack of popular appreciation had brought.

He bore his poetical genius as a mark of Cain; he was deceived even in his native city, and the brightest star in his heaven, Alcibiades, to whom he had written an ode on his victory in the Olympic games,

turned out to be only a brilliant meteor. The attempt to seek refuge from the bitterness of the time in mockery and derision was made by Aristophanes (450-385 B.C.). An adherent of the old, upright, Athenian conception of life, he hated war and all men who arose to power and distinction through war, even as he detested the new-fangled plans for the future, that appeared so foolish to him. A profound acquaintance with Nature and love for a life of peace are united with the most bitter satire in his comedies. Plays of his, such as "The Birds" and "The Frogs," as well as his personal caricatures — that of Cleon, for example —

**Aristophanes
a Hater
of War**

have become the property of all time. "Plunge deep into the full life of men" seems to have been his guiding principle; and, together with the highest realism, he mingled the most charming poetry of the world of fable. With his

clouds and his birds the mind of the great poet sought refuge from his own time, in which all things had gone to ruin.

Sparta had attained to victory over the rest of Greece; the question arose, could this military supremacy serve as a foundation for an empire? The governing class of Spartans, not a hundredth part of the entire population, were such a heavy burden upon all other men that even at this early time conspiracies, such as that of Cinadon, were frequent. The control of the ephors over the Spartan people, who, above all things, were forbidden to introduce any money into the country, was the more extraordinary, owing to the fact that desire for possessions was the guiding motive of all classes. The police made themselves

ridiculous in various ways, as when, out of zeal for austerity and simplicity, they cut away four of the eleven strings belonging to the lyre of a musician. Ambitious, tyrannous natures, as exemplified



THE WORSHIP OF MUSCLE

The Dorians and Ionians were as opposed in character as the spirituality of the works of Phidias and Cresilas is contrasted with the magnificent muscular development and lack of intellectuality in the statues of Polyclitus, shown in this fine Doryphorus, now at Naples.



THE SCHOOL OF ATHENS: THE GREAT PHILOSOPHERS OF GREECE

From a fine fresco in the Vatican by Raphael, representing the great Greek philosophers. In the centre Plato, with Aristotle beside him, is expounding to disciples standing around, while Diogenes lies on the steps, Alcibiades, Xenophon, and others listening to Socrates; below them Pythagoras, Heraclitus sitting alone, and Democritus by the base of the pillar; at the right, on the steps, Pyrrho, Arcesilaus and others; and below Archimedes teaching geometry.

by Lysander, became models for the imitation of Spartan governors, or harlots, in the various cities; and in a short time a policy was developed whose features we cannot regard otherwise than as a mere catalogue of political crimes. It began with the complete abandonment of old Spartan enmity to Persia—renounced, indeed, as early as 411 B.C.—which resulted from the so-called King's Peace. After King Agesilaus of Sparta, a man of great penetration and iron will but, nevertheless, a mere condottiere, had made several notable conquests in Asia Minor he was forced to return to Hellas on account of a war—the Bœotio-Corinthian—which the Persians had kindled in Greece. The Spartans soon found out that an alliance with Persia would be more profitable for them, and a decree of the great king, Artaxerxes, reversed all previous relations with the Greeks, and placed the maintenance of peace under the joint supervision of Persia and Sparta.

Through the King's Peace of 386 B.C.—it received the harmless name of the "Peace of Antalcidas" in order that its true significance might be hidden—

the Greeks of Asia Minor were given over to the control of Persia; but Sparta obtained free scope for the carrying out of her own particular schemes. Soon the migration of Arcadians to Mantinea came to be looked upon as dangerous, and as a result they were forced to return again to their former villages. Spartan troops, under the leadership of Phœbidas, on the march to Olynthus, seized, without warning, the Cadmea, the citadel of Thebes. Such actions were, to the rest of the Greeks, only signs that the rule of Sparta was based on tyranny and force alone.

It was but another proof of the popularity of military states at that time that Sicily, too, soon boasted a tyranny under Dionysius of Syracuse, who, indeed, had rendered the very greatest services to his country during the struggle for freedom against Carthage.

To a certain degree the tyranny of the Spartocides in the region of the Bosphorus, on the eastern fringe of Greek civilisation, may be counted as one of the many despotisms of the time. Their civilisation was a strange mixture of the Greek and the Scythian; the language spoken

was Greek, mingled with words of barbarian origin. The legs of the inhabitants were clad in absolutely un-Greek trousers and high boots; and their tastes turned to extraordinary, colossal sepulchral edifices and to excess of gold ornamentation peculiar to the Orient. A Greek goblet was found in the neighbourhood of the Obra, and a statue of Hygeia in Perm.

The people of Greece struggled in despair for internal order and external strength; and during this period they seem most frequently to have attained to both in many points through the leadership of one man, a "tyrant." Thus, Caesarism grew during these years in the same manner as Plato developed it in theory in the pages of the eighth book of his immortal Republic. But tyrants were able only to procure temporary order in social relations, and to maintain power in a nation through a transference of the strength of the state to an army, consisting for the greater part of mercenaries. When it is impossible to attain to both internal order and outward strength men strive at least to acquire the former; and, in order to do so, are seldom unwilling to subject themselves to the rule of a tyrant, if necessary, provided the despot guarantee the desired order, as did, for example, Mausolus of Caria.

But now two powers once more sought to play the role of leader in Greece—Thebes and Athens.


Thebes had never been able to establish so close a union of the different parts of Bœotia under her leadership as Athens had succeeded in bringing about. Lack of cohesion was not at all favourable to the foundation of a powerful state, although Thebes was strong enough from a military standpoint, by reason of her large population. So far, however, as culture was concerned, Thebes was not distinguished. It is true that Pindar was a Theban, and no poet was able to

portray Doric life in more glowing colours than he; but since his time Thebes had contributed nothing to literature except material for the comic writers. The Spartan occupation of the Cadmea aroused all the forces of resistance in the Theban

people. Pelopidas, distinguished for his great energy and influence, and Epaminondas, who wisely kept himself in the background until the proper moment arrived for action, were the two men who were chiefly instrumental in assisting Thebes to freedom. Military organisation and the wise use of opposing forces produced as great results in the northern part of the Peloponnesus as they had previously in the south. The successes attained by Pelopidas were temporary rather than lasting; it was not so much the battle of

Leuctra, in 371 B.C., that procured the downfall of Sparta for all time as the reawakening of Messenia and the alliance with Arcadia, achieved by Epaminondas.

The chief cities of these countries were Messene, possessed of magnificent fortifications, and Megalopolis, a town exceptionally well situated. Although the death of Epaminondas, in the battle of Mantinea in 362 B.C., may have prevented Thebes from reaping the full harvest of her victories, the chief object, that of hindering the future expansion of Sparta, was finally attained. To look upon the efforts of Epaminondas as having been directed towards the establishment of a pan-Hellenic state is probably wrong. But, nevertheless, his character was one of exceptional charm. His greatness, which consisted in his complete freedom from selfishness, in his capacity for quickness and boldness of action, and in his plans to raise Thebes to the position of a great sea power, through which were supplied the foundations for future development, is certainly not presented to us in any favourable light in the pages of the one-sided Peloponnesian history—the



SOCRATES

The great Greek philosopher, who lived and taught for the people.



PINDAR THE THEBAN

Though Thebes was not distinguished in culture, no poet portrayed Doric life in more glowing colours than the Theban, Pindar.

RIVALRY OF THE GREEK STATES

so-called Hellenica—of Xenophon, who was entirely favourable to Sparta. A large portion of Central Greece—Phocis, Eubœa, the two Locris, the Ænians, Heracleotes, and Maleans—had come under the influence of Thebes as early as 370 B.C. Treaties were made with the newly founded Arcadian League and with Alexander of Macedon; Sicyon, Pellene, Eretria, even Byzantium and single districts of Ceos, were brought into the Theban confederation. Thebes felt far more secure when she had obtained the protection of Persia by following the example of Sparta in recognising the former power as the arbiter of Greek affairs. Bound up with the deeds and names of Epaminondas and Pelopidas, the splendour of Thebes, as well as her ambitions of empire, vanished with the death of these two great men.

In the meanwhile, Athens had sagaciously endeavoured to construct new foundations for a future empire. Immediately after the conclusion of the King's Peace, she had established an alliance with Chios, which was entirely in accordance with the stipulations of the King's Peace, but recognised "freedom and self-government" as the political basis of all Hellenic



THE WINGLESS VICTORY

A beautiful sculpture from the Temple of Nike, built in memory of the Nicias truce in the Peloponnesian War.



MAUSOLUS OF CARIA

Mansell

The splendid statue of Mausolus, the tyrant of Caria, erected by his widow on his mausoleum at Halicarnassus.

relations. By means of similar agreements, Byzantium, Rhodes, Mytilene, Methymna, and Thebes became allies of Athens. But one more step was needed to form a general confederation out of the isolated leagues.

In 377 B.C. a call was issued, inviting other states to join. Members of the confederation were chosen only from among the states of Hellas and free barbarian nations, and not from the lands ruled by the Great King. It was expressly stated by Athens that no cleruchian colonies were to be founded. This second confederation of sea powers under the leadership of Athens was far more loosely bound than the first; and, although contributions were not lacking, it could not be used as a step to power, as had been the case with the first league, notwithstanding the fact that numerous states had become members, the west of the Balkan Peninsula being represented (Corcyra, Acarnania, and Alcetas, the prince of the Molossians), as well as Thrace (Dion, the Chalcidian) and the Archipelago. The highest triumph was attained when, after long negotiations, Dionysius of Syracuse entered into an alliance with

Athens (368-67); in the same manner Thessaly and King Philip of Macedon recognised the importance of the renovated empire; and the princes of Thrace peacefully arranged among themselves the government of the Græco-Thracian towns in complete harmony with the desires of the Athenian people.

But it was precisely where the foundations of this confederation had first been laid that the process of undermining began. Chios joined with Byzantium, Rhodes, Cos, and Mausolus, prince of Caria,

in a league against Athens. Diplomatic successes with the rulers of Thrace, Pæonia, Illyria, and towns of the north were not sufficient to counterbalance the general lack of fortune in war that led, in 354 B.C., to peace and to the dissolution of the confederation, and therewith to the end of the development of Athens as the centre of an empire.

Indeed, so far as the position of Athens as a commercial centre and city of capitalists was concerned, the loss of imperial power caused but little injury. On the contrary, the peace-at-any-price policy had been pursued entirely in accordance with the desires of the capitalists, as shown by a work on the income of the city, written by a financier of the fourth century B.C. and falsely attributed to Xenophon. In this it is stated that Athens arose to greatness, not as the capital of a loosely united empire of more or less hostile dependencies, but as the centre of a rich trade, secured by peace and by the pursuance of a sound commercial policy. Thus to the citizens the state was merely a


burden, which greatly impeded them in money-making. They looked upon all countries where their possessions could be increased as their home. The doctrine of cosmopolitanism had sprung from a higher ideal than this, but it was accepted by

the individualistic capitalists as signifying trading relations that were capable of embracing the entire world. If, then, the fatherland was an idealistic illusion and the state a necessary evil, naturally enough men sought to escape from their duties to their country.

The citizen army gave place to a host of mercenaries, and the positions of strategists of genius were filled by leaders of irregular troops, who belonged, body and mind, to the prince who was willing to offer them the highest wages. Thus all unity disappears as soon as the reasons for cohesion are removed, and retribution comes in the shape of struggles of one class against another. The question is, how did it happen that the different classes reached this state of opposition and hostility?

The government under Pericles had transformed the greater part of the citizens into wards of the state, as it were, and this was the "cement of democracy" that maintained the union. The differences in duty remained, but differences in rights had disappeared. Political equality

had been attained; but men began to strive for equality of possessions, and the endeavour to obtain income and wealth without labour was everywhere apparent. Thus social difficulties soon intruded themselves into political affairs, the more so, as there was no machinery of government for



ISOCRATES

One of the great orators who condemned the corruption of the time.



ARISTOTLE

The philosopher, called by Dante "Master of them that know."



PLATO

Of all philosophers of the time Plato, in his "Republic" and "Laws," saw deepest into the question of social improvement. In immortal words he lashed the domination of covetousness and greed.

dealing with such social and economic disputes among the different classes. The political parties became nothing more or less than organs of various social factions, serving them in their purely egoistic designs. "The rich would rather cast their possessions into the sea than share them with the poor," said Isocrates; and the judges who were without wealth condemned wealthy men whenever they were brought before them, simply in order to extort money for the benefit of the districts over which they presided. The so-called democracy ignored justice and right in its management of affairs quite as much as an absolute monarchy of the worst sort would have done; the role of courtier was played by flattering demagogues, and the luxury of a debauched and licentious court had long been attained.

The disinclination of distinguished and able men to take part in public life increased with the selfish struggles of individuals and of entire classes, which were characterised throughout by the loudness and vulgarity of an all-pervading eloquence. But such men reaped what they had sown by refusing to enter into public affairs; the unrestricted domination of the lower classes resulted,

architects, Hippodamus, who had been employed at Thurii and Rhodes and had constructed the harbour of Athens, the Piræus, had come forward with a plan for establishing the best form of government. He applied his geometrical principles to the state, dividing all things into three parts--society into three classes; land into possessions belonging to the temples for the support of the priests, into state territory for the maintenance of the army, and into private property owned by the peasants. Pheidon invented a political arithmetic, reminding one of the doctrine of Malthus: he recognised in overpopulation the cause of all social evils, and recommended a limitation of households and the placing of all citizens into one class. Phaleas of Chalcedon, the first communist, went even further; according to his teachings, all possessions should be held in common, and the education of all men should be the same. But already Aristotle had laid stress on the fact that the limitation of land and property was illogical, and that the whole system was unpsychological, since human nature mocked any equality of poor and rich, and diversity in talents, as well as in elemental passion, destroyed all

Schemes of the Utopians



HUMOUR IN POTTERY: GREEK DRINKING VASES

Extraordinary vases, called rhytons, in the form of grotesque animal and human heads, made about 400 B.C.

and it became a struggle of each against all. This was also a time when many ideal plans for a future society were invented by thinkers who lived solitary lives in isolation from the rest of the world. Already one of the greatest of Greek

arithmetical or geometrical plans regulating possession and population. The proposition to place all labour under the control of the state, and to transform the members of the working classes into organs rendering service to a

common governmental industry, is worthy of notice. Alcidas saw in slavery the chief cause of the troubles of economic life, and demanded its abolition. Finally, civilisation itself was looked upon as the root of all misery, and the doctrine "Away

**Civilisation
the Root of
all Misery**

from civilisation" was accepted and preached by the cynics as the best remedy, quite as it was in later time by Rousseau; the tendency of Plato's Republic, also, was clearly in this direction. Of all philosophers of the time, it was Plato who saw deepest into the question of social improvement. In immortal words he lashed the domination of covetousness and greed, setting up in opposition a state in which the government should be by the mentally and morally fittest alone. The division of men into classes, as adopted during the Middle Ages, took its origin in Plato; the communistic ideas of his Republic awoke to life again in the French Revolution, during which a supporter of absolute monarchy became through reading his works one of the most distinguished advisers of the Jacobins. Abbé Mably saw in private property the source of all man's errors and misfortunes.

Workers, warriors, and teachers formed the social pyramid of the "Republic." All men received an equal school education; from the most distinguished of the pupils were chosen those who were to compose the army and to take part in the civil service, while from among a class of especially proved individuals of fifty years and upwards were selected those who should hold the highest positions in the state, the offices of teacher and ruler combined. The greatest possible stress is laid upon the moral aim of the republic, and the necessity for a scientific education of its servants is likewise stated with unmistakable emphasis. Thus far all was possible, as has since been proven by the world's development; the fantastic portion of the scheme begins with

**Plato's
Social
Pyramid**

the scorn shown for all history and tradition. The education of children is to be the basis upon which the new state is to be erected; no family life, no marriage, and no individual property, but a community of goods, wives (not promiscuous, but strictly regulated), and children, are also indispensable features of the "Republic."

There is also a complete equality of women and men, the former taking part in all bodily exercises, sharing in the common fare of the state, accompanying the men on their military expeditions, and being eligible to any office.

In his "Laws" Plato no longer endeavoured to draw a sharp distinction between the real and the ideal, and made his state consistent with already existing conditions, although built upon new foundations. The common possession in land—that is, the territory occupied by the state—was to be divided into 5,040 portions of equal value, according to their yield—of course, differing in size—which should be unalterable and indivisible. In like manner, all movable property was to be divided, and the largest possible portion allowed for each individual to be fixed. Economic development was to be governed by laws forbidding the exportation of products of the soil, by the restriction of commerce and manufacture, and by official regulation, all in accordance with the highest ethical conceptions. The sovereign power, which in the "Republic"

**Laws of
the Ideal
State**

was vested in the magistrates, is assigned in the "Laws" to officials in certain cases; but, in general, the supreme power is conceived as resting with the mass of the people. It is true that, both in the teachings and in the life of Plato, the idea is also expressed that the dominion of one man is better adapted for the improvement of society. A "kingly man, in whom reason has won the mastery," would be able to adapt his personal views to the changeable relations of men; impersonal law, on the other hand, is unalterable. Thus the "Republic" itself hinted at the rule of a single individual, and in the "Laws" were pictured the princes of the future who should bring good government to their states, and therewith lasting happiness—rulers who should bring about a moral regeneration of their people. At the same time, however, the danger to the prince himself caused by the possession of the supreme power is dilated upon.

In teaching, as well as in life, there was no other escape from their unbearable conditions open to the Greeks, except that which could be furnished by the mind of a powerful leader who had the ability both to govern and to aid.



MACEDON

AND THE WORLD EMPIRE OF ALEXANDER

By Rudolph von Scala

THE EARLIER HISTORY OF MACEDON

THE oldest history of Macedonia is obscure. There is, indeed, a list of kings mentioned, but these are for us little more than names. It is not until Amyntas I., about 540-498 B.C., that the Macedonian kingdom is brought nearer to us; thus first from its connection with world-stirring events we gain a fuller knowledge of Macedonia. Thrace, as is sufficiently well known, was, after the Scythian expedition of Darius, subdued by the Persian general Megabazus, who was left behind in Europe. Even Amyntas of Macedonia submitted to the Persian king, but remained prince of his own land, and was forced merely to pay tribute and furnish troops.

In this position remained his son and successor, Alexander (498-454 B.C.), who was compelled to follow Xerxes on his campaign against Greece, although in his heart he was favourably disposed towards the Greeks. He proved his friendliness to Greece whenever he could. At Platæa on the night before the attack arranged by Mardonius, he communicated

**Macedonian
Sympathy
With Greece**

the Persian plan to the Athenian generals and thus contributed to the splendid victory of the Greeks. After the retreat of the Persians from Europe the subjection of Alexander naturally ended. He was from that time an ally and friend of Athens, until the formation of the Athenian maritime league firmly established the hegemony of Athens on the Thracian

Macedonian coast and inspired the king with mistrust. At the end of his reign he adopted a hostile attitude towards Athens,

**Expansion
of Macedon's
Power**

and he owed it to the friendship of Cimon that his country escaped a devastating attack of the Athenian fleet. His admission to the Olympian games and the victory he won there were very important for him. By these acts his own origin and that of his race were recognised as Hellenic, although his people continued to be regarded as barbarians by the Greeks. Macedonia owed to him the acquisition of the district of Bisaltia around Lake Prasias. By this means Macedonia extended her territory to the Strymon and came into possession of mines, which produced a rich revenue for the king. Under him Macedonia included all the country from the Candavian Mountains to the Strymon and from Olympus northward as far as the mountains of the Upper Axios. Of the Greek coast towns, Therma and Pydna, at any rate, were then forced to recognise the Macedonian rule.

His son and successor, Perdiccas II. (454-413 B.C.), had during his reign to face a difficult situation. At first he was in alliance with Athens; but when, in 432 B.C., the Athenians concluded an alliance with Dardas, chief of the Elimioti, who was at war with Perdiccas, and with his own brother Philip, from whom the part of the kingdom which lay eastward

of the middle course of the Axios had seceded, Perdicas joined the enemies of Athens. The rule of Athens weighed so heavily on her subjects that there was no lack of discontented and hostile spirits. Perdicas availed himself of this state of affairs. Through his exertions the defection of Potidæa and the other Chalcidian towns from Athens was accomplished. By his counsel the Chalcidians destroyed their small places on the coast and went in a body to the newly founded town of Olynthus—the beginning of the Peloponnesian War.

Athens immediately sent a fleet and troops to Chalcidice. Derdas, the opponent of Perdicas, and Philip, joined the Athenian commander, who, too weak to attack Potidæa vigorously, had invaded Macedonia. They captured Therma and besieged Pydna. A new Athenian naval expedition, bearing troops under Callais, joined the army encamped before Pydna and compelled the king to make terms. When the Athenians subsequently marched away to Potidæa, Perdicas declared the convention which had been forced from him void, and sent help to the Potidæans. But though they made him leader of their cavalry, he could not undertake the command in person, for his presence in his country was essential. He fought with success against Derdas and Philip. The latter was forced to give way, and fled to Sitalces, king of the Odrysæ, by whom he hoped to be reinstated in power, Athens being allied to Sitalces. Perdicas was, however, able to divert the danger which an alliance of Athens, Sitalces, and his fugitive brother threatened; he won over the king of the Odrysæ by promises not to restore Philip and to negotiate a peace between Macedonia and Athens. This was actually completed—Perdicas received Therma back from the Athenians and was bound in return to support them in their struggle against the Chalcidians. We hear no more of Derdas, who evidently


recognised again the suzerainty of the king. A most serious danger threatened when, in 429 B.C., the Thracians invaded the land of Perdicas—who had not carried out his promises to Sitalces—in order to make Amyntas, son of Philip, who had died in the meantime, king of all Macedonia and to make the Chalcidian towns subject to Athens.

Sitalces entered Macedonia with his powerful army and marched, plundering and devastating, along the Axios, down to the coast. Contrary to the preconcerted arrangement, the Athenian fleet was not ready on the spot to attack the Chalcidian towns in co-operation with him. The Odrysæans contented themselves with laying waste the plains, and the fortified towns remained unharmed. When winter began, and there came a growing scarcity of food, they withdrew. Perdicas again extricated himself from his difficulties by diplomacy; he won over Seuthes, nephew of Sitalces, who had great influence, by the promise to give him his sister to wife with a rich dowry; and he this time really carried out his promise. The pretender Amyntas was given up, and we hear nothing more of him.

Perdicas had afterwards to sustain a war with Arrhibæus, chief of the Lyncesti, and called in the aid of the Spartans. Since at the same time the Chalcidians desired the help of Sparta, Brasidas marched, in 424 B.C., through Thessaly to Macedonia. Athens now declared war against Perdicas. The expectation which Perdicas had entertained that Brasidas would subdue the rebellious chiefs of the Lyncesti was, however, not realised. In the first campaign no battle resulted at all, since Brasidas wished to reconcile the two antagonists, and not to strengthen the power of Perdicas by the subjection of Arrhibæus. Since, however, a reconciliation could not be effected, Brasidas concluded an agreement with the Lyncestian and withdrew. In the second campaign, however, Brasidas and Perdicas advanced into Lyncestis and defeated

**Rebellion
of the
Disaffected**

**Sitalces
Devastates
Macedonia**



ΑΡΙΣΤΙΟΠΟΥΣ

A GREEK SOLDIER
Archelaus of Macedon made the hoplites, the heavy Greek infantry, the type on which he re-modelled his army.



MOUNTS OLYMPUS AND OSSA FROM THE PLAINS OF THESSALY

These famous mountains became, under Alexander I. of Macedon, the southern boundary of the Macedonian territory.

Arrhibæus at first, but without following up or making use of the victory. When, therefore, the Macedonians were seized with panic at the mere rumour of the arrival of those extraordinarily dreaded Illyrians and of their union with the enemy, and fled in the night, Brasidas, too, was compelled to retreat. This was the end of the Macedonian alliance with Sparta. Once more Perdiccas made advances to Athens and concluded a second treaty with her; but he did not play a conspicuous part at all in the war between Athens and Sparta that was being fought in Chalcidice. When he died, in 413 B.C., he left the kingdom, which he had rescued by foresight and astuteness from the greatest dangers, as extensive as when he inherited it.

By his lawful wife, Cleopatra, Perdiccas left a son, seven years old, for whom the crown was destined, and also a bastard, Archelaus, who is said to have been born to him by a slave of his elder brother, Alcetes. He was appointed, it would seem, by the dying king to be regent and guardian of the infant successor to the throne; but this did not satisfy Archelaus. He first put out of his way Alcetes, who, being addicted to drink, had won for himself the surname of the Funnel. He

Death of Perdiccas of Macedon

destroyed also Alexander, the son of Alcetes. He invited them to a banquet, and when they were drunk he had them thrown by night into a cart, which drove off with them—nobody knew whither. It was then the turn of the heir to the crown. He was drowned in a cistern. Archelaus told his mother that the boy had run after a goose, had fallen into the water, and had perished there. This was the story told of Archelaus in Athens. It may not be all true, and much may be exaggerated or false. This much is certain—that he availed himself of foul means to seize the throne. However, the services he rendered Macedonia justify the supposition that he felt himself called to rule; the advancement and development of the country in the way he thought right and profitable could, he believed, be carried out only by him as king.

Thucydides says that Archelaus did more for his kingdom than all his predecessors combined. Frequently when the Thracians and the Illyrians had made inroads, Macedonia had keenly felt the want of strong-walled places, where the inhabitants of the plains with their belongings might find refuge and might offer resistance in conjunction with the town-folk. Now the limited number of fortified

Archelaus Usurps the Throne

Now the limited number of fortified

towns was increased, and by this means the security of the inhabitants was strengthened. At any rate, when their hostile neighbours raided the land the inhabitants could no longer be carried off as readily as their goos. With increased security the industry of the inhabitants was bound to increase. Archelaus

What Archelaus Did for Macedon

promoted the development of the land by making roads, and contributed largely towards rendering the interior more accessible. But the more Macedonia came into contact with the Greek civilisation through intercourse with the industrial towns on the coast, the more urgently did it require a suitable reorganisation of its army in order to win a place among the hostile and warlike states. It had repeatedly interfered in foreign affairs during the course of the Peloponnesian War as the ally of one or the other of the warring powers, and the defects of its own military system must have clearly appeared as a result. Archelaus recognised the defects and remedied them. His army consisted no longer, as formerly, of cavalry exclusively, but he added to his forces infantry, which he armed after the fashion of the Greek hoplites, or heavy infantry, and drilled in Greek style, whereas previously the national levy, when emergency required it, had been a badly armed and badly drilled rabble. We may assume that the value of his innovations lay in his making the foot-soldiers a permanent part of the Macedonian army. The nobility supplied the cavalry, as before, while the peasants, who now were brought into military service, composed the infantry.

What Archelaus aimed at, Philip II. was destined one day to carry on—that is, to liberate the country from its narrow limitations and to conquer for it a place among the civilised states of Hellas. Besides this, Archelaus was desirous of raising his people to a higher plane of civilisation. He always had Greek artists and poets living at his court in Pella. He founded at Dion, on the slopes of Olympus, a festival in honour of Zeus, marked by musical and gymnastic contests, such as were held in Greece; and Euripides composed for the inauguration of this festival his drama "Archelaus," in which he treated the history of the ancestor of the royal house of Macedon,

Efforts to Spread Greek Culture

whom arbitrarily, out of regard for his patron, he called Archelaus. Cultured himself, the king favoured Greek culture and learning when and where he could, so that they gradually spread from the court among the other classes of the people.

There are few warlike occurrences to mention in the reign of Archelaus. In 410-409 B.C. he brought back the rebellious town of Pydna to its allegiance and waged a war with Arrhibæus, prince of the Lyncesti, and Sirrhas, the dynast of the Elimioti, who, apparently disturbed by the strengthening of the kingly power, had invaded Lower Macedonia; we know no details about this, except that Archelaus gave one of his daughters to Sirrhas to wife, and by this means ended the war. His services consist more in his reforms and in his endeavours to exalt his country. He died in 399 B.C. by a violent death, as did many of his predecessors and successors. A young Macedonian named Crateus was his murderer. His son Orestes, a minor, succeeded him under the guardianship of Aeropus, who soon

A Period of Calamitous Struggles

put him out of the way. The next forty years were filled with struggles for the throne and disturbances of every kind. The dynasties rapidly changed, and the pregnant plans and aims of Archelaus ceased to be carried out. The names as well as the dates of the reign of these kings who followed one another quickly are not certain. Different historians have drawn up different lists of rulers according to the legends they have preferred to follow: Archelaus, Aeropus, Pausanias, Amyntas, Argæus, Amyntas, or Archelaus, Orestes, Aeropus, Pausanias, Amyntas, Argæus, Amyntas. We are here little concerned with the names; the picture of calamitous party struggles, which is shown us by that period, remains the same whether we adopt the longer or the shorter list. And, as very often happens, foreign enemies knew how to avail themselves of the internal distractions of the country.

Olynthus held at this time the foremost position in Chalcidice. Situated in front of Macedonia and projecting with three peninsulas into the Ægean Sea, Chalcidice had been early occupied by the Greeks and possessed a number of flourishing commercial cities and prosperous agricultural towns. Under the influence

EARLIER HISTORY OF MACEDON

and guidance of Olynthus the Chalcidian towns had united in a league, which left the individual cities administratively independent, but in other respects was

other states besides their native state, and exempted them from the burdensome barriers which Greek states had formerly erected against each other precisely owing to the citizenship, we can see in this league of the Chalcidian towns a consolidated state, with which the neighbours and even the states of the mother country had to reckon. Potidæa, the most important town of Chalcidice next to Olynthus had at last joined the league, which directed its efforts towards attaching to itself as many towns as possible, and did not shrink from forcible measures in order to attain this end. The Botticæans, Acanthians, Mendæans, and Apollonians were not members of the league, since they were unwilling to surrender their political independence; Amphipolis also, the town on the Strymon, held aloof.

Amyntas II. or III., who reigned from about 390 to 389 B.C. joined this league of the Chalcidian towns soon after his accession to the throne. He concluded

with it not only an alliance for mutual help in the event of either party to the treaty being attacked, but also a commercial treaty, in which advantages were conceded to the Chalcidians over other states in articles to be exported from Macedonia.

By these measures Amyntas was clearly seeking support against some imminent danger, for he also made concessions of territory to his ally. Unfortunately, we are unacquainted with details of the course of events; we only learn that Amyntas was driven by the Illyrians from his land, that Argæus, clearly in concert with these Illyrians, ascended the throne, and that the Chalcidians penetrated into Macedonia in the name of Amyntas and conquered great parts of it, including Pella, the capital.

In any case events soon took a favourable turn for Amyntas; supported by the Thessalians he returned after two years of absence with an army, entered his kingdom, and found now that



A HORSEMAN OF THE MACEDONIAN ARMY

Prior to its reorganisation by Archelaus, the Macedonian army consisted entirely of cavalry drawn from the nobility. From a bronze in the Naples Museum.

intended to prevent the disastrous splitting up of their strength, since for the common interest the separate states waived all claim to follow a policy of their own, whether in foreign affairs or in commercial transactions. In the meetings of the league, attended by delegates from the constituent states, at which the administrative board was chosen, resolutions were passed on the questions of foreign politics, which became binding on the individual states. The same course was adopted in the sphere of commercial policy; just as a war was resolved on by the league and waged by the league, so commercial treaties were subject to the decision of the league.

When we add that in the towns which were members of the league there existed equality of laws, and a citizenship of the league which allowed the acquisition of property and the conclusion of marriages, which gave individuals freedom of movement in

The Towns Sink Their Differences

the Chalcidians did not wish to give up the land they had acquired. We hear nothing more of Argæus : he had certainly been quickly deposed.

At this crisis, Amyntas, not being strong enough to face the Chalcidian league by himself, applied to Sparta for help. Acanthus and Apollonia, which

Greek Help had no longer been able alone
Against to defend their autonomy
Chalcidice against the encroachments of Olynthus, had already sent envoys there. Sparta, thus solicited for help, consented. In 383 B.C. Eudamidas invaded Chalcidice, but with his weak forces—Phœbidas, who was to accompany him had on the way occupied the Cadmea—was unable to undertake any serious operations. Potidæa alone deserted the league and joined Sparta. The next year Teleutias arrived at the head of 10,000 warriors. He had urged Amyntas to spare no efforts to regain possession of his kingdom ; to hire troops, since the land that was left him was too small to yield him an army for the field, and to win over the neighbouring chiefs by presents of money. In accordance with these instructions, Amyntas, with a small army, and Derdas, chief of the Elimioti, with 400 horsemen, joined the Spartan commander in his advance.

At the beginning Teleutias gained a victory over the allies under the walls of Olynthus ; but after that he sustained a reverse and was himself killed. It was left to Polybiades to invest Olynthus by land and sea and to cut it off from all communication. The Olynthians, through stress of hunger, were forced to make terms. The result was that they were obliged to dissolve the Chalcidian league, recognise the supremacy of Sparta, and furnish her with troops. The power of Olynthus, however, was not broken. The city soon revived and stood once more at the head of a powerful confederacy. The conquered territory in Macedonia had,

Chalcidian of course, been given up,
League and Amyntas thus became
Dissolved again master of all Macedonia.

Chiefly, then, through the support of foreign powers, Amyntas extricated his kingdom undiminished from its difficulties. The period of distress was followed by years of tranquillity and peace. The political situation of the Greek peninsula was in the king's favour. Sparta, which had just shown her power by the humilia-


tion of Olynthus, was too much taken up by the rise of Thebes and its immense progress under Epaminondas and Peiopidas to be able now to extend her power in Chalcidice.

At the same time Athens had succeeded in founding the second Athenian maritime confederacy and in inducing many towns on the Thracian coast as well as on the Chalcidian peninsula to join it. But Olynthus on the one side, Amphipolis on the other, did not enter it. Olynthus, it is true, was for the moment humiliated by Sparta, but still showed a degree of power which commanded respect. Amphipolis, in an extremely favourable situation on the mouth of the Strymon and with a rich hinterland on the high-road from Macedonia and Chalcidice to Thrace, itself originally founded by the Athenians from whom it afterwards revolted, was destined to be brought back under the dominion of the Athenians, now that they had again planted themselves firmly in these parts. Athens spared no sacrifices and equipped fleets and armies to attain that end. Under these circumstances we under-

Macedonian stand the aim of the alliance
Alliance concluded between Amyntas
with Athens and Athens, although the terms of it are not preserved to us.

Amyntas sought support against the towns of Chalcidice, once his confederates and now his bitter enemies. Athens desired a powerful ally in her endeavour to restore her former power. We know that at the peace congress at Sparta in 371 B.C., Amyntas admitted the claims of Athens to Amphipolis and offered to support her in the reconquest of the town. What, indeed, can Athens have offered Amyntas as compensation for this proffered assistance ? Unfortunately the terms to which the two parties agreed in the proposed alliance have not been preserved. But we shall soon see how great a part Amphipolis somewhat later was destined to play once more in the relations between Macedonia and Athens.

An alliance was formed also between Jason of Pheræ and Amyntas of Macedon. Jason had succeeded in suppressing political dissension in Thessaly, and stood as *Tagus* at the head of a united country. In the midst of the numerous unruly and discontented elements which must have existed there, when the power of this one man could be developed only at the cost of a number of families accustomed to



THE FLEET OF THE SPARTAN ADMIRAL TELEUTIAS, ALLY OF AMYNTAS OF MACEDON, ATTACKING PIRÆUS, THE FORT OF ATHENS

exercise a tyranny of their own, he thought it advisable to be on a good footing with his northern neighbours in order that Macedonia might not become a rendezvous for his foes. Perhaps also he wished to be able to reckon on the firmly re-established power of Amyntas in executing his own ambitious plans, for he aimed at nothing less than the hegemony of Greece. From all we know, this treaty started with Jason. The circumstance points to the fact that Amyntas at the end of his reign must have once more obtained an important and undisputed position. But before Jason could carry out his great schemes he was assassinated; and almost at the same time—in 370 B.C.—Amyntas also died.

The Death of King Amyntas

In Thessaly, Jason's power, after the short reigns of his brothers Polydorus and Polyphron, who were likewise assassinated, was transferred to his nephew Alexander. The successors of Jason, by their cruelty and tyranny, soon roused universal discontent, which they on their side sought to overcome by murder and banishment. Exiled nobles came from Larissa and Pella. Urged by them and by other Thessalians, Alexander of Macedon, the eldest of the three sons of Amyntas and his wife Eurydice, marched into Thessaly, drove out the garrisons of the tyrant of Phæræ from Larissa and Crannon, and occupied the two towns. This proceeding did not please the Thessalians, who wished to be freed from the yoke of Alexander of Phæræ, but not to have two lords instead of one; and they now solicited the help of the Thebans. Meantime, the Macedonian Alexander had been obliged to return to his country, where Ptolemy of Alorus, the paramour of Eurydice, was grasping at the crown. The garrisons which he had left behind in Thessaly could not long hold out without him, and thus his attempt to extend his power beyond the borders of his own kingdom was frustrated.

But this was not the worst. In Macedonia itself foreign influence was destined once more to become predominant for some years. The Thebans, called in by the Thessalians, came under the leadership

of Pelopidas. and arranged matters as best suited their own interests. From Thessaly, Pelopidas went also to Macedonia and brought about a reconciliation between Alexander and Ptolemy. But soon after his departure Alexander was murdered by Ptolemy, who became the guardian of Perdiccas, the second son of Amyntas, heir to the throne, but a minor. New complications ensued.



EURYDICE
The scheming wife of Amyntas II., king of Macedon.

A certain Pausanias came forward as claimant to the crown, occupied Anthemus and Threma with Greek mercenaries, and actually found supporters in the country. Under these circumstances Ptolemy and Eurydice, who were now married, turned to the Athenian general Iphicrates, who at that very time was

cruising on the coast of Thrace. Pausanias was driven out of the country by him. But the Thebans, anxious not to lose once more their recently acquired influence in Macedonia, sent Pelopidas there again in 368 B.C. He concluded a treaty with Ptolemy, the regent and guardian of Perdiccas, in virtue of which men were to be furnished to the Theban army and hostages given; among these latter, Philip, the third son of Amyntas, and eventually king of Macedonia, came to Thebes. The rule of Ptolemy did not last long. In 365 B.C. he was murdered by Perdiccas, who now ascended the throne as king. He withdrew from the influence of Thebes, and openly took the side of the Athenians, lending them assistance in their wars against the newly formed Chalcidian League, which once more was headed by Olynthus. Afterwards, however, he became



COIN OF PERDICCAS III.
A fine gold stater of Perdiccas III., the predecessor of Philip of Macedon.

hostile to the Athenians—we do not know exactly on what grounds. We might conjecture that the capture of Pydna by the Athenians, which occurred at this time, and was connected with the conquest of Potidæa and Torone in Chalcidice, had made Perdiccas an opponent of Athens. The Athenian arms won a victory over the Macedonian forces, and the contending parties made a compromise, the terms of which, it was said at Athens, were too favourable to Perdiccas and in 362 B.C. cost the Athenian commander, Callisthenes, his life. Perdiccas fell in a great battle against the Illyrians.

Peace with Profit to the Conquered



PHILIP OF MACEDON

AND THE FOUNDING OF THE EMPIRE

AFTER the death of Perdiccas, Philip, youngest son of King Amyntas, took over the government on behalf of his infant nephew ; and soon after—we do not indeed know the exact date—the nobles and national army of Macedonia summoned him to be king, and thus conferred on him the dignity and position for which he showed himself amply qualified from the outset.

Since more than four thousand Macedonians had perished with Perdiccas, the whole land was a prey to consternation and despair. The Illyrians invaded Macedonia and occupied the adjoining parts. Owing to this, their northern neighbours, the Pæonians, were likewise emboldened to invade and plunder the adjacent state. And, as had happened so often before on a change of ruler, kinsmen of the royal house appeared as claimants to the throne. Argæus, one of

Quarrels for the Throne

the claimants, found support at Athens, which had long been fruitlessly trying to reconquer Amphipolis, and now hoped to realise its object at last. In return for the promise of Argæus to help to conquer Amphipolis, the Athenians supported him with troops, which were landed in Methone by their strategus, Mantias, and then led to Ægæ by the claimant. Another claimant, the Pausanias mentioned towards the close of the preceding chapter, found support in the Thracians. This hopeless and complicated state of affairs showed only too clearly the point at which an energetic ruler must begin in order to lead his country onwards to a prosperous development and a more glorious future. The surrounding barbarian tribes would have to be subdued and brought to respect the power of Macedonia.

Even when this was successfully accomplished, Macedonia could not win a more important place in the political system of the old world until it was economically independent of those Hellenes to whom the

coast belonged. Macedonia could develop its powers only when the export of its natural products by sea was open to it, and when the import of foreign commodities was facilitated. But up till now it had been economically dependent on the cities on the coast—namely, Olynthus, the

Macedon's Dependence on Greece

Chalcidian League, and Athens, which, under Timotheus, had again obtained a firm footing in Chalcidice, had subdued the rich cities of Potidæa and Torone in the Olynthian War, and had actually conquered the originally Macedonian towns of Pydna and Methone on the western shore of the Thermaic Gulf ; so that no seaport worthy of mention was anywhere left to Macedonia. In fact, this remoteness from the coast had led to the circumstance that foreign states obtained and exercised political influence in Macedonia. But the success which the previous kings of the country had failed to obtain, despite their numerous attempts, was destined to attend the efforts of the young and energetic Philip to free himself from this cramped situation.

As we have already seen, Philip had been surrendered to Ptolemy as a hostage to the Thebans, and had thus early learnt in his own person the impotency and weakness of his country. However painful to the young patriot may have been his sojourn in Thebes, it certainly was beneficial to him, for at that time this town, through the services of Epaminondas and Pelopidas, stood at the zenith of its power. It is not known when he was allowed to return to Pella, but certainly it was before the death of his brother Perdiccas. Beyond this we know nothing of his youth : wherever he appeared afterwards he showed himself to be no rude and unschooled barbarian, but emphatically a man who valued Greek education and culture, and knew how to appropriate it for himself.

Philip a Hostage in Thebes

This could not have been due merely to his stay at Thebes. In Macedonia itself progress had in the meanwhile been made on the path pointed out by Archelaus. King Perdiccas, too, loved Hellenic art and Hellenic learning.

Philip undertook a difficult task when he first assumed the government for his nephew; but he showed natural capacity for it. When Argæus, rejected by the citizens of Ægæ, returned to Methone, he attacked and defeated him. This first success inspirited the Macedonians, and filled them afresh with that confidence and courage which had failed them after their defeat by the Illyrians. But this victory had far more important results: Philip sent back without a ransom the Athenians who were taken prisoners in the battle, and thus paved a way towards a reconciliation with Athens. A secret treaty was arranged with the Athenian envoys, which on their return was laid before the council, but not before the popular assembly. In return for Philip's promise to conquer Amphipolis for them the Athenians were willing to surrender Pydna to him.

But before this Philip had first to secure his frontiers against his enemies. At the beginning of the summer of 358 B.C. he began the campaigns which were necessary partly to secure the frontiers, partly to win back the portions of Macedonian territory occupied by the enemy. Philip turned his arms first against the Pæonians, whose king, Agis, had died about this time. After defeating them he forced them to submit to the power of Macedonia. He then marched against the Illyrians, whose king, Bardylis, offered peace on the terms of recognising the status quo. Philip could have peace if he waived all claim to the territory occupied by Bardylis. But Philip rejected the conditions. After a fierce battle, in which Philip himself commanded his right wing, the Macedonians were finally victors. The prize of victory for them and their king was the expulsion of the Illyrians from the Macedonian towns, which they had previously occupied.

**Illyrians
Driven From
Macedon**

Thus triumphant in the north and west, Philip turned his arms the next year 357 B.C., against Amphipolis, as he had promised in the secret treaty with the Athenians. Strangely enough, the Athenians themselves took no steps to secure

the capture of the long-coveted town, but even rejected the offer of surrender made by the Amphipolitans to avoid becoming subjects to the Macedonians.

Apparently they trusted Philip's promises; yet the conduct of the Athenians is the less intelligible since, after the successful storming of Amphipolis, they had no intention of fulfilling the duty imposed on them by the treaty of giving up Pydna to Philip. Did they think to keep the one town and to acquire the other in addition? The king did not hold this view. The leaders of the Athenian party in Amphipolis were banished, and the town became thenceforth Macedonian, even though its civic independence was left it, and it was compensated by other acts of favour for the loss of the freedom it had so often and so long defended. Not long after, Pydna also was captured and again incorporated into the Macedonian kingdom, to which it had belonged before its occupation by the Athenians. Philip thus became master of these towns, both of which were strategically important, since the one commanded the road to Thrace, the other the road to Thessaly. Both

**Founding
of
Philippi**

also opened for the king the way to the sea. But what made the possession of Amphipolis especially valuable was that, simultaneously with, or shortly after, its capture, the small town of Crenides, which had been founded by the Thasians, being attacked by the surrounding Thracians, sought and obtained the help of Philip. Crenides received new settlers, and was called Philippi after its new founder.

This new town, which soon flourished and found in the kingdom of Macedonia a powerful protection against its barbarian neighbours, presented on its side a favourable base from which to command the mountains of Pangæum, which were rich in precious metals, and the well-wooded plain of Datus; with the possession of Crenides Philip had acquired possession of all this district. The gold-mines were systematically worked, and are said to have brought him in 1,000 talents yearly. And while Amphipolis at the mouth of the Strymon offered him a port from which his ships might sail, Datus supplied him with the requisite timber and pitch for shipbuilding.

The Athenians now came to recognise the disadvantages of using someone else to pull the chestnuts out of the fire. They vented their indignation in high-sounding

PHILIP OF MACEDON

public resolutions. The treaty between them and Philip was, of course, broken off.

Athens at the moment lacked the means, and also the strength which proceeds from a definitely directed policy, to be able to carry on war against the Macedonian king with prospect of success. She had to fight with the rebellious members of her confederation, Byzantium, Chios, Cos, and others, and made great sacrifices in order to bring them back to their obedience. The Thracian Chersonese, the possession of which was the more important to her because through it she commanded the passage into the Black Sea, had to be

defended by her against the continued attacks of the Thracian princes. And the defects which had often calamitously affected and crippled the conduct of the campaign in the struggle against Cotys and his son Cersebleptes during recent years—the indolence and self-indulgence of the Athenian citizens, their reluctance to take the field, the constant fluctuations to which their party-life was subject—were all unfortunately apparent when war was declared on Philip.

It might have been supposed that Athens would now, as a matter of course, have been anxious to come to terms with Olynthus and the league of the Chalcidian towns, in order to obtain a base of operations in the immediate vicinity of Macedonia, and to oppose Philip vigorously in concert with the powerful resources of Olynthus, especially since Olynthus had already sent an embassy to Athens, and had taken measures to arrange the matters in dispute, when Philip marched against Amphipolis. The proposal was not then acceded to; and now, after the outbreak of the war, we do not hear that Athens sought allies in Chalcidice against Macedonia. On the contrary, Philip joined

**Athens
Without
Allies**

Olynthus and its league. He conceded to them Anthemus, a Macedonian town, and promised to conquer Potidæa for them, which, situated in the immediate vicinity of Olynthus, was the key to the peninsula of Pallene, and had been made an Athenian possession by Timotheus. Philip now advanced with a strong army against Potidæa, took it after a long siege, since the Athenian relieving fleet came too late, and sold the inhabitants into slavery, while he let the Athenian citizens who had settled there depart without a ransom. The town was destroyed and its territory given over


**Potidæa
Taken and
Destroyed**

to the Olynthians in 356 B.C. Thus Athens had once more lost a strong position.

About this time the Athenians negotiated a treaty of alliance with Cetriporis, the ruler of the western part of Thrace, who was indignant with Philip on account of the loss of Crenides and the adjoining coast, and with the two princes of Pæonia and Illyria, Grabus and Lyypeius, old enemies of Macedonia. In the treaty assistance was expressly promised to Cetriporis in order to wrest Crenides and "other places" from the king.

The concessions made to Grabus and Lyypeius, and the promises made on their part by the three allies to Athens have unfortunately been broken off the stone on which the treaty is inscribed. This league might certainly have caused trouble to Philip. But before the allies were completely prepared and could proceed to united and vigorous action, they were subdued singly, so that there was no longer any serious danger threatening Macedonia.

Athens, left alone, showed herself no match for the king; she had always been worsted when opposed to him, and she was destined in the further course of the war to reap no laurels. For in the face of the losses which she had previously suffered, it is of little importance that in 353 B.C.



PHILIP II. OF MACEDON

The great father of a still more renowned son, Alexander the Great, whose world empire he made possible.

the Athenian general, Chares, inflicted a defeat on a Macedonian detachment of mercenaries at Cypsela in Thrace, and that the newly formed Macedonian fleet could escape his ships only by a stratagem, or that here and there Macedonian harbours were occasionally blockaded. Philip, who accompanied the Theban Pammenes on his expedition to Ariobarzanes, the rebellious satrap of the Hellespont, and pushed on as far as the Hebrus, had taken away from the Athenians Abdera and Maronea, towns on the Thracian coast, which had belonged to the Athenian maritime confederacy since 375 B.C. These towns remained in the king's hands even after the victory of Chares. Philip indeed turned back, either because the Thracian chief Amadocus in the district of the Hebrus barred the passage through his territory, or because he wished to avoid a serious collision with Chares. For this time, at any rate, the Athenians were freed from their fear of a Macedonian invasion of their possessions on the Thracian Chersonese.

In the same year, however, Athens suffered another loss. Philip, having returned from Thrace, marched against Methone, which lay north of Pydna and had up till now remained in the possession of the Athenians; after a gallant resistance the citizens surrendered the town, which was plundered and destroyed, they themselves being allowed to withdraw. On this occasion also, as at Potidæa, Athenian aid came up too late. Philip himself lost his right eye by an arrow during the siege.

Meantime an opportunity presented itself to the king for interfering in Thessaly. Here Alexander of Pheræ had been obliged to surrender the headship of Thessaly, which Jason held, and was at strife and variance not only with the Aleudæ of Larissa, but with the whole country.

Even after his death, in 359 B.C., his successors, Lycophron and Pitholaus, were not able even to attain the former position of a Jason. By 361 the Thessalians, who had formed themselves into a league, had concluded an alliance with Athens against the attacks of Alexander; but Athens did nothing to secure for herself the dominant influence in Thessaly. So she lost here also a favourable opportunity, and by inactivity and want of foresight let things

**Athenian
Want of
Foresight**

go so far that Philip became master of the whole situation in Thessaly.

In the so-called Third Holy War the Piiocians, when attacked by the Amphictyons, especially by the Thebans and Locrians, had made themselves masters of the temple at Delphi and of its treasures, and had enrolled an army of mercenaries therewith; by which means they were able not merely to repel their antagonists, but also to interfere in the affairs of foreign states. The Dynasts of Pheræ had joined them; the Aleuadæ, on the contrary, and the Thessalian League called in King Philip. He immediately started for Thessaly, took over the supreme command of the army of the Thessalian League, defeated Phaellus, the commander of the Phocians, and occupied Pagasæ, the port of Pheræ. Onomarchus, it is true, advanced to bring help, worsted Philip in two battles and drove him out of the country; but the king was not the man to let himself be deterred by this disaster. In the next spring, 352 B.C., he advanced into Thessaly once more, and this time succeeded in checking and completely

defeating Onomarchus, in a spot admirably suited to the manœuvres of his own and the Thessalian cavalry. The forces of the Dynast of Pheræ came too late to aid Onomarchus. The Phocian general himself and six hundred mercenaries were left on the field of battle; the prisoners, three thousand in number, were thrown into the sea, which was near, as being robbers of the temple. Phayllus was able to bring only a small number safely to Thermopylæ, where the detachments of other friendly states, such as Sparta and Athens, joined him.

Philip advanced through Thessaly to Thermopylæ; but the occupation of the pass made him turn back. He had indeed no intention of risking the advantages which he had just gained in Thessaly by a defeat at Thermopylæ, a pass most difficult to take; yet the rejoicings, especially at Athens, were great when it was known that Philip was not advancing into the heart of Greece. This result was willingly ascribed to the despatch of the Athenian troops under Nausicles. The consequence of the victory over Onomarchus was the capitulation of Pheræ, and the expulsion of the tyrants there, a success which filled the Thessalians with great gratitude towards Philip and made them perma-

**Slaughter
of the
Phocians**

nently his allies. From this time Philip was the leader of the Thessalian confederation and commanded their forces, to the maintenance of which the customs from various ports were applied. Thus he attained the object for which his eldest brother, Alexander, had striven in vain.

Meantime, affairs in Thrace had taken a turn which caused Philip to interfere. We have already learned what exertions and trouble it had cost Athens to maintain for herself the Thracian Chersonese, an old Athenian possession, against the attacks of the Thracian princes Cotys and Cersebleptes. For more than ten years war had been waged there against the Thracians, without sufficient forces, and therefore without successful results. Athens was not in a position to reduce her restless and conquest-loving neighbours to a state of permanent tranquility, so that she might enjoy her possessions. Things seemed likely to turn out disastrously, when about 353 B.C., Cersebleptes made peace with the Athenians, and left the Chersonese to them, after evacuating the places conquered by him.

Dearly Bought Peace

But this reconciliation of the former opponents filled the Greek towns of Byzantium and Perinthus with anxious forebodings. They had won their independence from Athens in the war of the league, had left the Athenian maritime confederation, and for the moment indeed were living at peace with Athens but not exactly on terms of special amity. The two towns had also repeatedly suffered at the hands of Cotys and afterwards of Cersebleptes.

This anxiety was shared by the above-mentioned Thracian chief in the Hebrus district, Amadocus. He, as well as Byzantium and Perinthus, sought to join Philip of Macedonia and concluded a treaty with him, which was aimed at Cersebleptes but indirectly at the Athenians also. In fact we find Philip soon afterwards in Thrace, pressing along the Propontis, on which the kingdom of Cersebleptes lay; here he besieged Heræontæchus, a stronghold of the Thracian princes. The news caused great consternation at Athens; and it was resolved to equip a great fleet. But, as on so many previous occasions, notwithstanding their resolutions and their good intentions in the beginning, nothing serious was done. When, some months afterwards, ten ships

put to sea, Cersebleptes had already been overthrown, had been forced to make concessions of territory to the allies, and had given his son as hostage. Charidemus, leader of the Greek mercenaries, who had long been with him, was obliged to leave Thrace, and now entered the Athenian service. It must have been in this cam-

Expansion of Macedonia

paign that Cetriporis—who ruled that part of Thrace which immediately borders on Macedonia and had finally, in 356 B.C., attempted to make war on Philip in alliance with Athens and the princes Grabus and Lyppæius, as related above—was dethroned and his kingdom confiscated. Macedonia thus extended as far as the river Nestus.

The results of the long war were unusually favourable to Philip; the country from Thermopylæ as far as the Propontis came under his influence, and the last great possession of Athens, the Thracian Chersonese, was now directly menaced. But before this war ended a serious danger was destined to confront the king. As early as 352 B.C., while he was still occupied in Thessaly, Olynthus made peace with its old opponent Athens, contrary to the terms of the treaty entered into with Philip, which enjoined on the allies the joint conclusion of peace with their enemies as well as the joint declaration of war. Merely party politics alone induced the Olynthians to take this step; the supporters of Macedonia encountered an opposition which was friendly to Athens, and sought to join the Athenians, and the peace concluded with the latter city was a victory for this party. Besides this, there is no doubt that there prevailed in Athens an intense desire to render the Olynthians hostile to the hated Philip, and that the proper means were employed to create a popular feeling in favour of Athens.

For the time matters rested with the making of peace, and did not go so far as

The Great Orations of Demosthenes

an alliance. Philip first took active measures when Olynthus received into its walls his half-brother, who sought to gain the Macedonian crown, and refused to surrender him at the king's request. He then advanced into Chalcidice with a strong army, and Olynthus concluded an alliance with Athens in 349 B.C. There Demosthenes delivered his first speech against Philip; and his Olynthic orations sharpened the consciences of his fellow-

townsmen, who by their levity and dilatoriness had largely contributed to Philip's successes. He did not, however, succeed in completely rousing the Athenians and making them exert the force which he considered necessary, and from which alone he augured success. Chares, it is true, was immediately ordered to

Philip Destroys Olynthus Olynthus with 30 triremes and 2,000 light troops, and, under Charidemus, 18 more ships with 4,000 mercenaries and 150

horsemen sailed for the same destination; but the citizen hoplites remained at home. Of these 2,000 were at last sent, with 300 horsemen, when Olynthus appealed urgently for help, being hard pressed by Philip, who had subdued one town after another in Chalcidice and, in spite of the preliminary successes of Charidemus, had actually invested the town itself. But they came too late. In the interval Olynthus had fallen. The town was destroyed and the land divided among the Macedonians in the summer of 348 B.C.

The fall of Olynthus produced consternation at Athens. The ten-years war with Philip had brought a succession of disasters to the Athenians; their possessions in Chalcidice and on the Macedonian coast were lost. The prospect of once more acquiring Amphipolis, which they formerly possessed, was gone completely. Gone, too, was the hope they had entertained that by promptly bringing aid to Olynthus and holding it against the king they might gain there at any rate a firm foothold, from which they might perhaps regain their influence in Chalcidice. Now indeed it seemed dangerously probable that they would lose the Chersonese also, and their old possessions Imbros, Lemnos, and Scyros through a Macedonian attack. There was the additional difficulty that large sums of money had been already employed in the war—Demosthenes and

Financial Crisis in Athens and the Athenian finances had thus been considerably drained. Especially after the war of the league, the money contribu-

tions of the allied states were much diminished, while the expenses of the public treasury, the theatre, and law courts had rather increased. The prospect of obtaining help from outside was destroyed, since not one of the Greek states, on the invitation of the Athenians to make common war with Philip, had

shown any readiness. We can well understand the desire for peace that prevailed at Athens.

The revulsion at Athens in favour of Philip was produced by an event quite unimportant in itself. An Athenian citizen, Phrynon of Rhamnus, having fallen into the hands of Macedonian privateers during the Olympian truce of the gods, bought his freedom, and on his return to his native town begged his fellow-citizens to send an envoy with him to Philip, in order if possible to recover the ransom. This was done. Ctesiphon journeyed with him to Macedonia. Philip received the two courteously, refunded the ransom, and made it known to the Athenians how unwillingly he was at war with them, and how gladly he would be reconciled to them. The effect of this message was that at Athens a decree of the people, passed after the fall of Amphipolis, by which it was forbidden to receive heralds or envoys of peace from Philip, was repealed on the motion of Philocrates. And the good feeling towards Philip was still further increased when, on the

Philip's Generosity to Athens application of the Athenian people, he released without ransom two Athenian citizens who had been captured by him. These on their return to Athens praised both the friendly attitude of the king and his strong inclination for peace.

The Athenians therefore resolved to send an embassy to Philip and to enter into negotiations for peace. The terms were settled in Macedonia, and then, after the return of the Athenian ambassadors, and the immediate arrival of two representatives of Philip, were discussed in the popular assembly at Athens and accepted after a warm debate. The recognition of the *status quo*—that is, the abandonment of all claim to Amphipolis, Potidæa and all the other former Athenian possessions on the Chalcidian and Thracian coast—was the chief condition of the so-called "Peace of Philocrates"; the possession of the Thracian Chersonese was, on the other hand, guaranteed to Athens. A second article extended the peace to the allies on both sides. Under "allies," however, Philip understood only the members of the Attic League, while at Athens there was a disposition to include under this term the Phocians and Cersebleptes. This changed the whole aspect of affairs. The king was at the moment in Thrace, waging war

against Cersebleptes, and was urged by the Thebans to bring them help against the Phocians—the most favourable opportunity that could be imagined for interfering in Greek affairs and for firmly establishing the Macedonian influence on the other side of Thermopylæ.

Since his representatives refused to include the Phocians and Cersebleptes expressly in the peace, Demosthenes' contention was agreed to—namely, that the Phocians and Cersebleptes were not mentioned in the terms of the peace, and that

therefore "allies" meant in Philip's sense of the word only the states represented in the synod. On these terms peace and an alliance were concluded, and the treaty was sworn at Athens. In order that the king might take the oath to it, a new embassy was sent to him, in which among others Demosthenes and Æschines took part. On Demosthenes' motion the council ordered the ambassadors to start without delay and to hasten to the king by the shortest route, for as soon as he had taken the oath the orator hoped he would make no further conquests in Thrace. Demosthenes certainly believed that by his personal negotiations with the king he would be able to obtain the inclusion of Cersebleptes in the peace and avert the danger threatening the Phocians. But the embassy had to wait for Philip at Pella; and when he at last gave audience to the Athenian envoys he declared that he neither would nor could abandon his Thracian conquests nor desist from war with the Phocians; openly and before the eyes of all—besides Athens, other Greek states had sent embassies to Pella—he made preparations for this war. If Demosthenes had calculated on an alteration of the terms of peace through personal negotiations, he had deceived himself; and if afterwards

Failure of Athens Embassy

in his orations he made not himself but his fellow envoys and the craft of Philip responsible for this disappointment, his conduct is, humanly, quite intelligible. When Philip was actually on the march against Phocis, he signed the peace with the conditions laid down at Athens. The Macedonian king was now about to realise the scheme that may long have been floating before his mind, the establishment of his influence in Greece. When he marched against Thermopylæ, Phalæcus, the Phocian general, and 8,000 mercenaries laid down their arms. Phocis was in Philip's hand. His request that the Athenians should allow their army to join his, in order to settle the Phocian question in common, was rejected. The feeling in Athens was now changed, and the bitter opponents of Philip, especially Demosthenes and Hegesippus, made their influence felt. Thus the Athenians were obliged to approve and allow things to be done without sharing in the work, for they were helpless to prevent them, and could not make up their minds to join Philip in his task of reorganising Hellenic affairs. The Amphictyonic council, summoned by Philip, gave him the two votes of the Phocians, and decreed the destruction of all the Phocian towns

and the settlement of the inhabitants in villages—a penalty which they had well deserved, on account of their violation and plundering of the temple at Delphi, contrary to the law of nations, and of their numerous cruelties during the war waged by them. In alliance and amity with Thebes, and in possession of the pass of Thermopylæ, Philip could now march at any moment into Greece, as the decree of the Amphictyons allowed him at any time to interfere in Greek affairs. Thus, an important step had been taken towards the uniting of Greece, continually disturbed

Philip's Designs on Greece

of all the Phocian towns



DEMOSTHENES

The great statesman and orator who roused Athens for the final struggle with Philip of Macedon. From the statue in the Vatican.

When he marched against Thermopylæ, Phalæcus, the Phocian general, and 8,000 mercenaries laid down their arms. Phocis was in Philip's hand. His request that the Athenians should allow their army to join his, in order to settle the Phocian question in common, was rejected. The feeling in Athens was now changed, and the bitter opponents of Philip, especially Demosthenes and Hegesippus, made their influence felt. Thus the Athenians were obliged to approve and allow things to be done without sharing in the work, for they were helpless to prevent them, and could not make up their minds to join Philip in his task of reorganising Hellenic affairs. The Amphictyonic council, summoned by Philip, gave him the two votes of the Phocians, and decreed the destruction

of all the Phocian towns and the settlement of the inhabitants in villages—a penalty which they had well deserved, on account of their violation and plundering of the temple at Delphi, contrary to the law of nations, and of their numerous cruelties during the war waged by them. In alliance and amity with Thebes, and in possession of the pass of Thermopylæ, Philip could now march at any moment into Greece, as the decree of the Amphictyons allowed him at any time to interfere in Greek affairs. Thus, an important step had been taken towards the uniting of Greece, continually disturbed

by tribal and party feuds and exhausted by ceaseless wars, under the headship of Macedonia. In the course of this war, lasting twelve years, Philip not only made his country immune against the assaults of neighbouring powers that had formerly harassed it so often, but had brought Macedonia as an equal member into the state system of the time, and had actually created for it a leading position among the kindred tribes of the Hellenes.

Macedon's Rise to Power

Philip never planned a conquest of Greece, as his opponents falsely said of him, but a Macedonian hegemony.

In Athens the opposition which existed against the prevailing system of government increased after the Peace of Philocrates; the discredit brought by it on the city was finally evident to all. In addition to this, the opposition pointed to the glorious past of Athens, compared the present with it, and managed to remind the citizens from time to time that the headship of Greece belonged to them and not to a "barbarian," for as such the radical orators took pleasure in stigmatising Philip. They opposed the ambitious Macedonian by appealing to the spirit of nationality. Indeed, it is quite comprehensible that a nation with a great past should stake everything in order to remain in possession of her ancient power, and should refuse to divest herself of it in favour of another without a struggle. Up to this moment, Athens had certainly shown merely weakness where strength might have been expected. Nevertheless she roused herself once more.

This was the work of the great Demosthenes. He and his party had set their minds on a war from the very outset; not merely an Athenian, however, but a Hellenic war. He himself, and other orators of his party, frequently visited the Peloponnese, Eubœa, and other parts of Greece, in order to effect alliances with

The Statesmanship of Demosthenes

Athens. For the condition of affairs in Greece had driven into the arms of Philip the states of the Peloponnese, Megalopolis, Elis, Messene, which were continually attacked by Sparta, as well as the foremost towns of Eubœa, which Athens, in 348 B.C., had alienated by supporting Plutarchus, tyrant of Eretria. The important point now was to bring over to Athens the states which had gone to the side of Macedonia; in short, the Mace-

donian influence had here, as in other states, to be destroyed, and the Athenian once more to be made predominant. And it may well be ascribed to the indefatigable efforts of Demosthenes that, in 342 B.C., four years after the Peace of Philocrates, Athens had concluded an alliance with the Messenians, Argives, Megalopolitans, Achæans, and other states, and that soon afterwards Eubœa, Megara, Corinth and others also joined the league.

It is evident that these conditions could not escape the king's notice. In 344 B.C. he had attacked the Dardanians and Illyrians, those ever restless neighbours of his kingdom, and once more secured his frontiers against them. Then in 343 he had undertaken a campaign in Epirus, in order to depose the Molossian king, Arybbas, and to place Alexander, the brother of his wife Olympia, on the throne of his fathers. He had taken this opportunity to subdue, for Alexander, Cossopia, which adjoins the Molossians on the south, but had desisted from wider operations in these districts, presumably because the Athenians had sent a force to Acarnania.

Philip's Consideration for Athens

It is certain that Arybbas found a hospitable reception in Athens, and that to ensure his personal safety he was placed under the protection of the council and the generals, but the resolution to reinstate him in his kingdom with an army was not carried out. Philip would certainly not have allowed that, although he showed great consideration towards Athens, for in the same year he sent Python as envoy to Athens in order to negotiate the alteration of the Peace of Philocrates.

The Athenians desired recognition of their old claims on Amphipolis, Potidæa, and their former Thracian and Chalcidian possessions. It was easy to comprehend that Philip could not and would not accede to this demand. In the following year he made offers again to Athens to alter the terms of the peace. This time he conceded to them the freedom and independence of the Greek towns not included in the treaty, and professed his readiness to submit disputed points to arbitration; but Athens replied to this with her former demand that each party should have that which by right belonged to it. Under these circumstances it was hardly possible to avoid a rupture with Philip; and the Athenians soon produced it. Athens had sent new cleruchs under

Diopithes to the Thracian Chersonese, which had been guaranteed to her under the Peace of Philocrates. They demanded of Cardia admission into the town and its territory, although by the terms of peace in 346 B.C. its independence had been acknowledged. Diopithes obtained mercenaries and made an attack on Cardia, which then asked for and obtained a garrison from Philip, its ally.

Thereupon Diopithes invaded and pillaged the king's Thracian possessions and sold his prisoners for slaves. Philip demanded as satisfaction from Athens the recall of Diopithes. But this was not done; on the contrary, he was supported by fresh funds and munitions of war. This was tantamount to a declaration of war; yet the actual outbreak did not take place for a considerable time. Philip was busy in Thrace, whither he had marched with a strong army in 342 B.C. His object this time was to check the activity of the warlike chief, Cersebleptes, from whom he had already captured some fortresses. The Thracian chief, notwithstanding his unfortunate experiences, continued to devastate the territory

Thrace a Macedonian Province

of the Greek towns adjoining Thrace. Philip came forward now as the protector and patron of the Greek towns; of which, indeed, Cardia, Byzantium and Perinthus were allied with him. And since Cersebleptes was allied with Athens, which came now more and more under the influence of the war-party and seemed disposed to open hostilities against the king, it may have been satisfactory to Philip to have a good reason for taking decisive measures against Thrace. Cersebleptes, beaten in several battles, was deposed and his territory made into a tributary province of Macedonia.

It was on this occasion that Teres, the son of the Thracian prince Amodocus, mentioned above, was deprived of his dominions. The founding of towns, among them Philippopolis, which has preserved the name of its founder to the present day, proves that Philip wished to extend civilisation into the most distant parts of Thrace, and to make the fruitful valley of the Hebrus a permanent possession of Macedonia. By this war Philip became involved in hostilities with Byzantium and Perinthus, which, up till now allied with him, had refused to render aid to him in the Thracian war. Both towns

were besieged; they both, however, held out, being situated on the sea, by which they could get supplies, and being in addition supported by allies—Perinthus, by the Persian satrap of the opposite coast, and Byzantium by Athens and other Greek maritime states. The Macedonian fleet could not enforce a blockade in the

Expedition Against the Scythians

face of the superior power of the enemy on the sea. Philip next undertook an expedition northward, in order to attack the Scythians. Though he obviously could have had little hope of their complete subjection and of a conquest of their territory, it seemed advisable to him to show his power in order to deter them from their repeated raids. The Scythian king, Ateas, was defeated; unfortunately, the immense booty taken was mostly lost on the way back, where the Macedonians had to defend themselves against the attacks of the Triballi. In 339 B.C., after an absence of three years, Philip returned to Macedonia.

The refusal of the Hellespontine seaports Byzantium and Perinthus to support their ally, Philip, and the war that had thus been caused, had led in the meantime to a declaration of war by Athens against Macedonia. Since Philip required his fleet for the siege, and this might have been stopped on its passage through the Hellespont by the Athenian general Diopithes, who was still present in the Chersonese, he advanced on the Chersonese in order to accompany his ships, doing no more than Diopithes had previously done. This gave the Athenians the pretext to declare war on Philip in 340 B.C.

By means of appropriate financial measures on which Demosthenes had so long insisted, they raised the necessary money, prosecuted vigorously the fitting out of the fleet, and sent help to beleaguered Byzantium. If the king, nevertheless, undertook the campaign against

The Last War with Macedon

the Scythians first, it was clearly because he was momentarily more concerned with the security of Thrace, which he had conquered, than with a struggle against Athens. When Philip, therefore, returned to Macedonia he was summoned to Hellas. The accusation of gross sacrilege had been brought at the Amphictyonic assembly against the Locrian town of Amphissa. The levy of the Amphictyons had, however, been able to effect nothing against

the town, since the Thebans and Athenians would not permit their detachments to advance; and the Amphictyons, therefore, resolved to entrust the conduct of the war to Philip. He immediately advanced into Phocis through Thermopylæ, which he had permanently occupied, and took Elatea in the autumn of 339. Thebes and

Reconciliation of Athens and Thebes

Athens had long been at enmity. But men like Demosthenes, who wished to range against Philip the warlike inhabitants of Bœotia, after long endeavours to reconcile the two cities, succeeded. By this the power of Athens was considerably strengthened. Of her other allies, the Eubœans, Megarians, Corinthians and Achæans took the field, while Elis, Megalopolis and Messene had no part in the war. Once more Philip made offers of peace. Unfortunately, we do not know what conditions he laid down. But it was of no avail; the war party held the upper hand, and hostilities broke out. The army put into the field by the allies for the protection of Amphissa was completely defeated and the town captured; and their main army, which was in position near Chæronea, at the entrance to Bœotia, yielded to the veteran Macedonians and their skilful leaders after a brave resistance in August 338 B.C. The losses on both sides were great; the Athenians lost 1,000 men, and 2,000 were made prisoners.

This battle decided the war. Thebes surrendered and had to receive a Macedonian garrison into its citadel, the Cadmea; the union of Bœotia under the headship of Thebes, which had been established by Epaninondas, was destroyed, and the independence of the country towns of Bœotia was recognised. Corinth also received a Macedonian garrison, and probably also Chalcis in Eubœa. It is obvious that here, as in other towns, the leaders of the anti-Macedonian party

Philip's Supremacy in Greece

were banished, and Philip's adherents came to the helm; for it was an old-established custom that the victors should banish the vanquished. Philip showed himself a well-wisher of Athens. She retained her territory and her independence, actually received Oropus back from the Thebans, and had no garrison imposed on her; but in addition to the possessions on the Thracian and Chalcidian coast, which were already lost, she had now at

the conclusion of peace to give up the Thracian Chersonese as well; of her possessions there remained only Imbros, Lemnos, Scyros, Samos, Salamis, and Lesbos. After an expedition into the Peloponnese, in which he invaded Laconia but did not take the strongly defended town of Sparta, Philip went to Corinth, where envoys of all the Greek communities were assembled. The disputes of the Spartans with their neighbours were settled in such a way that Sparta was compelled to concede territory to the Argives, Megalopolitans, Tegeans, and Messenians.

What follows is more important. A league was formed between the Hellenes and Philip, and as Corinth was the usual place of meeting for its members, it has been known since as the Corinthian League. The Greek state south of Thermopylæ, with the exception of Sparta, which made no peace with Philip, sent their representatives regularly to Corinth; these composed the governing body of the league, which had to settle all disputes and to superintend the faithful execution of the terms of the peace, for universal

The Day of Universal Peace

peace was now to prevail in the country, and the everlasting feuds were to cease. The states were guaranteed their independence and their constitutions, as well as the possessions which they had at the moment when peace was concluded. There was also an important decree passed that no state should aid with money or arms any attempt made by exiles against their own city. The king of Macedonia was the general of the league; the Hellenic states, since they were autonomous, had not to pay any tribute to him, but had to furnish troops in case of war.

Philip, adroitly seizing on a sentiment already encouraged by the philosophers and popular in Greece, proposed a common war of all Hellenes against their hereditary enemy, the Persians; and all the members agreed with him. This common war, he thought, would bring the Greeks closer together, make them forget their hatred and dissensions, show them once more a goal towards which they might struggle with combined resources, and last, though not least, would reconcile them to his own leadership and accustom them to the Macedonian hegemony. There were undoubtedly germs in this league that promised good fruit. As soon as Philip returned to

PHILIP OF MACEDON

Macedonia, he made preparations for the war against Persia. An army under Parmenio was to invade Asia in the spring of 336 B.C. as an advance guard, while the king in person would follow soon. But, in 336 B.C., before this plan was carried out Philip was slain by Pausanias, one of his bodyguard, at a festival in honour of the marriage of his daughter Cleopatra with Alexander, king of the Mosolossians.

Philip had accomplished a stupendous task. How different was the position of Macedonia at his death from what it was at his accession! Its coasts were now open, and no obstacles hindered the export of its productions. Material prosperity and

by indefatigable training, and in part, too, by his many wars, in creating an army which had not its equal in the world. The Macedonian phalanx, with its long spears, formidable in its attack, invincible and impenetrable when attacked, roused the admiration of all antiquity. Notwithstanding its weight and size, it manœuvred easily and correctly, quickly changed its position, and rapidly re-formed. Besides this phalanx, the army of Philip, except for a light infantry regiment, which dispensed with the armour and the long spear of the Phalangite, and was equipped with helmet, sword, and small shield, consisted

**Unequaled
Army of
Macedonia**



SOLDIERS OF THE FAMOUS MACEDONIAN PHALANX

Macedonia owed to King Philip the army which, unequalled then by any other, achieved astonishing results.

culture were everywhere promoted. Philip had founded many new towns and had planted colonies near Mount Pangæus (Philippi) and in Thrace. Even in Macedonia itself Greeks had been allowed to settle. We are everywhere met by his unwearied efforts to advance the growth of his country and to blend its inhabitants together. The country owed its **Philip's** fleet to him. But before every- **Life** thing else Macedonia owed to **Work** King Philip the army which had achieved such astonishing results. Philip first created an infantry which was equal in effectiveness to the cavalry, raising the levies regularly and not merely in case of necessity. He thus succeeded

mainly of the cavalry, which was recruited from among the Macedonian nobility, and of the artillery, as we should term them to-day, with their catapults, battering-rams, and the necessary staff. Thus the nobility composed the cavalry, the peasants and citizens the infantry; united they formed the military assembly, which had the right to judge in penal cases.

One more great service rendered by the king to his country must be mentioned. To him Macedonia owed its political unity. Before this time there were local principalities which recognised, it is true, the royal house as overlord, but frequently waged war against it. Philip deprived these princely houses of their thrones.



ALEXANDER THE GREAT

AS JUDGED BY AN EARLY HISTORIAN

Arrian, who lived from 90 to 170 A.D., was one of the earliest historians of Alexander's world-conquests, and his "Expedition of Alexander," from which this personal study of the conqueror is taken, is his most valuable work.



His body was beautiful and well-proportioned ; his mind brisk and active ; his courage wonderful. He was strong enough to undergo hardships, and willing to meet dangers ; ever ambitious of glory, and a strict observer of religious duties. As to those pleasures which regarded the body, he showed himself indifferent ; as to the desires of the mind, insatiable. In his counsels he was sharp-sighted and cunning ; and pierced deep into doubtful matters by the force of his natural sagacity. In marshalling, arming, and governing an army he was thoroughly skilled, and famous for exciting his soldiers with courage, and animating them with hopes of success, as also in dispelling their private fears by his own example of magnanimity.

He always entered upon desperate attempts with the utmost resolution and vigour, and was ever diligent in taking any advantage of his enemies' delay, and falling upon them unawares. He was a most strict observer of his treaties ; notwithstanding which he was never taken at a disadvantage by any craft or perfidy of his enemies. He was sparing in his expenses for his own private pleasures, but in the distribution of his bounty to his friends liberal and magnificent.

If anything can be laid to Alexander's charge, as committed in the heat and violence of wrath, or if he may be said to have imitated the barbarian pride, a little too much, and bore himself too haughtily, I cannot think them such vast crimes ; and especially when one calmly considers his green years, and uninterrupted series of success, it will appear no great wonder if court sycophants, who always flatter princes to their detriment, sometimes led him away. But this must be said in his behalf, that all antiquity has not produced an example of such sincere repentance in a king as he has shown us.

I cannot condemn Alexander for endeavouring to draw his subjects into the belief of his divine origin because it is reasonable to imagine he intended no more by it than to procure the greater authority among his soldiers. Neither was he less famous than Minos, or Æacus, or Rhadamanthus, who all of them challenged kindred with Jove ; and none of the ancients condemned them for it ; nor were his glorious actions any way inferior to those of Theseus or Ion, though the former claimed Neptune and the latter Apollo for his father.

His assuming and wearing the Persian habit seems to have been done with a political view, that he might appear not altogether to despise the barbarians and that he might also have some curb to the arrogance and insolence of his Macedonians. And for this cause, I am of opinion, he placed the Persian Melophori among his Macedonian troops and squadrons of horse, and allowed them the same share of honour. Long banquets and deep drinking, Aristobulus assures us, were none of his delights ; neither did he prepare entertainments for the sake of the wine (which he did not greatly love and seldom drank much of) but to rub up a mutual amity among his friends.

Whoever, therefore, attempts to condemn or calumniate Alexander, does not so much ground his accusation upon those acts of his which really deserve reproof, but gathers all his actions as into one huge mass, and forms his judgment thereupon ; but let any man consider seriously who he was, what success he always had, and to what a pitch of glory he arrived who, without controversy, reigned king of both continents, and whose name had spread through all parts of the habitable world, and he will conclude that, in comparison of his great and laudable acts, his vices and failings are few and trifling, and are not of weight sufficient to cast a shade upon his reign.

I am persuaded there was no nation, city, nor people then in being whither his name did not reach ; for which reason, whatever origin he might boast of or claim to himself, there seems to me to have been some Divine hand presiding both over his birth and actions, insomuch that no mortal upon earth either excelled or equalled him.



ALEXANDER THE GREAT

AND THE MAKING OF HIS MIGHTY EMPIRE

PHILIP'S son and successor was Alexander, who in 336 B.C. was twenty years old. Brought up and educated by Aristotle, he was familiar with the literature and philosophy of Greece and full of enthusiasm for Homer and his heroes, of whom Achilles was his favourite. The young prince was also trained in all bodily exercises and familiar with the art of war and the whole military system; as, indeed, was to be expected in a country like Macedonia, where every man was liable to military service, and the officers and the bodyguard of the king were taken from the nobility.

Alexander could not have been unmoved by the influence which mighty deeds exercised on every man of that time. In fact we hear that at the age of sixteen the crown prince had held the regency while Philip was occupied with the war in Byzantium and Perinthus, and had during that time fought successfully the neighbouring Thracian tribe of the Mædi. At the age of eighteen he commanded the Macedonian cavalry on the left wing at the battle of Chæronea. Thus trained and familiar from boyhood with the demands of his future position, he entered on his heritage. What he had previously accomplished passed unnoticed amid the general brilliancy of Philip's successes; what the world saw was that the new king was little more than a boy. But he lost no time in proving himself a man, bold in decision, swift in action.

In Macedonia itself, where disputes as to the succession and wars were the usual accompaniments of the death of a ruler, Alexander immediately took vigorous measures and crushed all such attempts in the bud. His cousin Amyntas, whose kingdom Philip had once governed as guardian, and who had gradually sunk into the background, was put to death, since many held him to be the lawful successor; this step was certainly neces-

sary for the tranquillity of the country, though it may seem cruel, since there is no account of any rising led by Amyntas. But on another side preparations for an insurrection had actually been made. In 337 B.C. Philip had married Cleopatra, niece of Attalus of Macedonia,

and by this step had caused his former wife, Olympias, and her son, Alexander, to leave the country, the latter returning

to Pella shortly before his father's murder. Ever since the marriage feast, when Alexander had chastised Attalus for his wish that Cleopatra might bear a legitimate heir, hatred and hostility existed between them. Now, after Philip's death, Attalus, who meantime had taken over a command in the Macedonian advance guard in Asia Minor, immediately allied himself with the anti-Macedonian party in Athens; but before he had completed his proposed preparations against the young king he was murdered by Alexander's orders. His niece, Cleopatra, shared the same fate. In Macedonia itself, therefore, owing to Alexander's vigorous initiative, no disturbances of any sort resulted.

In Greece, where the unexpected death of Philip and the youth of Alexander had inspired all the enemies of Macedonia with renewed courage and made them think of a restoration of their former uncertain, but still independent, state, it seemed as if a determined rising would follow; at any rate, there was an intense

wish to be freed from the hegemony of Macedonia. The town of Ambracia in Epirus drove out the Macedonian garrison; the Thebans made preparations to do the same; in Athens and other parts disturbances broke out. Here also Alexander crushed all attempts by his sudden appearance at the head of a large army, and the Greeks submitted. As he had been received into the Amphictyonic

**Alexander
Crushes all
Pretenders**

**Victorious
General
at Eighteen**

**Risings in
Greece
Repressed**

League, the states which took part in the Corinthian League renewed the conventions drawn up by Philip, and nominated Alexander protector and commander-in-chief of the Hellenes in the war against the Persians, the object of which was declared by the congress to be vengeance for the outrages once committed by the Persians in Greece.

In the winter of 336-335 B.C. Alexander returned to Macedonia, in order to make

final preparations for the expedition into Asia which his father had already planned. But before this it was again necessary to make a demonstration in force in the Balkan peninsula and to subdue permanently the independent and irreconcilable tribes of Thrace and Illyria, who, bent on robbery and plunder, were apparently planning fresh inroads. Alexander started in the spring of 335, marched by the high-road to Thrace, through Amphipolis as far as the river Nestus, and up the valley of it, until in ten days he reached Mount Hæmus through the pass of the Rhodope Mountains. Here he first met with resistance.

The pass, which led over the mountains, was occupied by armed men and blocked by a barricade of waggons. But the Macedonians, led by the king in person, pressed on courageously. Even the waggons, which were hurled down the mountain, did not cause the loss that was expected, since Alexander had divined this intention of the barbarians and had given his soldiers timely orders to step out of their way, where the road was broad enough, or, where that was not feasible, to throw themselves on the ground

and to make a roof with their shields, held up high and closely locked together.

Thus Alexander routed the Thracians and made himself master of the pass over the Balkans. On the other side dwelt the Triballi. They had placed their women, children, and movable property for safety on an island in the Danube, whither their king, Syrmus, had also retired. The warriors allowed Alexander to advance without hindrance as far as the

Danube, intending to appear suddenly on his rear and attack him. But their plan miscarried: the Macedonians cut to pieces all who did not save themselves by flight. On the other hand, Alexander could not carry out his intention of occupying the island in the Danube. Instead of this he carried across the Danube during the night 4,000 foot soldiers and 1,500 cavalry in native boats, hollowed out of single tree-trunks, and on the tent-skins of the soldiers, sewn together and stuffed with hay. On the opposite bank the Getæ dwelt; they, indeed, were in a position with 14,000 men to resist the expected invasion of their country, but were so taken by surprise that they fled into their nearest town; and when

Alexander approached they abandoned this also, and fled precipitately with their women and children. The town of the Getæ was destroyed, and on the same day Alexander, richly laden with booty, re-crossed the Danube. In consequence, other neighbouring tribes, who had until now been independent, and Syrmus, the prince of the Triballi, sent envoys to Alexander and submitted to him. Even the Kelts who dwelt on the Adriatic—this is the



THE GREAT ALEXANDER
At twenty he became king of Macedonia and at thirty-two he had made himself master of a world-empire embracing the East as well as the West. Statue in Munich Glyptothek.



ALEXANDER THE WORLD CONQUEROR
From the fine statue in the Capitoline Museum at Rome.

first time that we hear of them in these regions, in which they were destined later to play an important part—sent envoys to make assurances of their friendship to the young king.

From the Danube, Alexander marched through the territory of the Agrianes whose prince, Langarus, had formed a friendship with him and remained loyal to him, and of the Præonians, and then along the valley of the Erigon up to Pelion, which was held by Clitus, king of the Illyrians. Glaucias, prince of the Taulantii at the back of Epidamnus and Apollonia, had promised him assistance. Since Clitus declined a battle, the siege of the town was determined on by the Macedonians; and when, on the next day, Glaucias appeared with large masses of armed men, Alexander withdrew. The Illyrians, who attacked him in a narrow road when crossing over the Devol, a river in Albania, were repulsed with loss, but his retreat was continued. Rendered confident by this, the Illyrians neglected all measures of precaution, whereupon the king surprised them on the third night and completely routed them. Pelion was evacuated by Clitus after he had set fire to it. Thus, security on this frontier was ensured by Alexander. He was not able to follow up his victory and in his turn to invade Illyria, in order completely to subdue the country, for his presence in Greece had meantime become urgently necessary.

We have seen how unwillingly the Greeks tolerated the headship of Macedonia, and how easily they allowed themselves to be driven to premature risings. In the autumn of 336 Alexander had nipped the movement in the bud by his rapid advance; now that he had been for months far away from his kingdom, all sorts of rumours were rife of the evil plight of the Macedonian army, and even of the death of the king. Theban fugitives, of whom there were many, secretly returned to their native town, induced their fellow-citizens to revolt from Macedonia, murdered the commanders of the Macedonian troops in the Cadmea, and blockaded the garrison itself in the citadel by a double line of circumvallation. In other Greek states also the party hostile to Macedonia held the upper hand, and from all sides the Thebans had good

**Successes
in
Illyria**

**Thebes
Again
Revolts**

prospects of aid. As soon as Alexander learned of these occurrences in Greece he advanced by forced marches from Illyria along the eastern slopes of Pindus, through Thessaly to Bœotia, attached to himself on the way the contingents of the Greek states which had remained loyal to him—Phocians and other Bœotians—and appeared before Thebes, where the approach of the hostile army had not been reported until it had already passed Thermopylæ.

Alexander delayed to attack the city in the belief that it would ask pardon for what had occurred. But the same persons who had urged on the revolt now in popular meetings counselled the most desperate resistance, while others spoke in favour of a reconciliation with Alexander, but could not carry their point. An attack, therefore, was made; after a bitter struggle the Macedonians forced the gates and joined the garrison of the citadel. And now a terrible slaughter began, in which the Phocians and the other Greeks of Alexander are said to have been conspicuous. By the decision of his allies,

**Terrible
Fate
of Thebes**

to whom Alexander entrusted the settlement of Theban affairs, Thebes was destroyed, its territory divided among its neighbours, and those of the citizens that escaped the massacre were sold into slavery, with the exception of priests and priestesses, friends of Philip and Alexander, and such as had been under the protection of Macedonia. In accordance with Alexander's own wish, the house in which once the poet Pindar dwelt was preserved and his descendants were spared.


The fate of Thebes had a terrible effect on Greece, and clearly placed before the eyes of all the dangers to which they exposed themselves by rising against the Macedonian rule. As quickly as possible envoys were sent to Alexander by the states to testify their submission, and the supporters of Macedonia were recalled to the places from which they had been forced to flee. Elsewhere those who seemed to be responsible for the revolt from Macedonia and for the making common cause with Thebes were put to death; in short, everywhere hasty measures were taken to undo what had been done. And Alexander was forgiving. From Athens, indeed, which had sent congratulations to him by ten envoys on his prosperous return from Thrace and



A beautiful head in the Capitoline Museum at Rome.



The "Dying Alexander" in the Uffizi at Florence.



A terminal bust now in the Louvre.



A fine head in the British Museum, from Alexandria.

THE FINEST BUSTS OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT

Illyria and on the punishment of the Thebans for their "revolutionary spirit," he demanded at first the surrender of several supporters of the anti-Macedonian policy, such as Demosthenes, Lycurgus, and Charidemus; but, persuaded by a new embassy, he withdrew this demand and contented himself with the banishment of Charidemus. Thus,

Peace With All Greece peace with the Hellenes was restored, and the Corinthian League was naturally renewed on its earlier terms. In the autumn

Alexander returned to Macedonia and devoted the winter to the necessary warlike preparations for the impending campaign in Asia. We are told that while still a boy he astonished the Persian envoys at his father's court by his able and thoughtful questions about the state of affairs in the broad Persian realm, and made them marvel at his intelligence. It may be confidently assumed that now his preparations for the campaign were not confined to the collection of auxiliaries from his allies and training them according to Macedonian discipline, or to the enlisting of mercenaries, the arrangement of the necessary means for the transport and the feeding of the troops, or the assignment of commands and the like. It is far more likely that Alexander carefully studied the geographical, political, financial, and military conditions of the kingdom of Persia.

On the resulting basis the plan of campaign was drawn up. We have, unfortunately, no extant account of it. Did the king from the very beginning meditate the conquest of the entire Persian kingdom, or did he merely wish, as the manifesto drawn up at Corinth in the autumn of 336 B.C., to take the field against the Persians on account of the outrages inflicted by them on the Hellenes? The plan of the war is to some extent adhered to throughout. The later events in Persepolis show

Persian Campaign Planned that Alexander considered it executed by the burning of the Persian royal citadel; but the succeeding events show clearly

that he already designed the conquest of the whole Persian kingdom. Whether he had, as it almost would seem, formed this plan from the very beginning, or only subsequently, his enterprise and audacity will always command our admiration and astonishment. In Persia, after the death of Artaxerxes Ochus, in 338 B.C., and after an

interregnum filled with bloodshed and atrocities, Darius III. had ascended the throne in 336 B.C. almost contemporaneously with Alexander.

Although the authority of the sovereign in the kingdom of Persia had been weakened since the times of Darius Hystaspes and Xerxes, and the power of the satraps had become more independent, Darius was still lord of a realm which was thirty times as large as the territories whose resources were at Alexander's disposal. Stored in the royal towns of Susa, Ecbatana, and Persepolis lay at the disposal of the great king enormous treasures of gold and precious metals; and Persia could place in the field from her wide territories an army that outnumbered the Macedonian forces many times. In addition, there was a fleet of 400 warships, manned by Cyprians and Phœnicians, the best seamen of the ancient world.

Opposed to this, Alexander's resources seemed weak. He had to raise 800 talents for his preparations; and no more than sixty were left at his disposal when he began his campaign. His fleet comprised

Alexander Advances Against Persia 160 warships; his army some 35,000 fighting men, of which 30,000 were infantry, and 5,000 cavalry. To this

must be added the contingent, of unknown strength, already sent to Asia by Philip. In any case, the war against the Persians was not begun with more than 45,000 men. But this well-trained and well-armed force of veterans was precisely Alexander's strength, for the Persians could not oppose any such body to him. However superior in numbers, they were far inferior in equipment, discipline, and experience of warfare; and he doubtless counted on the support of the Greeks in Asia Minor, who since 378 B.C. were again subject to Persia, but had in no way reconciled themselves to Persian rule.

The advance against Asia began in the spring of 334 B.C. Antipater remained in Europe as administrator of the kingdom, with an army of 12,000 foot soldiers, and 1,500 cavalry. Alexander himself marched along the Thracian coast to the Dardanelles, had his army carried over by the fleet, and united it with the troops already sent by Philip to Asia Minor, which, commanded by Calas since the death of Attalus, occupied the coast from Abydus to Rhœteum, and covered the king's passage. The Persian land force, under



THEBAN CAPTIVES BROUGHT BEFORE ALEXANDER AT THE SACK OF THEBES

From the painting by Dominiquin in the Louvre.

the command of the Greek, Memnon, who had enlisted Greek mercenaries for the great king, and of the satraps of Lydia and Hellespontine Phrygia, Spithridates, and Arsites, was encamped at Zeleia, to the west of Cyzicus; but neither that army nor the Persian fleet attempted to repel the invader at the outset. The want of a

**Alexander
Lands in
Asia Minor**

united command was at once felt. When Alexander had set foot in Asia Minor the most opposite plans were proposed in the council of war of the Persians. Memnon's advice was to avoid a battle, to retreat and lay waste the land, and gradually to entice Alexander and his army farther into the country; in the meantime, while the Macedonian king must necessarily be weakened by his march forward, the Persians would be able to strengthen themselves with new troops, until, protected by a strong line of defence, they could venture on a decisive battle with prospect of success.

The two satraps opposed him. They did not wish to give up their provinces to devastation and to retreat at the advice of a stranger in the face of an enemy by no means superior. Their views carried the day. Their army advanced westward to the Granicus, and took up a favourable position on the steep right bank of this river; their cavalry, 20,000 strong, were drawn up in a long line on the banks. Behind them was the infantry, equally numerous. It was here, then, that Alexander first met the Persians. On landing he had received news that the enemy was approaching from the east, and had marched along the coast against them. This first encounter at the Granicus showed at once the fiery daring of the young king and the ardour of his spirit, which swept everyone with it. The river was between the two armies. The Macedonian horsemen of the vanguard and a division of the

**Fiery Daring
of the
Conqueror**

phalanx received the order to cross it, and opened the attack. But the king himself soon followed with his heavy cavalry. The Macedonians dashed into the river. The Persians rode to meet them. A hand-to-hand fight ensued, and Alexander himself was saved from deadly peril only by the interposition of Clitus. By great efforts the Macedonians gained ground, scaled the steep bank, broke through the enemy's lines, and routed

the Persian cavalry. Afterwards their phalanx gradually advanced and deployed, and the Persian infantry was annihilated, with the exception of 2,000 prisoners.

At a single stroke the enemy's army had been driven from the scene, and no one was left to resist the advance of the conqueror into the heart of the Persian kingdom. But Alexander secured a firm base for fresh operations before he marched further east. Here, if anywhere, he showed his far-sighted policy.

On the entire west coast of Asia Minor lay Greek towns, which had early attained wealth and prosperity, and were seats of great intellectual and material culture. These had once been independent republics; but since the peace of Antalcidas in 378 B.C. were subject to Persian domination. They paid taxes to Persia and furnished her with troops, were garrisoned partly by Persians and were governed by "tyrants," who found their safest and best support in the great king, wherever an oligarchy had not been instituted with the assistance of the Persians in place of the former democracy. In all the cities there were parties

**Phrygia and
Lydia Fall
to Macedon**

which, hostile to the existing state of things, promised themselves fortune and wealth from a change. Alexander counted on these Greek towns for support. After the battle at the Granicus, the satrapy of Phrygia on the Hellespont was occupied and Calas appointed its governor.

After he had sent the captured Greek mercenaries, who had fought on the side of their hereditary foe against their countrymen, into Macedonia, condemned to hard labour, had granted immunity from taxation to the families of the fallen Macedonians, and had dedicated 300 suits of armour to the Acropolis at Athens in his name and in the name of the allied Hellenes as trophies, Alexander marched to Sardis, the ancient capital of the Lydian kings and the former capital of the satrapy of Lydia. The inhabitants came to meet him and surrendered their town. The citadel was likewise given up to him by the Persian commander, Mithrenes, and a Macedonian garrison introduced. Alexander was nominated governor of Lydia.

From Sardis, Alexander turned towards the coast and marched without meeting any opposition into Ephesus; the Persian garrison had withdrawn on news of the battle of the Granicus. Alexander's generals occupied the towns of Magnesia

and Tralles in the valley of Mæander and the Greek towns which lay northward of Ephesus. No opposition was encountered.

Only Miletus and, subsequently, Halicarnassus, both situated on the coast south of Ephesus, shut their gates before the approaching conqueror. Hegesistratus, indeed, the commander of Miletus, had already negotiated with Alexander about the surrender of the town; but the news of the approach of a strong Persian fleet of 400 warships induced him to break off negotiations and to prepare to defend the position. But Alexander rapidly came up, occupied the suburbs, and began to assault the walls. The Macedonian fleet, under Nicanor, had outsailed the Persian fleet, and was anchored at Lade, an island in front of the harbour of Miletus; and co-operation between the defenders of Miletus and the Persian fleet was rendered impossible. When Alexander, therefore, proceeded to storm the town, and at the same moment Nicanor entered the harbour, the Persians turned to flight. Many were massacred by the Macedonians, who pressed into the city. Miletus experienced the

The Fall of Miletus clemency of the victor. It received pardon and its freedom. The king had rejected the proposal made by various persons to order his fleet, stationed at Lade, to sail out and attack the enemy's ships, which were anchored off the opposite peninsula of Mycale. He clearly saw that in numbers, as well as in seamanship, his fleet was far inferior to the enemy's. He now dispersed it, retaining only a small part. Its maintenance was expensive, and its utility appeared small, especially as Alexander was master of the coast, and the hostile fleet could do little towards changing that state of things. We shall soon see that in the hand of an enterprising and far-seeing man this fleet could, nevertheless, threaten Alexander with serious danger.

The young king turned next towards Caria, which was under the satrap Orontobates. The princess Ada of Alinda, who belonged to the Carian princely house—whose most famous member was Mausolus—which had once ruled the whole country, but was now restricted to this one town and citadel, placed herself immediately under the protection of Alexander and adopted him as her son; hence the Carian towns surrendered to him so soon as he approached. Halicarnassus alone offered

resistance. This well-fortified town, guarded by two strong citadels, was defended by Memnon, who had thrown himself into the place after the battle on the Granicus, with an adequate garrison, consisting mostly of mercenaries. The walls were high, and a broad and deep moat had been dug in front of them, which had to be

Great Siege of Halicarnassus filled up by the assailants before any effective assault of the town could be thought of. This Alexander accomplished, notwithstanding a sortie of the enemy. He now raised siege-engines, though often hindered by attacks of the besieged, and at length succeeded in effecting a breach in the enemy's wall. But behind it rose an inner wall, running from the one tower to the other. Alexander wished to attack it, when Memnon made a final great sortie. Driven back after a fierce fight and with heavy losses, he determined to evacuate the city, and only the two strong castles remained occupied. The town was destroyed, but Alexander was obliged on account of the fortresses to leave behind a division of 3,000 mercenaries and 200 cavalry under Ptolemy. Ada received the satrapy of Caria.

Winter was now approaching. Parmenio was sent to Sardis at the head of the contingents of the allies to winter in Lydia, and in the next spring to join the king again in Greater Phrygia. All newly-married Macedonians were sent home on furlough with orders to join the army in the coming spring and to bring with them the fresh levies. Alexander himself marched without meeting any opposition through Lycia and Pamphylia, where hardly any preparations for defence had been made by the Persians. He then went through Pisidia, where the wild population, which in their almost inaccessible mountains had never submitted to the Persians, created all sorts of difficulties for him on his passage. From Greater Phrygia, where he occu-

Alexander's Conquest of Asia Minor pied Celænæ, the capital, with its strong fortress, Alexander eventually reached the city of Gordium in the centre of Asia Minor, and stayed a considerable time there. In barely one year the greater part of Asia Minor had been conquered by Alexander. Hellespontine Phrygia, Lydia, Caria, Lycia, Pamphylia, and Greater Phrygia were administered by Macedonian governors. The taxes from these provinces flowed now into the Macedonian

treasury, and important military points, such as Sardis, held Macedonian garrisons.

It may well be asserted that Alexander had from the very first contemplated the permanent retention of his conquests. Besides the appointment of Macedonian governors, the fact that, in addition to them, a special official was entrusted with the entire management of the taxation points to the same conclusion. Although this arrangement is mentioned as existing in the province of Lydia only, there is no reason to doubt that it had been introduced in a similar form into all the satrapies. The only innovation made was that now two royal officials stood at the head of each province; otherwise the extent of their jurisdiction and the amount of taxation remained as they had been under the Persians. It may also be noticed as an improvement that now the royal administrators of the province ceased to be supported by the provinces themselves, and were paid by the king; thus all "tyranny" was obviated.

The Greek towns on the coast were treated differently from these countries. They were proclaimed free—that is, they were made autonomous in internal affairs, were not subjected to the royal governors, and paid no taxes. They also received no garrisons, and, what assuredly was very valuable in the eyes of the Greeks, they were permitted to restore their democratic constitutions, which had been everywhere abolished under pressure from the Persians. These Greeks thus recovered, through Alexander, that independence and freedom for which they had once fought so bravely.

The Greek towns on the islands, at any rate so far as they lay north of Samos and could be freed from the Persian fleet by the Macedonian, underwent the same treatment. We know that they entered the Corinthian League. On the other hand, it is not recorded whether the Greek towns on the mainland also were incorporated in this league or whether they were organised into a union of their own for the maintenance of the universal peace of the country. Undoubtedly, Alexander had created for himself in Asia Minor, as well as on the islands, supporters, who promised to render him profitable services on his march forward. The

necessary funds for further operations were drawn from the inflowing taxes of the conquered Persian satrapies.

An event occurred at this time which suddenly threatened to bring a disastrous end to the good fortune of the king. Memnon, who but recently had valiantly though unsuccessfully, defended Halicarnassus against Alexander, had been appointed by the great king to be commander of the fleet, which till now had done nothing noteworthy, in spite of its strength. Memnon now embarked a large force of mercenaries, which he may in part have brought safely from Halicarnassus and in part newly enlisted, and put out to sea. What he planned was a landing in Greece, where, from the strength of the anti-Macedonian and revolutionary party, an insurrection could easily have been excited, and after that an attack on Macedonia carried out. This plan would, indubitably, have presented a most serious danger for Alexander had it been executed. But first Memnon had to reconquer the islands off the coast of Asia Minor. Chios had already opened its gates to him through treachery; the Lesbian towns, with the exception of Mytilene, were once more brought under the Persian rule, and wherever he went tyrants who favoured Persia were installed in place of the democracies. But suddenly, while besieging by land and sea Mytilene, which had refused to surrender to him, Memnon died in 333 B.C.

With the death of this man, who with daring determination and keen foresight was bent on transferring the theatre of war to the enemy's own land, his plan collapsed. Autophradates and Pharnabazus, his successors in the command of the fleet, took Mytilene, it is true, and subsequently won back Tenos for the Persian crown, but they did not achieve any other considerable success. The expeditionary troops on the ships were recalled by Darius to join the main army. Alexander, through Hegelochus and Amphoterus, and Antipater, through Proteas, collected ships from all the allied states on the Hellespont and in Greece and organised a fleet. Proteas with the ships collected from Eubœa and the Peloponnese succeeded in surprising Datames, who had been sent by the Persian admiral to Siphnus with ten ships, and in capturing eight of his vessels. This first success was

Macedonian Government in Asia Minor

Persian Attack on Greece

Greek Towns Regain Independence

ALEXANDER THE GREAT

followed by others. To anticipate events we may say that in the course of the next few years Hegelochus and Amphoterus freed the islands again from the supremacy of the Persians and the tyrants imposed by them, especially as the Persian fleet was dispersed after the battle at Issus.

In the spring of 333 B.C. Parmenio, with the troops which had been allowed to go home on winter furlough, and with some reinforcements, about 3,000 strong, entered Gordium. Here, according to the

collecting troops from his eastern satrapies in order to march with these to the west to recover what had been lost. He felt unable to leave Asia Minor without hazarding his conquests, for he did not wish to push on further east without urgent reasons, in order not to be too far removed from Greece, which was probably to be the new theatre of war. Memnon's death left the king to continue his march forward without anxiety. From Gordium he marched past Ancyra—

where the Paphlagonians, who were governed by their own dynasts, offered their submission through envoys—to the Halys, the Kizil Irmak, and then in a southerly direction to the Cilician Gates, a pass over the Taurus Mountains, leading from Cappadocia to Cilicia. This line of march was marked out for the king as soon as he had learned that Darius with his army, which comprised several hundred thousand native warriors, and some thirty thousand Greek mercenaries, had started from Babylon for Northern Syria. The Cilician Gates, easy as they were to hold on account of their narrowness, were deserted at Alexander's approach by the few Persian troops who had been sent there; and, unhindered, the Macedonians crossed the mountains and descended into the plain. The occupation of Cilicia was accomplished without



NATURE OF THE COUNTRY TRAVERSED BY ALEXANDER'S ARMY
A gorge in the Taurus Mountains crossed by Alexander in order to occupy Cilicia.

difficulty. The Persian garrison retired from Tarsus, the capital, and Alexander immediately after entered it.

Here he was seized with a violent fever, and his life was in great danger, until the Greek physician, Philip, saved him by a drastic remedy. With this event is connected the familiar story of the letter of Parmenio, in which he warned his king against Philip, who was alleged to be bribed by the Persians. Alexander, however, showed confidence in his physician, and drank the proffered medicine, while

story, in the temple of Zeus stood the royal chariot, the yoke of which was fastened to the pole by an ingenious knot. Whoever untied it (so the oracle ran) should hold the dominion over Asia. Alexander, without much deliberation, severed the knot with his sword. This was a good omen for Alexander in the eyes of the Asiatics as well as of many Greeks. Alexander spent a long time at Gordium, chiefly to watch the progress of Memnon's undertakings; but, on the other hand, he knew that King Darius was

and drank the proffered medicine, while

he gave Philip the letter to read. Restored to health, he subdued the remaining towns in the outlying region, and even undertook a short but successful campaign against the wild inhabitants of the mountains, who so often made inroads on the plain. Here he received the news of the fall of the fortress of Halicarnassus.

Campaigns in the Amanian Mountains The Amanian Mountains divide Cilicia from Syria towards the east; two passes, the so-called Syrian gates in the south, the Amanian in the north, lead into Syria. Parmenio was sent in advance to occupy and guard the Syrian Gates. As soon as the news came that Darius was on the other side of the Amanus at Sochi, Alexander started and marched through Issus close along the coast, through the Syrian Gates, in order to turn Darius's flank. But, meantime, the great king had advanced through the Amanian Gates, abandoning his position in the plain east of Amanus, which was far more favourable for deploying his masses, had occupied Issus, and was marching after Alexander. The latter was, therefore, compelled to march back.

The two armies met in the autumn of 333 B.C. south of Issus on the river Pinarus, the Persians being interposed between the Macedonians and the sea, in a country as unfavourable for Darius as it could possibly be. Between the sea and the mountains, which lay somewhat back, stretched a plain, far too small to admit of the vast Persian masses being deployed. Alexander, as usual, commanded his right wing, Parmenio led the left; in the middle stood the phalanx. The king attacked first, broke through the enemy's line of battle, and fell on the Persian centre, composed of Greek mercenaries, who were pressing hard on his phalanx, which had fallen into some disorder in crossing the Pinarus, and forced them to give way. Darius, who was seated in his chariot in the middle of his battle array, turned to flee, and thus gave the signal for a universal flight. The Macedonians now began the pursuit, from which they did not return until nightfall. The loss on the side of the Persians was enormous. The entire camp fell into the hands of the victors. The mother and the wife of Darius were among the prisoners, but were well treated by Alexander in consideration of their rank and dignity.

Tremendous Victory of the Issus

Once again, and this time against a vastly superior force, the Macedonians had won a splendid victory in the open field. Once again the victor did not turn immediately to the east, but first made Syria and Phœnicia submit to him. This he accomplished without difficulty; the towns of Aradus, Byblus, and Sidon immediately went over to him. The kings, who from old times reigned in the towns there, had their power confirmed, and a Macedonian was placed over the land as governor. Thus, Alexander again built himself a strong foundation for further enterprises. The ships of the Persian fleet had up till now been built in Phœnician yards and their crews recruited from the seafaring population. The conquest of this land and the submission of its towns and kings was bound to lead to the breaking up of the Persian fleet, which till now had ruled the sea. This was an invaluable gain for Alexander.

Tyre alone of the Phœnician towns opposed him, but it was too powerful and important for him to leave unconquered. He therefore determined to besiege it. Tyre lay on an island at a short distance from the mainland, and was entirely surrounded by a high and strong wall.

Alexander in Phœnicia In order to approach it, Alexander had a mole thrown up, for which purpose there was an abundance of stones and wood in the vicinity. So long as the water near the coast was shallow, the operations went on smoothly. But the further the Macedonians advanced and the deeper the sea became, the more frequent and serious became the attacks of the Tyrians, who could now bring up their warships and bombard with their heavy artillery the workers on the mole. Alexander ordered two high portable towers to be erected for their protection on the extremity of the mole; but these were set on fire by a fire-ship which the besiegers skilfully succeeded in bringing up. At the same time the mole itself, together with the war machines, during the confusion caused from the fire, were destroyed by the Tyrians, who came from their warships in small boats.

This set-back, far from deterring Alexander, only taught him that without a fleet he could not subdue the strong island fortress. The Phœnician towns, which had submitted to him, placed their ships under the command of Alexander



THE FAMILY OF DARIUS BROUGHT BEFORE ALEXANDER AFTER HIS GREAT VICTORY AT ISSUS.

who himself went to Sidon ; the Cyprian kings also made their peace with him and sent their ships to him. With this fleet, consisting of some two hundred vessels of war, he turned once more against Tyre, where, meantime, the Macedonians had

The great Siege of Tyre

begun to throw up a new and broader mole. This time, under the protection of the fleet, which blocked the two harbours of Tyre, they succeeded in bringing the mole right up to the enemy's walls. But the wall still offered a long resistance to the siege machines, which were brought close by means of the mole, and also of ships chained together ; until at length, in July, 332 B.C., by the combined efforts of the fleet and of the artillery, the Macedonians succeeded in penetrating into one of the Tyrian harbours, effecting a breach in the wall, and entering the city. This decided the fate of Tyre.

Alexander started from Tyre in order to reach Egypt through Gaza—which he captured only after a two-months siege—and Pelusium. This land bore the Persian yoke unwillingly, and had often risen against it. Alexander was here hailed as a liberator, and met with submission everywhere. At Memphis, the capital, the Macedonian sacrificed to Apis, and in this way, as in general by his consideration for their religious manners and customs, won the hearts of his new subjects.

From Memphis Alexander proceeded down stream on the west arm of the Nile to Canopus and founded a new town at a short distance from this old harbour, which, called Alexandria after him, was soon to attain great prosperity, and is still flourishing. This was the first town which

Founding of Alexandria

he founded. It was intended to be a centre and a protection for the numerous Hellenes already residing in Egypt, and a point of attraction to the newly arrived settlers from Hellas and Macedonia. Difficult to be approached by land, easily defensible, and provided with excellent harbours, Alexandria was fitted for a centre of intercourse and com-

munications between the mother country and the newly subdued territory, and helped to establish the new supremacy firmly in the land of ancient civilisation.

From Alexandria the king proceeded to the far-famed shrine of Ammon in the oasis of Siwah. He was led to do this chiefly by political reasons. He wished to sacrifice to the god of the country, as at Memphis, and by this diplomatic homage to bind more closely to himself the whole land, on the possession of which much depended. The priests of Ammon welcomed him and addressed him as son of their god, whom the Greeks had long identified with their highest deity, Zeus : an honour for the young monarch, which had nothing unusual in it for the Egyptians, who were accustomed from antiquity to regard their kings as gods.

From the oracle of Ammon, Alexander marched back across the desert to Memphis, twelve days' march distant, and there reorganised the government. He

Egyptian Government Reorganised

divided the whole of Egypt at first into four districts, but afterwards into three, since one of the Egyptians nominated by him as governor declined the post. These divisions were Arabia and Libya—that is, the countries east and west of the Delta, at the head of which Greeks were placed ; and Egypt—that is, the Delta and the rest of the land, the administration of which was entrusted to an Egyptian. The command over the fleet of thirty triremes stationed there was given to Polemon ; that over the troops left there to Peucestas and Balacrus, one of them commanding the infantry, the other the cavalry. The religion of the Egyptians was left unaltered, as well as their national institutions, such as the division of the land into provinces, which were at the same time districts for purposes of taxation. The appointment of the Egyptian Doloaspis as governor over the Delta and Upper Egypt showed clearly enough that Alexander was not bent on the subjugation, but on the peaceful development of the land, and thought to accustom the inhabitants to the new order of things.





ALEXANDER'S WORLD EMPIRE TO THE DEATH OF THE GREAT CONQUEROR

WHAT, in the meantime, had happened to Darius? The great king had fled in the night, after the battle of Issus, with some few followers, had on the next day collected round him scattered divisions of his army, and with these, which finally numbered some four thousand men, had continued his flight until he reached the Euphrates at Thapsacus. Not until the broad river separated him from his conqueror did he check his speed.

In what a different condition did he come back to Babylon, which a few months before he had left at the head of a mighty army, full of confidence and hope of victory over the far smaller forces of Alexander! Not merely was his army beaten and broken; his mother and wife and children were in the power of the victor; his baggage, which he had sent to Damascus before the battle under the orders of Cophes, had been captured by Parmenio,

Flight of Darius

and at the same time the war-chest and treasure of all sorts were taken, and the families of many noble Persians made prisoners. But the treasuries of Susa, Persepolis, and Ecbatana still held large quantities of gold and silver, and a fresh army could be recruited from the provinces which would far outnumber the Macedonian forces—in short, with some energy and circumspection, resistance could still be offered to the enemy and an attack on the heart of the kingdom repelled. Ample means for the purpose stood at the disposal of Darius, yet the blow at Issus had been so stunning that he at first thought of coming to a friendly understanding with Alexander.

While Alexander was still waiting at Marathus, a Persian embassy had petitioned for the release of the prisoners and proposed a treaty to the king. In his answer Alexander demanded complete submission and the recognition of his supremacy, on which conditions Darius might obtain what he wished. During the siege of

Tyre an embassy came for the second time, this time with definite offers of peace; 10,000 talents were to be paid as ransom for the captured women, all the land between the Euphrates and the Ægean Sea was to be ceded, friendship and alliance were to be concluded between the two rival monarchs, and to be sealed by the marriage of Alexander to a daughter of Darius. These terms also were rejected; once more the absolute submission of the great king was demanded.

Then Persia broke off negotiations. Darius assembled an army afresh, in order to repel the attack of the Macedonians on the very centre of the empire. In the course of the years 332 and 331 B.C. troops from Persia and Media, from Cappadocia and Bactria—in short, from all the satrapies which were still left to Persia—flocked into Babylon, and were there assiduously drilled and prepared for the campaign. The cavalry was more efficiently armed, being provided with shields and longer lances; two hundred scythe-bearing chariots were introduced, and even elephants equipped. In the summer of 331 B.C. Darius was able to leave Babylon and take the field with an army, the strength of which is estimated at 1,000,000 effective men.

In the spring of the same year, 331, Alexander had started from Memphis. He halted at Tyre, where his fleet was waiting for him. Here a festival was celebrated in honour of Heracles with contests in music and gymnastics, to which Greek artists in large numbers were attracted. From here Am-

Alexander's Festival at Tyre

photerus, the admiral, was sent with his fleet, which the Phœnicians and Cypriotes were to strengthen by one hundred ships, to the Peloponnese to co-operate with the regent, Antipater, in crushing the Spartans, who, under their king, Agis, aided by money from Persia, declared war against

Macedonia. The Macedonian army then started eastward, avoided the Syrian desert by a detour, and reached the Euphrates at Thapsacus. The advance guard had already begun the construction of two bridges, but had been prevented by the enemy's cavalry from carrying them across to the left bank. When Alexander

**Advance
on the
Persians**

himself appeared the enemy withdrew; the bridges were, therefore, completed, and the Euphrates was crossed without hindrance. From Thapsacus he first marched up-stream in a northerly direction, then eastward past Nisibis on the southern slopes of the Armenian Mountains, through districts which furnished ample food to the army and sufficient fodder for the horses, and exposed the troops less to the heat than if they had marched from Thapsacus directly eastward through the plains of Mesopotamia. The enemy, it was reported, was awaiting him on the Tigris.

On the news of the advance of Alexander, Darius had started from Babylon, crossed the Tigris, and occupied a position on its left bank on the far side of the Lycus—the present Great Zab—near Gaugamela, choosing advisedly a wide, level country, which allowed scope for the operations of the great masses of his army. But Alexander met with no opposition on crossing the Tigris. After a rest on the other bank he proceeded down stream, and after four days' march came on the enemy's cavalry sent out to reconnoitre. He learned at the same time that Darius was not far from there, at Gaugamela. On October 1st, 331 B.C., a battle was fought there, which, in spite of the numerical superiority of the Persians and their more favourable ground, ended in their complete overthrow. Darius fled with his bodyguard and some cavalry from Arbela—now Erbil—over the mountains to Ecbatana, and left to the conqueror the lower half of his kingdom.

**Darius'
Last
Defeat**

Soon after the battle, Alexander entered Babylon without encountering any resistance. Here also, as in Egypt, he understood how to win the goodwill of the population. He sacrificed according to the injunctions of the Chaldeans, and directed that the temple of Bel, which is said to have been destroyed by Xerxes, should be rebuilt. In the organisation of the satrapy we see the same principles followed as in

Egypt; here again a native, named Mazæus, was chosen governor, but along with him were Apollodorus of Amphipolis as military governor and also a Greek, named Asclepiodorus, as chief collector of the revenue. Armenia received a noble Persian as satrap in the person of Mithrenes, the former commander of the citadel of Sardis. Alexander organised the satrapy of Susa with its capital of the same name, whither he had gone from Babylon about the end of November, 331 B.C., in the same way as Babylon. A noble Persian, by name Abulites, became governor, while the command of the troops of the garrison was entrusted to Macedonians. Susa, where town and castle immediately surrendered to the victor, was during winter and spring the residence of the Persian kings. Here the treasure of 50,000 talents of silver (£12,000,000) fell into the hands of Alexander. Spoils from the Greek wars of Xerxes were found there. The king gave the statues of Harmodius and Aristogiton back to the Athenians. Reinforcements from home arrived here, in all some 8,000 men, and were enrolled

**Vast
Treasures
of Susa**

in the army, filling up the gaps that had been made. The real capital, with the sepulchres of the kings and their residence on especially solemn occasions—coronations and the feast of Norus—was Persepolis, south-east of Susa and separated from it by lofty and impassable mountains. This mountain district was inhabited by the Uxii, who had preserved their independence of Persia, and were accustomed to receive a present of money, even from the great king, when, marching through their land, he crossed the pass that lay in their possession; practically, then, they exacted tribute.

They demanded this tribute from Alexander also as he approached their pass; but the king, with picked troops, led by guides from Susa, avoided the pass by taking difficult paths, attacked the mountain settlements of the Uxii, amassed rich booty, returned by forced marches, and now attacked them assembled on the pass. The Uxii had to surrender and to furnish immediately as tribute a definite number of cattle, horses and sheep. The Macedonian army then divided. Parmenio with the heavy infantry marched further on the great road which leads past the western slopes of the mountains; Alexander himself marched through the



ALEXANDER'S FINAL DEFEAT OF DARIUS, THE "GREAT KING" OF PERSIA, AT ARBELA

In the two years following his defeat at Issus, Darius collected and trained a fresh army, the strength of which is estimated at a million effective men; but when he engaged with Alexander at Arbela on the Tigris, in 331 B.C. he was totally defeated and fled with his bodyguard over the mountains to Ecbatana, leaving to the conqueror the lower half of his kingdom.

mountains. The second pass, the so-called Persian Gates, which must be crossed on the route from Susa to Persepolis if a march is made through the mountains, was occupied by the satrap Ariobarzanes, who had walled across the narrow road and with his 40,000 men opposed Alexander's attack. Here also the king, who

Persepolis Falls to Alexander

had left his general, Craterus, in front of the pass, succeeded with a light detachment in turning the flank of Ariobarzanes, who, attacked in front and in the rear, was forced to give way and leave open to the conqueror the passage through the Persian Gates and the road to Persepolis.

The capital fell into Alexander's hands without offering further resistance; the treasure that was taken as booty, far exceeding that in Susa, is said to have amounted to 120,000 talents, or £25,000,000. At Alexander's orders the royal fortress with its large and splendid palaces was set on fire—a satisfaction exacted for the outrages which the Persians had once committed in Greece by the destruction of towns and shrines. Thus the programme laid down in the meeting of the league at Corinth in the autumn of 336 was carried out. The importance attached to the burning of the royal palaces in Persepolis is borne out by the fact that Alexander soon afterwards at Ecbatana—to mention it at once in this connection—dismissed the contingents of the Thessalians and Greeks belonging to the league to their homes, continuing their full pay until their arrival at their destination and distributing among them a present of 2,000 talents. Only a part of the Thessalians remained with the Macedonian army and entered the service of the king.

From this time the king conducted the war only with his Macedonians and the mercenaries he had enlisted; and the conquest of the entire Persian kingdom, an idea which may well have hovered before his mind from the first as his ultimate object, was now approaching completion. The great king still lived; the eastern satrapies still obeyed him. Alexander's next task was to crush him finally.

Darius had withdrawn after the battle of Gaugamela with some few troops, which had escaped with him, to Ecbatana (now Hamadan), the summer residence


in Media of the Persian kings, and here awaited developments. Ecbatana, in fact, was favourably situated for the purpose, owing to its easy communication with Babylonia and Persis, as well as with the East, whither the great road led past Ragæ (now Rei, near Teheran) and the Caspian Gates (now Pass of Serdarra), between the mountains and the salt desert, through a well-cultivated, fertile country. He had either to await fresh troops from the still unconquered eastern satrapies or to retreat further in that direction if the reinforcements did not come at the right time. Unfortunately, the latter happened. Alexander was more rapid. At the news of his advance Darius fled east, having taken the precaution to send ahead his baggage and his harem to the Caspian Gates.

Alexander left Persepolis in the spring of 330 B.C. After a short halt at Ecbatana, where he left Parmenio at the head of 7,000 Macedonians to guard the treasure which had been brought from Persepolis and Susa to Ecbatana, and had been entrusted to Harpalus and to protect the

Furious Pursuit of Darius

Median capital and satrapy, he followed the flying king by forced marches along the great road past Ragæ. Thence he advanced swiftly with only picked troops through the Caspian Gates. Alexander's speed was redoubled when he learnt that the satraps round Darius, Bessus of Bactria and Barsaentes of Arachosia, had seized their monarch and were taking him about with them as prisoner, and that Bessus had been proclaimed general by the troops of Darius; only Artabazus of the Persians and the Greek mercenaries had remained loyal to their master, and, since they were powerless to rescue him, had separated from Bessus. More and more of the Macedonians remained behind as their strength failed them in the furious pursuit, until at last the king had only 500 horsemen with him. Finally, on the sixth day, Alexander overtook the conspirators in the vicinity of the later Hecatompylus. The exploit of marching 256 miles in six days has always evoked astonishment, and deserves the reputation of miraculous which it possessed in antiquity.

The sudden appearance of Alexander made such an impression on the Persians under Bessus that, without thinking of resistance, they sought safety in a general flight, and murdered Darius, whom they



THE ENTRY OF ALEXANDER INTO BABYLON

were taking with them in a chariot. If the followers of Bessus, who thought themselves secure from any attack, had suspected with what a small and exhausted force Alexander was coming to meet them, they would certainly have found courage to oppose him; but the suddenness of his appearance robbed them of all reflection. Bessus fled with 600 horsemen. Alexander ordered the body of the great king to be buried at Pasargarda in July, 330 B.C.; he looked upon himself now as the lawful successor of Darius.

After he had given his exhausted troops some rest, he rejoined the army on its advance, and then subdued the satrapy of Hyrcania, situated on the south shore of the Caspian Sea. On this occasion he took into his army a great part of the Greek mercenaries, who, after separating from the conspirators, had taken the route to the mountains of Hyrcania. Only those who had entered the service of Persia before the conclusion of the Hellenic League were set free.

Many noble Persians, too, went over to his side, such as Artabazus, whom we have already mentioned; the chiliarch, Nabar-zanes; and Phrataphernes, the satrap of Parthia and Hyrcania. The envoys of Greek towns who had been with Darius, but had withdrawn with the Greek mercenaries after his capture, were treated variously by Alexander; he imprisoned the four Lacedæmonians and one Athenian, while he liberated the envoys from Sinope and Chalcedon, since their towns did not belong to the Corinthian League. Sparta did not actually belong to it, but at this time had waged war against the regent, Antipater. We find envoys from Greek states with Darius to the very last; only by his death and the transfer of his monarchy to Alexander were the hopes the Greeks cherished of Persian aid annihilated. Meantime, the instigators of the capture and subsequent murder of Darius had separated: Bessus fled to Bactria (now Balkh), the capital of his satrapy, placed the tiara of the murdered king on his head there, took the name of Artaxerxes, and organised an army afresh; in doing which he chiefly counted on the support of the warlike nomad tribes of the neighbourhood, the Scythians. Satibarzanes, on the other hand, the satrap of Areia, went to his own land, but submitted


when Alexander approached from the Caspian Sea. He confirmed Satibarzanes in his office, left with him some Macedonian cavalry under the command of Anaxippus, and started eastward to attack Bessus, attempting to reach Bactria through the desert by the shortest way, past the present Merv. But the revolt of Satibarzanes in support of Bessus and the murder of Anaxippus and his men compelled him to turn back, in order first to subdue Areia with its capital, Artacoana (which is supposed to be near the present Herat), the rebellious satrap having fled at the news of Alexander's advance. He afterwards made an attempt to come back at the head of 2,000 horsemen, and to induce the province to revolt, but paid the penalty with his life. The Persian, Arsames, received the satrapy.

This incident may well have determined the king not to carry out his original plan of marching through the desert past Merv, but first to conquer the country of the Drangi, who bordered on Areia, the present Seistan, and then to proceed thence through the valley of the Etymandrus (Helmund) and Arachosia (Kandahar) to the foot of the Paropamisus (Hindu Kush). He clearly wished to deprive Bessus of the possibility of obtaining support and reinforcements from these districts. He founded the town of Alexandria at the foot of the Paropamisus. He then crossed the mountains in mid-winter, in deep snow, suffering every kind of privation, and found when he reached the plain, after an equally laborious descent, that all the country had been devastated by Bessus. In spite of hardships of every kind, he advanced into Bactria.

Bessus had fled before him over the Oxus, or Amu Daria, to Sogdiana, clearly because he believed that his opponent would not dare to follow him thither, since Sogdiana was surrounded on the south, west, and north by waterless deserts. Alexander did not let himself be deterred. After a fearfully severe march of forty-five miles through the desert of Bactria, where the lack of water, together with the red-hot sand, made the march almost unendurable for the soldiers, he reached the river, which, swift, deep, and very broad, presented still greater difficulties in crossing, because Bessus on his retreat had burnt all the boats. Alexander overcame this obstacle, too; the leather tent-covers of

**Last Hope
of
the Greeks**

satrapy, placed the tiara of the murdered king on his head there, took the name of Artaxerxes, and organised an army afresh; in doing which he chiefly counted on the support of the warlike nomad tribes of the neighbourhood, the Scythians. Satibarzanes, on the other hand, the satrap of Areia, went to his own land, but submitted



MAP ILLUSTRATING THE CONQUESTS AND THE WORLD EMPIRE OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT

the soldiers were sewn together into bags, filled with reeds, and used to ferry the men across the river. The march was then continued in a northerly direction, in order to overtake Bessus in his flight. His companions, Spitamenes, the commander of the cavalry of Sogdiana, and the Persian. Dataphernes, made a proposition to Alexander to surrender the murderer of Darius into his hands if he would send them troops, upon which Ptolemy was sent forward with a division of horsemen and light infantry. He succeeded in coming up with Bessus, and as there were only few soldiers with him, took him prisoner. Fettered and bound, Bessus was brought to Alexander in the beginning of the summer, 329 B.C. The king ordered him to be scourged and to be taken as a prisoner to Bactria and afterwards to be crucified.

**Murderer
of Darius
Captured**

Two full years were to pass, however, before Alexander could leave Sogdiana. Spitamenes, who on Ptolemy's arrival had departed with his Sogdian horsemen, organised a rising in Sogdiana and Bactria, and won over the nomad tribes of the desert, whose horsemen supported him. Alexander soon after the capture of Bessus marched past Maracanda (Samarkand) for the Jaxartes (Syr Daria), founded on that river a town, Alexandria, with the additional name of Eschate (the "Furthest"), drove back by a swift, forward movement the Sacæ, assembled on the other bank of the river, and received from them the oath of obedience. Then the insurrection broke out. It was a war carried on at many points simultaneously, and repeatedly caused considerable losses to the Macedonians. But the persistence of Alexander eventually prevailed, especially after Spitamenes, the soul of the revolt, was murdered by the Massagetae.

At last, in the summer of 327 B.C., when some mountain strongholds situated in the east were captured after fierce fights and great exertions, the whole country up to the Jaxartes, which Alexander recognised as the boundary of the empire, as it had been under the Persians, might be considered as subjugated and pacified. Among the prisoners who fell into the hands of the conquerors after the storming of one of these mountain fortresses was Roxana, the daughter of Oxyartes, a woman of great beauty. She so stirred Alexander's passion that he married her.

**Alexander
Marries
Roxana**

By this he satisfied the long-cherished desire of his people to see their king married.

To these years belong some events which allow us a glimpse of the inner life at the court of Alexander. The first incident concerns Philotas, son of Parmenio, the leader of the Macedonian household cavalry. Even in Egypt he had awakened Alexander's suspicion by his dangerous intrigues and treasonable plans; but the king had given no credence to the information for old friendship's sake. When the Macedonians were in Drangiana in the autumn of 330, a conspiracy against Alexander was discovered, and its members were immediately arrested. Philotas also was seized, and brought by the king before the assembled army, which had to judge in such cases. Whether Philotas had himself taken any share in this conspiracy or not is undetermined; but this much is certain, he knew of a plot against the king's life and gave no information of it, although he daily went in and out of Alexander's presence. The assembled army condemned him and the men accused with him, and immediately put them to death.

**Conspiracy
Against the
Conqueror**

His old father, Parmenio, was involved in his fate. Alexander sent a message to Ecbatana with orders to kill the old general, either because he saw in him an accomplice to the conspiracy or considered him, on account of his great influence, to be dangerous after the death of Philotas. However little Alexander may be excused for such high-handed methods, yet it is apparent that a certain degree of justification existed for his acts. Later we will make these still clearer.

On a subsequent occasion Alexander was holding a banquet in honour of the Dioscuri, in which Clitus, who stood in peculiarly intimate relations with the king, also took part. When the wine had heated the feaster's heads, and flatterers struck up songs, which with scoff and scorn disparaged the old Macedonian kings and extolled Alexander to the skies, Clitus rose up, lauded Philip and the other kings, and told Alexander many unpleasant things which deeply wounded him. An altercation ensued. Alexander sprang up suddenly and snatched the spear from one of the bodyguard standing near. The guests threw aside their beakers and leapt up in terror, but Ptolemy had sufficient presence of mind to push Clitus out of the

door. He came back, however, by another door, and once more insulted his master. The latter, losing all self-control, struck him down with his spear. Immediately after this wicked deed remorse and grief seized on the king. He was carried to his chamber, where he lay, wailing and lamenting, until the exhortation of his friends and the impulse of his nature brought him back to reason. The act had been done in anger and passion, and his remorse certainly proves most clearly how far removed Alexander was from the bloodthirsty and revengeful nature of an Oriental despot.

In the spring of 327 B.C. a new conspiracy against Alexander's life was discovered at Bactria. A page, by name Hermolaus, had been punished for misconduct by his master, had vowed revenge, and, with four other pages, determined the murder of Alexander on a certain night. The king by chance did not come home, and the plan of the conspirators miscarried. One of them then revealed the plot, and the others were arrested and executed. It is certain that purely personal, and not political

Crucifixion of Conspirators

motives, lay at the bottom of this conspiracy; but it was not devoid of high political importance. Callisthenes of Olynthus, a nephew of Aristotle, accompanied Alexander on the campaign as one of the philosophers and men of letters, of whom there were several in the royal camp. He wrote a history of the war; and several fragments of it, which are preserved for us, show that he had attained a marvellous facility in the use of flowery language.

But his attitude towards the king had gradually changed. He now played the part of a lover of freedom, a hater of tyranny, and railed at the flattery which his rival, Anaxarchus of Abdera, only too lavishly bestowed on the king. According to the story, he is said to have denounced especially the ceremonial act of prostration before the king, which had been introduced into the practice of the court; to have consorted much with the young men, and not to have shown the necessary caution in his language before them. When Hermolaus and his companions were arrested, Callisthenes was charged with having prompted them to their crime. Alexander ordered him to be arrested and crucified; according to another account, he died in prison soon after his arrest. It thus became early

evident that between Alexander and a part of his followers a misunderstanding prevailed, which the altered position of the king had produced. As lord of the Persian realm he had to appear to his new subjects in the full splendour and majesty of an Oriental monarch, to assume actual Oriental attire, and to employ the Oriental ceremonial on festive occasions and state levees. Among the Macedonians secret dissatisfaction existed in many forms, and required only an opportunity to burst out into a raging conflagration. The opposition subsequently died out.

In the summer of 327 B.C. Alexander departed with his army from Bactria, where he left behind a strong division, crossed the Hindu Kush, strengthened and enlarged the town of Alexandria, which he had founded there, and then began the conquest of the country of the Indus. He had raised 30,000 Bactrians and Sogdians, armed and drilled in Macedonian fashion, and these were now to fight under his standard, side by side with the Macedonians.

But Alexander did not undertake this Indian campaign, as has been supposed, chiefly for the purpose of attaching to his person the conquered peoples and blending the old and new elements in his army by new victories. There were other reasons which certainly determined him to do so. Above all, former kings of Persia, a Darius and a Xerxes, had already ruled over the Indus territory, and Alexander wished to rule over an empire of the same extent as it had been under those monarchs. The Indus territory—the Punjab, as well as the mountainous parts in the west, now Afghanistan and Kashmir—was divided into many separate principalities, and had not yet been formed into a political unity. The different princes were at war with each other; some formed friendly relations with Alexander and had invited his help. Little as was

Alexander Goes to India

then known of India, and little though it had been explored, its profusion of valuable products of all kinds was known. Long before Alexander, Indian wares had been brought over the pass of the Hindu Kush to Bactria and then to the Black Sea into the Greek colonies and the rest of Europe. A motive that certainly helped to decide the king on his Indian campaign was his wish to open up these rich territories more

effectually to trade, to make them more accessible to his newly conquered lands, as well as to his own country, and thus to make new paths for traffic and commerce.

The way from the southern slopes of the Hindu Kush to the Indus leads through the Kabul valley and the Khaibar pass. Perdicas and Hephæstion advanced on this road with a part of the army, with orders to throw a bridge across the Indus as soon as they reached it. Alexander himself marched through the mountainous region watered by the northern tributaries of the Cophen, or Kabul River, the present Kafiristan and Chitral. The warlike tribes of the country, the Aspasii, Guræi, and Assaceni offered a vigorous opposition, and could be subdued only after many battles. Alexander nominated Nicanor governor, ordered many of the existing towns to be fortified, and rebuilt others, which the inhabitants had burnt on his arrival, placing garrisons in them. He thus regarded the complete subjugation of the land as necessary for the lasting peace and prosperous development of his territories lying to the south and north of the Hindu Kush. Since, as there is no room to doubt, he wished to retain the Indus territory, its permanent and secure union with the more distant districts of his monarchy was indispensable.

Not until the spring of 326 B.C. was Alexander able to effect a junction with Perdicas and Hephæstion and to cross the Indus on the bridge which they had erected. The prince of this district, Taxiles, who had already come to Alexander at Sogdiana and had asked him for help in the war with his neighbours, offered his submission and was confirmed in his possessions, which were soon largely increased. Other Indian princes likewise submitted; but Porus (probably a title, not a personal name), who ruled on the other side of the Hydaspes, sent no envoys

**Victories
in
India**

to Alexander, and awaited him on the river, which bounded his kingdom, with a well-equipped army. When Alexander arrived at the Hydaspes it was swollen by the summer rains, and was difficult to cross; Porus also was carefully guarding the banks. Craterus was ordered to remain on the bank, opposite the camp of the Indian king, and by all kinds of manœuvres to direct attention to himself, while Alexander at some little distance

accomplished the crossing of the river unnoticed by the enemy. The Macedonians won the battle, notwithstanding the elephants of the enemy. Porus surrendered and retained his kingdom, henceforth as a loyal ally of Alexander, who soon afterwards, on the defeat of a second Porus, on the other side of the Acesines, entrusted the subjugated kingdom to him. On the site of the battle against the first Porus a new town, Nicæa, was founded; and on the scene of the passage of the Hydaspes another, Bucephala, so called after Alexander's war horse, Bucephalus. Besides this, he ordered a fleet to be built on the Hydaspes, where there was abundance of timber for ship-building, in which to sail down the Indus. While this was being constructed Alexander marched forward over the Hydraotes but wheeled round at the Hyphasis; being forced to do so, it is said, by his own soldiers, who, exhausted by their intolerable hardships, clamoured to return.

After the construction of the fleet the return westward was begun. Alexander sailed down the Hydaspes, the Acesines, and lastly the Indus. Divisions of the army on both sides of the rivers accompanied the fleet. The king had frequently to halt, in order to fight the tribes inhabiting the country round. At the storming of the town of the warlike Malli on the lower Acesines, where the king himself was the first to scale the wall, and thence leapt down into the middle of the enemy, he was severely wounded and saved only by the heroic bravery of his followers. At last they reached the town of Pattala at the beginning of the delta, and eventually the mouth of the Indus.

Alexander sailed out into the open sea, and as the first of the Hellenes offered a sacrifice to Poseidon in the midst of the waves of the newly discovered Indian Ocean. Here the Greeks, to their intense surprise, saw for the first time the ebbing and flowing tide. Everything points to the conclusion that Alexander intended to maintain the Indus as a boundary. To the west of the river he had organised two satrapies; to the east of it lay the two vassal states of Taxiles and Porus. Besides the already mentioned towns of Nicæa and Bucephala, a town was founded on the Acesines, and Pattala, at the head of the Indus delta was fortified and



ALEXANDER'S INVASION OF INDIA: THE SUBMISSION OF PORUS, ONE OF THE INDIAN PRINCES

Alexander opened his great Indian campaign in 327 B.C., crossed the Hindu Kush, conquered the Indus territory, and entered the Punjab. Most of the native princes submitted, but Porus resisted Alexander's crossing of the Hydaspes river and was defeated. He surrendered and became a loyal ally. From the painting by Lebrun in the Louvre.

provided with docks and a harbour. At the end of the summer of 325 B.C. Alexander started from Pattala, whither he had returned after his voyage to the sea and an exploration of the two arms of the mouth of the Indus, marched through Gedrosia, now Baluchistan, towards the west, and after an indescribably difficult

**Alexander's
Geographical
Explorations**

march through the desert, entailing heavy loss, arrived in Persia. He had ordered his admiral, Nearchus, to sail down the Indus with his fleet and then put to sea, with instructions to look for the means of communication between the mouths of the Indus and the Euphrates, and to collect everywhere information as to the land and its inhabitants. Nearchus executed his task brilliantly; he discovered the sea route from India to Babylonia through the Persian gulf. Thus the rich and costly treasures of India were opened to the commerce of the western nations, and the towns founded by Alexander himself on the Indus became serviceable to the new and flourishing trade.

When Alexander reached Persepolis he found his presence urgently necessary. A usurper had arisen in Media and assumed the title of Great King; his treasurer, Harpalus, had fled, guilty of immense embezzlements and breaches of trust; some satraps were oppressing their subjects in the old Persian way, others had enlisted mercenaries and taken them into their personal service. Alexander acted promptly and with merciless rigour, and in a short time restored order.

The next years were devoted to the concerns of the internal administration, the perfecting and strengthening of the new government, and the task of blending the conquerors with the native population. In the spring of 324 B.C. Alexander married two princesses of the royal Persian house, Statira and Parysatis. At the same time many Macedonian generals celebrated their nuptials with noble Persian women; Alexander also gave a feast and a wedding present to the soldiers who married Persian wives. This was a wise step towards amalgamating the two races.

**Marriages
With Persian
Princesses**

The same idea was served by the incorporation into the Macedonian army of thirty thousand Persians, who had been raised by the king's order, armed in Macedonian fashion, and trained according to the Macedonian tactics. The


Macedonian army was mortified at the creation of these new troops, but Alexander appeased it by paying the soldiers' debts out of the royal treasury. After the exploration of the two rivers and the removal of hindrances to navigation on the Tigris, in the summer of 324 B.C. Alexander came to Opis, whither Hephæstion had previously led his army.

There he dismissed to their homes, under the command of Craterus, ten thousand veterans, into whose place the Persian levies were to step. Discontent in the army broke out and ended in open mutiny. But Alexander's appearance in person had a great effect on the disobedient soldiers; for when the king withdrew from their sight and entrusted his person to the Persians they were filled with remorse and entreated forgiveness. The ten thousand veterans marched homewards without murmuring; the thirty thousand newly levied Persians were enrolled in the army and united with the old army into military units. In the company, sixteen deep, the first files and the last were Macedonians, the

**Persians in
the Army
of Macedon**

intermediate lines Persians. From Opis Alexander marched to Ecbatana. Here he lost his friend and general, Hephæstion. He lamented for him a long time and paid his memory extravagant honours. He then went on further to subdue the Cossæi, a people that, like the Uxii, had remained independent and led a life of pillage in the middle of his empire. Alexander compelled them to settle and become agriculturists, and founded several strong forts in order to keep them in check.

His career was ended by his death at Babylon in the summer of 323 B.C. He had busied himself to the last with great plans: the country at the mouths of the Euphrates and Tigris, as well as the east coast of the Persian Gulf with its islands, were to be colonised, and Phœnicians to be settled there; Arabia was to be circumnavigated, starting from the Persian Gulf; the communications and commerce by sea of these Eastern lands and of the Indus valley with Egypt were to be restored. Alexander was intent at all times and all places in pointing out new paths for trade and intercourse and in promoting civilisation. Macedonia was no longer the petty inland state of former kings. Freed from



THE CONQUORER CONQUERED: DEATH OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT AT BABYLON IN THE YEAR 323 B.C.

its chains and narrow limits by Philip, it became a world-empire under Alexander. Whether the empire would have become permanent if its creator had lived longer, and whether the intention of its bold builder to amalgamate the various nations of that gigantic empire and to unite them into a flourishing political entity would

Death of the World Conqueror

have been realised, are idle speculations. A gloomy silence reigned in Babylon during the night after Alexander's death.

The inhabitants kept in their houses, and did not even venture to kindle a light. The Macedonians, who felt the insecurity of their position, stood under arms. In reality the situation was extremely uncertain and complicated, since there was no heir and successor; and yet someone had to undertake the conduct of affairs. The foremost generals met in council. After long debate it was decided to await the expected confinement of Roxana, and till then to have affairs carried on by a council of regency, consisting of four members.

The infantry, however, under the influence of one of their leaders, Meleagrus, nominated as king Alexander's step-brother, Philip Arrhidæus, who was of feeble intellect. The cavalry sided with the generals. In this dispute, which broke out among the Macedonians immediately after the death of the great king, and in the open war which followed, the generals with the cavalry evacuated Babylon and encamped before the town. After long negotiations the contending sides were reconciled.

Peace was concluded by the two parties on the terms that Philip Arrhidæus, as well as the expected child of Alexander, if it proved to be a son, should be clothed with the purple and should reign. Perdicas was to be entrusted with the conduct of affairs as the highest officer of the realm. Now came the epilogue. At a review and inspection of the army before the gates of Babylon the infantry stood opposite the cavalry and elephants. King Arrhidæus rode up to the infantry and demanded the surrender of the mutineers and ringleaders, threatening to attack them if they refused compliance. The chiefs of

the insurrection were given up, thrown before the elephants, and trampled to death. Meleagrus, too, was killed. The position of Perdicas was powerful, for he completely ruled King Arrhidæus. Thus order was once more restored, and the continued existence of the empire seemed secured by the nomination of Philip Arrhidæus as king and by the subsequent birth of a son to Alexander's widow.


But of the two kings, one was an infant, the other a man of feeble intellect. The generals and commanders, who mostly belonged to the high Macedonian nobility, and in some cases—for example, Leonnatus and Perdicas—were related to the royal house, had submitted to their great king, and under his rule had been obliged to suppress their ambition and desire of power in the interest of the common good. But the matter now stood thus: Perdicas was

only the equal of most of them in rank and dignity, and yet was to exercise the royal power in the name of the kings; and just as Perdicas on his side would be only too glad to have the generals go as far away as possible from Babylon, in order that he might not be hindered in the administration of the affairs entrusted to him, so, on the other hand, it was for the interests of each general to obtain a province where, far removed from the central

government, he might hope to find a field for his restless energy and ambition.

Thus it was with profit to all that soon after the restoration of order a division of the satrapies was arranged. Antipater received Macedonia and Greece, and Antigonus Greater Phrygia, where he had long been satrap. And to mention only the most important of the others, Ptolemy received Egypt; Leonnatus Hellepontine Phrygia; Lysimachus Thrace; and Eumenes Cappadocia, which he had first to conquer for himself with the help of his two neighbours, Antigonus and Leonnatus.

From this point Alexander's conquests in Asia and Africa pass out of our subject-matter. Their later history has been dealt with elsewhere. With the partition of his empire among his generals



THEOPHRASTUS

Who, with Aristotle, stood at the head of Greek science in Alexander's time.

Partition of the Empire

disappeared all prospect of the fulfilment of his world-embracing visions. Placed at an early age by his father under the instruction of Aristotle, the soul of the boy had been filled with the Aristotelian ideal of a kingship that should win the hearts of men through great abilities and noble deeds. His mind was stored with pictures of the Heroic Age of Greece; and the glorious figure of Achilles made an especially deep impression upon his imagination. He became inspired with the idea of a struggle of the West against the East; and with this conception the teaching of Aristotle, that the mission of

united through fear and admiration for him alone. The army with which he set out to accomplish the great object of his life was but little greater than that which Napoleon had with him in the Egyptian campaign; but it contained the flower of the Macedonian-Greek soldiery, and was complete both in knowledge and experience of the arts of war. The single combat had passed away, the closed phalanx had been introduced during Hellenic times. But already Xenophon had recognised the unwieldiness of a heavy mass of men, and had demanded a closer co-operation

The Army of Alexander



VASES OF THE FINEST PERIOD OF GREEK ART

These vases, made during the time of Alexander, are products of the finest period of Greek art. On the left is a fine vase in the Athenian style; in the centre a wine-bowl with medallion handles, and on the right an Apulian amphora.

the Greeks was to extend their dominion over the barbarians, was in full accord; while the march of the Ten Thousand through the Persian empire, and the conquests of Agesilaus, had revealed the weakness of the colossus with

Power of the Conqueror's Personality

feet of clay. At the death of Philip, Alexander was twenty years of age. He immediately succeeded to a dominion over faithful Macedonians, dissatisfied Greeks, and rebellious Illyrians and Dardanians; yet scarcely a year after his accession he was ruler of an empire that had already become

between the phalanx and the other branches of the army. By Epaminondas the phalanx had been separated into parts—a wing for attack and another for defence. Philip may have introduced the use of organised units, but Alexander returned to the older method employed by Epaminondas, retaining the ancient oblique order of battle and making the right wing the attacking body. The army of Alexander fought in single hand-to-hand encounters, just as men had fought during the Heroic Age, but with this difference—instead of individuals, troops of soldiers

that had become as indivisible bodies, swayed by one idea, filled the places that had formerly been occupied by single men. At the time of the conquest of Egypt, which brought the entire Mediterranean basin under the control of Greece, when Alexandria, the centre of Greek commerce and traffic, was built, Alexander was still the champion of Grecian ideals, the leader in the war of vengeance, and the hero of the pan-Hellenic ideals of Isocrates; but in his second period of development he turned away from the soil of his forefathers, which had given him his power, forsook the ideal of his nation, the conquest of the Persian empire, and



ONE OF THE WORLD'S FINEST SCULPTURES
The head of the Hermes sculptured by Praxiteles, one of the greatest of Greek sculptors, about 350 B.C. The statue is given on page 2457.

**Amalgamating
East
With West**

inferior to the East, both in morals and in manners. The proclamation by which he was recognised as son of Jupiter Ammon was, therefore, his first step in the new direction; and it only proved his profound knowledge of the Eastern spirit. The first link in the chain that was to bind Occident to Orient was Alexandria, the centre of world commerce, founded by him. With this plan of uniting mankind into a league of peace, the half-forgotten but deeply venerated Hellenic conceptions of international justice awoke in him to new life. This side of his character has been

regarded with enthusiasm, especially during the time when mankind sought to break down the barriers that separated nations from one another. Montaigne, Montesquieu, and Voltaire were all of them great admirers of Alexander. In short, it was no longer the conquest of the Persian empire, but the conquest of the world that had become the object of his ambition, for which firm foundations had been laid by the declaration respecting his divine origin. Thus from the union of Greece, through Philip, a theodivine dominion of the world arose. It fell, to be sure, at the death of Alexander; yet it lived on in the claims of the Diadochic kingdoms, and especially in

Egypt, where it furnished the basis for the divinity of monarchs. To the enormous circle of city colonies Alexander added Alexandria, Alexandretta, Herat, and Alexandria in the Punjab; these towns completed the Grecian sphere, and for the time being raised the Greek speech to the position of a universal language. Syrians, Indians, Persians and Bactrians were now joined to Scythians, Iberians, Kelts and Romans; the art and poetry of India were influenced by Greece and scientific investigations in astronomy, medicine and philosophy were carried on as far east as the regions of the Indus and Ganges. The results of Alexander's conquests were no less important to the civilisation of Greece itself. Greek science, with Aristotle and

Theophrastus at its head, was occupied for centuries in working over the enormous mass of new material for research which had been placed at its disposal. Art arose from the provincial decline into which it had fallen ; and the works of the sculptor Lysippus, who made a celebrated statue of Alexander, as well as pictures by distinguished painters of the time, were fully worthy of the spirit of this great



THE MNEMOSYNE OF LYSIPPUS

One of the results of Alexander's conquests was that art arose from the provincial decline into which it had fallen ; the works of Lysippus were fully worthy of this great age.



NIOBE AND HER DAUGHTER

This famous sculpture was probably executed by Scopas, the third of the three great sculptors of the period of artistic revival following Alexander's world conquests.

age of intellectual and material acquisition, in which Athens and Argos took the foremost place. Art and science were united in the writing of history ; the broadened horizon of the period and the ability to compare with one another the fundamental traits of different men and races led to descriptions which were not only accurate but which also possessed high literary value. Preparation for this had been furnished by the close investigations into psychological and ethical questions that had been carried on by the Socratic school, as well as by the results of the tendencies of the admirers of Isocrates, who, through the practice of delivering encomiums, were led into a closer examination of human character.

The personal plan of Alexander the Great opened up unbounded vistas to the Greek race, but failed. The greatest champion of cosmopolitanism known to the world of history suffered defeat in the attempt to form a political amalgamation of East and West.



GREEK ART AFTER ALEXANDER: THE FAMOUS BELVEDERE APOLLO

A marble copy, now in the Vatican, of a bronze statue executed a few years after Alexander's death.



THE MACEDONIAN SUPREMACY AND THE LAST OF ALEXANDER'S EMPIRE

WHILE Alexander was conquering the Persian power in Asia, his general, Antipater, had remained behind in Macedonia as regent. The Hellenic states were subject to his direction. They were, indeed, free, and bound only by treaties with Macedonia; but they no longer ventured to assert any policy of their own, since the charge of the common interests and the settlement of disputes and feuds were undertaken by the council of the league at Corinth under Macedonian influence.

Macedonia had also a seat and a vote in the Amphictyonic council, and thus acquired a most important means of exercising pressure and influence on Greece. In Athens, no less than in other Hellenic states, there was probably no lack of an anti-Macedonian party; but it kept quiet everywhere. The hope of a rising, as at Philip's death and a year afterwards, faded away in proportion as Alexander's victories were known, and thus the help

which so many looked for from Darius became impossible. Sparta alone had made no peace with the Macedonian king.

Her king, Agis, who in 333 B.C., aided by money and ships from the Persian admirals, had been able to take possession of the important island of Crete, continued later his intrigues against Macedonia. In the spring of 331 B.C. he was able to ally himself with other Greek states, such as Elis, Achaia—except Pellene—and Arcadia, with the object of freeing Greece from the Macedonian yoke. The allies besieged Megalopolis, which, not wishing to go over to them, remained loyal to Macedonia.

Antipater had now to intervene. But he was confronted in his native country by a difficult situation, of which we have very scanty information. We learn only that the general commanding in Thrace, Zopyrion, perished with his entire army on a campaign against the Getæ, who dwelt north of the Danube, and that in Thrace itself the native prince, Seuthes, clearly in connection with Zopyrion's over-

throw, organised a rising against Macedonia, in which a Macedonian general named Memnon seems to have taken part. Antipater having taken the field against the Thracians, soon found himself compelled, by the revolt of Agis, to patch up a peace with his foes in the north; it appears that he surrendered at least a

part of Thrace, probably in the hope of reconquering it later. Thus relieved, Antipater marched south and completely defeated Agis and the allies in a decisive battle before Megalopolis. The Spartan king fell, and the insurrection was crushed. Elis and Achaia had to pay 130 talents to Megalopolis, and even Sparta submitted.

By these means peace was, to outward appearance, restored in Hellas; but the hope of liberation from the Macedonian yoke, as the supremacy of Macedonia in Greece was called by many, was by no means quenched. It required only a spark to make the smouldering fire blaze into bright flames. This time the insurrection broke out in Athens. Here excitement was caused by the presence and the arrest of Harpalus, Alexander's treasurer, who had fled with vast riches from Ecbatana to avoid the punishment threatened by the king. Next came his escape from Athenian custody, and the trial, connected with this event, of Demosthenes, who was condemned, probably unjustly, for taking bribes. It is true that Harpalus's object—namely, to

hurry the Athenians into a war against Macedonia, was not immediately realised; but the money which they

took from him on his imprisonment—computed at 700 talents—was destined to be very useful to them. The excitement grew higher when, in 324 B.C., Alexander, by a decree, permitted the return to their native town of all Greek exiles, with the exception of common criminals and of the expelled Thebans. Athens and the

**Peace
Restored
in Hellas**

**Athens' Hope
of Freedom
Rekindled**

Ætolians did not execute this order. Then Alexander died suddenly, and with his death the desired liberation from the power of Macedonia seemed to the patriots to have arrived. Hyperides stood at the head of the movement. Since Alexander had ordered his satraps to dismiss their mercenaries, there were many unemployed soldiers who gladly enlisted. And as Athens had money enough and obtained a skilful general in Leosthenes an army was soon brought together. An alliance was made with the other Greek states in order to make the movement general in all Hellas; Ætolia especially sent troops and played an active part in the war, which at first took a favourable course for the confederates.

Antipater, who had advanced from Macedonia at the news of the revolt of Greece, was, after a disastrous fight at Heracleia, surrounded and besieged in Lamia. This is, therefore, called the Lamian War. During a sortie of Antipater, Leosthenes fell, and with him the real soul of the revolt. When Leonnatus, the governor of Hellespontine Phrygia, came to the help of Antipater, the Hellenes abandoned the siege and advanced against him. In a battle, disastrous for the Macedonians, Leonnatus fell; but the junction of his army with Antipater, who came to meet it, was achieved. Antipater, strengthened by the army of Craterus, who was leading back the discharged veterans of Alexander, soon afterwards defeated—near Crannon—the Greeks, in whose ranks disaffection had already appeared, and some contingents of whom had already gone home; he then concluded a separate peace with the allies of Athens. Athens herself had to consent to alter her constitution, and make the possession of a fortune of 2,000 drachmas a qualification for full citizenship, by which means out of 21,000 citizens only 9,000 remained entitled to full rights. Hyperides, Demosthenes, and other men connected with the revolt were condemned to death; and Antipater marched on to Ætolia in order to subdue that country also.

**The
Greeks
Subdued**

If Perdiccas, when he took over the administration of the empire, had hoped that the central authority would be strong enough to punish any insubordination of the governors and to frustrate their ambitious plans by means of the

imperial army under his command, he was mistaken; it was too soon apparent that there was an impassable gulf between the efforts of the governors to obtain more power and freedom, on the one side, and the supreme authority, representing the unity of the empire, on the other.

This led immediately to the war of Perdiccas against the two governors of Asia Minor, Leonnatus and Antigonus, who had not carried out the commands given them by the administrator of the empire to assist Eumenes in conquering the province of Cappadocia assigned to him. Eumenes joined the side of Perdiccas; Antigonus—for Leonnatus, as we have just seen, had, meantime, fallen in Thessaly—was supported by Antipater, Craterus, and Ptolemy of Egypt. Antipater and Craterus had to cross into Asia Minor to fight Eumenes. Craterus was killed in the war. Perdiccas himself went to Egypt, and after carrying on unsuccessful operations, which cost the lives of many men, was murdered by his own soldiers in 321 B.C. His army was led back to Syria. It here joined Antipater,

**Disintegration
of
the Empire**

who was now appointed regent of the empire. At Triparadisus, for the second time, a division of the provinces was made. In Europe, Antipater kept Macedonia with Greece, and Lysimachus Thrace. Antigonus was nominated general of the empire and entrusted with the war against Eumenes, who had been declared an enemy of the empire on account of his taking the side of Perdiccas. Antipater, after the discharge of the most urgent business with the kings, went to Europe, and took up his residence at Pella; Babylon, which lay in the very centre of Alexander's empire, was abandoned as the capital.

Another still more important step, which was fated to contribute much to the disintegration of the mighty empire, was likewise taken by Antipater. Before his death, which took place in 319 B.C., he had nominated an old comrade in arms, by name Polyperchon, to be regent. His own son, Cassander, who had been passed over by his father, deeply hurt at this slight, fled to Antigonus, who was governor of Phrygia, and at the same time, as general-in-chief in the name of the kings, was conducting the war in Asia against Eumenes. Polyperchon, who, till now quite unknown and possessed of no

authority, had been suddenly placed at the head of the empire, naturally looked for supporters. At his advice King Philip issued a decree conceding to the Greeks the reintroduction of the constitutions which they had had at the time of Alexander, and allowing the Greek exiles to return to their native cities. This was an appeal to the democrats of Greece, for Antipater as far as possible had favoured the oligarchs, and Cassander likewise had maintained the oligarchic institutions.

What Polyperchon wished to attain by this proclamation—namely, to bring over to his side the Greek communities, especially Athens and the Peloponnese—was not effected. Disturbances broke out at Athens; an attempt was made to introduce the democratic constitutions abolished by Antipater; but the Macedonian garrison in Munychia, commanded by Nicanor, was in favour of Cassander. And when Nicanor seized the Piræus, and when afterwards Cassander himself came to Athens, the town was obliged to content itself with the governor set over it by him, Demetrius of Phalerum. In the Peloponnese also Polyperchon achieved nothing. He failed to get possession of Megalopolis, which was under oligarchic government and had long favoured Macedonia. Thus he was restricted to Macedonia.

But another measure, by which he thought to make his power more felt, seemed more successful. He joined forces with Olympias, mother of the great Alexander, an enemy of Antipater and his house. Olympias, however, was at enmity with Eurydice, the wife of King Philip, who must have felt herself deeply injured by this arrangement between her and Polyperchon. These two allied themselves with Eumenes, who, having been nominated general-in-chief in Asia, with ample resources, was still fighting against Antigonus, and undertook to defend the rights of the kings. Eurydice allied herself with Cassander, who, through her agency, had been appointed regent by King Philip. The empire thus had two administrators, neither of whom had been appointed, as their two predecessors, by the really competent and popular representative body, the army, and both of whom were only partially recognised in the empire and at war with each other. Events in Macedonia were determined by the two hostile women, Olympias and

Eurydice. Olympias, who had stayed in Epirus, availed herself of the absence of Cassander from Macedonia to make an inroad. Eurydice marched against her with an army; but it went over to her foe, since the Macedonians would not fight against the mother of their great king. So Philip and Eurydice fell into

the power of the cruel Epirote princess, who caused both to be mercilessly tortured and miserably slain, and wreaked her fury equally on the kinsmen and adherents of Cassander. But when Cassander arrived from Greece and appeared in Southern Macedonia without Polyperchon's being able to hinder his crossing the mountains, Olympias shut herself up in Pydna; and when provisions gave out and the ship in which she wished to escape was taken away, she had to surrender. Impeached before the army by the friends and relatives of the many Macedonians killed by her, she was condemned to death; and as the old soldiers refused to slay the mother of their king, she was stoned by her accusers.

Roxana and the young king, Alexander, had fallen into the hands of Cassander at Pydna, and he kept them in strict custody. After the fall of Pydna, Pella surrendered to the conqueror, and soon afterwards the strong fortress of Amphipolis followed suit. Thus, Cassander was in a short time master of Macedonia. Polyperchon, it is true, maintained his position in the Peloponnese and some other places of Greece; but his post of administrator had lost all possible significance since the one king was dead and the other in the power of Cassander. Eumenes also, the ally of Polyperchon, and the most zealous protector of the royal rights, had been betrayed in the war against Antigonus by his own troops and murdered by his enemy. In fact, matters were in a favourable position for Cassander. His marriage with Thessalonice,

daughter of Philip, who had been at Pydna in the suite of Olympias, was sure to increase his importance with the Macedonians, and even to give him claims to the Macedonian throne when Alexander's son was no longer alive. For the time being, indeed, he was alive and universally recognised as king. But some years later the young Alexander was murdered by his keeper, Glaucias, at the command of

**Failure of
Antipater's
Successor**

**A War
of Two
Women**

**Alexander's
Son
Murdered**

Cassander. With the death of Alexander's son the empire of Alexander the Great became only a geographical conception. In fact, it was split up into separate parts, and the central power, continually weakened since Antipater's death, had completely vanished. The generals now regarded the provinces, which had been originally assigned to them by a higher power merely for administration, as their own dominions. It was, therefore, only natural that after 306 B.C. they styled themselves "Kings," for kings they had been for years.

Last of the Empire

However much Cassander may have striven at first for the possession of the Macedonian throne, in no case did he contemplate any scheme of world sovereignty or try to reorganise the empire of Alexander in its full extent. On the contrary, he opposed efforts such as Antigonos, for instance, made after the death of Eumenes, and was on the side of Ptolemy, Lysimachus, and Seleucus in their struggles against Antigonos, which lasted until his schemes of conquest were ended by the battle which the allies won at Ipsus in 301 B.C. Cassander's influence in Greece, which had been allied with Macedonia since Philip's time, and did not exist apart from Macedonia, no longer extended so widely, and was no longer so firm as it had been in his father's time. Demetrius of Phalerum, it is true, governed in his name at Athens: and Bœotia also, where Thebes had been rebuilt and re-peopled by him, stood under his influence, as did Epirus and other districts. But Polyperchon still opposed him in Greece, and the feeling in Ætolia was very hostile to him. The importance of Polyperchon waned, indeed, rapidly. In the year 310 B.C. he dragged Heracles, bastard son of Alexander, out of his retirement at Pergamus, and declared him his heir with the intention of striking a heavy blow at Cassander; but he then suddenly entered into negotiations with Cassander and

bought for himself the sovereignty over the Peloponnese by the murder of Heracles. From that moment the last imperial regent vanishes from history without leaving a trace.

A far more important antagonist in Hellas confronted Cassander in the person of Demetrius Poliorcetes "the Besieger," the son of Antigonos, who, in 307 B.C., starting with Athens, subdued for himself other Hellenic communities and territories. Cassander was himself freed from a great danger when, in 302 B.C., Demetrius was summoned by his father to Asia, in order to take part in the great struggle that was to end with the battle of Ipsus and the death of Antigonos. This forced Demetrius to abandon his plan of wresting Macedonia from his opponent. Now, for the first time, Cassander was able to subdue the Hellenic states, such as Bœotia and others, which in the interval had been subject to Poliorcetes.

Though Cassander's power was disputed in Hellas, in Macedonia itself his throne was firm. We have, unfortunately, little account of what he did for his country. He rebuilt Potidæa, the town in Chalcidice which Philip II. destroyed, and called it Cassandria. He considerably enlarged the former Therma, situated on the gulf of that name, and called this new and more extensive foundation Thessalonica after his wife.

The town has kept this name to the present day. Cassandria and Thessalonica, supported in every way by the king, became the most important seaports of Macedonia. A proof of his desire to improve the country, which had been greatly depopulated by the large levies and long wars, and to attract new inhabitants, is the settlement of 20,000 Autariates on Mount Orbelus. These Autariates, an Illyrian people, being pressed by other and stronger tribes, invaded Pæonia, where the king, Audeleon, applied to Cassander for



PYRRHUS, KING OF EPIRUS
One of the greatest commanders of ancient times, who attempted to emulate Alexander, making himself master of part of Macedon.

Cassander's Improvements in Macedonia

and to attract new inhabitants, is the settlement of 20,000 Autariates on Mount Orbelus. These Autariates, an Illyrian people, being pressed by other and stronger tribes, invaded Pæonia, where the king, Audeleon, applied to Cassander for

THE MACEDONIAN SUPREMACY

help. Instead of slaughtering them, he settled them in his land, and by this means helped both parties. Cassander died in 297. B.C., and his son and successor, Philip III., did not long survive him. The two other sons, Antipater and Alexander, divided the power between them. Now began for Macedonia a time of terrible struggles and great revolutions. Antipater killed his mother, Thesalonice, and expelled his brother, Alexander. The latter sought help from Pyrrhus of Epirus and Demetrius Poliorcetes, while Antipater solicited the aid of Lysimachus. Demetrius was occupied by Greek affairs, and could not immediately furnish the desired help; but Pyrrhus, to whom Alexander, as a reward, had conceded Tymphæa and Parauæa, besides Athamania, Ambracia, and Amphilochia, succeeded in driving Antipater back and restoring Alexander to power. Lysimachus did not, it is true, make any armed intervention in Macedonian affairs for the support of Antipater, but mediated a peace between the two brothers, and induced Pyrrhus, by a bribe of 300 talents to desist from helping Alexander, clearly because he wished to keep his enemy, Demetrius, away from Macedonia.

He failed to do this; in fact, Demetrius Poliorcetes appeared now, when he was no longer welcome, resolved to use this opportunity and to make himself master of Macedonia. Alexander went to meet him as far as Dion on the southern frontier of Macedonia, in order to make it evident that his interference was no longer necessary. In spite of feigned friendliness, the two princes regarded each other with great mistrust, since one was secretly plotting against the life of the other. In fact, Alexander was murdered while leaving the banqueting hall where he

had dined with Demetrius, and his army declared Demetrius, who justified himself before it, to be king of Macedonia. Antipater, who had made himself hated by the murder of his own mother, was banished without trouble. Demetrius was now king of Macedonia (294-287 B.C.). His restless spirit did not content itself with firmly establishing supremacy in Macedonia and Hellas, but wished to reconquer Asia, which Seleucus

and Lysimachus had divided between themselves after the death of Antigonus. The mighty preparations made for this purpose aroused the anxiety of these kings, so that they formed fresh alliances.

Pyrrhus joined them. Demetrius proposed to open the campaign with 98,000 infantry, 12,000 cavalry, and 500 ships. The kings advanced against him simultaneously from different directions. Lysimachus invaded Macedonia from the Thracian side, but was defeated near Amphipolis. Pyrrhus advanced from the west, and Ptolemy appeared with his fleet on the coast of Hellas. Demetrius was fated to learn now how detested his rule was. An insatiate love of war and the imposition of heavy taxes cannot win the hearts of subjects. As he was encamped opposite to Pyrrhus, his army went over and proclaimed the Epirote king. Demetrius had to flee from his kingdom in disguise. He died in Asia in 283 B.C., a prisoner of Seleucus, while his

son, Antigonus Gonatas, held his own in Hellas. In Macedonia, Pyrrhus came to an agreement with Lysimachus, who naturally claimed his share of the booty, on the conditions that the western districts with Edessa fell to Epirus. But this state of affairs did not last long. Pyrrhus, who was king only by a temporary arrangement, was driven out by Lysimachus. In the previous year Lysimachus had



PHILIP III. & ALEXANDER II.
Sons of Cassander, king of Macedonia, who, after very short reigns were succeeded by their brother Antipater.



DEMETRIUS POLIORCETES
Son of Antigonus, who subdued Athens and other Hellenic states, and became a king of Macedonia.



COIN OF ANTIGONUS GONATAS
Son of the great Demetrius Poliorcetes, whose conquests he retained. This coin shows the Macedonian shield.

united under his rule a great part of Alexander's empire. At the distribution of satrapies at Babylon, Thrace had fallen to his share. When he came into his new province he was unpopular. During the government of Antipater, as we have seen above, the Odryæ, under Seuthes, had already risen, and, as it appears, had won their independence. When

Lysimachus Fights for Thrace

Lysimachus came, the same Seuthes had succeeded in rousing his fellow countrymen to war, and marched against him with a strong army of 20,000 infantry and 8,000 cavalry. Lysimachus, notwithstanding his far inferior numbers, did not avoid a battle, which, thanks to the excellent discipline of the Macedonians, remained indecisive. Seuthes was afterwards conquered and forced to submit. Thus it was only by fighting that Lysimachus acquired possession of his province. But once in possession of the country of the Odryæ, the fertile and favoured valley of the Hebrus, he extended his power gradually over the Hæmus up to the Danube.

Here, on the coast of the Black Sea, were Greek colonies, Odessus, Callatis, Istrus, and others, which, like the Greek towns of Asia Minor, were proud of their freedom, and sought to retain it by force of arms. Lysimachus evidently succeeded at first in making himself master of these towns and occupying them with garrisons. In 313 B.C., Callatis expelled the garrison, declared itself free, and liberated Istrus also and other neighbouring Greeks. This was the signal for the outbreak of a war, in which Lysimachus very soon retook Odessus and Istrus, but was compelled to besiege Callatis for a considerable time. When the Scythian and Thracian tribes also encroached and Seuthes again revolted, Antigonus supporting the hostile movements by sending troops, Lysimachus required all his skill to defend himself against the different enemies. But the Scythians were beaten, Seuthes was overcome in battle, Antigonus' general was conquered, and Callatis finally surrendered. From that time, it appears, the Greek towns on the coast of the Black Sea were permanently subject to Lysimachus.

In 306 B.C. he, like the other governors, assumed the title of king; and in 301 B.C. he was, next to Seleucus, the chief parti-

cipator in the decisive fight against Antigonus at Ipsus. Lydia, Ionia, Caria, and Hellespontine Phrygia fell to the kingdom of Thrace. Notwithstanding its magnificence, it was not securely founded. The Thracians themselves were difficult to pacify and always inclined to rise, especially the unruly and unmanageable Getæ and Scythians in the north. Lysimachus once marched against the Getæ over the Danube, but got among the barren steppes between the Danube and the Pruth, and, continually surrounded and harassed by the bands of the enemy, was finally forced to surrender unconditionally to their king, Dromichætès. The conduct of the barbarian king was, indeed, noble and magnanimous: he let his prisoner go free on the promise to give up the portions of Getic territory which he possessed and to give him his daughter in marriage.

In 287 B.C. Macedonia also fell to Lysimachus. From 285 B.C. on he was king there, but in 281 B.C. he was defeated and killed in battle against Seleucus. Neither Thrace nor Macedonia was destined to enjoy quiet during the ensuing years. Ptolemy Ceraunus, who, abandoning the prospect of the Egyptian throne in favour of his younger brother, according to the wish of his father, Ptolemy Soter, had left his fatherland, struck down the old Seleucus, placed the double diadem of Macedonia and



SEUTHES IV.
King of the Odryæ, de-
posed by Lysimachus.

Thrace on his own head, and married the widow of Lysimachus, Arsinoë, who was his own sister. He then killed her children of the first marriage, who had claims on Thrace. But fate soon overtook him.

In the first quarter of the fourth century B.C. appear the earliest signs, for us at least, of a movement which, coming from the north-west, convulsed Thrace and Macedonia. On the south bank of the Danube there dwelt in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. the Getæ, between the sea

Barbarian Invasion of Thrace

and Mount Hæmus. To the west of them were settled some smaller tribes, which in turn the Oscians, now the Isker, divided from the Triballi, living in modern Servia. About 340 B.C. the Getæ had, to a large extent, left the south bank of the Danube and had crossed over to the other bank of the river, while the Triballi, pushed further westward, occupied the districts between the Danube and Mount Hæmus, abandoned by them. Diodorus relates that

the Triballi, compelled by hunger, marched out with bag and baggage about 370 B.C. and in their invasion of the neighbouring Thracian territory reached the town of Abdera, situated on the coast of the Aegean Sea, defeated all its effective forces, and besieged the town itself. The Athenian Chabrias liberated the beleaguered town and drove the enemy from the land. We know nothing more of this expedition, except that it clearly did not have the desired success; as a fact the Triballi changed their abode only by an expedition made towards the east.

This was no ordinary marauding expedition, as Diodorus thinks, for the point was that, being pressed by other stronger tribes, they were forced to leave their old homes. It was, indeed, through the Kelts, who, from the northern side of the Alps and from the plains of the Danube, pressed southward on the Illyrians and there produced revolutions—

20,000 Aurtariates, who had abandoned their homes, had been settled on Mount Orbelus by Cassander—just as they strove to spread eastward and thereby pushed the Thracian tribes onward. The Keltic Scordisci pressed on as far as the valley of the Morawa, where formerly the Triballi dwelt.

These are the first discernible traces of a flood of nations which was destined to break over Macedonia and Thrace. Powerful rulers, indeed, like Philip, Alexander, Antipater, Cassander, and Lysimachus, had kept the surrounding nations in check, and, in any case, protected their own territories.

An expedition into Thrace for plunder and conquest by the Kelts, or, as they are mostly called, the "Galatians," under their leader, Cambaules, must, indeed, come within the time of these last-named rulers; but that expedition did not at the time assume formidable proportions.

On the fall of Lysimachus the Galatians poured in three separate bodies over the Balkan peninsula; the bands of Belgius turned towards Macedonia, demanded money from King Ptolemy Ceraunus in case he wished for peace, and when he refused, invaded the land, ravaging and laying it waste. The king was defeated

and killed. The whole land was at the mercy of the barbarians. The inhabitants fled into the fortified towns, where the Galatians could not attack them with any prospect of success. At last, after some months, Sosthenes was able to drive the unwelcome guests out of the land. The army then placed him on the throne. The next year



A WOUNDED GALATIAN

After the fall of Lysimachus the barbarian Galatians overran Macedonia, but, marching into Greece, were defeated and nearly annihilated at Delphi. One of a series of Greek sculptures commemorating the victory, now in the Louvre.

the Galatians made another incursion, attracted by the rich booty which their comrades had brought home, but also with the intention of conquering new settlements. Lutarius and Leonnorijs overran Thrace, Brennus marched into Macedonia. Sosthenes fell; once more the inhabitants had to fly into the strong towns. Brennus marched further into Greece. There fate overtook him; the united forces of the Greeks, whom Apollo himself helped, so it is related, succeeded in defeating the Galatians at Delphi and in nearly annihilating them. Those who escaped

from the disaster, as well as the hordes which, meantime, had plundered other parts of Greece, withdrew to Macedonia. While a part of them returned home and another part went into Thrace to join Lutarius and Leonorius, the third remained in Macedonia, in order completely to ravage the disorganised country. At

**Macedonia
Freed from
the Galatians**

this crisis Antigonus Gonatas, the son of the king Demetrius Poliorcetes, appeared with a strong fleet and a well-equipped army. He succeeded in defeating the Galatians, who offered him peace in return for money, as they had once offered Ptolemy Ceraunus; and the people, at last set free from the oppression of the invaders, welcomed him with acclamation.

But Thrace, which Philip and Alexander and lately Lysimachus had ruled, together with Macedonia, became for the ensuing period the prey of the Galatians. Thither also had fled those able to escape from the battle with Antigonus. When Lutarius and Leonorius, who had made Byzantium and the whole coast of the Propontis tributary, conquered Lysimachia and the Thracian Chersonese, and crossed over in 277 B.C. to Asia Minor, in order, after many random expeditions, finally to found a kingdom, the hordes of Brennus which had escaped from the disasters at Delphi and in Macedonia remained behind in Thrace and entered, as it were, on the inheritance of their brethren who had gone to Asia. Under their leader, Comontorius, they brought into subjection the Thracians, who often endeavoured to shake off the yoke and had again to be conquered, and see their valour yield to the greater valour of a still ruder people.

Thrace thus became the spoil of strangers, who organised a state there and made their leader, Comontorius, the first king. The capital of the kingdom was Tylis; from its situation we may conclude that its dominion extended as much over

**Thrace the
Spoil of
Barbarians**

the territories north as over those south of Mount Hæmus. The conduct of the Galatians is shown by their treatment of Byzantium, the rich Greek emporium on the Bosphorus. This town, to have peace from these pests, was forced to pay yearly first 3,000, then 5,000, later 20,000 pieces of gold, and finally 80 talents. And the other seaports the Galatians treated in the same way. The rule of the Galatians in Thrace lasted several generations. About

213 B.C. the Thracians succeeded in shaking off the yoke. King Cavarus was, indeed, peaceful and sensual, weaknesses which aided the Thracians. Perhaps also the tendency of the Galatians to enlist as mercenaries may have stripped the land too completely of men capable of bearing arms.

As we have seen above, Antigonus Gonatas had become king of Macedonia after his victory over the Galatians. In Hellas he exercised sovereignty over Thessaly, Bœotia, and Eubœa; and in the Peloponnese, Corinth, Argos, Sicyon, Megalopolis, and Messenia were subject to him. In the north the task to which he first devoted himself was tremendous, for not only had the swarms of the Galatians cruelly wasted and impoverished the land, but pretenders, who since the death of Ptolemy Ceraunus and Sosthenes were for ever rising up and fighting, kept Macedonia in a perpetual state of disorder, and prevented all prosperous development.

Antigonus put an end to this confusion. First of all, he secured the frontiers of his kingdom by taking, after a long siege, Cassandria, where the cruel

**Antigonus
Restores Order
in Macedonia**

Apollodorus had seized the power, and deposing the tyrant. When he soon afterwards celebrated his marriage to his niece, Phila, by festivities to which Greek philosophers, men of letters, and poets were summoned, he wished to show to the world not only that his power was firmly established, but that he, like Archelaus, wished to foster the development of the moral and intellectual powers of his people and to make room for poetry at his court.

Antigonus was not fated long to enjoy quiet and peace, for, in 275 B.C., Pyrrhus of Epirus, who had just returned from Italy, undertook a war of conquest against Macedonia. His pretext was that Antigonus, in spite of his requests, had not sent troops to his assistance in Italy. In reality, he wished to avail himself of the present situation of his opponent, who was not prepared for a war, to break into the neighbouring country with his veteran troops, and to reconquer his old possessions. In point of fact, this preliminary success answered the expectations of the king. Antigonus, with his hastily levied troops and Gallic mercenaries could offer no resistance to the attack of Pyrrhus. Beaten, he was forced to withdraw to Thessalonica, and saw his power limited

THE MACEDONIAN SUPREMACY

to this town and some towns on the coast, while Thessaly and the whole of Upper Macedonia with the old royal town of Edessa fell to the Epirote. It was brought as a reproach against Pyrrhus even in antiquity that he allowed the sepulchres of the kings there to be plundered by his Gallic bands without interfering or punishing the miscreants. He also treated the inhabitants harshly. These were not means calculated to secure the possession of the land, which had hardly been conquered and had never been entirely subjugated.

Shortly afterwards Pyrrhus's army advanced into Greece, in order primarily to expel the garrisons of Antigonos from the towns of the Peloponnese, and thus to deprive his adversary of his bases of operation and supplies in that country. At the same time it was not unwelcome to him that Cleonymus, son of King Cleomenes, who had been forced reluctantly to renounce his claim to the Spartan throne in favour of his nephew, Arcus, placed himself under his protection and hoped with his help to bring about his accession to the throne. If this succeeded, Pyrrhus would have a devoted friend in the king of Sparta, who must stand or fall with him, while otherwise he had only opposition to look for in Sparta, should he wish to win the Peloponnesian towns for himself. After marching through Laconia and laying waste the country, Pyrrhus attacked the capital, but was repulsed.

Meantime, Antigonus Gonatas had reconquered Macedonia and had then advanced with an army into the Peloponnese. At the news of his approach Pyrrhus went as far as Argos to meet the enemy. There Pyrrhus was killed in a street fight at night in 272 B.C. Antigonus ordered his body to be burnt with every token of respect, and gave the ashes of it to his son Hellenus, who led the Epirote army back home. In this manner Antigonus Gonatas rescued Macedonia and restored his influence in Greece. This powerful position, however, was soon to entangle him in a new war, in preparation for which the kings Ptolemy of Egypt and Arcus of Sparta, together with Athens, formed a confederacy. The old catchword of the liberation of Greece was again called into play; yet nothing is more certain than

Death of the Great Pyrrhus

that every one of the kings taking part in this war understood by freedom merely the destruction of the Macedonian influence and aimed only at the widening of his own sphere of sovereignty. This war, usually called the Chremonidean War—after Chremonides, the leading statesman in Athens, under whose archonship the alliance for the freedom of Greece was concluded—was fought mostly round Athens, which was besieged by Antigonos and at last captured in 263 B.C. The attempt of the Spartan king to relieve Athens was unsuccessful.

Athens Falls Again to Macedonia

Arcus fell in a bloody battle in 265 B.C.; even the expected help from Ptolemy failed, the Egyptian fleet having been completely defeated near Cos. Athens was forced to surrender to Antigonos, who treated it with leniency. He placed garrisons on the Museum and in Munychia and Piræus. So Athens, after it had been free for some twenty-five years, was once more dependent on Macedonia, as formerly in the first years of Cassander's rule.

But the rest of Greece withdrew itself more and more from the influence of Macedonia. In 280 B.C. four Achæan towns had united into a league, which six others soon joined, the professed object being the expulsion of the Macedonian garrisons and the overthrow of the Macedonian supremacy. Its importance was insignificant at first. Yet in 251 B.C. Aratus liberated his own town of Sicyon from tyrants and induced it to enter the Achæan League. Acrocorinth was then wrested from the Macedonian garrison, and Corinth likewise joined the same league.

At last Megara, Troezen and other towns were won for the Achæans, and withdrawn from the Macedonian hegemony. And just as in the Peloponnese, the Achæan League gained ground, and with set purpose checked Macedonia, so the Ætolian League was founded in Central Greece, which, gaining ground more and more, attached towns and districts to itself, and in 245 B.C. compelled the country of Bœotia to join it. When Antigonus Gonatas died, in 239 B.C., at an advanced age, the Macedonian supremacy over Greece had thus suffered great loss. Only in Macedonia itself was the throne of the Antigonides still firm.



CLEOMENES III.
Who ruled in Sparta from 236 to 222 B.C., greatly extended her power, but was defeated by Antigonos.

Demetrius II. (239-229 B.C.) failed to evoke in Greece any important reaction in favour of Macedonia. The attitude of Demetrius towards the Illyrians was fated to bring about most weighty consequences in the future. It was admittedly to the interest of Macedonia, as of Greece, that all these northern barbarian tribes should be

Macedonia Supports the Barbarians

as much as possible kept in check. But Demetrius, far from attacking and attempting to weaken the power of Agron, prince of Scodra, who with his large pirate fleet rendered the Adriatic Sea unsafe, making raids as far as Elis and Messene and harassing the Greek settlements on the Illyrian coast, actually supported him with money in order, with the assistance of the Illyrians, to rescue the Acarnanian town of Medeon, which was besieged by the Ætoliens. He attained, indeed, his immediate object. In order to check the growing insolence of the Illyrians and to prevent the subjugation of the Greek colonies, Rome had to interfere. Illyria was humiliated, and its fleet of corsairs broken up. Corcyra, Epidamnus, Apollonia, and the Epirote tribes of the Parthini and Atintani became allies of Rome.

Rome had broken the power of the Illyrian princes, deserved the gratitude of the Greeks, and opened the way for the establishment of her influence in Greek affairs, thus undertaking the duty, which once Macedonia was accustomed to discharge, of protecting the civilised world from the wild barbarians of the north.

A near relation of the royal house, Antigonus, surnamed Dason, took over the government of Philip V., the infant son of Demetrius, who was killed in 229 B.C., in battle against the Dardani, who were invading from the north. In both cases there was absolute need of a grown man. In the north the Dardani had overrun Macedonia. In Central Greece,

Athens Lost For Ever to Macedonia

it is true, Demetrius had, by the recovery of Bœotia, restored the Macedonian influence; and even Athens, still a very important town, submitted, so long as Macedonian garrisons occupied Piræus, Munychia, Salamis, and Sunium. But now Athens, too, was lost for Macedonia, since the commander of the garrison, bribed by Aratus, the general of the Achæan League, gave up these places to the Athenians. Thessaly, too, which since Philip's time

had been allied with Macedonia, revolted. Antigonus Dason secured his frontier for the time by driving out the Dardani. He then brought back the greater part of Thessaly to its allegiance. He also won successes in Greece. The progress which Sparta made under King Cleomenes, and the expansion of the Spartan power in the successful war with the Achæan League, compelled Aratus, general of the Achæan League, finally to seek help against Sparta from Macedonia, the very power by combating which the league had grown strong. Antigonus naturally granted the request, came with an army to the Peloponnese in 223 B.C., once more took possession of the citadel and city of Corinth, and defeated Cleomenes so decisively in the battle at Sellasia in 221 B.C. that he was forced to fly to Egypt for safety.

The newly acquired power of Sparta was crushed at a blow; the supremacy of Macedonia in the Peloponnese, from which it had been forced since Antigonus Gonatas to retreat step by step, was restored, and in most states of Hellas the Macedonian overlordship was again recognised.

Macedon's Supremacy Restored

An inroad of the Illyrians summoned Dason back to Macedonia; he defeated them, but soon afterwards died from apoplexy, in 220 B.C. Philip V., son of Demetrius, for whom Dason had been regent, now became king. The Ætoliens, fearing Dason, had for some time kept quiet; but now, despising Philip's youth, they renewed their old raids. At this time Rome was engaged in the Second Punic War, and had been reduced by Hannibal to a perilous situation. Philip, in order to satisfy the hatred of the Romans, which he had inherited from his father, concluded peace with the Ætoliens and an alliance with Hannibal, under which a Macedonian army was to be landed in Italy; in return the Roman possessions in Epirus were to be given to him.

Thus the First Macedonian War broke out (216-208 B.C.). Philip, however, did not rouse himself to vigorous action. Moreover, the plan of landing a Macedonian force in Italy waned in proportion as the position of the Romans gradually improved and that of Hannibal grew less favourable. In 210 B.C. Rome concluded a treaty of alliance with Ætolia, Sparta and other states, so that Philip was again occupied in Greece and involved in a war, in which the Achæans stood on his side, and the

THE MACEDONIAN SUPREMACY

movements of his opponents were supported by a Roman fleet. After he had come to terms with the Ætolians and the other Hellenes, Philip concluded a peace with Rome also, which had no intention of carrying on the war against Macedonia without Greek help. Rome kept her possessions in Epirus; Philip took the territory of the Atintani. But this was, after all, only a truce between Macedonia and Rome; a decisive settlement between the two was reserved for a later time. Philip turned his attention for the moment to affairs in the east, since Rome was still fully occupied in the west.

The death of Ptolemy Philopator of Egypt, in 204 B.C., who was succeeded on the throne by a minor, led to a treaty of alliance between Philip and Antiochus III. of Syria. The two allied monarchs had no meaner schemes in view than the partition of the possessions of the Lagidæ (that is, the house of the Ptolemies). While Antiochus immediately set about the conquest of Coele-Syria and Phœnicia, Philip crossed to Asia Minor, took Chalcedon, stormed Chios, and sold its inhabitants into slavery. Such acts justly incensed the Greeks.

Byzantium, Rhodes and Pergamus concluded an alliance and declared war on Macedonia. Pergamus and Rhodes sought help from the Romans. At first they hesitated; finally, the invasion by Philip of the territory of their allies, the Athenians, gave the pretext, and the Second Macedonian War then began. In autumn, 200 B.C., the consul P. Sulpicius Galba landed at Apollonia, and in the spring of 199 B.C. invaded Macedonia from Epirus, being supported by simultaneous attacks of the Dardani and Illyrians on the north and of the Ætolians and Athamenians on the south. Philip was in a critical situation, but he repelled his opponents; Galba withdrew, and the Ætolians were beaten on the Peneius. The year 198 B.C. also brought no decisive result.

In the summer of 197 B.C. the decisive battle was at length fought near Cynos-

cephalæ—the Dog's Head Hills—in Thessaly; Philip was totally defeated, and accepted the conditions of peace which he had previously rejected. He had to give up to the Romans, who left them once more free, all the towns recently taken or previously possessed by him in Asia Minor and Greece. He was also compelled to surrender his fleet and to pledge himself to keep up only 5,000 armed men and to wage no wars outside Macedonia.

In this way Macedonia was struck out of the list of great powers. In the war of Rome with Antiochus III., which broke out shortly after, Philip stood on the side of Rome, but was disappointed in his hope of being permitted to hold some of the conquered Thessalian and Thracian towns. He did not, however, give up his hatred of Rome and the expectation of better times. He contrived skilfully to evade the command not to keep more than 5,000 armed men. He was continually training the young men—of whom he certainly never had more than 5,000 under arms at the same time—so that he left behind a well-disciplined army of 30,000 infantry and 8,000 cavalry. He also knew how to make skilful use of

the royal powers of taxation; he revived the working of the mines and made them profitable to the state coffers. At any rate, at his death, in 179 B.C., there was money in the treasury sufficient to keep 10,000 mercenaries for ten years, and in the state granaries a supply of corn also for ten years.


His son Perseus tried to carry out his father's unaccomplished plans, directed against Rome. In spite of a favourable start, the Third Macedonian War (171-168 B.C.) ended only in the overthrow of the Macedonians at Pydna by Æmilius Paulus. Macedonia was divided into four independent departments. This state of things was not permanent; after a pretender, Andriscus, had come forward and had been defeated by a Roman army, Macedonia became a Roman province in 146 B.C., and her history is absorbed in that of the Roman Dominion.



PHILIP V. AND PERSEUS, KINGS OF MACEDON
Philip V. of Macedon allied with Illyria and Carthage, and began the First Macedonian War with Rome, but, like his son Perseus, the last king of Macedon, was totally defeated.



THE LAST DAYS OF ANCIENT GREECE: THE DESTRUCTION OF CORINTH BY THE ROMANS
From the terrible days of the last stage in the political history of ancient Greece, when the national life was hurrying towards the precipice and a contemporary historian had to describe his countrymen as a nation of lazzaroni, having no hope for the future, from this ruin the yoke of Rome was a release. From the painting by Fleury in the Luxembourg.



THE PASSING OF ANCIENT GREECE

THE LAST STAGE IN HER POLITICAL HISTORY

ALEXANDER THE GREAT had assumed the part of a champion of freedom in Hellas, since he put an end to the power of the tyrants and showed especial honour to Athens. But he kept in view his plans for creating a monarchy invested with religious attributes. While in the army of Alexander the Greek opposition made common cause with the discontented Macedonian nobility, the cities of Hellas were generally tranquil.

Athens, in whose case the war of desperation had already marked a departure from her previous policy, returned after

Revival of Athens Under Lycurgus

Cheronea to the old paths, and flourished with fresh splendour under the guidance of Lycurgus (335-326) in the time of Alexander. In this era of peace the Ministry of Finance became the most important office in the state; like military offices, it had to be filled with experts—who, contrary to democratic traditions were elected and not chosen by lot—and secured from rapid changes by a four years' tenure.

Athens had found in Lycurgus one of her greatest finance ministers. This man, who amid the growing luxury of his native city led a studiously simple life, understood not only how to raise the state revenue once more to twelve hundred talents, but also how to turn his personal credit to the advantage of the state, since private individuals would lend their money to it only on his personal guarantee. In order to increase the public interest in the figures of the revenue, the budget was publicly displayed on tablets. The immense naval arsenal at Piræus was now constructed; accommodation for the

fleet was for the future provided by three hundred and seventy-seven boathouses. A pan-Athenaic racecourse was built, and the fleet was put on a war footing. But

Downfall of Lycurgus

after the downfall of Lycurgus Athens entangled herself in the Lamian war with Macedon, and had to consent to a diminution of her political privileges and to the introduction of a Macedonian garrison. The attempt of Polyperchon to restore the old constitution on a democratic basis failed completely. Demetrius of Phalerum, at once a statesman, philosopher, and orator, made Athens independent under a moderate oligarchy, even though the Macedonian garrison was left. Under his government (318-307) not only did a sound financial policy prevail, so that the revenue rose again to the amount which had been realised under Lycurgus, and the burdensome requirements for the

theatre could be paid out of the state coffers and splendid festivals held, but, owing to Demetrius, the researches of his master Theophrastus in the field of jurisprudence were revived and a reformation of the laws was carried out. But the luxury of the "Tyrant," and the way in which he allowed himself to be fettered, made him hated; Athens therefore greeted with effusion the man who liberated her from the Phalerian, Demetrius Poliorcetes, son of Antigonus. All Central Greece and the Peloponnese, with the exception of Messenia and Sparta, were freed from Macedonian and Egyptian



LYCURGUS

One of Athens' greatest finance ministers, under whom she flourished anew.

garrisons; the old Congress of Corinth was solemnly revived to maintain the national peace; and Demetrius Poliorcetes, like Philip and Alexander, was nominated

commander-in-chief of the league. The recall of Demetrius to Asia Minor by his father Antigonus did not directly destroy his power, but it gave opportunity for energetic opponents, such as Demochares, the nephew of Demosthenes, to come forward, and led to the revolt of Athens after the battle at Ipsus in 301. Under

Athens' Desperate Revolt

the leadership of Lachares, Athens offered a desperate resistance, for which the temple treasures and the golden robe of

Athene had to furnish means. In 294 B.C., however, Athens again fell to Demetrius, and henceforth was garrisoned for many years by the Macedonians. Victory over the Spartans, whom he had attacked, did not now attract Demetrius so much as the crown of Macedonia; this he secured by the conquest of Bœotia, where the historian Hieronymus of Cardia was governor, but he held it only for a short time. The son of Demetrius, the able Antigonus Gonatas, then ruled Greece on the basis of a new treaty and by the help of partisans, who governed in the various towns as tyrants.

It was everywhere evident that a more effectual resistance to despotism could be offered by the new leagues than by the antique city-state. The individual Greek city-state was a shuttlecock in the hands of the "Diadochi," the warring kings of the divided empire. What assistance could be given in the struggle by alliances of the old pattern? To-day cemented, to-morrow disunited—there was no relying on them, and no strength in them. Finally, after centuries, the further step was successfully taken, and the union of the country was achieved under a form which allowed to the individual city-state self-government, its own laws, and "the constitution of its fathers," but also rendered possible a combination of all the states for foreign policy. The contest with the great powers was now put on

The Greek States Re-combine

another basis. The new form of union was the federation of which we have examples in the Ætolian and Achæan Leagues. This marks the greatest advance of Greek development since the seventh century B.C. In order not to leave the greater city-states at the mercy of a numerical majority of the smaller, votes were taken in the Achæan League by cities, each of which had more or less votes according to their population. The highest

official of the league (strategus) had to attend to current business; he was assisted by a board of officials (Apocletæ in the Ætolian League, Demiurgi in the Achæan) who presided in the congress of the league. Most of the states of Central Greece united in the Ætolian League, the communities of the Peloponnesus in the Achæan League; a rural population formed the core of the first, while the second was composed mainly of the inhabitants of small towns.

These leagues were now the representatives of the political power of Greece. But they found only clever diplomatists, not great men, to lead them. Thus Aratus, who was strategus of the Achæan League after 251 and 245, obtained some increase of territory and temporary successes, but he was quite incompetent to lead the whole federation firmly towards a great goal. Vacillation between a pro-Macedonian and an anti-Macedonian policy was an attitude most injurious to the Greek cause at those grave times. It was Sparta and her reforming monarchs that produced this wavering. The struggle

between landowners and mortgagees under King Agis in 242 B.C., the revolution in all conditions of tenure by the "Lycurgan" redivision of the soil under King Cleomenes in 226 B.C., and the hegemony which Sparta claimed, and indeed already had assumed, over the Achæans, led to a great combination between Antigonus Doson of Macedonia, the Achæan League, the Thessalians, Epirotas, Acarnanians, Bœotians, Phocians, Locrians, and the towns of Eubœa in 223 B.C. The battle of Sellasia, in 221 B.C., drove Cleomenes into poverty and exile at Alexandria.

The peace congress of Naupactus, in 217 B.C., welded together all the states which we have enumerated, with the Ætolian League, for common defence against the West. However the struggle between Carthage and Rome might end, the conqueror was certain to become a menace to the Greeks. An effort was made to ascertain more clearly the inner sources of the strength of the Roman empire. The treaty, the terms of which are still extant, between Philip of Macedon and Carthage, represented by Hannibal, shows the desire to resist the alarming growth of the power of Rome by an alliance with the Semite.

But the foolish policy of Macedonia had made it impossible that the league of Naupactus should lead to a combined movement of Macedonians, Greeks, and Semites. The Ætolian League, in combination with the new military monarchy of Sparta, the Messenians, Eleans, and Athenians, took the side of Rome in 210 B.C., but were soon compelled to conclude a peace with Philip, to which the Romans became a party in 208 B.C., since the Achæan League under Philopœmen and Philip himself achieved considerable successes. The combined attack of Syria and Macedonia upon the Asiatic possessions of Egypt (204–201 B.C.) not merely broke up a federation of the states which, like Rhodes, desired to preserve the old balance of power in the eastern basin of the Mediterranean, but compelled Rome also to interfere. The independence of all the Hellenes formerly dependent on Macedonia was solemnly proclaimed by T. Quinctius Flamininus at the Isthmian games of 196 B.C.

The discontent in Greece increased, since neither had the Ætolian League obtained the alliance of Thessaly, nor the Achæan that of Sparta. In the latter state a communistic military monarchy asserted itself. The interference of Antiochus II., king of Syria, in 192 B.C., who was called in by the Ætolians, was quickly averted by Rome; the Ætolian League consequently sank into absolute insignificance. In the meantime the Achæan League had attained the zenith of its expansion. But it was apparent that the external unity of the federal state could not overcome the diversity of its component constitutions. Such confusion reigned in Sparta that order could not be restored either by the Ætolian League or by the arbitration of Rome. Nabis, the military despot, had, since 206 B.C., exiled or executed all the wealthy, and divided their possessions, wives, and children among emancipated slaves and hordes of mercenaries. But after the conquest of Sparta by Philopœmen in 192 and 188 B.C. the position of affairs was not improved; even Charon confiscated property and distributed it as he liked.

At other points of Greek territory national life was hurrying towards the precipice. In Bœotia only those were elected to office who could gratify the palate of the populace with something

new, division of property, or an embargo on all criminal procedure. Trials lasted a lifetime, and a man who embarked on a lawsuit did not venture to show himself if he wished to escape assassination. The rich man showed more favour to the members of his dining club than to his relations, or even to his children.

who frequently received a smaller Anarchy in Sparta heritage than the boon companions for whose carousals the month had not days enough. A fictitious brilliancy solaced the emptiness of an existence which was enlivened only by civil feuds, wholesale executions, and exiles, robbery, and redistributions of land.

A nation of lazzaroni physically effete, self-indulgent, without loyalty or religion down to the very swineherds, having no confidence in themselves or hope for the future—such was the description which the Arcadian historian Polybius of Megalopolis sorrowfully gave of his countrymen of the second century B.C. Terrible wars of class against class are recorded in Arcadia and Messenia, Ætolia and Thessaly; even the last hopeless struggle for independence was utilised for their own purposes by men—as, for example, Diæus, the head of the league—who only wished to fish in troubled waters and to obliterate accusations against themselves in the general confusion. There is a ring of mockery at this grave crisis in the speeches of the orators, who roused popular feeling first against Sparta and then against Rome, and wished to conciliate the masses by the repeal of the laws of debt and the enlistment of slaves in the army. Greece, unable to defend herself, felt the Roman yoke to be in some sense a release. Polybius would never have been able to write his history had he not realised this when face to face with the intolerable conditions of his day; it was not merely the friendly influence of the Scipios and their circle which taught him to value the firm fabric of the Roman empire, but the contrast between that fabric and the crumbling Greek confederations, which the Romans were now demolishing.

Terrible Last Days of Greece
Corinth a wilderness, the leagues politically dissolved and tolerated only as the managers of festivals, the imposition of a tribute and the supervision by the governor of the city constitutions—such was the last stage in the political history of ancient Greece.

RUDOLPH VON SCALA

GREAT DATES IN ANCIENT GREEK HISTORY

1200	Mycenean period	411	Overthrow of the Democratic Government at Athens
1183	Fall of Troy (traditional date)	410	Athenian victory at Cyzicus
1103	Doric migration; invasion of the Peloponnesus by the Heraclidae	406	Athenian victory at Arginusæ
1066	End of the Monarchy at Athens	405	Lysander captures the Athenian fleet at Ægospotami; blockade of Athens
884	The Spartan constitution established by the Laws of Lycurgus	404	Submission of Athens; end of war; supremacy of Sparta; the "thirty tyrants" at Athens
850	Period of Homer's epics	403	Overthrow of the thirty by Thrasybulus
776	First record of the victor in the Olympic games; era from which the Greek system of dating by "Olympiads" begins	402	Expedition of the "ten thousand Greeks" in the revolt of Cyrus against Artaxerxes
743	First Messenian war	399	Death of Socrates
734	Founding of Syracuse; period of colonisation	395	Agessilaus the Spartan in Asia
723	Messenian war ends; victory of Sparta	394	Corinthian war with Sparta; Spartan victories of Nemea and Coronea; Athenian naval victory of Cnidus
700	Perdiccas I. King of Macedon	593	Walls of Athens rebuilt
664	Great naval battle between Corinth and Corcyra	387	Peace of Antalcidas
655	Cypselus tyrant of Corinth	379	Revolt of Thebes against Sparta
645	Second Messenian war	378	Second Delian League, headed by Athens; alliance with Thebes
625	Periander tyrant of Corinth	376	Athenian naval victory at Naxos; Jason of Phæra
621	Draco's legislation at Athens	375	Spartans defeated by Pelopidas at Orchomenus
620	Thales of Miletus	371	Defeat of Spartans by Thebans at Leuctra
594	Solon's legislation at Athens	370	Establishment of the Arcadian confederacy; Megalopolis founded
546	Conquest of Lydia by Cyrus the Persian; the "Ionic" states of Asia subjected to Persia	369	Thebans invade the Peloponnesus
537	Pisistratus tyrant of Athens	362	Epaminondas of Thebes invades Peloponnesus; defeats the Spartans at Mantinea, but is himself killed
510	Expulsion from Athens of the Pisistratidæ; destruction of Sybaris by Croton	350	Philip becomes king of Macedon
509	Democratic reforms of Cleisthenes at Athens	358	Revolt of the allies from Athens
499	The Ionians revolt from Persia; burning of Sardis	355	The Sacred War against the Phocians
493	Suppression of the Ionic revolt	352	Progress of Philip
492	Persian expedition under Mardonius is broken up by storms, and by the Thracians	351	First "Philippic" oration of Demosthenes
491	War between Athens and Ægina	348	Philip captures Olynthus
490	Persian invasion; victory of Athenians, helped by Platæans at Marathon	347	Death of Plato and Aristotle
482	Development of Athenian navy	346	End of the Sacred War; destruction of Phocis
480	Second Persian invasion; Leonidas and the 300 at Thermopylæ; Persians occupy Athens; overthrow of Persian fleet at Salamis, due to Athenians and Themistocles; defeat of Carthage by Syracusans at Himera	340	War between Philip and Athens
479	Persian army annihilated at Platæa; Greek naval victory at Mycale	338	Victory of Philip at Chæronea; Philip chosen to command a Greek national invasion of Persia
478	Athens restored; the Piræus built	336	Philip murdered; Alexander the Great succeeds
475	Establishment of the Delian League; Athens at the head of the Maritime States	334	Alexander invades Persia; Asia Minor secured by victory of the Granicus
468	Pericles appears in public life at Athens	333	Alexander routs Darius at the battle of Issus
466	Victory over Persians at the Eurymedon	332	Siege of Tyre; Alexander in Egypt
458	Athens attacked by allied Peloponnesian states	331	Final overthrow of Darius at Arbela
456	Death of Æschylus	327	Alexander invades India
452	Five years' truce between Athens and Sparta	323	Death of Alexander; partition of the empire
449	Athens renews the Persian war; wins victory by land and sea at Salamis in Cyprus	322	Death of Demosthenes; supremacy of Macedon
447	Bœotians defeat Athenians at Chæronea	307	Ten years contest between Cassander and Demetrius Poliorcetes
445	Thirty years truce between Athens and Sparta; ascendancy of Pericles at Athens	287	Pyrrhus of Epirus in Macedon
444	Hostilities with Persia ended by peace of Callias; Sophocles, Phidias, Euripides	281	Formation of Achæan League
440	Revolt and reduction of Samos	279	Invasion of Gauls broken up at Delphi
432	Athens rejects dictation of Sparta	272	Death of Pyrrhus
431	Peloponnesian war begins, lasting till 404	226	Contest between Achæan League and Sparta
430	Plague at Athens	225	Restoration of Spartan constitution by Cleomenes
429	Death of Pericles	216	Treaty between Philip of Macedon and Hannibal
428	Fall of Platæa	208	Philopœmen at head of Achæan League
427	First comedy of Aristophanes	200	War between Philip of Macedon and Rome
425	Surrender of Spartans at Sphacteria; Cleon at Athens	197	Philip overthrown at Cynoscephalæ
424	Brasidas in Thessaly	192	Resistance of Ætolians, supported by Antiochus of Syria, to Rome
421	Truce between Athens and Sparta	191	Victory of the Romans at Thermopylæ
415	Ascendancy of Alcibiades at Athens; the Sicilian expedition despatched	188	Philopœmen overcomes Sparta
413	Renewal of war with Sparta; occupation of Deceleia by Spartans; destruction of Sicilian expedition	183	Death of Philopœmen, "last of the Greeks"
		171	War between Perseus of Macedon, and Rome
		168	Macedon absorbed into the Roman Empire
		147	War between Achæans and Rome
		146	Fall of Corinth; Greece becomes a Roman province



A GENERAL SURVEY OF GREEK CIVILISATION

By Professor Rudolph von Scala

PERSIA and Greece began at an early period to exchange the products of their civilisations. The palaces of the Persian kings were adorned not merely with the spoils of their victories over the Greeks, such as the brazen rams' horns found at Susa in 1901—which the Greeks cast from captured arms and had offered to Apollo of Didyma—and the statue of the god which Canachus of Sicyon had sculptured. The palaces at Susa must have been built and decorated by Greek artists. The name of one of these alone, Telephanes of Phocæa, who worked at the court of Darius, has come down to us; but their traces are visible in the whole style of Persian architecture, in the harmonious agreement between the interior and the facade, in the great audience-chambers and halls of columns (*apadana*), in the fluted pillars and their bases [see page 1800]. In sculpture and painting the bold treatment of the dress and hair, which, in spite of all similarity, is sharply differentiated from the Assyrian style, the drawing of the eye, the representation of the step, are all thoroughly Greek. Together with Greek artists, who must have been nearly akin to those of Ægina, numerous Greek works of art reached Persia and in their turn served as models.

The minor products of Persian art are equally Greek. The splendid amphora, of which two handles have found a resting-place in the Louvre and the Berlin Antiquarium, is, with its Ionic acanthus leaves and Persian winged ibexes, as completely Greek as the golden bowl of Theodorus of Samos, as the golden vine with the emerald-green grapes which shaded the throne of the Achæmenidæ, or the golden plane-tree, masterpieces

which Antigonus Monophthalmus ordered to be melted down. Numerous gems were made by Greeks for Persians, in Oriental setting but with Greek designs. Thus on a cylinder of chalcedony, found at Kertch, Darius is represented chastising the rebel Gaumata, the latter in Grecian garb. Another gem exhibits a scene of ritual, a Persian queen entering the presence of a deity; her cloak is drawn as a veil over the back of her head in the Greek fashion. Hunting scenes, with Persian cuneiform inscriptions, point to Greek workmanship in the fidelity to Nature with which the deer and trees are delineated. Indeed, the political disruption of the Greeks is strikingly expressed to us on one such Persian gem: a noble Persian holds two naked Greek prisoners fastened by a rope, and the guard of the prisoners appears as a Greek in full armour.

In other spheres, also, Greek culture was employed by the Persians. The Greek physician Democedes of Croton practised at the court of Darius, the first of a series of physicians in ordinary at the Persian court, and was sent on a journey of exploration. A Carian explorer, Scylax of Caryanda, used the Greek language to describe his travels, undertaken by the order of Darius, which included the courses of the Kabul river and the Indus down to the sea. Finally, this intimate intercourse increased the awe with which the Persian kings regarded the Greek gods. A strong proof of this is afforded by the well-known decree of Darius to the governor Gadatas, expressing his royal dissatisfaction that taxes had been imposed upon the officials of the shrine of the Branchidæ. Three

**Greek
Art in
Persia**

hundred talents of incense were offered to the Delian Apollo, and the most complete immunity was assured to all his subjects. Thus the every-day intercourse of Greece and Persia presents a picture quite different from that afforded by the Persian wars of traditional history. Phrygian art also was stimulated by

Widespread Influence of the Greeks

Greece. Façades in the style of the Greek temples took the place on the tombs of the native Phrygian façades with their Egyptian pylons and lions like those of Caria and Mycenæ. The tombs of Ayazinu show us the increasing effect of Greek influence, until finally the façade on a tomb at Gherdek-Kaiasi bears all the characteristics of a Dorian temple.

But the Greeks did not live merely among foreigners and near foreigners; the Greek community included members who spoke alien tongues. The Greeks thus lived with foreigners on the closest terms of intercourse.

Scattered over the wide expanse of the Mediterranean, on the desert which fringes the highlands of Barca, on the fertile banks of the Rhone, on the slopes of Etna, in the hill country of Epirus, on the coasts of the Black Sea, and in the valley of the Nile, the strangest types of city-state developed and adapted themselves to the country without faltering in their loyalty to their common home.

Prehistoric strata were preserved on completely Greek soil, as in Lemnos and Crete, down to the age of writing—witness the so-called Tyrrhene inscription from Lemnos and Eteacretan inscriptions from Praisos. The language of every-day life at Ephesus was permeated with Lydian, while the vernacular of Tarentum showed Italian elements; the town of Perinthus had a Thracian tribal division; Bithynians of Thrace served the Byzantines as bondsmen, and Siculi were the serfs of Syracusan landholders. The petty

Languages and Racial Intercourse

townships of the peninsula of Athos were inhabited by a Thracian population, which was, however, so far Græcised that it employed Greek as the colloquial language; while in towns of what is now Southern France, Iberian and Greek quarters existed, and from this region was diffused through the Greek world that influence of Northern, and especially Keltic, civilisation which is termed the La Tene culture. The language, writing,

and products of Greece were disseminated through purely Keltic regions. To this intercourse are due those imitations of Greek gods and letters on Keltic coins which were prevalent from the mouth of the Seine to Bohemia, and on the commercial highway as far as the Lower Rhine and Northern Italy.

In Egypt the Greek enclaves, the Greek mercenaries of Daphne or Tell Defennet, and the Greek manufacturing and commercial town of Naucratis carried on a brisk trade with the Egyptians, in accordance with whose customs scarabæi were made and engraved, and with whose neighbourly assistance a whole cycle of Græco-Egyptian myths was formed. It was then that the pretty legend of the treasure-house of Rhampsinitus originated, which throughout is not originally Egyptian, but an imitation of the legend of Trophonius and Agamedes, who built the treasury of King Augeias of Elis. The priests then adopted the legend of Proteus and the Egyptian king who tore Helen away from Paris in order to restore her to her husband. This arrest of Paris in Egypt looks much like a frivolous travesty of the Greek

Greek Myths Adapted by Egyptians

legend. The festival of Perseus was celebrated at Chemmis with gymnastic contests in imitation of the Greek games; in fact, the entire cycle of Delian myths is transplanted to Egypt, and a floating island was discovered there also. This mutual exchange of intellectual wealth between Greeks and Egyptians may account for the introduction of the bands and the annulets of the Doric columns which encircle the floated Egyptian capitals. Pharaoh Necho, after the victory over King Josiah of Judah at Megiddo, dedicated his coat of mail to Apollo of Branchidæ, and the earliest dated Greek inscriptions of 590-589 B.C. relate to an expedition of King Psammetichus II. against Ethiopia, in which Greek mercenaries were engaged; they are engraved on the leg of a colossal Rameses in the splendid rock-temple of Abu Simbel far up in Nubia.

Amasis the Philhellene contributed to the rebuilding of the temple at Delphi, dedicated in the temple of Lindus a linen breastplate, in which every thread was woven out of 360 strands corresponding to the days of the year in the old calendar, and sent presents to Sparta. In his reign the settlements of the Greeks were trans-

ferred from the Pelusiac arm of the Nile to Memphis and further, a place in the Delta, subsequently Naucratis, was assigned to them, which was entirely disconnected from the Egyptian state and received complete self-government. The Greeks, faithful to their language, manners, and customs, erected there a central shrine, the Hellenion, for all their Egyptian colonies, which thenceforward multiplied more rapidly and extended far into the desert. The Samians had founded a factory in the great oasis of Uah el-Khargeh, seven days' journey from Thebes.

We hear of the brother of the poetess Sappho as a wine merchant in Naucratis; Alcæus, the poet, stayed in Egypt, while his brother distinguished himself in the service of Nebuchadnezzar. The foremost men of Greece either actually visited Egypt, or, according to the legend, drew wisdom from these newly opened sources. Solon and Pythagoras undoubtedly stayed in Egypt. At this period the terms for coarse linen and fine linen, and linen tunics ornamented with fringes, found their way from Egyptian into Greek. There were

Great Men of Greece in Egypt

three strata of population in Epirus, Acarnania, and Ætolia: a Greek (Æolian or Thessalian), an Illyrian, and a Corinthian (or North-west Greek) imposed one on the other, and these tribes were usually regarded by the Greeks as mixed nationalities. In fact, the strong Thraco-Illyrian strain among the Macedonians enabled the more exclusive spirits of old Greece to stigmatise the Macedonians as barbarians.

The numerous Carian names among the families of Halicarnassus show how strongly the original population was represented, while the naming of Milesians after the goddess Hecate illustrates the power of the Carian cult. The intimate union of races is proved by the fact that the fathers of Thales (Hexamyes) and of Bias (Teutamios), the uncle of Herodotus (Panyassis) undoubtedly, and his father Lyxas probably, bear Carian names, such as occur also in Samos and in Cos. A similar mixture of blood occurs in Græco-Libyan and Græco-Thracian districts; Hegesypyle, wife of Miltiades, was a Thracian princess; Thucydides was descended from her father Ólorus, and the two Dions and also the historian Arrian had Thracian blood in their veins. In the aristocratic and agricultural state

of Lycia Greek settlers filled the rôle of a commercial and money-making middle class, and disseminated a knowledge of the arts for which their native land was famous. Dynasts of Lycia struck coins which represent them with the Persian tiara, but bear on the reverse the figure of the goddess Athena. Monuments were erected to the

Curious Results of Greek Influence

princes, which extol them in the Lycian and Greek languages, and an Attic epigram on the Columæa

Xanthia praises the son of Harpagus, because, with the help of Athena, the destroyer of towns, he laid low many citadels, and dedicated to Zeus more trophies than any mortal. Greeks and Dynasts together drew up in bilingual agreements the regulations for festivals, as is shown by the inscription of Isinda. The coins of the towns of Mallos, Issos, and other places on the Cilician coast bear Greek inscriptions by the side of those in Aramaic.

The Greek towns of the kingdom of the Bosphorus, such as Panticapeum, near the modern Kertch, founded by the Milesians, which climbs the hills in terraces, not only accepted the Phrygian Mother, but, since Scythians also lived in the same political community, had in great measure adopted Scythian manners. Thus they covered their lower limbs with the trousers and high boots of the barbarian. Masterpieces of Greek art, like the silver vase of Kertch [see page 2448], originated in these towns; nevertheless an Oriental influence became more and more prominent, in the huge sepulchral mounds which they raised, in the decoration of their robes with gold leaf, in the use of the Persian mitre and the golden diadem as the royal head-dress. Olbia also enjoyed brisk commerce with the Scythians, and was subject to Scythian influence. A flourishing inland trade was conducted along the Dniester, Bug, and Narew, and the connections of the traders extended to the mouths of the Vistula; on the caravan

Greek Culture in Distant Lands

road to Central Asia, which even at the present day possesses importance, and suggests the line of the future trans-continental railroad, there lay in the middle of forest-country a town, built of wood and surrounded with palisades, in which Hellenic farmers and trappers settled. They borrowed largely from the language of the adjoining tribes, and, far from their homes in the northern forests, worshipped their own deities, especially

Dionysus. A Greek cup found on the Obwa, representing the dispute between Ulysses and Ajax, and a statue of Hygeia found at Perm, show that Greek trade flourished even in those parts.

The Greek people thus grew to maturity in constant intercourse with every nation of the civilised world. The ancient bonds

**Hellenism
throughout
Civilisation**

of union, the national games, which united the Greeks of the most various regions, and the common religious centres, soon

made the whole nation share alike in the lessons which had been learned on the fringes of the Greek world. It was only when all intellectual importation had become unnecessary that exclusiveness became a feature of the city-state, and it was in the age of Pericles that Athens first regarded mixed marriages with non-Athenian women as invalid.

The founding of Alexander's empire brought to the East an expansion of Greek culture; it promoted an exchange of commodities between East and West, and a mixture of barbarian and Greek nationalities, such as the ancient world had never seen before. Iberian tribes in Spain, Keltic clans in Southern France, Etruscan towns, Italian arts and crafts, Egyptian military systems and Egyptian legends, Lycian sepulchral architecture and Carian monuments, the work of Scythian goldsmiths and Persian palaces had already long been subject to Greek influence, so that the Greeks won their place in the history of the world far more as citizens of the Mediterranean sphere than by their domestic struggles. But now the old colonising activity of the Greeks, which had been relaxed for two centuries, was renewed over the whole expanse of a broad empire, whose political life was Greek, whose government was Persian, whose rulers and army were Greek. The founding of Alexandria and revival of Babylon had created great cities in the

**Culture of
the East
Flows West**

East, which, from the height of their intellectual and material civilisation, were destined to become the centres of the new

empire. The whole stream of their wealth flowed westward: the stored-up treasures of the Achæmenids once more circulated in the markets; the observations and calculations of Chaldæan astronomers, which went back thousands of years, became available to the Greeks. Pytheas, and after him Hipparchus, used Baby-

lonian measures in calculating the distance of the stars. The political and religious traditions of Babylon, which had already brought the Assyrian monarchs under their spell, and made a coronation in Babylon appear the necessary condition of a legitimate title, played a foremost part in the world-sovereignty of Alexander, and fitted in marvellously well with his schemes for investing his empire with a religious character. The building of the temple to Marduk played in Alexander's plan a part not less important than the construction of harbours and dockyards.

Hellenism could now regard these conquered countries as a real intellectual possession. The reports of the general staff, which contained an exact survey of the conquered country, were deposited in the imperial archives at Babylon. Special officials—Bematists, or step-measurers—were responsible for the measurement of the distances. Trustworthy figures were forthcoming, instead of the estimates based on the caravan trade with eastern countries, against the inaccuracy of which Aristotle so vigorously protested. The course of the Indus and Ganges, and the

**Scientific
Conquests
of Greece**

island of Taprobane, or Ceylon, became known. The reports of Nearchus the Cretan effected a scientific conquest of the

coast between the Indus and Euphrates. In December, 323 B.C., this explorer, the leading member of the scientific staff of Alexander, entered the Persian Gulf with a fleet for which the Himalayas had supplied the timber. To his pen is doubtless due that wonderful account of the tidal-plants—the mangroves with their supporting roots, which grow on the shore and spread far out into the sea—in Theophrastus.

Alexander had entrusted to Heraclides the exploration of the Caspian Sea and its connection with the ocean—his death prevented the execution of the plan—and three times he organised attempts to circumnavigate Arabia; but Archias of Pella, Androstenes of Thasos, and Hieron of Soloi were all equally unable to pass the surf-beaten Cape Musandam. To the second of these naval explorers we owe the masterly description of the isle of Bahrein. Tylos, with its flowering gardens and cool fountains, on which Androstenes stayed from December, 324, to January, 323 B.C. Here the discovery was made that plants sleep, and we are given a beautiful description of the way in which

the ficus-leaves of the Indian tamarind fold up for the night. The cotton plantations, which recalled so vividly the vines of Hellas, were carefully studied. Thus we possess in this account, extant in Theophrastus, a brilliant commentary on the difference of the methods by which this expedition of Alexander opened up the conquered territories from those, for instance, of the Arabian conquerors, who saw barely anything on this marvellous island.

We do not know who of Alexander's staff supplied the observations on the banyan which were made about 326 B.C., during the halt at the confluence of the Hydaspes and Acesines, nor who so accurately mapped out the species of the trees on the north-western Himalayas, nor who discovered, from the case of the citron-tree, the existence of sexual differences in the vegetable kingdom. However easy it was to exaggerate in the description of the gigantic Indian fig-trees, where the Benatists fixed the circumference of the foliage at 1,450 yards—considerably less than that of the still existing giant trees of Nerbuda—and however difficult it was to

**Intellectual
Conquest
of the East**

explain the aerial roots which spring from the older branches and become supporting roots, we are everywhere astonished at the way in which these phenomena were surveyed with open eyes and intelligent appreciation. Nothing has been preserved for us of the reports of Gorgos, a mining expert, who explored, probably at Alexander's command, the gold and silver mines as well as the salt mines in the Indian kingdom of Sopeithes; and the treatise on harbours by Cleon of Syracuse is lost. But the comprehensiveness of the survey by which the new world was opened up is clearly shown us from such broken fragments of the keenest intellectual activity.

The intellectual conquest of the East was thus achieved by the keen Western faculty for scientific observation. But the nuptials of the Orient and Occident which were celebrated at the wedding festival in Susa remained a slave-marriage, in which the East was the lord and master. The admission of the Persians and other races into the great frame of the Macedonian army signified, it is true, a further victory of Western organisation; but the contemplated admission of Persian troops into the Macedonian phalanx would have ended in breaking it up.

And yet Alexander thought that the political organisation of Hellenism, the world-empire, was possible only by a fusion of races. By the transplantation of nations from Asia to Europe, and from Europe to Asia, it was proposed to gain for the world-monarchy, with its halo of religious sanctity, the support of those

**Alexander's
Dream of
World-Empire**

disconnected masses who were united with the ruling dynasty alone, but had no coherence among themselves.

At a distance the Hellenic Polis, the city-state, seemed the suitable representative of a new culture; at home, however, the old constitutional life might become dangerous, so that all recollections of the Corinthian League were suppressed, and decrees were published by Alexander which counselled the return of the exiled, but prohibited the combined meetings of Achaean and Arcadian towns. Garrisons were placed in the towns, tyrants were favoured or condemned, so that Oriental despotism seemed to have won the day over all Western developments.

In the East the association of Alexander's sovereignty with the substrata underlying the Persian imperial organisation was unmistakable. We see how fully Alexander used the religious convictions of the Egyptians and Babylonians, and perhaps even the political traditions of the latter, for his own ends, and how he restored to the city of Sardis and the Lydians the old Lydian rights.

Court etiquette and official institutions were, on the other hand, largely borrowed by Alexander from the Persian empire. His father, Philip, had taken the first step in this direction by imitating a Persian custom, the military education of noble youths at court. It was not the study of Herodotus's history and Xenophon's "Anabasis," but the presence of Persian exiles at the Macedonian court, that led to these views. The custom at the Persian

**Customs
Borrowed
from Persia**

court of kissing the ground, the harem, the Persian state-robe, the Persian criminal code, as in the case of Bessus, were adopted; and the eunuchs were taken over with the Persian court officials. The vizir was called in Greek, since Æschylus's "Persians," Chiliarch, a name which was now officially borne by Hephæstion. Chares of Mytilene was nominated chief chamberlain, and the head scribe or secretary took a prominent

position. The official protocols and royal diaries were kept up in the new Macedonian world-empire after the old Persian style. These royal diaries of Alexander form the core of the tradition on which our knowledge of the era of Alexander ought to rest, but owing to the later literature of romance they are not always

recognisable beneath the mass of legends. A considerable fragment, which comprises the last days of Alexander, has been preserved for us in tolerable completeness. The Persian system of roads and the Persian imperial post were maintained; and the basis of the imperial administration was the old division into satrapies. But the powers of the governors were kept as before in close connection with the centre of the empire. The command of the army and the administration of the finance were detached from the office of satrap; the rights of coining money and keeping mercenaries were altogether abolished.

The last year of Alexander's life was typical of the world-wide position of the Græco-Macedonian kingdom. Embassies from the sources of the Blue Nile and from the steppes of Southern Russia, from Ethiopia and the Scythian country, from Iberians, Kelts, Bruttians, Lucanians, and Etruscans, and, above all, from Rome and Carthage, came in that year to Alexander's court. Arabia was to be circumnavigated, and a scheme initiated to regulate the irrigation of the Euphrates region by lowering the weirs, repairing the canals, and building dykes. The coast and the islands of the Persian Gulf were to be colonised. It was intended also to rear temples on the most ancient holy sites of Greece—Delos, Dodona, Delphi—as well as at home at Dion, Amphipolis, and Cyrrhus. The old hereditary culture of the East and the energy of the West seemed to be welded together, and Greek had become the language of the civilised

provinces of Western Asia, just as Babylonian had been a thousand years before.

And this inheritance of Alexander was not transitory. Even if on that summer's evening of 323 B.C. (June 13), when the news that he was dead, and that the world was without a lord, burst on the passionately excited populace at Babylon, the plans for the future were dead, and the disintegration of the mighty empire was inevitable, yet the creation of a new

sphere of culture, which partially embraced the ancient East, is the work of Alexander. No Roman world-empire, no world-embracing Christianity, no Byzantine empire, with Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt, as provinces, would have been possible without this monarchy of Alexander.

At the time when geographical knowledge was immensely widened towards the east by Alexander's victories, a bold mariner set sail from Marseilles, or Massilia, the chief emporium of the products of the north, of amber, and of tin, and the centre from which Greek influence spread among Kelts and Iberians. This was Pytheas, one of the most successful explorers, and also the first Greek to reach the Teutons. As Humboldt characterises the great and common impulse which mastered the spirits of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries with the words, "The age of Columbus was also the age of Copernicus, Ariosto, Dürer, and Raphael," so we may point to the fact that the age of Pytheas was also that of Plato, Aristotle, and Lysippus, of Philip and Alexander of Macedon. Columbus started out in pure faith; that is shown by his *libro das pro-*

fecias. But Pytheas not only stood at the head of the science of his day, but increased that science by new discoveries which held good for all time. He worked with comparatively small apparatus for observation, with the gnomon (shadow-indicator), a rod, the length of whose shadow at noon during the equinox, compared with the actual length of the rod, gave the geographical latitude of the place where the observation was taken. Yet in spite of this insufficient apparatus, the latitude of Massilia, as determined by him, is correct within five minutes. The old idea that the Pole star marked the celestial Pole was definitely refuted by him.

Scientific problems, such as the inquiry into the size of the globe, and the extent of the inhabited world, led him far into unexplored regions; his intention was to reach the polar circle. As soon as the limits of the Mediterranean were passed a multiplicity of phenomena attracted the attention of the bold explorer; the phenomenon of the tides, which was explained even by Plato as due to supernatural causes, was then for the first time assigned by Pytheas correctly to the action of the moon. At first driven by south-westerly winds, and then pressing

forward more slowly without any assistance, he reached the north-west corner of Spain in thirteen days, and then steered out into the open sea with a northerly course for three days. The Pole star showed the observer the direction of his course, and ultimately the geographical latitude was determined from the altitude of the Pole. Westerly and south-westerly winds, as well as the Gulf Stream, drove Pytheas out of his course, and thus, under the belief that he had sailed continually northward, he reached the western point of Brittany and the island of Ushant.

He then circumnavigated Great Britain, since he first sailed thirteen days to the north, reached the most northerly cape of Britain, and, two days later, the Shetland Islands, which he calls Aibudes. The longest day, of nineteen hours, which he records, exactly tallies with this latitude. Accounts of "Thule" (Iceland) found their way to him. He brought with him mysterious tales of a mixture of water, air, and earth, comparable rather to the gleaming of a medusa or jelly-fish—a long misunderstood description, not merely of the thick, grey mist which makes earth, the water,

and the air indistinguishable, but of the Northern Lights. He then sailed to the mouths of the Rhine, penetrated to the Elbe, to the land of the Teutons, to the islands which at low tide were dry land, and to the island of Abalos, perhaps Heligoland, whither in spring the waves bring the amber; finally, he reached the coast of Jutland.

Pytheas, the discoverer of the Germans, undertook his bold voyage in the interests of science, and offered to science enormous tracts of new territory, which, from foolish but explicable doubts, it long wished to relegate to the domain of fable. Some practical extension of the sphere of Massilian commerce, in fact the founding of a settlement at the mouth of the Loire, may well have been connected with this important expedition. An excessive estimate of the distance over which he sailed, and the consequent assumption of the immense expanse of the coast of Britain, certainly caused errors in the chart of Pytheas; but our age is competent fully to grasp the high importance of Pytheas as one of the earliest and most successful explorers of all times.

Greek daring and Greek intellect thus surveyed the then known world from

the Shetland Islands to modern Turkestan, from the west coast of Libya to the Ganges. The survey of Britain and Persia, the Aurora Borealis, the tides in the Atlantic, no less than the growth of banyans and mangroves, amber on the shores of Germany, gold and silver mines in India, and scientific inquiry into the

Origin of Aristotle's Philosophy outer ocean and the limits of the land, were objects of Greek investigation as much as the laws of social development

and the laws of thought itself. Thus the philosophy of Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) seems to us like the paean of this world-embracing thought, teaching that thought itself is the immaterial divinity, the cause of all movement, the absolute self-consciousness. Insight into the laws of human thought is the most certain starting-point of all knowledge. We follow in thought the universal cause into its particular effects, just as we see the white light break up in the prism into its bright component colours. That thing which, through every period of change, preserves its comprehensible existence is the object of true knowledge. All development consists in the relation of potentiality to realisation, of matter to form. If the matter develops to the form which is latent in it by design, then, according to the laws of predisposition and necessity, it develops progressively, without beginning or end, in unceasing movement, from the formless, that is, the pure matter, through an immense series of graduations, upwards to the immaterial form, to the divinity. And in this scale of graduations, where even the changes of the inorganic imply a development of latent potentialities, the evolutionary process passes through the lower forms of life, possessing but a vegetative soul, to man, whose soul is reason. Happiness is the aim of human life, and to obtain it the ethical virtues, which are rooted in the will, come into play together with knowledge. But man can never pursue his goal in solitude. He requires fellow-men and society; he is a "political animal," a social being. One of the great intellectual discoveries of the age of Alexander shows itself in the doctrine that man cannot fully realise his latent potentialities except in the state; this doctrine supplies an irresistible protest against those cowardly and selfish anarchist delusions of the Cynics and Megarians,

A Great Intellectual Discovery

who held that the only happiness possible to the individual by himself consisted in the reversion to impossible conditions of barbarism and in the enjoyment of the moment. All intelligent persons grasped clearly the importance of the fact once established that only a combined social effort and the strength of the community had

Philosophy that Lives after 2,000 years

created for Hellenism that predominant place which it held in the world. Thus Aristotle, whose influence has been felt for two thousand years, is the best personification of that age which created a living and active philosophy from the results of its achievements, and no longer clung to political phrases, but from an investigation of the abundant historical material brought into clear relief the outlines of the state and its primary object, the education of the citizens.

The focus of political activity shifted towards the East, and the direction of world commerce changed; the centres of trade were now the new Greek cities, in comparison with which the ancient capitals seemed insignificant settlements. Alexander valued the Semite as a necessary complement to the Persian; he was also not without reverence for old traditions and for scientific eminence. He therefore promoted the prosperity of Babylon; but Seleucia on the Tigris, not Babylon, became the metropolis of the fertile plain of Mesopotamia.

The combined commerce of India, Ethiopia, Arabia, and Egypt itself converged on Alexandria, that city of world trade and cosmopolitan civilisation. It was there, close to that emblem of world trade, the marble lighthouse, the Pharos, which towered high above the palm-trees [see page 232], and near the museum and the library, the homes of civilisation, that the mortal remains of Alexander's fiery spirit found their last resting-place. How small seemed the "great" cities of the

The Mighty City of Alexander

mother country compared with this city of Alexander, covering some 2,200 acres (three and a half square miles) with its 500,000 of inhabitants. Carpet factories, glass-works, the production of papyrus and incense, gave the commercial city the stamp of a manufacturing town. Alexandria, as the centre of a new movement, became also the headquarters of the new industry of cameo-cutting. That marvellous Farnesettazza, which has rightly

been termed the foremost product of Alexandrine art, came from its workshops.

Alexandria, then, was the starting-point of that policy, justly to be compared with the attitude of the English in India, which ruled the Nile country in civilisation, politics, and nationality. It forced upon the native population the language of their rulers, and burdened the natives alone with a poll-tax; but in compensation it allowed an infinity of religious ideas to ascend from the lower strata of society to the ruling class. Districts, towns, and villages were given new Greek names, and at the period when the Greek influence was at its height many of the old population Græcised their names or gave them a Greek look; and not only were the royal edicts published in the Greek language—occasionally with an Egyptian translation—but also the private contracts of ordinary business, such as leases, labour contracts, and conveyances, are in Greek. Ptolemy Philadelphus succeeded in assigning the proceeds of a very ancient tax (the *apomoira*, or one-sixth of the produce of vineyards, orchards, and kitchen gardens) to the cult of his sister Arsinoë—

Greek Ascendancy in Egypt

that is, to the Ptolemaic government (264–263). The assignment of other imposts in compensation did not check a considerable shrinkage in the revenue of the native temples. The prevalence of Greek notions in the worship of Serapis is incontestable.

Counter influences, generated in the lower levels of society, offered a stout resistance to the potent ideas of the Hellene. The old native divinities brought not merely Alexander, but also the Ptolemies, so strongly under their spell that numerous temples were built in their honour. The old administrative divisions were left, with the natural exception that the Ptolemies, following Alexander's uniform policy in Persia, placed military commanders by the side of the civil officials. The wonderfully close-meshed net of taxation which the Pharaoh dynasty had drawn round its subjects was preserved and developed as a welcome institution; so also the system of monopolies, the exploitation of the royal demesnes, and the official hierarchy of the court. The old magic formulæ, the influence of the Magi, the mythology, and the religious ideas of Egypt poured in mighty streams into the Hellenic world.

And even if these latter suffered a transformation at the hands of the Stoics and other Greek schools, yet their essential features persisted, and showed a marvellous power of revival. Even in art the old Egyptian style carried the day. We find a princess of the Ptolemaic house depicted on a cameo as an Egyptian; and if artistic representations may be trusted, the princes themselves adopted native dress.

The ancient cities of Syria were so far Græcised that the new capital, Antioch, on the Orontes, with its suburb Daphne, henceforward the emporium for the Euphrates trade, was surrounded by a chain of Greek settlements. Military colonies, inhabited by veterans who had earned their discharge, as well as by natives, were founded on the model of the city-state, both in the old country and in Asia Minor. City life, with a government by a mass assembly and an organisation of the citizens in tribes, flourished in these colonies. Supported by the national government, occupying the position of the dominant class, the Greeks acquired enormous influence upon social life. How

Greek Influence in Syria

completely the Greek *polis* had conquered the Semitic East is proved by the forms of worship and of law. Ascalon could produce a Zeus, Poseidon, and Apollo, in addition to Astarte and the fish-goddess—Atargatis-Derketo. The coins of Damascus show, it is true, a Dionysus who exhibits some assimilation to the Arabian god, but they bear also the heads of Artemis, Athene, and Nike. The so-called Syrian Code was compiled in these regions on the basis of Greek legal notions. Even in the era of the Maccabees a gymnasium in Jerusalem shocked the orthodox Jews; the Feast of Tabernacles was, by the introduction of thyrsus wands, made to resemble the Dionysia, which, however, a Seleucid could not introduce.

The Jews of the Dispersion were Hellenised in various ways. The translation of the Scriptures, the Septuagint version, was due to the necessity of keeping up the knowledge of the Bible among those who had gradually lost their acquaintance with the sacred language. Thus a new channel was opened for the diffusion of Greek influence, although diffusion was accompanied by a process of corruption, and the Greek language took a tinge of Hebraic idiom among the Jews

of Alexandria. Even the remote countries of the East now drew nearer to Hellenism. The Greeks of Asia Minor had, of course, belonged to the same empire as a part of the Indian nation, so that commerce was early able to bring into the Punjab the products of Greek art; and philosophical ideas, such as the Indian doctrine of the

India's Influence on Greece

transmigration of souls, found their way into Greek territory. It is certain that the Indians, at the time of the grammarian Panini, had become familiar with the Greek alphabet, and had struck coins after the Athenian pattern. It was not until Alexander's expedition that the country was conquered by science, and the Indian trade, which was now so important to Alexandria, became a part of Greek commerce. The Indian custom of ornamenting golden vessels with precious stones was adopted in the sphere of Greek culture; thus Stratonice of Syria sent golden cups inlaid with ivory as an offering to Delos, and Indian jacinth became a favourite material with lapidaries.

After the conquests of science the spirit of romance asserted its claim; the imaginative writers of Alexander's age busied themselves with India. At a much earlier date the Greeks had welcomed the fantasies of Indian folk-lore, such as the gold-mining ants as large as jackals and clad in skins, which some wish to explain as a Tibetan fur-clad tribe. Even if the myth of the Cyclops, who occur substantially in the Mahabharata as Lalataxa, arose independently among the Greeks and the Indians, those tribes which always carry their homes with them, since they only require to wrap themselves up in their enormous ears, are distinctly the creation of an Indian story-teller. They also appear in the Mahabharata as Tscharnaprawarana. In the age subsequent to Alexander a flourishing commerce was maintained with India, and Megasthenes in astonishment tells of the marvellous country, its splendid mountain forests, its smiling well-watered plains, and the strong, proud race of men which breathes the pure air. What a fluttering, crawling, and leaping there is under the mighty trees, whose topmost foliage rustles in the wind! Tigers twice the size of lions, and coal-black apes, whose faces are white and bearded, roam through the Indian forest in the day-time. Gigantic

Greek Tales of Indian Marvels

the marvellous country, its splendid mountain forests, its smiling well-watered plains, and the strong, proud race of men which breathes the pure air. What a fluttering, crawling, and leaping there is under the mighty trees, whose topmost foliage rustles in the wind! Tigers twice the size of lions, and coal-black apes, whose faces are white and bearded, roam through the Indian forest in the day-time. Gigantic

serpents with bat-like wings whiz through the air at night; innumerable kinds of birds screech and coo and sing in a bewildering babel.

Among the men, however, the most remarkable were the Philosophers, who meditated over the problems of the universe in solitude for thirty-seven years, and then never discussed them with women. For, as Megasthenes naïvely thought, if women were unworthy of the high teaching, a grievous sin would have been committed in wasting it on them; but if they were worthy of the teaching, they would certainly be diverted from their own duties, or, to express the idea in modern phraseology, they would be filled with ideas of emancipation. The philosophy itself was gladly recognised as akin to the wisdom of the Greeks. Megasthenes, perhaps, when he makes this statement, has in mind the doctrine of transmigration. So, too, the Greeks, when they saw the procession in honour of Siva winding through the vine-clad valleys, with the clash of cymbals and kettledrums, may have thought themselves transported to their own homes during the noisy passing of a Dionysiac rout. With the Indian precious stones came their names—opal, beryl, etc.—into the west. Indian fables influenced the Greek travellers' tales, the true precursors of Defoe's immortal work. Thus the romance of Iambulus shows an unmistakable likeness to the adventures of Sindbad, which are the products of Indian fancy, and were later incorporated by the Arabians in the collection of "The Arabian Nights."

But an influence spread also from the west to the east. A typical instance of this is shown by the fact that Indian expressions connected with warfare found their way into Sanscrit from the Greek. An echo of the great struggles between Greeks and Indians is heard even in the commentaries of the grammarian Panini, and intellectual links of connection are forged in abundance. Alexander had brought the tragedies of Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides to India with him, and his gigantic train included numerous actors. We must date back to that period the similarities which the *Mritshshhakatika* present to the Attic comedy, the imitation of the Greek stage, which calls the curtain in Indian *yawanika*,

The Reign of Hellenism in India

or "the Greek," the transference of Homeric legends into the Indian epics, the beast fables on Indian soil, until later even the Greek romances of Achilles Tattius served to adorn the romance "Kadamhari" of Bana (600-630 A.D.) and his son. The plastic arts were enriched. Doric (Kashmir), Ionic (Taxila), and Corinthian (Gandhara) pillars arose in that fairyland, which, under King Asoka, after the Persian model, had passed from the stage of wooden buildings to stone buildings; the symbol of the god of love, the dolphin, may have been transported from Greece to India by the sculptor's art. Coins were struck on the Greek model. Finally, the Greek dialogue served as a framework for the discussions of Greeks and Indians on philosophic subjects; thus the Melinda = panha — of a somewhat later date—presents one such dialogue between King Menander and the Buddhist priest Naya Sena.

The relations of Asoka with the West in the field of religion and politics are somewhat audaciously stated in his thirteenth inscription, and the assertion that he, the "pious" king, had succeeded in winning over even the Greek princes Antiyoga (Antiochus), Tulumaya (Ptolemaus), Amtekina (Antigonus), Maka (Mayas), Alikasadala (Alexander of Epirus) cannot be seriously entertained. The Indo-Bactrian empire and the petty kingdoms parcelled out of it were long a home of the Greek spirit. Great vitality must have been latent in these kingdoms of the Greek conquistadores, since they did not shrink from the danger of mutual hostility. The struggle which was carried on from these parts seemed to the adjoining peoples more colossal than the conquests of Alexander the Great. Its importance for the establishment of relations between the Greek-speaking world, Ind'ia and East Asia, has not yet been sufficiently appreciated.

King Demetrius (180-165 B.C.) and the town of Demetrius, which he built, appear in the stirring verses of the Mahabharata. Tibetan hordes drove him out of Bactria and forced him completely into the Punjab. The huge gold coins of his successor Eucratides, with the bust of the king and a horseman, are described by Chinese records of the first century B.C. Indian culture and philosophy must have gained a footing in this kingdom by degrees.

Indian Home of the Greek Spirit

2598

King Menander (about 125-95 B.C.) was already a Buddhist; but, even when fading away, this Greek civilisation had strength enough to influence the adjoining Indo-Scythian territory. The coins of this empire usually bear Indian and Greek inscriptions in Greek letters; then Indian in Greek letters; finally the native language, but still in Greek letters.

But the influence reached still further eastward. The Bactrian province of Ferghana (in Chinese, Ta yüan), was occupied by the Chinese general Li Kuang li in 101 B.C.; we find here the bridge connecting the Greek and Chinese civilisations over which came the movement which revolutionised Chinese art under the emperor Wu Ti (140-87 B.C.). It had long been clear that the Chinese at this time and from this district imported the noble Turkoman blood-horses, lucerne as excellent horse fodder, and the vine. After Chang Kien, the explorer, had brought the vine from Ta yüan to China the emperor Wu Ti had it planted in the palace gardens at Singan fu. But now critics of Chinese art assign to this very period metal mirrors which show marvellous vine-leaf orna-

Connection of Greece and China

mentation, as well as the lion and the winged horse. It is more than mere conjecture that Chinese art, which had stood still since the second millennium B.C., owed its sudden renaissance to Græco-Bactrian influence and the naturalism of Greek art.

The excavations of Aurel Stein, 1900-1901, in Khotan, have brought to light fresh evidence of the expansion of Greek culture, as well as a further station on the road by which the peoples of the West migrated towards Eastern Asia. A Pallas Athene, represented on a seal in archaic style, a seal with a sitting Greek figure, probably Eros, and, above all, a seal with a portrait head after a Western model, but with thoroughly Chinese features, show that here, half-way between West Iran and Peking, Greek culture had established a firm footing. The types of the coins for Transoxania or Western Turkestan originated in the Greek centres of civilisation in Bactria, so that the silver tetradrachms found in Samarkand and Tashkent must have been struck after the pattern of the coins of Heliclos and Euthydemus, and similarly the path of Greek influences must have led thence through Ferghana, past the Greek city

of Alexandria Eschate and Kashgar and Yarkand, to Khotan.

And while thus in the remotest east of the countries which were included in the habitable world, on the fringe of the East Asiatic world, the Greek spirit, wantonly prodigal of its forces, was tearing itself to pieces, and nevertheless was able to in-

Rome Rises Under Greek Culture

fluence coinage, art, and flora, as far as India and East Asia; while in the Nile valley and at Babylon native authors wrote in Greek; while Greeks had explored the Red Sea, the Nile, the Caspian, and Scythia, this same Hellenism had founded for itself in the west a province of Hellenic manners and customs, and had completely enslaved it. This was the Roman empire, now coming to the fore, which, as it took its part in this international commerce, offered the Greek intellect a new home with new constitutional and legal principles.

Roman historiography, philosophy, eloquence, mathematics, medicine, sculpture, and poetry, the games of Rome, the fauna and flora of Italy, the forms of daily life and the religions of Rome, became Greek. A world-empire could not be won except in alliance with a cosmopolitan civilisation—Rome herself was powerless to create both these at once. The Greeks had given the Italians the fruit trees of the East, peach and almond, walnut, chestnut, and plum. In the midst of this enriched flora there now arose in Italy the Greek house, with its two divisions, ornamented with Greek marble, or the old Italian house transformed with the Greek ridged roof; its rooms, which bore Greek names, were divided by Greek tapestry curtains. In the dining-room (triclinium), the guests reclined, wearing long woollen tunics. The soft house-shoes, slippers, and sandals of the Greeks were in use. The girls in the house wore the Greek skirt (cacom-

Rome's Debts to Greece

boma). On the high-roads were seen the Macedonian kausia as head-wear, together with the Greek (broader-brimmed) petasos; for cold weather the fur tippet (arnacis) of Greek pattern had come into fashion. Whether we regard the higher employments of life, education with its three grades and its three classes of Greek teachers, or the new professions which originated in the development of the luxuries of the table, everywhere Greek

influence is predominant. In ancient times a critical period, such as famine or pestilence or a practical want, may have called in individual divinities of the Greek religion, and these motives were indeed always important. On the occasion of a pestilence in 293 B.C. the worship of Æsculapius was brought to Rome from

Greek Art of Medicine

Epirus, and attracted at the same time the Greek art of medicine. The war troubles of 249 B.C. effected the transference of the Greek ideas as to the lower world from Tarentum to the Ara Ditis—in the “Tarentum” on the Campus Martius—so that henceforward Pluto and Proserpine are worshipped as native divinities. Again, the defeat at Lake Trasimene in 217 B.C. aroused a desire to bring in new deities; Venus of Mount Eryx and Mens (Sophrosyne) then came into the Italian capital.

But now another point made itself felt. There was not only the continual wish to invoke the help of the Greek gods, but a desire was felt for the noisy festivals of the Greeks; thus in 238 B.C. the feast of a Greek goddess was introduced under the name of the Floralia. The ritual of the Greeks was so much more elaborate and artistic than that of Rome that a religious revolution at once resulted. Thus both Italian and Capitoline divinities—for instance, Juno Sospita, of Lanuvium, and Juno Regina of the Aventine—were now honoured with Greek rites. * To the latter a procession of virgins went in pilgrimage, chanting the refrain of the propitiatory hymn which L. Livius Andronicus, a Greek of Lower Italy, had composed. The circle of the twelve gods was completed after the Greek model; other assimilations were made, and Greek myths then completely concealed from view the old Italian divinities. But where, nevertheless, some clear ideas of their nature were preserved, there the plastic

Greek Myths Adopted

art of Greece, with its powerfully elaborated types of divinities, crushed the last remnants of native imagery. These dethroned deities seemed almost to exist on sufferance in order to fill up gaps in the chronology. What had become of the time when foreign deities might be worshipped only outside the boundaries of the city?

With the Greek religion came Greek philosophy, Greek rationalism, and re-

ligious inquiry into Italy, and although hindered in various ways—for example, by the censorship which prohibited the “Pythagorean” books and the expulsion of individual teachers—finally, in the dress of the Stoic school, attained to undisputed sovereignty.

Thus the past history of Rome was remodelled and given a Greek colouring. The national fancy had already tried to illuminate the obscure beginnings of the city, borrowing many details from the legend of Cyrus in Herodotus. Greek imagination now bestowed form and colour on the dark history of the kings of Rome. The siege of Veii was retold with incidents suggested by the Trojan War. Gods of the Greek type take part in the battles; characters are created according to Greek models (Decemvirs as a parallel to the Thirty Tyrants, Scipio as a new Alcibiades, Fabius as a modernised version of Nicias). How excellently the occupation of Athens by the Persians supplies particulars for the Gallic conquest! How the accounts of Greek battles (the battle of Cunaxa is a prototype for Cirta) and the stories of sieges (Hali-

Roman History is Greek

carnassus, Saguntum) make up for the Roman deficiency in imaginative power! To fill up the great void of the national past the Roman historians, if so we may call them, borrowed from their Greek precursors the descriptions of diplomatic negotiations, satirical reflections suited to the surrounding tribes of Italy, and questions on the theory of history. It is little wonder that the Roman historians, down to M. Porcius Cato, wrote in Greek.

The world has hardly ever seen such vast districts and nations so various thus steeped in a civilisation—however much it may have been a “world-civilisation”—which still showed its national origin in the greater majority of its component parts. The larger area belonging to the Anglo-Saxon race of to-day is dominated by the English world-language; but the civilisation which goes with the language is not purely Anglo-Saxon, it bears only an Anglo-Saxon tinge. Those centuries preceding the Christian era saw the language of Athens become the Greek vernacular, which, in its turn, became the language of the world; and a large part of the known world became at the same time a sphere of Greek culture and intellect.

RUDOLPH VON SCALA



ROME

THE SPIRIT OF ANCIENT ROME

BY W. WARDE FOWLER, M.A.

GREEK and Roman civilisations are two component parts of one great whole. Politically the form of state and the ideas of government which we meet in Greece and Italy are substantially the same. Greek literature, art, and science survived with abundant vitality throughout the period which we roughly call Roman; in half of the Roman empire Greek was the universal language, and every educated Roman of the later period spoke and wrote Greek almost as easily as Latin. Roman literature was modelled upon Greek; every Roman poet thought it a matter of duty to imitate some Greek original. The Christian fathers wrote both in Greek and Latin, and thus Christian thought was passed on into the Middle Ages strongly tinged with both Greek and Roman ideas.

Yet Rome was very far from being merely an outgrowth of Greece. Rome grew from her own root, and Greek ideas were grafted on to her stock only after it had attained a certain maturity of its own.

Rome made an independent contribution to the great whole which we may call Mediterranean civilisation, and thus also to the civilisation which we may call modern and European. The Roman spirit, though it came to be so greatly affected by the Greek spirit as to tempt us to call it Græco-Roman, did in reality survive all through the history of the Roman people, and it is the object of this section to trace it continually at work.

Rome's Original Culture

Let us begin by asking what was the peculiar contribution of the Romans, as distinct from that of the Greeks, to that great Græco-Roman whole on which our modern civilisation is so largely based? We can separate it from the other chief contributing element if we steadily bear in mind two facts. First, Rome became

Guardian of Greek Civilisation

the guardian of Greek civilisation after the political and material decay of Greece; she supplied the military force and the organising genius which saved the choicest products of the Greek spirit for centuries from destruction at the hands of semi-barbarous peoples of the east and wholly barbarous peoples of the north; and when at last the invaders broke through the barriers she had planted, her spirit was still so completely in the ascendant as to move them with an awe which secured the immortality of her long-guarded treasures. Secondly, the Roman genius for public and private law supplied a common basis of orderly life for the whole Græco-Roman world. Mommsen, the great historical exponent of Roman law, defined law as state interference in the interests and passions of humanity.

Applying this to the work of Rome in the world, we may say that in her a state power at last arose, after long periods of tentative and unintelligent government, which did so effectually interfere among the interests and passions of humanity in that Græco-Roman world that we still feel it at work among us.

The Roman "civil law" is still the basis of our best conceptions of jurisprudence. These two facts, the military defence of civilisation, and the legal ordering of human life, may both be summed up in a single expression—the Roman peace (*pax Romana*). Roman arms defended civilisation, allowing no enemy to invade its sacred precincts: and Roman law was thus able to develop itself leisurely and peacefully, to the infinite and permanent benefit of mankind. Incidentally, we may note that room was found under this Roman peace for the growth of Christianity, the most remarkable phenomenon of the later Græco-Roman period.

The Roman Peace

Such then was the main result of the work of Rome; and it shows us that the Roman had two great qualities which were denied to the Greek, and which, taken together, constitute what we may call the Roman spirit. The Roman could fight, not only in short campaigns or in single battles, but in long and protracted struggles, constantly defeated, yet never permanently losing ground, and holding tenaciously to the main object of securing a territory or organising a frontier. And he had the power of orderly government, taking shape not merely in a neat legal code suited to a single city-state, but adapting itself to the needs of a great variety of peoples, incorporating their usages, learning from their experience, yet subordinating all this variety to a single great end. In the possession of these two qualities the Romans seem to have stood alone among all the peoples of the Mediterranean basin. We see them at work throughout the whole of Roman history, in spite of many dark periods and many national shortcomings. Can we account for them by any reference to early Roman experience?

Conditions of Rome's Development

To some extent we may get an idea of the conditions under which they developed, even if we cannot altogether explain them, by fixing our attention on some unquestioned facts in the early history of Italy. Let us look at the map, and mark well the position of Rome in relation to Italy and the peoples inhabiting it. The long, narrow peninsula is cloven in two parts by the river Tiber, the largest stream south of the Po, draining almost the whole middle portion of the mountainous region of Central Italy. The whole country to

the north of the Tiber, when Rome first appeared on the scene, was held by the Etruscans—a mysterious people, whose origin is still unknown, a warlike people, spreading their dominion far to north and south, and an adventurous people, building fleets and engaging in commerce in the Western Mediterranean. To the south of the Tiber lay the territory of the Latins, extending over what we now call the Latin Campagna, on which from east and south the outskirts of the Apennines look down, then inhabited by peoples related to the Latins, but at constant feud with them. The natural centre and citadel of Latium is the Mons Albanus, which rises some miles to the south of Rome to a height of 3,000 feet. But this was too far from the river, the natural frontier against the Etruscans, to defend the Latins from these enemies; what was needed was not only a citadel of refuge, but an outpost to anticipate the need of such a citadel.

Rome at the Outpost of Danger

Rome was this outpost; sitting astride of the river in the post of danger, about twenty miles from its mouth, holding land on both banks, guarding the sacred wooden bridge which might be broken at any moment, and owning the mouth itself of the river with a settlement there by way of port (Ostia), she was obviously exposed to continual strain, while the kindred and allied peoples in her rear enjoyed comparative peace. Here we have something at least of the secret of Rome's genius for war; her training in the art of war was not that of a petty community apt to attack a neighbour or to be attacked by him, to raid or be raided in the course of a summer; it was that of a people having a continual duty before them, many miles of frontier to hold, constant liability to surprise and defeat, yet bound by sheer necessity to cling for very life to their position, and when and where possible, to advance and strengthen it.

Such advance, as time went on and the position was still held, became ever more possible and more tempting; the Tiber valley was the natural entrance into the heart of Italy. So it came about that the Romans, having learnt their lesson of military endurance in the school of defensive warfare, were able to put it to use in the slow but steady acquisition of the dominion of the whole peninsula. For of them alone could it be said, as the historian Tacitus said of the Chatti people

in Germany, that other peoples went out to battle, but the Romans went out to war.

But warfare of this steady, dogged kind, in which the Roman people have hardly ever been equalled, cannot be carried on without a habit of discipline, of obedience to constituted authority, for which the military position of Rome will not by itself account. To explain this we must turn to that other great quality of this wonderful people—the instinct for law and government. Can we find, in the internal organisation of the Roman people, or in their early experience, anything which helps us to explain not only their later genius for law, but their instinct for order and discipline ?

One fact we know which will go a long way towards supplying the explanation we need. From the earliest times the basis of Roman society was the family ; and the family was organised and governed on a principle at once simple and stringent. It was under the absolute authority of the head of the household (*pater familias*), subject only to the tradition that in matters of great moment he should consult his relations in a family council. Wife and children were “in his hand,”

**The Family
the Model
for the State**

and had no legal status of their own ; and in all the relations of the family to the beings both human and divine who dwelt around them he was absolute arbiter. He was chief priest of the family, and on his knowledge of the ritual necessary to the propitiation of its deities or the discovery of their will the very existence of it depended ; for without the proper rites and formulæ—so the Romans at all times firmly believed—the gods could not be induced to perform their functions as guardians of the land and its products, on which the family subsisted. Thus there must have grown up, long before the state came into being, the idea of authority, both civil and religious, vested in a single individual, to defy which was almost impossible and unthinkable, because the safety and welfare of the ruled depended absolutely on the ruler.

It was only natural that as the state gradually arose, built upon a concentration of families, its order of government should be based on the same ideas and traditions. In the earliest form of Roman state of which we know anything, the king (*rex*) was the sole interpreter of civil and religious law, subject only to

the tradition that in civil matters of great moment he should consult a council of heads of families (*senatus*), and in matters of religious difficulty a college of persons skilled in religious law and ritual (*pontifices, augures*) ; in war he was probably even more absolute than at home. Thus there developed itself that wonderful

**Obedience the
Keynote
of Citizenship**

conception, the *imperium* of the chief magistrate, of rex in the earliest age, and of consuls and their representatives afterwards, in which a Roman of all ages recognised a state force, which it was practically impossible for him to defy, because, like the members of the family, he had learnt that all that made life worth living for him depended upon his obedience to it. For this famous word, *imperium*, the Greeks had no real equivalent ; it sums up the genius of the Roman for discipline, whether in the observance of civil and religious order at home, or in obeying their commanders in the field. Even the limitations placed upon it as time went on—the discovery, for example, that the voice of the people is necessary to make a legal enactment binding on all, and to confirm a magisterial sentence of death—do but bear out the truth that this people had an instinct for law and order, for while they recognised the necessity of modifying their institutions to suit changed conditions of life, they never lost sight of the supreme value of the idea of *imperium*, or of that wholesome adjunct of it, the idea that its holder should in matters of moment consult those who were qualified to advise him.

Thus the Roman character was built up under a combination of external warfare and internal discipline. This character, as we might expect, was not altogether a pleasing one ; but it was admirably adapted for the work Rome had to do in the world. The typical Roman was hard, stubborn, narrow, un-

**Traits of
the Roman
Character**

sympathetic ; he was intellectually somewhat slow, wanting in the quickness and versatility that characterised the Greek ; wanting also in imagination, and in the adventurousness which is the practical side of the imaginative faculty. Deeds pleased him more than words, and it was long before he began to learn the wonderful resources of his own tongue. Seriousness (*gravitas*) in all his conduct, public and private, was the quality he

most admired, and this was expected also in married women, and even in children. He was not indeed without a certain sense of humour, but his humour was rough and apt to be coarse, and later on in literature developed into satire, the one original contribution of the Romans to literary form. In morals the Roman

**Roman
Morals and
Ethics**

seems to have been strict rather than delicate, and always more lenient to the man than to the woman; in religion he was—like all Italians, ancient and modern—peculiarly superstitious, but here his natural tendency was checked and regulated by his religious law and its administrators. These and all other tendencies to emotional excess or display were discouraged both in public and private life; marriages “for love,” for example, were quite unknown, and at all times in Roman history love was an illicit passion only. The emotional characters with whom we meet in later times, such as Cicero and Catullus, were not Roman by descent; and Virgil, who stands alone in Roman literature for sympathy and tenderness, was perhaps of Gallic blood. Cæsar, on the other hand, a true Roman by birth, had all the old characteristics of the race, but tempered by the courtesy and *humanitas* which had come in with Greek education and a wider experience of the world.

The character thus built up was put to severe trial in the third century B.C. The invasion of Pyrrhus and the long first struggle with Carthage strained the endurance and resources of the people to the utmost; but the war with Hannibal was a trial such as no people has ever gone through before or since, and survived. Fortunately, Rome had by this time become the head of what may loosely be called an Italian federation, using her conquests not to destroy the conquered, but to unite them with herself on terms

**The Greatest
Ordeal
in History**

by which both might profit; and the additional strength thus gained was enough to disappoint Hannibal's expectations and, materially speaking, to carry her through the ordeal. Yet it is none the less true that it was the Roman spirit that saved her—the “courage never to submit or yield,” the tenacity that was the result, as with the Boers of the Transvaal, of an imperfect education and a narrow range of vision. For fourteen years her

deadly enemy was in Italy, bent with an incredible vindictiveness on her destruction, ever victorious, and with famine and pestilence at his heels; but the great Roman families never gave up hope or allowed themselves to be beaten, and the people, trained to trust them, never really failed to answer to the call of duty. Whoever would really understand the Roman character, with all its strong and weak points, should read the story of this great struggle, and note how in such a crisis in the history of civilisation the victory lay ultimately with the people that could endure and obey.

And such a study is all the more valuable, because from this time forward the Roman character began to deteriorate. Rome passed safely through the struggle, but at the cost of the best part of her strength, moral as well as physical. The strain had been too great for her, and, indeed, for Italy as a whole. It is difficult to trace the subtle processes by which such a trial can affect the nervous tissue of the people, weakening its virility, laying it open to the temptation to indulge in ease, to look for wealth and comfort, and so gradually

**Aftermath
of Rome's
Success**

destroying the sense of duty towards family, state and gods. And here, indeed, it is not possible to say more than that a careful study of the two centuries that followed the war will show that alike in family life, in religion, in the performance of state duties, the Roman fell rapidly away from the old ideal of conduct; the true Roman spirit seems to have vanished. The state went on conquering and organising her conquests. Rome became the arbiter of the whole civilised world; but the spirit in which the work was done was not that which had built up an Italian federation, and driven Hannibal out of Italy.

It is now the individual Roman who comes to the front, seeking his own advancement; and this—simply means that the best qualities of the old type were failing, and the worst gaining strength. The individual had been subordinated to the state, and had found his best life in that subordination. In forgetting the state and working for his own ends, he simply gave the chance of growth to all his lower instincts, and neither Greek philosophy nor an improved system of education had the least power to check this growth permanently. We meet, indeed, with a few leading men of a finer

type than Rome had yet produced—Scipio Æmilianus, the two Gracchi, Mucius Scævola, Sertorius, who added the grace of learning and humanity to much of the old cast of character ; but the typical Roman of this age was the man who gained office by corruption, plundered the provincials whom he was called upon to rule, and then retired into luxurious ease to enjoy the fruits of his misdoings.

The result of this deterioration was that Rome ceased to perform adequately that function for which, as we saw, she was wanted in the world ; Mediterranean civilisation was no longer protected securely from enemies within and without. In the western half of her empire wild tribes from the north invaded the province of Gaul at the end of the second century B.C., and finally penetrated even into Northern Italy ; and the defeats the Roman armies suffered at their hands were due, not to the skill of the enemy as in the Hannibalic war, but to bad discipline and the corruption of generals. Then for nearly forty years Mithradates of Pontus continued to menace the Greek half of the empire, and at one time overran the province of

The Leaven of Corruption

Asia, and was with difficulty beaten back from the walls of Athens. The sea was infested with pirates, and no traveller's life or property was safe. All this was due to the supineness of the Roman government, and to the violence of party faction, in which the true interest of the state and of civilisation were lost to view. The Senate, the great council which had carried Rome safely through so many dangers, seemed to have lost its capacity for business, and wasted time in personal quarrels or in satisfying the interests of individuals.

Even after it had been reorganised and politically strengthened by Sulla it failed to hold the empire together effectually, and each provincial governor ruled his province only for his own advantage, or for the advantage of the companies of tax-collectors (*publicani*), with whom all Romans of property invested their capital. Thus the administration of the law was unsound and corrupt throughout the empire, for in every province it depended on the caprice of the governor, and the money extorted from the provincials was used at home for corrupt purposes in the courts. The genius of Rome for law as well as for warfare might well seem to have deserted

her. Unless the Roman spirit could be revived, the prospect for civilisation was dark indeed. True, Roman literature grew in this melancholy period into greatness ; the intense individualism of the age left us at least one valuable legacy in the works of such men as Cicero, Lucretius, and Catullus ; sound and able men like

Reviving the Roman Spirit

Mucius Scævola, and Sulpicius Rufus carried the philosophic treatment of jurisprudence to a height which it had never yet reached in any state. But in the field of action, whether in war or government, we can hardly find a trace of the old Roman spirit.

Yet this spirit was to be revived, but not in the body politic, which it had once animated. That body politic no longer existed ; the Roman city-state had been merged in something new and strange, which we call empire, but to which the Romans themselves were only just beginning to apply that famous word of theirs—*imperium*. The Roman citizen body was scattered all over this empire, and probably the meanest part of it was that which played at politics for money in the capital. The forms of the old constitution were still there, but they were forms without substance. No vital force underlay them ; neither magistrates nor senate, and not even the people, understood what the condition of the civilised world called on them to do, or had the will and energy to do it.

If in such an age the Roman spirit was to be revived, this could be done only by the character and genius of some individual having the necessary understanding and the necessary will, the understanding capable of grasping the conditions of the problem which Rome had to face—the defence of the frontiers and the internal organisation of the empire—and the will to carry this work through with infinite patience and perseverance. The actual material for the accomplishment of this

The Times Call for a Great Man

great task must now be drawn not only from Rome or even from Italy, but from all the resources of the empire ; the army must henceforth be organised on an imperial basis, and the host of workers in the domain of peaceful organisation must be recruited from east and west alike. But the animating spirit of it all was still to be Roman, and if it was to be found anywhere, must be found in an individual Roman of genius and industry.

Such a man was C. Julius Cæsar, a true Roman of one of the oldest patrician families, and, as has been already said, not without some traits of the old Roman character. We may allow that for the greater part of his life, like most of his contemporaries, he was playing for his own hand; but the last fifteen years of it he spent

**Cæsar, the
Greatest Roman
Statesman**

in continual hard work, to which he brought an amount of insight and determination such as had never yet been combined in a Roman statesman. His first work was the creation of an army thoroughly disciplined, ready to go anywhere and do anything, with which he conquered the great province of Gaul, henceforward to become the most valuable of all the Roman possessions, and established a permanent frontier for the empire in the Rhine and the ocean, removing far from Italy all danger of immediate invasion.

That he found himself compelled to use this army for the overthrow of the old constitution we may regret; but in this he was perhaps more sinned against than sinning. When he had grasped supreme power, he went on indefatigably with the work of internal reform, and all that he had time to achieve before he was struck down by fanatical assassins shows the same keen scientific intelligence that marks the conquest of Gaul as we know it from his own commentaries. His work is indeed only a torso; not only the internal reorganisation of the empire, but the completion of its military frontiers had to be left for others. Yet if we ask who it was that inaugurated the new type of Roman spirit—the spirit of hard work and rational intelligence in matters both military and civil—there is but one answer.

Cæsar woke the Roman world from the lethargy which had so long been paralysing it, and stood out as the visible impersonation of the Roman state and its function in the world at a time when men had

**The
Augustan
Age**

almost forgotten that there was a state claiming loyalty, and an empire demanding efficient work. We have a large correspondence surviving from the years in which he was in supreme power; and the impression it leaves on the mind is that the men of that time were fairly amazed at the audacity, energy, and ability of the new master. But there was also resentment, and Cæsar's opportunities were cut short. If we wish to

study the new Roman spirit, as it was applied to the necessary work without let or hindrance, we must turn to the long reign of Augustus the nephew and the pupil of Cæsar.

When Augustus became undisputed master after the defeat of the self-seeking Antony at Actium the empire was in chaos and confusion, the frontiers undefended, the provinces disorganised, the finance unscientific; and for many years men's minds had been given up to apathy and despair. When he died, forty-five years later, the *pax Romana* was firmly established, the empire was knit together in every department of government, the frontiers were adequately defended by an admirable standing army, or by the prestige arising from the long successful reign of the ruler, and, what was perhaps even more important at the moment, Augustus had succeeded in creating an almost universal confidence in himself and his government, and in renewing the conviction that it was the mission and the destiny of Rome to defend and to govern the whole civilised world.

This confidence and conviction are fully reflected in the literature of the age, and

**The Roman
Spirit
Idealised**

more especially in the history of Livy and in the *Æneid* of Virgil. The historian's part was to recall men's minds to the wonderful story of the growth of the Roman dominion, to induce them to look back on the past and be worthy of their great ancestry. The work of the poet was to paint a national hero, endowed with qualities which every Roman would recognise as the finest of his race; to tell the story of that hero's divine mission, to which he faithfully adheres in spite of many dangers and temptations. In a form which all educated men could appreciate, the *Æneid* showed the Divine Will guiding the Roman state from infancy onwards, and individual passion forced to give way not only to the will of the gods but to the interests of humanity. It pointed to the sense of duty, *pietas*, as the Romans called it, as the virtue which alone had enabled *Æneas* to fulfil his mission, and which alone could qualify Rome and Augustus to fulfil theirs. In the *Æneid* the Roman spirit is indeed idealised; but this itself explains why it took such strong and permanent possession of the Roman mind. Augustus himself was no heroic

character, and the great impression he made on the world can be explained only by the persevering industry and unfailing good judgment which he and his chief helpers devoted to the defence of the frontiers and the organisation of the provinces, thus at once exemplifying and stimulating the true Roman genius for warfare and for law.

Let anyone who would appreciate this industry follow the story of the gradual establishment of the military frontier from the mouth of the Rhine to the Euxine, which, as the map will show him, was a screen effectually covering all Græco-Roman civilisation from Spain to Asia Minor. In this story he will find the old Roman genius for protracted persevering warfare fully illustrated, and in the man who bore the brunt of the work and wore himself out in the prosecution of it—Tiberius, the stepson of Augustus, and afterwards his successor—all the true Roman caution and tenacity of purpose, shown especially at one period of extreme danger, in which he may almost be said to have saved Italy and the empire. Or let him follow the work of

Imperial Roman Citizenship Augustus himself and his faithful helpmate Agrippa, who spent year after year in re-organising the provinces both in east and west. This means that every community in the empire, and every individual in each community, was placed in a definite legal status, was secured in respect of his person and his property, and was no longer at the mercy of rapacious tax-collectors or provincial governors. His status (*jus*) might, indeed, be an inferior one; he might not have attained to any part of the Roman citizenship; but the central government now had a long arm, and as his legal position was defined and recognised, redress was to be had if injustice were done him. And in the course of the next two centuries the *jus* of all communities, of all free men, was gradually raised to the same level; the Roman citizenship was extended to the whole empire, and the Roman law—the interference of the state in the interests and passions of humanity—was administered in every court.

The Roman spirit, in this new phase of its being, can be discerned not only in the civil and military history of the empire, but in the great works of architectural art, bridges, aqueducts, amphi-

theatres, triumphal arches, of which the huge remains are still to be seen wherever Roman occupation left a lasting mark on the land. They are not the beautiful handiwork of a gifted race, but they seem to tell us of strong will, powerful organisation, love of things large and lasting. They are all on a

Americans of the Ancient World large scale; size predominates over beauty, and details are wanting in delicacy, and in true relation to the whole; the eye does not rest on them so much in admiration as in wonder. Here is laborious tenacity of purpose, never that inherent love of perfect proportion that inspired the Greek artist.

The same tendency is to be seen in the sculptures—in the scenes crowded with soldiers and captives adorning the triumphal arches—and again in the realistic portrait-busts of men who defended the frontiers or governed the provinces. Even in the greatest Roman poets, even in Virgil himself, some trace of the same spirit is visible; here, too, realistic descriptions and crowded scenes may be compared with the inimitable touch of the Homeric story-teller; and the minor poets, Statius or Silius Italicus, are as monotonously lengthy as the Colosseum is monotonously huge. Individual genius is absent or suppressed; the artist works on traditional lines, whether he produces poems, buildings, busts, or even coins, and does not indulge his fancy—because fancy, like adventure, was no part of the Roman mental equipment. Solid practical work, obvious to the eye in the public places of a crowded city, obvious to the mind in all the intercourse of human life—this was what the Roman spirit expected from all her great men, whether soldiers, legislators, or artists, and with this from first to last it was faithfully supplied.


This is not the place to explain the weak points of the Roman empire, or the internal cankers which slowly paralysed its strength.

What Rome Did for Mankind The real value of the empire to mankind lay in the fact that for four centuries it did effectually protect the civilisation which had been developed in the basin of the Mediterranean, and by an elaborate internal organisation raised the whole level of human comfort and confidence. Thus, the chance was given to Christianity to grow, with comparatively few interruptions, into a universal

religion of high and low, rich and poor ; and as the invaders also gradually embraced this religion there arose upon the ruins of the Roman dominion the new far-reaching organisation of the Church of Christendom, inheriting not a little of the old Roman spirit, as well as of the prestige of the great system on which it was built. The Holy Roman

Empire of the Middle Ages was rather an idea than a fact of overwhelming importance to mankind ; it is in the Latin Church, with its genius for law and organisation, and with its popes and their claim to universal supremacy, that we may see the legitimate heir of the Roman dominion.

W. WARDE FOWLER



THE TRIUMPH OF A CÆSAR IN THE DAYS OF ROME'S GRANDEUR
From the painting by F. W. Topham, R.I., by permission of the Corporation of Leicester.

A PAGEANT OF ANCIENT ROME

AS REPRESENTED IN THE PICTURES
OF ITS GREATEST MODERN PAINTER
SIR LAURENCE ALMA-TADEMA, R.A.




AN AUDIENCE AT AGRIPPA'S

By permission of the Berlin Photographic Co., London, W.





LIFE IN ANCIENT ROME: "LOVE IN IDLENESS"

By permission of the Bertha Photographic Co., London, W.



"FÊTE INTIME": BEING A BACCHANALIAN DANCE FROM "THE VINTAGE FESTIVAL"

By permission of the Berlin Photographic Co., London, W.



"SPRING": THE ROMAN FESTIVAL OF FLORALIA IN HONOUR OF FLORA
By permission of the Berlin Photographic Co., London, W.



THE COLOSSEUM: THE GREAT AMPHITHEATRE IN TIME OF FÊTE

By permission of the Berlin Photographic Co., London, W.



"AVE CÆSAR! IO SATURNALIA!"

A favourite subject of Sir Laurence Alma-Tadema. The terrified Claudius, halled by the soldiers as Caesar with the expectant "Io Saturnalia!" of the populace, half hides behind a curtain, unwilling to come forth as emperor, while the bodies of men and women who have been despatched, like their patron Caligula, lie before the busts of the Caesars. by permission of the Berlin Photographic Co., London, W.



"CARACALLA"

The Emperor Caracalla, son of Septimius Severus, and murderer of his brother Geta, was infamous for his cruelties and his inhuman conduct. He was assassinated in the year 217 A.D., ending a life of unrestrained license at forty-three. By permission of the Berlin Photographic Co., London, W.



"AT THE SHRINE OF VENUS"
By permission of the Herth Photographie Co., London, W.





THE STORY OF ANCIENT ROME

ITS RISE TO WORLD-DOMINION AND ITS DECLINE AND FALL


THE BEGINNINGS OF THE CITY-STATE

THE pleasing legend told by the Romans concerning the origin of their city has passed into the literature of the world. Art in early times embellished it. The she-wolf with the sucking twins appears on the Roman-Campanian coins of the fourth century B.C. In the year 296 B.C. the government erected a bronze monument representing this group in the "Wolf's Cave," the Lupercal, on the Palatine, where the wolf is said to have suckled the twins. Sacrifices were offered here on February 17th, the festival of the Lupercalia, to Faunus, god of the woods and fields, and to Lupercus as "guardian from wolves." The so-called Capitoline wolf has been partially restored in later times. We know, besides, that in the ninth and tenth centuries A.D. a "Lupa" stood near the Lateran. Afterwards the mother-wolf was known as the divinely honoured symbol of the Roman state throughout the world which was ruled from the city on the Tiber. The birthday of Rome was celebrated at the same time as the Palilia, the spring festival of the

herdsmen, on April 21st, on which day King Romulus, with herdsmen from Alba Longa, is said to have planned the foundation of the city. The Roman historians afterwards calculated the year of the foundation to be the year 753 B.C., if we may anticipate our own era. The millennial jubilee of the city of Rome was celebrated, therefore, in the year 248 A.D., under the Emperor Philip, the Arabian.

A partially trustworthy tradition begins in the fifth century B.C., when the record of the lists of magistrates—the *Fasti Consulares*, as the Romans called them—and the publishing of the calendar by the Pontifices, or colleges of priests, come to be supplemented by notices of the most important occurrences of each year, which

increase in amount as the town becomes of more consequence. Disasters, such as the taking of Rome by the Gauls, were, naturally, recorded the most fully. The decisive phases of the constitutional struggles also were noted. The earlier period is veiled for us in darkness or semi-darkness,



THE CAPITOLINE SHE-WOLF OF ROME

The legend of the founders of Rome, Romulus and Remus, being suckled by a wolf in their infancy has been for ages the subject of many statues in the city. This is reproduced from the most ancient existing group, which has been partially restored in modern times.

notwithstanding the many legends which are to be read on the subject in the Roman historians. Oral traditions, fables, myths and etymological interpretations are worked up together, from which we must strip away the husks before we can disclose the true kernel.

In order that the historical state of affairs may be clear, we must go further back in our narrative. At the period when Phœnicians and Greeks were disputing the supremacy over the islands and coasts of the Sardinian Sea the Etruscans appear as the predominant power in the central and northerly portions of the Apennine peninsula. They frequently took part in those struggles as the allies of the Phœnicians, in order to protect themselves in their own Tyrrhenian Sea against the aggressive Greek seafarers. The ascendancy of the Syracusans was particularly hateful to the maritime towns of the Etruscan country, and they therefore

sent some ships to aid the Athenians in their expedition to Sicily in the year 476 B.C. We see from this that the Etrurians preferred the more distant powers to the nearer; that is to say, leaving the Carthaginians out of the question, the Corinthians and Athenians, who were rivals on the coasts of Italy since the fifth century B.C., were preferred to the Syracusans and the Massiliots. Even Cumæ, an ancient colony of the Chalcidians and the Græci (Latinised as Græci) on the Campanian coast, the mother town of Naples, had to keep its maritime communications free from the Etrurian privateers by force of arms, until finally the Etruscans were decisively beaten in a great sea-fight by the allied Cumæans and Syracusans. The Etruscans, at the height of their prosperity—sixth and fifth centuries B.C.—had the upper hand in the neighbouring regions inhabited by the Umbrians, Sabellians, and Latins down to Campania.

According to tradition, Rome, the frontier town of the Latins, was repeatedly captured by the Etruscans, and, indeed, became a large city under the rule of dynasts of Etruscan descent. In details the Etruscan account varies from the Roman. On the wall paintings which adorned a tomb at Vulci, the present

Vulci, in Southern Etruria, a place where many Etruscan vases are found, is a representation of the liberation of Caile Vipinas (in Latin, Cæles Vibenna), whom the Romans had taken prisoner, by his friend Macstarna and his companions. During this fight Cneve Tarchu Rumach, that is, Cn. Tarquinius, the Roman, found his death. His troops, it is to be noticed, equally bear Etruscan names. The Roman account, on the other hand, names a Tarquinius the Elder, with the prenomen Lucius, which is derived from Lucumo, the designation of the chief men in the Etruscan towns. It is said that he came from the Etruscan town Cornetio (near the present



THE FOUNDER OF ROME
Romulus, the legendary king
who is said to have founded
Rome in 753 B.C. From a coin.

to Rome, and there became king. Since, however, the name Tarquinius is a well-accredited native Roman name, the whole story seems to owe its existence to the unfortunate etymology of later historians. So much, at any rate, is certain: though the development of the constitution proceeded on native, that is to say, Latin, lines, the relations with the towns of Southern Etruria from the beginning decided in many respects the political position of Rome. In architecture, in art, in religious ceremonial, this influence was only gradually crossed by the Greek power, which spread through the whole Mediterranean. On the other hand, the country "beyond the Tiber" was considered a strange country, into which the hard-hearted creditor sold his debtor. The Greek influences which come to Latium proceed from towns which are hostile to the Etruscans, as Cumæ and Syracuse. Writing, indeed, developed in Latium, as in Etruria, under Greek influence, but independently, a fact which shows that the two countries were for a long time closed to each other. In this uncertain light Rome appears to us at the beginning of her history. The town had sprung up on the lower course of the Tiber, the largest river of Central Italy, which was then navigable for ships far upstream. Besides this, the Via Salaria—that is, the salt road—which touched Rome, led inland from the sea into the country of the cattle-breeding Sabines. This Sabellian stock lived in villages, so that for them Rome

Rome in
the Twilight
of History

became "the town." The towns of the Latins also, which lay on the terrace at the foot of the Alban Hills, were outstripped in development by Rome. Alba Longa, the acropolis of which has lately, and with some probability, been supposed to be Castel Gandolfo, stretched along the Alban lake. Alba Longa was the chief town of the Latin confederacy, which held its conferences by the Ferentine spring, in the beautiful part of the valley between Albano and Marino. The sacrifices of the league were offered on the Alban Mountain, from which the whole country of Latium could be surveyed down to the sea. The sacred grove of Aricia also, the "Nemus Dianæ," on the Lake of Aricia (now Lago di Nemi), was at all times one of the most frequented places of pilgrimage for the Latin race.

It is significant that Rome very early acquired the headship of this Latin league, which in the first instance served religious objects. Alba Longa, which appeared as a rival, was destroyed, the confederation of towns was dissolved, and the foremost families were compelled to remove to Rome. In this way the union of the two ruling towns into a single power was effected at that time: Alba Longa, the mother city, was blended into Rome, the daughter. At the same time the commanding positions on the mountain ridge came into the possession of Rome, in consequence of which the Latin national festival was from that date held every spring on the Alban Mount under the presidency of the Roman magistrates. Thirty "cities" were entitled to take part,

**Rome Leads
the Latin
Confederacy**

and their emblem was a sow with a litter of thirty young. After the sacrificial bull had been offered to Jupiter Latiaris, the tribal deity, the flesh of the sacrifice was divided among the rightful members of the league.

While extending her influence towards the mountains, Rome took possession of the most commanding position down-stream—namely, the mouths of the Tiber, where the port of Ostia was constructed and secured against attacks by a permanent garrison. On the other side of the river the Roman territory abutted on the district owned by the Etruscan towns, Cære and Veii. Cære lies near the modern Cerveteri. The town was removed in the Middle Ages on account of its unhealthiness, in consequence of which another Ceri was founded in the neighbourhood. The whole district has been deserted since the close



THE LEGEND OF THE FOUNDING OF ROME

This ancient sculpture from Ostia, now in the National Museum at Rome, illustrates the legend of the suckling of Romulus and Remus and their coming with their shepherds to plan the foundation of the city, the god of the Tiber being shown below.

of the Middle Ages. Rome early established friendly relations with Cære, which maintained one harbour for Greek and another for Phœnician ships. On the other hand, a war broke out with Veii, which was waged partly for the salt meadows at the mouth of the Tiber, partly for the possession of Fidenæ, the tête-du-pont of Ætruria to Latium, on the left bank of the Tiber. The citadel of Veii lay near the modern Isola Farnese; Fidenæ was near Villa Spada, four miles from Rome. The Romans interrupted the communication between Veii and Fidenæ by building a

the social crisis, which was threatening in Rome, as in all the agrarian communities of antiquity, might not reach a dangerous point it was necessary to tread the path of conquest and to colonise new tracts with settlements dependent on Rome. Therefore, the tedious siege of Veii was afterwards compared with the Trojan War by the poetical narrators of early Roman history, Nævius and Ennius, who flourished during and after the Second Punic War. This war with Veii was of decisive importance for the development of Rome. In fact, the fall of Veii immediately



THE SABINE WOMEN INTERVENING BETWEEN THE ROMANS AND THEIR OWN KINSMEN

According to the legend, the Romans needed wives, so Romulus invited his neighbours of the Sabine Hills to a series of games, and at a signal the Roman youths made captives of the Sabine women who had come as visitors. Later on the Sabines attacked Rome, but the women interceded with their kindred, and the two peoples joined hands.

fort on the brook Cremera, which flows into the Tiber opposite Fidenæ, and placed a garrison there. It is recorded that the clan of the Fabii undertook this task, but sustained an almost annihilating defeat.

At the same time the war was constantly renewed until Fidenæ fell, when hostilities were directed against Veii itself. The Roman population received great additions, since other towns had been incorporated, like Alba Longa, into the Roman territory; but, in order that the population might not be crowded there, and that

doubled the power of the Romans. Hardly a town of Italy could now compare with Rome in extent of territory. Added to this, the Latin league, under her headship, showed itself to be far more firmly united than the confederation of the Etruscans, which held its meetings in the sacred grove of Voltumnia. Veii, left to itself, was plundered and destroyed by the Romans, who sallied out in small bodies; the population was put to the sword or sold into slavery, and the territory of the town declared the property of the



MAP OF ITALY, CISALPINE GAUL AND THE ISLANDS IN THE FIRST CENTURY B.C.

Roman people. This territory reached as far as the ridge of the Ciminian Forest, north of Sutri (beyond the Ciminian lake, now Lago di Vico, past which the Ciminian road led), and up to the mountain group of Soracte, which can be seen from the hills of Rome. Soracte is the present

Monte Sant' Oreste, so called because in the Middle Ages an inscription was misinterpreted and a new saint created in consequence. Here the Romans and their allies some years later planted the settlements, or *coloniae*, of Sutrium and Nepete, employing a strictly regulated ritual,

since they had first to determine, by observation of the flight of birds and other signs in the sky, whether the gods approved of the founding of the town. Such colonies were termed "Latin" because the same autonomous position was conceded to them as the old Latin towns enjoyed, and because, like them, they remained in their external policy independent of the head community, Rome. Thus the destruction of the one city, Veii, was followed by the founding of two towns, which were, so to speak, scions of Rome, while the remaining portions of territory were left as public land of Rome, and as such could be used by the citizens entitled to do so. Sutrium and Nepete formed afterwards the advanced posts of the

The Early Latin Colonies

the metropolis of the Etrurian league of twelve towns, was compelled to abandon its resistance. The towns lying to the north soon found themselves obliged to seek support from the Roman-Latin power, since the Gauls, who had established themselves at the cost of the Etruscans and Umbrians on the Po and southward on the Adriatic, were already extending their inroads over the Apennines. Here, some years after the capture of Veii by the Romans, an army of the Senonian Gauls besieged the town of Clusium, the modern Chiusi, whose territory extended in the north as far as Lake Trasimene, where Cortona and Perugia meet. Clusium had formerly taken a leading position in Etruria; and, according to tradition, under its king

the metropolis of the Etrurian league of twelve towns, was compelled to abandon its resistance.

The towns lying to the north soon found themselves obliged to seek support from the Roman-Latin power, since the Gauls, who had established themselves at the cost of the Etruscans and Umbrians on the Po and southward on the Adriatic, were already extending their inroads over the Apennines. Here, some years after the capture of Veii by the Romans, an army of the Senonian Gauls besieged the town of Clusium, the modern Chiusi, whose territory extended in the north as far as Lake Trasimene, where Cortona and Perugia meet. Clusium had formerly taken a leading position in Etruria; and, according to tradition, under its king



THE MOTHER CITY OF THE ROMAN PEOPLE: ANCIENT ALBA LONGA

From the Alban Hills south-east of Rome came the people who founded the imperial city. Alba Longa was the chief of the Alban towns, and in this sense the mother city of Rome, with which it became incorporated as Rome rose into power. The present Castel Gandolfo, a general view of which is given, is supposed to be the ancient Alba Longa.

Roman-Latin power in Southern Etruria, which underwent such great political and agrarian changes.

The neighbouring communities of the Capenates at the foot of Soracte, which formed a canton among themselves, and Falerii—which was moved by the Romans westward into the plain, while in the Middle Ages the old site came again into importance as Civita Castellana—where the population was not Etruscan, but more nearly akin to the Latins, recognised the supremacy of Rome. Finally, Volsinii also, near the present Orvieto—Urbs Vetus, because the Romans, in the year 264 B.C., founded a second Volsinii as a colony on the Lake of Bolsena, near which the "old town" still continued—

Porsenna had actually defeated Rome. The Romans, although not directly menaced, sent two envoys in order to collect accurate information as to the state of affairs. As these envoys treated the Gauls as barbarians, with whom the rights of the law of nations might be disregarded, a disaster ensued, which re-echoed throughout the whole of the then predominantly Greek world. Since the older Roman chronology can be only approximately determined, this may have happened about 387 or 386 B.C. Other calculations place it in the year 390. The Gauls marched against Rome without encountering opposition, since the Veientine territory was not yet colonised; the Roman

Gauls March on Rome

Porsenna had actually defeated Rome. The Romans, although not directly menaced, sent two envoys in order to collect accurate information as to the state of affairs. As these envoys treated the Gauls as barbarians, with whom the rights of the law of nations might be disregarded, a disaster ensued, which re-echoed throughout the whole of the then predominantly Greek world. Since the older Roman chronology can be only approximately determined, this may have happened about 387 or 386 B.C. Other calculations place it in the year 390. The Gauls marched against Rome without encountering opposition, since the Veientine territory was not yet colonised; the Roman

THE BEGINNINGS OF ANCIENT ROME

army was overthrown and scattered at the brook Allia; on the fourth day the town was captured after the inhabitants had taken refuge in the neighbouring places, such as Cære, carrying their sacred objects thither for safety. Only the highest quarter of the city, the Capitol, where the chief temple of Jupiter and the citadel connected with it stood, was successfully defended, and an attempt to scale the height was repulsed. After seven months the Gauls, suffering from disease and also seeing their homes threatened by the Veneti, consented to withdraw on payment of one thousand pounds of gold. The tradition which attributes the delivery of Rome to the victorious arms of Camillus is, beyond question, mythical. Although the losses incurred by the attack were soon repaired, and the city rebuilt and fortified, the "fear of the Gauls"

was for centuries impressed on the Romans. The Gauls renewed their invasions periodically. At such times Rome put into the field every available man, not excepting the priests and law officers, who were otherwise exempt, until the danger was past. But these wars had another and wider significance. The Romans acquired in them an experience of the methods of desultory warfare which made them superior to the troops of the Etrurian, Latin, and Italian towns generally. At the same time the fact is emphasised that the Romans could be marshalled in large bodies, that after the siege of Veii they were accustomed to continue the war, if necessary, even in the winter season—"to go out to wage war, not merely to fight battles"—and that the grant of pay to the troops in the field, which was defrayed from the revenue of the public land,



CHIEF GODDESS OF THE ROMANS

Juno was the chief goddess of the Romans, and especially the patron of virtuous womankind. She was called also Matrona, or Romano, and Juno Sospita. Newly elected consuls made solemn sacrifice to her.



THE ANCIENT ETRUSCAN TOWN OF VEII, DESTROYED IN THE EARLY DAYS OF ROME
The ancient civilisation of Etruria, many centuries older than our earliest records of Rome, had its southern posts in the towns of Veii and Fidenæ, a few miles north of Rome on the other side of the Tiber. From Canina's reconstruction.

marked a considerable advance on the otherwise usual custom of a citizen army providing their own supplies.

With the fourth century B.C. the Romans, and not the Etruscans, became the representatives of Central Italy to the outside world, even to the great maritime Powers. Not merely the Greek towns,

**Rome's Final
Triumph
Over Etruria**

such as Massilia, but the Carthaginians, now concluded with the Romans, as formerly with the Etruscans, treaties for the protection of commerce, which suffered much from piracy. The allies of both parties were included. But the power of Rome had already expanded in a southern direction.

The country of the Latins was bordered on the south-west by the Volsci, on the north-east by the Æqui. The Volsci were settled around Suessa Pometia in the Pomptine or Pontine plain, and in the hill country as far as the Liris and beyond its upper course. The Æqui, whose settlements extended up the Anio and as far as the uplands near the Fucine lake, disturbed the country round Tibur. Mount Algidus also, east of the Alban Mountains, was often the scene of collisions between Latins and Æqui. Occasionally the Æqui and Volsci made common cause. On the other hand, the towns of the Hernici, with Anagnia (now Anagni) as centre, early joined the Latins, who were headed by Rome. These founded along the line of communication from Rome to Anagnia on a slope in a strong position, from which the whole country of the Hernici is visible, the colony of Signia, of which the old walls and gates are still partly standing.

All the places of the Hernici are, like Signia, situated on high ground. The wars of these tribes turned for a long time on the possession of some few positions; sometimes they were mere raids, in which the mountaineers ravaged the plain, which was richer through trade and a more fertile

**The Latin
League Grows
in Power**

soil. The unrest was fostered by immigrants and political exiles, who sought with their enemy a refuge from their


victorious antagonists in the civil dissensions. In this manner Romans found shelter with the Volsci. Since the Romans, however, had obtained such successes in Etruria, and had repulsed the Gauls, their superiority over these small tribes was decisive. The war against the Volsci ended, like that against Veii, in the con-

quered being deprived of a portion of their territory and its addition to the Roman public domain, the *ager publicus*. Two colonies were also planted—namely, Satricum—in the plain, near the present Conca, where in 1896 the walls of circumvallation of the colony Satricum were discovered—and Setia. Velitræ was also occupied, and Ardea, the town of the Rutuli. Finally, we find Suessa Pometia made into a Latin colony in the middle of the region where, later, when the cultivation of the district was neglected, the Pontine marshes extended.

Of course, reverses occurred; a part of the Volsci rebelled, while others submitted and in return were placed on an equal footing with the Romans as regards rights of commerce and intermarriage. This prepared the way for the assimilation of the Volscian country to Latium, a process to be accomplished only in the course of time, and with variations of place and circumstance. It was an important fact that the seaports of the Volsci, especially Antium, Circeii, Anxur, or Tarracina, and the inland group of Pontia, belonged henceforth to the Roman dominion. The

**How Rome
Governed
Her Colonies**

majority of these places were not organised as autonomous communities, but were administered from Rome as Roman colonies; the burgesses settled there had to perform permanent garrison duty, as at Ostia, and were, consequently, only in exceptional cases employed in the field. Individual towns were treated differently, in order that common sympathies might not be aroused. The same policy was adopted by the Romans with respect to the Latin towns. When these resisted her encroachments Rome declared the Latin league to be dissolved; each town had to enter separately into a new agreement with Rome, which was dictated by the capital, and to some all municipal rights were denied. Thus, for example, Laurentum, the rival of Ostia, forfeited its independence. Its territory was conceded to Lavinium, which lies more inland, near Pratica, in the Roman campagna. In return Lavinium had to take over the traditional religious institutions of Laurentum, also, for the Romans did not wish to fight against the gods. This they had shown before, when Alba Longa was incorporated, for they took measures that the neighbouring Bovillæ should be responsible for carrying out the cult of the



HOW ROME WAS SAVED BY THE SACRED GEESE OF JUNO

About the year 390 B.C., when the Gauls attacked Rome and speedily occupied the lower parts of the city, the Capitol Hill remained uncaptured. According to legend it too would have fallen but for the sacred geese kept near the temple of Juno raising the alarm by loud cackling as the Gauls endeavoured to climb up the height under cover of the night.

From a photograph by Braun, Clement & Cie. of the painting by H. P. Motte.

Albans; the same thing occurred at the conquest of Veii, where Juno, the goddess of the town, had been expressly asked whether she, in fact, wished to settle in Rome. The goddess, so the holy legend ran, distinctly nodded assent. Isolated towns of the Latins, as, for example, Tusculum, "the proudest town of all," received favourable terms, which rendered the acquisition of the full Roman citizenship easier for their inhabitants; while to others, as to Tibur and Præneste, their communal independence was guaranteed in appropriate forms.

Extension of Roman Citizenship

others, as to Tibur and Præneste, their communal independence was guaranteed in appropriate forms.

In Rome itself the members of the old "families," or *patricii*, were for a long time very haughty towards the new citizens, or *plebs*, created by the destruction of neighbouring towns or by voluntary domicile. The plebeians were not admitted to the ancient Roman cults, the priest-hoods or the magistracies, in accordance with the strict ritual of the ancients, by which each town formed a distinct religious association. But the plebeians increased in numbers, came to discharge military duties, created the office of tribune, which was held only by members of their own body, and enforced the promulgation of a legal code, so as to set bounds to the caprice of the magistrates. In these political struggles, which on one occasion led to an actual revolution and made the founding of an "opposition Rome" a possible contingency, the tribunes asserted themselves as the leaders and advocates of the plebs, and their "inviolability" had to be guaranteed by the state on the final restoration of peace. Rome, moreover, since the expulsion of the Tarquins, was a free state, where death was the price of any attempt at tyranny or kingly rule. This was, in fact, the fate of Spurius Cassius, who thrice filled the highest magistracy, and had effected the league with the Hernici; similar cases occurred

When Rome Abhorred a Tyrant

twice again, for the Roman annals record the execution of M. Manlius and of Spurius Maelius by order of the government as a warning example. From that time it was considered dangerous at Rome to become too popular. Since the offices could now be held only for a year, no danger on this ground threatened the constitution.

On the other hand, the plebeians demanded to be admitted to the magisterial dignities and to the priesthoods, a claim

which the patricians resisted as long as possible. For a considerable time, as in the years when Veii was besieged and conquered, military tribunes, to whom magisterial powers were given, governed the republic; the plebeians in this way first attained to the highest offices. But since the retention of the patrician privileges was not favourable to the general condition of the community, the admission of the plebeians to the consulship was finally granted in 367 B.C., while their admission to the ancient traditional priestly colleges of "pontifices" and "augures" did not follow for many decades. Some priestly posts, from consideration for the gods, to whom any deviation from traditional custom must be displeasing, remained even later in the exclusive possession of the patricians. These priesthoods were preserved as an honourable legacy of antiquity up to the time of the emperors, until, finally, there was no one left worthy to fill them.

In opposition to this conservative spirit of the old citizens, the practical requirements of the people were met by the Greek cults, which had been introduced into Latium and into Etruria at a very early period. At times of great crisis, particularly when pestilence or famine threatened, the oracular books, which had come to Rome from Cumæ, were officially referred to and consulted by the plebeian keepers of the oracles; and the usual result was the introduction of a new foreign cult, by which the inherent religious feeling of the country was satisfied.

The supreme official power was exercised by two equally powerful magistrates, who were judges, as well as generals, and to whom, in fine, the term "consules" was appropriated. The year was dated after the two consuls. As the state expanded, separate functions were detached and entrusted to independent functionaries: to the prætors, the maintenance of justice; to the censors, the new assessment to be made every five years; to the ædiles, the police authority; to the quæstors, the financial business. When critical times demanded the concentration of the command in a single hand, one of the consuls, at the request of the senate, had to nominate a dictator, or "commander," who himself chose his subordinate colleague, the master of the horse (*magister equitum*). Both could hold office only for six months.

Rome Looks to Greece for Religion

Latium and into Etruria at a very early period. At times of great crisis, particularly when pestilence or famine threatened, the oracular books, which had come to Rome from Cumæ, were officially referred to and consulted by the plebeian keepers of the oracles; and the usual result was the introduction of a new foreign cult, by which the inherent religious feeling of the country was satisfied.



AN EARLY ROMAN IDEAL OF PATRIOTIC DEVOTION

Decius Mus was a celebrated Roman consul, who, in the year 338 B.C., when Rome was engaged in bringing all the Latin cities within her power, dedicated himself solemnly to the gods manes, or spirits of the dead, before going to battle, an example frequently followed in later years. From one of a series of paintings by Rubens, now at Vienna.

All these offices were developments of the municipal magistracy prevailing among the Latins.

By the side of the officials stood the senate and the popular assembly, the former for deliberation, the latter for the final decision of mere municipal business as well as state affairs. The magistrates had to lay motions before the senate. According to the order of business, the report on religious matters, which the municipal officers on entering office had to furnish to the communal council within ten days, had precedence of all others.

Here also great attention was paid to omens and to popular superstition generally; monstrous births, thunder-claps, wolves roaming over the Capitol, were appropriately expiated according to the advice of the pontifices. Special haruspices, or augurs, were appointed by the state for the inspection of entrails, according to the custom of the Etruscans, and augury from the flight of birds was practised by the magistrates themselves. The sacred geese of Juno on the Capitol,

like the sacred fowls, which, by their manner of eating, foretold the issue of an enterprise, play a part in the traditional history of ancient Rome. Since the popular assembly did not meet very often, only the most important matters could be decided by it; for the ordinary transaction of business the decision lay entirely with the senate. The multitude was content with the government if salt was cheap, the "tributum" not assessed too high, and the forced labour imposed by the community, as, for instance, the rebuilding of the town walls, did not weigh too heavily on them, and, finally, if there was from time to time a distribution of conquered territory. Thus the Roman state continually gained ground.

The Apennine peninsula, which did not yet possess a collective name—the name "Italy" was only given to it in the second century B.C.—was now the scene of remarkable movements among the nations. Races which did not develop any fresh powers of expansion, as the Etruscans and the Umbrians, were crowded together within

narrow limits. The Sabellian stocks, on the other hand, which had their ancient settlements in the central mountain districts round the Gran Sasso and the Majella group, proclaimed, so often as they were threatened with over-population, a "sacred spring": everything that was born of man or beast within a certain period was destined to be sent beyond their boundaries and to be, as it were, offered up to the gods. About the time that Romans were fighting with Veientes, Gauls, and Volsci, such bands of Sabellians occupied Campania, Apulia, and Lucania, making friendly terms with the natives, and waged war on the Greek towns. Cumæ and its daughter town, Neapolis, suffered especially in this way; but even in Magna Græcia proper many less populous Greek colonies were unable to withstand the attack. They were forced to capitulate and to give the immigrants a share in their territory; and since these were reinforced by fresh bands, while the Greek numbers diminished, an ethnical displacement resulted, of which the end could not be foreseen.

Only towns like Tarentum, Croton, Thurii, Locri, Rhegium, could maintain their position, Tarentum being a not unimportant maritime power. The supremacy of the Sabellian immigrants was never, indeed, firmly established, chiefly because they were scattered over too wide areas, and often seized a more remote position before an important and nearer one was completely occupied: in contrast to Rome, they worked without a definite plan. In any case, the movement convulsed the whole southern portion of the peninsula, and those towns or districts which opposed the Sabellians looked round for aid in their resistance. This was the case of Cumæ and Neapolis in Campania, and Teanum also, the town of the Sidicini, which competed with Capua. Capua was, indeed, settled by Sabellians, but wished to develop independently. The opportune help was offered by Rome, since her sphere of power after the incorporation of the Volscian country extended to the Liris, and thence, through the territory of the Aurunci, came into touch with Campania. For some time the Samnites and Romans avoided all collision, and rather tried to mark out their spheres of interest, so that the Romans

Roman Power Reaching Southward

had a free hand against the Latins, Volsci, and Aurunci. But finally a treaty was made between Rome and Teanum; and, what was more important, Capua was forced to form the closest kind of alliance with Rome in 338 B.C. Capua was put on an absolutely equal footing with Rome as regards trade and commerce and even marriage rights, points which were usually treated by the ancients as exclusive privileges. In other respects Capua was left to the Capuans, who retained their own magistrates and Oscan as their language, since Capua was politically Roman in obligations, but not in rights. In particular, the Capuans had no right of voting at Rome; but they termed themselves "Romans," and the identity of the Roman-Campanian state was emphasised on the coinage, since the Capuans struck on their coins, which they still struck according to the customary Phocæan standard, the mother-wolf with the twins. The same thing was noticeable in their military system, for the Campanians formed their soldiers into legions, after the Roman style, not into smaller divisions, the so-called cohorts, as was customary in the more insignificant towns. Thus the Roman power was increased a second time, for that Rome was the leading party is clear from the above-mentioned circumstances, and is also expressed in a divergent tradition of the legendary founding of Rome, according to which Romus, a son of Æneas, is said to have founded both Rome and Capua. In this way the Roman power was established over the lower portion of Central Italy. Nine other places of Campania, Cumæ among the number, were, like Capua, given the right of citizenship without the right of voting, while a part of the district north of the Volturnus was embodied into the Roman public domain, or *ager publicus*, and two colonies were afterwards founded on it—namely, Minturnæ and Sinuessa, in the old country of the Aurunci.


But soon the might of the Samnites was seen to be opposed to this power. On the upper Liris, in Fregellæ, in former Volscian territory, a Latin colony had been founded; and, secondly, the Romans forced a Samnite garrison, which had been imposed on Naples, to withdraw. On these grounds war was declared, for the Samnites did not choose to be cut

The Nations in Time of Change

More Land for the Mother-wolf

customary in the more insignificant towns. Thus the Roman power was increased a second time, for that Rome was the leading party is clear from the above-mentioned circumstances, and is also expressed in a divergent tradition of the legendary founding of Rome, according to which Romus, a son of Æneas, is said to have founded both Rome and Capua. In this way the Roman power was established over the lower portion of Central Italy. Nine other places of Campania, Cumæ among the number, were, like Capua, given the right of citizenship without the right of voting, while a part of the district north of the Volturnus was embodied into the Roman public domain, or *ager publicus*, and two colonies were afterwards founded on it—namely, Minturnæ and Sinuessa, in the old country of the Aurunci.

But soon the might of the Samnites was seen to be opposed to this power. On the upper Liris, in Fregellæ, in former Volscian territory, a Latin colony had been founded; and, secondly, the Romans forced a Samnite garrison, which had been imposed on Naples, to withdraw. On these grounds war was declared, for the Samnites did not choose to be cut



THE FATHER OF THE REPUBLIC WITNESSING THE EXECUTION OF HIS OWN SONS, WHOM HE CONDEMNED FOR TREASON
L. Junius Brutus, a connection of the Tarquin family, vowed as a young man to avenge the crimes of Tarquin the Proud upon his relatives, and it was due to him that the Romans finally banished the Tarquins and set up the republic. His own sons conspired to restore the Tarquins, and were tried and condemned before Brutus himself, who also attended their execution.

off from access to the sea or from their communications with the country round the source of the Liris. When the Romans took the aggressive and tried to force their way through the defiles of Caudium to Apulia, which had fallen to the Samnites, they suffered a severe defeat.

The Roman army was surrounded by the Samnites in the mountains of Caudium and "sent under the yoke," a sentence which was considered a great degradation. The consuls and the officers were forced to guarantee that the places in dispute would be evacuated by the Romans and that peace should be maintained. Nevertheless, the war was continued by the Romans, and lasted over twenty-two years. Though the Romans

were not a match for the Samnites in the hills, they were superior to them on the plain. The Appian Way was then built by the censor Appius Claudius — from whom it derived its name — from Rome to Capua, the passage through the country of the Hirpini was permanently secured, and, to keep Apulia in check, the colony of Luceria was founded in

314 B.C. This became a populous Latin centre, possessing an ample territory. It lay in the plain, extending to the foot of the Samnite Mountains, with which it was most closely connected economically, since the mountain pastures in summer and the lowland meadows in the winter are, up to the present day, the alternate homes of the cattle-breeding industry.

The founding of Luceria was, therefore, a great event in the history of Italy, for by it the Samnite supremacy in those parts was checked and the Roman established in its place; and it is not strange that the war between Romans and Samnites centred for years round this town. The Romans, however, held it, and planted in 291 B.C. a second colony, Venusia. In order to

secure once for all the connection of Campania with that part, the colony of Beneventum was afterwards founded in the country of the Hirpini in 268 B.C., while the Appian Way was extended as far as the Ionian Sea.

The Romans had already come into touch with Tarentum, which jealously guarded its sea route, with the other Greek towns, which rejoiced that Rome had humiliated the hated Sabellians, and, finally, with Syracuse. The latter, under the rule of the tyrants Dionysius and Agathocles, extended her power in the Adriatic, on the Campanian coast, in the Ægean Sea, and at the expense of Carthage, but was hindered from further advance by internal dissensions. With the pirate




THE TWIN GODS CASTOR AND POLLUX

The sons of Leda and Jupiter, the heroic twins were favourite gods of the Romans, and being supposed to have helped the Romans in the great battle at Lake Regillus against the Etrurians, who sought to restore the Tarquins, a temple was reared in their honour in the Forum.

state on the Lipari Islands, which Greek settlers from Rhodes and Cnidus had founded, the Romans first came into contact when, after the conquest of Veii, they sent ambassadors to the oracle at Delphi. There was an old friendship with Massilia. With Rhodes the Romans concluded a commercial treaty in the year 306 B.C.;

and it is also reported that they had extended their voyages as far as Asia Minor.

The nations conquered by the Romans resisted repeatedly the planting of colonies in their territory. The Etruscans and Umbrians actually called in their hereditary foe, the Gauls, to their help. The Samnites also joined the coalition. This gave the Romans a pretext to subdue the Etruscan towns and to bring the southern coast directly into their power by planting colonies, while Cere remained in possession of the Roman citizenship without right of voting. The Romans also won the pass over the Umbrian Apennines in a battle with the allies, after which they attacked the Gauls in their



A FRUGAL AND INCORRUPTIBLE HERO OF ANCIENT ROME

Curius Dentatus was three times consul, and had twice the honour of a triumph. To him was due the decisive victory over the Samnites. He was famed for his fortitude and frugality. It is said that Samnite ambassadors, finding him cooking some vegetables in an earthen pot, sought to bribe him to their side with offers of rich presents, which he firmly refused, saying that he wished to command those who lived in plenty while he himself continued in poverty.

own homes on the Adriatic Sea. Part of their territory was taken from them, and the colony of Sena Gallica—now Sinigaglia—was endowed with it in 283 B.C.

The Romans established a firm footing also on the coast of Picenum. The Tarentines, discontented that "their sea" was no longer respected, and yet unable to check the encroachments of the Romans, called in the help of King Pyrrhus from Epirus. Pyrrhus appeared with a well-trained army in Lower Italy, where, as a champion not merely of the Tarentines, but also of the Samnites, who would gladly have seen Luceria and Venusia destroyed, he marched against

he was defeated at Beneventum by the Romans, while Tarentum was threatened by the Carthaginians. Pyrrhus returned to Greece, for at that time there was a prospect of winning the throne of Macedonia; but not without having left behind a garrison in Tarentum in the expectation of returning to Italy. When the king soon afterwards was killed, the Tarentines had to join the Romans.

On the other side a colony, Æsernia, was planted right among the Samnite Mountains, situated so that it commanded the communications between the valley of the Volturnus and that of the Sangrus. In consequence, the newly founded town



THE APPIAN WAY AS IT APPEARED AT THE HEIGHT OF ROME'S PROSPERITY


Originally built about 310 B.C. by Appius Claudius, this great highway, paved with lava blocks, ran from Rome to Capua, and was later extended to Brindisi. Within some nine miles of its length from Rome it was lined with splendid mansions and imposing tombs of noted and wealthy Romans. On the opposite page it is shown in its existing ruin.

Rome. By his skilful manœuvres he repeatedly gained the victory over the armies of the Romans, who for the first time faced the Macedonian phalanx and the war elephants of the East. But he could not prevail against the strong circle of colonies founded to secure Roman supremacy.

Besides this, Pyrrhus did not make directly for his goal. He allowed himself to be won over by the Syracusans, who called in his help against the Carthaginians, and the only result was that Carthage and Rome made common cause against him. The victorious advance of the king on Sicily was of short duration; when he returned to Italy

attracted all the traffic of the interior, since the upland villages of the Samnites were inadequate to meet the requirements of the improved conditions of trade.

The land of the Æqui also, which, since the successes against the Samnites, could be attacked from the side of the Liris, had been taken by force of arms. The Latins now wreaked vengeance on their hereditary enemies. Fully two-thirds of their territory was taken from the Æqui and employed for the establishment of two unusually strong colonies, Carsioli and Alba (on the Fucine lake). Where now the railroad mounts from the valley of the Anio to the uplands, between



CHARACTER OF THE COUNTRY IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD OF ROME

Rome occupies a slightly elevated position in the midst of a plain with hills in view to the north, east, and south. The Alban Hills, whence came the pastoral peoples who founded Rome, are seen across the Campagna in the first view, while the lower picture gives a distant view of Rome across the Campagna. Inset is a scene on the Appian Way as it is to-day. Now infected with malaria, the Campagna was in ancient times very populous, and it is suggested that the destroying of the enormous aqueducts which extended over its entire length turned the plain into a swamp.

Photos by Anderson and Underwood & Underwood.

the modern Arsoli and Carsoli, near Piano del Cavaliere, lay the municipal centre of the territory of Carsoli, between the forty-second and forty-third milestones on the road leading from Rome. Carsoli and Alba were the Roman guard in the heart of Italy, half-way between the western and the eastern seas. The Valerian Way was

Great Fortresses in the Making

the line of communication between Rome and the new Alba, which had been made one of the most important fortresses in Italy. Three hill-tops, on the most north-easterly of which, 3,200 feet above the sea, lies the modern Alba, were connected by a strong wall in the polygonal style, and each of them was separately fortified as a castle. Only a third of the territory, which extended to the frontier of the Sabines, was left to the Æqui, or, as they were so called, the Æquiculani; that is the district now called Cicolano on the River Salto, the Himella of antiquity, which in its upper course, in the territory of Alba, still bears the name of Imele. The Sabellian tribes lying more to the east, the Marsi, Peligni, Marrucini, and Vestini, who had not taken part in the resistance of the Samnites, and, besides, were not in the immediate sphere of the power of Rome, formed an alliance with Rome on favourable conditions. The Sabine country also lost its independence, and was deprived of some territory; but the Roman settlers soon amalgamated with the natives, with whom they had had intercourse from early times.

In the course of the third century B.C. the Sabines were admitted to the full Roman citizenship, and were assigned to a particular division, with powers of administration and the right of voting, called the Tribus Quirina. Cures, the capital, though still in the Sabine country, took a privileged position, since it was allotted to the Tribus Sergia. From that time there grew up, side by side with the legends of the founders of Rome, the twin brothers Romulus and Remus, whose legal successors were the two consuls, the story of the Sabine kings, Titus Tatius and Numa Pompilius, such

as we have it presented to us now in the historians of the Augustan Age. In Umbria the road which led on the one hand over the Apennines to Picenum, on the other to Perugia and Etruria, was guarded by Rome through the planting of the colonies Narnia and Spoletium. Rome itself, which had been surrounded with new walls since the Gallic disaster, could be reckoned an almost impregnable fortress. These are the walls mentioned in history as those of Servius Tullius, parts of which are still standing.


Thus a few decades after the death of Alexander the Great of Macedon a power was founded which, as the head of a confederation, could throw the weight of almost the whole Apennine peninsula into the scale. The foreign policy and the supreme command in war belonged exclusively to Rome; the contingent which the allies had to furnish and the duties of each separate colony were fixed as a matter of course. It was estimated that the league could furnish in time of need over 700,000 foot-soldiers and 70,000 horse. The places where the troops had to meet were once for all settled. Thus, for operations against the Kelts in the north the rendezvous were Arretium in Etruria, and Ariminum, a colony founded in the year 268 B.C., on the Adriatic coast. Both points were connected with Rome by national roads.



A LEGENDARY KING OF ROME
The long, peaceful, and enlightened reign of Numa Pompilius, the Sabine philosopher, belongs to the realm of legend.

These roads, with Rome as their point of departure, exercised a consolidating effect, while the former communications had rather served the needs of separate districts or towns. The Via Appia led southward to Brundisium, which had been secured by a colony in the year 244 B.C. The small navies of the Greek towns, together with the Etruscan, Volscian, and Latin ships, formed the beginnings of a maritime power, which was first to test its strength and grow powerful in opposition to neighbouring Sicily, which enjoyed a large commerce.

The real centre of the power lay in the Roman citizen class, which was divided into thirty-five departments, the so-called



THE MAKER OF THE APPIAN WAY AND HIS HISTORIC APPEAL TO THE HONOUR OF ROME

Appius Claudius Cæcus, the senator whose oratory had raised him to a leading position in the state, and who built the first important aqueducts as well as the Appian Way, when old and feeble caused himself to be carried to the senate to appeal against the proposed peace with Pyrrhus, which, he urged, would be dishonourable to Rome. His appeal succeeded.

From the fresco by Maccari in the Senate House at Rome.

tribes, four urban and thirty-one rural. These tribes were made the basis both for voting and for levies, and thus became more and more important. Within the tribe the individual citizen was assessed

Extraordinary Increase of Citizens

according to his property, so that the man who was in a position to bear the larger burdens of the community enjoyed also the privilege of voting. Those without property were excluded on principle; but the social grievances were at all times successfully surmounted, since the newly-conquered territory was always redistributed among indigent citizens or the privileged classes of allies. The commonwealth was thus victoriously advancing, and the citizen body increased to an extent that roused the astonishment of the outside world. At the same time it was prepared to adopt vigorous action concerning every new question that arose.

In the north the Roman sphere of power bordered on the Gauls. In the islands the Carthaginians tried to make themselves more exclusively supreme, as regards both the Syracusans and also

any interference from Italy. Economic conditions, originally very simple, had been somewhat more developed under Greek influence since the settlement in Campania. The oldest standard of value in Latium, as among all pastoral peoples, seems to have been cattle, which is shown by the name "pecunia" (from *pecus*, cattle) for "money"; ten sheep were equivalent to one ox.

Besides this, precious metals were weighed out, and copper also, which served as the ordinary medium of exchange. The next step was to mark the bars of copper officially—for instance, with the figure of an ox. The later ones have the inscription *Romanom*—that is, *Romanorum*; over it is seen a pegasus, on the reverse a flying eagle with a thunderbolt in its claws.

From this was developed the oldest Roman coin, the *as*, on the obverse a head of Janus, on the reverse the bows of a ship, the arms of Rome, all well executed, but massive. Rome appears to have been in advance of the other Italians.

Economic Advance of Rome



REMAINS OF THE SERVIAN WALL OF ROME, NEARLY 2,500 YEARS OLD

Parts still remain, such as this near the railway-station, of the walls of Rome built by the sixth king, Servius Tullius, who surrounded the city with new walls after the Gallic disaster, making it an almost impregnable fortress.



THE STRUGGLE WITH CARTHAGE

THE GIANT NATIONS OF THE ANCIENT WORLD AND THEIR FIGHT FOR MASTERY

BEING THE STORY OF THE PUNIC WARS

WITH the entrance of Rome into general commerce begins the struggle which in its consequences determined the course of history in our part of the civilised world. It was a contest between the foremost power in Africa—in the ancient and narrower sense of the word—formerly the ally of the Etruscans, and the new leading power in Italy. Often in later times these waters have been the theatre of conflicts and struggles for empire.

It was in the beginning a struggle for Sicily. Besides the Carthaginian power, which had its strongholds in Lilybæum, in Drepana, and in Panormus, and Syracuse, which ruled the south-easterly part of the island, Campanian mercenaries had seized the power in Messana, through a revolution, and set up a state there, in which Oscan was the official language.

These so-called Mamertines found themselves forced to call in the help of their Italian kinsmen and even of the Romans if they did not wish to be overpowered by the Syracusans and Carthaginians. Only after considerable hesitation, and after the Carthaginians had already entered Messana, did the Romans determine to cross the straits. After this the Carthaginian garrison, by cunning, force, and negotiations, was made to withdraw in 264 B.C.

The Romans remained in Messana, much against the will of the Carthaginians and the Syracusans, who did not, however, long remain united. In the end Syracuse itself went over to the Romans in order to win support against the selfishness of Carthage. During their united action Agrigentum, a Greek town, but allied with Carthage against Syracuse, was taken. The Carthaginians retained only the places on the western coast, especially Lilybæum, to which at the same time assistance could be sent from Caralis. On the other hand,

the Romans renewed the attempt which Agathocles, tyrant of Syracuse, had made fifty years before to transfer the theatre of war to Africa.

But a fleet that should be able to face the Carthaginians had first to be built and organised by the Romans; and even then they were no match for their antagonists until they placed soldiers on board the ships and, by the employment of boarding-bridges, transferred to naval warfare the manœuvres of the land army. Thus in the year 260 B.C. the consul, M. Duilius, succeeded in defeating the Carthaginians at Mylæ, on the northern coast of Sicily, and in annihilating half of their fleet.

Encouraged in their projects, doubtless, by this success, the consuls of the year 256 B.C. landed an army in Africa, in order to compel Carthage to submit. As the war dragged on, the senate ordered part of the troops to return to Italy, while one of the consuls, M. Atilius Regulus, encamped with the other part near Tunis, and from that point blockaded Carthage. But after the Carthaginians had succeeded in enlisting mercenaries, the Numidian cavalry had hurried to their assistance, and the Greek tactician Xantippus had properly drilled the troops, Regulus sustained a complete defeat in 255 B.C., and only a small portion of his army saw Italy again. The war was again restricted

to Sicily, Corsica having been previously occupied by the Romans. On the whole, the Roman admirals proved themselves incompetent. In particular, they failed to take Sardinia. The southern coast of Sicily, which has no good harbour, and is excessively exposed to the tempestuous south wind, proved repeatedly disastrous to the naval operations. Even at the

**How the
Punic Wars
Began**

**Failure of
the Roman
Admirals**

present day ships sail from Cagliari, the old Caralis, or from Marsala, the old Lilybæum, directly to Tunis, in the vicinity of which ancient Carthage stood; but not from Syracuse or Agrigentum. In Western Sicily the Carthaginians held the strongest positions on land also—Lilybæum, Drepana, and Mount Eryx, which commands the country eastward of Drepana, and was renowned for its temple of Venus. Mount Ericta, above Panormus (now Monte Pellegrino), was occupied by Hamilcar Barca, the boldest of the Carthaginian generals, and made the starting-point of his raiding expeditions.

Both powers were weakened by a struggle which lasted twenty-three years, and was waged sometimes without spirit, sometimes with renewed energy. In Rome, which was the aggressive party, there were conflicting views. At the outset the senate, as well as the popular assembly, had supported the operations in Sicily, but their zeal cooled. The Italian peasantry saw that they would win nothing; that only the wealthy traders would gain by the continuance of the war, especially since the state of war stimulated profitable privateering. The great political aim, the liberation of the coasts and islands of Italy from the foreign dominion, seemed no longer attractive to the people. It was sufficient that Corsica was held, and that Syracuse was a strong ally of Rome in Sicily.

The decisive turn in events was given by the wealthy private individuals in Rome who directed the policy of the state, when they adopted the resolution of equipping a fleet at their own cost, and of once more trying whether permanent success could not be attained in Sicily. The attempt was successful. The Carthaginian fleet, which, heavily laden with reinforcements and provisions, was steering towards the harbour of Drepana, was attacked, defeated, and annihilated off the Ægæan Islands.

The moral effect was still greater than the material loss. The Carthaginians were at the end of their pecuniary resources as much as the Romans were; but, while the latter were waging war with their own forces, the Carthaginians had

their mercenaries to pay, which were collected from Libya, Greece, Gaul, Liguria, and even from among the Campanians. Now, after this disaster, these soldiers, who had long been put off with promises, could no longer be restrained.


They refused to obey orders, in Sicily, and soon after in Sardinia and in Africa. The Carthaginian generals, who, with the exception of Hamilcar, had lost the confidence of their troops, adopted preposterous measures. Rome had offered peace on condition that Sicily was evacuated; Hamilcar, who conducted the negotiations, laid great stress on the importance of keeping Caralis for Carthage, and had given up Lilybæum and Drepana in exchange.

In the meantime, the mercenaries were led over to Africa, although no means were forthcoming to satisfy their demands, and no plans had been formed for keeping the mutinous masses in check. The Carthaginian government had completely lost its head; incompetent aristocrats got themselves appointed as colleagues of Hamilcar, with equal powers, until he suddenly withdrew. The soldiers then


mutinied, and masses of them chose leaders of their own, Campanians, Gauls, or Libyans, with the immediate object of obtaining their pay. But the movement might well have gone further, and Carthage have shared the fate of Messana, where the Mamertines had massacred the males, and taken the women for their wives. Even Syracuse had once been saved from its mercenaries only through the energetic measures of Hiero, a service which gained him the crown of the Sicilian kingdom. In the same manner Carthage was now saved, after

years of desperate efforts, by Hamilcar Barca, to whom the terrified citizens entrusted the supreme command with unlimited powers. He brought about a thorough reorganisation of the whole political system. Hamilcar took over the command of the army and the direction of foreign affairs. The aristocratic party, which had shown itself as incapable in carrying on the war as in checking the mutiny, was completely crippled for the future, while Hamilcar handed down his

The Carthage Mercenaries in Revolt



ATILIUS REGULUS
One of the most eminent of the Roman commanders engaged in the First Punic War.



REGULUS RETURNING TO CARTHAGE AND HIS FATE: A DRAMATIC EPISODE OF THE FIRST PUNIC WAR

The consul, Atilius Regulus, achieved immense success in the campaign against Carthage, but refused to grant peace. He was soon after defeated and taken captive to Carthage, whence he was sent to Rome to propose an exchange of prisoners and a peace arrangement; but in the event of failing, to return to Carthage. He dissuaded his countrymen from accepting the conditions he was sent to offer, and returned, in accordance with his oath, to Carthage, where he was tortured horribly before he died.



SOLDIERS OF THE ARMY THAT SAVED ITALY FROM HANNIBAL

A fine sculpture in high relief from the base of the Antonine Column, representing soldiers of the victorious Roman army, which, as Tacitus said, went out not to battle but to war. It is one of the least damaged reliefs of its kind in Rome.

post of general of the state first to his son-in-law, and then to his son. Their policy was directed towards an aggressive war against Rome, which had deprived them of their superiority at sea. The Romans perfidiously availed themselves of the revolt of the mercenaries to seize Sardinia and, above all, Caralis, a point most important for the position of Carthage in the world; and the Punic capital, busied with internal disorder, had been unable to prevent this. Hamilcar Barca, like any other Carthaginian, had never been able to forgive the Romans for this step.

If we would realise the importance of Caralis to the commercial and political power of Carthage, we must study the commercial treaties of the Carthaginians. From them we see that the foreign trade was organised in Carthaginian Sicily on a much freer system than in Africa or in

Hamilcar's Scheme of Vengeance

Sardinia, which seemed an island belonging to the southern continent. Trade was here strictly supervised, and the Sardinian Sea closed to the subjects of a state which was not admitted to treaty rights. The indignation of the Carthaginians at the loss of Sardinia had greatly contributed to the granting of full power to Hamilcar in

carrying out his far-sighted scheme of vengeance. Since Carthage was outstripped at sea, Hamilcar was driven to begin land operations, in order to acquire for Carthage enlarged spheres of commerce, and to

Founding of New Carthage

renew her position as a power. He went with his army to Spain, where the Phœnicians had till now occupied merely the south coast and the Balearic Isles. Thence he pushed into the interior, seized the mining districts, and founded in the neighbourhood an arsenal, with the significant name of "New Carthage." The administration was completely in the hands of the general, who struck coins of his own, and set about bringing the Spanish chiefs into relations of personal loyalty to himself. The Spanish trade with Africa revived.

Nothing is more characteristic of the citizens of Carthage than that they regarded the whole enterprise from the commercial point of view, as one intended to replace the lost market with a new one. Only on the north coast was there competition with some Greek towns, which were favoured by Massilia and thus indirectly by Rome. The Romans demanded that Carthage should not cross the

line of the Ebro, and concluded with Saguntum, which actually lay to the south of that river, a treaty which was expressly recognised by Hasdrubal. The Greek towns in the country, moreover, took an active part in the newly-opened trade with Africa, and assimilated their currency to the Carthaginian monetary standards, as had been already

Long Preparations for Revenge

done in Sicily by the Carthaginians, who elsewhere retained their Babylonian-

Tyrian system of coinage. The Carthaginian commanders required time to complete their schéme of organisation. Hamilcar trained his army and the future generals by constant wars with the natives. Though the business interests of the republic were too vast to allow of any hard-and-fast policy, the preparations for the war of revenge were carried on for decades in Spain with marvellous pertinacity.

Meantime, the Romans secured the frontiers of their Italian dominion, in the country of the Po, and on the Illyrian coast. They chastised the pirates of the coasts of Dalmatia and Epirus, who harassed the trade between the seaports of Picenum and the country of the Senones and the Greek places on the islands and on the mainland. The Gallic tribes north of the Po also, especially the Insubrians, were attacked, and two colonies were founded to guard the passages of the river, which were called Cremona and Placentia.

Even the country lying further back, which was still swampy or wooded in many parts, was now opened up, and only the way across the Central Apennine passes was avoided, since the Roman generals preferred to march by a long circuit over the Umbrian Mountains in the east or over the most westerly pass from Pisæ to Placentia. Here, in the Keltic country, everything was still incomplete; the territory of the Senones had been allotted

to Roman settlers, after the former inhabitants had been expelled by force, and the opposition of the Boii was still to be broken, so that no one at this time contemplated a new war between Rome and Carthage. The Carthaginians could make great exertions in the subjugation of Iberia, the Romans in their wars against the Kelts. Between them lay the civilised zone of Massilia, which stretched far into Gaul and the Alps, and after the close of the First Punic War had come into fresh prominence

Death of the Great Hamilcar

at sea. It was only owing to unforeseen occurrences that the efforts of Carthage did not lead to a permanent consolidation of its power in Spain. Hamilcar Barca, after nine years of splendid achievement, was killed in an attack by the enemy in 229 B.C.

The army and the Carthaginian generals present recognised his son-in-law, Hasdrubal, as commander; Hamilcar's three sons, whom he had taken with him to Spain, Hannibal, Hasdrubal, and Mago,

were not yet grown up, the eldest being only nineteen years old. The new commander pursued the aims of Hamilcar until he too fell, in 221 B.C., by an assassin's hand. The officers and the army now raised the young Hannibal to the supreme command, but not without loud opposition in Carthage against this family policy. This was the reason that Hannibal made an active start to maintain his position. If once the war with Rome was on them, he knew he was secure. Hannibal, after subduing some of the



HANNIBAL, THE CARTHAGINIAN GENERAL
Hannibal, son of Hamilcar, and a greater military genius, led the Carthaginian army in the Second Punic War.

tribes of Central Spain, advanced against Saguntum and besieged it with all his forces. He did not trouble himself about the intervention of the Romans; and, indeed, such intervention would have had little effect at Carthage. Thus, war was decided on; the senate at Rome deliberated the question at every meeting



HANNIBAL AS A BOY SWEARING ETERNAL ENMITY TO ROME

In Hannibal's early life Spain was the great scene of Roman and Carthaginian rivalry. The boy was educated in his father's camp, experiencing all the rough life of campaigning, and at nine passed into Spain with his father, when the latter made him take a solemn vow never to be at peace with Rome. Reproduced from the painting by Benjamin West.

until the capture of Saguntum was announced. Then it was decided to begin hostilities simultaneously in Africa and in Spain at the beginning of the following year, 219 B.C.

Every preparation had been already made at Carthage for this event. Africa was supplied with a strong garrison from Spain in order to keep in check the Libyan subjects and also the allied tribes, and to guard against any landing of the Romans. A second army, under the command of Hasdrubal, brother of Hannibal, was to hold Spain, not merely for Carthage, but especially for the Barcids. Thence were to be sent the reinforcements which Hannibal might at any time require. Hannibal,

with the flower of the army, was to cross the Pyrenees, march through Gaul, and join hands with the Kelts on the other side of the Alps, who were still fighting against Rome, or were inclined to rebel—a magnificent plan, and carefully prepared, since already an understanding had been arrived at with the Italian Kelts. Its practicability, however, had been over-estimated, owing to the deficient geographical knowledge of the time;

Hannibal lost half of his troops on the march. Besides this, it had been prematurely undertaken in so far as Spain had not yet been completely pacified; but, whatever the result, it was a marvellous undertaking. Carthaginian officers who accompanied Hannibal, as well as Roman senators who served in the campaign,

Fabius Pictor, Cincius Alimentus, and others wrote on the subject. Two generations later these materials were worked up in a well-ordered way by the Greek Polybius of Megalopolis, who, during a prolonged stay in Italy, came into close relations with the foremost Roman families, among them the Scipios.

At Rome, after the news of the capture of Saguntum and when negotiations had been broken off, it was resolved to send one consular army on a fleet of one hundred and sixty ships from Sicily to begin an attack on Africa, and to despatch a second to Spain. When this latter landed in the territory of Massilia the news came of Hannibal's march through the country. A cavalry detachment, sent out to reconnoitre, engaged the enemy in a skirmish, without being

**Contemporary
Chronicles of
the Punic War**

able to block the Carthaginian general's passage over the Rhone, or to prevent him from continuing his march to the Alps. The consul P. Cornelius Scipio thereupon determined to send a part of his troops into Northern Spain under the command of his brother, Gnæus, but with the other part to return to his starting-point, Pisæ,

**Hannibal's
Elephants
Cross the Alps**

and from there to march to Placentia, where, meantime, two prætors were conducting operations against the Kelts.

Five months after his start from Carthago Nova, in the late autumn of the year 218 B.C., Hannibal arrived with 20,000 foot soldiers and 6,000 horse among the Kelts of Upper Italy, after crossing the Alps by a pass which cannot be exactly determined; it is noteworthy that he brought with him elephants, which suffered much on this march. He had to fight innumerable skirmishes with the Celtic mountain tribes; and then, when he had reached the plain, the Ligurian tribe of the Taurini showed themselves so hostile that their capital, the present Turin, had to be stormed.

Other Celtic tribes, however, especially the Insubrians, near the present Milan, showed themselves at once ready to support the Carthaginians against the Romans, with whom they had fought years before; and when Hannibal won considerable successes, first on the Ticinus, the present Ticino, against the consul P. Cornelius Scipio, then to the south of the Po, on the river Trebia, where the defile leads into the country of Placentia, against the troops arrived from Sicily under the other consul, Tiberius Sempronius Longus, a general defection ensued. Even the Ligurians, settled in the south on both sides of the mountains, went over to Hannibal, so that he could take up winter quarters without molestation, and obtain news as to the passes over the Apennines, which were to be crossed at the beginning of the

**Rome
in a State
of Crisis**

the next campaign. Hamilcar's plan of carrying the war into Italy had succeeded, though at a great loss in men and animals.

The Roman plan of campaign had failed in the first year. Both consuls were beaten, and the troops sent to Spain were in a dangerous position, as the Punic cruisers cut off all supplies. The excitement at Rome was intense. The consular elections were impending. There were factions even after the settlement

of the struggle with the plebeians, who since then had the nomination of one consul. The people were still influenced by agrarian conditions. In the year 233 B.C. their leader, C. Flaminius, had proposed and carried the distribution of the Gallic territory north of Picenum among Roman citizens. This C. Flaminius, who did not enjoy the confidence of the other party, was chosen consul as representative of the plebeians; his patrician colleague was Cn. Servilius.

The question how the war was to be conducted was hotly debated at Rome. The party of C. Flaminius was for an energetic attack, the rival party for a more cautious policy. The existing Roman constitution involved the election of two commanders, who followed the suggestions of their party. To Cn. Servilius fell the supreme command of the army collected at Ariminum; to C. Flaminius that over the second army, posted at Arretium in Etruria. Each consisted of two legions of five thousand (or, precisely, 5,200) foot-soldiers and three hundred cavalry. In addition came

**Hannibal
Threatening
Rome**

the divisions of the allies, so that the force of Cn. Servilius was raised to forty thousand foot and four thousand horse,

and that of C. Flaminius to thirty thousand foot and three thousand horse. It was proposed to block the march of the Carthaginians on Rome, should they advance by the Via Flaminia or one of the Ligurian and Etrurian passes. Similar operations had been conducted in the last campaigns against the Kelts, in 225 B.C., when the Kelts invaded Etruria. Besides this, a reserve army of eight thousand men was placed in the Umbrian Alps, near Plestia, under C. Centenius, a man who held no office, to whom the prætor of the city had given the command because he himself did not venture to leave the city. The start of the two consuls took place, at least as far as C. Flaminius was concerned, under unfavourable auspices, a circumstance which the conservative party employed later greatly to their own advantage.

All was still in confusion when Hannibal advanced to the attack. He did not cross the nearest pass, but marched to the west, where he could avoid the positions of Lucca and Pistoja, and march between them, along the swampy plain of the Arno, to Fæsulæ, a route that no one

had considered possible, so that Flaminius was completely surprised. From Fæsulae, Hannibal struck southward, hardly giving his followers time to recover from the exhausting march, and laid waste the country right under the eyes of the enemy. Flaminius' staff were, however, opposed to attacking until the junction with Cn.

**The Great
Battle at Lake
Trasimene**

Servilius was accomplished. Hannibal then threw himself between the hostile armies. He did not here attack Flaminius, whose attention was chiefly directed to guarding Clusium, but turned south of Cortona, along the lake of Trasimene, towards Perugia, whence he could reach the Flaminian Way, the other road which led to Rome. Hannibal foresaw that the consul, fearing to risk his popularity by longer delay, would follow him, and laid an ambush for Flaminius near the lake, which is surrounded on the north by a range of hills. The Roman army fell into the trap; on a misty morning, attacked simultaneously in front and in the rear, it was completely broken up; C. Flaminius himself was killed, and the next day the Roman vanguard, which had escaped, was compelled to surrender.

The road by Fulginium was thus open to Hannibal. He sent on his advance guard as far as Spolegium and Narnia,

places which were put into a state of siege; the bridges also were broken down. In consequence, Hannibal resolved to try the other road, which the victory at Trasimene had opened. He first broke up the reserve army of the Romans on the height of the Camerinian Alps, near the lake of Plestia. Hannibal then crossed over to Picenum. Servilius, who, on receiving news, had sent out his cavalry from Etruria and followed with the infantry, saw that he had come too late.

Without making an attack, he withdrew to Ariminum and the fortresses near the Po, while Hannibal reached the coast of the Adriatic Sea on the tenth day after the battle at Trasimene, and there obtained rich sources of supplies for his troops. The horses in particular, whose numbers had been much diminished by

**When Joy
Reigned at
Carthage**

the exertions of the campaign so far, were the object of Hannibal's greatest attention. He equipped his Libyan infantry with Roman weapons, since these had proved superior in the previous battles. Booty was abundant. Joy reigned at Carthage, and the necessary reinforcements were sent to Spain as well as to Italy. The countries of the east had already fixed their eyes on affairs in Italy, since the whole basin of the Mediterranean must have been



PERUGIA'S PEACEFUL LAKE, THE SCENE OF A GREAT BATTLE IN THE PUNIC WAR
Lake Trasimene, now the Lake of Perugia, is celebrated for the great battle fought here between Hannibal and Flaminius, 217 B.C., when the Romans lost between 6,000 and 15,000 lives, and 10,000 men were taken prisoners



THE FLAMINIAN WAY: PART OF THE ACTUAL ROAD TAKEN BY HANNIBAL

The Via Flaminia, now the Furlo Pass, the direct road to Rome through the Apennines, fell to Hannibal as the result of his victory at Trasimene over C. Flaminius, the builder of this famous way, near which the railway now runs.

concerned in the outcome of a struggle which had assumed such dimensions. At Rome all was confusion when the news of the defeat at Lake Trasimene, and soon after of that at Plestia, arrived. As it was thought that the enemy must immediately advance against the capital, the divisions of seniors, who were not bound to serve in the field, were called out; at the same time, with the omission of the usual formalities, since the one consul was dead and the other absent, Q. Fabius Maximus, the old leader of the conservatives against the agitations of C. Flaminius, was appointed dictator. Sixteen years before he had celebrated a triumph over the Ligurians.

Fabius took over the army of Cn. Servilius, strengthened it by new levies, and

**Hannibal's
Triumphant
Progress**

followed Hannibal, who, meantime, marched through the country of the Prætutti (from whom the "Abruzzi" derives its name), the Marrucini, and the Frentani, meeting with no resistance; for here, on the east coast, the Romans had no colony south of Hadria, while the federal towns possessed only antiquated fortifications. All that remained loyal to Rome was ravaged by Hannibal. At the same time, he accelerated the process of defection from Rome. The

opposition of the individual tribes and towns to Rome revived; all that had been suppressed by the Romans rose once more. In Lower Italy there was the rivalry of the Lucani and Bruttii with the Greek towns; in Apulia, the opposition of Canusium and Arpi; in Campania, the intolerance of the Roman rule; and the same with the Samnites. But the Latin colonies everywhere remained true to Rome, and Hannibal was therefore compelled to take the Adriatic littoral north of Apulia as the base of his operations.

The policy of Q. Fabius Maximus was to conduct the war cautiously, since, indeed, C. Flaminius, holding the opposite view, had lost his army and his life by his impetuous action. Accordingly, when he reached Apulia from Latium, Fabius marched after the enemy at a safe distance, and avoided every encounter, in the hope of wearying and outmanœuvring the Carthaginian general. But Hannibal comprehended this method of fighting, since he was accustomed to study, not merely the country, but the opposing general. He attacked the allies, who remained loyal to the Romans, before the eyes of the "Delayer," or *Cunctator*. He crossed into the valley of the Volturnus

and ravaged the territory of Beneventum. He advanced into Campania, where he plundered the rich land north of Capua. He then went unimpeded past Samnium into the territory of the Frentani, in which he accumulated great stores for the winter, without being attacked by the dictator; so that, finally, Q. Fabius lost his reputation with the army and the

Rome Prepares for a Final Effort

popular assembly. The more energetic magister equitum, M. Minucius, was given equal powers with the dictator, an unparalleled step. But when M. Minucius, soon afterwards, through his rashness, came near to being crushed by Hannibal, and Fabius went to his aid, popular feeling changed once more in favour of the dictator. His term of office expired after six months' tenure, when Cn. Servilius, as consul, began to officiate again, together with the colleague chosen in place of C. Flaminius. There were already agitations about the consular elections of the ensuing year.

L. Æmilius Paullus, who had previously held a command in the wars against the Kelts and the Illyrians, was chosen out of the patricians; C. Terentius Varro, who had led the opposition against Q. Fabius Maximus, was the plebeian choice. The senate resolved to raise the consular armies to double their ordinary strength—that is, that each consul should have four legions instead of two under his command. This, with the contingents of allies, would give an army of 80,000 men. Troops were also sent against the Kelts on the Po, who had provisioned the Spanish army. The consuls of the previous year and the more experienced troops were assigned to the army operating against Hannibal in order to resist him more stubbornly. The war was to be decided once for all this year, 216 B.C., by one mighty effort.

Hannibal had encamped during the winter with his army, which amounted to 40,000 foot and 10,000 horse, at Gereonium, in the country of the Frentani. His strength lay in his cavalry, and after that in the troops which he had brought with him from Spain. The Kelts, who had shared the march through the swamps of Etruria, the battle of Trasimene, and the passage over the mountains into Lower Italy, would never have followed another general as they did Hannibal, whose bravery filled them with awe, and whose

successes astonished them. He was the soul of an army composed of soldiers of the most distinct nationalities; there were Africans, Iberians, Ligurians, Kelts, men from the Balearic Islands, and emigrants from the Greek towns of Sicily, where one party favoured Carthage, and most of its leaders were, consequently, in exile at Carthage. Hannibal himself, married to a Spanish wife, and possessing the Greek education then prevalent in the basin of the Mediterranean, revered, next to his father Hamilcar, Alexander the Great and Pyrrhus of Epirus, whom he took as models.

Maharbal, his second-in-command, who had done excellent service at Trasimene and at Plestia, stood at his side. After the decisive battle in Etruria, he had followed the surviving Romans and had concluded terms of surrender with them, which were disregarded by Hannibal. The latter ordered the Roman citizens to be thrown into chains, but let the allies go free. He waged war, he said, only with Rome. By this policy he hoped to dissolve the Italian confederacy, to restrict

What Carthage Fought for

Campania and Samnium independent. This had been the state of affairs some hundred years before, when the first commercial treaties between Rome and Carthage were effected. Sardinia and Western Sicily were to become once more Carthaginian, and Syracuse was to withdraw from the alliance with Rome. The Carthaginian plan included a general political reaction towards the old state system.

This was the stake played for when Hannibal, in the year 216 B.C., opened the campaign in Apulia. The Romans had accumulated their supplies in the district of Canusium, near Cannæ, in the well-cultivated country on the river Aufidus, which was protected against an immediate attack of the Carthaginians by the colony of Luceria, and in the south had a stronghold in the colony of Venusia. Hannibal, nevertheless, was successful in taking Cannæ, by which means he came into possession of a strategically important point. This brought on the decisive battle for which both sides wished.

Hannibal, in order to manœuvre his cavalry, required a level country, a battlefield which, therefore, the Romans ought to have avoided. But they were without any unity of leadership, for the two

consuls held the command on alternate days, as prescribed by the Roman constitution. Nor could the two commanders agree, so that the choice of the battlefield was left to the enemy.

Hannibal posted the Iberians and the Africans on the wings, the Kelts in the centre, where he himself was. He knew that the Kelts would stand firm if it was war to the death, and, besides that, they had him with them. The infantry, generally, was to keep the serried columns of the Romans engaged, and the cavalry to operate on the flanks and in the rear of the enemy until an advance should complete their overthrow. This ably planned manœuvre succeeded entirely, and resulted in a defeat such as the Romans never before or since sustained. The "black" day of the Allia, when the Kelts overthrew the Romans, was matched by the "black" day of Cannæ, when Hannibal conquered the two consuls of whom Æmilius Paullus, with many others—including Cn. Servilius—perished. Terentius Varro escaped to Venusia. The Roman army lost seventy thousand men, while the rest were scattered in all directions. Hannibal

**The Romans
Lose
70,000 Men**

seemed to have attained the goal of his policy, and his father's plan appeared to be completely realised. Not only Arpi in Apulia, Tarentum and the other Greek towns of Lower Italy—Rhegium excepted—with the majority of the Bruttii, but even Capua, the second town in Italy after Rome, with which it had been for more than one hundred years closely united, went over to the Carthaginians, and Hannibal declared his intention of making Capua the first town of the peninsula. Syracuse also broke the treaty with Rome and joined the Carthaginians. King Philip of Macedonia meditated opening negotiations with Hannibal, since the interests of his kingdom on the Illyrian coast had been harmed by repeated attacks of the Romans. Egypt alone of the eastern powers observed a friendly neutrality towards Rome, since Alexandria disputed with Carthage the position of the first commercial city. Italy, which had suffered immensely during the war, drew its supply of grain from Egypt.

The Roman government called out for service the entire male population capable of bearing arms. Even slaves were brought into the ranks of the legions on the promise that they should be emancipated

if they fought well. This shows the favourable position which up to this time the servants enjoyed under the *patres familiarum*. Rome thus placed on a war footing in one year twenty-two or twenty-three legions, not full ones, of course, while at the beginning, in 217, only thirteen legions in all were put into the field. In addition, there were

**The City
in Desperate
Strai's**

troops outside of Italy, in Sardinia, Sicily, and in Spain. There was the necessity of being on the watch against a diversion from Macedonia; and, consequently, a garrison was kept up in Brundisium. Finally, one or two armies were kept in the north to intercept contingents from the Keltic country or reinforcements from Spain. But without reinforcements Hannibal was not in a position to assume the offensive against Rome by himself, while the Romans could send out their forces, under their best commanders, to the critical points; first of all, against Syracuse and Capua, over the defection of which the greatest bitterness prevailed.

The siege of the two towns, the scenes of the chief operations of the next years, was difficult, owing to the desperate resistance of the guilty parties. But it was successfully brought to a close, and a terrible retribution was enacted. Syracuse was sacked and then changed into a provincial town in 212 B.C. In Capua, after the execution of all suspected persons, the town territory was proclaimed forfeited to the victor, by which means the most fertile part of Campania became the public domain of the Romans. The town itself was reduced to a village, a sort of appanage of the temple of Diana on Mount Tifata, a famous place of pilgrimage above the town, which was not molested on religious grounds. The territory of the Capuans remained in this position till the time of Julius Cæsar. Hannibal had in vain staked everything to free Capua. Once,

**Hannibal
Before the
Walls of Rome**

in a bold march, of which later writers had many stories to relate, he had advanced right up to the walls of Rome, in order thus to draw off the blockading army. There was great alarm in Rome at his approach, but Hannibal could not seriously attempt an attack on the well-fortified capital, and withdrew.

The Carthaginians had tried to relieve Syracuse by their fleet. But it was shown that Rome, since the end of the first Punic

War, had the superiority at sea. In Spanish waters Massilia, her ally, offered the desired support. The Carthaginian fleet proved too weak, and did not risk a battle. Communication with Carthage, which had been open after the battles at Lake Trasimene and at Cannæ, was now cut off. It followed that Hannibal could no longer be informed of important matters, while the Romans, with their privateers, took prisoners, from whom they received timely news of the plans of their great adversary.

The alliance with Philip of Macedon was not effective, because guerrilla warfare in Greece, especially with the Ætolians, demanded the attention of King Philip of Macedonia and his Achæan allies, and then the Romans made a demonstration with a fleet in Greek waters. Hannibal stood on the defensive, without trying to bring matters to a decision. The Romans took Tarentum from him, but lost in the year 208

B.C. both consuls, for whom Hannibal had laid an ambush. He wished, however, to await the reinforcements which his brother, Hasdrubal, was to bring him overland from Spain. Although the Carthaginians had experienced a heavy blow from the young P. Cornelius Scipio, the son of the consul, when he took New Carthage by a stratagem and made their allies waver, Hasdrubal succeeded in crossing the Pyrenees and in leading his army through Gaul over the Alps, under decidedly more favourable conditions than his brother had done ten years before—a proof of the important effect which the march of Hannibal had produced even in subsequent years towards opening the lines of communication from the west to the east.

The winter of 208–207 B.C. Hasdrubal spent in Celtic territory, planning in the spring to advance to Umbria by the Flaminian road. This plan was frustrated, because the messengers of Hasdrubal never reached his brother, but were captured. The whole plan was betrayed to the Romans, who could take their counter-measures. One consular army, under M. Livius Salinator, guarded the Flaminian road; the other,


under C. Claudius Nero, opposed Hannibal in Lucania. When Claudius learned from the captured despatches the combined movements of the Carthaginian generals he determined on a bold manœuvre, which proves that the Roman commanders had greatly improved in strategy in the war with Hannibal. Nero left part of his

troops behind, facing Hannibal, who undertook no serious operations, but awaited news. The Romans had other principles than we moderns for the rapid concentration of an army on one point. The consul hurried on northward with the best troops, while he requisitioned waggons and placed his men in them, in order to unite with M. Livius for the decisive blow against Hasdrubal. They met him south of the River Metaurus, near Sena Gallica. Hasdrubal did not wish to fight alone; but while trying to escape he was defeated and slain. The expedition coming to his aid from North Italy, strengthened by the Kelt,

an expedition on which Hannibal rested all his hopes, was frustrated by this battle. Nero hastened back after the battle as quickly as he had come, and in six days he was again with his troops in the south. The head of Hasdrubal was thrown into his brother Hannibal's camp.

From that time Hannibal gave up the war as lost, but maintained his position in the country of the Bruttii, although restricted to a constantly diminishing territory. He finally took up his position in the country round Croton, not far from the Lacinian Promontory, where the famous shrine of Juno stood. Here he placed a votive offering with an inscription, in which he stated the number of the troops with

which he had come out of Spain into Italy to fight Rome, his hereditary foe. Castra Hannibalis remained in the recollection of later ages as the name of the place. The decisive blow came from the secondary theatres of war. P. Cornelius Scipio had formed alliances in Spain with the Numidian chiefs, among whom there were two rivals—the young Masinissa and Syphax. Mago, the youngest brother of Hannibal, finally evacuated the country of



SCIPIO AFRICANUS

Took the name of Africanus because it was he who engaged Hannibal on African soil and won the decisive victory over the forces of Carthage.

Rome's
Fortunes
Brighten

The Tide
Turns Against
Carthage

THE STRUGGLE WITH CARTHAGE

Gades, in order to cut his way through with the fleet to Hannibal. Thereupon Scipio received at Rome the consulship for 205 B.C. and at the same time the command in Sicily, with permission to transfer the war thence to Africa. In fact, Scipio landed in the year 204 B.C. in Africa, where the allies of the Carthaginians were then troublesome and Numidian dissension was at work. The Carthaginian supremacy began to totter, as formerly in the year 241 B.C. Masinissa succeeded in taking the kingdom of Syphax, and proved himself the most active partisan of the Romans, in consequence of which the Carthaginian troops were everywhere beaten. In these circumstances the Carthaginian

Hannibal Recalled to Carthage government resolved to summon to their aid Hannibal and his army from Italy. It was in the year 202 B.C., sixteen years after Hannibal had first trodden the soil of Italy. He obeyed the summons. As negotiations with Scipio led to no results, arms had to decide. At Naraggara, in the vicinity of Zama—there were two places of this name, which makes the matter difficult to settle—five days march from Carthage, the armies

met. The Carthaginians lost the battle, since their opponents were far superior in cavalry, and Scipio had manœuvred skilfully. After the fight Hannibal rode to the coast, 200 miles away. He soon became convinced that further resistance was impossible. Terms of peace were proposed, according to which Carthage gave up

Carthage Loses her Proud Place all her foreign possessions, not only the islands, but also Spain, and renounced all aspirations for an independent foreign policy. She had to recognise Masinissa as ruler of Numidia, to surrender her fleet, and pay the costs of the war. Carthage was now a petty state, as Rome had been 150 years before, and was restricted to her original territory. The allied towns, Utica, Hadrumetum, Leptis, were put into a position to resist successfully the efforts which Carthage made once more to consolidate her possessions.

By the peace of the year 201 B.C. the positions of the powers in the basin of the Mediterranean were finally changed. Carthage, whose influence formerly extended from Phœnicia to the Pillars of Hercules, had been hurled from her proud place ;



RUINS OF THE TEMPLES OF PÆSTUM, A ROMAN COLONY IN LUCANIA

One of the colonies which, founded after the years of stress of the Hannibalic wars, established the superiority of the Latin over the Greek population in Italy. The above is taken from the painting by W. Linton in the Tate Gallery.

Italy, until then the plaything of foreign nations, now set about arranging the frontiers on a system much more favourable to herself, especially those of the opposite coasts—Africa, Spain, Illyricum, and Greece. But she had also gained a firm place in the state system of the East. Friendly relations had been established with Egypt at the time hostilities against Macedonia began in the last war; and as Macedonia, in combination with Syria, opposed the annexations which had been claimed or brought about by the Ptolemies in favour of the Alexandrian trade, Syria also was confronted with Rome. Besides Egypt, the smaller states, which were oppressed by the adjoining great powers, such as Pergamus and Rhodes, rested their hopes on Rome. Macedonia was humiliated in the year 197 B.C. by the victory at the “Dogs’ Heads” (Cynoscephalæ, near Pharsalus), and the Illyrian coast was permanently occupied. But Greece, the mother of all higher culture in Rome, from an enthusiastic love of Hellenism, was declared to be free.

Some years after, war followed with Antiochus of Syria, who had interfered with Greek commerce. Hannibal, who had been exiled from Carthage, was with Antiochus, although the proud Seleucid paid little heed to his advice. While Macedonia remained neutral, Pergamus and Rhodes caused the Romans, who had driven Antiochus out of Greece, to cross over to Asia in 190 B.C. The consul L. Cornelius Scipio, brother of Publius, led the army across. Antiochus met with so decisive a defeat at Magnesia on the Sipylus that he was forced to evacuate the territories this side of the Taurus, then an important boundary between states and races. At Ilium, Scipio greeted the supposed kinsmen of the Romans. Pergamus and Rhodes had ample territory allotted to them, while the Galatians,

**End of
the Great
Hannibal**

who for a century had played a chief part in all Asiatic struggles, were attacked and punished by an expedition into their homes in the year 189 B.C. Hannibal, hunted from one corner to another, died by his own hand at the little town of Libyssa in Bithynia. There a Roman emperor of Punic descent, Septimius Severus, erected a monument to him almost 400 years afterwards. Such was the end of the great antagonist of the Romans. He died in

183 B.C. at the age of sixty-five, at about the same time as P. Cornelius Scipio.

The great revolution which the Hannibalic War had begun in Italy was now completed. All the communities which had deserted to Hannibal were punished by the loss of their territory, which was distributed among Roman colonists or allies who had remained loyal. Tarentum, Croton, Thurii, Sipontum, were made colonies, and in this way the superiority of the Latin over the Greek population was established for the future. The same was the case on the Lucanian coast, where Pæstum was founded as a colony. On the gulf, northward, the town Picetia had previously stood; this was reduced to a village, on account of its decided leaning towards the Carthaginians, and the colony of Salernum, the modern Salerno, was planted on its territory. In the district of Naples the colony of Puteoli was founded, which soon attracted a great share of the transmarine commerce.

In a similar way the Romans were active on the northern frontiers. The Kelts and Ligurians had to pay for their conduct in

**Roman
Power
Consolidated**

showing themselves conciliatory and helpful to Hannibal. The two colonies of Placentia and Cremona especially were strengthened, the Apennine passes and the valleys leading to them were cleared, and complete cantons were transplanted. The districts which had shown themselves of importance during the Hannibalic War were secured by the planting of colonies. Such were sent to Luna, near the modern Spezia and Carrara, and to Luca in Liguria. In the Celtic country Bononia was then made a colony; soon afterwards followed Mutina and Parma, then Aquileia in the country of the Veneti, and, finally, Eoredia at the foot of the important Alpine pass leading to Transalpine Gaul. The construction of roads went hand in hand with this process, highways being built from Arretium to Bononia and from Ariminum to Placentia.

Thus the Roman-Italian power on the Apennine peninsula was once more put on a firm basis. The Po district was already reckoned geographically as belonging to Italy, although strictly, according to political laws, Italy did not extend beyond the Arnus and Ariminum. Like Sicily and Sardinia, Cisalpine Gaul also was a province, but it was administered, not by prætors, but directly by the consuls.

ANCIENT
ROME
III



DECLINE
OF THE
REPUBLIC

THE DECLINE OF THE REPUBLIC AND THE CORRUPTION OF THE OLIGARCHY

THE senate of Rome, which directed the internal and external policy, still stood at the head of the state. It was the supreme arbiter of the affairs of the Italian confederacy, and, outside Italy, of all powers in the basin of the Mediterranean. It had to be ready to answer all questions which concerned the narrow home territory, as well as to settle the disputes of African or Asiatic potentates. If we add to this the economic conditions, which were given quite a new aspect by the victories of Rome, and now required serious consideration, we can estimate what a burden of business was then weighing on the Roman government.

This government formed a complete oligarchy, since the magistrates were only the executive organs of the senate. The popular assembly submitted usually to the will of the senate, even in the matter of the election of the magistrates. It was

**How
Rome was
Governed**

exceptional for an opposition to be formed and to have its candidate elected. The representative of the opposition could, as consul, effect very little against the will of the senate, and this was ensured by the circumstances that the other consul necessarily belonged to the opposite party, and that the consent of the two consuls was requisite for every act of government. Besides this, the office lasted only one year, when the senate was again free from any undesirable man. Re-election, according to the more recent laws, was possible only after a considerable interval.

In the senate itself there were rival factions, in which personal rather than real differences mostly turned the scale. Thus M. Porcius Cato, a Tusculan, who had acquired the highest reputation in Rome, opposed all his life the group of the Scipios. These prided themselves on having fought the battles of the republic in Spain, Africa, and Asia. The one brother took the name "Africanus," the other "Asiaticus." In answer to which, Cato, in his History of

Ancient Italy, took care to mention, not the names of the great generals, but only that of a famous war elephant, "Syrus."

With reference to foreign policy, the question was long debated whether dependent principalities should be governed by client kings—"friends and allies of the Roman people"—and dependent republics by the party which observed

**The
Colonial
System**

the interests of Rome—when Macedonia rose under King Perseus, it was divided in the year 168 B.C. into four republics—or whether it was better to place them under the direct administration of the Roman state. In the latter case it was usual to nominate a commission of ten senators and to place the country in question under a "prætor," annually appointed. He was not merely a judge, but also a general, and therefore exercised within the province the functions of the old consuls in an undiminished form. This was the administration established by Rome in Sicily, Sardinia, and in Hither and Further Spain; after 146 B.C. in Africa and in Macedonia; after 133 in Asia, as the province was called which was formed out of the confiscated kingdom of Pergamus; and, finally, in Gallia Narbonensis, which was made a province in 121 B.C.

The internal organisation was always based on the existing state of things, since, on the one hand, the Punic and Hellenistic civilisation was superior to the Roman; and, on the other, the Celtic system was incompatible with it. Consideration had to be paid to the cantonal constitution and clan system of the Kelts.

**Roman Respect
for National
Characteristics**

Thus a treaty was concluded with the Hædui in Transalpine Gaul, by which these were styled "brothers and kinsmen" (*fratres et consanguinei*) of the Romans; and, therefore, the identical obligation to blood vengeance and support was formed, which was customary

among the allied Keltic tribes. After the Punic wars a class of citizens, which in earlier times had not come into prominence, became of great importance—the “knights,” *equites*, so called because the wealthier citizens discharged their military service in the cavalry. They became the real capitalists of the state, since it required larger means to carry on its foreign operations. Thus the first Punic War had been brought

**The “Knights”
of Ancient
Rome**

to a favourable conclusion entirely through the voluntary contributions of these persons; and the second by the employment of their slaves for military purposes, particularly on the fleet. The owners had stipulated only that they should be indemnified after victory had been gained. In fact, the equestrian order, which was organised about the middle of the second century B.C. as a peculiar class between the senatorial families and the commons, proceeded eagerly to turn political success most fully to their own interests.

According to the views of antiquity, not only the goods and chattels, but also the persons of the conquered, were at the disposal of the conqueror. On this rested the system of slavery, which has impressed a particular stamp on every ancient state, as compared with modern conditions. Whenever a peace was concluded with a conquered opponent it was made always on such conditions that the conqueror enjoyed permanent advantages. If the weaker party, nevertheless, recovered its strength it was threatened to such an extent that its existence was at stake; and if it defended itself then a pretext was provided for putting an end to it.

In this way the Roman state proceeded against Carthage, which, after the loss of her sovereignty, flourished, nevertheless, as a commercial city, in spite of the competition of Alexandria, and much to the chagrin of the Roman

**Final
Destruction
of Carthage**

merchants. These took advantage of the dread which still possessed men’s minds after the Hannibalic wars to accomplish the destruction of Carthage, which was carried out in 146 B.C. after a memorable resistance by the desperate inhabitants. In the same year the disturbances which had broken out in Greece were made an excuse for the destruction of Corinth, which stood as much in the way of the

Roman capitalists as Carthage. The place where these towns had stood was cursed, so that a restoration of them might never succeed; and, in fact, such a restoration took place only under the emperors.

The detailed history of Polybius goes as far as these events, the overthrow of Carthage and Corinth. In the suite of his pupil, Scipio Æmilianus, he was an eye-witness of the destruction of Carthage, and afterwards went to Greece, or, as it was now called, Achaia, in the interests of his countrymen.

The associations of Roman merchants and of the “Italian” merchants, who in foreign countries were closely connected with them, soon extended over the most important places in the dependent countries, over Africa and Numidia, over Greece and the Orient. They formed everywhere a distinct privileged company, whose political and economic power was not only felt abroad, but reacted at home. The republic was repeatedly forced to undertake a campaign because the Roman traders abroad had met with some unpleasant experiences, even though they themselves were in the wrong. If a war proved disastrous, a monetary crisis occurred at Rome, such as Cicero depicts at the time of the Mithradatic War. If, on the other hand, a new province was marked out, the Italian capitalists were there at once, in order to do business. It may be that they advanced money to the conquered at high interest, or that they farmed the whole revenue of the province, since the Roman state, following the model of Carthage and Alexandria, preferred indirect to direct management of taxation.

**Wars
Made by
Traders**


The “publicani”—that is, the farmers of the state revenues—were an object, not merely of fear, but also of hatred, to the provincials, as was shown in a sanguinary fashion at every revolt. While the merchant class obtained in this way their part of the spoils of the new world sovereignty, the Roman peasant proprietor, who had taken the most considerable share in the victories of the republic, had obtained as reward absolute exemption from taxes, for now the financial requirements of the state could easily be met by the income which was derived from the public domains and from the taxation of foreign subjects.

DECLINE OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

A development was now brought about which no one had anticipated. The farmers, instead of being placed out of the reach of peril by the immunity from taxation, were oppressed by evils of another sort. The agricultural interests, which had suffered terribly during the long war with Hannibal, owing to the long terms of military service and the devastation of wide tracts of land, were now injured by the superior competition of the subject countries, Sardinia, Sicily, and Africa, countries which supplied cheap grain to Italy, and, indeed, had to furnish it as a tax in kind, since in this way full advantage was taken of their submission; and in this connection the trifling cost of freight to the western coast of Italy did not come into the question. It was soon discovered that it barely paid to grow grain—one of the blessings of the empire. The state of affairs was somewhat better in the countries of the allies far from the capital, and especially on the east coast of Italy, in Picenum, and elsewhere.

The country towns of Latium began to lose their populations, while crowds collected in Rome chiefly in order that they might there enjoy as "Roman people," without work, the theatre, which produced the comedies of Plautus (up to 184 B.C.), of Terence (after 166 B.C.), and of other less distinguished but popular authors, as well as the public games, which were always being produced on an increasing scale of magnificence, and to make themselves influential in the public assemblies. Thus the right of the liberty of migration and of voting in the


assembly of citizens, which had been granted to the Latins in olden times and under quite other circumstances, was now indeed a valuable privilege.



TERENCE, THE DRAMATIST
A native of Carthage, and originally a slave, his comedies were immensely popular with the Romans.

While the constitution of the popular assemblies was altered by this circumstance, as well as by the fact that the numerous freedmen desired some, even if limited, recognition, the reaction on the character of the army must not be overlooked, since political rights and military service were most closely connected at Rome. The old organisation of the army, ascribed to King Servius Tullius, took as a basis the wealth of the citizens. Since every citizen soldier had to pay for his equipment, the wealthiest were enrolled in the cavalry, while the arming of the infantry was graduated in a descending scale down to the proletarians, who in case of need had to be provided by the state with arms, but usually were not taken into account at all. After the wasting Hannibalic War this system could no longer be observed; on the contrary, the material for the army steadily grew worse as economic conditions failed to improve. This was shown by the wars against Macedonia and in the fighting before Carthage, and Numantia in Spain, where the Roman armies, with their train of camp followers, years

achieved no success. The political and social ferment which prevailed in Italy spread far beyond its borders. In Greece, about the middle of the second century B.C., socialistic agitations were rife. In Sicily great masses of slaves, whom the Roman knights employed, after the Carthaginian fashion, to cultivate the soil,



SCENE FROM A COMIC PLAY

A mosaic found at Pompeii representing actors in a comedy. The smaller of the two theatres at Pompeii was devoted entirely to comedy.

broke away and ravaged the whole island for a year. This same economic policy had been already recommended for Italy by radical economists. The speculators who returned from the provinces to Italy with the riches they had won bought up tracts of land and cultivated them by unfree labour, which had become unusually cheap. The Carthaginian literature on the subject of agriculture was translated into Latin.

**Agriculture
and Money
Making**


On the other hand, a man of practical and conservative mind, like M. Porcius Cato, defended the traditional Italian method of agriculture.

It was recognised with alarm by the best element of the Roman republic that the nation was being ruined by the so-called empire. Men began to speak in Rome of how their ancestors had checked the latifundia system, the excessive accumulation of landed property in the hands of individuals at the cost of the small proprietors. In point of fact, there had been as little lack of legislation on the subject in Rome as in the Greek states. It had been settled in antiquity that no one should be allowed to possess more than five hundred *jugera* of the Roman public land, and at the same time that the buying out of the smaller farmers by speculators should be prohibited.

The reform party at Rome, which proposed to check the ruin of the farmer class, identified itself with these restrictive measures. As no one of the more experienced statesmen at Rome ventured to come forward—since manifold difficulties must have been in the way of such a “reactionary” policy—Tiberius and Gaius Sempronius Gracchus, two young men who belonged to the senatorial nobility, did so, one after the other. They were both tribunes of the plebs, and were fired by the example of the Greeks. In the previous century an effort had been made once more to bring into prominence the Spartan state on the basis of the “Lycurgan laws”; and after Polybius, the historian of the Punic wars, had become the counsellor of Scipio Æmilianus, Greek tutors were customary in all noble families. The senate was opposed to the discussion of these questions, especially since long-

established proprietary rights were at issue. One even of the tribunes of the people, Cn. Octavius, who was a personal friend of Tiberius Gracchus, and enjoyed his respect, spoke against his proposition.

Tiberius Gracchus then allowed himself to be forced into an unconstitutional step. He brought forward in the popular assembly a proposal to depose his colleague, and carried his point. It was decided to elect an agrarian commission, which should regulate the conditions of land tenure. When Tiberius Gracchus, his father-in-law, Appius Claudius, and his younger brother, Gaius, were elected, the *optimates*, as the senatorial class were called, grew irritated, as the whole matter was thus placed in the hands of one family. In order to secure his inviolability, Tiberius Gracchus sought re-election to the tribu-



SALLUST, THE HISTORIAN
His histories were as elegant and refined in style as he was himself depraved and coarse in character.

nate of the people, which was a step contrary to constitutional tradition, and caused a violent demonstration in the senate. It declared its political opponent a national enemy, who was not entitled to a regular trial. This involved a suspension of constitutional rights, against which the consul, Q. Mutius, a skilful lawyer, in vain urged objections. On the day of election a riot ensued; a senator, P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica, placed himself at the head of the opposite faction, which was armed with clubs; Tiberius Gracchus fled and lost his life. His adherents were prosecuted for high treason, and the execution of the agrarian laws was crippled by the fact that the jurisdiction over the disputed proprietary rights was withdrawn from the commission and given over to the consuls. Nevertheless, the laws of Tiberius Gracchus remained in force and filled all Italy with factions, since the territories of the allies were equally affected. The question was then first mooted whether it would not be advisable to concede the Roman citizenship to the allies, since only in this way could agrarian reform be possible for the whole peninsula.

**Foreigners
as Roman
Citizens**

The movement received fresh life when, ten years after Tiberius, his younger brother, Gaius Gracchus, became tribune of the people in 123 B.C. He was more

gifted, but also more impetuous, than his brother, for whose death he had vowed to take vengeance on the aristocracy. During the two years that he was in office he took the initiative in all administrative and constitutional questions, one plan rapidly following another. The machinery of the state was put into motion: G. Gracchus reorganised the system of Italian roads, led colonies to Tarentum and Squillacium in Lower Italy, and originated the custom that the senate should dispose of the consular provinces even before the periodical consular elections. Further, in order to secure support for himself, Gaius carried a measure that the knights should farm the taxes of the newly constituted province of Asia, an arrangement convenient to the state treasury and profitable to the syndicate of capitalists, but disastrous indeed to the subjects who were oppressed and impoverished by the moneyed classes.

A more sweeping measure, by which Gracchus sowed discord between the senatorial order and the knights, was that by which the functions of jurymen in matters of administration, which up till then, in accordance with custom, had been exercised by men of senatorial rank, were transferred to the knights, under the pretext that the senatorial jurisdiction over the provincial administration had not proved to be satisfactory, since it was prejudiced by caste considerations. In this way Gaius made the capitalists his political friends.

Gaius Gracchus met his ruin before he was able to carry out the intended reform in the agrarian question. It was difficult

for such a statesman to hold his position, since, indeed, the constitution strictly forbade re-election after the expiration of the official year, and because the citizens

from outlying districts seldom came more than once in the year to Rome for the purpose of voting. Finally, numerous separate interests conflicted. The Roman citizens and the Italian allies could not be brought into common action. The bestowal of the citizenship on the allies met with little support at Rome, since the dominant people preferred to enjoy their privileges alone; in consequence of this, both classes of the population of Italy now began to scan each other with hostile looks. Even the plan of Gaius to devote to the settlement of indigent Roman citizens not only Italy, but also the adjoining provinces, as Africa and the part of Gaul beyond the Alps,

which was occupied to secure the land route into Spain, appeared at the outset so novel that the conservative party had good reason to hope for a change in public feeling.

And this, indeed, resulted while Gaius was detained for two months in the district of Carthage—which had been devastated and laid under a curse—occupied with measurements and other preparations for founding a colony there. In his absence his opponents carried the election

of L. Opimius as consul, who immediately opposed Gaius, since he was no longer tribune. As this led to a rising of the Gracchan party, the consul was invested by the senate with extraordinary powers. The adherents of Gracchus were attacked by force of arms and conquered. Gaius



STATUE OF A COMIC ACTOR
He is represented in the mask which Roman actors of comedy wore when discharging their parts on the stage.



ROMAN ACTORS WITH THEIR THEATRICAL MASKS
From a realistic bas-relief in the Lateran Museum, Rome.

himself ordered his slave to kill him during the rout. In addition, the rising cost the lives of some 3,000 of his partisans. This was in the year 121 B.C.

The agrarian agitation was continued for some years, but the rights of private proprietors, in the form they had now assumed, were not attacked any more.

An Era of Rural Depopulation

The African system of latifundia was preserved only in some districts of Lower Italy. Near Rome, in the direction of Etruria, as well as of Campania, centres of the agricultural population no longer existed. When the Latin feast was celebrated on the Alban Mountain fewer and fewer claims were made at the distribution of the meat-offering. Places like Gabii, Labicum and Bovillæ were almost deserted; Fidenæ was an insignificant village; of Ardea only the name was left; other places had disappeared without a trace, and the farmers had departed.

Only the villas of the Roman nobles in the immediate vicinity of the capital, on the Alban Hills, in the Volscian territory, near Tibur and Tusculum, and on the sea-shore, brought life into the country in the best season of the year. If a politician was for a time out of office he would spend the whole period at Tusculum or Albanum or on the Campanian coast, whither the elder Scipio, Africanus, had withdrawn in dudgeon, and where, later, Lucullus laid out his splendid gardens. Thus, the agricultural aspect of entire districts had completely altered within a few decades. The successors of the farmers from Latium, Southern Etruria, and further afield, composed the proletariat of the capital, and were, according to a law which C. Gracchus had passed, fed with corn at the cost of the state. For the future, senators, knights, and proletarians shared in the profits of empire.

After the downfall of C. Gracchus the centre of gravity again rested with the senate, which had assumed the protection of the conservative interests against the revolutionaries. The Roman annals of this period are equally tinged with conservatism. Not until the ensuing period do the political speeches have a party character. But there was much that was

corrupt in the ranks of these "conservatives." This was especially apparent in the sphere of provincial administration and in the disputes which broke out at that time among the successors of King Masinissa of Numidia.


Jugurtha, an illegitimate descendant of Masinissa, who had gained the friendship of the Roman aristocracy in the war before Numantia, expelled and murdered his cousins, the princes Adherbal and Hiempsal, in order to make himself sole ruler. In Rome this conduct had met with lenient criticism, until the tribunes of the people, from party considerations, revealed the systematic bribery to which Jugurtha owed this indulgence. After the most respected heads of the governing party had been compromised in the matter, the scandal became greater by the way in which the punishment which

had been resolved upon for Jugurtha was carried out. Jugurtha himself, as soon as he had been admitted to the negotiations, came to Rome. He knew that everything, the city itself in the last extremity, had its price. When, at the urgent pressure of the opposition, active measures were taken against him, he inflicted a defeat on the Roman army. The war continued, greatly influenced by the attitude of parties in the city; we

have an excellent account of the course of affairs in the monograph of Sallustius Crispus (Sallust), who wrote as a partisan of Julius Cæsar.

In the Roman army a townsman of Arpinum, C. Marius, had distinguished himself as a subordinate officer of the consul Q. Metellus. He had allied himself by marriage with the Julian family, and was now, in 107 B.C., elected consul through the efforts of the popular party. After Marius had conquered Jugurtha, and made him prisoner through the craft of his quæstor Cornelius Sulla, he became the worshipped hero of the opposition, especially when, in attempting to repel a migration of Keltic and Germanic peoples which threatened Gaul and Italy, the aristocratic generals suffered repeated defeats in close succession. Marius, consequently, was again elected consul amid violent excite-

When Every Roman had His Price



GAIUS MARIUS

Who rose from a peasant to the mastery of Rome in the time of the consular government. He was extremely masterful and tyrannical.



THE UNIQUE CHARACTERISTIC OF ROME'S PUBLIC GAMES

Gladiatorial displays between prisoners of war are peculiarly associated with Rome and, later, the Roman empire as a whole. These sanguinary combats originated after the proletariat made the army their profession, and were designed to accustom the people to bloodshed. Hence "butchered to make a Roman holiday." In later years not only prisoners fought in the arenas but Roman citizens, and even an emperor coveted its sanguinary honours.

ment, and his election was renewed every year until the Teutones had been defeated in Transalpine Gaul, and the Cimbri and their allies in Cisalpine Gaul (102 and 101 B.C.). It is curious to remark that the authorities hold that the Teutones were half Keltic, and that the Cimbri were Germans.

At this period Marius effected the re-organisation of the Roman military system in accordance with the requirements of the existing social conditions. Marius admitted into his army the proletarians, who gladly enlisted in expectation of booty, and at the same time he abolished the existing composition of the legion, which had taken into consideration differences of property. A uniform armament of all legionaries was introduced, every man receiving a javelin (*pilum*) and a sword. Since owners of land had to be dismissed to their fields after every campaign, the tactical training of the troops had been neglected. Now, when the proletarians made the army their profession, as it were, greater stress could be laid on drill and swordsmanship. In order to accustom the people to bloodshed numbers of prisoners of war, who had been trained in fighting, were pitted against each other at the public games, and not only imitated a

Origin of Gladiatorial Combats

battle, but fought it out to the death. This is the beginning of the gladiatorial shows, without which men soon could not live at Rome—a barbarous amusement for the degenerate rabble of the sovereign city. The previous military organisation was thus practically, though not legally, abolished. In time of need now, as before, the entire male population of Italy capable of bearing arms, between the ages of seventeen and forty-five years, could be called out. On ordinary occasions enlistment was sufficient, since enough recruits gave in their names.

Extent of the Conscription

But the soldiers were anxious, not only for profitable wars during their period of service, but for a provision for their old age, an allotment of house and land. They wished their victorious commander to gain this point for them from the government. This involved a diminution of the public domain, and, therefore, of the financial resources of the state. They were ready, for their part, to vote for him in the comitia. The soldiers were well aware that not every general possessed the necessary influence; and, therefore, when they enlisted they paid great attention to the person of the commander, a circumstance by which party struggles in Rome from this time assumed a quite different aspect.

2657

After his return from the Cimbrian War C. Marius had been elected consul for the sixth time, thanks to the agitation of his partisans. It was found, however, that he was not as familiar with the struggles of the forum as with those of the battlefield, so that, in virtue of a decree of the senate, which authorised him to take extraordinary measures, he acted

**Rivalry
of Marius
and Sulla**


most sharply towards his own party friends; and at the end of the year he was quite discredited as a politician. In consequence of this, the senatorial party, now actually in league with the knights, to whom the socialistic views of the leaders of the proletarians were antagonistic, once more came forward. They recognised as their leader L. Cornelius Sulla, the rival of Marius, and his former quaestor in the Numidian War.

When Sulla had become consul for the year 88 B.C. the question arose, what general should conduct the war against King Mithradates of Pontus, who was then stirring up the whole Orient against the Roman rule. The king had been received with acclamations in the province of Asia, and at his orders all the Italians who lived there had been massacred. The settlement of Eastern affairs generally was, therefore, bound up with the command against Mithradates; and thus a prospect of rich gain was held out to the general and his army, quite apart from its significance for the relations of the parties in Rome itself, where the general victorious in a great war now always took the first place in the state. The opponents of the senate wished that Marius might be entrusted with the command, and carried their proposal by a decree of the people. Sulla marched with his troops against Rome, took the town, and had the leaders of the opposition proscribed by the senate. The command in the Mithradatic

campaign was thus secured to Sulla, but at the same time a new era of civil war was begun.

The distinction which existed in the Italian-Roman state system had already made itself felt, and now was revived by the conflict of the citizen factions—the distinction between the privileged citizen of the city of Rome and the Italian confederates. The native allies had up till now derived advantage from the increased power of the Apennine peninsula, which had spread over the opposite coasts and gradually over the whole Mediterranean. On the other hand, it pleased the sovereign people of Rome to load the allies as far as possible with the burdens of government, especially with the troublesome duty of garrisoning the provinces. The comitia of

the Roman citizens certainly exercised influence on the government in Rome, but not so the allies, who had powers only of local government and had no unity of organisation. This was felt to be unjust. When the Gracchi came forward with plans for reform, they excited the hopes of the allies, a circumstance which did harm to those young champions of the allies against the Roman citizens. After the fall of Tiberius Gracchus the disaffection of the allies became open hostility. At their head stood the colony of Fregellæ on the Liris, which, after the overthrow of Capua, was the first town in those regions, and probably the first in Italy, after Rome. The revolt of Fregellæ was mercilessly suppressed, but the factions in Rome continued; and the opponents of the ruling optimates maintained relations with the discontented allies, which soon spread over the whole of Italy; so that it was said of M. Livius Drusus, the tribune of the people for the year 92 B.C., that he tried to govern Italy through such clientage. The conspirators demanded a part in the Roman



Mansell


A ROMAN CITIZEN
Showing the manner of wearing the toga.

elections, admission to the offices in Rome, in short, the complete rights of the Roman citizenship. M. Livius Drusus moved resolutions to this effect, and the opposite faction got rid of him by assassination.

Then the revolt of the Italians broke out. At the head stood those Sabellian tribes which once had taken only a feeble part in the resistance of the Samnites, and, therefore, were admitted into the Italian confederation on very favourable terms. There were the Marsi, who had kept their territory nearly intact. Their capital, which was also the political centre of the stock, Marruvium, was situated on the Fucine lake. The same was

true of the Peligni, whose capital was Corfinium. The tribes of these districts placed themselves at the head of the revolt, so that the war was styled the Marsian War. But Corfinium became the principal place of the confederation of "Italia." In the south the Samnites immediately joined, in the north the district of Picenum. The movement soon extended to the regions lying nearer Rome, to Campania, and Æturia. Rome saw herself attacked on all sides. In the first year many Roman magistrates fell victims to the revolt. If the hostile factions in Rome had not united, at least for the moment, in a common policy, and if, as shortly afterwards, one party had sided with the Italians, Rome might well have fallen. In any case, the seat of government would have been changed even if the constitution remained the same, for the insurgents had formed their senate, their consuls

and their prætors entirely on the Roman model, although their coins partly bore Oscan inscriptions. As we have already remarked, some of the popular leaders in Rome had expressly recognised the justice of the demands made by the Italians. The proposal to split up the forces of the rebellion by granting the citizenship to all those who still hesitated to join it, especially in the adjacent countries, was now received with some favour. The Sabellian races were, however, so incensed against Rome that they would hear nothing more of concessions, but set about their avowed purpose of destroying the "lair of the she-wolf." One colony of Rome,



MARRIAGE IN ANCIENT ROME

Mansell

Although the morals of Rome passed through many phases, from austerity to licentiousness, and women were at times notoriously incontinent, from first to last the principle of monogamy was maintained.

Venusia, actually joined the insurgents; others, which lay in the disaffected district or near it, such as Alba, on the Fucine lake, Æsernia, and Venafrum in Samnium, were compelled by force to join the cause.

But, on the whole, Rome gained breathing space by these measures, at any rate on the side of Campania, Etruria, and Umbria. The war was carried into the more distant countries, first into Picenum, where Asculum was a centre of the insurrection. Numerous Roman leaden missiles with inscriptions which refer to this war have been found in the bed of this river. Asculum, after an obstinate resistance, was finally taken by Cn. Pompeius Strabo, the father of the great Pompey, consul in the year 89 B.C. Corfinium, after that, could not longer hold out; and the war was continued chiefly by the Samnites, who selected Æsernia as their centre. In Rome, meantime, the strife between the factions had again

"Italia"
Against
Rome

broken out, and now the popular party demanded further concessions for the Italians. It was now a question only of the greater or less restriction on their right of voting, and thus the violence of the insurrection was diverted. The leaders lent the popular party assistance against their opponents, especially as Sulla, after


The Rising Star of Sulla

his return from the Mithradatic War, attacked the democratic government. For L. Cornelius Sulla had, meantime, conducted a three years' war against Mithradates of Pontus in Greece and Asia, in the course of which his army was trained and grew attached to his person, so that he was now far superior to the leaders of the rival faction. These were at variance with each other, and possessed, indeed, no leader of universally recognised authority, since Marius had died in his seventh consulship, in 86 B.C., and Cinna, in his fourth consulship, had fallen victim to a mutiny in 84 B.C. When Sulla advanced from Brundisium, he became master, through a second mutiny, of the army sent against him in Campania. The opposition of the confederates, who once more attacked Rome itself, was crushed, and a bloody retribution exacted. Samnium and the Etrurian coast district never recovered from the devastations caused by Sulla's soldiery. Sulla no longer delayed to bestow the citizenship on the Italians.

In the distribution of the allies among the thirty-five citizen tribes much "electoral geometry" was employed, since the new burgesses were now entitled to take part in the voting at Rome; thus the Marsi and the Peligni were united into one tribe, the Sergian. The place of the customary local authorities was taken by two magistrates, corresponding to the Roman consuls. As the administration of justice rested with them, they were usually styled *duumviri juridicundo*. Thus the Latin-Roman institutions, which up till now had been found only in the colonies, were extended over the whole of Italy, including the Greek towns. Sulla caused himself to be named dictator to reorganise the constitution, and in doing so he went back to the system which had prevailed

before the Gracchi. The tribunate of the people was once more to be a convenient tool of the government; the administration of the state was to rest in the hands of the senate, without being influenced or controlled by the knights. In order, once for all, to guard the constitution from attacks, Sulla gravely determined to exterminate the opposition.

He is the originator of the system of proscriptions, the extermination of the best, as this procedure has been called. While Marius and Cinna had proceeded only against the leaders of the optimates, Sulla; quite unexpectedly, had the names of the senators and knights who were to be executed publicly posted up. The list was frequently renewed, until some two thousand senators and knights had forfeited their lives. Their property was confiscated, but freedom was given to their slaves, in order that the system might find supporters in them.



SULLA, RIVAL OF MARIUS
A victorious general who raised himself to the dictatorship, and after two years of undisputed sway retired to a twilight of debauchery.

Sulla governed for two years with unlimited powers. He reorganised the provincial administration; in Greece and in Asia, when the question arose as to restrictions to be imposed on the farmers of the taxes, he introduced regulations which were permanent and satisfied the subjects. In fact, for the towns of Asia 84 B.C. was the beginning of a new era, which lasted for more than

500 years. With regard to the magistracy, Sulla established the rule that the consuls and prætors should discharge their office in the capital, and then, as proconsuls and proprætors, govern a province for one year.

Sulla hoped that, through his enactments, the conservative party, whose views satisfied the main body of the nation, had been firmly seated in the saddle; the histories of this period are conservative, though moderate in tone. He himself kept within the limits of his constitution; and, after two years, laid down the dictatorship in 80 B.C., and withdrew to his villa on the Campanian coast. There he wrote his "Memoirs." While the possessors of such power have usually been eager to secure for their sons a dynastic precedence Sulla refrained from any such attempt.

What Sulla Did in Two Years

period are conservative, though moderate in tone. He himself kept within the limits of his constitution; and, after two years, laid down the dictatorship in 80 B.C., and withdrew to his villa on the Campanian coast. There he wrote his "Memoirs." While the possessors of such power have usually been eager to secure for their sons a dynastic precedence Sulla refrained from any such attempt.

ANCIENT
ROME
IV



POMPEY
AND
CÆSAR

POMPEY THE GREAT & JULIUS CÆSAR

THE RULE OF THE TRIUMVIRATE

AND THE FOUNDING OF THE JULIAN DYNASTY

NOTWITHSTANDING all the precautionary measures which Sulla had adopted, political agitation was not ended by him. Numbers of people had joined Sulla for personal reasons who supported the reaction towards a strict oligarchy so long as they themselves were not affected by it. This was the view of many of the most important subordinate officers who had supported Sulla in the Italian War and afterwards during the operations in the provinces. Such were M. Licinius Crassus, who had acquired an immense fortune by lucky speculations at the time of the proscriptions, and Cn. Pompeius Magnus, whose father had belonged to the equestrian party.

Revival of Civil War


Firmer supporters of the oligarchy were Q. Metellus Pius, Q. Lutatius Catulus, and the brothers L. and M. Licinius Lucullus. The life and activity of this period are well depicted in the Lives of Plutarch, who, in the second century A.D., recast the old materials. We gain a further insight into it from the speeches, letters, and numerous writings of M. Tullius Cicero, one of the principal creators of the Latin literature.

For the moment all were intent on crushing the remnants of the popular party, which showed signs of active life in the year of Sulla's death, 78 B.C., even in Rome itself. In fact, one of the consuls for this year, M. Æmilius Lepidus, publicly advocated the Gracchan policy, together with the restoration of those who had been exiled and whose property was confiscated. A rising ensued, which spread to various parts of Italy, particularly Etruria, until Lepidus was

defeated before the gates of the capital in a regular battle by Lutatius Catulus and Pompeius in 77 B.C. The remains of the army of Lepidus, after its commander himself had fallen on the way, fled under M. Perperna to Spain. Here, from the time of Cinna's rule, Q. Sertorius had held the position of governor, since he knew how to win over the natives. Q. Metellus and Cn. Pompeius were now sent against him. They carried on the war for years in an inglorious fashion, and only in 72 B.C., after M. Perperna turned traitor, did Sertorius fall.

In the meantime, L. Licinius Lucullus, consul in the year 74 B.C., had taken command in the war against Mithradates of Pontus, which had broken out again. The optimates, who wished to get the profitable administration of the East into their hands, had struggled for the conduct of the campaign. By special provisions, M. Crassus, as prætor, had to exercise military functions. A general rising of the slaves and gladiators had broken out in Italy, with which the consuls, who had no military experience, were unable to cope, while Crassus successfully repressed it. Pompeius, who had just returned from Spain, annihilated some bands that attempted to cross the Alps.

Cn. Pompeius Magnus, though only thirty years old, had often commanded armies; but he had never held any curule office. He did not, however, wish to hold a position inferior to Crassus, who was now canvassing for the consulship; for, in spite of his wealth, Crassus was not reckoned to possess any peculiar



M. TULLIUS CICERO
Whose writings illuminate the
period following the death of Sulla.

intellectual ability. This led to all kinds of intrigues. C. Julius Cæsar, who was four years younger than Pompey, had already brought himself into notice, and was conspicuous among the young nobility of Rome for the insolent audacity of his conduct and the enormous extent of his debts. As son-in-law of Cinna, he attached himself to the popular party, an act which was not regarded seriously at first in outside circles, although Sulla in his last years is said to have declared that more than one Marius was concealed in the young Cæsar. On account of the dissensions which prevailed among the leaders of the party of Sulla, Cæsar attained to political importance for the first time in the year 71 B.C. Cæsar, who was personally on good terms with Crassus, persuaded him and Pompey that, if they were to combine with him, they would be superior to all rivals. He held out to them the prospect of the votes of the popular party at the consular election if its principal demand, the restoration of the tribunate


of the people, were granted. In order to win over the knights also, their former privileges—namely, the participation as jurors in the tribunals—were to be conceded to them. At this time great excitement was caused by a notorious trial, in which the Sicilians impeached their former governor, C. Verres, and M. Tullius Cicero came forward as their advocate: Verres was condemned. Pompey and Crassus, who were influenced by party interests, but not by principles, pledged themselves to the demands of Cæsar in their speeches as candidates, and were then elected consuls for the year 70 B.C. Cæsar had won his first success as a politician; since he broke down the constitution of Sulla in very essential points, and at the same time irremediably compromised two leaders of the opposition.

Pompey gained most by this coalition. On the proposal of the tribune of the people, A. Gabinius, he was placed at the head of the fleet and of an army with extraordinary powers, in order that the outrages of the



CICERO AT HIS COUNTRY VILLA DURING HIS RETIREMENT FROM ROME

Though better remembered for his literary work than for his public life in Rome, Cicero was one of the foremost senators of his time. Lacking somewhat in resolution, but on the whole honest of purpose, his fortunes varied greatly from time to time, and at different periods he withdrew from Rome to the seclusion of his country villa.



CICERO IN THE SENATE ACCUSING CATILINE OF TREASON

One of the most memorable episodes in the consular career of Cicero; but his impeachment failed for lack of evidence. Cicero escaped the dagger of Catiline's assassin, though his later years were passed in dread of assassination, which finally was his fate at the hands of an emissary of Antony. From the painting by Maccari, Rome.

pirates, which had been increasing since the downfall of most of the maritime powers, might be terminated. The Roman state had neglected the fleet after the Punic War. A special decree was passed that the commander-in-chief should himself choose twenty-five inferior commanders, *legati*, from the body of the senators, and that these should be invested with prætorian rank. All places on the coast up to forty miles inland were placed under Pompey's jurisdiction, so that his rivals said with justice that his authority was tantamount to that of a monarch. On the other hand, it was notorious that Sulla had made a blunder when he abolished the central command of the consuls. As there was no fleet to guard the shores of Italy, the communications with the east and the corn-growing countries were more and more endangered, so that there was a threatened failure of the supplies on which the Roman plebs were fed.

Pompey's Popularity in Rome The proposal of Gabinius was therefore carried, and Pompey executed his commission in the shortest time. He thus became the most popular man in Rome.

Pompey aimed higher. In fact, he was able, through the help of the equestrian party, to contrive that the war against Mithradates and the regulation of affairs in the east should be entrusted to him.

This was effected by the "lex Manilia," for which M. Tullius Cicero spoke—a fact of importance, since Cicero was accustomed to state his views plainly. L. Lucullus had been unfortunate in incurring the hostility of the Roman knights, who were concerned in the most scandalous financial transactions in Asia. By a

The Usury of the Roman Knights usury edict, according to which only one per cent. per month could be charged as interest,

the towns in the provinces had been enabled to pay off in a comparatively short period an enormous contribution imposed on them by Sulla. The knights had lost thereby immense profits, and they now raised a violent agitation against Lucullus. As, under these circumstances, the Sullan constitution, among the supporters of which was L. Lucullus, was overthrown, the effect on the province, and even on the discipline of the army, was such that the proconsul could not make use of the advantages he had won over Mithradates. In 66 B.C., Lucullus received his recall, and with it his administrative measures became inoperative.

After Pompey had taken over the command and had reorganised the army, he conquered Mithradates, as well as his ally and son-in-law, Tigranes of Armenia, who had extended his dominion over Syria. When Pompey then formed an

alliance with the Parthians, a peace was arranged with Tigranes, in which he renounced his conquests. Mithradates was forced to fly to the north of the Black Sea, where he met his death, while the conqueror formed a province out of the countries of Pontus and Bithynia (64 B.C.). Legates of Pompey had already taken possession of Syria, where the rule of the Seleucidæ was ended.

After the withdrawal of Tigranes there was no supreme government until Pompey assumed it at Antioch. He ruled there in the winter of 64-63 B.C., like a "king of kings," set up and deposed princes, and granted privileges to the towns. In the spring of 63 B.C. he proceeded to Damascus, where he settled the dispute between the two Jewish princes, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, in favour of the former.

As Aristobulus did not submit, Jerusalem was taken, the temple stormed, and the pretender led away captive. Antipater, the Idumæan, was already prominent as the procurator of Hyrcanus, and from that time succeeded in making himself indispensable to all Roman rulers. The Jewish historian, Flavius Josephus, gives us particulars as to the activity of Pompey and his lieutenants. The Roman authority made itself felt as far as the borders of Arabia and Egypt. The former kingdom of the Seleucids was converted into the province of Syria. In the east, on the side of the Parthians, the Euphrates was adopted as a boundary, to which the Roman government subsequently adhered, and crossed it only at a far later period.

All this was the work of Pompey, who, in his administrative arrangements, always took into account existing conditions. In Syria the chronological era of the Seleucids remained in force during the entire length of the Roman rule; and, in fact, has persisted among the Aramaic-speaking Christians up to the present day. The boundaries of the districts were altered

only when necessary. Galatia was divided into three principalities. Pontus, although forming with Bithynia one administrative sphere, retained its legislative assembly, if we may give this title to the partly religious, partly political, union of the towns of that province.

We cannot fail to recognise the abilities of Pompey. He delivered his decisions after careful deliberation, and also repressed corruption among his lieutenants. His freedmen had most influence over him, among others the writer Theophanes of Mitylene. Pompey attached considerable value to the fact that his exploits were given publicity, especially his last romantic campaign against Mithradates. The best account of it is preserved for us in the geographical and historical work of the Cappadocian Strabo. Pompey was by no

means as great a genius as Julius Cæsar. But when, after long struggles, the principate was accepted as the final form of government, the institutions of Pompey were revived in many respects, and were preferred to those of Cæsar.

At Rome the oligarchy still ruled, busied in preparing an in-

glorious end to the extraordinary power of Pompey. L. Lucullus thought, with the help of his party, to persuade the senate to declare the arrangements of Pompey null and void, just as his own had been annulled.

The other factions of the optimates agreed with Lucullus in this; and they were offended, besides, in many ways by the manner in which Pompey had gained possession of the imperium. Men like the younger M. Porcius Cato, who on principle held to the constitution, and, on account of his honourable character, enjoyed the respect even of his political opponents, were by no means disposed to smooth the way of Pompey to the principate. Least of all could Pompey expect support from Crassus, with whom he had quarrelled during his year of office. Julius Cæsar about this time declared he would rather be first in a village



POMPEY THE GREAT

Pompey was the dangerous rival of Julius Cæsar, until the latter settled his account at the battle of Pharsalia. Lepidus, a weak, ambitious character, was, for a brief period only, one of the triumvirs.



LEPIDUS THE TRIUMVIR

than second in Rome. He became ædile in 65 B.C.; prætor in 62 B.C., and was entangled in all the political intrigues of the time, chiefly behind the scenes

While his friend Crassus gave immense sums to enable him to win the favour of the Roman populace by the celebration of magnificent games, Cæsar kept in close touch with the anarchists, in whose ranks bankrupt nobles from both camps were to be found. These cherished the idea of once again bringing in an era of proscriptions by a political revolution. The



soul of these attempts was L. Sergius Catiline, a former adherent of Sulla, who had been prætor and then governor in Africa, but had found that his road to the consulate was barred by the present ruling party. In 63 B.C. Catiline was defeated for the consulate by a citizen from one of the municipalities, who had come into prominence at Rome as an advocate, M. Tullius Cicero, whose colleague was the insignificant C. Antonius. After having been an unsuccessful candidate once more at the elections of the year 62 B.C., and crushed by an immense burden of debt, Catiline resolved to reach his goal by violent measures. He collected round his standard at Fæsulæ in Etruria the victims of the Sullan

confiscations and the veterans who had settled there. These intrigues were no secret at Rome; on the contrary, so effectively had precautions been taken by the government, with the help of

the wealthy classes, that Catiline found himself compelled to leave Rome. His confederates were waiting only for a victory in Etruria, to raise an insurrection in the capital. But their schemes were betrayed to the consul, Cicero, who had followed up the matter most vigorously. He arrested the

conspirators, and the course of action that should be taken with them was the subject of an unprecedentedly heated debate in the senate. Notwithstanding the opposition of Cæsar, Cicero and Cato carried the proposal that the arrested should be executed without further proceedings, since there was danger in delay. Catiline and his confederates were declared national enemies, and the levies of the Italian militia were sent against him. Near Pistoria, now Pistoja, the points of departure of two passes over the Apennines to Modena and to Bologna, he was forced to fight a battle against a legate of the consul, C. Antonius, in which he was killed in 62 B.C.

Catiline is a typical figure of the Roman nobility of the day, in



Mansell

JULIUS CÆSAR, THE MAKER OF IMPERIAL ROME

The intellectual keenness of the great Cæsar is well seen in this bust; but the face is without softness or show of kindness. Ambition was his guiding star, but his abilities in every sphere were exceptional, and on the whole his public conduct puts him among the rare heroes of ancient Rome.



JULIUS CÆSAR, IMPERATOR

From the statue in the National Museum at Naples.

whose career personal feuds, women, debts, and the desire to win promotion at the cost of the state play the greatest part. The description given by Sallust in his "Catilina" is verified and supplemented by Cicero, Suetonius, and other authors. We see also how the elections in Rome became the subject of speculation, in which the market in votes, organised by the election committees (*sodalicitii*), played an important part. For the same reasons, the games were now given on a continuously increasing scale.

Corruption of the Elections

The conspiracy of Catiline, who had entertained wide-reaching plans, would have thwarted the schemes of Pompey. For this reason, Crassus, as well as Cæsar, was not unfavourable to the movement in the beginning. Cæsar's attitude was particularly irritating to the capitalist party, who knew his financial difficulties. Nevertheless, he was successful about this time in securing his election as pontifex maximus, although Q. Lutatius Catulus was the rival candidate (63 B.C.), a fact which shows that he ruled the comitia. But it was due entirely to the wealth of Crassus, who became his surety, that his creditors allowed him to go as proprætor to Farther Spain (61 B.C.).

It was generally believed in Rome that Pompey would make the anarchist movement a pretext for keeping the power in his own hands after his return from Asia. But Pompey, who, in a certain sense, clung to the letter of the law, disbanded his legions after landing at Brundisium, in accordance with constitutional precedent. He then proceeded to Rome, in order to secure from the senate the ratification of his acts, as well as the pensioning of his veterans. He found such opposition in the senate, now that his opponents had joined cause, and encountered such a delay in business that his complete fall was imminent. He was rescued from this plight only by the return of Cæsar from Spain in the year 60 B.C., who, in order to further his own plans, which were directed towards obtaining the consulate, once more made common cause with Pompey and Crassus. Cæsar pledged himself to promote, and under all circumstances to carry out, the wishes of Pompey and his party in the

Cæsar Joins Pompey

event of his becoming consul by their aid. Cæsar, then, was elected consul for the year 59 B.C. He, a member of one of the oldest families, became leader of the popular party and followed in the footsteps of G. Gracchus. His plebeian colleague, M. Calpurnius Bibulus, was a tool of the optimates, but was unscrupulously disregarded by Cæsar. This was the first step towards the establishment of the Julian monarchy, which a hundred years later was actually dated from the first consulship of Cæsar. From that day to his death Cæsar never ceased to be a magistrate of the state, and, accordingly, irresponsible. Men thought of this when the last C. Cæsar (Caligula) was murdered, in the year 41 A.D. After Cæsar's consulship the political literature of the time divides into the Cæsarian, at the head of which Julius Cæsar himself stood, and the anti-Cæsarian, lasting beyond the victory of the dynasty.

Power of the Triumvirate

He provisionally shared the government of the state with Crassus and Pompey. The acts of Pompey in the east were ratified by a decree of the people at the proposal of Cæsar, and the veterans of Pompey were rewarded by donations of land. The Campanian public domain, which, since the Hannibalic War, had been farmed out for the benefit of the treasury, was then also set apart to be allotted. Capua revived as a Cæsarian colony. But while Pompey was again confirmed in his supreme authority in the east, Cæsar claimed for himself a western sphere, Gaul; not merely the nearer province, with which the administration of Illyricum was connected, but also that of Transalpine Gaul, which, since the time of the Cimbri and Teutones, was continually menaced by invaders.

A rich field for action offered itself here to any man who wished to accept the post—a post, however, which required to be held for some years, and was, therefore, incompatible with the principle of holding office for a single year, which till then was applied to republican magistracies. The powerful triumvirate carried their point. Cæsar became proconsul for five years with the same rights Pompey had enjoyed in his command against the pirates and against Mithradates. He received legates, with proprætorian rank, and four legions, with the right to strengthen them by



THE LANDING OF JULIUS CÆSAR AND HIS LEGIONS ON THE COAST OF ENGLAND IN THE YEAR 55 B.C.

further levies; and, finally, unlimited authority to act in Gaul.

Cæsar governed in Gaul for ten years, as the Barcids had formerly done in Spain, and regulated the movements of the nations, since he forced the Helvetii, who had migrated into Gaul, to return to their country, and then defeated the Suevi,

who advanced across the Rhine under Ariovistus. But he settled **Cæsar in Gaul** on the Rhine German tribes, who, in the succeeding campaigns, took the side of the Romans. Even the Kelts were not united. In the same way he made the Helvetii his allies, and won over, among the Belgian tribes, the Remi (near Rheims) and the Lingoni, and obtained a strong base for his operations in Northern Gaul. During the ensuing years he became supreme over the Belgian tribes also. His lieutenant, P. Crassus, son of the rich Crassus, secured the submission, first of the Armorici and then of the Aquitani. In order to crush the last remnants of resistance, and to punish all that gave help to the rebels, he twice crossed the Rhine, and twice invaded Britain. While Pompey employed others to write for him, Cæsar prepared his own account of the Gallic War and had it published in book form, but without revealing his ultimate projects. Finally, after he had crushed a great rising under the Arvernian Vercingetorix in 52 B.C., he reduced all Gaul to one form of government, so that he could at any moment employ the resources of the land and its population against Rome itself. At the same time, the enormous amount of money that became his spoil was employed in extending his sphere of influence. He even came to terms with the client states and the provinces of the east, in order to be master of the situation.

Pompey, in the meantime, was in a difficult position at Rome, since he was being attacked on the one side by the optimates, on the other side by the extreme men of the popular party. He could make head only because of the strength the victories of Cæsar lent the triumvirate. The triumvirate was renewed in the year 56 B.C. at a meeting at Luca, which was still in Cæsar's province. While Cæsar obtained an extension of his command for five years, Pompey and Crassus were to hold the consulate for the second time, in 55 B.C., and afterwards the provinces of Spain and

Syria respectively. The most important military commands lay, therefore, in the hands of the three. As a matter of fact, Pompey, on the expiration of his year of office, administered Spain through his lieutenants, while he himself remained in Rome, and, together with his wife, Julia, daughter of Cæsar, held court there.

Crassus made use of his provincial command in Syria to enrich himself, as Cæsar had done in Gaul. He attacked the Parthians; but in the sandy district of Northern Mesopotamia the heavy-armed legionaries were no match for the light troops, and especially the cavalry of the Parthians; his guides failed him, provisions gave out, and the Roman army suffered a fearful defeat at Carrhæ in 53 B.C. Crassus himself, who wished to negotiate terms of surrender, was killed and with him his son, P. Crassus. The frontier on the Euphrates was held by the quæstor of Crassus, C. Cassius, but the defeat was not avenged until later.

Only Pompey and Cæsar were now left of the great powers in the state. The former, since the death of Julia, and his marriage with the widow of P. Crassus, a daughter of Q. Cæcilius Metellus Scipio, the leader of the optimates, had been driven more and more into rivalry with Cæsar. Family alliances proved very important in Rome, especially in the case of men like Pompey. The party of the optimates, in whose eyes the old oligarchic constitution alone was legitimate, wished to effect the withdrawal of both Pompey and Cæsar from their offices. But, since they could not be master of both, they first contemplated the humiliation of Cæsar, who seemed more dangerous to them, since he had already had a hand in the conspiracy of Catiline—a step which clearly amounted to a breach of the constitution—and he had paid no attention to the remonstrance of Bibulus, his colleague in the consulate; nor while he was ruling as supreme lord in Gaul did he cease to keep up communications with parties in Rome, and to take the most disreputable persons into his service, in order not to allow the opposition to the overthrown oligarchy to die out.

The powerful position of Pompey was respected by the optimates, to which party he leaned. When fresh difficulties arose as to supplying Italy with grain from abroad, Pompey was entrusted with the



JULIUS CÆSAR'S COMPLETE SUBJECTION OF THE GAULS

During the triumvirate Cæsar was supreme in his great province of Gaul, which he had reduced to one uniform government, with the design of using its strength against Rome itself if the need arose. He achieved this result after crushing a formidable rising under Vercingetorix in 52 B.C. The illustration shows the rebellious Gallic leader before Cæsar.

settlement of the matter. As the rivalry of certain party leaders, such as Clodius and Milo, who had played some part as tribunes of the people, ended in street fighting—indeed, Clodius was, finally, killed by Milo at Bovillæ, in the immediate vicinity of Rome—Pompey was placed at the head of the state as consul “without colleagues” (52 B.C.)—that is, he was exempted from constitutional restraints.

This was the case when a law came into force, according to which an interval of five years was established between the tenure of the consulate and that of a provincial governorship. Pompey retained his Spanish provinces without opposition, and Cæsar brought no objections against it, although he allowed his partisans to declare that the authority of the proconsul

of Gaul had the same basis as that of Pompey. In reality, the rupture between them was postponed, since Pompey adhered to the agreement with Cæsar until the expiration of their covenant.

From the year 49 B.C. onward there were no longer any obstacles to prevent the recall of Cæsar from Gaul and the appointment to the governorship of a loyal supporter of the optimates: and Cæsar, out of office, could be tried before a court for the numerous breaches of the constitution which he had committed. Metellus Scipio, M. Bibulus and M. Porcius Cato made preparations for doing so. And at the last moment T. Labienus, who had for years served as lieutenant under Cæsar in Gaul, and had taken a considerable part in his successes, joined this party. The

attempt, however, to break up the army of Cæsar, in the same way as that of Lucullus had been broken up at an earlier period, by political measures, totally miscarried. Cæsar's efforts were inevitably directed towards the single aim of winning a further extension of his term of office. He therefore demanded the consulship for the year 48 B.C., as well as the permission to be a candidate for it in his absence. The consulship would follow directly on the proconsulship, and, therefore, an impeachment for breach of the constitution would be rendered impossible. Besides this, Cæsar hindered the action of his antagonists, since he caused the tribunes of the people, whom he had gained over, to "intercede" for him at the debates in the senate. In January, 49 B.C., however, matters came

to a rupture, and Pompey was concerned in bringing it about. Cæsar was ordered to resign his province; L. Domitius Ahenobarbus was appointed to succeed him, and the other provinces were filled with partisans of the optimates. Finally, in order to render ineffective the protest of the tribunes of the people, the emergency decree was published—"Videant consules ne quid detrimenti capiat respublica" ("Let the consuls see to it that the commonwealth suffer no harm"—the formula employed to authorise the consuls to choose a dictator).

If Cæsar proved insubordinate, the same measures could be taken against him as against Catiline. The population of Italy was summoned to take up arms; and a man of consular or prætorian rank was



SCENE FROM THE TRIUMPH OF JULIUS CÆSAR

Braun, Clement

This, the first of Mantegna's nine panels at Hampton Court, shows the beginning of the procession, musicians and soldiers carrying the bust of Roma Victrix, while others follow with banners illustrating the towns conquered by Cæsar.



Draun, Clement

ANOTHER SCENE FROM THE TRIUMPH OF CÆSAR

This second painting by Mantegna shows two giant statues carried on a triumphal car, followed by soldiers and chariots bearing gods and other trophies taken from the vanquished, while at the side is a bust of Cybele surmounted by a laudatory legend to Cæsar. The most noticeable feature of the whole is the huge battering-ram used for reducing citadels.

sent into each district, in order to direct the measures for defence. At the same time the legions stationed in Spain could advance into Gaul. Pompey was nominated commander-in-chief, and thus remained at the head of the state, while he disregarded Cæsar's repeated proposals that the coalition should be observed.

Cæsar, on his side, was determined not to give his opponents time to arm. He stood at the head of the largest body of troops, a force of eleven legions, well seasoned by campaigns, while the remaining armies of the republic were scattered throughout Italy and the provinces. Cæsar had already advanced one legion as far as the south-eastern frontier of Gallia Cisalpina. When the friendly tribunes of the people—among

their number, M. Antonius—who could no longer hold their position in Rome, came to him as fugitives, he made this a pretext for crossing the Rubicon, the frontier of his province, with the troops that were then at hand. "The die is cast," he said in great excitement, as an eye-witness tells us. He had no other resource left, since the opposite party acted with such fury.

Cæsar surprised his opponents by the speed with which he pressed on from Ariminum to Picenum and Etruria, where he disarmed the militia who had been called out, or forced them to serve in his army. He then won the central districts of Italy by investing Corfinium, where L. Domitius Ahenobarbus held out, contrary to the orders of Pompey, and

forcing it to surrender. The government in Rome itself was no longer secure. The senate hastily withdrew with Pompey to Brundisium. Cæsar entered the capital without opposition. He made himself master of the treasury and the public stores and of the whole machinery of government, without troubling himself

**Cæsar
Triumphant
in Rome**

further about the forms of the constitution or the protests of the tribunes of the people. Individual magistrates who had remained behind, such as the prætor L. Roscius, were forced to publish laws—as, for example, one providing for the bestowal of citizenship on the communities of Cisalpine Gaul, to whom it had been obstinately refused by the optimates. Only a few members of the great families joined Cæsar, among them the prætor M. Æmilius Lepidus, son of the consul of the year 78 B.C., who thus laid the foundations of his subsequent importance. Together with him, M. Antonius came into prominence as the most capable subordinate of Cæsar.

Pompey, the commander-in-chief, and the optimates had sailed to Illyricum, in order to effect a counter-revolution—as Sulla had formerly done—in the east, the peculiar sphere of Pompey's supremacy. Great preparations were made under the protection of the legions which had followed him from Italy. The Greeks and the Orientals hurried up with their auxiliaries and rallied round Pompey as round their monarch, while the governors of the provinces were placed under his orders as legates, an arrangement which provoked much jealousy among the senators who had accompanied him. Cæsar had the great advantage of possessing the sole authority in his own camp. The superiority of Cæsar to Pompey, which may be recognised from comparing their features, consisted especially in the rapidity of his decisions and the energy with which he carried them

**The Quick
Decision
of Cæsar**

out. He could count on effective support everywhere. In Spain, Pompey, a generation before, had deposed the followers of Q. Sertorius from power and had placed their rivals at the head of affairs; Cæsar declared the acts of Pompey void, and thus could rely on resolute supporters when he hurried from Rome through Gaul into Spain, in order there to disarm the legions of Pompey. This result was

attained by skilful strategy at Ilerda in a surprisingly short time. Massilia, which had declared for the government of the optimates, was forced to capitulate after a prolonged siege. A large share of its territory was assigned as a reward to the veterans by Cæsar, who did not wish that Italy, as had happened under Sulla, should now be made to suffer unfairly.

Cæsar's moderation was universally praised. His opponents had expected the worst, imagining that he would execute the plans of Catiline, and they were pleasantly undeceived. His immediate object was to acquire control of the countries which furnished Italy with grain—Sardinia, Sicily, and Africa. He was successful in the islands, but in Africa, Cæsar's general, C. Scribonius Curio, met with a reverse, in consequence of the untrustworthiness of his own troops and the superiority of the Numidian cavalry which King Juba led against him. Curio himself was killed. At sea also the opposite party was superior: M. Bibulus, the former colleague of Cæsar, commanded the fleet. Nevertheless, Cæsar, with great

**Decisive
Battle of
Pharsalia**

audacity, transported a part of his army in November, 49, from Italy to the opposite coast of Illyricum, where he took up a position near Dyrrhachium until M. Antonius crossed over with the rest of the troops. Pompey, who held the chief command against him, was victorious in two engagements with Cæsar. But the latter advanced into Thessaly, and Pompey followed him. A battle was fought at Pharsalia, where Cæsar, on June 6th, 48 B.C., with 22,000 experienced soldiers, defeated an army of double strength. The Pompeians were driven back to Macedonia; and, owing to the energetic pursuit, could find no opportunity to rally. This was really the deciding blow. Those senators who did not actually belong to the extreme party made their peace with Cæsar after Pharsalia.

Pompey, however, did not give up his cause as lost, since the east was still unharmed, for Cæsar's partisans there had kept in the background; but he experienced the fickleness of popular feeling, and resolved to go to Egypt, where the royal family, whose throne had been supported by Roman troops at his instance, were under an obligation to him. The officers and eunuchs who surrounded Ptolemy, a boy of thirteen years, thought it



"BEWARE THE IDES OF MARCH!"

On the eve of his assassination Cæsar's wife had a strange dream about him, and he had other warnings which might have made him "beware the Ides of March," while at his death various phenomena were reported, including the appearance of a comet. From the painting by Sir E. J. Poynter, P.R.A., by permission of the Manchester Art Gallery.

only wise to change sides : and they therefore had Pompey murdered before he had actually landed at Alexandria. Cæsar arrived a few days afterwards, and was presented with the head of his rival, the man who had so long been his political colleague and afterwards his son-in-law. There was, however, a feeling of deep resentment when Cæsar made

**Cæsar
Presented with
Pompey's Head**

his entry as a conqueror and undertook to play off the princess Cleopatra against her brother, Ptolemy, and the ministers. Cæsar was placed temporarily in a very dangerous position, from which he was freed only by the arrival of reinforcements from Syria. In this connection Antipater, regent of Judæa, who had just saved Hyrcanus from the attacks of Aristobulus, recently released from imprisonment by Cæsar, received the reward for his services from the new ruler. Cleopatra, who lavished her charms on Cæsar, received the throne of Egypt, which was vacant through the death of her brother.

Cæsar went to Asia, where he defeated Pharnaces, a son of the great Mithradates, and reduced to order the affairs of the princes and of the towns. He then returned to Italy, where all sorts of irregularities had been tolerated under the slack administration of M. Antonius. There was also the necessity of annihilating the remnants of the optimates. They had collected a large army in Africa, under Metellus Scipio, the successor to Pompey as imperator, and under King Juba, while in Spain, Cnæus and Sextus Pompeius were in arms against Cæsar's governors, and had won successes. Cæsar, aided by the former follower of Catiline, P. Sittius, coming from Mauretania, defeated his African opponents at the battle of Thapsus in 46 B.C. Metellus Scipio, Cato, and Juba met their death, some by their own hands. Exasperated at the continuance of opposition, Cæsar allowed no pardon to be granted. Sittius received for his

**End of
the War
in Spain**


reward the territory of Cirta as an independent principality. The war in Spain lasted until 45 B.C., when Cæsar ended it by the battle of Munda, in the province of Bætica. Cæsar's victory here, as everywhere, resulted in a complete revolution, not only in the political status of the republic, but also in its economic conditions. The whole Roman world was in commotion, and no one knew what the end would be.

Cæsar had formed certain plans, but he had been swept on by the course of events. He conducted the government as dictator with constitutional powers, as Sulla had, but he never relinquished his office ; thus he held in turn the consulship, or, if not that, a proconsulship, by virtue of which he ruled from Rome, as Pompey had done. In short, he always held the highest power constitutionally attainable. He allowed his head to appear on the coins, crowned with laurel, and the inscription ran "Cæsar Imperator." After the victory had been won, the army was reduced to thirty-two legions, of which twenty-six were destined as garrisons for the provinces, and six as an army in the field.

The senate was retained ; but while Sulla had restored its broad authority, Cæsar proceeded in an entirely different way, and troubled himself very little about it, especially since he was assured of a majority through his own creatures, and the Sullan opposition did not even appear at the sittings. Cæsar settled as he though fit the most important matters, such as the questions of state finance and the appointment of governors, and paid no regard to the laws which had been enforced under the rule of Pompey. He was at the same time concerned with the reconciliation of parties. He nominated as governors men, not only of his party, but also of the opposition, so far as they had effected a timely reconciliation with him.

**Cæsar
as
Dictator**

After the year 45 B.C. the west seemed pacified, but in the east much was still undecided. The defeat of Crassus had not been avenged, the relations of Egypt towards Rome were not defined, and the ruler of Egypt still had control of resources which might once more jeopardise the whole Roman supremacy in the east. Apart from other considerations, the significance of Alexandria as a world emporium was so great as to eclipse Rome in many respects. The constitutional question, too, had to be considered, for in the east men were accustomed to the kingly rule. Nothing had caused such resentment in Egypt against Cæsar as his ordering the fasces and axes to be borne before him as a Roman consul. Roman legions still remained in the country after Cæsar's Alexandrian War. It was said that Cæsar thought of having the kingly title conferred on him for the east, and that he



THE END OF THE GREATEST FIGURE IN THE HISTORY OF ANCIENT ROME: DEATH OF JULIUS CÆSAR


The plot to assassinate Cæsar, on the pretence that his rule had grown tyrannical, involved some of his own friends, chief of whom was Marcus Junius Brutus. Cæsar was set upon by the conspirators in the senate, Cæsar giving the first blow, and it is said that when the tyrant saw Brutus among his assailants he submitted to his fate, exclaiming, *Tu quoque, Brute!*

From the painting by J. L. Gérôme

would live at Alexandria, where Cleopatra had won his heart. These were things which even Cæsar's trusted friends, such as M. Antonius, believed. At the feast of the Lupercalia, in February, 44 B.C., the latter presented Cæsar with a crown; and, though he refused it, many thought that it was a concerted plan.

Against such schemes there rose an opposition among people who had imbibed the republican spirit in the schools—where they learned of Junius Brutus, the legendary liberator of Rome from tyranny—and had generally grown up in the traditions of a free state. This feeling vented itself in public placards, or rather pasquinades. On the statue of the famous Brutus were found the words: "Would thou wert now alive," and on a billet: "Brutus, art thou asleep?" These hints were directed at

the prætor of the year, M. Brutus, a man whose family had nothing in common with the liberator except the name, but who was a "philosopher," and was accessible to such counsels. Thus a conspiracy was quietly forming against Cæsar, in which persons took part who stood on a familiar footing with the dictator—such as Decimus



BRUTUS AND CASSIUS

M. Junius Brutus, though a friend of Pompey, whom he supported at Pharsalia, was admitted to Cæsar's intimacy. He killed himself after the ineffectual battle at Philippi, at which Cassius had earlier committed suicide in the hour of defeat.

Brutus, who had served under Cæsar in Gaul. Others had gone over to Cæsar after Pharsalia, and had since then been in no way superseded in their careers; for instance, C. Cassius, the former prætor of Crassus in Syria. The whole conspiracy was engineered by optimates, angry because they had lost all their importance under a monarch like Cæsar. It cannot, indeed, be maintained that these liberators benefited their country. Under the circumstances it would have been the best course to have allowed Cæsar to act as he pleased, both at home and in foreign affairs.

Cæsar was on the point of departing for the east, and had arranged the affairs of government for the immediate future. M. Æmilius Lepidus stood next to him as magister equitum. His colleague in the consulate was M. Antonius—Mark

Antony—who was again designated to govern Italy after Cæsar's departure. A sitting of the senate was fixed for March 15th, 44 B.C., in order to settle the final arrangements. The conspirators determined to effect the assassination of Cæsar on that occasion. The roles were assigned, just as the followers of Catiline had once done. D. Brutus was to accompany Cæsar, who, as pontifex maximus, lived in the "Regia," to the capitol. Another was entrusted with the duty of keeping Antony, the consul, at a distance, since they feared his strength. The legitimist republicans shrank from putting him also out of their path, since they wished to strike the "tyrant," but not the consul. Thus the hideous deed was done; Cæsar was stabbed and killed by the conspirators during the session of

the senate. The senators, who knew nothing of the plot, rushed away in consternation. Even Antony fled, while the murderers yelled "Freedom!" The corpse of the dictator was carried to his house by slaves.

Immediately confusion set in. The conspirators had intended to declare all Cæsar's acts as ruler void, and to bring things back

to the condition in which they had been before the year 59 B.C., the date of Cæsar's first consulship. But the senate did not remain in session after the occurrence; and when, on the next day, the murderers tried to win over the people by speeches, it was seen that only a few approved of the deed.

Several of the conspirators had acquired offices and positions under Cæsar, and had been lately nominated by him to governorships, as D. Brutus, M. Brutus, and C. Cassius. These, therefore, had nothing to win if a new division of offices was desired. The summoning of the senate and of the popular assembly was, as the theorists who were loyal to the constitution discovered, in the discretion of the first magistrate of the republic, M. Antonius, the consul



ANTONY AND OCTAVIAN

THE TRAGEDY OF ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA AND DAWN OF THE AUGUSTAN AGE


WHILE the so-called liberators were thus negotiating among themselves, Cæsar's friends had recovered from their first consternation. Calpurnia, Cæsar's widow, had made over the entire property left by the dictator to the consul Antony, who thereupon came to an agreement with M. Æmilius Lepidus. This latter was just on the point of setting out for his province of Gallia Narbonensis ; he had troops stationed on the island in the

**Farce that
Followed
Cæsar's Death**

Tiber, but made no further use of them. Antony did not wish to have him at Rome ; and promised him, therefore, the place of pontifex maximus, the object of universal ambition, now left vacant by Cæsar's death. Since, for the time being, the results of Cæsar's murder could not be estimated by either side, even the Cæsarians were inclined to adopt a diplomatic attitude. An agreement was entered into with the liberators. Antony appointed a sitting of the senate for March 17th, in which a universal reconciliation and amnesty were announced, and these were afterwards celebrated by banquets, to which the heads of the parties invited each other—the veriest farce. Soon afterwards Antony seized upon the state funeral of Cæsar as an opportunity to incite the people against the murderers. Cæsar had left large legacies to the people, and this fact so heightened the excitement that the houses of the conspirators were threatened with fire, and they themselves were completely overawed. Antony was also supported by the veterans of Cæsar, so that

he discontinued his part in the republican movement, and rather thought to tread in the footsteps of Cæsar. In any case, Antony, endowed with physical rather than intellectual gifts, was not clear as to his object. He was vacillating, and wasted time ; he indulged in excesses, like Cæsar, but had not his power of restraint ; a talented officer, of easy disposition, he was regularly without means when these were most essential.

Julius Cæsar in his will had adopted and appointed as his principal heir his sister's grandson, C. Octavius—afterwards Augustus — called indifferently Octavius and Octavianus, the latter being the correct form, after he had been adopted into the Julian house. Octavius, a youth of not quite nineteen years, was, at the time of Cæsar's murder, at Apollonia in Illyria, where he was pursuing his studies and preparing to join in the campaign against the Parthians. His friend, M. Vipsanius Agrippa, was with him. The startling news came through an express messenger from the mother of Octavius, who, as widow, had married M. Philippus. The question arose now as to what should be done. Agrippa advised him to place himself at the head of the legions, concentrated for the ensuing



THE YOUNG AUGUSTUS

This celebrated sculpture, one of the most beautiful busts in Rome, shows us Octavian as he was about the time of Cæsar's death.

campaign in Illyricum. But Octavius determined to go at once to Rome and to enter on his inheritance, contrary to the advice of his nearest relatives. We have ample particulars about the matter in the Life of Cæsar Octavianus, which the

court scholar, Nicolaus of Damascus, wrote. On his arrival at Rome he presented himself before Antony, and declared that he would accept the will and the clause of adoption, and desired the private fortune of the dictator to be handed over to him, in order that he might pay the legacies. Antony was embarrassed, since he had so dealt with Cæsar's estate that after two months very little was left of it; he refused, however, to give any account of it, since, he said, it was owing to him that the entire estate of the testator had not been confiscated, and private money and public money were mixed up together. He showed no small disposition to treat as invalid the adoption, in virtue of which Octavius assumed the name of Cæsar Octavianus.

Antony might have been able to put the young man out of his way if his dissolute conduct had not roused enemies against him, even outside the circles which proposed the restoration of the republic. On the other side, the veterans, particularly those settled in Campania, gave their support to the heir of Cæsar, who bore his name. Cæsar Octavianus thus found persons ready to help him who otherwise were hostile to each other; the republicans were convinced that, after the overthrow of Antony, which was their first object, they would be able to put the boy—for he was then little more—aside.

M. Tullius Cicero, the famous writer and orator of the law courts, had, as consul, disagreed with Cæsar on the subject of Catiline's punishment. When Cæsar became consul and proconsul, Cicero had to undergo the penalty of banishment. During Cæsar's supremacy he had kept in the background, but came forward once more as spokesman of the senate to confront Antony, whose stepfather had been

among the executed accomplices of Catiline. In his "Philippic" orations he treated Antony himself as a Catilinarian. Hence a savage and bitter enmity arose

between them; and, all the more, because Antony, very unlike Cæsar in this respect, could not repel these attacks by the pen. In general, indeed, Antony carefully copied Cæsar, since the latter had disregarded the rule of the senate and governed Rome and Italy by military power, while in Gallia Cisalpina M. Antony planned to do the same, and wished, as proconsul, to go to Gallia Cisalpina, and not to Macedonia, as had been previously determined. He was desirous only of having with him in the new province the several legions that were stationed in Macedonia. The actual

governor of Gallia Cisalpina was D. Brutus, who had gone there soon after Cæsar's murder, and did not choose to quit the province, where he found strength in support of the republicans. Antony was resolved to drive him out by force of arms, and ordered the Macedonian troops

to Italy. Cicero came forward to oppose this, while Octavian, by means of emissaries, was inducing the soldiers to join his cause in preference, and spent his entire private fortune in largesses. Antony could do little in opposition, as he had no money left, and tried in vain to maintain discipline by severity. Octavian thus placed himself at the head of an army which swore allegiance to him, although he had not at that time been a magistrate of the republic.

The senate, at the same time, approved his procedure, in order that they might make him their champion against Antony, and granted the young man a prætorian command with consular rank. In the further course of events, while D. Brutus offered



ROMA, THE GODDESS OF ROME



MARK ANTONY

Aspired to Cæsar's place after the death of the dictator and leagued with Octavian, but, quarrelling with him, was defeated at Actium, and ended his life.

ANTONY AND OCTAVIAN

a successful resistance in Mutina, and Greece and the eastern provinces declared for the republicans, the governors of the western provinces were ordered by the senate to proceed against Antony. Cicero's correspondence and his "Philippic Orations" supply us with details. Thus, amid constant preparations for war, began the year 43 B.C., for which, according to the arrangement of the late dictator, A. Hirtius and C. Vibius Pansa filled the consulate. C. Cæsar Octa-

extend a friendly welcome to Antony, although Lepidus thus fell under the ban. There were still two governors in the west, on whom the issue depended—Asinius Pollio, who was stationed in Southern Spain, and L. Munatius Plancus, who administered Gaul, which Julius Cæsar had conquered. Both saw themselves clearly forced, by the sentiments of their troops, to declare their adherence to the Cæsarians. This left D. Brutus isolated. His own troops soon



MARK ANTONY'S ORATION OVER THE BODY OF CÆSAR

Antony, who was one of the triumvirs with Cæsar, had no part in his death, and at first was undecided in his course, but seized the opportunity of Cæsar's funeral to turn the mob of Rome against Brutus and the republican leaders.

vianus took the field as sole general, in order to fight Antony. There was a sanguinary encounter in the vicinity of Mutina, in which both consuls fell, so that Octavian alone was left; but Antony was defeated, and was outlawed by the senate, while D. Brutus received the chief command. Antony withdrew with the rest of his army to Gallia Narbonensis, where M. Æmilius Lepidus was in command.

The veterans of Cæsar, whose influence decided the attitude of the troops, allowed Lepidus no choice but to

went over to Octavian, and Brutus met his death among the Sequani, to whom he had fled.

In the meantime, M. Brutus and C. Cassius, seeing that they could play no part in Italy, had gone to the east, to buy corn in Crete and the Cyrenaica at the commission of the senate; but, secondarily, inasmuch as the senate was in conflict with Antony, to take possession of the provinces, Macedonia and Syria, which had been assigned to them originally—that is, by the dictator Cæsar. Every

one in these regions, where the influence of Pompey had been predominant once, joined the "liberators," on whom the senate conferred the supreme command (*imperium majus*). P. Dolabella, the colleague of Antony in the consulate, for whom this latter had procured Syria as province, was reduced to such extremities by Cassius that he committed suicide. Cicero displayed a feverish energy at Rome; men thought that they were nearing their goal, and would be able to disregard the young Cæsar. In the Sicilian and Sardinian waters Sextus Pompeius, who had disappeared from view since the day of Munda, came on the scene at the head of a powerful fleet, which was reinforced by fugitive slaves.

This stress of circumstances produced a coalition between the leaders of the Cæsarian party. Octavian suspended the pursuit of the Antonian forces, and actually allowed a detachment which had been cut off to march away unhindered, while, at the same time, he made overtures to Antony and Lepidus. An advance on Rome soon followed. A deputation from the army demanded the consulate for Octavian, since, through the death of Hirtius and Pansa, both places were vacant. There was no available army at Rome, so that the soldiery met with no opposition. Octavian marched to Rome, in order to press his claim. On August 19th, 43 B.C., he became consul, and with him his cousin Pedius.

**Octavian
Becomes a
Triumvir**

Octavian thus attained to a position in which he could treat with Antony and Lepidus on equal terms. In November, 43 B.C., after the death of D. Brutus, the decisive arrangements were completed at Bologna, where the three leaders of the Cæsarian party met. War against the murderers of Cæsar was to be waged.

Antony, Lepidus, and Octavian, under the title of *triumviri rei publicæ constituendæ*, that is, men charged with unlimited powers, placed themselves at the head of the state, and apportioned among themselves the most valuable provinces. Narbonensis and Spain fell to Lepidus, the rest of Gaul to

Antony; Africa, Sicily, and Sardinia—which had, indeed, first to be conquered—to Octavian. Proscriptions were decreed against the opposite party, in order to raise the necessary funds. The government was divided among the triumvirs. The soldiers were to receive, after the victory, assignments of land in Italy; and in a secret note the eighteen towns were named which were to be sacrificed to this purpose. The Cæsarians prepared to carry out that which Cæsar had avoided. Their programme was completed.

It was soon evident that a true statesman was dealing with affairs in the person of the young Octavian, whose peculiar characteristics were a ripe judgment and a fatalist belief in his own rights. To confirm his claims it was necessary that the murderers of his adopted father should be punished as traitors. This object was especially dear to the soldiers, while Antony, who, at the period of his supremacy, had followed other aims, now joined the cause; Lepidus' claims were considered as justified only by the emergency. The march against Rome was immediately begun, and the most prominent leaders

of the senatorial party were proscribed, Cicero among them. Antony was peculiarly bitter against him, and his vote was decisive. Even towards Octavian the great orator had acted more than ambiguously after Mutina; and if the first Cæsar, who had treated him very indulgently, had failed to win him, the triumvirs could not hope to do so.

In other respects, when once the necessity was recognised, the proscription was carried out in a spirit of remarkable callousness, and relations and friends

**A Reign
of
Terror**

were sacrificed by each of the three. Informers were rewarded, slaves who betrayed their masters were promised freedom, and all evil passions were inflamed, just as had happened forty years before, in the time of Sulla. Cicero was killed by a certain Popillius Læna, whom he had once defended on a serious charge. Many distinguished men were betrayed



SEXTUS POMPEIUS
This son of the great Pompey was defeated and pursued to his death by the triumvirs.

ANTONY AND OCTAVIAN

by their own wives, but in some cases the proscribed were rescued by the devotion of their slaves. Altogether, 130 senators and more than 2,000 knights fell victims to the proscription, in addition to a larger number of the populace. Since the proceeds of the proscriptions were insufficient, especially as Antony never knew how to hold on to money, forced loans and taxes were decreed.

The war was then begun with a force of more than forty legions. Lepidus was left at home. Octavian was to conduct operations against Sextus Pompeius, with Lower Italy as his base, but discontinued the campaign when the decisive blow

against Brutus and Cassius was impending, and joined Antony in Macedonia. The war then took a similar turn to that six years before between Pompey and Cæsar. Brutus and Cassius had completed their preparations in Asia and Syria, and had wrung large sums of money

from these rich countries. Egypt had also been forced to contribute. Recruiting was necessary; and, as there was a deficiency of officers, the young Romans who were studying in Athens and elsewhere in the east received important commands, among them Valerius Messalla, who afterwards became one of the most influential senators, Cicero's son and namesake, and others. The poet Horace went through the war as *tribunus militum*. The army took the road from Asia which Xerxes had once followed, crossed the Hellespont, and marched through Thrace to Macedonia, where in the interval Antony had taken up his position. Octavian was with him, being prevented by an indisposition from taking more energetic action.

The decisive engagements took place at Philippi in the autumn of 42 B.C. First of all, Cassius was beaten by Antony; but, at the same time, Brutus defeated the army of Octavian, whose camp was actually captured. Cassius, under the mistaken impression that Brutus also

had been worsted, killed himself. Twenty days later Brutus, who no longer believed in success, fought a second battle and lost it. He also died by his own hand. Valerius Messalla thereupon surrendered with the remnants of the republican army. All the murderers of Cæsar who could be captured were executed. The other officers received pardon, while the soldiers were drafted into the ranks of the victors. Valerius Messalla describes the occurrences in his "Memoirs." Only the fleet under Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, son of Julius Cæsar's antagonist, escaped, and tried to combine with Sextus Pompeius. Thus the Cæsarians had reached their goal.

Two tasks had now to be performed. In the first place, the veterans, who, according to the arrangements of the triumvirs, were entitled to discharge, 170,000 in all, had to be allotted the

promised lands in Italy, and, in the second place, the pacification and reorganisation of the east had to be carried out. The first task was a very delicate one, since its accomplishment would once more throw Italy into confusion. The latter was attended with no special difficulty for anyone who already knew the land and the people. Antony, who, as the real victor at Philippi, had the casting vote, chose the latter duty. Lepidus, whose attitude had been passive and equivocal, was almost contemptuously ignored. Had not his relations to Sextus Pompeius shown him in an invidious light he might have been for some time regent in Africa. Octavian was to receive the Spanish provinces; Antony, Narbonensis; while Cisalpine Gaul was joined to Italy.

Antony went to Asia and resided, first at Ephesus, then in Cilicia. Everywhere he set up or deposed client kings, confirmed the existing conditions in some towns, altered those of others, and made arrangements generally, according to his own pleasure. Everyone was eager to do the will of the new lord. He was in especial

Cæsar's Murder Avenged



LUCIUS, ANTONY'S BROTHER
When Octavian declared war against Antony, Lucius Antonius was defeated by Octavian, but his life was spared.

need of money, and the Asiatic towns were required now to pay twice as much in contributions as Cassius had taken from them, an exaction from which Antony granted the unlucky province but small remission. The princes willingly sacrificed their wives and daughters if they could gain anything by so doing, and Antony

**Cleopatra
Fascinates
Antony**

showed himself very willing to receive such gifts. He also summoned the queen of Egypt before his tribunal, to excuse herself for the aid she had given the liberators. Cleopatra, who had received precise information as to the character of the man, appeared before him in Tarsus as Aphrodite, and immediately succeeded in captivating him. She had once followed the old Cæsar to Rome; now, Antony accompanied her to Alexandria. He believed that he was acting like Cæsar; but, whereas the latter had dallied with the fair coquette, he had always carried wide-reaching schemes in his mind. Antony became blind and deaf to what was happening outside, though it was of the greatest importance for him.

The task which the young Cæsar had undertaken was not merely difficult in itself, but there were circumstances connected with it which accentuated the difficulties. All Italy was in a ferment, for the towns sacrificed to the veterans had not committed any offence. The way in which the confiscations were to be carried out was undefined; whether, for instance, the large landowners mainly would have to bear the cost, or whether it would fall also on the middle class and small proprietors, who predominated in Northern Tuscany, the Po districts, Samnium, and the country of the Hirpini. One of the consuls of the year 41 B.C., Lucius Antonius, brother of the triumvir, declared that he disapproved of the whole measure, and adopted a republican policy, since he considered the continuance of the "constituent" power had no justification, now that Cæsar's murderers were punished. He set himself up as the champion of

**All Italy
in a
Ferment**

the towns. Sextus Pompeius also entered into alliances with the towns situated in Southern Italy. In other places the veterans had recourse to violence. Virgil, afterwards so famous as a poet, might have lost his life in the vicinity of his native town, Mantua, had not Asinius Pollio, then lieutenant of Antony in those

parts, extended his protection to him. The fate of Virgil befell the other poets of the time, with whose lives we are familiar; Horace of Venusia, Propertius of Asisium, and the father of Tibullus, lost the whole or part of their property. We can picture the wail that arose in the districts affected, for we possess an accurate account of these events by one of the parties concerned, Asinius Pollio. The veterans insisted that the promises made to them should be kept. Cæsar admitted the justice of their claims, and was resolved to carry out the soldiers' wishes in the face of all obstacles, since he would otherwise lose his prestige with them.

M. Antony concerned himself no more about the matter, the unpopularity of which he preferred that his colleagues should bear. He was at his ease in Egypt. But at Rome, against his will, his interests were represented by Fulvia, his wife, one of the spirited women of that stormy epoch. She loved her husband, who had married her when she was the widow of Clodius. She saw clearly that if Octavian, whose adoption by Julius Cæsar the opposition did not admit, were to carry out

**Antony Prefers
Cleopatra
to World-power**

unaided his plans for rewarding the veterans, Antony would necessarily lose the esteem of his soldiers. Fulvia wrote to her husband that his presence in Italy was urgently required. Above all, she wished to bring him back to Italy from the arms of Cleopatra.

Thus the whole of the year 41 B.C. was full of ferment. The consul L. Antonius, Fulvia, and her procurator Manius, the veterans, the victims of confiscation, and Cæsar, were acting, now independently, now in concert, now in opposition. At last matters ended in actual war. L. Antonius was surrounded and besieged in Perugia. M. Vispanius Agrippa, who here first showed his strategic ability, was at Cæsar's side. The decision rested with Antony, who did not move from Alexandria for all the messages of Fulvia, and did not send any orders to his lieutenants, so that they looked on irresolutely at the siege. Cæsar thus won the upper hand. Perugia, after a desperate resistance of five months, was forced to capitulate and was cruelly punished; while L. Antonius, out of consideration for his brother, received a safe-conduct; Fulvia escaped to Greece. Many fugitives were received by Sextus Pompeius, who



THE MASTERY OF THE WORLD LOST THROUGH THE FASCINATION OF A WOMAN

Antony fell a victim to the fascination of Cleopatra, the queen of Egypt, who had earlier been the mistress of Caesar. She appeared before him as Venus Aphrodite, and he succumbed forthwith to her charms. Her flight at the battle of Actium was the signal for Antony's defection, and suicide soon ended the life of the once victorious general.

From the painting by Sir Laurence Alhaja-Tadousa, R.A., by permission of the Berlin Photographic Co., London, W.

was engaged in operations against Italy, unhindered by Lepidus. It happened at this time that the senator Ti. Claudius Nero had to fly from Cæsar in Campania, and with him his wife, Livia, the future Augusta, holding the little Tiberius in her arms—a noteworthy event at a time when all passions were unchained. The Parthians, meanwhile, had made an attack on Syria, and the son of T. Labienus served as their leader.

The Civil War Continued

Antony received the news of it simultaneously with the tidings that Perusia was captured, and that Cæsar was growing hostile to his lieutenants, owing to their ambiguous behaviour. He had the choice of either turning his attention to the Parthians or of going to Italy, in order to arrange matters. He preferred the latter course. He joined Fulvia in Greece, and husband and wife had much to reproach each other with. Soon afterwards Fulvia fell ill and died. Antony then went over to Italy. He had with him Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, who came forward with the fleet of the republicans as an independent party leader. He had gone to Antony, who, after the most recent events, did not seem nearly so baneful to the republic as Cæsar. Even Sextus Pompeius seemed disposed to come to terms with Antony, who accepted his proposals when Cæsar, on account of the presence of the outlawed Domitius Ahenobarbus with the fleet of Antony, refused to open his harbours to him.

But as Italy suffered so severely under the blockade, the friends of the two triumvirs bestirred themselves to effect a reconciliation. At the conference which was inaugurated at Brundisium, Asinius Pollio acted as confidential friend of Antony, while Cæsar's was C. Mæcenas. In his suite was Horace, who has described in verse the journey to Brundisium. Cæsar was not strong enough to venture on a rupture with Antony. The latter was called to the east by the Parthian War. There followed, therefore, towards the end of summer, 40 B.C., a reconciliation between the two great men, which was to be cemented by the marriage of Antony with Octavia,

half-sister of Cæsar, one of the most esteemed Roman women of the time. There could be no idea of Cleopatra. The queen had been the mistress of the old Cæsar; why should she not be the mistress of Antony?

For the time being Sextus Pompeius had been excluded from the treaty. But, as the supply of provisions for Italy was thus cut off and famine broke out, the relatives of Sextus Pompeius and the triumvirs brought about a new agreement at Misenum, according to which Sextus Pompeius was recognised in his independent command as lord of the sea, especially of the islands of Sardinia and Corsica, to which Achaia was to be added. At the same time, in 39 B.C., he became augur and was designated consul. The convention of Misenum was, for the time, most important. Sextus Pompeius called himself from that moment Magnus Pompeius Pius, since he bore the surname of his father

Pompeius as "Lord of the Sea"

as his first name, as the custom was later in the family of the Cæsars, while the name "Pius" marked him as the avenger of his father. From the agreement with Antony, Cæsar had gained the advantage that the Gallic and Spanish provinces were entirely given over to him. Antony was to receive reinforcements from the west in his campaign against the Parthians, and was to be allowed to recruit troops in Italy. The Parthians had in 39 B.C. made fresh attacks on Syria and Hither Asia, and had everywhere placed the party of opposition in power. In Jerusalem, the Hasmonæan, Antigonus, triumphed over his opponent and uncle, Hyrcanus, and his procurator, Herod, son of Antipater. As Antony was not on the spot, his lieutenant, Ventidius Bassus, conducted the campaign, and brought it to a successful termination. A second invasion in the following year was repulsed. Antony was displeased at this, since he wished it to be understood that the campaign against the Parthians, which Cæsar had once planned, was reserved for him. The Parthians retired to their own country after they had lost in battle Pacorus, son of their king, in



OCTAVIANUS AUGUSTUS

When he became a triumvir Octavius took the name of Octavianus Augustus.



THE CATAPULT AS A GREAT ENGINE OF WAR IN ANCIENT ROME

The catapult was a formidable engine of attack, and, together with the battering-ram, performed the function discharged by heavy artillery in modern military operations. From the painting by Sir Edward Poynter, P.R.A.

38 B.C.; Labienus also fell. Antony then placed his lieutenant on the retired list. Herod, to whom the triumvirs granted the title of King, seized power at Jerusalem in 37 B.C.

Antony had gone to Athens, where he and his wife, Octavia, established a court. The latter understood how to arrange matters adroitly between her husband and brother. Antony was in such good humour that long afterwards the memory of it was general in Greece. Two daughters, the elder and the younger Antonia, were born of the marriage. The preparations for the Parthian War were, meantime, proceeding. This campaign against the Parthians in 36 B.C. failed, and ended in a calamitous retreat, due partly to the faithlessness of the Armenian allies of Antony and partly to the circumstance that Antony had started too late. The reinforcements which had been promised Antony from the west amounted to very little, since the war against Sextus Pompeius required all available troops.

As Antony did not disguise his annoyance at this, the insinuations of the friends of Cleopatra gained the upper hand with him. When he summoned the queen to meet him at Antioch, the power of her charms, by which he was once more entranced, proved stronger than the political reasons which rendered his marriage with Octavia so important. The latter vainly tried to win back her husband. Antony went to Alexandria with Cleopatra, and ruled from there as her husband.

The general course of politics was now diverted into quite different channels. The dictator Cæsar had already considered the point that it was possible in the east, though not at Rome, to wear the title of monarch safe from the attacks of the republicans, and Antony followed his example. The empire round the basin of the Mediterranean, at any rate the eastern half, might thus have had a Hellenistic head, while, in the west, Rome might still maintain the leadership. This plan was once more discussed when,

in the fourth century A.D., the court was removed to the city on the Bosphorus.

Besides the rulers of Rome and Alexandria there still remained Æmilius Lepidus and Sextus Pompeius, of whom the latter, now that the alliance had been dissolved, was again the scourge of Italy. In addition to political refugees, thousands of runaway slaves fled to him,

The Rising Fortunes of Octavian

and the economic welfare of Sicily was seriously endangered. It was imperative to end such a state of affairs. M. Vipsanius Agrippa, Cæsar's right hand in all military matters, organised the Julian fleet at Misenum, and Antony and Lepidus sent reinforcements.

After great preparations the war was begun seriously with South Italy as a base; Cæsar himself met with a reverse on his first landing in Sicily, and the slaves fought so well that it was not until two years later, in 36 B.C., that the final victory was won in the naval engagements off Mylæ and Naulochus. When Sextus Pompeius fled, his troops surrendered to Lepidus, who had crossed with his legions from Africa. Lepidus wished to keep Sicily for himself, but Cæsar boldly entered the camp of Lepidus and commanded the soldiers to recognise him as their emperor. His schemes succeeded, as the veterans of Lepidus were promised the same rewards as those of Cæsar, while the veterans of Pompey went empty-handed, or were crucified as runaway slaves. Lepidus was declared by Cæsar to have forfeited his sovereignty, on account of his ambiguous conduct; on the other hand, he was given his life and allowed to retain his property and the office of pontifex maximus, but was forced to withdraw to Circeii.

This was a splendid success for Cæsar, since he was now master of the sea and emperor over forty-five legions. Antony, who was incensed at the action of Cæsar, by which the balance of power had been destroyed, received Sextus Pompeius; the latter, however, met his death the following year, 35 B.C., while attempting to raise an insurrection in Asia. Antony was at that time occupied in Armenia, where he avenged on the king the disasters of the Parthian War. Later, in 34 B.C., he brought him a prisoner to Alexandria. He then turned all his attention to the west, where the final struggle for the supremacy could no longer be postponed. While Antony, in the capital


The Coming Struggle for the Dictatorship

of Egypt, was consolidating the countries of Nearer Asia, which had once been owned by the Ptolemies, into a realm for his children by Cleopatra, and was thus planning to base his power on a restoration of the Hellenistic state system, Cæsar, with that keen, political insight peculiar to him, was following other paths, which led him far indeed from those of his adoptive father, but materially contributed to his ultimate success. He effected a total reconciliation with the party which formerly had supported the great Pompey against the divine Cæsar, and showed himself contented with a position such as that which Pompey had assumed in, and by the side of, the senatorial party. The second Cæsar wished to make complete use of his supreme power, not as dictator or king, but as "princeps," as the first citizen, as the foremost member of the senate, in direct opposition to Antony, who was disposed to combine the dictatorship and kingly power.

In order to increase his popularity, Cæsar had done much for Italy and Rome in the few years which preceded the crisis. He conducted a campaign in Dalmatia and Istria, in order to give an advantageous frontier to Upper Italy. At Rome a new water supply was provided—a long-felt want. In general, all steps were taken to ensure that the break did not come until a favourable moment. Mæcenas, who influenced public opinion in Cæsar's favour by his patronage of the poets, and Agrippa, who kept the army and fleet in good order, were continuously working towards this object, while Cæsar held the reins of government firmly in his hands. Men like Asinius Pollio, who did not wish to co-operate, kept quite in the background, since they saw what would be the result of Antony's infatuated love. Only republicans like Domitius Ahenobarbus and inveterate enemies of Cæsar adhered to Antony. These, with the exception of Ahenobarbus, complied with the queen's wishes that she and Antony should not be addressed as "Thou," as the Roman custom was, and took part in the court festivities in Alexandria, at which everything was conducted with Oriental pomp.

Octavianus Prepares his Way to the Throne

Cleopatra brought up her son by the first Cæsar, Ptolemæus Cæsarion, together with her children by Antony, and now played him off against "Gaius Octavius." Octavia, on the other hand, educated



THE BATTLE OF ACTIUM, AT WHICH AUGUSTUS DEFEATED ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA IN THE YEAR 31 B.C.

in Rome not only her own children, but also those of Antony by his first marriage, even after she had obtained a divorce from him.

The year 32 B.C. saw further vicissitudes, since, on the one hand, the adherents of Antony became active, and, on the other, Cæsar took vigorous measures. He appeared, armed, in the senate, and compelled his opponents to fly, and, as at the time of the proscription, showed himself devoid of scruples. He caused the will of Antony, which was deposited with the vestal virgins, to be opened, in order to prove that it contained dispositions in favour of Cleopatra and her children, as well as instructions that he should be buried in Alexandria, a revelation which caused an immense stir in Rome. Numerous pamphlets were circulated, in which the plebeian origin of Cæsar and the Oriental masquerading of Antony were criticised. While the boys in Rome were playing at "war between Cæsar and Antony," the population of Italy and the western provinces took the oath of loyalty to Cæsar as their leader, according to the custom, in case of "tumultus" or war. By far the greater number of senators accompanied Cæsar on his departure for the war, which was officially declared against the queen of Egypt. Antony, who, in the campaigns against the Parthians, had shown himself once more a brave soldier, if not a successful general, thought that the issue should be decided by a land battle, as, after the defeat of Sextus Pompeius, the opposite party was superior in ships and in experience of naval warfare. But Cleopatra, who was strongest in her ships, insisted on a sea-fight, although there was a deficiency of sailors, and the soldiers, in accordance with their training, did not

willingly go on board. As the Romans about Antony could not prevail against the queen, many deserted the triumvir, among them Domitius Ahenobarbus.

With Cæsar everything went well. Agrippa had shown his worth on land and on sea; and there stood at his side other capable leaders, as Statilius Taurus and Valerius Messalla. Their ships were, indeed, fewer than those of Antony, but they were fully manned; and the legions were not merely on paper. Again Italians

and other western nations confronted the east, where recruiting for the legions was difficult, and even the auxiliaries were less efficient soldiers. Antony meditated a landing in Italy, in order to bring the war to an end there, as Sulla had once done. His headquarters were in Patrae, while his army and fleet collected in the Gulf of Ambracia in the autumn of 32 B.C.


But in the spring of 31 B.C. Agrippa took the offensive, and was successful in some naval operations, while the land forces faced each other without fighting. On September 2nd a great sea battle was fought off the promontory of Actium. Antony was defeated, as Cleopatra made for the open sea during the fight, and Antony, in his infatuation, hastened after her. A few days after, the land army, left without a leader, surrendered

on the same terms as that of Lepidus. The soldiers of Antony, who acknowledged Cæsar as their imperator, were placed by him on an equal footing with his own troops. Traces of the fact that Cæsar's army had been formed out of three others existed for centuries afterwards in the numbers of the Roman legions.

There were, for example, three legions numbered III.; namely, the III. Cyrenaica the III. Gallica, the III. Augusta. The first mentioned might have originated



ROMAN LICATORS CARRYING FASCES
 The lictors were an ancient institution in Rome, dating from the time of the kings. The "fasces" was a bundle of rods of elm or birch, enclosing an axe and bound with a red strap. Great officers of state were always attended by lictors in all public ceremonies.



THE NILE GOD: A COMPANION GROUP TO THE TIBER

The sixteen little figures symbolise the rise of the river in cubits at its highest.

in the army of Lepidus, the second came certainly from that of Antony.

The war was ended in Egypt, whither Antony and Cleopatra had fled. Serious opposition could no longer be offered, since the foreign tributaries and allies, after Actium, all did homage to the victor, who was delayed only by the insubordination of his own soldiers. In the summer of the year 30 B.C. Cæsar advanced from Syria against Egypt, while C. Cornelius Gallus attacked from the side of Cyrene.


Alexandria was captured on August 1st, 30 B.C., after Antony had taken his own life. Cleopatra, detained by negotiations, became a prisoner. She had an interview with Cæsar, but found no mercy; nor did her son, Cæsarion, fare better. All claimants who opposed the dynastic interests of Cæsar were killed, including Antyllus, an elder son of Antony. His other children were

spared. Egypt ceased to be the kingdom of the Ptolemies, though the kingly power still continued officially. Cæsar allowed himself to be hailed as "Pharaoh," giving merely another form to the procedure of Antony, and reckoned the years of his reign in Egypt from the death of Cleopatra. He appointed as his representative Cornelius Gallus, a man of equestrian rank, who had acquired a reputation as a poet and a patron of the arts. An insurrection in Upper Egypt was suppressed by him, the Roman dominions were extended to the cataract of Syene, and treaties were concluded with the tribes settled to the south. Cornelius Gallus, a man of somewhat strange fancies, felt himself so completely the successor of the old kings that he was suspected at Rome and recalled. When Cæsar made him feel his displeasure, he committed suicide. The age of pretenders was over, once for all



THE TIBER GOD, "TO WHOM THE ROMANS PRAY"

This sculpture, together with that of the Nile, was part of the decoration of the temple of Isis in Rome.



THE SPLENDID SPECTACLE OF A CHARIOT RACE IN THE CIRCUS MAXIMUS AT ROME

The circus was a favourite amusement of the Romans, and many magnificent buildings were devoted to this purpose, the largest of all being the famous Circus Maximus, erected in the time of the Tarquins. This mighty building is said to have seated 300,000 spectators, and the emperors outdid each other in adding to its beauties. Julius Cæsar introduced naval displays into it by constructing canals that could be flooded in a short time and made the scenes of mimic battles. From the painting by E. Forti.



ROME IN THE AUGUSTAN AGE HOW AUGUSTUS MOULDED THE EMPIRE AND THE GREAT MEN OF A GLORIOUS ERA

ONLY those who had successfully passed through these crises remained in the foreground, even after Octavian had announced at Rome the restoration of the old constitution. The senate conferred on him, in the year 27 B.C., the additional name of "Augustus," the "Exalted"; and he was in the future officially called "Imperator Cæsar Augustus." With Agrippa, his trusted friend, in victory and power, he shared the consulate in the years 28 and 27 B.C. Both were then between the ages of thirty-five and thirty-six.

Augustus and Agrippa as Consuls

Augustus was fair and blue-eyed, but not otherwise physically striking; Agrippa had an expressive head, which resembles that of Napoleon in his youthful days. He wore, as a naval victor, the naval crown (*corona classica*), while Augustus was awarded the civic crown (*corona civica*) of oak leaves for his humane behaviour after the battle of Actium. Neither of these honours was beyond the reach of any citizen. In their capacity as consuls these "crowned" leaders, who were popularly compared to the twin brothers, Romulus and Remus, carried out a satisfactory settlement with the senate, formerly the ruling body.

The problem was how to preserve the Roman constitution and at the same time to assure the supremacy of Augustus, to give him such a position as Hiero had held in Syracuse, the Attalidæ in Pergamus, or, earlier still, the Pisistratidæ, or Pericles himself, at Athens. The more conservative the spirit in which they acted, the more lasting would be the new arrangement.

This was the belief of Augustus, and he always acted in accordance with it. By the constitution of Augustus one position was still left as a sort of hereditary possession, which the senate had already granted to Pompey the great, but had refused to the first Cæsar. Just

Asserting the Hereditary Principle

as the sons of Pompey and the son of Antony had come forward as successors to their fathers, so the adopted son of the dictator Cæsar thought to keep this position in his family; they called it the "principate," the first place among the families that ruled the republic. With this was to be joined the supreme command over the troops in the countries not yet specified—Syria, the Rhine, North Spain, and, soon after, Illyricum. These provinces, since the "princeps" could not always leave Rome, were governed, as Spain had been under Pompey, by lieutenants (*legati*), who were entrusted with independent power of action, but were always related to the ruling family.

Generally speaking, the fiction was officially kept up that Augustus, after five or ten years, when everything was reduced to order, would willingly resign this accumulation of governorships. In Rome and Italy the consulate did not carry with it absolute predominance, for the office had to be shared with a colleague. Augustus, therefore, after being re-elected to the consulate up to 23 B.C., had the "tribunician power" conferred on him, once for all, by virtue of which he could exercise supervision over all ordinary magistrates; while, by historical tradition, the championship of the plebs—



Mansell

CÆSAR AUGUSTUS
The title of "Augustus," the "Exalted," was conferred on Octavian, the adopted son of Julius Cæsar, by the senate, 27 B.C.

that is, of the people against the nobility—was inseparably connected with it, a point which seemed of importance as evidence of the formal restoration to the old constitution. While the years were still dated, as before, after the two consuls, the number of the year of Augustus's tribunate was also recorded. When the former triumvir,

Augustus Grasps Every Means of Power

Lepidus, died, in 12 B.C., Augustus assumed the chief pontificate. He was then already a member of the chief priestly colleges, a condition contrary to the customs of republican times, when, at the most, two priestly offices might be held together. In every respect the "princeps" held an extraordinary position. The senate continued to act together with him, being formally in possession of the powers which Sulla had conferred on it, with the exception that more scope was given here to the initiative of the "princeps." If he did not wish to come forward with a motion, this was done for him by senators who belonged to the circle of his friends.

An opposition made itself felt only on unimportant questions. The noblest families, such as those of Æmilius Lepidus, Domitius Ahenobarbus, Fabius Maximus, Antony, and Claudius, were connected by ties of relationship with the ruling house. Asinius Pollio lived, after the battle of Actium, in complete retirement; but his son, Asinius Gallus, became consul in early life, later proconsul, and married a daughter of Agrippa. L. Munatius Plancus, always a trimmer, played the part of a loyalist, and it was at his initiative that the senate conferred on Octavian the title of Augustus. Valerius Messalla, descended from a republican family, closely attached himself to Augustus, though not without clinging to constitutional forms with excessive punctiliousness.

Another man, who, during the civil wars, had stood on the side of the republicans, Cn. Calpurnius Piso, was induced by Augustus to accept the consulate for the year 23 B.C., in order thus to show his acceptance of the new state of things. The son of M. Tullius Cicero became consul at the time of the battle of Actium, in order to wreak vengeance on Antony for his father and his uncle. On his motion the name of Antony was erased from the consular lists. This Cicero, though personally unimportant, afterwards went to Asia as proconsul. The

Cicero's Son as Consul

civil wars had swept away all men of independent views. When the consul for the year 23 B.C., M. Terentius Varro Murena, attempted to form a conspiracy, he was brought to trial, condemned, and executed.

Public opinion was in favour of the "princiate," and of the primacy of the Julian house in particular. This was important, in view of the fact that most writers at the time of the first Cæsar had upheld the republic; not merely Cicero, Brutus, and Labienus, but also the poet Catulus and the historian Cornelius Nepos, who were both natives of Cisalpine Gaul. The historian Livy of Patavium grew up a "Pompeian" in feeling; the poet Virgil of Mantua appears first as a client of Asinius Pollio, and Horace the Apulian had fought for "freedom" at Philippi. But soon after Actium, when Livy began to cast the old annals into an appropriate form, he was already one of the circle of Augustus, who took a personal interest in his productions. Virgil and Horace were intimately acquainted with the trusted friend of

Greek Scholars in Rome

Augustus, Mæcenæ of Arretium. Greek literary men also began to make Rome the centre of their labours. Strabo of Amasea in Cappadocia, as historian and geographer, followed in the footsteps of Polybius and Posidonius, who, according to the most approved models of the period of the Diadochi, had combined the history of the Roman West and the Greek East into a universal history; so also did Diodorus, who came to Rome from Sicily.

Others, as Dionysius of Halicarnassus, treated the earlier history of Rome after the example of the Roman antiquaries, whose most learned representative, M. Terentius Varro of Reate in the Sabine country, lived during the principate of Augustus. The rhetorician Nicolaus of Damascus, who was engaged for some years in teaching the children of Antony at the house of Octavia, wrote a comprehensive history of the world, in addition to an account of the youth of Augustus. The poet Crinagoras of Mitylene, whom his native town sent repeatedly as envoy to Rome, dedicated some of his best poems to Octavia and her relatives. King Juba of Mauretania belonged to this circle. He was a son of that Juba, king of Numidia, who had fought with the optimates against



THE SPLENDID STATUE OF CÆSAR AUGUSTUS IN THE VATICAN MUSEUM, ROME

Cæsar, and had been educated at Rome. He married there the daughter of Cleopatra and Antony, who also was called Cleopatra, and afterwards proudly named her son "Ptolemæus," as if he were heir of the Ptolemies. Juba wrote in Greek on Roman antiquities and African geography—a memorable literary phenomenon of a time when Rome became the capital of the Hellenic-Roman sphere of civilisation, and to a certain extent had maintained her position as

such in the struggle against Antony and Cleopatra. The princes of other client kings were, like Juba, sent to Rome to be educated, and there they entered into personal relations with the house of Augustus, as in the case of the sons and grandsons of the Jewish king, Herod, of whom we learn many interesting particulars in the "Antiquities of the Jews" of Flavius Josephus. The children of the Parthian kings also came, and so did Thracian princes and even the sons

of German chiefs, who went to Rome as hostages, and were, indeed, lost to their own people, since they grew effeminate amid the delights of the capital.

Augustus stood for more than forty years, after the establishment of his principate, at the head of the state, supported at first by Agrippa, who became his son-in-law in 21 B.C., and afterwards by his stepsons, Tiberius and Drusus, and for a time by his grandsons, Gaius and Lucius Cæsar, the sons of Agrippa and Julia. The supreme command of the army, the administration of the frontier provinces, the foreign policy, were all united in the hands of the ruling house, while the senate had under its supervision only the affairs of Italy and the pacified provinces, among which Asia and Africa took the first rank. The same dualism was apparent in the financial question.

The rule was soon established that the coinage of gold and silver was the concern of the "princeps," whose likeness the coins bore, while the copper pieces struck through separate masters of the mint.

The largest item in the state budget was the outlay for the army. Augustus, after he had disbanded the enormous masses of troops which were kept up during the period of the triumvirate, had organised a standing army, in order, once for all, to ensure the protection of the frontiers of the empire.

The organisation of Marius was, on the whole, retained, Cæsar's alterations were modified, and, out of consideration for the finances, even the field army was done away with, a change which later proved disastrous. Not merely the pay of the troops actually serving, but the rather high pensions of the retired soldiers, had to be met; for this purpose a 5 per cent. inheritance tax was imposed even in Italy. The princeps, as commander-in-chief, was entitled to a staff, which drew high pay. Two naval stations, Misenum on the Campanian coast and Ravenna on the Adriatic, were established, to guard the sea.

Great sums were expended on the capital, in feeding it, in keeping the Tiber embankments and the sewers in good order, and especially in producing the public games. The "Roman people" were anxious to retain the advantages of their lordly position, and demanded "bread and games." Of the provinces under Augustus, Egypt yielded the most in taxes.

Asia was, it is true, a senatorial province, but in the way of indirect duties soon paid a considerable revenue into the coffers of the princeps. Gaul and Spain, which at first cost more than they brought in, became, in the course of the peaceful times that followed, countries of great financial importance. Africa and Narbonensis were closely identified with Italy, and shared its prosperity. Carthage, which Cæsar had restored, became again the capital of the far-reaching sphere of Punic-Roman civilisation. In Spain, Augustus

and Agrippa completed the conquest of the Cantabrian and Asturian highlands, though a considerable force was required for a long time afterwards to hold the country. Three provinces were created, of which the most southern, the country of the Bætis, was under senatorial rule, while the other two,



TWO GREAT POETS OF THE AUGUSTAN AGE
In the poetical works of Horace—on the left—and Virgil
—on the right—the triumphs of an emperor who was himself a poet and patron of letters are immortalised.

Lusitania and the so-called "hither" province, were subject to the princeps. Corduba, Emerita, and Tarraco were the capitals. Emerita was a new colony, which Agrippa had settled with his pensioned soldiers.

In the north of the country Cæsar Augusta, now Saragossa, so called in honour of the princeps, has preserved the recollection of Augustus up to the present day. In

Gaul, which was conquered by the first Cæsar, or rather in the "three Gauls"—that is, the

districts of Celtica, Belgica, and Aquitania, which were always distinct from the old province (Narbonensis), as being departments with a military government—the newly founded Lugdunum became the religious and economic centre of the Roman rule. Belgica was afterwards combined with the German departments for administrative purposes. Aquitania

also tried to keep its separate institutions. The "concilium" of the three Gauls, which met yearly at the confluence of the Arar (Saône) and the Rhodanus (Rhône), in order to sacrifice to "God the emperor and Rome the goddess," was an important institution; Lugdunum became the capital of one of the great territorial divisions of the empire, just as Carthage was of Africa. In both places was stationed a cohort, resembling the police soldiery of the city of Rome, which was at the disposal of the administrative authorities. We find no less than eight out of the twenty-five legions, which the army numbered in the last years of Augustus, stationed on the Rhine, where they could be employed equally against the Kelts and the Germans. The interests of the districts occupied by these troops became all the more identified with the Roman interests, in that the tribes of Belgica and the neighbouring Germans eagerly took service among the auxiliaries of the legions. This branch of the service was well paid, and the national characteristics of the tribes were preserved under native leaders, in so far as they themselves did not covet Roman titles and rewards. The second large army, four legions, was in Syria, facing the Parthians, who soon, however, adopted diplomatic methods, as they were weakened by internal dissensions; the standards which had been captured by the Parthians from Crassus at Carrhæ were thus regained. Augustus, in 20 B.C., declared he was content with this arrangement, since he preferred the west to the east, and devoted his energies more willingly to places where Latin civilisation might thrive. In Egypt the military system

was left on the footing on which it was placed during the time of the last Ptolemies. The numerous Galati were united with the Greek elements into army corps, which were counted as "legions" of the imperial army.

Their commanding officers were nominees of the princes; and, therefore, never senators, but usually men of the rank of Roman knights. In Africa alone the proconsul commanded one or, if necessary, two legions, which had to guard the

frontier against the unruly tribes of the desert. In Illyricum the forces were originally under a senatorial governor, until Augustus submitted his plan for the regulation of the frontiers, and entrusted its execution to his colleague, Agrippa, and, after his death, to his stepson, Tiberius Claudius Nero. Tiberius was then, in


12 B.C., merely "legatus" of Augustus, and from that time the command in Illyricum also was "imperial." The aim of the government was directed, first and foremost, towards obtaining firm and, as far as possible, natural frontiers for the empire.

In the east the Euphrates, and in the west the Danube and the Elbe, form this frontier. While the line of the Euphrates was easily secured by strong fortresses, difficulties were met with on the Danube and in Germany. The Alpine districts, except Noricum, with which, since the time of the Cimbri, peaceful communications had been opened, had to be taken by force of arms.

The hardy tribes in the heart of Illyricum showed similar hostility. Here, too, the Roman system would have taken firm root, through the services which the natives rendered as auxiliaries, had not the legionary been accompanied by Roman tax-gatherers and Roman lawyers, who were compared by the Illyrians to wolves. The same

was the case in Germany, which Drusus, the second stepson of Augustus, had traversed victoriously as far as the Elbe, by land, from Mogontiacum (now Mainz) and from Castra Vetera, and by water as far as the mouth of the Elbe, where the Romans prided themselves on capturing the original home of the Cimbri—splendid feats of arms, which extended the geographical knowledge of the time as much as the earlier campaigns of Pompey and of Julius Cæsar.

After the premature death of Drusus, in 9 B.C., Tiberius continued the policy of his brother. The German tribes were content to serve under the Roman standards. Arminius, a young prince of the Cherusci, became a Roman knight, and personally commanded the contingent of his tribesmen, while his brother, who was surnamed Flavus, became a Roman even



MÆCENAS, THE FRIEND OF AUGUSTUS

This great man was the intimate friend of Augustus, and ruled Rome in the emperor's absence. Even after his retirement he continued to enjoy the imperial favour.

in sentiments. The lawyers, here as elsewhere, ruined what the soldiers had won.

In the year 9 A.D., owing to the failure of the incompetent governor, P. Quinctilius Varus, to preserve order, an insurrection broke out, at the head of which Arminius placed himself. In the Teutoberg forest the unfavourable nature of the soil, rendered treacherous by heavy rains, the desertion of the German officers, and the blunders of the general, brought annihilation on three Roman legions. The position of the *Saltus Teutoburgensis* cannot now be exactly determined; but, as numerous gold coins of the times of Augustus have been found at Barenau, to the east of Bramsche, many are inclined to locate the battlefield at that place. Quinctilius Varus killed himself, while many of the prisoners were massacred by the insurgents or sacrificed to the gods; only the cavalry escaped. The numbers of the legions, seventeen, eighteen, and nineteen, disappeared for ever out of the imperial army; their memory was "accursed," to adopt the ordinary expression.

As a consequence of the defeat of Quinctilius Varus, Augustus withdrew the frontier from the Elbe to the Rhine, and the latter river was not again crossed until the emperors of the Flavian house did so to effect a permanent occupation of the country. Until then the district on the right bank of the Rhine was, if not free, at any rate neutral, a region where the Romans went to forage or to hunt. In times of peace the Roman officers certainly led their men across in large bands to catch the wild geese, of which the feathers were highly valued in Italy. Germans also came over the frontier to trade, and exchanged natural products for implements and ornaments of Roman manufacture. The *Hermunduri*, who settled north of the Danube, were allowed, by special permission, to come to *Augusta Vindelicorum* (Augsburg), the market town of the *Rhætian* province, while elsewhere commercial transactions had to be conducted on the frontier under the supervision of subordinate officers.

Carnuntum, situated on the Danube, near the middle of its course (below Vienna), was considered an important emporium for the trade between *Illyricum* and the *Baltic* countries. *Amber*, which

was then highly valued, was brought to Rome by this route. The main Roman army was, at the time of Augustus, concentrated in Southern Styria, while the *Hungarian* districts on the Danube were not included within the Roman line of defence until the time of Trajan. *Singidunum*, near Belgrade, and *Viminacium* (*Kostolatz* in *Servia*) were the strongholds on the Danube, and kept in check the countries lying to the north and south.

The province of *Dalmatia*, to which *Herzegovina* and *Bosnia* belonged, was occupied for decades by two legions as garrisons, since a great insurrection, lasting four years, from 5 to 9 A.D., had shown that the peoples of that part were by no means subdued. In order to settle matters there, Central Germany had to be relinquished, for its occupation would have required an enormous expenditure in money and men, an expenditure which Augustus, at the end of his life, could no longer make up his mind to incur. It was enough if, by the suppression of the insurrection of *Pannonians* and *Dalmatians*, the eastern frontier of

Upper Italy was rendered as secure as the north had become earlier through the *Rhætian* War. As a result, the *Po* district attained to a hitherto unknown prosperity. The great monuments commemorative of victory, the "*Tropæum Alpium*," on the summit of the *Maritime Alps*, and in *Ticinum* (now *Pavia*), testified to the gratitude of this country, and spread the fame of the sovereign and his family.

In other respects, too, Italy was benefited by the government of Augustus. The country towns recovered from the terrors of the civil wars and the proscriptions. Augustus did everything to heal the wounds which he himself had inflicted, especially at the time when he had been forced to recompense the veterans after the battle of *Philippi*.

Perusia received its entire territory back again, and remained a *municipium*, entitled, according to custom, to vote in the sacred *Etruscan League*. Roads like the *Via Flaminia* were put into better order, an improvement very welcome to the towns situated on it, such as *Fanum* and *Ariminum*. The management of the Italian roads, which could not be entirely entrusted to the separate *municipia*, on account of their keen rivalry, was provided



WARS OF THE ROMANS WITH THE GERMAN TRIBES

In the time of Augustus a third of the whole army of the empire was stationed along the Rhine for service against the Germans and Kelts. Nevertheless, the greatest disaster of his reign was the total defeat of Varus by the tribes of the Teutoberg forest in 9 A.D. The bas-relief at the top depicts a battle with the barbarians. Below is a relief from the Antonine Column, showing the execution of German nobles captured in battle.

for by the appointment of a central commission, composed of distinguished senators, which sat at Rome. In other respects, indeed, the separate municipia, while enjoying the advantages, were also liable to the burdens of autonomy. They were small states within the state; annually they changed their two magistrates, who stood at the head of the government, after the manner of the consuls in ancient Rome, and with a few subordinates conducted the administration under the authority of the municipal council. The financial question caused little difficulty in the municipia, so long as persons who had amassed wealth in the imperial service thought it an honour to fill the offices in their native town, and to make contributions out of their own purses. Thus, the material advantages of the imperial system were felt even by the smallest communities of the Apennine peninsula.

The new monarchy introduced many improvements in the administration of the capital. A prefecture of police was established for Rome, modelled after that of Alexandria, a change which would never have commended itself to republicans. The prefect had a few cohorts of military police under him; the supervision of the numerous slaves, as well as their protection from the caprice of their masters, was assigned to the new magistrate, whose sphere of duty steadily increased as time went on. Architectural regulations were introduced, according to which a new quarter sprang up on the Campus Martius, to which the trade of the capital was attracted more and more from the old districts. The Forum of the republican time and the new forums, as well as the Capitol, served chiefly for the transaction of legal business and for public purposes, while the Palatine was adopted by Augustus for his residence.

Cities were built after the model of the capital even in those provinces where the Italian municipal system had not yet obtained a footing; colonnades, long lines

of tombs, the forum, the theatre, the amphitheatre, arose. The republican city had been exclusive; imperial Rome became the subject of assiduous imitation.


A similar reproduction of Alexandrian institutions was found in the fire brigade at Rome, organised on a military system; this had previously been composed of the slaves in the town, or else the duty had been left to private enterprise. A special prefect was now appointed for this purpose, as well as to supervise the provisioning of the capital, which was dependent entirely on the regular importation of grain from Egypt and Africa, since the vicinity of Rome had become the mere "garden of the empire." The villa quarter of the imperial capital extended on the north as far as the Lake of Sabate

(now Lago di Bracciano), on the south to the Gulf of Naples, on the east into the country of the ancient Sabines, Æqui and Volsci. The conquered world had to supply all that was required, a state of things at once as ideal and as unnatural as Paradise, since the greatness of Italy had been built up by the free farmer, who now survived only in remoter districts.

The period of the Æquian and Volscian wars was even then ancient history. However, men did not experience the grief of the Gracchi at this state of things, but were contented with matters as they stood, enjoyed the era


of peace, and praised Augustus as the author. Above all, joy was felt at the immunity from the oppressive burden of military service, since Italy south of the Po was not ordinarily a recruiting ground; and ancient Latium, Etruria, and Umbria furnished soldiers chiefly for the prætorian cohorts—that is, for home service.

The cheap slave markets had ended with the close of the incessant wars. A stratum of half-free, or entirely free, workmen and husbandmen was now formed, which produced in the sequel a more peaceful development in the economic life of Italy. There was, besides, a natural improvement in many respects. The value of land in Italy increased



M. VIPSIANUS AGRIPPA
May be called the "right-hand man" of Augustus, who owed much to the intelligence and executive ability of Agrippa.

Augustan Age at its Best



THE PANTHEON AS IT WAS IN THE TIME OF ITS BUILDER, M. VIPSIANUS AGRIPPA
 This is the only building of ancient Rome that, after two thousand years, is used for the purpose it was designed to fulfil, as it has been made the burial place of the reigning house of Italy. It also contains the tomb of Raphael.

notably, trade and commerce prospered, public morals and order, which had greatly deteriorated during the civil wars, were ameliorated. Increased respect was officially paid to the cult of the gods; and in the year 17 B.C. the great feast of atonement, the Secular Festival, was celebrated with unprecedented splendour; in commemoration of this event the poet Horace, by order of Augustus, wrote the noble dedicatory hymn, the "Carmen Sæculare." Of the old fraternities, the origin of which went back to the time of King Romulus, that of the Husbandmen was revived by Augustus with great magnificence. The princeps, together with the foremost members of the senate, joined it, while the remaining places were filled up by election.

Under such circumstances, and for the reason, too, that the stability of the system of

government was involved in them, the personal and family relations of the "First Citizen" became increasingly important.

In the good old republican times the individual had kept much in the background, even if the senatorial families kept alive the memory of great ancestors in their splendid halls by pictures and busts with appropriate inscriptions. Thus we hear, for instance, of the Fabii, who distinguished themselves in the war against Veii and later in the Samnite

wars. Even the Fabius "Cunctator," who had avoided all battle with Hannibal, was honoured, because his conduct appeared justified by the subsequent disaster at Cannæ. Then the Scipios came into prominence, and influenced, in their way, the outcome of the Second and Third Punic Wars. There followed the Gracchi, Marius, Sulla and his contemporaries, Pompey the Great, and



Underwood & Underwood, London

THE PANTHEON OF AGRIPPA AS IT IS TO-DAY

Julius Cæsar, the predecessors and models of Cæsar Augustus.

The old commemorative inscriptions of the family halls were no longer sufficient to mark the rôle of the individual who now stood at the head of the commonwealth, and towered predominant in all circumstances. The whole course of history was intimately connected with the individuality of those men, who were conscious of their own greatness. Sulla left "Memoirs": Cæsar published his "Civil War" after his "Gallic War," and ordered his other campaigns to be described by men who had served in them. His adopted son followed his example.

M. Vipsanius Agrippa, the victor over Sextus Pompeius and Antony, stood in very intimate relations with the sovereign. Sprung from an unimportant family, a contemporary and friend of the young Augustus, he had stood by him through the vicissitudes of fortune at Perugia against S. Pompeius and on to Actium. Later he was actively employed on the Rhine frontier, where he founded the city of the Ubii, which became a "colony" under his granddaughter, Agrippina. It is the modern Cologne. Subsequently we find Agrippa with Augustus in Spain, which he reorganised after the subjugation of the mountain tribes. In order to



ALL THAT REMAINS TO-DAY OF THE GLORIOUS PALACES OF THE CÆSARS

The great mass of ruins gives a profound impression of the vastness of the palaces which the Cæsars reared on this eminence, but the destruction has been so complete that no more than a ground plan remains.

and published in the year 36 B.C., after the successes against Sextus Pompeius, a survey of his previous operations; at his death he left an account of the acts of his reign, which has come down in an inscription, the famous "Monumentum Ancyranum," which was engraved on the walls in the Temple of Roma and Augustus at Ancyra in Galatia.

Asinius Pollio wrote the history of his time, uninfluenced by the biased account of Augustus, who had the tact to allow the former comrades-in-arms of his adoptive father to do as they pleased, as when Valerius Messalla, in his description of the decisive battle of Philippi, praised Marcus Brutus as his imperator.


make the resources of Spain, Gaul, and Germany available for the needs of the empire, he completed a census of those countries. He also devoted his energies to the administration of the city of Rome.

In the year 33 B.C., after having served as consul, he took over the ædileship, in order to establish a system for the supply of drinking-water to Rome. It is not the least of Agrippa's services that Rome up to the present day is one of the capitals of Europe possessing an excellent water supply. One of his buildings, the Pantheon, still bears his name on the front. He was an energetic and, above all, a practical man. At a time when all the world, up to the very highest circles,



THE PALATINE HILL IN THE GREAT DAYS OF THE EMPIRE

This reconstruction, made by the archæologist Gatteschi, for M. Boyer D'Agen's work on the Forum, shows how the road to the Palatine Hill looked in the great days of the Empire. In the foreground is part of the Sacred Way, as the Arch of Titus on the left stood across that road, which then turned to the right and entered the Forum at the right bottom corner of the picture. On the immediate left is the portico of the great Temple of Venus and Rome; in the distance a glimpse of the palaces of the Cæsars.



THE PALATINE HILL AS SEEN TO-DAY FROM THE NORTH OF THE ARCH OF TITUS
 All the splendid buildings have vanished; nothing but the Arch of Titus remains erect. A portion of the paving of the Sacred Way has here been preserved, however, and may be seen plainly in the foreground of this photograph.

dabbled in poetry, Agrippa kept from the temptation. On the other hand, his geographical and statistical labours formed a foundation for the knowledge of the following centuries. Agrippa was considered an upstart by the old nobility. Augustus, however, recognised how greatly indebted he was to his friend. The position

The Friends and Colleagues of Augustus

of C. Mæcenas was different. He was the intimate personal friend of Augustus, and was sent by him on important diplomatic missions, as at the time when, after the fall of Perusia and the disarmament of L. Antonius, a conflict with the triumvir Antony seemed imminent—a conflict which would have come all too soon for Cæsar. Mæcenas then negotiated the marriage of M. Antony with Octavia. When, later, the rupture was brought on, C. Mæcenas remained in Rome as representative of Cæsar, and held the reins of power in the capital. He relentlessly crushed the attempt at a rising made by the son of Lepidus, the deposed triumvir. After the triumph of Augustus, Mæcenas withdrew from public affairs and, without aiming at political distinction, lived as a Roman knight, though, as a scion of Etruscan Lucumones, he looked down on the Roman nobility. He devoted himself to the fine arts and the pleasures of life, and was lauded by the poets as their patron, while he was constantly consulted by Augustus on all private matters. His wife, Terentia, ruled him, while Augustus played the part of the friend of the family.

Among the members of the family, Octavia, the eldest sister, or half-sister of Augustus, took the first place. She had supported her brother's policy at a critical moment, when, just become a widow, she gave her hand to Antony, and by this means kept him, for several years to come, loyal to the triumvirate.

Matrimonial Affairs of the Emperor

When Antony preferred Cleopatra to her she returned to Rome, where she won universal sympathy by her dignified conduct. She also made an impression on the literary men of the time, for she showed no small appreciation of their works.

Next to Octavia stand Livia, the third wife, and Julia, the daughter of Augustus by his second marriage with Scribonia. Augustus had twice married from political


motives; first, Clodia, a daughter of Fulvia by Clodius, the opponent of Cicero, and, therefore a stepdaughter of Antony. This marriage, which was arranged at the time of the first triumvirate, and had never been consummated, was ended when Fulvia rose against Cæsar, in the year 41 B.C.

When, soon afterwards, Sextus Pompeius attained to great importance, and was especially courted by the Antonians, Cæsar made approaches to the family of the senator Scribonius Libo, from which Sextus Pompeius had taken his wife, and married Scribonia. Julia was born of this marriage. Scribonia was afterwards divorced, for Livia, wife of the prætorian Ti. Claudius Nero, had so captivated the triumvir Cæsar that he compelled her husband to divorce her in order that he might marry her. Her sons, Tiberius and Drusus, remained at first under the control of Claudius; and only on his death, which followed soon after, did Cæsar receive them into his house. His union with Livia was childless. Under these circumstances Julia, the only legitimate child of the prince, attained to great prominence, for

Augustus' Schemes of Succession

Augustus intended to confer the principate on the husband of his daughter. He had actually selected the son of Octavia by her first marriage, M. Claudius Marcellus, as his heir, just as he himself, a great-nephew of Cæsar, had become Cæsar's heir. Five years after the battle of Actium, in 25 B.C., the marriage of Julia, aged fourteen, and Marcellus, a youth of eighteen, took place. Marcellus was pointed out to the senate as the future sovereign, and was paid appropriate honours.

This purely personal policy of Augustus was now challenged by the man who had played the most important part next to him, M. Vispanius Agrippa. He was admittedly a thorough-going partisan of the monarchical order of things, and recognised in Augustus the right man for the place; but such a combination of state and personal interests was foreign to his taste. The saying was heard at Rome, "Marcellus may be the favourite grandson of Augustus, but Agrippa will not let him have the power." The latter withdrew from all political life and went into voluntary exile in Lesbos. The rupture between the two chiefs was thus made plain to the world. Fate then interposed, for Marcellus, barely three years afterwards, at the end




THE FORUM ROMANUM AS IT APPEARED IN ITS SPLENDOUR

In this reconstruction by the archaeologist Gatteschi, for the work of M. Boyer d'Agen on the Forum, we see it at the time when the immense Basilica Julia, or Palace of Justice, was razed to the ground, the bases of the columns prominent in the right foreground. On the left, marked by its five small columns with figures, is the Rostra, a part of the Arch of Septimius Severus showing behind, and beyond is the Curia, or meeting-place of the senate. To its right is the great Basilica Æmilia, and beyond that on the right the Temple of Faustina. In the centre are the five "honorary columns," and at their base the Sacred Way.




THE FORUM ROMANUM IN ITS PRESENT STATE OF UTTER RUIN

Here is the state of ruin to which this splendid place has been reduced. The bases of the honorary columns by the Sacred Way may be noted, in the foreground the remnants of the later Basilica Julia, on the right, part of the Temple of Faustina, and on the left the bare façade of the Curia, with the Arch of Severus to its left. The prominent column in the centre, known as the "Phocas Column," from the inscription, which states that a statue of King Phocas was erected upon it in 608 A.D., dates probably from the fourth century of our era, and was thus about 300 years later than the other columns, shown in the reconstruction. In Byron's time its base was still buried and its identity unknown; hence his line, "Thou nameless column with the buried base."



THE FORUM, LOOKING TOWARDS THE CAPITOL; TEMPLE OF FAUSTINA ON THE MIDDLE RIGHT AND ARCH OF SEVERUS IN THE DISTANCE



THE FORUM, FROM THE CAPITOLINE HILL; TEMPLE OF SATURN IN CENTRE, AND THE COLISEUM AND ARCH OF TITUS IN DISTANCE

of 23 B.C., was carried off by an illness, to the intense grief of Octavia and Augustus.

The question of the succession was once more open. Mæcenas now intervened in the matter. He pointed out to Augustus that he had placed Agrippa in such a position that nothing remained except to have him put to death or to accept him as a son-in-law. Augustus chose the latter alternative; and in 21 B.C., two years after the death of Marcellus,



TWO NOTORIOUS WOMEN OF THE AUGUSTAN AGE

Julia—on the left—the only child of Augustus, married finally to Tiberius, who put her to death for her licentiousness. On the right, Livia, second wife of Augustus and mother of Tiberius.

Agrippa, having divorced his own wife, married Julia. It was a marriage which, like many of that time, was completely dictated by policy; father-in-law and son-in-law were of the same age, just as Pompey had been actually older than his father-in-law, Cæsar.

The marriage did not, on the whole, turn out badly. Two sons, the issue of it, Gaius and Lucius, were adopted by Augustus, and destined to be the future rulers of the empire. Agrippa displayed unwearied activity in the establishment of the royal house, especially in the eastern half of the empire, and Julia followed her husband there. In Lesbos, where she resided for some time, she was extolled as a new Aphrodite. Everything seemed propitious.

This state of affairs lasted nine years, certainly the most prosperous period of Augustus's reign. But in the year 12 B.C., Agrippa, while preparing for a campaign in Pannonia, was taken ill, and soon afterwards died. By this event the existing family arrangements were thrown into confusion. Augustus, never

of a strong constitution, grew so feeble, that all expected his speedy death. If he died, it was doubtful if the principate could be gained for the young children of Julia by Agrippa.

In any case, they needed a trustworthy guardian until they should grow up. Besides this, Julia, who was but twenty-eight years old, could not be left without a husband: Augustus knew his daughter. It seemed best, under these circumstances, to marry Julia to Tiberius, the

elder stepson of Augustus, who had already given proofs of his abilities.

Tiberius was, it is true, happily married to Vipsania, the daughter of Agrippa by his first marriage, while there was no trace in him of any affection for Julia. But Augustus was not the man to be deterred by such considerations. He carried out his family scheme in a despotic manner, and the marriage of Julia with Tiberius was concluded.



THE HOPE OF AUGUSTUS

When Cæsar Augustus married his fourteen-year-old daughter Julia to the young Marcellus, the latter was designated heir to the throne, but died two years later.

The marriage proved a complete failure. Husband and wife soon grew to hate each other. Julia was full of vivacity, and she was interested in poetry; Ovid, the amatory poet, belonged to her circle. She was a true princess in her licentiousness. It was said she had been unfaithful to Agrippa in his later years. Julia was no suitable wife for the cold and stern Tiberius. The couple separated without being divorced, for official decorum would not allow of this. From a political point of view the position intended for Tiberius did not appeal to him: he was to keep

the throne warm for Gaius and Lucius Cæsar, but to retire when they came to mature years. When Augustus ordered Gaius, a boy of fifteen, to be designated consul by the senate, and prepared the same honour for Lucius, Tiberius acted like Agrippa in similar case ; in 6 B.C. he retired from all public affairs, and went as

Tiberius Leaves Augustus in the Lurch

a private citizen to Rhodes, as if into exile. The work of empire naturally suffered from this ; an invasion of Armenia had to be postponed because Augustus had no trustworthy officer at his disposal, and he complained, justly, that he was left in the lurch. It was only several years later that Gaius Cæsar could be sent to Armenia with a proper suite ; but at the siege of Artagira he received a wound, from which he never recovered. In the year 4 A.D., Gaius, who was just twenty-four, died ; his brother, Lucius, had died two years before at Massilia on a journey to Spain.

No course now remained for Augustus but to nominate as his successor Tiberius, who had in the interval returned to Rome. The man of forty-six was adopted into the family of the Julii, "for political reasons," as Augustus said, who was certainly not actuated by love. At the same time, on June 27th, 4 A.D., the powers of imperator and tribune were conferred on Tiberius, as they had been on Augustus himself. In this way the principle of a hereditary principate was broken and yet adapted to the peculiar arrangements of Roman family life. For ten years Tiberius stood loyally by the side of Augustus, and displayed great energy wherever it was necessary, in Illyricum or on the Rhine.

This was the period when Tiberius won respect and popularity, especially in military circles. He suppressed the rising in Pannonia more by skilful administrative measures than by force of arms, a considerable achievement. Augustus, nevertheless, jealously held the reins of government in his own hands up to the very end. The form which

The Aged Emperor Clings to Power

Augustus gave to the Roman empire remained in force for 300 years, although it was based on a compromise between oligarchy and monarchy, and thus contained a contradiction within itself. Practical politics do not always agree with theories, and depend rather upon the individual. A man like the first Cæsar would have given another direction

to the state after the senate had been completely subordinated to him. Augustus, when in opposition to Antony, had united in himself the old offices, which, even after his triumph, kept their importance. Augustus is characterised by the dynastic trait of his policy, as shown by the way in which he made himself the successor of the dictator even in his political position, and staked everything for the interests of his family. He recoiled before Agrippa, but not before Tiberius, and maintained his own authority even against these great men. At a time when his own grandsons stood by his side he courted popularity with both the senate and the people.

In his private life Augustus found no happiness. After her separation from Tiberius, Julia had continued her gay life in her own circle, despite all the warnings of her father. Finally, the love precepts of Ovid became facts, for regular orgies were the order of the day. The most prominent among Julia's lovers was Julius Antonius, the younger son of the triumvir by Fulvia, who had been educated by Octavia,

Notorious Daughter of Augustus

and held the first rank by the side of Livia's sons. He was married to Marcella, daughter of Octavia and the divorced wife of Agrippa, gained the consulate in 10 B.C., and then became proconsul in Asia. In short, his intrigue with Julia had a political colouring, as though the principate could be transferred from the Julian to the Antonian house, even against the will of Augustus. When the matter could no longer be hushed up, Julius Antonius was executed for high treason, and Julia herself banished by Augustus in 2 B.C. Nine years later Ovid went as exile to dismal Tomi, chiefly on account of Julia's daughter and namesake.

Octavia and Mæcenas, who had formerly been his agents in such delicate matters, were now dead ; and Livia saw with satisfaction the downfall of Julia and her children, since the road to the throne was now opened to her own son, Tiberius. As she outlived her rivals, she assumed in the later years of Augustus a position of importance in politics. She was with her husband when he was taken ill at Nola on a journey into Campania. Messengers were immediately sent off to Tiberius, who had started on a mission to Illyricum. Tiberius was on the spot when Augustus died, on August 19th, 14 A.D.



TIBERIUS IN HIS LATER YEARS AT ONE OF HIS PALACES ON THE ISLAND OF CAPRI

The last ten or eleven years of the life of Tiberius were passed away from Rome on the lovely and solitary island of Capri, in the bay of Naples. There he built many palaces, and abandoned himself to a life of luxury and licentiousness unparalleled even in the history of Roman morals. Of all his palaces only a few stones now remain.

ANCIENT
ROME
VII



TIBERIUS
CÆSAR

ROME UNDER TIBERIUS CÆSAR

LAST OF THE FOUNDERS OF EMPIRE

AN AGE OF UNPARALLELED PROSPERITY

TIBERIUS was "imperator." The military officials of the capital, especially the commandant of the guard, as well as that of the fire brigade, were thus under his orders. According to precedent, the consuls, the military officers, the senators, the soldiers, and the people, swore allegiance to the new lord. In the same way the corresponding orders were issued to the provinces. At Rome itself a meeting of the senate was called, by virtue of the "tribunician power" of Tiberius, at which a vexatious incident occurred. Tiberius, always somewhat awkward as a speaker, did not at once find the right word to explain that he took over the place of his adoptive father, and he acted as if he expected the orders of the senate; when some orators prepared to take this seriously, for in this body the independent feelings of their fathers, as of an Asinius Pollio, had been inherited by the sons, the supporters of the dynasty had to intervene.

**The Spirit
of Freedom
Not Dead**


There was, indeed, a party already working for the succession to the throne. There was living at the time a posthumous son of M. Agrippa and Julia, Agrippa Postumus, whom Augustus, after the scandals connected with his daughter, had been unable to favour above Tiberius, but who was regarded by the opposition as a rightful claimant. He was executed in his place of exile without the orders of Tiberius. Julia was put to death in her prison at Rhegium, but we have no particulars of the occurrence.

Tiberius entered on the sovereignty at the age of fifty-six, beyond the prime of life, but having displayed fine abilities for many years in the foremost positions, a Claudius,

who had come into the house of the Cæsars by adoption. He was now officially styled Tiberius Cæsar, or, in brief, "Cæsar"; or, as the title was as well known as the name, simply "Tiberius,"

**Favourite
of
Augustus** just as modern monarchs usually call themselves merely by their Christian names. Tiberius did not belie his Claudian

descent; the arrogance which was innate in that family was not brought forward against him by his enemies alone. Augustus had fixed still more exactly the order of succession in his house. The younger son of Livia, Drusus, the conqueror of the Germans, had always been his favourite, so that town gossip gave out that he was his son; for Drusus was born after Livia had come into the house of the triumvir Octavianus. The noble youth, when grown up, received the hand of the second Antonia, daughter of Octavia by the triumvir Antony, a splendid woman, who, even as widow, enjoyed the complete esteem of the family, and was on especially good terms with Tiberius all his life.



TIBERIUS IN HIS YOUTH
Adopted by Augustus as his successor, Tiberius had an honourable and great career before he came to the throne, but his conduct as emperor was tyrannical in the extreme.

Drusus had died, a young man, in 9 B.C., from the effects of a fall from his horse, and left two sons behind him, of whom the elder, inheriting the cognomen won by his father's victories, called himself Germanicus, while the younger, Claudius, was considered feeble of intellect, and was the butt of the family. Tiberius, at the command of Augustus, was compelled to adopt Germanicus, now aged twenty, although he had, by his marriage with Vipsania, a son, named Drusus, who was only a little younger, but now was obliged to yield precedence to his cousin, or rather

his adopted brother. Germanicus, who had shown himself a brilliant officer at the time of the revolt in Pannonia and Dalmatia, was married by Augustus to his granddaughter, Agrippina. Numerous children were born of this marriage, to the joy of the old emperor, who thus saw his descendants multiplying and the succession secured to them after the death of Tiberius. Germanicus, at the moment when Augustus died, was in command of the eight legions stationed on the Rhine frontier, the strongest corps of the imperial army. He ordered the troops to swear allegiance at once to the new ruler, for the will of Augustus was as sacred to Germanicus as to Tiberius.

It happened then that the legionaries wished to seize the opportunity of a change in the person of the sovereign, to improve their own condition. The armies of Illyria and the Rhine mutinied simultaneously. The soldiers complained of their long period of service, which spread over twenty years; of the hard work in the improvement of the provinces which was exacted from them in times of peace; of the brutal corporal punishments which were continually inflicted on them by the subordinate officers; of the constant drilling and training in heavy marching order. When a man was lucky enough to have ended his twenty years' term, and became entitled to the reward of his services, he was often kept in suspense for years, from financial reasons, or he was given house and land in a mountainous or even swampy district, which he had first to make habitable. The Prætorian guards, on the other hand, had only sixteen years of service, could share in the pleasures of life in the capital and the provincial towns of Italy, and received higher pay. The whole movement assumed a dangerous aspect, since the

legions on the Rhine were inclined to proclaim Germanicus as imperator. But he took energetic steps to prevent this. When Agrippina with her children was sent away from the camp, the soldiers' mood was changed. In Illyricum, where Tiberius had sent his son, Drusus, an eclipse of the moon produced a favourable turn of affairs. The demands of the soldiers were, indeed, momentarily conceded, but the ringleaders were seized, and discipline was restored.

This was the first time that the principate measured its strength in this way with its tool, the imperial army. The government afterwards gradually withdrew the concessions which had been made, since the finances of the empire did not permit a reduction in the length of service or an increase of pay; and, according to the view of the most experienced officers, of whom Tiberius himself was one, discipline could not be maintained without corporal punishment, drills, and the labour of constructing camps and cultivating the fields. Germanicus thought that the soldiers



TIBERIUS CÆSAR

Mansell

He was fifty-six years of age when he succeeded to the purple on the death of Augustus.

should be restored to their proper mood by a new and inspiring campaign; and, therefore, without any previous inquiries at Rome, he led his troops on his own responsibility over the Rhine. In fact, he repeated these expeditions in the following years, wishing once more to follow the victorious steps of his father, Drusus, and to avenge the defeat of Quintilius Varus. He reached the Weser and the Elbe, sent his ships into the North Sea, fought with Arminius, and actually invaded the Teutoberg forest. The remains of the fallen Romans were recovered, but such dangers were run and such heavy losses incurred that Tiberius resolved to place restrictions on the adventurous spirit of the heir to the crown. Germanicus was recalled on the most honourable terms, and



TIBERIUS AND HIS WIFE AGRIPPINA, WHOM HE DIVORCED TO MARRY JULIA
From a fine painting by Rubens, in which the likenesses are carefully studied from existing portraits.

granted a magnificent triumph at Rome. The consulate, "for the second time," was bestowed on him, an office which Tiberius assumed at the same time with him in 18 A.D. But the chief command in Gaul and Germany was abolished; and, while the inner provinces were placed under civil governors, the Rhine legions were divided into two corps—one for Upper Germany, with headquarters at Mogontiacum, the other for Lower Germany, with headquarters at Castra Vetera.

Germanicus was given a command in the east, where some affairs had to be arranged which might well have been entrusted to the provincial governors. Germanicus saw the commission in this light, and combined with the journey a pleasure trip, in order to visit the scene of the battle of Actium, the monuments of Athens, and, lastly, the pyramids of Egypt. In Syria the imperial governor, Cn. Calpurnius Piso, refused to obey the

prince. Piso was the son of the consul of the same name of the year 23 B.C. He had himself been consul in 7 B.C. with Tiberius, and was married to Plancina, a daughter or granddaughter of L. Munatius Plancus. There were at first angry scenes; and finally the officers on both sides confronted each other with drawn swords. When Germanicus, who, by virtue of his proconsular authority, had suspended Piso, suddenly was taken ill he believed that he had been poisoned. He died, and bequeathed this suspicion to his widow, Agrippina, who, in her bereavement, accused the emperor himself of having had a hand in the matter. Tiberius left the investigation to the senate. The charge of poisoning was not found to be proved, but Piso was condemned for disobedience. He committed suicide. The whole affair compromised the government, which, in any case, had played an ambiguous part. There was

talk of secret instructions which Piso, an old friend of Tiberius, had received, and perhaps had exceeded, according to the letter; at any rate, the emperor's intention had been to give the haughty prince a rebuff. Piso's wife, Plancina, implored Livia to save him; and the hostility between Livia and Julia and her descendants was known. But the opposition party was not less busied in procuring proofs, so that Piso was left to his fate. All this caused great excitement at the time, for Germanicus had been very popular (19 A.D.).

Drusus, own son of the emperor, was now designated successor to the throne; but the most important part at court was played by Sejanus, a Roman knight of Volsinii, whom Tiberius had placed at the head of the guard. This guard consisted of nine cohorts, which Augustus had distributed in Italy; Sejanus concentrated them in Rome. Their fortified camp, which was constructed in front of the Viminal gate, became thenceforward the citadel of the capital. The administration of the imperial provinces was in good

hands, since Tiberius kept round him the efficient members of the nobility, and appointed as governors men who had been put to the test. It was seen that the best rulers were not men born in the purple, but those who, in an inferior position, had long studied the methods of governing.

The provincials were thankful that the peaceful rule of Augustus had been continued by the new monarch. He was praised for punctiliously observing the constitution of the empire. Each province, and occasionally an individual tribe, had a charter or enjoyed certain privileges. Thus in the three Gauls at first sixty and later sixty-four states were self-governing, and they alone had a share in the "council" of Lugdunum. The others were apportioned to the privileged states—that is, were governed by them. In Egypt and Judæa itself the Jews possessed peculiar rights, by which they were protected in the observance of their religion, and were excused from military service in consideration of paying certain taxes. Regard had also to be paid to Egyptian superstition, since the killing of a sacred



THE TRIUMPH OF TIBERIUS, FROM THE BEAUTIFUL VIENNA CAMEO

cat would have deeply insulted the native population. Tiberius had strict order maintained in all such matters. In consequence of this, trade and commerce attained to an unprecedented prosperity, and the finances of the empire showed a surplus which was unparalleled even under Augustus. In the event of unforeseen calamities — for example, when an earthquake destroyed a dozen towns in the province of Asia — the emperor was not niggardly

but spent his money at the right time. Only in his later years was the complaint heard that economy had degenerated into avarice and the useless hoarding of treasure.

Strabo and Philo, contemporary writers, give us full details of provincial affairs under Tiberius. The attitude of the provinces towards the emperors was very loyal, since the improved administration was greatly appreciated. The foreign policy of Tiberius was pacific. The conquered positions on the Rhine, the Danube, and the Euphrates were occupied without any attempt, after the recall of Germanicus from Germany, to extend the frontiers. In Africa a rising of the border tribes had to be quelled. Any other events that occurred were limited to Rome and Italy. At first only narrow circles were interested in them; but, finally, the general policy of the empire was sympathetically affected.

The relations of the members of the ruling house were far from satisfactory. Drusus, the heir to the throne, could not tolerate Sejanus, the commander of the

A Court Scandal of Old Rome

Prætorian guard; in fact, he went to the extent of striking him, an insult the prefect never forgave. The latter was firm in

the confidence of the emperor, who made it a principle never to abandon capable officials. Sejanus, evil by nature, was initiated into the family affairs of the dynasty, since he seduced Livilla, the wife of Drusus, and induced her to poison

her husband, whose death, in 23 A.D., caused no surprise, for the life of the prince was calculated to undermine his health.

The sons of Germanicus and Agrippina were now presented to the senate as next in the succession. Tiberius, for his part, successfully carried out the Augustan policy, but without the formalities to which Augustus, from certain considerations, had adhered. These were concerned, for example, the acceptance of the provinces for a

limited period, and not for life. Augustus had had his full powers renewed every five or ten years, though they could not have been refused. Tiberius accepted the principate absolutely without any

Vigorous Reforms of Tiberius

restriction of time, while he reserved to himself in general terms the right of retiring at some future time. Augustus

had continued the existence of the comitia, although for the last century they had no significance as a popular assembly; and the candidates designated for the offices by the government—that is, by the senate and the princes—were chosen by the comitia. Tiberius, however, abolished the comitia as superfluous, and had the usual officials, whose competence was continually decreasing owing to the progressive development of the principate, nominated in the senate, on which he, as a member, could bring influence to bear.

Notwithstanding the fact that the imperial system, as originated by Augustus and perfected by Tiberius, had sprung from existing conditions, and was completely justified by them, an opposition appeared. The restoration of the comitia formed one of the objects which they put before the people. In this way the republican propaganda and the dynastic opposition, for which Agrippina and her sons had worked, were revived. Tiberius remained firm, and did not fail



DRUSUS THE ELDER AND GERMANICUS

Brother to Tiberius, Nero Claudius Drusus was a victorious general against the German tribes, and died from a fall off his horse, in the year 9 B.C. His son Germanicus was a trusted and able general under Tiberius, who adopted him; but his successes engendered the imperial jealousy, and at his death, by poison, suspicion rested on Tiberius.

to issue warnings, since the passionate Agrippina regarded him as the murderer of her husband, and acted as if her life were in danger; but she would not be warned. Besides Agrippina and the circle devoted to her, the aged Livia, whom Augustus had adopted in his will, played her part. She had a special following among the older senators, who formed a separate party. Then came Livilla, who wished to marry Sejanus; although the emperor did not allow that, the intimacy continued. Sejanus, in the name of the emperor, directly opposed the party of Agrippina, who planned a rising in the provinces, but could not prevail against the powerful prefect.

Tiberius was so weary of these intrigues that he resolved to avoid them. His house was desolate. Since his divorce

from Vipsania he had become so soured that he had given himself up to excesses in Rhodes, and in his old age he could not abandon them. The gossips of the capital told hideous stories about him. The appearance of the old Tiberius was anything but beautiful. The once majestic form was bent, while his face was disfigured by an eruption; in consequence of this, the custom of kissing, which formerly played a great part in Roman etiquette, was discontinued at court. There was also the annoying state of his family relations; the three widows especially were antagonistic to each other, even though Livia insisted strictly on decorum. In the year 26 A.D. Tiberius went to Campania, never again to return to Rome. Instead of that, he went to the island of Capri in the Gulf of Naples, which Augustus had acquired.

Here he established his royal residence, where he could avoid all intercourse that was unpleasant to him. The numerous deputations which usually came to the royal abode were, as a rule, not admitted, since Tiberius thought that if he received one party, he could not refuse the other. He contented himself with the society of a few friends of senatorial or knightly rank, and he welcomed learned men.

In his suite there was an astrologer, for Tiberius, who otherwise was not of a religious nature, attached importance to divination. The prefect of the guard, who represented the emperor in Rome, came to and fro on business, while a company of the guard was



SOLDIERS OF THE FAMOUS PRÆTORIAN GUARD

This remarkable body of Roman soldiers was raised to a unique position by Augustus, who made it his personal bodyguard, and its commander became the most courted man after the emperor. In time the Prætorian guard acquired such power that several of its chiefs were able to place themselves on the throne. The above group is from a bas-relief in the Louvre.

stationed on Capri, and acted as couriers.

In 29 A.D., Livia, the mother of the emperor, died at the age of eighty-six. The destruction of the family of Germanicus, which had long been premeditated, was no longer postponed. Agrippina, as well as her two elder sons, Nero and Drusus, was arrested on a charge of treason and conspiracy; Nero was executed, Agrippina banished, Drusus imprisoned. This was the work of Sejanus, who aspired to the first place in the state.

Tiberius was now more than seventy years old. The question was arising, who should rule when he died? There were Drusus and his brother Gaius, the sons of Germanicus and Agrippina; and there was the young Tiberius, Livilla's son and the reputed grandson of the emperor himself. If the party of Agrippina came into power, Sejanus was lost. He, therefore, wished to secure himself against all emergencies. Sejanus did not underrate the strength of the opposition, which lay in the popular programme it possessed. He was ready to lend himself to this programme in order to reach his goal. The prolonged absence of Tiberius, and the reports which reached Rome of his life on Capri, made the undertaking appear promising. The guard was devoted to its prefect; he had a following in the senate; the most important governors and some client princes were on his side; he had been for years the "vice-emperor." Tiberius trusted him as much as ever. In fact, in the year 31 A.D., Sejanus, as a signal mark of imperial favour, had been made regular consul with Tiberius. If he acquired also the tribunician power, he would be *ipso facto* successor to the throne. Tiberius and the surviving members of the dynasty could then be put

on one side without difficulty. Only at the last moment did Tiberius receive a warning. It came from his sister-in-law, Antonia, who sent a trusty messenger to



Mansell

A NOBLE WOMAN IN AN AGE OF LICENSE
 Antonia, wife of Drusus the elder, and mother of Germanicus, Claudius, and Livia. As Drusus was killed at thirty, Antonia was early a widow, but refused to marry again, and devoted herself to the education of her children. Her daughter Livia was one of the worst women of her time.

Capri with the disclosure. Tiberius now recognised the danger in which he was. He took his counter-measures with great circumspection. There was no time to be lost, and recourse could not be had to open action. Preparations were made to enable him to take ship and escape to the legions on the Rhine if the worst happened. In Rome the services of Nævius Macro were employed, who took into his confidence Graccinus Laco, commander of the fire brigade, since no trust could be reposed in the guard. At the same time a

missive of the emperor was despatched to the senate; and, as some urgency was attached to it, Sejanus believed it announced the conferment on him of the tribunician power. The letter was read in the senate by the presiding

Tiberius Gives Sejanus Short Shrift

consul. After many circumlocutions it contained at the end the command to arrest Sejanus and to condemn him. Macro, meanwhile, had gone to the camp of the praetorians, in order to declare to them the will of the emperor and to assume the command. Laco surrounded the council-room of the senate with the men of the fire brigade, and the order was also given to release, in case of necessity, Drusus, who was prisoner in the Palatium, to act against Sejanus. But the surprise was so complete that resistance was utterly paralysed. Sejanus was executed the very same day. The soldiers of the guard showed some resentment at the fact that more confidence had been placed in the firemen than in them. The disturbances produced by the fall of Sejanus and the arrest of his partisans lasted several days. Tiberius remained master of the

Vice-emperor Who Aspired to the Purple

Sejanus and the surviving members of the dynasty could then be put

situation, but the treachery of Sejanus made the deepest impression on him. He had thought that he could rely on Sejanus, since the latter had saved his life before his retirement to Capri. Sejanus had been promoted to the highest dignities. The most noble houses of Rome had formed family alliances with him, and he himself belonged, as it were, to the imperial house, since the daughter of Livilla had been betrothed to him. Yet he had not been able to wait until the aged Tiberius should close his weary eyes. In addition, the trial of the relations and partisans of Sejanus had revealed most exasperating facts, among others how the death of Drusus, his intended successor, had been brought about, and many other black crimes. It is scarcely surprising that after the shock the mind of the old Tiberius was in all probability unhinged.

Trials and the executions went on for two years, until, in the year 33, the emperor gave orders that an end should be made; he wished for the future to hear no more of the matter. Tiberius still held the reins firmly; but his life became more and more lonely. The two elder sons of Germanicus were dead. Gaius, the youngest, who was brought to Capri, did not inspire Tiberius with much confidence; not until two years after the fall of Sejanus did Tiberius nominate Gaius to be quæstor. The affections of the emperor were fixed rather on Tiberius Gemellus, his own grandson; but, after the relations of Livilla with Sejanus had become known, little certainty could be attached to his parentage. The emperor, therefore, let things have their own way, since he named in his will the two princes as heirs to equal shares of his private estate, without solving the problem of the future principate.

Nævius Sertorius Macro, with whose wife Gaius carried on an intrigue, held the office of prefect of the guard, in which he replaced Sejanus, a post that turned the scale in every event. As companion to the prince there lived at Rome Julius Agrippa, grandson of Herod

the Great, son of the Aristobulus who had been executed in the year 7 B.C. Those times weighed heavily on the upper circles at Rome. Insults to the emperor had been prosecuted before this as a violation of the sacred tribunician power. Literature, and especially history, was subjected to censorship on this ground. Nothing could be written against the government. The historian Cremutius Cordus, whose views were republican, was condemned. In consequence of this Velleius Paterculus of Capua, who in his youth had served as an officer under Tiberius in Germany and Dalmatia, published a Roman history full of cringing flattery of the Caesars generally, of Tiberius and the then all-powerful Sejanus in particular. Another work, a collection of biographies from Roman history, by Valerius Maximus, which appeared after the fall of Sejanus, ends with imprecations on the memory of Sejanus as one who deserved to be punished even in the lower world. Thus they wrote, because thus only were they allowed to think and write.

Tiberius had become gradually very feeble, but held himself upright, and would not hear of a physician. He was indignant when he read in the protocols of the senate, which were laid before him, that the conclusiveness of his evidence in some trial had been disputed; as a matter of fact, after his death the oath was not taken to his "acta." Tiberius crossed over from Capri to the mainland of Campania, wishing to reduce the senate to its former obedience. A fainting fit seized him at Misenum, in the former villa of Lucullus, which now belonged to the emperor. Thus died, on March 16th, 37 A.D.,

Tiberius, after Pompey, Cæsar, and Augustus, the fourth founder of the Roman imperial power, nowhere beloved, hated in some circles, but certainly a memorable character.

The empire and the principate survived the succeeding reigns of evil only because both had been securely founded by these great men.

The Aged Tyrant Master of the Day

Works of Servile Historians



TIBERIUS IN LATER LIFE
 Handsome in youth and manhood, the drunkenness and debauchery of his old age made him an ugly object.

ANCIENT
ROME
VIII



DEGRADATION
OF THE
PURPLE

THE DEGRADATION OF THE PURPLE

AN ERA OF ORGIE AND BLOODSHED

UNDER A SUCCESSION OF EVIL EMPERORS

GAIUS was brought by Macro to Rome, where he was greeted with acclamations as son of Germanicus, and his right to the principate was recognised by the senate. Gaius then adopted Tiberius Gemellus, and thus placed him under his paternal authority. Then the old demand for the restoration of the comitia was granted, various limitations on the senate were put aside, even literature was declared free from its fetters, and, generally, there was a return from the system of Tiberius to that of Augustus. The new ruler had a favourable reception from the army, since the younger officers ventured to hope that now more rapid promotion would become possible, Tiberius, from economical motives, having kept the old commanders in the service. Even the members of the family of the young princes are said to have shared the common joy. Gaius's uncle, Claudius, who had been hitherto much ignored, became consul; his grandmother, Antonia, was proclaimed "Augusta," and his sisters were granted imperial privileges; the bones of his mother, Agrippina, and of his brothers, who had been executed, were recovered and solemnly buried. But Gaius soon proved not a mere incapable, but a homicidal madman. The decisive turn for the worse came after a severe illness, which attacked him in the eighth month of his reign. The emperor did not fail to notice that many persons had set their hopes on the succession of Tiberius Gemellus, and that the latter stood in the way of his own glory. Ti. Gemellus received the command to kill himself. No man might venture to lay hands on him, since a Julius was, by his descent, inviolable. When Macro

attempted to urge Gaius, who had been his creature, to serious action, he was deprived of his post of prefect of the guard, and sent as viceroy to Egypt—a pretext to remove him far from Rome. Later he was put to death. Macro's wife, who once had been the favourite of Gaius, shared his fate. When the father-in-law of Gaius, the venerable senator, M. Junius Silanus, remonstrated with him, he was despatched to the other world, to join his daughter, as Gaius said with a jeer.

And so things went on. All the tried statesmen of Tiberius were soon recalled from their posts as governors, so that the new system made itself felt in the provinces also, and turned out by no means to their advantage. We learn particulars about this from the writings of the Alexandrian Jew, Philo; he was one of the embassy which was sent to implore the protection of the emperor against the attacks of the mob of Alexandria. The less the new monarch accomplished the more exalted did he feel himself above all mortals. He extolled his glorious descent from Augustus and from Antony, while he was



GAIUS, OR CALIGULA

It is thought that Tiberius chose the debauched Gaius to succeed him so that his own excesses might be forgotten in the new horrors.

less delighted with his descent from Agrippa. He regarded himself as the fixed star round which the client kings should move like planets. They, therefore, received from him various marks of his favour. Herod Agrippa was provided with a principality in Judæa. Ptolemæus, king of Mauretania, was granted the extraordinary privilege of issuing gold coins of his own. The princes of Thrace, Armenia, and Commagene, also experienced his kindness.

Soon afterwards military affairs were thrown into confusion by Gaius. In order to win laurels as a general, Gaius

marched to Gaul and the Rhine, where the Chatti were unquiet. After he had obtained a specious victory he proceeded to the north coast of Gaul, in order to invade Britain. The expedition resulted in nothing, and the emperor ordered the troops to collect shells on the beach as a tribute of the sea. He quarrelled decisively with the commanding officers, and made many enemies in the lower ranks by his numerous dismissals. Besides this, there was a deficiency of money, since Gaius had squandered in an incredibly short time the hoard gathered by Tiberius; which was the more needed, because loans from the temple treasuries were difficult to negotiate. It was, of course, an easy task to enrich many people, but now the deficit had to be made good by taxes and extortions, confiscations and executions.

Those who were in the intimate circle of the emperor's friends were already aware that the state of his mind was not normal, and that in the interests of the empire and the imperial house he must be deposed. The husband of Drusilla, a sister of Gaius, M. Æmilius Lepidus, and Cn. Lentulus Gætulicus, the governor of Upper Germany, took the matter in hand, but were betrayed, and, in 39 A.D., paid for the attempt with their lives. Since, however, Gaius treated even the officers of the guard churlishly, some of them, including the old tribune, Cassius Chærea, formed, together with the consular L. Annius Vinicianus and others, a conspiracy, to which the chief personages of the palace offered no opposition. On the occasion of a state performance in the theatre, on January 24th, 41 A.D., Gaius was struck down behind the scenes by Cassius Chærea, who was on duty. His wife, Cæsonia, and her child were also killed.

Gaius had not been unpopular with the lower strata of the inhabitants of the

capital, who used to call him by the pet-name Caligula—that is, Little Boots—which had been once given him by the soldiers on the Rhine. He had, unlike his predecessor, scattered money among the crowd, given games, and shown his appreciation of every kind of sport, for he felt himself at home in the stables of the circus riders. He had deteriorated through excesses. The race of the Julii, to whom Rome owed so many great men, ended with this boy. His German body-guard remained loyal to him even after his death, since they made an attack on the assembled people and killed or wounded several senators present.

What was to be done?

For the first time no provision had been made for the succession of the principate. Since the fall of Macro the power of the prefect of the guard had been weakened by a division of his functions, and the dynasty had been deprived of all manly scions by Tiberius and Gaius. No one took serious account of Claudius. He had never been given office under Tiberius; Gaius had, it is true, frequently conferred the consulate on him, but no importance attached to that post. Vinicianus and Cassius Chærea thought of a restoration of the rule of the senate, since the "principate" was only an extraordinary author-

ity, according to the constitution. On the other hand, some senators hoped that they themselves would be able to step into the first place, though others, such as the future emperor, Galba, at once disowned any such suggestion.

A session was called, to which the senators hastened from their country seats. Here the consuls pronounced the usual phrases, as in old times, while the police, who were under the orders of a prefect of senatorial rank, placed themselves at their disposal. "Freedom" was proclaimed. But among the soldiers of the guard other considerations prevailed; if there



CALIGULA, THE LAST OF THE JULII
The Julian family, which gave many notable men to Rome, ended miserably in this demented youth.

THE DEGRADATION OF THE PURPLE

were no princes, there would be no guard. Some of them had dragged out Claudius from behind a curtain in the palace, and brought him, frightened to death, into the camp of the prætorians. Here the adherents of the dynasty were assembled, among them the Jewish king, Agrippa, who had played some part under Gaius.

He now acted as mediator, inspiring Claudius with courage, confirming the good resolutions of the prætorians, and negotiating with the senators: Flavius Josephus has incorporated his recollections of Agrippa into the nineteenth book of his "Antiquities of the Jews," while Tacitus' description of these events has been lost. The result of the discussions was that Claudius was proclaimed imperator by the soldiers, and that the majority of the senate did homage to him. As soon as this was settled, Cassius Chærea was arrested and executed. An agitation in favour of the rule of the senate, which was attempted by Camillus Scribonianus, the governor of Dalmatia, a friend of Vinicianus, soon failed, owing to the opposition of the legions. The army was everywhere loyal to the principate, so ingrained had monarchy already become in men's minds. The institution could live even apart from the personality of the ruler.

Claudius, the son of the elder Drusus, was born at Lugdunum in 10 B.C., while his father was governor of Gaul and was therefore now in his fifty-first year. Weak-minded in youth, he had grown up among servants, and had been carefully kept out of public sight in order not to compromise the dynasty. He had later become a diligent student, and acquired much learning, of which, indeed, he made a display in inopportune moments. His long speeches in the senate, which frequently began with a survey of the period of the kings, were dreaded and ridiculed. As an authority on Etruscan history and antiquities he reformed the

guild of the Haruspices. He had in other respects the best intentions; he openly blamed his uncle, Tiberius, for his persistent absence from the capital, reproved Gaius for his mad acts, was a diligent attendant at the law courts, and respected the senate.

The real power lay with the freedmen of the palace. The most conspicuous for their ability were Callistus, who had kept the machinery of government working, so far as it had worked, even under Gaius; Pallas who directed the finance department; and Narcissus, who decided the foreign and home policy at the most critical moments. Under this reign many beneficial changes were introduced. In order to simplify the problem of feeding the city, a new harbour, the Portus Claudius, was constructed at the mouth of the Tiber, and the system of waterworks was enlarged by the Claudian aqueduct, which ran from the upper Anio. Its arches are still a feature of the Roman campagna. The district round the Fucine lake was drained by means of a tunnel driven through the mountain, which led off the superfluous water into the Liris. When, in 1874, the water of this lake was completely drawn off by its owner, Prince



CLAUDIUS, THE UNWILLING CÆSAR
Tool of stronger men, he was forced on to the throne by the army, anxious to maintain the monarchy.

Torlonia, the work of the Claudian era could be seen. As Gaius, by his march to the sea-coast, had pledged the Roman government to action, steps were taken to occupy Britain, although this necessarily involved great expenditure and a permanent increase of the army.

Narcissus carried out the expedition. When it succeeded, Claudius went to Britain, in order to join in the campaign and to be personally saluted as imperator. He named his son Britannicus in commemoration of his journey. He celebrated a stupendous triumph without according any distinctions to the commanding generals, one of whom was

the later emperor, Vespasian, who had seized the island of Vectis (that is, the Isle of Wight) and subdued two tribes. In the army there had been many improvements. The districts from which recruits could be obtained for the legions were enlarged by the bestowal of the Latin or Roman franchise on the Alpine countries. In Lower Germany, where Domitius Corbulo then commanded, a successful expedition was made against the Chauci on the North Sea, in which the elder Pliny, the well-known writer, took part as a staff officer.

The government did not, however, allow the general to give play to his schemes of conquest, but ordered him to maintain securely the Rhine frontier and to go no further. The emperor, on behalf of Gaul, which he esteemed as his native land, proposed in the senate the admission of its Roman burgesses to the magistracies in the capital. This was conceded to members of the Hæduan tribe, which had long been friendly. The kingdom of Mauretania, where disturbances had broken out after the execution of Ptolemæus, was incorporated and placed under Roman administration, as Egypt had been after the death of Cleopatra.

If, however, the reign of Claudius brought with it much that deserves to be honourably recorded, since some officials of the palace showed political ability and continued the traditions of the ruling house, the personal incompetence of the monarch was very clearly apparent. Claudius, from consciousness of his own defects, was so nervous that it was easy to entice him to sign the death warrant of a senator or a knight; and, naturally, this disposition was greatly abused. Then there were his family affairs. Claudius was married several times: when he came to the throne his wife was Messalina, who

came of a distinguished family, and bore him Britannicus and Octavia, but afterwards, as empress, took to ways which aroused horror even in that immoral society. She was grossly sensual; it was dangerous for men to refuse her advances. She caused her husband to command the dancer Mnester not to show himself insubordinate towards the empress; though Claudius did not, indeed, know what the real issue was. Finally, she had a love affair with a distinguished youth, C. Silius, to whom she was formally

married. Silius wished, indeed, to pose as a claimant to the throne, for, from other reasons, no one would have wished to take Messalina as wife.

There was a diversity of opinions among the freedmen of the palace as to the course of action. Men were so used to things at this court that even so monstrous a scandal as this might have been ignored. But Narcissus was in favour of warning and saving Claudius. This was done. Narcissus had the command over the guard in Ostia, where the emperor then was, transferred to him, and led the amazed Claudius to Rome, straight into the camp of the prætorians. These received him with acclamations, and the cause was won. C. Silius was killed and Messalina arrested.

Were she allowed to see Claudius, no one was sure that she would not make her peace with

him and annihilate her enemies. Only through cunning did Narcissus succeed in extracting the death warrant from Claudius. Messalina was forced to commit suicide in the gardens of Sallustius (on the modern Monte Pincio), in 48 A.D. Narcissus was supported by a party in the senate, at whose proposal the insignia of a quæstor were conferred on him. This aroused the jealousy of the other freedmen, which was apparent when several candidates



THE NOTORIOUS MESSALINA.
In the horrid records of Roman vice and crime this evil woman stands supreme. She became empress with the elevation of her husband, Claudius, and turned his palace into a place of debauch. At last she had to kill herself.

THE DEGRADATION OF THE PURPLE

for empress were proposed to Claudius, who wished to marry again. Why not? Of the rivals, Agrippina, who was supported by Pallas, was finally chosen; she was a niece of Claudius, being a daughter of Germanicus by the first Agrippina, and had been married to Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, to whom she had borne a son. She was licentious, as most of the great ladies of the time were, but was still more ambitious. She wished to be empress. After her marriage to Claudius, she had the title of "Augusta" immediately bestowed on her, an honour to which Messalina had never aspired. Narcissus was put into the background, and in his place Pallas, who maintained scandalous relations with Agrippina, was brought forward.

The nomination of Sex. Afranius Burrus, an experienced officer and administrator, to the prefecture of the guard, effected by Agrippina, was an important measure. At the same time, the philosopher L. Annæus Seneca, who had been banished at the instigation of Messalina, was chosen tutor of the young Ahenobarbus, for whom Agrippina wished to procure the throne in place of Britannicus. He was, in fact, adopted by Claudius and betrothed to his daughter, Octavia. Narcissus vainly opposed her schemes, and advocated the cause of Britannicus. Claudius wavered, but his fears were always allayed by Agrippina. Claudius died suddenly while Narcissus was in Campania taking the waters for his gout, and it was publicly whispered that his death was caused by poisoned mushrooms. Burrus presented the son of Agrippina, called, after his adoption, Nero, to the prætorians as the heir to the crown; and these, accustomed to obey their commander, saluted him. Britannicus, had he been brought before them, would have equally pleased them. But Britannicus, deprived of his trusted friends, did not venture to leave the house

after his father's death. Narcissus was away, and Burrus had completely identified himself with Agrippina, while Seneca supported her in the senate. It did not cause much excitement that the stupid Claudius, as Seneca described him in a biting satire, the Apocolocyntosis—that is, "Gourdification," instead of "Deification"—was dead. The proposal was made in the senate, for the sake of appearances, that he should be worshipped as a god, an honour previously only conferred on Julius Cæsar and Augustus. It was unanimously adopted, and no greater loyalty could be evinced.


Nero, a boy of seventeen, now ruled in place of the aged emperor, who had been the tool of so many different powers. Men asked who would lead the new emperor. For this period we have, besides the account of Tacitus, the works of the contemporary Flavius Josephus, who was presented at court in the year 63. He gives us important information in his autobiography as well as in his "Antiquities of the Jews." Court scandals alone interested, as might be expected, the circles in the capital, which had become so accustomed to them; and only in the provinces did accounts of real events

trickle through. Government by freedmen had caused, under Claudius, disgust in senatorial ranks and in the army, which had once saluted Narcissus with the shout, "Io Saturnalia," a distinct allusion to his position as freedman. A government, of which Burrus and Seneca were the representatives, seemed, in comparison, an improvement. At the same time, it is true, the mother of the emperor tried to assert herself as co-regent, although she had not shown political abilities. The young Nero was equally incapable, and preferred to follow his ignoble impulses.

He was in love with a freedwoman of the palace, Acte—so deeply in love that he wished to marry her against the protests of his mother. The ministers made use



DOMITIUS CORBULO
An able Roman governor, whose powers roused Nero's jealousy and led that monster to order his death.



THE MOTHER OF NERO
Successor to Messalina as wife of Claudius, and a good second to her in vice, Agrippina was suspected of the emperor's death to clear the way for her son Nero.


of this dispute to undermine the influence of Agrippina. When she threatened him with Britannicus, Nero gave the latter a poisoned cup of wine at a court dinner in 55 A.D. Such occurrences did not even excite especial interest. There was far greater fear of future complications than there was horror felt at a murder in the imperial house. The government, under Burrus and Seneca, pursued its regular course, so that the later emperor, Trajan, used to declare that the empire had never been better governed than in the first five years of Nero. Burrus proved a success at the head of the army and of foreign affairs. A revolt which broke out in Britain was quelled by the governor, Suetonius Paulinus, while in the east Domitius Corbulo conducted skilful operations against the Parthians. In the senate, Seneca was spokesman in the name of the government, and Nero had to read speeches composed by Seneca. It was much remarked that Nero was the first emperor who did not show himself a capable speaker, so that in this respect he was inferior to Gaius. On the other hand, Nero dabbled in all arts which had nothing to do with his position. He drove, sang, composed, carved. Sometimes he roamed the streets at night in disguise, and indulged in escapades which occasionally ended in his being cudgelled. Such freaks were harmless so long as the young man did not interfere with the real conduct of affairs. For the moment it seemed a point gained that the ambitious Augusta was removed, together with her favourite, Pallas.

Happy Years of Nero's Early Reign

The hostility between mother and son was increased when the latter was drawn into an intrigue with an empty-headed woman, Poppæa Sabina, wife of Nero's friend, Salvius Otho. Poppæa, who came of a noble stock, wished to become empress. Agrippina, however, declared that Nero had received the throne by the hand of Octavia, which, indeed, was the general view. Nero's hate was vented on his mother, whom he accused of plotting against his life. He availed himself of her absence in Misenum, on the Campanian

coast, to make an attempt to kill her by a preconcerted shipwreck. When this plot failed, Nero had Agrippina murdered, in March, 59 A.D., by the sailors whom the admiral of the fleet placed at his disposal. The ministers subsequently approved of the deed, and the senate congratulated the emperor on his escape. Nero had hardly expected this, and for the moment had feared popular feeling. He got his divorce from Octavia, on the ground of her barrenness; but his marriage with the new "Augusta," Poppæa Sabina, did not take place until 62. As people made remarks about this, Octavia, an innocent victim of all these complications, was exiled and killed.

In this same year, 62, a complete change in the governmental system was inaugurated, for Burrus was dead, and the position of Seneca was weakened. Ofonius Tigellinus, the new prefect of the guard, shared and acquiesced in all the iniquitous actions of Nero. At this date the personal rule of Nero begins.



SENECA, THE PHILOSOPHER
Who had a large share in the government during the minority of Nero, but eventually lost favour, and had to destroy himself at Nero's command.

In the year 64, Rome suffered from a great fire, which raged six days, and destroyed many quarters of the town. Nero took energetic measures for the rebuilding of the destroyed parts. He ordered broad and perfectly straight streets to be constructed, while he built on the Palatine "the golden house," with such extensive grounds that the Romans

jestingly said he would include everything in them as far as Veii, if not Veii itself. Town gossip even accused Nero of having intentionally set the city on fire, partly to gain a vivid conception of the burning of Troy, partly in order to carry out his plans for building. When this talk came to the emperor's ears he thought it best to charge the Christians of Rome with incendiarism. Many of them were, consequently, put to a cruel death.

Nero Wreaks Vengeance on the Christians

The Christians were held to be a Jewish sect, and the Jews a worthless race, which might well be sacrificed to higher considerations. This had been the view of Tiberius, who otherwise protected the Jews in the provinces, as in Alexandria, where Jewish disturbances broke out, first

THE DEGRADATION OF THE PURPLE

under Gaius, and lasted for a long time. Judæa itself was in a ferment. The people were expecting a Messiah, who should free them from the foreign yoke. There

was also the opposition of the official priests and teachers to the popular preachers. As one of such, Christ had been given up to be crucified by the native and the Roman authorities. But the movement still continued: a

former adherent of the orthodox Jewish doctrine adopted Christianity, Saul of Tarsus, who possessed the Roman citizenship, and, for this reason, styled himself Paul. He spread the new teaching in Syria, Nearer Asia, Macedonia, Greece, wherever there were large Jewish communities, and, besides that, among the non-Jews, until he was arrested as an enemy of the public peace, and, on appealing to the emperor, was brought to Rome. In prison there, he continued his activity; and in this manner the new religious movement was transplanted to the capital of the empire at an early period.

Nero, unrestrained by anyone, lived according to his inclinations and lusts. As he considered himself a gifted poet and singer, he let himself be heard, first in private circles and then in public. He founded the Neronic games, after the Greek model, which were to be dedicated to the arts of the Muses, while up till then gladiatorial combats and wild-beast fights on a large scale had chiefly interested the population of the city of Rome. The emperor compelled his suite to attend, and employed the troops of the

guard as a *claque*. In 66 and 67, Nero undertook a journey to Greece with a large following, in order to give a performance at the national games. When the Greeks loudly applauded, the emperor issued an edict, by which they were for the future granted freedom and immunity from taxation: the Roman governor, who had till then resided at Corinth, was withdrawn. The



A TRAGIC TRIO IN ROME'S HISTORY

On the left is Nero's wife, Poppæa Sabina, on the right his mother, himself in the middle. In this contemporary portrait the vicious character of the man is seen, but the features of the women do not betray their baseness. Nero had both murdered.

edict was composed by Nero himself in a high-flown strain, and was proclaimed throughout Greece.

Things had thus gone as far as under Gaius. There was an emperor who plumed himself greatly on his high and divine origin, but who entrusted the conduct of business to his servants, while he himself toured as an artist. That could not go on for ever. Nero wasted enormous sums. When the coffers were

empty, the trials for *lèse-majesté* began to assume larger proportions, especially as there was no lack of informers. As this did not produce enough, Nero took measures to debase the currency, an act which caused discontent in the army and among the state officials. The general ill-will led to a conspiracy at Rome in the year 65, in which distinguished officers and senators were involved, including Seneca and the poet Lucan. The consular C. Calpurnius Piso stood at the head of it. When the



THE MONSTER NERO

The gross sensuality of the man is illustrated in this bust, the face showing signs of irresponsibility and madness.

conspiracy was discovered owing to the rashness of its members, the emperor seized the opportunity to rid himself of his former tutor and of two rival poets

at the same time. Thræsea Pætus, the leader of the rival school of Stoicism, was also executed. Nero insisted on the fact that, as Poppæa Sabina had borne him no heir, he alone was left of the whole dynasty, and that, therefore, nothing could happen to him. Domitius Corbulo, who, as governor of Syria, had brought the prolonged negotiations with the Parthian empire to a successful conclusion, was suspected by Nero, and had to commit suicide at his orders. Vespasian, who attended the artistic performances of the emperor, received the chief command against the Jews, who had revolted in the year 66, and had driven the Syrian army out of the field.

In March of the year 68 a rebellion broke out in Gaul, at the head of which stood the governor of Lugdunum, C. Julius Vindex, a man who belonged to the provincial nobility, and now roused his countrymen to arms. His proclamation promised not only the liberation of Gaul from the Roman rule, but, still more, the liberation of Rome from the tyrant. The insurrection in Gaul caused Nero, who, in the course of the year 67, had returned to Rome, as if in triumph, little concern at first, since the Roman rule in those parts depended on the legions along the Rhine; and these, on account of their opposition to the Gauls, were loyal to the emperor.

The commander of the Upper German army, Virginius Rufus, who belonged to an undistinguished family of Upper Italy, led his troops into the disaffected district. While he was beginning negotiations with Vindex, the legions and auxiliary troops came into conflict with the Gallic militia; and, as was to be expected, the latter was defeated. Vindex fell by his own hand, while Nero rejoiced at the thought of coming confiscations. But the state of affairs had altered.

Sulpicius Galba, the governor of Hither Spain, had, like Virginius Rufus, treated with Vindex; that is, these officers had proceeded to check the rising less energetically than Nero had expected. He immediately sent orders to the administrative officials in Spain that the governor should be superseded. Galba, in concert with his officers, declared against Nero and for the "senate and people of Rome," leaving it uncertain whether the principate as such would be maintained, and who was to hold it. The decision was entrusted to the senate as the representative authority. Virginius Rufus adopted this standpoint, although his soldiers offered him the imperium. Galba was of famous lineage, an advantage which, at the beginning of the revolution,



THE EMPEROR GALBA

As a private citizen and later as a general he showed many virtues, but as emperor he disappointed every reasonable hope and was assassinated in his 73rd year.

was still considered. The Praetorian guards at Rome had already become wavering: they no longer placed any sentries in the palace, and their commander, Tigellinus, allowed Nero to fall. Nero, seeing himself completely deserted, fled to the farm of one of his freedmen, which lay outside Rome, by the fourth milestone, between the Via Salaria and the road to Nomentum. The senate at once outlawed him. When the officers came to find him, he ordered his freedman, Epaphroditus, to kill him. He was thirty-one when he died, on June 9th, 68 A.D. Acte buried him in the tomb of the Domitii, to which family Nero had belonged before adoption. With him died the last descendant of the Julian, Claudian, and Domitian houses. It is noteworthy that legends sprang up about the name of Nero to the effect that he was not dead, but would reappear.



THREE MONTHS CÆSAR

Of princely descent, Otho was ambitious but weak. He secured the death of Galba, but destroyed himself three months afterwards.

Years afterwards garlands were still placed on his tomb, an eloquent proof that rulers of his stamp are always popular in certain circles so long as their misdeeds affect only the upper ten thousand. Just as after the murder of Gaius, the

THE DEGRADATION OF THE PURPLE

republic momentarily ruled at Rome. The senate had deposed the incapable princeps; the consuls issued commissions, and sent despatches, under their seal, into the provinces by the official post. The governors declared that they stood at the orders of the senate, and changed their titles; in the same way the commander of the legion in Africa, who, since the reign of Gaius, acted, together with the proconsul, as legatus of the emperor, now styled himself legatus of the Roman people.

But the reasons which had led to the restoration of the principate after the death of Gaius still prevailed. The army required an emperor, and a revival of the disunited republican times would have struck a deadly blow at the interests of the empire. The guards, under the influence of one of their prefects, Numidius Sabinus, who wished to keep his position for the future, proclaimed as emperor Servius Sulpicius Galba, the most distinguished in lineage of those who had opposed Nero.

When this was done, there was nothing left for the senate but to approve it. The recognition of the new ruler by the provinces followed. Under such conditions Galba, at whose side his freedman, Icelus, and the commander of the legion, T. Vinus, were conspicuous, started for Rome. In Gaul he commended and rewarded the adherents of Vindex, at which the German legions chafed. As he approached Rome the marines, whom Nero had collected into a legion in order to resist his enemies, met him, and demanded that their organisation should be recognised, since the legionaries were in every respect better situated than the marines. Galba refused to hear them; and when they became more urgent, he decimated them. In Rome itself discontent was aroused because Galba treated leniently persons who, like Tigellinus, had deeply compromised themselves under Nero, while,

on the other hand, he insisted that actors and such people, on whom Nero had lavished great sums, should pay these back, an impossibility for most of them. Icelus and T. Vinus governed as favourites, since Galba, who was seventy-two years old, lacked the requisite energy. He belonged to the class of rich but complacent senators whom Nero had sent by preference into the most important provinces, since he had nothing to fear from them.

Besides the above-mentioned favourites, Salvius Otho played a part. Nero had sent him as governor to Lusitania, because he wished to have Otho's wife, Poppæa Sabina, for himself. Otho had joined Galba, and with him gone to Rome, as he hoped to be adopted by the childless old man and to be nominated his successor. With this object he turned to good account his old connections in Rome, including those with the guards, to whom he was known from the time when Nero had been his friend.

The classes which had profited by Nero's administrations were for Otho, but Galba was not. He decided in favour of L. Calpurnius Piso Licinianus, a very distinguished and thoughtful youth, who was proclaimed his successor at the beginning of 69. But the legions in Germany had already refused allegiance, and on New Year's Day had proclaimed the governor of the lower province, A. Vitellius, as emperor.

Otho, smarting at being passed over, stirred up the praetorians, who murdered Galba and Piso on January 15th. Otho was then proclaimed emperor, and recognised as such by the senate. The whole Roman world was in an uproar.

The legions in Germany prepared to march on Rome. Otho, in defence, summoned the Illyrian troops to guard Upper Italy. Troops which Nero had set into movement were drawn into the contest by one or the other party just as they stood. In the east the campaign against the Jews,



THE IMPERIAL GLUTTON
An intimate of all the debaucheries of his time, infamous for gluttony and every vice, Vitellius reigned—one continuous orgie—for a year.



VESPASIAN, THE GOOD EMPEROR
He rose from obscurity by integrity and generalship, being declared emperor by the army. His reign of ten years repaired the ravages of his predecessors.

whose capital, Jerusalem, Vespasian was besieging with divisions of the Syrian, Egyptian, and Danubian army, was suspended till the struggle in Italy was determined. Vespasian had sent his son Titus to do homage to Galba. Under the present circumstances the only course was to wait and see whether Otho or Vitellius would prove superior. In the early spring the German troops began their advance under the command of two "legati,"

**A Man
of Straw
as Emperor**

Cæcina Allienus and Fabius Valens, of whom the one took the route through the country of the Helvetii and over the Great St. Bernard, while the other marched through Gaul, in order to press into Italy over the western passes. Vitellius followed them after he had organised his court at Lugdunum. He himself was a man of straw. The affair was arranged by the generals who were opposed to Galba, as a friend of Vindex, and, still more, by the soldiers who had conquered Vindex and did not wish to see his adherents rewarded.

The Illyrian legions were for Otho, since they were rivals of the German troops. But in Italy no one would hear of the "German emperor," the new Germanicus, as he called himself. The choice of an imperator was, people said, the business of the court and the senate at Rome. Not merely a constitutional form, but the supremacy of Italy over the provinces was at stake. When Vitellius and his generals advanced, the population was incensed because they wore trousers, like the barbarians. This costume had been adopted by the Romans in Germany on account of the more inclement climate; in Italy they still wore the toga, while the soldiers had their legs bare. The extensive literature recording the "Year of the Three (or the Four) Emperors" is epitomised in the biographies of Galba and Otho by Plutarch of Chaeronea, who was then about twenty years old, and later made the acquaintance of the highest circles in Rome. Tacitus follows the same sources in his Histories. Where these Histories break off, the "Lives of the Emperors," by Suetonius, becomes more and more valuable.

**Four
Emperors in
One Year**

The first stand was made on the line of the River Po, which now became once more strategically important. The system of roads branched in such a way that the union of the two divisions of Vitellius's army was bound to take place in the


district of Ticinum, for the routes from Germany and Gaul met there. Cremona also and Placentia received, in these circumstances, renewed importance, since from this point the fords of the Po were commanded. Above all, the road leading from the east, by Mantua, through Bedriacum, to Cremona was of importance, since the junction of the guards of Otho, strengthened by gladiators and sailors, with the Illyrian legions advancing by way of Aquileia would necessarily take place on that route.

The Vitellians were eager to prevent this meeting. The first encounter took place near Placentia, between Cæcina, who had anticipated Fabius Valens, and the Othonians. Cæcina was forced to withdraw to Cremona, but effected his junction with Valens unopposed. When the Othonians crossed the Po and offered battle near Bedriacum — between Cremona and Mantua—they were beaten. No decision was, however, arrived at by this defeat, since the Illyrian corps was not yet on the spot. There was no supreme commander in the camp of the Othonians; Otho

**Otho
Kills
Himself**

himself was considered incapable as a soldier, and the better generals, who joined the expedition, as Suetonius Paulinus, displayed no real enthusiasm. Otho, whose nervous temperament was overstrained, gave himself up for lost when he saw that many soldiers would fight no longer. He killed himself on April 15th, 69, A.D., the day after the battle, at Brixellum, where he had awaited the result.

The senate then recognised Vitellius. He sent back the defeated legionaries to their old quarters, though not before excesses had been committed. The victorious army, whose discipline was loose, then marched to Rome. All the demands of the soldiers, some of which had been expressed as early as the death of Augustus, were conceded by Vitellius, the prætorians were disbanded, and a new and stronger guard was made up out of the best troops of the German army, while the rest drank greedily of the pleasures offered by Italy and the capital. Vitellius was not the man to create order out of chaos. He was of noble birth, had been in his youth a comrade of Gaius, a favourite at the court of Nero and in the stables of the circus drivers; a great gourmand, without energy and brains for business, and now a plaything of the



THE LAST PROCESSION OF AN IMPERIAL MONSTER

Vitellius had no thought of anything but his own pleasures, and was speedily ruining the country to entertain his companions in debauch, until retribution came when Vespasian was declared emperor and Vitellius was made thus to parade the streets, a sword held beneath his chin to make him keep up his head, on the way to execution.

From the painting by Georges Rochegrosse.

troops and their leaders, whose opinion of him grew worse with time. The result was that the course of affairs in Italy was soon criticised by the outside world. The Illyrian troops, who had come too late to decide the matter, returned to their quarters in disgust, and their officers plotted conspiracies. In the east, where the

The Army Declares for Vespasian

governor of Syria, C. Licinius Mucianus, and the governor of Egypt, Ti. Julius Alexander, had entered into intimate relations with Flavius Vespasianus, the commander of the army which was investing Jerusalem, the belief prevailed that neither Vitellius nor the rule of the Rhenish soldiery should be endured. Mucianus, who was childless, suggested Vespasian and his son, Titus. Ti. Julius Alexander, who, as *Præfectus Ægypti*, was only a member of the equestrian order, and, therefore, was not himself considered in the question, had Vespasian proclaimed emperor in Alexandria on July 1st, 69.

The attitude of Egypt was of decisive importance, since that country to a great extent supplied Italy, and especially the capital, with grain, and from there pressure could also be brought to bear on Africa. Vespasian thereupon went to Alexandria. Mucianus finally marched from Syria through Asia and Thrace to the Danubian provinces, in order to join the legions posted there, and to advance against Italy, if their opponents did not transfer the theatre of war from Italy to Dyrhachium.


In the meanwhile, the officers of the troops on the Danube had, on the first news, declared for Vespasian. They deposed the thoroughly useless governors, who dated from the times of Nero, and began on their own responsibility the advance upon Upper Italy, with Antonius Primus, one of the commanders of the Pannonian legions, at their head. The corps from Dalmatia and Moesia followed.

The invading force advanced without encountering any opposition as far as Verona, which they quickly seized, in order to cut off any possible reinforcements from Germany and Rætia. An important turning-point was reached when Ravenna went over to the side of Vespasian, for the crews of the fleet there were recruited from Dalmatia and Pannonia.

The Vitellians, who had thought first of holding the line of the Adige, marched back again to the Po; but Cæcina, who commanded there, had so completely lost confidence in Vitellius that he came to an understanding with the party of Vespasian. Not so the soldiers; the Germans did not choose to capitulate to the Illyrians, and they threw the treacherous general into chains. In a murderous encounter between Bedriacum and Cremona, superior generalship decided for the Illyrians. Cremona was taken by the troops of Vespasian, sacked, and reduced to ashes.

Fabius Valens now tried to reach Gaul from the Etrurian coast in order to alarm the troops stationed on the Rhine, but was captured near Massilia and afterwards killed. It was already winter when Antonius Primus marched forward in mad haste on the Flaminian road over the Apennines, deep in snow. The Vitellians in Umbria surrendered. Vitellius himself declared his wish to abdicate, and began negotiations with the prefect of Rome,


Death of Vitellius Flavius Sabinus, a brother of Vespasian. But the soldiers were against the plan, besieged the capital, set fire to it, and slew the prefect on December 19th, 69. The next day the troops of Vespasian, who had met with resistance in the suburbs, succeeded in forcing their way from the Milvian Bridge into the city, and stormed the camp of the prætorians. Vitellius, who had crept away like a coward, was put to death.



THE GRANDEUR THAT WAS ROME
 ILLUSTRATED IN A SERIES OF REMARKABLE RECON-
 STRUCTIONS OF HER MOST FAMOUS MONUMENTS



RESTORATION OF THE CAPITOL AS SEEN FROM MOUNT PALATINE




THE GREAT TEMPLE OF VENUS AND ROME, BUILT BY THE EMPEROR HADRIAN

Reconstruction by the archaeologist Gatteschi for M. Boyer d'Agen's work on the Forum.




THE CIRCUS MAXIMUS, THE LARGEST IN ROME, WITH THE PALACES OF THE CÆSARS ON THE LEFT


See also page 709




GENERAL VIEW OF THE FORUM, TOWARDS THE CAPITOL, WITH RELIGIOUS PROCESSION PASSING THE TEMPLE OF CASTOR AND POLLUX



INTERIOR OF THE PANTHEON OF AGRIPPA



INTERIOR OF THE GREAT BATHS OF CARACALLA



CHARACTERISTIC INTERIOR OF THE HOUSE OF A RICH CITIZEN



EXTERIOR AND GARDENS OF A ROMAN VILLA IN THE COUNTRY




PART OF THE SACRED WAY, WITH THE TEMPLE OF JOVIS STATORIS
 From the reconstruction by the archeologist Gatteschi for M. Boyer d'Agen's work on the Forum



This view of the Forum shows, on the extreme left the Temple of Venus and Rome, with the Arch of Fabian in front and in the foreground the Temple of Julius Caesar. To the right of that is the beautiful little Temple of Vesta, where the sacred flame was tended by the vestals; and the mystic palladium preserved. Behind it is the house of the vestals, a sort of nunnery, and behind that again rises the mighty pile of the Imperial Palace. On the extreme right is a portion of the Basilica Julia, and to the left of it the Temple of Castor and Pollux. The equestrian statue is that of Vespasian. The reconstruction is the work of Professor Becchetti, of the Royal Academy of Fine Arts, Rome.

TWO SCENES IN THE ROMAN FORUM



A GENERAL VIEW OF ROME AS IT APPEARED IN THE TIME OF AURELIAN

In the centre the Capitoline Hill, Forum and Colosseum beyond; in front of the Capitol is the Circus Flaminus, the Portica and Circus of Pompeius. The large circus in the left foreground is that of Alexander Severus, and beyond it is the Pantheon. On the right is the Tiber, and in the distance the Alban Hills, to the right, and the Volscian Hills, to the left



ROME UNDER THE GOOD EMPERORS

WITH INTERLUDES OF TYRANNY

EVENTFUL REIGNS FROM VESPASIAN TO COMMODUS

WHEN the senate recognised Vespasian as emperor, the latter's second son, Domitian, came out of his concealment, in order to take part in the revolutions, and at the same time to prove, by all sorts of eccentricities, committed with impunity, that he was a prince. Mucianus, as soon as he entered Rome, set Antonius Primus and his followers aside, for persons whose past was not without reproach were to be found among them—persons who were fit enough to effect a revolution but not to organise a government. First of all, steps had to be taken to provision the capital, for the supplies on hand were sufficient for only ten days. There followed some appointments, executions, suicides—the new order of things had come.

When Vespasian came to Rome from Egypt, in the spring of 70 A.D., he was hailed on all sides with joy, for men were wearied of civil wars. Vespasian, leaving the events of the year of revolution alone, accepted the government in the same form as the Julii and Claudii. While Vitellius had styled himself merely "Imperator" and "Perpetual Consul," Vespasian connected his name with the first dynasty, since he called himself "Imperator Cæsar Vespasianus Augustus," and named his two sons "Cæsar." Thus the principate, which, after the fall of the Julii and of the Claudii, had to go through a grave crisis, emerged in a definitely recognised constitutional form.


T. Flavius Vespasianus, born at Reate, in the Sabine country, was sixty years old at the time of his elevation. He was no genius, but a thoroughly practical character. He came of a moderately wealthy municipal family, and had laid the foundations of his career under Gaius and Claudius,

especially when, at the head of a legion, he shared in the conquest of Britain, distinguishing himself in the campaign. Nero had given him advancement, because he loyally overlooked the follies of his emperor. Vespasian's father had been a banker, and the son inherited the aptitude for finance, which was then peculiarly necessary. Vespasian, however, began his reign with an immense deficit, which had to be made good by new, and in many respects unpopular, taxes. Even the public latrines were taxed; and when Titus ventured a remark on this subject, the old man held a gold coin under his nose, with the words, "*Non olet*"—"There is no smell about that." Thus, after a reign of ten years, he placed the finances once more on a sound footing.

The affairs of the army had also to be thoroughly reorganised. The defeat of the German legions in Italy had a sequel. That part of the legions which had remained behind in Germany, together with the German auxiliaries, especially the Batavi, had been greatly excited at the occurrences of the times, and had, moreover, been worked upon by the emissaries of the different parties. The rivalry between the auxiliary troops and the legionaries was apparent, and the former found support among their kinsmen in the tribes. A heavy price was paid for having employed these national troops near their homes; and all the more because the province of Belgica and the adjacent parts of Germany were inhabited by very warlike tribes, on the auxiliaries from which the strength of the Rhenish army chiefly rested. These, in opposition to the legions, declared for Vespasian before the decision was known. But when

**Vespasian
a Master
of Finance**

**Vespasian
Re-establishes
the Principate**



MAP ILLUSTRATING THE ROMAN EMPIRE AT THE HEIGHT OF ITS POWER. The names refer to the mediæval as well as the ancient period of Roman history. The towns are chiefly indicated by their modern names, and for those which belong exclusively to a later period a lighter writing is used.

Vespasian had won, Julius Civilis, at the head of the Batavi and the Caninefates, supported by reinforcements from the right bank of the Rhine, continued the war against the legions, while at the same time, the Treviri and Lingones, with other tribes of Belgica, rose under the leadership of Julius Tutor and Julius Classicus, who were Treveri, and of Julius Sabinus, a Lingonian. An independent Gallic empire was planned, a scheme far wider than that entertained two years previously by Julius Vindex, whose rebellion was remembered.

The leaders were now Germans and Belgi with the rights of Roman citizenship, as Arminius the liberator had been. The opposition of the legions failed after the overthrow of the Vitellians in Italy was completed, since even the higher officers, excepting C. Dillius Vocula, the commander of the XXII. Legion, completely lost their heads. The troops mutinied, and deposed their officers—first the governor, Hordeonius Flaccus, and later, Vocula, too. All the frontier camps in Lower Germany, Castra Vetera, Novæsium, and Bonna, fell into the hands of Civilis.

**Mutiny
of Roman
Legions**

This was the climax of the rising. As soon as Vespasian was in Rome, he sent to Germany an efficient officer, Petilius Cerealis, who had distinguished himself in Britain. He received four or five legions, including the serviceable portions of the Vitellian troops. At the same time, reinforcements from Spain, Britain and Rhætia were brought up.

The advance on the insurgents was made, after the recapture of Mainz, from Upper Germany, where the legionary camp of Vindonissa had held out. It was soon apparent how unnatural was the alliance between Gauls, Germans, and Roman soldiers. The last returned to their allegiance everywhere; the Treveri were defeated at Bingen, and their capital occupied. Civilis, it is true, surprised the Roman army at Trier with his combined forces; but Cerealis atoned for his want of caution by splendid bravery, and by his victory opened the way into the country of the Batavi. The vanquished were, in the end, leniently treated; only the Gallic insurgent leaders were executed, and Civilis, who had not favoured the scheme of a Gallic empire, was pardoned. By the autumn of 70 everything was quiet. Vespasian disbanded the legions which had mutinied, and formed new ones.

Changes in garrisons were also made. The principle was laid down that auxiliary troops should never be employed in the vicinity of their homes; that the separate divisions should be kept apart, and should be commanded by Roman and not by native officers. Most of the German auxiliaries went to Britain, where they

**When Britain
Was First
"Germanised"**


were separated by the sea from their kinsmen, until at a later period the bodies of men who voluntarily came over from their homes led to the "Germanising" of that island.

At the same time, Titus, the son of Vespasian, ended the Jewish War after he had invested Jerusalem in April, 70. The town had three lines of fortification. After the first and the second wall were taken, the old city and the Temple Hill still offered a successful resistance, although the miseries of famine were daily increasing. On August 29th, the Temple was taken and burnt, and on September 26th, the upper town was also captured [see plate facing page 1859]. The victors levelled all the fortifications, except three towers, which were left standing to testify to the difficulties of the siege. The city, which had been for a thousand years one of the homes of the ancient civilisation, was destroyed, as Carthage and Corinth had been.

The Jewish people were deprived of their ethnical and religious centre, and scattered over the face of the globe, a dispersion that has often been regretted later. The Jews who remained true to their ancestral religion were forced from this time to pay to the Capitoline Jupiter that tribute which they had previously offered to God in the Temple at Jerusalem. A hundred thousand prisoners were sold into slavery, after the soldiers had crucified as many as they pleased. The province of Judæa received a legion as garrison, and some military colonies, among them Emmaus,

**After the
Destruction
of Jerusalem**

were established there; these were intended to facilitate the work of holding the country, and to complete the mixture of nationalities. In the Syrian legions, Syrian was frequently spoken by the soldiers when off duty; otherwise, Latin was adopted there also as the military language. Cæsarea, founded by Herod, remained the capital of the province. Titus, together with his father, celebrated a triumph at Rome. On his triumphal



SOLDIERS BEARING THE SEVEN-BRANCHED CANDLESTICK
A reproduction of the remarkably preserved sculpture on the Arch of Titus, illustrated below, showing his soldiers bearing the famous candlestick taken by him from the Temple at Jerusalem and carried through Rome in his triumph.

proving the condition of the towns. Vespasian conferred the Latin rights on the Spanish communities, and by this means the way was prepared for the spreading of the Roman spirit. In Africa the institution of the provincial cult goes back to Vespasian. Achaia became a province again, since, as the emperor remarked, the Greeks had forgotten how to be free; with no governor there to decide, the quarrels between the separate communities had broken out once more.

arch were represented scenes from the war, and the sacred vessels of the Temple, while the inscriptions stated that the Jewish people had been tamed, and that the hitherto unconquered Jerusalem was destroyed. It was noticed that the emperors scorned to assume the surname *Judaicus*, though they received the greetings for their victory as "*imperatores*."

In Rome, Vespasian carried out great architectural schemes, since the prisoners supplied the necessary labour, and the rest of the population was eager for employment. He built the temple to the

Vespasian reorganised affairs in the rest of the East. Thus he transferred a legion to Cappadocia, because the countries by the Caucasus and Armenia often showed themselves eager to make inroads. An invasion of the Dacians on the Lower Danube had to be repelled and the garrison strengthened. On the other hand the legions were withdrawn from Dalmatia, a province perfectly pacified, and, instead, the legionary camps of Carnuntum on the Lower Danube, and Vindobona—the modern Vienna—were formed in Pannonia. Much was also done in the Danubian provinces and in Dalmatia towards im-



THE TRIUMPHAL ARCH OF TITUS

One of the best preserved monuments in Rome, this beautiful arch was erected over the Sacred Way, where that road led to the Forum on the east, near the Colosseum. The triumphal procession of the conqueror of Jerusalem would pass through it on its way to the Capitol. The bas-relief is seen under the arch.

goddess of Peace and the great Flavian Amphitheatre, called the "Colosseum." It was shown that the emperor, otherwise so thrifty, did not shun expenditure for objects of general utility.

Mucianus and Titus exercised great influence in the government. While the former filled the consulate for the second and third times, Titus received, as the nominated successor to the throne, the command of the guard, which had been restored to its old footing. By this means the necessary force could be brought to the aid of the authorities. When Cæcina, the former general of Vitellius, tried to stir up the soldiers to sedition, Titus invited him to dinner and had him stabbed on leaving. At first Vespasian found opposition in the senate, because he was descended from a plebeian family. He was opposed, too, by the doctrinaires, who always honoured Cato, the antagonist of the Cæsars, as their ideal. This resistance was broken down; the resolute republican, Helvidius Priscus, son-in-law of Thræsea Pætus, was brought to trial, and the senate was reorganised. The old families, who had once governed the republic, were greatly diminished, for the numerous executions in the Julian and Claudian times, as well as their own excesses and celibacy had reduced their numbers. Thus the last Sulpicius had been buried with Galba. When Vespasian and Titus assumed the censorship, in 73, they filled up the senate from the municipal ranks, which even in Rome were far less independent than their predecessors. A new era began, both for the principate and for the senate, an era of which the literary standard-bearers were Cornelius Tacitus and the younger Pliny.


When Vespasian died, in 79, after a vigorous reign, his son Titus, then in his fortieth year, succeeded him. Titus had grown up at the court of Claudius as the playmate of Britannicus, with splendid talents; a brilliant officer, but licentious.

His health was undermined. Great notoriety attached to his relations with the Jewish princess, Berenice, a daughter of Julius Agrippa, who followed him to Rome. When he assumed the sole sovereignty, he laid down the principle that no one would be permitted to leave the emperor unconsoled. He would not have gone very far thus in the long run, but he was fated to find an occasion to test his charity on a large scale. On August 24th, 79, an eruption of Vesuvius overwhelmed the Campanian towns of Herculaneum, Pompeii, and Stabiae. The elder Pliny, a comrade-in-arms of Titus from the time of the Jewish War, then prefect of the fleet at Misenum, met his death there, for his curiosity as a naturalist carried him too far into danger. Of these



THE EMPEROR TITUS
Conqueror of the Jews and destroyer of Jerusalem, he succeeded his father Vespasian in the year 79.

buried towns, Pompeii especially has been brought to light by excavations made in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, to which we are indebted for an exact picture of the domestic life of the Italian population in the first century A.D. The emperor did all that lay in his power to help the sufferers, as he did on the occasion of a three-days fire, which devastated Rome in the following year.




TACITUS, THE HISTORIAN
This great man was one of the chief ornaments of the reigns of Vespasian and later emperors. His friendship with Pliny is famous.

Titus was succeeded two years afterwards by his brother, Domitian, who had up till now been kept in the background, except that he had repeatedly filled the consulate, and had been admitted into all the priestly colleges. His personality is unsympathetic. Just as he had previously intrigued against Titus, so he now made the senators feel his power in every way, as he filled the consulate seventeen times; and, as perpetual censor, reserved to himself the right of filling up the senate with nominees of his own liking.


The title of censor disappeared after Domitian; but the right of nomination remained in the emperor, and formed an important stepping-stone in the

THE BEAUTIFUL HOUSES OF POMPEII



RESTORED INTERIOR OF THE "HOUSE OF THE TRAGIC POET"


The remains of this house are so good that restoration is easy. On the vestibule in mosaic is the figure of a barking dog with the famous legend "Cave canem." The house takes its name from an enigmatic inscription on the wall, but as there are two shops, one on each side of the vestibule, the house was possibly that of a rich tradesman.



REMAINS OF THE HOUSE OF THE BANKER L. CÆCILIVS JUCUNDVS


The actual state of the house of the banker, identified by his bust and inscription, is seen in this picture. The house was rich in frescoes. In the background we look, on the left, into the peristylum (the courtyard), which was enclosed on two sides by a portico running out on seven pillars; on the right we see the viridarium (the garden), amongst the once isolated pillars of which three sleeping and dwelling rooms have later been built on. The room on the left edge of the picture is the triclinium (eating-room), that on the right is an exedra (a reception room).

THE GARDENS AND BATHS OF POMPEII



RESTORATION OF A TYPICAL GARDEN AND PORTICO

Well-stocked flower gardens were not greatly in favour among the Pompeiians, fountains with brightly coloured fish and decorative mosaic paths being the chief features of the open courtyards, the walls of which were lavishly covered with frescoes, not always of a high order of art. The above illustrates the typical style of garden.



THE HOT ROOM, OR TEPIDIARIUM, OF THE PUBLIC BATHS

The baths of Pompeii are very well preserved, and the lead pipes through which the water was carried from Stabiae, 2,000 years ago, are still to be seen. This picture shows the remains of the tepidarium partially restored.

POMPEII TRADESMEN 2,000 YEARS AGO



INTERIOR OF A BAKERY IN THE MAIN STREET

None of the remains of Pompeii are more interesting than those of the numerous bakeries, where the ovens are still intact, the heavy granite mills for grinding the corn still standing on the ancient floors, and even the remains of the bread and pies, which were being baked when the city was destroyed, are preserved in the museum.



THE SHOP OF A GENERAL DEALER IN FRUIT, POULTRY AND WINES

Very little restoration is necessary to make the ruined shops of Pompeii as they were. The counters still stand with deep holes in them where the great wine-jars, with pointed bottoms, were placed to keep their contents cool.

TEMPLES AND STREETS OF POMPEII



SUPLIANTS BEFORE THE TEMPLE OF FORTUNE

There were numerous temples in Pompeii to Greek, Roman, and even Egyptian deities. One of the most notable and most popular was the Temple of Fortune, the above restoration of which is based on the existing remains.



ONE OF THE PRINCIPAL STREETS AS IT IS TO-DAY

Edwards

The streets of Pompeii were paved with blocks of lava, and at every crossing were large stepping-stones on a level with the pavements to enable people to cross the roads without the fatigue of stepping down from the pavements and up again. The chariots had to be carefully guided in clearing these large stones. In the foreground is a fountain, and in the distance, on the left, one of the posts marking the different wards of the city may be seen.

development of the principate into the monarchy. Domitian, on the whole, took Tiberius as his model. Epaphroditus, the freedman of Nero, long enjoyed influence over him, until Domitian recollected that Epaphroditus had aided the suicide of Nero; this caused his fall and death. The emperor was resolved

Domitian Assumes Divinity

to rule without favourites, trusting in the support of the army and the people. He wished to be addressed as "Lord" and "God," which corresponded to the Oriental conception of the attitude of the ruler to his subjects, not to the Roman idea of the "First Citizen." The emperor called the month of October, in which he was born, Domitianus, after himself, just as in the same way July and August received their names. The mistrust felt by the emperor for all senatorial officials resulted in his exercising a strict control over the administration of the provinces. This proved beneficial to the subjects, and his government can in no way be put on the same level as that of a Caligula or a Nero. An insurrection, which

L. Antonius Saturninus, the governor of Upper Germany, attempted in Mogontiacum with the help of the independent tribes on the other side of the Rhine, was suppressed by armed force in 88 or 89 A.D. In these operations the Spanish "legatus," Ulpius Trajanus, the subsequent emperor, distinguished himself. The conquest of Britain, under the administration of C. Julius Agricola, which took seven years, proceeded rapidly, especially with regard to the strengthening of the interior, which had been frequently interrupted by repeated insurrections. The geographical horizon of the Romans was thus widened by sea and by land.

War also was made on the Chatti and the Sarmates, in which the latter completely annihilated a Roman legion. Finally, the war against the Dacians

demanding the exertion of the full strength of the empire. The sphere of Dacian influence, starting from the modern Transylvania, had gradually extended, on the one side, through the easterly passes up to the Black Sea; on the other, on the west towards the Central, and on the south towards the Lower, Danube. The governor of Mœsia fell in battle, and the province was placed in so critical a position that Domitian himself went there with his prefect of the guard, Cornelius Fuscus.

The war, in which the Romans assumed the aggressive, was in the end successful. After the death of Cornelius Fuscus, Domitian concluded a peace in 89 A.D. with Decebalus, the Dacian king, in which the latter received a yearly present of money and certain privileges; the opposition, therefore, said that the peace

was bought. It became apparent that Domitian was not fit for the task which had to be performed there; but he did not wish to entrust it to any one else, in order not to effect a change of parties. The tension between the emperor on the one side, and the senators and military chiefs on the other, in-



DOMITIAN AND HIS WIFE DOMITIA


Domitian was the last of the twelve Cæsars. He was a cruel and unpopular emperor and was suspected of poisoning his elder brother Titus, whom he succeeded. Despite elaborate precautions he fell a victim to the assassin in his forty-fifth year, and in death the senate and all Rome dishonoured one who had often dishonoured them.

creased. Besides this, there were family disputes. The emperor was not on good terms with his wife, Domitia Longina, a daughter of Domitius Corbulo, after he had ordered her lover, the actor Paris, to be assassinated. The emperor also ordered his cousin, Flavius Clemens, and his wife, Flavia Domitilla, to be executed, because


Domitian Stands by the Old Gods

they were well inclined towards Christianity. Domitian strictly upheld the old religion. On September 18th, 96, Domitian was murdered by members of his household. He was forty-five years old.

The "Lives of the Emperors," which were published under Hadrian by his secretary, Suetonius Tranquillus, is a sufficient authority so far. From this point the "History of the Emperors," by Dion Cassius, becomes the chief source.



THE GREAT AUDIENCE CHAMBER IN THE IMPERIAL PALACE OF DOMITIAN



STADIUM, WHERE THE GAMES WERE HELD, CONNECTED WITH THE IMPERIAL PALACE
These reconstructions, based upon existing remains on the Palatine Hill, are by the archaeologist Gatteschi, and were made for the work of M. Boyer d'Agen on ancient Rome.

Although Domitian had selected the sons of Flavius Clemens to succeed him, their dynastic claims had ceased to be respected, and the aged consul, M. Cocceius Nerva, was proclaimed emperor; quite an unsuitable choice, made, it is evident, by women and lackeys. A reaction was setting in against the govern-

**A Love
Poet as
Emperor**

ment of the senate, which, up to this time, had been in violent opposition to the principate, and was now officially suppressing all memorials of Domitian and annulling his acts. It was soon apparent that Nerva, who had been a successful writer of erotic verse under Nero, but had shown no special ability in a military or civil capacity, was unequal to his task, at all events as far as the enemy was concerned. When the prætorians, whose favourite Domitian had been, demanded the surrender of his murderers, Nerva was powerless to protect them. Moreover, an able soldier was required both for Germany and for the Dacian campaign. The situation as regards the Parthians and other Oriental peoples was likewise far from reassuring, and there was always the danger of these hostile groups uniting into a formidable confederacy if timely measures were not taken.

Such were the motives which, in 97, led the childless Nerva to adopt M. Ulpius Trajanus, the governor of Upper Germany. Henceforth it became the rule for the reigning emperor to choose his successor in the principate, contrary to the previous custom, by which the welfare of the state was subordinated to dynastic interests. Recent events had proved the inefficiency of purely senatorial government and the need of an actual imperator.

Trajan, a native of Italica in Spain, and at this time forty-four years of age, was the son of a man who had commanded a legion in the Jewish War and had been subsequently consul and governor of the province of Syria. The new emperor-elect was, above everything, a soldier. He was then in Germany engaged in carrying out the policy of the Flavian emperors, of which one feature was to resume possession of the districts on the right

bank of the Rhine, including the so-called *agri decumates* with their capital, Samelocenna. The origin of the name *decumates* is uncertain; it is possibly a term used by the *agrimensores*, the rendering "titelands" resting on no real evidence.

It was his countryman, the consul Licinius Sura, who recommended Trajan to Nerva. The news of his adoption reached him at Cologne. He at once sent for the mutinous Prætorian guard, in order to seize and punish the ringleaders. A victorious campaign was fought against the Suevi on the Danube, in consequence of which Nerva and Trajan assumed the title of Germanicus. At the same time the concentration of troops on the Lower Rhine, begun under Domitian, was continued.

On the 27th of January, 98 A.D., death removed Nerva, and Trajan assumed supreme authority at Rome. He received a hearty welcome from all who had felt themselves oppressed under Domitian, above all from Cornelius Tacitus, consul in the year 98, and from the younger Pliny, consul in the year 100 A.D.

Steps were taken at this time to reform the condition of Italy. The sovereign country had become more and more a land of capitalists. Apart from the senatorial class, in whose hands numerous large estates in various parts of Italy became concentrated, there were the office holders returning home with well-

filled purses after filling some civil or military post in the provinces. Others had made fortunes out of trade and speculation. These men played an important part at home, as they spent their money freely, particularly in the endowment of public institutions—baths, libraries, games—by which the lower classes benefited; but, in reality, such public benefactions formed only a vast subsidy system extremely unfavourable to sound economic conditions. Domitian had endeavoured by police regulations to preserve agriculture wherever it was still found in Italy; otherwise wine-culture would have been more general, especially as Italian wine, which at this time found no competitors in Burgundy or Tokay, formed a profitable article of export.



NERVA, THE MAN OF PEACE
The first emperor of foreign extraction, and a model of mildness, temperance and pacific government.

**How the
Wealthy Spent
their Money**



NATIVE LABOURERS UNDER ROMAN OFFICERS BUILDING A WALL
From the fresco painting by William Bell Scott



Valentine

REMAINS OF THE GREAT WALL BUILT BY HADRIAN FROM THE TYNE TO THE SOLWAY

But the country was suffering from other disorders; the condition of society was such as might be expected of an enervated population living in indolence. A reluctance to marry or to bring up a family, unresponsive to such universally disseminated vices as we find censured in the satirists of the period, Petronius, Martial, and

Emperors who Encouraged the Young

Juvenal, was taking such deep root that the population, instead of increasing with the material progress of the country, was rather on the decline. Some attempt, therefore, had to be made to rescue those, at least, who as yet were not hopelessly corrupt—the young. This was done by means of the magnificent alimentation endowments which Nerva initiated and which Trajan continued. Their object was to provide yearly allowances

(*alimenta*) for boys and girls until the completion of their education. The endowments were in land, and several records in the form of land registers have come down to us, one from the district of Beneventum, the rest from that of Veleia (in Liguria).

This beneficent scheme, which aimed at preserving the supremacy of Italy, was further developed and organised by succeeding emperors.

After spending the years 99 and 100 at Rome, Trajan in 101 took the field against the Dacians. The positions of Aquincum and Acuminum on the Middle Danube had already been taken and the garrisons reinforced from Britain and the Rhine; the whole campaign, indeed, was carefully planned and vigorously executed. Trajan commanded in person. It was intended not merely to relieve Mœsia, but also to seek out in their own territory the Daci, whose rich gold-mines must have been in themselves a strong attraction to the Romans. The first campaign ended in the overthrow of Decebalus, whose authority, extending to the Danube and the sea, was now confined to the region of Transylvania.

There, in 102 A.D., he was left to rule, a vassal of the Romans. But Trajan soon discovered that Decebalus was unfaithful to the terms of the treaty, and that a second campaign would be necessary.

This opened with the building of Trajan's Bridge over the Danube (near Severin), by which the river, which had proved his most formidable adversary, was put in irons. For the second time Trajan converged his forces on the Dacian capital, Sarmizegethusa, in the Hatzeg valley, by way of the valley of the Alt and the Rothenturm pass, the Banat and the Iron Gate, and most probably the Vulkan pass. The Daci defended themselves in their woods and fortresses, whither they had conveyed their treasures for safety—among other places at the "Muncselor Grediste," which lies at the head of the valley to the south

of Broos, a region which, to this day, is remarkable for the discovery of Greek and Roman coins and even of entire treasure-hoards hidden at that time. Decebalus committed suicide when he saw that all was lost. Of the Dacians, part submitted and part were exterminated or expelled, their place



TRAJAN AND HIS WIFE PLOTINA

When Nerva chose Trajan as his successor all Rome rejoiced, and his rule was one of enlightenment though it ended in misfortune. His wife, Plotina, was a worthy helpmeet of a good emperor.

being taken by settlers from other provinces. Sarmizegethusa became the new colony of Ulpia; the gold region was occupied and a legion quartered at Apulum for its protection in 107 A.D.

The triumph of Rome was now complete, and the Greek cities on the Pontus were delivered from the oppression of the Dacian


Dacian Power Destroyed power. There was great rejoicing in Olbia and in Tomi; and the founding of Nicopolis on the northern slopes of the

Hæmus worked effects that were felt later throughout the whole of the Balkan peninsula. The hard-won victory was recorded at Rome as well as on the banks of the Danube and on the Euxine on coins and monuments. Fitting honours were paid to the fallen warriors, and a triumph and games were celebrated. A "Tropœum

ROME UNDER THE GOOD EMPERORS

Frajani" was erected at Adamklissi in the Dobrudscha, not far from Tomi, on the coins of which town the trophy is represented. The monument to the fallen soldiers has been recently discovered. None the less the new province of Dacia entailed fresh burdens on the finances and necessitated a permanent increase in the military establishment.

About the same time (106 A.D.) the governor of Syria, A. Cornelius Palma, annexed the district round Bostra and Petra. It received a legion as garrison and formed henceforth the Roman province of Arabia, through which an imperial road led to the Red Sea. The emperor, however, proceeded from Dacia to Rome. Here he spent the following years and built the "Forum Trajani," containing the Pillar of Trajan, on which are bas-reliefs commemorating the Dacian War. Trajan devoted himself with



THE FORUM OF TRAJAN AS IT IS

Although nothing but stumps of the noble pillars remain, the great column is still intact, but a statue of St. Peter replaces that of Trajan.

TRAJAN'S FORUM AS IT WAS
Trajan's most notable adornment of the city, reared to commemorate his Dacian campaigns.

energy to the business of government, above all to the encouragement of Italian commerce. He began the improvement of the harbour of Ancona, which was important for the trade with the opposite coast of Dalmatia and the East. He further constructed the Via Trajana from Beneventum to Brundisium, which, being shorter than the Via Appia, opened up new districts to commerce. The gratitude of the inhabitants was expressed in the triumphal arches, erected in his honour, which exist to this day in Ancona and Beneventum.

Provincial affairs were not neglected at this time, as may be seen from Trajan's correspondence with the younger Pliny, who from 111 to 113 was governor of Bithynia. Pliny had been entrusted by the emperor with an extraordinary mission, which accounts for the interest displayed by the latter;

but we see at all events that the central government wished to be kept informed even of comparatively unimportant matters. About the same time, or a little earlier, P. Cornelius

Tacitus as Proconsul of Asia

Tacitus became proconsul of the province of Asia; he already possessed a great reputation as orator, advocate, and historian. Tacitus had completed the "Histories," which covered the period from Galba to the end of Domitian, and was engaged on the period from the death of Augustus to the downfall of Nero when Trajan entered upon his Oriental campaign.

In 114 the war with the Parthians broke out. The late king of the Parthians, Pacorus, had formed an alliance with the Dacians, and the ruling king, Khosru, had encroached upon the Roman sphere of influence in Armenia by arbitrarily imposing a king on that country. In Armenia Parthian interests had ever been in conflict with those of Rome, and Trajan resolved to determine the dispute once for all. With the support of the Caucasian tribes and of the dependent princes of Syria he annexed Armenia and made it a province. After setting up a rival claimant to the Parthian throne Trajan went into winter quarters at Antioch. Early in the following year he crossed the Tigris, and reduced the districts of Adiabene and Babylon with the towns of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, reaching the Persian Gulf through the territory of Mesene. Two more distant provinces were formed—

Mesopotamia and, beyond the Tigris, Assyria. Only old age prevented Trajan from going to India, as Alexander the Great had done. Soon, however, reverses came. A rising in the conquered countries forced Trajan to retreat in order to preserve his communications.

The strongly fortified town of Hatra was besieged by him in vain; Khosru regained possession of Parthia. In addition, a rising of the Jews took place throughout the eastern provinces, partly fomented by their kindred, who were enjoying

prosperity in the Parthian kingdom, and partly occasioned by a revival of Messianic hopes; in Cyrene they went so far as to set up a "king." Trajan broke down under a strain that was too severe for a man of sixty, and returned to Antioch a pitiable wreck. He had hardly set out on his journey to Rome when he died on the way at Selinus in Cilicia on August 8th, 117 A.D.

And thus the life of Trajan ended in grave misfortune. He had overtaxed his own and his country's strength and the

result had been failure. It was at this time the aim of Roman policy in the East to control the overland trade with India. An advance in the direction of

Rome's Policy in the East

Arabia had been attempted by Augustus, and Trajan's expedition to the Persian Gulf had been undertaken with the same object. But the attempt generally miscarried, the interior of Arabia being protected by its deserts; the province of "Arabia" was no more a province than were "Africa" or "Asia." Arabia proper,



THE ARCH OF TRAJAN AT BENVENTUM

One of the two arches still existing erected by the Romans to mark their gratitude to Trajan for his services to the country.

with its caravan routes, remained a world apart till the rise of Islam. The Romans had therefore to content themselves with developing the maritime route from Egypt to India, and with entering into an agreement with the Parthian kingdom, which secured the trade route to India and the country of the Seres—that is, China. In such circumstances, no reason remained for the retention of Assyria and Mesopotamia, or even of Armenia, either from a military or from an economic standpoint.

So thought the man who became Trajan's successor, P. Ælius Hadrianus. He also was a native of Italica in Spain; he was a cousin of Trajan, and had been brought up as his ward. His marriage with a grand-daughter of Trajan's sister, Marciana, had brought him into still closer connection with the imperial family. An able officer, he had accompanied Trajan on all his campaigns and had held important commands, both on the Danube and on the Euphrates; after the Second Dacian War he had been made governor of Lower Pannonia. At the time of Trajan's death he was at the head of the army of Syria. His biography is the first of the lives of the various emperors in the "Scriptores Historiæ Augustæ."

As regards the real circumstances of his adoption, a tradition was preserved in the family of a later governor of Cilicia


that it was due to a forgery on the part of Trajan's wife, Plotina, after the decease of her husband. It could, however, have been no secret that

Hadrian was not in sympathy with Trajan's policy of expansion. On the other hand, the generals, who, like Trajan himself, reasoned only as soldiers, were all in favour of this policy; such were Lusius Quietus, the governor of Judæa, who, after much bloodshed, had lately been victorious over the

Jews in their native country, Cornelius Palma, the conqueror of Arabia, and others. Hadrian had therefore to face a strong opposition in this quarter when

he departed from the path of his predecessor. His first act was to terminate the Parthian War by recognising Khosru as king, abandoning the conquered territories, Arabia excepted, and consenting to the installation of a member of the Parthian royal house as ruler of Armenia. Immediately afterwards came the suppression of the Jewish revolt in Egypt and Cyrene by Hadrian's most devoted lieutenant, Marcus Turbo. This Marcus Turbo was sent to Mauretania and afterwards to Pannonia and Dacia.

Even this last province would have been resigned by Hadrian had not so many Roman settlers been established there. Hadrian contented himself therefore with reducing the garrison, after travelling in



THE EMPEROR HADRIAN AND HIS WIFE SABINA
Hadrian was, like Trajan, without legal issue, and was on bad terms with Sabina, who refused to bear an heir to the throne.




HADRIAN'S FAVOURITE, ANTIPOUS
The beautiful youth, immortalised in sculpture, who accompanied the emperor everywhere and died mysteriously.

person from Antioch through Mœsia and Dacia. Marcius Turbo was appointed by Hadrian to the post of prefect of the prætorians at Rome, where a conspiracy seems to have been formed shortly before

administered justice. But it was to the organisation of the army and of the civil administration that Hadrian especially devoted himself. Every province and every army corps came under his personal supervision. The civil service of later times is his creation; whereas previously imperial freedmen of all sorts had held office, he drew far more exclusively on the middle class, the "Roman Knights." He revised the army tactics with an eye on the methods of warfare pursued by hostile nations.

In the auxiliary troops the peculiar virtues of each nation were encouraged and rendered effective. The army respected Hadrian for his thorough knowledge of the service, in war as well as in peace; and it is said he knew by name multitudes of soldiers in the ranks. On the whole, Hadrian may be regarded




REMAINS OF THE GREEK THEATRE AT HADRIAN'S VILLA. The immense series of ruins known as Hadrian's Villa, near Tivoli, some fifteen miles from Rome, are among the most interesting in Italy. The model Greek theatre, like many of the other more public buildings of the "villa," was connected by underground passages with the private apartments.

his arrival. Lusius Quietus and Cornelius Palma, together with Avidius Nigrinus, who under Trajan had been mentioned as his possible successor, met their deaths on this occasion, and the new ruler was rid definitely of all who coveted or envied his position.

Hadrian took the affairs of state vigorously in hand. The finances, which Trajan's military policy had thrown into confusion, were organised with such success that Hadrian was able to remit a great accumulation of arrears in taxes in Italy, and to a smaller extent in the provinces. This measure gave general satisfaction.

Further, a notable advance was made in the direction of the codification of the law, the jurist Salvius Julianus being instructed by Hadrian to define once for all the principles on which the prætors




REMAINS OF HADRIAN'S IMITATION CANOPUS Canopus was an Egyptian city devoted to the worship of Serapis and infamous for its obscenities. Hadrian, who imitated in his wonderful "villa" all the great sights of his wide travels, built a small Canopus and reproduced its life within his own grounds. "Hadrian's Villa" was really a large and populous town.

as the most gifted in will and intellect of all the emperors between Augustus and Diocletian. Traces of his activity are everywhere to be met with. In Britain he constructed a rampart against the Cale-

ROME UNDER THE GOOD EMPERORS


donians. In Africa his orders to the army have been preserved in the camp of Lambæsis, engraved in stone as a record of his presence there; he even visited Mauretania. In Judæa he founded, on the ruins of Jerusalem, the colony of Ælia Capitolina. It was this that caused the revolt of the Jews under Rabbi Eleazar and Barcochebas, the "son of a star," a revolt which entailed great financial sacrifices, and which was put down only after two years of bloodshed (132-134), by reinforcements summoned from Mæsia and elsewhere. Even after the victory the garrison remained double its original strength; the province received the name of Syria Palæstina, for the name Judæa was to be uttered no more. Greece owes much to Hadrian, who from youth

custom. At Athens, before he became emperor, he held the archonship: in return he adorned the city with buildings, and invested it with certain liberties and revenues. His extensive improvements in



HADRIAN'S MAUSOLEUM AS IT WAS

This magnificent tomb, which the emperor built for himself on the banks of the Tiber, is still an outstanding feature of Rome. His ashes were deposited here.



Underwood

HADRIAN'S TOMB AS IT IS

It has passed through many vicissitudes, having been used as a stronghold in the Middle Ages, and is now merely a show place. It is known as the Castle of St. Angelo.

was so fond of Greek literature that he was called "Græculus." He was certainly the first of the emperors to wear a beard after the Greek fashion, all his predecessors having been shaven according to Roman

the Peloponnesus were commemorated a generation later by the traveller and antiquarian Pausanias in his "Tour of Greece." In the neighbourhood of Rome, at Tibur, Hadrian built a colossal villa surrounded by extensive gardens, in which were represented the places of interest which the emperor had visited in his travels. The cost must have been enormous.


Like Trajan, Hadrian had no children; the Empress Sabina would have none, as she was on bad terms with her husband—a fact which she very frankly admitted to those about her. This estrangement caused troubles at the court, in some of which the imperial secretary, Suetonius Tranquillus, author of the "Lives of the Emperors," was concerned. Hadrian's favourite was the beautiful boy Antinus, who accompanied the emperor on all his travels, until he met with a mysterious death in the Nile on the occasion of the emperor's visit to Egypt. While the Oriental peoples deified this boy, the art of the Greek masters exalted him into an ideal figure with the expression of sentimental melancholy characteristic of the portraiture of this epoch. To perpetuate the memory of his favourite, Hadrian founded the town of Antinopolis. As he was constantly attended on his travels by a numerous retinue of architects and

builders, such an undertaking presented no difficulties. On the whole, the character of Hadrian was imperious and restlessly energetic, egoistic, and capricious. In literature his tastes were original, and he preferred among the Latins the ancient authors, such as Ennius and Cato to the more modern; in this, too, his influence on his own and the following age was considerable.

As his successor, Hadrian had selected L. Ceionius Commodus; after his adoption in the year 136 he received the name of L. Ælius Cæsar, and was at once despatched to Pannonia to take over the command of the four legions quartered there, while at the same time he assumed the consulship for the second time. We know that deputations came even from Asia to Pannonia to congratulate him. But he died before Hadrian on January 1st, 138, immediately after his return to Rome. In his place T. Aurelius Antoninus was adopted. He was the husband of a sister of Ælius Cæsar; having no sons he was obliged, in order to secure the succession, to adopt M. Annius Verus (later the Emperor Marcus Aurelius) and L. Verus, son of Ælius Cæsar. So violent was the opposition which this step aroused among Hadrian's next of kin that he was obliged to procure the removal of the consular L. Julius Ursus Servianus, now ninety years of age, and of his grandson, a youth of eighteen.

Hadrian died of dropsy on July 10th, 138, at Baïæ, the famous health resort on the Campanian coast. Antoninus caused the body to be burnt with due solemnities at Puteoli in the villa which had formerly belonged to Cicero, but he had great difficulty in prevailing upon the senate

to grant the customary honours. The ashes of the deified Hadrian were deposited later in the magnificent mausoleum which he had built across the Tiber, now known as the Castle of St. Angelo.



ÆLIUS CÆSAR

Chosen to succeed Hadrian, he predeceased the emperor, dying after his return to Rome from the East.

While Hadrian had avoided war for political reasons, keeping at the same time a firm hand on soldiers and generals, and insisting on full and accurate reports, his successor, T. Ælius Hadrianus Antoninus "Pius," who at the time of his accession had reached his fifty-second year, was by his mild and equable temperament strongly inclined to peace. His family was sprung from Nemausus, but had for two generations enjoyed senatorial rank, and had acquired large estates in Italy. He had held the consulship in the year 120, and had later been one of the four consulars to whom Hadrian entrusted the supervision and judicial control of the Italian municipia.


After his proconsulship in Asia Antoninus returned to Italy. During the twenty-three years of his imperial rule he scarcely left Italy, although on the Danube and in the east troubles were brewing which caused his successors much difficulty. The frontier feuds he left to his provincial governors to fight out. In Britain a second wall was built south of Hadrian's, and named after Antoninus. On the advanced frontier of Upper Germany and Rhætia a similar boundary wall or *limes* was erected.



ANTONINUS PIUS AND FAUSTINA

Hadrian's successor ruled peacefully for twenty-three years. The beautiful Temple of Faustina, of which considerable remains still exist, was built by him in memory of his wife, who was a disgrace to her sex.

fighting which had broken out with the turbulent Moors along the whole frontier rendered it necessary to strengthen the forces in that quarter. In addition to reinforcements from Spain, for which employment was found in Tingitana,



THE MOST IMPOSING VIEW OF THE COLOSSEUM



THE INTERIOR, SHOWING THE ARENA, AND THE UNDERGROUND CAVES

The Colosseum typifies ancient Rome, as St. Peter's does the modern city. Known as the Flavian Amphitheatre, it was built in the reign of Vespasian, and was long the scene of gladiatorial combats and fights with wild beasts. Capable of accommodating 80,000 spectators, each class had its special part of the mighty building set apart, the imperial benches and those of the vestals being on the first stage, and the common people on the topmost. Faced with white marble, it was one of the finest structures the world has ever seen, and even in its ruin it remains a majestic monument of the builder's art.

TWO VIEWS OF ROME'S MOST WONDERFUL BUILDING

troops were also despatched to Cæsariensis from Germany, from Pannonia, and even from Syria, until in 150 B.C., after a struggle of several years' duration, peace seemed firmly established.

In the provinces of the interior, proconsular Africa, Narbonensis, Southern Spain, this period of peace, which lasted for fifty years, witnessed a vigorous growth of municipal institutions and a rapid extension of Roman civilisation. This is attested by architectural remains. Meanwhile, the emperor resided on his estates, his favourite one being that of Lorium, near the twelfth milestone on the Via Aurelia, and enjoyed the delights of a country life. For this reason, and also because he observed with painful precision the ritual of the Roman state religion, he was by partial critics compared in wisdom to the old Sabine king, Numa Pompilius. But it is evident from the letters of the African orator and imperial tutor, Cornelius Fronto, that life at the court was parsimonious and not a little tedious. The intellectual activity of the time was no longer controlled and inspired by political circles, as under Julius Cæsar and Augustus, and even under Trajan and Hadrian; literature was becoming divorced from politics both in Athens and in Alexandria, where the pulse of intellectual life beat strongest.

When, in 161, Pius succumbed to an illness contracted by eating Alpine cheese, he was succeeded by his adopted sons, M. Aurelius Antoninus and L. Verus, the latter having been chosen to share the functions and title of emperor: the first instance of a dual sovereignty. M. Aurelius was forty years of age at the time of his

accession; an earnest man, whose leisure was devoted to philosophical studies, of which his book "To Himself," written in the Greek language, is the fruit, and whose chief aim was the conscientious discharge of his duties as emperor. L. Verus took matters far less seriously. It




THE FIRST CO-EMPERORS OF ROME

Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, the adopted sons of the childless Antoninus, were the first emperors to share a dual sovereignty. The one was celebrated as a philosopher and the other a philanthropist.

was consistent with the stoic views of M. Aurelius, but it was none the less a sin against the state, that he allowed first his worthless adopted brother and later his still more worthless son to succeed to the government. The internal administration was continued on the lines laid down

by Hadrian; but externally a storm broke out in this reign which marked the beginning of a new era for Italy and a great part of the empire.

In the east it was necessary to make war on the Parthians, as they had taken advantage of their ascendancy in Armenia to overrun Syria also. In the year 162 L. Verus was despatched to the east, and the mobilisation of troops on a large scale was begun in that quarter. Forces from the Lower Rhine and the Danube received orders for the Euphrates, and the Italian fleets had to convey the drafts to Seleucia Pieria, the harbour of Antioch. But the bulk of the work fell to the lieutenants of Verus while he preferred to hold his court at Antioch. After Armenia and the districts on the Mesopotamian border had been subjugated, the Tigris was



THE YOUNGER FAUSTINA
Wife of Marcus Aurelius and daughter of the elder Faustina, she was a true daughter of her mother.

crossed; and Seleucia and Ctesiphon, the free Greek towns of the Parthian kingdom, were annexed. The booty taken was considerable. The district of Osroene, with its capital Edessa, was permanently occupied, and the Roman supremacy firmly established in Armenia. After four

ROME UNDER THE GOOD EMPERORS

years the war came to an end, and both emperors enjoyed, in 166, a splendid triumph at Rome.

War, however, had already broken out on the Danube, which, owing to the fighting in the east, had been left exposed. Along the whole course of the river the tribes, yielding no doubt to pressure from behind, were in motion, swarming into the Roman provinces and threatening Italy from the Alps. They laid siege to Aquileia and took Opitergium (now Oderzo). In all haste the generals who had distinguished themselves against the Parthians were despatched to raise new levies and restore the northern frontier. For the first time for many years Italy itself had to furnish recruits, and two new legions were formed, to which at first the title of Concordia was given in honour of the two emperors; later they were known as the Italian legions. Meanwhile, Upper Italy and the Cis-Alpine district were united under one government; this was important as determining their future organisation.

To make the situation worse, the troops returning from the east had brought the plague with them; thousands succumbed to it, and the effects were felt even in the next generation. Owing to the cost of transportation from provinces so remote as Africa and Egypt, a scarcity of money was beginning to be felt. The expedient was therefore adopted of enrolling on the spot, without regard to the consequences, all who were capable of military service. Whereas formerly the possession of the Roman franchise, or, at all events, the first step towards it, the Latin *jus*, had been a


necessary condition of service in the legion, the requisite qualifications were now conferred at the moment of enlistment by special dispensation of the emperor. This measure recalls that of Marius, 270 years before. The result was that the army corps on the Danube were composed entirely of barbarians. As these legions constituted more than a third of the imperial army, the preponderating influence in politics belonged henceforth to the Illyrian districts. Of the thirty legions, later increased to thirty-three, twelve



MARCUS AURELIUS AND FAUSTINA WITH THE GODDESS ROMA
Reproduced from a beautiful bas-relief preserved in the Villa Albani at Rome.

were quartered in the vicinity of the Danube, nine, and later eleven, were in the provinces of the east, and four on the Rhine.

Both emperors went to the front. After the death of L. Verus, in the year 169, at Altinum (near Venice), Marcus was left in sole command. He established his headquarters at the Pannonian fortresses of Vindobona, Carnuntum and Brigetio, successively falling back in winter on the less exposed position of Sirmium. By the time the Alps had been cleared of



THE EMPEROR COMMODUS AS A VICTORIOUS GLADIATOR, WEARING HIS LION'S SKIN IN IMITATION OF HERCULES
From the painting by E. H. Bishopp, by permission of Messrs. Braun, Clement & Co.

the enemy, and the line of the Danube recovered, the theatre of war extended from Castra Regina (Regensburg) as far as the modern Transylvania. The Roman armies suffered considerable loss, especially in officers of high rank. By the year 172 the Germanic tribes had been reduced, but it was not till 175 that the Sarmatian tribes, which included the Iazyges, were finally subjugated. The emperor now assigned settlements in the devastated provinces of the frontier to entire nations. This measure, which was repeated in Dacia and Pannonia more than once in the following ten years, was useful as mitigating the antagonism existing between the various races under Roman sway. The attempt to check the depopulation of Italy by establishing barbarians there, notably at Ravenna, as a peasantry bound to the soil, failed utterly owing to the intractable nature of these people. It was necessary either to exterminate or to expel them; the contrast between the home of an ancient civilisation and the frontier regions with their thin veneer of Roman culture was here strikingly displayed.

The war on the Danube came to a premature conclusion owing to the fact that the governor of Syria, Avidius Cassius, had been deceived by a false report of the death of Marcus Aurelius, and had proclaimed himself emperor in the east; personal antagonism seems to have played some part in the affair, for the emperor, busied with his philosophy in his Pannonian winter quarters, was by no means universally popular. When Marcus took the field in person Avidius Cassius was speedily abandoned by his adherents and slain in 175.

Marcus returned to Rome and appointed his unworthy son Commodus to be co-regent. In the year 178 he returned to the Danube with his son, as disturbances had again broken out in that quarter of the empire. The emperor now proposed to cross the Danube and to occupy the country on the further banks, though

he had previously been content to maintain a neutral zone beyond the frontier. But before Marcus could carry out these plans he was taken ill in Vindobona and died on March 17th, 180. Commodus




A SECOND NERO

Marcus was blamed for letting his unworthy son, Commodus, whose portrait we give, succeed him.


assumed the imperial power. He contented himself with a merely formal conquest and returned to Rome in the course of the year 180. The young man was fond of physical exercise, and sanctioned a public festival in honour of himself as the Roman Hercules; in other respects, he was idle and licentious, in fact, a second Nero. The government was at first in the hands of the prefects of the guard, Tarruntius Paternus and Perennis.

The former, who was a capable officer, fell a victim to the intrigues of his colleague in the year 183; Perennis was the victim of a mutiny two years later. From that time onwards Cleander governed. He was a Phrygian slave, who had been brought to Rome and had been freed by Marcus Aurelius; Commodus advanced him to the position of chief chamberlain, and gave him command of the guard with two others. But three years later, in 189, Rome was threatened with famine and Cleander was abandoned to the fury of the populace. The greatest influence was now exercised by an Egyptian, Eclectus, who was chamberlain, and by Marcia, a concubine of the emperor, who acted in close concert.



THE AURELIAN COLUMN

Reckless expenditure soon produced a considerable deficit, but this fact in no way checked the emperor's profligacy. He appeared in public as a gladiator, naturally with due precautions; Commodus gained the victor's prize no fewer than 735 times. His relations, and all officials of high rank were in constant peril of death by poison or the sword. However, he continued to rule for thirteen years. Commodus fell a victim to a conspiracy, plotted by Marcia, Eclectus, and the prefect of the guard, whom he had threatened. He was strangled on New Year's Eve, 193, by a gladiator, hired for the purpose.



A SCENE OF ROMAN ORGIE DURING THE PERIOD OF THE DECADENCE

From the painting by Thomas Couture in the Louvre.



THE PRÆTORIAN EMPERORS

ROME UNDER THE POWER OF THE ARMY THE PRÆTORIAN GUARD AS KING-MAKERS


DURING the next ninety years the average length of reign was four years. The morning after the murder of Commodus, P. Helvius Pertinax, prefect of the guard, and colleague of Commodus in the consulate, was saluted emperor.

Pertinax was the son of a wood merchant of Alba Pompeia in Liguria; he had done such good military service under Marcus Aurelius that he had been promoted to the consulate, and afterwards to the important posts of governor of Mœsia, Dacia, Syria, and Britain. He was advanced in years and of unassuming character, and in general he looked upon himself as an agent appointed by the senate to perform the duties of the highest office in the empire. He would allow no special honour to be shown his wife, and even desired to keep his private property distinct from the emperor's income. In the provinces, however, his own elevation was publicly celebrated, and to some degree that of his wife and his son. Pertinax attempted to abolish abuses, to relieve financial distress, and to restore discipline among the troops quartered in Rome. In consequence he lost the support of the Prætorian guards, to whom Commodus had shown special favour. Their commander, Æmilius Lætus, also considered himself slighted. Consequently the soldiers mutinied, and on March 28th, 193, Pertinax was slain after a reign of eighty-seven days.

The Prætorian guard carried their audacity to the point of putting up the empire at auction. The consular M. Didius Severus Julianus offered 6,200 drachmæ per soldier, and outbid the city

prefect Sulpicianus. Julianus came from Mediolanum. Like Pertinax, he had passed through the usual official career; he had been legatus legionis in Mogontiacum, imperial governor in Belgica, Dalmatia, and Lower Germany, and pro-consul in Africa. He now became emperor by the will of the prætorians. We have an admirable account of these occurrences by the senator, Dion Cassius; there is also the more rhetorical history of Herodian, who had no access to official circles. Dion and Herodian both wrote in Greek.

But the expectations of both sides proved false. Pertinax had been highly respected in the provinces, where he was regarded as a capable officer and governor. When the armies in the provinces heard of the scandalous proceedings at the capital their indignation knew no bounds. The events which had followed on the death of Nero were repeated. The soldiers recognised that the government lay really in their hands; but as each of the great army corps had its own candidate for emperor, they proclaimed their respective generals elected—D. Clodius Albinus in Britain, L. Septimius Severus in Pannonia, and Pescennius Niger in Syria. Of these three, the last-named was an Italian by birth, from the town of Aquinum. The other two were Africans; Septimius Severus came from Leptis, Albinus from Hadrumentum. All three had risen through the military and civil service to the great offices they held. Albinus was the most distinguished of them, but distinction did not now imply pre-eminence. Septimius Severus commanded the most powerful



THE EMPEROR PERTINAX
Would have been a wise and just ruler, but the Prætorian guard, which had elected him, disapproving of his policy, after eighty-seven days, mutinied and killed him.

army; he was also in the more immediate neighbourhood of Italy, and he at once began his march upon the capital city.

The prætorian troops professed themselves ready to defend their emperor; but they had become so effeminate as to be utterly unfit for real warfare. They marched out with a large band of camp followers, to whom they left all the work of entrenchment, and the bardy Illyrian legions of Severus met with practically no serious resistance. An attempt

at interference on the part of the senate came to nothing; their ambassador, Vesprius Candidus, the consular, had made himself very unpopular with the soldiers when governor of Dacia at an earlier period. The proscription issued by the senate against Septimius Severus was equally ineffectual. Rome was captured by the legions, and Didius Severus Julianus was slain after two months of power.

After Septimius Severus had thus secured himself in possession of the government, he came to an agreement with Clodius Albinus, granting him the title of Cæsar, and handing over the western provinces to his independent charge. An important precedent for the future was thus set up. Septimius Severus

found that it was necessary, first of all, to subdue Pescennius Niger, who had already established himself in Byzantium. The siege of Byzantium lasted for three

years, and continued even after the defeat of Niger's army in Asia Minor and the death of the pretender himself, who had finally made common

cause with the Parthians in 196. Byzantium was razed to the ground upon its capture, a step which was afterwards bitterly regretted, as the straits were thereby laid open to barbarian inroads. Severus was obliged to bring the Parthian War to an abrupt conclusion, as affairs in the west were urgently demanding his

attention. Clodius Albinus enjoyed the confidence and goodwill of the senate to a much greater extent than Severus, who shrank from no means by which he could attain his ends; a conspiracy against him was rigorously suppressed.

Hitherto Severus had posed as the avenger of Pertinax; he now proclaimed himself the official son of Marcus Aurelius and brother of Commodus. He gave the name of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus to his son Bassianus,

on whom he also conferred the dignity of Cæsar. He thus made himself the legal successor of the Antonines and of Commodus, who had been overthrown largely through the efforts of the senate. Leaving a number of legions to guard Italy, Severus

Marched with the Illyrian and Mœsian legions through Noricum and Rhoetia upon Gaul, where Albinus had collected his troops, the legions of Britain, the Spanish troops of occupation, and the Gallic contingents; the army of the Rhine



DIDIUS JULIANUS AND CLODIUS ALBINUS

At the death of Pertinax different sections of the army declared for different emperors. Julianus was elected in Rome, Albinus in Britain, Severus in Pannonia, and Pescennius Niger in Syria.



SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS AND HIS WIFE JULIA DOMNA
Severus commanded the strongest forces and headed for Rome, where Julianus was defeated and killed. Albinus was given the western provinces, but later Severus crushed him, as well as the supporters of Pescennius Niger. Severus died at York in the year 211.

declared for Severus. A decisive battle was fought at Lugdunum, in which Albinus was defeated, in 197. The capital of Gaul was sacked, the provinces were subjugated, and the adherents of Albinus were everywhere hunted down and slain.

Severus owed his elevation and his triumph to the Illyrian soldiery, which had been a deciding factor in military affairs since the wars under Marcus Aurelius. They were barbarians, in conscious antagonism to such centres of civilisation as Italy, Narbonensis, Noricum, and Spain, which had hitherto given tone to the empire and had furnished recruits for the Prætorian guard.

This guard, as previously under Vitellius, was now disbanded, and a new corps was formed, in which the flower of the Illyrian legions was incorporated; at the same time, the "imperial horse" (*equites singulares*), selected individually from the mounted auxiliary troops, became of great importance. These forces were thought insufficient; a legion was stationed in Italy on garrison duty, at Albanum near Rome, where once Alba Longa had stood; where, later, the Roman grandees, and finally the emperor himself, had each their "Albanum." Italy was treated as though it were a conquered province, and the preponderating influence of the Illyrian districts became manifest.

Severus Organising his Empire

Severus showed great energy as a ruler. After he had conquered the Parthians in a second war, Mesopotamia was reorganised as a province; later on, he went also to Britain, where the tribes to the north of the wall were in a state of continual turbulence. He reorganised the system of pro-

vincial administration in every part of the empire. His object was to diminish the size of individual districts, in Syria and Britain, for instance, where the commanding generals had been previously too powerful, as shown by their recent edicts. For the same reasons provincial governors were drawn from the equestrian rather than from the senatorial class; succeeding emperors followed this example. The African countrymen of Severus obtained great influence.

Posthumous Honour to Hannibal

He looked upon himself as a cosmopolitan Roman, and also as one of Hannibal's countrymen, and raised monuments to that general. It is related that the emperor's sister spoke nothing but Punic in the family, and never succeeded in mastering Latin, so that Severus sent her home to Africa. The emperor's brother, Septimius Geta, governed the province of Dacia for some time; and one of his successors, Mevius Surus, seems also to have been a relative. The all-powerful prefect of the guards, P. Fulvius Plautianus, became the father-in-law of the heir to the throne, but afterwards brought about his overthrow. Together with the Africans, the Syrians also took an important place at court, as Severus had married a Syrian for his second wife, Julia Domna from Emesa, who had great influence over him.

Septimius Severus died at York (Eboracum) during the military operations in Britain in the year 211; he bequeathed the empire to his two sons, who had been appointed Augusti during his lifetime: M. Aurelius Antoninus, who was nicknamed Caracalla, from a Gallic mantle which he had made fashionable in Rome,



THE ARCH OF SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS

This arch was erected 203 A.D., as a memorial of Severus' successful campaigns in the east. It also bore the names of his sons Caracalla and Geta, but after Caracalla murdered his brother he erased his name from the arch and substituted in the fourth line a bombastic reference to himself. The alteration is easily detected.

about his overthrow. Together with the Africans, the Syrians also took an important place at court, as Severus had married a Syrian for his second wife, Julia Domna from Emesa, who had great influence over him.

Septimius Severus died at York (Eboracum) during the military operations in Britain in the year 211; he bequeathed the empire to his two sons, who had been appointed Augusti during his lifetime: M. Aurelius Antoninus, who was nicknamed Caracalla, from a Gallic mantle which he had made fashionable in Rome,

and P. Septimius Geta. These two could not agree, and eleven months after the death of Septimius, Caracalla had Geta killed. The uproar caused by this deed was quelled by rich and timely presents to the troops. The jurist Papinian, who was at that time prefect of the Prætorian guard, was executed because he hesitated to declare the act of fratricide justifiable. Caracalla followed his father's methods in the favour he showed to the soldiers; but he utterly demoralised them as regarded discipline. He was a poor man of business and no general, as became apparent when he took the field to defend Rhætia against the new Germanic confederacy of the Alemanni in 213 A.D.

He was also obliged to carry on a campaign on the frontier of the Lower Danube, and finally against the Parthians. The last war dragged on at great length, as neither the emperor nor his troops displayed any military capacity. This fact led to the murder of Caracalla at the instigation of his præfectus prætorio, M. Opellius Macrinus, on April 8th, 217, between Edessa and Carrhæ. His step-mother, Julia Domna, who had come with him as far as Antioch, committed suicide.


One measure of Caracalla's proved of the utmost importance in the internal development of the empire. Hitherto, the separate provinces of which the empire consisted had been in possession of widely differing privileges. They held either the Roman, Latin, or "peregrine" rights, according to which they stood in different relations to one another. Thus, for instance, Gauls and Spaniards could obtain the office of senator much more quickly than Africans and Asiatics or even Pannonians; the first Egyptian senator appears under Caracalla. The "Antonine decree," which now remodelled these conditions, was based upon the principle

of conferring the same privileges upon each separate unit of the empire; reasons of finance were also taken into consideration when Caracalla conferred Roman citizenship upon every community. It took, however, some decades before this measure was carried out. Even then many remained excluded, as, for instance, the majority of the Egyptian peasantry; whereas the Greek-speaking towns, even in Egypt, obtained the Roman rights. Similarly, both European and Asiatic Greeks were now proud to call themselves "Romans," while since the second century they had only had the title of "Roman citizens."

Caracalla's successor, M. Opellius Macrinus, was born in Cæsarea in Mauretania, and had been advanced in office by Plautianus on account of his legal abilities, until he had become one of the prefects of the guard under Caracalla. He concluded the operations against the Parthians which the murder of Caracalla had interrupted. The highest official of the empire was thus of equestrian, and not of senatorial, rank, and obtained his position because no member of the royal house had shown any fitness for it. However, the dynastic principle had taken root, and the Syrian soldiery were particularly anxious to shake off the heavy yoke of discipline. The sister of Julia Domna, Mæsa, who had withdrawn to Emesa, had two daughters, Soæmias and Mamæa. The former had a son, now fourteen years old, by a high dignitary named Varius Marcellus; this son was a priest of the sun-god Elagabalus, and was proclaimed emperor by the soldiers stationed in the neighbourhood; Macrinus was defeated near Antioch in 218, and slain with his son Diadumenianus in their flight.

The new emperor, who called himself M. Aurelius Antoninus, son of Caracalla and grandson of Severus, came to Rome,

**Caracalla
Kills his
Brother**



CARACALLA AND HIS WIFE PLAUTILLA

This son of Severus was a poor degraded creature, who, though already married to the daughter of the prefect of the Prætorian guard, publicly married his own mother, and murdered his brother Geta. He built the famous baths, and in due course was assassinated.

**An Emperor
Introduces
Sun-worship**

Elagabalus, and was proclaimed emperor by the soldiers stationed in the neighbourhood; Macrinus was defeated near



Edwards

REMAINS OF THE IMMENSE BATHS OF CARACALLA NEAR THE APPIAN WAY

bringing with him the Syrian sun-worship in its most licentious form, while his grandmother looked after the affairs of state with the title of Augusta. The son of Mamæa and Gessius Marcianus was advanced to the position of joint regent and successor to the throne under the name of Marcus Aurelius Alexander. "Heliogabalus," as the emperor was soon called by a Roman confusion of names, carried his excesses too far, and was deposed in 222.

Alexander was only thirteen and a half years of age; he reigned under the guidance of his grandmother and his mother,



THE EMPERORS MACRINUS & ALEXANDER SEVERUS
The former had a very brief reign before he was slain, and the degraded youth "Heliogabalus" began his three years' imperial orgie, to be followed in turn by Alexander Severus, who was only a child of thirteen when elected and a man of twenty-six when deposed.

a state council of senators also taking an important share in the government. In the year 229, the historian Dion Cassius held the post of consul for the second time, as the emperor's colleague; after his retirement, he wrote at Capua a history of Rome up to his own times. This was

also the time of the famous jurists, Ulpian, Paulus, and Modestinus, who exercised a controlling influence upon the legislature and the executive. The more important magistracies at Rome were entirely in their hands, and the code of civil law received constant additions from their

authoritative decisions or from their opinions delivered as *juris consulti*. So much deference was also shown to the special systems of the provinces, especially where Greek jurisprudence had taken root, that the provincial codes began to assume a distinctly cosmopolitan appearance.

The women in power proved to be satisfactory rulers in times of peace and made their court a centre of intellectual life, but showed themselves, of course, incapable of meeting the exigencies of war. Alexander Severus, to give him his imperial title, was obliged to turn his attention to Roman

interests on the Euphrates frontier, where the Parthian empire had been displaced by the later Persian kingdom, whose new-grown power destroyed the ascendancy of Rome. Before any decisive result could

be attained the emperor was forced to hasten to the Rhine, where the German races were pressing more and more closely upon the frontier. Here the required display of energy was again wanting; a general of high repute, C. Julius Verus Maximinus revolted, and overthrew Alexander Severus and his mother in their camp at Mogontiacum in 235.

The imperial system, which had hitherto prevailed, collapsed. A bitter struggle to the death now begins, with no ruling dynasty in existence; for a long period there was no emperor who reigned more than two years or who died a natural death.

Maximinus was of Thracian origin, and had risen from the ranks; he was now made emperor, without having filled any one of the higher state offices. He was a capable soldier, brought the war on the Rhine to a prosperous issue, and then hastened to

the Danube, where great danger was threatening the province of Dacia. How far the great migrations which had first attracted attention under Marcus Aurelius had advanced was shown in the case of the Goths, who had reached the Black Sea, and had definitely established themselves on its northern coast.

This district included the imperial provinces of Lower Mœsia and Dacia. The latter province possessed regular communication, by the Ojtoz pass, with such commercial ports on the Black Sea as Olbia and Tyras, corresponding in importance to the modern Odessa. When the Goths had seized this point, they threatened Dacia from the east, while other races, as the Asding Vandals, established themselves to the north of the province. Maximinus obtained several successes,

enough to gain the victorious title of Dacicus. But he had not time to go to Rome, and therefore took up his winter quarters in Pannonia, as Marcus Aurelius had done before him, where the towns of Sirmium and Siscia (the modern Sissec) were then important centres.

The senate, however, declared against Maximinus, as was reasonable enough, if their conception of the empire be taken into account. The aged proconsul of Africa, M. Antonius Gordianus, was proclaimed emperor by his province and was recognised by the senate. He, however, with his son and co-regent Gordian II., was, in 238, defeated by the legion stationed in Numidia, which remained true to Maximinus. Thus there was an open breach between the senate and the army. The senate caused Italy to be put into a state of defence by a

regency of twenty senators. The importance of Mediolanum and Aquileia to Upper Italy is seen in the fact that they became centres of enlistment and manufacturing arsenals. Aquileia prepared to oppose the entrance of Maximinus into Italy. The reserves were collected at



THE EMPERORS MAXIMINUS AND BALBINUS

After the deposition of Alexander Severus the imperial system, which had hitherto prevailed, collapsed, and emperors were for a long time to come mere creatures of a day, none of their reigns exceeding two years.

Ravenna, and communications were kept open by the fleet. Maximinus marched forward from Emona, and besieged Aquileia. When it was seen, however, that the town would be hard to take, and want began to appear among the soldiers, the troops lost patience; the members of the second Parthian legion were especially anxious about their wives and children, whom they had left behind in Albanum. The emperor and his son, whom he had appointed co-regent, were defeated in 238. The history of Herodian goes as far as these events. For the history of the succeeding period up to the time of Diocletian, we are referred to the "Scriptores historiæ Augustæ," a collection of biographies of the emperors, some of which are merely rhetorical fabrications.

The Defeat of Maximinus

Under these circumstances, inscriptions, coins, and Egyptian papyri become of considerable importance as throwing light upon the history of the times.

The senate had already elected two Imperatores from among its members, M. Clodius Pupienus Maximus and D. Cælius Calvinus Balbinus; at the demand of the troops, the grandson of the elder Gordian, who was also the nephew of the younger, was appointed Emperor as Gordian III. The two senatorial emperors were regarded with but little sympathy by the troops, partly because the Numidian legion had been disbanded on account of its goodwill towards the two first Gordians, the soldiers being sent to Rætia and embodied in the legions there stationed.

The wars both against the Carpi and the Goths, and also against the Persians were about to be renewed, when Pupienus and Balbinus were overthrown by the soldiery at Rome after their government had lasted about three months. Gordianus was only fourteen years of age, and the præfectus prætorio, C. Furius Timesitheus, acted as regent; the emperor married his daughter in the year 241. In the following year the Goths and the Carpi were driven out of Dacia. The war against the Persians was then begun, and continued with unbroken success until the death of the præfect Timesitheus in 243.

The new præfectus prætorio, the Arab, M. Julius Philippus, could not agree with the young emperor. Gordianus was also


anxious to get rid of him, but Philippus had him murdered in 244 before this desire could be accomplished. He then made peace with the Persians and betook himself to Rome, where he was recognised by the senate, his son becoming co-regent. In the year 248 the thousandth anniversary of the foundation of the city of Rome was celebrated amid great rejoicing.

Meanwhile, the other divisions of the army were by no means satisfied with

the state of affairs. When war with the Goths broke out again the troops in Mæsia proclaimed their general, Trajanus Decius, as emperor. He marched to Italy, defeated and killed the Arab emperor Philippus at Verona, and afterwards overthrew his son in Rome in 249. After Decius had appointed his two sons to be co-regents he hastened to finish the war against the Goths, who had already overrun the Balkan districts. Decius forced them to retreat, but fell in fighting against them at Abrittus, three miles south of Adamklisse in Mæsia, his elder

son being slain with him in 251. The governor of Mæsia, C. Bibius Trebonianus Gallus, a Perusian, now had himself proclaimed emperor, the younger Decius remaining co-regent, until the plague carried him off.

The war with the Goths continued. The governor of Mæsia, M. Æmilius Æmilianus, obtained a victory over them, and was proclaimed emperor; he defeated Gallus and his son Volusianus in



Gordianus and his son, Gordianus II., who acted as co-regent.



Trebonianus Gallus and Gallienus.

A GROUP OF BRIEF EMPIRE-RULERS

The elder Gordianus and his son Gordianus II. were recognised for a short time but were soon defeated, while Gallus, a Perusian, had got himself proclaimed emperor only a little while before the plague carried him off, and Gallienus, son of Valerian, was assassinated.

Italy in 253. But three months later, a friend of Decius, the consular P. Licinius Valerianus, was proclaimed emperor in Rhætia, where a strong army corps was then stationed. In this affair the Numidian soldiers, whose legion had been disbanded sixteen years previously, took a considerable share. This legion was

Valerian Dies in Captivity now reconstituted. Valerian appointed his son Gallienus as co-regent; the son of Gallienus was also made Cæsar and co-regent.

But Valerian was not fortunate in other respects. On every side the nations beyond the frontier were pressing upon the provinces, on the Rhine and Danube, in Africa and in the east. In Germany the imperial boundaries were broken down, and Dacia was seized by the Goths and their allies: Syria and Cappadocia were occupied by the Persians. While Gallienus went to Gaul, to hold the line of the Rhine, Valerian undertook the war against the Persians. He suffered a defeat, and was taken prisoner by the Persians and died in captivity in 260.

Upon the receipt of this news in the west a time of general confusion ensued. On every side were incursions of the barbarians; a profusion of edicts increased the disorder; in Italy and Africa plague was raging. When Gallienus went to the Danube to crush the rebel leaders in that quarter Gaul broke away from the empire, with the object of forming an independent empire in alliance with Spain and Britain. The Goths were in possession of Dacia and the Black Sea; they sent expeditions from Taurica over to the opposite coast of Cappadocia, or southwards to Greece and Asia Minor through the Hellespont, which had remained unprotected since the destruction of Byzantium. In the east Palmyra had become the centre of an empire which extended to Further Asia and Egypt, under Odenathus, who, however,

The Empire in the Throes of Dissolution recognised the supremacy of Gallus, and was appointed *dux orientis* by him. Gallienus, who was a feeble, though not an utterly senseless ruler, finally took up his permanent headquarters in Upper Italy; from there he checked the advance of the Alemanni or let things take their course.

The Alemanni advanced as far south as Ravenna, the Franks plundered Tarraco, and Antioch was taken by the Persians. The empire was in the throes

of dissolution. During this time Gallienus made a rule which led to important consequences—that senators, and even men of equestrian origin, should be excluded from military commands. These posts were consequently filled by men who had risen from the ranks, and who exercised a material influence upon the future development of affairs.

Aureolus, one of the best generals of Gallienus, declared against the emperor, who besieged him in Milan; the result was a conspiracy among his officers, who determined to depose the emperor and to set up one of themselves, M. Aurelius Claudius. After both Gallienus and Aureolus had been killed the new emperor was recognised throughout the empire, with the exception of Gaul and Britain. It was chiefly the generals of Illyrian origin who undertook the task of re-establishing the empire; they relied mainly on the forces of Illyricum and Upper Italy, the frontiers of which included Rhætia and Noricum up to the Danube. Central and Southern Italy with Africa formed a separate sphere of civilisation. In the west,

Buried Treasure after 1,600 Years Gaul, Spain, and Britain stood aloof under their own emperors, while the east was entirely dissociated from the empire.

Claudius first defeated the Alemanni, who had advanced from Rhætia into North Italy, on Lake Garda, and drove them back after the inhabitants had suffered severely from their marauding raids; even at the present day in South Tyrol buried pots are found containing coins of this period, which had been thus hidden on account of the Alemanni, the owners being afterwards unable to recover their property.

The district round Lake Garda then became of importance, for the enemy did not hesitate to pass round Verona, and to push further westward into the district of Brixia. Claudius gained a second success against the Goths, who had advanced down the Balkan peninsula as far as Thessalonica. The emperor marched upon them from the west, so that the Goths were obliged to retreat; Claudius then defeated them at Naissus (the modern Nisch) and took numerous prisoners, whom he either enlisted or settled as colonists. When Claudius, the "conqueror of the Goths," died of the plague shortly afterwards in Sirmium his brother Quintillus was appointed emperor and


THE PRÆTORIAN EMPERORS

recognised as such by the senate in 270. Shortly afterwards, however, he abdicated in favour of L. Domitius Aurelianus, who was chosen by the majority in the army. Aurelian was first obliged to deal with a fresh incursion of the Alemanni.

In view of these repeated attacks, Rome itself seemed insecure, though the passes of the Apennines formed a strategical protection, like the Balkans in the east. Aurelian surrounded Rome with a defensive wall of vast extent, which was later to be of great importance. The emperor then proceeded to pacify the Goths. Dacia, which had been occupied by Trajan and where

settled, after the manner of the "sacred spring" of the old Italic.

Aurelian transported the Roman population from the districts beyond the Danube to the "new Dacia," which he had constituted south of the Danube: he came to an agreement with the Goths and Vandals on the question of the frontier, and turned his attention to the east. The problem before him was to restore the unity of the empire. The kingdom of Palmyra was ruled by Zenobia (in the Palmyran tongue, Bathzebinah), the widow of Odœnathus, and by her son Vaballath Athendorus, both of whom



PART OF THE AURELIAN WALL OF ROME, BUILT ABOUT 270 A.D.

Aurelian had a glorious reign of six years, and greatly improved the city—a considerable part of his walls still remain.

they had been established securely for twenty years, was handed over to them. He did not again attack the Alemanni in the *agri decumates* and on the frontiers of *Rhætia*, but they were to receive a permanent settlement, and to live in peaceful intercourse with their neighbours.

The plan would have been successful but for the many roving bands which, under leaders of their own choosing, persistently raided into North Italy and Gaul. About the middle of the third century *Aventicum* of the *Helvetii* was destroyed by the Alemanni; since that time they looked upon the eastern districts as a land open to colonisation, which they occupied and

usurped the title of Augusti, in face of Aurelian's preparations. Aurelian sent Probus, who was afterwards emperor, to attack Egypt; he himself subdued Further Asia, then won a victory at *Emesa* and pressed on to *Palmyra*. Zenobia attempted flight and was taken prisoner [see page 1867]; her counsellor, the philosopher *Longinus*, was executed, and she herself was sent to Italy. *Palmyra* rose in revolt and was destroyed in consequence (272 and 273 A.D.). From this catastrophe the city never recovered, though the Byzantines built a castle there. The splendid ruins have remained standing in the oasis, together with numerous inscriptions, written

in Greek or in the Semitic dialect of the Palmyrans [see page 1865].

When Egypt had likewise been subdued opposition was confined to the Gallic dominion, where several emperors had ruled within a short time; they had their residence at Augusta Treverorum (Trevés), which then rose to be one of the chief

Gallic Emperor as a Senator

towns of the empire. But the Gallic power was already much shaken—on the one hand by the insubordination of the

generals and the army, and on the other by a revolt of the Gallic peasants, who had united into a regular society, and received some measure of support from the barbarians. The freedom enjoyed by the German peasants came as a revelation to the Roman colonists, who were crushed by their heavy burdens under the empire, for the municipal officials, whose business it was to apportion the payment of taxes among the citizens, were in the habit of throwing the weight of taxes on the lower ranks of society. The Gallic emperor, C. Esuvius Tetricus (268–273), felt his position growing insecure, and made overtures to Aurelian; in consequence, Aurelian appeared in Gaul and took over the government in 274. Tetricus followed Aurelian to Italy, where he became a senator and spent the rest of his life in a position of dignity and respect.

Aurelian celebrated a splendid triumph in Rome; he took advantage of his presence in the city to do away with the persistent abuses that had grown up in connection with the Roman coinage; he had, in consequence, to repress a revolt of the workmen with much bloodshed; the mints were in part transferred to the provinces. Aurelian was inclined to regard force of arms as the means of settling even domestic difficulties; on the other hand, he assumed the title of “Lord and God,” after the Oriental fashion, and the introduction of the court ceremonial peculiar

Aurelian as “Lord and God”

to an eastern despotism was due chiefly to him. Aurelian also built in Rome the great temple to the sun god. This

deity was of considerable importance in the struggle to found a monotheism upon the old polytheism; even Diocletian was accustomed to swear by “the great god Sol.” The widespread worship of the god Mithra was only an offshoot of the sun-worship. All cults of this kind were spread to all parts of the world owing to

the constant increase of communication between the east and the west on the part of soldiers, merchants, officials, and their retinues. Religious societies sprang up in increasing numbers, for neither the emotions nor the intellect found satisfaction in the ancient liturgical rites that constituted the essence of the state religion. In one kingdom, where there were no opposed political parties, religious strife became so intense among the people that the government was obliged to interfere.

The government allowed freedom of debate, but maintained the religion of Rome as the state worship, and therefore continued to support the worship of emperors. To this the Christians were entirely opposed; the veneration of stone images was also discordant with the spirit of Christianity. Philosophical discussion of these difficulties went on at Alexandria, where Greeks, Egyptians, and Jews met, and attempted to find some system which should be generally acceptable as embodying their several religious conceptions. A decisive change in Alexandrine thought took place about the beginning of the

The Sowing of Christian Thought

second century A.D. That was the period of Clement of Alexandria and of Origen, who were

in communication even with the imperial court. Alexander Severus and the women of his family lent a ready ear to the discussion of subjects formerly unheard of in Roman society; the same remark applies to Philippus the Arab. Christian propaganda was highly successful in Africa, thanks to the efforts of Tertullian and Cyprian, the latter of whom was bishop of Carthage. As Tertullian informs us, Christians might then be found in every province of the empire and in every position of life. On the other hand, there were occasional periods of reaction, as under Maximinus the Thracian, who pursued a different policy on this question. Moreover, such thorough Romans as Decius and Valerian persecuted the Christian belief, as conflicting with the state religion. Public opinion was already beginning to follow the emperors, according as their attitude towards Christianity was friendly or the reverse.

Christianity was continually gaining followers among the masses, on account of its mysterious doctrine of immortality, its rules enjoining charity and love for neighbours, and for other reasons, which, to the public mind, were as little capable

of rationalistic explanation as were the doctrines of the Roman priests, augurs and soothsayers. Religious development proceeds by its own laws, which human forces are inadequate to resist. There was, indeed, no lack of causes to help the growth of the faith. When the worship of the sun god became the official religion of Rome the Christians immediately substituted their own God as the "true sun"; on December 25th they celebrated, not the nativity of "the sun invincible" or of Mithra, but the nativity of "the Lord," and in this sense, they were able to keep "Sunday" as a general festival.

In the year 275, as he was on the point of making an expedition against the Persians, Aurelian perished near Byzantium, the victim of a conspiracy, which had been organised by his secretary. The senate named as his successor a man who claimed descent from the historian Cornelius Tacitus, M. Claudius Tacitus of Interamna in Umbria. Tacitus took the field against the Goths, who were plundering the district of Pontus. He defeated the enemy; shortly afterwards, in 276, he was murdered in Cappadocia by some officers who bore him a grudge. His brother, the præfectus prætorio, M. Annius Florianus, was proclaimed emperor in succession to Tacitus.

But M. Aurelius Probus, the Illyrian, who had distinguished himself under Aurelian, was proclaimed emperor by the Syrian legions. Florian could make no stand against him; he was betrayed by his own soldiers and killed at Tarsus.

Probus had the murderers both of Aurelian and of Tacitus executed, and restored discipline. He then drove the Alemanni and the Franks out of Gaul, conquered the Burgundians and the Vandals in Rhætia, and settled thousands of barbarians on the frontier. After he had pacified the Goths, he was acclaimed as the "Restorer of Illyricum." Probus then crossed over to Asia Minor, where he cut off the plundering Isaurians from the zone of civilisation by settling veterans in the districts to act as frontier guards; he also took measures against the Persians. On his return Probus made some stay in the Danubian districts; to occupy his troops, he employed them in draining the marshes and planting vineyards, a procedure which made him very unpopular with the army.

After several abortive attempts in the east and the west the troops in Rhætia proclaimed M. Aurelius Carus as emperor; Probus met his death in Sirmium in 282.

Following the custom of an earlier period, Carus appointed his sons Carinus and Numerianus to be Cæsars; to the first of these he entrusted the protection of the Gallic frontier, while he himself marched through Pannonia with Numerian against the Persians. He was so far victorious that the possession of Armenia and Mesopotamia, for which a perpetual and obstinate contest had been fought, seemed to be assured; but Carus was killed by a stroke of lightning as he was returning home. Numerian was proclaimed Augustus, but was murdered a month later.

Murder of Tacitus

The Soldiers Despise Useful Work



A RELIC OF EARLY ROME: REMAINS OF THE CELEBRATED HARBOUR OF OSTIA



CONSTANTINE AT THE BATTLE OF MILVIAN BRIDGE

The decisive battle of Constantine in his movement against the emperor Maxentius. Here he fought with the cross for his emblem. The victory established his supremacy, and with him the dawn of the new era for followers of Christianity.



THE RECONSTRUCTED EMPIRE

CONSTANTINE UNDER THE BANNER OF THE CROSS PAGANISM'S LAST STRUGGLE WITH CHRISTIANITY

IN Italy, Carinus, who had also assumed the title of Augustus, held his own against his rival. But on November 17th, 284, the army of the East declared, not for Aper, but for an officer of the guard, who had come into prominence since the reign of Aurelian, C. Valerius Diocletianus. He crushed Aper in person without much ado. On the River Margus in Mœsia, not far from the junction of the Morava and the Danube, where there was a town called Margum, Carinus confronted Diocletian, who had marched upon that point from Gaul; Carinus won the battle, but was afterwards, in 285, slain by his own officers, who bore a personal grudge against him. Diocletian then came to an understanding with the leaders of the other factions, and thus obtained universal recognition, an unheard of event at that period.

Diocletian was in the prime of life when he began his reign. His family came from Dalmatia, and occupied a low position in society; but at an early period he became a member of the new imperial guard, the "protectors," which was a nursery for the generals and statesmen of the age, and accompanied the reigning emperor into every part of the empire, the affairs of which were continually becoming more difficult for one man to control. It was then that Diocletian conceived his plan of dividing the administration of the empire. He appointed his comrade M. Aurelius Valerius Maximianus—generally known as Maximian—as co-regent, first with the dignity of Cæsar in 285, shortly afterwards with that of Augustus in 287. In the year 293 he added two other Cæsars to help him and his fellow Augustus in their labours.

The empire was thus divided into four principalities, over which Diocletian merely held supreme control; his authority was so great, a contemporary observes, that the other rulers looked up to him as

to a father or a supreme god. Maximian was first obliged to quell the peasant rising in Gaul and to secure the frontiers. Diocletian, meanwhile, subdued the Persians and Saracens in the east, in order to restore security in that quarter. His residence, when he allowed himself a little ease, was Nicomedia in Bithynia, while Maximian resided partly in Aquileia, partly in Milan, preference being finally given to the latter town. The Cæsar whom Diocletian had chosen, C. Galerius Valerius Maximianus—known as Galerius—had his headquarters in Sirmium, whence the Danube and Balkan districts were controlled. The principal headquarters of the other Cæsar, M. Flavius Valerius Constantius—distinguished as Constantius, or Constantius Chlorus—was Augusta Treverorum (Treves) and also Eboracum (York), according as his presence was more especially needed on the Rhine or in Britain, which had long been under the government of two usurpers in succession, Carausius and Allectus. All these capitals of Rome were adorned with splendid buildings marking the beginning of a new period of architecture.

All four rulers were sprung from the Illyrian provinces, which were then the kernel of the empire, and all four had risen through military service. Constantius, the only one who was not of low birth, had governed the province of Dalmatia under Carus; Galerius enjoyed the reputation of a bold and even reckless general. The two Augusti assumed additional

titles from the gods, Diocletian taking the name "Jovius" and Maximian "Herculius"; two new legions that were formed on the Lower Danube were known by these titles. Moreover, the Cæsars were united to the Augusti by family ties; Constantius married Maximian's stepdaughter, Theodora, and Galerius Diocletian's

The Empire Ruled by Four Cæsars

Diocletian's Division of his Empire

Relationships of the Four Emperors

daughter Valeria. In other respects also the connection between the emperors and the Cæsars was closely maintained; thus, Constantine, the son of Constantius, was educated at Diocletian's court. Augusti and Cæsars were to give one another mutual support, when necessary; thus, Maximian aided Constantius in his war against Allectus, in the year 296. Maximian then turned to Africa, in order to check the unruly frontier tribes.

Diocletian next reorganised the affairs of Egypt, whose peculiar position in the empire was abolished, and secured the southern boundary so thoroughly against the Blemmyes, that it remained peaceful for a long period. From Egypt, he was obliged to march against the Persians, who had overrun Armenia and Mesopotamia. The Cæsar Galerius, who had the chief command, lost a battle, for which Diocletian reprimanded him before his troops; however, the disaster was redeemed by a decisive victory. Not only was Armenia increased in extent, but the Tigris and some territory beyond it was acquired as a frontier, and the occupation was rendered permanent. Thus, not only was Valerian's defeat avenged, but a condition of affairs was established which endured for some time to come. We repeatedly meet with Galerius in Nicomedia, while Diocletian was directing the erection of his great buildings at Rome, Salonæ and elsewhere from his residence at Sirmium.

Diocletian proved himself to be an organiser of the first order. His division of the empire was made upon principles founded on experience gained during the period of threatening dissolution. During the last decade, the emperors had paid only passing visits to Rome, so that the guard there stationed was nothing more than a garrison. The senate ceased to exercise any influence on the conduct of affairs from the time the emperors began to come from the ranks

of the army. On the other hand, Northern Italy was of great military importance, on account of the continual incursions of the barbarians; Milan was an excellent centre for operations on the Rhine or the Danube. Rome became, then, merely the theoretical capital of the empire that bore

its name; the senate degenerated into a useless institution based on caste. A distinction was made between the city (urbs) and the district which it ruled and those parts of the empire ruled by the authorities in Milan; the one was known as the "urban" district, the other as the "Italian"; and thus the name Italy came to have a new political meaning.

Rhætia on the north, Africa on the south and the islands, with "Italy" and the urban region, formed one administrative district, the control of which centred in Mediolanum (Milan). The country which had once been predominant sank to provincial position during the second half of the third century, and was rated as a province even for purposes of taxation. The following districts were constituted by Diocletian for administrative purposes: (1) Rhætia, (2) Venetia Histria, (3) Æmilia Liguria, (4) Alpes Cottiae, (5) Flaminia Picenum, (6) Tuscia Umbria, (7) Campania Samnium, (8) Apulia Calabria, (9) Lucania Bruttii, (10) Corsica, (11) Sardinia, (12) Sicilia. In consequence of further division, the number of governmental departments, or provinciae, amounted to sixteen a hundred years later, and afterwards to seventeen.

The financial administration of the empire became of increased importance after the most prosperous districts began to substitute money subsidies for their required contingents of troops. The result of this system was that the administration passed from these districts to those which supplied the best soldiers, the defenders of the boundaries of the empire; these were the Illyrian provinces. The military system introduced by Augustus had been found insufficient when the



Diocletian



Maximianus



Galerius




Constantius


FOUR CÆSARS AT ONCE

Diocletian, a great and far-sighted organiser, divided the empire with three colleagues while remaining the supreme emperor, and great progress was made under the four Cæsars, Rome existing merely as the titular capital.


**Diocletian
a Great
Organiser**




ROMAN COLONNADE AT MILAN—THE ANCIENT MEDIOLANUM



THE PONT DU GARD: AN ANCIENT ROMAN AQUEDUCT NEAR NÎMES



THE PORTA NIGER AT TRIER—THE ANCIENT TREVIRORUM



THE MAISON CARRÉE, NÎMES: FINEST EXISTING ROMAN BUILDING

THE SPREAD OF ROMAN ARCHITECTURE DURING THE TIME OF THE FOUR CÆSARS

When Diocletian and his colleagues divided the empire, and government ceased to be centralised in Rome, splendid buildings arose in the provincial capitals, such as Milan and Treves.

barbarians began to attack the empire on several sides simultaneously. A standing army was required, capable of reinforcing the troops on the borders in case of emergency. Moreover, those soldiers who had married and were in occupation of allotments of ground were not equal to severe fighting; but to keep a standing army in addition was found extremely expensive. So the want was supplied by auxiliary troops, drawn from the barbarian tribes upon the frontiers, and these became one of the most valuable arms of the service. In North Britain they were taken from the districts north of the wall; many of them were Germans; in Africa, the Moors held this position; in Syria the Saracens; and all these were by no means to be despised. Diocletian increased the army to four times its previous size.

Such measures necessitated a corresponding increase in taxation. The revenue in the west of the empire began to be administered with that financial skill which had, up to this time, been displayed in Egypt alone. The currency was placed upon a firmer basis by the coining of the *solidus*, to serve as a standard value, an innovation corresponding to the reforms of Aurelian. The character of Diocletian's economic policy is shown in the edicts concerning usurers, fixing a maximum price for the necessities of life and a standard wage for labour. As a social reformer Diocletian was in advance of his age; for instance, he made professions hereditary

and the relations of these to one another and to the state as a whole were subjected to strict and arbitrary regulations.

The senators, the members of the council of state, the artisans, the peasant coloni, the quarrymen, etc.—upon the relations of these to one another was the whole system of taxation founded, and the "sacred Fiscus" became the main feature of the state's activity.

In reorganising the administration Diocletian introduced the bureaucratic system. Under the emperor were the *præfecti prætoria*, under these the *vicarii*, who were put over the so-called "Dioceses" (twelve in number for the whole empire). The lower grades of office holders were all subject to the *vicarii*. These officials, however, were concerned only with civil matters, military affairs being under a special officer, or *dux*; then there was a division between the civil and military powers, contrary to the custom of earlier times, when both had been united. The number of the provincial districts, which

had been greatly reduced in extent, amounted to 101 under Diocletian; this number was increased at a later time, as a consequence of many alterations, which were, however, of no great importance as a whole. In other respects, Diocletian's system was no less permanent than that of Augustus. Diocletian made shipwreck upon the religious question, which he took in hand in

a spirit of absolute hostility to Christianity. On February 23rd, 303, he issued an edict, with the view of completely suppressing



CONSTANTINE THE GREAT
This son of Constantius became sole emperor, founded Constantinople, and made that the centre of his empire. He was the first emperor who recognised Christianity.



THE ARCH OF CONSTANTINE AT ROME
Near the Colosseum stands this famous triumphal arch. It is constructed very largely of sculptures which were removed from earlier arches, and is thus, in a sense, a memorial of vandalism.

the practice of the Christian religion. Christians were dismissed from the army and from all other offices, their places of meeting were destroyed, the property of their congregations was confiscated. Their organisation under their bishops had been already so far developed as to run on parallel lines with the hierarchy of state officials. There were bishops at Rome, at Lugdunum (Lyons), Mediolanum (Milan), Aquileia, Ravenna, Verona, Brescia, Carthage, Sirmium, Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus and Nicomedia; they exercised immense influence and their writings had a wide circulation. A considerable literature of Christianity was already in existence: there were the records of the life of Christ, of the Apostles, St. Paul in particular, and of the martyrdom of their most famous men; there were polemical writings against the Jews and the heathen, dogmatic explanations to prevent error, and much else of like character.

Propaganda was rife and vigorous, its results varying with place and circumstances. Generally speaking, the town populations were more ready to accept the new ideas than the peasants, who were still satisfied with the religious conceptions inculcated from of old. Diocletian had previously persecuted only the Manichæans, whose activity in the Eastern Persian provinces showed prospects of success. It was only after eighteen years of power that he found sufficient cause for interference in the spread of the Christian organisation throughout the empire and the encroachment of the different factions on the functions of the state. He met with a resistance which, being merely passive, was the more difficult to crush. Of his regents, Maximian and Galerius carried out the edict energetically: Constantius held back. Many bishops suffered death or were condemned to the mines. However, Christianity survived the

Diocletian's Measures Against the Christians

persecution and came forth from it purified. In proof of this we have a document, "De mortibus persecutorum," ascribed to Lactantius, though this authorship is denied by many. The author was a Christian, who represented all the misfortunes which fell upon the persecutors, and the manner of their death, as a judgment from God. A Pannonian legend of Christian stone-masons in the district of Sirmium reveals Diocletian in more gracious light: here in the neighbourhood of his birthplace the king seems to have been less hedged in by his divinity.

Diocletian was much cast down by the poor result of his attempt, and was also physically weakened by a severe illness. He had originally planned as a feature of his system of government that the two Augusti should abdicate after a certain time, and that then the two Cæsars should be advanced to the position of Augusti. Each Augustus was then to choose another Cæsar as his associate. This arrangement, which seems to have some connection with his superstitious ideas, Diocletian brought into effect after reigning for twenty years. He laid down his office on May 1st, 305, at Nicomedia, and obliged Maximian to do the same at Mediolanum, although Maximian had ruled a year less.

Both retired into private life as *seniores Augusti*. Diocletian to his home at Salonæ, Maximian to Lower Italy. Diocletian's place as emperor was taken by Galerius; he appointed the two new Cæsars, Flavius Valerius Severus for Italy and its frontier together with Africa, and Galerius Valerius Maximinus Daja (or Daza) for the East. Both were of humble origin. Constantius became Augustus, without having had any share in making appointments or fixing delimitations.

Diocletian's system depended for its permanence upon the continued supremacy of the emperor; it was too delicate

Christians Proof Against Persecution



THE CROSS AND CONQUEROR

The legend is that, seeing in the heavens a sign of a cross, Constantine adopted it as his standard, and under the banner of the Cross gained his victories.

an arrangement not to be speedily broken down by personal ambition. In July, 306, Constantius, then Augustus, died at Eboracum, and his army proclaimed his son, Constantine, who while still young had proved his worth, though only a year before he had been passed over. Galerius was opposed to the step, but finally recognised Constantine as Cæsar, while Severus was raised to the position of second Augustus.

Conference of the Emperors

The prætorians in Rome speedily followed the example set them; the ancient capital had long been dissatisfied with the political changes, and Maxentius, the son of Maximian, was summoned to the position of emperor.

The supreme emperor, Galerius, opposed this step also, and ordered Severus to crush the usurper. But meanwhile the old Maximian had determined to come forward again, and the troops would not fight against him. Severus had to fly to Ravenna, and there he surrendered. Maxentius slew him afterwards in the neighbourhood of Rome, and had himself proclaimed Augustus. Galerius himself returned to Italy, but was unable to restore order. Maximian, who could not agree with his son, betook himself to Gaul. Constantine there married Maximian's daughter, Fausta, and was advanced to the dignity of Augustus by the emperor in 307. Universal confusion resulted. A general conference of the emperors was called at Carnuntum, the headquarters of the Pannonian army, with the object of restoring order. Diocletian took part in this conference, and both Maximian and Galerius attempted in vain to induce him to resume control of the government. However, he persuaded Maximian, who had always bowed to his decisions, to retire to his former position.

In place of Severus, who had been killed, Galerius nominated as Augustus his old comrade in arms Valerius Licinianus Licinius. When Galerius had entrusted him with the government of the province of Illyria in 308, Maximinus Daia resigned the title of Augustus. Galerius accepted his resignation in the following year, when he gave Maximinus and Constantine respectively the titles of Sons of the Augusti. Meanwhile, the old emperor Maximian had made an attempt to win over the sympathy of the army at Arles. This proved a failure. Maximian was

The Emperors Struggle for Seniority

besieged in Massilia by Constantine, who had hurried to the spot, and was driven to suicide in 310. Shortly afterwards Galerius fell ill at Serdica and died in dreadful agony in the nineteenth year of his reign, at the beginning of 311. Thereupon the Augusti, Constantine, Licinius, and Maxentius came to a mutual understanding, recognising at the same time the seniority of Maximinus.

Maxentius, whose authority extended from Africa to Rhætia, was not a capable ruler; his excesses and oppression made him an object of hatred, but he was strongly supported by his præfectus prætorio. Constantine's army was not numerous, but well trained; he attacked Italy, drove back the troops of Maxentius to Turin, and, after a second encounter, blockaded Verona, thus cutting off all approach from the passes of the Alps. After the fall of Verona, Constantine marched upon Rome. The crushing victory of the Miliran Bridge brought ruin and death to Maxentius, and decisive triumph to Constantine, who, moved, as it is said, by a dream and a vision, avowed him-

Constantine Raises the Banner of the Cross

self to have fought under the banner of the Cross of Christ. A fuller account of his relation to the newly adopted faith will be found in the chapters describing the rise of the Christian Church.

The prætorian troops were wholly disbanded, so that the only forces in Rome were the cohorts under the prætor urbanus. Constantine had a meeting with Licinius in Milan, and gave him his sister in marriage. Licinius and Maximinus could not, however, come to an agreement. When the latter crossed into Europe and advanced to an attack, he was beaten at Heraclea on the Propontis on May 1st, 313, and obliged to flee to Asia. There Maximian ended his life. Licinius then put to death every one who might have become dangerous, such as the relations of Galerius, Maximian, and Severus, not even sparing the women—Valeria, the widow of Galerius and her mother Prisca, the wife of Diocletian, who had taken refuge with Maximinus Daia, and had been kept prisoners by him, because Valeria had refused his hand in marriage. These events greatly embittered Diocletian's last years in Salonæ.

But the agreement between Constantine and Licinius was not of long duration. Dissension appeared in the year 314, after

Bassianus, who had married a second sister of Constantine, had been raised to the position of Cæsar. He was to have governed a district between the dominions of Licinius and of Constantine, to keep the balance between these two forces. But when Bassianus showed himself more inclined to favour Licinius, Constantine immediately deposed him. War broke out in consequence. Constantine, who was by far the more capable general, defeated Licinius at the Save, near Cibalæ, in Pannonia; a second indecisive battle was fought in the neighbourhood of Philipopolis. Licinius, who had appointed Valens, the commandant of the Thracian frontier, to be Cæsar, retreated on Beroëa, with the object of falling on Constantine's rear as he pressed on to Byzantium.

However, both parties were so exhausted that they entered into negotiations, and Licinius had to resign Illyricum with Serdica and Thessalonica into the hands of Constantine. The latter thereby obtained a great military advantage, as experience had proved that the Illyrian soldiers were the best; the protection of the frontier on the Lower Danube was reorganised by both emperors. Valens was sacrificed by this arrangement, and it was determined that both emperors should nominate only their own sons as Cæsars, and this not as co-regents, but as mere successors to the throne. This implied the victory of the dynastic theory over Diocletian's arrangements, and was an advantage to Constantine, inasmuch as his son was the elder of the Cæsars.

Religious questions had a bearing on all these events. Constantine had originally declared himself for the Christians, although he permitted the earlier religions and the worship of the emperor to continue. After Galerius had initiated a persecution a short time before his death, the Christians were permitted to practise their religion by the edict of April 30th, 311. On June 13th, 313, Constantine and Licinius issued a second edict, whereby the Christians were allowed the same religious freedom and civil rights as the followers of the old religions, and the confiscated Church property was restored. The defeat of the Emperors Maxentius and Maximinus Daia, who were hostile to the Christians, made possible the promulgation of this edict throughout the empire. But after relations became strained between Constantine

and Licinius, the latter abandoned Christianity, hampered the Christians in the practice of their religion, and would not tolerate them about him, whereas Constantine, apparently from conviction, consistently followed the opposite course of policy. Constantine considered himself as supreme emperor, and therefore encroached on the jurisdiction of Licinius, as, for instance, on the occasion of a marauding expedition which the Goths had made into Thrace. This led to a breach between the two rulers in the year 323.

Their respective armies encountered one another in the neighbourhood of Adrianople; Licinius was beaten on July 3rd, and besieged in Byzantium, while the Cæsar, Crispus, the son of Constantine, conquered his fleet within the Dardanelles at Callipolis (the modern Gallipoli). Egypt fell away from its ruler; Byzantium became untenable. Finally, Licinius and his new regent Martinianus were decisively defeated at Chrysopolis, the modern Scutari, on September 18th. These events led ultimately to the foundation of the future capital of the empire. Hitherto, Serdica, the modern Sophia, in Bulgaria, had served as Constantine's Rome on the European side, while Nicomedia was honoured in like manner on the Asiatic side; now, however, men recognised, as though "by divine inspiration," the importance of the straits to the government of these two continents, for defence against the barbarians of the north. Licinius, who had fled to Nicomedia, surrendered to the conqueror, who gave him his life at the request of his wife Constantia. But in the next year he created disturbances in Thessaly, and was slain in 325.

Constantine was now sole Augustus. His rise is portrayed in a writing usually known as the "Anonymous Valesianus," from the name of its first editor, Valesian; more recently it has been called "Origo Constantini imperatoris" (the Origin of the Emperor Constantine). Constantine's great work was the completion of Diocletian's system. As the centre of gravity was situated in the Græco-Oriental east, the court ceremonial underwent a great change; the emperor became a superior and almost unapproachable being to his subjects. Constantine preserved the four-fold division of the empire, and placed a præfectus prætorio at the head of the civil

**Dynastic System
Displaces
Diocletian's Plan**

**Constantine
Supreme
Emperor**

**The Great
Work of
Constantine**

administration in each division. In the department of finance he carried out thorough reforms by withdrawing the debased currency from circulation. In the military organisation of the empire he made several alterations. He created a new commander for cavalry and for infantry, the *magister*; he lowered the strength of the frontier garrisons, while increasing the standing army; he also showed particular favour to German troops and commanders, who had acquitted themselves with the utmost credit in his wars.

**Constantine
a Founder
of the Church**

As regards religion, his influence over the Christian hierarchy enables us to place Constantine among the founders of the new Church, which was now supplanting the old faiths. He took the initiative in quelling dissensions on points of dogma; he presided in person over the great council at Nicæa in 325. Eusebius, the bishop of Nicomedia, was his confidential adviser; Athanasius, the bishop of Alexandria, opposed him with varying success. Another Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, wrote a history of Constantine as well as a history of the Christian Church. This book was the first of a new genus of historical composition, written from an ecclesiastical point of view. Similar tendencies appeared in the members of Constantine's family. His mother, Helena, who had been the wife of Constantius Chlorus, and was cast off when Constantius married the daughter of Maximinus, was held in high honour. She was a zealous adherent of the Christian faith. Constantine's eldest son, Crispus, was taught by the learned scholar Lactantius, a passionate defender of Christianity.

The younger sons of Constantius, the step-brothers of Constantine, also took a personal interest in the theological disputes of the time. Constantine broke with Diocletian's system, in the first place, by upholding the integrity of the administration against the rights of the Cæsars; and, in the second place, by not laying down his authority when his twenty years' rule expired in 326. This involved him in a quarrel with the Cæsar Crispus, which resulted in the banishment of the latter to Pola in Istria. The empress Fausta was also involved in this disturbance, and shortly afterwards Constantine had her strangled in her bath, and also had the

**The Crimes
of
Constantine**

son of Licinius, who was nearly eleven years old, put to death; all this after the manner of Eastern sultans and without any clearly apparent motive. As a result, we find that the three step-brothers of Constantine by Theodora became more prominent; with their descendants they had formerly been kept in the background, but they now came forward, perhaps because no one of the sons of Constantine, who had been raised in turn to the dignity of Cæsar, appeared to be of particular ability, and their mutual relations were not in any way satisfactory. In the year 335 the emperor determined to divide the empire, so that his eldest son, Constantine II., should have the west, the second son, Constantius, should have the Asiatic provinces and Egypt, and Constans, the third son, Italy, Illyricum, and Africa. Constantine also appointed his nephew Dalmatius, who had been raised to the post of Cæsar, and was a skilful soldier, to the province of Thrace, with which was connected the command of the line of the Danube against the Goths; while a second nephew, who was also Constantine's son-in-law, Annibalianus, was made king of Armenia and the adjacent district of Pontus, with the town of Cæsarea in Cappadocia as his capital.

**The Longest
Reign Since
Augustus**

It is remarkable that in these arrangements no express mention is made of Constantinople. This town covered a more considerable expanse of ground than did the ancient Byzantium; the foundation-stone had been laid in the year 326, and on May 11th, 330, the dedication ceremonies had taken place. As Constantine modelled his new Rome on the ancient city and gave it similar privileges, the division of the kingdom into the eastern and western halves was already prepared for. But Constantine's foresight in his choice of a capital has been attested by the course of history; his "Rome" has held a prominent place in the events of the last fifteen hundred years. Thrace and Bithynia at once gained new importance in the empire. The maritime traffic on the Propontis and Bosphorus increased, the more so, as "the town of Constantine" was fed, on the model of the Roman Annona, from Egyptian sources.

Constantine died at a vigorous age on May 22nd, 337, at a villa near Nicomedia, while preparing for a campaign against



JULIAN THE APOSTATE ADDRESSING A CONFERENCE OF THE SECTARIANS
The Emperor Julian, nephew of Constantine the Great, was reared in the Christian faith, but secretly cherished the old gods of Rome, and when he became emperor he lost no time in declaring for the ancient religion. Hence the epithet, "apostate." But Julian must always be regarded as an enlightened ruler and a philosopher, despite his paganism.
From the painting by Edward Armitage, A.R.A., by permission of the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool.

the Persians; he had reigned thirty-one years, longer than any emperor since Augustus. This was a fact of considerable importance, as it gave time for the reforms which he introduced to take root.

After Constantine's death Constantius hastened from Mesopotamia to Constantinople, to perform his father's obsequies and to execute the provisions

**Constantine's
Sons Murder
All Relatives**

of his will, the other sons being unable to arrive so early. We hear nothing of Dalmatius;

apparently the stroke was already prepared. The soldiers demanded the removal of Ablavius, the *præfectus prætorio*; then they murdered Optatus, a brother-in-law of Constantius. Finally, the brothers of Constantine, and no less than seven of his nephews, fell victims to this anxiety of the sons to secure the power; with the exception of two youthful nephews, the emperor's sons alone remained. Each of these took the title of Augustus in September, 337, the official theory being that the three brothers ruled jointly.

Constantine II. was soon at war with Constans, as he had gained no advantage from the murder of his cousins. But when Constantine II. pressed forward into Italy he was surprised and slain at Aquileia by the troops of Constans. Constans then seized the western throne in 340, the division of the empire being, however, maintained. Constans quarrelled with Constantius, who was then fighting against the Persians, about the theological questions which then disturbed the Christian world concerning the nature of Christ—whether he was only a man, as the rationalist Arius declared, or whether he was God, as Athanasius of Alexandria maintained. Constantius was an Arian, Constans an Athanasian, and it was the opposition of the latter which prevented the complete victory of Arius.

Constans was, besides, so hated for his excesses and his brutality that a revolution broke out; Magnentius, a brave commander, though of half barbarian origin, revolted in conjunction with one of the highest court officials; Constans lost his life while in flight in 350. The whole western empire came into the hands of Magnentius, including Rome, where a more distant relation of the house of Constantine had set himself up, while in Sirmium the soldiers hailed their old leader Vetranio as emperor.

**A Christian
But Still
a Tyrant**

and to execute the provisions of his will, the other sons being unable to arrive so early. We hear nothing of Dalmatius; apparently the stroke was already prepared. The soldiers demanded the removal of Ablavius, the *præfectus prætorio*; then they murdered Optatus, a brother-in-law of Constantius. Finally, the brothers of Constantine, and no less than seven of his nephews, fell victims to this anxiety of the sons to secure the power; with the exception of two youthful nephews, the emperor's sons alone remained. Each of these took the title of Augustus in September, 337, the official theory being that the three brothers ruled jointly.

But Constantius, who had made peace with the Persians, took up arms for the legitimate cause. He first induced Vetranio to retire. At Mursa (the modern Esse) in the region between the Save and the Drave, where Constantine and Licinius had once met, was fought what was considered the greatest battle of the century. The Saxons and Franks in the army of the Gallic emperor stood firm against the troops of Constantius.

But the desertion of a commander, who felt bound by duty to Constantine's house, decided against Magnentius in the autumn of 351. He was obliged to retreat to Italy and found himself attacked there by land and sea in the following spring. The troops of Constantius received a slight check at Ticinum, but Magnentius was obliged to retreat by the Cottian Alps to Gaul; there his opponent stirred up the Alemanni against him and when Magnentius saw the collapse of his power he committed suicide in 353.

Constantius, who thus became sole monarch through the overthrow of his adversaries, was a narrow-minded bigot, full of theological and legitimist theories, who devoted himself rather to court etiquette than to state business. His palace swarmed with eunuchs and informers, and there was great lawlessness among the military and civil officials. As there had been no fruit of the emperor's marriage, two cousins, Gallus and Julianus, who were the solitary survivors in the direct line, were brought up with a view to their succession; hitherto they had been kept in complete isolation in a villa at Cæsarea in Cappadocia. Gallus was sent as Cæsar to Antioch. The portion of the history of Ammianus Marcellinus which has been preserved begins with the description of the elevation of Gallus. Julian remained in Constantinople to complete his studies and afterwards proceeded for that purpose to Nicomedia and Athens. The emperor in the meantime resided at Milan, in order to continue his anti-Athanasian policy.

Synods were held and refractory bishops were banished; when such measures were applied to the Roman bishop Liberius, great dissension arose in Rome. In the year 354 Gallus fell into disfavour with Constantius; he was recalled and finally executed. Trouble had been brewing in Gaul since the last popular rising,

and the incursions of the Alemanni and the Franks were becoming more numerous. In the east, war with the Persians again broke out. The emperor determined to conduct the Persian war in person, and to send Julian as Cæsar to Gaul in 355. Julian was only twenty-four years old, a man of letters and a philosopher, but he showed no less ability as administrator and general. He defeated the Alemanni at Strasburg, and inflicted severe reverses upon the Franks. The Roman government offered, however, no objection to the barbarians settling upon the frontiers, which had been already depopulated by constant raids; the Alemanni settled in Alsace, and the Salic Franks on the Lower Rhine.

Meanwhile, Constantius had been so unsuccessful in the war with Persia that he sent to Gaul for reinforcements. The troops in that country were anything but inclined to leave their usual quarters and their wives and children. In the winter of 360, Julian was residing in Paris, a little town built round an island, as he himself describes it. The soldiers mutinied, raised him on a shield, according to the Germanic custom, and saluted him as Augustus. Julian

attempted to procure the recognition of his title from Constantius; when Constantius refused to grant it, Julian began war, advancing through Rætia into Illyricum. But before another conflict could take place between the armies of the east and the west, the news arrived that Constantius had died of an illness in Cilicia. Julian was now everywhere recognised (361). He immediately entered upon a policy of reform, especially with regard to the system of taxation, and considerably lightened the burdens laid upon his subjects.

Religious questions largely claimed his attention. As a philosopher, he ac-

knowledged the old gods, whose worship he attempted to revive; his writings, which show considerable intellectual power, give us full information on this point. As the historian Ammianus Marcellinus and the rhetorician Libanius of Antioch were his friends, we have detailed information concerning Julian's personality and aims. Christianity was, however, still tolerated, and Julian allowed the bishops, whom Constantius had banished, to return to their sees. In the course of his administration he certainly deprived them of many privileges which Constantine and his sons had bestowed upon them. Thus, ecclesiastics were no

longer released from the obligations binding upon ordinary citizens; they were also ordered to restore the possessions which they had wrested from the votaries of the old religion. Christians were also forbidden to teach the liberal arts, rhetoric, etc. Julian's attempt to repress Christianity lasted only two years, so that it is impossible to say what the results might have been if his reign had been prolonged. Generally speaking, it appears that the old religion could reckon upon

active adherents only among special classes of society, as among the Roman senators, the rhetoricians in Antioch, in Alexandria and Athens; or at particular centres of worship, as at Olympia, where the games were continued for the sake of maintaining trade, and Cyrene, where the shrine of Isis brought in a large income, and in other places.

In the year 362 Julian betook himself to Antioch, to resume the conduct of the war against the Persians. The next year he triumphantly crossed the Tigris, a fleet being maintained upon the river to provide supplies and to protect his communications. Later developments, however, obliged him to retreat, and the

Attempts to Restore the Old Religion



Jovian



Valentinian I.



Valentinian II.



Eugenius

A GROUP OF EMPERORS AFTER JULIAN

Numerous rulers of short reigns followed Julian the Apostate. Several of these are here illustrated from coins and medallions. Eugenius was the last to make a stand for the old paganism, but fell before Theodosius.

Julian Comes to Power

Julian was now everywhere recognised (361). He immediately entered upon a policy of reform, especially with regard to the system of taxation, and considerably lightened the burdens laid upon his subjects.

emperor was mortally wounded in action. Julian expired while discussing the immortality of the soul on June 26th, 363, and with him the house of Constantine became extinct.

During the confusion that arose upon Julian's death the military and civil officials, who were stationed at headquarters, chose the captain of the household troops, Jovian, emperor. Jovian succumbed to an illness before he reached

Constantinople, and an officer in Nicæa was elected in a similar manner to the post of emperor, the Pannonian Valentinian, who had come into prominence during the last reign. He appointed his brother Valens joint-regent, and entrusted the east to him, while he himself undertook the pacification of the west, where disturbances had broken out upon the death of Julian. Valentinian, who was an admirable ruler for his time, succeeded in securing the frontier on the Rhine and the Danube by a chain of fortresses; but in the year 375 he died at Brigetio.

He was succeeded by his young son Gratian, who appointed as joint-regent his brother Valentinian II., only four years old. In his religious beliefs Gratian was a zealous follower of Athanasius; he discontinued the policy of toleration that had been maintained towards the followers of the old religions and proceeded actively against them. On the other hand, Valens in the east was an Arian; under his influence, Arianism spread among the German races, especially the Goths.

The frontiers on the Lower Danube, especially on the delta, were reconstituted by Valens. Beyond these, in the modern Transylvania, and afterwards further to the east, dwelt the Gothic tribes, occupying extensive tracks of land with their flocks; among them and near them were the remnants of the earlier populations. Communication with the banks of the

Danube was closely maintained, especially by way of the River Alt, or Aluta. An event occurred at this time which disturbed the balance of power that had subsisted during a century on the line of the Danube. The Huns, an old Tartar nation, attacked the eastern Goths and subdued them. The impulse travelled in a westerly direction, so that the Goths who were settled in Transylvania began to feel themselves insecure, for the Huns

were already pressing forward towards the eastern passes of the country. As allies of the empire, the western Goths demanded permission to settle in the district south of the Danube, and finally extorted it by threats; but the Roman officials put difficulties in their way, and treated them shamefully. The emperor Valens, who hurried up from the east to drive them back, suffered a defeat near Adrianople, which cost him his life, in 378.

In these circumstances, Gratian, who was a weak ruler, found himself obliged to appoint the valiant Spaniard Theodosius as joint-regent, and, later on, to accept him as a brother-in-law, although it was but two years before that the father of Theodosius, a celebrated general, had been executed. While Theodosius was occupied with the pacification of the Goths, the emperor Gratian was slain in Gaul by a usurper, Maximus, who had arisen in Britain, in 383. Maximus, who took up his residence in Treves, was recognised by Theodosius and Valentinian II. as Augustus for Gaul, Spain and Britain. Maximus showed himself strongly orthodox in the religious dis-

putes on points of dogma, and persecuted the Priscillianists, a growing sect originating in Spain. Theodosius, too, was an


Athanasian, and his policy was therefore diametrically opposed to that of the emperor Valens. Valentinian II., with the support of German auxiliary troops, made his capital, Milan, a centre of Arianism, in strong opposition to native population and their famous bishop Ambrose.

These dissensions gave Maximus the opportunity of attacking Italy. Valentinian fled to Theodosius, who demanded his restoration; Maximus would not consent, and war broke out. In 388 Theodosius was victorious at Siscia, Poetovio, and Emona, where his Gothic auxiliaries afforded valuable assistance. Valentinian's rule was restored, but shortly afterwards he quarrelled with the Frank Arbogast, the commander of the troops in Gaul, who murdered Valentinian in 392 and raised the famous Roman, Eugenius, to the position of emperor. Eugenius once again gathered round himself the adherents of heathendom. But Theodosius refused to recognise him, and conquered him in a bloody battle on the River Frigidus, the modern Wippach, east of Aquileia. Eugenius was slain, and Arbogast committed suicide in 394.

Confusion at the Death of Julian

An Emperor Arises in Britain

Quarrels of Arians and Athanasians



THE COMING OF THE GOTH

THE SUNDERING OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE AND DECAY OF THE WESTERN POWER

THEODOSIUS united the whole empire under his rule, but subdivided the government between his two sons Arcadius and Honorius, the former having the east, the latter the west in 395. From this time the history of the east definitely diverges from that of the west. For the events which follow, our guide is the historian Zosimus, who wrote in the fifth century. We have, besides, the extensive poetical works of the court poet Claudian, and finally the historical notices in the calendars of Rome, Ravenna, and Constantinople. Notwithstanding this division, it was intended that the empire should continue a unity; but when Theodosius died,

The Death of Theodosius

in the year 395, at Milan, there was a strong divergence of opinion concerning the best mode of maintaining this unity. The commander-in-chief, Stilicho, who was descended from the Pannonian Vandals, and had hitherto been supreme, desired to maintain the unity of command over the army, and proposed also on military as well as upon political grounds the retention of one governing authority for Illyricum—that is, the western portion of the Balkan peninsula as far as the southernmost point of Greece. The fall of Eugenius had not disturbed the unity of the army in the west, and here Stilicho at once assumed the guardianship of the emperor Honorius during his minority; he also attempted to become guardian to the emperor Arcadius, but this project was opposed by the court officials of Arcadius, who won over the Gothic leader Alaric to their side.

Theodosius had settled the western Goths on the Balkan peninsula, and employed them in the imperial army, though they retained their own leaders and their national organisation. Of these

leaders, the most important was Alaric. The struggle between himself and Stilicho was continually breaking out into war, the theatre of which was the Peloponnesus; the constant machinations of the court at Constantinople, at whose disposal Stilicho had been forced to put the Oriental troops, added fuel to the flames. Alaric was favoured as against Stilicho, and was made commandant of Illyricum in 397. At the same time, the comes Gildo was also stirred up by Byzantium to revolt in Africa against Stilicho, but he was eventually overthrown by force of arms.

So sharp was the division between the two portions of the empire that, contrary to all previous usage, the consul appointed in the east was never publicly mentioned in the west, where the date was marked with the name of one consul only. In addition to this, the tribes on the Danube were again in a state of restlessness.

A few years later, while Stilicho was holding the Rhætian frontier, Alaric made an attack upon Italy. He overran the whole of Upper Italy, so that Honorius fled for refuge from Milan to the fortress of Ravenna. Stilicho, however, defeated Alaric in the battle of Plentia and drove him out of Italy, past Verona, by a series of strategic movements in 402. In the year 405 large bands of heathen Goths, with an admixture of other peoples, came into Italy under the leadership of Radagais and crossed the Apennines; but they met their fate when Stilicho marched upon them from the Po with reinforcements of Goths

and Huns. They were beaten and destroyed at Fæsulæ in 405. Rhætia and the Rhine frontier were now denuded of troops, and hordes of varying

Beginnings of the Break-up



UNITED ROME'S LAST RULER

Theodosius united the whole empire, but his later division of east and west was the definite cleavage of the Roman power.

nationalities crossed the Rhine, Vandals, Alans, and Suevi, and pressed into Gaul, and even into Spain; nor was Stilicho able to offer effective resistance, as his presence in Italy was required by the general affairs of the empire. In the year 408, Arcadius had died at Constantinople, leaving behind him a son still in his minority, Theodosius II.

Honorius Listens to Slanderers Stilicho again attempted to avail himself of this opportunity to gain the whole of Illyricum for the western empire and so to obstruct the migrations on the Central Danube. He tried to secure Alaric's help for this purpose. Alaric and his people had demanded better lands for settlement than those they were occupying, but in other respects were ready to place themselves at the disposal of the government. The court intriguers took this opportunity of slandering Stilicho to Honorius, to the effect that he was working to overthrow the dynasty.

Honorius was a very incapable ruler; he was Stilicho's son-in-law, but, as is usual with weak rulers, he was imbued with absolutist ideas. Moreover, a new pretender, Constantinus, had arisen in the west, who was first recognised by Britain, and afterwards by the provinces of Gaul and Spain, which had abandoned the Italian government to its fate. Honorius made no effort to save Stilicho; the foreign troops belonging to him were attacked and overpowered by the Roman forces, and Stilicho himself was executed in Ravenna in 408. His wife Serena suffered the same fate in Rome, as the people feared her, and his son Eucherius was killed, after vainly attempting to save himself by flight.

The court declined to recognise the compact that Stilicho had made with Alaric, and relied for help against the usurpers and barbarians upon the alliance with the court of Constantinople to which Eastern Illyricum with Sirmium was formally ceded: and the empire was to be saved by edicts against Arianism, paganism, and the wearing of trousers. Alaric then crossed the Italian frontier unopposed. Such barbarian troops as there were deserted to Alaric, as did thousands of slaves of barbaric extraction. The government was abandoned by all its political opponents. They fled into the marshes of Ravenna, and declared every measure that was taken to be unconstitutional. Alaric arrived before Rome and

was prevented from sacking the city only by the payment of a large sum; he also demanded of Honorius his recognition as captain-general of the empire, so as to lend him authority over Roman subjects. Though he had expected to settle his west Goths in Venetia, Norica, and Dalmatia, he accepted the two provinces of Noricum.


When the negotiations led to nothing, Alaric marched a second time upon the city, where Galla Placidia, the step-sister of Honorius, was ruling with the senate. After a short siege, Alaric obtained possession of Rome by treachery on August 24th, 410. This event caused great excitement in the Roman world; the greatest authors of the time—Augustine, Orosius, Salvianus, Rutilius Namatianus—mention the fact with horror, or give it a theological interpretation, in accordance with the widespread ideas of the time, looking upon it as a punishment from God. Salvianus of Massilia remarks that the Goths did but little damage in Rome, and in particular that they respected the churches, although they were Arians.

Alaric had set up the town prefect of Rome, Allalus, as a rival emperor; but as he gained nothing by this measure, he let him fall again. Ravenna was too well provided with provisions and troops to be attacked with any great chance of success. Alaric therefore contemplated the conquest of Sicily and Africa, the granaries of "urban" Italy, the possession of which would give him command of Italy itself. As he was setting out upon this expedition Alaric died suddenly in Lower Italy, and was buried by his Goths at Consentia (the modern Cosenza) in the bed of the river Busentus.

Athaulf, Alaric's brother-in-law and successor, began negotiations with Honorius; the government at length agreed to his terms. Athaulf was recognised as commander-in-chief, and marched into Gaul with his people, where the usurper, Constantine, had just been defeated by the *comes* Constantius near Arles in 411; Athaulf and Constantius found themselves rivals. Galla Placidia, the step-sister of Honorius, who had been carried about by the Goths as a hostage since the capture of Rome, married Athaulf; but he fell at Barcino (the modern Barcelona) in the year 414, a victim to a blood-feud. Three years later, Placidia was married

The Goths in the City

Alaric the Goth Before Rome



HONORIUS, THE EMPEROR OF THE WEST, FEEDS POULTRY WHILE HIS COUNTRY FALLS INTO RUIN

The son of Theodosius, who succeeded to the empire of the West, was totally unfitted for his position, lacking energy even to enjoy the pleasures of his age. Most of his time was wasted in feeding poultry. Honorius is here seen at his favourite occupation, while his secretaries, charged with urgent affairs, have to wait his pleasure.

From the painting by J. W. Waterhouse, R.A.

against her will to Constantius, whom Honorius made his joint-regent. He was an Illyrian, and a friend of Stilicho, for whom he took vengeance on the court party, but he, too, died in the year 421. Honorius followed him in 423, after he had quarrelled with Placidia, and forced her to depart to Constantinople. The eastern court, which jealously guarded the interests of the dynasty, sent her with her son by Constantius, Placidus Valentianus III., who had been advanced to be Cæsar and Augustus, to Ravenna, where one of the superior court officials had, in the meantime, usurped the power. The legitimate succession was restored; Placidia became Augusta and undertook the regency, as her son was but seven years of age.

In decaying dynasties, women, as a rule, are better sovereigns than men, but in the court at Ravenna party intrigue dominated everything. Among others who struggled for influence was Boniface, the governor of Africa, who in the crisis after the death of Honorius had vigorously supported the dynastic policy, and Aëtius, who had been opposed to that policy, but had afterwards gone over to Placidia. Aëtius, was a native of the Danubian territory, and kept up relations with the Huns and Goths, whom he cleverly played off against one another; after he had recovered Rhætia and Noricum he took Pannonia from the Huns and drove the Goths out of Dalmatia. Boniface thought himself threatened by court intrigues and called to his assistance the barbarians settled in the south of Spain.

These were the Vandals and Alans under their king Geiserich—not a very powerful band, but one that proved sufficiently strong, as soon as it got a footing in Africa, to conquer the whole province, torn apart as it was by religious dissensions. Boniface, after making his peace with the court, found himself unable to drive them out again. Geiserich even seized Carthage and there founded a state, which was essentially a pirate state, and henceforward became no less a terror to the Italian coast than the Carthaginians had once been. To complete the analogy between Vandals and Carthaginians, Sardinia and the west of Sicily were speedily conquered by Geiserich. He divided the great estates of the wealthy Africans among the Van-

dal and Alan chiefs, favoured the schismatics against the orthodox, won over the small proprietors to himself, and also entered into relations with the Moorish race. Thus was founded a kingdom, which existed for a century. This was a heavy blow for Italy, which lost both its granary and the security of its seas. In Hispania and Lusitania, the west Goths and the Suevi had established themselves: the west Goths, the Burgundians and the Franks had also settled in Gaul, so that the empire ruled from Ravenna was confined to Italy and its frontiers.


The rivalry between Aëtius and Boniface led to a battle, in which the latter was victorious, but was mortally wounded by Aëtius. Aëtius fled to the Huns, and with their help, in 432, recovered the high position at the court which he had held for two decades. Aëtius was able to make use of the dissensions that arose among the barbarians so as to gain some influence over the provinces that had been lost, such as Gaul. He was, however, obliged to give up Britain; fugitive Britons crossed to the continent of Gaul, and settled in the district of Armorica (the so-called "Brittany") while the Angles and Saxons came to Britain, at first to protect the Britons and afterwards to rule them.

Meanwhile, the Huns had found an energetic leader in Attila, who united in addition numerous Germanic races under his rule. He established his seat of government in the plains between the Theiss and the Danube. From this point, he made war upon the provinces of the eastern empire, while keeping up his friendship with Aëtius. Complications were caused later by the dissolute Honoria, the emperor's sister, who offered Attila her hand in marriage, an act equivalent to high treason, in order to escape from her imprisonment. But Aëtius organised a great confederacy in Gaul, to which the west Goths and Franks adhered, to oppose Attila. A great battle was fought in 451 in the plain of the Moors (near Troyes); Attila was defeated, and obliged to evacuate Gaul. In the next year he overran Upper Italy, after conquering and destroying Aquileia, but retreated when the eastern empire made common cause with the western. Attila died suddenly in the year 453. His empire immediately fell to pieces; the races that

The Court at Ravenna

Britons Flee to "Brittany"

The Vandals Found a Pirate State



THE BARBARIAN INVASION: PILLAGE OF A ROMAN VILLA BY MARAUDING HUNS
From the painting by Georges Kochergosse, by permission of Messrs. Brauh, Clement & Cie.

had been kept together by his personal ascendancy, the Gepideæ and Goths, drove the Huns out of Pannonia. The territories on the Danube were insufficient to support them; the younger part of the male population, and sometimes an entire clan, emigrated in search of foreign service, or to found new kingdoms; so that

**Barbarian
Unrest after
Attila's Death**

the decade following Attila's death is marked by constant unrest and continual shifting of population. Theodosius II. ruled over the eastern empire from 408 to 450, but only nominally, for he was never declared of age. His sister Pulcheria was a personage of great influence during his reign.

The empire gradually contracted round its firm nucleus, the city of Constantinople, which was protected on every side by its walls and by the sea. Ministerial crises occurred which cost much bloodshed, and saved the eastern empire from the puppet-emperor form of government, which had now become established in the west; with this exception, the main interest of the period attaches to ecclesiastical events.

Orthodoxy was now the rage in Byzantium, and all surviving remnants of paganism were rooted out; even local names were being constantly changed for those of the Saviour or the saints. The Christian population in Armenia, whose literature was then in its most flourishing period, were granted protection against the Persians; on the other hand, Attila, who had made a terrible visitation upon the Northern Balkan provinces, was bought off with titles and money. The præfecture of Illyricum was transferred at that time from Sirmium to Thessalonica. Theodosius II. had the constitutions of the earlier emperors codified; the codification was accepted in the west, and also made its way to the Romans in the German states. After the death of Theodosius II., "the little," Pulcheria gave her hand

**Murder
and Rapine
in Rome**

and the throne to the Illyrian Marcianus, who had won a good reputation as a commander. In the same year (450), Placidia died in Ravenna: her sarcophagus is still to be seen in the mausoleum, where her husband Constantius and her brother Honorius also rest.

Placidia's son, Valentinian III., finally quarrelled with Aëtius; urged on by the jealousy of the eunuch Heraclius, he attacked and slew him with his own hands

in the palace in 454; a year later, two friends of Aëtius murdered Valentinian in a villa near Rome in March, 455. One of the conspirators was the Roman senator Petronius Maximus, whose wife Valentinian had dishonoured. Petronius tried to secure the power for himself by marrying Eudoxia, Valentinian's widow, while his son received a daughter of Valentinian as his wife. The story goes that Eudoxia then called in the Vandal king Geiserich, who appeared with a fleet at the mouth of the Tiber and took Rome. The senators fled, Petronius Maximus was killed, and the imperial palace sacked. After Geiserich had ravaged the coast of Campania, he returned in triumph to Carthage, taking Eudoxia and her daughter with him. Thus the dynasty of Theodosius came to an end in the western empire; but the hostility between Italy and the Vandals continued for decades.

A man capable of dealing with the situation now came forward in the person of Ricimer, the leader of the Italian federal troops, who defeated the Vandals at sea near Corsica. Ricimer was of Germanic

**Strong Man
and Puppet
Emperors**

origin and an Arian; for these reasons, the prejudices of the time forbade his becoming emperor; but after he had held the consulship in the year 459, he ruled, under the titles of *patricius* and *magister utriusque militiae*, as Stilicho and Aëtius had done before him, setting up and deposing emperors at pleasure.

In 456 he obliged Avitus to abdicate. Avitus was a Gallo-Roman and a comrade in arms of Aëtius, and had been made ruler by the western Goths dwelling in the Arrelate region (the modern Arles). His successor, Majorianus, was executed by Ricimer, because an extensive campaign which he had undertaken against Geiserich proved a failure in 461. After him Libius Severus was nominal emperor for some years (461-465). After an interval, Anthemius, a son-in-law of Marcian, succeeded in 467. In his time, a general but unsuccessful attack upon the Vandals was made by the eastern and western empires. Anthemius resided in Rome, and Ricimer in Mediolanum (Milan): Anthemius ventured to thwart the wishes of the emperor-maker, who besieged and overthrew him in 472. Shortly afterwards Ricimer died of the plague, and six months later the same fate overtook Olybrius, whom he had set up, and who

THE COMING OF THE GOTHS

had married the emperor's daughter, Placidia.

During this period Dalmatia and that part of Gaul which had remained under Roman rule were governed by their own native rulers, whether civil or ecclesiastical. In Dalmatia, Marcellinus, a friend of Aëtius, held the power. He attacked the Vandals on his own initiative, and as an imperial ally; he was finally killed in Sicily. In Gaul, the brave Ægidius made a name for himself among the Frankish barbarians, as also did his son Syagrius, who preserved his independence until 486. Among the Arverni, the family of the emperor Avitus was predominant; as the

as no longer to his advantage. From Gaul, he afterwards made an attempt to conquer Italy. Glycerius had been made emperor at Ravenna by Gundobad; he retired to the bishopric of Salonæ, when Julius Nepos, a Dalmatian, who was supported by Byzantium and was a nephew of Marcellinus, made his way into Rome and gained recognition there.

Orestes, who had been Attila's secretary, rose in opposition to Nepos. Nepos fled to his native land, where he retained the title of emperor until his death, in 480, and Orestes appointed his little son Romulus to be Augustus in 475. However, the Germanic troops rose against Orestes. Since



THE DEATH OF ATTIILA, THE GREAT LEADER OF THE HUNS

There were two legends of the death of the mighty Attila. He is said to have died from an effluxion of blood on his marriage night; but another story states that he was murdered on the eve of his nuptials with a royal bride by a woman he had previously married. This is the legend which St. George Hare has chosen for the above picture in the Royal Academy of 1908.

west Goths had extended their power over that district, Sidonius Apollinaris, who was a son-in-law of Avitus, and afterwards bishop of the town of the Arverni, shows the transition from open resistance to submission to the rule of the "barbarians," who prided themselves on the title of "barbarian," as opposed to that of "Roman." "Barbarus" was then an honourable designation; it is the origin of our "bravo."

From the year 472, Italy was in a state of anarchy. The Burgundian Gundobad, a nephew of Ricimer, was called to the regal power in his native Gaul, and therefore considered the position of patricius

the dissolution of Attila's kingdom they had been quartered in Ravenna to support the court; they demanded that their position in Italy should be in no way inferior to that of the Germanic races in the western provinces; they desired land for permanent settlement, and declined to remain permanently under arms. When Orestes made objections, Odoacer, of the race of the Turcilingi, who had already become of importance under Ricimer, was elected king; Orestes was defeated in Ticinum, his brother Paulus at Ravenna, and both were slain. Odoacer took pity on the pretty Augustulus (Romulus), to whom he granted a pension

and the Lucullanum at Naples as a residence.

There was no further occupant of the imperial throne, and Odoacer ruled as Stilicho, Aëtius, Ricimer, and Orestes had done, but resting on his own title; after a few years his position was formerly recognised by the emperor of the eastern

The Throne for Him that Seized it

empire (479). As regards these events, we gain a considerable amount of information from the municipal chronicles of Ravenna, which become more comprehensive about this time; but many conclusions are based upon the evidence of coins and titles.

The progress of affairs in the east was widely different from that which we find in the west. In Byzantium there was an uninterrupted succession of native emperors—that is to say, emperors coming from Thrace and Illyria and Asia Minor; these stood in close connection with their predecessors by marriage, and were formally crowned by the Patriarch. The list of rulers runs as follows: Marcian, an Illyrian, 450–459; Leo, a Thracian, to 474; Zeno, an Isaurian, to 491; Anastasius, an Illyrian, to 518; Justinus, a Thracian, to 527, followed by his nephew Justinianus, to 565. The eastern emperors were generally able to visit upon their disobedient generals and ministers the fate of Stilicho.

In the west, on the contrary, the tendency was entirely in the opposite direction. At the bidding of Odoacer, the senate of old Rome declared that it no longer required an emperor and that a governor for the western empire, whose position was sanctioned by the eastern court, would be sufficient. Under these conditions, Odoacer governed Italy and the neighbouring territory for thirteen years, coming to an agreement with the aged Geiserich on the question of Sicily. After the death of Julius Nepos, Odoacer

Theoderic the Goth Destroys Odoacer's Power

occupied Dalmatia in 481, and advanced into Noricum against the Rugi in 487: this was the beginning of entanglements with Byzantium and with the Goths settled into Mœsia, who were in alliance with the Rugi. Theoderic, the Gothic king and patricius, was authorised by the emperor Zeno to march against Italy, overthrow Odoacer's rule, and set up himself in his place. Theoderic defeated Odoacer on the Isonzo and at Verona,

took Milan, and established his headquarters at the important strategical point of Ticinum. He again defeated Odoacer and his allies on the Adda; after a three years' siege, he got possession of the capital of Ravenna in 493, and destroyed Odoacer and his troops, in spite of the capitulation that had been agreed upon.

Thus Theoderic gained the power; he stepped into Odoacer's position, in the first place as king of the Goths and Rugi, and secondly as appointee of the eastern emperor to the administration of the realm. The senate of old Rome, which still retained its ancient prestige, carried on negotiations with Byzantium concerning Theoderic's appointment. Theoderic reigned thirty-three years, a period of peace and prosperity for Italy. The Goths were distributed over the country, as the barbarian troops had been after Stilicho's time, while in other respects the Roman official organisation and the municipal arrangements remained intact. Italy and the neighbouring territory were now thrown upon their own economic resources, and the national prosperity greatly in-

Peace and Prosperity Under the Goths

creased in consequence; the Pomptine marshes were drained, and agriculture was again introduced into Italy. Sicily, which again became prominent as the granary of Rome, was spared the infliction of Gothic settlers. From Dalmatia, sheep, cattle, and corn were introduced into Italy.

On the other hand, all those places which had flourished under the empire were now desolate heaps of ruins. Rome had been taken five times during the Gothic wars, had been lost and reconquered. Hadrian's villa had been destroyed; the imperial statues in the mausoleum at Rome had been thrown down by the raging Goths during the siege. The Goths had ruined the splendid aqueducts, so that the water ran to waste and helped to convert the Campagna into marsh land. All the well-known country seats of the emperor and the senators in the Roman "Campagna," in the Sabine country, at Tusculum and Southern Etruria, on the gulfs of Naples and Misenum were in ruins. On the other hand, these extensive wastes served the neighbouring population as places of refuge; new settlements were founded, as was Frascati (the modern Frascati) on the site of the imperial villa near



THE GOTHs APPROACHING ROME
Specially drawn for this work by W. Edward Wigfall.

Tusculum. In Rome itself the ornamental buildings of imperial times were employed as fortresses, as the town walls built by Aurelian were so extensive as to demand an enormous army for their defence. Thus, Hadrian's mausoleum became the citadel of Rome during the Middle Ages, while the great families established themselves in the

Hadrian's Tomb as the Citadel

Colosseum and elsewhere. The once prosperous district of Etruria had become as desolate as the Roman "Campagna," even from the outset of the fifth century, when Rutilius Namatianus passed along the coast after the capture of Rome by Alaric. This desolation was largely brought by the system of latifundia, which continued even in Gothic times. Theodahat, the Gothic king, was originally a Tuscan landed proprietor, and his attempts to buy up the estates of his neighbours or to expel them from their land had made him very unpopular.

It is noteworthy that many ancient towns, such as Volsci and Tarquinii, became more and more deserted, while others began to be densely populated. Places that had once been of importance deteriorated, while others, such as Castrum Viterbum (the modern Viterbo) now rose into prominence. Sometimes, moreover, the most ancient places of settlement in a district again became famous, because of their natural strength; thus the inhabitants of Falerii, who had descended into the plains and settled there during the peaceful period of Roman supremacy, now reoccupied the old fortress; hence the name Castellum (the modern Civita Castellana). Inhabitants of the Roman town of Volsinii, which was rendered insalubrious by the marshy exhalations of its lake, reoccupied in force the old Etruscan town of Urbiventum (the modern Orvieto), because its lofty situation and natural strength promised security against attack.

Coming Struggle Between Goths and Byzantines

Upon an island in the lake of Volsinii (the modern Lago di Bolsena) the Goths had founded a strong fortress, where a portion of the royal treasure was kept. It was here that Amalasintha, the daughter of the great Theoderic was imprisoned and put to death by her cousin and co-regent, Theodahat.

Other districts in Central Italy continued to enjoy prosperity until the period of the struggle between the Goths


and the Byzantines. The harm wrought by the invasions of Alaric, Radagais and Attila had been only temporary, with the exception of the destruction of Aquileia; and the struggle between Odoacer and Theoderic had been confined to Northern Italy.

On reading the episcopal registers of Italy for this period we are astonished to see how many places that have now disappeared were in existence about the year 500 A.D., as for instance, in Umbria. Plestia, where Hannibal, in the year 217 B.C.—that is, 700 years before this time—had effected the passage from Umbria to Picenum, now had its bishop; so had such places as Tadina, Ostra, Vettona, Forum Flamini, etc. Generally speaking, the "urban" portion of the Apennine peninsula was no less blessed with bishoprics than the province of Africa. Not only all towns, but also many of the latifundia, such as the fundus Carminianus (the modern Carmignano) in Southern Italy, had their bishops. This organisation had become perfected since the second half of the fourth century.

Near Rome there were bishops, not only at Ostia, but also at Portus, the harbour on the right-hand mouth of the Tiber, which had been founded by Claudius and further extended by Trajan.

The same was the case with Lorium, where a town had grown up round the villa of Antoninus Pius, which was also known as Silva Candida, and with Gabii, Albanum, Labicum and Nomentum. From this we learn that these places in the immediate neighbourhood of Rome were important cities; their bishops were under the immediate control of the Roman bishop or pope, just as the Patriarch of Antioch controlled the bishops of the provincial diocese of Syria Prima. In general, the episcopal organisation was analogous in detail to the imperial; the highest dignitaries of the empire often exchanged their temporal for a corresponding position in the Church. On such circumstances was based the theory of Augustine, the learned bishop of Hippo, who declared that the Roman state was but transitory, while the Church was permanent, as its development was uninterrupted and vigorous.

Inannonaric Italy—those provinces, that is, that paid tribute to Rome in the form of products of the soil—the bishops



Sketch showing
 THE LOCALITIES & GRADUAL ADVANCE
 of the
 BARBARIAN NATIONS.

SKETCH MAP ILLUSTRATING THE LOCALITIES OF ORIGIN OR OCCUPATION, AND GRADUAL ADVANCE, OF THE BARBARIAN NATIONS

of Milan and Aquileia acted as metropolitans; the bishop of Ravenna also performed that function when his residence became the capital. The bishop of Rome was regarded as the first prelate of Italy, of the West, and of the whole Church, though his authority was occasionally disputed in individual districts. This was

Ascendancy of the Bishops of Rome

the case in the east, the west, and even in Italy. The bishops of Ravenna turned their connection with the emperors and regents to good account. Occasionally a general congress of the Italian bishops was held at Rome; this happened repeatedly during the years 499-502, when the merits of two rival candidates for the Papacy were under discussion. On such points we gain much information from the biographies of the popes in the "Liber Pontificalis," which took the place of the biographies of the emperors as an historical record. Similar records were possessed by the churches of Ravenna, Milan, and other towns.

The age is especially notable for ecclesiastical controversies. The struggle between the Arians and the Athanasians continued for three hundred years, and important Church councils were repeatedly summoned to settle the matter, at Milan in 355, at Ariminum in 359, and at Aquileia in 381. Christian dogma, however, was developed exclusively by the churches of the eastern half of the empire, especially those of Alexandria; next in importance were the imperial capitals, Nicomedia, Antioch, and Byzantium.

A great event was the alliance between old and new Rome at the council of Chalcedon in 451, which broke down the supremacy of the "Pope" of Alexandria. From this time on, new Rome went its way in close connection with the Church policy of the government, whereas old Rome, after Italy had fallen under Arian rulers, such as Ricimer, Odoacer and

Relationship of Church and State

Theoderic, did not fall in with every decision emanating from the east upon points of dogma. Ecclesiastical events exercised a considerable influence upon the general policy of the empire; Justinian found an opportunity for interfering in the affairs of the west, in the closing of the schism between the Churches of old and new Rome, which had continued for nearly forty years (484-519). Sometimes even separate parts of Italy itself might be

divided upon ecclesiastical questions. Thus about the middle of the sixth century (553) Northern Italy broke away from the Church of Rome, because its opposition to the emperor's opportunist policy on dogmatic questions had not been sufficiently marked. Years passed before the Church of Aquileia could unite with the subordinate bishoprics of Venetia, Noricum, Rhaetia Secunda, and Istria.

Side by side with dissension among Christians there grew the opposition to Jewish communities, which gave rise to uproar and tumult, not only in great cities, like Rome, Milan, Ravenna, and Naples, but also in many of the smaller towns, as in Venusia or those on the Etruscan coast. The Gothic government was reputed to have kept stricter order in this respect than the Byzantine rulers, and to have exercised a strict supervision over incapable local authorities. The Jews derived many advantages from the economic decay of Italy, but this made them objects of hatred; and we find Rutilius Namatianus deploring the fact that the destruction of Jerusalem should have brought Jews to every corner of the earth.

Church Grows in Riches

A point of more than mere economic importance in the development of the country was the number of gifts and bequests to the clergy, which gradually increased until the landed property of the Church became of great value. Thus the Roman Church had possessions in the province of the Alpes Cottiae; it had an extensive forest at the source of the Tiber, large districts in Tuscany, Sabina, Campania (the "campagna"), Southern Italy, and Sicily. Similarly, the churches of Milan, Aquileia, and Ravenna acquired great possessions, partly in the neighbourhood of their capital towns, but also at a distance. All these lands were carefully surveyed and registered; they were either worked by bond-slaves ("coloni") or let out to farmers.

In the sixth century began the foundation of monasteries, modelled on the cloisters of the east; and, as in the east, their heads sought to increase their interests by skilfully adapting themselves to the spirit of the times. As the "world" deteriorated, the finer spirits sought solitude where they might realise the ideal of living out their lives in the city of God. Time began to be reckoned from the birth of Christ—a chronology which was first

THE COMING OF THE GOTHS

employed by the monk Dionysius Exiguus, who drew up a table for the determining of the recurrence of Easter, at Rome, in 525. Benedict, a man of good family, from Nursia in the Sabine country, was the first superior of a monastery at Sublaqueum (Subiaco) at the sources of the Anio, where Nero formerly had a villa. He soon founded a similar institution on the rocky summit which overhung the town of Casinum, on which the old Oscan town of that name had once stood, and in later years a shrine to Apollo; this was the monastery of Monte Casino (529 A.D.). Casinum was subsequently renamed San Germano after its patron saint. Benedict's example was followed by Cassiodorus, who had previously been private secretary to Theo-

inheritance of "classical" antiquity was preserved, even after the senatorial families in Rome who had collected old manuscripts under Odoacer and Theoderic had succumbed in the storms of that period. The philosopher Boethius and his father-in-law Symmachus had been suspected of treason by Theoderic towards the end of his rule, and put to death by him. Twenty years later, when Badvila (Totila) reconquered Rome, their relatives were reduced to beggary. Cicero was honoured by Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine as a father of the Church, and, in consequence, his works were preserved in their entirety to future generations. Christian interpretations were put upon many poems, as, for instance, upon the works of Virgil.



HOW THE GOTHS AND VANDALS RUINED ROME: DESTRUCTION OF THE AQUEDUCTS

The immense aqueducts which carried water to Rome across the Campagna from distant hill sources were the weakness of the imperial city, and the attacking barbarians naturally cut off the water supply by destroying the aqueducts. It was thus that the Campagna became a marsh. The ruins of the aqueducts are still a magnificent sight.

deric and præfectus prætorio to his successor; his birthplace was Squillacium (the modern Squillace) in Bruttium. Cassiodorus wrote a history to extol the Gothic government, extracts from which have come down to us in the Gothic history of Jordanes; when the Gothic empire fell, Cassiodorus withdrew to the monastery of Vivarium, which he founded in his own home upon his own land.

Benedict had expressly enjoined the pursuit of literature upon the monks who followed his rule; Cassiodorus composed or had written handbooks, which served as a guide for the scientific efforts of the following centuries. By this means the

As few barbarian languages had been reduced to writing, the literary influence of the Latins continued, and their language remained the medium of international communication. In every civilised district of the empire the barbarians, after establishing their supremacy, adopted the language of the conquered race, as did the Langobards in Italy and the western Goths in Spain. Only in districts where Roman civilisation had not fully penetrated and where the ties between the invaders and their German Fatherland remained strong, was the Romance population absorbed by the Teutons.

JULIUS JUNG

GREAT DATES IN THE HISTORY OF ROME TO 500 A.D.

B. C.		B. C.	
751	Founding of the city of Rome by Romulus (traditional); the "Year One" of the Roman chronology	91	Social war
650	Rome at the head of the Latin League	89	All Italians enfranchised
510	Expulsion of the kings	88	Sulla puts the Marians to flight, but departs to take command in the Mithradatic War
508	Ascendancy of the Etruscans [tribunes]	87	Cinna's popular revolution; Marian proscription
494	First secession of the plebs; institution of	84	End of Mithradatic War [tion]
489	Series of wars with Volsci and Æqui begins	82	Sulla dictator
486	Agrarian law of Spurius Cassius [Syracuse]	81	Reactionary Sullan constitution
474	Power of Etruscans checked by Hiero of	79	Sertorius in Spain; party war continues
451	Decemvirs; the XII tables form the basis of written law at Rome	74	Second war with Mithradates
449	Second secession of the plebs	72	Pompey ends the war in Spain
445	Military tribunes commonly take the place of	71	Coalition of Pompey and Crassus; end of Sullan constitution [the east by Pompey]
443	Institution of censors [consuls till 377]	63	Catiline's conspiracy at Rome; settlement of
431	Overthrow of Volsci and Æqui	60	Triumvirate of Pompey, Crassus and Cæsar
396	Conquest of Veii by Camillus	58	Cæsar in Gaul (till 49)
393	Gauls capture Rome, but retire	55	Cæsar's expedition to Britain
385	Latin League closed to new members	49	Cæsar leads his army across the Rubicon
377	The Licinian Rogations proposed	48	Battle of Pharsalus; death of Pompey
367	The Licinian Rogations passed, the plebs now acquiring full political rights; the senatorial oligarchy of official families takes the place of the patrician aristocracy as ruling power	45	Cæsar's supremacy secured at Munda
366	First plebeian consul (L. Sextius)	44	Murder of Julius Cæsar
356	First plebeian dictator (C. Marcus Rutilus)	43	Triumvirate of Antony, Octavian and Lepidus
348	First treaty with Carthage	42	Overthrow of Brutus and Cassius at Philippi
343	Beginning of Samnite wars	41	Octavian overthrows Antony at Actium
339	Leges Publicæ	31	Octavian, with title Augustus, becomes emperor (princeps, imperator, etc.); organisation of the empire into senatorial and imperial provinces
338	Dissolution of Latin League	12	Death of Agrippa
327	Renewed Samnite war	8	Tiberius on the German frontier
323	[Death of Alexander the Great]	A. D.	
312	Appius Claudius censor	6	Tiberius in Pannonia
304	Peace with Samnites till 298	9	The German Arminius overthrows Varus
290	Peace and league with Samnites [macy of plebs]	14	Death of Augustus; accession of Tiberius
287	Lex Hortensia establishes legislative supremacy	37	Gaius Cæsar (Caligula) emperor
281	Declaration of war with Tarentum	41	Claudius emperor; conquest of Britain
280	Invasion of Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, as ally of Tarentum; Samnites and others join the alliance [Sicily]	54	Nero emperor
278	Alliance of Rome and Carthage; Pyrrhus in	68	Galba emperor [Vespasian emperor]
275	Defeat of Pyrrhus by M. Curius Dentatus	69	Accession and death of Otho and of Vitellius;
273	First Roman treaty with Egypt	79	Titus emperor
272	General submission of Italians	81	Domitian emperor (last of the "Twelve Cæsars")
266	Completion of conquest of S. Italy	96	Nerva (first of the "Five Good Emperors")
264	First Punic War (till 241)	98	Trajan emperor
263	Alliance of Rome with Hiero of Syracuse	117	Hadrian emperor; reorganisation
262	Agrigentum taken from Carthage	138	Antoninus Pius emperor
260	First Roman naval victory, at Mylæ	161	Marcus Aurelius emperor
255	Regulus routed and captured in Africa	180	Commodus emperor
250	Roman victory of Panormus	193	Pertinax emperor; first of the series of "Prætorian emperors," lasting 90 years; he is followed by Septimius Severus (to 211)
247	Hamilcar Barca in Sicily; birth of Hannibal	211	Caracalla emperor
241	End of First Punic War	222	Alexander Severus emperor (to 235)
229	Illyrian War	244	Philip the Arabian emperor to 249; claimed as a Christian
228	Romans admitted to the Isthmian games	249	State persecution of Christians under Decius
222	Overthrow of the Boii (Gauls)	263	Advance of Goths checked under Claudius
218	Second Punic War; Hannibal crosses the Alps	270	Goths and Alamanni checked by Aurelian
217	Roman defeat at Lake Trasimene	274	Fall of Palmyra (Queen Zenobia)
216	Roman defeat at Cannæ	277	Franks and Burgundians checked by Probus
214	First Macedonian War	284	Diocletian becomes emperor; reorganisation
211	P. Scipio (Africanus) in Spain	303	Last persecution of Christians begins
207	Defeat and death of Hasdrubal at the Metaurus	312	Constantine secures supremacy at battle of Miliesian Bridge; Christianity recognised
202	Carthage crushed by Scipio at Zama; end of	323	Constantine sole emperor
200	Second Macedonian War [Second Punic War]	325	Council of Nicea
197	Decisive Roman victory at Cynoscephalæ	360	"Pagan" reaction under Julian
190	Overthrow of Antiochus of Syria at Magnesia	364	Division of empire into Eastern and Western
171	Third Macedonian War	592	Empire reunited under Theodosius
168	Victory of L. Æmilius Paulus at Pydna	395	Final partition of empire
149	Third Punic War, to 146	403	Successes of Stilicho against "barbarians"
148	Macedonia becomes a Roman province	410	Alaric the Goth sacks Rome; Britain evacuated
146	Carthage destroyed; Roman province of Africa constituted	415	Goths occupy Spain
133	Tribunate of Tib. Gracchus, who is murdered	420	St. Augustine <i>floruit</i>
123	Tribunate of C. Gracchus	429	Vandal kingdom in Africa
121	Death of C. Gracchus; Gallia Narbonensis first Roman province in Transalpine Gaul	455	Sack of Rome by Geiserich the Vandal
112	Jugurthian War	476	End of West Roman emperors (Romulus, Augustulus); Odoacer the Herulian King
102	Marius totally defeats the Teutones at Aquæ Sextiæ and the Cimabri at the Raudine Plain	481	Clovis king of the Franks [of Italy]
		493	Theoderic the Ostrogoth becomes master of
		495	Cerdic founds the house of Wessex [Italy]



WHY ROME FELL

A POSTSCRIPT TO A WONDERFUL STORY

By Dr. C. W. Saleeby

TH**ERE** is a paragraph in Mr. A. J. Balfour's lecture on "Decadence" (Cambridge University Press, 1908) to which all modern thinkers will assent:

It is in vain that historians enumerate the public calamities which preceded, and no doubt contributed to, the final catastrophe. Civil dissensions, military disasters, pestilences, famines, tyrants, tax-gatherers, growing burdens, and waning wealth—the gloomy catalogue is unrolled before our eyes, yet somehow it does not in all cases wholly satisfy us; we feel that some of these diseases are of a kind which a vigorous body-politic should easily be able to survive, that others are secondary symptoms of some obscurer malady, and that in neither case do they supply us with the full explanations of which we are in search. Consider, for instance, the long agony and final destruction of Roman Imperialism in the West, the most momentous catastrophe of which we have historic record. It has deeply stirred the imagination of mankind, it has been the theme of great historians, it has been much explained by political philosophers, yet who feels that either historians or philosophers have laid bare the inner workings of the drama? Rome fell, and great was the fall of it. But why it fell, by what secret mines its defences were breached, and what made its garrison so faint-hearted and ineffectual—that is not so clear.

These words, we may fairly say, represent the attitude of the modern mind towards the common type of explanation; the catalogue of contributory causes is clearly incomplete. The biologist has a natural conviction that we must turn to

Is there a Modern Parallel? his science, departing from the fields explored by the ordinary historian to find the most fundamental causes of all. We

cannot but believe that Rome fell because the Roman breed degenerated, and it is the causes of that degeneration that really concern us. Having found them, may we also find that they are at work in another empire to-day?

Mr. Balfour's own conclusion is that decadence is due to decadence, by which

he means the equivalent of old age. And here we recognise at once, as the very latest explanation of the fall of Rome, offered us by a writer who has been compelled to abandon the accepted doctrines, none other than the most ancient, as also the most wildly fallacious, of all the doctrines which have ever been advanced in

Mortality of Nations the name of philosophy to explain the mortality of nations. This is the misinterpretation of the doctrine of Plato and Aristotle, that just as nations may be compared to individuals in other respects, so also their life, growth, and decay present similar phenomena to those of the individual. This is transformed into the doctrine that each race, like each individual, is doomed to inevitable extinction.

By the modern student of life this explanation is wholly rejected as constituting a denial of the first and most conspicuous of biological truths—the truth that individuals are necessarily mortal and races are not. As Tennyson puts it: "The individual withers, the race is more and more." Space does not avail for a discussion of the science of the matter here. It is sufficient to say that no doctrine can appear more ludicrously absurd than this doctrine to the biologist, who can point to countless animal and vegetable species compared with which the whole race of mankind is but a mushroom of yesterday, for it consists in a denial of the most salient and universal truth which the study of life offers us. The utmost that can be said of this popular doctrine of the fall of empires is that in directing us to the quality of the imperial people as the factor of which we are in search it points to a side of the question which the ordinary historian omits to investigate; but the

cause of this racial failure—a failure which we are undoubtedly entitled to postulate—must not be sought in a denial of the fundamental antithesis between all living individuals and all living races. The decay of a race is preventible; the decay of the individual is not. Can the biologist, then, assign causes for the degeneration of the Roman people which, so far from denying the obvious truths of biology, are in accord with it?

**Malaria
the Neglected
Factor**

The most recently alleged of these causes is probably very far from being the whole of the truth, but the doctrine is a novel one. It comes before us on extremely high authority, and since it can be briefly dealt with, a few words may first be devoted to it.

In the year 1907 a small book was issued from the University of Cambridge under the title "Malaria—a Neglected Factor in the History of Greece and Rome." The main body of the book is written by a distinguished historical student, Mr. W. H. S. Jones. There is an introduction by the greatest living authority on malaria, Professor Major Ronald Ross, F.R.S., and a concluding chapter by Dr. Ellett. Malaria, we may here note, even at the present day causes more illness—though tuberculosis causes more deaths—than any other disease to which mankind is subject. And we are warranted in saying that "it seizes all, fit and unfit alike, gradually lessening the general vitality until, in some cases, it has exterminated the people among whom it has become endemic."

It may be added that malaria is of an utterly different character from epidemic diseases, such as plague and cholera, which sweep through a population for a time, and then leave it. It is to be ranked among those diseases which, when once introduced into a population, oppress it for ever, and it has the particular character that it attacks the children, killing many of them, and rendering a large percentage of the remainder sickly

**How Disease
May Destroy
a Civilisation**

for years. As Professor Ross says—and his words are momentous for Great Britain at this moment—"A people of whom a large proportion have passed through a sickly childhood cannot but be at a disadvantage compared with more healthy nations; and it is quite possible that the sudden introduction of an endemic disease

among a people hitherto dominant in the world may end in its rapid downfall as regards science, arts, commerce and war."

The argument which issues, then, from the modern scientific study of the historical evidence is that a factor in the fall both of Greece and of Rome may have been the introduction of this terrible disease, malaria, which proceeded to cause the degeneration of the race in a fashion which is absolutely paralleled under our own observation to-day by the action of newly imported diseases upon various aboriginal races in many parts of the world. It is not necessary for us to go here into the historical evidence. It suffices to have directed the reader to an instance of the modern tendency in explaining the facts of history, and we may leave this matter by a brief quotation from Professor Ross—who speaks, be it remembered, as one of the greatest discoverers and original thinkers now alive. He says:

The student of biology is often struck with the feeling that historians, when dealing with the rise and fall of nations, do not generally view the phenomena from a sufficiently high biological standpoint. To me, at least, they seem to attach too much importance to individual rulers and soldiers, and to particular wars, policies, religions, and customs; while at the same time they make little attempt to extract the fundamental causes of national success or failure.

**History from
the Standpoint
of Biology**

Let us turn now to a wholly different aspect of our question—an aspect emphasised by the study of motherhood as it is to be observed in Great Britain to-day. The dethronement of motherhood on all hands sometimes by fashion, sometimes by economics—as in married women's labour—and its absolute degradation in many instances in all classes of society by means of the racial poison we call alcohol—these are factors which seem to be so palpably making history that it is natural to dwell upon the evidence as to the similar state of motherhood during the decline of Rome.

In all higher animal species, and pre-eminently in the case of man, motherhood is the dominant fact of the racial life, as the mere name mammalia should be sufficient to indicate. Absolutely necessary and cardinal though it be, so that without motherhood or foster-motherhood no human being could ever have survived its birth for twenty-four hours, this is

not one of the factors of history which excite the interest of the orthodox historian; it is enough for him to see in the degradation of the sense of motherhood one of the standing symptoms of a decadent society. Carlyle, "the greatest historian since Tacitus," as Ruskin called him, has a passage in "The French Revolution" which, without mentioning motherhood, yet hints at the kind of error into which all historians are so prone to fall. He points out that the oak grows silently in the forest for a thousand years, and no one utters a word. Only when the woodman fells it and "with far sounding crash it falls" are we interested. And he continues in a fine passage:

It is thus everywhere that foolish Rumour babbles not of what was done, but of what was misdome or undone; and foolish History (ever, more or less, the written epitomised synopsis of Rumour) knows so little that were not as well unknown. Attila Invasions, Walter-the-Penniless Crusades, Sicilian Vespers, Thirty-Years Wars: mere sin and misery; not work, but hindrance of work! For the Earth, all this while, was yearly green and yellow with her kind harvests; the hand of the craftsman, the mind of the thinker rested not: and so,

An old Fault of History after all, and in spite of all, we have this so glorious high-domed blossoming World; concerning which, poor History may well ask, with wonder, Whence *it* came? She knows so little of it, knows so much of what obstructed it, what would have rendered it impossible. Such, nevertheless, by necessity or foolish choice, is her rule and practice; whereby that paradox, "Happy the people whose annals are vacant," is not without its true side.

Murder, not motherhood, is indeed the theme in which the historian too commonly delights—the taking of life, not the making of it. But the factors which make life make history, as well as the factors which destroy it; and it is indeed very greatly to the discredit of historians that they usually pass by, as mere commonplaces which demand no emphasising, the home truths which will continue pre-eminently to determine human history so long as three times in every century the only wealth of nations is reduced to dust, and begins again in helpless infancy.

Sometimes, however, the historians preserve for us a story on account of an epigram or what not, and one such story is familiar to all of us.

Cornelia, "the mother of the Gracchi," was undoubtedly one of the greatest women in Roman history. She was left a

widow, the mother of twelve children, and devoted herself to them; and the story goes that when a Campanian lady asked to see her jewels, she presented her children to the inquirer, with the words, "These are my jewels." Cornelia represented the spirit of Roman motherhood in Rome's great days. A very

Importance of True Motherhood

different spirit marks the decline. Let us illustrate the change that took place by a quotation from the work of a pleasant scribbler named Aulus Gellius, who wrote a volume called the "Attic Nights," about 150 A.D.—a date which makes his evidence of the utmost value. Our rendering is borrowed from Mr. Quintin Waddington.

Aulus Gellius tells us that one day, when he was with the philosopher Favorinus, word was brought to him that the wife of one of his disciples had just given birth to a son, so they went to inquire after the mother and to congratulate the father:

"Of course," said he, "she will suckle the child herself." And when the girl's mother said that her daughter must be spared, and nurses obtained in order that the heavy strain of nursing the child should not be added to what she had already gone through, "I beg of you, dear lady," said he, "to allow her to be a whole mother to her child. Is it not against Nature, and being only half a mother, to give birth to a child, and then at once send him away? To have nourished with her own blood and in her own body a something that she had never seen, and then to refuse it her own milk, now that she sees it living, a human being, demanding a mother's care? Or are you one of those who think that Nature gave a woman breasts, not that she might feed her children, but as pretty little hillocks to give her bust a pleasing contour? Many, indeed, of our present-day ladies—whom you are far from resembling—do try to dry up and repress the sacred fount of the body, the nourisher of the human race, even at the risk they run from turning back and corrupting their milk, lest it should take off from the charm of their beauty. . . . Is it a reasonable thing to corrupt the fine qualities of the new-born man, well-endowed as to both body and mind as far as parentage is concerned, with the unsuitable nourishment of degenerate and foreign milk? Especially is this the case if she whom you get to supply the milk is a slave or of servile estate, and—as is very often the case—of a foreign and barbarous race, if she is dishonest, ugly, unchaste, or *addicted to drink*. . . . And besides these considerations, who can afford to ignore or belittle the fact that those who desert their offspring and send them away from themselves, and make them over to others to nurse, cut, or at least loosen and weaken, that chain and connection of mind and affection by which Nature attaches

Roman Appeal for Motherhood

And besides these considerations, who can afford to ignore or belittle the fact that those who desert their offspring and send them away from themselves, and make them over to others to nurse, cut, or at least loosen and weaken, that chain and connection of mind and affection by which Nature attaches

children to their parents. For when the child, sent elsewhere, is away from sight the vigour of maternal solicitude little by little dies away, and the call of motherly instinct grows silent, and forgetfulness of a child sent away to nurse is not much less complete than that of one lost by death.

"A child's thoughts, and the love he is ever ready to give, are occupied, moreover, with her alone from whom he derives his food, and soon he has neither feeling nor affection for the mother who bore him. The foundations of the filial feelings with which we are born being thus sapped and undermined, whatever affection children thus brought up may seem to have for father and mother for the most part is not natural love, but the result of social convention."

Roman Mothers and English

Perhaps the most astonishing thing about this quotation is its modernity. Here are the very things which speakers at our Infant Mortality Conferences are saying about the mothers of England to-day. It is sufficiently evident from the remarks made by Favorinus that at this most critical period in Roman history the very same tendencies were at work which we deplore in England to-day. And these tendencies are not merely symptoms of moral degeneration; they are actual causes of decadence both moral and physical.

Further, we must turn to yet another inquiry. The most recent thinkers are coming more and more to lend their support to the memorable words of Darwin in "The Descent of Man," published in 1871. He there said that, if there are no means by which to "prevent the reckless, the vicious, and otherwise inferior members of society from increasing at a quicker rate than the better class of men, the nation will retrograde, as has too often occurred in the history of a world." More recently, Dr. Francis Galton, referring to "the rates with which the various classes of society—classified according to civic usefulness—have contributed to the population at various times, in ancient and modern nations," said, "There is strong reason for believing that national rise and decline is closely connected with this influence."

A Problem for Modern England

And only four years ago, Professor Karl Pearson said, "The inexplicable decline and fall of nations, following from no apparent external cause, receives instant light from the relative fertility of the fitter and unfitter elements combined with what we now know of the laws of inheritance."

This problem is facing us in England to-day; that it is a matter of primary importance for thinkers to find some solution of it becomes the more evident when we recognise its importance in the degeneration of the Roman people.

Keeping in mind these various expressions of one great idea, let us reconsider one of those phenomena of history which no historian can be accused of neglecting; that phenomenon is war. This has ever been the historian's delight. But while war is one of the most important factors in history, a dominant reason of its importance has hitherto escaped all historians. Their interest is in generals and armies and battles; in treaties of peace and terms of conquest; in short, in its political results. The new history will inquire into all the racial consequences of war. If the historian learns that the flower of a nation's youth has been destroyed in a victorious campaign, he may think the fact worth reckoning with, as well as the circumstance that the indemnity demanded amounted to so many pounds. Perhaps it is always of some

Military Rome Exhausted the Best Stock

interest to the philosopher to observe the individual—the nation—who exchanges life for gold, and his certain fate. Consider now the case of Imperial Rome. The immediate instrument of empire was, of course, military force. There was always some "little war" proceeding on the confines of the empire. There was a persistent selection from decade to decade and century to century of the most competent and physically capable men for military purposes.

A distinguished American thinker, Professor Jordan, has lately suggested that we have here a biological key to the problem of the fall of Rome. The best were chosen for soldiers, one may say, and those that were not good enough to be soldiers were left to be fathers. The best stocks were gradually exhausted; of which, perhaps, the strongest proof is the fact that the "Roman" legions ceased to be recruited from the Roman people. When the process of the survival and perpetuation of the worst had continued long enough, the race had degenerated into that Roman mob which demanded "bread and games," upon whose heads their empire came crashing down, as all empires will, upon their living foundations when those foundations decay.

WHY ROME FELL

Let us illustrate this by the now accepted truth that the small stature of the modern French, if not other vital facts in the recent history of France, may be laid at the door of Napoleon. Tall men, and strong men,

Why Frenchmen are Small

and healthy men make good soldiers, but if you persistently take all such men for soldiers, and relegate fatherhood to those who are not good enough for your ranks, the future must pay the price; and the price is very heavy. Professor Arthur Thomson, our great student of heredity, has remarked that "even Pasteur could not add the cubit of stature which Napoleon lopped off Frenchmen."

Thus, in the light of the supremely important truths which we associate mainly with the name of Darwin modern thinkers are coming more and more to believe that the great historical tragedies, like the fall of Rome, are due to the operation of what may be called reversed selection; under which those individuals to whom Nature would allot the privilege of parenthood are treated as food for powder, or are swamped by the multiplication of individuals of both sexes from whom in a natural state the supreme privilege of parenthood would have been withheld. In the early days of a nation such a process cannot possibly be permitted; moreover, it is held in check by the mere fact that the weakly children do not grow up to become fathers and mothers. It is when success is attained that the quality of the race comes to be forgotten as the dominant factor of its permanence. Thus, among many savage peoples to-day, who have no powers except those inherent in the individuals composing them, the principle that the culture of the racial life is the vital industry of any people is recognised and acted upon.

Marriage must be the privilege of those who have proved themselves worthy members of the tribe.

In short, in our modern study of history we are coming down to basal biological fact, and especially to that universal and immeasurably potent fact termed heredity, in virtue of which the principle of the selection of the best for parenthood, the principle of the new science of Eugenics or race-culture, is conceived as a political ideal compared with which all others are trivial. We come back, indeed, to the golden words of Ruskin, who tells us that the essence of all government is "the production and recognition of human worth, the detection and extinction of human unworthiness." Those of us who believe in these principles, and who incline to the view of Ruskin that "the beginning of all sanitary and moral law

The Golden Words of Ruskin

is in the regulation of marriage," are fully entitled to look backwards into history to ask whether the biological truths upon which these ideas are based, truths applicable to all forms of life whatsoever, are not also illustrated in the events of human history. It may thus be that we shall learn deeper lessons from the past than any which have hitherto been drawn. We may be absolutely assured that such lessons must be drawn, from a fact so amazing as the




CORNELIA'S JEWELS

There is a beautiful story of Cornelia, "the mother of the Gracchi" and one of the great women of Rome. Left a widow with twelve children, she was once asked to show a lady her jewels and she presented her children.

the greatest empire in history. The more we study the causes commonly cited for this event, the more assured do we become that the kind of thing with which the historian commonly concerns himself is apt to "hide the obscurer but more potent forces which silently prepare the fate of empires." The pity is that the records of the past contain so little decisive evidence as to the fundamental facts.

C. W. SALEBY



BONDAGE
From the painting by Ernest Normand by permission of the artist.



THE SOCIAL FABRIC OF THE ANCIENT WORLD AND THE DOOM OF THE GREAT NATIONS

By W. Romaine Paterson, M.A.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SLAVERY

IT is no longer possible to consider the history of mankind as a thing apart from the history of the great forces, conscious and unconscious, personal and impersonal, organic and inorganic, which have brought the visible world to the stage at which we find it. For human society falls within the realm of Nature, and its institutions are likewise an expression of natural law. The condition of all living things to-day is the result of a struggle carried on during many ages by an interminable line of progenitors. Whenever we watch closely enough the behaviour of a set of living forces we discover that the principle of their activity is a principle of opposition as well as of combination. Although co-operation may take place within different groups, it is a co-operation directed against other groups which are hostile. And the struggle between human wills is only another form, more intense and more articulate, of the struggle which goes on among all organic and inorganic things—among stars for their places in the sky; among plants for their places in the earth; and among animals for their places in the species into which they are born.

In their effort to maintain their equilibrium the stars, for example, spend an amount of energy which is measured in terms of the law of gravitation; in the effort to obtain nourishment from the soil every tree is an enemy to every other tree; and in the animal world every beast is really a beast of prey. Likewise every civilisation, however refined, hides beneath its polished surface a mass of

implacable forces. Its fabric was never raised without the sacrifice of millions of human beings, and that fabric is not maintained without immeasurable labour. During many centuries history was a bloody panorama. The precincts of battle, to use a phrase of Hobbes, are as extensive as the ranges of created things, and in this formidable war man has taken an ample share. The chaos of his history, the consolidation and the catastrophe of his empires, the struggle between nations and within them, the cry of the slave against the free in ancient, and of the poor against the rich in modern, times mark nothing exceptional in the apparently merciless economy of Nature. For Nature expresses and transforms her energy with equal indifference in the birth of a star or in its extinction, in a tidal wave or in an earthquake, in a social revolution and the ruin of states, or in the disappearance of a race of men.

If, therefore, we desire to obtain any genuine insight into the fortunes of mankind we must link them to the history of all other struggling organisms. There is nothing fundamentally different in the conditions of human existence, except that they are far more elaborate and poignant. The gift of full self-consciousness has in its case been accompanied by a more acute sense of pain and fear which mankind have betrayed in their religions, their laws, their literature and their arts.

If, then, we accept the view that human society is only another exhibition of a

**The
Eternal
Conflict**

**The Merciless
Economy
of Nature**

natural process, we shall not rest content, like Rousseau, to arraign the human will as the sole cause of the disorder of history. There have been in operation numerous and intricate causes over which the human will had no control. According to Rousseau, the unequal distribution of well-being is the result of man's interference with the course of Nature. Closer

**Justice
Awakens
Late**

study of Nature's methods, however, convinces us that human society in its slow evolution has only obeyed instinctively those laws of struggle and survival which regulate the destiny of all living things. The truth is—and it is a truth which ought to be dear to idealists—that it is only in human society that any conscious effort has been made to mitigate the conflict. No doubt that effort came late. Justice has long overslept herself. The human will has been a powerful factor in retardation. But, after all, history is partly the record of the intellectual and the moral education of humanity, and the record is progressive.

To the members of every one of her species Nature presents harsh conditions as the means of success. For they are all compelled to fight not only the members of rival species but of their own. And in this war of each against all perhaps the most startling fact is that the struggle is severest between members of the *same* species. It is this latter struggle which has been called the struggle for existence. One variety of bee destroys another variety, one type of rat drives out another type, one kind of ape is the enemy of another kind, and so on up the scale until we find the same fact expressed among human beings by racial and national hate.

In the struggle for territory and for subsistence not only does one race of men enter the field against another, but members of the same race are found to have been perpetually at war. Every

**In the
Arena of
Nature**

species, in fact, is involved in a great family quarrel, and it is to this formidable education within its own ranks that its ultimate predominance is due. In that gladiatorial show, which is Nature, only the "fittest," who are generally the strongest combatants, preserve their place in the arena. A species disappears by reason of deterioration from within, or by reason of destruction by a more powerful foe. If one beast moves more

slowly than another, it will be caught and destroyed by its fleet-footed rival. Clumsier instincts, less accurate methods of attack and defence, defective eyesight or sense of smell, teeth, horns and claws that are weaker and blunter, absence of rapid decision or of prolonged endurance, are all serious handicaps in the conflict for the means of subsistence. Those animals which suffer from all such defects will thus fail whenever they are attacked by enemies better equipped.

Now if we keep in view the fact that this law of antagonism has operated likewise within the human species throughout all its branches, savage or civilised, we shall perhaps be less surprised by the confusion of human history. War is really the fundamental fact, for the primary wants of men are not different from those of all other living creatures—space to live in and food to eat. Wolves, indeed, hunt in packs, but when the prey has been hunted down a struggle for a share of it begins between all the members of the pack. And although men early organised themselves into tribes and nations for

**Wars are
the Duels
of Nations**

the purpose of attacking other tribes and nations, there immediately took place between the individuals of every community a struggle for a share of whatever their corporate activity had achieved. The motive, therefore, of this struggle which goes on between individuals is not really different from the motive which brings organised masses of men into conflict. For war is only a duel multiplied indefinitely.

The earliest forms of social consolidation were the work not of the most humane but of the most inhuman tribes. In their ruthless aggressions on the territory of their neighbours they were, however, obeying unconsciously the law of successful evolution, according to which all living things must, in order to prolong their life, absorb other living things. Societies are composite parasites. In their primitive stage they moved over the earth's surface like locusts, devouring what they could find. By the conflicts which raged between one community and another the military basis of human society was gradually prepared, and each tribe became an armed camp.

The factors of social progress have been both positive and negative—the survival and predominance of the fittest

and strongest, and the disappearance of the weakest types. So far as the fortunes of the human individual are concerned, the issue of his struggles depended upon the superiority or the inferiority of his natural equipment. There was no question of rights. Even Rousseau, in the essay in which he attempts to discover the origin of the inequality among men, admits that the primal causes of that inequality are to be discovered not in human institutions but in Nature. "I observe," he says, "that there are two kinds of inequality among human beings; one which I call natural or physical, because it is established by Nature, and consists in difference of age, of health, and of the powers of body and mind. The other is a conventional or political inequality which is the result of human arrangements. This latter inequality consists in the various privileges which some men enjoy at the expense of others—such as, for instance greater wealth, honour, power, and authority."

Rousseau, however, in his survey of human society argues as if the first and deeper causes, of which he is perfectly aware, were not responsible for those differences of human well-being which every community displays. But it is impossible to believe that they were not at work very early, and that it is not owing to their operation that the entire subsequent structure of social institutions, ancient and modern, is due. In fact, apart from them there would have been no human race at all. We cannot admit that, if in every other known species a superior type has been produced at the expense of an inferior, this principle ceased to have any importance precisely in the species which is highest of all. On the contrary, we observe that in spite of man's interference it is still active within his own ranks. Owing to superior physical, moral, and intellectual endowment some individuals rise where others fall, and one nation gains a hegemony over another.

According to Rousseau, man in the primitive state is a mild and harmless being (*rien n'est si doux que l'homme dans son état primitif*). Savage practices belong, he thinks, not to the earlier but to the later stage of tribal development. Now, it is not to be denied that certain tribes, which owe nothing to civili-

sation, as we understand it, exhibit virtues which we often look for in vain among men who enjoy a higher stage of culture.

Travellers tell us that certain hill tribes in India are remarkable for their veracity, and that, indeed, they begin to lose that quality only after contact with the white race. The Todas and the Khonds have

a reputation for commercial honesty. Among the Lepchas, too, robbery is rare, and they are described as a kind and cheerful people, possessed of a religious sense of duty. As Herbert Spencer pointed out, communities which share a relatively high material well-being are often less civilised in their methods of life and conduct than peoples at a far lower level of civilisation.

There is certainly no reason to deny that moral ideas, conceptions of right and wrong, of truth and falsehood, and of justice, may grow among men whose social system is only rudimentary. For all such ideas are the result of corporate life, and they must make a beginning somewhere. But, on the other hand, there are innumerable data which prove that existing social organisms, whether savage or civilised, are the issue of a struggle in which the predatory instincts played an overwhelming part. Societies, like the individuals of which they are composed, originally lived and thrived by the destruction of their enemies. A conquering tribe either exterminated its rival or enslaved it.

If we examine the reports of ethnological research we shall find it difficult, or rather impossible, to accept Rousseau's picture of a state of Nature which was a scene of unbroken social harmony. The elements of discord were present and active from the beginning. Social hierarchies of primeval origin appear, although in a humble and grotesque scale, among those uncivilised tribes which still exist. A traveller from Central South Africa wrote

in 1881 that the Barotse employ as herdsmen young slaves and the poor. Among the Kaffirs poor men subject themselves

to the rich, and, according to Fritsch, the rich tyrannise over the poor who voluntarily submit to this state of dependence. Among the Ovaherero, he who has no cattle is despised, and becomes a slave. The sheikh of a Shilluk tribe keeps as slaves those who possess no flocks. The Kalmucks compel the poor to serve

**Weakest
go to
the Wall**

**Riches
Breed
Inhumanity**

the rich as herdsmen. In North Somaliland, among the Wer-Singellis, we find an aristocracy, a commercial caste, and a labouring class. The Massai, a warrior tribe of East Africa, keep in subjection as agricultural helots the tribe of the Warombutta. Likewise the Beni Amer, another East African people, employ slaves as ministers of luxury.

Wild Tribes Corrupted by the Whites Thus, communities whose social organisation has been evolved and elaborated apart from the influence of civilisation reproduce that division of labour and that scheme of privileges for which Rousseau held civilisation to be responsible. It is true that in some cases wild tribes began to introduce slavery only after they had come into relation with civilised peoples. Thus in North America the Indians purchased negroes from the whites.

On the other hand, in Tahiti, New Zealand, and Brazil slavery had existed before the arrival of the foreigners. If, as in the case of the Eskimos or the aborigines of Australia, slavery is absent, the reasons are not moral but economic. In his valuable work on "Slavery as an Industrial System" Nieboer has shown that certain tribes, owing to their mode of life, are unable to keep slaves. For instance, hunting and fishing tribes seldom employ them. The reason is that where food is difficult to procure unskilled labour is useless, and does not pay its expenses. Moreover, escape would be easy, since a slave employed as a hunter is quite capable of maintaining himself by his own prowess.

The economic condition of slave-keeping tribes differs fundamentally from that of tribes like the Fuegians, the Andaman islanders, and the African pygmies, who do not keep slaves. Scarcity of food compels some savages to live in small groups, and thus there is no motive to burden the tribe with superfluous members. Each man finds his own food, or his wives find it for him. Where, on the contrary, food is abundant, and especially where agriculture, in however rude a form, is practised, we generally find that slavery becomes an integral part of the social system of primitive peoples. We are actually met by the paradox that in certain communities slavery is sometimes a sign of social and moral progress. Thus it was because women were held in rather high

Slavery as a Sign of Progress

esteem among the tribes of the Pacific coast that slaves were employed to relieve them of the most irksome labour and drudgery. And the reason for the absence of slaves among Australian natives is that the women are the toilers. In this case, the introduction of slavery would have implied a higher status for the female population.

Such facts taken at random seem sufficient to prove that social institutions are the result of causes which Rousseau ignored. Nevertheless, he was correct in his view that it is only as social organisation becomes more stable and rigid that the cleavage between its classes becomes more and more marked. If, for example, we contrast primitive pastoral with primitive agricultural communities, we shall find that among the former there exists a more numerous body of freemen, for pastoral tribes are more mobile, and if an entire society is nomadic, it is necessary that all its members must be free, otherwise the movements of the tribe would be hampered. A herdsman must be at least as free as the cattle he tends. Besides, in such cases there is no great demand for labour. The owner and his family herd their flock, and slaves would be a useless expense.

Labour and the Soil But the case is different when we turn to those tribes which enjoy a more settled existence and possess an extensive and perhaps ever-widening agricultural area. A labourer at work on the soil can be attached to it, and he is easily controlled. His labour is productive. If, owing to a successful war, the tribe's territory has been increased, there will be no danger in increasing the number of slaves. More labourers are urgently required, and they will be found among the captives. We find, therefore, that just as man tamed certain beasts to work for him, he began to tame his fellow-men for the same purpose.

It has been calculated that among 219 agricultural tribes scattered over Polynesia, America, and Africa, as many as 133 kept slaves. In cases where a wealthy tribe reaps a harvest in excess of its own needs commercial exchange with neighbouring peoples begins to develop. Nieboer gives instances in which slaves are employed for tillage and for transport. The increase of the servile class is an indication of growing revenue. A traveller among the Ewe people of West Africa

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SLAVERY

found sometimes three and even four hundred slaves owned by a single master, who employed them in carrying oil from the interior to the seaboard. Another traveller, Köler, states that on the coast of Guinea slaves were employed as oarsmen in the canoes in which palm oil was transported. In other cases the wealth and influence of a savage chief are indicated by the number of his servile attendants.

In 1867, among the natives of Brazil, Martius noticed that social distinction was measured in this manner, and that the chief who possessed most slaves was able to cultivate the largest amount of land. In Equatorial Africa, in 1875, a French explorer, Compiègne, was asked by a native for an advance of wages wherewith to purchase a slave, "because," said the man, "he will work for me, and I shall become a person of rank." On the Gold Coast in 1864 Finsch found slaves employed as domestic servants. They carried parasols and fans for their masters, who, when appearing in public, were attended by a numerous retinue like the grandees of ancient Rome. Thus we see that class distinctions are not merely the

Man the Prey of Man

creation of civilised society. In the surviving practices of savage tribes we rediscover in a vivid form that struggle which Nature has imposed upon every species. But the predatory period never passes away. Although disguised and mitigated among civilised beings, yet, if we look deeply enough, we shall find traces of it in modern war, and even in commerce and finance. Long before the dawn of civilisation, however, man had made man his prey.

How many hundreds of thousands of years passed before the semi-erect progenitors of man became gradually erect, and out of what strange chaos were evolved the creatures whose posterity would become the human race, are matters which can arouse only our wonder and conjecture. Stone implements shaped by hands already human were in use at least 150,000 years ago. But an immeasurable length of time had elapsed between the date of the men who made such implements and the date of those half-human beings who had been slowly struggling upwards out of still lower species during the midnight of ages. Type after type, and generation after generation of warring creatures had disappeared before the comparatively high level of savage existence

was attained. "It is not impossible," says Sir E. Ray Lankester, "that it was in the remote period known as the Lower Miocene—remote even as compared with the gravels in which neoliths occur—that natural selection began to favour that increase in the size of the brain of a large and not very powerful semi-erect ape which eventuated, after some hundreds of thousands of years, in the breeding out of a being with a relatively enormous brain-case, a skilful hand, and an inveterate tendency to throw stones, flourish sticks, protect himself in caves, and, in general, to defeat aggression and satisfy his natural appetites by the use of his wits rather than by strength alone—in which, however, he was not deficient. Probably this creature had nearly the full size of brain and every other physical character of modern man, although he had not as yet stumbled upon the art of making fire by friction, nor converted his conventional grunts and groans, his screams, laughter, and interjections into a language corresponding to (and thenceforth expressing) his thought."

Now this intellectual superiority of primitive man received its most significant expression in his perception of the need of co-operation between beings similarly endowed. Ever afterwards man was to fight his way not by brute force alone, but by the cunning of his brain, and, within restricted limits, by union with his fellows. Co-operation, indeed, for various ends takes place among the members of other species, such as bees, ants, wasps, wolves, and apes. The original secret of the success of the human species above all others, however, undoubtedly lies in the greater depth and extent of its powers of organisation. Those powers are not even yet realised, and the future of mankind depends upon their full development. To operate not in isolation but in masses was the great discovery of the human species. Even in the most rudimentary stage of society that factor of progress was already present. Whereas it is the tendency of most animals to lead isolated lives, it is the tendency of man not only to herd together, as animals do, but to combine for the conscious achievement of a common purpose. This movement towards cohesion, therefore, is the first great fact in social history. Among birds

and beasts family life is of brief duration. The offspring rapidly reach maturity, and then go their own ways in order to form fresh sexual unions, which result in the same broken cycles.

But among human beings the cycle tends to remain unbroken. The different branches of a given family remain in contact and become the nuclei of clans and tribes. The blood tie remains strong and binding. Help is afforded by parent birds, by the she-lion, and by the she-wolf to their respective progeny only as long as the latter remain helpless. Later, the relations of consanguinity are forgotten, and the parents become the enemies of their own offspring. But among human beings aid is prolonged and mutually rendered far beyond maturity towards old age. And this fact, in spite of some exceptions, marks, and marks impressively, man's first interference with Nature's more ruthless methods in the struggle for existence. As a result of man's action the human family reaches a stability unknown among the families of the lower animals.

The next important advance consists in that amalgamation of human families which marriage makes possible. Hence the clan. Instead of scattered individuals, groups begin to present a common front to a common enemy. A thick veil hides from us those dim, early advances towards incorporation and cohesion between human groups which occupied the same area; but to all such instincts the foundation of subsequent social and political institutions is due. The same climate and the same hardships, intermarriage, and the need of union in the face of the foe, gradually modified the egoistic impulse of each ferocious individual in such a way that isolation was seen to mean danger, and combination was seen to mean safety. But, as we have already noticed, great differences in individual

power and character become apparent as soon as human beings gather together. A levelling process begins, and for various reasons, and in various forms, some members of the community become servants of the other members. Among savage tribes the distinction between the sexes in itself early suggested a division of labour. Certain kinds of work fell naturally to women or to the weaker males. On the other hand, men who

**Man's Respect
for Ties
of Blood**

**How
Slavery
Began**

**Beginnings
of the
Caste System**

were incapable of sharing danger would be despised. They would be a source of weakness to the tribe. Women's work would be allotted to them, and they would gradually fall into a state of subjection which would tend to become hereditary. In such a way the foundations of a system of caste were laid. At first this compulsion of the weaker by the stronger was probably limited to domestic service. As the number of captives increased, however, slavery became a social institution, and discipline within the conquering tribe became more severe.

War has invariably been a great factor of cohesion. It has been pointed out that when we pass from those tribes which are without chieftains to those which are not only better organised but organised especially upon a military basis, we immediately find classes of masters and slaves. Slavery, in fact, was an attempt to create social stability. Instead of wandering hordes and loose aggregations of men dependent upon the precarious produce of the chase, there were gradually built up communities fixed upon the soil. It has been supposed that the genesis of slavery

is to be found in cannibalism. At first, in savage warfare, captives were killed and eaten. "But," says Herbert Spencer, "the keeping of captives too numerous to be immediately eaten, with the view of eating them subsequently, leading, as it would to the employment of them in the meantime, caused the discovery that their services might be of more value than their flesh, and so initiated the habit of preserving them as slaves."

Such conclusions are strengthened by the fact that those uncivilised tribes which are also unwarlike are generally without slaves. But whenever the community is militant, slavery sooner or later appears. There is thus a sense in which, after all, Rousseau's theory is not wholly false. The aggregation of human beings involved a change in the status of some of those who originally enjoyed full rights. In the tyranny already visible in the earliest societies we stumble once again upon the traces of that destroying instinct by means of which some of the members of a species are sacrificed for the sake of others. In substituting slavery for death, man discovered a new, extraordinary, and dangerous weapon, wherewith he armed himself against his fellow-men.



SLAVERY IN THE ANCIENT EMPIRES

THE WONDERFUL ACHIEVEMENTS OF FORCED LABOUR

WE have made brief reference to certain aspects of savage life because, even in its rudest form, the tribe was the nucleus of the great states of antiquity. They all arose out of the forced or voluntary amalgamation of tribes. Behind the great civilisations of the east and the west there lay ages of experience, during which mankind submitted to the rough discipline of a rudimentary social and political education. In even the most lowly and most imperfectly organised society we discover the beginnings of that hierarchy of powers and privileges which all the great states exhibit. Every community in which corporate life had really begun to manifest itself possessed (1) a military class, into whose hands the functions of government gravitated; (2) a class of primitive traders, who were the forerunners of the great distributing agents of modern times; and (3) an industrial class, upon whose shoulders the greatest weight of the social structure rested. It is to this subject class—the slaves—that we shall pay most attention, because they formed the underpin of the social fabric of antiquity. Governments came and went; dynasty ousted dynasty; kingships became democracies, and democracies lapsed back into kingships. In a word, the political permutations and combinations of antiquity were innumerable; but no matter what form the state assumed, its basis was the same, and that basis was slavery. Wars were undertaken for the express purpose of increasing this great stagnant population of both sexes, to whose lot it fell to work out the problems of ancient industry.

**The Basis
of Ancient
Society**

A system of labour, the origin of which is to be found among savage tribes, was consolidated, elaborated, and prolonged throughout the history of all the great empires and republics of the ancient world, and it became the source of their wealth. By studying those societies, therefore, from beneath rather than from above we shall be able to seize their

common features, and to catch something of their spirit. Whereas their governments were changing and diverse, the fundamental principle of their social and economic systems was changeless. Every state fought for liberty against every other state, but within each state there existed a class to whom liberty was denied. It mattered nothing by what name the state was known. The slavery which formed the main basis of the wealth of Babylonian, Egyptian, and Persian kings formed likewise the main source of the wealth of the Athenian and the Roman republics. The struggle for political rights was carried on without any reference to the slaves. The freemen of Babylon, of Egypt, and of Persia, like the freemen of Greece and of Rome, were, in their respective countries at least united in their denial of liberty to the servile class. In Roman law we find a vivid expression of the principle which governed the policy of slave holders in antiquity. "Summa itaque divisio de jure personarum haec est, quod omnes homines aut liberi sunt aut servi."

This dogmatic pronouncement (from the Institutes of Justinian) that human beings are either free or slaves had long been accepted both in Asia and in Europe as the fundamental fact in the government of men. And although the Roman lawyers admitted that it was "contrary to Nature" to enslave a fellow creature, they stated in unmistakable terms the right of the strongest. "In potestate itaque dominorum sunt servi. Quae quidem potestas juris gentium est; nam apud omnes peraeque gentes animadvertere possumus dominis in servos vitae

**The Power
of Life
and Death**

necisque potestatem esse, et quodcumque per servum adquiritur id domino adquiritur" ("Slaves are thus in the power of their masters. And this is in accordance with the law of nations, for wherever we turn we see that masters have the power of life and death over their

slaves, and whatever the slave earns he earns for his master"). This statement gathers up the theory and practice of slavery not only as regards Rome but as regards all the great civilised states of antiquity.

The Code of Law of Hammurabi, king of Babylon, and the Babylonian contracts for the sale of slaves, the laws of Manu in Hindustan, and the legal practice of Egypt and of Greece, all imply an elaborate servile system and a vast slave trade. That trade was international. In the Delphic inscriptions there occur names of slaves from many other lands besides Syria—Phœnicia, Egypt, Arabia, Lydia, Phrygia, Cyprus, Thessaly, Eubœa, Thrace, Macedonia, and Rome. Every city had its market for this merchandise in men. Capital found in slavery its best investment, and speculators followed the armies in order to be present, after the battle, at the auction of the prisoners of war.

In the middle of the nineteenth century there were 4,000,000 slaves in the slave states of America, and it has been calculated that the annual value of the domestic trade—that is to say, of the exchange of slaves between the states—reached the sum of £3,290,000 sterling. This was the result of a tyranny which had lasted only about two hundred years. Now, when we remember that the duration of the slave trade of antiquity is measured by thousands of years, we shall, perhaps, gain some dim conception of its vast ramifications, of its crowded and over-crowded markets, of the fortunes which were lost and won in it, and of the accumulation of human suffering which it involved.

But we should carry away an utterly misleading impression if we supposed that the colonial slavery of modern times reproduced the servile system of states like ancient Egypt, Babylon, and Rome. Whereas in the ancient world men of every race and rank were, owing to the fortunes of war, liable to fall into servitude, the modern planters of America and the West Indies laid violent hands on a single race, the African negroes. Moreover, the labour which, under the lash, they compelled the negroes to perform was restricted to such products as rice, sugar, indigo, cotton and tobacco. In the slave

states there was no attempt to teach those men any handicraft.

On the contrary, the education of negroes was expressly forbidden. Here, for instance, are some passages from the code of Virginia in 1849: "Every assemblage of negroes for the purpose of instruction in reading or writing shall be an unlawful assembly. Any justice may issue his warrant to any officer or other person requiring him to enter any place where such assemblage may be, and seize any negro therein; and he or any other justice may order such negro to be punished with stripes." Again, "If a white person assemble with negroes for the purpose of instructing them to read or write, he shall be confined to jail not exceeding six months, and fined not exceeding one hundred dollars."

Here is another paragraph from an Act passed in South Carolina in 1834: "If any person shall hereafter teach any slave to read or write, or shall aid in assisting any slave to read or write, or cause or procure any slave to be taught to read or write, such person, if a white person, upon conviction thereof, shall for every such offence against this act be fined not exceeding one hundred dollars, and imprisoned not more than six months; or if a person of colour, shall be whipped not exceeding fifty lashes, and fined not exceeding fifty dollars. And if a slave, shall be whipped, not exceeding fifty lashes." Similar acts were passed in Georgia and Alabama.

Those Christian legislators thus doomed the entire servile population to perpetual ignorance and degradation. Their aim was to exclude their slaves from all human and humanising influences. Contrast this policy, however, with the policy of antiquity. No doubt thousands and thousands of slaves worked and perished in chains on the harvest fields of Egypt, Babylonia, and Sicily, and in Asiatic and European copper, tin and silver mines. Their forced labour upon the raw materials of ancient industry was as severe as the labour which Christian states imposed upon the negroes of Africa in the nineteenth century. But the slave products of antiquity were not confined to agricultural and mineral wealth. There was no department of art or of industry in which servile labour was unrepresented.

Difference of Ancient and Modern Slavery

ancient Egypt, Babylon, and Rome. Whereas in the ancient world men of every race and rank were, owing to the fortunes of war, liable to fall into servitude, the modern planters of America and the West Indies laid violent hands on a single race, the African negroes. Moreover, the labour which, under the lash, they compelled the negroes to perform was restricted to such products as rice, sugar, indigo, cotton and tobacco. In the slave

The Shame of Christian Slavery

white person, upon conviction thereof, shall for every such offence against this act be fined not exceeding one hundred dollars, and imprisoned not more than six months; or if a person of colour, shall be whipped not exceeding fifty lashes, and fined not exceeding fifty dollars. And if a slave, shall be whipped, not exceeding fifty lashes." Similar acts were passed in Georgia and Alabama.

SLAVERY IN THE ANCIENT EMPIRES

Although chained gangs worked in the fields, the vineyards, and the mines, and suffered under the crushing weight of an impersonal despotism, a large class of slaves worked under domestic supervision and came into personal and more human relationship with their masters. In Babylon, for instance, apprenticeship was fully developed, and slaves were taught many trades. The term of apprenticeship for weaving was five years, for stone-cutting four years, and for baking a year and a quarter. The law made sure, moreover, that the apprentice was to be well taught. Technical skill, therefore, and interest in work for its own sake were acquired by the slaves of Babylon, whereas the slaves of America were the victims of the most monotonous and degrading drudgery.

And what is true of Babylon is true of all the great ancient civilisations. The slave merchant prospered most when he passed educated slaves through his hands. Both in Greece and in Rome slaves became teachers, secretaries, and physicians. Men like Aristotle, Cicero, and Atticus and the Plinys required cultured servants, and spent time and money in the education of them. In a letter to Atticus Cicero laments the fact that Cæsar's prisoners from Britain would only prove themselves to be barbarians, incapable of becoming the servants of cultivated people. In fact, in Egypt and in Babylon, in Rome and in Greece, slaves formed among themselves a reproduction of society with its upper, middle, and lower classes.

Some of them were compelled to remain at the lowest level all their lives, but others rose to high positions in domestic service, and in the pursuit of industry, commerce and the arts. They copied manuscripts, wrote books, played music, studied and practised architecture, painting, and sculpture, designed pottery, worked in the precious metals, built ships, and laid out gardens, became philosophers (Epictetus was a slave), were sometimes the companions of men of the world, and some of them rose even to be ministers of state.

Such a fact no doubt casts a startling light on the character of ancient civilisation. It implies that the real work of the world was being performed, not by the class which enjoyed hereditary privileges and the best fruits of

education, but by the class which, in theory and in practice, was, during many ages, excluded even from elementary human rights. As we shall see when we come to consider the influence of the system on national progress, one of the most serious economic effects of slavery was the destruction, or at least the impoverishment, of free labour.

The Modern Worse than the Ancient Nevertheless, it must be admitted that the character of ancient slavery and the fact that in some cases careers were actually open to slaves somewhat relieves the system of the dreadful gloom and horror which attended the institution in its modern form. So far as I am aware, no ancient state ever passed a law which made it a crime to educate a slave.

In all the great states and cities of antiquity there existed a domestic as well as a foreign traffic in slaves. It was not merely that owing to poverty, debt or crime freemen might fall into servitude, but that slavery was hereditary. Thus the owner of a slave was also the owner of the slave's family. The breeding of slaves was often a profitable business, and the markets were fed by a constant influx of thralls born within the boundaries of the cities. But fresh batches were always arriving from abroad, since war and the slave traffic were the two great agents which augmented the servile population. The average duration of the life of a slave in the mines of Laurium has been calculated at about two years. In other cases eight years are allowed. There was thus a constant drain, and a constant demand for new labourers.

Slavery was, indeed, a cause and a consequence of war. A powerful state was tempted to increase not only its territory, but its industrial population. It imposed its yoke either by bringing away the conquered people or by compelling them to till their land and reap its harvest,

Better than Cannibalism or exploit its mineral products for the benefit of the conquerors. Serfdom and slavery thus existed side by side both in Asiatic and European states. Strange as it may sound, this enslavement of captives was, as we have already noticed, a sign of progress. Formerly they had been killed, and, at a lower stage of society, they had been eaten. The practice of slavery was thus better than cannibalism. Yet the savage method of the treatment

of prisoners of war was of long continuance, and it broke out again even in civilised communities. It depended upon the causes of the conflict, upon the resistance or non-resistance of the enemy, and upon the degree of heat of the vengeance of the victors, whether in a given case the prisoners were killed or enslaved. This is made clear

by some of the accounts of Assyrian battles which have come down to us. Thus, in one of the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria (667-635 B.C.), we read these words: "After a bloody struggle I occupied the city of Tiela. I killed three thousand warriors. I led away the captives, the spoil, the oxen and the sheep. I burned much booty. With my own hand I took many prisoners. I cut off the hands and the feet of some, the nose and the ears of others, and put out their eyes." In the account of another successful siege the same monarch states: "I burned alive one thousand captives. Of set purpose I spared not one among them." And in still another case he informs us that he covered the walls of Nineveh with the skins of his enemies.

But sometimes it was seen to be more profitable to enslave men *en masse*. Thus Tiglath Pileser I. (1116 B.C.) announces that from one campaign he brought back 6,000 men, whom he presented as slaves to his own people. Those brief extracts will help us to understand how ancient battlefields formed an inexhaustible source of supply for the slave-dealers. Cæsar, for instance, counted by thousands his captives from Gaul, and unless ransomed, every captive, irrespective of rank, was sold into servitude. Alexander the Great on one occasion sold as slaves 30,000 inhabitants of the Greek city of Thebes, and he received about three guineas per head. And a Roman general, Paulus Æmilius, put up to auction on a battlefield 150,000 men. One by one each captive found himself at last awaiting his turn for inspection in some great European, Asiatic, or African market, where he awaited a purchaser. He was examined as tame cattle were examined, and his qualities and defects were duly declared.

The codes of law both of Babylon and Rome indicate how carefully the buyer was protected in case of fraud. For it was as common to attempt to dispose of an 'unreliable and vicious slave as of a vicious

horse. Sellers were compelled by the law of Rome to declare the incapacities as well as the capacities of slaves in order that intending purchasers might not be deceived. And if within a specified date undeclared defects manifested themselves, the purchaser was authorised to return the slave and be reimbursed.

In Babylon, for instance, this happened if a certain disease, called *bennu*, which was common among slaves and was probably a form of paralysis, broke out within one month after the slave had been bought. In Assyria the contract could be cancelled for the same cause within one hundred days after the purchase. These, and many other facts which we are about to adduce, will help us to see—what, indeed, the law of Babylon implies and the law of Rome expressly declares—that the slave was a chattel, and was the absolute property of his owner.

So far as the essential features of the social basis of antiquity are concerned, the main facts of any one great civilisation might be chosen as typical. For, in spite of the differences of race, it was the tendency of slavery to create universally the same social and economic results. A man in chains in Egypt resembled a man in chains in Babylon or Phœnicia, in Athens or in Rome. Among Semitic peoples only the Israelites appear to have passed legislation on behalf of their slaves. Everywhere a free and privileged class annexed as their property a whole population, whose labour was involuntary and wageless. In the pyramids of Egypt, which were built by slaves, we might see an image of ancient civilisation. The servile class formed the broad and immobile base. All society, indeed, is pyramidal, and as we reach the summit, we find that there is room only for a few. In antiquity the disproportion between those who enjoyed rights and those to whom rights were denied was immense.

The fact which surprises us is not the absence of justice in those societies. An elaborate system of justice, and even of equity, prevailed in the administration of empires like Babylon and Egypt, Athens and Rome. But justice was dispensed only among freemen, and was the privilege of a minority. It stopped short at the boundary which divided the free from the servile class. Private slaves formed private property, and they

150,000
Men for
Sale!

remained outside the jurisdiction of the state. Only the slave's master was the slave's judge. In the case of Rome it was not until late in the imperial era that any restriction was placed upon the domestic tribunal. Slaves were not recognised as "persons," and during many ages the basis of European was not different from the basis of Asiatic society. The condition of the 120,000 slaves who perished in digging the canal which the Egyptian King Nekos began but did not finish was as hopeless as the condition of the slaves who built the Colosseum, made the roads of Rome and her viaducts, and worked in the Athenian silver mines.

Yet in Egypt, as well as in Rome and in Athens, there existed a powerful central government which redressed wrongs among freemen. Ancient, like modern, states suffered from industrial crises. There was a middle-class problem, and the bourgeois and small proprietor were often impoverished by excessive taxation. But the grievances of Egyptian and Roman farmers cannot be compared with the grievances of Egyptian and Roman slaves. Historians have recounted the

Miseries of the Egyptian Peasantry

miseries of the Egyptian peasantry from whom taxes were extorted by flogging. The power of the king and his barons rested upon the soldiers and the priests, beneath whom there lived and laboured the commonalty and the peasantry.

According to Maspero, these latter formed "an inert mass," subjected to forced labour and taxation at the will of their masters. And yet some degree of justice was vouchsafed. Although the taxes were severe, they were sometimes remitted. The peasantry paid a tax of one-tenth on the gross produce of their holdings. The amount of the produce depended upon the rise of the Nile. If in any year the rise was insufficient, or if the water overflowed and ruined the crops, the tax was lessened accordingly, and occasionally it was waived. Moreover, even in a land like Egypt, in which the population was characterised by the most profound submission, the king in person supervised the administration of justice, and heard appeals made by the humblest of his subjects.

In one of the papyri at present in Berlin there is an account of a workman who, on a charge of fraud, was brought

before the king, Nab-ka-ra, pharaoh of the eleventh dynasty. The man, who was employed in the extraction of carbonate of soda, had delivered a quantity below the declared amount. He endeavoured to escape, but was seized. In cross-examination the case broke down. The king remarked: "He does not answer

Providing for a Prisoner's Family

the questions put to him. When desired to speak, he remains silent." Conviction and punishment followed. Then an interesting pronouncement was made.

By law the wife and children of a fugitive became the property of the king. In the case in question the king, instead of wreaking vengeance on the man's family, ordered that while the husband was in prison the wife was to be provided for, and was to receive three loaves every day. The papyrus is damaged, and we are not informed of the final result. The last sentence, however, states that the accused supplicated for the fourth time.

This is an instance of a minute judicial inquiry, but we are not to suppose that similar investigations took place on behalf of the great mass of public and private slaves who toiled in Egypt. Diodorus Siculus presents a vivid picture of the conditions under which the public slaves worked in the mines. He tells us that "at the extremity of Egypt," on the borders of Arabia and Ethiopia, there were gold-mines, and that the gold was extracted "at great expense and by great labour." The army of workmen was composed of criminals, prisoners of war, and of men arrested under false pretences; "in short, various classes of miserable human beings, whom the kings of Egypt are accustomed to send, sometimes alone, sometimes accompanied by their entire families, to work in the mines either for the purpose of expiating crimes or merely increasing the royal revenues." They were all chained, and were compelled to

An Awful Picture of Servitude

work day and night. Escape was impossible. Since the overseers were foreigners, and spoke languages different from the language of Egypt, the slaves were unable either by words or by any other means to corrupt their task-masters or move their compassion.

Diodorus gives us an idea of the industrial method used in the exploitation of the mines. The hardest portions of the soil containing the gold were

exposed to fire, and were then broken up by the slaves, who numbered thousands. Iron implements were employed. The strongest slaves split the rock, and hewed their way by pickaxes through the underground passages which followed the natural windings of the metal. Diodorus adds a graphic touch when he tells us that in order to light up the darkness of the mines the slaves carried lamps fixed to their foreheads. The lash of the overseers who superintended the different gangs was the sole incentive to the continuation of the work.

Child labour was also employed, for some of the passages and holes were too narrow to admit grown men. Children were also engaged in carrying the debris to the mouth of the mine, where mortars and stone pestles were used to reduce the ore. Women and old men worked the hand mills which ground the ore to powder. According to Diodorus, the condition of the slaves was entirely hopeless. Neither sex nor age nor weakness was allowed to exempt them from sufferings, from which they were rescued only by death.

There can be no doubt that similar conditions prevailed in the construction of the vast works which still remain as memorials of the megalomania of Egyptian kings. Since a successful razzia brought an inexhaustible supply of new slaves to fill the places of those who perished in the public works there was a reckless expenditure of human lives. If, as some historical documents indicate, the discomfort of workmen engaged, not in the public but in the private workshops in Egypt was excessive, we can believe that the picture which Diodorus presents is not overdrawn. The state which employed servile labour and exploited it to the uttermost, was by its own policy debarred from interfering with domestic control. There is extant a papyrus which

conveys to us the emotions of Egyptian slaves engaged in private industry. It has the satirical and realistic tone of "Piers the Plowman." "I have never seen a blacksmith on an embassy," says the writer, "nor a smelter sent on a mission, but I have seen the metal drudge at his task, at the mouth of the furnace, his fingers as rough as the crocodile and stinking like fish. The labourer of every sort that handles the chisel, he is not

always on the move like the man who plies the hoe in the fields, but for him his work is amidst timber or metals, and at night, when the other is free, he is compelled to go on working at home. The stone-cutter, who hews his living out of the rock, stops when at last he has earned something and his arms are exhausted. But if he is found idle at sunrise, he is punished by having his legs tied to his back." This is a reference, we are told, to one of the forms of punishment in use in Egypt, by means of which idle or obstreperous slaves were tied in a bundle with their legs bent along the back and fastened to the arms. In this posture they remained during their master's pleasure.

Then from the same document we have the picture of a man half naked and exposed to all kinds of weather, labouring and starving, "for there is always a block to be dragged for this or that building." Again, the weaver, shut up in the workshop, must weave all day, and if he stops his work "he is bound fast as the lotus of the lake." The dyer and the shoemaker are next declared to be specially unfortunate, while the slave baker plying an unhealthy trade, his head in the oven and his son holding him by the legs, runs the risk of perishing in the flames. In such passages we seem to hear the cry of the submerged democracy of antiquity.

If, now, we turn to the greatest of the Semitic states which rose in Asia, a state which at one time made even Egypt her vassal, we shall find a servile population likewise engaged in the creation of wealth which it did not share. Babylon was the Rome of the East, and like Rome she built her social structure upon slavery as a foundation. Scholars place the date of the rise of Babylon as the great political centre of Western Asia at about 3800 B.C.

Long before that date, however, other cities had flourished in Chaldæa. The plain, which is watered by the Tigris and the Euphrates as far as the shores of the Persian Gulf had been the scene of interminable struggles between rival races. Prior to the building of any city nomadic hordes had pastured their cattle on the soil which the rivers made rich by their alluvial deposits. Berossus tells us that the district had always been characterised by the density of its population. That

**Under
the
Lash**

**Worse than
the Beasts
of the Field**



THE SLAVERY OF WOMAN IN THE ANCIENT WORLD: THE BABYLONIAN MARRIAGE MARKET
Reproduced from an engraving of the painting by Edwin Long, R.A., by permission of the Fine Art Society, 148, New Bond Street, London.

fact is explained by the fertility of Babylonia, for, although the desert reaches almost towards the banks of the Euphrates, the overflow of that river and of the Tigris converted what might otherwise have been a barren tract into a land which, according to Herodotus, was unsurpassed for the abundance of its harvests. Moreover, the rude engineering of early Sumerian marsh dwellers and the vast and scientific system of intercanalisation, carried out by Babylonian kings, made the entire region during many centuries the garden of Asia.

Hence the struggle for its possession. Sumerians and Semites, Kassites and Elamites, Medes and Persians, Parthians and Greeks, all in turn were drawn as by a magnet towards Babylonia. Its inter-racial and international character is well indicated by the fact that among Babylonian archives we find instances of marriages which took place between Persians and Egyptians, while the witnesses to the contracts bear Chaldæan, Aramean, and Egyptian names. As Mr. Johns points out, Medes rent Babylonian houses, and Persian fathers give their children Babylonian names. And at one period the language of the Babylonian court was the diplomatic language of the Orient, for we find Egyptian kings using it in their letters to their overlord, who was king of Babylon.

The Part Played by Babylon

The long struggles which lay behind this amalgamation of forces, once hostile, are partly concealed but also partly revealed. Babylonia was a battle-ground ages before the name of Babylon was known. One city after another gained the hegemony of different parts of the area which lies between the twin rivers. The oldest monuments, such as the famous vulture stele discovered by Sarzec and Heuzey at Tello, convince us that from the earliest times the chief instruments of aggression had been slavery and war. The ultimate dominion rested with a Semitic people whose political and military achievements gave Babylon her name in the world.

But the springs of her civilisation as of her religion are to be found further south on humbler sites. A people called the Sumerians settled in the marsh lands and on the Persian Gulf, and there they dedicated cities to their gods and laid the foundations of trade. A sea-port

like Eridu and cities like Ur and Nippur formed great centres of religious life and commerce ages before a brick of Babylon had been laid. It is not improbable, for instance, that Nippur, of which, according to some authorities, Abraham's birthplace Ur, was a colony, flourished as early as 6500 B.C. Recent discoveries prove that there existed in Chaldæa a series of minor monarchies, whose rivalries gradually prepared the way for the one great centralising force which at last appeared in the person of Sargon I., the political founder of Babylon. One city became another city's vassal, one king another's vice-king. Such rearrangements took place, for instance, after the advent of Sargon I., for neighbouring kings, who had hitherto been independent, acknowledged him as their over-king.

Babylon as a Slave Power

As Rome drew all the minor powers of Italy within her orbit until even her language obliterated the languages of her rivals, so Babylon became the political centre of Western Asia. It forms no part of our task, however, to repeat facts which have been already narrated in the course of this work. We shall attempt only to select some of those historical data which promise to illuminate the social basis of certain great states of antiquity. Dynastic and political changes do not, therefore, concern us here. Fortunately there exists sufficient evidence to show that Babylon, like Egypt, was a slave power of the first magnitude.

We speak of Babylon as a city, but it was really an enclosed district which comprised harvest fields. The outer walls, which were pierced by a hundred gates, measured a length of fifty-six miles. The area which they surrounded formed a square of which the Euphrates is supposed to have been the diagonal. Canals connected that river with the Tigris, and there was a constant traffic in trade boats. According to Quintus Curtius, hand-

some quays lined both banks. From writers like Herodotus, Strabo, and Didorus Siculus we gather hints of the city's splendour and magnitude, and their statements seem to be corroborated by the vast extent of the ruins. Discoveries of greater moment have no doubt been made on the sites of neighbouring and less important cities, but one of the reasons is that Babylon suffered more seriously from the ravages

A Picture of Old Babylon

From writers like Herodotus, Strabo, and Didorus Siculus we gather hints of the city's splendour and magnitude, and their statements seem to be corroborated by the vast extent of the ruins. Discoveries of greater moment have no doubt been made on the sites of neighbouring and less important cities, but one of the reasons is that Babylon suffered more seriously from the ravages

of successive invaders. For instance, the great city of Seleucia, on the Tigris, was built out of the ruins. As it is, her remains cover many miles.

It was not until comparatively late in her history, however, that she reached the zenith of her splendour. For it was Nebuchadnezzar (604-562 B.C.) who, by his

**Mammoth
Buildings of
Babylon**

passion for building, elaborated the works of his predecessors, and planned and carried out works of his own. The circum-

ference of the walls of the royal palace on the Euphrates, for example, measured about seven miles. Nebuchadnezzar completed the palace until its seven stages rose to 600 feet, which was about the height of the great temple of Bel. That temple was used as an observatory, and it dominated not merely the metropolis, but the plain for many miles. Babylon contained not only numerous temples, streets, and houses, but vast garden areas. She was, indeed, a garden city, and we are not surprised when Strabo tells us that Alexander preferred Babylon to any city he had seen.

The character and costliness of her public works may be inferred from the fact that the walls were 32 feet thick. The roadway upon the top allowed four-horse chariots to pass each other with ease, so that the wall was reckoned among the seven wonders of the world. The hanging garden, with its vast hydraulic works, by means of which water was pumped from the Euphrates, its vaulted terraces rising one upon the other, and resting upon cube-shaped pillars, its flights of stairs, and its wealth of trees and flowers, likewise stirred the admiration of ancient writers, one of whom tells us that at a distance it looked like a high hill.

We can only dimly imagine the amount of human labour which had been spent in creating and maintaining these great edifices. So vast

**Babylon
Built by
Slaves**

was the mass of material employed in the building of the temple of Bel that, after its

destruction by the Persians, Alexander the Great found it necessary to employ 10,000 men for the purpose of clearing away the débris. The river was spanned by a bridge 1,000 yards long, and 30 feet broad; and under the river a tunnel was bored for the purpose of connecting the two great wings of the royal palace, which

thus extended itself upon both banks. There was a tradition that a queen of Babylon temporarily turned the Euphrates from its course in order that this tunnel might be completed in safety, and it was said that its construction occupied only seven days. A special reservoir was built to contain the water of the river while the work was in progress. These are perhaps myths, but they are valuable because they allow us to see what was expected from servile labour in antiquity. In any case, the actual material structure of Babylon was the work of slaves.

We have no means of discovering the number of inhabitants. Some writers reckon it in millions, and there can be no doubt that the population, both servile and free, increased with the increase of Babylon's power. Every foreign war introduced thousands of slaves, who became the living implements of trade and industry. According to Delitzsch, the postal service was elaborately organised, and that fact pre-supposes a high development of trade. The trade roads, in fact, ran east and west as far as India on one side, and the Mediterranean on the other,

**Three
Orders of
Society**

and Babylonian wares were found in all the markets of the civilised world, for the commercial centre of Western Asia

naturally attracted the wealthiest merchants, who reached the metropolis by means of her great caravan routes. When Herodotus describes, all too briefly, the manners of her people we feel that we are suddenly in the midst of a cosmopolitan city, bright with fashion if dark with vice. And we can only dimly guess what vast social problems, moral and economic, made themselves felt in her teeming streets.

There is the clearest evidence that her society took the form of those three great divisions into which every society naturally falls. From her code of laws, and from the legal documents which have been preserved graven in clay, we discover that there was an upper class, or nobility, every member of which was known as "Amêlu"; a great middle class, composed of freemen of varying fortunes, to whom the name "Muskênu" was given; and lastly there came the slave or "Ardu," whose social designation consisted only in this—that he was his master's property. Owing to the fact that emancipation was possible; owing also to the fact that the children of a freeman by a slave woman, and the children

of a slave by a free woman were free, the ranks of the Muskênu were continually recruited from the ranks of the Ardu.

On the other hand, since for various reasons, and among others insolvency, a freeman might become a slave, there was a gradual leakage from the free classes. In other words, in Babylon, as in every other

The Status of the Slave great community, there took place a continuous upward and downward movement in the population. Some individuals ascended while others descended in the social scale. But the bulk of the labouring class remained throughout the long history of Babylon a great stagnant mass, and we may treat them as a unit. Dynastic and political changes were only ripples on the surface of her civilisation. The enslavement of great bodies of men for industrial purposes was a traditional policy, and without this social understructure there would have been no Babylon at all. The status of the slave is made clear in the "Code of Hammurabi," and in the legal contracts which have been translated. Both the code and the contracts reveal the fact that an elaborate legal system had existed in Babylon in a prehistoric age. Indeed, scholars have deciphered fragments of a code of Sumerian laws which were enacted ages before a Semite had appeared in Chaldæa.

The code which was drawn up by Hammurabi, who probably reigned in Babylon about 2250 B.C., was a modern recension and reorganisation of existing laws. By its means the entire social system of the city is made articulate for us. In spite of its brevity it does for us as regards Babylon what the codes of Justinian and Theodosius do for us as regards the Roman empire. We must not expect, however, to find in the law of Babylon those philosophic pronouncements concerning the servile condition which in the later law of Rome indicate that the question of the

The Slave a Chattel not a Person justice or injustice of slavery had already begun to stir some of the best minds of antiquity.

It probably did not occur to a Babylonian jurist that slavery was "contrary to Nature." As we have already seen, it is not contrary to Nature at all, and it is only man's superior social sense, slowly developed, which has caused, him to interfere with a ferocious instinct. The collective force of a state like Babylon never hesitated to betray itself in the

number of the captives brought within the walls, and doomed to labour for behoof of the captors. Hence in the code, which gathers up the experience of ages, the slave figures not as a person, but as a chattel. It is implied that there was nothing abnormal in the fact that generations of human beings excluded from human rights had perished in the service of Babylon. In the earlier contracts of sale the technical term for slave is *sag*—"caput." In other words, slaves, like cattle, were numbered by the head.

It is true that some scholars doubt whether *sag* should be translated by "head," with the meaning which we attach to it when applied to beasts. But in Greek slave markets there was an analogous usage, for slaves were referred to as σώματα, or bodies. Likewise, in Rome, the legal term for slaves—*mancipia*—signified creatures devoid of personality. It was for that reason that both in Rome and in Babylon they were never named after the father. In cases where the father is named, and especially when the name is Assyrian or Babylonian, we are probably dealing with freemen, who had become

Master's Absolute Power enslaved owing to poverty or to other reasons. That the authority of the master over the slave was absolute is proved by the last paragraph of the code: "If a slave has said to his master 'you are not my master,' he shall be brought to account as his slave, and his master shall cut off his ear."

The fact that in such a case the code prescribes the punishment seems to imply that already the state had begun to regulate the relations between master and slave. If so, only the interests of the former were considered, and at least in the earlier period the master had the veto of life or death. How sternly the right of property in a slave was vindicated may be seen from the following paragraphs in the code: "If a man has induced either a male or female slave from the house of a patrician or plebeian to leave the city, he shall be put to death." "If a man has harboured in his house a male or female slave from a patrician's or plebeian's house, and has not caused the fugitive to leave on the demand of the officer over the slaves condemned to public-forced labour, that householder shall be put to death." Again, "If the captor has secreted a slave in his house, and afterwards that slave has



"BY THE WATERS OF BABYLON": THE JEWS IN BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY

"How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?" Psalm cxxxvii.

Reproduced from the engraving of Herbert Schmalz's painting by permission of Messrs. Landecker & Brown, London, E.C.

been caught in his possession, he shall be put to death." These extracts form paragraphs 15, 16, and 19 of Mr. Johns' translation of the Code of Hammurabi, and we may infer from the severity of the punishments which they decree that slaves had frequently attempted to escape. That fact again implies the harshness of their treatment. "If," we read in paragraph 17, "a man has caught either a male or female runaway slave in the open field, and has brought the slave back to his owner, the owner shall give him two shekels of silver." And we may be sure that in the Babylonian, as in the Greek and Roman, slave markets those slaves who were suspected of the vices of the fugitive fetched the lowest price.

Elaborate precautions were taken to protect the interests of the buyer. A sale, for instance, was rendered void if the slave who had been sold happened to be claimed by the state or by the seller's creditor; or if the bennu disease, which, as we have already seen, was common among Babylonian slaves, appeared within one month after the purchase. That a slave might be placed in pawn like any other chattel is proved by paragraph 118, which enacts that "if a debtor has handed over a male or female slave to work off a debt, and the creditor proceeds to sell the same, no one can complain." Creditors often demanded slaves as hostages for the payment of a debt, and the following enactment brings vividly before us the reckless expenditure of human life: "If the hostage has died of blows or of want in the house of the creditor, the owner of the hostage shall prosecute his creditor, and if the deceased were free born, the creditor's son shall be put to death; if a slave, the creditor shall pay one-third of a mina of silver." The last clause expresses a principle of valuation which appears frequently in the code.

The lessee of a slave was compelled to indemnify the owner for any injuries which the slave might have received during employment, for men hired out slaves as they hired out horses and oxen. In every case the damages are to be paid to the master, and, of course, the value of a slave's life is stated at a lower figure than the value of a freeman's. Thus the law declared that if an ox caused the death of a freeman the owner was required to pay half a mina of silver, but if a slave had been killed, only one-third was payable. In like

manner, whereas a doctor's fees for professional services to a patrician are fixed at ten shekels, and to a plebeian at five, the owner of a slave is required to pay only two. And again, the injury to a slave is punished far less severely than the same injury to a patrician or a member of the middle class. Thus, "If a man has knocked out the eye of a patrician, his eye shall be knocked out" (196). "If he has knocked out the eye of a plebeian, he shall pay one mina of silver" (198). But "if he has knocked out the eye of a patrician's slave, or broken the limb of a patrician's slave, he shall pay half his value" (199).

There is one other passage which indicates even more strikingly the social status of a slave at Babylon: "If a brander has cut out a mark on a slave without the consent of his owner, that brander shall have his hands cut off" (226). In other words, slaves were branded like cattle. We have one case, in which the name of the owner—Ina-Esagil-cilbur—was stamped upon the slave's right hand, and there is another in which the owner's name—Meskitu—was stamped upon the left hand. These marks were incised, and thus remained upon the slave during life. There could be no clearer evidence of the fact that he was the absolute property of his master. Like dogs also, slaves wore clay tablets engraved with the name and probably the address of their owner. If we turn to the contracts of sale we shall find that slaves were exchanged like any other chattels.

The following deed of sale, which is taken from Meissner's "De Servitute Babylonico-Assyriaca," may be regarded as a typical example of such transactions: "Sini-Istar has purchased a slave named Ea-tappi from Ni-Ni-ellati and his son Ahia. The full price, ten shekels, has been paid. Ni-Ni-ellati and his son, Ahia, can make no further claim." Then follow the signatures of three witnesses, together with the date. Another deed declares that Sinbilam presented to his sister, Saddasu, a female slave named Muti-Casti, and that all children subsequently born to Muti-Casti were to become the property of Saddasu and her heirs. Slavery was thus hereditary, and although sometimes emancipation took place, yet in thousands of families the servile line was never broken.

Branded Like Cattle

Slaves in Pawn

Babylonian Servitude Hereditary

The occupations of slaves were as numerous as the needs of a luxurious community. Private slaves were not merely engaged in domestic duties, but also in trade and industry. There were also serfs, or "glebae adscripti," who cultivated the soil and were sold with it as in Europe during the Middle Ages. And the temples

**Slaves
of the
Temples**

of Babylon, like the Christian monasteries, owned serfs, who tilled lands dedicated to a god.

It seems that it was upon rural slaves that the *corvée*, or forced public labour, chiefly fell. The king could command the levy at specified times, and often it took the form of industrial work, especially weaving. Women as well as men were enrolled, and children were not exempt. Slaves were also pressed into military service, and they worked on the boats which plied not only on the Euphrates but on the numerous canals which intersected Babylonia.

As we have already seen, the code ordains the death penalty for anyone who conspired at the attempt of a slave to escape the forced labour commanded by the state. Mr. Johns points out that the king could exact contributions of corn and wheat, straw, waggons, and cattle, as well as men. And we can imagine that the overwhelming weight of the entire imperial system was felt most severely by the servile class. In a letter addressed to one of his officers Hammurabi sends the news that the canal that had its terminus at the city of Erech was blocked. Slaves were to be employed to clear it out *in three days*. The king orders certain slaves to be "yoked together" and brought by ship, and a "strong man" is to accompany them as overseer.

That the lot of such slaves was harder than that of men engaged in domestic service is indisputable. Some slaves occupied even enviable positions. Many represented their masters in commerce. In other

**Clever
Slaves
Liberated**

words, they played the part of agents, and transacted business by power of attorney.

Such men had bought their liberty by their own savings. Even if technically and legally in the servile condition, they nevertheless enjoyed considerable liberty. Their business would often carry them far beyond the walls of Babylon. After emancipation these ex-slaves, however, paid to their former owners a percentage of their earnings.

Thus it was often in the master's interest to liberate a clever slave. It is not necessary, indeed, to suppose that the motive for manumission was *never* humane, yet more often it was probably merely economic. Moreover, if the ex-slave possessed other slaves, these latter also belonged to their master's master. The liberation of slaves, therefore, was often a form of speculation, and the master mortgaged his rights in expectation of a return from the slave's business talent. If, on the other hand, the master remained dissatisfied with the results of his slave's independence he could, as a punishment, reimpose the yoke. Out of the great mass who were sunk in servitude, only a fraction displayed those intellectual and artistic faculties which would make their liberator a profitable investment.

The men who toiled in the public works, or in the fields, or who handled the raw materials of industry were, like the negroes on the American plantations, shut out for ever from any hope of freedom. We may thus be able to form some conception of the destiny of the great inarticulate multitude whose labour

**When
Slaves
Rebelled**

lay at the basis of the imperial wealth and prestige of Babylon.

And yet there is some dim evidence that the slaves were not wholly inarticulate as regards their own rights. There was a word, "sihu," which scholars tell us meant civil war. Or, according to others, it meant the mob who attempted to deliver a slave from his master. It was during a civil rebellion that Sennacherib lost his life. And we have evidence that mutiny took place on board the ships.

But the organisation of the slaves for mutual defence, if it existed at all, must have been weak in presence of the military power of the state. The rights of property extended not only over inanimate things but over those animate implements who, as agents for the production of wealth, were the most valuable of all. And the code allows us to see how sternly any violation of those rights was suppressed.

It covers all the ground of possible litigation between freemen; but while their wrongs are redressed, and their rights are vindicated, there is no legislation on behalf of the slaves. The entire fabric of justice was thus raised on a basis of injustice, and this is the fundamental fact in all the social systems of antiquity.



SLAVERY AMONG THE GREEKS AND ROMANS

THE LIFE OF THE BONDMEN AND THE FREEDMEN

WE have chosen Babylon as typical state of the Orient. When, however, we now turn to ancient civilisation in the West we are met by facts which prove that it, too, rested upon a servile basis. Peiser even maintains that slavery in the civilised states of ancient Europe was more destructive of life and happiness than slavery in the East. But it would be impossible to strike a balance between the amounts of moral and economic disaster contributed by two systems fundamentally the same. Asiatic and European civilisation were already entangled long before the era of recorded history. The contact is visible both in religion and in art, and it became closer as the slave traffic between the two continents increased. Both in the East and the West the instruments of production were the living instruments bought and sold in the slave markets. Asiatics enslaved Europeans, and Europeans enslaved Asiatics. In the East white slaves were highly prized, and in Greece and Rome Orientals were employed in the industries and the arts. No one can prove that work in the Athenian silver-mines or in those Spanish mines which the Romans inherited from the Carthaginians was less or more arduous than in the mines of Egypt or of Sinai.

The fact which surprises us is that, although European communities early displayed an instinct for free institutions, they nevertheless adopted the policy of slave states. Apart altogether from a contact with Asiatic powers, they would have passed through the same cycle of evolution. War in Europe, as in Asia, meant the enslavement of the vanquished. Moreover, in communities such as the early tribes of Greece, in which all the members of the tribe originally shared the same liberty as they shared the same blood, there took place that levelling process which resulted in a

gradual loss of privileges in the case of some families and individuals, and a gradual gain in the case of others. In the poems of Homer a monarchy and an aristocracy are already fully developed, and there is an assembly composed of the body of the people. Before such a political and social organisation could have been formed the amalgamation of different families and tribes must have taken place, and that amalgamation was not always voluntary. Individual power brought individual leadership. The king divided the land among the families of the tribe. It appears that the head of the family had no power of alienating the estate, since it belonged to the whole kin. But maladministration might create debt, and the kin might be held responsible. In this way land tended to exchange hands, and certain families became proprietors of larger and larger areas. Greater wealth meant greater political importance, and hence an aristocracy was gradually evolved. And as villages became towns the differentiation between the classes became more pronounced. Poor men fell into that state of subjection which was likewise reserved for conquered enemies.

Although in Greece monarchies were succeeded by oligarchies and oligarchies by democracies, the lot of this submerged mass of the people remained stationary. Aristotle, in "The Athenian Constitution," points out that about the middle of the seventh century B.C. the government was oligarchial, and that the poorer classes—men, women, and children—were in absolute slavery to the rich. This is not merely a figure of speech. The whole land, he tells us, was in the hands of a minority, and if the tenants failed to pay their rents they and their families became the slaves of their creditors.

This custom of mortgaging the debtor's person was common in all Indo-European communities, and it was a cause of social

Asia
Leads
Europe

Mortgaging
the Debtor's
Person

unrest in early Rome, as well as in early Greece. It formed one of the chief sources of slavery within the state's own domain. As soon as the debt was paid the debtor recovered his freedom, but it was in the interest of the creditor often to postpone payment, since he thereby retained services which were often more

**Serfs and
Slaves Side
by Side**

valuable than the property he had lost. If Herodotus is correct, there were no slaves in early Attica, but only a kind of serfs, who were allowed to retain one-sixth of the produce. According to another interpretation they were required to *pay* only one-sixth. In any case, these serfs were probably survivors of the original inhabitants of the country. Like the helots of Sparta, they were compelled to till the ground for the conquerors. Serfs of alien and slaves of Greek origin thus existed side by side, while social and political privileges became the apanage of a few ruling families.

It was not until the archonship of Solon in 594 B.C. that any remedial legislation was undertaken. In Solon's poems we have a few vivid glimpses of the state of affairs of the Attica of his day. He found the whole land in the power of usurers, whose claims he cancelled by means of a revolutionary measure called *Seisactheia*, or "the shaking off of burdens." With the political and economic aspects of that measure we are not concerned. We are more interested in the fact that Solon attempted to deal with the problem of servitude. He tells us that he delivered the slaves.

"And many a man whom fraud or law had sold,
Far from his god-built land, an outcast slave,
I brought again to Athens."

Again,

"And those that were in vilest slavery
Crouched 'neath a master's frown, I set them
free."

These passages, together with many others in Homer, are sufficient to enable us

**Solon
Sets Slaves
Free**

to see that slavery formed part and parcel of early European society. The slaves whom Solon set free were, however, men who had been, and in spite of their servitude continued to be, citizens. He did not interfere in the case of slaves who had been purchased or captured. Likewise, although Aristotle in his account of those early struggles complains that freemen were being sold into slavery, we are not to suppose that he had any objections to

slavery as a social system. On the contrary, in his "Politics" he offers an elaborate defence of it, and he gathers up the whole philosophy of the matter as it presented itself to the Greek mind.

Aristotle died in the year 322 B.C., and he thus wrote upon slavery after the Greeks had had a long experience of it as an industrial system. He is satisfied as to its necessity, and he cannot conceive a state existing without it. He attempts to find its justification in Nature. And although the reasons which he alleges are curiously unconvincing, his perception that slavery originated in the natural inequalities of men is unfortunately nearer the truth than the more humane philosophy of the Roman jurists. In Aristotle's opinion "he who has the capacity of belonging to someone else is by nature a slave." In his attempt to discover in what this capacity consists, Aristotle points out that Nature created a difference between the bodies of slaves and of freemen. The former are merely muscular, and are evidently fitted for labour, whereas freemen are well bred and graceful, and their minds may be expected to correspond with their bodies. The reasoning, of course, is false, and Greeks often chose their slaves on account of personal accomplishments.

On the other hand, some freemen proved themselves to be gross and degraded. But although Aristotle is aware of the contradiction, he nevertheless concludes that Nature intended the superior type to be served by the inferior. He expresses concern only for those freemen who have been made slaves by the fortune, or rather the misfortune, of war. He compares the ordinary slave to the unruly body ruled by the soul, and does not stop to inquire whether slaves have souls. Again, he compares them to the animals which man has tamed to co-operate with him, and once more he finds an analogy and justification for the relationship between master and slave in the superiority of the male over the female.

Lastly, in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, he gives his famous definition of slaves as "living implements." This was the theory which lay behind the practice of all the Greek states, every one of which possessed a servile population. We usually think of Athens as a purely intellectual and artistic community. But Athens was really an industrial state, and she employed

thousands of slaves in her workshops. One of those facts—too often neglected in schools and colleges—which help to bring Athenian life near to us is that the father of the orator Demosthenes was a maker of iron bedsteads, and had slaves as workmen. Nicias, the general, owned a thousand slaves, who formed part of his great wealth, for he hired them out as miners. Aristotle owned thirteen, and at his death he emancipated some, and made presents of others to his friends. Both in public and in private, slaves formed an integral part of the social mechanism, and, indeed, without them the mechanism would have ceased to operate.

In Greece, and especially in Athens, democratic institutions reached a full development. Never has the doctrine of social and political equality been so logically carried out as in the age of Pericles. Political and judicial offices were thrown open to the whole body of the citizens, and those citizens considered themselves to be equal in worth, so that appointments were made by lot. We have to wait till the French Revolution in order to find political doctrine of the same levelling tendency.

Paradox of Greek Freedom and Slavery

And yet in Athens the democracy rested on a basis of slavery. A people who, in fashion characteristically European, fought for their own liberty, and gained it, denied liberty to the class upon whose industry they subsisted.

So far as the status of the slaves was concerned, Athens might have been an Oriental despotism rather than a republic. The great doctrine of human liberty which animated the Greeks in their struggle with the Persians was preached only to men who were already free. And perhaps the strangest paradox of the whole situation consists in the fact that in that struggle slaves had borne a very important part, for they had fought at Marathon, Platæa, and Salamis. Moreover, it was servile labour in the Athenian silver-mines which created the victorious Athenian fleet. It was a proposal of Themistocles that the surplus revenue from the mines should be devoted to the building of the ships which won the battle of Salamis.

The mines belonged to the state, and were worked by gangs of chained men. The Athenian coinage was manufactured out of the silver which came in abundance from Laurium, and that a vast body of workmen were concentrated in the district

is proved by the fact, mentioned by Thucydides, that on one occasion during the Peloponnesian War as many as 20,000 slaves escaped. The explorations conducted by M. Ardaillon support the testimony of Plutarch and other ancient writers as to the unfortunate condition of the miners. The discipline was as crushing

The Terrible Slavery of the Silver Mines

as in the mines of Egypt, and the loss of life must have been as great. And here I may be permitted to reproduce what I have written elsewhere: "Many of the actual tools with which the Athenian slaves worked have been discovered in the mines—iron hammers, chisels with bent edges, where the blows have been struck, shovels, pickaxes, and spades. With these paltry implements the slave was compelled to fight his way through the hard rock, slowly creating galleries as he went. Many of these galleries begin at a depth of 150 feet, and are often only large enough to admit the human body.

"The fact that labour was necessarily slow, and that nevertheless the annual return of silver was large, implies that great numbers of slaves must have been employed. Some writers have been content with an estimate of 10,000 workmen. But those who have visited the mines believe that that number should be at least doubled. A single capitalist, one Sosias of Thrace, employed 1,000 slaves, who had been leased to him by another capitalist, Nicias. Moreover, the yearly wastage among the slaves was so great that many thousands must have passed through the hands of the overseers.

"The fact that more than 2,000 shafts have been discovered indicates the wide extent of the operations. Some of those shafts reach a depth of 400 feet, and in the perpendicular walls there have been noticed niches where the ladders once rested. Ancient writers mention that the air below was very foul, and yet a rude

The Awful Waste of Life

system of ventilation had been devised, because mention is made of air shafts. It is difficult to believe, however, that the hygienic and sanitary conditions were even tolerable. Plutarch makes Nicias responsible for the sufferings and death of many of the miners employed in Laurium. The lessee who hired Nicias's 1,000 slaves was compelled to keep the number at not less than 1,000. Owing to wastage in the ranks, the gaps were

continually being refilled. Some interesting calculations have been made for the purpose of discovering the duration of the day's labour. Many of the clay lamps used by the miners have been found, and, according to certain experiments, those lamps, when filled with oil, will burn for ten hours. It was thus, perhaps, not more than a ten-

**Chained
Labourers in
Noisome Mines**

hour shift. This view has been confirmed by the fact mentioned by Pliny, that in the Spanish mines the same method was adopted. For the mines, of course, were utterly dark. Some of the actual chains which shackled the miners as they chiselled their way through the passages have been discovered. We can imagine the frequent anxious glances which the slave cast on the little flame which had been given him, as a clock to measure the hours of his slavery. Modern visitors to these interminable galleries have noticed, cut in the walls, numerous niches where the lamp was placed as the workman hewed his way along.

"The ore was brought to the surface either in bags strapped to the backs of slaves employed for that purpose, or in baskets attached to ropes and drawn up by pulleys. In the workshops the analysis took place, and special slaves were engaged in bruising the ore, others in washing, and others in smelting it. Iron pestles, stone mortars, and sieves were used in the process, and in various shapes the metal was taken to Athens to be stamped, for the state remained sole proprietor of the mines, even after mining rights had been assigned to private individuals. The state's share, payable in bullion or in cash, was augmented by a percentage on the profits. The workshops were private property, and could be sold by one lessee to another; but, contrary to the views of earlier writers, it appears that the mining rights were not transferable, and that concessions could be obtained only from the state."

**Torture
of the
Slaves**

A state which exploited servile labour for revenue purposes was naturally debarred from interfering with the authority of the slave master in his private workshop. In Athens, as in Babylon, the slave was simply an item in the inventory of his owner's property. He was a mere automaton, to be utilised at the master's discretion. That he was devoid of personality and of rights is proved by the

fact that the state refused to admit his evidence in a court of law except under torture. It was not expected that an irresponsible being could speak the truth.

Nevertheless, Demosthenes in one of his speeches declared that the testimony extracted from a slave under torture was sometimes more valuable than the voluntary evidence of a freeman. Hence in civil as well as in criminal cases slaves were invariably examined while physical pain was being inflicted upon them. They were surrendered to the official experts in torture (Basanistae), either on the offer of the owner or on the demand of the other contending party. If a master refused to expose his slave, the presumption was that the slave's evidence would be found to be too damaging to the master's cause. If, on the other hand, the slave had been surrendered and had received injury, or had died under the torturer's hands, the law allowed compensation to the master.

There could be no more striking proof of the fact that, judged by its social basis, European society in the most brilliant period of Hellenic culture had made no advance on the Asiatic civilisations which had already bloomed and perished. In some cases there was even a retrogression. For whereas, for instance, in Babylon the children of a freeman and a slave woman were free, in Greece they were slaves. No doubt emancipation frequently took place. But it is significant that in Athens there existed no legal means of carrying it out, and that fact is another indication of the indifference of the state towards the servile population.

The only way in which a bondsman could be emancipated was by dedicating him to a god, and, as Foucart has shown, the price of freedom was generally paid by the slave. When we remember that although the actual material glory of Athens was the work of slaves, that although they had quarried the marble blocks of which temples like the Parthenon were built and from which statues of the gods were made by great artists like Phidias, had raised and fortified the great walls which connected Athens with the Piræus and the sea, had built and manned Athenian ships, had wrought the weapons which brought victory to Athenian armies, and had worked the mines and tilled the soil of Attica, when

we remember that all this labour went unrequited—nay, that generations of labourers were not merely shut out from the most rudimentary human rights, but suffered innumerable wrongs, we cannot help thinking that the punishment was just which at last made Greece herself the slave of Rome.

And now, when we turn to the case of Rome, it will be necessary to weary the reader by a repetition of the same monotonous facts. In any attempt to discover the common social basis of ancient civilisation it would be impossible to neglect Rome, since she employed servile labour on the most gigantic scale the world had known. In the space which remains to us, however, we can mention only a few of the most significant truths. Both in her political and social evolution Rome described the cycle which had already been described by the smaller communities of Greece. From being an agricultural free state, bounded by narrow frontiers, she became an industrial state, whose industry, however, was based upon a vast organisation of slave labour not merely in Italy, but in her provinces throughout the world. The disproportion in well-being, however, was visible among her members long before the era of conquest. That disproportion originated in the divisions of the clan lands between families united by blood, religion and common interests.

Since some clans and some families contained more members than other clans and other families, the division was naturally unequal, and the inequalities became hereditary. As usual, poor men became subservient to the rich, and, as we have already seen, the law of debt involved the slavery of the debtor. In the pages of Livy we are presented with a vivid picture of the social confusion which resulted. The state which was divided within itself was only temporarily united against its enemies; or, as sometimes happened, relief was actually sought by aggression, and a territory which had become too limited for the number of people subsisting upon it was augmented by successful war. But war brought captives, and captives were slaves, and thus the industrial and economic foundations of the state were laid. In the early period of the republic, however, the slaves were outnumbered by the freemen. Landed

properties were as yet of small dimensions, and the farmer and his sons ploughed their own fields. Or if slaves were employed they were few, and they lived with the family. Moreover, the industrial guilds of carpenters, potters, shoemakers and smiths were composed of freemen, among whom a handicraft descended from father to son. It was only as Rome expanded beyond her early boundaries, and by a process of continual suction absorbed people after people and territory after territory within Italy and far beyond it, that free labour was displaced by the labour of slaves. She thus inherited the industrial wealth and the means of production of the countries which she conquered, and every one of those countries was a slave market.

Then took place that divorce between productive and governing classes which contains the secret of the economic as well as of the ultimate social and political sterility of ancient civilisation. The fall of the monarchy and the rise of the republic, the fall of the republic and the rise of the empire, made no change in the industrial organisation of the state. The slaves, whose numbers were being continually increased, formed the working classes, and at last free labour was driven from the market. It has always been the tendency of slavery to bring labour into contempt. Wherever it is adopted a freeman working for wages is considered to be no higher than a slave, and since he is more expensive his services are rejected. In Rome the state deliberately discouraged the free artisan, since in the vast public works which it undertook it employed only gangs of slaves.

Already, in 367 B.C., the condition of the free agricultural labourers was so desperate that a law was passed which compelled landowners to employ a certain proportion of freemen. But such measures had little effect. The victories of the republic introduced an inexhaustible supply of slaves, and capitalists continued to speculate in this cheap and abundant labour. And it was precisely in the overstocked condition of the slave market that the slave's chief peril lay. For as long as prices remained low it mattered little how soon the slaves were worked to death. On the contrary, it was good economy to exploit the slave

**Slavery
Displaces free
Labour**

**Beginning
of Roman
Slavery**

**Inexhaustible
Supply
of Slaves**

to the uttermost since his place could be so easily and so cheaply refilled. When, however, the supply fell below the demand and prices rose the slave had a chance of more humane treatment, since his death would involve a serious loss.

How vast the traffic in human lives became may be measured by the fact that in the Ægean island of Delos, a market much frequented by Roman slave merchants, as many as 10,000 slaves are said to have been sold in a single day. As wealth increased landed properties became larger, and, whereas in Italy areas which had formerly been cultivated by peasant proprietors were now transformed by slave labour into vast private pleasure gardens ornamented by fish ponds and fountains, in Sicily and the other provinces capitalist slave-owners carried out the plantation system and by the help of chained gangs raised crops of corn and wheat for purposes of speculation. Cattle were reared, the vine was cultivated, and fruits were grown by the same means, and slave herdsmen, slave gardeners and slave vine dressers were busy on the soil of Italy. But this was the system which, according to the elder Pliny, ruined not only Italy but the provinces. It has been said that slavery is not possible without a reign of terror. And it was on this artificial basis that the great fabric of the Roman empire was raised.

A Roman writer on agriculture, Columella, complained that while during the empire there were to be found at Rome masters who taught rhetoric, geometry and music, there was not one to teach agriculture. When a rich man bought an estate he sent his most corrupted valet to manage it, as if agriculture had become an ignominious and criminal occupation. In the old days the most eminent men, Quintus Cincinnatus, Fabricius, and Curius Dentatus, lived in the country, and tilled their own ground, which seldom extended beyond four and a half acres. But during the empire the rich men left the city with regret even although, as Columella tells us, their domains in the country were so extensive that they could not ride round them in one day.

It is not surprising, however, that owing to the agricultural methods described in

the pages of Columella, Varro and Cato, the country became less and less attractive. Even in Cato's day it was not uncommon to see bands of shackled labourers, *compediti*, at work in the fields or the vineyards. Rural districts had the appearance of penal settlements. There was no joy in harvesting because it was superintended by slave overseers who wielded the slave whip. Men were reduced to the condition of cattle, but even cattle had more liberty. The writings of Cato, Varro and Columella prove that the rustic labourers were subjected to the sternest discipline. It is significant that by order of the senate an agricultural treatise by a Carthaginian writer, Mago, was translated into Latin. It became a handbook for agriculturists, and, needless to say, the servile system formed the basis of the scheme of husbandry which it advocated.

The Romans were thus able to supplement their own agricultural experience with the methods of the cruel Carthaginian slave-hunters. "The slave and the ox," says Mommsen, "were fed properly so long as they could work, because it would not have been good economy to let them starve; and they were sold like a worn-out ploughshare when they became unable to work, because in like manner it would not have been good economy to retain them longer." Every *familia rustica*, or body of slaves, working on a farm was under the command of a steward, *vilicus*, who was likewise a slave and was responsible to the owner for the management of the property.

His wife superintended the work indoors, while out of doors the ploughing, sowing, reaping, the tending of cattle, and of the olive and the vine, and all the other labour connected with farming fell to the serfs and the slaves. In Columella we read that their dormitory, *ergastulum*, was underground, and served also as a workshop and a prison. He specially recommends that in the vineyards the work should be done by chained gangs each consisting of ten men in order that supervision might be made easy. And in Varro the social position of the servile labourer is vividly brought before us when we are told that the slave was only one among a variety of agricultural implements and that all that distinguished

**10,000
Slaves Sold
in One Day**

**The Slave
an Agricultural
Implement**

**Agriculture
Becomes
Contemptible**

him was the fact that he was articulate. When the wealth of Rome increased and her own native agriculture declined, capital became diverted towards commerce and manufactures. But in every branch of industry the artisans were still slaves. The tunics, blankets, boots and ox collars, which Cato advises farmers to buy at Rome, were the products of servile labour. The *familia urbana*, or body of city slaves, comprised those who worked in private shops and factories, and those who were engaged in domestic service. There were also *familie publicæ* or slaves employed in all the departments of public works. It is supposed that in the age of Aurelian the servile employes at the mint numbered as many as 10,000. In the navy, in the imperial postal service, in the baths, the temples and the public gardens, a vast retinue were kept in continual labour, and since the state catered for the amusement of the public, slaves were exhibited as actors and gladiators and as victims in the shows of the wild beasts.

Slavery, in fact, touched Roman life at every point. Capitalists like Crassus, who owned 500 builders and carpenters, owed their fortunes to the work of wageless men. The banker, the accountant, and the architect, the master weaver, the master miner, and the master of a ship, were dependent for their profits upon the talent and industry of men of all nationalities who had been kidnapped by the Roman slave-hunters and by the pirates who swarmed in the Mediterranean, and had then been sold in the slave market. According as income from capital thus invested grew greater, the style of living became more extravagant. A man who could not afford to keep slaves was considered to be a beggar (*cui neque servus est neque arca*). Every respectable householder owned at least ten, and the word *familia* was generally understood to mean at least fifteen slaves. All forms of

**Social Standing
Based on
Slave Ownership**

domestic necessity and domestic luxury were supplied by men whose ultimate freedom, if it ever came at all, depended on the caprice of their masters. Tutors and physicians, nurses, bathmen, pages and serving men, keepers of the wardrobe, letter carriers and torch-bearers, as well as cooks, coachmen and

musicians, were numbered as chattels and formed part of a man's wealth. And when we remember that the same conditions prevailed throughout the provinces we shall not be surprised to learn that the servile population in the Roman empire was reckoned in millions. In Italy alone at the beginning of the empire there existed at least 1,500,000 slaves, and as the empire grew older that number was increased. Throughout the entire imperial area, when Rome reached the maximum of her territorial development in Europe, Africa, and Asia, her slaves probably numbered 60,000,000.

The great jurist Ulpian likened slavery to death. But in Rome, as elsewhere, the treatment of slaves varied according to the nature of their work and the character of their masters. As we have already seen, the higher domestic slaves profited by the affluence of their owners, and often enjoyed early emancipation. On the other hand, men doomed to work in the mines, those capable of nothing but manual labour and the coarsest forms of drudgery, found their deliverance only in death.

**Slavery
Worse Than
Death**

"It is very possible," says Mommsen, "that, compared with the sufferings of the Roman slaves, the sum of all negro sufferings is but a drop." Amelioration did, indeed, come by law, but it came late, and we do not know how far it penetrated. The rights of property in living beings were sternly protected until the fall of the empire. "Caput enim servile," says Paulus, "nullus jus habet, caret nomine, censu, tribu." In other words, the slave was a pariah. He had no appeal against his master's violence, and we know from the pages of Seneca how often violence was used. It is true, as Gaius tells us, that during the reign of the Antonines a master who murdered his slave "without cause" was held to be as guilty as if he had murdered the slave of another citizen.

The fact that great slave risings occurred in Sicily and in Italy, and that the fear of insurrection was never absent from the minds of Roman statesmen, may help us to imagine the amount of misery which must have accumulated before beings, isolated and shackled and devoid of any organisation within their own ranks, were yet able to combine for their own defence and to prolong their resistance.



THE EFFECTS OF THE SLAVE SYSTEM “MAN’S INHUMANITY TO MAN” ITS OWN RETRIBUTION

IN the preceding chapters we have attempted within narrow limits and only in rough outline to portray some of the main features of the foundations of ancient society. The data of slavery both in the east and the west are so voluminous that any adequate account of them could be furnished only in a special treatise. But perhaps we have been able to show that, apart from the study of those data, it is impossible to gain any real insight into the social conditions of antiquity. As the architect’s first concern is about the foundation of his building, so the student of political and social institutions must first understand their basis.

It is upon the organisation of human labour that every one of those institutions rests. In antiquity that social, or rather, unsocial, basis was so uniform, and its moral and economic effects were so universally similar, that a patient study of it enables us to grasp ancient civilisation as a unity.

The Unity of Ancient Civilisation The chaos of facts begins to assume a more regular order when we remember that beneath the welter of dynastic and political change there lay a dead sea of slavery. No matter where we go in ancient history, we discover the working of one perpetual formula, according to which one portion of humanity was by law the slave of another portion. The methods of social cohesion and construction were everywhere alike. Differences of race, of geographical and climatic conditions, of natural products and industrial resources, and differences of national religion and national character, did not prevent each nation from adopting the same methods for the production of national wealth.

To the instances which we have chosen as typical there might be added, besides many other vanished empires, Persia and Parthia, Phœnicia and Carthage, and the Aryan communities in Hindustan. The slave market formed not only the main factor in the internal development

of those states, but it was a controlling factor in their external relations. For one of the motives of ancient war was the capture of slaves so that an aggressive policy involving new territorial arrangements was actually the outcome of industrial needs. In other words, wars were undertaken for the purpose of maintaining and strengthening the artificial basis of ancient society. Yet, as we have seen, there is a sense in which that basis was not wholly artificial. In any case, it was not the invention of civilised communities, because it existed ages before they were civilised. Its prehistoric presence in savage life causes us to regard it rather as a new expression within the borders of man’s own world of that principle of the struggle for existence which dominates the evolution of human as well as of all other things. The most powerful tribes captured and enslaved the least powerful. The great states, thanks to their military organisation, kidnapped hordes of men as the indispensable agents for the production of wealth. And as the state’s structure became more elaborately developed, and when power was measured in terms of money, wealthy individuals were able to take advantage of the constant traffic in slaves, and they purchased those human beings best fitted to minister to wants and to luxuries.

How deeply-rooted the institutions became, and how universal was the appeal which it made to certain human instincts, is seen in the fact that the same methods of using and abusing men and women remained constant during thousands of years, and were adopted by peoples geographically and racially remote.

The Mark of the Slave

We saw that in Babylon some two or three thousand years before Christ it was customary to brand the slave’s body with his owner’s name, or to stamp the name upon a tablet which the slave was compelled to wear. In like manner we find that in Rome, long after the Christian

era, slaves, like dogs, wore collars, and the following may be taken as an example of the inscriptions engraved on the metal: "Prevent me from escaping, and take me back to my master, Pascasius, at his colour-shop in the Forum of Trajan."

Now, the perspective of history is still more strikingly foreshortened, and a strange light is cast on the

Christian Slavery in Last Century permanence of some of the darker elements in human nature, when we find that Christian slave states in the nineteenth century passed laws which are identical in spirit and almost in letter with the slave laws of Babylon. We saw that in Babylon death was the penalty for anyone who assisted a slave to escape. The Code declared that "if a man has induced either a male or female slave from the house of a patrician or plebeian to leave the city, he shall be put to death." We may compare this enactment with a paragraph from the Black Code of South Carolina, which, still valid in 1863, declared death as the penalty for him who dared "to aid any slave in running away or departing from his master's or employer's service."

Now, the recurrence throughout widely separated tracts of history of this predatory instinct of man against man may be admitted as another proof that the law of struggle between the members of a species remains active within human society. But, according to that law, the strongest, or at least the most cunning individual, and the most militant society should survive. In other words, the great slave states never should have perished. Their power was chiefly exhibited in their success in bringing both individuals and weaker states into subjection.

How, then, are we to explain the fact that one after another the slave states were blotted out? Perhaps we shall be able to answer that question if

Ruin of the Slave States we remember that man has imposed his own institutions upon Nature, and has therewith surrounded himself by what, from one point of view, are unnatural conditions. Owing to the interference with some of Nature's processes certain changes take place in the operation of some of her laws. If man had remained at a level only slightly higher than the level of the brutes, if he had captured and consumed his prey, not collectively but

individually, the units of the human species would have possessed as little cohesion as those of any other species. But men grouped themselves together, settled on the soil, and gradually created new conditions of subsistence. The enslavement of fellow men played the chief part in making those conditions more and more unnatural, or perhaps we should say non-natural, and in causing their permanence. The human community became divided into warriors and workers.

As power became consolidated and wealth increased, the division of labour became more and more minute. A gulf separated the governing from the governed class. The number of voluntary workers grew less, and the number of involuntary or enslaved workers grew greater. The fruits of the labour of a great servile population were consumed by an unproductive minority. The slave became his master's proxy in work and, what was still worse, in war. In Babylon, in Athens, and at last even in Rome, slaves were compelled to fight. That fact alone implied that an insidious process of de-

Ancient Society at a Deadlock terioration had been taking place during many centuries in the ruling classes. In short, we believe that it was due to a clumsy combination of the forces of freedom and slavery that ancient society at last arrived at deadlock and dissolution.

That misgiving appears to have troubled some of the best minds of antiquity. Fortunately, however, some modern experiments in slavery enable us to see clearly how it may have been a main cause in the moral and economic collapse of ancient states. De Tocqueville contrasted the flourishing condition of the free states with the impoverishment of the slave states of America. "The traveller," he says, "who floats down the current of the Ohio may be said to sail between liberty and servitude. Upon the left bank of the stream the population is sparse; from time to time one descries a troop of slaves loitering in the half-desert fields; the primeval forest recurs at every turn; society seems to be asleep, man to be idle, and Nature alone offers a scene of activity and of life.

"From the right bank, on the contrary, a confused hum is heard which proclaims the presence of industry; the fields are covered with abundant harvests, the elegance of the dwellings announces the taste and

EFFECTS OF THE SLAVE SYSTEM

activity of the labourer; and man appears to be in the enjoyment of that wealth and contentment which is the reward of labour. Upon the left bank of the Ohio labour is confounded with the idea of slavery, upon the right bank it is identified with that of prosperity and improvement; on the one side it is degraded, and on the other it is honoured. On the former territory no white labourers can be found, for they would be afraid of assimilating themselves to the negroes; on the latter no one is idle, for the white population extends its activity and its intelligence to every kind of employment. Thus the men whose task it is to cultivate the rich soil of Kentucky are ignorant and luke-warm; while those who are enlightened either do nothing, or pass over into the State of Ohio, where they may work without dishonour."

These observations were true of other modern slave plantations in the West Indies and in Brazil. Every one of them became a scene of economic stagnation and failure. The American planters were called "land killers." As Cairnes points out in his great work on "The Slave Power," the employment of negroes in America and the West Indies resulted in the steady deterioration of the soil. The characteristic of slave labour was its want of versatility. Slaves were doomed to work on a single product all their lives. Again and again the soil was compelled to yield the same crops until it became sterile. Then the planter moved with his gangs of slaves into new soil, and herein we may detect the aggressive tendency of slave societies.


An American slave-holder made the following admission: "I can show you with sorrow in the older portions of Alabama, and in my native county of Madison, the sad memorials of the artless and exhausting culture of cotton. Our small planters, after taking the cream off their lands, unable to restore them by rest, manures, or otherwise, are going further west and south in search of other virgin lands, which they may, and will, despoil and impoverish in like manner. Our wealthier planters, with greater means and no more skill, are buying out their poorer neighbours, extending their plantations, and adding to their slave force. The wealthy few, who are able to live on smaller profits, and to give their blasted

fields some rest, are thus pushing off the many who are merely independent. . . . In traversing that country one will discover numerous farm-houses, once the abode of industrious and intelligent farmers, now occupied by slaves or tenantless, deserted, and dilapidated. He will observe fields once fertile, now unfenced, abandoned, and covered with those evil harbingers—foxtail and broomsedge; he will see the moss growing on the mouldering walls of once thrifty villages, and will find 'one only master grasps the whole domain,' that once furnished happy homes for a dozen families. Indeed, a country in its infancy, where, fifty years ago, scarce a forest tree had been felled by the axe of the pioneer, is already exhibiting the painful signs of senility and decay apparent in Virginia and the Carolinas; the freshness of its agricultural glory is gone, the vigour of its youth is extinct, and the spirit of desolation seems brooding over it."

Now, if these causes produced these results in modern, they must have produced the same results in ancient times. We can now understand why the harvest fields of Italy became blasted, and why Rome became dependent on foreign supplies. It was only because she could command the produce of unlimited areas that she was able to fill her granaries at all. Where difficult soil required skilful agriculture, or where the system of the rotation of crops was not in use, the soil remained barren, and the industry upon which all others depend was destroyed.

It is true that in antiquity slavery was infinitely more versatile than in its modern form. But since industry was a badge of degradation, free labour was discouraged, and at last killed. And slavery itself did not pay its expenses. Although all the great states were omnivorous of human life they were perpetually threatened by a deficit in the labour market. If to these economic causes we add the moral results of the system on the character of the slave lords, we shall see to what an extent slavery was responsible for the dilapidation of the social fabric of antiquity. The captive reacted upon his captor, and slavery, once a sign of the superior strength of the slave masters, became the main factor in their fall.

WILLIAM ROMAINE PATERSON



THE ENTRY OF CHRIST INTO JERUSALEM
This painting, by H. C. Selous, gives a carefully studied restoration of the general aspect of the city at the time of Christ.



THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

THE DAWN OF THE NEW DAY HOW CHRISTIANITY CHANGED THE WORLD

CÆSAR AUGUSTUS organised, on the foundations laid by his adoptive father, the mightiest political power that the world had known. And in his days there went forth a "decree that all the world should be taxed," and so it befell that the Child Jesus was born and laid in a manger in Bethlehem of Judæa. Incarnate in the Babe was the spiritual force, mightier than that of Rome itself, which conquered the west, penetrating those peoples in whose hands lay the destinies of mankind from that time forth. Of high lineage but low estate, the Child grew up "in the favour of God and man." Only one story of His boyhood is preserved; until suddenly, being nearly thirty years old, He was hailed by John the Baptist, the last prophet of the Hebrews, as the Messiah, the fore-ordained Saviour of the race.

For three years He moved among men, revealing the new doctrine of salvation, of the Kingdom of God realised through the Christ. To the learned classes of the Jews and to the priesthood the new doctrines were anathema, for they brushed aside the formulæ of scholastic pedantry and the authority of those who claimed to be the

interpreters of the law; it was easy to condemn them as monstrous blasphemies.

Christ's Teaching Offends the Priests

To the populace they were confused, by a material literalism, with dreams of a restored Jewish monarchy. The personality of the Teacher inspired on the one side bitter animosity, on the other intense devotion. To the devotees, the whole world seemed to reel when the Saviour sent by God was crucified by the order of the Roman procurator. Again,

in a moment all was changed; the rumour flew among His followers that the crucified Christ was risen from the dead. He had been seen by and had spoken with those who could not be mistaken; not two or three only, but hundreds could bear their testimony. As joy took the place of mourning, the misinterpreted riddle of

A Religion to Move Worlds

Christ's teaching found a new, a tremendous, a triumphant meaning. Material misconceptions were overwhelmed in a spiritual illumination. Faith in the Christ became a religion, momentous, to move worlds; a religion resting on a newly-discovered personal relation between the believer and the God who made him, whose name is Love; awful, mysterious, but unspeakably blessed.

The religion of Christ came into a world where there was no religion, but countless cults. Religion as a vital moving force had no existence. The wise found their consolations for the troubles of life in philosophies which satisfied their intellectual cravings; vulgar intelligences could pick and choose among innumerable superstitions; the state could deify itself and impose upon the world the formal recognition of an authorised pantheon. In none of these was there the renovating spiritual force which could do battle with an enervating materialism, the more enervating because of its unconsciousness of its own needs. The necessary idealism, though it might take perverted and distorted forms, was to find its source in the faith of the crucified Christ.

Without entering upon the labyrinths of theological controversy, or offering a

condensed substitute for the narratives of the evangelists, there are aspects of the ministry and teaching of Jesus which cannot be passed over in a historical survey which includes Christianity in its purview as a world-force. For three

**Jesus
and His
Disciples**

years Jesus preached throughout the land of Judæa that "the kingdom of Heaven was come." He devoted special instruction to those Jews who had resolved never to leave Him again. These "twelve" were some day to continue his work. What new thing did He intend to teach? What did He mean by saying that with Him the kingdom of God was

of the race of Abraham, which made it possible to be excluded from eternal salvation. If such errors were refuted, it was only to clear away obstacles to the reception of the absolutely new teaching given by Him.

"No man cometh to the Father, but by Me." That is the claim which He asserts. He will not adduce new ideas. He wishes rather to place men in such a position towards the God who is objectively present that they may hold Him actually as a father. That which every religious craving, however unconscious, strives for at bottom, and by which it can be completely satisfied, He wishes to



THE CHILD JESUS IN THE HOUSE OF JOSEPH AND MARY AT BETHLEHEM
From the painting by Sir John Everett Millais, P.R.A.

present on earth? In order to settle this point rightly, we must not overlook the fact that very much of that which He taught was intended to be, one may say, elementary instruction, and was only spoken on account of the special needs of His chance hearers. Thus many of His sayings are directed against a distortion or disregard of such truths as were already to be found in the sacred writings of the Jews, against the Pharisaical transformation of the law as the will of God into a number of separate ordinances, the outward observance of which was effectual in gaining the approbation of God. He spoke against pride in the mere outward membership

give, and this He says He can give. "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Does anyone seek rest from the accusations of his conscience? "I am the way" to this. Does anyone seek certainty of belief? "I am the truth." **Teaching of Christ** Does anyone seek a real life, raised above all that is miserable and transitory? "I am the life." He thus intensifies the idea of the "kingdom of God," which, according to the national hope of his people, the promised King, the Messiah, was to found, and declares Himself to be the Mediator of that Kingdom of God.



THE FINDING OF THE SAVIOUR IN THE TEMPLE
From the painting by William Holman Hunt, by permission of the Corporation of Birmingham.

But to have God as father and thus to stand in the kingdom of heaven is for man a thing important beyond everything else. "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" Compared with this relation to God, the relation to the nearest human being must take a secondary place. "He that loveth father or mother," son or daughter, "more than Me is not worthy of Me," not worthy of that which I alone can give. And whoever has found this highest thing, must completely change his valuation of everything else. He would rather cut his hand off, pluck out his eye than give up that possession; he is ready "to lose his life for My sake," in order not to lose Me, through whom he has it.

But it is man as man who shall stand in this kingdom of God: "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever should believe on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life!" The distinction between Jew and heathen, then, loses its meaning: "They shall come from the east and from the west, from the north and from

the south, and shall sit at meat in the kingdom of God." Thus all who possess in common this "pearl of great price" are by this most closely bound together: "One fold under one shepherd." So it cannot be immaterial to them that all men have not yet found that which brought peace to their own souls. They shall "testify" of Jesus, let their "light shine before men," and "make all nations disciples of Jesus." From the love of God proceeds naturally the love of mankind: "The second is like unto the first." Finally, whoever lives in communion with the eternal God has thereby the pledge of eternal life. "For God is not a God of the dead, but of the living." And if the actual state of things in this world seems to contradict the claim which Jesus maintains, as well as the high honour promised to His disciples, yet the "kingdom of God will" one day "come in majesty." Jesus will separate the "godless" from the "just," and the latter, clothed with a new body, will "inherit the kingdom prepared for them since the foundation of the world."

From that community between God and man which Jesus desired to establish there sprang, therefore, thoughts which at that time had already taken life in

the heathen world, the conceptions of the one God, of humanity, of the importance of the individual, of the justification for the desire after happiness, of the better world to come, of sin, and of purification. Jesus did not announce these as mere ideas, but as realities, which partly exist, even if they are not acknowledged, partly will exist, even if they are not desired;



A GREAT ITALIAN'S PICTURE OF CHRIST

When the art of Venice was flourishing, none excelled Giovanni Bellini in the tender grace and spiritual beauty of his pictures of Christ, as in this fine conception.

and as an actual fact, which "belief"—that is, the trustful surrender to Him, proves to be real: "My teaching is from Him Who sent me. If anyone will do His will, he will know if this teaching be from God." "Whoever believes on Me, he hath eternal life." Religion, consequently, is raised above human choice and human

ordinance. State religion is a denial of the true religion; and this is the meaning of the saying, "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." Religion is a matter of the conscience. It is the immediate relation of the individual towards God; yet such a relation that its goal, the communion with God, is, in fact, only

many had known neither Him nor His Father; but that no hostility would be able to check the growth of the kingdom of Heaven brought by Him. The small grain of seed was to become a mighty tree. The little leaven was to penetrate all, the whole world and all conditions of things.

Those Jews who surrendered themselves to his influence found in Him that which they had sought. "Master, Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we have believed and known that Thou art Christ, the son of the living God." But the more distinctly Jesus let it appear that He wished to be recognised as the Messiah, and the larger the number of those who, full of confidence, hailed Him with joy, the higher rose the hostility of those in power among the people. This hostility reached its culminating point when Jesus on the first day of the week in which the Easter feast began made a striking and solemn entry into the capital. He thought that He had preached long enough, and that by word and deed He had fully corrected that misunderstanding

The Entry into Jerusalem He wished for earthly honour; now He might bring matters to a decision. Whoever was not with Him was against Him. What must be, was now to happen. The leaders of the people resolved on His destruction.

He did not withdraw from the gathering storm. He gave Himself into the hands of His enemies. Both by silence and by speech He brought on the end. The Sanhedrin pronounced sentence of death on Him, because He "blasphemed God" by the profane declaration that He was "Christ, the Son of the living God." The Roman procurator, Pontius Pilate, recognised that the accusation that Jesus had given himself out as a king was based on a misinterpretation of His words. But at the pressing persistence of the Jews he allowed at last the death sentence to be carried out, in order to be secure against the slanderous report at Rome that he had not sufficiently guarded the sovereign rights of the emperor. Jesus, hanging on the cross, prayed God to forgive His murderers, and assured the criminal crucified at His side, who in consciousness of his debt of sin turned in trust to Christ, that he would enter into everlasting bliss. And when he had overcome the deepest spiritual pang, the feeling of being forsaken




"THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD"

Among modern conceptions of Christ none is better known than Holman Hunt's. It has been the subject of great controversy, and is given here purely as a work of art.

reached through Jesus. The assertion of this claim by Him, who bore no signs of external rank, tended to rouse many to sharp contradiction. As He said of Himself He was "come to stir up men against each other," so He foretold to those who were ready to labour for Him that they would be hated and persecuted, because



CHRIST BEFORE PILATE
Reproduced from a photograph by Messrs. Braun, Clement & Cie. of the painting by Munkacsy.



" ECCE HOMO " -- BEHOLD THE MAN !
From the painting by Antonio Casati, in the Gallery of Modern Art at Rome.

by God, He declared when dying that His work was "done," and commended His spirit into His Father's hands.

In vain had Jesus tried to prepare His disciples for His death, and had represented it as His free act and as necessary for the "reconciliation of many." The hopes which they placed in Him were still so deeply tinged with national expectations that they had come to understand such statements figuratively. His death thus perplexed them in every way. He had so completely identified their religious belief with His own person that this belief could no longer exist when He, on whom they trusted, was given up to death. One feeling only mastered them, fear—fear lest the same fate might be brought on them by their enemies.

Seven weeks later, when the Jewish feast of Pentecost is being celebrated, we see them completely transformed. Not a faint trace of human fear, nothing of doubt or uncertainty. The belief which Jesus' death had destroyed lives again in them with a certain inner conviction until now unknown, and with an almost alarming recklessness, that finds expression in the bold confession of their faith. In that same Jerusalem which had shouted round Jesus, "Away with Him, crucify Him!" they were now able publicly to preach before thousands "Jesus of Nazareth, the Man of God, you have with wicked hands nailed to the Cross and slain. Him hath God raised up. Of this we all are witnesses. So now let the whole people of Israel know certainly that God hath made this Jesus Lord and Messiah."

The possibility of doubt in Christ's resurrection is so entirely excluded from their thoughts that even before the Sanhedrin, and after they had been forced to suffer imprisonment and scourging for this declaration, they unflinchingly hold fast to their belief, "We cannot but

**Resurrection
and
Ascension**

speak what we have heard and seen." The four Gospels and the Apostle Paul (1 Corinthians, 15) suggest to us what effected this tremendous revulsion in the feelings of the disciples when they tell us that Jesus during the first weeks after Eastertide appeared constantly, sometimes to his disciples singly, sometimes to many together, and, as it were, forced them, who expected anything rather than His resurrection, to the belief that He had

not remained in the grave, and demonstrated to them the necessity of His death and of His resurrection, assuring them at the same time that even in the future He would "be with them even unto the end of the world." This conviction determines henceforth their whole life.

By preaching to the people they achieved important results. In a short time the number of those men only who let themselves be "baptised in Christ for the remission of sins" reached some 5,000. The feeling of the people was so favourable to this new religious community that the Sanhedrin did not yet venture to do more than to threaten and scourge some of the preachers. Men agreed with the counsel of the much-respected teacher, Gamaliel, to wait quietly for further developments.

What a picture is presented by this first Christian community when we remember how Jesus had exalted the value of belief in Him. Incontestably an unshaken certainty of religious trust filled these Christians. Neither the harsh contradiction of those who from education and position in life might have been the first to learn the truth was able to make them waver, nor could the threats and the punishments, announcing still heavier penalties, on the part of the Sanhedrin, reduce them even to silence. Hard though it was for them to resist the distinct command of the leaders of their nation, yet they could only put the question to them: "Judge yourselves if it be right before God that we hearken unto you more than unto God!"

For them religion had become a direct intercourse of the individual with God, into which no other man might intrude. They no longer recognised a religion of state or nation. Independent personal belief took the place of state belief; but the basis of their religious conviction is the consciousness of that which they possess in faith, the certainty that they have received "forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost"; and, therefore, also that one day they should be refreshed by the vision of the face of God. They feel themselves so happy in this possession that "joy" is mentioned as the keynote of their spirit, which, on the one side, expresses itself in a continually new "lauding and praising of God"; on the other side, makes it impossible for them to conceal the great gift they have

CHRISTIANITY—THE DAWN OF THE NEW DAY

acquired. And in their joy at that which they all possess in common they feel themselves as "one heart and one soul," and that so sincerely that no one of them regards his material possessions as his own. Not, indeed, that those who enter into their community are required or expected to renounce personal possessions, but the

their circle. Jews by birth, they still feel themselves members of their nation. They continue to live according to the forms of their ancestral law, take part still, as before, in the religious meetings in the Temple and in the synagogues. We notice no trace here of that overstrained piety which is intended to conceal from the



THE DESCENT FROM THE CROSS
From the painting by Rubens.

brotherly love which animates all makes them devote their goods for others also "so far as there was need," in order that "no man might want."

And yet this intimate union and close co-operation of the early Christians among themselves did not lead them to erect barriers against those who stood outside

man's own consciousness the want of a real fund of piety in the soul. There is, indeed, joyful enthusiasm but no religious extravagance or fanaticism. They cannot refrain from boldly confessing their belief, but as yet they are far removed from the enthusiastic desire of conquering the world.



'THE SPIRIT OF CHRISTIANITY'

From the symbolical painting, 'Dedicated to all the Churches,' by G. F. Watts, R.A., by permission of Mr Frederick Hollyer.



THE APOSTOLIC ERA

THE TEACHING OF THE DISCIPLES

AND THE LIFE AND WORK OF THE APOSTLE PAUL

THE acceptance of Christianity as an evangel for Jews alone—of Christ as the Messiah, the Redeemer of the “Chosen People” according to the flesh—would have left the world undisturbed. The Gospel of Christ, the Redeemer of mankind, gradually assumed the supreme position as an influence modifying every political and social conception in the development of European civilisation. It is in this light, and not as a theology, that we have to treat of it in these pages.

The merit, however, of having definitely conceived and preached Christianity as a world-religion belongs primarily to Saul, of Tarsus in Cilicia; otherwise, St. Paul the apostle. He had been introduced to a profound study of the Jewish law by the renowned rabbi, Gamaliel, and had given himself up to it with the fullest enthusiasm. Nevertheless, he was not without some tincture of Greek culture. A man cast in one mould, with nothing false, nothing incomplete in him, he had been kindled by that which he had learnt of Jesus and His followers into flaming zeal for the maintenance of the sacred ancestral law as the only path to salvation.

Stephen’s death and the flight of the Christians from Jerusalem did not content him. Armed with letters of introduction from the Sanhedrin, he started for Damascus, in order to track out the Christians who had escaped thither and to lead them, fettered, to Jerusalem. But the Christians in Damascus learnt the incredible news that he had caused himself to be received into their community through baptism in the name of Christ. What had so completely transformed him on the way he often told in the words: “The Lord Jesus appeared to me.” This marvellous experience had forged and stamped his new religious conceptions. He was then convinced that He whom he had hated and opposed bitterly was not rejected of

God, but was exalted to eternal glory. In what blindness had he then lived, what a burden of sin was on him! Notwithstanding his perfect observance of the law, nothing else but condemnation would have lighted on him. He was called back from his path of error and saved, owing to Him whom he had persecuted. Jesus met him, not with avenging wrath, but with mercy. From that time he praised the majesty of Jesus as the Saviour. Thus the doctrines of sin and of grace become the cardinal points of his preaching. And as all men are sinners, the grace of God in Christ extends over all mankind, over the Gentiles as much as over the Jews.

Paul devoted several years to gathering and assimilating the elements of his new religious conviction. For it is necessary for him to put before himself in all its logical consequences that which has become certain to him directly by faith, in order that he may recognise it as “divine wisdom.” Then begins his incomparably great activity, in the extension of the belief in which he has found salvation. With unspeakable toil he lays in ten years the foundations of the Church in Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece. He seeks to strengthen by epistles the communities founded by him and to shield them from errors. On his second missionary journey, which leads him over Asia Minor, through Macedonia, into Greece, he sends from Corinth his two epistles to the community recently established in Thessalonica; on the third journey he makes a longer stay in cosmopolitan Ephesus, and from there writes to the Christians assembled in Galatia and his first epistle to Corinth; writing a second also when, on his way to Corinth, he has reached Macedonia. From Greece his glance is directed further towards the

Epistles to the Thessalonians

Paul the First Great Preacher

The Grace of Christ to Paul

west. At Rome a Christian community has already arisen, we do not know in what way. In the hope of preaching his gospel of salvation at Rome, in the centre of the "world," he addresses an epistle to the Christians, in order to prepare them for his arrival. He is to go there, but in fetters. In Jerusalem he is recognised by Jews from Asia Minor. They rouse the mass of the people by their cry that

Philemon, the Colossians, Philippians, and Ephesians. Recently there has been a tendency to accept the view that he once more obtained his freedom and was able to carry out his wish to bear testimony to Christ as far as the Atlantic and Spain. If this is really the case, the journeys of which the two epistles to Timothy and to Titus speak would have to be assigned to that date.

It may be considered as fairly well established that by the orders of Nero at Rome his noble head fell beneath the sword of the executioner.

The hardest struggle of his life was concerned with setting Christianity free from the leading strings of Judaism. How could Christians who were Jews by birth immediately assent to his demand, so clearly and emphatically asserted, that in the presence of Christianity the wall between Jew and Gentile must be destroyed? For them it was a natural thing that even after their baptism they should continue to observe the law of their fathers. But that law prescribed the strictest separation from all Gentiles. It was only a preliminary and insufficient concession when Paul—at the so-called apostolic council at Jerusalem—succeeded in inducing the leaders and the majority of the community there to admit that the Gentile Christians were not bound to the observance of the

Jewish law. All Christians were not "one fold under one shepherd" until the Jewish Christians also abandoned their law.

This was a principle so bold that even the energy of a Paul could establish it only in the communities which he himself had founded, and there only after the greatest waverings and the most bitter struggles. For the Jewish Christians once more tried to persuade the Gentile Christians that without circumcision and the observance



THE CONVERSION OF ST. PAUL

The great merit of first preaching Christianity as a splendidly conceived world-religion belongs to Paul, who, from being a persecutor of the Christians, became the most ardent apostle of the new faith, for which he was eventually martyred.

"this is the fellow who instructs men everywhere against the law and the Temple." The Roman tribune saves him from the fanaticism of the mob by arresting him and sending him to Cæsarea. Kept a prisoner without reason, he avails himself of the right of a Roman citizen to appeal to Cæsar, and he is taken to Rome. From that period of his mild imprisonment are dated his epistles to



"Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars' hill and said, Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious. For as I passed by and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, 'To the Unknown God.' Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you."—Acts xvii., 22, 23



When Paul and Barnabas were at Lystra, a cripple was healed through faith in their teaching, whereupon the people were ready to believe the apostles gods come to earth, and the priest of Jupiter brought forth an ox to offer a sacrifice; but Paul and Barnabas rent their clothes, crying out, "Sirs, why do ye these things? We also are men of like passions with you."—Acts xiv., 8-15.

SCENES FROM THE GREAT MISSIONARY VISITS OF ST. PAUL

After paintings by Raphael.

of the Mosaic law they could not be saved. These disputes caused Paul to cast his "Gospel" into a form which excluded every distinctively Jewish feature. In contrast to those who, through observance of the Jewish law, thought to please God, he defended with all his energy

The Gospel According to St. Paul the proposition that no observance of the law in itself—in fact, no outward act of man at all—had any value in God's sight; that before God the attitude of children, childlike trust, and "faith," were far more necessary, and that from this relation of man to God true morality followed necessarily: "By faith, without works of the law, we are righteous."

The separation from Judaism, which Paul had demanded, was greatly helped by two events. The Christians of Jerusalem could not but see that even the strictest obedience to the law on their side could not cure their countrymen of their hatred of Christ. The head of the community, James, the brother of Jesus, bore the surname of the "Just," because his strictness in observing the law and his asceticism were universally admired. The epistle in the New Testament which bears his name is full of exhortations of obedience towards the law; and yet his countrymen hurried him down from the pinnacle of the Temple because he had praised Jesus.

How could the Christians any longer hold fast to the hope that the Jewish people as a whole would still believe in Jesus! How much more easy for them was the separation, now that the terrible struggle of their nation against the Romans blazed up! Should they take up arms for the national freedom, in order to be persecuted in return by their own people? The Christian community abandoned the city when it was threatened with complete investment by the Romans. If—as is conjectured—some Christians re-

mained behind to share the fortunes of their nation, they were the elements which had ever hindered an amalgamation with the Gentile Christians. The burning of Jerusalem and its Temple must have given the death-blow to national restriction on Christianity.

This catastrophe drove the apostles at the same time from the centre of their present activity into far distant lands. One, Andrew, is said to have turned towards the north-east and to have spread the Christian faith in Scythia, north-east of the Black Sea, and the Caspian. A second, Thomas, selected, as it is said, the countries between the Euphrates and the Indus for his sphere of work; at the present day a Christian society in




THE APOSTLE PAUL
From the painting by Rubens.

India call themselves "Christians of St. Thomas" after him. We are likewise told of a third, Bartholomew, who preached in India. Others turned their steps to the interior of Asia Minor or to North Africa. The Christian community in Alexandria traced its foundation to John Mark, the companion of Paul and Peter, and the writer of the second Gospel. Peter seems to have laboured in Syria and Asia Minor (we have an epistle from him to the Christians of Asia Minor) and finally to have turned

his steps to Rome, where he suffered martyrdom.

Only one figure rises in sharp relief out of the mists of tradition, that of the apostle John. After the imprisonment of Paul the communities founded by him in Asia Minor were left desolate. John entered on Paul's work, labouring in wide circles from Ephesus. The spirit which animated him is characterised by the tradition that when brought in extreme old age into the Christian assembly, he contented himself with the admonition, "Little children, love one another!" Yet this love of his was anything but

St. John and the Gospel of Love



SPAGNOLETTO'S CONCEPTION OF THE APOSTLE PETER
From the painting in the Prado Gallery at Madrid.



THE MIRACULOUS DELIVERANCE OF ST. PETER IN ROME
From the painting by Spagnoletto (Ribera) in the Prado Gallery at Madrid.

effeminate, as later tradition represented it. On the contrary, he was sure that fervent love among the Christians was possible only so long as the truth was not distorted among them. Once—so the story runs—as he entered a bath he learnt that the false teacher Cerinthus was there. “Away from here,” he cried to his companions, “that the bath may not fall in on us, since Cerinthus, the foe of truth, is there.” The feeling of bitter indignation at the “spirit of lying,” which was then creeping into Christian communities, speaks in his epistles. His Gospel also follows the line of confuting misstatements and proving that “Jesus is the Christ,” who is come into the world, and that “through faith in His name we have life.” The Apocalypse, which he is said to have written while an exile on the island of Patmos in the Ægean Sea, vigorously attacks all indifference to false doctrines. Thus, quite at the close of the apostolic era we meet those tendencies towards the distortion of original Christianity which were destined in the ensuing period to jeopardise its existence.

What was the constitution of the original community? We find, on the one hand, no eagerness for organisation; on the other hand, fundamental aversion to it. Questions of organisation were clearly far removed from these Christians. This

was not because they hoped, at any rate in the early days, to win their whole nation to their faith, in which case an independent, permanent organisation seemed unnecessary, or because they expected the immediate end of the world, and thus thought it unnecessary to secure the permanence of their society by the introduction of legal forms; but chiefly because the fulness of life and a strong social spirit filled them all, and because they knew that their continued existence was guaranteed by their Lord, who, though invisible, was ever near. Naturally the apostles took a leading position, but this “office” was regarded as a “service.” And when

more rights, or, properly speaking, more opportunities for rendering service, were given them than they could exercise usefully, they caused certain men to be chosen out of the community, who relieved them of the care of the poor: the “Seven,” as they were first called in contradistinction to the “Twelve” apostles, the “Elders” (presbyters), as they seem to have been designated later, when their number became greater with the growing community. But it did not occur to the apostles to reserve to themselves the superintendence

over this society, as if its powers emanated from their supreme authority, nor did the community claim a right



SAINT MATTHEW
From the painting by Rubens.



SAINT MARK
From the painting by Fra Bartolomeo.

THE APOSTOLIC ERA

of electing its officers, nor do we even notice anywhere any aversion from the creation of a new office. New conditions and apparent needs caused new offices to be formed, and no extravagant feeling, which would wish to leave everything to freedom and to the impulse of the spirit, opposed this better arrangement. But when the apostles had no longer any permanent abode in Jerusalem, we see another man at the head of the community: the brother of Jesus, already mentioned, James. Yet we cannot ascertain how far his authority was limited; evidently it was not closely limited, being a service of love shown to the community. After his death it is another kinsman of Jesus, Simeon by name, who stands serving at their head. Together with the one

intended sense of the word by which the importance of the chief office was expressed—"episcopus." As the Christians called Jesus "the shepherd and bishop of their souls," so also they called the men who, like Him, cared for the flock. The meaning to be conveyed was not that of overseers, but of guardians. **The Origin of Bishops** "Not as those who rule the people" were they called shepherds, but because they fed the flock, provided it with nourishment, and guarded it from wolves. We soon come across still another office, that of the "servants," deacons. They performed special commissions or services, which the bishops pointed out to them.

This, then, was the organisation—if we may speak of it as such—of the separate



SAINT MARK PREACHING AT ALEXANDRIA, WHERE HE FOUNDED A CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY
A famous painting by Giovanni Bellini, now in the Brera Gallery at Milan

"leader," the elders seem to have attended to the external affairs of the community.

The development was somewhat different in the communities composed principally of Gentiles. Here Paul instituted elders. Not, however, at once, as if such an office were necessary in itself; it was only on the return journey from his first missionary tour that he determined to do so. The need for

Paul Institutes the Elders

some single administrative body had soon shown itself. It is not told us whether he himself nominated these men or whether he left the election of them to the community. Such questions of jealousy and distrust still lay far from those Christians. They recognised only duties in the service of the brethren, but no rights. This was the

communities; in the original community a leader and with him a number of presbyters entrusted with separate tasks; in the Gentile Christian communities a college of presbyters, or "bishops," at the head, with the deacons to aid them.

What, then, was the relation of these different communities to each other? Did they stand independently side by side, or did they legally form a united whole? Neither one nor the other. The separate communities neither sought anxiously to preserve their absolute independence, nor did they wish to compel a united organisation. They *felt* themselves to be a unity, and, therefore, tried to create and to preserve ties among themselves, to smooth or abolish distinctions. As soon as communities were formed outside Jerusalem,

HARMSWORTH HISTORY OF THE WORLD

the apostles felt that they had obligations towards them. Two of them went to Samaria, in order to minister to the Christians there. Barnabas was sent to Antioch, in order to "strengthen" those who had been baptised into Christianity. In every imaginable way Paul tried to establish the fact that all Christians formed a

The Oneness of the Christian Community

single aggregate. He greeted the one community from the other, sent salutations from individuals to individuals at a distance. He made the communities exchange among themselves the letters they had received from him. One community sent support to him while he laboured in another. He organised a fund among the Christians converted by him on behalf of the distressed Christians of Palestine. Even in outward relations he tried to establish equality among all believers, and based such arrangements on the argument that other communities observed them. But the violent dispute over the necessity of observing the law established the fact that all baptised in Jesus were one. The different attitudes with regard to this question would destroy this unity, hence the struggles to find a compromise. But there was not yet any need to represent this unity in any systematic form. As long as apostles lived, they were the outward bond of the Church.

The common religious life in this first period bore the same character. Here, again, there was nothing of legal precept and fixed ordinance. The Christians of Jerusalem still took a zealot part in the religious life of their nation. But withal there was the need to emphasise and to promote that which was common to them, and which differentiated them from those who did not believe in Jesus. They assembled in the houses, in order "to remain in the teaching of the apostles," to pray in common, to testify to the close

bonds of union between themselves by partaking of common meals, and to celebrate the Lord's Supper "in remembrance of Him."

In the communities composed principally of Gentiles two sorts of religious services were soon distinguishable. The one class, intended only for the brethren, comprised the agapé, or love-feast, and the celebration of the Lord's Supper; the other, to which those also who had not

yet received baptism were admitted, served for the preaching of their faith. If Paul was the leader of the assembly, he naturally was the speaker. If he was not there, an extract from the Old Testament or from letters written by Paul was read, or some other person stepped forward who felt moved to speak. One spoke as "prophet" on the strength of a revelation; another, as "teacher," explained what the present or former revelation connoted; a third "exhorted," while he applied the word of God to individuals by name.

Not only in comparison with the apostles, who were equipped with this threefold gift, but also in comparison with the members of the community to whom one of these gifts was granted the elders (or bishops) at first were quite subordinated in the religious service. But soon, in certain places at least, were seen the dangers of a procedure so exposed to caprice. The excitable Greek spirit allowed religious enthusiasm to express itself in forms, which did not tend towards the "edification" of the meeting, and vanity and self-complacency could easily lead to intemperance of speech. To meet

such a state of affairs in the Corinthian Church, Paul had to lay down the principle that all gifts are bestowed for the "common good," and that all speech, therefore, which did not seem to edify those present, must be discontinued. There appeared, then, quite soon, in the celebration of the divine service a limitation on the rightful liberty of the individual.

As the number of the Christians increased and the expectation of the approaching end of the world lessened, the religious zeal of the earliest period yielded to a more restrained calmness, and the gift of prophecy was more rarely seen. Therefore, in the choice of new bishops the condition was laid down that they must possess the gift of teaching, in order that the communities might not, when none of the old apostles were any longer among them, be dependent in their religious meetings merely upon "prophets" and "teachers." Thus, it also happened that while at first the Christians assembled daily, if possible, gradually a definite day of the week was reserved for meeting for divine worship. Even in apostolic times this was the "Lord's Day," the first day of the week, on which the Lord rose from the dead.

THE APOSTOLIC ERA

In order to form a correct conception of the moral conditions prevalent in the Gentile Christian communities, we must not fail to notice that the high demands which the writings of Jesus' disciples, so well known to us, make upon their readers do not at all reflect the opinions of Christianity at that date, but only the ideas of those who had grown up in the purer atmosphere of Judaism. On the contrary, not only do we come upon instances of gross offences against morality, but especially the warnings and admonitions given by Paul in his epistles as to what was necessary for "salvation" show how completely the moral bias of the Christians was as yet under the influence of the conditions and ideas which prevailed in the Gentile world.


That there must be another standard of morality than custom, and that every Christian with regard to this question must acquire a completely independent judgment and maintain it and follow it in opposition to a world which judges quite otherwise—to inculcate this and to accustom the Christians to the permanent realisation of these new moral notions, must have required tens, if not hundreds, of years. A man announced the desire for regenerated life only by his request to be received into the community. Only gradually were people forced to learn what this new life comprised, to learn somehow that the relation of the sexes was not a matter of moral indifference; that even the nourishment of the body required rules, and that man was not the free lord over his own words.

On the other hand, there now arose the danger of a miscomprehension of the new and great ideas which Christianity had brought forth. They were, according to the word of their Founder, to work gradually, like leaven, in the world, inwardly first, then outwardly; they were little by little to change the universal ideas, so as to make the outward form of life more and more different. The danger rested in the fact that Christians would come to regard existing institutions and conditions as abolished by Christianity, since they were influenced by the spirit of paganism, instead of adapting themselves to them until they were changed by the new spirit. It might be thought that the high position and the freedom which were fitting to the Christian as a

"child of God and heir of eternal life" did not allow any subordination to other men, especially to non-Christians—any subordination of the wife to the husband, of the slave to his master, of subjects to heathen magistrates. The apostle Paul is obliged to prove that the Christian, through his new relation towards God, is in no way exempted from the laws of the community; that he should show his faith in God, who has willed or permitted these regulations, by willing self-submission to them. He is compelled to warn them not to make "freedom a cloak for wickedness." Not without reason the apostle Paul looked at the future of the Christian communities with gloomy forebodings when he thought himself at the end of his ministry. John, too, cries warningly: "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God."

One thing the Church took with her to meet the approaching storms: the writings of her founders, a substitute for their oral preaching and a means through which they could be moved by the spirit of the founder. Attempts were made to keep alive the form, the life, the teaching of Jesus. Collections of His sayings (logia) must soon have been made, with the addition, more or less, of the historical events connected with them.

The Gospel, the good tidings, is the name given to these attempts to recall the facts on which the Christian belief rests. Of those Gospels which are extant, the three with which the New Testament opens are the oldest. There are no cogent reasons for refusing to ascribe the first to the apostle Matthew or to doubt the old account that he wrote his book, in the first place, for the Jewish Christians in Palestine, and, therefore, in the Aramaic language. The Greek version, which we know, may also be attributed to him, since such a bilingual publication of a work is familiar to us from other writers of the time. The correctness of the tradition that the second Gospel is the work of the already mentioned John Mark, the companion of Peter, is vouched for by some peculiarities of the book. The authorship of the third is attributed to Luke the Physician, who, on many occasions accompanied Paul. He wished to produce a treatise on the sacred story for the Gentile Theophilus.



"NERO'S TORCHES": THE EMPEROR WITNESSING CHRISTIANS COVERED WITH INFLAMMABLE MATERIAL BEING SET ABLAZE

From the painting by H. Sieniradzki, by permission of the Berlin Photographic Co., London. V



THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY

FOLLOWERS OF THE APOSTLES AND THEIR WORK

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE EARLY CHURCH

AS the coral reefs rise higher and higher from the bottom of the sea, until a storm discloses to those who sail over them the secret growth of long ages, thus Christianity expands in the calm, and the great world knows nothing of it, until suddenly through the storm of persecution a Christian community becomes visible to all. There are records of martyrs from which we learn that in the country of Garamæa, east of the Tigris, south of the Little Zab, Christians dwelt even before 170 A.D. The kingdom of Osroene, having Edessa as its capital, extended along the eastern bank of the Euphrates. There were Christians here at so early a period that the legend could arise of the Agbar, or prince, of this land sending letters to Jesus.

Towards the end of the second century Agbar Bar Manu stamped the sign of the cross on his coins. The governor of Bithynia announced to the emperor, Trajan (98-117), that not only the towns, but also the villages and the plains were full of Christians, the heathen temples were almost deserted, the duty of sacrificing to the gods almost forgotten.

From Egyptian Alexandria, Christianity pushed on towards the south. Not only Jewish and Greek circles were opened to it, but in the next few years a Coptic translation of the writings of the New Testament was able to find circulation, and Christian communities appear in the Thebais. In the same way the Gospel spread towards the east in Arabia and towards the west in the district of Cyrene. From Rome the Christian faith was borne over the sea to Africa, and Carthage became a new colony. At the beginning of the following period (about 200) Tertullian could declare that if a persecution of the Christians were to be carried out, "Carthage must be

decimated." A synod which was held there united no fewer than seventy African and Numidian bishops. The commercial relations between Asia Minor and Southern Gaul facilitated the sowing here of the seed of the new faith. About the year 177 Christian communities flourished there, at Lugdunum (Lyons) and Vienne (Vienna), as we learn from the account of the cruel persecution endured by them, which these communities sent to the churches in Asia and Phrygia.

It is only by chance that we hear anything of new Christian communities. Wherever in the Roman empire or beyond its boundaries Christians came, they spoke of that which was the highest to them. Celsus, the enemy of the Christians, reports in 178: "Weavers, tanners, shoemakers, the most uneducated and roughest men, are the most zealous preachers." At the same time, many Christians made it their life's work to spread their faith. These missionaries were called apostles. The "Teaching of the Apostles," which appeared about 110, required that they should restrict themselves to labouring among the heathen, and permitted them to remain two days, at the longest, in places where Christian communities already existed. In what circles did this new belief find adherents? With the conviction that Christianity was the true wisdom, Paul had complained: "Not many wise, not many mighty, not many noble!"

With the view that only those learned in philosophy could judge of such transcendent questions, Celsus scoffed at the uneducated Christians.

But we hear also of philosophers who found in Christianity that which they sought for vainly in the different schools of heathen wisdom. We know of near relations of the emperor who became

The Onward March of the New Gospel

Common People and Philosophers Accept the Gospel

Christians. Certainly in the meetings of the Christians there were far more poor men and slaves than noble and learned men. But if we take into consideration how small the number of educated men was at that time in comparison with the mass of uneducated—only one-half per cent. of the inhabitants of Rome belonged to the upper classes


—there is absolutely no reason for the assumption that Christianity attracted principally only the uneducated. The Christian literature of this period contradicts such an assumption. Comparatively little of it has been preserved. But in it we find such writings as in no way betray a low standard of education in their authors.

Above all, the wish to possess material for Christian teaching induced persons to alter Jewish writings according to Christian notions. At the end of the first century the "Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs" appeared, which places prophecies in the mouths of Jacob's sons, to which are joined moral warnings and references to the fulfilment of the hopes of Christians. Consequently some, through the wish to picture to themselves the beginnings of Christianity in a more clear and thorough manner than the writings preserved from primitive times afforded—others, through the need to lend authority to new but divergent views through ostensibly old records—let themselves be led away into creating new Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, Epistles, or Revelations. We are acquainted merely with the names or with scanty fragments of most of such works; and, as a rule, there are no data by which to determine the period of their production and to decide the

question whether they should be reckoned as religious romances or as records from ancient times. Early in the post-apostolic period must have been composed the "Protevangelium of James the Younger," which depicts the infancy of Jesus from the birth of his mother, Mary, to the Massacre of the Innocents at Bethlehem. To the same period roughly belong

the Gospel and Revelation of Peter, our knowledge of which has been greatly enriched by the latest discoveries in the monk's grave at Achmin. The former so depicts the story of Jesus' passion that Pilate, the representative of the heathen world, appears in a more favourable light. The latter regards the present Christians as degenerate, and attempts to bring them back to their senses by describing hell and its unspeakable torments. An Asiatic presbyter is said to have composed the "Stories of Paul and Thecla." When called to account for his boldness, he declared he had so treated the subject only out of love for Paul. But this motive could not shield him from deposition. The Church did not wish, like the heretics, that pious frauds should prevail.

A second group of writers of our period is comprised under the title of "Apostolic Fathers." A schism had arisen in the Corinthian community and had led to the



IGNATIUS AWAITING MARTYRDOM IN THE COLOSSEUM
 Ignatius, the first bishop of Antioch, was taken to Rome in the year 112, and there, in the arena of the Colosseum, he was given over to wild beasts. It is said that his last prayer was, "May I, O God, as Thine own corn, be now so ground between the teeth of these wild beasts that I may become white bread for my Heavenly Master."



POLYCARP'S TESTIMONY FOR CHRIST

Polycarp, the first bishop of Smyrna, long ruled the Christian Church there, but in the reign of Aurelian he suffered martyrdom. Brought before the proconsul, he was asked to deny Christ, but is said to have refused, saying, "Hear my free confession—I am a Christian."

removal of certain presbyters from office. Then—probably in the year 97—the presbyter Clemens sent thither from Rome a letter exhorting them to humility and love. Clemens did not write as Roman bishop or as Pope, and did not even mention his own name—"The Church of God on pilgrimage at Rome, to the Church of God abiding at Corinth in a strange land." A second letter, known under the name of the "Second Letter of Clemens," certainly did not emanate from that presbyter. It was probably written about 140, and is not a letter but the oldest Christian sermon of which we know, an exhortation to the "trial and conflict in this life, that we may be crowned in the life to come."

The famous Hermas was a layman; his writings bore the title of "Shepherd," because the angel of repentance, in whose mouth most of the exhortations are placed, is introduced by him as a shepherd. In the form of visions the point is impressed

that there is yet time for repentance. This writing at first enjoyed such high esteem in the Church that it was almost placed on a level with the Holy Scriptures of primitive times, and reckoned at any rate worthy of being read aloud in divine service. This fact should be evidence that it appeared at an early date, somewhere at the beginning of the second century. The so-called "Epistle of Barnabas," which may belong to the same time, stood in high esteem in Alexandria, although the author carries his opposition to Judaism to such a pitch as to declare the observance of the Mosaic laws by the Jews to be a diabolic error, and although he puts a new interpretation on the Old Testament by means of almost incredibly bold allegories.

A peculiar interest is presented by the seven letters which the bishop Ignatius of Antioch wrote in 112, on his way to martyrdom at Rome, to different communities in Asia Minor and to the bishop Polycarp in order to exhort them to steadfastness and concord. He begs the Christians at Rome not to make another attempt to liberate him, for he is absolutely convinced that death will lead him to life, and that by anything which he might

still say or do in life he would not be able to testify so forcibly to his faith as through steadfast endurance of death by the teeth of the wild beasts in the arena at Rome.

Soon after his death we find the letter of Polycarp from Smyrna to the community in Philippi, which had asked him to send all the writings of the martyr that were in his hands. This letter contains so many quotations from the New Testament Scriptures that it is at the same time of importance as an eloquent testimony of their antiquity. While the Christian literature of this

The First Evangelical Writings

period which we have so far mentioned was intended for Christians, the third series of writings was directed to the heathen. It was called forth by the new position which the pagan world, especially the state authorities, assumed towards Christianity. Up to the beginning of the post-apostolic era the Christians had certainly suffered from the hatred of the

Jews. The Roman state, on the contrary, as a rule, laid no obstacles in their way, holding as yet no regard for them. Sprung from Judaism, they were reckoned as a Jewish sect. When they were suddenly, in the year 64, recognised at Rome as an independent body, and were persecuted by the state, the disregard which was again

**Why Nero
Massacred
the Christians**

shown them during the next decades, proves that such exceptional procedure requires a special explanation. The motive of the massacre of the Christians by Nero was merely the need of the emperor to shift upon others the suspicion that he had set fire to the capital of the world for his own pleasure. Who should these others be but the Jews, especially those who had their stalls where the fire broke out? And how could these escape the danger threatening them more simply and safely than by diverting the suspicion from themselves to the hated Christians? Thus the state authorities learnt to make a difference between the Jews and the Christians of the town, but only for the immediate occasion. The authorities never believed in the real guilt of these Christians, and the previous state of indifference towards them continued.

The position must have become quite different when the outbreak and failure of the Jewish rising not only entirely separated the Christians from the Jews in internal relations, but compelled them to take precautions no longer to be mistaken for a Jewish party. And now, when the distinction between them and the Jews was universally known, it was perceived that their number had become unsuspectedly large, and was increasing every day on a scale which had never been noticed in any sect. It had become impossible to disregard them.

The fact that the Christians wished to be regarded as different from all others, that they did not attend the popular festivals,

**How the Pagans
Misrepresented
Christianity**

closely connected with the state cult, and the licentious or brutal spectacles in which the people expressed their national self-consciousness, that they defined the task of life so differently from the rest of the world, and staked their all on something other and presumably higher than wealth, honour, or enjoyment—this irritated the heathen world. It invented, spread, and believed only too gladly incredible crimes of this weird sect which

could not be measured by any traditional standard. At their secret meals they were said to slaughter and eat children—perhaps a listener had once heard the words, "Take and drink all of this; this cup is the New Testament in my Blood." Or they were reported to indulge in the grossest immorality—perhaps a spy had once seen the Christians before the celebration of the sacred feast giving each other the kiss of brotherhood, but had not reported that only men with men and women with women thus showed their close bonds of union. Men felt themselves the more entitled to attribute these crimes to them since they were indignant at their secret proceedings. It is quite comprehensible that under such circumstances the persecutions of the Christians were on many occasions due to the wishes of the mass of the people.

The courts, however, needed the support of the law before they could accede to such demands. Three laws of the empire could be brought to bear on the question. The law of the Twelve Tables forbade men to have other gods than those publicly recognised. The Julian law as

**Christianity
as Treason
to the State**

to treason declared everything to be a crime against the state which bore in itself the character of secret discontent with the government—for example, secret nightly meetings. The law as to sacrilege, finally, was directed against the refusal to sacrifice to the gods or to the genius of the emperor. It is clear that all these laws rest on the same conception. Everything, even religion, must be subordinate to the state. Not that which is true must be believed; not that which is moral must be done; the welfare of the state stands above truth and morality. It is a crime against the state to doubt the religion adopted by the state and not to submit to it. Would the Christians admit this theory? In so doing they would give up their Christianity. For, according to Christianity, religion is the personal bond between man and God which has to precede all other relations.

Therefore, there was nothing left to the state but to compel these Christians by its own power to adopt its religion. But if they could not be forced to do so, if their fellowship with God was worth more to them than life itself, then the question was bound to arise whether the state could maintain its position against such unexampled constancy and slay until not one of

these heroes was left on earth, or whether, finally, vanquished by the supernatural, it would abandon its claim and bow before the God of these Christians. A tremendous spectacle, this struggle for life and death between the Roman state, equipped with the united strength of this world, and this band of Christians, with no other power at their disposal than the power to die.

As early as the reign of Domitian the blood of Christians flowed in Rome. Where after that they were brought to trial no one can say. As the younger Pliny, governor of Bithynia, in the year 112 inquired from the emperor Trajan how he was to deal with the Christians, persecutions must already have taken place. Pliny excused his inquiry on the plea that he had never yet been present at the trials of Christians. He begged for information on the question whether those Christians also who had committed no offences were to be condemned; whether, that is to say, the mere fact of being a Christian was punishable, and whether he was authorised to discharge those who, by invocation of the gods and by sacrifices before the statue of the

The Proscribed Name

emperor, proved their loyalty to the state even if previously they had been Christians. The emperor answered both questions in the affirmative, but forbade officials to spy out the Christians or to give credit to anonymous suspicions. Christianity was evidently to him only an extravagance, innocent in itself, but also unlawful, and one which could not be declared permissible. This correspondence was published a few years after. Accordingly, a definite precedent for the treatment of the Christians was established for the officials, which was observed up to the middle of the third century. What a peculiar position was created by that edict! "When dealing with the Christians," complains Tertullian, "they punish not deeds, but the name." And yet they did not punish the use of the name Christian as an illegal act, which is punished, even if it is not likely to be repeated. On the contrary, a man could win complete exemption from penalty if he relinquished the name temporarily—a man might be a Christian before and after the judicial proceeding.

What real strength must Christianity have had in itself if, despite this easy means of defence, Christians never thought to make use of it, and regarded those members of their community who did make use of it

as no longer Christians! What love for truthfulness must this Christian faith have inculcated! It was the name which was punished, and yet not only a name, but a deed.

No one can say how far this persecution, which we hear of through Pliny, extended. The head of the community at Jerusalem, Simeon, fell. One of the last victims was Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, who was dragged to Rome to be thrown before the wild beasts. But up to the end of the post-apostolic time the hatred against the Christians kept breaking out, now here, now there, into violent eruptions. The notion that Christians were punishable as such was so universal that the heathen people regarded a formal judicial inquiry as unnecessary punctiliousness, and wished the Christians to be punished without it. In public disasters men thought they could trace the wrath of the gods. "If the Tiber rises to the houses, if the Nile does not rise over the fields, if the earth shakes, if famine or pestilence breaks out, straightway the people cry out, 'To the lions with the Christians!'" Antoninus Pius (138-161) was compelled to issue edicts which enforced strict observance of legal methods with regard to such violent proceedings. Yet the state never doubted its ability to annihilate completely this preposterous movement so soon as it seemed necessary. To be obliged to fear it was pure absurdity!

This new situation, that both the bulk of the population and the authorities considered Christianity worthy of notice and of opposition, produced a new class of literature, the apologetic. Experience taught that neither the self-vindication of the Christians when placed before the courts, nor the fact of their moral purity were sufficient to move their opponents from their hatred. The attempt had, therefore, to be made to obtain another

The Aid of the Pen

verdict, through writings intended to prove all hostile reproaches to be meaningless and Christianity to be the fulfilment of that for which the nobler heathen also craved. Soon there were Christian philosophers and rhetoricians, heads of committees, who addressed such writings sometimes to the heathen generally, sometimes directly to the emperor.

Born in Samaria of Hellenic parents, Justin had sought for certainty of religious

conviction in one school of philosophy after another, and had found it at last in Christianity. This, therefore, was reckoned by him as the true philosophy, in the sense that it actually performed that which philosophy only promised to give. He did not for this reason doff his philosopher's cloak, but tried by lectures and disputations to win adherents to Christianity. About the year

**Justin
the
Martyr**

150 he addressed an apology to Antoninus Pius, and soon afterwards, moved by a specially outrageous case of an unjust sentence against Christians, he published a second and shorter apology. As he had risen through philosophy to Christianity, so he now gladly pointed to the fact that among the nobler philosophers traces of the same divine wisdom appear which manifested itself perfectly in Jesus. But there speaks in his writings not only a lover of wisdom, who has to do with mere knowledge, but a manly character glad to die for the truth.

"You can kill, but you cannot harm us!" He, indeed, suffered scourging and death at Rome in the year 165, together with a number of his scholars, "because they would not sacrifice to the gods."

The same road to Christianity led his pupil Tatian, who was of Assyrian stock, to another conception of what previously had been dear to him. He, too, found at last among the Christians that which he in vain looked for among the Greeks. But he was concerned, above all, with the question of moral regeneration. He therefore saw now only the dark side in Greek philosophy and art, and in his "Speech to the Greeks" praised Christianity as the truth, accessible even to the uneducated, which morally recreated mankind.

Quite contrary is the method of the "Representations on Behalf of the Christians"—the ordinary translation, "Petition (Supplicatio) for the Christians."

**Philosophers
Defend
Christianity**

is hardly a correct rendering of the meaning of *πρεσβηλα περι χριστιανων*, the somewhat difficult Greek title—which the otherwise unknown "Athenian philosopher," Athenagoras, addressed to Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. He not only answered the taunts and charges of crime flung at the Christians, but tried also to prove that precisely those views which were condemned in Christians were to be found in a similar form in heathen

philosophers. In a second writing on the Resurrection he sought to represent this single doctrine as in no way unreasonable.

The classical treatise of the Roman advocate, Minucius Felix, may have been written about 180. In form it followed Cicero's "De Natura Deorum" as a model. It is entitled "Octavius," because its contents are in the form of a conversation which Octavius, the friend of the author, holds on the seashore near Ostia with the heathen Cæcilius about the Christian and heathen religions. The latter, a sceptic, is disgusted at the positiveness with which uneducated Christians judge of God and God's attributes. Simply because nothing is certain, he maintains men ought to adhere to the traditional belief in the gods. All that the average pagan education of that time could adduce against Christianity could be freely expressed in this discussion. Octavius makes a friendly answer, but with such clearness and emphasis that his opponent finally declares himself vanquished. "We then went joyous and glad on our way. Cæcilius rejoiced that he had become a believer,

**Teachers
of the
Love of God**

Octavius that he had conquered, and I that my Cæcilius had become a believer and that my Octavius had conquered."

While the above-mentioned and similar writings were only intended for such heathens as despised Christianity or hated and persecuted it, and, therefore, were meant only to demonstrate to them the baselessness of their hostility, and selected isolated points against which to direct their attack, passing over in silence the deepest truths of Christianity, another treatise of this class was able to work more freely, since it was meant for a man who already faced Christianity with some interest and goodwill.

The unknown author of the "Letter to Diognetus," a man who was capable, through classical acquirements, of writing in a pure style, had no need to shrink from describing to such a man the great truth of Christianity, which might seem to the genuine pagan a degradation of the Divinity, the truth that "God is love." To this love, he explained, a man must surrender himself. In joyful gratitude he cannot but love God in return, and from this springs also brotherly love. Thus Christianity is the religion of the spirit and of truth, which can surmount all incidental, individual, and national distinctions, and is

able to create new men. "Its adherents are not differentiated from other men by country, speech, or any external qualities; they take part in everything as citizens, and are satisfied with everything as strangers. They live in the world, and yet are not of the world. They obey the existing laws, but by their life transcend the requirements of the law. They love all and are persecuted by all. They are not known, and yet they are condemned. They are put to death, and by this led to life."

Even in these few words a breath of that peculiar spirit is wafted towards us which inspired these early Christians, and is apparent in all the extant literature of that time. Everything is sustained by the consciousness that the Christian has found something inexpressibly great; that his life has gained a glorious importance, an exalted purpose; that the discord in it is abolished; that unity and harmony has entered into its thoughts, will, and deed. Ignatius calls the Christians "Bearers of God, bearers of Christ, bearers of the Holy One, adorned on all sides by the commands of Jesus Christ." He terms Christianity "something colossal." The Christians are not perplexed because the heathen do not understand it. That which faith gives remains concealed to profane eyes. But they know themselves to be so rich that the keynote of their life is joy. Even Hermas, the earnest

preacher of repentance, can write: "Banish all sorrow. It is worse than all evil spirits. The spirit of God which is granted you endures no sorrow and no complaining. Put on the joyous mood, which is ever well pleasing to God. Let it be well to thee in Him. For all live in God who cast away sorrow and clothe themselves in pure joyousness." Conscious that in truth they need not

**Valiant
for their
Faith**

be ashamed of their faith and of their life, and that no power of the world could take from them their unseen kingdom, the Christians scorned to beg for mercy. Even in the apologies which were laid down at the throne of the rulers of the world no cringing or flattery is found. "Not with flattery nor begging

for forgiveness do we come before you," writes Justin. Rightly has it been said that there was here no trace to be found of a submissive, sorrowful, apologetic tone. The consciousness of fighting for the truth, and of being able to die for it, gave them a dignified bearing, and they did not shrink from any attempt to make the murderous opponent feel his own grievous injustice. The Cæsars thus came to hear a strain hitherto unknown to them. In their meetings for divine worship the Christians prayed fervently for their emperor, whom their God had appointed. How could they, speaking before this emperor, in order merely to obtain indulgence, deny that Christianity was something hitherto unknown? While the Christians were thus fighting against the



A FATHER OF THE CHURCH
Born of Greek parentage, Justin, the martyr, was a Platonic philosopher, but became a Christian and wrote in defence of the faith.

annihilation which threatened them from the heathen world, that current in their midst, of which we have already noticed the first traces in the apostolic age, grew stronger. The storms from without coincide with a process of disintegration within.

The more the old religions lost in estimation, the greater was the tendency to put new philosophic interpretations on the old myths, to find in them popular descriptions of profound ideas, and then to blend the ideas won from various religions into one speculative system. Thus a distinction was made between

the religion to be conceded to the uneducated and the Gnosis, a knowledge which was to be accessible only to a select band. This was to solve the riddle of the universe; above all, to give a clear evidence as to the origin, meaning, and object of the dualism which pervades everything, of the contrast between idea and sensible manifestation, between good and evil, between light and darkness. This movement of the times affected the Christian communities also. Primitive Christianity wished to give fellowship with God; but he who found that fellowship extolled also "the wealth in wisdom and knowledge" which had become his.

And, without doubt, Christianity announced many thoughts quite new to the heathen world; so those men turned to it

who looked to it for an actual solution of speculative problems and for a means of satisfying their eagerness for knowledge. Soon the numbers of the Christians had become too great to be completely free from such elements. They drew other Christians to themselves, promising to them knowledge higher than the common belief which the Church

Mingling of Paganism and Christianity

could give. A society of the initiated was formed. The magic system of mysteries with its symbolic actions and secret consecrations was borrowed from the heathen world, in order that not merely the understanding but also the spirit might be contented. Essentially all this was paganism. But it accepted Christian thoughts, above all, the idea of redemption, and in this process of evolution assigned a place to Him from whom Christians take their name. Yet they do not mean by this that redemption from sin and its consequences which Christianity desires, but a redemption from the world, a liberation of the spiritual from the material, of the light from the darkness

Endless is the variety of these different Gnostic systems, strange, weird, bizarre phantoms in the pale moonlight; a mixture of the most opposite cults, of Greek and Jewish philosophy, Syro-Phœnician theories as to the creation of the world, the astrology and magic of the East; all hardly to be grasped by modern conceptions. Some required strict asceticism and won over many by their conspicuous sanctity. Others declared that they were raised above the lower laws of conventional morality, and did not wish to resist the all-powerful impulses of Nature. They all offered the hand of friendship to Christianity if it would only adapt itself to the new and brightly glittering fabric.

A serious menace to the Church! Fixed standards were still wanting by which to test what doctrines were authorised in the Church. There were, indeed,

The Gnostics Against the Church

holy writings from the primitive times of Christianity; but the Gnostics also appealed to these in support of their views, putting arbitrary interpretations on them by means of the system of figurative explanation prevalent among the Christians. At the same time they themselves fabricated professedly apostolic writings, and prided themselves on being in possession of a secret tradition which only the chosen apostles could have

received. Who was to decide what was truth? The order of independent prophets was still esteemed. The offices in the Church were still appointed without regard to unity. The connection between the communities was as loose as ever. Only one thing was left which could teach them to recognise and avoid the troubled waters that were surging in—that was the Christian spirit. Would it be clear and strong enough to repel this self-conscious, insinuating Gnosis? The Church recognised this enemy, presenting itself as a friend. It did not rest until he was overcome. But the ensuing period will show that the Church itself in the course of these hard struggles assumed another form.

We notice the first tendencies in this direction early in the post-apostolic period. A college of elders or bishops had formerly stood at the head of the communities. We now find in the letters of Ignatius mention of a single bishop. His epistle to the Romans tells us, indeed, that this innovation was not yet introduced in that community. The letter of Polycarp shows the same thing regard-

The Need of a Central Organisation

ing the community at Philippi. But the communities in Asia Minor were already under *one* bishop, with presbyters and deacons below him. Was it, perhaps, the apostle John who in these communities, where he had gone to minister after Paul's death, introduced the arrangement, which he had learnt to value at Jerusalem, in order to have a responsible representative in those places where he could not be present personally? This is suggested by the circumstance that each of the seven "circular letters" in his Apocalypse is addressed to one "angel" of the community in Asia Minor. In any case, the new feature soon gained increasing ground for itself. The greater the dangers which threatened the communities from without and from within, the more was the wish felt for a central administration.

And since there was no longer any question of a divinely revealed order, men allowed themselves to be led by the new-felt need of adopting a new form. From the fear that divisions might arise in the communities, Ignatius on his way to death warned them urgently to hold fast to their connection with the bishop. Yet he did not thereby set forth a theory that men should subject themselves blindly to bishops as such. On the contrary,

since he knew that these bishops, to whose communities he addressed himself, were true "overseers," bishops after God's heart, he writes: "Whoever does not follow the will of his bishops opposes the will of God." But later the views as to the importance of the office were changed, for it was only too easy to understand such utterances to mean that all bishops were representatives of God by virtue of their office. The later extension of meaning taught this.

A second point arose in post-apostolic times. What was more natural than that the man who desired baptism should pronounce in some way or other his assent to the Christian faith? At first this must have been done in the shortest form, some addition to the formula adopted by the baptiser: "I baptise thee in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," which is also prescribed in the "Teaching of the Apostles." If, then, heresies had to be rejected, short explanatory sentences were certainly added to that brief expression. Thus a rule of faith was formed which served to distinguish, as it were, the universal faith from perversions of it. The significance of this countersign was bound to increase as the number of those who desired to be received into the Church grew greater, and as, therefore, it became more desirable to possess a short epitome of that which constituted the Christian faith.

Beginning of Ritualism

Such epitomes were at first, as might be expected, different in the different countries. But the increase of intercourse between the various communities made it necessary to adjust such differences by accepting sentences that appeared important and were customary elsewhere, and by excluding what was too comprehensive. In the conviction that they were expressing nothing else in such sentences than what the founders of the Church, the apostles, had taught, this rule of faith was called "the apostolic confession of faith."

In any case, before the middle of the second century some such "creed" was in use, almost exactly like that in use at the present time. This could not have been first composed in Rome, but must have been based on a confession originating in the East.

We notice the beginnings of a third action of the Church. The sacred Scriptures of the Jews were accepted by the Christians as inspired by the spirit of God. Extracts from them were read aloud in

the services. Together with these came letters of the apostle Paul and other works of Christian authors. In order to multiply the available materials for the edification of the public, the communities exchanged such writings among themselves. When the original apostles were dead and the "prophets" became fewer, these writings

Selecting the Apostolic Writings


replaced what was lost. At the same time also the need arose of not permitting all and every Christian writing to be read aloud at divine service, but of examining whether by age and contents it was suitable for the purpose. This question became still more weighty when the Gnostics attempted to secure the recognition of their heresies by means of edited or forged writings; and when Marcion, a Christian enthusiastic for Paul, about 150, wished to find distortions of the true Christianity in a series of writings which up till then had been reckoned apostolic, and rejected some and mutilated others.

The important point now was that everything which, as dating from the foundation of the Church, must count as apostolic, whether composed by an apostle himself or by another witness of the earliest times, should be definitely separated from other literature; nor was it material whether the contents of such literature were orthodox or tainted with heresy. The problem was to construct a "canon." The first list of this kind which is extant—unfortunately, in mutilated form, and, therefore, not to be certainly defined as to its extent—called after its discoverer, Ludovico Antonio Muratori, the "Muratorian canon"—contained twenty-two out of the twenty-seven writings collected in the present New Testament, and is said to have been made in Rome about 180. Some 130 years later we learn, through the Church historian, Eusebius, that not even then were all the writings in our present New Testament popularly recognised; the decision was still wavering over

The Church Fixes its Standards

the Epistle of St. James, the two Epistles of Peter, the second and third Epistles of St. John, and the Epistle of Jude. In 360 Athanasius put forth a tract, in which these writings also were reckoned canonical

The Church thus sought to win a firmer position and fixed standards, that it might not lose its course and be wrecked in the overpowering fury of the waves. It is on the way to become the Catholic Church.



THE EARLY CHURCH TRIUMPHANT: CONSTANTINE THE GREAT PRESENTING ST. SILVESTER WITH A STATUETTE OF ROME
From the painting by Penni in the Vatican. Photo by Andersch, Rome.



THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN BEING

ITS EARLY TRIALS AND TRIUMPHS

STRUGGLE BETWEEN HEATHENISM & CHRISTIANITY

ALTHOUGH during the previous period the Christians had been an oppressed and cruelly persecuted body, they were not exterminated. "The blood of the martyrs had been the seed of the Church." The rage of the storm was spent. It would seem that men had grown weary of murder as an ineffective measure. It is true that the existing law made the trial of Christians possible, and that bloody persecutions still occurred, but a period of comparative rest had begun.

Men, moreover, ascended the imperial throne who lacked the moral power to hate a religion. The Roman bishop, Victor, was able to acquire influence over the profligate Commodus (180-192). Septimius Severus (211) took a Christian slave, to whom he owed his cure, into his palace and protected the Christians who held high posts round him; and he is said to have given a Christian nurse to his son, Caracalla. The Christian author, Hippolytus, carried on a correspondence with the second wife of Elagabalus. Alexander Severus placed the pictures of Abraham and Jesus among his household gods in the Lararium. "The maxims of the Master came readily to his lips." Over a room in his palace he had the saying of Christ written up: "Do unto others what you would that they should do unto you!" The empress-mother was on intimate terms with the famous teacher of the Church, Origen.

**Christian
Influence on
the Emperors**

Philip the Arabian (244-249) is said actually to have been a Christian; and even if it were only a legend, yet what a change it implies that such a story could have been told and believed!

The sword of Damocles hanging over the Christian name, which had formerly kept so many back from Christianity, and which had served closely to sift the communities, now seemed to have been

taken away. The heathen pressed in masses into the Church. Once it had been the aim of the Christians to rescue individuals from the "world which lay in wickedness" for the approaching day of judgment, and not to bow before the power of the enemy, but to regard the martyr's crown as the noblest ornament.

**Increased
Importance of
the Pastors**

Now they ventured to think, as Origen writes, that all other religions would perish and that the divine truth would in the end rule alone on earth.

In what a new aspect appear the chiefs, especially of the Christian communities! How greatly has the importance of these pastors increased through the growth of the flock, through the increase of the burden of work laid on them, especially as these large communities, constantly feeling less inclination to act themselves, entrusted all church work to the bishops! The presbyters and deacons proved soon insufficient to manage everything. Thus, in the second quarter of the third century new officials were created for the performance of the inferior services, such as subdeacons, readers, exorcists, and acolytes.

But in order that the single guidance might be secured, the offices formed a graduated system, at the head of which stood the one bishop. Formerly this office had been regarded as a hard test of loving service towards the community, and the only privilege of the leader had been to die first in the fight. Now, it might be reckoned an honour, flattering to pride, to stand at the head of these great communities, recruiting themselves from the highest ranks in the empire. The rights of the office now became a prerogative. Rivalry between the priests and the laymen became possible. Tertullian, who wished to check this development, could exclaim wrathfully

and prove by the manner of his protest that the new movement had touched him already, "Are not laymen priests? Where three are, there is the Church, even though they be laymen."

But how could the tendency be checked?

If these masses were to be held together by the Church, submission to the bishops must be exacted. And in order to justify this unwonted claim the bishops were clothed with the same honour which men had been accustomed to show to the apostles, the founders of the Church. A second cause hastened this development. Men appealed to the Holy Scriptures in order to refute the heretics. But how was it to prove to them that such standards really dated from the first origin of Christianity? No one was alive whose memory reached back to that age. Was there, then, no substitute for such witnesses? Tertullian writes:

**The
Apostolic
Succession**

could give the most certain information? Evidently the bishops. The apostles had placed such men as pastors in the communities founded by them, and the latter had again appointed as their successors the men who had absorbed most accurately the original doctrine.

The unbroken succession of these officials guaranteed in the earliest times certain information on points about which men could, unfortunately, no longer inquire from the apostles themselves. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, was a pupil of Polycarp, who had sat at the feet of the apostle John. As, in consequence of this, he himself was able to say what the original faith was, he declared it as a general rule, about 180, that the heads of the apostolic communities were qualified, by virtue of their succession in office, to state the truth. He was not speaking of any power of infallibility handed down to them from the apostles; he meant only that such communities, and especially their heads,

were in possession of historical knowledge valuable in the struggle against the heretics. As an instance, "since it would take too long to relate the succession in office of all churches," he mentions the "greatest, oldest, and best-known" community,



ORIGEN OF ALEXANDRIA

Among the early fathers of the Church he was the most notable for his immense literary services. A Greek of Alexandria, he was brought up in the Christian faith.

community, that of the Church of Rome. An inquiry made of them alone would certainly be sufficient, since naturally all other communities in which the apostolic tradition was preserved would agree with its answer. But, indeed, such innocently intended phrases might well be misinterpreted when the inroad of the masses and the rush of different ideas into the Church rendered desirable some governing body with authority to decide disputed questions! How easily could these words be read to mean that the bishop's office was the bearer of the truth!

Another sentence of Irenæus could then be distorted: "Where the Church is, there is the spirit of God. To be outside the Church is to be outside the truth." Thus he writes after he has demonstrated that the "preaching of the Church is uniformly the truth as testified by the apostles, and the teaching of that which is outside the Church is 'perverted' truth." He adds, however: "And where the spirit of God is, there is the Church; but the spirit is the truth."

He declares only the clearly proven fact that truth is to be found in the Church, and not among the heretics. But that sentence, torn away from the context, carried a great thesis in itself, since by the "Church" was understood the external corporation of the Church to which the bishops guaranteed the apostolic truth. It was but a short step to the next proposition, that the Church was formed by the bishops, and truth and salvation were to be found only in connection with them. At this time, too, the desire for a visible unity of all

**Origin
of the
"Church"**

communities became continually stronger. How, then, was order to be maintained in these great communities which were in perpetual flux if identical doctrines and identical procedure did not link them together? The name "Catholic Church" is found, indeed, in Ignatius; but he

meant by it the ideal aggregate community, scattered throughout the whole world (Καθ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης), in contradistinction to the individual community. But now it was desired to mould the aggregate into a comprehensible, definite unity, in order that each individual might know to what to hold fast, and not be led astray. What else could represent this unity except the office of bishop ?

Hippolytus, the pupil of Irenæus, already declares the bishops to be the *diadochi*, or successors, of the apostles, participating in the same grace of the high priesthood and of teaching as they did. In the middle of the third century Cyprian, bishop of Carthage (248-258), elaborates

also to decide to whom the divine gifts belong. They are not merely administrators, but judges in the Church. They are thus in the fullest sense what the priests were among the Jews.

Now, the duties incumbent on the bishops were considered priestly, and the bishops were regarded as priests.

Duties of the Bishops Only they might administer the mysteries (sacraments) of baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Their offering at the Lord's Supper was a sacrifice. Formerly the gift of the bread and wine for this holy meal, brought by the community, was called the sacrifice of the community. In the same way the prayers of the Christians, in particular the prayer

at the Lord's Supper, were designated a sacrifice. But the priest offers the body and blood of Christ as a sacrifice to God. "The priest imitates what Christ has done when He offered Himself to the Father." The bishops are regarded as holding their high office from God Himself, although the community may have co-operated in their election. It is, therefore, presumption to assume that a bishop is not worthy of his office. He acts, therefore, from the "inspiration of the Holy Ghost."

Thus believers are bound to the bishops. The unity of the Church is represented in them. The old conception is forgotten, according to which the "number of believers" is the Church, and "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," makes a man member of this Church. Not everyone who, by virtue of the faith and the baptism, has the one Lord belongs to the Church; but "whosoever has not the Church as mother cannot have God as father." "Outside the Church is no salvation." And this Church is the outward community, represented by the bishops. Only he who submits to the episcopacy stands in the Church.

To sustain this claim it was necessary that all bishops should desire and command one and the same thing. As early as 180-200 the representatives of the communities here and there felt the need of counsel as to their official action in difficult questions. They held synods. It was naturally the political



THE MARTYRDOM OF ORIGEN

It was under the decree of Decius in the year 254 A.D., that Origen met the fate he had coveted even as a youth. His warders are here seen taunting him with the fiery torment he goes forth to face.

the thoughts of his time as to the existence of a Church into a self-contained system. That is true of the bishops which Christ said to the apostles filled with the spirit of God, "Whoever hears you, hears Me." Only through the bishops are the divine mercies communicated to us. They have

capital of a province where assemblies were held, and it was the bishop of this town who made preparations for it and assumed the presidency. It thus followed,

**How the
Metropolitans
Originated**

as a matter of course, that the metropolitan gradually came to be regarded as the unifying force of the episcopacy of the province. Of the capitals, some had peculiar importance in the eyes of the Christians. Rome was not only the capital of the world, but it held the bones of Peter and Paul, the apostolic princes. Alexandria, the second city of the empire, was renowned as the seat of Christian learning. Antioch, the third city of the empire, had long had the apostle Paul for its teacher. Ephesus numbered a specially large Christian community, and Paul, as well as John, had long been at its head. The countries round Carthage received the Gospel from it. Assuredly in any disputed questions it was more valuable to have the bishop of such a community on one's side than the bishop of some unknown place.

There was, indeed, at first no claim of prerogatives, but the urban bishops already enjoyed a higher estimation. It was the beginning of the patriarchate system of the visible unity of several provinces. Soon there would be the sole problem, that of fixing a central point for the aggregate of *all* Churches. One bishop already asserted a claim to such a position—the bishop of Rome.

Who knows whether Cyprian, if he had been bishop of Rome, would not have crowned the fabric of his Church with the claim that the Roman bishop was the high priest placed over all priests? But he was bishop of Carthage, and had not always agreed with the decisions of the bishop of Rome, and, therefore, most vehemently opposed the claim of Rome

to the primacy over all other Churches. Yet Cyprian's longing not merely to imagine the episcopacy as a unity, but actually to see it, was so great that he at least put forward the proposition that Christ intended the episcopacy to be *one* in investing Peter with all the powers enjoyed by the other apostles. Thus the successor of Peter, the bishop of Rome, represents the unity of the bishops and with it that of the Church. This Roman

**The
Chair of
Peter**

community, the community of Peter, was indeed that "from which the unity of the bishops took its origin," which more than all others strove for unity among the bishops. What men dreaded, then, was, nevertheless, greatly desired. Doubtless, the desire would prevail

over the dread. It would cost hard struggles, because now office in the Church was regarded as a privilege and was valued as the highest calling and carried highest honour. But the whole course of events set irresistibly towards the establishment of a primacy.

As a firmly compacted unity the Church might better hope to keep together, to lead, and to educate the masses that were pressing into it, even such as were as yet little moved by the Christian spirit. It is not strange that now the whole rule of faith, which was originally a mere declaration of the existing creed, was fixed more and more as a *law* of faith, to which all must submit who wished to belong to the Church. But personal belief could

not be coerced, and no one wished to bar unnecessarily admission into the Church. What was left, then, except to be content with the absence of spoken opposition to the Church? And what was more natural than to regard



A BISHOP OF THE EARLY CHURCH

This carefully detailed portrait of a bishop of the early Church is reproduced from a very ancient mosaic in the church of St. Sophia at Constantinople.

the submission to the law of faith established by the Church as the badge of Christianity? Many pagans, especially the educated men among them, could not yet reconcile themselves to this rule of faith.

But men were already hopeful that the whole world would become Christian; and an attempt was, therefore, made to bring the belief of the Church as near as possible to the educated among its disparagers and to force it on their convictions. It was necessary to reduce Christian doctrine to a complete system which could be compared with the systems of the heathen philosophers. Where could this need have been more keenly felt than in Alexandria, that most prominent abode of Hellenic learning? No one, unless familiar with this, and able to reconcile philosophy, could hope to influence wider circles. There was a second incentive. Gnosticism dazzled many men, for it promised a deep knowledge, not accessible to all. If it was to be defeated, it must be shown that pure Christianity granted wisdom and knowledge.

What a task was set by this! It was desired to give a scientific form to the Christian doctrine, and yet the only available method of scientific thought was that of Hellenic philosophy. It was necessary to try how far this was adapted to the statement of Christianity, and everything had to be excluded which originated in the heathen conceptions of the world. This required not merely extraordinary acuteness of thought, but also an absolutely pure knowledge of Christianity. Those who first set about the gigantic work could pride themselves on the former qualification, but not on the latter, for everywhere in the Church

there was now present a dimness of conception regarding the nature of Christianity. Precisely those doctrines which the apostle Paul had expressed in so clear a manner, forming as they did the kernel of what was essentially Christianity, were all forgotten.

It might seem the conception of "faith" was so changed that it no longer could take

the predominant place which Jesus and Paul had assigned to it. In its room a code of morals had entered which might be termed a mixture of Jewish and heathen ethics. Thus one fundamental difference between paganism and Christianity was no longer recognised, and conceptions and ideas common in the heathen philosophy were unhesitatingly employed to expound Christianity. The result would have been a complete change in Christianity if at the same time the conviction had not been firm that the Holy Scriptures of the early period were based on divine revelation, and, therefore, must be maintained as the foundation. Their decisive utterances would, no doubt, have been completely misinterpreted by means of the favourite allegorical explanation had not the short



CYPRIAN OF CARTHAGE
Though born in heathenism the early Church had no more austere and devoted member than Cyprian, who suffered martyrdom in 258 A.D.

sentences of the rule of faith, universally handed down as unassailable, raised too loud a protest. The creed of the Church saved the Church from complete degeneration. Pantænus, Clemens, Origen, worked in this line in the school at Alexandria.

They made the conception of the "Logos," which is borrowed, according to its contents, from Greek philosophy, the central point of their theology. This is the absolute reason, the principle which binds God to the world. It was also operative in the heathen world. The Platonic philosophy derived truth from the "Logos." In Christianity, again, the "Logos" has become man, and, therefore, the full and pure truth is present in it. Thus a saving bridge was constructed from paganism to Christianity. It did not need a leap to go from the wisdom of the world to the faith of the Christian, only one step, a step forward.

The Catholic Church is born. Christianity has lost simplicity of faith, but has gained unity of organisation. The church system has interposed itself as mediator of salvation between God and man, but, on the other hand, has attained the possibility of communicating to the great mass some of the benefits of salvation. The danger is lest communion with the Church take the place of communion with God;

but as admission into the communion of the Church is made easier, the way is afforded to those who are dissatisfied with the world of pressing on to communion with God. But before this new position is completely attained a raging tempest bursts rendering everything doubtful. The last seventy years had taught incontestably that to let Christianity alone was merely to further its supremacy. It had been seen as well that partial persecutions were useless, and, indeed, merely afforded the Christians the opportunity to prove the constancy of their faith and to make new conquests. It had been made clear that the struggle between paganism and Christianity was one of life and death. And perhaps it was already too late for the former to conquer. But was the world still capable of enthusiasm for the heathen faith? Had not the old belief in the gods long since been shaken and now shattered by the ridicule of the Christian writers? Yet religion was more necessary now than ever. Warmed by the brightly glowing fire of Christian faith, the yearning for the Invisible had flared up again in the hearts of many who had felt themselves contented by none of the religions known to them, and had turned their backs on metaphysics.

A Struggle of Life and Death

Numbers, however, thus awakened from religious indifference, did not wish to turn to Christianity, for they hated it. Yet they could no longer despise it. The Christians had many advantages over them—joyous enthusiasm, consciousness of their communion with God, the sense of elevation above the world. If men wished to raise up enthusiastic opponents to Christianity they must purify the old faith from the notions which have brought it into contempt, and give it the advantages of Christianity. Thus arose the last form of the Greek philosophy, the first philosophy formed in opposition to Christianity, Neo-Platonism, founded by Ammonius Saccas, who died in 241, and elaborated by his scholar, Plotinus, who died in 270. Much surprise has been caused by the hostility between Neo-Platonism and Christianity. As if anything but a struggle for life and death could prevail between the real faith and a substitute, pursuing the object of driving out the former! All religions, barbarian as well as the Jewish, are justified in so far as they strive towards the true religion. Christianity alone makes

The Last Philosophy of Greece

no defence of this kind, for it proclaims itself the only true religion and denies the right of all others to exist. Thus all religions of the world might unite in Neo-Platonism, and unite in a struggle against Christianity.

Porphyry, who died in 304, the pupil of Plotinus, makes a further attempt to see if the Christians will not allow themselves to be drawn into the porticoes of the Neo-Platonists. He wrote fifteen books, the title of which is variously translated, "about the Christians" or "against the Christians." They might confidently continue, said Porphyry, to reverence their Founder, from whom they take their name, for He was a wise and holy man. But His disciples have altered the truths preached by Him and have made him a God against His will. The Christians must place no belief in their holy writings, for these contain contradictions and improbabilities.

The ill-success of such attempts at proselytism resulted merely in determining men not to shrink from quite other weapons in order to wipe Christianity from off the earth. The emperors after Philip the Arabian were filled with pain and anger at the decay of the empire. Their object was to restore its old power and splendour, and for this unity in worship was essential. In 249 Decius mounted the throne. He first formed the plan of systematically extirpating Christianity. The system of espionage on the Christians set up by order of the state and forbidden by Trajan was now reinstated.

The decree of the year 250 ordered that throughout the empire the Christians were to be forced to take part in the state religion. The priests were to be immediately put to death as presumably incorrigible, the others to be made humble by continually increasing penalties. Heavy punishment would fall on the prefect who did not bring back the Christians of his district to the old religion. What a thunderbolt for the Christians! And it burst, too, on a community grown effeminate and full of half-Christians, owing to the entry of masses of the people. When, therefore, torture and death suddenly threatened, many acted as if they could not purify themselves quickly enough of the suspicion of being Christians. Others, with bleeding heart, consented to offer incense to the gods. Others, again, tried to extenuate their backsliding to

Decian Persecutions Begin

2872



CHRISTIAN SOLDIERS DECLARING THEIR FAITH BEFORE DECIUS

When Decius came to the throne, in 249 A. D., he set himself to the extirpation of Christianity, but his harshest measures were unavailing, and many officers and soldiers in his army were not afraid to avow themselves Christians before him.

themselves by bribing the officials, in order to get a certificate that they had satisfied the imperial orders.

But, strange to say, many of those who separated themselves from the Christians by a definite renunciation were not yet in a position to return to the pagans. They wished themselves back in the community from which fear had driven them. They implored to be taken back. They knew that in that case they were again threatened by what only now they had been too weak to endure. They knew that they must undergo an ordeal of repentance, lasting, perhaps, many years in shame and privation, before they were again received into the Church, and enabled to suffer torture or death for their faith. And yet they could not do otherwise: they could not live without that which once had inspired them.

And by the side of the weak ones what proofs of heroism! The victims in Alexandria were not less numerous than in Rome. The constancy of the boy Dioscurus under all his torments was so great that even the governor, full of wonder and pity, set him free. In the Thebais a Christian and his wife hung for days on the cross, speaking words of encouragement to each other. In Jerusalem and Antioch the bishops died after enduring tortures manfully. At Carthage the prison was filled with Christians, whom the officials wished to force to renunciation through hunger and thirst. They were no longer content with the ordinary tortures, but devised new and ingenious torments.

It was the heroic endurance of the constant that exasperated them most. Formerly they thought they had conquered when they had shown their power over the life of the Christians. They now felt that there could be no talk of victory unless the Christians were brought to renounce their faith. The martyr who died bravely triumphed over agony, death and his murderers; only he who drew back from the instruments of torture or from death was a conquered man. This led to the new sort of warfare—to kill only those who could not be conquered themselves and encouraged others, but to compel the rest, by unwearying persistence and perpetually renewed torments, to abandon the castle of their faith. As if the enlightenment and humanity

**The Martyrs
are
the Victors**

of the age were ashamed of this brutality, a short period of tranquillity began with the death of Decius, in 251. And although Valerian (253-260), with the greatest resolution, planned the annihilation of the Christians, he first tried to attain his purpose by less ferocious means. The Christian communities were to be, as it were, spiritually starved out, in order that they might break up from internal weakness. The bishops were removed and all assemblies of Christians forbidden. Thus the law of 258 ordered that all bishops, presbyters and deacons, as well as senators and knights, should be executed if after confiscation of their property they did not give up their faith. Noble women were to be banished, Christians in the imperial service were to work in chains on the emperor's estates.

In this persecution Cyprian suffered death at Carthage. But though very many bishops and presbyters were slain, the desired object was not reached. When Valerian was taken captive by the Persians, his successor, Gallienus, gave up the profitless contest. For some forty years the Christians had rest. Their numbers once more grew mightily. There was no longer need to search for Christians—they were met everywhere. In the army there were Christian officers, among the servants of the state there were Christians up to the governors themselves; there were Christian courtiers round the emperor. Finally there was even a rumour that the wife and daughter of the emperor, Diocletian, wished to be baptised.

After 284, Diocletian was on the throne. He succeeded where his predecessors had failed in restoring strength and unity to the shattered empire. He was able to form the unwieldy Roman empire into an organised structure. A Neo-Platonic state Church was now the goal of the friends of unity. The Bithynian governor, Hierocles, especially sought to propagate this idea. He addressed two books of "truth-loving words to the Christians." The use of other means than words and truth, the exercise of rude force, to overcome the Christians, accorded but little with the lofty morality of the Neo-Platonist and his conception of the man's union with God. But what of the present time, when it appeared that words were in vain? If this noble virtue of Neo-Platonism could prevail universally only after annihilation

**Forty
Years of
Rest**

of Christianity, were other weapons than to be shunned?

Hierocles found an enthusiastic helper in the emperor, Galerius. The emperor, it is true, was not ready for such a step; he was the son of a Dalmatian bond-woman and subject to the superstition of his race. To the question whether action should be taken against the Christians the oracle of Apollo at Miletus gave the answer that the Christians made it impossible to declare the truth. The emperor gave way to the pressure, insisting only that no blood should be shed. Galerius ventured to have the Christian church at Nicomedia stormed and destroyed by his prætorians in February, 303.

On the next day a decree was publicly posted up. All Christian churches were to be demolished, all Christian books burnt, every Christian meeting prohibited. All who persisted in the Christian faith were to lose their offices, and the free to become slaves. A Christian, carried away by indignation, tore down the decree. He was cruelly tortured and executed. Fire twice broke out in the imperial palace, and the blame was laid upon the Christians. Insurrections occurred in Armenia and Syria, and the Christians were supposed to have instigated them.

Thus the opposition of the emperor was overcome. The Christian officials of the court were required to abandon their faith. Their steadfastness irritated the emperor, so that his disinclination to shed blood soon disappeared. One decree followed another until the final

order that all Christians should be forced by every means to sacrifice. "If I had a hundred tongues, and every tongue of metal," writes a Christian author of those days, "they would not suffice to describe all the cruelties, to name all the tortures which were inflicted by the judges on the righteous and the unrighteous." The different methods of death, which men did not shrink to employ, cannot be recorded. The empire was drenched with streams of Christian blood. At times the arm of the

murderer appeared weary; but when in times of rest it was seen that all the previous fury had not led to any result, the enemies of Christianity gathered their strength again in order to end the war of annihilation. Their blind rage at their want of success led men to have recourse to the expedient of pouring the wine or water used at sacrifices over the articles of food in the market, so that the Christians who could not be compelled to sacrifice still tasted something of the sacrifice. The persecution lasted eight years.

Galerius, attacked by a dread disease, issued shortly before his death, in 311, a decree for the east of the empire, ordering the toleration of the Christian religion. He does not recognise them as privileged; his wish still is that the Christians should willingly return to the faith of their fathers. But he has seen that nothing is able to force them to it, and that the result of his efforts has been the reverse of that which he wished to attain. The Christians now show no reverence to any god; to his



BLANDINA, THE SLAVE GIRL

Her story is one of the most interesting among those of the early martyrs. Converted to Christianity by her mistress, she suffered a terrible ordeal by fire; and later, when exposed to the wild beasts, it is said they would not attack her; so she was hung in a net to be gored by a wild bull, but finally had to be despatched by the executioner.

gods because they do not choose, to their God because they do not dare. The interest of the state requires the prayers of all for the state. It is thus to be arranged that "they become Christians again, and again hold their meetings for divine service." in order that they may pray to their God for the emperor and the empire. A toleration reluctantly conceded out of a feeling of personal impotence before this incomprehensible resistance of faith—that was what the dying man gave. The prisons were opened, the crowds of the tortured prisoners returned to their homes, welcomed even by the heathen "with pity and rejoicing."

**The State
Impotent Against
the Martyrs**

In the west of the empire the emperor, Constantius Chlorus, had "contented himself with the destruction of the temple, but had spared the temple made of men." The victorious progress of his son Constantine caused the persecution gradually to cease throughout the whole west, and, in 313, gave to the Christian Church the edict of Milan, which surpassed all expectations. What made Constantine the liberator and patron of the Church? When he started from Gaul for the south his religion was probably nothing else than the vague monotheism of his era, which had kept his father from hating the Christians and venting his fury on them. Later it became a warm interest in Christianity, an unmistakable conviction of its truth. The dark stains in his moral life do not give us the right to consider him a conscious hypocrite.

For even the actual conviction of the truth of Christianity does not make it at all impossible that morality lagged behind knowledge, especially in a Roman emperor accustomed to boundless licence. That Constantine was baptised only on his death-bed was nothing unusual at a time when Christians thought to gain by baptism forgiveness only for their past sins, and the

**Constantine
Baptised on His
Death-bed**

necessity for the act might have been brought home the more to the emperor in that he was well aware of his moral deficiencies. The fact that, although long considered a Christian even by Christians, he did not wish to die without receiving baptism might be adduced as proof that he expected something from the Church for the next world; that he was concerned about the remission of his sins, and that, therefore, not mere political considerations

determined his attitude towards the Church.


When did Constantine first turn with interest to Christianity? Judging by the difference between the edict of 312 and that at the beginning of 313, his opinion must have altered during that interval. He bases his "intervention for the Christian Community" in the decree at Milan on the hope that in return "the divine favour, which he has experienced in such great things, will at all times bring him success and safety." He must, therefore, have already experienced God's help in such a way that it was clear to him God was for the Christians.

In support of this view we first find the cross as the badge under which Constantine fights and conquers in the war against Maxentius. And after his victory over his opponent he causes to be erected in Rome the statue of himself holding in his hand the cross as "the salvation-bringing badge under which he freed the city from the yoke of the tyrant." He could hardly have made this declaration merely out of political considerations, for he no longer needed to win the Christian

**The First
Victories of
the Cross**

for himself, and could only estrange the heathen by the act. But if the conviction had been forced on him before the battle with Maxentius that God was for the Christians, and that their cross was a salvation-bringing badge, we shall not have to relegate to the realm of legends what Eusebius is said to have learnt from the emperor himself on the subject. As he stood confronting his powerful opponent and meditated as to what god he should summon to help him, he received the order to conquer in the sign of the cross. Therefore, he looked with superstitious reverence on this symbol, and thought to gain God's favour for himself by showing favour to the Christians. His victories under the new banner strengthened him in this belief, so that in inward conviction also he approaches nearer and nearer to Christianity.

If we reflect how vastly predominant the pagans of the empire were at the accession of Constantine, and how the last terrible persecution had driven the Christians from all higher posts; if we reflect further how little he actually did for the repression of heathendom and for the supremacy of Christendom, his conviction that the future



SCENES IN THE CATACOMBS: THE REFUGE OF THE EARLY CHRISTIANS

After martyrdom, nothing could better illustrate the vitality of their faith than the stupendous industry of the early Christians in constructing great underground cities in the Campagna, near Rome, where they could assemble in considerable bodies for the worship of God. These labyrinthine passages, going down three and four storeys into the earth, were at once cemeteries, churches, and places of refuge for the Christians, and were long used as burial places.

belonged to Christianity cannot be thus explained merely as a stroke of genius, but must rest on a firm belief of the superior strength of the Christian faith. And then also his hope that the religious unity in the empire to be obtained by Christianity would bring with it a civic unity would not seem a misuse of the Church for political ends. In reality, he never wished to do more than to render it possible for the Church to develop all her forces absolutely unfettered, in the expectation that then paganism would decay and the state flourish.

This was the state of his mind when he issued the edict of Milan in 313. In concert with Licinius he conceded by it religious freedom for the entire Roman empire, and that not reluctantly, but rather considering his action as the only just course. The Roman state abandoned its former view that religion was an affair of state. Constantine relegated it to the sphere to which it belongs, according to Christian notions, the conscience. In acting in this manner he acted in the "interests of public peace." He recognised that the state can never be quiet if there is a living religious spirit present. Yet religion is, nevertheless, to be controlled by the state. For the sake of the public peace men had often and terribly wreaked their fury on Christianity, because it roused the conscience, and thereby created a spirit of intolerable independence. On the same grounds conscience was now declared to be free.

How had Christianity transformed the ideas of the old world! The emperors proclaim the principle laid down by Christ: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and unto God the things that are God's." But if no one was to suffer from the fact that he was a Christian, the Christian Church must also be granted the same privileges which the previous state religion had enjoyed. Constantine issued—first for his own dominions and then, after the conquest of his last opponent, Licinius in 234, for the whole empire—a series of laws, by which the Church became a protected and a favoured estate.

That which lately was hated as the deadly enemy of the state was now formed into a most important element in the organism of the public life. The priests were freed from public burdens, especially from the

oppressive services and payments in kind and from the liability of filling the municipal offices. The property of the Church was secured by the grant of corporate rights to the Church, and was increased not merely by donations from the emperor but also by the legal decision that legacies in favour of the Church were valid. The law recognised the right of the bishops to act as judges over members of their communities in civil matters and fully to exercise the power of punishing their priests. The privilege of sanctuary was also conceded to Christian churches.

Sunday was recognised as a holy day, on which public state affairs—for instance, law suits—were to be suspended. The state gave the force of law to resolutions passed by the Church and lent its authority to aid in carrying them out. Something of the Christian spirit already entered into the secular legislature. The face of man, created in the image of God, was no more to be branded. The criminal who had forfeited his life was no longer to be despatched in a cruel fashion by crucifixion or by being torn in pieces by the teeth of wild beasts. Children might no longer

be sold. How great a change! There had been times when the Christians would have feared such rich gifts as a gift of the Danai. Just now the Church had become Catholic. Just now it had been prostrate under the headman's axe. Men could only rejoice. We must pardon the Christians who lived to see this change if Constantine seemed to them "as a heavenly messenger sent by God," and if they could not see his stains because the glory which the Church had gained through him dazzled their eyes.

Constantine also gave the Church that which up till now it had lacked sadly, a formal bond of unity. The cardinal point of the Church's rule of faith was the acknowledgment of "Jesus Christ, begotten Son of God, our Lord." Granted that at first men assented to this profession as taken from the writings of primitive times in the Church, and as corresponding to the Christian consciousness of the incomparable majesty of the Saviour, yet as decades of peace came (since about 180) and the number of educated men in the Church increased, the necessity must have been felt of determining definitely what was expressed and what excluded by those phrases.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN BEING

Say that Christians exulted because they had vanquished polytheism and had found the one God; would not this conquest be endangered by the other proposition that Christ, Son of God, *was* God? Some thought that the unity of God could only be maintained by the assumption that the one God had taken human form in Christ, and as such was called "Son of God." Others did not wish Christ to be taken as God himself. The latter view especially was contested and rejected. But when the Church finally obtained peace under Constantine, the presbyter Arius in Alexandria renewed this false doctrine in a form which somewhat more closely approached the view of the Church. Christ, he said, was not a mere man, but the manifestation of a higher spiritual Being, created by God, and, therefore, in its nature unlike (*ἀνόμοιος*) to God.

The flames of this dispute blazed brightly. Constantine saw it with deep sorrow. He had hoped that in the future the one religion which he thought the best would prevail in the entire Roman empire, and that through it the unity of the empire would be firmly established. Now, the adherents of this religion which Constantine saw to heal all divisions were divided! He implored the Church at Alexandria, in a letter, to desist from such disputes over secondary points, but in vain. How was this concord to be restored? Only a general conference of all the bishops could lead to the desired end. The emperor resolved to make this possible and to summon an imperial synod. Thus, he invited attendance at the meeting and defrayed the expenses of the delegates out of the public treasury.


From June to August, 325, this first "Œcumenical Council" sat at Nicæa in Bithynia. Among the three hundred and eighteen members, some of whom were present only for a part of the time, there were a Persian and a Gothic bishop; from the west, which was less agitated by this dispute, naturally few (six) appeared. At the opening, and more than once during the conferences, Constantine himself spoke, in order to urge peace. And after the terrible storms of the persecutions—many of those present still bore conspicuous traces on their bodies of the torments they had endured—the sunshine of imperial favour was too sweet to allow all present to maintain their independence.

Constantine was not to blame if "for the sake of peace and out of regard for the imperial will" even those who did not find their own conviction expressed in the final confession of faith (Christ is consubstantial with the Father: *ὁμοούσιος*) declared themselves satisfied with it. Only two bishops supported Arius in opposition. The emperor gave to the resolutions of the synod the force of law. The opposite view was, therefore, illegal, and banishment was inflicted on those who refused to abandon it.

In this manner the Church arrived at an outward expression of the unity of the episcopacy, so long desired. The community which had formerly been held together only by the bond of the same faith, the same love, the same hope, had now become the imperial Church, possessing a uniform outward government. Thus the question whether one bishop should be regarded as first among all was put for the moment into the background. The matter was not pressing.

In this first general council neither the bishop of Rome—his advanced age prevented him from taking part—nor the presbyters representing him presided. It is true that the bishop of Rome had been granted the primacy over the churches of the political diocese of Rome—that is, over the greatest part of Central Italy and all Lower Italy, with Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica, but nothing more. Would this state of things continue? Would the successors of Constantine refrain as much as he did from direct interference in the internal affairs of the Church? Would not a Church which had already so thoroughly carried out the principle of rank and subordination be in the end forced to declare above all others one bishop, who should maintain himself absolutely independent in the face of worldly potentates? But Rome had already found a rival.

The Rival of Rome emperor had removed his court to the town in the east bearing his name. If the Roman community acquired its high reputation, as there is no doubt, chiefly because it lay in the centre of the empire, would not the bishop of the new capital be still more highly exalted by the splendour of the Christian emperor? Or perhaps, on the contrary, the very proximity of the emperor will prevent him from soaring so high.



THE BURIAL OF THE MARTYRS IN THE CATACOMBS OF THE CAMPAGNA, NEAR ROME
From the painting by Jules Lenepveu in the Luxembourg.



THE CHURCH ESTABLISHED

ROME'S LONG FIGHT FOR THE PRIMACY AND THE SPLIT BETWEEN EAST AND WEST

OWING to Constantine, the Church had become the favoured religious body. Nothing now deterred men from entering it; much attracted men strongly towards it. There was some difficulty in keeping aloof from it. The dykes, as it were, that protected it were broken through, and, unhindered, the turbid floods of those who were strange to the true religious spirit poured in. This, indeed, did not make the Church really poorer in Christian spirit, but immeasurably richer in unworthy members. To govern them so that they might all lead a life worthy of the Christian name was completely impossible.

The unholy "world" spread within the "Holy Church." The more earnest spirits were roused to protest all the more energetically against this unchristian life by the impressive eloquence of acts. The hour struck for the birth of monasticism.

How the Monasteries Began

Christianity required self-renunciation and the subdual of sinful desires. The more thorough the abhorrence felt by a Christian snatched from pagan immorality for intemperance and shameless licence, the more easily could he bring himself to keep as far as possible from everything which the pagans boldly misused; and he could even find honour in denying himself such things as were not exactly forbidden, simply because natural desire impelled him to them. By the middle of the second century it could be pronounced as a universal Christian view that marriages were to be entered into not out of sexual inclination, but merely for the purpose of giving birth to children.

To enter into a second marriage after the death of the husband was regarded by many as "respectable adultery," on the ground chiefly that natural desires might be excused in youth, but not in riper years. The highest merit, however, consisted in total abstention from sexual intercourse.

Such views were able to mislead persons to exhibit fanciful displays of self-denial. Ascetic maidens ventured to live with men of like feeling on such intimate terms that their virginity, preserved in spite of great temptations, revealed a laudable

Asceticism of the Devotees victory of the spirit over the flesh. Originally, indeed, such restraint was valued only as an exercise, which was intended to strengthen the will power for the battle against sin. But because such acts were a proof of the earnestness of the feeling it might only too easily be thought that they were also in themselves meritorious practices; that the greatest possible subjection of natural desire and absence of passion was true Christianity.

In quiet years between periods of persecution there came to the Church many members of whom such self-denial could not be expected, and whom the Church did not wish to reject. A twofold code of morality was then formulated. Under the complete code men abstained from marriage and abjured earthly possessions in order to serve God alone. Under the other, men lived the ordinary life of the world, but avoided in it what was forbidden by God.

It was supposed that this distinction was to be found in the Holy Scriptures of the early Christian time. The former code of morality followed the advice of the evangelists; the latter only the commandments. But since the masses flowed into the Church, and with them came that

The Revolt Against Worldliness immorality which formerly was seen only among the pagans, even the original form of the higher code of morality

no longer seemed to the more earnest spirits a sufficient protest against the worldly feeling. The former ascetics had still remained in the body of the Church and of the state; but now men wished by open rupture with the worldly life, ruled by

natural desires, to proclaim aloud that true Christianity despises the world. Flight from the world was put forward as the ideal. This error certainly brought a blessing with it.

The enthusiasm for monasticism, which was awakened by the growth of immorality in the Church, was a constant protest against corruption, and prevented it from establishing itself in the Church and completely ruining it. For many, too, who dreaded a relapse into the pagan ways, life in circles permeated with unchristian practices must have proved too strong a temptation. They had cause to fear for their Christianity if they remained in the old, and yet now so new, surroundings. Hence came that longing to withdraw into solitude even in those who ventured later to face again the storm of life. But, on the other hand, how greatly must the general conception of life have been influenced if such renunciation of the world was praised as the highest ideal, if the highest worth of Christianity consisted in contempt for the world! Neo-Platonism had not been able to conquer Christianity, either by learned writings or through brute force. But it had infused its spirit into its deadly enemy.

At first there were individuals who took refuge in the solitude of the Libyan desert and lived as hermits for the sake of contemplation only. The example of Egypt was soon followed by Palestine, Syria, Armenia, Pontus, Cappadocia. Nothing was more natural than that the fame of some specially holy anchorite—as, for example, Anthony, who died in 356—should induce other refugees from the world to settle in his neighbourhood. Thus were formed the monastic villages, the *Lauræ*. They met for common prayer and singing. But why should each individual have his own hut? Was it not simpler if a considerable number lived together in one house? Pachomius first suggested this. About the year 340 he founded on Tabennæ, an island in the Nile, a monastery which soon obtained great renown. Naturally a rule had to be prescribed for such a brotherhood. Pachomius instituted a uniform dress, common meals, fixed times for prayer, and required a vow of obedience to the head.

The evil results of the hermit life soon appeared, not only in licentiousness and

coarseness, but also in the rise of new religious errors. Monasticism was hardly formed when it threatened to create a religious society, standing in opposition to the mass of the Church. The fruits of the view of "the worldly," which prevailed in the Church, were now reaped.

The Euchetes in Mesopotamia wished only to pray and beg. If it was perfection to possess nothing, then the most perfect thing was not to call anything one's own even for the briefest moment, and, therefore, not to earn anything by work. If praying was something higher than work, the highest thing was never to work, always to pray; and if such a monastic life was perfection, there was no longer any need of the former means of attaining perfection, of a divine law, of the Bible, of the Sacraments. In such errors the Church found no perfect realisation of her teachings, but only a caricature of her own new ideas. Yet centuries elapsed before she quite eradicated them by persecution.

Another important movement originated with Eustathius of Sebaste—in Little Armenia—and spread to the neighbouring districts of Asia Minor. If celibacy was a higher state than marriage with its gratification of the natural impulse, then marriage was emphatically sin, and no married man could be saved. If all earthly possessions, all ornaments, all comfort, were something impure, then those only would be saved who abandoned all that was earthly. Thus women were not even permitted to wear the natural ornament of their hair or female dress, but had to crop their heads and put on men's clothes. A Church which did not appreciate all this was a worldly Church.

The Apostolicans wished to restore the apostolic life, declared property, theft, and marriage, sin. The Audians in Mesopotamia, Palestine, and Arabia blamed the Church for falling away from the true Christianity, because the monastic ideal was not realised by all in it. Even the author of the *Panarion*, the apothecary's chest, in which the antidote to eighty heresies is to be found, the strictly orthodox Epiphanius, who died in 403, stands as if lost in admiration at the sanctity of these Audians—so uncertain was the attitude of the Church towards these logical exponents of her own views. Indeed, the Church could have admired

**The Days
of the
Hermits**

**Extremes
of Religious
Fanaticism**

**The First
of the
Brotherhoods**

even the most incredible caricatures if this contempt for the earthly had not become an attack on itself. The well-known Simeon Stylites in Northern Syria first established a fame for fasting. He abstained from all food so long that he was at the point of death. Then he had an enclosure prepared and lay therein, fastened to a chain. At last they had to erect a pillar on this spot, on the summit

tivity to the Church, induced at last the more thoughtful—as Basilius of Cappadocia, who died in 379—to devote themselves to the task of making the anchorites conform to a regulated cloister life and maintain some connection with the official Church. They also endeavoured to get the monasteries removed from the deserts into the vicinity of the towns, a measure which led the monks to join in ecclesiastical disputes and to carry their own views by the reputation of their sanctity and occasionally by the use of their fists.

While some thus conceived asceticism to be the essence of monasticism, others emphasised in monasticism the opportunity for contemplation and observation of the inner condition of the soul. Individuals had withdrawn from the world, in order to purify more thoroughly the inner self and to raise it to God. They were obliged to think over the ways which led to union with God. This prepared the way for the monastic mysticism which was afterwards zealously practised, and which developed into an independent movement.

As the first mystic we may mention Macarius, who died in 391, founder of the monastery in the Scetic desert, if he was really the author of the fifty homilies which pass under his name.

In a somewhat later period the holy Nilus is conspicuous; he was born at Constantinople, gave up his high post, entrusted his wife and daughter to an Egyptian monastery, and settled with his son as an anchorite on Mount Sinai, and died after 430. We possess some ascetic writings of his and some two thousand letters, which, in the form of maxims, praise the splendour of the monastic life and the abandonment of the world as leading to the freedom of the soul and to its union with God.



THE HERMIT AT HIS DEVOTIONS

When the Church began to flourish as an organisation, great masses of people with no genuine spirituality were swept into it. Many withdrew from it and became hermits; and, later, bodies of such men formed monastic communities, in which unchristian qualities speedily developed, until there was little to choose between the worldliness of the Church and the extravagances of the hermits.

of which he spent some thirty years. Both the pagan Bedouins and the Christians honoured him most highly; even in Rome small statues of him were in demand as objects of great value. A large number of others imitated his hazardous feat. Soon everyone lost the courage to blame such conduct.

But the extravagances of monasticism in particular, amounting almost to hos-

Owing to the new position in which Constantine placed the Church, the Christians had rest, and with it time and desire to celebrate feasts. The Church wished to make its life attractive and impressive to the masses and to give them a substitute for the joyous and glittering pagan feasts, of which they

Beginning of the Church Feasts

had been deprived since their conversion to Christianity. Formerly, besides the Sunday, only the Easter feast, in remembrance of Christ's death and resurrection, was celebrated. Then in the east the feast of the Epiphany on January 6th had been introduced (first in commemoration of Christ's baptism).

The west now gave to the whole Church a far more beautiful feast. On December 24th, the feast of the *Sigillaria*, the pagans were wont to give the children dolls and images of wax or earthenware or dough, and the next day they kept the "birthday of the invincible sun." The Church declared this day the birthday of Him whom all the dark storms of persecution had not been able to conquer. This feast, which is traceable in the west after 354, was introduced into Constantinople in 379. To the fortieth day after Christmas, February 2nd, they assigned the feast of "the Purification of Mary," or "Candlemas," since the holy candles were then consecrated. Thus a Christian festival replaced the February lustrations, in particular the *Amburbale* (procession round the city), with its procession of torches.

Further feasts were created to meet a similar spiritual longing. Paganism had been proud of its heroes, had sacrificed at their graves, and celebrated their festivals. Their place was taken by the religious martyrs, whose *natalitia*, or birthday feasts, in commemoration of their death as the entry into the true life, became real, popular festivals with the customary feasting. Theodoretus could boast before

Martyrs Replace the Heroes of Paganism

the former pagans: "The Lord has introduced his dead, instead of your gods, into the temple. They are, in truth, the leaders, the champions, and helpers in need." Formerly the Christians had assembled for divine service at the tombs of the martyrs, in order to gain strength for the war of faith in which all shared. Now these assemblies developed into an adoration of the

martyred heroes, redounding to the glory of the Church. Chapels and churches were erected over their graves. Their remains were sought out; their relics were taken into the church in solemn procession, to be laid beneath the altar.

If men had formerly prayed for the dead with the feeling that those who have departed hence are still bound by love with those left behind, they began now to pray to them as to heavenly agents, who from heaven protect mankind below. But if these saints were near at hand to help, where could they be nearer than where their remains were to be seen? Thus all sorts of wonders were wrought by the relics; and the half-pagan masses felt proud and safe, because they belonged to a communion in which such exalted patrons were revered. The trade in relics became so profitable a business that in the year 386 the emperor Theodosius was obliged to forbid men by law to dig up the bones of the saints and carry them away for sale.

It might be surprising to find that there was not yet any talk of an adoration of Mary, the mother of Jesus; but at that time the remembrance of the bloody persecutions was still so vivid that the martyrs were held by the Church to be stars of special glory in heaven. The mother of the Lord lacked the martyr's crown. But the way which led later to the adoration of Mary had long since been open. While Tertullian, who died about 220, still assumed, as the earlier Christians did, that Jesus had had brothers of the flesh, Epiphanius, who died in 403, already opposed the representatives of this view as heretics, led astray by the old serpent. Mary's virginity had not been injured even by Christ's birth. While Chrysostom, who died in 407, still upheld the possibility of blame in her, Augustine, who died in 430, thinks that with her (though with her alone) there can be no question of sin.

Thus she might co-operate in the work of redemption, and was, therefore, exalted, like her son, Christ. The Holy Scriptures, indeed, mention nothing of this, but that was not fatal. "The Ascension of Mary" was produced and ascribed to the apostle John; in soul and body had she been taken up into heaven, and the high privilege of being invoked for help had been solemnly assured to her by Christ himself.

THE CHURCH ESTABLISHED

If she had thus been placed at the side of the Son of God as the mother of God, then she must have her high festivals, as He did. Each of the next centuries added a fresh one. They celebrated the day of the Annunciation, the day on which she came with her Child into the temple for "purification," her assumption, her birth. Even the angels were clothed with divine powers for protection. Their aid was invoked, and a special day was consecrated as a festival to the archangel Michael.

It was sought to offer a Christian substitute for the fading classical education. The quiet in the external world gave

make a deep impression on the great world. It was desired to give the people, who delighted in spectacles, some compensation for the solemn pageants in which they had found pleasure at the high festivals of Dionysus, Athena, and others of their favourites. Thus the Church began to unfold her splendour in processions. Joyful events and public disasters alike offered an opportunity. The joy and sorrow of the people are placed in the beneficent hand of the Church.

The buildings for divine service could now be erected and beautified so as to inspire those who stood outside with



ART IN THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH

As the Church developed into settled communities, and buildings were consecrated to worship, the ancient pagan temples being chiefly used for this purpose, rude Christian art began, particularly in mosaic. The favourite subject was the enthronement of Christ, as here seen in one of the sixth century mosaics at St. Sophia, Constantinople. Christ is in the act of blessing, and the words on the book in His left hand read: "Peace be with you! I am the Light of the world." The emperor bows at His feet, and the medallions contain images of Mary and Michael.

leisure for composition, and the educated men, now become Christians, felt the need of poetic literature. Apollonius of Laodicea, who died in 390, sang of the sacred history as far as King Saul in an epic of twenty-four books, and imitated with Biblical subjects the tragedies of Euripides, the comedies of Menander, and the lyrics of Pindar. Ephraim the Syrian, who died in 378, composed nearly all his writings in poetical form in peculiar lines of seven syllables each.

The Church, which had so long been pushed aside into a corner, ventured to let herself be seen in the open marketplace of the world, and wished now to

a sense of the greatness of the Church, and those who entered with a feeling of her power, extended over the world. It is characteristic that Constantine most eagerly encouraged the extension and the improvement of the existing Church buildings and the erection of new ones, because up till now they had not been suitably restored, from fear of persecution. The amelioration in the condition of the Church was followed by the improvement of the churches.

Art was called in to aid. At first, indeed, the wish to influence the masses by art had to contend with the repugnance to the pictorial representation of the divine

Being—a custom with which paganism had been reproached. But were not these pictures a silent sermon for the ignorant people? Gradually even those who were still biassed by the old ideas became accustomed to the innovation.

About the year 440 men acquired courage enough to introduce pictures of Christ himself into the churches, not, as before, merely under emblems, such as the lamb, the shepherd, or the fish. And it is noteworthy that He was no longer represented, as was formerly done in the catacombs, as a beardless youth, but as the King of Heaven in full majesty and sometimes with a halo round his head, as was customary with pagan emperors. How should not the still half-pagan people show to these pictures the same honour as formerly to the statues of their gods? Men prostrated themselves before them, kissed them, offered incense to them, and lighted lamps before them. Why should not these pictures work wonders also? Ought the Church to prohibit such a proof of reverence for the Holy One? At a time when men must have thought that much had been attained, ought they not to have rejoiced if all the so-called Christians could only be maintained in concord with the Church?

Since the Church succeeded so splendidly in making her cult pleasant, interesting, and comfortable to her new members, there remained only two reasons that caused some still to adhere to the obsolete system of paganism and delayed its complete disappearance. The old Roman spirit had been too closely bound up with the old gods. In Rome itself the friends of the mother country thought that the glory of the empire would be destroyed if the religion under the protection and guidance of which the world had been conquered were to die out. How much more quickly did the remnants of paganism disappear in the new capital, which knew no sanctified traditions, but arose under the eyes of a Christian emperor!

Christians Turn to Persecutors

The second hindrance to the complete victory of Christianity was the anxiety lest classical culture should disappear, together with the old belief in the gods. For this reason the places where this culture was fostered held tenaciously to the old order of things; Athens, Miletus, Ephesus, Nicomedia, Antioch. The hos-

tility of these groups to Christianity could only increase as the sons of Constantine proceeded to violent measures against paganism, being spurred on by Christians who had only too soon forgotten how urgently their fathers or even they themselves had formerly demanded religious liberty. What a source of grief it was for the enthusiastic friends of classical times, and to what obstinate resistance they must have been driven, when revered temples were demolished, works of art annihilated, the monuments of a glorious past destroyed, in order to establish the undisputed supremacy of an unenlightened religion! Was no return to the good old times still possible?

Julian (331-363) ventured to entertain this hope. He tried to stay and to overthrow the triumphal car of Christianity. He had become acquainted with Christianity in a sad form, clothed in the mask of hypocrisy, for at the imperial court those who indisputably possessed no trace of Christian faith tried, nevertheless, to get the start of each other in exhibiting their burning zeal for the Church. Julian was convinced that the number of the Christians would diminish if the sunshine of imperial favour no longer smiled on them, and if the might of the imperial arm no longer stood at the disposal of the Church.

Julian's Futile Effort to Restore the Ancient Gods

Just as he had too little confidence in Christianity, he had too much in paganism. He did not doubt it would shine out again with its old brilliancy if only complete freedom were restored to it. In point of fact he was able to secure many converts. A smile of the former emperors had sufficed to convert masses to Christianity, and to make these once more pagans did not even require a smile on the part of Julian. It was quite enough if they knew that he wished it. Now they were no longer Christians, but none the more pagans. The emperor was in despair at their lukewarmness in the service of the gods, at their disinclination to visit the temples, at their lack of moral rectitude.

He, therefore, wished to reform paganism; but he could only borrow from Christianity the means for so doing. The religious meetings of the pagans were to be organised similarly to the Christian divine services. The priesthood was to be cleansed of unworthy members. The charitable character of Christianity was

THE CHURCH ESTABLISHED

to be imitated, hospitals and almshouses were to be erected, and the needy were to be supported. He worked with all his energies, but he found no fellow-workers. The classic spirit would not revive. He had to go further than he had wished. If anywhere Christians were oppressed or killed by pagans, he let it pass unnoticed. When he started on the war against the Persians, he is said to have threatened to employ other measures against Christianity if he came back safely from the campaign. What else was left for him to do? As he fell, wounded by an arrow, while retreating from the enemy on the

of separation formed by the diversity of religion throughout the empire it was necessary to be content with a merely formal adhesion to the Christian Church, and not to shrink from strong measures, in order to establish unity. It was inevitable from this that the old paganism continued under the cloak of Christianity, and that Christianity was more and more strongly tinged with paganism.

Men had gone too far away from the spirit of the first Christians, according to which the essence of Christianity consisted in the communion of the individual with God. From being a "community of the



INTERIOR OF THE CHURCH OF ST. PAUL AT ROME, SHOWING ANCIENT MOSAICS

The church of St. Paul without the Walls is one of the oldest of the basilicas in Rome, though it has been much restored. The mosaics over the altar are among the most ancient Christian work in existence, dating from the fifth century.

battle-field, he is said to have exclaimed: "Nazarene, Thou hast conquered!" His words may not have run thus literally, but the phrase expresses the impression which his fall made on the contemporary world. The last attempt to re-establish paganism had failed; and not from incidental causes. Paganism had shown itself to be dead beyond the possibility of revival by any power.

But it was also impossible to realise the other ideal—to imbue the entire Roman empire with the Christian spirit and through it to cause the still existing paganism to disappear. To overthrow the wall

faithful" the Church had become an educational institution, and had received into herself such masses of persons needing education that she lost sight of the real goal of this education and professed herself content if she obtained to some extent outward obedience.

And because this task was made more difficult by the existence of paganism she was obliged to aim at the complete eradication of the latter. Theodosius I., eastern emperor from 378, ruler of the entire empire from 392 to 395, worked for this object. He forbade visits to the temples and declared every sort of idolatry to be high treason.

In 394 the Olympian games were celebrated for the last time. His son continued his work. Bishops and numbers of monks were sent into the provinces to destroy the old shrines. In Alexandria the celebrated teacher of philosophy, Hypatia, perished at the hands of the Christian mob. Pagans were excluded from posts in the government and army.

The last bulwark of classic paganism, the school at Athens, was closed by Justinian in the year 529. The teachers emigrated to Persia. About 545, at the emperor's commission, John, bishop of Ephesus, went about in order to track out the pagans "wherever they were still to be found." He prided himself on having made in Asia 70,000 Christians. How long, however, the worship of the gods, which many loved, defied the imperial legislation in the provinces the temple of Isis at Philæ in Upper

Paganism in the Sixth Century

Egypt shows; it was not closed until the middle of the sixth century. The conviction that outside the one visible Church there was no salvation had become universal. The attempt to make of the Church a firmly articulated organism had been successful. The state had lent its arm to uphold the single will of the Church against personal independence. But, strangely enough, the result was not only the defection of large groups from the Church, but also its division into two parts, which, in spite of repeated attempts, could not be reunited. This development was due chiefly, first, to the wish to see the unity of the visible Church confirmed by the creation of a permanent head, raised above all other members, and, secondly, to the intervention of the powerful arm of the state, which had been invoked to protect the unity of the Church. The former cause was especially active in the West, the latter grievance especially prevalent in the East.

The Council of Nicæa had not really quenched the flames of the Arian heresy, for the majority of those present had voted against their conviction in order to please the emperor. When they returned home they repented and sought to convince the emperor that Arius was by no means a wicked heretic, and that it would never be possible to restore unity in the Church on the basis of the resolutions passed at Nicæa. One of the ecclesiastics at court was well disposed towards Arianism. He worked upon the emperor's sister, and she succeeded in changing her brother's attitude. Athanasius of Alexandria, the great opponent of Arianism, was banished. Only the sudden death of Arius prevented his being



ATHANASIUS

For nearly fifty years bishop of Alexandria and the unwearrying opponent of Arianism, maintaining devotedly the divinity of Christ. Athanasius died 373 A.D.

received back into the body of the Church. When Constantius mounted the throne Athanasius was permitted to return; but before long the Arians were able to bring about his second deposition. The imperial governor at Alexandria was obliged to employ force to instal the successor of Athanasius in office. Scourging and imprisonment were the lot of those discontented with the act. Was there no one now

A Bishop Installed by Force

in the whole of Christendom to take under his protection the persecuted representative of orthodoxy? For a long time the community at Rome had possessed special repute among Christians, for, indeed, all the world had been accustomed to look with reverence to the ancient capital of the world as the source of all imperial laws and ordinances and as the ultimate court of appeal in all civil questions. In disputed questions men could not help considering what the community at Rome thought on the debated point. Questions had been submitted. Men did not always follow the answer they received; but, nevertheless, they had not ceased to inquire, in the hope that Rome would be on their side.



AUGUSTIN OF HIPPO

This bishop was one of the greatest of the early Christian writers, and intimate with pagan philosophy. He died in the year 430 A.D.

The bishop of Rome had the courage to take up the cause of the banished Athanasius; Julius I. and a Roman council definitely accepted his doctrine. The East held a rival council at Antioch—the first beginning of the schism. Men wished rather to settle the controversy. A general council met at Sardica in 343, but the members could not agree. The supporters of Arianism left the town. Those who remained behind wished to testify their gratitude to the Roman bishop, Julius, and to express the confidence which they reposed in him.

They therefore passed the resolution that bishops deposed by provincial synods might appeal to him. This concession was made to him personally, and only in that period of immediate distress was a harbour of refuge sought. The world soon forgot the resolution. Rome has never forgotten it, and has interpreted it to mean

What Rome Has Never Forgotten

that the Roman throne is the highest court of appeal in all ecclesiastical questions. In addition, there was the fortunate incident that the resolutions of the Council of Sardica were confused in western assemblies with the rules laid down by the Council of Nicæa. Rome applied them, therefore, as resolutions of that famous first œcumenical council. The Arians who had seceded from the Council of Sardica expelled the Roman bishop from the body of the Church. Athanasius himself was forced more than once to go into exile.

The emperor, Valens (364-378), proceeded to measures of unexampled severity against all who would not become strict Arians. All this could have no other consequence but to enhance the importance of the Roman throne, until at last the view represented by it and maintained in defiance of all emperors gained the victory at the second œcumenical council at Constantinople in 381. The fact that the eastern

Church and the bishop of the new imperial capital had not been able to act freely, but were guided by the caprice of the emperor, made it more easy for the Roman bishop

to press on unchecked to his goal, the primacy. If in any question bishops turned to Rome for historical information on the subject, the Roman bishop did not deliver an opinion, but rendered a decision, as if he had been appealed to as judge. He issued a "decretal." Or if he held a synod on some question he communicated to other Churches the resolution passed in a form as if they also had to comply with it. Such communications were, perhaps, put aside with surprise or amusement. But there they were, and could be employed by later bishops

of Rome as proof that for a very long time the "apostolic throne" had been accustomed to issue regulations for other Churches. Innocent I. (402-417) followed this line of policy with signal success. In Constantinople Byzantinism was flourishing once more. The great orator and austere preacher of morality, whom the people highly honoured, John Chrysostom, was obnoxious to the imperial court, and especially to the empress herself. He was sent into exile in 404.

The Exile of John Chrysostom

Innocent dared to intervene for him and to demand his recall. The answer, indeed, was an imperial order to send the exile still further into the desert, and the noble Chrysostom sank beneath the exertions of this journey. But thirty years later it was recognised what injustice had been done him. The emperor, Theodosius II., had his bones brought to Constantinople. When the coffin was brought to land the emperor fell on his knees before it and implored pardon for the sins his deceased

parents had committed against the innocent man. The beloved remains were laid in the imperial vault. What a triumph for the bishop of Rome! He was the



JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

The great preacher of Constantinople, for whom Innocent I. declared against the emperor Valens, and to whose remains the emperor Theodosius II. paid reverence.



CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA

A great figure in the war of the doctrines and opponent of Nestorius.

champion of innocence when no one dared to speak, and God in the end justified him before the whole world.

A new doctrinal dispute was kindled over the question as to how far salvation depended on a man's own exertions. Pelagius advanced the proposition that man, being free, can choose the good and fight his way through to holiness, and that the grace of God only rendered it more easy for him to realise his high destiny. Against him rose up the greatest and most influential of all the fathers of the Church, Aurelius Augustinus, bishop of Hippo Regius in Numidia, who died in 430. According to him, true freedom consists in the ability to attain one's destined development. The sinful man no longer possesses this liberty, and only the grace of God can redeem him and make him holy. Pelagius turned to the east. There the view prevailed that the divine grace and human freedom co-operated in the conversion of any man.

Two synods in Palestine declared themselves for Pelagius, but Innocent of Rome decided against him. Augustine held this up in triumph before his opponent, "Roma locuta, causa finita" (Rome has spoken, the dispute is decided). He may only have meant by this that if the "apostolic throne" had declared the teaching of Pelagius to be an innovation, it could not belong to the teachings of the old Church, but still Rome could henceforth make good use of this catch word as evidence coming from the greatest of all churchmen, that Rome had the right to speak the last word in all ecclesiastical disputes.

Nevertheless, the Church which had laid this splendid foundation for the establishment of the primacy could not yet give up its longing for independence. This was seen again in this very dispute. Zosimus, the successor of Innocent, was firmly convinced that Pelagius was no heretic. He blamed the African bishops for having attacked a man of so perfect faith. But these, under the guidance of Augustine at a council at Carthage in 418, openly declared their opposition to this decision of the bishop of Rome and gained the victory, so that in the end even Zosimus condemned Pelagius. The victors, however, were soon made harmless. In 428 the Vandals crossed over to Africa, and not only ravaged the

**Rome Freed
of Her
Western Rival**

beautiful land, but also rendered the Church powerless. Rome was freed of its most powerful rival in the west.

In the east at that time the attempt was being made to reduce to fixed formulas the doctrine concerning the person of Christ and of the union of the divine and the human in Him. Two theological schools had tried their ingenuity on the question. The Alexandrians set out to establish the redemption as a divine act, and, therefore, emphasised the divine nature in Christ; their war-cry became the designation of the mother of Jesus as "Parent of God" (*theotokos*). Their opponents of the school of Antioch taunted them with the denial of the true humanity of the Redeemer.

The main thought by which they were led was a moral one. The Redeemer is for us the type of moral union with God. But He can be that only if a free moral development of His humanity remains possible. Thus they laid every stress on His humanity. The union of the divine and the human in Him is only a moral one—in the same way that God dwells in other pious men. Their opponents retorted that they did not observe the essential difference between the Redeemer and the redeemed.

**Nestorius
Appeals
to Rome**

Nestorius, the patriarch of Constantinople, had come from this school of Antioch. In sermons he fought against the shibboleth, "Parent of God." Against him rose Cyril of Alexandria. In order to win a powerful ally, he turned to the bishop of Rome with the declaration that, "according to ancient custom in the Church inquiry must be made at Rome in the case of disputed questions." Celestine I. listened gladly and demanded a recantation from Nestorius.

The emperor, Theodosius II., thereupon called the third œcumenical council at Ephesus in 431. Cyril and his supporters declared Nestorius deposed, and the Roman envoys confirmed the sentence. The opposite party replied by deposing Cyril and his friends. Both sides turned to the emperor. At last, in 432, the majority agreed to a formula which attempted to cut away the most irreconcilable points in the two doctrines. Nestorius was given up to the revenge of his enemies, and died in misery. The result of this dispute was the severance of the Nestorians from the imperial Church. In the year 440 Leo I. became bishop of

Rome, and his reign of twenty-one years was devoted to the one object of accustoming the world to the belief that the successor of Peter was the head of entire Christendom. Whoever ventured to desert the rock, Peter, lost connection with Christ and had no part in the kingdom of God. The views of the Alexandrians were represented in their most crude and exaggerated form by Eutyches, the old archimandrite of Constantinople. Christ, he taught, after His incarnation had but *one* nature, His humanity having been, as it were, swallowed up by His divinity.

Eutyches was deposed at a synod at Constantinople held under the patriarch Flavian. He appealed to Rome, as did Flavian. Leo I. demanded an exact report, in order that he might decide by virtue of the apostolic authority. He decided in his famous "Letter to Flavian" against Eutyches, and thus against monophysitism. But the east did not wish to allow itself to be ruled by Rome. The emperor called a council at Ephesus in 449, and entrusted the post of president to the successor of Cyril, the passionate and unscrupulous Dioscurus of Alexandria, the patron of Eutyches. His intimidating appearance prevented the Roman envoys from securing an audience, the doctrine of Eutyches was ratified, and all its opponents, even Leo of Rome, were declared to be deposed. The emperor approved of these resolutions. The party which at this "synod of bandits" was in the minority fell back all the more on the support of the bishop of Rome, declaring more and more strongly that the decision lay with him. The end of the burning dispute was that at the council at Chalce-

don in 451, which condemned Nestorius as well as Eutyches, Leo's "Letter to Flavian" was made the basis of the decision. The feeling which this victory of the Roman throne produced is shown by the rise of the legend that Leo had placed his letter on the tomb of St. Peter and prayed that he would change anything wrong that was contained in it, and that on the next morning an alteration by the apostle's hand had been actually found.

But the supporters of the condemned Alexandrian dogma, the monophysites of the east, did not abandon the struggle.

And again it was the emperors who, led by political considerations, undertook to dictate their own views to the Church and to impress them by force. Leo I., the Thracian, banished the heads of the monophysites; on the other hand, Basiliscus extolled monophysitism as the exclusive state religion and condemned the letter of Leo. Zeno again forbade men to touch upon these points of doctrine which had been so hotly disputed in the last century, and thus

annulled once more the resolutions of the last General Council of Chalcedon. The bishop of Rome broke off all ecclesiastical relations with the east. For thirty-five years (484-519) the imperial Church was divided. Justinian I. (527-565) at last succeeded at the fifth œcumenical council at Constantinople in reconfirming these resolutions of Chalcedon.

The result was that the extreme monophysites severed themselves from the Church and formed independent communities, especially in Egypt, Syria, Persia, Armenia, and Abyssinia. The rejection of



ONE OF ROME'S OLDEST CHURCHES

The church of St. Mary in Aracoeli is one of Rome's most ancient Christian buildings, dating from the sixth century. Photo: Alinari.

the resolutions of Chalcedon and the recognition of the "bandit synod" at Ephesus are common to all.

In Syria, and also in Egypt, the monophysites termed themselves "Jacobites" after the man who, in the first period after the separation from the imperial Church, was the spiritual head of this entire party.

**A Bishop Appoints
100,000
Priests & Deacons**

Jacob Barradai for thirty years — after becoming monophysitic bishop of Edessa in 541

—wandered through the whole of Nearer Asia disguised as a beggar, and, sparing no exertions, everywhere collected and encouraged his scattered fellow-believers, organised communities, appointed many bishops, and "fully one hundred thousand priests and deacons." In Asia Minor, it is true, the imperial Church prevailed, but in the patriarchate of Antioch for a time almost the entire population became Jacobite. The hope of reconciling the monophysites with the Church would not let the question once raised drop, even within the imperial Church. How, if a compromise were offered the discontented party by the admission that the Redeemer had only *one* will, even if He had two natures? Thus the monophysite dispute passed into the monothelitic. The same aspect of events was presented as before, the eastern Church hanging in the most complete dependence on the state, and the life of the state wasting away in ecclesiastical controversies.

There was the same result as before. At the sixth œcumenical council at Constantinople, in 680, the encyclical letter of Pope Agatho was made the basis of the decision, and the resolution was sent to him for confirmation. There were two wills in Christ. The former pope, Honorius, was solemnly and vigorously condemned as an execrable heretic, who had assented to an irregular imperial formula. Agatho confirmed this condemnation of his predecessor, "who

**Pope Brands
his Predecessor
as a Heretic**

by mean treachery had tried to overthrow the unsullied faith." This, at

a time when the infallibility of the pope was not yet declared, must have assured to the "apostolic throne" the reputation of a disinterested vindicator of orthodoxy.

Controversies over dogma were followed by disputes as to pictures and images. By the beginning of the eighth century the worship of images had reached such a

pitch in the east that the more thoughtful became anxious. Images were invited to act as god-parents, and men scraped the colour off them in order to consecrate with it the wine at the Lord's Supper. The energetic emperor, Leo III., the Isaurian (717-741), ventured on the command to hang the pictures so high as to make it impossible for worshippers to kiss them.


His son and successor, Constantine V., undertook the systematic persecution of the friends of image worship. They were imprisoned, scourged, and their noses and ears were cut off. The popes protested. More than once they hurled the terrible bolts of excommunication at all foes of image worship. But for many decades, according to the imperial orders, the images were repeatedly torn down and raised again. In the end the Roman view gained a decisive victory: the empress, Theodora, in 842 caused the resolutions of the seventh council to be reinforced and celebrated the festival of orthodoxy.

If, now, it was possible to deprive Rome of its glory as champion of immaculate orthodoxy, then its claim to the first rank in the Church could be repudiated. Search was made for some ground of complaint, and a pretext was found in the failure of Rome to respect the ancient faith and customs. Rome ordered fasting on Saturday. It permitted the use of milk, butter, and cheese during the first week of Lent. It did not tolerate the marriage of priests.

**Victory
of
Rome**

When Pope Nicholas I., therefore, declared himself for the deposed patriarch of Constantinople and against his successor, Photius, the latter impeached the Roman Church of heresy on account of these innovations, and obtained from a council in 867 the deposition and banishment of the pope. Nicholas pronounced excommunication against him and his followers. In 1053, the patriarch of Constantinople, Michael Cærularius, renewed the charges against Rome, adding the new heresy that Rome, in the Lord's Supper, used unleavened bread, after the manner of the Jews. When negotiations for peace proved vain, the papal legates laid a letter of excommunication on the altar of the church of St. Sophia, and Michael, with the other patriarchs of the east, put the Roman Church under the ban in 1054. The Churches of the east and west were permanently severed.

WILHELM WALTHER



EUROPE
SECOND DIVISION
EASTERN EUROPE
 From the Sundering of Rome to the
FRENCH REVOLUTION

With the partition of the "World Empire" of Rome into East and West, the History of Europe also divides into two main streams; not indeed without their points of contact, but following distinct courses until the shock of the French Revolution brings all the nations of Europe into closer political relations.

In our next division, therefore, we trace the course of events in Eastern Europe during this period. The West is Latin, Keltic, Teutonic; the East is Greek, Mongolian, Slavonic. At first its history is that of the Roman Empire as it survived in the East—the Greek or Byzantine Empire. But new peoples appear on the scene from the regions beyond the Danube, whither the Roman power had not penetrated.

These are in part of Mongolian or Tartar origin: Huns, Avars, Bulgarians, then Magyars or Hungarians; in part Aryan Slavs; southwards, the Serbs and Croatsians; the Western Slavs or Czechs of Bohemia; the Eastern Slavs of Poland and Russia. Finally come the Mongolian Turks, creating the Ottoman Empire, the single aggressive Mohammedan element among the Christian peoples of the West.

Thus the nations whose story we here record are those of the Balkan peninsula; of Hungary and Bohemia, which form the bulk of the composite Austrian Empire of to-day; of Poland, and of Russia.

GENERAL SURVEY OF THE PERIOD

By R. Nisbet Bain, M.A.

BYZANTIUM

By Professor Rudolf von Scala

THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

By Professor Heinrich Zimmerer

**HUNS, BULGARIANS, ROUMANIANS, MAGYARS,
 GIPSIES**

By Dr. Heinrich von Wlislöck and Dr. H. F. Helmolt

ALBANIANS

By Professor Karl Pauli and Dr. H. F. Helmolt

WESTERN SLAVS

By Dr. Berthold Bertholz

POLAND AND RUSSIA

By Professor Vladimir Milkowicz



EASTERN EUROPE TO THE



FRENCH REVOLUTION GENERAL SURVEY OF THE PERIOD

By R. Nisbet Bain, M.A.

THE origin of the states of South-eastern Europe must be sought in the history of the East Roman Empire. We have long outlived the curious prejudice which affected to regard "the Lower Empire," or "the Byzantine Empire"—both names, by the way, are absolutely without historical sanction—as fit only to be relegated to the limbo of things best forgotten. It is doubtful, even now, if we realise adequately the excellence of the immense and imposing edifice which Justinian founded, and Leo the Isaurian completed. Yet, if stability and vitality, if power of cohesion and recuperative virtue, be the true tests of political efficiency, then the East Roman Empire must be pronounced one of the most marvellous political organisms which ever existed.

The same ethnographical revolution which bridged over the gap between ancient and mediæval history in the west operated in the east likewise, but with this great difference: while the old order of things in the west vanished at the first touch of the new barbarian hordes, in Eastern Europe the empire gradually transformed and assimilated

**Eastern Diplomacy
and Western
Brute Force**

the new elements without suffering irreparable damage to itself for many centuries. The unique situation of the imperial city; the more pliable and adaptable genius of the Greeks (for from Justinian onwards the Hellenic element predominates); the intellectual superiority of the Constantinopolitan government, which invented and triumphantly applied the science of diplomacy when brute force was, everywhere else, the *ultima ratio*—

these were the most salient advantages which enabled the rulers of New Rome not only to weather the earlier and more terrible tempests of the transmigration period, but also to provide against similar perils in the future.

The first barbarians with whom the reconstituted empire had to do were the Slavs. As early as 449 one of the numerous branches of this great family, possibly the Serbs, established themselves along the northern banks of the Danube, extending as far westwards as Dalmatia. An ancient and respectable tradition claims both Justinian ("Upravda") and Belisarius ("Velichar") as members of this race. Somewhat later, about the end of the sixth century, the Bulgarians, a Finno-Ugrian race, migrated from the steppes between the Don and the Dnieper, settled in Mœsia, and, by the ninth century, were completely Slavified in their new surroundings. Both races became the nominal subjects of the empire, which aimed at making them serve the double purpose of buffer-provinces towards the north, and recruiting grounds for the imperial generals, while preserving a local autonomy. But the Bulgarians, who remained heathens for two centuries after their inclusion within the confines of the empire, were too martial a race to submit to any yoke for long. The empire was continually at war with them; more than once they besieged Constantinople itself, and their onslaughts were the more perilous as they coincided with the interminable attacks of the Arabs from the south. During a considerable portion of this period the Bulgarian hosts must

have included the Servians also as subject auxiliaries. Bulgaria and Servia were converted to Christianity about the same time (about 864-867) by the famous orthodox missionaries Cyril and Methodius and their followers.

The process was accelerated by political considerations, and had important political consequences. Two new king-

A Great Bulgarian Nation

doms, for whose alliance east and west competed, arose within the Balkan peninsula.

The first independent Servian kingdom—founded by Peter in 872—was of comparatively brief duration; but the Bulgarian kingdom of Boris and Simeon lasted for two hundred years and overshadowed the eastern empire itself. At the period of its greatest expansion the Bulgarian realm stretched from the Danube and Drave to the Rhodope and Pindus ranges, embracing the whole valley of the Danube, nearly the whole of Thrace, and large parts of Thessaly, Macedonia, and Epirus.

In 866 the eastern empire first came into contact with another Slavonic race—the Russians, who, a few years previously, had established themselves under their Norse leaders at Kiev on Dnieper, immediately abutting on the vast south-eastern steppes. It was an ideal resting-place and starting-point for predatory barbarians with a taste for adventure. In 907 Oleg, prince of Kiev, imposed a heavy tribute upon Constantinople; but his successor, Igor, in 945 made a perpetual peace with the Greeks and Christianity began to permeate "the land of the Russ."

In 955 the Russian princess Olga was christened at Constantinople, though it was not till 990 that Vladimir the Great, who two years previously had been baptised at Cherson in the Crimea, on which occasion he married the Greek princess Arna, forcibly converted the Kievlyans to the new faith with the assistance of orthodox missionaries. Hence-

Why Russia Adheres to the Greek Church

forth the relations between the two states were almost uniformly friendly; Svyatislav, prince of Kiev (945-972), even aided the Greeks against the Bulgarians; but during the latter part of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century the intercourse between Constantinople and Kiev was interrupted by the interminable Bulgarian wars which engrossed the attention of the emperors of the Macedonian dynasty. During the

interval the young Russian Church, under Yaroslav the Great (1019-1054), became virtually autocephalous.

Hitherto the most potent weapon of the imperial city on the Bosphorus, a weapon far more effectual than diplomacy, regular armies, or Greek fire, because it had a moral aim and a supernatural sanction, was the orthodox religion. But at the beginning of the eighth century the very foundations of the orthodox religion were undermined by the rationalistic movement known as iconoclasm. There can be no doubt that a closer acquaintance with Mohammedanism as a religion promoted scepticism as to the central verities of Christianity among the more speculative Byzantines, especially in the eastern provinces of the empire.

To such theorists a deism like the religion of Islam would seem clearer, purer, and more natural than the highly-developed dogmatic system of Christianity, with its intricate, interpretative ritual. The emperors of the Isaurian and Armenian dynasties, who reigned from 717 to 867, themselves more Oriental than Hellenic, and certainly statesmen rather than

War Against Images

theologians, imagined that the readiest way to defend orthodoxy against the onslaught of a deistic philosophy was to abolish or at least to curtail as much as possible everything symbolical in religion as being parasitical, or at best superfluous, and therefore more liable to attack from outsiders. Hence their open, persistent war against the icons, or images. It was the same principle, in a less extreme form, as that which moves the more destructive section of the higher critics of our own day to eliminate the miraculous element from Scripture. But strong men though the iconoclastic emperors were, they were not strong enough to reform orthodoxy. The sole result of all their efforts in this direction was the division of the empire for a century and a half into two fiercely antagonistic camps, whose hostility seriously weakened both the Church and the commonwealth. Historically, the ultimate victory of the opposing, or icondulist, party meant the triumph of the Hellenic and Slavonic over the Oriental elements in the empire.

The two following centuries (867-1018) were a period of recovery and re-expansion under the princes of the great Macedonian dynasty. Its salient features are the

systematic conversion of the southern Slavs, and their subsequent life and death struggle with the empire for the hegemony of South-eastern Europe. All the previous wars had been, more or less, plundering raids; these later wars were for political ascendancy. Finally, at a terrible cost, the empire prevailed, and Basil II. (976-1025) once more extended its limits to the Danube.

Within the same period occurred an event of capital importance to the Slavonic race generally, which, roughly speaking, at that time occupied the whole of Central Europe from the Baltic to the Danube. That event was the intrusion of the Magyars, or Hungarians. The Magyars, presumably an Ugro-Finnic race, though the real origin of this interesting people is still a riddle, are first heard of on the right bank of the Don, the Lebedia or Livadia of Greek chronicles. Expelled thence by the more numerous Pechenegs, they took refuge in "Etelcum," as the contemporary Greeks called the districts roughly corresponding to Podolia and Moldavia, and were immediately, 893 or 894, enlisted in the service of the emperor

Changing the Face of Europe

Leo VI., against the Bulgarians. In 895 their chieftain, Arpad, led them through the Vereczke pass into what is now the "Alföld," or great Hungarian plain, but which then formed the eastern portion of the vast, shadowy empire of Moravia, extending from Prague to the Drave and the Vistula. By 905 the Magyars had occupied the whole of this plain, separating permanently the northern and western Slavs from their southern and eastern brethren, and thus changing the face of Central Europe.

For nearly a century after the "honfoglalás," or "occupation," as Hungarian historians call it, the Magyars continued to be pagan and predatory, ravaging east and west impartially. Tamed at last by the disasters of Augsburg in 955 and Adrianople in 970, they set about putting their house in order. For some time it was doubtful whether they would accept Christianity from Pope or Patriarch. Proximity favoured the eastern Church, and the first Hungarian prelate, Hierothus, consecrated "Bishop of Turkia," came from Constantinople.

But as the Byzantine empire grew stronger and stronger under the Macedonian dynasty, fear of a neighbour so

formidable and so near moved the Hungarian duke, Geza, to solicit missionaries from Pilgrim, bishop of Passau. The question to which branch of the Church the Magyars were to belong was settled, once for all, when Saint Stephen accepted the kingly crown from the hands of the Pope, Sylvester II., in 1001. Christianity was not, however, definitely established in Hungary till the beginning of the twelfth century, and even then a large pagan population, constantly reinforced from the outer barbarians—notably the Cumanians, or Huns, who were planted in large colonies beyond the Theiss—had to be tolerated.

Fortunately, the immediate successors of St. Stephen were men of valour and genius, quite equal to the double task, difficult as it was, of preserving domestic order and, at the same time, of asserting the independence of the young central kingdom alike against the eastern and the western empires, both of which repeatedly endeavoured to reduce it to the condition of a vassal state. One of these early princes, St. Ladislaus (1077-1095) conquered and Christianised Croatia. His successor, Coloman, went still further, and extended the boundaries of Hungary to the sea, successfully contesting the possession of Dalmatia and its islands with the rising young Venetian republic. This was the beginning of the struggle, centuries long, between Hungary and Venice for the command of the Adriatic, which ultimately resulted in the triumph of the latter.

The most dangerous period for Hungary was when the Comnenian dynasty restored for the last time the supremacy of the eastern empire. During the glorious reign of Manuel (1143-1180), himself a semi-Magyar—he was the grandson of St. Ladislaus—this danger became acute. Manuel treated the Hungarian throne as if it were a family possession; but he was too much occupied elsewhere

Hungary a Conquering Power

to attempt to conquer the country, and on the collapse of his dynasty, shortly after his death, Hungary once more became a conquering power. This (1173-1196) is the period of the acquisition of those "banates," or protective marches, Rama, or North Bosnia, Macso, or North Servia, and Szöreny, or West Wallachia, which so long protected Hungary from the incursions of her southern neighbours.

The thirteenth century, however, was a period of dire calamity and complete disintegration. The degeneracy of the Arpad dynasty, the consequent domination of a lawless and conscienceless oligarchy, the Tartar cataclysm (1240-1243), the haphazard re-peopling of the ruined kingdom with semi-pagan elements, like the Cumanians, resulting in a general

Predominance of the Slavs

lapse into savagery affecting the dynasty itself—all these visitations and their cumulative effect demonstrated that Hungary must be regenerated from without if she were to remain a member of the Christian commonwealth. The Holy See, therefore, wisely intervened; the last Arpad was hunted down, and the iron discipline of feudalism, administered by the great princes of the Neapolitan branch of the house of Anjou (1308-1382), raised the fallen kingdom once more from her ashes to an unprecedented degree of power and splendour.

Meanwhile, the Balkan peninsula had become predominantly Slavonic. The Greek empire disappeared from Europe. Its supplanter, the feudal empire of Rumania, withering rapidly in uncongenial soil, had, within a few years of its foundation, virtually shrunk within the walls of Constantinople. It was an easy task for Michael Paleologus, in 1261, with the aid of the Genoese and the Venetians, to cleanse the orthodox capital from the Latin debris. But the new empire was but a shadow of the old one. Its restoration was mainly a successful commercial speculation on the part of the Italian maritime cities. The Greeks were from the outset too heavily burdened by their obligations to their allies to profit by their delusive good fortune. They could pay their debts only by reducing their armaments, and collapse was the inevitable if long-postponed result. Anyhow, from the beginning of the thirteenth to the middle of the fourteenth century Serbs and Bulgars triumphed over Greeks and Latins alike, and divided the inheritance of Constantine between them. Unfortunately for themselves, and for Europe, the great Nemanjidiæ and Asyenidiæ dynasties, which represented Serbia and Bulgaria respectively, were constantly at war with their neighbours and with each other, and the intermixture of religious with political questions—such, for example, as the rivalry of the two young autocephalous Churches

Serb and Bulgar at Variance

and the proselytising efforts of the Popes, to whom more than one "rex Slavorum" owed his kingly crown—prevented anything like stability. Another more insidious but none the less powerful solvent was the Bogomil heresy. This unnatural and antisocial revival of manichæism, which established itself in Bulgaria between 927 and 968, and by the end of the fourteenth century had permeated all the Slavonic races of the Balkan peninsula, though most virulent and indomitable in Bosnia, struck at the roots of domestic, social, and political life, and was one of the most powerful contributory sources of the comparatively easy triumphs of the Turks over the outwardly imposing but inwardly rotten Slavonic kingdoms.

The Turks, on the other hand, when they first appeared above the European horizon—conquest of Gallipoli, 1356—were uniquely equipped for a career of conquest. Already they alone of all nations possessed in the "Jenicheri," a regular standing army recruited from the flower of the conquered populations and bound together by the indissoluble ties of a discipline which was a tenet of their religion. How could the self-willed, undisciplined hosts of South-eastern Europe stand before veterans whose first and last duty was absolute obedience to their leaders? Five years after the transference of their capital from Broussa to Adrianople, the forces of the united Slavonic kingdoms were annihilated on the field of Kossovo in 1389. The gallant attempt of the feudal chivalry of Hungary and Western Europe to stem their progress failed miserably on the field of Nicopolis in 1396. By the end of the century their empire stretched from the Danube to Thessaly.

The Turk Equipped for Conquest

The destruction of Sultan Bajazet I. by Tamerlane the Tartar, or more correctly Tatar, at Angora, in 1402, presented Christendom with the only real opportunity it has ever had for expelling the Turks from Europe at next to no cost. The opportunity was neglected; the young Osmanli empire was allowed a quarter of a century to recover from its wounds, and by that time the fate of the southern Slavonic lands was sealed. For the next 500 years they are simply Turkish sandjaks, or military districts, with no history of their own. Constantinople owed its brief respite to the energetic intervention of

the Hungarians, who were routed, indeed, at Varna in 1444 owing to the undisciplined impetuosity of the feudal chivalry, but, under Janos Hunyadi and his son Matthias, held the balance equal during the critical last half of the fifteenth century. The victories of these extraordinary men, which so astounded their contemporaries, were due principally to their consummate generalship. They were the first to demonstrate that a skilfully-handled, regular army of Europeans was a match for almost any number of janicharies (janissaries) and spahis however brave, unless the odds were absolutely overwhelming, as at Mohacs in 1526.

The Hunyadis were materially assisted by a new nationality, the Wallachs—from which they themselves were descended—who founded semi-independent principalities in Moldavia (1354-1359), and in Wallachia (1338-1369). It is evident from the earliest known coins of the Wallachs that their rulers were Slavs of the Ruthenian, or Little Russian, stock, and originally vassals of the Hungarian Crown. The official language of the Hospodars of Moldavia and Wallachia was

**Descendants
of Trajan's
Colonists**

Ruthenian for centuries to come, though the people over which they ruled seem to have been the descendants of Trajan's Roman colonies and spoke a language in some respects even closer to Latin than either Italian or Spanish.

The independence of the Hospodars was necessarily short lived. Their principalities traversed the line of least resistance to the Turkish advance, and, at the best of times, they were dependent either upon Hungary or Poland, according to circumstances and political exigencies. Wallachia paid tribute to the Porte as early as 1396, Moldavia not till 1513. But their comparative distance from Stamboul enabled them to maintain some pretence of autonomy at the worst periods of their chequered history, and the Turks themselves regarded the Danubian principalities as something higher than the down-trodden provinces of Servia, Bulgaria, Bosnia, and Greece. In the figurative language of the Divan they were "the two wings" by means of which the Padishah could take further flights northwards.

When Hungary also was finally submerged beneath the Turkish deluge in 1543 a third vassal principality, Transylvania, was added to the two Danubian "wings."

Still more remote from the Turkish capital, Transylvania consequently enjoyed a still larger measure of autonomy than Wallachia and Moldavia, and was even strong enough at times to take up an entirely independent attitude and successfully play Turkey off against the emperor, who was for long, and not un-

**National
Spirit of
the Magyars**

justly, regarded as a more dangerous enemy than the sultan himself. Under the Protestant princes of the houses of Bethlen and Rakoczy in particular (1613-1648), Transylvania occupied a commanding position, which enabled her to act as the champion and guarantor of the constitutional privileges and the religious liberties of the Hungarians generally. Her political mission was to keep alive the Magyar nationality during the terrible Turkish domination and the scarcely less mischievous anti-national Catholic reaction which aimed deliberately at the denationalisation of Hungary.

The Hungarians as a nation took but a minor part in the final deliverance of their country from the Turkish yoke. Indeed, during the sixteen years war which was terminated by the Peace of Karlovic, in 1699, their most brilliant national representative, Imre Tököly, figured conspicuously on the Turkish side. It is also worthy of remark that the full limits of the ancient kingdom of Stephen were never recovered. It is true that by the Peace of Passarovic, in 1719, most of the old border banates, comprising Wallachia west of the Aluta, and the northern parts of Bosnia and Servia, were temporarily wrested from the Porte, but the Turks regained them all by the Peace of Belgrade in 1739, even including the fortress of Belgrade itself, which had belonged from time immemorial to Hungary, but forms part of modern Servia.

We now turn from South-eastern to Central Europe, which, as early as the seventh century, seems to have been peopled by numerous branches of the Slavonic family, but of these only the two principal ones, the Czechs and the Poles, need here occupy us. In the middle of the seventh century we find the former located in the modern Bohemia and owning some loose allegiance to Charles the Great. From Germany also the Czechs received their Christianity about 814, the traces of the earlier mission of Cyril and

Methodius having vanished irretrievably; and till 973, when the bishopric of Prague was established, the vast Bohemo-Moravian realm, which then extended as far as the modern Galicia, was ecclesiastically part of the diocese of Ratisbon.

Bohemia was never able to found a permanent Slavonic state in Central Europe.

German influences were too potent and too close at hand, and, besides, as already mentioned, the intrusion of the Magyars cut her off from her natural allies, the southern and eastern Slavs. German proximity was not, indeed, an unmixt disadvantage. To it Bohemia owed her relatively superior culture—the first German university was actually founded at the Bohemian capital, Prague, in 1349—and, more than once, especially during the brief but brilliant domination of the Premyslidæ (1197–1278), rose, by means of it, to an unlooked for degree of grandeur. But she was rarely more than one of several competing states of almost equal strength, which were for ever confederating against any neighbour which might happen, temporarily, to be the stronger. Matters were also complicated by dynastic amalgamations.

Thus, the Hapsburg dukes were frequently kings of Bohemia as well as emperors of Germany, while Hungary and Bohemia were more than once united under the same sovereign, to the serious detriment of both. No wonder, then, if the politics of Central Europe, from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century, were in a continual state of flux, and neutral intermediate provinces like Moravia, Silesia, Lusatia, Styria, and Carinthia, all of them Slavonic lands originally, were perpetually changing hands, belonging by turns to Bohemia, Hungary, and Poland, till the German element, as represented by the Hapsburg dukes, grew strong enough to subordinate the scattered Slavonic elements everywhere and altogether. Bohemia was saved from actual absorption partly by her strong natural frontiers, a bastion of mountains protecting her on three sides, and partly by the extraordinary vitality of her Slavonic population. This was notably the case during the Hussite Wars, when the Czechs became a terror to all the surrounding states. At a later day they supplied Central Europe with its

**Bohemia's
Mountain
Bastions**

finest mercenaries—the so-called *zsebraks*.

We possess no certain historical data relating to Poland till the end of the sixth century. It would seem that the progenitors of the Poles, originally established on the Danube, were driven thence to the still wilder wildernesses of Central Europe, settling finally among the forests and morasses of the basin of the Upper Oder and Vistula, where they dwelt in loosely connected communities till the pressure of rapacious neighbours compelled them to combine for mutual defence under the semi-mythical Piast and his successors. The Piasts wrested Chrobacya, a province extending from the Carpathians to the Bug, from the shadowy Moravian empire already mentioned. Under Mieszko I. (962–992) Poland nominally accepted Christianity from the Greek Church, but was reconverted by the Roman Church at the instigation of Boleslaus I. (992–1025) in order to obtain the protection of the Holy See against the persistent pressure of the Germans from the west.

Boleslaus was also the first Polish king, and he founded an empire which extended from the Baltic to Volhynia and from the Elbe to the Bug. This empire persisted in its main outlines till the death of Boleslaus III. (1102–1138), whose last act was to subdivide his territories among his numerous sons, who re-subdivided them among their children. This "partitional period," as it is called, lasted till 1305, during which period Poland ceased to be a political entity. By the time that the kingdom was reconstituted by Wladislaus Lokietek (1306–1339), the Teutonic Order had excluded Poland from the Baltic, and a new state, Lithuania, had intervened between her and her ancient neighbour in the east—Russia.

The Lithuanians, an Aryan but not a Slavonic race, originally dwelt among the impenetrable forests and morasses of the Upper Niemen, where they were able to preserve their original savagery longer than any of their neighbours, and foster a tenacious and enterprising valour which made them very formidable to all the surrounding states. They first emerge into the light of history at the time of the settlement of the Teutonic Order in the north. Rumours of the war of extermination waged against their near kinsfolk, the wild Prussians, by the Knights, first awoke them to a sense of

**Poland's
First
Sovereign**

their own danger. They immediately abandoned their loose communal system for a monarchical form of government, and under a series of exceptionally capable princes, notably Mendog (1240-1263) and Gedymin (1315-1341), began an astonishing career of conquest, so that, at the death of Gedymin, the grand-duchy of Lithuania, as it was henceforth called, extended from Courland to the Carpathians and from the Bug to the Dniester, including the old Russian principalities of Polock, Kiev, and Chernigov.

Poland and Lithuania were naturally drawn together by their common fear and hatred of the Germans, sentiments even strong enough to bring about a personal union of the two autonomous states under the Lithuanian Grand Duke Jagiello, or Jagellon, who took the name of Wladislaus II. on the occasion of his baptism and coronation at Cracow in 1386.

The cardinal political event of East Central Europe during the next century was the duel *à outrance* between Poland-Lithuania and the Teutonic Order. Ultimately decided in favour of Poland, it was, nevertheless, but a half-victory, for

**Poland
the Leading
Power**

while the Knights were compelled to relinquish their grip on the modern Courland, Samogitia, and West Prussia, they were permitted, as the vassals of Poland, to retain possession of the modern East Prussia, or Ducal Prussia, as it was now called, when, in 1525, the last Grand Master of the Order became the first Duke of Prussia, with his capital at Königsberg.

This partial triumph was due entirely to the foresight and tenacity of the princes of the house of Jagiello, who steadily recognised that unification, and the possession of a seaboard, were the essential conditions of the maintenance and stability of the Polish commonwealth. The last prince of that house, Sigismund II. (1548-1572), crowned the work of his predecessors by amalgamating Poland and Lithuania indissolubly by the Union of Lublin in 1569. Poland was now the leading power of Central Europe, and indisputably the head of the Slavonic world. Territorially, she was superior to every other contemporary state except the Turkish empire.

Meanwhile, the existence of another vast state in the depths of the Polish hinterland was barely suspected in Western Europe

much before the end of the fifteenth century. Muscovy may be said to have been discovered, about the same time as America, by a German traveller, Ritter Niklas von Poppel, who, in 1486, brought to Vienna the strange tidings that North-eastern Russia was not, as generally supposed, a part of Poland, but a

**Beginnings
of the Russian
Empire**

vast independent state even larger than Poland. Yet the beginnings of the Russian empire had been far more brilliant in promise than the beginnings of the Polish kingdom. While the progenitors of the Poles were struggling in their native swamps, the progenitors of the Russians were alternately the adversaries and the allies of the Greek emperors of the east. As early as the tenth century the court of Yaroslav, the son of Vladimir the Great, was renowned throughout Europe as much for learning as for splendour, and the kings of France, Hungary and Norway were suitors for the daughters of the grand duke of Kiev.

But after the destruction of Kiev by the Tartars evil days fell upon "the land of the Rus." The current of the national life was now forced to flow north-eastwards instead of following its natural south-western course as heretofore. It was in the rude climate and among the vast virgin forests of the plain of the Upper Volga that the Russian princes, cut off from western civilisation, began, painfully and laboriously, to build up again the Russian state. For generations to come they were the tributaries and the vassals of the Tartar khans. Nor did their own hands deliver them. It was the victories of the Lithuanian princes which compelled the Tartars somewhat to relax their grip of South-western and Central Russia, and the provinces so released fell, naturally, to the victors.

Thus it came about that by the time the northern princes had established a fresh centre of nationality and orthodoxy under the leadership of the patient and strenuous grand dukes of Moscow, at least one-half of the old Russian lands, with their orthodox Slavonic population, had become part of Lithuania, a foreign state, and, still worse, the ally and consort of Catholic Poland.

In fact, from the end of the fourteenth to the middle of the eighteenth century the term "Russia" is merely a geographical

expression with various significations. As used by the Poles, it invariably means the woiwody, or palatinate, of Red Russia, which extended, roughly speaking, from the watershed of the Upper Vistula to the watershed of the Pruth. As used by the Muscovites, it meant all those Russian lands outside the actual limits of the grand duchy of Moscow, which the

grand duke claimed as the descendant of Vladimir; that is to say, Black Russia, Red Russia, Little Russia and White Russia, by far the larger portion of which had been incorporated either with Lithuania or with Poland. Hence the peculiar significance of the coveted title, "Sovereign of all the Russias." The highest encomium which the old Muscovite chronicles could bestow upon a prince in those miserable days of anarchy and dispersion was to describe him as a "*sobiratel*," or "gatherer," of the provinces which, taken together, formed the original heritage of the Russian people.

All the old Muscovite grand dukes and tsars from Ivan I. to Ivan IV. (1328-1584) were more or less successful "gatherers" of land. They were, generally speaking, a stealthy, crafty, cowardly race. Indeed, personally they seem contemptible by the side of the heroic and sagacious rulers of contemporary Poland. The means such men employed to gain their end were almost necessarily base and vile in the extreme; but the end invariably aimed at—the unification and civilisation of Russia—was indisputably a high one, and whatever their vices, patriotism, the highest virtue of a statesman, cannot be denied to the worst of them. Moreover, they were popular, for they stood between the people and the people's secular oppressors, the official classes. So far as their arm could reach, the people were protected, and rough justice was

Russia the Work of Autocrats

generally done. Thus, on the whole, it is no hyperbole to declare that whatever of glory and prosperity she may possess, Russia owes it almost entirely to the initiative of her autocrats.

In the very nature of things, the history of Poland and Muscovy was bound sooner or later to resolve itself into a struggle for the possession of the alienated orthodox Russian provinces. At first, however, this struggle was desultory and intermittent. Other questions more imme-

diately urgent postponed the final settlement. Poland could not give proper attention to the Muscovite question, still of but secondary importance, so long as the Prussian incubus thwarted and crippled her nearer home; while till Muscovy had freed herself from the paralysing Tartar yoke, she could do little more than harrow and vex the Lithuanian borders. The inevitable antagonism between the two peoples was exacerbated by the determined attempts of Muscovy to gain an adequate seaboard on the Baltic, on the collapse of the Livonian Order, and the equally determined efforts of Poland to prevent her rival from becoming wealthier and more civilised by means of maritime commerce and free intercourse with the west.

By this time Muscovy had dealt a mortal blow at the Tartar domination. The overthrow of the khanate of Kazan by Ivan the Terrible, in 1552, was, perhaps, no very extraordinary exploit from a purely military point of view; nevertheless, politically, it was an epoch-making event in the history of Eastern Europe. At Kazan, Mohammedan Asia had fought behind its last trench against Christian Europe marshalled beneath the banner of the Tsar of Muscovy. Nothing could now restrain the natural advance of the young Russian state towards the east and south-east.

For the first time in history the Volga became a Russian river. The conquest of the Caucasus and of Central Asia was now only a matter of time. But the superior civilisation of Poland and Sweden still barred the progress of Muscovy westwards. She had, indeed, taken advantage of the embarrassments of the Polish Sigismunds (1506-1572) to extend her dominions westwards to the Middle Dnieper, and the capture of the great fortress of Smolensk in 1514 was the first serious advantage she had yet gained over her rival. But, half a century later, Poland also had improved her position. By the middle of the sixteenth century most of her external embarrassments had vanished; the Union of Lublin had almost doubled her material resources, while in Stephen Báthory and Jan Zamoisky she possessed the greatest warrior and the greatest statesman of the age. It was in vain that Ivan IV. pitted his innumerable semi-barbarous hordes against such

opponents. Victory, with whatever odds, was impossible.

But the collapse of Muscovy and the triumph of Poland at the end of the sixteenth century were, after all, most delusive phenomena. Muscovy was saved from apparently inevitable dissolution by an outburst of religious enthusiasm, which demonstrated that the nation, after all, was sound at the core; and less than fifty years after the humiliating treaty of Deulino, in 1617, which had flung the Muscovites back among their steppes and forests, the scales were reversed, and Poland had already entered upon her long agony.

Poland presents the unique example of a people which deliberately destroyed itself, politically, rather than submit to the trammels of ordinary government. Absolute individual liberty as the exclusive privilege of a single class (the *Szlachta*, or nobility) was the one ideal of Polish politicians. The earliest manifestation of this arrogant self-will was the claim, constantly made by the aristocracy, to renounce their allegiance whenever they differed from the king as to the nature and extent of their obligations—a claim which ultimately received legal sanction by the statute “*De non præstanda obœdentia*” in 1607.

Simultaneously, a movement against the middle and lower classes began. The burgesses were deprived of their right to send deputies to the local diets. They were forbidden to hold extra-mural estates, with the view of disqualifying them for military service. Their goods were heavily taxed, so that they should not compete with the nobles, the produce of whose estates went toll free. They were excluded from high ecclesiastical preferment. The peasantry fared even worse. They were chained to the soil, forbidden to learn trades, and degraded into serfs, becoming, at last, as much the property of their masters as the oxen with which they tilled the fields. The Jagiellos, indeed, had fought with some success against these aristocratic centrifugal tendencies. Five out of seven of these princes were great statesmen who, on principle, defended the rights of the middle and lower classes against the usurpations of the gentry, lest the equilibrium of the state should be destroyed. They were able to exercise this balancing

power because they were hereditary monarchs, and possessed such vast estates in Lithuania as to make them, in ordinary circumstances, independent of the subsidies of the diet.

When, however, in 1572, Poland was converted into a purely elective monarchy, every safeguard against aristocratic domination was swept away.

Limiting the Power of Polish Kings Henceforth the diet was composed exclusively of the gentry. The kings in time of peace were little more than honorary titled presidents, with far less of influence than the presidents of the United States exercise in our own day. In time of war, if they happened to be distinguished soldiers, they were allowed to lead the armies of the republic against its enemies, generally at their own expense. But it was conceivable that a victorious monarch at the head of a devoted army might chafe at his humiliating condition of tutelage, and thus become a dangerous rival to the diet. To prevent such a contingency, the *szlachta* deliberately used its power of the purse to cut down the national armaments and the national defences to starvation point—finally abolishing the regular forces altogether as superfluous. Yet of all the states of Europe, Poland stood most in need of a large, a very large, standing army.

With no natural boundaries, constantly exposed to attack from every quarter, surrounded by watchful and greedy neighbours, it should have been the first principle of the dominant *szlachta* to be always and everywhere on the alert, well mounted, armed *cap à pie*, and with whole arsenals of offensive weapons ready to hand. The geographical position of Poland, even more than the duty of her rulers to their own people, demanded such precautions. The Jagiellos had shown the way. They had fused into one homogeneous political whole a congeries of different nationalities, more or less akin ethnologically, but differing immensely in language and religion, and, above all, in degrees of civilisation. The lawlessness and parsimony of the diets had, it is true, prevented the perfect accomplishment of their patriotic dream of empire.

A Dream of Empire Dispelled Had the diets loyally responded to the just demands of these great monarchs, Silesia and Lusatia might not have been lost, the Prussian provinces would

have been incorporated and Polonised, Smolensk would never have fallen, the dangerous steppes would have been fortified and colonised. Nevertheless, despite every obstacle and impediment, beneath the guidance of the Jagiellos Poland had gradually ascended to the dignity of a great power, and they left her the mistress of her own destiny.

**A Country
that Committed
Suicide**

her own destiny. Circumstances, moreover, were most favourable. Transylvania separated her from Austria as well as from the Turks. The collapse of the Livonian Order opened up a prospect of fresh and easy conquests. The German emperors, absorbed by their own affairs, had ceased to be dangerous. The tsars had barely emerged from the enervating Tartar bondage.

Thus Poland was at the starting-point of an imperial career. Fortune's ball was at her foot, and she had but to kick it. She preferred, instead, to destroy her executive and her legislature as a first step towards political renunciation, as if she were safely isolated in the midst of an impassable ocean instead of being cast in the midst of a fermentation of ceaselessly struggling nationalities in which only the fittest fighter could hope to survive. Still worse, she deliberately threw away the providential gift of great men so liberally bestowed upon her during the latter part of the sixteenth and the earlier part of the seventeenth century. No other nation ever threw away its chances with such reckless bravado. She gave little help and no thanks to Stephen Báthory for driving back the Muscovite invasion of Ivan the Terrible. She even rejoiced that the wounds he had got in defending her were the cause of his death. She prevented Chodkiewicz from driving the Swedes out of the Baltic provinces, and Sigismund III. from partitioning Muscovy. She sent Zolkiewsky, her greatest captain, to certain death on the Turkish frontier rather than

**The Cause
of Poland's
Doom**

reinforce him adequately, and broke the heart of her most popular king, Wladislaus IV., by crossing his patriotic endeavour to found a navy. She frustrated John Casimir's plan of dealing adequately with the Cossack peril, thus throwing away her last chance of political salvation. And all for what? Simply for this—that half a million county magnates and country squires might each, in his own province or parish, do precisely what he liked.

While the high-born, showy Pole, the Slavonic Esau, was thus rejecting his political birthright, the hegemony of the Slavonic races, for the pottage of personal comfort the Slavonic Jacob, as we may call the Russian, stealthily, craftily, patiently and laboriously, with an unquestioning belief in the divine mission and ultimate triumph of orthodoxy, was already entering upon the inheritance which his more gifted brother on the Vistula had contemptuously thrown away. As early as 1667 the secular struggle between Poland and Muscovy was concluded by the "Truce" of Andrusovo, a truce which proved to be one of the most permanent peaces of history, for it endured for more than a hundred years. Muscovy recovered thereby the whole eastern bank of the Dnieper, including Kiev, the metropolis of ancient Russia and the source of her culture and religion, Chernigov and all the land between the Dnieper and the affluents of the Don. The thirteen-years war, terminated at Andrusovo, was the last open contest between the two powers. Henceforth, the influence of Russia over

**Growth
of Russia's
Influence**

Poland was to increase steadily without any struggle at all, the republic being already stricken by that creeping paralysis which ultimately left her a prey to her neighbours.

Muscovy had done with Poland as an adversary, and had no longer any cause to fear her ancient enemy. She was now free to devote herself to other and more important matters upon which depended her historical continuity and existence, such as the subjection of the Cossacks, the colonisation and the extension of the vast Southern Ukraine, internal reforms in Church and State, and the recovery of the Baltic seaboard.

Throughout the reigns of the earlier Romanovs the great work of reform and reconstruction went steadily on. It is often too much taken for granted that Peter the Great created modern Russia. The foundations of modern Russia were laid while he was still in his nursery. Increased respect abroad was the corollary of increased efficiency at home. The mere fact that Russia, at the end of the seventeenth century, was invited to participate in the grand league against the Turk was eloquent as to her political progress, and although the campaigns of Prince Vasily Golitsuin in 1687-8, ended

in disaster, yet the very appearance of a Russian army at the gates of the Crimea was a significant sign that the "steppe" was no longer a barrier to Russia's progress southwards. The subsequent capture of Azov, in 1696, by the youthful Peter marks a still further advance. It was the first time that Russia had ventured openly to cope with the forces of the Ottoman empire.

It is true that this initial success was discounted by the subsequent reverse on the Pruth in 1711; nevertheless, by the end of his reign Peter could safely challenge the Porte to a third contest, which he well knew it would never dare to accept. A few years before his death Russia was already one of the great powers of Europe, equally formidable on the Baltic and the Caspian. She had obtained, at last, a seaboard, and learnt to know her own value. Throughout the reigns of Peter's immediate successors (1725-1762) the prestige of Russia steadily increased. During this period her foreign policy was directed by two statesmen of the first rank, both of them Peter's "fledglings," Andrei Osterman and Alexis Bestuzhev.

**Elizabeth
and Catharine
of Russia**

Peter's own daughter, the Empress Elizabeth, was also, in some respects, an even more remarkable personage than the brilliant and meretricious Catharine II. Anyhow, Elizabeth was a greater statesman than Catharine, because she always knew her own mind, and never allowed herself to be diverted from the main issue. At the end of her reign Russia was certainly the preponderating state in Europe. It should also not be forgotten that most of the great captains and statesmen who made the name of Catharine so illustrious were educated in the school of Elizabeth.

While Russia had thus become a great empire with a dominant voice in the European concert, Poland had, politically, almost ceased to exist. Under the Saxon kings (1697-1763) there was no government at all to speak of. The king, who resided in Dresden, rarely visited the kingdom. The biennial diet continued its sessions regularly enough; but it was as regularly "exploded" by the unscrupulous use of the "*liberum veto*," so that no work was done and not a single measure was passed for two generations. The long-sought political utopia of the Polish squirearch had, in fact, at last been realised. There was no army because he would not

pay for it. There was no diplomatic service because he did not see the use of maintaining so expensive an establishment. There was no administration of justice, because nobody dared to enforce the laws against offenders. The castles and fortresses were in ruins, the arsenals were empty, the frontier was defenceless, because the Grand-Hetmans, or Captains-General, who were supposed to provide all these things out of the revenues of their starosties, set apart for that special purpose, simply pocketed the money.

Poland, in fact, had ceased to be a state, and was nothing more than a loose collection of independent clans. The only focuses of whatever social and political life had managed to survive were to be found in the "courts" of two or three hundred magnates scattered all over the country. Many of these magnates were fabulously wealthy. The estates of the Potocki extended over thousands of square miles. The Radzivills were equally opulent. One member alone of that princely house was worth thirty millions sterling. It would have been a small thing to many of these great nobles to have contributed towards the national defence by training to the use of arms a few thousands of the heydukes, cossacks and "gentlemen servitors," who ate the bread of idleness in their palaces and country mansions, and never was Poland so much in need of a military police as during the last days of her existence.

That period was for Central Europe a period of almost incessant warfare. Poland generally lay in the direct path of the belligerents; and, despite her anxious and constant neutrality, her territories were systematically traversed, exploited, and ravaged as if the republic was a no man's land with which everybody might make free. But what could be expected from private enterprise when the Grand-Hetman Potocki, the dignitary responsible for the defence of the country, refused to place a small corps of observation on the Silesian frontier during the Seven Years War, "for fear of provoking hostilities," and when even such a friend of reform as Waclaw Rzewuski, who resigned a high position in order the better to serve his country, could flippantly exclaim: "The republic died long ago, only it has forgotten to tumble down."

**Fabulous
Wealth of
Polish Nobles**

**Poland
a Theatre
of War**

Since the days of Sobieski, in fact, Poland had become utterly incompetent to save herself from destruction. The demoralisation of her governing classes was incurable, their ignorance of affairs and events invincible. There was much of private virtue and personal excellence in the land, but of public spirit or political instinct scarce a trace. The Poles slumbered on with folded arms in the naive belief that Europe was so vitally interested in the maintenance of their anarchic independence and their useless territorial integrity that they need not stir a finger to help themselves. Warsaw was the last place in the world where the possibility of a partition was even imagined. There was now only one way of arresting the otherwise inevitable catastrophe, and that was for Poland to fling herself unreservedly into the arms of Russia, because, strange as it may sound, Russia was the enemy from whom she had least to fear.

Even now it is by no means so generally recognised as it might be that so late as 1770 the idea of a regular partition of Poland formed no part of the political calculations of the court of St. Petersburg. Count Nikita Panin, the political mentor of Catherine II., who controlled the foreign policy of Russia during the first sixteen years of her reign, had other views for Poland. He could not endure the thought of destroying the republic because he regarded it as an indispensable member of his projected "Northern Accord," which was to counterpoise in the north the influence of the Bourbon-Hapsburg League. In this "accord" Poland was to take the place of Austria, especially in the case of Oriental complications.

Panin conscientiously opposed the first partition to the very last. In reply to an impatient reminder from Potsdam, in February, 1771, he informed the Prussian Ambassador that the empress had so often and so solemnly guaranteed the territorial integrity of the republic that the open violation of that principle must produce everywhere the most unpleasant effect. He added that Frederick's suggestion that Russia should compensate herself in Poland for losses sustained elsewhere was regarded by the empress as "hard and offensive." The territory of Russia, he said, was already so vast that he


doubted whether any accretion would benefit her. This was perfectly true at the time. It was the absolute control of an autonomous but submissive Poland that Russia originally desiderated.

None of the contemporaries of the first partition seem to have regarded it unfavourably either from a political or a moral point of view. The general condemnation of it was of a much later date, and largely due to Europe's growing dislike of Catharine's policy in general and Panin's methods in particular. It should be added too that Russia comes best out of the miserable business. She prevented the partition as long as possible, and she won her share of it—which, by the way, consisted entirely of old Russian lands—at least by right of conquest, whereas Austria and Prussia got their portions of the spoil by no right at all.

Even after the first partition it was indisputably Poland's best policy to go hand in hand with Russia. It cannot fairly be urged that the diminution of the Polish state was in any way injurious to the Polish people. Panin's contention that the wrested provinces would benefit by the transfer was perfectly correct, and it should not be overlooked that the new constitution, adopted by the diet of 1775, which Russia invented to meet the new conditions of the republic, was, sentiment apart, far superior to anything of the kind which the Poles had been able to devise.

It is also a fact that, materially, Poland largely benefited by it. During the second Turkish war Poland had a unique opportunity of cementing the Russian alliance permanently, but the famous Quadrennial Diet, animated doubtless by the loftiest motives, flung away the last chance of an understanding, followed blindly the treacherous counsels of Prussia, and sacrificed Poland to an outburst of patriotic sentiment. The result we all know; Poland disappeared from the map of Europe. The methods of the Russian empress were, after all, less contemptible, less heinous, than those of the Prussian king. Catharine openly took the risks of a bandit who attacks an enemy against whom he has a personal grudge: Frederick William II. came up when the fight was over to help to pillage a victim whom he had encouraged to fight by swearing to defend him.

R. NISBET BAIN





THEODORA: THE BYZANTINE EMPRESS WHO WAS A DANCING GIRL

From the painting by Val Prinsep, R.A., by permission of Mrs. Sholto Vere Hare, the owner.



THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE

RISE OF THE EASTERN POWER

THE FLOURISHING OF BYZANTIUM

AND DREAMS OF A NEW WORLD-EMPIRE

WHEN the sixth century opened, the emperor at Byzantium was the Illyrian Anastasius. At his death, in 518, the captain of the guard was Justinus, a man of peasant birth from Tauresium, near Bederiana in Dardania—near the modern Uskub on the borders of Albania. His great reputation among the troops and the clergy impressed upon the eunuch Amantius, who administered the imperial treasury, the expediency of proposing him as emperor, in spite of his being very illiterate and hardly able to read or write. The newly-elected emperor, now an old man, had sometime previously invited his nephew, Flavius Petrus Sabatius Justinianus to the capital, and had given him a brilliant education.

The latter became the support, the counsellor, and the co-regent of his uncle. Accomplished in every subject which could win him the love of the clergy, and indeed of the Pope himself, the enthusiasm of the people, and the reverence of the senate, he was orthodox, lavish in providing games for the populace, and courteous towards the highest classes, although he ventured to marry an ex-ballet dancer,

A Dancing Girl Becomes Empress

Theodora, daughter of a bear-leader. His influence can be traced back to the year 518: from 520 onwards he is actually designated monarch—for example, by Leontius of Byzantium. Vitalian, his most dangerous rival, had been put out of the way at a banquet on the advice of Justinian. So, too, the completely coherent policy in Church and State, which aimed at gaining the West, and therefore had concluded peace with Pope Hormisdas

in 519 and reconfirmed the resolutions of Chalcedon, bears so clearly the stamp of Justinian's individuality that we must certainly term it his doing. Again, the provisions of a bilingual edict—issued in 527 by the two emperors, and found in 1889 on the borders of Pisidia and the Cibyrtis—which protects the property

Emperor's Lack of Culture

of the churches against those enemies of all landowners, the passing or permanently quartered troops, show the same zeal for order as the "novels" which Justinian subsequently issued in his capacity of sole monarch. Only in less important departments, such as in the barbarous types of the coinage, which later were retained by Justinian himself until 538, is Justin's complete want of culture observable.

On August 1st, 527, Justinian took over the sole government of the empire, which remained under his guidance until November 14th, 565. The emperor, whose mother tongue was Latin, and whose family bore a Thracian name, Sabatius, has been claimed as a Slav; it is said that his original name was Upravda, which was translated into Latin as "Justinian"; but there is no adequate foundation for the legend. We may with much more probability recognise in him a Thraco-Illyrian, who, born on the frontiers of the decaying Thracian and the expanding Illyrian nationalities, bears a Thracian name and shows the vigour peculiar to the Illyrian, that is, Albanian nationality.

Gentle and forbearing, but proud of these as of other qualities, full of self-restraint towards his enemies, simple

almost to asceticism in his life, singularly conscientious in his work, for which he rose in the middle of the night, so that he was called the "sleepless monarch," endowed with the highest sense of his imperial dignity, which seemed to give him the power of producing legal commentaries, theological disquisitions, and schemes for military operations, a jealous despot, often vacillating and irresolute, but always supported by the activity of his intellect, Justinian towered above all his immediate predecessors by his peculiar talents. In the graceful head with the small mouth and strong lips, the straight nose and the soft expression of the eyes, which are represented in the mosaics of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo and San Vitale at Ravenna, we should see a cleric or a simple official rather than a great emperor, who showed creative genius in the fields of jurisprudence and architecture, who worked great reforms in the administrative sphere, but also in military and theological matters achieved ephemeral successes greatly to the detriment of the empire and the army.

Justinian performed a permanent service by his settlement of the principles of jurisprudence, completing the work of Constantine. The latter effected the first great reconciliation between the old civilised world and Christianity; his New Rome with all its creations was the fruit of that union. But Christianity, so far as its governors the priesthood were concerned, remained obstinately hostile to the legal forms and ideas of the ancient state; the legal ideas of the Mosaic code appealed to the clergy more nearly than the Roman law, and the masses must have shared this feeling. In this way religion and the judicial system became antagonistic one to the other; the judge who gives sentence according to "pagan" law becomes alien to his people until he prefers to be alien to his law, which nobody values. Ignorance asserts its dominion everywhere. But the legal conceptions of individual peoples grow dim before the

knowledge of Roman law; if that knowledge is strengthened, these peoples are no longer any obstacle to the despotism of the Roman law. Justinian had the deepest regard for this "infallible power"; he therefore tried by consolidating it to destroy Oriental influences for good and all.

Tribonian, a Pamphylian from a remote corner of Asia Minor, was the man who helped him in this great task. An active thinker, the greatest scholar of his time, competent to write on the nature of fortune and the duties of sovereignty as well as on the harmonious system of the universe; as much in his element when president of the various committees for recording the law as when treading the marble pavements of the emperor's palace at Byzantium, complete unscrupulousness in pursuing his private aims—these are the characteristics of the man who was the soul and the most active instrument of legislation. The colossal task of collecting

all imperial ordinances (*constitutiones*) in one new single work (*Codex Justinianus*) was carried through, thanks to the efficiency of the imperial chancery, in less than fourteen months. Antiquated ordinances were

omitted, whether superseded by new laws or merely nullified by the practice of the courts. Chronological arrangement within the separate titles facilitated reference. After April 16th, 529, all legal procedure throughout the empire had to conform to the ordinances of this collection. With praiseworthy consistency special decisions (the *quinquaginta decisiones*), by which the old law was expounded, were given on doubtful cases and disputed points. After these most difficult questions, and with them some useless matters, had been settled, Justinian appointed a committee to make a collection of the old jurists and a book of extracts from them. Tribonian, the president of the committee, supplies with pride some hardly credible figures, which should give us a clear idea of the mere physical labour: 2,000 books with



Anastasius

Justinus I.

Justinian I.

THREE OF THE EARLY BYZANTINE EMPERORS
Anastasius ruled in Byzantium at the beginning of the sixth century, and on his death the uneducated Justinus, captain of the guard, was elected. His nephew and successor, Justinian, was brilliantly educated, and was called the "sleepless monarch," reigning from 519 to 565.

**Condensing
the Books
of the Law**

omitted, whether superseded by new laws or merely nullified by the practice of the courts. Chronological arrangement within the separate titles facilitated reference. After April 16th, 529, all legal procedure throughout the empire had to conform to the ordinances of this collection. With praiseworthy consistency special decisions (the *quinquaginta decisiones*), by which the old law was expounded, were given on doubtful cases and disputed points. After these most difficult questions, and with them some useless matters, had been settled, Justinian appointed a committee to make a collection of the old jurists and a book of extracts from them. Tribonian, the president of the committee, supplies with pride some hardly credible figures, which should give us a clear idea of the mere physical labour: 2,000 books with

3,000,000 lines were compressed into 50 books with 150,000 lines. Professors and practitioners extracted in three large divisions the decisions which were before them, and in doing so cited the names and titles of the works on which they drew. Contradictions could not be entirely avoided; professional commentaries were to be forbidden, since they encroached on the sovereign's rights. This collection of the Digest, or Pandects, was invested with the authority of law on December 30th, 529.

The next task was to ensure that future lawyers should be educated on the lines of these new sources of jurisprudence; the institutes, which contained the principles and essential elements of preliminary legal study, had to be brought into harmony with the form which the sources of jurisprudence now assumed. This was accomplished by Theophilus, a teacher of law in the school at Constantinople, and Dorotheus from the law school of Berytus, of course under the supervision of Tribonian, and with special use of the best existing text-books, above all to the institutes of Gaius. Antiquated expressions which might deter students were expunged so that the "new Justinians," as the young lawyers were now called, might not be discouraged.

The necessity now presented itself of revising the Constitutions once more, for there were many ordinances left among them which, owing to the legal lore now collected and available, must have seemed superfluous or contradictory. A second edition, the only one

Justinian's Revisions of the Constitutions

now extant, was therefore prepared in continuation of the Digest. Finally, the legislative activity of Justinian himself did not cease with the conclusion of the great work; it continued until the death of Tribonian, in 545, and found scope in the "Novellæ," which, composed in Greek or Latin (some bilingually),

are preserved far more completely than the earlier ordinances incorporated in the Codex Justinianus, and are extant in private, though not in official, collections. The simplification of the professional work


Christian Principles of Jurisprudence

of lawyers, the introduction into jurisprudence of Christian principles instead of Mosaic law, the establishment of complete legal uniformity—with which purpose the old law school at Athens was closed on account of the attention there devoted to Greek law—and special attention to the interests of the small citizen,

were the leading aims of Justinian and his scholars. The predominance of the rich was broken down by the grant of special privileges to the soldier caste, by laws concerning the succession to landed property, by giving the wife the right to inherit, by usury laws (in dealing with countrymen only four per cent. was allowed), and by measures in favour of debtors (thus by the *beneficium inventarii* the liability of the heir was limited by making an inventory to the amount of property left). At the same time the Christian duty of protecting the poor was emphasised, the relaxation of the *patria potestas*, the legal authority of the father, aimed in the same direction, and the remains of the old family state were destroyed. Consideration for the weak-

nesses of inferiors, in imitation of the Divine mercy, was laid down as the guiding principle of the new jurisprudence, and thus as much opposition was shown to the old Roman law, with its doctrine of "reward and compulsion" as to the Mosaic code; a phrase employed in another connection, which speaks of the "contemptible and Jewish sort," is very significant of the attitude of the emperor.

The Nika riots helped Justinian to crush the still existing popular organisations, and to establish a perfect absolutism. Hitherto the parties of the Hippodrome had



JUSTINIAN AND HIS CODE

This emperor's great work was the compilation from the vast existing writings of the "Justinian Code," which, in its final and digested form he is here shown presenting to Tribonian, his great assistant in the task. From the Vatican.

been organised as Demes in civil and military division, received some sort of popular representation, and took some part in the election of the emperor, even of Justinian. Precisely as the Hippodrome in its collection of works of art—the bronze horses, and Heracles Trihesperus of Lysippus, the ass of Aktion, the

**Blues and Greens
Against
the Emperor**

Wolf and Hyena, Helena, and a number of other works of art stood there—had become the successor

of the Roman forum and the Greek Agora, so it resounded with echoes of the political importance of the forum. The civil divisions stood under Demarchs, the military under Democrats; the Democrat of the Blues was the *domesticus scholarum*, the Democrat of the Greens *domesticus excubitorum*.

This military organisation rendered it possible to employ the Demes occasionally to defend the walls. The rule of whichever was temporarily the stronger party—under Justinian that of the Blues—produced an intolerable state of affairs. The impartiality of Justinian, who punished alike misdemeanants of either colour, led, in 532, to the union of the two parties (their cry “Nika”—victory), to the burning and destruction of the imperial palace, of the library of Zeuxippus and the church of St. Sophia. On the following days renewed fires reduced many buildings to ashes and street-fighting raged everywhere. Hipatius, nephew of the emperor Anastasius, was proclaimed rival emperor, and only the firmness of Theodora prevented Justinian from taking to flight. Negotiations with the Blues and the massacre of the Greens by Belisarius in the circus, where from thirty thousand to fifty thousand victims are said to have fallen, ended this last struggle of Byzantine national freedom.

Justinian had magnificent schemes of foreign policy. He frankly declared at a later time (in his “Novels”) that he cherished confident hopes of winning by the grace of God the sovereignty over those territories which the ancient Romans had once subdued as far as the boundaries of both oceans, but had subsequently lost through their carelessness. Hilderic, king of the Vandal state in Africa, had submitted to the influence of Byzantium, had coined money with the head of Justin I., but had been deposed on May 19th, 530, on account of his unwarlike nature and his

Byzantine sympathies. The repeated intervention of Justinian on behalf of Hilderic was rudely rejected by the newly-elected Gelimer; nevertheless, in view of the Persian War, and the want of a naval force and adequate supplies, a punitive expedition seemed impossible. But hatred of Arianism finally forced on the war. Belisarius was given the command of the fleet, which set sail at the end of June, 533. Although the voyage was necessarily prolonged, and laborious efforts were required to prevent the dispersion of the vessels, Belisarius entered Carthage on September 15th. By the middle of December, 533, the entire Vandal power was overthrown. At the end of March or beginning of April, Gelimer, the last Vandal king, surrendered.

The reintroduction of the Roman fiscal system and the stern suppression of Arianism made the Byzantine rule irksome; but it was consolidated by the timely repulse of the Mauri, or Berbers, and by the prosperity of Carthage, which now, with its palaces, churches, and baths of Theodora, became one of the most splendid cities of the empire. Byzantium now possessed a Latin province, for Latin had remained the diplomatic language, and the official language for petitions to the

**Latin still
the Official
Language**

Romans, even among the Vandals. The province comprised Tripolitana, Byzacena, pro-consular Africa (Zeugitana), Numidia, Mauretania Sitifensis; while in Western Africa only a few places, such as Casarea (Cherchel) and the impregnable Septem, were Byzantine. Sardinia, Corsica, and the Balearic Islands were annexed. The result of the conquest was, however, not so lamentable as Procopius represents when he depicts in bitter words the depopulation, impoverishment, and misgovernment of Africa. The administration of Africa became important in determining the primitive form of the Byzantine military province, since it showed the necessity of a union between the civil and military authorities, which had been separated since the time of Constantine the Great. One hundred and fifty towns rose from their condition of desolation and ruin.


Justinian had become in Africa “the Avenger of the Church and the Liberator of the nations,” and his general, Belisarius, the “glory of the Romans,” as he is styled on the commemorative coins, could display in his triumphal procession the costly vases and robes, the gorgeous chariots, and

the golden ornaments which had found their way into the Vandal treasury from successful raids. Mosaics on the walls of the imperial palace glorified the conquest of Africa.

The conquest and annihilation of the East Gothic empire in Italy occupied fully eighteen years (536-554). Here two religious motives co-operated, at least at the outset of the struggle. The year 554 saw finally an expansion of East Roman power over the Spanish peninsula, where a small province was

panic into Byzantium in 558; his tents were pitched at Melanthias, or Buyuk Chekmadje, eighteen miles from Byzantium. The treasures from the churches in the neighbourhood had already been put into places of safety, and fear filled the trembling spectators on the walls. But Belisarius was victorious, and the defeated Koturgurs were attacked on their retreat by their hostile brethren the Urtigurs. The fortresses which had been planted over the wide Byzantine dominions

**Belisarius
Again
Victorious**



A TYPE OF THE GREAT BYZANTINE FORTRESSES

As the possessions of Byzantium extended vastly in the remoter parts of Europe, Nearer Asia and North Africa, immense fortresses such as this picture illustrates were erected in the conquered districts, with the idea of saving expenditure in troops; but this proved impracticable, as the garrisons required increased instead of diminished numbers of men. The castle illustrated is that of Haidra, erected in Tripoli, after Justinian's North African conquest.

formed, with Cordova as the capital. On the other hand the Persian wars (531-532, 539-562) brought little glory or success; the first ended with a treaty, which imposed annual payments on Byzantium.

**Barbarians
Threaten
Byzantium**

The second treaty, of 562, contained the same condition, rendered less bitter by the cession of Laristan to Byzantium. Meanwhile waves of nations surged round the walls of Anastasius. Zabergan, the head of the Koturgurs—a Hunnish tribe which lived between the Don and the Dnieper—struck

proved unpractical; they required too many garrisons, instead of diminishing the necessity for troops. To commerce Justinian gave his fullest attention. The wars with Persia were certainly to some extent commercial wars, with the object of ousting Persia from the silk trade. Trading interests and religious motives led to an alliance with the Goths of the Crimea. The alliance with the Axumites must be criticised from this point of view. A treaty had been made with the emperor Justin which in 525 induced Elesbaas, or Caleb, of Axum to

make a campaign against the Jewish king of the Himyares. The immediate cause of the renewal of relations between Byzantium and Axum was that the reigning king of Axum had vowed to become a Christian if he conquered the Himyares, and that after his victory he applied to

**Justinian
Makes Friends
With Rome**

Justinian for a bishop. Finally the introduction of silk-worm breeding from Serinda, probably to be identified as Khotan, gave a great stimulus to the Byzantine silk industry. After that time silk-making, which, to the great detriment of the Syrian factories, was treated as a monopoly, turned to good account the traditional methods of Persia and China.

The ecclesiastical policy of Justinian was influenced by his ambitions and also by his great theological talents, which actually created new dogmas. He wished to gain the West, and therefore put himself on good terms with Rome, a policy which incensed Syria and Egypt. These conciliatory efforts of the emperor drove the Monophysites to leave the Church; and schism was further provoked by the theological leanings of Justinian, who wished himself to decide questions in the Church, although at that particular time her struggle to win independence was finding loud expression.

Facundus, bishop of Hermiane, preached vehemently: "It is better to remain within the assigned limits; to transgress them may ruin many and will help none." A clear contrast was made between the reigning emperor and his predecessor, Marcianus: "Never has the pious and good emperor believed that he, a layman, can repeal with impunity that on which the holy fathers have decided in matters of faith." Gentle measures and force were alike unable to restore ecclesiastical unity. The clever and marvellously far-seeing Empress Theodora recognised more clearly than Justinian himself that the roots of Byzantine strength lay in the East; but, as

we have seen, the interference of Rome had prevented any abandonment of the resolutions of Chalcedon, and violent measures taken against the Monophysites in Alexandria could not be counter-balanced by the most subtly devised diplomatic revival of the old *Henotikon*, or Confession of Faith. This was Justinian's most serious mistake. Provinces which were, both in politics and in culture, the most important supports of Byzantium, were compelled to leave the Church; and the overtures which he made to them, though sufficient to incense the West, were insufficient to appease their dissatisfaction.

The military energy of Justinian attained no definite results, and the frittering away of his forces in ambitious efforts entailed heavy loss. But the importance of Justinian's reign lies in other fields. The true function of the Byzantine empire, as the focus of western and eastern intellectual powers, was largely his creation. The art of Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt blended on Byzantine soil into one uniform whole. Western law, reconciled with Christianity, spread over the world and prevented reactionary legislation. The political constitution of Roman times was extended

and improved until it embraced all spheres of human activity. The splendour of an Oriental court shed its brilliancy over the throne. The theological disputes of the world, in which the last remnant of liberty of thought had taken refuge, were decided by the secular sovereign himself; but here he encouraged the separation of West from East. With Justinian, Byzantium attains her position as the home of old traditions and the foremost civilised power, a position she maintained for centuries.

Procopius of Casarea (400-563) is not only invaluable as the historian of the Justinian age, but in his mixture of irreconcilable elements is an admirable



MOSAIC PORTRAIT OF JUSTINIAN

A reproduction on a larger scale of the portrait of Justinian from the St. Vitale mosaic on the opposite page. It is from this contemporary portrait of the emperor that we are able to study with some approach to accuracy his personal characteristics.

**Byzantium
the First Power
in the World**



THE CELEBRATED BYZANTINE MOSAICS AT RAVENNA

The upper of these two illustrations, which are reproduced from the mosaics of St. Vitale, at Ravenna, is the group with the Emperor Justinian in the centre, supported by the great religious and military dignitaries of Byzantium; while the lower mosaic, from the same church, shows the Empress Theodora with priests and ladies of her court. These are of great historical and artistic importance, being contemporary works of Byzantine mosaicists sent into Italy.

illustration of Byzantine degeneracy. A native of Greek Syria, he showed a thorough receptivity of Greek culture, betraying only in his language that he had been educated on the outskirts of the Hellenic world. A sceptic towards Christianity, he lived in an artificially archaic superstition, cherishing the ideas of Herodotus about dreams and portents. He was impressed with the grandeur of the Roman world and the necessity of ruling it by law; he wished to keep up the old ordinances and to place more power in the hands of the upper classes.

Therefore he, in contrast with the Roman, Anastasius, hated the barbarian on the throne, Justinian, who ruled according to his own caprice, subverted old ordinances, and in his legislation gave preference to the lower strata of the population. Classical antiquity lived anew in the vigorous Syrian author. He far excelled his ancient models both in the variety of the sources which he used and in his ethnographical studies, which had become indispensable for the mixed population of Byzantium. His "History of the Wars" is based on extensive inquiries and the personal experience which he had acquired as private secretary and assessor of Belisarius. His "Secret History," composed in 550, agrees mainly with the "History of the Wars," although he relates in it everything which his hatred of Justinian and Theodora suggests, and all that the vulgar gossip of the court offers him, on the model of Suetonius.

He disclosed no new facts, but insinuated everywhere the meanest motives. The treatise on the buildings of Justinian, written certainly by order of the emperor in 560, contains such highly coloured praise of Justinian that we may fairly suspect the author of an ironical intention. The book, which caused great

satisfaction, brought him the prefecture of Constantinople.

Menander, who was intended to study jurisprudence, had begun at an early age to lead a desultory existence, and to devote his attention to the disputes of the factions in the theatre and the dances of the pantomimes, such as he describes in his splendid preface. It was only on the accession of the emperor Mauricius, the guardian of his people and the muses, that Menander began to realise his own powers and to write his history, treating the period 558-582; he conveys important information, especially about the embassies of Zemarclus to the Turks.

Nevertheless, he did not think he could afford to challenge comparison with the brilliance of Procopius. His descriptions are plain and unadorned but excellent; as,



FATE OF BELISARIUS, THE GREATEST BYZANTINE GENERAL
The legendary fate of the great Byzantine warrior was to fall from power and, being blinded and bereft of his possessions, made to wander, a beggar, throughout the land. He had a guide, but the youth was killed by a snake bite, and Belisarius, not knowing him to be dead, carried his body for a time. This, of course, is the legendary story; but that Belisarius died in poverty and neglect is history.



RUINS OF THE TRADITIONAL PALACE OF BELISARIUS, THE GREAT BYZANTINE WARRIOR
 A palace of Constantine the Great, in Constantinople, reputed afterwards to have been the residence of Belisarius.

for instance, of the three tents in which Zemarchus dined on three successive days : the walls hung with bright silken tapestry, holy relics in various forms, golden vessels, the Turkish ruler on a golden couch supported by four gilded peacocks, silver figures of animals on his chariot, in no respect inferior to the Byzantine. Menander's special merits lie in his love for painting miniatures and his comprehension of great events.

The poet Agathias of Æolis felt himself to be, in his historical works (552-558), the successor of Procopius as an artistic exponent of current history and the ancient historical style. Quite different was the position of John Malalas, who addressed the mass of the people in his "Universal Chronicle," reaching to 565, perhaps to 574, and produced the greatest effect by a popular work of the first rank composed in a homely Greek dialect. Not merely his Syrian countrymen but also the Greek historians, and even Slavs and Georgians, made use of this invaluable monument of Byzantine popular wit.

It is important, not merely from the critical standpoint, to indicate these sources for the history of Justinian's age ; they give us a full picture of the intellec-

tual movement of the time, in which the higher intellectual classes still appear as patrons and guardians of all classical treasures, but in which also the masses, in the modern sense, with fresh life pulsing through their veins, struggle for their share in culture, and create their own homely picture of the world in a Greek language which had assimilated Latin and Oriental elements. Thus the "motionless" Byzantine life must be relegated henceforth to the sphere of historical fable no less than the "unchanging" character of Egypt and China.

Neither the nephew of Justinian, Justinus II. (565-578), whom the senators proclaimed as his successor, nor Tiberius (578-582), the captain of the palace guard, who, at the recommendation of the empress Sophia, was raised to be co-regent in the lifetime of Justin, could continue on an equal scale Justinian's dream of empire. Tiberius was the first genuine Greek to mount the Byzantine throne, which, since the overthrow of dynastic hereditary succession—leaving out of consideration the Isaurian Zeno I.—had been occupied by Romanised barbarians of the Balkan peninsula. This is a significant event ; it illustrates the

The First Greek on the Throne

Literature in Byzantium

growing importance within the empire of the Greek nationality. This nationalist movement is traditionally connected with the emphasis laid by Mauricius on the use of Greek as the political language.

Justin, it is true, refused to pay tribute to the Avars, a people who, after entering Upper Hungary through Galicia, had occupied in Iazygia, between the Theiss and the Danube, the homes of the Gepidæ, in Pannonia those of the Lombards,

and who exercised a suzerainty over Bohemia, Moravia, Galicia, and later over Moldavia and Wallachia. But after the loss of Sirmium in 581 the northern districts were lost for Byzantium. The Lombards, in a rapid victorious progress, conquered in Italy during the year 568 Forum Julii, Vicenza, Verona, and all Venetia with the exception of the coast. The next years saw piece after piece of the Byzantine dominion in Italy crumble away; in 569, Liguria and Milan (without the coast and Ticinum) and Cisalpine Gaul; in 570-572, Toscana, Spoletum, Beneventum, Ticinum, and the future capital Pavia; in 579, Classis. These Lombards, behaving otherwise than the east Goths, broke with the old traditions of the empire; they did not recognise the Byzantine suzerainty, and founded an entirely Germanic state on Roman soil, so that in these years the West Roman empire was more completely destroyed than in the traditional year 476. On the scene of war in Persia alone did the year 581, so disastrous for Byzantine power in Europe, bring a victory to Constantine, the defeat of the Persians under Khosru at Tela d' Manzalat.

In the first half of the sixth century a new and powerful empire had been formed in the East, with which Byzantium was bound to cultivate good relations—the empire of the Turks. The name of the Turks first occurs in an inscription of 732

A.D. This inscription was set up by a Chinese emperor in honour of a Turkish prince; but outlying fragments of the Turkish race, as early as the fourth century B.C., at the time of Alexander's Scythian campaign, can be traced on the Jaxartes, where the brother of King Karthasis simply bears the Turkish designation kardashi (his brother); in fact, the main body of the Turks was known to the Greeks of the seventh century B.C. by

Byzantium's Relations with the Turks

caravan intelligence, as the report of Aristæas of Proconnesus shows. The branch of the Turks which then became powerful was connected with the Hiung nu; its home in the sixth century A.D. was the east coast of the Chinese province Kansu, near the southern Golden Mountains. The embassy of a Turkish vassal, Maniak, came to Byzantium; in 568 and 576 Greek envoys stayed at the court of the chief of the northern Turks, Dizabul (or Silzibul; Chinese, Ti teu pu li), at the foot of the northern Golden Mountains (the Altai), and concluded a treaty with them. Menander furnishes a detailed account of these embassies and of the ensuing treaties, which gave the Byzantine empire a good base in Central Asia.

Mauricius (582-602), the victorious general of the Persian War, became also the successor of Tiberius. He was of Græco-Cappadocian birth, nominally of an old Roman stock. A second Persian war brought many successes in the field, but disappointing terms of peace, in 591. Mauricius, who himself had risen to the throne by a military career, must have

seen the difficulties which beset the Byzantine provinces of Italy and Africa through the separation of the military and the civil powers. Thus the military governors of these two provinces were granted the new and magnificent title of exarch, coupled with extraordinary powers. The creation of exarchs was the starting point for the further organisation of the military provinces.

Mauricius, on the other hand, was not in a position to protect the northern frontier of the Balkan peninsula, which Avars and Slavs continually inundated. Not only did the North become completely Slavonic, but invading Slavonic hordes settled even in Greece, where a considerable intermixture of races can be proved. The Slavs were undoubtedly the ruling power in Greece during the years 588-705. Hellenism was still more driven into the background in consequence of the plague of 746-747: as the emperor Constantinus VII. Porphyrogenetus says: "The whole country (Hellas) became Slavonic and barbarian."

The capabilities of the Slavs had been already recognised by Justinian in his military appointments. Dobrogost was in 555 at the head of the Pontic fleet; in 575 Onogost became a patrician. Piscus,

Wars with Persia

the conqueror of the Slavs, who defeated the general Radgost and took captive King Muzok in 593, availed himself of the Slav Tatimir in disposing of the prisoners. A Slav, Nicetas (766-780), mounted the patriarchal throne of Constantinople; descent from a distinguished Slavonic family in the Peloponnese is ascribed to the father-in-law of Christopher, son of the emperor Romanus I. Lacapenus; but the Slavonic descent of the Armenian emperor Basilius, asserted by the Arab Hansa, is obviously as untrustworthy as the fable of the "Slav" Justinian related by Theophilus.

We must see in these expeditions of the Avars and Slavs a true national migration which flows and ebbs. Capable generals, like Priscus, inflicted heavy reverses on both nations; but on one occasion only the outbreak of pestilence in the Avar camp saved Constantinople, and the demands made on the army increased enormously. It mutinied and raised to the throne the centurion Phocas (602-610), who put Mauricius and his five sons to death. But this arrogance of the army led to popular risings, especially in the native country of the emperor, Anatolia and Cilicia, then in Palestine, Syria, Egypt, and above all among the monophysites.

**Justinian's
Age Ends
in Murders**

The Persians attempted to avenge Mauricius, and a peace with the Avars had to be concluded at any price. But the Byzantine standard of government had long been too high to tolerate permanently on the imperial throne an incapable officer of low rank who dealt with insurrections in the most merciless fashion. Priscus, the general, allied himself with the exarch Heraclius of Africa, and the latter became emperor. The age of Justinian had ended in murders; the dissolution of the empire would soon have followed had not the sword rescued it.

The attacks of the Persians on the Byzantine empire at the time of the emperor Heraclius (610-641) tore from the Byzantines not merely Syria and Egypt, but also, in 619, the important town of Ancyra in Asia Minor. But it seemed a more terrible blow when, in 615, the Holy Places and the Holy Cross fell into the hands of the infidels. Three crusades brought war into the heart of Persia; the battle of Nineveh, on December 17th, 627, was decided in favour of the Byzantines, so that the Roman provinces reverted to them, and

on September 14, 629, the festival of the Elevation of the Cross was celebrated at Jerusalem by emperor and people with great solemnity. The conflict raging in the East made it impossible to retain the Spanish possessions or the territories lying to the north of the Balkans, but the capital itself, in 626, proved the bulwark of the empire against Avars and Slavs, and the wise policy of Heraclius raised a dangerous foe against them in the shape of the Bulgarians. It was shown, however, that the Persian danger had become formidable for the reason that isolated sections of the empire, through their ecclesiastical separatism and the formal institution of a Coptic and Syrian national Church, no longer remained loyal to Byzantium, and saw welcome allies in the Persians, while in Egypt the orthodox were contemptuously styled the "royalists." The formula of the One Will, or Monothelism—"the God-Man consisting of two natures has achieved all things by one god-like operation"—more closely resembled the doctrine of the One Nature of the monophysites; consequently a reconciliation was effected through the diplomacy of the king, which extended even to the Armenians.

The condemnation of this doctrine by Sophronius, the patriarch of Jerusalem, shattered the concord, which was hardly yet established, as violently as the entirely inappropriate attempt at reconciliation made by the emperor in his edict. Consequently the Syrians, in 635 and 636, and the Egyptians, in 641-643, fell a prey to the invading Arabs as rapidly as the Roman citizens in the West yielded to the Germanic invaders, although in Egypt the treachery of the governor contributed mainly to the surrender of the country. Economic reasons may have co-operated, since the political and social structure of the Arabic empire gave great power to the conquerors. Constans, the grandson of Heraclius (641-688), whose kinsmen had been castrated according to the Oriental custom, was able to retain Asia Minor and even to exact tribute from the Arab caliph Muaviya; his success was due principally to the transformation of the empire into military provinces, which had already been instituted under Heraclius. Great

**Persia
and the
Crusades**

**Religious
Confusion Worse
Confounded**

importance attached to the military governors in Africa and Italy, and the critical times had compelled Heraclius to form the capital and the adjoining provinces into a military district; the Thracian province had to carry on the war against the Bulgarians, the Anatolian and Armenian the war with the Arabs, and the fleet was soon divided

State and Theological Quarrels

into two commands—on the south coast of Asia Minor, and the twelve islands. The regency during the minority of Constans attempted to end the theological controversy by the Edict of the Typos in 648, according to which the subjects of the empire “no longer are permitted to dispute and quarrel anywhere over one Will and one Operation, or over two Operations and two Wills.” When Pope Martin I. condemned this edict in 649 at the Lateran Council, and Maximus, formerly imperial private secretary, stirred up Roman Africa against Cæsaro-papism, the emperor banished the pope to the Crimea, and ordered Maximus to be brought to trial. It was then that the bronze statues of the Pantheon were carried off from Rome by Constans. The island of Sicily, which was strongly Græcised by immigration, was intended to become the base for the recovery of Africa from the Arabs, who had taken it in 647. But an expedition from Syracuse, the capital, succeeded only in capturing Carthage.

Under Constantine IV. Pogonatus (668-685), son of Constans, Constantinople had to defend itself against the Arabs (April-September, 673), which it did successfully, owing mainly to the Greek fire of the Syrian Callinicus; and Thessalonica was attacked by the Slavs (675) and Avars (677). The greatest danger to the empire seemed, however, to be the Bulgarian kingdom under Ispërich, in which the Turkish conquerors gradually adopted the language of the subjugated Slavs. In view of all these dangers, the ecclesiastical connection with Rome, which was effected in 680-681 by the sixth œcumenical council in Constantinople, was intended at least to secure moral support. Justinian II. (685-695, 705-711), had, it is true, concluded a treaty on favourable terms with the Arabs and had conquered the Slavs; but serious

political, military, and economic mistakes led to the mutiny of one of the generals, Leontius (695-698), by which the sovereignty of the army was once for all established.

Under the two generals now elevated to the purple, Leontius and Tiberius III. (698-705), Africa and Cilicia were lost. Justinian, who had taken refuge with Ispërich's successor, Tervel, was brought back by a Bulgarian-Slavonic army; he wreaked vengeance with an insane fury on his enemies. He fought without success against Bulgarians, Arabs, and the revolted town of Kherson. The Armenian Philippicus (711-713), who was raised to the throne as a rival, and Theodosius II. (715-717), successor of the able Anastasius II. (713-715), proved themselves equally incapable.

The voice of literature was dumb in that rough age. It produced strong natures, and a pious superstition led them to battle. Andrew the Apostle comes to the help of the citizens of Patras, borne on his galloping war-horse, and drives the Slavs to flight. St. Demetrius of Thessalonica is the god of the city, who imitates Christ in every detail. He changes the purpose of God to deliver over the town to the opponents; he is the guardian of the city, the “prescient grace”; indeed, he aspired to be the Third Person with Christ and the Holy Ghost.

The miracles of St. Demetrius are a valuable source of information for this age, when the Slavs navigated the Greek waters in their primitive boats, interrupted trade and communications, and accompanied by their wives and children, inundated Pannonia, Dacia, Dardania, Mysia, Thracia, Achaia, and the suburbs of Constantinople itself. The country population streams into the towns or migrates to lonely capes, and founds isolated settlements. Greeks and Slavs grow into a mixed race, which fills the depopulated regions, once more colonises the deserted islands, and even mixes with the Bulgarians in the north. Sword and crosier rule the Greek world, in which old pagan traditions crop up on the surface; science and art are almost entirely silent in the regions of Europe and of Asia Minor.

Art and Literature Slumbering

Futile Effort to Regain North Africa

the sixth œcumenical council in Constantinople, was intended at least to secure moral support. Justinian II. (685-695, 705-711), had, it is true, concluded a treaty on favourable terms with the Arabs and had conquered the Slavs; but serious



CIVILISATION OF THE EARLY BYZANTINE EMPIRE

THE LINK BETWEEN THE EAST AND THE WEST

CONSTANTINOPLE, Byzantium, or New Rome, was, like Old Rome, divided into fourteen districts; even the seven hills could, to the satisfaction of some Byzantine students of history, be rediscovered, if required, by the exercise of some imagination, within the limits of Constantinople itself. The old patrician families, who had lived on the Bosphorus since the days of Constantine, might, as regards the games in the circus, which were accurately copied, cherish the belief that no alterations had been made in the customs of Old Rome. The military system, the strength and pride of the Romans at a time when the army no longer consisted of Italians, or even the subjects of the empire, still remained Roman at Byzantium. The only difference was that in the seventh century the word of command became Greek; and in this connection the old word "Hellenic" might no longer be employed, having degenerated into the meaning of "pagan." The old traditions of the Roman senate, extolled more than five hundred years before by eloquent Hellenic lips as an assembly of kings, were cherished in the New Rome.

The East Roman senate preserved a scanty remnant of the sovereign power, since it claimed the formal right of ratifying a new emperor. The political ideal of the Byzantine Empire was Roman, only diluted into an abstraction by a tinge of cosmopolitanism. Huns, Armenians, Khazars, Bulgarians, and Persians were employed in the army. The employment of such mercenaries, and constant later intercourse with the governments of Arabia and Persia, helped largely to give the Byzantine Empire, in intellectual and ethical respects, the stamp of an Oriental empire. Not merely was the imperial office conceived as a mystery which might come into publicity only on extra-

ordinary occasions amid the most splendid and most ridiculous pomp; even the western feeling of personal dignity slowly died away, and occasional corporal punishment was quite consistent with the exalted position of the Byzantine nobles.

Revival of Oriental Ideas

The stiffness and pedantry of the state based on class and caste, in the form which Diocletian had given it, had precluded any new stimulus from below. The upper classes would have remained in the ruts worn deep by the lapse of centuries, devoid of every powerful incentive, had not religious disputes offered opportunities for the assertion of personal opinion, while the intrusion of Oriental influences, the revival of Oriental ideas on art and law, caused an agitation like bubbling springs in standing pools.

Not merely did the Asiatic governors possess a higher rank than the European; even Orientals, especially Armenians, acquired an ever increasing importance at court and in the army. Among the leaders of the latter, Manuel (under the emperors Theophilus and Michael III.) and John Kurkuas (940-942, commander-in-chief against the Arabs, "the second Trajan") are especially famous. Even the pearl diadem of the East Roman emperors repeatedly adorned the brows of Armenians, and once fell to an Arab, Nicephorus I. A grand-daughter of Romanus I. married in 927 the Tsar Peter of Bulgaria. The Ducas family and the Comneni prided themselves on their relationship to the Tsar Samuel of West Bulgaria, an Oriental in spite of his European home. In the veins of the Empress Irene, after 732 wife of Constantine V., there flowed Finnish blood; she was the daughter of the chief, Khakhan, of the Khazars. The khan of the Bulgarians was made under Justinian II.

Roman Culture Continued in Byzantium

Orientalis Increase in Power

a patrician of the empire, as was a Persian of the royal house of the Sassanids. The Byzantine general, with whose battles the shores of the Black Sea echoed, and whose glory an epic of the tenth century rapturously extols, Basilus Digenis Acritus, was son of the Arabian Emir Ali of Edessa by a Greek wife. The family of the Arabian Emir Anemas

**Constantinople
in the Time
of Justinian**

in Crete was in the service of John Tzimiscees, while George Maniaces, who reconquered Sicily in 1038, bears a Turkish name. In order to obtain an idea of the strange mixture of Oriental and Western life, let us consider the appearance which Constantinople itself would present to a stranger in the time of the Emperor Justinian.

As we skim over the glittering water of the Bosphorus in a Byzantine dromond, we see, rising above the gentle slope of the Nicomedean hills, the snowy peaks of the Bithynian Olympus, a fitting symbol of Asia. But on our left hand the mighty capital with its palaces and domes enchains the eye. From behind the strong ramparts which guard the shores, between the long stretch of the hippodrome and the various blocks of the palace, the Church of Holy Wisdom, "St. Sophia," towers up, its metal-covered cupolas glittering like gold in the sunlight. In the gulf of the Golden Horn our boat threads its course through hundreds of dromonds and smaller vessels; when safely landed, we must force our way through the motley crowd, and reach the church of St. Sophia through a seething mass of loose-trousered turbaned Bulgarians, yellow and grim-faced Huns, and Persians with tall sheep-skin caps. Forty windows pour floods of light on the interior of the church; the sunbeams irradiate columns gorgeous with jasper, porphyry, alabaster, and marble; they play over surfaces inlaid with mother-of-pearl; they are reflected from the

**A Graphic
Picture of 1,000
Years Ago**


rich golden brilliance of the mosaics in a thousand gleams and flashes. The want of repose in the ornamentation, the deficiency of plastic feeling, and the prominence which is consequently given to coloured surfaces are emphatically Oriental; not less so are the capitals of the pillars, stone cubes overlaid with ornament, in which we must see a reversion to the traditions of Syro-Phœnician art, and the pattern of the

mosaics, where the after-effect of a style originally Chinese, and later Perso-Syrian, is seen in the network of lozenges.

A walk round Constantinople confirms this impression. By the side of the golden throne of Theodosius huge Egyptian pylons tower up; we pass by immense water-tanks constructed in the Syrian fashion, and glance at the columned cisterns, which are of Egyptian origin. If we enter the house of a noble we find the floor, according to the immemorial tradition of the East, paved with glazed tiles; the furniture covered, so far as possible, with heavy gold-leaf—a revival of Assyrian fashions, which through Byzantine influence reached even the court of Charles the Great (Charlemagne). We notice on the silk tapestries and carpets strange designs of animals, whose childishly fantastic shapes might be found in the Farthest East.

The products of the goldsmith's craft, pierced and filled with transparent enamel, point also to Oriental traditions, no less than the extravagant splendour of the nobles and their wives who inhabit these rooms. Gold, precious stones, or transparent enamel, glitter on the long tunics of the men, on their richly-ornamented chlamydes and even on their shoes, while their swords are damascened in the primitive Assyrian fashion. The ample robes of the women are thickly covered with embroidery; broad sashes encircle their waists, while narrow embroidered capes hang down from their shoulders. These fashions recur at the court of the later Carolingians, who are shown to be Germans only by the fashion in which they dress their hair.

The immense imperial palace is a city in itself, a city of marvels. The inhabitants of the rustic West who visited the Cæsars of the East were amazed, as if the fables of the East had come to life. The golden spear-heads of the bodyguard carry us back in thought to the old Persian court, the splendid colours of their robes are borrowed from the East. A mysterious movement announces some great event; the clang of the golden bell and the deep-toned chant of the priests herald the entry of the Basileus. If an envoy were admitted to an audience in the imperial hall, his eye would be caught by another relic of the Persian court, the golden plane-trees, which rose high into the air behind the



THE CHURCH OF CONSTANTINE, NOW A MOHAMMEDAN MOSQUE.

A Mohammedan mosque dedicated to a saint seems strange; but "Saint Sophia" signifies "Holy Wisdom." It was originally built by the Emperor Constantine, and was, of course, a Christian church, but it was not destroyed by the Moslems. On the contrary, the Christian effigies were left untouched, and the name of the Saviour is still among the prophets honoured therein, as we have seen on page 2885. The interior of St. Sophia is a magnificent sight.

throne; artificial birds fluttered and chirruped, golden lions roared round the throne; in the midst of all that bewildering splendour sits immovable a figure, almost lost in costly robes, studded with gold and jewels, more a picture, a principle, or an abstraction than a man—the emperor. Everyone prostrates himself at

Wonders of the Gorgeous Orient

the sovereign's feet in the traditional eastern form of adoration. The throne slowly moves upwards and seems to float in the air. Western sovereignty had never before attempted so to intoxicate the senses; the gorgeous colouring and vivid imagination of the East were enlisted in the cause of despotism. If we go out into the street again we hear a stroller singing a ballad which the populace has composed on the emperor in Oriental fashion.

This composite art of Byzantium thus represents a decomposition of the Græco-Roman style into its original Asiatic elements, and a fuller development of these in a congenial soil. The wonderful Greek sense of form was gone, and the style of the Roman Empire had disappeared, if it ever existed; the concealment and covering of the surfaces, the Oriental style of embroidery and metal plates, had become the Byzantine ideal.

In other respects also the intellectual life shows effeminate and eastern traits. The authors make their heroes and heroines burst into tears or fall into fainting fits with an unpleasing effeminacy and emotionality, explicable only by Oriental influences. Not only the novelists but even the historians, with that lavish waste of time peculiar to the Oriental, describe their personages in the minutest and most superfluous detail. This habit of elaborate personal descriptions was a tradition of Græco-Egyptian style, due to the same craving for the perpetuation of the individual which produced mummy portraits on the coffins of the dead, and caused will

Byzantium Thoroughly Orientalised

to be adorned with the testator's picture. In the domain of "belles lettres" the fable and the adventurous travel-romance of the Indians were interwoven with late Greek love stories, so that motifs which first appear in Indian fables spread thence to the West, where they can be traced down to Boccaccio's Decameron. Byzantine architecture shows close dependence on the Arabian models. The emperor Theophilus (829-842) had his

summer palace built at the advice of John Grammaticus, who was well acquainted with the Arabs, on the model of the caliph's palace at Bagdad, while in the palace of Hebdomon the decoration of the Arabs was imitated.

The West faded out of the Byzantine range of vision, while the nations of the East attracted more attention. Procopius of Cæsarea relates strange notions as to the appearance of Britain. When the Book of Ceremonies, which treats of the procedure with foreign rulers, mentions the princes of Bavaria and Saxony, it states that the country of the Niemetz belongs to them. Little more was known of the Germans in 900 than the name given them by Magyars and Slavs, and the ambassador of the emperor Otto I. sat at table in the Byzantine court below the Bulgarian ambassador.

The eastern countries, on the other hand, came more and more clearly into view. The historian Theophylactus Simocattes drew in 620, presumably through the good offices of the Turks—instructed by the letter of the khan of the Turks to the emperor Mauricius, which envoys had brought to Byzantium in 598 —an able sketch of China, and congratulated the Chinese, in reference to the Byzantine disputes as to the succession, on being ignorant of such matters, and spoke enthusiastically of Chinese law, praising especially the rule which forbade men to wear gold or silver. The legend that Alexander the Great was the founder of the two largest Chinese cities appears also in his writings.

Thus the new influences which now came into play had long existed in the lower strata of Oriental society, or had their origin in Oriental spheres outside Byzantine national life.


While the southern provinces of the Byzantine Empire maintained in general a brisk intercourse with the East, the enthusiastic East Roman patriot Cosmas Indicopleustes journeyed from Egypt to India, which he described in vivid colours. Syria especially offered a *jardin d'acclimatation* for western and eastern suggestions and ideas, and continued to do so, even after the Byzantine dominion was destroyed in 640 and the Arabs took over the country. Græco-Roman culture had been completely victorious there under the Roman Empire; the sound of the old

CIVILISATION OF THE EARLY BYZANTINE EMPIRE

Aramaic national language was heard only in isolated villages. Christianity, as a genuinely democratic power, had adopted the discarded language of the mother country and the people, and soon raised it to the rank of a universal language. The achievements of Greek intellectual life were translated into Syrian.

Syro-Greek writers, whom we can with difficulty classify as true Syrians, with rights of voting as Byzantines, as Syrians of a stock which had long been Græcised, and as Greeks of old descent, stand in the forefront of the intellectual life of Byzantium. Romanus the Melode (about 500), the most celebrated hymn-writer of Middle Greek literature, was a native of Syria. That country produced numerous historians: Procopius of Cæsarea; John of Epiphanea, who knew Persia thoroughly; Evagrius Scholasticus (about 600); John Malaias (Syrian *malal* = *rhetor*), for whom, although Byzantium was the political capital.

373), heads the list of Syrian dogmatic theologians, to whom, among others, Anastasius, a native of Palestine by birth, belongs as a "precursor of scholasticism" labouring in Syria. Ecclesiastical interests are further represented in the domain of exegesis by Procopius of Gaza; under this head are counted the friends of the historian Evagrius, Symeon Stylites the ascetic, with his glorification of the monastic life, and the ecclesiastical orator



THE OLD BYZANTINE WALLS OF CONSTANTINOPLE



RUINS OF JUSTINIAN'S PALACE AT CONSTANTINOPLE

Antioch was always the intellectual focus; and John of Antioch. In the domain of grammar, the versatile John Philoponus of Cæsarea, Sergius of Emesa, the zoologist, and Timotheus of Gaza were busily occupied. Aëtius of Amida, in Mesopotamia, subsequently imperial body-physician, belonged to the same race, although he is said to have begun the study of the ancient physicians at Alexandria. His nearest countryman, Ephraim (306-

Gregory, patriarch of Antioch. Syria thus played a part in early Byzantine literature which was altogether disproportionate to the number of her inhabitants.

Aristotle was introduced into the schools and expounded; the philosophy of Pythagoras and Plato and the sonorous eloquence of pseudo-Isocratean speeches were once more subjects of study; the physician Sergius of Ras'a-in did especial service in this department. Later writers also, such as Severus of Antioch, John Philoponus, Porphyrius, Sextus Julius Africanus, Eusebius, the Apology of Aristides, were translated; Persian and Hebrew writings were brought within the scope of Syrian studies. Legends, such as the Invention of the Cross, the Seven Sleepers, and the Baptism of Constantine come from this source. Some "Episodes from the Lives of Saintly Women" were written on the pages of a gospel in Old Syrian. The last story among them contains the temptation of Yasta of Antioch by the scholastic Aglaidas, who,

after his suit had been rejected, applied to the magician Cyprianus. The latter is bound by a compact signed in blood to a demon, who now undertakes to win over the maiden, but has to acknowledge himself defeated before the sign of the cross. Cyprianus, convinced of the inefficiency of self-acquired wisdom, and impelled by

Eastern Source of the Faust Legend

his thirst for truth, then abjures all magic. This legend of Cyprianus, which certainly arose on Syrian soil,

has become important for the west in many ways through the effect of the Faust legend and of the material which lies at the bottom of Pedro Calderon's "Magico Prodigioso."

Syria again was successful in propagating her own culture far to the east and west. Syrian Christians were settled on the coasts of India, on the Himalayas, and in Ceylon, and exercised a deeply felt influence on India. Memories of it are echoed in the Indian epic Mahabharata; the legends of the birth of the demigod Krishna and of his persecution by Kansa, the Avatars system, probably an imitation of the Christian dogma of Christ's descent to earth, and the adoration of Krishna's mother, Dewaki, are speaking proofs of it; while the appearance of the Greek astronomer Ptolemy as Demon (Asura) Maya and the numerous technical terms in Indian astronomy can be explained only from the connection with Alexandria. Whether the Syrian Christians of India really maintained so close an intercourse with the west that King Alfred of England could send them an embassy is still a moot point.

Syrian missionaries penetrated into the mysterious highlands of Central Asia. When China was ruled by the great Emperor Tai Tsung (627-649),

before whose command Northern India bowed, whose help Persia implored, enthusiastic Syrian missionaries appeared there. A tablet, composed in 781 in Chinese, but containing some lines of Syriac, which was found in 1625 at the

famous Singan fu, testifies both to the religious zeal of the Syrians and to the tolerance of the Chinese emperor, who had ordered the translation and circulation of the Scriptures, and had commanded a church of the pure faith to be built. Incidentally, it shows that the supposed political embassy of the Byzantine regents to China during the minority of Constans II. (about 642), was nothing more than a mission sent by the Syrian Nestorians.

Syrian sepulchral inscriptions were discovered in 1885 from the soil of the steppes of Turkestan in the vicinity of Issik kul. Just as man in the earliest times paid reverence to the tombs, in order to rescue from oblivion the memory of his dear ones, and to form some bond between the existence he knew and the mysterious world beyond the grave, so even the poor Turks of Semirjetchje have since the ninth century utilised the Syrian language and letters to perpetuate the recollection of their departed.

Widespread Commerce of the Syrians

From this influential position of the Syrians, who, being then in full possession of western

culture, must be claimed also for the west, it is plain that the alphabet of the Manchu Uigurians and, through the agency of the latter, the alphabet of the Mongols, are derived from the Syrian script; the circumstances in particular under which the Syrian-Nestorian script came to the Uigurians are well known to us from the monument of Kara Balgassun.

An equally important rôle was played by the Syrians in the west. Jerome had already said, "Their lust for gain drives them over the whole world; and their frenzy for trade goes so far that even now, when barbarians are masters of the



TYPE OF BYZANTINE CHURCH ARCHITECTURE

globe, they seek wealth amid swords and corpses, and conquer poverty by risking dangers." As a matter of fact we find Syrians scattered far and wide, not only before but also after the fall of the West Roman empire. Tyre, the metropolis

of Phœnician commerce as far back as the eleventh century B.C., and now in the fifth and sixth centuries A.D. it had become the great centre of the silk trade—Sidon, and Berytus send their merchants especially to Italy. Inscriptions in various towns prove their existence in the kingdom of the Franks.

We find Syrians in Narbonne, Bordeaux, Vienna, Lyons, Genay, Besançon, Orleans, Tours, La Chapelle Saint-Eloy, Paris. On German soil they appear at Strassburg, Trèves, Rheinzabern, and in Bavaria; in England at South Shields.

They were the carriers of the wine trade and of the Egyptian papyrus trade; they encouraged horticulture and brought plants from their own country, of which only the shallot—so called from the name of the town Ascalon

—need be mentioned. They circulated the silk stuffs manufactured in their own workshops; these show Persian patterns, especially the two horsemen, as a centre, but the surfaces are filled up in the Syrian fashion—with vine tendrils, vine branches with ivy leaves and grapes—or they chose genuinely Syrian themes. Syrian ideas for pictorial ornamentation accordingly reached the West. The Gospel-book of Godeskalk, painted between 781 and 783 for Charlemagne, contains a picture, in the Syrian style, of the fountain of life, with animals, like the Bible of the Syrian monk Nabula produced in 586. Syrians transmitted to the West the story, originating in India, of the king's son who takes no pleasure in pomp and show, and, chafing at the nameless sorrow with which men's hearts throb, flies into solitude in order to atone for himself and mankind by devotion to a new doctrine which may redeem the world. In that story of Barlaam and Josaphat Europe actually possessed a sketch of the life of Buddha before it became acquainted with Buddhism.

Eastern Legends Brought to the West

India, of the king's son who takes no pleasure in pomp and show, and, chafing at the nameless sorrow with which men's hearts throb, flies into solitude in order to atone for himself and mankind by devotion to a new doctrine which may redeem the world. In that story of Barlaam and Josaphat Europe actually possessed a sketch of the life of Buddha before it became acquainted with Buddhism.

It was, moreover, from Syrian and not from Greek tradition that the West derived the Alexander legend. Some main features of the earliest form of the Faust myth may, as already stated, be traced back to the Cyprian legends current in Antioch. After surveying these rich


results of Syrian brokerage we cannot be surprised that Syrians were employed by Charlemagne for the revision of the text of the gospels, which he himself had planned.

The East Roman province of Syria still performed the function of an intermediary, even when Syria itself, through the Arabic conquest, no longer recognised the suzerainty of Byzantium. The Arabs, even before this, had been subject to the influence of the Græco-Byzantine mode of life, especi-

ally the Arabs of Khirat and Ghassan.

Architects who, if not Greeks, were schooled in the art traditions of Greece, built on the far side of the Jordan in the territory of Moab, one and a half days' journey east from Jericho, the palace of el-Meschetta for a Sassanid. The division of the walls by zigzag lines in high relief is

as non-Semitic as the six-sided or octagonal rosettes in the angle spaces. So, too, the vine branches springing from a vase, which rise symmetrically upward and display a wealth of leaves, point to the Oriental embroidery style which was developed in Byzantium. The details correspond as much to Old Byzantine models—for example, the drums of the pillars in the Tchiniti-kiosk—as to Middle Byzantine motifs—for example, the design on the marble panelling of the Panagia church at Thebes. But in their strong yet delicate technique the reliefs of el-Meschetta resemble only the Old Byzantine art, and date certainly from the fifth or sixth century. The ruin of el-Kastal (Castellum), which lies in the



SYRIAN CHURCH OF THE FIFTH CENTURY
This, compared with the picture on page 2924, shows how Syrian architecture was affected by that of Byzantium.

neighbourhood, was, according to a trustworthy tradition, built by the Sassanids; and a ruin to the east of Damascus (Khyrbet el-Beda) may probably be assigned to the same period. Into this close intercourse, in which the Byzantines appear as the givers, we gain a vivid insight from bilingual and trilingual inscriptions of the period. South-

The Syrian Missionaries at Work

east of Aleppo in the plain of Jebbul still stand the ruins of a basilica, in which we can recognise the usual ground plan, the great central nave, the two side aisles, the apse to the east, and the main door to the west. This basilica contains inscriptions in Greek, Syrian, and Arabic commemorating the foundation in the language and script of each of the three sections of the community—namely, the ruling official class; the ordinary population; and the northern Arabs, who had already penetrated this region and had been Christianised by the Syrians. The most ancient linguistic monument of these Arabs is this inscription of Zebed. Since the fathers still bear Semitic names, but their sons actually the name of the martyr Sergius, perhaps the work of conversion was then proceeding. Another Græco-Arabic inscription from Harran in Trachonitis dates from the year 568.

The Arabs come on to the scene as a completely uncivilised people of the desert. Byzantine trade therefore satisfied their growing needs. For this reason they measured with the Greek pound (litra), and when they themselves went among commercial nations they called their warehouses by the Greek name. Oriental fruits were known to them under Greek names. Finally, the Bedouins called the sheet of paper by the Greek name. When, therefore, a great power was formed from the Arab tribes, there is, notwithstanding the propagandist zeal of the Arabs, a proof discernible, even in religious relations, of the degree to which the Arabs were conscious of this transference of culture. Omar prays on the steps of the church of Constantine in Jerusalem, although he declines the invitation of the patriarch Sophronius to perform his devotions in the church.



The economic and legal systems of the Arabs were strongly influenced by Byzantium. They employed at Damascus, Baalbek, and Tiberias Greek coins with the

simple imprint of the name of the town. When they minted money for themselves, it was struck according to the Greek monetary scale, and occasionally, as in the case of the so-called Heracleian Dinars, with Latin inscriptions. They concluded contracts for hire or lease according to the models which Byzantium gave them, and, according to the Roman custom, did not release their sons from their guardians until they were twenty-five years old.

If a Byzantine, after the conquest of Syria by the Arabs, looked down from the old caravan road on the Anti-Libanus upon the paradise in which Damascus, a vast sea of houses, glittered among a green circle of gardens, he might, at the sight of the cupola-crowned mosques, which were still occasionally built by Greek architects, and which always retained the cruciform structure, cherish the belief that this bright land from the serrated Gebel el-sheikh to the burning desert was yet under the dominion of Greece. All the more if he went into the plain and saw Arab troops, armed after Byzantine fashion, marching past in Byzantine formation; if he entered the houses in the town and found everywhere replicas of the Roman gateway and the open courtyard; and if, finally, he visited a Syrian harbour, and saw the Arab ships built on the model of the Byzantine dromond.

Greek artists and workmen exerted in many ways this Byzantine influence on the Arab empire. Thus, as Abd ur-Rahman ibn Khaldun in 1406 records, the Caliph Velid received at his own request from the Greek emperor in the first decade of the eighth century architects in order to rebuild the church of St. John in Damascus; Greeks were employed to reconstruct the mosque of Medina. Christian, and therefore certainly Greek, architects were probably employed on the Kubbet es-Sakhra and on the Jami el-Aksa, which in the central portions resemble Justinian's church of St. Mary.

Most remarkable, however, is the late and distant influence of Byzantine culture in Spain, where Abd ur-Rahman III. (912-961), according to Makkari, employed Byzantine workmen. This transmitted civilisation is especially evident in the shrine of the mosque at Cordova. The mosaics of this temple, glittering with gold and bright colours, were, according to



THE INFLUENCE OF BYZANTINE ART IN SPAIN: THE MOSQUE OF CORDOVA

An example of how the art of Byzantium, so essentially Oriental, reached into Spain, is seen in the mosque of Cordova, where the marvellous mosaics are said to have been made by Greek workmen sent from Byzantium by the emperor.

Edrisi (1164-1165), executed by Greek workmen whom the emperor had sent from Byzantium. The iron gates and the fountains of Cordova, like the bronze fountain of Zahra, are emphatically Greek. Byzantine influence extends even to the smaller objects of art; an Arabic casket in the Louvre, with an inscription which mentions

Alexandria the Intellectual Centre of the Empire

Almog ueina (a son of Abd ur-Rahman) certainly shows signs of it. So, too, the Byzantines

assisted in transmitting Greek science to the Spanish Arabs; the translation of Dioscurides was carried out only by the help which the Byzantines afforded to the Arab scholars engaged upon it, and by the co-operation of a Jewish linguist.

Thus the first movement towards influencing and civilising the Arabs by Greek culture came from Syria and the Syrian nation, and was perhaps continued from Alexandria, the city which down to the seventh century may be still regarded as the intellectual centre of the Byzantine empire. In Egypt, the Arabic art of ornamentation had adopted the universal elements of the late antique, as is shown by the palm frieze, the waving vine shoots, and the acanthus leaf in outline in the Ibn-Tulun mosque at Cairo. Here, too, we may possibly trace local influences, and the effect of the late antique tinged with Byzantinism. The central power in Constantinople had often on its own initiative influenced intellectual progress; for example, by the despatch of Byzantine workmen, of whose nationality we are unfortunately ignorant. In many cases this transmission of culture was rendered possible only through the strong imperial power.

Just as the influence of Byzantinism on the Arabic world came first from Syria, so the Syrian transmission of culture paved the way for the influence of Byzantium on Armenia. The main conceptions, with their terminology, of western civilisation, political imperialism, and religious martyrdom, may have already reached the Armenians directly from the sphere of Greek civilisation, proving that there was an early intercourse with Greece in the first three centuries; but Syria supplied the most essential links in the chain.

The founder of the Armenian Church, Grigor Lusavoric, united it to the Syrian ritual, and employed, as Moses of Khorene tells us, Syrian letters for the Armenian

language, and nominated the Syrian David as superintendent of all the bishops. Even when we disallow the alleged Syrian origin of the Armenian creed, there remains sufficient to attest the Syrian religious influences, since it is dependent on the pseudo-Athanasian creed. Among the schools attended by young Armenians, Edessa, owing to its accessibility and its splendid library, was given the preference over Constantinople and Alexandria.

Monasteries and episcopal palaces were founded in Armenia by Syrians; numerous Syrian writings were translated into Armenian; and Syrian patriarchs stand at the head of the Armenian Church, even though not universally recognised; Syrian bishops are found in Armenia down to the sixth century. Art products, Syrian miniatures, were introduced into Armenia. The miniatures in the Etchmiadsin Gospel-book in the details of the ornamentation, in the employment of plants and of birds on the sides of a vase, as well as in the representation of scriptural types such as the message to Zachariah, the Annunciation, and the Baptism of Christ are so closely connected with the Syrian Bible

Armenian Nationalism Encouraged

of the monk Rabula of 586 that we must assume an older Syrian copy. Both in politics and in culture Armenia was for a long time less closely connected with Byzantium than with the Byzantine province of Syria. An alliance had certainly been concluded in 323 between the founder of Constantinople and Khosru II., the son of Tiridates the Great. But Valens soon found it more advantageous to make common cause with the Persian Shapur II. against Armenia in 374. The Armenians, who were subject to Byzantine dominion, may have no longer required the Syrian alphabet. But the national union of the Armenian people took place under the auspices of Byzantium. A national Armenian alphabet was designed by the holy Mesrob in 441 in Syrian Samosata. Six pupils of the Armenian Catholicus came in 432-433 to Constantinople, in order to master the Greek language.

It is possibly the case that, when the Catholicus Sahak (384-386) wished to collect also the Armenians of the west for this national propaganda, a refusal was received from the Byzantine governors. The protest of the Catholicus, and the answer of the emperor, who had countenanced the acceptance of the Armenian

alphabet, are preserved in Moses of Khorene, but can hardly be genuine. The consciousness of the necessity for a transmission of culture triumphed over conflicting political and religious interests. The Armenians borrowed from the Greek almost all their written literature and their church music; in recognition of this intellectual dependence, the emperor Theodosius II. and his all-powerful sister Pulcheria gave these zealous translators both literary and financial help.

The Armenian patriarchs were educated in "Greece," that is to say, in Byzantium. Giut, patriarch from 465 to 475, emphasises his intellectual dependence on Byzantium, whence he obtained his material requirements, such as clothes. It is recorded of Nerses III. (640-661) that he had been educated in Greece. At least two churches and one monastery had been built by Justinian in Armenia, and others restored; and in the post-Justinian era the chief church of Etchmiadzin with its cupolas had been erected. Nerses III. even later built a church in the vicinity of the town of Walarchapat, of

Mutual Dislike of Byzantines and Armenians

which some pillars are still erect and show his monogram. These capitals exhibit the corbel of Justinian's age, but Ionic flutings in place of the Byzantine animals, a renaissance, as it were, of older Greek ideas in a Byzantine setting.

Even towards the middle of the eighth century, in a disquisition on the question of admitting images into the churches, we find the emphatic statement that, even in the domain of painting, all productions can be traced to the Greeks, "from which source we have everything." It is true that national hatred prevailed for centuries between Armenians and Greeks, so that under the emperor Heraclius the armies would not encamp side by side; and Byzantine proverbs declared that no worse foe existed than an Armenian friend, while the talented historian Casia drew an alarming picture of the Armenian national character. Yet the influence of Byzantium on Armenian literature and architecture, and the importation of images from that source, give the keynote to the relations between the two nations.

Armenian courtiers, Armenian officers, Armenians in the administrative and the legislative departments at Byzantium had, by correspondence with their homes and their relations, opened a hundred channels

through which that higher civilisation, as expressed in language, flowed into Armenia. Greek words crowded first into the learned language of Armenia. Meteorological phenomena were called by Greek names; so, too, were minerals; mathematics, astronomy, chronology, jurisprudence required to borrow words from

Byzantine Culture Flows East

Greek. Expressions for the business of Church and State were to a large extent first adopted by the learned class.

But soon popular borrowings must have co-operated in that direction, and with the words for man, his qualities and occupations, and for the ideas of nature, town and country, money, weights and measures, house and home, dress and ornament, arts and games, a strong Greek element was introduced into the Armenian language.

Armenian influences first brought Byzantine culture nearer to the Caucasian nations; the Georgians—like the Bulgarians, Servians, Russians, Wallachians—adopted the Greek church music, both vocal and instrumental. The princes of independent tribes were proud of Byzantine titles—as, for instance, the prince of the warlike Alani in the Caucasus, on whom by the favour of Byzantium the title of Mighty Sovereign was conferred; others were styled Archons. Thus here, too, in the East a wide sphere of Byzantine influence was created, which was in many ways, not all of them superficial, imbued with a higher civilisation.

Notwithstanding the strong inclination of individual Persian kings towards western civilisation, the effect on Persia of any special Byzantine, as apart from Greek and Roman, influences, can as yet hardly be demonstrated. It has, indeed, been long observed that the palace of the Sassanids at Ctesiphon, which dates from Khosru I., as far as the construction of the façade and the mural decoration are concerned, displays the same

Persia Owes Little to Byzantium

round-arched arcades and pilasters as Diocletian's palace, and that the goldsmith's art has remodelled Roman motifs; thus, a dish shows an Eros, playing the lyre, seated on a lion, but in Oriental dress. But these influences are in reality so universal that it is better to speak of a transmission of the late antique. At most, the trapezium-shaped capitals may be traced back to Byzantium, while the

acanthus decoration on a capital at Ispahan still shows the Hellenistic form.

It seems difficult to investigate the early influence of Byzantine culture on the West. So long as the belief prevailed that Old Roman or "Old Christian" art alone fructified the West, it was impossible to submit the monuments to an un-

Byzantine Influence in the West we know that Græco-Oriental influences were at work in the West, even before they were transmitted by Byzantium, the "Byzantine" question becomes more complicated. Nevertheless, we may consider in this connection the influences of individual Oriental spheres of the Byzantine empire, so far as they have not been already discussed in dealing with the importance of Syria.

Byzantium and the states of the West bear towards each other in matters of culture the same relation as the left to the right lobe of the brain, or the right to the left half of the body, which are very differently provided with blood. On the one side, we have states which laboriously extricate themselves from the effects of the national migrations and the fall of the West Roman empire; rustic populations with isolated towns and no commerce; nations which by hard struggles try to build up their own constitution on the ruins of the Roman empire: monarchies which can alone supply this want, but cannot make head against the conditions of the age; aspects of development which cannot yet create any advanced culture.

On the other side is a polity which, after the institution of the genuinely Germanic empire of the Lombards on West Roman soil, appears as the sole heir of immemorial traditions of world-empire; an empire which alone could follow out an imperial policy as distinct from the momentous and yet

The Germanic States and Byzantium locally restricted conflicts of the Germanic empires; a well-organised bureaucracy,

based on the practical experience of centuries of political existence; a community which possesses a capital of unparalleled magnificence, numerous flourishing cities, and a well-organised commerce, embracing the whole civilised world, which had absorbed all the refinement of Hellenistic Roman and Oriental culture; a Church in which were ex-

emplified all the principal types of religious organisation; a communion in which all the struggles for the settlement of Church dogmas had been fought out with passionate obstinacy. On this side the Germanic states; on that, Byzantium.


Whether the Frankish coins are stamped with the name of Tiberius or Mauricius, whether the envoy of the emperor Anastasius confers on Clovis the consular title, and thus promotes him to be the lawful ruler over his Roman subjects, or whether the negotiations of Tiberius bring treasure and revenue to Chilperic and Gundobad, or Lombard dukes undertake to assume Byzantine dress—Byzantium always appears as the old and wealthy civilised power face to face with the poor upstart.

The last will of the emperor Mauricius, who divided the East and Italy—with Rome as capital—among his sons, may have been only a dream of the old world-policy; but assuredly Byzantium was not content with idle dreaming. The great land-owning families of Italy, from whom sprang the commanders of the Byzantine castles—the Tribunes—saw in Byzantium the sun of all civilisation; the severance

Western Gateways for Eastern Culture of the provinces of Lower Italy and Sicily, which were now more strongly Græcised, and so had

entered on a completely divergent development, met the wishes of their ruling classes. Naples as the port for Rome, and Ravenna as the centre of Byzantine administration, are the great gates by which Byzantine influence enters Italy; in this connection Istria may be reckoned as a thoroughly Byzantine region, within which religious ideas, political organisation, and art—*e.g.*, the cathedral at Parenzo—show the closest affinity with Byzantium. Marseilles, on the contrary, retained its old Oriental connections and directly transmitted to Western Europe the influences of Syria and Egypt. So also did Montpellier in a less degree.

Byzantine administration, the head of which in Italy, the exarch of Ravenna, received his instructions in Greek, helped much to spread Greek influence. Still more effective were religious ideas and the influence of the clergy and the monks. We must realise that, while in Ravenna Syrian bishops are found during the first four centuries only, in Rome there are eight Greeks and five Syrians among the popes between 606 and 752. Græco-Oriental



BYZANTINE ART IN ITALY: THE FAMOUS MOSAICS OF RAVENNA

Ravenna, in Italy, was one of the chief centres of Byzantine influence in the west, and the churches of San Apollinari and San Vitale there are rich in mosaics made by artists from Byzantium in the sixth century. The first mosaic here reproduced, shows Christ enthroned between angels, and a group of saints to the right. The second is the enthronement of the Virgin and Child. The third illustrates the sacrifices of Abel and Melchisedec, with Moses and Isaiah shown above.

monasticism spread first over Central and Southern Italy, and conquered further regions of the Christian world. The Greek Theodore of Tarsus, from 669 onwards, reformed the Anglo-Saxon Church, and transmitted a rich civilisation to England; and in France, as in Italy, this Greek spirit had much effect on the construction and the decoration of the churches. The Greek bank of the Tiber (Ripa Græca), the Greek school at Santa Maria in Schola Græca (later in Cosmedin), and the founding of the monastery of San Silvestro in Capite by Pope Paul I. (757-767), where Greek church-music flourished, may suffice as illustrations of Hellenistic influence in ecclesiastical and commercial spheres. The foreign trade of Byzantium also contributed largely to the spread of the Græco-Byzantine culture. In this connection the Syrians, who, according to Gregory of Tours, mostly spoke Greek, may be regarded as disseminators of Byzantine civilisation.

The fresher vitality of the east, which had formerly forced Constantine to Orientalise the empire, soon dominated everything in Rome itself. The motifs of Oriental art are to be seen in the mosaics of Santa Maria Maggiore towards the middle of the fourth century, and in the marvellously carved wooden door of the church of Santa Sabina, which shows the Syrian conception of the crucifixion; finally, also in the transept of the basilica of San Pietro in Vincoli, which Eudoxia commanded to be built in 442. The old Byzantine art had then firmly planted itself everywhere in Italy. The arts and crafts of Constantinople enjoyed so excellent a reputation that the bishop of Siponto, a kinsman of the emperor Zeno, sent to Constantinople for artists "especially skilled" in architecture. At Ravenna, Byzantine craftsmen were employed as early as the time of Galla Placidia.

The building operations of Narses and Belisarius in Italy—the bridge over the Anio on the Via Salaria Nova, the Xenodocheion on the Via Lata, and the monastery of San Juvenale at Orte—were certainly carried out by Byzantine workmen. The cycle of mosaics of San Vitale at Ravenna, begun after 539, was executed under the immediate influence of Justinian, in order to glorify the dual nature of Christ, and in

special illustration of a Biblical line of thought which was, undoubtedly, of Oriental origin, and found in the West its most brilliant representative in Ambrosius of Milan. The churches of Ravenna reveal to us the importance of Byzantium as linking East and West; these Chinese tessellated patterns, which developed from woven fabrics into mural decorations, appear here just as in the St. Sophia in Constantinople and in Thessalonica.

Again, clothing, court manners, minor arts, and tapestry were affected both in the West and at the court of Charlemagne by Byzantium itself. Byzantine gilding at the court of Charles is praised in the poem of Angilbert addressed to him, while the Byzantine custom of guarding the women is mentioned by Theodulf. The throne of Charles at his tomb in Aix-la-Chapelle is thoroughly in keeping with the Byzantine gold-plate style. A four-sided wooden platform covered with metal and studded with jewels, and a portable altar (a wooden frame overlaid with plates of gilded lead), show this style of facing. The

Byzantine origin of the inlaid tables mentioned by Einhard cannot be asserted with equal certainty. Oriental carpets and silk stuffs were exported in quantities from Byzantium, which had established a monopoly of silks and satins. The courtiers of Charlemagne obtained, according to the "Monk of St. Gall," their silk robes trimmed with purple through Venetian traders from the East—certainly therefore from the Byzantine empire.



A BYZANTINE MADONNA
This example of the Byzantine treatment of the Mother and Child is to be seen in the church of St. Mary the Great at Florence.

Quantities of woven goods which imitated Persian patterns were sent out from Byzantium over the whole of Western and Central Europe. Even in the eleventh century Byzantium appears as the intermediary for this art industry. The ivory workmanship of Byzantium not only conquered Italy, but its distinctive features appear again in the art of the West. Even in the diptychs Byzantine realism predominates—as, for instance, in the representation of fights between wild beasts and of other contests of the arena ; but in

the upper part the solemn ceremonial dignity of the Old Byzantine art prevails. Even the flat treatment of the reliefs of that epoch points indirectly to Byzantium. Small ornaments of daily use must have been sent out of Byzantium in quantities ; in Hungary, as well as at Reichenhall, are to be found those peculiar rings with a drum-shaped casket, the lid of which is ornamented by a row of filigree pearls, and a glass bead in the centre. Byzantine jewellery reached the Swedish island of Oeland and West Gotland. The golden diadem from Färjestaden certainly dates from the old Byzantine era.

Byzantine coins came far into the west and north, and supply strong evidence of the world commerce of Constantinople ; we need instance only the finds in Westphalia, Holstein, Usedom, Gotland and Bornholm. If the Byzantine monetary system, as regards smaller coins, in its recognition of the Oriental local coinages as legal tender and in its special respect for Egyptian drachmas, is true to the main principles of Byzantine imperial administration, the Byzantine gold currency, which was


universal in Europe until the appearance of zechins and florins, testifies to the strong position of the world trade and the financial power of Constantinople.

Finally, Byzantium's influence was far-reaching in the domain of military history, and certainly affected the empire of the Franks. The successes won by the Byzantines over their enemies, not in great battles, but by a clever policy of delay, must have made a great impression in the West. The cavalry had played the most prominent part in all active operations under

Leo, Constantine, and Irene ; in war with nations of horsemen, the cavalry regiments and not the old legion came to be the backbone of the Byzantine army ; they were recruited from Armenians, Iberians, and the inhabitants of Asia Minor. These lancers, who were clad in iron—they wore the iron cuirass, the gorget of mail, iron gloves, greaves and boots—with their short lance, their sword, their javelin, and their plumed helmet, were the models for the cavalry of the Frank

empire. The name also, *Cabellarius*, the armament and the harness (compare the Byzantine saddle in the cathedral treasury at Troyes), were then introduced. Men armed with bows and arrows after the style of the Byzantine mail-clad horsemen appeared in the levy of the abbot Fulrad in 810.


Reverence for the culture of Constantinople pervaded the western world. Church and State, arts and crafts, world-wide commerce and military science, co-operated to guide the rays toward the West. Even for that age the saying holds good, " Ex oriente lux."



ANCIENT BYZANTINE IVORY CARVING
Carved ivory cover for copy of the Gospel, dating from the fifth century



SKETCH MAP OF THE GREAT EMPIRES BETWEEN THE YEARS 777 AND 814 A.D.



DAYS OF THE IMAGE-BREAKERS AND THE CLEAVAGE OF CHRISTENDOM

NOW that the enemies of Byzantium were pressing on, and Byzantium's share in the commerce of the world was shrinking and financial distress widespread, the only salvation lay in a strong government. Leo, the Isaurian, who had distinguished himself against the Arabs as a general and diplomatist, was raised to the purple (717-741). He entered Constantinople on March, 25th, 717. Maslama, the general of Suleiman, appeared before the city on August 15th. Leo's unwearied energy, the Greek fire, and a hard winter, whose snow covered the ground for one hundred days, caused terrible privations among the Arabs. While the Byzantines could catch fish, the Arabs ate the flesh of baggage animals, skins, or the leaves from the trees. Greek tradition, not satisfied with this account, preserved in Tabari, made the Arabs feed on human flesh. A severe defeat which the Bulgarians

**Byzantium
the Bulwark of
Christianity**

inflicted on the Arabs finally caused the abandonment of the siege of Constantinople in August, 718. Byzantium had thus proved herself the bulwark of Christianity. The year 718 may be compared with the year 490 B.C. as an epoch in the history of the world; the withdrawal of the Arabs in 718 is a parallel to the retreat of the Persians after Marathon.

The old fiscal system of the caste-state of Diocletian and Constantine, in which, according to the law of 319, the municipal councillors (Decuriones) were responsible for the entire land tax of their community, had been handed down to the Byzantine empire. If, according to this arrangement, heavy responsibility on the one hand weighed down the great landowners, on the other hand they had large powers and important influence over their colleagues in the towns. It was a masterly measure of the emperor Leo III. when he took that onerous duty, which had increased in the years of insecurity, away from the Curiales; but by so doing he

also destroyed their importance for a long period. Henceforth imperial revenue officials were appointed to conduct the collection of the land tax. Imperial officials henceforward kept the register of male births for the poll tax throughout the empire. The emperor, solicitous for social prosperity, ameliorated in many ways the position of the country population. Every proprietor of a village community shared the responsibility for the taxes; a deficiency was made up by an additional charge, which was imposed upon all. Since all suffered from the bad economy of one individual, a right of pre-emption was allowed to the neighbouring cultivators in the event of plots being sold.

**Promoting
the Country's
Prosperity**

Distinct from these small landowners were the free labourers, the "adscripti" on the estates of great proprietors; the former were always free as regards their persons, but became after thirty years bound to the soil. The latter were at once bound to the soil, could not inherit any property, and differed little from the slave save in their marriage being legal. The Agricultural Act of Leo III. radically altered this state of affairs. The country labourers were now divided into those who paid a tithe, and "metayer" tenants, neither of them bound to the soil. The former were required to render the tenth part of the produce as ground rent; the latter, who worked the soil with the means provided by the owner, shared the produce with him. Village communities owned the soil in common; private ownership existed

**Communal
Ownership
of the Soil**

only in consequence of a partition of some property held in common. Abolition of compulsory service and the concession of the liberty to migrate are the great achievements of this legislation. It was profoundly affected by eastern models. Its resemblance to the Mosaic code as regards the nine sheaves and the period of seven years was noticed long ago; it

was assumed that the idea was adopted from the Bible. The discovery of the code of the Babylonian king Hammurabi has supplied another solution. Not merely do metayer tenants occur in the old Arabic and Semitic sphere of civilisation, a fact which by itself would prove nothing, but there is a surprising similarity in particular regulations. Such are those

**Influence of
the old
Semitic Laws**

about the restitution of waste land in the fourth year, which, though divergent, still spring from the same school of thought; those as to the cultivation of land and the felling of timber without the knowledge of the owner; and those as to the restitution of land which had been cultivated in the absence of the owner—a provision in contradiction to the right, conceded by Justinian, of acquiring the ownership of a field after two years' cultivation of it. Thus the agrarian policy of the emperor Leo was in particular points influenced by Semitic principles of justice, which had been maintained in a conservative spirit, although the necessity of a reform of the system of colonisation was rendered imperative by the numerous new settlers, especially Slavs. With regard to the free village community, Slavonic influences are certainly to be assumed.

The Rhodian maritime law, according to which the skippers and charterers in those times of bad trade shared the risks already increased by Slavs and Arabs, recurs in its main principle to the rule of Hammurabi, according to which the skipper must make everything good to the charterer in the event of an accident through negligence. Some not yet quite intelligible references appear finally in the criminal code, so that even there, in view of the great prominence of the "Lex Talionis," some Semitic influence might be assumed. This victorious increase in the strength of Semitic undercurrents is hardly surprising at a time when the Syrian nationality,

**Guarding
the Life of
the Family**

from which the emperor Leo himself sprang, was drawing East and West under its spell. The legislation of Leo handled family life in a spirit very different from that of Justinian's code, which intruded on the emotional side of the relations between parent and child when it defined the grounds on which parents might cherish resentment against their children. We see everywhere a delicate consideration and respect for the intimacy of family life.

The position of the wife is, with a fine feeling, ameliorated. The patria potestas (paternal authority) becomes the authority of both parents, since the mother's consent is needed no less than the father's for the marriages of the children, and since the mother possesses generally the same rights over the children as the father, and, on the death of the father, retains them in virtue of her position as their guardian.

The community of property between married couples indicates the high conception of matrimony as a community of life which may not be degraded by the contraction of a third marriage, and may not be carelessly dissolved by separation without stringent reasons. A noteworthy idea appears at all events in the "Eklöge" (or Selection of Laws). Marriage is allowed only between Christians of orthodox belief, and is much complicated by the extension of the impediment of spiritual affinities—for instance, the prohibition of marriage between the son of the godfather and the godchild. This was an ecclesiastical notion, which constantly gained ground, and soon afterwards, even amongst the Germanic nations, made sponsorship an impediment to marriage even in

**Establishing
the Dignity
of Marriage**

the Capitularies of Pepin (755-757). The necessity of a Christian marriage contract was a rule certainly borrowed from the Oriental regions of the Byzantine empire. It is in keeping with the idea of the dignity of marriage, and with the new taste for a solemn and dignified formalism.

Leo, himself raised to the throne as a general, wished to weld together the empire with links of iron; but he had to cure the paralysis produced by the existence of a civil administration which no longer served any useful purpose. In these warlike times the commander in the field could not be hampered by civil authority, however feeble. Thus the commanders of the military districts, called Themata, received also the full civil power. The importance of the Anatolian command necessitated its division into the Anatolian thema of the Bucellarians, and the Thracian, which embraced Asia, Lydia, a part of Caria and Phrygia, and got its name from the regiments on garrison duty there. To maintain military discipline and keep up the learning of the past, which had led to the actual invention of "Greek fire," seemed equally imperative. One emperor met these needs, as far as possible,

by publishing the "Tactica," a book on military science, in which the author treats of military law and of land and naval warfare, adhering closely to previous works; but since the fresh spirit of the reformer does not breathe in this book, the writer was probably not the great Leo, but a successor, Leo VI.

It required disciplined valour and knowledge to restore the army and the empire to their old position; it was therefore a serious danger that in Syria towns and individuals trusted to images and amulets in time of war. The society in which Leo had grown up at Germaniceia, on the borders of Cappadocia, Syria, and Armenia, must have had close relations with the Paulicians, whose capital Samosata lay so near. Mananalis, near Samosata in Commagene, is the home of that Constantine who, as Silvanus, in 660 revived the sect of the Paulicians (presumably an Armenian form for Paulians, after Paulus of Samosata in the fourth century). Cibossa in Armenia, Phanaræa in Helenopontus, became the headquarters of these sectaries, who imported the primitive Aryan dualism of good and evil into the

Growth of Image Worship Christian doctrine, rejected any distinct priesthood, and regarded each individual as a priest; and, finally, in their strict conception of the idea of God, refused the worship of the Virgin as well as that of the saints. The religious attitude of the emperor Leo III. was probably largely influenced by this sect.

How far had men gone in these centuries of dispute? The worship of the saints had confused the conception of the Deity. The belief in miracles brought its most hideous offshoot, superstition, into power. While in some parts of the empire the saints appear like the gods and heroes of antiquity, and, hastily concealing their original form, bring victory in battle, in others, attempts are made, as in the town of Pergamus, to win strength by most revolting practices—as, for example, by dipping the hand in a broth of human flesh. The lifeless images of Christ, Mary, and the saints are more esteemed than the living faith. Their importance becomes perfectly clear to the traveller in modern Russia, the heir to the Byzantine empire, where the eyes are wearied by innumerable icons of the Iberian Mother of God, and copies of the icon on Mount Athos. It had become

a universal habit to scrape off the colour of the pictures and mix it in wine, and to honour images with incense, prostrations, and kisses.

The old paganism, which still continued in the festivals of Pan and Bacchus and dominated certain districts of Greece, was finally prohibited at the council of 692;

Emperor's War Against the Images but the images "made without hands," as the usual phrase ran, enjoyed the most profound reverence.

The old paganism had found its way into Christianity itself. The emperor Leo III., a thinker far in advance of his age, waged a bold warfare against image worship, and by so doing struck a blow, not merely at the mass of the people, but, above all, at monasticism, which influenced the masses by image worship, and lived to some extent on the trade in sacred pictures.

This great controversy has been handed down to us in a distorted form by later advocates of images, or Iconodules: such were Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople (806-815), and Theophanes, a monk who drew in part from the same sources, and wrote between 811 and 815; he was kept in confinement by Leo V. on Samothrace. The "Papal Letters" to the emperor Leo III. may afford some idea of the state of feeling, but that is all; they are ascribed to Gregory II. (715-731), but are the forgeries of some later writer, who was badly informed in matters of political geography and topography.

But even from these scanty accounts the energy and moderation of the emperors shine out conspicuously. Unity of religion and purity of religion hover as twin ideals before the eyes of the man who was influenced neither by Judaism nor Islam, but by Paulicianism. The command was issued to Jews and Montanists that they should change their religion; the former submitted, the latter preferred

Struggle for Religious Purity to die. Whereas, one of the heads of the Paulicians, Genæsius, after his orthodoxy had been tested, obtained a letter of protection; the zeal in conversion flagged when this sect came in question. In 726 the struggle for religious purity began: the first edict of Leo ordered that the images should be destroyed. And the schools, the hotbeds of superstition, which conducted the education of the young on the old lines, were fated to fall. Tradition

affirms that the school in the Iron Market was burnt to the ground, professors, books, and all. When, therefore, a celebrated image of the Redeemer was being carried away by imperial officers, some fanatical women attacked and killed them—an exploit which greatly delights the author of the pseudo-Gregorian

**Educated
Classes Steeped
in Superstition**

letters. Stronger measures were imperative, not against the masses, but against the educated classes, who supported the struggle for superstition.

The pressure of taxation and enthusiasm for image worship drove Greece and the islands of the Ægean into a revolt, which led to the election of an emperor (Cosmas) and to the advance of the insurgents to the gates of Constantinople in 727. The movement was soon crushed by the Greek fire and the superiority of the imperial fleet. At the assembly of the year 729 the patriarch Germanus was sacrificed. He, the supporter of image worship and the monks, retired, and in his place was chosen Anastasius, who now solemnly ratified the ecclesiastical policy of Leo. Anastasius was not, however, recognised by Pope Gregory II., who entered into dangerous relations with Charles Martel. Italy turned against the Iconoclasts; insurrections seemed likely to tear the whole peninsula away from Byzantium, and the papal authority of Gregory II. and Gregory III. partially supported the anti-Byzantine agitations. Matters were not, however, allowed to go so far as the election of a rival emperor.

An armada was despatched by Leo against Italy, but was wrecked in the Adriatic. Under these conditions Leo, in 733, set about restoring ecclesiastical unity in his empire. He separated Sicily and Calabria (Rhegium, Severiana, Hydrus-Otranto) ecclesiastically from Rome, and placed them under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople. The property

**Increase of
Power to the
Eastera Church**

of the Church was confiscated. In this way the Græcising of Lower Italy and Sicily, begun under the

emperor Constans II., was carried a step further, and Southern Italy was left in a position to develop on her own lines far differently from the North. This Græcising process was again extended by the immense immigration of Greek monks (estimated at 50,000), who now came over and settled, with their images “not made by

men's hands,” in the freer atmosphere of the western dominions of the empire.

Equally important appears the removal of an old obstacle to development which concerned Illyria. When Valentinian as emperor of the West ruled over Illyria also, it was only natural that Pope Damasus (366-389) should exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction over this region, the thoroughfare between West and East. But when the Illyrian prefecture was attached to the East under Theodosius in 379, Rome still maintained this spiritual jurisdiction, and the metropolitan of Thessalonica was appointed the representative of the apostolic chair; when, later, Mœsia and Macedonia were transferred to the bishop of Ochrida by Justinian, even then these two provinces remained ecclesiastically one with Rome. This last relic of the encroachment of Roman ecclesiastical sovereignty over the dominions of the Byzantine empire was now abolished by Leo III., and Illyria placed under the patriarch of Constantinople.

The severance of Isauria from the patriarchate of Antioch, and the subjection of these ecclesiastical provinces to the patriarchate of Constantinople, broke down the barriers between political and ecclesiastical sovereignty, between the boundaries of the Byzantine empire and the diocese of the œcumenical patriarch. No foreign spiritual jurisdiction was to be recognised within the borders of the Byzantine empire.

The emperor Leo comes before us as a man in advance of his age. The advocate of a free peasantry, a supporter of the marriage tie, a stern foe to superstition, a champion of the rights of the state against the Church, a military reformer—his public energy fills us with deep regret that we cannot penetrate his real personality. Could we do so we should doubtless rank him as one of the greatest figures of the Byzantine empire. Himself his own finance minister, certainly his own commander-in-chief, a man whom the Church celebrated in her chants as her liberator from the Arabs, impelled by affectionate recollections of his home even in the domain of law, which he wished to be administered gratuitously to the poor; finally, in the sphere of religion, a firm, clear-headed character, who represented primitive Christianity enthu-

siastically and rejected every compromise with paganism—behind the politician in significant outlines stands revealed the man in all his greatness.

The son of Leo III., Constantine V. (741-775), nicknamed Copronymus, undoubtedly raised the bitterness of the image controversy to the highest pitch. Perhaps the cheerful strain in his nature—for he loved music, dancing and feasting, and ordered fruit, flowers and hunting scenes to be painted instead of sacred subjects—the gentleness which forgave his daughter Anthusa for worshipping images, the solicitude which procured pure drinking-water for the capital by the restoration of the aqueduct of Valens, were deeply planted in him and were his true characteristics.

Yet he was harsh, for he confined Stephanus and 342 monks in the Prætorium; and cruel, for he ordered eyes to be put out, arms, ears, noses to be cut off, and men to be executed and their dead bodies to be dragged through the streets. The treachery of his brother-in-law Artavasdus (from Mara'sh in Commagene, 743), and the opposition of

**The Emperor
Against
the Monks**

the monks to the proscription of images which the council of 754 had officially pronounced, and therefore to the emperor and the Church, had kindled in him a wild desire for revenge. The fanaticism of the freethinker who no longer tolerates the title of "holy," and is deeply incensed at the exclamation "Mary, help!" impelled him, after 761, into a savage war against the monks, in whom not merely image worship but also the "spiritual state" within the state was most clearly personified. The phrase "The monk, not I, is emperor," was wrung from the furious Constantine. There was no statutory abolition of the monasteries, though this has been inferred from the fragment of the patriarch Nicephorus in a manuscript of Theophanes, but separate enactments of Constantine confiscated monasteries and bestowed them without documentary record on laymen, from whom they could again be taken at pleasure.

It was a time of ferment and of agitation; new germs were developing in a rough age of strife; the terrible plague of 745 to 746 had almost depopulated the capital, and therefore Greek settlers were summoned to Byzantium from the islands and Hellas; and Hellas itself and Thrace

offered new fields not merely to the imperial colonists from Syria and Armenia, but to the immigrating Slavs themselves. Slavs were then settled in Bithynia—to the number of 280,000—and in Cyprus. Did the celibacy of the monks incense the emperor at this period of depopulation? It is certain that he was deeply indignant when his nobles sought monastic retirement. Skilfully contrived campaigns and breaches of faith were the weapons with which Constantine fought against the Bulgarians. After the sovereigns from the family of the Dulo and other Bulgarians—of whom a list down to 765 is preserved in a Slavonic text with Old Bulgarian phrases—we find rulers whose names, Paganus and Sabinus, attest the prominence of the part played by the Wallacho-Bulgarians. Cerig, or Telerig (763-775), in the end outwitted Constantine and wheedled out of him the names of all the Philhellenes in Bulgaria, who were then at once put to death.

Constantine's son, Leo IV. (775-780), surnamed the Khazar after his mother, carried on the ecclesiastical policy of his father in a milder form. The oath of fealty was ordered to be taken to his son Constantine not merely by the provincial governors, ministers and senators, and all the soldiers present, but also by representatives of the artisan guilds, and other classes of citizens. Constantine's mother, Irene, an Athenian, did not swear fealty to him. In 788, when he was eighteen, she annulled his betrothal with Rotrud, the daughter of Charles the Great. Finally, she put out his eyes in 797. For the next five years she ruled herself. A tedious contest between her favourites, a lamentable attitude towards the Arabs, and complete retreat in the question of the image controversy form the salient points in her reign. The œcumenical council of 787 enjoined the worship of images

**Triumph of
the Image
Worshippers**

as a duty, although the state right of supervision was not waived. Hence the image controversy ended in favour of the image worshippers (Iconodules) and of monasticism, and all the results of Leo's efforts were wiped out. None more sharply criticised this Church council of Nicæa than Charlemagne. There is sufficient evidence to recognise that Charles held the same views as the Byzantine emperors Leo III. and

Constantine V. The objection of Constantine to the invocation. "Mary, help!" and such phrases can be paralleled by similar criticisms on the part of Charlemagne. Thus he stigmatises as blasphemous the phrases of the Byzantine chancery style, "God rule with them," "God entreat the Pope to co-operate," etc. It was, he said,

Charlemagne Denounces Image Worship foolish to light before the images candles which they could not see, or burn incense which they could not smell. To the lifeless images, which are only works of men's hands, no adoration is due, such as was shown to living men—a hit at the *Cæsar-cult* of Rome and Byzantium.

The papacy, unchecked by dogmatic variances, threw itself into the arms of the Franks. The flight of Pope Leo III. to Spoleto and the romantic meeting of Charles and the Pope at Paderborn, where the mail-clad horsemen headed by Charles galloped forward amid the clash of trumpets to meet the Pope, led to the wonderful coronation on Christmas Day, 800 A.D., in St. Peter's. The legal question of the precedence of the Byzantine emperor, which even Alcuin in 799 had acknowledged in a letter to Charles, was not settled by this ceremony, but only shelved, for the view of the Lorsch Annals that the question was ended when the imperial title passed to a female did not appear to have any legal foundation.

The successor of Irene, who was soon deposed, was Nicephorus, the treasurer-general (802-810). The Syrian or Isaurian dynasty was overthrown, and a new house came up. The mere fact that a man once more filled the imperial throne of Byzantium made it impossible to maintain the argument, upon which the coronation of Charles as emperor had been based, that there was a vacancy in the empire. Nicephorus received overtures for peace from Charles, and left them unanswered. It was only when Venice, which, having revolted

Bulgarian Empire in Being from Byzantium in 806, had returned again in 807, was punished by Pepin for so doing in 810 that Nicephorus sent Arsafius his representative to conclude a preliminary peace. Charles in his letter to Nicephorus rejoiced that it had at last become possible to realise the wish for peace. But when the envoys of Charles reached Byzantium the skull of Nicephorus was already serving the great Bulgarian prince Krum (802-814) as

a drinking-cup; Krum had conquered almost all the European possessions of Byzantium, had in particular won Sofia, and after some preliminary successes of Nicephorus had defeated the emperor and his whole army.

This Bulgarian empire comprised at its heart Lower Mœsia (between the Balkans and the Danube), extended over the territory of the modern kingdom of Roumania, absorbed Transylvania, the salt of which the Bulgarians exported to Moravia, and extended to the Dniester, possibly to the Dnieper. The princes lived at Preslav (Marcianopolis) on the great Kamcija. Islam seems to have been preached in the ninth century; but the influence of the subjugated Slavs, who transmitted their own language and customs to their rulers, and only assumed their name, was stronger. Greek culture soon began to influence the Bulgarians. Even in the eighth century a Bulgarian prince had counsellors who spoke Bulgarian, Slavonic, and Greek. They fought with Greek siege-machines and with Greek fire. Inscriptions were composed by them in Greek, though no longer classical Greek.

Hellenic Influence on Bulgarians Thus, on a pillar of red marble still preserved in Tirnovo, Omortag (between 820 and 836) explains his plan for constructing a palace and a sepulchral monument after a Greek model.

After the incapable Michael I. Rhangabé (811-813) had sustained a decisive defeat from Krum in the vicinity of Adrianople in 813, the emperor Leo V., the "Chameleon" (813-820) was able at last, in 817, to conclude peace with Omortag. Leo was also successful against the Arabs; less so in the deposition of the patriarch Nicephorus and in the organisation of the synod of 815, which revived the almost buried image controversy. The agitation which had once been religious now led to the sharpest persecution, and ceased to be a movement in favour of liberty.

Leo V., the "Chameleon," had, in his time, when he accepted the crown, been under-estimated by the man who succeeded him, Michael II., the Phrygian (820-829), who had given the hesitating officer the choice: "With this sword I will open the gates of Constantinople to you, or I will plunge it into your bosom." The king-maker, showing dissatisfaction with his secondary position, had been arrested; but now breaking prison he murdered his former

protégé in the royal chapel, into which he and his companions, dressed as priests, had forced their way.

His rival in power, Thomas the Slav, was the instigator of the most dangerous revolt of the subjugated nations against the foreign yoke of Greece. Thomas had raised the lower strata of populations, such as the Arabs, the Slavs of the Balkan peninsula, the races of the Caucasus and the Armenians, in rebellion against the empire. On the plea of hereditary right, since he professed to be that Constantine whom Irene had blinded, he persuaded the patriarch of Antioch to

Crete by the Arabs in 823, the revolt of the Dalmatian towns from Byzantium, and the progress of the Saracen conquest of Sicily, indicate the critical state of the Byzantine empire under his rule.

Michael's moderation in the image controversy led the head of the ecclesiastical party of independence, the **Fiery Abbot** abbot Theodorus of Studion (752-826), to entertain various hopes, the frustration of which drove that fiery spirit into violent antagonism. An uncompromising enemy of Cæsaropapism, who did not endure that "our word should be hidden for one single

**Fiery Abbot
Defies the
Emperor**



THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA IN THE YEAR 787, WHICH ESTABLISHED IMAGE-WORSHIP

The great religious controversy of the eighth century was over the worship of images. The Emperor Leo III. was a great Iconoclast, but his vigorous efforts to suppress the superstitious veneration of images were without permanent success, as the Council of Nicæa in 787, under Constantine, son of Leo IV., forty-seven years after the great Leo's death, re-established the worship of images. From a miniature in a Greek Testament of the ninth century.

crowns him; and relying on a large army and a powerful fleet, this "pupil of the old devil," as Michael styled him, was only defeated by the emperor with the aid of the Bulgarian prince Omortag, in the vicinity of the capital.

**Byzantium
Helped by
Bulgaria**

The terrible shock which this revolt caused to the Byzantine empire appears clearly from a letter sent by Michael in 824 to the emperor Louis the Pious, accompanied with costly presents, green and yellow silks, Tyrian purple, crimson and blue stuffs.

The emperor Michael showed himself by no means capable where Bulgarian help was not forthcoming. The capture of

hour," and paid no regard to ecclesiastical superiors or synods, he had already claimed the supremacy of the law and the Gospel over the emperor, and had argued that the emperor was not mentioned in the Gospels. He now pointed to the government of the Church, which had to decide the divine dogmas, while the emperor and princes had to help them and ratify the decisions.

The antagonism of this talented and firm prelate would have been far more damaging to the Byzantine monarchy had not Greek national pride been aggrieved by the constant stress laid on the primacy of Rome—which was to Theodorus the safe harbour of refuge for the whole Church

in every storm of heresy; in fact, he smoothed the path for Photius, the leader of the Greek party of independence. Theodorus extols the peaceful monastic world in a biography of the abbot Plato, and by epigrams, in which every useful member of the community, from sick-nurse to abbot, is glorified as an emblem

Revival of

Iconoclasm

of duty faithfully fulfilled; his addresses contain golden grains of sincerest philanthropy. From them, as from the biography of his mother Theoctiste, and from his letters—"I shall never grow weary of writing," he says, in the last letter of the collection—breathes a full and rich humanity and an inflexible power of resistance which could not be broken by thrice-inflicted imprisonment and scourging. But his lofty conceptions of Church and State ran counter to the stream of Greek development. The monastery of Theodorus remained the seat of varied intellectual labours; and from it the perfected system of minuscules was carried out, as the *Tetra-Evangelium* of Porphyrius Uspensky, dating from the year 835, attests.

Iconoclasm on the lines of Constantine V. was continued under Michael's son Theophilus (829-842), who wished to ensure the victory of his school by the unsparing infliction of imprisonment and branding. At the beauty contest before the nuptials of Theophilus, who wished to award the apple to the fairest, Casia, a maiden who pleased him particularly, retorted to his remark. "Sorrow came into the world through woman." with the answer, "Yet woman is the source of happiness."

For this she was passed over by Theophilus. She founded a convent, where her poetic gifts were developed. Discarding the old poetic forms, and trusting to the popular style, she ventured to write verse whose rhythm depends not on quantity, like the classical Greek and Latin, but on stress, as in English poetry.

A Noble Poetess of Byzantium

Reminiscences of Menander and echoes of the Bible could not deprive her of her own feelings; a self-conscious originality flashes forth in her songs of hatred, "I hate him who adapts himself to every custom." We can believe that frivolity and laziness roused to indignation this defiant spirit, and that a laborious life among learned men had more attractions for it than a pleasant existence in the society of fools. Theophilus was consistently

pursued by ill-fortune. The Saracenic advance was checked in Asia Minor by a Persian prince, called, as a Christian, Theophobus; an inroad was even made into the Arabian empire. But to balance this came the terrible pillage of the town of Amorion after a siege from the 7th to the 15th of August, 838, by the caliph Mutasim, or Motassim (833-842). The martyrdom of the forty-two Greeks of Amorion was deeply graven on the memory of the Greeks. In the west, Palermo fell into the hands of the Arabs.


The belief in images still flourished in spite of violent measures; the three eastern patriarchs repeated in a letter of 839 to Theophilus the story of the impression of the face of Mary on a pillar at Lydda. Theophilus, whose panegyrists extol his exertions in the cause of science—for instance, by conceding to scholars the permission to teach—and for the safety and buildings of the capital, rewarded his greatest general, his brother-in-law, Theophobus, with base ingratitude, and his last act as monarch was to order the execution of this meritorious servant and kinsman.

The regency for the thirteen-year-old son of Theophilus, Michael III. (842-867), was undertaken by his mother Theodora, his uncle Burdas, a strong and unscrupulous character, and the Magister Manuel.

The connection of the latter with the monks of the celebrated monastery of Studion seems to explain the order which was given for the restoration of image worship. The synod of 843, the anniversary of which the Greek Church celebrates, ended the long controversy.

All the symptoms of madness appeared in the young emperor; passion for the circus and for low company, infatuated extravagance, drunkenness, unrestrained lust, and mischievous cruelty. That malicious delight in turning to ridicule what was sacred to other men—by desecrating the Sacrament and arranging processions of his boon companions attired in episcopal vestments—sprang with Michael from that same mania for outrage which prompted the emperor Caligula to erect his statue in the Temple at Jerusalem. He is to be compared with Caligula rather than with Nero, although the latter is the parallel preferred by the Byzantine historians.

As a terrible warning of the dangers which threatened a weak Byzantium from the north, the Russians appeared



THE EMPEROR THEOPHILUS OF BYZANTIUM CHOOSES HIS WIFE

With a golden apple in his hand, he slowly walked on the line of contending beauties; his eye was dazzled by the charms of Casia, and, in the awkwardness of a first declaration, the emperor said that if in this world women had been the cause of much evil. 'And surely, sir,' she pertly replied, 'they have likewise been the cause of much good.' Thus affection of unreasonable wit displeased the imperial lover. He turned aside in disgust; Casia concealed her disappointment in a convent; and the modest silence of Theodora was rewarded with the golden apple. —*Orlando*.
From the painting by Val Prinsiep, N. A.

before Constantinople on July 15, 860, according to the anonymous chronicler of Brussels. These Scandinavian hordes—not Slavs from the Baltic or Goths from the Crimea—had won great fame early in the ninth century. They themselves bore northern names and gave Scandinavian names to the falls of the Dnieper, which they descended in their boats.

**Northern
Heroes Rule
the Slavs**

Even the treaties of the Russians with Byzantium in 907, 911, 945 and 971 show precisely the same northern military oath as the treaty of Charles the Bald with Regner, in 845, and of Siegfred and Halfdan with Lewis the German. Otherwise the traces of northern names and designations are scanty enough. In the name of the town which in Slavonic is called Turow is concealed the name Turý, which came to Russia with Rogvolod = Rag(e)vald; otherwise the Ivor Street in Novgorod and the spot in Kiev where the god Thor was worshipped are, with the "knout," almost the only memorials of the northern home from which the invaders came.

These northern heroes had been called into the country by the Slavs, Tchades, Kriviches, and Wesses as the superior national power. "Our country is large and rich, but there is no order in it; do you come and rule and govern over us," said the Slavs, according to Nestor's chronicle. But the Russians appeared savage and boorish, the "most blood-stained" people, to the Byzantines, who, mistrusting their own strength, ascribed the retreat of the Russians to the dipping of the robe of the Mother of God in the waves of the Bosphorus, as Photius relates, and claimed the credit for the subsequent conversion of the Russians to Christianity.

The Russians then made Novgorod and Kiev centres of the empire, and retained their Scandinavian character for a long time in the former city; in the latter, notwithstanding northern followers (Druschina),

**Russia Gets
Christianity
From Byzantium**

they became Slavonic by the year 1000; but in reality they accepted Christianity under Byzantine influence and drew their learning and culture from Byzantium—although not until far later; the peace of 907 was still sworn to by the god Perun, in whom we detect features of the Scandinavian Thor, and Volus, who is certainly not Basilius. Olga, Igor's wife, was the first to receive baptism, and the entire nation became Christian under Vladimir

(980-1015). A section of the crews in the fleet, and later a company of the imperial body-guard, celebrated for their weapons—axe and pike combined—were formed out of the Russians; the Varagi, or with Slav nasal, Varangi, Varengians.

Byzantium was regarded at that period, about 863, as the centre not merely of civilisation, but of Christianity; and Ratislaw of Moravia—then the country on the March, comprising a part of Lower Austria as far as the Danube, and Northern Hungary between the Danube and Gran—requested the emperor Michael III. to send him a missionary familiar with Slavonic, and in this way endeavoured to obtain a Slavonic liturgy and a Church of Græco-Slavonic constitution. Through the brothers Constantine and Methodius of Thessalonica not merely did the Slavonic dialect of that region (in Moravia slightly blended with German words) become the prevailing dialect for ecclesiastical purposes, but in other respects we can see there the beginning of that complex civilisation which we may term Slavo-Byzantine. Eastern elements are prominent in this civilisation, as might be expected from its

**The Slavo-
Byzantine
Civilisation**

Byzantine origin; but among the Slavs, owing to the manner of its transmission, it has been everywhere influenced by the national Church. We have not yet surveyed the extent of the Slavonic debt to Byzantinism. Institutions and forms of government, law and plastic arts, religious conceptions and liturgy, legends and myths—all flowed in narrow but numerous channels down to the Slavonic nations. And there the differentia of the races down to the present day has been not Teutonism and Slavonism, but Teutonism and Byzantinised Slavonism.

We derive our information about the life of the brothers Constantine and Methodius from their biography, the so-called "Pannonian Legends." They were born at Thessalonica as Greeks, certainly not of a mixed race, in the midst of Slavonic tribes, with whose tongues they became at an early age familiar, so that Methodius actually administered a Slavonic principality in Thessaly, before he retired to Olympus in Asia Minor. Constantine had close relations in Byzantium with Photius, who in 855-856, was sent with him to the Arabs, and went (860-861) as missionary to the Khazars; he then, at the request of Ratislaw in

863, accompanied Methodius to Moravia, and certainly took with him some portions of the Old Testament already translated into Slavonic. The heretical attitude of Photius forced the brothers to break with Byzantium and turn to Rome, where Pope Hadrian II. consecrated them bishops in 868; the Slavonic liturgy was at first sanctioned there — by Pope Hadrian II., in 869, and Pope John VIII. in 880—although it was afterwards prohibited in the “Commonitorium” of Pope Stephen VI. and in his letter to Svatopluk (discovered in the monastery of the Holy Cross). Constantine, or as he was now called, Cyril, died in 869; Methodius laboured on the shores of the lake of Platten, extended his influence to Croatia, and died in Moravia in 885. The struggle about the Slavonic liturgy was carried on with much heat by the clergy; the victory of the liturgy, in spite of the restrictions imposed by Pope Stephen VI., enabled the Slavs to outstrip the Germanic nations in the work of organising a national church. We may see here the effect of the spirit of independence characteristic of the Byzantine Church. The Slavonic national (glagolitic) alphabet, invented by Cyril and closely modelled on the Greek cursive character



BYZANTINE COSTUMES OF THE EIGHTH CENTURY

and Dalmatia. Subsequently we find a simplified form of the Cyrillian alphabet which was probably composed by Bishop Clement of Drenovica under the Tsar Symeon on the model of Greek uncials. It was certainly not directly through Methodius and the picture of the Last Judgment ascribed to the Slavonic apostle—by an erroneous identification with a painter—but indirectly through the whole Christianising movement and the influence of Byzantium, that the conversion of Boris, prince of the Bulgarians and of the Bulgarian people, came about. The Bulgarians, standing on a low plane of civilisation, retained their barbarous habits and were profoundly superstitious. The Oriental turban was worn by the men, while close-fitting dresses, long sashes ornamented with gold and silver buttons, and veils for the face were still retained by the women.



BYZANTINE SOLDIERS OF THE NINTH CENTURY
From an illustration in a rare Byzantine manuscript in the Paris National Library

facilitated the establishment of Christianity among the Slavs. The sphere of glagolitic monuments extends from Moravia and Bohemia to Croatia, Istria

eat at the same table with the prince. The core of the nation was represented by the greater and inferior nobility. Boris had clearly seen how necessary

They employed oxen and sheep as mediums of exchange; slaves worked for them in an oppressive serfdom, or were even sold to Byzantium. Wonder-working stones were hung round the necks of the sick, and the dead man was given his slaves and wives to accompany him to the grave. A deep gulf separated ruler and subjects, of whom even the foremost did not

it was for his kingdom of Bulgaria to receive Christianity, which he had himself adopted, with an imperial sponsor, under the name of Michael. The question whether to join Rome or Byzantium was more obscure. The persecutions of the pagans, which he himself initiated, and the inrush of eager missionaries of the most

Persecutions of the Pagans various sects (for example, of the Paulicians) into this new domain of Christianity—of lay Christians who professed to be priests and mixed all the superstition of their own homes with Christianity, or of Jews who wished to disseminate their creed—did not conduce to make the new doctrines more popular. To crown all came the teaching of the highest ecclesiastical party of Byzantium, of the patriarch Photius, which must have driven the Bulgarian prince out of his senses; he received a sketch of the essential nature and features of orthodoxy, a theological treatise on the Trinity, and a history of the seven œcumenical synods and their most influential personalities, all of which he must have found hopelessly unintelligible. This much was clear to him, however, that his people, or at any rate he in his own person, should take a leap from their primitive manners to the ideal of the Byzantine court, where no one was allowed to talk too fast, laugh too loud, or speak unbecomingly.

The Bulgarian prince therefore experimented with Rome. Pope Nicholas I., cleverly recognising the needs of a simple race, conceded the Bulgarian's requests, some of which were truly marvellous. The grasp which Rome possessed of the Bulgarian situation, the care with which her representatives suggested

AQUEDUCT OF THE GREEK EMPERORS, NEAR PYRGO



a higher civilisation, were in striking contrast to the ostentatious erudition of Byzantine theologians, and to the Byzantine insistence upon tedious ceremonies. But the advantage of Rome was thrown away, owing to quarrels of

a personal kind. The Pope refused to approve the bishop who was presented to him, and the alliance was broken off.

The discourteous attitude of Rome towards the Greek envoys in Bulgaria, who were simply driven out of the country, and the rejection of the message communicated by them, supplied Photius, who, patriarch of Constantinople since 858, had been deposed at a Roman synod in 863, with the final motive for a rupture with Rome. The theological basis of the renunciation of Rome, the encyclical of 867, so important in the history of the world, was not weighty or burdensome. In the West, men had taught that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and the Son, and by so doing had, according to the view of Photius, denied the monarchical constitution of the Trinity. In conformity with the western view the creed had been altered by the admission of the words "and from the Son," against

Primacy Transferred to Byzantium which the confessions of faith engraved by Pope Leo III. on silver plates bore witness. Further, in order most thoroughly to shatter Rome's claim to supremacy. Photius asserted the transference of the primacy to Byzantium, by the removal of the imperial residence from Rome to New Rome. But undoubtedly the weightiest reason was the rejection in the West of so many Church customs which were knit up with the Greek

national life. Photius then revealed the deep rift between East and West; it was national, and only brought into relief by the Church dispute. Meanwhile the secular power had passed to the Macedonian ex-groom and friend of Michael, the joint-emperor Basilius, who put Michael to death,

and founded the "Macedonian" dynasty.

Now first, long after the loss of the eastern provinces, the Greek spirit had vigorously roused itself and produced among the people the consciousness of national unity.



BYZANTIUM AT ITS ZENITH AND THE BEGINNING OF THE EMPIRE'S DECLINE

THE intercourse with the east and the former incorporation of Oriental provinces in the empire, with their great influence on culture, left traces for centuries; eastern suggestions, Armenian colonists, and natives of Asia Minor played a great part at court and in the state. But the Greek elements had begun to combine; and here too the first attempt at national union found expression in the Church. Learning and education, law and literature, had seen a renaissance of the old Byzantine and Greek life, and the whole state became emphatically an expression of Greek intellect.

The divinely appointed rule of the emperor, despotic and unrestrained by law, in things spiritual and secular alike, swayed the Byzantine intellect. The spiritual and secular dignitaries were nominated by him, and a shadowy senate was summoned. The imperial finance minister, the keeper of the privy purse, the commandant of the watch and the postmaster-general, the other great dignitaries known as patricians, and the "protospatharii," the private secretary, the captain of the city, and the quæstor (then probably head of the police) flocked round the throne and executed the commands in the various administrative and legislative spheres.

The high military officers ruled the provinces, and played an important rôle at court. They were excellently paid, as also were the subordinate officers, if we consider that everything was found for them. The army itself was devoted to its leaders, received small pay, but complete board, lodging, and clothing, and was in other respects treated considerately. This is attested not merely by their exemption from taxation, and by the splendid baths at Dorylæum, which could hold seven thousand men; the reputation they enjoyed in the wars with the

Arabs as the avengers and saviours of Christianity, and the demand that all fallen soldiers should be declared martyrs, furnish an eloquent proof of it. There was also a powerful clergy, who had immense monastic estates as well as poor monasteries at their disposal, and ruled the people politically also by using religious controversy for political opposition and urging the masses to fight through enthusiasm for the cause. From the clergy also came to a large extent the "cloud of humanists, who made verses and turned phrases, who begged and were not ashamed." They found an appreciative audience in the large class of wealthy men who bought titles, and even salaried offices as a life annuity.

Then came the bourgeois class, from which were sometimes recruited the ranks of the clergy through the desire for seclusion, sometimes those of the lower officials of court and civil service, by the sale of offices, or the posts once bought became hereditary in the families of the order. The artisan guilds protected the old church customs as unassailable achievements of faith.

Then came the peasantry, diminished by the attractive power of the monasteries and by the sale of the land, and also ruined by a defective system of credit. All round the capital, in the district called the Province of the Walls, large estates had been formed, on which peasant serfs worked for the emperor, for patricians and monasteries—a picture of the whole empire. The peasant, once perhaps free, who worked on these estates could not be evicted, but also did not possess the right of emigration, and he paid protection-money and blood tithes far more than the former tithe of corn; he was indeed a serf. The diminution of the free peasant class became noticeable from the increase

**Emperor
by Right
Divine**

**Power and
Riches of
the Clergy**

**Peasantry
in
Serfdom**

in the mercenary forces, as in the Athens of the fourth century.

Thus, this prosperous season of the Byzantine empire is naturally characterised by a constant struggle for the protection, maintenance, and increase of the free peasantry. A powerful effort in this direction was made by the Homestead

Struggle for a Free Peasantry

Act of the emperor Romanus Lacapenus, who in 934 passed a law forbidding the magnates to acquire any villages or hamlets from the poor; they had actually to give back any purchases of land, except in the case of their having raised valuable buildings. As magnates were reckoned higher officials and place-holders, members of the superior clergy, and all who had money and position. The old connection between landed property and military service appears further in the resuscitated institution of inalienable military fiefs, the owners of which had to provide equipment and food; and only the heirs, and those who bore a share of military service and taxation, might acquire such property.

The artisan class was superstitious, dull-witted, and, notwithstanding Christianity, addicted to the old cults. The lowest section finally was represented by the very numerous slaves, in whom a flourishing trade was carried on. Danilis, the richest lady of the Peloponnesus, presented to her imperial adopted son Basilius 500 slaves (including 100 eunuchs), and 100 slave girls; after her death, in 888, the emperor emancipated 3,000 of her slaves and settled them in Lower Italy.

The strength of the Byzantine empire lay in the army and fleet. Mercenaries and newly settled subjects occupied a large place among the tenants of military fiefs. The imperial fleet, under the Drungarius, was paid from the state coffers; the provincial fleet by the Themata provinces; the majority of the ships belonged to the imperial fleet. Tubes for discharging Greek fire were placed on the bows of the dromonds. The fleet was manned by Russian Northmen,

Byzantium's Naval Equipment

who served as mercenaries, at one time also by Syrian Mardaites, as barbarians who had settled in the empire and were liable to service, and finally by the native population of the island province, of the province of Samos, and of the Cibyrrhæotic province. When this latter territory was lost the navy also was ruined, so that in

the eleventh and the beginning of the twelfth century pirates swept the seas. When the necessity of a navy made itself felt in the war with the Norman fleet, the Venetians fought and decided the battles of the Greek emperor.

The core of the Byzantine empire was Asia Minor, which required to be defended by perpetual war against the Arabs. On the Black Sea it still possessed the Crimea, the starting point for the trade with the surrounding nations, especially with the Khazars. The Pechenegs and Bulgarians enclosed the small part of Thrace and Macedonia which still remained Greek. The Peloponnese, through the attitude of the Slavonic tribes, was only in parts nominally dependent. Dyrrhachium served to secure the communications with Italy. By the side of the independent kingdom of Italy, with Pavia as its capital, Calabria still maintained its position as a Greek province; an attempt was also made by Byzantium to exercise some maritime supervision in these waters. In Sicily, on the contrary, there were but few points still in Byzantine hands. Basilius I. (867-886) laid the founda-

Basilius I. on the Throne

tions for the internal and external consolidation of the empire. He was descended from an Armenian family of military colonists at Adrianople; his mother was called Pankalo and was, according to Tabari, a Slav. In compensation for Sicily, which soon became completely Arab, and where only the Byzantine law prevailed, he added to Calabria a second province of Southern Italy, Longibardia. Considering the actual secession of Venice, which had created for herself an invincible position on the sea by the treaty of 840 with Lothaire, and its ratification by Lewis II. in 857, it was a master stroke of diplomatic self-control on the part of Basilius I. to regain at any rate a formal recognition of his suzerainty from Venice by sending an embassy, transmitting presents, and conferring on the Doge, Ursus Partiacus, in 879 the title of Protospatharius.

Buildings shot up in numbers—according to report more than 100 churches and palaces. The emperor Basilius was so amicably disposed towards Rome that the learned and indefatigable Patriarch, Photius, who in 867 had deposed Pope Nicholas I. at a so-called council, was at the eighth œcumenical synod at Jerusalem

declared to have forfeited his office and was replaced by the patriarch Ignatius. The thought that one single faith ought to govern Christians induced the prelates of the east, who were under the emperor's influence, to sign a formula of submission to Rome.

A fitting pendant to this ecclesiastical policy was the suppression of the Paulicians by Basilius; they removed under Tzimisces to the Balkan peninsula and were revived in the sect of the Bogumiles. Perhaps also the persecution of the Jews in Southern Italy by Basilius may be traced to a renewal of the claim of Leo the Isaurian to establish one faith throughout the empire. Glancing over the domain of art we might regard the decorations of the church of Scripu, built in 873-874, as an instructive allegory of the spiritual movement of that time; an abundance of designs attests the presence of a strong vitality, but is still, it must be confessed, crude in execution, an echo of the hard struggles of the Byzantine people from which the old language, altered in many ways, emerged victoriously. The hereditary monarchy, which extended from 867 to 1028, was unusually emphasised in form by the joint sovereignty of the sons—in the case of Basilius I., Leo VI. and Alexander; in the case of Romanus II., Basilius II. and Constantine VIII.—but, in fact, it broke down through the institution of mayors of the palace.

The learned emperor Leo VI. (the Wise, 886-911), who was compared to the emperor Claudius, had a far higher importance than the "wise fool" of the Julian line, whose studies exercised no sort of influence upon his time. It may be that merely utilitarian considerations led the Byzantines of this age to collect all the learning of the past, and, above all, that of Justinian's epoch, but, at any rate, they completely resuscitated it. The process of decay, uninterrupted since Heraclius, seemed checked for the future;

**Leo the Wise
Rules over
Byzantium**

even in the descriptions of the provinces which the emperor Constantine VII. Porphyrogenetus supplied the sixth century is the authoritative basis, notwithstanding the new organisation by Leo VI. The great code of the Basilica in sixty books, compiled between 887 and 893, was one such renewal. Basilius in his "Procheirus" had restored this basis as much as possible, and now the entire code of Justinian was revived, not merely as regarded the marriage law, divorce, and the limitation of marriage contracts to the wealthy, but also in matters of family law, the authority of the father, the law of compulsory inheritance, and usury.

But in a still more significant fashion Leo recurred to the glorious age of Justinian. Cesaro-papism arose afresh; ordinances were issued as to the admissibility of married aspirants to bishoprics, and the age limits of subdeacons; festivals were appointed for celebrated preachers, marriage dispensations were granted. A patriarch who opposed his wishes, Nicholas, a friend of his youth, whom he had honoured with the title of a trusted councillor, was compelled by the emperor to hand in his resignation, as he refused to bless the emperor's fourth marriage, and even excommunicated him in 907.

It was then quite obvious that the emperor settled the rank and the precedence of the prelates. The dioceses formerly subordinated to Rome were now recovered—Nicomolis, Stellas, Sicily, Stygmon, Cephallenia, Thessalonica, Dyrhachium, Dalmatia were finally separated from Rome and made subject to Byzantium. Conformably to this change, these countries were regarded as new provinces, and, as such, enrolled in the new list of Themata. Even then the generalisation of Constantine Porphyrogenetus, that the empire was split up into governorships, and that the emperor had not, therefore, his old power, might hold good for the emperors, with the

**Justinian's
Code
Revived**

regarded the marriage law, divorce, and the limitation of marriage contracts to the wealthy, but also in matters of family law, the authority of the father, the law of compulsory inheritance, and usury.



BYZANTINE SEWED WORK, 1,000 YEARS OLD
A piece of richly decorated sewed work from the state robe of the emperor Romanus Lacapenus, bearing his name and that of his son.

exception of the greatest. Wealthy families, especially on the frontiers of the empire, collected followers, transformed the peasants into soldiers, and founded Byzantine feudalism.

Theological interests drew Leo into church meetings as an official orator; scholastic attainments led him to imitate

Leo's Keen Interest in Theology

Latin verse in a macaronic vein. Much certainly has been fathered upon him which he did not compose, but brought on

him his bad reputation. On the other hand, when we consider the great attraction of the successes of his father, Basilus, and his commander-in-chief Nicephorus Phocas, as well as the reference to the capture of Theodosiopolis, and the predominant position of the Arabs, it is almost certain that Leo is really the author of the "Tactics." Leo employed pagan Magyars as "executioners" against the Christian Bulgarians, but hardly with success; the Tsar Symeon was justified in reproaching him with this violation of Christian fellow-feeling.

A commercial question, that of burdening the trade between Greece and Bulgaria with heavy tolls and of diverting it from Constantinople, induced Symeon (893-927) to wage war on Byzantium. The appointment of a Bulgarian patriarch in Achrida—which from this time down to 1767 was the intellectual centre of the Western Balkan countries—and the assumption of the imperial title Tsar (Cæsar), over the Bulgarians in 917, and the Greeks in 924, clearly revealed his plans. He told the emperor: "This is an empire which has come to me!" In his opinion the Bulgarians usually coveted the land of others; the Greeks ceded their own.

Symeon, who before his accession had lived in a monastery, to which his uncles also withdrew, wished to elevate his people by the introduction of Greek learning; he had himself read Demosthenes

An Emperor Taken From a Monastery

and Aristotle at Byzantium in his youth. He projected a reference book, which comprised treatises on theological,

philosophical, and historical subjects, and was translated into Russian in the eleventh century, and he caused an epitome of the Greek law to be prepared. Grigori then translated Malalas; his cousin, Todor Dutsov, copied manuscripts in his monastery; John the Exarch described in his preface to the Hexameron the residence

of the tsar, in which the splendour of Byzantine architecture and painting, and the glittering gold of the robes of the princes and nobles, contrasted so sharply with the cottages of the country. Fresh strength and a recently-adopted culture had here to be overcome. The Turkish and new Slavonised people of the Bulgarians thus formed at that age of international consolidation the very heart of Slavonism and became its champions in virtue of their military and political capabilities.

The Magyars seemed to Leo the most suitable allies against Symeon. The race is in its germ Finno-Ugrian, since its numerals and words for ordinary objects of life are identical with those of the Finnish-Ugrian Vogules. From their far distant home on the Isim, Irtish, and Om, where Aristaeus of Proconnesus, the authority of Herodotus, describes the forefathers of the Magyars, the Iyrkes, on their hunting expeditions, the Magyars had come in the course of nearly 1,500 years into the country between the Caspian and the Black Seas, and into the region between Kuban and Don, where fishing might be

Magyars Set Against the Slavs

combined with the chase. They had then settled, about 860, in Livadia, between the Don and the Dnieper, where they fell under the influence of the Khazars and adopted numerous Turkish words. The Khazars, who adopted Judaism soon after 860, then ruled over an empire which stretched from the Jaik to the Dnieper and Bug, from the Caspian Sea and the southern slopes of the Caucasus to the Middle Volga and the Oka. The Magyars, pressing on further, came to the country of Atelkuzu, where they ruled the Slavs and sold them into slavery, but also came under Slavonic influence, which affected their customs and language.

In the war with the Bulgarians the Magyars were at first successful; but on the way home they suffered a disastrous defeat and were now attacked by the Pechenegs, or Patzinaks, on the Dnieper, whom the Bulgarians launched at them, thus imitating the Byzantine system. Their families, which remained behind on the steppes of Bessarabia, were crushed or captured; the whole nation thereupon decided in 896-897, under the rule of Arpad (890-907), to march further to the west, and so immigrated into their present home, separated into North and South

Slavs, and made great expeditions through Europe. With this event concludes the second national migration. Old native sources were first worked up in the thirteenth century into the untrustworthy "Gesta Hungarorum" of the anonymous notary of King Bela IV., so that the passages in Leo's "Tactica" and Constantine Porphyrogenetus are more valuable.

The terrible sacking of Thessalonica by the renegade Leo—from the Syrian Tripolis, 904—showed that the navy was still unable to fulfil its duties of guarding the seas. The lamentations of the patriarch Nicholas, with which the church of St. Sophia resounded, testified to the weakness of the empire. It is interesting to note that, in spite of these Arabian plundering expeditions, fairly good relations were maintained with the Arabs at Constantinople, who, according to the testimony of that patriarch, were allowed to possess a mosque and to profess their religion without let or hindrance.

The foolish provocation given to Symeon by Leo's successor, Alexander (912-913), who insulted his envoys, renewed the war between Symeon and Byzantium; the latter was besieged in 913. The new Great Bulgaria now comprised the Balkan peninsula from Mesembria to Rhodope, from Olympus to the mouth of the Calama with the exception of the strip of Macedonia on the sea, towards Servia as far as the united Drin, the White Drim, the Ibar, and the Save. Wallachia, parts of Hungary, and Transylvania, completed the immense empire.

Constantine VII. Porphyrogenetus ("Born in the Purple"), 912-959, early turned his attention to learned studies. His restoration of the old university went hand in hand with an eager revival of the old learning in the domains of history, geography, agriculture, natural history and medicine. At that period the taste for collecting literary treasures was widely prevalent, as is shown by other collections—for example, that of old epigrams by Constantine Cephalus—which Constantine had not initiated; but his influence did much to mould the characteristics of this "encyclopædic age." The connoisseurs of antiques—such as Basilus of Neocæsareum—dedicated their works to him. He had the consciousness, in spite of all the learning of past ages,

that the language could not be cramped and stationary, but that it ought to develop continuously and in keeping with the present. He showed the same taste for history as his grandfather, Basilus I., and continued the work of Theophanes, but in an inflated and boastful style. In his age the Byzantine system of mayors of the palace was developed.

Encyclopædic Age of Byzantium It is beyond any doubt that we may thus designate the position of the Basileiopatōrs, who ultimately bore the imperial title Stylianus Zautzes, as in 894. The fact that in the Frankish empire the post of the mayor of the palace grew out of the royal civil service, which was concerned with the administrative duties of the royal household, and in Byzantium out of the post of commander of the foreign guard, cannot establish convincingly any difference between the mayor of the palace and the Basileiopatōr. More distinctive is the fact that the Carolingians only rose to be viceroys, but the Byzantine commanders to real imperial dignity by the side of the Armenian dynasty; in fact, the latter formally took the second place.

Romanus I. Lacapenus (919-944 co-emperor), the son-in-law of Constantine, reduced the latter not merely to the second, but, by the coronation of his own three sons, actually to the fifth place; and, unlike the Carolingian mayors, abandoned even the outward semblance of respect for the ruling dynasty. In Bulgaria, after the conclusion of peace in 924, and after the death of Symeon in 927, the recognition of the Bulgarian patriarchate and the marriage of Maria, grand-daughter of Romanus, with the Tsar Peter, produced friendly relations with Byzantium. The solidarity of Islam was broken up by an alliance with the emir of Melitene in 928. Armenia, which was bound to East Rome by so many private ties, and had become a great power under Asot (915-928), was

Political Alliance with Armenia now brought into a political alliance; and amity was established with the Russians after their severe defeats by the commercial treaty of 945:

The glory of acquiring new relics, especially that of the image of Christ, which had been brought from Edessa to Rome, cast a halo round the usurped crown of Romanus; the latter knew also how to employ the Curia for his own purposes; he won its friendship, ostensibly

by a "union" in 920, and really by the enthronement of Theophylactus, his horse-loving son, as patriarch. It is hard to say how far Romanus may have entered into financial negotiations with the senator

Poor Innkeeper's Daughter Becomes Empress Alberic, the protector of the Curia, for the transference of imperial rights. Finally, Constantine VII.,

by the agency of the sons of Romanus, freed himself from the father, and then from the sons themselves.

Even if little that is complimentary can be said about the talents of Constantine as a ruler, as a man he stands far above his son Romanus II. (959-963), who at the age of nineteen had married Theophano, the beautiful daughter of a poor innkeeper. Joseph Bringas, the moving spirit of the government, confided the war against Crete to the experienced Nicephorus Phocas, who conquered the island in 961 and brought it back to Christianity. He had already captured the Cilician towns and Aleppo, when the news arrived of the death of Romanus II. Theophano was to act as regent for his infant children, Basilus II. and Constantine VIII.


Nicephorus thereupon marched to the capital and had himself crowned emperor, not without the co-operation of a bastard son of Romanus Lacapenus, Basilus, the president of the senate.

Nicephorus II. (963-969) was a silent ascetic with a fiery soul, who practised the virtue of self-suppression not only through the privations of a soldier's life but also in the monastic cell; rude, rough, and ugly, but surrounded by all the charm of victorious campaigns, the idol of his troops, he became the husband of the most seductive and most delicate of women, the empress-widow Theophano, who thus secured for herself the successful general. He carried on the crusade against Islam with the fanaticism which is peculiar to the Cappadocian race from which he sprang; the fallen were to be reckoned martyrs. Everything must be subservient to the purposes of the war, of the army, and of the navy, which Byzantium alone possessed, as the emperor boasted to

Liutprand. The coinage was debased as a means of relieving the finances; restrictions upon the acquisition of land in mortmain, perhaps also a limitation of the right of pre-emption to individuals of the same status as the vendor, were tried as a means of restoring solvency.

The wide stretch of frontier facing the Arabs had become with its fortresses a military frontier, which urgently needed settlers. Patience was required; the Jacobitic immigrants were, according to the emperor's word, to remain exempt from all annoyance on the score of dogma. The emperor had, it is true, made more promises than the clergy of Byzantium wished to keep; in spite of everything the Syrians were dragged into the capital for religious tests. No monk ever formed

so rigid an ideal as this emperor, who would have wished to lay all the riches of the world at the feet of Theophano, but had himself absolutely no wants. The home for which he sighed was Laura on Mount Athos, founded by Athanasius in 968 at his instigation; there retirement from the world was possible in the strictest form, in the spirit of the old Oriental monasticism, in the spirit of Abbot Theodorus of Studion.



CROWN OF THE BYZANTINE EMPERORS
This is a reconstruction of the style of crown used by the emperors of Byzantium. It was most richly worked in gold and precious stones and decorated in cloisonné enamel.

As a part of official salaries was kept back by Nicephorus, as Cæsar-papism threatened to revive in its harshest form through his policy, since without the emperor's consent and command no episcopal election could be held, and no See occupied, and as an almost extortionate advantage of the corn monopoly was taken by the government, the whole empire was in ferment. Theophano took measures to ensure that a palace revolution under the young Armenian John Tzimisces should find the bedroom of her husband open; and


The Throne Falls to an Armenian

Nicephorus was put out of the way. The empress Theophano was banished by the patriarch. John Tzimisces was compelled to devote half of his entire fortune to the impoverished peasantry in the metropolitan thema, by the enlargement and furnishing of a great hospital in Constantinople. On this condition he was

recognised as emperor, and was crowned in 969 in the church of Saint Sophia. Tzimisces conducted the war against Russia with brilliant success, since he liberated Bulgaria. But he did not restore the empire to the Tsar Boris II., who was released from captivity; Bulgaria remained henceforth under Byzantine rule. Only a small piece of Macedonia and Albania had passed in the year 963 under the rule of the Sismanids, and now remained independent. Tzimisces obtained great successes against the Arabs under the leadership of the Fatimites of Egypt; he conquered Syria and crossed

as the capital, still stood unbroken; in fact, it had been considerably extended under Samuel (976-1014). Not merely had the Byzantines received a severe defeat in 991 but even the more southerly Adriatic coast was abandoned to Bulgaria, the northern coast with the Dalmatian islands went to the Croat Kreszimir I., and Servia became a vassal state of Bulgaria. But the defeat of Samuel on the Spercheus, and still more the capture of 15,000 Bulgarians effected in 1014 on the Belasitza Mountain, south of the passes of Klidion and Kimpolung, decided

Barbarism of a "Christian" Emperor



THE MONASTERY OF LAURA ON MOUNT ATHOS, FOUNDED BY ATHANASIOS IN 963. During the tenth and eleventh centuries, when the religious and political unrest of Europe was so great, the monasteries attracted many notable men of Byzantium who wished to retire for a season if not for life from the turmoil of affairs.

Lebanon. The east was then thoroughly stripped of its treasured relics. He died on the march home, and there are grounds for suspecting that he was poisoned.

The kingmaker of that time, the eunuch Basilius, proclaimed Basilius II. (976-1025), then twenty years of age, as independent sovereign. The sense of the duties of a ruler

Basilius II. Comes to the Throne completely changed his character, and moulded a youth addicted to every form of licence into a firm and almost ascetic man.

The West Bulgarian Empire under the Sismanids, with Prespa, later Achrida,

the fate of the Bulgarian Empire. The prisoners were blinded; one in every hundred was left with one eye to guide the others home. Basilius was called from this deed Bulgaroktonos—slayer of the Bulgarians. We can understand that the Tsar Samuel, to whom this pitiable army was sent, was heartbroken at the sight.

In the year 1018 Basilius made his entry into Achrida, where the splendid royal treasure, gold-embroidered robes, and a crown of the Sismanids set with pearls, fell into his hands. The Bulgarian nobles, who retained their privileges, could now

rejoice in Byzantine titles. The fiscal system was for the moment left unaltered. Finally independence was guaranteed to the Church of Bulgaria; its first archbishop was a Bulgarian, though it may be noticed that his successor, Leo, was a Greek. Although at first the extent of the archbishopric of Achrída had been fixed at what it was in later years, the emperor, on the request of the archbishop, re-established the diocese on its old scale, as it was under Tsar Peter, notwithstanding that Greek dioceses, especially Thessalonica, were prejudiced thereby.

The high estimation in which the new subjects of the empire were held was clearly shown by the intermarriages of noble families with the royal Bulgarian house of the Sismanids. Thus Basilus was loyal to the principle which he had announced in his proclamation of 1020—"Although we have become lords of the country, we have maintained its privileges as inviolable." Bulgaria was linked to Byzantium only by a personal union. For the acquisition of a new province, West Bulgaria with Servia, by this energetic policy of reconciliation, and for the victory of the Greek spirit over the Bulgarian, Basilus offered his thanksgiving in the church of the Mother of God at Athens, to whom costly vessels from Achrída were dedicated.

In social matters Basilus followed in the steps of Romanus I. Lacapenus, checking most stringently the formation of large landed estates. He extended the list of the magnates who were prohibited from acquiring a village or hamlet by adding to it the members of the bodyguard, abolished the right of the magnates to acquire a title by forty years' possession, and introduced a rule requiring the production of the original title-deeds. In fact, he confiscated large estates in Cilicia and Cappadocia, commanded a speculator in land to pull down his mansion, and allotted the ground among small proprietors. The whole burden of military service was, at least for some decades, put on the shoulders of the magnates and

great landed proprietors in such a way that the rich neighbours were responsible for the outstanding taxes of the small farmers.

His attack on the system of large estates was essentially a national attack, aimed by the European element in the empire at the ring of noble landed proprietors in Asia Minor. He had, perhaps, been counselled to draw the attention of the wealthy to personal anxieties and divert it from politics by heavy taxation. Basilus by unwearied exertions had acquired districts of Armenia in Asia Minor and given them back as fiefs, and had strengthened the garrisons and fortresses in every direction. The wide extent of his acquisitions may be inferred from the new bishoprics of Keltzene. He treated the Armenian Empire, which he annexed in 1021, with the greatest leniency, so that the Armenian historian Matheus Urhaci extolled his mercy and kindness.

Armenian Empire Annexed

Under Basilus the Byzantine Empire attained not only its greatest territorial expansion, but also the zenith of domestic prosperity.

The reign of Constantine VIII. (1026-1071), in spite of his patronage of favourites, still showed the capability of repelling foreign foes, such as the Pechenegs and Arabs. His daughters, Zoë and Theodora, had some influence on the succession. An old senator, Romanus Argyropulus, was married to Zoë, and reigned as Romanus III. (1028-1034). His rôle of a crowned philosopher was ill suited to him. A remorseless persecution of the Syrian schismatics, which aroused bitterness even in the lay circles of Byzantium, drove many Syrians into the country of the Arabs. His own expedition against the Saracens ended disastrously, after he had rejected the caliph's proposals of peace. Nevertheless, the celebrated general Georgius Maniaces won Edessa.

Zoë seems to have put the emperor out of her path in favour of her paramour Michael, who, as Michael IV. (1034-1041), exercised the sovereignty in name alone; he was the brother of John, a eunuch and



BASILUS II.

He was known as "Slayer of the Bulgarians," having sent back to Tsar Samuel a captured army of 15,000 men every one of whom he had blinded, only one man in each hundred being spared one eye to lead the others home.

head of the orphanage, who became the real monarch as imperial chancellor. At any rate, the sense of the responsibilities of his great power had such effect on Michael that he was able to protect the empire against invasion. In him a zealous theologian and philosopher, who courted the society of the Theosophists, once more mounted the Byzantine throne. The Ptochiotropheion, the hall which he built in Constantinople, was a sort of refectory for the devout poor. He succeeded, with the help of large mercenary forces, in repelling the attacks of the Saracens.

The traditional recapture of Athens after a revolt against the emperor is ascribed to the northern hero Harald Hardrada, son of Sigurd; but the story springs from the erroneous interpretation of a Runic inscription on the gigantic lion in the arsenal at Venice. Thus the beautiful reflection of Athenian greatness in Icelandic ballads fades away to nothing. But it is certain that Harald fought gloriously in the years 1034 and 1035 against the Saracens on the coast of Africa and in Sicily, and against the Bulgarians on the Balkans. A yearning for his own country drove him back to

**Bulgaria
Strikes for
Independence**

the north, even when the emperor Constantine did not wish to let him go. Danger seemed threatened by the revolt of the Slavs, whose privileges, dating from Basilius, were no longer respected. A grandson of Samuel, Peter Delaenus, was proclaimed tsar of the Bulgarians, and the Albanian population now joined them, owing to the oppressive burden of imperial taxation. But Michael crushed most remorselessly the ecclesiastical independence of Bulgaria.

The arrogance of Michael V. Calaphates (1041-1042) led to the proclamation of the princesses Theodora and Zoë as empresses; and in 1042 Zoë married Constantine IX. Monomachus (1042-1054). The rebellion of the general Maniaces, who had reconquered Sicily in 1038, was suddenly ended by an accident, most fortunate for Constantine, which cost Maniaces his life. The appointment of Greeks to Armenian bishoprics, after the incorporation of the second part of the Armenian empire, provoked the bitterest hatred of the Armenians towards Byzantium, since with this policy a confiscation of the property of the Church was evidently connected. The Armenians, or some of them at least, looked to the Seljuk Turks as their

liberators. This defection became all the more important when the Oriental Church isolated herself and completely broke away from Rome in 1054. Pope Leo IX. had indeed cherished the hope that the Greek and the German emperors, being, as it were, the two arms of the Church, would annihilate the Normans. But the title, already acquired by the Church


**The Split
in the
Church**

of Constantinople, of the "hotbed of heresy," and the contention of the patriarch Michael Cerularius that he was the true oecumenical patriarch, the sovereign over the Churches of the whole world, and that the Pope, on the contrary, was only the bishop of Rome, had made bad blood. In spite of the honest efforts of the emperor Constantine to bring about a peace, the Roman legates deposited on the altar of the church of St. Sophia a Bull of excommunication against the patriarch Cerularius; the Synod, then convened, retaliated by condemning the Bull and its author. Thus the split between the churches was made irrevocable.

At Constantinople Monomachus then revived the old university for the study of law, philosophy, and philology. The moving spirit of this restoration was the author, Michael Psellus. Deeply influenced by the poetry and philosophy of the ancient Greeks, especially by Homer and Plato, he possessed a wonderful mastery of the Greek language. It is hardly astonishing that a supernatural knowledge was attributed to him when we consider his comprehensive and by no means drily encyclopædic mastery of the most diverse subjects. He donned the monk's dress and withdrew from the whirl of the capital and its intrigues to the Mysian Olympus. Then once again returning from the solitude, which could not appreciate his genius, into the crowded life of the court, he used his pen as a weapon, which he sold. He served under a succession of emperors,

**Last of the
Macedonian
Dynasty**

and became first minister under Michael VII. Parapinaces. After the death of Constantine IX. Theodora assumed the government, which she administered wisely with the help of the priest Leo Paraspondylos until the unconciliatory attitude of the patriarch Cerularius led her into violent opposition against the Church. The Macedonian dynasty became extinct with this empress, who transmitted the crown to the general Michael VI. Stratioticus.



THE UNDERGROUND BYZANTINE RESERVOIRS OF CONSTANTINOPLE

A most remarkable feature of Byzantine Constantinople still remaining are the strange underground reservoirs, vast in extent and splendidly constructed, used for the water supply in the time of the Byzantine empire. The upper picture shows one of these reservoirs empty of water, but the lower one, called the Basilica Cistern, is still in use.

EASTERN
EUROPE
TO THE FRENCH
REVOLUTION



THE
BYZANTINE
EMPIRE—V

BYZANTIUM ON THE DOWN GRADE VICISSITUDES OF THE EMPIRE UNDER THE DYNASTY OF THE COMNENI

THE rich landowner who was chosen as successor to Michael VI., Isaac I. Comnenus (1057-1059), resisted the claims of the Oriental Church, but retired himself into the monastery of Studion and entrusted to his friend, Constantine X. Ducas (1059-1067), the heavy responsibility of the throne, for which he had no special qualifications, as the result showed. Magyars, Pechenegs, Uzes were pressing forward on every side.

The decline of Byzantine prestige was reflected in a scheme for uniting the Churches. Gagik of Armenia tore up the deed of union, delivered a successful speech on the Armenian faith which was commended by Constantine, and contrived the murder of the patriarch of Caesarea as a heretic. Ani, the old royal city of the Armenians, then fell into the hands of the all-conquering Seljuks, and the Armenian nation was almost broken up. The empress-widow Eudocia at least

A Despairing Effort of Militarism

attempted, by the choice of the general Romanus IV. Diogenes, who reigned from 1067 to 1071, to effect a military reorganisation. The neglect and delay of the last years was not to be retrieved suddenly, and an army formed with worthless soldiers. In his efforts Romanus had not only the Turks to withstand, but also the whole body of courtiers and officials, who immediately undermined his position by gibes: "He expects to check the enemy's charge with a shield and to stab him dead with a cloth-yard lance, and everyone claps his hands and shouts 'Hurrah!'"

The empire of which educated classes thus ridiculed the earnest efforts was committing suicide. The treachery of Turkish mercenaries and the incompetence and treachery of Byzantine officers, allowed the battle at Mantzikert to end so disastrously for Romanus that he was completely defeated and taken prisoner. He

was, it is true, soon released, only to fall on his return into the hands of the cruel John Ducas, who raised his nephew Michael to the purple, and put out the eyes of Romanus. The battle of Mantzikert marks the definite disruption of the

The Rabble of Pretenders to the Throne

possessions of the Byzantine empire in Asia Minor. In the wild competition of local pretenders for the imperial crown, fomented by mercenary officers and Turkish machinations, the latter proved the most effective factor in the founding of the sultanate of Iconium. The prosperous era of Byzantium was then dead and gone.

The feebleness of the emperor Michael VII. Ducas Parapinaces (1071-1078), who in his difficulties applied to Pope Gregory VII. in 1073 for help against the Turks, offering to renew the old union between Rome and the daughter church of Constantinople, as well as the foolish attitude of the emperor Nicephorus III. Botaniates (1078-1081) towards the Normans, complicated the position of Byzantium, which in any case was sufficiently critical after the battle of Mantzikert. The part played by the Turks on the accession of Nicephorus was significant; troops of the sultan of Iconium, who had been won over by the adherents of Michael VII., were to fight against him, but the Turkish captain of the mercenaries of Nicephorus persuaded them to retire. Both there and in other places Turks turned

Beginnings of Turkish Aggression

the scale by their troops, which they hired out to the emperor and the pseudo-emperors.

Alexius I. Comnenus (1081-1118) succeeded in capturing Constantinople through the treachery of a German mercenary officer Hanno. A clever diplomatist and consummate general, Alexius would have been able to confront the Turks with great force had not a new foe

arisen in the person of the Norman duke Robert Guiscard, who allied himself with Pope Gregory VII. Calabria had already fallen to the enemy, and the Balkan peninsula was the prize to which Guiscard's ambition now aspired. Robert conquered large portions of Illyria. Alexius tried by large sacrifices of money to win over the emperor Henry IV., who, indeed, only turned against Robert's ally, the Pope. Church treasures were sold, and the connection of Venetian with Byzantine interests was adroitly used in a struggle against the common foe.

The Venetians, with whom a formal treaty was concluded in May, 1082, brought their ships to replace the Byzantine fleet, which had been ruined by the loss of the provinces in Asia Minor. This treaty guaranteed to them the widest commercial rights, extending to all parts of the empire — immunity from tolls, harbour dues, and other imposts, and an independent quarter in the port of Pera. This marks the beginning of the Venetian colonial dominion in the east and of the supremacy of Byzantine culture, and above all of Byzantine art, in Venice.

In return for these trading advantages it was hoped that valuable allies had been secured for the service of the empire by Byzantium. The Venetians had to pledge themselves to fight on behalf of the possessions of their allies; in 1111 the Pisans also were pledged

to allow those of their citizens who were settled in Byzantine territory to share in defending the empire against attacks. The aggressive policy of the Normans was ended temporarily by a victory of Alexius and the death of Guiscard in 1085, when the most powerful Norman prince, Roger, adopted a policy of compromise with Byzantium.

Serious dangers threatened the Byzantine empire from the Pechenegs (1088–1091); Alexius had already sustained a defeat from them. He contrived to prevent a second reverse by buying over another Turkish race, the Cumani, who first appeared in Russia in 1055, and in 1065 expelled from Atelkuzu the Pechenegs, who had earlier ousted the Hungarians. The Cumanian language happens to be known to us through the existence of a Cumanian glossary.

The partition of the Seljuk empire in 1092 gave Alexius some hope of driving out the Turks, not indeed alone, but with the help of the west. The letter, still extant, which the emperor addressed to Count Robert I. of Flanders may well contain many inaccuracies of translation, but in any case Alexius asked for help, and, among the many motives which impelled the Crusaders, his appeals may have been effective.

In 1095 the petition of Alexius for the protection of the Holy Church was read at the

Buying Turkish Friendship



CROWNING OF ROMANUS IV. AND EUDOCIA

The empress-widow Eudocia allied herself with a general in the hope of retrieving the Byzantine fortunes by military effort, but Romanus soon suffered defeat. This ancient Byzantine carving suggests that Christ crowned the unfortunate emperor and empress.

out of the current prejudice against the Greeks and to divert the dangerous attacks of the Byzantine emperor on Antioch by a crusade of Europe against Byzantium. But he could not raise the mighty storm which, in his own words, was necessary in order to uproot the lofty oak, although he preached from the pulpit in Chartres that the crusaders against Byzantium would obtain the richest towns, and often forced the conviction on minds irritated against the emperor that a successful crusade could begin only with the war against Byzantium. Owing to the energy of the Comneni a full century was still to elapse before these ideas were matured.

In the peace of 1107-1108, which followed on a severe defeat near Durazzo, Bohemund was forced to renew the oath of fealty for his sadly diminished principality of Antioch, which was to become again Greek—ecclesiastically so at once, and politically after Bohemund's death, in 1111. On the other hand, the promise of the subjection of the crusaders by Alexius had less importance. The severe defeat of the papacy, in 1111, induced Alexius then to offer the Pope protection and union in return for the imperial Roman crown, which offer Paschall II. declared possible under the proviso that Alexius subjected himself and abandoned his obduracy.

In 1100 the East Roman empire embraced the Balkan peninsula, including Bulgaria, as far as the Danube. Servia, Bosnia, and Croatia had been lost. The Southern Crimea was subject to Byzantium; the southern coast of the Black Sea, with Trebizond, was taken from Gregory, prince of Georgia, only in 1107, and he was enfeoffed with it in 1108. The islands of the Ægean Sea, Crete, Rhodes, and Cyprus, were Byzantine. This sovereignty was, it must be acknowledged, only nominal in many places. A rebellion caused by the pressure of taxation still surged in Crete and Cyprus; in Rhodes the pirates were the virtual rulers.

The charter of the monastery of Christodulus on Patmos, dating from April, 1088, shows how that island was a wilderness,

overgrown with thorns and treeless, without any buildings except a miserable chapel inside an ancient temple. Even this deserted rock was incessantly harassed by attacks of Turks and Christian pirates, who had driven St. Christodule from Mount Leros, in the vicinity of Halicarnassus, to Cos, and finally to Patmos. The old naval provinces of Asia Minor, from which the fleet was recruited, had fallen into the hands of the Turks as far as the Sea of Marmora. The Turk Tzachas, formerly in the Greek service, had with the title of emperor ruled from

Smyrna not merely over the surrounding country, but also over Chios, Samos, and the greater part of Lesbos, which became once more Byzantine only after 1092. Under such conditions we must consider it merely a faint echo of the times of greatness if the phrase "the fleet is the glory of Romania" is still heard. The population was a motley mixture.

Traders flocked together from every quarter of the world, not merely into the capital, but to the October fair at Thessalonica, and to Halmyrus. The great traveller, the Jew Benjamin of Tudela, testifies to this state of things at Byzantium under Manuel: "Merchants from Bagdad, Mesopotamia, Media, Persia, Egypt, Palestine, Russia, Hungary, the country of the Pechenegs, Italy, and Spain." The Greek population had then revived, and lived in crowded villages and towns. Arcadia, Lacedæmon, Astypalaia, Achrida, Joannina, Castoria, Larissa, Platamuna, Cytros, Dyrrhachium, Chimara, Buthroton, Corcyra, are mentioned as Greek towns by the Arab Edrisi, who wrote at the commission of Roger II.

Slavonic immigrations had almost submerged the old Greek race. Jewish colonists, Albanians, and Wallachians pushed their way into the Greek peninsula. A province of Thessaly was called Great Wallachia, and we find Wallachians in the army. The cities of Western Italy began slowly to plant their colonies in the crevices of this tottering empire. The disintegrating force of this luxuriant foreign growth must not be under-estimated when we consider the progress of Byzantine

**Wonderful
Cosmopolitanism
of Byzantium**



ALEXIUS

Who restored the Byzantine power for a time in union with the Venetians near the close of the 11th century. From old Greek manuscript.

decay. It is not the profit-making powers of trade that we must consider, but that of the colonial system, which ventured to work in the sinking Byzantine empire with its own surplus of capital and surplus of hands. The system of forced labour, which employed the former Byzantine serfs as if they were slaves, created for the Italian communities those riches which we should never comprehend as a result of the Levant trade alone.


John II. Comnenus (1118-1143), also called John the Handsome, averted by his moderation the ambitious efforts of his sister Anna to place on the throne her husband Nicephorus Bryennius the younger; he also fought with success against the Pechenegs in 1122, the Servians in 1123, and the Hungarians, and in Asia against the Seljuks (1126-1137), and Armenians (1137). The treaty of 1108 was renewed, in 1137, with Raymond of Poitou, successor of Bohemund II., on the terms that Antioch should be surrendered to the Greek throne, but that a territory on Turkish soil, Aleppo and the petty towns on the Upper Orontes—still, however, to be conquered—should be ceded to Raymond as a hereditary fief.

The action of the emperor against Antioch was sharply censured by Pope Innocent II. in the Bull of 1138; the Latins were ordered to withdraw from his company and his service. The Byzantine clergy then felt the widening of the gulf which separated them from the papacy. "The Pope is Emperor and no Pope," said a

**The Greeks
Reject
Rome's Claims**

Greek who was staying at Monte Cassino; and the archbishop of Thessalonica bluntly rejected the claim of Rome "to send her orders thus from on high," since the Greeks, "to whom the knowledge of science, the learning of their masters, and the brilliant intellects of Hellenism were useless," thus became slaves. Gentle and wise, never enforcing

a death penalty, thrifty, since he curtailed the luxury of the court and left behind him a well-filled treasury, John enhanced the glory of the empire and extended its frontiers. Only Italy was definitely given up; Naples, the last possession of Byzantium on Italian soil, became Norman in



THE BYZANTINE WALLS OF ANTIOCH

1138. The attempt to withdraw from the iron grip of Venice proved a failure, since the latter proceeded to ravage the islands.

The ideas of West European chivalry united with Byzantine culture and statesmanship in the person of the fourth son of the emperor John, Manuel I. Comnenus (1143-1180). We cannot appeal to the testimony of the hack-poet, Theodoros Prodromos, who wrote witty and pleasing verse on everything which could bring money to his purse; but we have better

authorities in the historians Cinnamus, a soldier skilful in his profession, and Nicetas Acominatus. The rash daring with which the emperor, escorted by two faithful followers, made his way through a dense Turkish army, charged alone with the standard against the Hungarian ranks, and after the crossing of the Save did not actually burn his boats but sent them

**Chivalry
of the
Emperor**

back; his return with four Turks bound to his saddle-bow: his acceptance of a challenge to single combats in honour of his wife; and the skill with which, in the lists at Antioch, he hurled two Latin knights out of their saddles—all this brought him nearer to the western chivalry. He seemed to be an Occidental among the Greeks.

And in admirable harmony with the whole picture is his German wife, Bertha of Sulzbach, sister-in-law of Conrad III., who, in defiance of the stately etiquette of the Byzantine senate and court, gave expression to her joyful admiration of her heroic husband. Even the superstitious liking for astrology,

which the emperor defended in a treatise of his own composition, forms a natural pendant to this. Natives of the west received high posts in the army and the government. The great western shield and the long lances were now introduced into Byzantium.

The way seemed paved for a reconciliation between east and west, and at this price the Roman and Greek Churches, according to Manuel's views, might be united under a Roman primate. Pope Alexander III. lent a willing ear to these proposals, so long as he found himself in conflict with Emperor Frederick I. Barbarossa (1161). Then the cardinal-presbyter William of Pavia spoke, quite in the Byzantine spirit, of the oppression which the tyranny of the barbarians had brought on the Church since the name of emperor had been arrogated by them.

In this sense the sanguine spirit of Manuel was understood when he wished, in the year 1175, to win the co-operation of the west by a new crusade. But the Greek clergy were quite opposed to the union, and the parallel of the wandering sheep was indignantly repudiated by the Greek Church with the remark that it had not added anything to the creed. The clouds in the west lowered threateningly. Barbarossa at the end of 1177 wrote to the emperor Manuel that not merely the Roman imperium, but also the Greek empire, must be at his beck and call and administered under his suzerainty. In the theory of "the two swords" there was no room for a Greek empire; Frederick even offered his services as an arbiter in the ecclesiastical disputes of the Greek Church.

Thus in the west, twenty-seven years before the annihilation of the Greek empire, political doctrines were started which simply denied the existence of the Greek crown. It was of little importance, then, in view of the failure to win over the Curia and to conduct successfully the diplomatic war against the western empire, that Manuel had his own party in Rome, Venice, Dalmatia, and Hungary, or that he hoped to gain the crusading states by great undertakings on their behalf, and the goodwill of the Latins generally by trade

**No Room
for a Greek
Empire**


concessions, or the education of Ragusan nobles at the cost of the state. The calamitous defeat near the sources of the Mæander, at Myriocephalon, in 1176, which Manuel sustained at the hands of Izz ed-din Kilij-Arslan, was, it is true, quickly retrieved by two great victories, but the intense energy of Manuel was broken. The ascendancy of Barbarossa and his own defeat show that his life-work as a statesman and a soldier had not been successful.

Under Alexius II. (1180-1183), a minor for whom his mother Maria of Antioch governed, the smouldering hatred of the Greeks for the Latins burst into flame. The unscrupulous exactions of labour-service and money imposed by the Occidentals were terribly avenged on May 2nd, 1182. Andronicus I. Comnenus, the Alcibiades of the Middle Byzantine empire, stirred up this rebellion, and, as a liberator, occupied the highest place in the empire in 1183, first as co-regent, and after the murder of Alexius, in 1184, as sole ruler. A favourite with women, of infatuating personal charm, an orator whose flood of eloquence no hearer could resist, an admirable general, a distinguished administrator of the empire, whose great landowners and feudal nobility he remorselessly attacked, he was the most exemplary of rulers, and the most unscrupulous of men in his private life.

Once more the administration was to be altered, bureaucracy terminated, and the refractory grandes crushed with iron strength and condemned for high treason. But when the avenging massacre of the Latins at Thessalonica on August 24th, 1185, and the restriction of the games exasperated the people, Isaac Angelus, who had been spared during the proscription, was chosen emperor on September 12th, 1185, after turbulent meetings of the electors.

Thus ended the era of peace in which "every man sat quietly under the shade of his own vine and fig-tree," in which canals and aqueducts had been planned, taxes lessened, and the population of the empire amazingly augmented. The scenes after the fall of Andronicus, when the mob robbed and pillaged in the palace, the arsenal, and the church, as if in an enemy's country, throw a lurid light on the condition of the capital.

**End of
the Era
of Peace**



FALL OF THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE AND ITS INFLUENCE ON THE WEST THE TRIUMPHS OF THE VENETIAN REPUBLIC

THE reigns of Isaac II. Angelus (1185–1195) and his brother Alexius III. (1195–1203) mark the complete decline of the empire. The mob and the capital played the chief rôle. The weakness of the government, which could no longer ward off plundering inroads, was apparent to all its subjects. The collection of taxes on the marriage of Isaac II. weighed especially heavily on the Bulgarians and Wallachians. Peter and John Asen, two brothers of the old stock of the Bulgarian tsars, who had grown up among the Wallachians and were familiar with their language and beloved by the people, took advantage of political discontent and religious enthusiasm to stir up revolt; Peter became tsar of the Bulgarians and Greeks in 1185. The new empire was supported by the Servian prince Nemanja. The alliance with Frederick Barbarossa did not indeed lead, as had been hoped, to a recognition of the imperial style, and the Servian king, Stephen II. Nemanja, was defeated by Isaac in 1194, while John was murdered in 1196, and his brother Peter in 1197; but nevertheless Caloian (1197–1207) was able to rule over a realm which extended from Belgrade to the Lower Maritza and Agathopolis, from the mouths of the Danube to the Strymon and the Upper Vardar.

**Complete
Decline of
the Empire**

The imperial army of Isaac, whose commander, Alexius Branas, proclaimed himself emperor, was defeated by Conrad of Montserrat, with a force composed of Franks, Varangians, Turkish and Georgian mercenaries. The non-Greeks already decided the destinies of Byzantium. The army, which already was mostly non-Greek, was strengthened by colonists and Hungarian mercenaries abroad. The defeat of Adrianople, as well as the crusade of the emperor Barbarossa, showed the complete feebleness of the generals and the army. Of the former dominions of the

empire Macedonia and Thrace were in the possession of the Bulgarians. Corfu, Cephallenia, Zacynthus were held by Margaritone of Brindisi, who was first an admiral of Tancred's, then a pirate on his own account. A tribute of fifty and later of fifteen hundredweights of gold was asked by the emperor Henry VI.

**The
Privileged
Pirates**

for the territory from Dyrrhachium to Thessalonica. The fabric of the empire was cracking in every joint. Archons rose up in particular towns and districts, and exercised a completely independent sovereignty. Where imperial officials, "privileged pirates," still governed or appeared, they only extorted taxes for Byzantium, for themselves, and for a retinue of rapacious underlings, so that—as in the period of the *taille* under Louis XIV.—the inhabitants preferred to leave the fields uncultivated and fled.

Archbishop Michael Acominatus of Athens, a native of Asia Minor, unfolds a thrilling picture of that age of misery. He gallantly defended the Acropolis against the Archon Leo Sgurus of Nauplia, and asserted the privileges of his residence, which no one now respected. Although Athens still retained a reflection of her renown, so that the king of Georgia sent there yearly twenty youths for education—among them the Georgian poet Lota Rustavell—and although the Englishman John of Basingstoke, later archdeacon of Leicester, praises his ever-to-be-remembered Athenian instructor Constantina as a model of learning, yet the pupils of this Greek culture, of which Acominatus—if we believe his lament over his rustication in Athens—detected little trace, are for the most part aliens.

**Athens
Still Draws
Scholars**

Alexius III. in 1195 ordered his brother Isaac to be blinded and Isaac's son Alexius to be imprisoned. The fear he entertained of his brother-in-law, Philip of Suabia, is

shown by the treaty of 1198 with Venice, by the terms of which the Venetians were forced to pledge themselves to protect Byzantium even against the German king. The rights of the Venetian consul were then fixed. As he exercised civil and criminal jurisdiction over the Venetians, we may date from this treaty the origin of consular jurisdiction. Alexius III. was, nevertheless, foolish enough to infringe the treaty on his side. Continual demands for tolls were made of the Venetians, and alliances with Pisa and Genoa formed a leading feature of Byzantine policy.

The young Alexius (IV.) fled by way of Rome to the court of Philip, who then sent envoys to Venice, where princes were already collected in considerable numbers for the Fourth Crusade. The prospect of reward, the consciousness of supporting the legitimate heir, and the hope of ecclesiastical union induced everyone to vote that Alexius, who promised military support to the crusade, together with provisions and the expenses of the fleet, should be raised to the throne. The Venetians made use of the crusading army to effect the capture of Zara. They also received from the emperor-elect the guarantee of a trade monopoly. Thus it was proposed that outstanding disputes should be definitely settled by installing a friendly emperor. Byzantium fell on July 17th, 1203.

Alexius III. fled, and Alexius IV. was placed by the Latins at the side of his father, Isaac, who was now released from prison. Disputes, partly between the Latins and Mohammedans on account of the mosque which Isaac had built for the latter, partly between the mob and the colonists, formed the prelude to the vast conflagration which devastated Constantinople from the 21st to the 24th of August. But Alexius IV. could hardly meet his financial obligations, much less dissuade the Greeks from their hatred of the Latins. For him also the day came when the demands which were presented to him nettled his pride, and the words of Enrico Dandolo, the Doge, "Shameful wretch, from the mire we raised you; into the mire we shall push you back again!" cast a terrible light on his position.

The national reaction brought to the front Alexius V. Murzuphlu (the Stammerer), who ordered Alexius IV. to be strangled in his dungeon, and expressly

declared his readiness to die rather than support the expedition against the Holy Land or promote the promised union of the Churches. Then the Occidentals decided on the partition of the empire. The Venetians retained their old commercial privileges. Each party appointed six electors for the election of the emperor, who received a quarter of the empire. The other parts, as already agreed, fell to the Venetians and the Franks. The church of St. Sophia and the election of the patriarch were given to the nation, to which the emperor did not belong. The division of the fiefs and organisation of the feudal system rested with a council of twelve members. The capture of the city was postponed for another year, and the consent of the Pope was obtained.


On April 12th, 1203, some towers were stormed by the crews of two ships; a city gate was burst open by Peter of Amiens; and while Byzantium was burning the emperor fled, having vainly called on his citizens to resist. Even Theodore Lascaris, newly elected in St. Sophia, was forced to escape across the Bosphorus. Unparalleled horrors of devastation, pillage, murder, and rape raged through the streets. The foreign colonists took the bitterest revenge. Two thousand citizens fell, and the terrible scene was ended only by the eclipse of the moon on April 16th. Never before can so many monuments of classical antiquity have been destroyed as then. All the statues of bronze in the Hippodrome were melted down and coined into money. There perished then the works of art in the Hippodrome, the colossal statue of Hera of Samos, the obelisk of brass with the female figure turning at the slightest breath of wind, Bellerophon with Pegasus, the eagle and the snake, the sphinx, river-horse and crocodile, the charioteers, Paris handing the apple to Aphrodite. Only the splendid horses of Lysippus were rescued by the Doge, Enrico Dandolo, and conveyed to Venice.

Byzantine culture, especially art, exercised in this, as in the preceding period, a widespread influence on the west. Greek artists are frequently mentioned in our authorities as transmitting this influence. It is obvious that the east still held an intellectual sway over Illyria and Dalmatia, that ancient debatable land of western and eastern civilisation; Ragusa

Treaty with Venice

Reign of Terror in Byzantium

The Doge Threatens the Emperor



BATTLE OF ZARA: VENETIANS, ASSISTED BY CRUSADING ALLIES, SUBDUING THE TOWN ON THEIR WAY TO CONSTANTINOPLE
Zara was the scene of numerous battles, as it was continually rebelling against the authority of the Venetians. When the Venetians, under the Doge Enrico Dandolo, set out for the Fourth Crusade with all the chivalry of Europe, they cunningly got the crusading army to help them in the capture of Zara, though the Crusaders had no concern with Zara.

From the painting by Tintoretto.

supplies a striking proof of this in Greek surnames and expressions. The great field, then, for Byzantine influences is naturally Italy. Greek painters (Theophylactus, 959; Eustathius, 1020) worked at the frescoes of Carpignano at Otranto—one delicately executed and one rather rough figure of Christ. If we disregard the

vague tradition which speaks of architects being summoned from Constantinople to Venice by the Doge Pietro Orseolo in the year 1000, in order to remodel San Marco, we find in Leo of Ostia a quite trustworthy account of the employment of Byzantine artists by Abbot Desiderius of Monte Cassino in 1066. Apparently the walls of the apse and the vestibule of the basilica were ornamented with mosaics, and the floor with tessellated marble, by Byzantine artists; in fact, we can prove that a complete school of arts and crafts was set up by Desiderius under the influence of Byzantium. According to the chronicle of the monk Amatus of Monte Cassino, Desiderius also called in Arab artists from Alexandria. We cannot be surprised that Byzantine costumes were retained in the decorations of the church of Sant' Angelo in Formis, which Desiderius built.

The Byzantine influences in the baptistery of Parma certainly go back to the twelfth century. Greek painters—for example, a certain Kalojohannes—are mentioned in the year 1143 as working in the neighbourhood of Padua. In connection with the cathedral at Pisa the Greek architect Buschetos may be named, and to him may be referred the cruciform shape, the unusual length of the transepts, and the polychrome decoration of the exterior. The transmission of funds for the completion of the cathedral is expressly mentioned by the emperor Alexius I. in the year 1099. The direct export of works of art from Byzantium to Italy is proved by a series of bronze church gates, on the

bronze plates of which designs are executed in low relief overlaid with silver. Such gates we find in the church of St. Paul outside Rome, cast in 1070 by Stauracius; and in others, including St. Mark's at Venice.

Byzantium created two complete provinces of art on Italian soil. This is attested not so much by our literary authorities as by the works themselves. Of these provinces, Venice was one;

Southern Italy and Sicily formed the other. The first summons of Greek mosaic artists to Venice can be proved to have been given in 1153 to Marcus Indriomeni. But the church of St. Mark, altered from a basilica into a domed building on the model of the church of the Holy Apostles, the whole Venetian style of church architecture with its Byzantine splendour of gold and marble, and the Doge's palace with its bright upper walls, show us how Byzantium has supplied here the essential forms of Venetian art, and how these were gracefully combined with Gothic and Arabic models.

In the case of Sicily, with its large Greek population, its Greek liturgy, its Greek law—for example, the strong influence of the Ekloge of Leo and Constantine, and the Greek chancery of its Norman kings—it is of course obvious that there existed countless ties of union with Byzantium. The permanent residence of Byzantine artists in Messina is attested by edicts of the archbishops of Messina. Numerous silk-weavers from Corinth, Thebes, and Athens were brought to

Palermo in 1154 by King Roger of Sicily, in order that the "celebrated art" might spread to the west. We may assume bronze-workers from Byzantium for the gates of the Capella Palatina, and can prove their employment on the great bell of the cathedral; and many other examples of the direct influence of Oriental art may be named.

Greek merchants and artists, Greek monks, Greek envoys, and Greek princesses travelled along the Danube on the old Byzantine trade route. The merchants brought Greek textiles, ivory carvings, goldsmith's work, book bindings, and enamels. Greek painters and architects evinced proofs of old artistic skill; Greek envoys negotiated family alliances, such as the marriage of the Byzantine Theophano with Otto II. in 972; and an elaborate court ceremonial was introduced by the Greek princess and her suite. As before, artistic woven fabrics were sent in quantities from Byzantium to the west. The diptychs in the Green Vault at Dresden and at Hanover, the reliquary of the cross at Cortona, the triptych of Harbaville in the Louvre, the covers of the Gospel-books belonging to Count Stroganov and the Barberini Palace, show the appreciation of the west for Byzantine ivory work.



THE TAKING OF CONSTANTINOPLE BY THE VENETIANS AND CRUSADERS


The capture of the Byzantine capital was no part of the business of the Fourth Crusade, but the wily Venetians were chief in contriving that the crusading army should capture the city, which fell to them on July 17th, 1203. The world-famous bronze horses which adorn the front of St. Mark's at Venice were rescued from the awful ruin of Constantinople's art treasures which took place in the reign of rapine that preceded by a few months the capitulation of the city.

From the painting by Tintoretto

German masters had already imitated Byzantine models, as is shown by the ivory carvings of the Echternach book of gospels with the Byzantine Christ, with which the delicately-executed border designs of a Byzantine goldsmith are in striking contrast. Byzantine goldsmiths' work influenced the gold ring of Lorsch. Abbot Salmann of Lorsch, an abbey the façade of which bears a surprising resemblance to those of the Doge's palace at Venice and the Tekfur-Serai in Constantinople, introduced book bindings of Byzantine origin. Byzantine enamel work was well known and popular, as is shown by a description of the process of smelting and of glass mosaic in the book of the monk Theophilus.

Painting in general first influenced the

west through the medium of Byzantine illumination. This in some essential principles furnished a model for the Rhenish school of painters, which in other respects must be considered as under the influence of early Christian and Syro-Egyptian art; in the Egbert Psalter of Trèves, about 980, Greek models are followed in colouring and arrangement of figures. In the eleventh century, on the contrary, Regensburg, so far as the style of colour and form in dress and figure was concerned, had become a stronghold of Byzantinism, exhibiting everywhere Oriental patterns, in the Sacrament-book of Henry II., in the Book of Scriptural Extracts in the Munich library, and in the Vota-Evangelium of Niedermünster with its flat style and Byzantine foliage.



CHAPEL OF NORMAN KINGS AT PALERMO
A notable example of Byzantine influences in the west

Salzburg then made similar copies, as the custodian Berthold shows in his manuscript account of the foundation of St. Peter's.

The Thuringian and Saxon school of painting undertook to develop Oriental motifs. The illuminated manuscript of the abbess Herrad of Landsberg shows Byzantine types in the Nativity, the Annunciation, and other scenes. The miniatures of the Gospel-book of Goslar and of the Halberstadt Missal, and the Byzantinised frescoes in the churches at Newerk and Frankenberg, date from the period subsequent to the Latin sack of Constantinople, when art treasures in profusion were disseminated over the west. Westphalia must have become a focus of such influence, which expressed itself in the course of the century in pictures and Antependia. The genealogical tree of Christ from the root of Jesse, Christ as judge of the world, and the prophets and patriarchs on the wooden ceiling of the central nave of St. Andrew's Church at Hildesheim are deeply imbued with the Byzantine spirit.

We may assume that Italy early

adopted the Byzantine technique of painting, and, by the thirteenth century, the Byzantine tradition of landscape drawing. Eastern influence is far less conspicuous in the domain of architecture, to the earlier period of which seems to belong the choir chapel of Lorsch, which we have already mentioned. The chapel of St. Bartholomew's Church at Paderborn was certainly built under Bishop Meinwerk (1009-1036) by Greeks. We see in the art of the Ruthenians—for instance, in the Franciscan church of Halicz—how Byzantine ideas contended on the soil of modern Austria-Hungary with western tendencies.

Influences of Oriental sculpture can be seen in Quedlinburg, Bamberg, Strassburg, and Rheims. Links of connection can be traced between Byzantium and Southern France—for example, at Toulouse and Vézelay. The relations of Byzantine with Spanish art are obscure; notwithstanding the investigations of Lamperez. The tomb of Princess Constantina, a daughter of John III. Vatatzes, belongs to a later era.



BYZANTINE BOOK COVER FOR GOSPELS
Richly carved in ivory with a border of pearls and precious stones



Photo: Giraudon


THE BEAUTIFUL HARBAVILLE DIPTYCH, A BYZANTINE WORK OF THE XIth CENTURY
 Byzantine culture, especially art, had a widespread influence on the west from the tenth to the thirteenth century, and this fine diptych, now in the Louvre, is an example of western appreciation for the beautiful ivory work of Byzantium.

An imperishable impression was made upon those natives of the west who visited the enchanted city of the east, and saw the splendour of its churches and palaces, by the court ceremonial, which bound even the emperor in its chains. Just as at an earlier period the imperial dress—the crown with the cross, and the coronation shoes—so now the court ceremonial of the west had been in many ways, especially after the marriage of Otto II. with Theophano, affected by Byzantine institutions. The customs of the east were copied both in earnest and in jest; court dwarfs even appeared in the west, such as are proved to have existed at the time of the murder of Nicephorus Phocas in the tenth century, and of Constantine Manasses in the twelfth.

There is, however, room to doubt the statement, confidently as it is made, that changes were produced in western strategy owing to the force of Byzantine example. It is true, the triple-attack theory, which the Emperor Leo's

"Tactica" advised, was subsequently adopted for the French and German battle array; and for the two flank divisions, a formation first demonstrable under Henry IV. at Nāgelstädt in 1075, an eastern model is equally presupposed. But the alleged observance of this rule by mercenary commanders in the case of Italy in 940 must be compared with a real application of it in the engagements of 921 and 990 by France, and in those of 1075, 1106, 1128, and 1167 by Germany, besides which the fact of the appearance of the triple-attack system in 843 forbids us to look for its source in the "Tactica," supposing that this treatise is the work of Leo VI.

In conclusion, we may point out how the enlightenment of Byzantium spreads over the Slavonic world as far as the Finno-Ugrian races and the Carelians and Mordwines. On the other side, Byzantine suggestions reached Moravia and Bohemia (between Neuhof and Rabstein), where the stone-masons make crosses whose arms taper from the centre to the ends.



AN EMPIRE IN RUINS

THE END OF BYZANTIUM AND RISE OF THE TURK

THE residence of Alexius V. was at Tzurulon; farther to the west was the seat of the sovereignty of Alexius III. at Mosynopolis. Leo Sgurus had pressed on to Thessaly. The cousin of Alexius III. was lord of the despotic monarchy of Epirus from Naupactus to Dyrrhachium, Cephallenia, Zante, Ithaca, Santa Maura,

**Many
Small States
Rise Up**

Baxo. In Asia the grandson of Andronicus I., Alexius Comnenus, with the help of his brother David and Queen Thamar of Georgia, had founded the empire of Trebizond, which embraced the coast district of Pontus and Paphlagonia and the Crimea. The Venetians received a strip of country from Adrianople to the Propontis, the coast from Perinthus to Sestos, the islands of the Ægean Sea with Crete, a large portion of Morea with the harbours of Modona and Patras, the coast from the Ionian islands to Dyrrhachium. The Podesta of the Venetian colony in Constantinople became an imperial dignitary and exercised the rights of a sovereign.

For the kingdom of Thessalonica, westward of Nestus, King Bonifacio had to fight against Leo Sgurus and his ally Alexius III. He easily succeeded in the case of Athens and Thebes—both entrusted to Otto de la Roche—but in the case of the Peloponnese, only with the help of Godfrey of Villehardouin and William of Champlitte. The successes of the Emperor Baldwin's brother Henry, the most pleasing figure among the Latins, and of Louis of Blois against Lascaris, are important,

**Fire and
Sword
At Work**

until finally, the boundless hatred of the Greeks for the Latins cemented an alliance with the Tsar Joannisza of Bulgaria. The Emperor Baldwin was taken prisoner in the battle of Adrianople on April 15th, 1205. Fire and sword then did their work. The prisoners were sacrificed to the gods; towns like Philippopolis were levelled to the ground. Then Henry, the new vice-regent of the empire, styled emperor, after August 20th, 1206, tried

to use the ill-will of the Greeks toward the Bulgarians to effect a peace between Greeks and Latins. Theodore Vranas, a friend to the Latins, became lord of Adrianople and Didymoteichos.

The most gifted of the "Romans," the hope of the Greek nobility and clergy which had assembled in Nicæa, Theodore Lascaris, crowned emperor in 1206, was now the mark of friend and foe. Since he was threatened on the one side by David Comnenus, who in the summer of 1206 had become a vassal of the Latin emperor, and on the other hand by the Seljuk Sultan Ghayath ed-din Kai Khusrau of Iconium, who had received Alexius III., he had not shrunk from calling in the help of the Bulgarian scourge of the Latins. After the murder of Joannisza before Thessalonica on October 9th, 1207, that empire split up.

May 2nd, 1210, saw the parliament of Greece meet in the valley of Ravennika, near Zeitun or Lamia. The following was

**Strife of
Parties in
the Capital**

the result of the arrangement and confirmation of the territories. The French were left as the virtual possessors of Greece proper; the prince of the whole of Achæa was William of Champlitte. The twelve lords of Morea were all Frenchmen. Athens and Thebes were under Saint Omer and Otto de la Roche; Amphissa was in the possession of the Stromoncourts. The Lombards had occupied Macedonia and Thessaly with Eubœa, where the dalle Carceri had settled; the Pallavicini resided in Bodonitza in Thermopylæ; on the other hand, Venice had chosen the island for herself, and possessed a colony and the patriarchate in Constantinople. The Flemings, lastly, were in possession of the capital and the empire. In the capital, under the first Emperor Baldwin, the Greek element had been momentarily thrust into the background, while his statesmanlike brother Henry clearly saw the necessity of bringing Byzantium into close touch with the government.

The stratum of Frankish knights and Italian colonists was imposed upon the Greek, Slavonic, and Armenian settlers of the Balkan peninsula. It was a strange mixture of nationalities, of social and political institutions. A vivid picture of this absorption of two foreign civilisations is presented to us by the chronicle of the Morea, composed in its most ancient form in the Greek vernacular after 1300. The writer of the chronicle was certainly a true Frank, since otherwise he would have had Greek sympathies.

The Greek spirit and the Frankish spirit were indeed long opposed one to the other. There were at first but isolated instances of mixed marriages; but slowly and surely the Frankish feudal system with all its expressions forced its way into the Greek life and language. The court life of the Frankish principalities was magnificently developed. Godfrey II. of Villehardouin was always followed by eighty knights with golden spurs; eight hundred of the flower of the chivalry of Western Europe lived at the court of William II. of Villehardouin. Twelve families were lords over the Greek and Slavonic peasants in

Morea. Through the strict enforcement of Frankish feudalism the last relics of a free peasantry disappeared from Greece. Frankish castles rose up on the spurs of mountain ranges and on hills which fell away precipitously on every side. Misithra first of all, built on an outlying ridge of Taygetus with an octagonal wall of circumvallation, and guarded by strong towers; then Acova in North Arcadia, on a hill 1,914 feet high, which commands the valley of the Alpheus, and with it the high road of the peninsula of Carytena; and lastly the most complete mediæval fortress, Gritzena, between Ira and Ithome, vast battlemented lines of walls, behind which rise round and pointed towers.

Churches were erected in a peculiar early Gothic style. We may instance Sancta Sophia in Andravida, and Isova above the left bank of the Alpheus, where Gothic lancet windows are inserted in the plain windows of the former Greek church, and eight-ribbed capitals falteringly express some artistic capabilities. A stirring life of jousts and tournaments was developed; troubadours came on the scene, and the singing matches of the palaces aroused the echoes of the valleys. The Franks, with their superiority in

military science, were responsible for the introduction of many new military terms.

In compensation the Frankish knights in Morea after a few decades spoke the Greek vernacular; this is proved by the general statement of the chronicle of the Morea, and also by the exclamation of Godefroi de Brières in the battle of Boula

Lagos in 1259: "We speak one tongue." But the thought of the terrible sack of Constantinople in 1204 had sunk too deeply into the hearts of the Greeks to allow them to be won over. The deep religious difference prevented the hatred of the Latin movement from slumbering, especially among the monks and the clergy. The latter now seemed to be real supporters of the Greek nation. The letter from the clergy to Theodoros Lascaris, in which they urge him as the lawful monarch to enter Constantinople as soon as possible, shows that the Nicæan dynasty, which had fled to the Asiatic side of the empire, were regarded as the legitimate rulers of Byzantium. Thus, the house of the Latin empire was built on shifting quicksands. Morea might, indeed, long appear to the West European chivalry as a training ground in knightly practices and attract the younger generation, but the Latin empire itself had fallen so soon as the fact was realised in the west that it was less competent than the Greek empire had been to provide the Crusades with a base of operations.

The new ground for Frankish chivalry became naturally the theatre for adventures, just as Byzantium itself was an enchanted land. In a Greek region which was saturated with Frankish culture a Greek composed the epic of Belthandros and Chrisantza. The epic of Lybistos and Rhodanne sprang more directly from the soil of a Græco-Frankish mixed civilisation. Rhodes, or rather Cyprus, must have produced these verses instinct with

warm feeling. Less importance attaches to the translation of French romances such as "The Old Knight," or an Italian adaptation of "Flore and Blancheflur" (Phlorios and Platziaphlora).

The west, carried on by religious fervour, chivalrous valour, the joy in cheerful daring and success, introduced its organisation into the other parts of the former Byzantine empire. Armenia, whose monarch, Leo II., styled himself "King by

Frankish Feudalism in Greece

Greek Hatred of the Latins

The East Copies Western Feudalism

the grace of the Papal Chair and the Emperor," consciously copied the feudalism of the west. It was not till long after Roman feudal expressions and institutions had acquired their right of domicile, as in Greece, and French barons had been filling all the offices at court and playing a more important rôle than

**An Era of
Great Trading
Colonies**

the native nobility, that at last the really French family of the Lusignians (1345 and 1370) mounted the Armenian throne. The exceedingly prosperous middle class of the west established itself firmly in the domains of the former Byzantine empire. The splendid position of Tyre had remained still unimpaired.

The heights of Lebanon, still rustling with forests of cedar and cypress, looked down upon a busy life, thriving trade, and flourishing industries. Venetians, Genoese and Pisans had their own quarters; their trading colonies, under the authority of a magistrate, were grouped round the custom-house and warehouses, where the goods of Western Asia and China were stored. Flotillas, called in Arabic caravans, fetched away twice yearly to their homes the rich merchandise, as well as the produce and fruits of the fertile soil. To the Italian colonists were assigned rich tracts of ground in the open country, where Syrian peasants cultivated sugar plantations and vineyards and planted oranges, figs, and almonds. In the towns themselves, especially in Tyre, purple-dye works and glass manufactories still flourished. Silk factories satisfied the western craving for luxury with costly white stuffs. Italian towns sprang up in Armenia; the Venetians owned an entire quarter in Mohammedan Aleppo. In this way were created colonial empires on the widest scale, which made the fullest use of the native population.

Theodore I. Lascaris, first as despot in Nicæa, then as emperor, thoroughly learned the art of playing off the different powers one against the other, and of employing for his own ends Seljuks, Bulgarians, and Franks. A battle at Antioch on the Mæander in the early summer of 1211 had reduced the Seljuks to great straits; it had been largely decided by the single combat between the emperor and Kai Khusrau. The Duke of Naxos, Marco Sanudo, his son-in-law, was captured. The successor of Lascaris was his

second son-in-law. John III., Ducas Batatzes (1222-1254). He obtained in 1224 Adrianople, and in 1234 the king of Bulgaria, John Asen II., as allies against the Frankish state, and by a successful arrangement with Demetrius Angelus of Epirus he reduced that country to the condition of a province.

Without any doubt, all who made any pretension to higher culture in Byzantium had fled from the barbarism of the Latin empire to Nicæa, to the court of that Theodore II. Lascaris, who, in spite of bodily infirmity, showed an extraordinary vigour of mind. The first step towards a complete revival of Greek life was taken from the soil of Asia Minor. Nicephorus Blemmydes, the greatest scholar of his age, had brought up and educated the crown prince Theodore. Before his accession Theodore seemed gentle and impressionable, meek when blamed by his master, and inclined to the tranquil life of a scholar. As emperor (1254-1258) he appears fully conscious of his powers, strong in spite of his infirmity, and keenly aware of the isolation of Hellenism. He retained his gentleness and solicitude for

**Revival
of
Hellenism**

friends, especially for his counsellor Georgios Mutzalon, but with stern resolution refused to "be humble, or relax the vigour of his rule." He suppressed the Slavonic movement under the tsar Michael Asen, after a brilliant campaign, by the peace of 1256.

Michael Palæologus as "Despotes" took over the regency for his son John IV. Lascaris until he was proclaimed on January 1st, 1259, as co-emperor.

On August 15th, 1261, Michael VIII. Palæologus made his entry into Constantinople. Michael needed all his strategic abilities to hold his ground against the Latins of the Morea, against Epirus, the Servians, and Bulgarians, and against Charles of Anjou. Not merely did he in a war against Michael II. Angelus of Epirus obtain possession of Joannina, 1265, and at the beginning of April, 1281, checkmate Charles of Anjou in a battle at Berat, but he showed a masterly diplomatic skill, which played the Genoese off against the Venetians, roused enemies on every side against Anjou, and excluded the Curia from the war against Byzantium.

A union with the papacy was intended to effect the expulsion of the Occidentals from every Byzantine region,

to annihilate the western barbarians, and prevent any attack in the future. The Sicilian monarchy and the Curia were struggling for Byzantium, which was itself the first to profit by this struggle. Compared with that time, 1261, when William of Villehardouin proclaimed a crusade against Byzantium and the Pope commanded the cause to be preached in France, Poland, and Aragon, and wished to devote to that end a tax for three years imposed on the young clerics, what a change was visible on July 6th, 1274! The creed of Greeks and Latins was once more sung in common, and the Greek envoys were sent to announce in public places the participation of the Greek emperor in a crusade. The union of the two Churches had been accomplished by the recognition of the papal primacy, and of the doctrine of the Double Procession, and of the use of unleavened wafers in the sacrament—a result which, as Pope Gregory X. said, “no one had considered possible without secular compulsion.”

The Greek clergy certainly resisted strongly any union under such conditions, but Michael knew how to suppress them.

To Renew the Latin Empire The patriarch of Bulgaria and the primate of Servia also submitted, and were now, by ecclesiastical incorporation in the Roman empire, once again more firmly linked to Byzantium. The powerful alliance which Charles of Anjou concluded at Orvieto on July 3rd, 1281, in order to renew the Latin empire, seemed to involve considerable dangers; it was intended, with the help of Venice and Philip of Courtenay—the titular Latin emperor, son of Baldwin II. and son-in-law of Charles—and with the co-operation of the Curia, to “restore the power of the Apostolic Chair.” Charles had already ordered the siege train for the investment of Constantinople, and fixed the mighty expedition for 1283, when the Sicilians rebelled against these heavy impositions on March 30th, 1282, the occasion of the “Sicilian Vespers”; Peter III. of Aragon, who had been crowned at Palermo, had sympathised with their cause. Michael was thus saved from the lord of Italy, Burgundy, and Provence, to whom Pope Martin IV. proffered a willing submission.

Andronicus II. (1282–1328) gave the empire a new ecclesiastical organisation and turned his attention toward the orthodox clergy. The sinking empire had

not been spared the scourge of mercenaries; the firebrands of the Catalans seemed more to be dreaded than the Turks, even when the hidalgos secured a permanent home for themselves in Athens and Thebes in 1311. Some light on the panic caused by these adventurers, and on the high honour paid to valiant defenders,

The Scourge of Mercenaries is cast by the mission of the rhetorician Thomas Magistros, with the monastic name of Theodulos, who, in the name of the city of Thessalonica, petitioned the emperor between 1314 and 1318 to bestow some distinction on the general Chandrenos. At that time probably Joseph, a monk, of a noble family in the island of Ithaca, produced his great encyclopædia of knowledge. A marriage ode, ornamented with valuable illuminations, in honour of the wedding of Andronicus II., gives us a vivid picture of the court costumes of that day. Michael VIII. wears a round crown set with pearls, the courtiers white caps with stripes as badges of rank; the ladies have plaited tresses or long waving hair.

Byzantine art at this period of temporary recovery once more produced great results; thus the mosaics of Kachri-Djami, formerly Moni, with their lives of the Lord and of the Virgin, represent faces which are natural and individualised, Peter appearing as an Egyptian. The figures are full of movement as if an admixture of western blood had also revived art, quite differently from the contemporary miniature painting. A counterpart to this varied life meets us in the host of itinerant poets, men of high intellectual powers, who, like Manuel Philes, put well-rounded laudatory verses at the disposal of any who satisfy their hunger and thirst and clothe them with a mantle of Russian fur. A stratum of useless idlers, who think themselves too good for real work, corrupt parasites who by their

A Brief Renaissance of Art cringing contaminate their patrons—they are typical of this age in Byzantine history. Andronicus III. (1328–1341) was freed

from the Bulgarian peril since the Serbian prince Stephan Uros defeated the Tsar Michael of Widdin at Belbuzd on June 28th, 1330. But in its place came the danger of the Serbian empire which Stefan Dusan (1331–1335) now founded. This comprised large portions of Macedonia and Illyria, and also included

Epirus, which had been taken by Andronicus from the house of Angelus (1334-1335). Andronicus was more fortunate in the acquisition of Chios in 1329, Lesbos in 1336, and Phocæa in 1340. The infant John V. (1341-1376 and 1379-1391) and the Megas Dux (high admiral) Alexius

Apocaucus were soon opposed by the grand servitor John VI. Cantacuzene, who, aided by the Bulgarians, Turks, and John Angelus, the governor of Epirus, entered the capital on February 3rd, 1347. We may believe it was less on his own account than in the interests of the common welfare that the Cantacuzene resolved to become emperor of the Romans and to withstand that immense complication of adverse circumstances. He was a level-headed, upright statesman at a critical period.

The position of Byzantium had become deplorable. Disconnected fragments of the Balkan peninsula and a few islands composed the "Empire." The district of the capital and Thrace—a triangle extending from Sozopolis past Adrianople to Christopolis—formed the core. Thessalonica with Chalcidice, portions of Wallachian Thessaly and Albanian Epirus, and the principality of Misithra represented three more disconnected provinces, in parts completely surrounded by Servia. Of the islands, since 1269, Ceos, Seriphos, Sifanto, Sicino, Polycandro, Nio, Scyros, Sciathos, Chelidromi, Lemnos, belonged to the Greek empire; as did after 1310 Scopelos, from 1333-1346 Chios and Samos, from 1337-1357 Cephallenia, Zante, Ithaca; and Lesbos permanently. Stefan Dusan was crowned "Tsar of the Servians and Greeks" in 1346. With the help of the Venetians and Servians on one side, and the Turks on the other, the two emperors waged war on each other. It was John VI. who paved the way for the Ottomans into Europe.

Asceticism, meanwhile, in its most fanatical form had created a home for itself on Mount Athos in the monastic community, which soon became a national sanctuary for the Greeks. The Quietist

controversy originated with the Omphalopsychites, and represented a reaction of the national Greek theology against the intrusion of western scholasticism. The victory of the Quietists implied schism with the west. Their system is the last successful development of Greek mysticism. It may be traced back to Simeon the Younger (963-1042), who asserted the doctrine of the vision of the Uncreated Light as well as that of the Divine Presence.

The West Greek Barlaam of Calabria, who wished that the Aristotelian proof, based on reason, of the existence of God should alone be taken into account, expressed himself most emphatically against the mysticism of Athos. This eastern practice of contemplation was attacked also by Gregory Acyndinus with the arguments of Thomas Aquinas, but defended by Gregory Palamas, who, about 1347, thanks to the support of John Cantacuzene, played a prominent rôle, and entered into relations with the tsar Stefan Dusan. There are links connecting the old sects of the Paulicians and the Bogumites, whose influence again extends to the Russian sect of the Strigoliki.



JOHN VIII., PALÆOLOGUS
The Eastern Empire became, under this rule, a small and miserable petty state, though the capital city of Byzantium still contrived to be gay and gorgeous.

The victory of Palamitism, to which in any case John Cantacuzene, a passionate lover of theology, contributed, widened enormously the gulf between the east and west, but cemented more firmly the ecclesiastical unity of the Greek world. This religious mysticism was now confronted in the very country itself by an ethical counter movement. The Idiorhythmic monasteries, in which each man lived after his own way, and might acquire property of his own, then arose; the monarchical monasticism of the past made way not for a democratic but an aristocratic constitution, in which the two Epitropi were merely an administrative committee of the synaxis of fifteen brethren. The ethical aspects of the common life were developed. An interest in the classics and philosophy showed itself and increased appreciably.

Strange Monastic Orders

Manuel II. (1391-1423) lived to see, after the conquest of Bulgaria by the Turks, a systematic blockade of Constantinople. The assistance afforded by the west met with various successes, but the terrible defeat of Nicopolis, by Bajazet I., ended the crusade. The Morea became tributary to the Turks; but the French relief expedition under Marshal Boucicaut effected the liberation of the capital. The emperor a French pensioner, who wrote poems on Franco-Flemish carpets, the patriarch a Russian pensioner—such was the situation of affairs when Tamerlane destroyed the empire of Bajazet in 1402. After 1413 the Emir Mohammed I. maintained peace with Manuel, who with his son established order in the Morea, but quarrelled with the Venetians, who deprived him in 1419 of Monembasia.

The policy of the Turks in welcoming Byzantine claimants to the throne was now adopted by the Byzantines against the Turks, but, it must be confessed, with so little success that Byzantium only with difficulty repulsed a dangerous attack in 1422. For the first time in the east cannon were now employed by the Turks. A terrible devastation of the Morea followed.

To this time belong the curious treatises of Gemistus Plethon, on the political and social renaissance of the Peloponnese. Starting from the purity of the Hellenic population settled there, Gemistus proposed to divide the population into soldiers and agriculturists. Capitalists, officials and authorities were assigned to the third class. He would exclude from all share in the public revenue persons who abandon themselves to tranquil meditation and lead a contemplative life. Man should live by the labour of his hands and not upon offerings extorted from the faithful. All private possessions should become public property; the field should belong to the individual only so long as he cultivates it. Gemistus would abolish the mutilation of criminals and introduce in its place penal servitude. Coined money should be prohibited, as

**Mediæval
Exponent of
Socialism**

in ancient times, and imports should be paid for with cotton—a proof of the abundance of the latter commodity. Necessities of life, when produced in the country, should be exported only under heavy duties. In his second treatise, Gemistus tilts violently against military officers who are at the same time merchants. His proposal of a threefold impost—forced labour, money taxes, and taxes on commodities—calls attention to the urgent necessity of fiscal reform.

This Roman empire became under John VIII. (1423-1448) a miserable and petty state, possessing the small peninsula of the Bosphorus and one or two towns, but paying tribute for what it did possess. Thessalonica fell to the Turks in 1430,



THE LAST CHRISTIAN KING OF CONSTANTINOPLE
Constantine XI. was killed when the Turks captured Byzantium in 1453, but the Eastern Empire which he ruled had already dwindled to a mere city state.

while the Morea at any rate became quite Greek. Once more the word of salvation, "Union!" resounds. But not only did the sturdiest opponent of the Union, Marcus Egenicus, declare in Florence: "I will not sign my name, come what may!" Even the nation did not acquiesce in the Florentine Union of 1439. Nevertheless, Eugenicus IV. allowed the Crusade to be preached which led to the victory on the Cunovitch near Nisch on December 24th, 1443, but, also to the defeat of Varna on November 10th, 1444. Notwithstanding the severe defeat in the Morea on December 4th, 1446, this peninsula was left at the beginning of 1447 to the Palæologi in return for tribute. There was still plenty of amusement in the capital. Grand processions, religious ceremonies, and dramatic representations were held in the church of St. Sophia, as Bertrandon de la Brocquière describes. Now and again envoys were most graciously received—as, for example, the ambassador of Ragusa, Ser Volzius de Bavaglio, who was dismissed with gifts and privileges. Clearly no one in Constantinople realised how great was the danger, how imminent the destruction of the city.

The last emperor of Byzantium, Constantine XI. (1449-1453), fell in the final battle against the Turks, as we shall

presently narrate. He was buried in the Wefa square on the north side of the city; the memory of the last Palæologus still lingers there. Not Greeks alone depict the tragic fall. Narratives penned by members of the most various nations bear testimony to the world-wide importance which the capital still possessed, though the empire was now no greater than a city state. The theme is handled in Greek folk-songs, which give hope; and also in polished verses which were to rouse all Europe so that the city, crushed by the weight of her sins, might be restored.

**Byzantium's
Last
Christian King**

Four historians deal with the rise of the Turkish empire or the fall of the Greek. Laonicus Chalcondyles, a distinguished Athenian, who went to Murad II. in 1446 as an ambassador, describes the period from 1298 to 1463. Though he took as his models Herodotus and Thucydides, he was unable to suppress his admiration of the growing greatness of the Ottoman empire. Ducas, secretary of the Genoese Podesta of Phocæa, describes the years between 1341 and 1462. Georgios Phrantzes, the Great Logothete, a Turkish prisoner in 1415, fled to Venice and Rome; in contrast to Chalcondyles he is filled with a burning hatred of the Turks. Critobulus of Imbros, an imitator of Thucydides and on the whole admirer of the Turks, wrote a history of the emir Mohammed II. to the year 1467.

The Græcising of the Balkan peninsula, Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt had been attempted by Byzantium, the East Roman empire continuing what had been begun during the Hellenistic age. The basis of population, however, on which the Byzantine empire rested was so narrow that we cannot agree with the censure passed on the weakness which Byzantium showed in this task. The gain for modern civilisation would certainly have been enormous if Byzantium had succeeded in Hellenising the whole of the Balkan peninsula and thus sweeping away the multiplicity of hindrances to racial development and international peace. But owing to the weak foundation which the Greek nationality itself supplied to the Byzantine empire, such large drafts had to be drawn upon foreign nations that only, on the one side, the conception of the state, and, on the other side, the Greek Church and Greek culture, formed the bond of

union for these heterogeneous elements of the Byzantine population. Military genius had organised the forces of this state; literati of the Byzantine empire had at least tried to preserve the treasures of the Greek past, even though they were incapable of producing new masterpieces.

Theological controversies had in centuries of dispute built up the completely independent fabric of the Græco-Oriental Church. But these forces did not produce a coherent Græco-Byzantine nationality, in the widest sense of the word, on the Balkan peninsula. The Græco-Oriental Church is in its essence national, and could not therefore in the further course of development withhold national independence from the Churches of other nations such as that of Bulgaria. The immense mass of writings which Byzantine intellectual life has bequeathed to us shows the strangest curves of development.

Barlaam of Calabria, who, according to the testimony of the Emperor Cantacuzene, was familiar with Euclid, Aristotle, and Plato, had formed a friendship, at the court of Avignon, with Petrarch, and the latter hoped to be initiated, with Barlaam's help, into the Greek language. Boccaccio accomplished what Petrarch did not attain, and was taught Greek by Leontius Pilatus, who, in Florence, became the first professor of Greek in the west. The real founder of Greek studies in Italy was Manuel Chrysoloras. Leonardo Bruni of Arezzo, who pored over the great Greek literature night and day, bears witness to the enthusiasm which then pervaded Italy. Cardinal Bessarion played a prominent part in Rome. Cosimo dei Medici and Pope Nicolas V. vied with each other in collecting manuscripts.

The effect of this study of Greek and of the growing knowledge of the treasures of classical antiquity has been in former times much exaggerated. It was to be imagined that the Renaissance and Humanism owed their entire origin to these envoys, artists, and refugees from Constantinople. In reality this Renaissance, which had already begun with Dante's "Vita Nuova," signified rather a Renaissance of the strength of Barbarism than of the antique. The treasures of the past require the strength of the present, so that the latter may be stimulated to liberate the innermost forces of the soul.

RUDOLPH VON SCALA

**Europe's Loss
in the Failure
of Byzantium**



THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE



THE RISE OF THE TURKISH POWER A NEW TERROR TO CHRISTENDOM AND THE STRUGGLE OF THE EAST AGAINST THE WEST

THE Ottoman power and the Turkish nationality are rooted at the present day, as they have been from the beginning of the Ottoman State, in Asia. For this reason the historian of Turkey in Europe is obliged to direct his gaze from the shores of the Bosphorus steadily towards the East, since from the East came forth that warlike people who for nearly four centuries were the terror of Europe, and still present to western diplomatists the insoluble problem of the "Near Eastern Question."

As regards the origin of the modern Turks, the information available since the discovery of the "Orthon inscriptions" on the Upper Yenisei in Siberia (1889-1890) enables us to describe their ancestors without hesitation as of pure Mongolian race. From the earliest times their nomadic tribes have formed compact political unions, which measured swords with their neighbours the Chinese in continual frontier warfare. They possessed some degree of Asiatic civilisation, including the art of writing, as is evidenced by inscriptions from the eighth century A.D. Generally speaking, however, the fact is that the great stretch of territory between Lake Baikal and the Caspian Sea has been for centuries, and still remains, the arena of barbaric struggle between the nomad Turkish and Tartar tribes.

During this long period in Eastern and Western Turkestan, that inexhaustible breeding-ground of nations, the seeds were

sown of those military and civil characteristics which are clearly recognisable, in the Turks of Asia Minor, at any rate, notwithstanding manifold infusions of Aryan, Hamitic, and Semitic blood. We refer to the virtues of the warrior who, at the trumpet

Warrior Character of the Turk blast, obediently pitches or strikes his tent, saddles or unsaddles his little horse, arranges his camp kettle where he may happen to bivouac, takes his simple meal, content with the humblest fare, and, crouching on the ground like a true son of the steppes, bears with infinite patience the toils of march and migration, bends piously and devoutly in prayer towards the rising sun, performs the duties of hospitality where he feels himself the lord and master, but where he meets resistance slaughters his victims with the cruelty of the hunter of the steppes, like his brothers the Avars and Huns, the Pechenegs, Seljuks, and Mongols, and so devastates the land that desolation marks the pathway of his feet.

It is impossible to say how many inroads of this nature may have been made from east to west in the course of time by the mounted hordes of Turks and Turkomans, advancing through the lowlands of the Aral and Volga districts to Europe, and through those of the Amu and Syr Daria to Persia, Afghanistan, and India. We know that as early as the eighth century they had overrun the empire of the Persian caliphs, had made their way even into India, and were a

dominant military people among the Iranians and Semites long before they appeared in Asia Minor and Europe. They are said to have borrowed the crescent moon as their crest and standard from the Chinese in 1209, during their sojourn in Central Asia. The first appearance of the Othman, or Ottoman Turks in Asia Minor is described in a Turkish

First Westward Movement of the Ottomans

legend with miraculous additions of the most extraordinary nature. About the

year 1225 a horde of some 50,000 souls under their tribal chief Suleiman, or Soliman (I.), were forced by Mongol attacks to leave Khorassan for Armenia. Suleiman's son Ertogrul became the vassal of the Seljuk Sultan Ala ed-din Kai Kobad (1219-1236) of Iconium, who gave him a strip of territory in Bithynia. The beautiful and fertile valley of Söğud, twenty eight miles from Eskeshihir and forty-eight miles from Lefke, the ancient Leuka on the Sangarios, became the cradle of the Ottoman state. When once the Turks had gained a footing in Europe the unexampled rapidity of their advance was facilitated on the one hand by the compact military organisation of the new Turkish feudalism, and, on the other hand, by the weakness of the Byzantine empire in Asia and Europe, by the rotten constitutions of the Slavonic Balkan states, and by the lack of unity among the powers of Western Christendom, especially those immediately threatened — Venice, Genoa, Hungary, Poland, and Austria.

But the weapons for this career of conquest were forged in Asia. Osman I. (1299-1326), or Othman—of which Ottoman is the corruption—the son of Ertogrul, who was buried in Söğud, did not pursue the peaceful pastoral life of his father. At first an officer of the sultan of Iconium, he soon rose to the command of the army, secured his independence, coined money, made himself master of the greater part of Bithynia,

Warriors Known as Leg-breakers

and with the help of his son Urkhan extended his kingdom by the conquest of Brusa, Nicomedia, and Nicæa (1326 and 1330). Although he belonged to the powerful nomadic race of the Turks, he called his warriors Osmanli—that is, the sons of Osman, or, in other words, leg-breakers. The Moslems of Anatolia, Mesopotamia, and European Turkey, who honour the memory of Osman even at the present day, regard the name of Turk almost

as an insult. The Emir Urkhan or Orkhan, 1326-1359—the Ottoman rulers were not known as "Sultans" until 1473—is regarded as the first organiser of the Turkish state in Western Asia. He retained Osman's custom of dividing conquered territory into fiefs, called Timars, for distribution among his warriors; in order, however, to secure a more compact and uniform system of administration, he divided his kingdom into two, and afterwards into three, military divisions, called Sandjaks, and by organising a militia force provided both a support for the state and a nucleus for the army.

Ertogrul and Osman had employed only Turkoman cavalry on their campaigns, the Akindji—that is, scouts or skirmishers; in case of need they were summoned as the troops of their overlords and afterwards dismissed. They proved, however, incompetent for siege operations. The first conquests in Asia Minor were due chiefly to the treachery of the Byzantine generals and governors. Urkhan was the first to organise an infantry force, consisting of permanently engaged and paid soldiers,

Beginning of Turkish Militarism

the Yaya or Piade (that is, foot soldiers); they received one "akdje" or silver kreutzer daily, and were divided into tens, hundreds, and thousands, severally commanded by decurions, centurions, and generals. This organisation was outwardly an imitation of the Byzantine military system, which had at one time done excellent service in the Themata or provinces into which that empire was divided. These troops, elated by receiving pay, increased by their excesses, their disobedience, and their exaggerated demands those disorders which they should have helped to repress.

The emir, in conjunction with his brother and the Vizir Ala-ed-din, then resolved upon an unexampled *coup de main*. A proposition was advanced by the cadî or military judge of Biledjik, Kara Khalil Tshenderli, to replace the native infantry by a force formed exclusively of Christians, who were to be forcibly converted to Mohammedanism. This proposal was actuated not so much by religious fanaticism as by clever calculation and a full appreciation of the necessities of the situation. It was from their former nomadic habits of life that the Turkomans derived that incapacity for organised infantry service which induced Kara Khalil to turn his attention to the Christian subjects

of his master in 1330. The surprisingly rapid growth of this force was possibly due to the compulsion which may have been exercised to some extent at the time of its formation, and was also depicted in most baleful colouring by the anti-Christian movement of a later period; but a far more potent cause was the readiness with which the Christian population seems to have fallen in with Urkhan's scheme, abandoned as they were to hopeless isolation and deepest misery by the impotence of their Byzantine rulers.

Far from offering opposition, the young Christians—Adjem Oglan, inexperienced boys—attracted by high pay and other advantages, began to enlist in the new force voluntarily and even at the instigation of their own parents. It was not until considerably later in Europe and especially in Greece that this blood tax made so painful an impression as to be felt equivalent to a method of extermination. However, these Byzantines deserved no other fate. For centuries they had cried again and again, "Rather would we be Turks than Latins." They had gained their wish.

The Origin of the Janissaries These troops, Tsheri, were named Jeni, or the new, and the name of the Janissaries was soon borne from Asia to Europe on the wings of victory. Their name and their distinctive uniform of white skin caps they received from the dervish Hadji Begtash, founder of the famous monastery and of the order of monks which still pervades the whole of the Ottoman Empire. As a truly Turkish indication of the generous provision made for the treatment of the new troops, the names of the officers were borrowed from various kitchen employments. The chief of the chamber—that is, of the regiment—was called Tshorbadji, or the soup-maker; the officers next in importance were the Ashdjibashi, or chief cook, and the Sakabashi, or water-carrier. On their blood-red banner shone the silver crescent and the two-edged sword of Omar. The regimental totem was the meat-kettle, round which they gathered for council as well as for food, while in later times the upsetting of it was often enough the signal for mutiny.

About this date, and apparently at the instance of Ala ed-din, a standing force of cavalry was added to the Janissaries, like them, in receipt of pay and originally divided into two classes—the Spahis, or

knights, and the Silihdaris, or light-armed skirmishers. At first only 2,400 strong, the force was modelled on the guard of honour for the flag of Mahomet formed by the Caliph Omar, and was composed of four squadrons, to which the imperial standard was in like manner entrusted, until this was afterwards replaced by the standard of the Prophet, under Selim I. Urkhan had created the army; his brother Ala ed-din, the Numa Pompilius of the Osmanli, added two more institutions, the right of coinage and the regulation of dress. At a later period the minutest details of clothing were regulated for the faithful; for the moment stress was laid chiefly upon uniformity of head-dress, the fur cap, from which the old Arab turban was developed for the Turks. Regulations of this kind—the "Fetwas"—issued to meet state necessities, form the four sources of Mohammedan constitutional law, which must in no way contradict the three higher sources, the Word of God, the Koran, the words and life of the Prophet, and the Sunna, the traditions, interpretations, and decisions of the first four caliphs, or rather of the four great Imams. Silence or deficiency in these last may be supplemented by decrees known as Urf—that is, secular and arbitrary legislation.

Such legislation was and is subject to change, and modern Turkish legislation, dealing with the thousand conditions of modern life for which the Koran does not provide, is Urf. Here we have the only breach through which European civilisation can legally penetrate. From an early period in the Osman empire, the Greek term "kanon," or "canon," was adopted for these decrees, and the canonical book containing the body of decrees was called "Kanunnameh."

However, the most decisive fact for the whole history of the Ottoman Empire was the accession of the Emir Urkhan.

Hereditary Succession Established Urkhan was not the eldest son of Osman; his brother Ala ed-din was the elder. The latter, however, was a scholar with no inclination to militarism. It was impossible for such a man to take up the government of a rising kingdom, which could secure its existence only by war. With his consent, therefore, the Emir Osman had named the warlike Urkhan his successor and appointed Ala ed-din his vizir. The principle of direct succession

was thus abolished in the house of Osman. The succession depended thenceforward upon the Arab principle, by which, for instance, in the Omayyad family not the son but the brother of a ruler was regarded as the lawful successor. Mahomet himself had left no male issue, but only a daughter, the mother of the sons of Ali. So

Children of Mahomet's Daughter

long as the Ottoman conquest continued, and the people settled in proportion as the army moved onward, the leadership could never have been entrusted to a child—a very possible eventuality under other rules of succession—as the emirs were bold warriors who fought exposed to all dangers. In such times it might be the best policy to have a succession of strong rulers, even though they were not united by the closest ties of blood relationship. But when warfare ceased and peace began, and with it the long and toilsome work of advancing the arts of peace, then a strict succession was desirable; the son should then be able to finish what the father had begun. The father would then find encouragement to begin tasks which he had no prospect of seeing completed, secure in the knowledge that he would leave their achievement to his offspring. If Turkey was ever to become a constitutional state instead of a conquering power, and to lead the progress of Islam towards civilisation, then a change in the principle of succession to the throne was indispensable. Seniority must become primogeniture. That this change has not yet taken place may be regarded as one of the reasons for the present decay of the empire.

The spirit with which the growing state was inspired may be exemplified by a fragment descriptive of Ottoman capacity for culture, taken from the ode "To Culture" of Aashik, a contemporary of Urkhan:

"Empty form is nothing more than body without soul;
 Structure in the world is of the great world-soul's design.
 Culture vivifies the world; else would there be but soulless form.
 Knowledge is the breath of soul and soul of all the souls,
 Wanting knowledge, soul is dead and like unto the dead.
 Knowledge giveth to the Sultans empire over human souls.
 Knowledge wanting, life is wanting. This my word is truth indeed."

An impartial examination of the earlier West Turkish and Seljuk literary monu-

ments shows Aashik Pasha at the outset of the fourteenth century as beginning the line of Turkish poets with a great mystical poem, which betrays the influence of the Persian poetry. Aashik Pasha was a clever dervish of the order of Mevlevi, "the whirling order," which produced several poets, the most important of whom was the actual founder of the order, the famous Jelal ed-din Rumi. His title of Pasha does not imply the court dignity of State Vizir, but that of vizir in the spiritual kingdom. In this latter sense we find many poets bearing the titles of Sheikh, Emir, Hünkiar (monarch), Shah, and Sultan. The whole body of Ottoman poetry, and even the literary language of the present day, was developed beneath the standard of the Book; though the ancestors of the Osmanli, the Oghuz, Ghuzi, or Kuni, may have acquired some veneer of Chinese culture, no trace of this intellectual relationship remains, save certain grammatical forms, and the "Karagöz," a degenerate form of the Chinese shadow-play, which continued the Greek mimes on Byzantine soil. Where

Sources of Ottoman Culture

the Ottoman culture is not derived from sources purely Arabian, that is, under Arab religious influences, it draws upon Arab-Persian sources. Of greater originality and in closer conformity with Turkish peasant humour are the rough jests of Khodja Nasr ed-din, who was a priest and teacher in Akshehir between the period of the last but one of the Seljuk sultans, Ala ed-din Kai Kobad, who died in 1307, and that of Timur, who died in 1404. His humorous pieces were widely circulated in prose narrative form from an early date, and are still read and recited by young and old in all classes of society. The custom of giving place names by topographical description, which was adopted in countless instances by the primitive Turkish races for the nomenclature of towns, districts, woods and rivers, mountains and valleys, within the area of original Persian, Greek, and Byzantine civilisation, finds its counterpart in modern China.

Divergence of religious belief apparently excluded Byzantine influence, although this can be recognised in the material, military, political, and social institutions—for example, with regard to eunuchs—which it imposed upon its conquerors. In the great days of the Macedonian dynasty the Byzantine empire seemed destined

to endure for ever, in contrast to its elder sisters in the West, who had long before succumbed to the assaults of the Germans. From the age of its founder Constantine, and of its legislator Justinian, it had steadily increased its power. The tenth century had been a period of renaissance in civil, economic, and military life, and for Greece in intellectual life also. The empire had triumphantly emerged from the deadly struggle with the forces of Islam. By the subjugation of the Slavs and the acquisition of Armenia, the Byzantine empire had extended in 1025 to limits unexampled since the days of Justinian. The mingled severity and kindness of the Emperor Basil, "the slayer of the Bulgarians," had left the millions of Slavs in possession of their freedom and their native institutions.

Then came the turning point, the beginning of the irrevocable decay of the empire. The great territorial lords made the succeeding emperors their tools, exhausted the resources of the European and Asiatic provinces by their extortion, destroyed the yeoman class by their unbearable taxation, deprived the Slavs of their national privileges, paralysed the action of the best generals by their influence in the all-powerful senate, and when the Seljuk invasion took place in 1071 lost the best provinces of the Asiatic empire, Cappadocia, Armenia, and Iconium. The West fell into the hands of the Normans. The death-stroke, however, from which Byzantium never recovered, was given by the Latin crusade in 1204. The shadow of the imperial government migrated to Nicaea, and as a shadow it returned with the Palæologi to the city of Constantine in 1261.

Instead of seeking to effect a peaceful settlement with the rising kingdoms of Bulgaria and Servia, and thus to save something from the wreck, seeing that the old forms of absolute monarchy had been definitely replaced by the western forms of feudal government which the Crusaders obeyed, the romantic spirit of these shadowy emperors pursued the phantasm of their lost supremacy, the "great ideal" on which even within our own times the finest enterprises of the Hellenes have made shipwreck.

This ruinous megalomania was, moreover, poisoned from the outset by the wildest forms of monastic strife, by

theological quarrels, and by the burning hatred of patriarchs, priests, and people for the "Latinists." While the Ottoman power was rising in the east, the Slav kingdoms were advancing on the north. Servian kings had secured the supremacy over the Balkan peninsula. The power of the Bulgarian state had been broken in 1330, and when Stefan Dusan ascended the throne it seemed that for the Servian monarchy was reserved the task of defending the Bosphorus against the Ottoman advance. But the Slavs were not a sea power, and were therefore unable to interfere successfully in the bitter commercial strife which Venice and Genoa waged for half a century in Greek waters.

Civil war broke out repeatedly in Byzantium. The Palæologus John V. looked for help to the Venetians and Serbs, while John VI. Cantacuzene turned to the Ottomans. As early as 1336 Andronicus, no less unscrupulous than the Christian republics of Italy, had joined the Asiatic Seljuks against the Ottomans, and had thereby lost the best towns of Ionia. In 1353 the Ottomans defeated the Serbs at Didymonteichos, and Cantacuzene appointed his son Matthæus co-regent. Then Stefan Dusan died in 1355, and with him died the hopes of saving Europe from the yoke of Islam. Servian and Albanian chieftains broke away, and Bosnia made herself independent. Thus the Balkan Christians destroyed one another, while the hour of doom was approaching. In 1356 Cantacuzene himself, in the improvidence of despair, called in the Ottomans. Urkhan, already in possession of Brusa, Nicaea, and Nicomedia, thought the moment had then come when the brilliancy of Constantinople and the beauty of Greece lay helplessly at his mercy.

Upon two rafts made of logs bound together with straps and skins, the crown prince Suleiman crossed into Thrace with eighty warriors and surprised the castle of Thymbe—the modern Tshini. The conquest of Kallipolis, the modern Gallipoli, in the following year—1357—opened the way for the extension of the Ottoman Empire in Europe. Urkhan announced this joyful news to the Seljuk princes and his other rivals in letters breathing the full pride of victory. For centuries onward it became the privilege of the

Ottoman chancery to employ the luxuriances of their literary style in inditing documents of this nature to friend and foe.

The emperor John VI. was astute enough to treat with Urkhan, to whom he had given his daughter in marriage as the ransom of Kallipolis. The bargain was on the point of conclusion when an earthquake

**The Warrior
Who Crossed
the Dardanelles**

destroyed all the towns and fortresses in the Thracian Chersonese, and left the Turks in undisputed possession of the whole of this territory, if we can trust the account of the imperial historian. Suleiman died before his father on a hawking expedition. For more than a century his tomb in Bulair (Greek, Plagiari), on the shore of the Hellespont, was the only grave of an Ottoman prince on European soil: and of all the tombs of the Ottoman heroes was most often visited, as being the resting-place of the second vizir of the empire and of the warrior who had successfully crossed the Dardanelles.

In 1360 the Emir Murad I. (1359-1389) crossed the Hellespont. In the following year he reduced the important fortresses of Tzurulon and Didymonteichos, and in spite of a brave resistance made himself master of Adrianople, the second city of the empire. This town, situated at the confluence of the Maritza with its tributaries, the Arda and Tundsha, in a fertile valley, provided with all the attractions of a tropical climate, vineyards, rose fields, and quince gardens, became, next to Brusa, the first, and after the fall of Constantinople the second, city of the Ottoman Empire. At a later date was erected in it the famous mosque of the Sultan Selim II., which the Turks regard as the most beautiful in Islam.

Brusa remained henceforward the sacred burial ground of the Sultans; and its splendid mosques and baths still afford the finest examples of Osmano-Persian architecture. Murad's vizirs Lalashahin and Evrenos

**The Sacred
Burial Ground
of the Sultans**

made their way up the valley of the Maritza. Towns, villages, fortresses, and the open country with its enormous booty fell into their hands almost without a blow. In 1363 Lalashahin crowned his career of conquest with the capture of Philippopolis, which had belonged to the Bulgarian Empire since 1344. The Emir Murad made this most prosperous of the Bulgarian towns the outpost of his daily growing empire by the construction of

fortified outworks. Four great rocks of syenite were included in the outer ring of walls, and the Maritza was spanned by a stone bridge. The statement that Murad shortly afterwards—in 1365—concluded a convention with the Dalmatian republic of Ragusa, which commanded the inland trade in the Balkan peninsula, is an invention of later times.

The small Christian states were unable to combine in any kind of opposition to the Ottoman advance; they also lacked a standing army. The emperor John VI. was at variance with his son Andronicus. When he attempted, in 1365, to form a federation against the Turks in Tirnovó on the Jantra, the old capital of Bulgaria, he was imprisoned by Zar Sisman, or Shishman, until his cousin, Amadeo VI., of Savoy, liberated him. The hard-pressed emperor then travelled to Avignon, to induce the papacy to promote a relieving crusade; without hesitation, he signed the Latin formula of union.

Pope Urban V. returned with him to Rome, where they were met by the eastern emperor Charles IV., Queen Joanna of

**Emperor of
Byzantium
in Extremis**

Naples, and the chivalrous king of Cyprus, Peter I. of Lusignan, while Stephen of Bosnia was expected to arrive. Peter of

Lusignan had been travelling round the courts of Western Europe since 1362, and on April 1st, 1363, at Avignon, had promised to undertake a crusade in conjunction with John the Good of France, who died in 1364, and Amadeo; however, the enterprise was inadequately supported by the European powers, and the crusaders confined themselves to a temporary occupation of Alexandria on October 10th, 1365. On the present occasion no agreement could be brought about.

Low indeed had fallen the prestige of the once all-powerful East Roman emperor; the Venetian bankers who had advanced the money for his journey to Avignon kept him a prisoner at Venice. Andronicus declined to oblige his hated father, who formally went over to the Roman Church in 1369, by paying the money; and it was eventually his younger son Manuel, ruler of Thessalonica, who secured John's return in 1370, at great cost to himself. In 1371 John excluded Andronicus from the succession in favour of Manuel. In 1375, when Adronicus joined Sauji, a revolted son of Murad, Murad beheaded the Turkish prince and

punished Andronicus by blinding him. However, the prince gained the help of the Genoese, who assisted him to enter the capital in 1376, dethroned his father and crowned him as Andronicus IV. In 1379, the old emperor escaped from imprisonment, and fled to Murad, who restored him to the possession of the capital. Two years later the emperor was reconciled to his eldest son, but after his death, in 1385, he set aside the claims of his grandson, John VII., and gave the succession to his beloved Manuel.

These events form an interlude of secondary importance in the great maritime struggle between Genoa and Venice, which ended only with the peace of Turin on August 8th, 1381. Matters were going no less badly in the Peloponnese. From Thrace Murad had advanced westward to the Balkan passes. He then turned southwards into the fair province of Thessaly and even reached Thermopyke, whereupon Roger de Lauria, who was governing Attica in the name of King Frederic III. of Sicily, appealed to him in 1363 for help against his Catalonian rivals who were in possession of Athens, Helene Fadrique of Aragon, and the Venetian governor of Negropont in Eubœa.

The Emir Murad on the Warpath

As the allies of Roger, the Turks marched into Thebes, the seat of government and the most distinguished city in the duchy of Athens. These facts plainly show that the Spaniards, Catalonians, and Sicilians were but foreigners in the Latin principalities of Greece, with which they had nothing in common. The news of this movement spread terror far and wide in the West. Urban V. summoned to arms the Venetians, as being the masters of Eubœa, together with the archbishop of Patras, all the prelates and dignitaries of the period within the Latin Empire, the despots of Misithra and Guido of Enghien in Argos.

In the north also a movement of resistance was stimulated by the Pope. The Greek commander of Philippopolis had fled to the king of Servia; at his appeal the kings of Hungary, Servia, Bosnia, and the province of Wallachia agreed to undertake a campaign in common against the Turks, who were now threatening their frontiers. By forced marches they advanced to the Maritza at a point two days' journey above Adrianople, but in the night of September 25th-26th, 1371, they were

surprised by Hadji Ilbeki and suffered a fearful defeat; the army was shattered and dispersed in flight. The battle-field is still known as Ssirbsindüghi, the defeat of the Serbs. This was the first battle in which Magyars fought against the Ottomans.

A year of peace followed, which Murad employed in extending his empire in Asia Minor. In 1381 he arranged a marriage between his eldest son Bajazet and the daughter of Yakub of Kermian.

The Turk in the Balkans

The princess brought as her dowry Kutahia and other valuable districts in the Seljuk state. Shortly afterwards other of Murad's troops under Timurtash crossed the mountains of Rhodope and advanced to the Axios on the Albanian frontier, where they conquered the towns of Monastir and Istip. On the far side of the Balkans Indje Balaban had already spent two years in the siege of the fortress of Sofia, the ancient Sardica, when he gained his object by treachery in 1382. Sofia, the most important fortress and the key of Bulgaria, Macedonia, and Thrace, splendidly situated on the Boyana in the wide plain traversed by the Isker, rose again from its ruins.

The Turks had already burst into Bosnia through the Balkan passes, but were repeatedly defeated in the gorges and mountains of the Alps of Dinar by the united Bosnians and Serbs. In 1387 Stefan Vuk Lazar left Prizren and began a threatening movement southward with thirty thousand men. Before Murad sent his forces across the Balkans, which he was surprised to find unoccupied by the enemy, he celebrated with great splendour in Asia, in the presence of his troops on the plain of Jemishehir, his own marriage and that of two of his sons with Byzantine princesses, and the circumcision of his three grandsons, the sons of Bajazet.

The decisive battle was fought on June 15th, 1389, on the field of Amsel. The Turks under the

The End of the Great Murad

Emir Murad and his son Bajazet opposed the Serbs under Lazar and his nephew Vuk Stefan Brankovic of Prishtina, the Bosnians under their king Stefan Tvartko, and the Voivode Vladko Hranii. With them fought the Croatians, under their Ban Ivan Horvat, those Bulgarians who had escaped the destruction of their country, Wallachian auxiliary troops, and numerous Albanians. At

the outset of the battle—at its conclusion, according to another tradition—the Emir Murad was stabbed in his tent by the Servian nobleman Milos Obilic; Lazar, however, was captured and beheaded, with a number of Servian knights, over the corpse of Murad. The new Emir Bajazet I. interred his father's remains at Brusa, the splendid mosque erected by Murad himself. He strangled his brother Yakub in continuance of the gloomy custom supported by a verse of the Koran, according to which succession in the house of Osman was legalised by fratricide.

The new Emir Bajazet I. (1389-1402) was now able to make preparations for the conquest of Greece. Manuel was one of his adherents. This circumstance John VII., the son of Andronicus, who had come to an understanding with Selymbria, the modern Siliwri, and Thessalonica, turned to his own account to secure the dethronement of his grandfather in 1390. Manuel, it is true, restored his father's supremacy; but when Bajazet forced the old emperor to cease the work of restoring the fortifications of his capital, John VI. died of vexation at this insult on February 16th, 1391.

Manuel at once seized the throne, but the sultan punished his presumption by the capture of Thessalonica in 1391, the blockade of the capital, and the conquest of the Bulgarian capital of Tirnovo with Widdin, Nicopolis, and Silistria in 1393; and it became obvious that Bajazet intended to abolish the shadowy East Roman empire. So early as 1392 his general, Evrenos-Beg, had advanced from Seres to the Isthmus. Nerio Acciajuoli, who had ruled Athens from 1385, in place of the Catalonians, made a fruitless appeal to Venice for help, and secured his safety by submission and payment of tribute. From this moment the fate of Athens was only a question of time. When Timurtash occupied the lower part of Athens, the Turks were expelled by the

**The
Fate of
Athens**

Venetians, who at last came up from Eubœa to relieve the place. From the end of 1394 to the end of 1403 the lion standard of San Marco waved upon the battlements of the stronghold of Cecrops and on the tower of the Latin church of the Holy Virgin on the Acropolis.

It is not known how far the Turks penetrated into Bœotia and Attica upon this occasion. Some portion of the Greeks were in alliance with the Turks. But the


Ottoman triumphs were suddenly checked by the news that Sigismund of Hungary, to whom the emperor Manuel had appealed for help, was approaching the Danube with a brilliant army of French and German knights. Bajazet left Gallipoli, which was then his base of operations for the blockade of the capital, and also Seres, to advance northward against the Christian army. On September 12th, 1396, the Christian troops reached Great Nicopolis, on the right bank of the Danube. On September 28th Bajazet's superior generalship secured him a bloody victory over the Christians, who were unable to follow any practical plan of campaign.

The consequences of the defeat were borne by the Christian inhabitants of the peninsula. Evrenos-Beg advanced upon the Peloponnese, the Byzantine port of which was governed by the "despot" of Misithra, Theodore Palæologus, a son of John V. Defeated at Leondari at the sources of the Alpheus on June 21st, 1397, he was forced to agree to the payment of a yearly tribute. In 1399 the emperor Manuel, who was blockaded anew, approached the French

**Christian
Peoples
Disorganised**

marshal Jean le Meingre, or Boucicaut, with a request for help, and this general once again cleared the Turks out of the environs of the capital. John VII. was reconciled to his uncle, and Manuel travelled in the West, and met with a brilliant reception wherever he went. The Venetians were then at the zenith of their power. As early as 1355 the Bailo, or governor, of Constantinople had advised the senate to seize the inheritance of Byzantium without more ado. Now, however, they lost Athens in May, 1402. Antonio Acciajuoli gathered a force in Livadia, the strongest place in the country, and captured the citadel in 1403, after a heroic defence.

But at that moment all eyes were turned eastward. When Timur, the Mongolian ruler of Samarkand, began to extend his conquests westward, he came into collision with the Ottoman emirate. The struggle of these two great powers for the possession of Western Asia was decided on July 20th, 1402, in the murderous battle of Angora. Bajazet himself fell into Timur's hands, and died in captivity on March 8th, 1403. But in the spring of 1403, Tamerlane turned eastwards again without attempting to cross the Hellespont, as his fleet consisted only of twenty-two ships of Trebizond.



THE OTTOMAN CONQUEST OF BYZANTIUM

THE CRESCENT TRIUMPHS OVER THE CROSS

THOSE of Bajazet's sons who had escaped the carnage began fighting among themselves for the throne which they had set up again in Brusa and Adrianople. Henceforward Brusa and Aidin were to be the citadels of pure Turkish power in Asia. Christian Europe was too busy with internecine strife to utilise the moment of Ottoman helplessness, an opportunity which never recurred. The papacy was paralysed by the Great Schism. Before the Emperor Manuel had returned from Paris, where he had learned the news of Bajazet's destruction, the eldest son of the fallen emperor, Suleiman, had been proclaimed emir in Adrianople.

The Greek princes hastened to resume their old feudal relations with the Sublime Porte. Antonio Acciajuoli paid a visit to Suleiman in person to ask his help against Venice in the struggle for Athens. From March 31st, 1405, the Venetians were forced to leave Antonio in possession of Athens; he would agree only to style himself their vassal. Yet their power in the Levant was on the rise, and their maritime preponderance was undisputed at the time when they retired from Attica. While Genoa, their rival, was on the point of collapse, the mistress of the Adriatic, under her Doges Michele Steno (1401-1413) and Tommaso Mocenigo (1414-1423) was still at the zenith of her power.

When for this reason she delayed, in common with the western powers, to avenge Nicopolis, her means of resistance were speedily paralysed before the advance of the Ottomans in new strength. Under the Doge Francesco Foscari (1423-1457) the prudent republic sought by the acquisition of Italian territory to secure firmer foundations for her vanishing and disputed power.

The wars aroused by the hatred and jealousy of the four sons of Bajazet in

their struggle for the throne lasted for a decade. Fortunately for the Turkish Empire no partition resulted, but dynastic unity, the fundamental principle of the house of Osman, was preserved. Suleiman (I.) was killed behind Adrianople on June 5th, 1410, while fleeing

from his brother Musa; Musa then lost his throne and his life at the hands of Mohammed I. (1413-1421), the third and most fortunate of the hostile brothers, after a victory on the plain of Tshamorlu, not far from Sofia, on July 10th. Mohammed had concluded a close alliance with Manuel, and being on the best of terms with him, gave him back a number of Macedonian and Thessalian places which he had taken from Musa, including the splendid Thessalonica.

Again, and for the last time, the affairs of the East Romans seemed to have taken a favourable turn. The emir had also assured considerable remissions of taxation, with commercial and territorial concessions, to the remaining members of the Christian league, Venice, Genoa, the Knights of St. John in Rhodes, and the duke Jacopo Crispo of Naxos. In the security of peace with the Ottomans the Greek Emperor Manuel, whose restless co-regent John VII. had died in a monastery, was able to visit the miserable remnants of his empire. He spent the winter of 1414-1415 in Thessalonica, the possession of his son Andronicus. He then assisted his son Theodore (II.), the despot of Misithra, to subjugate the refractory barons and toparchs of the Peloponnese in 1415.

At the same time he zealously urged on the construction of the Hexamilion, the wall across the isthmus, which was to serve as a defence against the barbarians, as formerly in the time of the Persian wars. Contemporary writers express their astonishment at this bulwark of defence, as

**Dynastic
Unity
Preserved**

though it were comparable with the famous walls of Hadrian. They were, however, soon to learn that it was no obstacle to the Janissaries. In 1417 the crown prince, John (VIII.), appeared with the intention of making Misithra his base of operations for the subjugation of the rebellious Genoese centurion Zaccaria of

**Albanian Troops
Ravage Venetian
Possessions**

Achaia (1404-32); he then let loose his Albanian troops upon the Venetian possessions also, and destroyed his good relations with the republic. The latter espoused the cause of the centurion, and in 1419 wrested from the East Romans the important position of Monembasia, the home of the once admired Malvasier.

Mohammed, who had been indefatigable in the task of resubjugating the emirs of Asia Minor, had always proved an honourable ally of the Byzantines. Manuel, therefore, displayed a considerable lack of foresight in supporting the cause of a rebel pretending to be Prince Mustafa, who had disappeared in 1402: again, on Mohammed's death, in 1421, Manuel was persuaded by his son John (VIII.) to play off this pseudo Mustafa against the youthful heir, Murad II. (1421-1451). The impostor was defeated, and strangled in Adrianople at the beginning of 1422. In June, 1422, Murad advanced upon Constantinople with 50,000 men. The capital,

which had made alliance with Mustafa, a revolted younger brother of the emir, was saved, though Mustafa himself was defeated and suppressed. The work of vengeance could now be begun. First, the warlike Murad sent his vizir Turakhan to Thessalonica, which was saved only by the help of Venice. Andronicus ceded it to the republic in 1423 for purchase-money amounting to 50,000 ducats. However, Turakhan then burst forth from Thessaly to expel from the Morea Theodore of Misithra and the Venetians, on whom he desired vengeance for Pietro Loredano's destruction of the Turkish fleet at Gallipoli on May 29th, 1416. The wall across the isthmus was stormed by the Janissaries and destroyed on May 22nd, 1423. The victors contented themselves with re-

ducing the Peloponnese to the position of a tributary vassal state. Smitten by an apoplectic stroke, Manuel retired from the government in 1423 and took monastic vows in 1424. His son, John VIII. (1423-1448), concluded peace with Murad, who made him pay 30,000 ducats for the Morea, and seized most of his possessions in Macedonia and on the Black Sea.

Meanwhile, the emperor's enterprising brothers, Thomas and Constantine Palæologus, were successfully extending their supremacy in the Peloponnese, where the last remnants of Frankish power, with the exception of the Venetian fortresses, fell into their hands between 1428 and 1430. However, on March 29th, 1430, Murad II. reduced the fortress of Thessalonica, the old capital of the Lombard kingdom,

which for more than two centuries had served as a base for the Frankish conquests of Hellas. Under the name of Salonika it became henceforward one of the first commercial ports and naval stations of Turkey in Europe. After the fall of Thessalonica the emir sent his pasha, Sinan, to subjugate Epirus. In that country Carlo I. Tocco, the brother-in-law of Antonio, had died at Janina on July 4th, 1429, leaving no legitimate heir. His fair kingdom, which since 1381 had included Albania, Acarnania, Ithaca, Zacynthus, Cephallenia, and Leucadia, went to his nephew Carlo II. (1429-1448), the son

of his brother Leonardo. However, the Turks took up the cause of Memnone, an ambitious illegitimate son of the deceased, and forced Janina to surrender on October 9th, 1430, after a long siege. Carlo II. Tocco thereupon became tributary to the emir for Epirus and Acarnania. Mean-

while, the Emperor John VIII., who was in despair at the loss of Thessalonica, had hastened westward, to make his submission to the Roman Church and to seek help from the co-religionists. To Murad's fierce resentment his appeals for help were again directed to Rome. Pope Eugenius IV. zealously urged a new scheme for reunion, deceiving himself and others with the hope that the brief and infrequent efforts of the West to repel the followers



BAJAZET I.

This Ottoman emperor ruled from 1389 to 1403. He conquered Bulgaria and a great part of Asia Minor, Macedonia, Servia, and Thessaly, and was defeated by Timur at Angora in the year 1402.

THE OTTOMAN CONQUEST OF BYZANTIUM

of the crescent would now culminate in a great enterprise for the final expulsion of the Turk. In view of the extremity of the danger, the project of union—in other words, submission—was now considered in full seriousness by the emperor and most of the prelates, including the œcumenical patriarch Joseph.

The "Florentinum," the decree of union which was solemnly recited on July 6th, 1439, in the cathedral of Florence, is of importance in so far as it became the dogmatic basis for the actual reunion of the Ruthenians, Roumanians, Armenians, Jacobites, Nestorians, and Maronites. Constantinople, however, held different views. Monks and laity alike declined to confirm the convention which the imperial government and the hierarchy had concluded. The latter were defeated in the unequal struggle against a national will, which, though impotent in all else, was implacably obstinate on this particular point of anti-Latinism. The agreement of Florence was torn in pieces, and the church of St. Sophia was doomed to become a mosque.

In the spring of 1441 the Turks devastated Lower Hungary as far as the Theiss, and also Slavonia and the district between the Save and the Drave. Fortunately for Christendom, Janos Hunyadi, who had been appointed Count of Temesvar and Duke of Transylvania in 1441 as a reward for faithful service, took up the supreme command among the towns on the southern frontier. Among other exploits he defeated the Roumelian Beglerbeg Kulle-Shahin in the spring of 1442 at Vasap on the Jalomita. Pope Eugenius had despatched earnest appeals to the western princes calling for union and defensive measures. At the beginning of 1443 he issued a general circular, imposing a tithe upon the Church for the Turkish war; he also sent Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini to Hungary and Bishop

**Preaching
the
Crusade**

Christoph of Corona to Moldavia, Wallachia, and Albania to preach the Crusade. The mobilisation of the fleet was begun in Venice. However, the majority of the western princes viewed the enterprise with indifference; exceptions were the Poles,

Wallachians, and the lower classes in Hungary, who took up arms in every quarter. In July, 1443, the crusading army set out under King Wladislaw III. of Poland and Hunyadi, accompanied by Cardinal Cesarini and the fugitive Servian king George Brankovic, advanced through Servia, defeated the Turks at Nish on November 3rd,

reached Sofia, and crossed the plateau between the Balkans and the Ichtiman Sredna Gora at Mirkovo, arriving finally at Zlatitza. The defeat of the Turks at Kunovitz on December 24th, 1443, brought about an Albanian rising under George Kastriot, or Skanderbeg; and in 1444, in spite of the cardinal's opposition, the Hungarians concluded a ten-years' peace with Murad at Szegedin, by the terms of which Wallachia, as a Turkish tributary state, fell to Hungary, Bulgaria was left to the Porte, and Servia was restored to Brankovic; neither Turks nor Hungarians were henceforward to cross the Danube.



ONE OF THE TURKISH JANISSARIES
A type of the soldiers whose fortitude and prowess were the qualities which went largely to the building up of the power of the Ottoman Empire.

But in the meantime the papal fleet under Luigi Loredano and Francesco Condolmieri had appeared in the waters of the Levant; the leaders sent letters adjuring the Hungarians to avail themselves of this favourable opportunity. Persuaded by the eloquence of Cesarini, the Hungarians broke the peace; Murad, who had carried his army over the Hellespont in Genoese transports, met them on the shore of the Black Sea. On November 10th, 1444, was fought the battle of Varna, which after some initial success, resulted in a severe Christian defeat. King Wladislaw fell in a sudden charge upon the Janissaries, delivered out of jealousy of

Hunyadi ; Cesarini was killed in flight, and Hunyadi alone was able to conduct an orderly retreat of his troops across the Danube. Western Christianity was deeply humiliated. The Emperor John VIII. attempted to make his peace with the

**Venetians
Make Peace
With Turks**

emir by means of gifts ; the Venetians, in fear for their trade, concluded a special peace with the Turks on February 23rd, 1446. Constantine of Misithra alone continued his resistance, and with such success that he made a triumphant advance into Central Greece, hoping for Skanderbeg's help. The attention of the latter was, however, claimed

by a war with Venice ; apparently, the Signoria was not ignorant of the revolt among the Albanian chieftains excited by the Turks, as Skanderbeg was in close relations with King Alfonso of Naples, the enemy of the Venetians. As soon as Murad found his hands free, he left Seres in the spring of 1446, at the appeal of Nerio II. Acciajuoli and his general Turakhan in Central Greece, and set out to crush the bold Palæologus in the Peloponnese. Constantine offered him Northern Hellas as the price of the

Morea. Murad answered by imprisoning Constantine's ambassadors, among whom was the historian Chalkondyles. The battle began, the last great effort of the Hellenes against the Asiatic barbarians who were preparing, as aforetime under Xerxes, to rush upon the Peloponnese.

The Turks had now brought that most terrible of western inventions, artillery, to such perfection that the walls of the Greek towns could not hold out against them. For three days their cannon-balls breached the defences of the Hexamilion, and on December 10th the Janissaries and Serbs were sent forward to storm the breach ; on December 14th,

1446, the last bulwark of Greek freedom fell into their hands. The whole of the Peloponnese lay open ; with incalculable booty and 60,000 slaves of war, Murad returned to Thebes, whither Constantine and Thomas had sent their plenipotentiaries in the spring of 1447. By payment of a poll tax they secured the continuance of their precarious predominance in the Peloponnese. A year after this peace the Byzantine emperor, John VIII., died on October 13th, 1448, in the castle of Misithra, above the ruins of Sparta ; on January 6th, 1449, his son received the deputies from the capital, who delivered to him the diadem and purple. With the

emir's permission, to secure which he had sent his councillor Phrantzes at the beginning of December, Constantine XI. Dragases, the last successor of Constantine the Great, assumed the crown of thorns of the East Roman Empire ; while his brothers Thomas and Demetrius divided the responsibilities of the Peloponnese, he sailed to Byzantium, on March 12th, in Catalanian ships. The emperor was received with great rejoicing in his new state, which was limited, as in the times of ancient



THE CONSOLIDATOR OF OTTOMAN POWER
Sultan Mohammed II. was the great consolidator of Ottoman power in the middle of the fifteenth century, and in 1453 captured Constantinople and established the empire there, reigning from 1451 till 1481.

Greece, to the environs of the castle. A few days after the battle of Varna, the

emir had again wrested victory from the grasp of the noble Hunyadi of Hungary in the three days' battle of Kossovo on the Amsel, on October 17-19th, 1448. The Pope, Nicholas V., who was naturally

timid, was so terrified by this defeat that he advised the Hungarians through his nuncio to remain within their own frontiers ; he urged that it was no longer Greece, but Hungary, that was the bulwark against the Turk.


King Stephen of Bosnia had already reverted to the Roman Church in the time of Eugenius IV. ; Nicholas V.

THE OTTOMAN CONQUEST OF BYZANTIUM

was chiefly busied in opposing the sect of the Patarenes, who were in alliance with the Turks. The monastic and secular clergy, building on the emir's favour, sought to lay hands on the Church property of Bosnia; at a later date the Bosnian—that is, the Slavonic—magnates embraced Mohammedanism with enthusiasm. But of Slavonic race also was the famous Christian hero, George Kastriot, who had begun his struggle against the Turks in 1444, with the victory in the Dibra, and kept the standard of freedom flying in Albania for twenty years with unbroken courage and supported by the Pope. The same Pope supported, with utmost

to his powerful son, Mohammed II. (1451–1481), who ascended the Ottoman throne at the age of twenty-one. The Duke of Athens, Nerio II., also died in the same year as Murad. Mohammed II. had no intention of allowing Attica to fall into the hands of the Venetians, who had seized the island of Ægina in the summer of 1451. For the moment he sent to Athens the son of Antonio Acciajuoli, who was living at the sultan's court, and was received with enthusiasm by the orthodox population, who favoured the Turks.

Mohammed also solemnly renewed the pledges of peace and friendship with Byzantium, as with other petty states



THE HISTORIC TOWN OF THESSALONICA, THE MODERN SALONICA

This ancient capital of the Lombards, famous in Scripture through Paul's epistles to the Thessalonians, served for more than two centuries as the base of the Frankish conquests of Hellas, and fell to the Turks, under Murad II., in 1430.

sympathy and self-sacrifice, the course of the struggle for Rhodes, and also that for the island of Cyprus, which was threatened by the Turks shortly afterwards; he placed half of the French indulgence money at the disposal of the king of Cyprus. Between 1454 and 1455 a German popular book was printed for the first time with the movable types of the Mainz Bible, "Eyn manung der cristenheit widdir die durken" (in the Hof und Staatsbibliothek at Munich), an appeal to take the field against the Turks and to exterminate them. The pamphlet is in direct connection with the Cypriot indulgence. When Murad died, on February 5th 1451, he left a heritage of war

While, however, he was occupied in Asia with the subjugation of the refractory Emir Ibrahim of Karaman, the Emperor Constantine XI. Dragases conceived the unhappy idea of demanding twice the ransom offered by the Turks for the Ottoman prince Urkhan, who was then a prisoner in Constantinople. The Grand Vizir, Caliph Pasha, who befriended the Greeks, was horrified at the presumptuous folly of this demand, which the Greek ambassador brought to the camp of Akshehir.

Mohammed immediately concluded peace with the ruler of Karaman and satisfied the Janissaries with monetary gifts, with the object of gaining freedom to concentrate the whole of his strength upon


Constantinople. Making Adrianople his base of operations, he cut off the revenues of the Strymon, now Vardar, which were destined for the maintenance of Urkhan. In the spring of 1452 he began the construction of a fortress at a spot where the Bosphorus is narrowest, its breadth being only 550 metres, and where a strong current, still known to the Turks as "the devil's stream," carries ships from the Asiatic side to the promontory of Hermaion on the European side. It was here in antiquity that Xerxes crossed with his army by the bridge of Mandrocles. Opposite to Anadoli Hissar, previously built by Bajazet upon the ruins of the Byzantine state prison, the "Towers of Lethe," rose the bastion with walls 25 feet thick, and 60 feet high, known to the Turks as Boghaskessen, and to the Greeks as Laimokopion—that is, decapitator. The possession of the two castles of Rumili

**Emperor's
Ambassador
Beheaded**

and Anadoli Hissar enabled Mohammed to cut the communications of the Genoese and Venetians with their colonies in Pontus. The emperor's protestations and proposals were totally disregarded by the emir, who beheaded the second ambassador, as he had threatened, and definitely declared war in June, 1452.

Constantine XI. now showed further inclination to union with the Latins; however anxious he may have been to accomplish this project, he was unable to bend his people to his will. In May, 1452, the Pope sent Cardinal Isidore, an enthusiastically patriotic Greek, as legate to Byzantium with

200 auxiliary troops. In his following was the archbishop Leonard of Mitylene, who has left us an account of the siege of the town. The festival of union, which was celebrated in the church of St. Sophia on December 12th, 1452, with prayers both for the Pope and for the uniate patriarch Gregor, who had been living in banishment since 1450, was in reality a mere farce. The schismatic clergy were furious with the emperor for his public adherence to the union; the mob uttered curses on the uniates, and the harbour workmen drank to the destruction of the Pope. The "archduke" (high admiral and chief of the artillery) Lukas Notaras, the chief official of the helpless empire, represented the sentiments of true orthodox animosity with the words, "We would rather see the turban of Turkey than the tiara of Rome in our city." With the exception of the Pope and



SOME OF THE STRANGE WEAPONS OF MEDIÆVAL WARFARE

These old engravings show the crude and clumsy character of mediæval weapons. 1 and 2 are movable sheds for protection while undermining the walls, and 3 is a huge sling for throwing stones, while 4 is a portable stage for scaling. In 5 we see the battering-ram in use, the besieged endeavouring to counteract its blows, while the sixth illustration shows a great movable tower combining a variety of uses and carrying spearmen on the top.



SOLDIERS OF THE CRUSADES AND ARTILLERY OF THE MEDIÆVAL AGES

In this old print we see, ready for action, some of the cumbrous machines of war described on the opposite page.

Alfonso the Noble of Aragon, Navarre, Naples, and Sicily, who was really furthering his own political ends, the only Christian powers who gave the Greek emperor any real help were the two republics of Genoa and Venice. They possessed an incalculable amount of public and private property in Galata, Pera, and the Pontic colonies. In Galata the Genoese had strengthened their fortifications a short time before, and had raised their long-famous tower. They and their colony of Chios sent two ships and 700 soldiers under Giovanni Longo of the Giustiniano family. So recently as September 10th, 1451, the Venetians had renewed their commercial treaty with Mohammed; hence the ambiguity of the instructions which they gave to Jacopo Loredano, the commander of their fleet.

**Mighty Army
of Fanatics Attacks
Constantinople**

Jacopo Veniero, archbishop of Ragusa, from Porto Recanati as legate on April 28th.

On March 23rd, 1453, the Emir Mohammed started from Adrianople. On April 6th he was within half a mile of Constantinople with an army of 165,000 fanatics greedy for plunder. To this overwhelming force the Greek emperor could oppose

a total of only 4,973 armed Greeks and some 2,000 foreigners, including Genoese, Venetians, Cretans, Romans, and Spaniards. The siege was begun forthwith; its details have been transmitted to us by a number of eye-witnesses. Fourteen batteries on the land side and twelve heavy guns at special points hurled stone cannon-balls of even 500 pounds weight day and night upon the city. A bold resistance was offered, in which the emperor himself was specially distinguished, as also was Giustiniani with his foreign troops, who worked incessantly to repair the breaches. The colossal walls with their towers and breaches remain as evidence of the strength of the Byzantine fortress, and of the fury of the struggle which then raged about it. The German Johann Grant, by driving countermines at the Egrikapu gate, forced the Turks to abandon their mining operations at the Blachernæ gate in May. Many Greeks, however, instead of bearing their part in the struggle, consoled themselves with the prophecies of the monks, to the effect that the Turks would make their way into the city as far as the pillars of Constantine and would then be driven out of the town to the very borders of Persia by an angel from heaven.

When Mohammed was able to begin his attacks from the sea side, from which the Greek fire had driven him for a time, the fate of the city was sealed. In the night of the 21st and 22nd of April he dragged his ships over a roller-way across the isthmus from Top-hane on the Bosphorus to Kassim

The Glorious Death of Constantine Pasha. Constantine rejected a final proposal to surrender. On Tuesday, May 29th, 1453, the tremendous assault was begun at two o'clock at night. Sagan Pasha at last forced his way through a breach with his Janissaries. Giustiniani was wounded and fled to a ship. Constantine XI. fell dead upon the heaped-up corpses of his faithful adherents.

His splendid death, says Gibbon, is more glorious than the long prosperity of the Byzantine Cæsars. When his blood-stained body was at length discovered, the Turks cut off the head and brought it to the emir. In fierce delight he ordered it to be placed upon the summit of Justinian's bronze pillar, and afterwards sent it round to the governors of his Asiatic provinces for exhibition. Cardinal Isidore had the presence of mind to exchange his purple robe for the uniform of a dead soldier; he was thrown into prison, but afterwards escaped to the Morea and to Venice, bringing to the West the first detailed account of the event which was to exercise so vast an importance on the history of the world. Thousands had taken refuge in St. Sophia, the church which they had scorned as a means of spiritual salvation since the union festival of the previous December. "If at that moment," says a Greek historian, "an angel had descended from heaven and had commanded, 'Accept the union of the churches,' they would have preferred falling into the hands of the Turks to surrender to Rome."

The massacre which broke out in the town and in the church was checked only by the consideration that the living were of value for their

ransom. According to an entry in the journal of the Venetian Barbaro, the prisoners amounted to 60,000; the plunder was valued at 300,000 ducats, and it became proverbial to account for a man's wealth by saying that he must have been at the conquest of Constantinople. On the morning of May 30th, when Mohammed rode among the devastated ruins of Constantine's buildings, which had seen many a splendid century of time and had housed the glory of so many monarchs, he pondered the lines of the Persian poet, "The spider weaves her web in the emperor's house, and the owl wakes the echoes with her scream in the royal chambers of Afrasiab (Samarkand)."

The capture of Constantinople gave to the emir, Mohammed II., the key to the Black Sea and the Eastern Mediterranean. The new monarch contented himself with levying a poll tax on the conquered;



ENTRY OF MOHAMMED II. INTO CONSTANTINOPLE
The conqueror entered a city of slaughter, and the plunder was so enormous that it became proverbial to account for a man's wealth by saying he had been at the conquest of Constantinople. Amongst the slain was the Emperor.



THE FINAL CONQUEST OF CONSTANTINOPLE

One of the most momentous events in history was the fall of the Byzantine Empire with the capitulation of Constantinople to Mohammed II., in May 1453. The Turks established themselves in the great capital of the Eastern Empire, and the Church of Holy Wisdom (St. Sophia) became a Mohammedan mosque; the Crescent had triumphed over the Cross.

he also attempted to draw the Greek priesthood into his toils by declaring for the anti-union party and appointing as patriarch the orthodox Gennadios. The emir was henceforward sedulously careful that the rights of previous emperors, especially the confirmation of the patriarch in office, should remain in his hands. In this case there was no possibility of an investiture quarrel. Henceforward the patriarch was obliged to buy his position from the emir, and shortly afterwards from the chief officials of the empire as well, at a high rate of purchase. Mohammed the conqueror transformed the temple of the Holy Wisdom (St. Sophia) into a praying-house of the servants of Allah.

The new patriarch was given the second best church, that of the apostles, as his patriarchion; however, this was pulled down two years later, and the memorial column of the mighty empire-founder was afterwards erected on the site. It was not until 1606 that the Phanarists—*i.e.*, Christians in Phanar, the Greek quarter of the Golden Horn—were able to make the modest church of St. George their religious centre. The families from Trebizond, Kassa, Amastris, and other places, who settled here soon formed a pluto-

cracy, and, as bankers, became indispensable to the Ottoman government, which was always in want of money. The Phanarists obtained the most productive posts, and their daughters became influential in the harems of the Seraglio and of the Turkish grandees. The higher spiritual and secular classes of Greek society ended by making common cause for mutual profit with their Mohammedan masters, with the object of plundering the Christian rayahs.

It became usual for Greeks from Constantinople, Smyrna, the Peloponnese, and the islands to occupy the bishops' thrones in the Turkish Empire and to throng the monasteries of Mount Athos. The Phanariote clergy were bound by no national ties to their people, and were often entirely out of sympathy with the inhabitants of their dioceses in Europe and Asia. This ecclesiastical and secular supremacy of Greeks over Slavs, Roumanians, and Arabs gradually engendered deep hatred, and was the cause of the intricate linguistic and ecclesiastical complications which still exert a confusing and embittering influence upon the national questions and struggles of the Balkan states. Henceforward, the Greek clergy in every quarter

Corruption of Byzantine Officialdom

Greeks and Moslems make Common Cause

preferred siding with the Ottomans to accepting the tutelage of the Pope; for them the sultan's rule eventually proved more tolerable and more profitable than, for instance, the hated government of the Venetians, who desired to enchain soul as well as body. Mohammed also summoned the Archbishop of Armenia from

Western Europe's Lamentation

Brusa to Constantinople and appointed him patriarch; from that date numerous Armenian immigrants streamed into Constantinople. The news of the great Turkish victory over the "Christian dogs" soon reached every country in the East. The Emir Mohammed had now success on his side, and prestige has always counted for more with the East than with the West. Western Europe, however, burst into loud lamentation over the heavy loss which Christendom had suffered. The literature of this century resounds with threnodies or songs of woe upon the fall of the eternal city. With twenty or thirty thousand warriors and a few ships, Christian Europe might have brought salvation; but now the banner of the Cross had bowed before the sacred standard of Mohammed.

Retribution was paid to the full. For two centuries the West trembled before the Mohammedan rulers on the Bosphorus. The earliest news of the fall of Eastern Rome and the bloody end of the bravest of the Palæologi was received at Venice on June 19th. On June 20th the signoria imparted it to the Pope, who was deeply shocked and at once sent out legates to try and secure peace among the Italian states, which were torn by internecine conflict. On September 30th, Nicholas V. issued a great appeal for a new Crusade, and in 1454 the Reichstag of Ofen appointed Hunyadi commander-in-chief. On the other hand, the Venetian Bartolommeo Marcello concluded a peace on April 18th, 1454, with the "ruler of the faithful," which became the basis

Appeal For a New Crusade


of all subsequent relations between Venice and the Porte. The first article of this disgraceful convention ran thus: "Between the Emir Mohammed and the Signoria of Venice exists peace and friendship now as formerly." Yet the emir had executed the Venetian Bailo in Constantinople, and was holding 500 Venetian subjects as prisoners. But the consideration of their warlike neighbours in Italy, their

increasing financial difficulties, and the commercial interests which they valued above everything decided the question.

Genoa also attempted to enter into relations with the emir, and in Naples, Florence and Milan men rejoiced openly at the embarrassment of the lagoon city. The remainder of Western Europe remained inactive. No one, indeed, confessed to inaction; on the contrary, official announcements were made by all the princes of their readiness to help in driving out the Turk. With the exception of Hungary, Alfonso of Portugal alone manifested any serious intent; but his attempts at relief were interrupted by the North African Moorish states of Fez and Ceuta. The mournful news reached Rome from Cyprus and Rhodes that a Turkish fleet of fifty-six sail had attacked Moncastro in the Black Sea, surprised Sebastopol, raided Kassa, Sudak, and Balaclava, and devastated the coast of the Crimea.

Nicholas V. issued invitations for a peace conference at Rome. On August 30th, 1454, Venice, Milan, and Florence there concluded a twenty-five years' league for securing the safety of their states. This peace marks the true renaissance of art and science in Italy. Together with his Crusade preachers, Nicholas V. had sent out a band of emissaries and messengers provided with considerable sums to all the countries in Europe and Asia which the Ottomans had subdued, with orders to discover the manuscripts carried from Constantinople and to buy them up at any price.

Pope Calixtus III. issued a new Crusade Bull on May 15th, 1455. The order of the Minorites worked miracles of eloquence as Crusade preachers; in particular, Capistrano and Heinrich Kalteisen of Coblenz succeeded in gathering and exciting the masses of the people. Charles VII. of France absolutely forbade meetings in his country, and retained the crusading fleet for service against England. Burgundy embezzled the funds for the Crusade, Alfonso of Naples misused the papal fleet for an expedition against Genoa; and in 1455 King Christian of Denmark and Norway plundered the cathedral sacristy of Roskilde of the "Turkish offerings" given by the pious. In vain did Calixtus order that the angelus should summon all Christians at midday to prayer against their hereditary foe.






A GLIMPSE OF LIFE IN A TURKISH HAREM

From the painting entitled "The Gilded Cage," by Frederick Goodall, R.A.
By permission of Sir Francis Cory-Wright, Bart., owner of the picture.



EASTERN
EUROPE TO
THE FRENCH
REVOLUTION



THE
OTTOMAN
EMPIRE
III

THE SHINING OF THE CRESCENT OTTOMAN POWER AT ITS ZENITH

THE GREAT AGE OF SULEIMAN THE MAGNIFICENT

MOHAMMED II. was confirmed in his resolution to act on the aggressive by observing the fruitless endeavours of the Holy Father to induce the European nationalities to unite for the repulse of Islam. With true foresight the Ottoman ruler recognised that Hunyadi and Skanderbeg were his most dangerous opponents. In July, 1455, he conquered the well-fortified Servian mining town of Novoberdo with all its treasures. In Krushevatz, on the western Morava, he established a foundry in which his workmen, including German, Hungarian, Italian, and other Christians, were busied day and night in casting heavy guns for the siege of Belgrade. Careful war organisation of this kind, extending even to the smallest details and the most remote contingencies, was at that time unprecedented in the West.

Belgrade had been invested since June, 1456; the courage of the besieged was beginning to fail by the time that "the three Johns" approached. Hunyadi, Capistrano, and the papal legate Carvajal advanced at the head of an army consisting mainly of ill-armed citizens, peasants, monks, hermits, and students, with a few German men-at-arms and three hundred Poles. On July 14th, 1456, they reached Greek Weissenburg. Carvajal had failed to reconcile the Emperor Frederic III. with King Ladislaus Posthumus of Hungary. The Hungarian nobility themselves stood aloof. The troops, however, inflamed by the inspiring eloquence of Capistrano, broke the Turkish barrier of ships in the Danube after a murderous conflict of five hours' duration. A bold sortie gained some breathing space for the besieged; the emir himself was wounded. Belgrade, the outpost of Christianity, was saved, but Servia was lost. A fearful epidemic decimated the army and carried off the heroic Hunyadi on August 11th, 1456;

the aged Capistrano also succumbed on October 23rd at Illok, on the Danube, the most beautiful town of Sarmatia.

The complete indifference of the Western powers obliged the Pope in December, 1456, to apply for help against the Turks to the Christian king of Ethiopia, to the Christians in Syria, Georgia, and Persia, even to Uzun Hasan, the chieftain of the Turkomans of the White Ram. The Turks had conquered Servia without difficulty after the death of the despot Georg Brankovic on December 24th, 1457. Helene, a daughter of Thomas Palaeologus, and the widow of his son Lazar, who had died at the end of January, 1458, had surrendered the country as a papal fief in the hope of thereby securing its safety. The whole of the people rose against this presumption; they would rather throw themselves into the arms of the Turks than attempt to purchase the entirely unreliable support of the Latin West at the price of their ancestral faith. Albania and Bosnia were soon to share the same fate.

In Bosnia private and sectarian feuds and dissensions were raging alike in the ruling house which inclined to Rome, and among the magnates and the anti-Roman Paterines, whose sympathies were Turkish. The king Stefan Thomashevic paid for his double dealing towards King Matthias of Hungary and Mohammed in 1458 under the executioner's axe in 1463; thirty thousand young Bosnians were incorporated with the Janissaries. In vain did Stefan's mother Katherina bequeath her lost country to the apostolic chair. Hunyadi's son, Matthias Corvinus, conquered Jaicze on October 1st, 1463, but could not prevent the advance of the Turks to the mountain passes of Herzegovina and Montenegro, and the victory of Islam in 1464. The Franciscans were the sole shelter and refuge for the

**The Outpost
of Christianity
Preserved**

Christians who remained in Bosnia under decrees of toleration and the letter of protection issued by Mohammed.

In Albania, notwithstanding the treachery of the jealous leaders of his warlike mountain people, the heroic spirit of Skanderbeg offered a most tenacious resistance; in the autumn of 1457 he gained a bloody victory over the army of Isabeg in the Tomornitza. At the same time the papal fleet under Lodovico Scarampi defeated the Turks at Metelino. But in the summer of 1458 the Morea and Attica were overrun and devastated by Mohammed's wild troops; Athens fell into the hands of the Turks in June, as did Corinth on August 6th. In that region Turakhan was summoned by the despots of the Morea, Thomas and Demetrius Palæologus, to quell an Albanian revolt; in 1453 and 1454 he defeated the Albanians in a series of bloody engagements.

The "despots" now felt the conqueror's power. A quarrel began between the Duke of Athens and Bartolommeo Contarini, who fled to Stamboul. The emir then resolved to make a clean sweep. Omar Pasha, the son of Turakhan, marched into Athens in June, 1456, while a great famine wasted the land and a comet appalled the inhabitants; two years later the Acropolis surrendered, as we have related. After the massacres in the Peloponnese the emir himself appeared in Athens in the last weeks of August with a brilliant following at the invitation of his pasha. Though his arrival marked the beginning of four centuries of servitude, he proved more merciful than Xerxes or Mardonius in days of old. His admiration of the architecture and situation of the city is related by his flattering biographer Kritobulos.

However, the jubilation of the Greeks at the retirement of the Roman clergy from the Latin church of the Parthenon was premature. When Mohammed revisited the city in the autumn of 1460, he transformed the Parthenon into a mosque, in anger at the repeated revolts of the inhabitants. In 1458 the duke was spared, but he was executed at Thebes in the next year for treachery. His sons were placed in the Janissary life-guard. His widow, a daughter of the dynast Demetrius of Morea, was given in marriage to the former Protovestiarus George Amoirutzis, who had betrayed to the sultan in 1461 the

"Great Comnenus," David of Trebizond. Athens was no longer a name of importance in Europe.

In 1462 the Ottomans began the subjugation of Wallachia, whose tyrannical prince, the Christian Voivode Vlad—Vladislav IV., nicknamed Drakul—had roused the sultan's anger by the treacherous destruction of a Turkish army under Hama Zenevisi Pasha. Mohammed's punitive campaign led him through that appalling oak forest where for two miles the army marched past the 20,000 Turkish and Bulgarian corpses which Vlad had impaled in 1461. Vlad Drakul took refuge with Matthias Corvinus, who kept him under strict guard, since the fugitive had plotted for the betrayal of his protector to the emir. His brother Radul, a hostage of Mohammed, obtained the power in Wallachia under Turkish supremacy.

During the six years of his pontificate (1458-1464) Pius II. (Æneas Silvius) had worked incessantly to raise a general crusade. So early as October 13th, 1458, he had issued a vigorous bull inviting the Christian princes to a council of war at Mantua; but the French cardinals opposed him both publicly and privately. King Lewis XI. of France not only retained the crusade tithes for his own purposes, but would not allow Duke Philip of Burgundy to perform his promise to the Pope. In 1459 Frederic III. had received the crown of Matthias Corvinus from the magnates of Hungary. At the Nuremberg Reichstag, the legate, Cardinal Bessarion, strove in vain to heal the breach between the emperor and Hungary.

Disasters soon occurred in rapid succession. The island of Lemnos, which belonged to the Genoese family of Gattilusio, had been betrayed by the Greeks to the Turkish fleet in the spring of 1456. In September, 1462, Lesbos also fell into the power of Mohammed II. On March 7th, 1461, Thomas, the dethroned despot of the Morea, arrived in Rome by way of Corfu; his brother Demetrius had submitted to the emir at the end of May, 1460, and had given him his daughter in marriage; he died in 1470 as a monk at Adrianople. The daughter of Thomas, the Princess Zoë, married in 1472 the Grand Prince Ivan III. Vassilievitch of Moscow, thereby placing her claims in the hands of Russia. Ivan adopted a new coat-of-arms for Russia, the two-headed eagle, which

**Papal Fleet
Defeats
the Turks**

**A Rapid
Succession
of Disasters**

**Parthenon
Becomes a
Mosque**

may be seen to-day in the Kremlin at Moscow, and sent an ambassador to Stamboul, naturally to no purpose. Andreas, recognised as titular despot of the Morea by Pope Paul II. in 1465, the last male descendant of the royal house of the Palæologi, in order to relieve his financial difficulties, sold his rights to the French king Charles VIII. in 1494, and bequeathed them on his death on April 7, 1502, to the Spanish rulers Ferdinand and Isabella.

In the summer and autumn of 1461 the principality of Sinope and the empire of Trebizond fell into the hands of the Ottomans. Argos was lost on April 3rd, 1463, and the whole of Bosnia in the summer. Ragusa was then placed in a highly dangerous position. The Pope projected and actually carried out an attempt to convert the emir himself, holding out as an inducement the possession of the whole of the East. At length, on July 19th, 1463, the Pope's zealous efforts were rewarded by the reconciliation of the emperor with the king of Hungary. A convention was executed in Vienna-Neustadt, which recognised the Corvini as kings so long as their family should continue, while securing

The Pope's Unrealised Ambition

the succession to the Hapsburgs in case Matthias should leave no children. About this time Venice

and Hungary concluded an offensive and defensive alliance, upon which Skanderbeg reopened hostilities in Albania. Milan and the Florentines stood aloof, watching the Venetian disasters with malicious joy. A Florentine chronicler even relates that his countrymen intercepted Venetian letters and handed them to the emir. In vain did the Pope attempt to dazzle the Florentines with a stupendous plan for the partition of Turkey, the first of the many subsequent projects of the kind which have continued to our own times. When the crusading army in Ancona grew tired of waiting and disbanded, Pius II. died in sight of the Venetian galleys his life's object unrealised, on August 14th, 1464.

His successor, the Venetian Pietro Barbo, Paul II., resumed his predecessor's task with vigour. Of pressing importance was the relief of the bold Skanderbeg in his fortress of Kruja, or Croja. In the event, the Turks were defeated in 1466 and 1467, their leader Balaban killed, and Kruja saved. But on January 17th, 1468, Skanderbeg succumbed to the effects

of a fever at Allassio at the age of sixty. Christianity had suffered no severer loss since the death of Hunyadi and Capistrano. "They have lost their sword and their shield!" cried Mohammed II. in joy. The Albanian army was dispersed, and the upper and wealthier classes of the Albanian population accepted Mohammedanism, while the lower

Venetians as Naval Conquerors

classes, the ancestors of the modern Catholic Gheges, preferred to retire to the life of shepherds and klephts, or brigands, in the inaccessible mountain ranges.

Between 1465 and 1468 the Venetians had gained some success in Greek waters under Sigismondo Malatesta, who died in 1468, Vittore Capello, who died in 1467, and Niccolo da Canale. To the energetic emir this was but a stimulus to raise his fleet to the invincible power which it attained in 1469. His crews included the most capable seamen of the age, Jews and Greeks, especially the so-called Stratiotes, who then served as mercenaries all over Europe. Mohammed started for Greece in 1470 at the head of an army of 100,000 men, while his admiral Mahmud Pasha co-operated with a fleet of three hundred sail. On July 12th, Negropont—Chalcis in Eubœa—fell after a desperate resistance. Fortunately for Christendom, the Turkoman prince Uzun Hasan created a diversion in Asia which drew off the main body of the Turkish forces, for the Ottoman cavalry had completely overrun Croatia to the very borders of Styria and Carinthia.

On June 24th, 1471, the famous "general Christian assembly" was opened at Ratisbon under the presidency of the emperor. Messages of disaster and appeals for help rang in the emperor's ears more importantly than ever before. In vain did the papal legate strive to heal the quarrel between the brothers of the house of Wittelsbach; in vain did the Venetian ambassadors make glowing promises; in vain was

The Miserable End of the Council of Ratisbon

it resolved to send embassies of peace to Poland and Hungary. These selfish

point of view from which the lethargic emperor began the negotiations for help against the Turks and imperial reform unfortunately decided the attitude of the princes of the empire. Compared with the great hopes built upon it, the assembly came to a miserable conclusion. Pope Sixtus IV. (1471-1484) also hoped

to secure a general federation of the European powers for exclusive action against the Turks. But on November 18th, 1472, died the noble Bessarion, the life and soul of the movement for resistance within the Curia. He, together with famous Greeks, like Chalkondyles, Laskaris, Argyropulos, and Gaza, had done their work as missionaries of Greek life, to raise those great intellectual centres in Italy whence the humanist movement sprang.

For the moment, however, defeat followed defeat. Disputes broke out between the Venetians and the cardinal-admiral Carasa, although their united fleet had won victories at Satalia and Smyrna.

On July 26th, 1473, the lion-hearted Mohammed had crushed the Persian ruler Uzun Hasan at Terjan and was now pressing upon his enemies in Albania, on the Adriatic, and on the Danube frontier. A fruitless victory was gained by Stefan the Great, the Voivode of Moldavia, at Racova on January 4th, 1475, over superior numbers of the enemy. In June the Genoese colony of Kassa in the Crimea fell into Turkish hands; in 1478 Mohammed II. appointed the Tartar Mengli Giray as Khan of the Crimea, of the north coast of Pontus, and of Tartary Minor, under Turkish supremacy. Lepanto and Leukas were vigorously assaulted in May, 1477. In Albania, Kruja the capital, on June 15th, 1478, Shabljak, Alessio, and Drivasto were captured by the Turks, who repeated their devastating incursions into the Austrian Alps. The Venetian Republic, devastated by a fearful pestilence, then came to the momentous resolution to give up the bloody struggle, to surrender Albania, Eubœa, and Lemnos, but to save their Levant commerce. At this price Venice concluded peace with the sultan through Giovanni Dario on January 25th, 1479. The conqueror, however, did not remain quiescent. Leonardo III.

The Horrors of the Fall of Otranto

Tocco was driven out of Leukas in the summer of 1479. Rhodes offered renewed resistance from May to July, 1480, under Pierre d'Aubusson, grand master of the order of St. John. But on August 11th, Otranto in Apulia fell into the hands of the unbelievers amid the horrors of dreadful carnage. This news came upon Christendom like a bolt from the blue. In the midst of hurried preparations for resistance the

news arrived of the death of Mohammed II., the mighty conqueror who had terrorised the whole of Europe for a full generation. He died on May 3rd, 1481, at Ankyron, near Hunkiar Chairi, between Gebse and Herake in Asia Minor. Here, centuries before, Constantine the Great, who founded the city which Mohammed captured, had breathed his last. On September 10th, Otranto was recovered by the cardinal legate Fregoso and King Ferrante of Naples.

It is difficult to form an estimate from a Western standpoint of the character of Mohammed II. and of his importance to Turkish history. When this sultan expired in the midst of his army, he had ruled the Ottoman Empire for thirty years, and was nearly fifty three years of age. The accounts of contemporary historians concerning him are coloured either by grovelling admiration of his personality or by hatred and abhorrence of the misery which he, above all men, brought upon Christendom. The cruelties practised by his troops in Austria can hardly have met with his approval, resulting as they did in a useless expenditure of force, and the horrors of Otranto so disgusted him that he executed the pasha responsible for their commission. But in order to secure himself in undisturbed possession of the throne he murdered his brother at his mother's breast, and added an enactment upon fratricide to the legal code of Kanunnameh, supporting it by the maxim of the Koran, "Disorder is more ruinous than murder."

Imperial Murder Supported by the Koran

After his victory he erected in Stamboul the mosque of Ayub, the prophet's standard-bearer, wherein all sultans were henceforward girded with the sword of Omar. He constructed a countless number of buildings, chiefly through his architect Christobulos. His greatest architectural work, the Mehmedieh, displays in its interior the words of the prophet in letters of gold: "Ye shall conquer Constantinople; happy the prince and the army who shall achieve this." Mosques, hospitals, caravanserais, lunatic asylums, libraries, fountains, and the old Serai were completed or begun at his command.

He wrote poems under the name of Auni, the ready helper. Ottoman poetry previous to the conquest of Constantinople had been dominated by

mysticism and didactic tendencies. Mohammed II. begins the series of poets of conquest; as his contemporary appears the oculist Sheichi with a romantic love epic, "Khosrev and Shirin," which was merely an imitation from the Persian. Murad II., who had retired to live a life of contemplation at Magnesia, or Manissa, on the Sipylos, was in the habit of holding gatherings twice a week of the "knights of intellect," and rewarding them liberally; he also made attempts at verse composition. The conquest of Constantinople by Mohammed II. gave the empire and the art of poetry a secure basis. Among the swarm of poets who surrounded the artistic sultan were two poetesses, Zeineb and Mihri, who dedicated their divans, or collections of poems, to the sultan.

The conqueror was the founder of numerous schools, and kept such Persian and Indian scholars in his pay as Khoja Jihan and Jami. Bajazet II. followed this example. He, like his brother Djem and Prince Korkud, whose end was no less tragic, occupied himself with art and poetry. The Bajazet, or pigeon mosque, in Stamboul, with its splendid forecourt, remains one of the finest monuments of Ottoman architecture. Before the battle of Jemishehir, Djem, who had been previously victorious at Brusa, proposed to Bajazet that they should divide the empire as brothers. Bajazet replied with the Arabian verse: "The king's sword cleaves the ties of blood; the sultan

has no kinship even with his brothers." Selim I., Suleiman the Great, and Selim II. followed this example, conquered kingdoms, and cherished the Muses amid all their cruelties. Mention must also be made at this point of the sheikh Vefasade. His dominant personality and his character of the old Roman type made him typical of the sages who adorned this period of Mohammed II. In his time occurred the first installation of a poet laureate in the

person of Sati, who was commissioned to produce yearly three Kassidé (poems on special subjects), at the beginning of spring and at the two festivals of Beiram. It must be said that the skilful management of rhyme and metre was the first consideration with the Ottoman poet. Form was to him more important than content, manner than matter, description than feeling; his poetical forms were derived chiefly from the Arabs, the spirit and home of the desert.

After the death of Mohammed II., two dangers threatened the Turkish Empire—revolt on the part of the Janissaries and internal disruption. Both of these were overcome by Bajazet II. (1481-1512). To the Janissaries he made rich presents; indeed, the presents given to these prætorian guards rose at every change in the succession, until their delivery three centuries later brought about a financial crisis. Prince Djem, on the other hand, was for a long time a source of fear and anxiety to the sultan



THE MOSQUE OF THE PROPHET'S STANDARD-BEARER
The famous mosque of Ayub, the Prophet's standard-bearer, was erected at Stamboul by Mohammed II. after his conquest of Constantinople, and here henceforward each successive sultan girded on the sword of Omar. It is an excellent example of Ottoman architecture.

in the hands of his enemies. Beaten at Jenishehir on June 20th, 1481, he fled from Konia to Cairo; defeated at Konia with Kasimbeg of Karaman in the spring of 1482, he took refuge with the knights of Rhodes, on July 23rd; in return for an annual subsidy of 45,000 ducats from Turkey, they kept him confined at Rousillon, a

**"The Grand Turk"
a Prisoner
in the Vatican**

commandery of the order on the Rhone; after February, 1483, he was kept at Le Puy. All the princes of Europe rivalled one another in their efforts to get the "Grand Turk" into their power. On March 13th, 1489, the prince, famous, like his brother, as a poet, entered the Vatican as a prisoner in honourable confinement. On February 24th, 1495, he died at Naples, after Pope Alexander VI. had been compelled to hand him over to Charles VIII. of France. He was presumed to have died from poison administered to him in Rome by the Pope, who was paid by Bajazet for this service.

Bajazet's court had now become the arena of the diplomatists of Europe. Embassies and proposals for conventions had replaced the sword. The six Italian powers were the chief rivals for the sultan's favour; they did not shrink upon occasion from employing the help of the infidels to procure the destruction of their Christian opponents. While Bajazet conquered Kilia and Akjerman, two important points in Moldavia, and while the Emperor Frederic III. was embroiled with Matthias Corvinus in further disputes upon the succession after the death of the King of Hungary on April 6th, 1490, Spain conquered Granada in 1492, and was consequently able to interfere independently in the course of European affairs. A short time previously, King Ferrante I. of Naples had secretly supported the Moors against the Spaniards. He now concluded peace with Spain, from whose harbour of Palos the Pope's

**The Jews
Expelled
From Spain**

great compatriot, Columbus, had sailed to the discovery of a new world. Impressed by these events, the sultan sent the Pope the sacred lance of Longinus as a most valuable present. The decree of the Grand Inquisitor Torquemada of March 31st, 1492, expelled 300,000 Jews from Spain; they were hospitably received by Bajazet, who settled them in Constantinople, Salonica, Smyrna, and Aleppo. From their great centres of refuge the

Spanioles, or Sephardim, rose to positions of high honour and wealth, even as diplomatists in the service of the Porte, and were therein surpassed only by Greeks, Armenians, and Levantines.


On March 31st, 1495, a holy league was concluded by Venice, Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, Maximilian I., Lodovico il Moro, and the Pope for the protection of Christianity against the Turks. None the less, several Hungarian towns in Bosnia were conquered in 1496. In 1497 the Turks, Tartars, and Wallachians burst into Poland, devastating the land far and wide from Lemberg and Przemysl to Banczug. On August 26th, 1499, fell Lepanto, the only possession remaining to Venice on the Gulf of Corinth. Starting from Bosnia the Turks devastated the Venetian continent to the neighbourhood of Vicenza. The coasts of Southern Italy were plundered; in August, 1500, the Venetians lost Modon, Navarino, and Koron in the Morea. In vain did Alexander VI. issue a great jubilee indulgence.

Benedet to Pesaro succeeded in reconquering Ægina; towards the end of the same year, Cephallenia; Alessio in 1501, and

**Venice Reaps
the Fruits
of Peace**

Santa Maura (Leukas) in 1502; but in 1501 Durazzo was lost, as also was Butrinto in 1502. Venice was reaping the fruits of her former careless peace policy; under the peace of October 6th, 1505, she was obliged to return Santa Maura. Hungary, which had accomplished nothing save a few marauding raids upon Turkish territory, had concluded a seven years' armistice on October 20th. The Holy Roman Empire was not even able to collect the "common penny" which had been voted at repeated diets. In vain did the humanist Jakob Wimpheling of Strassburg complain in 1505 in his "Epitome rerum Germanicarum" of the decay of the empire, the selfishness of the princes, and the advance of the Turks. Fifty years before Hans Rosenblüt had uttered an emphatic warning in "The Turk's Carnival Play": "Our master the Turk is rich and strong, and is very reverent to his God, so that He supports him, and all his affairs prosper. Whatever he has begun has turned out according to his desire."

The last years of Sultan Bajazet were troubled by disturbances within the empire and revolts excited by his sons. The Janissaries, who had placed him on the



CONTEMPORARY PLAN OF CONSTANTINOPLE IN THE YEAR 1520

This plan, published in Venice about the year 1520, shows the city as it was two generations after the Ottoman Conquest.

throne, obliged him to abdicate on April 25th, 1512, in favour of his third son, Selim.

Selim I. (1512-1520), an imperious and warlike character, revived the plans of Mohammed II., and threatened Christianity with death and destruction. After poisoning his father Bajazet, two brothers, and five nephews, he built a powerful fleet of 500 sail; conquered the Shah Ismail of Persia at Khaldyran on August 23rd, 1514, after arousing him to fight on Turkish soil by the capture and murder of 40,000 Shiites; conquered Armenia, the west of Aserbeijan, Kurdistan, and Mesopotamia; and in 1516 overthrew in Syria and Palestine the mighty kingdoms of the Egyptian Mamelukes, with which his father had been unable to cope.

After the battle of Heliopolis he marched into Cairo on January 26th, 1517. Tuman II. Bey, the last of the Burjites, was taken prisoner, and executed on April 13th. Selim had the most beautiful marble pillars of the citadel broken out and taken to Stamboul. Cairo was reduced to the position of a provincial town. The richest merchants emigrated to Constantinople. Selim, being recognised as protector by Mecca and Medina, forced the last descendant of the

Abbasid caliphs, Mutavakkil, to surrender his rights of supremacy, that he might himself thus become caliph; that is, the spiritual and temporal head of all the followers of Islam. His position as such was recognised neither by the Persian Shiites nor by the fanatical Arabs of the sacred cities, who regarded their Shereef as their spiritual head and as related to the prophet. At the time, however, the event implied the highest limit of power in the East.

Algiers had also fallen into Turkish hands. The towns on the Italian seaboard were now harried by the descents of the Turkish corsairs. In Hungary the Turkish problem had grown more acute than ever before. Carniola, Styria, Carinthia, and Austria lay open to Turkish attacks. At the peace congress of Cambrai in 1517 the Emperor Maximilian I. proposed a detailed scheme for the partition of Turkey to the monarchs, by the adoption of which their differences might be settled with the utmost profit to all concerned. At the imperial diet in Augsburg, in 1518, the crusade of Leo X. was approved. Nothing was done, however.

But a few years and two main outposts of Christendom fell into the hands of the

Ottomans—Belgrade on August 29th, 1521, and Rhodes on December 21st, 1522. Selim's son, the glorious Suleiman, had ascended the throne. In honour of his father he built the splendid Selimije mosque on the fifth hill of Stamboul, and placed the following inscription on the warrior king's grave : " Here rests Selim,

**Suleiman's
Revenge on the
Knights of St. John**

the terror of the world ; yet his body alone is here, his heart is still in battle." He avenged upon the Knights of St. John the defeat which the conqueror of Byzantium had suffered before Rhodes, in 1480 ; after a heroic defence and a six months' siege the strong island-fortress fell. A son of Djem, whom Suleiman found in Rhodes, was strangled. The inhabitants of the island migrated in 1527 to the barren Malta which Charles V. presented to them, the Pope confirming their possession.

Similarly, in the case of Belgrade, Suleiman avenged the repulse which Mohammed II. had suffered there in 1456 by his capture of the city. Europe trembled with fear, imagining his "riders and wasters" already before Vienna. A German ballad of 1522 depicts the terror which then pervaded the Holy Roman Empire : " The furious Turk has lately brought great forces into Hungary, has overcome Greek Weissenburg, and thereon he prides himself. From Hungary he has quickly and lightly entered Austria in the light of day ; Bavaria is his for the taking ; thence he presses onward, and may soon come to the Rhine, for which cause we have no peace nor rest. Our carelessness and selfishness, our proud distrust, hate, envy, and jealousy against our neighbours, these it is that give the Turk his victories."

In truth, in 1522, the Turks had already devastated a part of Hungary and were meditating an incursion into Lower Austria and Bavaria. Mehemed Bey had occupied Wallachia ; in May he ravaged the whole of the Karst to Friuli, and sat down before Laibach. The Venetians made no effort upon the loss of Rhodes ; they remained secure in Candia. Francis I., " the most Christian king of France," actually sought

an alliance with the sultan against the emperor. The noble oligarchy in Hungary were not indisposed to accept the Grand Turk as their ruler. John Zapolya, count of Zips and voivode of Transylvania, attempted to secure the Hungarian throne with the sultan's help. Peterwardein on the Danube was captured by the Grand Vizir.

Then on August 29th, 1526, followed the decisive battle in the plain of Mohacs, where the Christian army with its king was defeated after a heroic struggle. Lewis II. himself, the last Jagiello ruler of Hungary, was drowned in a swamp while in flight. Two thousand heads were placed on pikes before the grand master's tent. Four thousand prisoners were massacred, Ofen was reduced to ashes, and the land

was ravaged as far as Raab and " the Etzelburg " Gran. Zapolya, who had done homage to the sultan on his knees, received the crown of the country from Ofen to Stuhlweissenburg, and was crowned at the latter town on November 11th. King Ferdinand, the brother-in-law of the fallen Lewis, was elected king of Hungary at Pressburg on December 16th ; the day of Mohacs thus became the birthday of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. Henceforward all the enemies of the Emperor Charles V. and of King Ferdinand were on the side of the Turks and Zapolya. Even the dukes William and Lewis of Bavaria entered into secret negotia-





THE GREAT SULEIMAN

Under this greatest of all sultans the Ottoman power reached its zenith. While he ruled " sword and pen were never dry," for he fostered the arts as keenly as he fought " the infidels." His was the Augustan age of Ottoman history.

tions with the Grand Turk in regard to their claims to Bohemia.

The sultan forthwith sent the following intimation to King Ferdinand in an open letter : " With reference to the loss of our crown, you may fully expect that we shall visit you at Vienna shortly with thirteen kingdoms, and bring the most miserable death that we can devise upon all your helpers." The advance of the Turks and the fact that a Turkish fleet was cruising off Sicily expedited the conclusion of entire peace between the Emperor Charles V. and the Pope at Barcelona on June 29th, 1529, two months after the dispersal of the diet of Speyer. Francis I. had also made peace with the emperor at Cambrai, though

**Emperor
and Pope
at Peace**



INSIDE AND OUTSIDE THE GREAT MOSQUE OF SULEIMAN AT STAMBOUL

he remained in secret communication with the "Lord of all lords, the dispenser of crowns to the monarchs of the earth, the shadow of God over both worlds."

In 1528 Zapolya was forced to adopt Henry, the son of Francis, as the successor to Hungary. On September 21st the Turks appeared before Vienna. Their army was

A Quarter of a Million Turks Attack Vienna 250,000 strong, occupying sixteen encampments and 25,000 tents. Count Nikolaus Salm had evacuated the suburbs, and burnt and dismantled the castle on the Kahlenberg. With the courage of despair he established himself in the city with a garrison of 12,000 men. The imperial army voted by the diet of Speyer and the Protestants consisted of 100 horse and 14 companies of infantry. Yet, frequent sorties were made and five vigorous assaults repulsed. Suleiman had sworn to take no rest until the prayer of the prophet was delivered from the tower of Stephan's church; nevertheless, on October 15th want of supplies, unfavourable weather, and dissatisfaction among the Janissaries obliged him to raise the siege.

The wave of advancing Turkish power had been broken upon the walls of Vienna. But Hungary remained in the sultan's hands, held in feudal tenure by Zapolya. The Venetians hastened to send assurances of their goodwill to the sultan and the voivode, to whom they had done good service as spies. Aided by the religious confusion in Germany, Kasimbeg carried devastation through Austria, as did Zapolya with the Wallachians through Moravia and Silesia. Resistance was offered by an army of the empire and the forces of Charles V., amounting in all to 50,000 men. Clement VII. sent money and his nephew Hippolito dei Medici. Once again the Mohammedan advance was broken before Güns, which was heroically defended by Niklas Jurishitz from August 9th to 28th, 1532. But the imperial army dispersed again. When Ferdinand's

Luther Advises the People not to Resist the Turks ambassador boasted of the emperor's power to Ibrahim Pasha, the Grand Vizir interrupted him with the words: "Has he made peace with Martin Luther?" Luther's attitude towards the Turkish danger is remarkable. Luther advised the people not to give help against the Turks, "seeing that the Turk is ten times cleverer and more pious than our princes." Hans Sachs, the enthusiastic poet of the Reformation, repeatedly

sings of victory over the arch enemy in his poems and satires (1529). "Awake, my heart, my mind, and my good cheer, help me to praise the man at arms as is his due; his knightly deeds have been performed in Austria, even at Vienna in the city."

Luther, on the other hand, in his table talk and in his "army sermon against the Turks" in 1529, often used language which can be explained only as prompted by the deepest despair at the disunion of the rulers and the slow progress of the evangelical movement. "The Venetians," says Luther, "have done nothing of note; they are not warriors, but pepper bags. Had Germany a master, we could easily resist the Turk, but the Papists are our worst enemies, and would rather see Germany laid waste. The Papists will say that the Turk has come because of my teaching, that God has sent him to scourge Germany because Luther and his doctrine is not rooted out. But I would rather have the Turks as enemies (*sic*) than the Spaniards as protectors. As the Pope has robbed us before of our money with his indulgence in the name of the Turkish war, so also for our money will the Turk de-

Luther Charges the Pope With Robbery vour us, following the Pope's example. So may our dear Lord Jesus Christ help us and strike both Pope and Turk to the ground." Luther, however, does express patriotic sentiments. To him the Turks are *populus ira Dei*, children of wrath, servants of the devil; he utters emphatic warnings against apostasy to Islam, cheers the courageous, and consoles the prisoners. In sharp language he points the contrast between Turkish discipline and German lawlessness. But the point of dispute among the Christians continually recurs: "To go to Turkey is to go to the devil; to remain under the Pope is to fall into hell."

At length a peace was patched up between the sultan and the emperor in the summer of 1533. Suleiman employed this breathing-space to cross the Euphrates and to settle accounts with the Persians. He captured Tebriz, Tauris, and Bagdad, returning in triumph in January, 1536. To the year 1535 belong the "capitulations" concluded between Francis I. and the Porte, which served as a basis for all later conventions of the kind with other nations, with a special reference to France, the nation that was always on friendly terms and most favourably treated. These agreements secured free trade for the

THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE AT ITS ZENITH


Turks in France and for the "Franks" in all Turkish countries. They formed the point of departure for the principle of consular jurisdiction, provided for the great question of the holy places, and stipulated for a kind of protectorate over the Latin (Catholic) subjects of the Grand Turk, on which the modern French "protectorate" is based.

It was in order to alleviate the miseries of the prisoners of war and to check the enormous growth of piracy, that Charles V. undertook his famous expedition against Tunis in 1535. Goletta was conquered, many guns were taken as booty, including cannons stamped with the French lilies, 20,000 Christian slaves were set free, and Muley Hasan was allowed to hold Tunis

common enemy," and struck commemorative medals with the inscription, "Non contra fidem, sed contra Carolum." He and the Venetian republic contributed so large a sum for the sultan's help that the latter boasted that the king of France was more profitable to him than all other tributaries. With tears

Ferdinand of Austria Begg for Protestant Help in his eyes Ferdinand of Austria begged for help from the Protestants at Beggensburg. Suleiman marched through Hungary in 1542, capturing Valpo, Siclos, Fünfkirchen, Gran, Tata, and Stuhlweissenburg, while Ferdinand had only 4,000 men with which to oppose him.

Meanwhile Khaireddin Barbarossa had fruitlessly besieged Corfu in 1537, but had



THE HARBOUR AND TOWN OF RHODES AT THE END OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY
This ancient island fortress was besieged in vain by Sultan Bajazet in 1480; but when Suleiman came to the throne he soon avenged the defeat by taking Rhodes; after a defence of six months by the Knights of St. John, December, 1522.

as a fief of the Spanish crown. Charles V. contemplated the conquest of Algiers—captured in 1506 and 1509 by Ferdinand the Catholic with Oran and Bugia, but lost by Barbarossa to Horuk in 1515—and even Constantinople. But after the death of Zapolya, on July 21st, 1540, Suleiman made almost the whole of Hungary a Turkish province in September, 1541, and the expedition of

Charles to the African coast failed utterly, as a great storm either shattered his ships or drove them scattered upon the Spanish coast.

Francis I. loudly proclaimed his delight at the emperor's misfortune, congratulated the sultan on "the overthrow of their

conquered Naxos, Tinos, and Seriphos, as also Castelnovo in Dalmatia in 1539, and had forced Venice, under an agreement of October 2nd, 1540, to cede Malvasia, Napoli di Romania, Nadin, and Urana. He now landed with the Turkish fleet at Reggio in Calabria, devastated the coast, joined the French fleet at Toulon, and won a victory at Nizza on August 20th, 1543, the last refuge of the Duke of Savoy.

At the same time Suleiman Pasha, the governor of Egypt, was spreading terror even to the Indian Ocean, where he conquered the Portuguese, captured the town of Diu, and subdued the Arab princes on the coast of the Red Sea. The years 1546-1547 saw the death of four of the most

powerful men of the period—Francis I., Henry VIII., Luther, and Khairaddin Barbarossa. Even in his tomb on the right bank of the Bosphorus at Beshik Tash this great sea hero was the example and the guiding star of his successors. After the victory of the old corsair chieftain over Andrea Doria at Prevéza in 1538, the war

Piratical Turks Sweep the Mediterranean

fleets and pirates of the Turks were masters of the Mediterranean. While Maurice of Saxony gave up the towns of Metz, Toul, and Verdun to Henry II. of France in 1552, King Ferdinand sent an embassy to the camp of Sultan Suleiman at Amasia in Asia Minor. Roger Ascham, the English ambassador of the time, says of the French king, that in order to do the emperor a mischief he was ready to sell his soul simultaneously to Protestants and Papists, to the Turk and to the devil. Though not inspired with the spirit of Machiavelli, yet well acquainted with the learning of the renaissance, Ferdinand's ambassador, Augier Ghiselin of Busbeck, set out for Amasia in 1555. Not only did he bring back from Persia documentary proof of an armistice with the "glorious and splendid" conqueror, but with this embassy is also connected the discovery of the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, "the queen of inscriptions," near Busbeck in Angora, which led to a revival of interest in antiquities, paleography, epigraphy, and numismatics in the West. The same ambassador also brought the tulip bulb and the elder-tree to Europe.

Besides the four long Latin letters reporting upon his mission, he sent a despatch to the emperor containing a "proposal" as to "the possibility of waging a continued conflict with the hereditary enemy of the Christian name and blood, taking the field without dismay and securing victory." This pamphlet displays Turkish military discipline in the best and

Tragedies in Turkish Court of Splendour

German discipline in the worst possible light. But it also contains numerous suggestions for improvement. A century was to elapse before this seed could bear fruit. The Roman emperor of the German nation could not, as such, send emissaries to the Porte, since he swore in his coronation oath to wage eternal war with the infidels; it was possible for him only as king of Hungary to send ambassadors to the

Turk. A permanent German embassy could no more be maintained in Constantinople than a German colony.

Busbeck gives a full description of the court life and court splendour, and also of the horrible domestic tragedies which stained Suleiman's imperial purple with blood. For the love of his Russian consort Roxalana, Khurrem Sultana, the sultan sacrificed Mustafa, the first son of his first marriage in 1553, and Mustafa's little son, Ibrahim. Jehangir committed suicide upon his brother's corpse before his cruel father's eyes. As the younger brother Bajazet revolted against Selim II., Roxalana's eldest son, he was forced to flee to Persia in 1561. The sultan's myrmidons caught him at the Shah's court, and strangled him with his four sons.

In the summer of 1565 the Maltese order repulsed a strong Turkish attack. The better to secure the safety of the order, the grand master Jean Parisot de la Valette founded the town of Valetta in 1566, which was increased by later additions to a fortress of first-rate importance. But the campaign begun by the Emperor

Death of the Great Suleiman

Maximilian II. with 60,000 men came to a miserable end. In vain did the brave Zrinyi sacrifice himself in Szigetvar in 1566. After his heroic death this outpost fell on September 7th, and Gyula, the capital of the county of Beke, was lost with the surrounding territory.

But before the fall of Szigetvar the lion whose roar had long so affrighted Christianity had passed away on September 5th. Suleiman II. had brought the Ottoman Empire to the zenith of its power and splendour. At the same time Ismail had established the power of Persia by the consolidation of the state, Siegmund II. had secured Poland's greatness and prosperity, Ivan the Terrible had laid the foundation of Russian greatness by the conquest of Astrachan—three dangerous neighbours and contemporaries. But Suleiman the Magnificent undoubtedly takes precedence of these as a ruler both in war and peace. In his reign originated the proverb: "Treasures in Hindustan, wisdom in France, splendour in the house of Osman."

Under this greatest of all sultans a golden age began for Turkish scholarship and poetry. The lyric poet Baki made his appearance. Fazli wrote his allegorical mystical epic "Rose and Nightingale." Khalil was pre-eminent in elegiac poetry.



THE GALLANT SORTIE OF COUNT ZRINYI AGAINST THE TURKS DURING THE HEROIC DEFENCE OF SZIGETVAR IN 1686
Zrinyi made a heroic but unavailing stand against the Turks ; and the last outpost of Maximilian's movement against Ottoman oppression fell to the conquering Turk after his death

Jelili, Fikri, Sururi who died in 1561, and especially the fertile Lamii, translated and expounded the masterpieces of Persian poetry. Emri, Chiali, and Yahia were their rivals. The fable and the animal epic came into fashion, as did the writers of historical epics *Shahnameji*; they were creators and defenders of fame. Sheikh Ibrahim Halebi composed the second legal code, *Mülteka ül Buhur*, a religious, political, and military code of civil and criminal law. The *Humayun nameh* (the emperors' book) of Ali Veissi (Ali i-Wasi) is an unsurpassed model of Turkish prose. Firdusi the Long, so called to avoid confusion with his great namesake, composed the *Suleiman nameh*, a collection of Eastern tales and legends. Famous, too, are the performances of the *Khattat*, that is, the calligraphists *Psherkef*, *Hasan Effendi*, and *Karahissar*. Sultan Suleiman himself left behind a "divan" under the name of *Muhibbi*—that is, the kindly lover. Under his rule sword and pen were never dry. Messages of victory alternated with songs, and intellectual rivalry outshone the trophies of captured weapons. This was the Augustan age of Ottoman history.

Everywhere greatness, power, and splendour, to which the treasures in the old Seraglio and the sultan's castles still bear testimony, a splendour which defied the sharpest introspection to discover the

germs of decay in the roots of the flourishing growth which bore these tropic blooms. As the calligraphy, the epistolary art, and the music of the Ottomans were based on Arab models, so in content the Ottoman poetry was a formal, intentional, voluntary work of imitation. It began with artificial forms of religious mysticism and didactic writing, and continued its existence as the hothouse growth of the atmosphere of court and chancery. Even the language affected by the poets was a special product, which was and remains unintelligible to the mass of the people.


The ideas of love and freedom appealed to no Ottoman poet; the passion of love remained with him a primarily sensual impulse; his imagination never awoke from that half-sleeping rapture which the Ottomans call *Keif*. Despotism above the restraints of right and morality, the cruel extermination of the prominent and therefore dangerous members of the dynasty and the court, seraglio education, the strict seclusion of the young princes from public life, polygamy, and slavery, destroyed the freedom of intellectual and political life, destroyed the power of the ruling dynasty and of the government. The bold warrior nation became indolent amid the sweets of peace; the fighting race of Janissaries became ever more lawless and a danger to the empire instead of a support.



A DEFEAT FOR THE AGGRESSIVE TURKS AT MALTA IN THE YEAR 1565

After exhausting every effort to reduce the place, held by the Knights of Malta, the Ottoman army withdrew defeated.

EASTERN
EUROPE TO
THE FRENCH
REVOLUTION



THE
OTTOMAN
EMPIRE
IV

THE WANING OF THE CRESCENT THE MOSLEM WARS WITH CHRISTENDOM AND GRADUAL DECLINE OF TURKISH POWER

THE long and expensive war with Suleiman the Magnificent had utterly exhausted the imperial revenues of the Hapsburgs. In the year 1568 Maximilian II. was forced to consent to the payment of a yearly tribute of 60,000 ducats to Selim II. In spite of this, the devastating incursions of the "frontier guards" upon the Austrian territories continued, and from these, even in time of peace, the Turks carried off year by year as many as 20,000 Christian slaves. The boundary of the imperial hereditary lands, extending about 2,000 English miles with 21,000 men in 96 stations, absorbed 1,400,000 gulden annually in payment of service alone, and this amount was doubled in time of war.

On February 1st, 1570, Selim II. wrote to the Signoria of Venice, "I want Cyprus from you," and the Venetians, who were objects of suspicion to the powers themselves as "Christian Turks," could find no helper but the Pope. Pius V. issued a jubilee decree touching the Turkish war, and appealed to the Protestant princes to "cast away religious differences in the face of the universal danger"; he gave support to the Maltese, made Italy secure, and promoted an alliance between Hungary, France, and Spain. But Charles IX. of France had a short time previously renewed his treaty of peace and commerce with the sultan, and dissuaded even the Queen of England from supporting the movement for "help against the Turks."

**Inauguration
of the
Holy League**

News soon reached Rome of the bloody overthrow of Nikosias in Cyprus on September 9th, 1570; Marcantonio Bragadino, who heroically defended Famagusta until August 1st, 1571, was flayed alive on August 18th by the order of Lala Mustafa. It was not until May 20th, 1571, that the Holy League was solemnly inaugurated.

Don John of Austria, the natural son of the Emperor Charles V., at length left Messina on September 19th, 1571, with a fleet of 208 ships and 80,000 soldiers from Spain, Venice, Malta and Savoy. A battle was fought in the Gulf of Lepanto, off the Curzolari Islands, on October 7th. The Kapudan Pasha

**The Great
Battle of
Lepanto** Muezzin Sade Ali, the Beglerbeg of Algiers, Uluj Ali, and the Beg of Negroponte, Mohammed Shaulak, commanded the Turkish fleet of 277 ships with 120,000 men, which still flew Khairuddin's victorious pennant. Don John, Marcantonio Colonna, Agostino Barbarigo and Sebastiano Veniero, Gianandrea Doria and Alessandro Farnese, directed the battle on the Christian side, in which Cervantes lost his left arm. "This immortal day," he says in Don Quixote, "broke the pride of the Ottomans and undeceived the world, which regarded the Turkish fleet as invincible."

But the King of Spain's commands and dissensions among the allies nullified all the consequences of this shattering victory. Don John, the "man sent from God," as the triumphant Pope designated him, was obliged to surrender Goletta, which Charles V. had captured in 1535, together with Tunis and Biserta, his own captures of 1573, to the Turkish admiral, Sinan Pasha, in 1574. The Signoria of Venice, who had again concluded a special peace with the Turks at the price of Cyprus, true to its traditions, congratulated the sultan on his success of 1574. The Grand Vizir Sokolli, an old comrade-in-arms of Suleiman, scornfully thanked the Bailo of Venice with the words, "By the conquest of Cyprus we have cut off one of your arms; by the destruction of our fleet you have but shorn our beard." The continual diplomatic intercourse between the Porte and the West European

powers found expression in numerous commercial conventions; France and England in particular were eager and jealous rivals for the sultan's commercial favour, though they did not join him in alliance against Spain.

Selim survived the defeat of his fleet by only three years, and died on December 12th, 1574, exhausted by his excesses and his intemperance. His son Murad III. secured the throne (1574-1595) by the murder of his five brothers. The Popes Gregory XIII. (1572-1585) and Sixtus V. made fruitless attempts to promote a new general federation against the enemy of Christendom. Sixtus V., one of the greatest Popes, and a most far-sighted ruler, pondered the possibility of a conquest of Egypt, the construction of the Suez Canal to secure the trade of the Old World, the liberation of the Holy Sepulchre, and alliances with Persia, the Druses, Rus-

sia, and Poland. But the most powerful of the Christian powers of Europe were in alliance with the sultan. The counterpoise to Rome was to be found in the rooms of the Divan; it was as though the old relations between the papacy and Byzantium had been renewed. The Emperor Rudolf II. was tributary to the Turks. Every year he was obliged, like his father before him, to send 130,000 gulden, with an infinite quantity of silver-work and watchmaker's work, to the sultan, to his wives, and the grandees of the Porte by way of homage. At the same time the breaches of the peace continued. In view of the

disturbed state of Hungary it would be wrong to conclude that the Turks were always the aggressors. In the great military camp, which Hungary had been steadily forming for decades, breaches of the peace and of frontier rights on both sides were the order of the day. The imperial soldier fought with the same wild courage and ferocity as the Turk. We are upon the eve of the Thirty Years' War. To scalp the fallen after a victory, to impale them before the camp, to cover the scalp with hay or powder and set fire to it, were as usual as to plunder the dead, to outrage women, to break conditions on surrendering a fortress, and to commit every kind of treacherous surprise and betrayal. Yet on both sides were the same conviction of the fear of God and the same piety. The noble and capable Grand Vizir Sokolli was murdered on October 11th, 1579, and was succeeded in




THE HERO OF LEPANTO
Don John of Austria, commander of the forces of Spain, Venice, Malta and Savoy, was described by the Pope as the "man sent from God."

the same piety. The noble and capable Grand Vizir Sokolli was murdered on October 11th, 1579, and was succeeded in



A LEADER AT LEPANTO
Sebastiano Veniero was one of the Christian leaders acting with Don John. From a portrait by Tintoretto now at Vienna.

1580 by the Albanian Sinan, who had already distinguished himself, as governor of Egypt, by the conquest of Yemen in 1571 and of Goletta in 1574, though mutiny among the Janissaries had on two occasions obliged him to resign the great seal to his enemies and rivals, Ferhad and Siavush. On his elevation to the post of Grand Vizir for the third time, in 1593, he induced the peace-loving sultan to declare open war upon the emperor on August 13th. Sinan proposed to conquer Bohemia, while his vizirs began the war from Bosnia. At the head of 150,000 men he had captured Totis, or Tata, and conquered the important town of Raab



THE GREAT BATTLE OF LEPANTO, WHICH BROKE THE SEA POWER OF TURKEY
At the great naval battle of Lepanto in 1571 Don John of Austria led the European Christian allies against the Turks, and "this immortal day," says Cervantes, who lost his left arm in the fight, "broke the pride of the Ottomans and undid the world, which regarded the Turkish fleet as invincible." The Ottoman fleet consisted of 277 ships with 120,000 men.
From the painting by Veronese in the Doges' Palace at Venice.

in 1594. On the death of Murad III., Mohammed III. (1595-1603), after strangling his nineteen brothers, marched in person to the "holy war"; but on August 13th, 1595, he was defeated with crushing loss at Kalugareni by Michael the Bold, the national hero of Wallachia. Accompanied, however, by his wise tutor, the mufti of Stamboul, and the court historiographer Sead ed-din, he conquered Erlau on October 13th, 1595.


"Drunkenness, the great curse of Germany," wrote the Lutheran theologian George Mylius from the camp, "has chiefly betrayed us into the hands of the temperate and watchful Turks." On October 20th, Kanizsa, the bulwark of Styria, sank into ruins. Siegmund Bathori, who had been independent ruler of Transylvania since 1588, had been attempting to break away from the Turkish federation since 1592; in 1597 and 1599 he resigned the government, and was finally expelled from Transylvania by the Imperial troops in 1602. The peasants themselves considered the Turkish government more tolerable than the tyranny of the magnates, and were anxious for religious reasons to shake off the yoke of the ultra Catholic house of Hapsburg. In 1604 Stefan Bocskay concluded an alliance with the Turks, and was recognised as prince of Hungary and Transylvania in 1605. The commanding fortress of Gran had again fallen

into the hands of the Turks in 1604. Ultimately, on June 23rd, 1606, peace was made with the representatives of Bocskay at Vienna, and with the Turks at

Zsitva-Torok on November 11th. But under what conditions! The Turks were to retain all previous conquests and receive a yearly present of 200,000 gulden. Bocskay was recognised in Transylvania and in eight counties of Hungary during his lifetime. In a secret protestation the Emperor Rudolf II. affirmed that his signature had been extorted by necessity and was not binding for the future. He was forced to take this step by the Protestants in the empire and in Hungary, the fratricidal struggle in the house of Hapsburg, bad harvests and a general rise in prices, and the incapacity and petty jealousy of his soldiers. That heroic race had not yet grown up which was to proceed from the military school of Parma and Orange, and to enter the arena of Hungary equipped with masterly strategical skill and with an art of warfare and siege work which was made infinitely superior to the Turks.

Ottoman Power Begins to Wane

After the Peace of Zsitva-Torok in 1606 the Hapsburgs did not long remain tributary to the sultans; thenceforward the Turkish Empire gained no further accession of territory. The peace marks a halting point in the progress of Turkish power, the transition to impending decay; and on this depends its importance to the history of the world. It was not until 1616 that the corrections in the documents of the peace were presented by the Austrian ambassador Von Czernin. He was the first Christian ambassador who entered Constantinople publicly with the banner of the Cross and accompanied by music.



TYPES OF VENETIAN GALLEYS USED IN THE GREAT BATTLE OF LEPANTO



THE MOSQUE OF THE SULTAN AHMED AND THE HIPPODROME AT STAMBOUL
 This rich and beautiful monument, "like a vision of the air," commemorates an unprofitable reign of fourteen years.

Two circumstances saved the Holy Roman Empire from overthrow—internal disturbances and disputes concerning the succession in Turkey, and the strengthening of the military frontier. In 1603 the Persians took Tebriz and Bagdad from the sultan, and defeated more than 50,000 men in a pitched battle. The crescent was waning. "The breakwater of eastern and western migrations at the Golden Horn" still ruled, it is true, over a world extending from the Rif shores of Morocco to the Arabian seas, from the Gulf of Oman to the Don, and from the angle of the Danube at Waitzen to Georgia. But the Porte's powers had obviously flagged during the fifteen years' struggle from 1591 to 1606; Asiatic support was tottering, and enemies at home, more dangerous than the Persians or Egyptians, had undermined the army, the navy, and the supremacy of the theocratic sultanate. The Mohammedan Empire was founded upon no basis of national sentiment, and any nationalist movement was stifled by the doctrines of the Mohammedan religion. The decline of the Ottoman power dates from the outbreaks in the last quarter of the sixteenth

century, the revolts in the army, the frequent changes of personnel in the Grand Vizirship and all the higher posts of the empire; but the chief cause was to be found in the person of the sultan himself. The tyranny of the Grand Vizirs, the female government practised by the harem, the system of rapacious extortion practised by the Beglerbegs, "the sultan's sponges"—these are evils closely connected with the pusillanimity, fear, greed, and licentiousness of Murad III.



SULTAN MOHAMMED III.
 An infirm old man while still young in years; he was so timorous that he trembled at the sound of the cannon. He reigned eight years.

His character was compounded of the strangest contradictions. In common with his contemporary, Rudolf II., he had not only a pacific disposition, but artistic and scientific inclinations. Evidence of his artistic and architectural taste may be seen in the numerous buildings, of which many were erected under the Grand Vizir Sinan, such as a new seraglio in Scutari, the mosques of Adrianople, Magnesia on the Sipylos, and Cyprus, in the great fortifications of Erivan, Kars, and Shamachi, and the drainage works of Mecca. Even the accounts of his enemies praise his interest in music, legislation, and history. But as with Rudolf II. so with

him, the influence of favourites was predominant in every department of governmental administration.

At the age of thirty-three Mohammed III. (1595-1603) was already a sick and infirm old man. For the first time since the foundation of the empire a Padishah was seen upon the throne who trembled even at the thunder of the cannon, whereas his predecessors had appeared daily before the troops and had been accustomed to practise archery and throwing the jered in the Okmeidan. Ahmed I. (1603-1617) followed his father's example: he was licentious, incapable, and proud to the point of insanity. Ahmed died on November 22nd, 1617, after an unprofitable reign of fourteen years. His memory is perpetuated by a great and beautiful monument, the Ahmed Mosque, with its six minarets, on the Atmeidan in Stamboul. The mosque is a huge, yet light and delicate, building, like a vision of the air, with a dome supported on four enormous marble pillars, while the interior could contain four small mosques. The six minarets were regarded as an infraction of the dignity of the central shrine of Mohammedanism, the Kaaba of Mecca, and the sultan was forced to add a seventh praying tower to the Haram of the Kaaba to restore its prestige and appease the suspicions of the orthodox.

Ahmed left seven sons, the eldest, Osman, being but twelve years of age. Mustafa I. (1617-

1618), the brother of the deceased sultan, therefore succeeded to the throne. He, however, was insane, and the body of the Ulemas, Muftis, and the Divan, resolved upon the unprecedented step of deposing the sultan and confining him to a tower

of the old seraglio. Notwithstanding his minority, Osman II. (1618-1622) was placed upon the throne. At the age of fourteen he shook off the guardianship of his vizirs, executed his younger and more talented brother, and undertook a war

against the Poles in the forests and steppes of Khotin. His Janissaries were conquered, and when he attempted to punish them by extermination, they confined him also in the Castle of the Seven Towers, where he was strangled by Daud Pasha in May, 1622. The mad Mustafa was brought out of his prison, and under his rule the provinces of Georgia, Erivan, Bagdad, and Basra were again lost to the Persians in 1622.

Mustafa I. was once more deposed, and Murad IV.

(1623-1640), a younger brother of Osman II., was placed upon the throne. In the year 1620 Gabriel Bethlen had already attempted to secure recognition as King of Hungary by sending rich presents to the Porte through Franz Balassy, Stefan Korlath, and even by an embassy of the "winter king," Frederic V. of the Palatinate. The price of this recognition was

Waitzen, which fell into the hands of the Pasha of Ofen on November 5th, 1621. The Sultana Validé Kassamu Mahpeiker governed during the minority of her grandson Murad IV; to her Stamboul owes its largest and finest caravanserai, the Validé Han.

At the same time Mohammed Girai III., the

khan of the Crimean Tartars, destroyed the Turkish fleet; the Cossacks plundered Böyük-dere on the Bosphorus; Abasa, the Pasha of Erzeroum, revolted, and the advance of Wallenstein, in 1626, against Mansfeld and Bethlen forced the Turks



MUSTAFA I.

Found to be insane, this sultan was deposed and kept in confinement.



SULTANS IBRAHIM AND MOHAMMED IV.

The arrogance and caprice of Sultan Ibrahim resulted in his deposition and murder; while Mohammed IV., his son, began to reign just when Germany was rising after the devastating Thirty Years War.



to raise the siege of Neograd. In 1634 George I. Rakoczy, the successor of Bethlen, who died on November 15th, 1629, hesitated to join the sultan in an attack upon the Poles. The sultan then gave his support to one Szekely and to Stefan Bethlen, the brother of Gabriel, whose claims were also urged by the ambassadors of France and Holland. Meanwhile the cruel Murad had conquered Tebriz and Erivan in a vigorous campaign in 1634, had murdered his brothers Bajazet and Suleiman, and recaptured Bagdad, four years later, in 1638.

The imperial Christian government pursued the task of resistance with remarkable energy by the slow but sure creation of a military frontier, which was to secure their ultimate victory. Matthias Corvinus and Ferdinand I. had already begun the work; but it was not until the time of Maximilian II. that this line of fortresses, extending about one thousand English miles from Transylvania to Dalmatia, was definitely secured. The Archduke Charles was appointed "permanent residential governor of the Croatian and Wendish frontier lands." After the fall of Belgrade, in 1521, the stream of "Uskokes," Servian and Bosnian fugitives, began to pour into Austrian territory. Ferdinand I. had granted them numerous privileges and immunity from taxation in 1535, and had settled them in the Karst deserts of the Sichelburg district, the modern Uskoke Mountains. They were followed by a steady stream of refugees, who were ready and willing to serve in the local levies as cavalry and infantry.

From this material the Austrian rulers created that militia to guard the Danube and the Save which for two centuries acted as a bulwark against the Turkish assaults. The bravest of them and the scourge of Turkey were the Zeng Uskokes of the maritime frontier. For more than a century they were the terror of Adria, and inflicted the most serious loss both upon the maritime power of Venice and the continental power of Turkey. Piracy was carried on throughout the Mediterranean by the Barbary states—Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli—by the Maltese, the Sicilians, and the Neapolitans. But the Zeng Uskokes were the pirate kings of Adria, and from their impregnable fortress of Zeng on the sheltering Quarnero, the home of the terrible Bora, their bold expeditions went forth even to the shores of Persia.

Murad, the Ottoman Nero, who, like Nero, was passionately devoted to music, was succeeded by his brother Ibrahim I. (1640-1648), the Ottoman Heliogabalus. His arrogance and threatening caprice drove the



THE BEAUTIFUL VALIDE MOSQUE AT STAMBOUL. Fifty years were occupied in erecting this place of worship. It was begun in 1615 by the wife of Sultan Ahmed I., and completed in 1665.

Ulemas, the scribes, and lawyers to contract an alliance with the Janissaries in their mosque of Ortajami. Ibrahim was the first sultan to be deposed and murdered under an apparently constitutional form of procedure on August 18th, 1648.

His son, Mohammed IV. (1648-1687), ascended the throne in the year in which Germany began to rise from the devastation of the Thirty Years' War. It was fortunate for the Holy Roman Empire that, during this decade, a succession of feeble sultans, wars with the Persians, and

internal disturbances, had weakened the strength that repeatedly threatened the destruction of Christendom. The struggle for the guardianship of the sultan, who was but ten, or perhaps even seven, years of age, resulted, in 1651, in the death of the mother of three sultans, the beautiful Greek slave Tarkhan, and brought the empire to the verge of dissolution. An attempt was made to relieve the hopeless financial embarrassment by tripling the state taxes and debasing the coinage. At the beginning of 1656 crowds of peasants appeared from Anatolia to complain of the unprecedented extortion practised by their governor. The name "Runjiber"—that is, full of woe—clung to them henceforth as a memorial of the continuous oppression under which they groaned. Mutinies among the Janissaries and revolts of vizirs increased; to appease the mutinous guards, who marched to the Seraglio, Mohammed IV. sacrificed thirty of his councillors, whose heads were suspended from the famous plane-tree on the Etmeidan. Francesco Morosini conquered Lemnos and Tenedos, while Lorenzo Marcello destroyed seventy Turkish sailing-vessels at the entrance to the Dardanelles.

The saviour was at hand. Mohammed Kuprili became Grand Vizir in September, 1656. An Albanian peasant boy, he had come to Stamboul, and though he could neither read nor write, his keen intelligence and his strong will had raised him to the highest position in the empire. Kuprili crushed the revolt in the blood of 30,000 victims; he took as his model Murad IV., the pupil of Machiavelli. He destroyed the Venetian fleet of Lazzaro Mocenigo, recaptured Lemnos and Tenedos in 1657, conquered the castles of the Dardanelles, in 1657-1658 defeated the troops of George II. Rakoczy, who had made himself independent, and appointed Achatius Barsay prince of the country with an

**Human Heads
Decorate the
Seraglio Walls**

increased tribute of 40,000 ducats. He drove the Cossacks across the Dnieper, caused thirty pashas of Asia Minor and Syria to be massacred in a treacherous ambush at Aleppo in the spring of 1659, and placed cartloads of heads on the Seraglio walls as a warning. He even ventured to repress the insane extravagance of the Seraglio and the harem. His only failure was his enterprise against Crete, Cardinal Mazarin having sent relief

to the Venetians, who were hard pressed in that island. Kuprili retorted by immediately imprisoning the French ambassador Jacques de la Haye in 1658, and treated the threats of Louis XIV. with contempt.

Kuprili died on November 1st, 1661, at the age of eighty. Mohammed IV. paid him a visit on his death-bed, and promised that his son Ahmed Kuprili should succeed him in the office of Grand Vizir, a measure unprecedented in the history of this high office. Ahmed was highly educated, and possessed a thorough knowledge of the Koran, the Sunna, and Mohammedan science in general. His experience had been acquired as Pasha of Erzeroum and Damascus, and as Kaim-makam of Stamboul, and he became Grand Vizir at the age of twenty-seven. The sultan was then twenty-three years old, absorbed in luxury, the chase, in youths and afterwards in women, and was resident in Adrianople. In 1662 Leopold's troops had seized Serimvar in Transylvania; Ahmed attacked them in the spring of 1663. In spite of the fact that the soldiers' pay was stinted by the avaricious sultan, he succeeded in capturing

**" Powdered and
Perfumed Frenchmen "**
Fight the Turks

Neuhäusel, Ujivar, Serimvar, and Gran. However, on August 1st, 1664, he was defeated at Sankt Gotthard, a monastery on the Raab. This battle marks a turning point in Turkish military history. The Austrians and Hungarians were co-operating with 6,000 French under Count Jean Coligny and François d'Aubusson, Vicomte de la Feuillade, with the flower of the French nobility. The Grand Vizir regarded the powdered and perfumed Frenchmen with their bright uniforms as girls. The army was under the leadership of Raymond, Count Montecuccoli, the Austrian field-marshal. Before the battle the cavalry general Johann von Sporck bared his head and prayed: "Almighty God, our General on high, if Thou wilt not help us, Thy Christian children, yet help not these Turkish dogs, and Thou shalt see somewhat to Thy delight."

Coligny's French then charged the hostile ranks with the awful war-cry "Tuez!" and the small-arm volley firing here secured its first triumph. The chapel of Sankt Gotthard, built in commemoration of the destruction of the Turkish army, is still to be seen. Jealousy and mistrust, as usual, made it impossible to reap the

full advantage of the Christian victory. In the peace of Vasvar, on August 10th, 1664, the Porte retained the fortresses of Serimvar and Ujvar. But a great moral effect was produced; the Sanjak-i-shereef, the banner of the Prophet, which had been unfurled in vain on August 13th, 1595, had suffered another overthrow.

Ahmed Kuprili was obliged to seek compensation in the conquest of Crete. At ten o'clock in the morning of September 27th, 1669, the Proveditore Morosini handed to the Grand Vizir the keys of Candia, which the Venetians had held for 465 years. The French relieving force, under the Duke Anne Jules de Noailles and François de Vendôme, was as ineffective as the fleet of Pope Clement IX. Naintel, the French ambassador, renewed the capitulations of Francis I. with the Porte on June 3rd, 1673. According to these, special rights were reserved or confirmed to the French ambassadors—French goods, the East India trade, the Catholics in Turkey, the ecclesiastical buildings, the French in Pera and Galata, and the Holy Places.

Some time previously Francis Bacon and Hermann Çonring had published suggestions for the solution of the Eastern question. These ideas were reopened by G. W. Leibnitz in 1670 and 1671 in his comprehensive memorial: "De propositione Egyptiaca," which he presented in person to the Most Christian King in Paris. His proposals involved nothing less than the conquest of Egypt and the cutting of the Suez Canal. A French diplomat ironically observed of the memoir: "Mais vous savez que les projets d'une guerre sainte ont cessé d'être à la mode depuis Saint Louis."

The place of the powers hitherto predominant is now taken by two new states in hostility to the crescent — Poland and Russia. The Porte had confirmed the revolted Cossack Hetman of the Ukraine, Doroscenko, in the position of Sanjak Bey, or governor, as though he were dealing with a Turkish province. Poland raised a justifiable objection which ended in war. In the early autumn of 1672

Mohammed IV. and Ahmed Kuprili ravaged Poland with 150,000 men as far as Kamenez, Lemberg, and Lublin, and forced the feeble King Michael Koribut Wisniowiecki to cede Podolia and the

**The Victories
of the
Tsar Feodor**

Ukraine in the peace of Bucsacs on September 18th, 1672. But in the following year the crown field-marshal John Sobieski defeated the Grand Vizir and the Seraskier Hussein Pasha on the plain of Khotin (November 10-11th, 1673), and captured the green banner, which still hangs in St. Peter's at Rome. In 1674-1675 Sobieski, who was now King John III., captured the towns of Hunan and Lemberg and utterly defeated Kara Mustafa, the brother-in-law of Kuprili. Doroscenko threw himself into the arms of the Russians. The Tsar Feodor III. of Moscow,

against whom the holy war was declared, came off victorious in three successive campaigns, 1677-1679. Ahmed Kuprili had previously died at the beginning of November, 1676.

In the peace of Radzyn, February 11th, 1681, the Poles obtained portions of the Ukraine and Podolia, which had already been of necessity returned to them in the peace of Zuravna, concluded on October 27th, 1676, between Sobieski and Abraham Sheitan; while the Russians again obtained access to a port on the

Black Sea by the cession of the Laprog Cossacks. With this year begins the insidious influence of Russia upon Turkey.

The pathway to this goal could be engineered only by the triumph and the blood of Austria. On August 10th, 1683, the Porte at the instigation of Louis XIV. had appointed the rebel Count Emerich Tököly, to whom the King of France had sent one De Ferriol as ambassador, as King of Hungary, with influence extending over territory belonging to Austria. War was thus rendered inevitable. Prince Eugene of Savoy afterwards declared in his memoirs: "Had it not been for Louis XIV., the Moslems and the revolted Hungarians would never have reached the gates of Vienna." The arrogant and ignorant Kara Mustafa, who acted as Seraskier and Sirdar, with unlimited power, had dreams of founding



A FAMOUS GRAND VIZIR
The Grand Vizir, Ahmed Kuprili, who, with Mohammed IV., ravaged Poland in 1672, died early in 1676.

**Poland Ravaged
by an Army of
150,000 Men**

a second Turkish Empire, of which he was to be the ruler, with Vienna as his capital. The Emperor Leopold I. fled to Linz. On March 31st, 1683, Pope Innocent II. brought about an alliance between the emperor and Poland. Charles of Lorraine, with 40,000 men, had been enabled to prevent the Turks from crossing the Raab, and was waiting behind the Kahlenberg, anxiously expecting the help of the empire and of the Poles, while Count Rüdiger of Starhemberg established himself in Vienna with 10,000 men. On July 14th, 200,000 Turks pitched their tents before the town, and surrounded the whole of the fortifications, in conjunction with the Tartars and Khan Selim Giray I. A siege of terrible ferocity began, which lasted for forty-five days; the Turks delivered eighteen assaults and the besieged made twenty-four sorties. Notwithstanding a brilliant defence, the city was at the last gasp, when from the Kahlenberg and Leopoldberg rockets rose in the night of September 6th and 7th announcing the

approach of the relieving army, which had gathered at Tulln, on the Danube. In conjunction with Charles of Lorraine, and John George of Saxony, Max' Emanuel of Bavaria, and George Frederic of Waldeck, John III. of Poland gathered his army of seventy thousand men, and made the Kahlenberg his base at the outset of the battle, which ended on September 12th in a total defeat of the Turks. On September 13th he made his entry into Vienna, and was greeted as the liberator

of the town. It was not until all danger was past that the emperor returned.

The Turks fled from Germany for ever, abandoning inestimable treasure. Sobieski, with Charles of Lorraine, pursued and defeated them at Parkany, and captured Gran. Kara Mustafa fled to Belgrade, where he was strangled by the sultan's orders on December 25th. In 1684 the imperial troops won a series of victories at Wissegrad, Waitzen, Pesth, and Hamzsabeg over Suleiman Pasha. Count Leslie

made a victorious advance into Bosnia. The age of Ottoman triumphs had passed; on August 19th Neuhausel was stormed and captured. But the greatest event of this campaign was the siege and the fall of Ofen on September 2nd, 1686, an exploit which saved some portion of the library of the Corvini. The German Emperor's field-marshal Charles of Lorraine, supported by the German elector Maximilian Emanuel, and by troops from Bavaria, Saxony and Brandenburg, had forced from the hands

of the infidels the most important Turkish outpost, the capital city of the realm of St. Stephen, and also the remainder of those territories. Thus the freedom of the Magyars was by no means due to the bravery of that proud and warlike nation. On August 12th, 1687, the indefatigable Charles defeated 60,000 troops of Suleiman Pasha in the battle of Mohacs, and thus avenged the victory which Suleiman II. had gained there in 1526. The high expectations which were



MUSTAFA II.: A VICTIM OF THE JANISSARIES
This unhappy sultan, who ruled from 1695 till 1703, was deposed in favour of his brother, Ahmed III., and was done to death in the Seraglio.

excited by the Austrian victories and the simultaneous successes of the Venetians in the Morea are displayed in the pamphlet of the year 1687: "The Triumphant Imperial Eagle"; it was already reported that the sultan would have to transfer his capital to Cairo, Damascus, or Aleppo. In 1688 Transylvania also gave in her submission to the Emperor and King of Hungary, and secured full toleration for the four Christian religious communities that were recognised in the country. In this same year the Turkish Empire suffered severely from a famine and from conflagrations.

In 1685 the Poles had advanced to Jassy and were defeated at Bojan. All the more meritorious were the victories of the Venetians in the Morea under the defender of Candia, the capable general Francesco Morosini. They drove the Turks out of Dalmatia, conquered Santa Maura, Prevéza, Arta, Corinth, Argos, Patras, Koron, Modon, Navarino, Napoli di Romania, and Malvasia. The banner of Saint Mark flew once again in Greece, and in the Palace of the Doges the grateful senate erected a triumphal arch to "Morosini the Peloponnesian." It must be said that during the siege of

**Venetians
Destroy the
Parthenon**

Athens the Venetians inflicted great damage upon the immortal Parthenon. The powder explosion which was caused in the Parthenon by a shell from the batteries of the Venetian general, on September 26th, 1687, at seven o'clock in the evening completed the destruction of this ancient sanctuary of Pallas Athene, the Madonna, and the Panagia.


The liberation of Greece, the unbroken dream of European Phillhellenes, and the event for which the oppressed Greeks yearned, had never been so near realisation since the fall of Constantinople and Athens. For Athens, however, the interval of freedom lasted only until April 9th, 1689, when Morosini, who

appointed Doge, gave up the town, which he found untenable. From Porto Leone (the Piræus) he carried off in safety the Athenian lions, which stand to-day before the Arsenal of Venice as memorials of the abortive attempt at liberation, and of the pillaging of Athenian art treasures, and form a counter-piece to the bronze horses upon the portal of San Marco, which were taken from the sack of Constantinople in 1204. For three years the town of Pallas was abandoned by its inhabitants, until the sultan allowed the Athenians to return in 1690.



AN AMBITIOUS SIRDAR
Kara Mustafa dreamed of ruling a second Turkish Empire, but was strangled by the sultan's orders.

This series of misfortunes led to conspiracies among the Janissaries and Ulemas and to the deposition of the sultan, who was imprisoned in the Seraglio, where he died forgotten five years later. The conspirators passed over the sons of Mohammed IV., Mustafa, who was twenty-three years old, and Ahmed, who was fourteen, and appointed his brother Suleiman III. (1687-1691) as sultan. The Germans continued their conquests under the Margrave Ludwig Wilhelm of Baden, and captured Lippa, Illok, Peterwardein, and Erlau. On August 11th, 1688, Belgrade was surrounded by the elector Max Emanuel of Bavaria, with 53,000 troops from the empire and imperial provinces, and stormed on September 6th; it was, however, recaptured on October 18th, 1690, by the Grand Vizir Mustafa Kuprili. Charles of Lorraine was fighting on the Rhine; this brilliant leader would no doubt have advanced upon Constantinople after the fall of Belgrade, true to his motto, "aut nunc aut nunquam."



AHMED III.
He succeeded his brother on the throne, and, after being summarily deposed, died of poison in 1736

Mustafa Kuprili, known as Fazil, the virtuous, was now the one support of the tottering empire. In the new ordinance, the "Nisam Jedid," he issued orders for Christian toleration, renewed in 1690 the capitulations of 1673 with the Marquis de Chateaufort, the ambassador of Louis XIV., and after the victory of Tököly at Zernesht

and Athens. For Athens, however, the interval of freedom lasted only until April 9th, 1689, when Morosini, who

over Generals Häusler and Doria, he successfully renewed the war with the conquest of Nissa, Widdin, Semendria, and Belgrade.

On July 23rd, 1691, Suleiman III. died, and was succeeded by his brother Ahmed II. (1691-1695). The Grand Vizir, in whose army 300 French officers were serving, was utterly defeated on August 19th at Slankamen, not far from Peterwardein, by the Margrave of Baden (the "Turkish Louis") and the Brandenburg general Hans Albrecht von Barfus; with him perished on the field of battle thirteen pashas, many officers, and 20,000 men. The Germans also suffered severe losses. After the death of Ahmed II., on February 6th, 1695, and the accession of Mustafa II. (1695-1703) the Kapudan Pasha, Hussein Pasha, "Mezzo Morto," recaptured Chios from the Venetians on February 18th. Mustafa in person defeated the bold Count Friederich von Veterani-Mallenheim at Lugos on September 22nd, and took Lippa, while Peter the Great of Russia forced Azov to surrender in July, 1696.

On July 5th, 1697, Prince Eugene of Savoy was appointed commander-in-chief of the whole of the imperial army. On July 24th the prince, who was thirty-four years of age, took the field; he had already won his spurs before the walls of Vienna, and from that moment the fortunes of the Turks deserted them. After pacifying a revolt in Upper Hungary, he followed the sultan by forced marches to Zenta; when the sun set upon September 2nd, 20,000 Turks lay dead upon the battlefield, and 10,000 in the Theiss; only 2,000 escaped. The sultan was obliged to watch the destruction of his army from the opposite bank of the river; he fled to Temesvar and retired across the Danube. Making Transylvania his base of operations, Count Roger of Bussy-Rabutin made an incursion at that moment,

with 30,000 cavalry, into the Banat and recaptured Uipalanka on the Danube. The results, however, of the peace of Ryswick, and of the battle of Zenta, could not be utilised to the full, as the emperor was obliged to carry on war in four different places at one and the same time. Moreover, the Austrian war ministry was utterly exhausted. After more than three months of negotiations which were spent in breaking down the resistance of Poland and

Russia to the intervention of the sea powers, Holland and England, and in overthrowing the influence of the French ambassador in Stamboul, the peace of Carlowitz, on the Danube, was concluded on January 26th, 1699.

This peace gave the emperor Transylvania and most of Hungary, and to the King of Poland, Kamenez; the Venetian Republic secured the Morea, without Lepanto, while Ragusa was embodied in the Turkish Empire. The chief result, however, of the peace was to place diplomatic relations between the emperor and the sultan upon a basis that corresponded to the dignity of the former. The emperor was now in a position to secure the solidarity of the Hungarian territories, though unfortunately his administrative capacities were not equal to the task. Revolts on the part of the magnates Franz Rakoczy, Anton Esterhazy-Forchtenstein, Alexander Karoly, and others, and of the evangelical population, repeatedly endangered the position of this dearly-acquired province.

Mustafa II. retired to Adrianople. The Grand Vizir Hussein Kuprili employed the peace of Carlowitz for the introduction of opportune reforms; but his premature death in 1703 deprived the empire of his services. His successor Mustafa Daltaban, showed great cruelty to the Catholic Armenians. He, together with the Grand Mufti Feisullah, was sacrificed to the Janissaries, who then dethroned the sultan, and set up his brother, Ahmed III. (1703-1730), under the condition that he should transfer his residence back to Constantinople. Mustafa II. was confined in the Seraglio, where he was poisoned four months after his deposition. Like his predecessors, Ahmed devoted himself personally to the art of poetry.

The most important event in his government was the arrival at Bender of the Swedish king Charles XII., who had been defeated at Pultowa in 1709 by the Russians. The Grand Vizir Ali Chorli had promised him the help of the khan of the Crim Tartars, and thus induced him to enter the Ukraine, in spite of the Russian superiority. The Grand Vizir was prevented from fulfilling his promise by his deposition. "Charles Ironhead" (demirbash), as the Turks called him, placed 1,000 men at Czernovitz on the border of Moldavia to keep watch upon the Russians, and with his

faithful friend, Stanislaus Poniatoffsky, induced the Turks to declare war against Russia on November 21st, 1710. He had already begun secret negotiations with the Greek subjects of the sultan. At Kush on the Pruth the Grand Vizir Baltaji Mohammed defeated the 30,000 men of the Tsar Peter, with a force three times as great; but the Tsarina Catharine succeeded in securing freedom and favourable conditions of peace on July 21st and 22nd, 1711, by bribing Osman Aga, and the Grand Vizir. After this the Tsar gave up his claims to Azov and its territory. After an adventurous journey through Central Europe, the Swedish king returned from Demotika to Stralsund in November, 1714.

Thanks to the treacherous Greeks, who preferred the Ottoman yoke to the Catholic government, the Grand Vizir Damad Ali was enabled, in 1715, to recover the Morea from the Venetians, who had grown effeminate in the luxurious life of their palaces, and did nothing to secure their precious possession. The emperor and Pope found an occasion for alliance in the "Holy Federation" of 1697. Their united fleet traversed the Archipelago under the papal flag. On August 19,

The Fleet of the "Holy Federation"

1717, Corfu was freed from the Turkish besieging forces by the bold resistance of the Venetian general Johann Matthias, Count of Schulenburg; his marble statue in Corfu, erected in 1718 by the Venetian Senate, bears the fine inscription: "Adhuc viventi." Prince Eugene insisted upon carrying out the terms of the treaty, and gathered an army at Futak near Peterwardein. On August 5th, in conjunction with Prince Alexander of Würtemberg, he won the battle of Peterwardein, "the Hungarian Gibraltar," in which the Grand Vizir Ali Kamurjich was slain. Pope Clement XI. sent the prince a consecrated sword and hat. The Banat was conquered by Claudius Florimund Count Mercy, and Temesvar fell on November 13th. Eugene decisively rejected an attempt at intervention on the part of the sea powers, and turned upon Belgrade. The bombardment of the island town began on July 23rd, when the Turkish army approached from Semendria. The imperial troops had been increased by six infantry battalions from the electorate of Bavaria and a dragoon regiment. The Bavarian princes, Charles Albert and Ferdinand, were before the walls on which their father

had performed his most brilliant feat of arms in 1688. On August 17th, Prince Ferdinand Albert II. of Brunswick-Bevern began the assault and the battle; Belgrade, with a garrison of 25,000 men, surrendered on the following day. The fame of the "noble knight" was in all men's mouths. In the spring of 1715 negotiations for peace

Christian Powers Attempt to Weaken Rome

were begun at Passarowitz, on the Danube. The Christian powers which had formerly made such feeble efforts to crush the enemy of Christendom now displayed great anxiety to diminish the strength of the Holy Roman Empire. Eugene determined to make a military demonstration towards Nish and far into Bosnia. On July 21st the convention was concluded. The Porte gave up the Banat, with Temesvar, Belgrade, and a strip of territory running to the south of the Save. The jurisdiction of the imperial consuls over subjects of the Roman Empire resident in the Turkish Empire was confirmed in a commercial treaty.

Between 1722 and 1724 a protracted struggle broke out between the Turks and the Safevi Shahs, Hosein and Tamasp, of Persia, which brought some advantage to the Russians by the conquest of Daghestan and other provinces on the Caspian Sea; it resulted, on September 7th, 1730, in the deposition of Ahmed III., who had vainly sacrificed to the demand of the Janissaries the Grand Vizir Damad Ibrahim, the Kapudan Pasha, and the Kyaya-beg, or minister for domestic affairs. Ahmed died in 1736 of poison, after which war again broke out between Russia and Turkey.

Mahmud I. (1730-1754), a nephew of Ahmed, was a learned prince, devoted to luxury, science, and fine architecture. He enriched Stamboul with four libraries, a mosque, several fountains, and eight summer-houses on the banks of the Bosphorus, punished drunkenness severely, and

Mahmud I. and the Evil of Drunkenness

induced the Moslems to exchange the wine-beaker for the coffee-cup. He exercised great severity against the libertine manners of the women. He displayed a stern fanaticism in opposing the movement of the reformer Mohammed Abd el-Wahhab and of the Wahhabites in Arabia in 1745, and decorated the Kaaba at Mecca with extravagant splendour. He allowed the Janissaries to exercise unlimited influence upon all affairs of state.

However, under his government the kingdom reached a further height of prosperity. The campaign of the Turks against the Austrians and Russians ended in the defeat of the Austrians at Krocza on July 23rd, 1739; this led to the peace of Belgrade on September 18th. The death of Prince Eugene, on April 21st, 1736, was a loss severely felt. The imperial generals endangered all success by their mutual jealousies, and were forced to retire from Serbia and Bosnia, beyond the Save and Danube. They, therefore, accepted the proposals formulated by the French diplomatist Villeneuve, which implied the cession of Belgrade, Orsova, Lesser Wallachia, and Bosnia. Austria's Eastern policy was checked at this boundary for a long period. Russia, however, which had gained a firm footing on the Baltic since the northern war, began to entertain hopes of entering upon her inheritance. For the moment, however, she was forced to content herself with Azov, on the Black Sea, which she had captured on July 1st, 1736, on her first devastation of the Crimea, and to resign her other conquests.

Russia's Strong Position on the Baltic

Turkish politics had never been in such close connection with those of Europe in general as in the reign of Mahmud I., the Solomon of the Golden Horn. Diplomats of every country thronged to his court, and rivalled one another in their efforts to secure the favour of the Grand Turk and of his vizirs, and to conclude favourable commercial treaties. The greatest influence was possessed by the French ambassadors such as Villeneuve, Castellane, and Desailleurs, who renewed and increased the old capitulations in 1740. The success of the Turkish army in the campaigns of 1737-1739 was apparently due to the prudent counsels of the French renegade Bonneval ("Ahmed Pasha," 1675-1747). In 1747 Louis XV. sent the sultan many splendid presents, and twenty-two artillerists to work his new guns. In 1748 the Sublime Porte offered to act for the king as mediator at the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle; Turkish pride had thus reached its zenith. The Turkish historian Izzi relates the conclusion of the peace with the words: "God gave the dog power over the swine."

Osman III. (1754-1757), a brother of Mahmud I., who died on September 13th, 1754, was fifty-four years of age when he emerged from prison, an embittered and hardened character. During his reign the post of Grand Vizir changed hands fifteen times. The eldest son of Ahmed III., Prince Mohammed Khan, on whom high hopes were set, died before his father. Hence, on the death of the sultan the succession went to the second son of Ahmed, Mustafa III. (1754-1773). His reign was distinguished by the Grand Vizirship of Raghib Mohammed, who gave new vigour to the empire, and also won considerable reputation as an author. In 1747 he routed the Mameluke Beys in Cairo, and on March 23rd, 1761, he concluded a treaty for maritime commerce, trade, and friendship with Frederick the Great of Prussia, the sole object of which was to deprive the Austrians of the fruits of Carlowitz and Poscharewitz.

Turkish Pride at its Zenith

The Polish question brought about a fresh war between the Porte and Russia. On October 6th, 1769, the Grand Vizir Hamsa confined the Russian ambassador Obryeskoiff in the Castle of the Seven Towers. The khan of the Nogish Crimean Tartars, Krin Giray, entered the Russian provinces on the Dnieper and Dniester, though his death, in March, 1769, freed Russia from this enemy. Mustafa III. had already adopted the name of Ghazi, the victorious. The sultan beheaded both the Grand Vizir Mohammed Emin, and also the Voivode of Moldavia, Kallimachi, for their ill success against the Russians under Alexander Golizyn and Peter Romanzoff at Pruth. Khalil Pasha suffered defeat in 1770 at Giurgevo, Bucharest, and Slatina.

Meanwhile, the Russian fleet, under Spiridoff and Elphinstone, had sailed from the Baltic to the Archipelago, and landed troops at Vitylo in the Morea. Orloff had defeated a Turkish fleet on July 6th in the roadstead of Krini at Chios, and burnt it. Further, the Christians of Montenegro, the Mainots, and other Greeks of the Morea, especially in Kalamata, revolted in numbers under the leadership of Russian officers. But the hour of liberation had not yet struck. The Russian fleet could not force the passage of the Dardanelles, which had been fortified by the Hungarian-Frenchman Baron Franz Tott (1733-1793); the Greek revolt was suppressed with great slaughter with the

Sultan's Short Way with Defeated Generals

Meanwhile, the Russian fleet, under Spiridoff and Elphinstone, had sailed from the Baltic to the Archipelago, and landed troops at Vitylo in the Morea. Orloff had defeated a Turkish fleet on July 6th in the roadstead of Krini at Chios, and burnt it. Further, the Christians of Montenegro, the Mainots, and other Greeks of the Morea, especially in Kalamata, revolted in numbers under the leadership of Russian officers. But the hour of liberation had not yet struck. The Russian fleet could not force the passage of the Dardanelles, which had been fortified by the Hungarian-Frenchman Baron Franz Tott (1733-1793); the Greek revolt was suppressed with great slaughter with the

help of the Albanians, enlisted by the Porte. The Albanians inflicted terrible devastation upon Greece, until the Porte was forced to take measures against them; but it was not until 1779 that they were almost destroyed by Hassan Pasha at Tripolitsa. Romanzoff, however, captured Kartal, Bender, and Braila.

Mustafa III. died on December 24th, 1773; as his son Selim (III.) was but twelve years old, Mustafa's brother Abdul Hamid I. (1774-1789) ascended the tottering throne. On July 21st, 1774, at Kutchuk-Kainarje, four hours from Silistria, that peace was concluded which Thugut has named the masterpiece of Russian diplomacy. Russia obtained a kind of protectorate over Moldavia and Wallachia and the Greek Christians in Turkey; so, at any rate, an article in this convention referring to Pera and Jerusalem was afterwards interpreted by the Russians. Further advantages were certain stations in the Crimea, and free passage in the Black and Ægean Seas.

Peace was not, however, concluded "for all time." As early as 1783, Grigorii Potemkin again invaded the Crimea, seized the peninsula of Taman, drove out the Tartar khan, Shahin Giray, and incorporated this country and the Kuban territories in the Russian Empire as the provinces of Tauria and Caucasia. Joseph II. had come to a meeting in April, 1780, with the Tsarina Catharine II. in Mohileff, and had forced the sultan to give way by threats of war. In May, 1787, followed the memorable meeting of the rulers in Kherson, where Potemkin inscribed upon the southern gate the boastful inscription: "This way to Byzantium." On August

**The Sultan's
Tottering
Throne**

16th, the Grand Vizir anticipated a revolt of the Janisaries by confining the Russian ambassador Bulgakoff in the Castle of the Seven Towers. On October 12th, Suvarov (or Suwarrow) began the second war. Austria had never led so powerful an army against the Turks. Her force included 245,000 infantry, 37,000 cavalry, and 900 guns, but no plan of co-operation with the Russians had been evolved.

Prince Josias of Saxe-Coburg captured Chotin, the famous Laudon Novi and Dubicza in Bosnia in 1788; Potemkin conquered Oczakoff on September 17th, 1788, and in the Crimea the city of Hajibei, the later Odessa, in the autumn of 1789.

On April 15th, 1789, Abdul Hamid I. died, and was succeeded by Selim III.

Austria at War with the Turks (1789-1807), an energetic character, and the only son of Mustafa III., who had hitherto pursued his studies in the Seraglio; he was the bitter enemy of Austria. The first important events during the continuation of the war were the victories of Coburg and Suvarov at Focsani on August 1st, and of Clerfait at Mehadia on the Cerna at Orsova; on September 22nd followed the victory of Suvarov and Coburg at Martinestie on the Rimnek. On



AN ENERGETIC SULTAN
Selim III., the bitter enemy of
Austria, and only son of Mustafa
III., reigned from 1789 till 1807.

October 8th Belgrade was surrendered, and the imperial banner again floated on the battlements of the fortress.

Joseph's system of government, however, excited the strongest opposition, both in the Netherlands and in Hungary. Austria was obliged to agree to negotiations at Sistova. The Russians gave a decided refusal to send delegates to the congress, and declined to admit any intervention whatever on the part of foreign powers. On December 22nd, 1790, Suvarov had stormed Ismail, the strongest of all the fortresses on the Danube. The French Revolution forced Austria and Prussia to compose their difference; the result of their deliberations was the convention of Sistova on the Danube, August 4th, 1791. The allied imperial courts had failed to obtain their object—the partition of European Turkey. Leopold II., emperor since February 20th, 1790, was forced to surrender the fertile district of Wallachia, and even his acquisitions of Laudon and Belgrade; it was settled that the stream of Cerna should henceforward form the frontier.

After the death of Potemkin, on October 16th, 1791, the peace of Jassy was finally concluded on January 9th, 1792, by Count Besborodko. The northern shore of the Black Sea had become Russian.

HEINRICH ZIMMERER



ARMENIA AND THE ARMENIANS

ARMENIA, situated in Asia, has an Asiatic history down to the period of the Roman world-empire, into which it was absorbed. But from the disruption of that empire it becomes in religion and politics so bound up with the West, and especially with the Ottoman Empire, that it is best treated in connection with Eastern Europe.

Armenian Religion Tolerated by the Mohammedans After the downfall of the Sassanid kingdom (651) the Armenians came under the dominion of the Arabs, and since that time have been subject, with short interruptions, to the Mohammedan Arabs, Seljuks, Mongols, Tartars, Persians and Ottomans, without, however, accepting Mohammedanism. The Mohammedans tolerated their religion, and set them free from East Roman supremacy, which the Armenians hated, until the late Middle Ages, with a hatred which runs like a blood-stained thread through the whole of their theological literature, notwithstanding all the attempts at reunion which were occasionally made on either side.

How far the Armenians were successful during the Parthian and Sassanid period in assimilating the people of Greater Armenia is a question which has never yet been thoroughly investigated. In the valley of the Upper Tigris and Euphrates, during the first thousand years of the Christian era, the express testimony of Armenian and Syrian authors and the place names of the district show the predominance of Aramaic, Syrian, and (in the eastern mountains) of Kurdish populations, and in the northern district as far as Basean (Phasiane) the dominant Armenian population is decidedly in the minority compared with the foreign populations, which belong chiefly to Iberian and Georgian stocks; this, indeed, is the state of affairs at the present day.

It is probable that only in Upper Armenia was there anything like a dense Armenian population, which had settled in the district of Ararat, Turuberan, and Vaspurakan. Upon the restoration of the

old limits of the Byzantine Empire in Thrace after the downfall of the East Bulgarian Empire (970 A.D.), it was not so much the Greek nationality that brought about the revival, but, on the contrary, the Armenian population, which gave the Byzantine Empire its best rulers and generals between 867 (Basil I.) and 1025 (Basil II.). The Armenian John I. Tsimisces followed the example of Constantine V. in settling numbers of his compatriots about the newly-conquered town Philippopolis to secure its safety.

The kingdom, however, reached its highest pitch of prosperity under the Jewish race of the Bagratids, nine kings of which between 859 and 1045 ruled almost independently the great buffer state between the empires of the Arab caliphs and the East Roman emperors. At that time the fortified capital of Ani on the Arpatshai and Alajajai was decorated with castles, palaces, and churches, the ruins of which astonish, even at the present day, the wanderer in the west of Alagoez. Tshoruk in the Caucasus was the cradle of the race of the Bagratids; after their conversion they secured the royal power in Grusia as well as in Armenia, and, like their great ancestor Tigranes, showed themselves invariably friendly to the Jews. In consequence, numerous colonies of the Israelites settled in Erevantashad, Van, Nachitshewan, and Artaxata. However, in terror before the invading Seljuks, Senekherim, the last of the Artsrunians, ceded his kingdom, in 1021, to the East Romans—an

Armenians Refuse Union With Rome example followed by Gagik the Bagratid in 1045; but submission naturally failed to prevent the utter devastation of these districts by the Seljuk and Mongol invaders.


After the destruction of Ani numbers of fugitives fled into the Caucasus and the mountains of Pontus, to Trebizond, to the Byzantine Empire, to Russia, to the Crimea, to Poland, and Galicia. A large number settled on the far side of the

Taurus in the kingdom of Cilicia. At this point in Tarsus and Sis the Armenians once founded a native kingdom ("Armenia Minor"), which from 1080, under the Bagratid Reuben and his successors, repeatedly joined in battle with Byzantium and in friendship with the crusading states, and even attempted a union with Rome, which was often concluded and as often broken, for the reason that the Armenians clung tenaciously to their national liturgy.

When, however, in the year 1375, the last king, Leon VI. of the house of Lusignan, was obliged to surrender his last castle to the Egyptian Mamelukes, the nation preserved a merely ecclesiastical existence in the patriarchate seats of Sis and Etchmiadsin. However, like fire in the ashes, their own poetry and literature remained alive, cherished in the numerous

of their patron the Surb Karapet (St. John), and instituted annual poetical contests in his sanctuary at Mush.

In the fourteenth century, when the Armenians both in the south and in the north succumbed to the Turks, the Turkish yoke was not oppressive; and, shortly after the conquest of Constantinople, in 1463, they received permission to retain their own patriarch, while they secured the confidence of the Sublime Porte itself and grew rich in its service. In Persia, however, they had to undergo a period of deep tribulation when Shah Abbas I. transported the best portion of the Armenian nation, under circumstances of great cruelty, to Ispahan (the suburb of Julfa), and in 1614 went so far as to transfer the national sanctuary to



THE GREAT ARMENIAN FORTRESS OF VAN AS IT WAS IN MEDIÆVAL TIMES

monasteries of Asia Minor and Southern Europe; while the industrial population gained a living as shepherds and farmers in the gorges of the Taurus and in the mountains of Upper Armenia, and the capable townspeople laid the foundation of their wealth in Byzantium, Smyrna, Damascus, and Alexandria. The most brilliant representative of the abundant Armenian literature of that period was

Annual Poetical Contests Among the Armenians Nerses Klajetsi, otherwise Snorhali (the Graceful) Catholicus from 1066 to 1073. Many hymns and songs were collected in the "Sharakan," the Armenian liturgical book, while the ballad singers, "Ashuges and Sasandares," whose names have disappeared, guarded the perennial fountain of popular poetry, and formed a society under the protection

Persia; it was not restored to Etchmiadsin, with the relics of St. Gregory, until 1683.

During the Persian persecutions the Armenians had been dispersed far westward, even to Italy and France. In particular, a considerable colony was received in the Polish town of Lemberg, which, with its bishop, was induced by Jesuit influence in 1625 to accept union with Rome. This was the beginning of the great intellectual movement which was soon to embrace the whole of Armenia. Clergy were sent out from Etchmiadsin to found Armenian printing-presses. These were erected, in 1616, at Lemberg, in 1640 at Julfa and Livorno, in 1660 at Amsterdam—transferred to Marseilles in 1672—in Constantinople in 1677, and elsewhere. "But the imperishable service of winning back the Armenians to European culture,"

says the historian Gelzer, " is the glorious work of Mechitar and of his order the Mechitarists, who settled at Venice in 1717 on the island of San Lazzaro, together with the mission to the Catholic Armenians ; but apart from this, their labours as authors and their splendid printing exercised a highly important influence upon the development of modern Armenian literature and upon scientific knowledge among their nation." Mechitar (the Consoler) da Pietro was born in Sebaste on February 7th, 1676, and after long persecution on the part of his compatriots founded a congregation of Armenian Christians in Constantinople in 1701, a community which soon fell under the suspicion of the patriarch on account of its leanings to the Latin Church. In consequence Mechitar removed, in 1703, to Modon in the Morea, where he received permission from the Venetian republic to build a monastery and church. After their secession to the communion of the Armenian Uniates, the congregation was confirmed by Pope Clement XI. in 1712, and received a rule similar to the Benedictine. The war which broke out in 1714 between Turkey and the Venetians necessitated a migration to Venice, where the Senate granted them the island of San Lazzaro (1717), upon which their magnificent monastery was erected. Mechitar died there on April 27th, 1749.

Turkey at War with the Venetians

The Mechitarists had a ritual of their own for purpose of worship, and devoted themselves after 1708, when the first printing-press was set up, more particularly to the publication of the classics in Armenian. Their most famous productions are their Bibles ; the text was improved by Mechitar in 1733, and appeared in 1805, based on the collation of nine manuscripts. The press catalogue of 1716 to 1808 includes 1,000 entries of books, chiefly in the Armenian language, which provided numbers of the nation with first-hand information upon Western science, and upon the history of the Armenian East as derived from manuscripts.

After the death of Mechitar twenty-one priests migrated from San Lazzaro to Trieste, where the support of the bishop and the authorities of the town enabled them to found the Mechitar congregation of Trieste on May 19th, 1773. The Empress

Armenian Literary Activity


Maria Theresa conferred important privileges upon the congregation, and on March 20th, 1775, secured their recognition by the State as an ecclesiastical order, and gave them a piece of ground. Shortly afterwards the Mechitarist printing-press was opened in Trieste in 1776. The French administration, however, of 1810 brought about the suppression of the monastery and the press, which had produced many books in Armenian, German, Latin, ancient and modern Greek, Italian and French.

The Armenian Uniates maintained their position since the period of the Crusades and the Unitores, and had gradually increased, though to no great extent. Almost contemporaneously with the rise of the Mechitarist movement a Catholicate was created in actual communion with Rome. Abraham, the Catholic Armenian Bishop of Aleppo (1710), founded the monastery of Kerem in Lebanon, to which he gave the rule of St. Antonius. In 1740 his adherents made him patriarch of Sis, and in 1742 he received the pallium from Pope Benedict XIV. He was, however, unable to maintain his position in Cilicia against the persecutions of the Gregorians, and the Catholicus transferred his residence to Lebanon, where he died in 1749.

Russia's Bid For Armenian Friendship

The efforts of the Russians to secure the favour of the Armenians, who had obeyed the Ottomans and the Persians since 1555, were highly encouraging. In the year 1768 the Empress Catherine II. reminded the Catholicus Simon that her predecessors upon the throne, Peter the Great and Catherine I., had assured the Catholicus of their particular respect for the Armenian nation by autograph letters in 1724 and 1726. Further communications from the Tsar Paul I. in 1798 and 1800 opened to the Armenian leaders and clergy the prospect of placing their countrymen under the protection of Russia. The Persian rulers had made similar promises to the patriarchs ; hence in 1768 Catherine II., resolved not to let slip the opportunity of "protecting" Armenia, concluded a formal convention with the Archbishop Arguthianz, promising nothing less than the restoration of the old Armenian independent Christian kingdom. Thenceforth Armenia occupies a prominent position in the Eastern Question of the nineteenth century and of the present day.

HEINRICH ZIMMERER



THE HUNS ON THE WARPATH AND THE BARBARIC TRIUMPHS OF ATTLA

ABOUT the year 50 B.C. the Mongolian kingdom of the Hiung nu in the north of China had been divided into an eastern and northern portion. The eastern state came to an end in 142 A.D., and its people were for the most part absorbed by degrees into the Chinese Empire; the northern kingdom of the Huns, however, succumbed as early as 84 A.D. to the repeated attacks of their more powerful foes the Sien pe and of other Siberian Tungusian tribes. Part of the Hun population then fled westward to the steppes of Lake Aral, where a separate kingdom had been founded under Tshi tshi immediately after the disruption of the empire.

Considerably reinforced by the arrival of these fugitives, about 90 A.D., this nomad power extended so rapidly in the course of the following century that it reached the Caspian Sea and came under the notice of European geographers such as Dionysius Ptolemy about 130 and Ptolemy about 150. About the year 300 the state was involved in war with Tiri-dates the Great of Armenia, became a disturbing force among the peoples of Eastern Europe, and was able to make a considerable step westward about the middle of the fourth century, after attaining more or less success in a series of petty struggles.

At this point we should emphasize the fact that the ethnological character of these composite Hun people must have been considerably changed during these years by the reception and incorporation of related and foreign elements; the truth of the matter probably is that only the leaders and the nobles of the hordes were of pure Mongolian blood, while the majority were a very mixed race, containing infusions of other branches of the Ural-Altaic-speaking peoples, of the Turkoman Tartars, of Finns and Ugrians, and also of the Sarmatians and others. All that we know of the customs and manners of the Huns is in correspondence

with the peculiar characteristics of Mongolian races. This remark is also true of their physical characteristics, as described by contemporary writers—their large round heads, small deep-set eyes, prominent cheek-bones, flat noses, dirty complexion, low stature, broad chests, and heavy build above the waist. In certain races this original type had so far disappeared under the influence of infusions from elsewhere that we may doubt whether the result was rather Turkish or Finnish. These tribes were accustomed to slit the cheeks of their children in order to prevent the growth of hair; their noses were tied down with broad bands, and the skull compressed at the sides.

The Huns were true nomads, possessing neither houses nor huts. Their women—they were polygamists—and their children they led about from place to place in covered waggons, pasturing their herds in summer on the wide steppes, and retiring to the river-beds in winter. They were hardy riders, accustomed to remain day and night in the saddle, where they ate and drank. The horse, the sword, and the favourite tools of a dead man were buried with his body, which was placed in a grave with the head towards the west and the face turned to the rising sun. Over the grave a mound was erected on which the meal of the dead was placed. Singers then extolled the deeds of the departed in their songs, while the relatives cropped their hair and slit their cheeks in token of their grief. About the year 372 the Huns left their new habitation and advanced into the district on

this side of the Volga, subjugating in 375 the Alans, who were living on the Don and the Sea of Azov; part of the Alans were speedily incorporated with the conquerors. Under the leadership of Balamber, or Balamir, they attacked the

Curious Habits and Customs of the Huns

Suicide of Centenarian King

Eastern Goths, whose king Hermanarich, who was more than one hundred years old, committed suicide upon losing a decisive battle. His successor, Vithimir, or Vini-tharius, fell in a battle; his two sons and some adherents fled to the Western Goths, while a larger portion of the Eastern Goths, who were led by Gesimund, submitted

**Asiatic Nomads
Pour
Into Europe**

to the supremacy of the Huns. The Western Goths afterwards retired behind the Pruth, and when the

Huns also passed the Dniester they escaped after a short time, some behind the Sereth to Kaukaland, the modern Transylvania, under the leadership of Athanarich, while another portion, the Tervings, who had accepted Christianity, entered the Roman Empire at the advice of their Bishop Ulfilas, under the leadership of Fritigern, whither Athanarich followed in 380, notwithstanding his hatred of Rome, as he had been expelled from Transylvania.

The Hunnish hordes of Balamber now overran the whole country of the Danube; only the lower portion of this river and the territory about its mouth divided them from the Roman Empire. Both for the civilised and for the barbarian nations this mighty invasion of Europe by Asiatic nomads had grievous consequences. All traces disappeared of the rising German civilisation, which had been begun by the Goths; rich colonies and flourishing settlements fell into ruins. The wooden palaces of the chieftains of the Huns advanced nearer year by year to the borders of civilisation, and Hunnish mercenaries soon became one of the main supports of the Roman domination, which was then entering on its decline.

During the years 400 to 408 the government was in the hands of Uldin, and in the first half of the fifth century three brothers reigned over the Huns—Mundzuk—known as Bendeguz in the Hungarian traditions—Oktar, and Rua—also known as Rof,

**Hun Ruler
Dies from
Gluttony**

Rugha, and Rugilas. Oktar, who was in the pay of the Romans, appeared several times on the Rhine and disturbed the Burgundians; he died in that district, as a result of excessive gluttony, on the eve of a battle. His inheritance was divided between his brothers Mundzuk, who died early, and Rua; the latter was in friendly relations with Byzantium, and was granted the title of general by Theodosius II., together with a yearly

subsidy of 350 pounds of gold (about £22,000). Upon his death, in 434 A.D., the supremacy was taken over by his nephews Bleda (or Buda, by Hungarian tradition) and Attila, the sons of Mundzuk.

Many different attempts have been made to explain the meaning of the name of Attila, the greatest of the Hun Kings. Some derive it from the Gothic "Atta," or father, and consider it as meaning "little father;" probably, however, it is connected with the name by which the Byzantines denoted the Volga in the sixth century. Magyar myths call him Etele, and in the German heroic legends he is known as Etzel. The year and the place of his birth are equally unknown. Upon his father's death Attila was sent by his uncle, Rua, as a hostage to Novæ, where he made the acquaintance of his later opponent, Aëtius, who was there living in similar circumstances. Here he acquired some tincture of Byzantine culture. Immediately after his accession the two Hunnish princes renewed their peace with the emperor Theodosius under conditions of great severity: the Byzantines

**Attila's Way
of Enriching
Friends**

were forced to dissolve all their alliances with the peoples in the Danube district, to surrender all

Hunnish subjects who had taken refuge with them, and also to pay a yearly tribute of five hundred pounds of gold. Attila discovered an easy mode of enriching his favourites by suddenly sending one or another of them with some despatch or proposal to the court of Constantinople, which was then forced to expend rich presents in return for the supposed communication.

The Hunnish hordes subjugated the German and Slav peoples on the Danube; Attila's eldest son, Ellak, ruled over the Ugrian hunting people of the Akatzires on the Don from 488. At an early date Attila turned westward, and between 435 and 437 destroyed the flourishing Burgundian kingdom on the Central Rhine and on the east of Gaul; the king, Gundihar, or Gundicharius, was killed. In the year 441 the town of Margum, at the confluence of the Margus (Moravia) and the Lower Danube, fell into the hands of the Huns, who from that date remained the perpetual guests of the East Roman Empire.

Under excuses of a very varied nature Attila now sent out his bands to invade Mœsia, Thracia, and Illyria; a delay in payment of the yearly tribute or the flight

of some Hunnish grandee whom he was pursuing provided sufficient excuse for such aggression.

In 445 he removed his brother Bleda by a treacherous murder. Shortly afterwards a Hun shepherd brought in a sword which was said to have fallen from heaven ; to this object the superstitious people attached the significance of future imperial power, and Attila encouraged his people in this belief. He himself was convinced of the possibility of his future empire, in view of the weakness which then prevailed in the East Roman Empire. In the year 447 he advanced with his bands as far as Thermopylæ; the Emperor Theodosius then begged for peace, which was granted him, at the beginning of 448, at the price of a war indemnity of six thousand pounds of gold (English money, £275,000) and a yearly tribute of two thousand one hundred pounds of gold (£95,000). Shortly afterwards (448) he sent Ediko, one of his nobles, to Constantinople to receive the yearly tribute, which the Byzantine court could collect only by means of extortion from the im-

Plot Against Attila Discovered and Defeated

poverished people; he further demanded from Theodosius II. the cession of the whole of the right bank of the Danube. Thereupon Chrysaphius "Tzuma," the all-powerful eunuch of the empire, induced the Hunnish ambassador to join a conspiracy for the murder of Attila.

In the year 449 the Byzantine embassy approached Attila to treat with him concerning his new demands. The leader of the embassy, the senator Maximin, and his secretary Priscus, a rhetorician and sophist from Pannonia, fortunately for themselves, knew nothing of the conspiracy, though the interpreter Vigilas was a party to it. However, Ediko himself betrayed the proposal to his master, who joyfully seized this favourable opportunity to demand from the Emperor Theodosius the head of the hated Chrysaphius, together with an increase in the amount of the yearly tribute; it was with great difficulty that he was persuaded to give up this demand.

To the rhetorician Priscus we owe an important description of his travels, which gives us a glimpse of life at the Hunnish court. He describes the capital and the simple palace of Attila, which was situated somewhere between the Theiss

and the Danube, in the modern lowlands of Hungary, possibly near Tokai. He also gives us a description of the dwellings of the Hunnish grandees, including that of the minister Onegesius (Hunigis, a Goth by descent). He informs us that upon the entry of Attila the monarch was preceded by a band of girls in white garments. Priscus made the ac-

At the Court of Attila

quaintance of Queen Kreka, to whom he handed the presents of the emperor. He was present at a banquet given in honour of the embassy, at which singers and jesters attempted to entertain the courtiers, while the Hunnish monarch sat buried in gloomy silence, with a whole band of Greek interpreters and Roman scribes awaiting his commands. It appears from this narrative that the Hunnish king found Roman culture indispensable. By his diplomatic insight, his great generalship, his personal bravery and daring, he so entirely surpassed contemporary princes that from the Rhine to the Volga, from the Baltic to the shores of the Black Sea, nations anxiously awaited their fates at the hands of this powerful and gloomy conqueror.

In the summer of 450 disturbances broke out in Constantinople; Theodosius died in the course of a revolt, Chrysaphius was executed, and Marcianus ascended the tottering throne. When the ambassadors of the Hunnish kingdom came to Constantinople shortly after his accession to demand the yearly tribute he gave them a short answer—"Gold for my friends and steel for my enemies." Attila was apparently satisfied with this answer. Geiserich, the king of the Vandals, had, about 446, mutilated the first wife of his eldest son, Hunerich, in consequence of some suspicion; she was a daughter of the West Goth Theoderic I., and dreading the revenge of the Goths, he concluded an alliance with Attila, who now turned his attention to the West Roman empire.

Roman Princess Desires to Marry Attila

The reigning emperor, Valentinian III., had designed that his sister Grata Justa Honoria should take the veil; she, however, had begun a love affair with her procurator Eugenius, had been banished for some time to Byzantium in consequence, and on her return home had secretly sent Attila a ring, thus offering herself to him as his wife. For the moment Attila vouchsafed no answer to the proposal, but at a later date he sent

repeated demands to Valentinian, requesting the bride for his harèem and half of the western empire as her dowry, basing these demands on the gift of the ring. The refusal to these requests was transmitted to the Hunnish ambassador in the name of the emperor by Aëtius, "the last of the Romans," the companion of

**Eastern Europe
Converted into an
Armed Camp**


Attila's youth. In fierce anger Attila now turned the whole of Eastern Europe into an armed camp. In the spring of 451 he advanced with a gigantic army, composed of the most different nationalities—said to amount to 500,000 men—along the Danube towards Gaul. The attention of the Hun prince had been drawn to this country in 448 by a rebel named Eudoxius, and afterwards by the Vandal Geiserich and by an ambitious Frank; a long series of ruined towns marked his progress. At Strasburg, Attila crossed the Rhine with his army, burned Metz, and attempted to capture Orleans. However, the inhabitants of the town held out, under the leadership of their bishop, until the vanguard of the army of Aëtius appeared; he had been joined, after long negotiations, by Theoderic, the king of the West Goths.

Attila raised the siege and led his columns back to the wide plain extending towards Troyes and Mery, between the Seine and the Marne.

On the field of Mauriazen, or Katalaun, in the beginning of July, the great battle of peoples took place in which Roman Christianity was opposed to the Huns and heathendom. After fearful slaughter—reports vary between 160,000 and 300,000 men, while later legends asserted that even the fallen continued to struggle in the air—Attila retired to his bivouac at nightfall, and the death-songs of the Huns were heard even in the camp of the conquerors. The Hunnish king hastily erected a funeral pile of saddles, on which he proposed to undergo a voluntary death by fire in case of a renewed attack by the victorious enemy. Aëtius, however, did not wish to destroy so valuable a counterpoise to the Gothic power, and had, moreover, himself gained the victory at the price of heavy sacrifices; further-

more, the West Goths had immediately marched home on the death of their king. Attila was thus able to retire to Pannonia without opposition.

In the following year, 452, Attila marched upon Italy with a strong army. After a siege of several months he captured the town of Aquileia, the gate of Italy, and levelled it to the ground. The smoking ruins of Padua, Verona, Milan, and many other towns marked the path of the Hunnish bands as they marched upon Rome. The whole civilised world was awaiting with horror the fall of the "eternal city," when Attila suddenly began to retreat. To this step he was probably induced, not so much by the magnificent present sent him by Pope Leo I. at Mincio, as by the news that the East Roman Emperor Marcian had invaded Pannonia, and that an even more dangerous adversary, Aëtius, was collecting an army for the relief of Rome. To these motives must be added the intolerable heat, the unaccustomed climate, plague, the lack of provisions, and last, but certainly not least, superstition.




"THE SCOURGE OF GOD"

The claim to this title was made by Attila, the Hunnish leader, whose hordes overran all Eastern Europe.

It was thought that the conqueror of Rome would die shortly after the capture of the city, as Alaric had died before. The fact remains that Attila retreated homeward to the banks of the Theiss. After threatening the Byzantines with punishment in the following year, he

died in the winter of the year 453 of hæmorrhage on the night of his marriage with Idliko, known to German legend as Kriemhild. The body was buried in an unknown spot, and the workmen employed upon the grave were killed, that no one might be able to betray the last resting-place of the Hunnish monarch. Rome and

Byzantium had lost a dangerous foe. After Attila's death both his empire and his people declined with rapid strides. Ellak, his destined successor, had acquired Roman culture and Roman military tactics in his early youth, but was not a suitable ruler for a barbaric people of nomads. The new ruler was attacked by Attila's other sons, especially Dengizich and Irnach. This fratricidal effort led to no result, while the



THE CHURCH FACES THE BARBARIAN: THE POPE AND ATTLA, THE HUN

Attila's course of devastation was a track of utter ruin, the avowed purpose of "the Scourge of God," as he claimed to be. But it is said that Pope Leo I. met him with all the majesty of the Church Established, and succeeded for a time in staying the hand of the destroying Hun. After Attila's death the Huns declined and finally disappeared from history.

From the painting by Chenavard, by permission of Messrs. Braun, Clement et Cie.

Goths and the Gepids seized this opportunity to revolt. Ellak marched against the rebels, but his army was defeated by the mighty force of the Gepids (under Ardarich). Goths, Rugians, and Herulians at the river Netad in Pannonia, where Ellak lost his life. Dengizich now undertook the leadership of the Huns, who had

**Defeated Huns
Make Alliance
With the Goths**

been driven back to the plains between the Lower Danube and the Don. In 456 and 462 he attacked the Pannonian Goths on the Save, but was twice defeated by King Valemir. He then made an alliance with the Goths, and advanced to Dacia and Moesia. Three armies sent against him by the East Roman Empire were enticed by the allies into a narrow valley, where they were surrounded and almost exterminated. Nevertheless, in the year 469 Dengizich again invaded Thrace, but on this occasion he was captured by the Roman Anagastus, was executed, and his head was sent to Constantinople. With his death ends the unity of the East European nomad peoples under the name of Huns, which had formerly been created by Rua and Attila. Irnach, accompanied by his brothers Emnedsur and Ultzindur, withdrew with the remnants of the Huns far into the steppes of South Russia.

For more than fifty years we hear no more of the Huns. Shortly before 523, the Byzantines mention the Hunnish tribe of the Uturgurs, whose king, Gorda, accepted Christianity, and was killed in a revolt led by his brother Muager. As early as 507 and 508 the Albanian Bishop Qarduct of Arran had made a missionary journey into the lands of the Sabir. In the middle of the sixth century Procopius speaks of the Huns as a people divided into the two tribes of the Kuturgurs and Uturgurs. The Kuturgurs, who were also known as Black Bulgarians, joined for the most part with the Avars,

**Huns Fall
From Place
and Power**

who are henceforward often known as Huns, in an expedition to Pannonia in 568; about 630 they were forced to leave this country in consequence of the failure of a revolt. The Khagan of the Avars now proclaimed himself ruler of the two Hun tribes, and sent a demand to Justin II. in 568 for the yearly subsidy which Byzantium had formerly paid. In the year 576 we find the Uturgurs, with their neighbours the Alans, subject to the

Western Turks. Shortly after that time the name of the Uturgurs disappears from history; their place is taken by the Bulgarians in Old or Greater Bulgaria to the east of the Sea of Azov. On the other hand, in 598 we meet again with the Kuturgurs, or Kotzagirs, who took refuge, to the number of 10,000 men, with the Avar Khagan, while flying, with the Huns of Tarmiach and Zaben, from the Turks. But the supremacy of the Avars lasted only until 626.

At the outset of the seventh century the Prince Organa ruled over the Kuturgurs, who had remained on the Sea of Azov. He was an ally of the Emperor Heraclius, and accepted Christianity in 619. After the death of Organa, his cousin Kuvrat united his nation with their kinsmen the Bulgarians on the Kuban, and shook off the yoke of the Avars. After the death of Kuvrat, in 668, this allied tribe divided into five different hordes under his sons.

One horde was united about 679 with the Khazars under Bäg-Bajan, the eldest son of Kuvrat; with these the Bulgarians had formerly been in alliance as a neighbouring people, and were now to be conquered by them. The danger threatened by their neighbours, the Turkish Pechenegs, induced the Magyars about 840 to form an alliance with the Khazars, under whose supremacy they retained possession for twenty years of their second European home, Lebedia, to the east of the Don. When the Hungarians abandoned these districts shortly after 862, they were joined by the Kabars, who now broke away from their mother tribe the Khazars.

**Fate
of the
Huns**

The empire founded by the Khazars, augmented by the remnants of the Huns, became a formidable menace to the South Caucasian peoples in consequence of its great raids, ending in 799. About 969 the empire fell before the advance of the Russian Svjatoslav.

The second horde of the Hunnish Bulgarians found a temporary home to the west of the Don. The third horde, mingled with other tribes of the Huns, founded the modern Bulgaria under the leadership of Isperrich, while the fourth, unless there is some confusion here with the above-mentioned settlements of 568, advanced to Pannonia.

Thus the nationality of the Huns was broken up, coalesced with other nations, and then disappeared.

HEINRICH VON WLISLOCKI



THE OLD BULGARIAN KINGDOM AND ITS LONG STRUGGLE WITH BYZANTIUM

THE desert between the Ural Mountains, the Caspian Sea, and Lake Aral was at one time the home of those Ugrian families of peoples to which the Bulgarians belonged. How long the Ugrians may have inhabited these districts is impossible to say. At some time or other Ugrian races were driven into that territory by the Sabires, who, on their side, had retreated from the Avars, who were driven out by the Huns; at that time it is probable that the Voguls and Ostiaks, perhaps also some Magyar tribes, had retired northwards to the Tobol, Irtish, and Ob. On the other hand, the eastern branch for the most part extended at least to the Lower Volga and the Caucasus district, in the neighbourhood of which Bulgarian tribes, who had emigrated at an earlier period, must have been settled. These North Caucasian Bulgarians were strongly influenced by the overwhelming invasion of the Huns. The fact is undoubted that it was the Bulgarians who formed the main element of the Hunnish armies; hence we may explain the fact that we hear of

Mingling of the Huns and Bulgarians

Hunnish Bulgarians in the land of the Alans in the fourth century, and that we learn, shortly after 375, of the Langobards being overwhelmed by Bulgarians of this kind.

Thus during those decades the Bulgarians must have partly exchanged their old name for that of Hun. This fact naturally does not facilitate the task of distinguishing the individual families of Mongolian race, of which we have in any case only scanty records, difficult to interpret. The Huns, as we have seen, had gradually received large reinforcements from other members of the Ural Altaic-speaking peoples; and their Turkish-Tartar nationality had been so entirely transformed thereby, that it is difficult to say whether the hordes who invaded Europe were primarily of Turkish or Finnish race.

After the disruption of the Hunnish unity in 469 A.D., this same phenomenon, which reduces every conscientious

historian to complete despair, is repeated with greater intensity. The tribes formerly subjected to the Huns had now indeed recovered their freedom; but they had been subject for so long a period to Hunnish supremacy, had so entirely assimilated their manners and customs, had felt themselves to be so entirely members of the great Hunnish

Predominance of the Bulgarians

nationality on their marauding expeditions, and had so often acted in accordance with this belief, that contemporary chroniclers are continually in a state of confusion as regards the identity of these separate elements; Avars, Bulgarians, Sabines, etc., are shortly and simply known as "Huns." A century later the opposite tendency is in force; the remnants of the Hun nationality are incorporated with the Bulgarian people, and the name of Hun disappears from history, although the representatives of this nationality were by no means extinct.

In that highly disturbed age of the great migrations we hear only occasionally, with the exception of the events above mentioned, of actions which can be ascribed with any certainty to the North Caucasian Bulgarians alone. In the year 482 the emperor Zeno invited their help against the Eastern Goths. This was the first occasion on which the Bulgarians came into practical contact with the East Roman Empire. In 505, Sabinianus, the Magister Militum of Illyricum, at the head of 10,000 Bulgarian auxiliary troops, was defeated on the Morava while operating against Mundo the Gepid and Pitzia the Goth. From the shattered remnants of the Western Bul-

In Contact with the Eastern Empire

garian outposts left in these districts, that branch may have been formed or have diverged, which was received about 670, under its leader Alzeco, into the old land of the Samnites by the Langobard Duke Romuald of Beneventum. In any case, at that moment the main body of the North Caucasian Bulgarians were in enjoyment of complete independence from

the time that Kuvrat shook off the yoke of the Avars, about 635, and founded a formidable state in conjunction with the other branches of the Southern Ugrians who had been driven into that district.

However, in 679 the power of the Unugundur Bulgarians was so entirely shattered that for a time only fragmentary remnants of them existed; their destroyers were the West Turkish Khazars, among whose earliest conquests and settlements are included the East Caucasian plains on the Terek and Ssulak, together with the nomad settlements of Balangar and Samandar. Yet the broken power recovered itself with comparative rapidity, and soon became a force to be reckoned with. One portion was entirely absorbed by the Khazars; Isperich, the third son of Kuvrat, founded a new kingdom on the Lower Danube, the fate of which will be followed more in detail below; the fourth and fifth sons with their following migrated to the Avars.

The second son of Kuvrat, Kotrag, settled on the right bank of the Don, and from this point advanced along the valley of the central Volga to the country of the Kama (known at this point as the Isgil, the second of three or four tribes of these Volga Bulgarians), where he founded the state of "Great Bulgaria." This name also gives rise to difficulties. The shores of the Sea of Azov, which were occupied by those Hunnish Bulgarian Uturgurs who fell victims in 568 to the Avars and in 576, together with the Alans, to the Western Turks, are now called, as occasion rises, either "old" or "great" Bulgaria until the occupation by the Magyars in the first half of the ninth century.

Special care must be taken to avoid any confusion of the "Old Bulgaria" on the Kuban with the other "Old Bulgaria" in Europe. Now that all the remaining

The Two "Old Bulgarias"

Bulgarian states have entirely disappeared from the map, the term "Old Bulgaria" is justifiably used to distinguish this country from the modern Bulgaria; it will occupy our attention later on. Of greater permanence than that Uturgur kingdom was Great Bulgaria, created by a remarkable retrograde movement of the bands of Kotrag on the Volga and Kama, which showed considerable powers of endurance, and flourished from the ninth

to the thirteenth century. We may connect this state with al-Balchi.

On the Volga and the Kama the Bulgarians certainly carried on cattle-breeding and agriculture to some extent. They were soon in constant communication with the Arabs; as early as the year 922 the Bulgarians are said to have accepted Mohammedanism, a statement which appears credible. In consequence of their intercourse with the Arabs, these Volga Bulgarians acquired considerable influence over the neighbouring Ugrian races, the Magyars and others. Among other proofs of the fact are a few surviving monuments, written in a language similar to that of the modern Chuvashes; instances are the inscriptions on the grave-stones found in the ruins of the town of Bulgar on the Kama, also the remnants of a list enumerating the heathen princes of the Danube Bulgarians before 765, wherein the ages are given in old Bulgarian numerals, which can be compared with the words in Chuvash.

The development of Great Bulgaria was hindered for a time by the invasions from the Baltic of the Norse

Development of Greater Bulgaria

Vikings, or Russians; in 969 they devastated Bulgaria, and a considerable proportion of the inhabitants removed to Hungary. Notwithstanding the repeated invasions of the Russians, Greater Bulgaria maintained its independence for a long period. We have specimens of Arab coins, dated 976 and 977, which were struck in Bulgar and in Suvar in the name of the Bulgarian prince Mumin ben Ahmad. Besides agriculture, the Volga Bulgarians learnt from Iranian immigrants manufacture and trade which rapidly developed in the towns of Suvar, Bulgar, and Bilar, and extended even as far as Persia. In the thirteenth century Greater Bulgaria lost its independence; the country was conquered by the Tartars, and afterwards fell into the hands of the Muscovite Tsars.

The Bulgarians who had migrated to the left bank of the Lower Danube under Isperich, the son of Kuvrat, had meanwhile extended their settlements in the district between the Dniester and the Danube, whence they made invasions into Moesia and into Thrace. The Byzantine emperor, Constantine IV. Pogonatus, sent a punitive expedition against

them in 679, with a precisely opposite result to that intended; the victorious Bulgarians moved to the right bank of the Danube in the same year, and Isperrich occupied the territory from the Moesian plain to the shores of the Black Sea. The Slavs settled in those districts resigned themselves more readily to their fate, as they were thereby freed from the hated Byzantine yoke. This European kingdom of Old Bulgaria extended so rapidly that, at the outset of the ninth century, it included all the numerous Slav races of the Balkan peninsula, who under this new and comparatively mild government soon united into one people, and adopted the name of their conquerors, the Bulgarians. The ruling class was weak in numbers, was soon subdued by the higher civilisation of their Slav subjects, and adopted their language after two or three centuries, certainly after their prosperous period.

This Old Bulgarian state, the centre of gravity of which lay in the plains of the modern Dobrudza, was ruled under an aristocratic constitution. The supreme power was in the hands of a prince, known by the native name of Khan; he was supported by a council of six nobles, or *boyars*. Serfdom was an ancient institution, and hence the administration of justice was barbaric and arbitrary. Rebel nobles not only lost their property and wealth, but their entire families were also exterminated. Polygamy was usual; when the husband died, his wives were burned with his corpse or buried in the same grave. Human sacrifices, a practice indulged only at the expense of Latin and Greek enemies, are reported from the outset of the thirteenth century under the "Pious" Johannisza; an instance among the savage Cumanians belongs even to the year 1241.

Hardly had Isperrich settled with his nation in the Lower Danube districts when the Byzantines, in order to save Thrace, were forced to agree to pay tribute under a convention of 679. When the Emperor Justinian II. Rhinotmetos, the last descendant of the house of Heraclius, refused the demand, Isperrich defeated the Greeks and imposed a heavier tribute on them. Under his successor Tervel (about 700 to 720), the Byzantine emperor, who was exiled in 695, found his chief support in

the Bulgarians of Great Preslav. With the help of Tervel, Justinian, who had meanwhile married the Khazar princess Theodora, re-established himself in Constantinople in 705, heaped honours of every kind upon his ally, and conferred upon him the title of Cæsar, though shortly after he was ungrateful enough to dissolve the alliance and attempt to surprise the Bulgarian Khan. At Anchialos he was, however, himself defeated by the Bulgarian ruler in 705, and was forced to pay a yearly tribute and to cede the Thracian district of Zagora, situated to the south of the Balkans, which afterwards gave its name to the Bulgarian kingdom of Tirnovo—a name in use for centuries among the Serbs, Byzantines, and Italians, though denoting different localities according to the changing situation of the race. When the Arabs besieged Constantinople in 717 the Bulgarians hastened to the help of the hard-pressed defenders and relieved the town in 718.

Under the two succeeding princes the Bulgarians lived in an alternate state of peace and war with the Byzantine Empire. When the iconoclast Constantine V. (741–775) ascended the East Roman throne, he made preparations in 758 for a campaign against the encroaching Bulgarians, but was defeated in 759 in the passes of Beregava, between Anchialos and Varna. Fortunately for Byzantium internal disturbances broke out among the Bulgarians, whose vigour had moreover been diminished by the transportation of more than 200,000 Slovenians to Bithynia in 762, immediately after the death of their prince Kormisos, of the house of Ukil, who on his side had overthrown the ruling dynasty of the Dulo in 753. Telec, or Teletsh (760–763), of the family of Ugain, was summoned to the throne; he, however, was defeated by the Greeks

at Anchialos, and died under the weapons of his own exasperated subjects. His successor Sabbin—a Romanised Wallachian, as the name implies—was soon deposed, and forced to flee to Constantinople. Under the princes Bajan, Umar, and Toktu confusion within and pressure from without reached their highest point. Part of Bulgaria was occupied by Byzantine troops, and the rest was devastated by the neighbouring Slav races. A change

**Barbaric
Customs of the
Bulgarians**

**In Alliance
with
Byzantium**

**At War
with
Byzantium**

of fortune took place upon the accession of Cerig shortly after 763. He succeeded by treachery, rather than by force of arms, in freeing his country from the East Romans; later he was expelled by his revolted nobles, and forced to flee to Constantinople, where he was baptised, and married one of the imperial princesses.

The Khan Annihilates a Greek Army His successor, Kardam, defeated the Greeks on four occasions and forced them to pay a yearly tribute.

Under the government of the Khan Krum (802 until April 13th, 814 or 815), who had conquered Serdika, or Sofia, in 809, the Emperor Nicephorus appeared with the object of definitely incorporating Bulgaria with his empire. The capital of Krum was levelled to the ground and all proposals for peace were rejected. The Khan closed the mountain passes with barricades and annihilated the whole Greek army, together with their emperor, on their retreat on the night of July 25-26, 811. In July, 813, Krum advanced against Michael I. Rhangabé as far as Adrianople; he captured the town, and transported 10,000 men with their wives and children to the left bank of the Danube.

His successors, Cok, or Dukum, and Diceng, remained within the frontiers of their own kingdom until the Bulgarian prince Omortag concluded an armistice in 817 for thirty years with the Emperor Leo V., desiring to turn his attention to the Franks, who were endangering the Bulgarian kingdom after the expulsion of the Avars from Pannonia. In 818, 822, and 824, requests were made to Lewis the Pious for admission to the Frankish imperial federation by the Eastern Abodrites from the old Servian town of Branicevo, which had for the moment shaken off the Bulgarian yoke, as a result of the revolt of the Pannonian Slovenian Ljudevit (819-828); a similar request was made by the Timoans on the Timok.

Bulgars at Belgrade 1,000 Years Ago Omortag raised fruitless objections to these proposals in 824, conducted a successful war against Lewis the Pious between 827 and 828, and secured his supremacy over the Pannonian Slavs. However, the Bulgarian rule was of no long duration in this quarter; only the district at the mouths of the Save and Drave remained subject to them until the arrival of the Magyars. A Bulgarian official was resident in Belgrade as late

as 885. About 835 the "Macedonians," who had been forcibly removed in 813 to the far side of the Danube from Adrianople and its surroundings, attempted to avail themselves of the absence of some part of the Bulgarians, who had marched against Thessalonica under their leader Khan Boris-Michael, to flee to the Roman districts. They actually succeeded in their attempt, for when the Khan Vladimir, a grandson of Krum, crossed the Danube on this news, they inflicted such a blow upon him that he was forced to turn for help to the Magyars, who then dwelt not far from the Danube mouth; in the meantime the fugitives found their way safely on board the ships which the Emperor Theophilus had sent to meet them.

Under the Khan Presjam, Christianity had already begun to take root in the Bulgarian Empire. His successor, Boris, who reigned from 852, was largely occupied during the first half of his reign with wars against the Greeks, the Serbs, the Croatians, and the Franks. For the most part his conflicts ended unfavourably. Against the Franks he fought in 853, as an ally of the

Spiritual Transformation of the Slavs Moravian prince Rastislav; he also fought against the Pannonian Slavs at the instigation of Charles the Bald, who had suffered a severe defeat at the hands of Lewis the German. Boris now joined the East Frankish king, whose son, Karloman, had revolted with the help of Rastislav in 862. Karloman was beaten; Lewis and Boris concluded a treaty of alliance in 864 at Tulln on the Danube, which was renewed in 892 by the Emperor Arnulf, and remained in force for centuries. In the same, or in the following, year (865) the Byzantines ceded to the Bulgarians Zagoria, between the important frontier fortress Develtos, or Valandar, and the Iron Gate. There may be a connection between these and the following events.

A great transformation had been brought to pass in the spiritual life of the whole of the Slav people by the brothers Constantine and Methodius. By their efforts Christianity spread so rapidly in Lower Pannonia and Moravia, that the Bulgarian prince Boris found himself in the midst of powerful Christian nobles, whose doctrine he was forced to consider indispensable to the maintenance and security of his kingdom. Boris also became a Christian for political reasons. At first, in 864, he

began to negotiate with Pope Nicholas I., through the medium of King Lewis, but afterwards preferred to turn to Byzantium; when he was there baptised, he took the name of Michael, in honour of his godfather the Emperor Michael III. He showed indefatigable energy in preaching the new faith to his subjects and also to the Slavs in the south-west, by the founding of seven churches, and by continual threats and exhortations, between 864 and 867, while he cruelly crushed the revolt of the nobles who remained faithful to heathendom; he even executed their women and children in a most cruel manner and exterminated whole families.

After a reign of thirty-six years, Boris abdicated, in 888, in favour of his eldest son Vladimir and retreated to a monastery. While Symeon, the youngest son of Boris, devoted himself to science in Constantinople with a zeal which afterwards procured him the nickname of the "Half Greek," Khan Vladimir led a dissipated life, and thereby seriously endangered the work his father had begun. After four years Boris found himself obliged to leave his monastery for a short time for the purpose of deposing Vladimir and raising Symeon to the throne. Michael Boris died on May 2nd, 907. He is the first of the series of Bulgarian national saints, and is revered as the converter of his nation to Christianity.

Under the government of Symeon (893-927) the Bulgarian state attained its greatest expansion. It extended from the banks of the Danube to the mountains of Rhodope and Pindus, and southward from Mesembria to Adrianople. Besides the Danube Bulgarians, he ruled over Macedonia, Thessaly, and Epirus, while Servia paid him tribute. By means of a series of fortunate campaigns, Symeon brought the East Roman Empire to the verge of destruction. The first inducement to a breach of the peace was given by the Byzantines themselves, who imposed heavy customs duties upon goods imported from Bulgaria. When Symeon was unable to remove this embargo upon Bulgarian trade by diplomatic means, he declared war; after he had beaten the guards of the capital in several battles, he sent home the Khazar mercenaries, whom he had captured, with their noses cut off.

The Emperor Leo VI. now called to his aid the heathen Magyars, who at this time,

in 894, occupied Moldavia and Wallachia. Symeon was forced to retire at the end of January, 895, before the general Nicephorus Phocas, who was quickly recalled from Asia Minor, while Bulgaria was devastated as far as the royal seat of Great Preslav by the Magyars and Khazar Kabars under Liuntis, the son of Arpad, who had been ferried across the Danube in the imperial ships. Symeon suffered two defeats, threw himself into the fortress of Drster, or Silistria, and begged for an armistice. The Emperor Leo agreed, and recalled his armies. Symeon forthwith, in May, 895, annihilated the Magyars whom the Byzantines had left on his side of the Danube, and those that were left on the further bank were driven away by the Pechenegs, who were in alliance with Symeon.

He then secured an advantageous peace from Byzantium by promising the unconditional return of the prisoners, including those who had been made by the Magyars and purchased from them. Soon, however, the unsatisfactory completion of this contract gave him an excuse to break the peace, and he defeated the Byzantine troops under the new commander of the Guards, Katakalos, at Bulgarophygos, not far from Adrianople. The Emperor Leo was so alarmed at the loss of his general that he even armed the Mohammedan prisoners of war then confined in Constantinople. The peace now concluded between the Bulgarians and Greeks lasted until the death of the Byzantine emperor in 911.

Symeon who assumed the title of Bulgarian Tsar in 917, employed the years of peace in stimulating literary movements. Educated in Constantinople, he was a zealous scholar of Christian literature, and did his best to bring home the new teaching to his people. The reign of the Tsar Symeon forms the closing age of the early Slavonic Bulgarian literature, which is confined to ecclesiastical writings. The Bishop Constantine, the Pope Gregory, John Exarch, the monk Chrabr, and other authors at Symeon's magnificent court, raised ecclesiastical literature to a height that justifies comparison with the Latin and Greek literature of the period, and also extended it from Bulgaria to Servia and Russia. At the command of the Tsar, theological works and translations from

More Wars with Byzantium

First of the Bulgarian National Saints

Early Bulgarian Literature

the Greek were composed. Surrounded by scholars, he found time himself for literary activity; to him is ascribed the translation of a whole collection of homilies of John Chrysostom.

In the year 912, Symeon's peaceful work was interrupted. The Emperor Leo had died, and his successor Alexander went out

**Bulgaria's
Triumph over
Byzantium**

of his way to insult the messengers of Symeon when they requested a renewal of the peace. Alexander did

not feel the weight of Symeon's revenge, which was reserved for his successor, Constantine VII. Porphyrogennetos; notwithstanding the help of the Magyars, Servians, and Arabs, the battle of Mesembria ended with the defeat of the Byzantines on August 20th, 917. With the exception of Constantinople and some parts of the seaboard, almost the whole of the peninsula fell into the hands of the Bulgarians. About the same time the Serbs also came under Symeon's supremacy; with the support of Michael Wysevyc (912-926), the prince of the Southern Serbs, or Zachlumians, he imprisoned and executed their high Zupan, Peter, whose policy favoured the Byzantines, and set up Paul, a relative of the murdered man, as his successor in 917.

In 919 the Byzantine emperor, who was distinguished for scholarship rather than for political capacity, appointed his field-marshal Romanus Lakapenos as co-regent against Symeon's will. In 923 Symeon appeared before the gates of the capital and began negotiations for the necessary naval assistance with the Fatimid Fadlun of Kairuan, and captured Adrianople. It was only anxiety with regard to the Pechenegs and Magyars in the north that induced him to conclude peace at the personal request of the Roman.

While Symeon was occupied with Byzantium, the Servian Zupan, Paul, whom he had set up, was aiming at independence. Symeon sent an army to Servia, deposed

**The Greatest
Tsar of the
Bulgarians**

Paul, and handed over the principality to a certain Zacharias in 923; he, however, also entered into relations with the Byzantines, and was

therefore forced to flee from Symeon to Croatia. Symeon was unable to realise his plan of bringing Croatia under his supremacy, owing to the defeat in the year 927 of his field-marshal Alpbagatur. He died on May 27th, 927, the greatest Tsar of the Bulgarians, at once a general,

a scholar, and the first pioneer of European culture.

Symeon's carefully constructed state fell to ruins under his son Peter (927-969). Under his government the decline of the newly formed state of Old Bulgaria was accelerated by foes within and without. Symeon had left four sons. Michael, the son of his first marriage, had been confined in a monastery to secure the throne to Peter; the latter had two other brothers, John, and Boyan, who was popularly supposed to be a magician. The Byzantines, Magyars, Servians and Avars were only awaiting an opportunity to humiliate the youthful Tsar. Hard pressed on every side, Peter contracted a marriage on September 8th, 927, with Maria, the grand-daughter of the Emperor Romanus, in order to secure the peace of his kingdom with the help of the Greeks.

This step, however, was destined to be fatal to Bulgaria. With the entry of the first Byzantine Tsarina, East Roman influence began to take hold of Bulgarian politics, an influence destined to produce unlimited disaster in the following centuries. Greek tendencies now made them-

**The Fatal
Influence of
the Greeks**

selves felt both in Church and state. The older strain of the Bulgarian people, the comrades

in arms of the Tsar Symeon, were dissatisfied with the new state of affairs and joined the younger brother John. However, the revolt was soon suppressed with the help of Byzantine troops; John was taken to Constantinople, was overwhelmed with presents by the Emperor Romanus, and was married to a noble Armenian woman. After a short time the monk Michael, Symeon's eldest son, also revolted, and placed himself at the head of the malcontents in 929. However, he died before he was able to drive the Byzantine courtiers out of the country.

The continual opposition to Byzantine misgovernment, which was always smouldering at the court of the Tsar, broke out into flame in 963, when the boyar Sisman revolted against the weak government, and after a short struggle secured the western provinces of Macedonia and Albania. The Serbs also broke away from Bulgaria, and constant plundering raids upon the country were made by the Magyars and the Turkish nomad people of the Pechenegs. Meanwhile, however, Peter carried on a luxurious life amid his Greek relations and courtiers.

Under the government of this good-natured and cultured ruler the intellectual life of the Bulgarians was exposed to severe attacks. A few years after the introduction of Christianity into Bulgaria, a special form of opposition made itself felt among the people to the teaching of the state Church, which began to decay under the influence of the pedantry and preciosity of Byzantine literature; while this opposition was based upon old religious traditions, it was specially drawn to the teaching of a new sect. The not

to Thrace, to act as frontier guards, and a persecution initiated by Basil about 870 can only have increased their numbers.

In the first half of Peter's reign the Pope Bogumil appeared in Bulgaria; he was also known as Jeremias, and came forward as the reformer of the Paulician doctrine. His teaching was merely a new stage in the steady development of a doctrine formed by the mixture of Syrian, Persian, and Greek theories with fragments of Christianity; it was marked by a gradual conformation to Christianity, though at the same time the remnants of the old heathen cosmogony, derived from the Ugrian religion, were not cast away.

According to the traditions of the Ugrians, God created the world with the help of Satan, who eventually desires to secure the chief power for himself. From this division proceed the good and the evil principles. According to Bogumil, the good divinity was a perfect Triune being, the creator of the perfect and unseen world, inhabited by spiritual beings; while the bad divinity, Satan, or the devil, created the visible changeable world, the cosmos animate or inanimate. The opposition arising from this contrast between matter and spirit exists, according to the moral philosophy of the Bogumiles, only in the soul of man. "The soul is an angel fallen from heaven, imprisoned in the body, which will return to its former home after the last death." Besides the

Scriptures, the Bogumiles had many other writings, which, together with their preaching, they spread over the whole



TENTH CENTURY PICTURE OF A BULGARIAN ROUT

This crudely drawn illustration appears in colour in an ancient Slavonian manuscript in the Vatican Library, and represents a cavalry skirmish in the tenth century between Russians and Bulgarians, the latter being routed.

inconsiderable survivals of the heathen Ugrian popular mythology and cosmogony, faded remnants of which still exist in those districts, formed the basis for the development in Bulgaria of the sect of the Bogumiles, whose dualist doctrine was at the outset in harmony with the spirit of the nation. Bogumilism began its career on the Balkan Peninsula with the settlement of the Armenian Paulicians; in 746 Constantine V. Kopronymos had transported a large number of them from Syria

to Europe. Bogumil himself made a collection of apocryphal writings, which were counted among the sacred books by his adherents. His gloomy doctrine, which pronounced the damnation of all animate nature, dominated the minds of the masses, whereas the nobility clung more closely to the powerful Eastern Church.

This intellectual movement brought mischief enough upon the Tsar Peter. In the year 963 the imperial throne of Byzantium was ascended by Nicephorus II.

Phocas; at his secret instigation the Russian prince Svjatoslav invaded Bulgaria in August, 968, and devastated the country with the support of the Byzantines. The nobility joined the Greeks, while the common people, whose minds were clouded by the teaching of Bogumil, resigned themselves to quiet neutrality.

A Deathblow to Old Bulgaria

Nicephorus, however, soon perceived that he had brought a dangerous enemy into his own neighbourhood in the shape of the Russians, and secured a peace, which was to have been confirmed by the double marriage of two Byzantine princes with Bulgarian princesses. Peter also sent his sons, Boris and Romanus, to Constantinople to be educated. He himself enjoyed this doubtful peace only for a short time; he died on January 30th, 969, leaving his tottering throne to his son Boris II.

Attracted by the prosperity of the Danube districts, Svjatoslav invaded the country with his Russians for the second time in the summer of 969, took the title of Tsar, and established himself in the country; this was a deathblow to Old Bulgaria, after an existence of three hundred years. In 971 the new Byzantine emperor, John Tzimisces, freed Bulgaria from the Russians, but incorporated it with the Byzantine Empire. Boris II. was forced to abdicate, and his younger brother Romanus was made a eunuch.

Western Bulgaria alone continued an independent existence under Sisman I., who had secured his independence under the Tsar Peter in 963. He left behind him four sons; of these his successor, the Tsar David, fell in battle against the nomad Wallachians, while Moses lost his life in an attack upon Seres; the third son, Aaron, was executed by the orders of his youngest brother, Samuel. Samuel now ascended the throne of Western Bulgaria, and retained it for almost four decades, amid great confusion (976-1014). His domestic policy was guided by one great principle, to avoid arousing the hostility of the Orthodox Church, which was pre-eminent in the country and enjoyed the support of the powerful Boyars, or of the Roman Church, which had conferred the Tsar's crown upon him.

After the death of the Emperor Tzimisces (976), the throne of Byzantium was ascended by two youths of the family of

Basil I., the brothers Basil II. and Constantine VIII.; revolts thereupon broke out in every corner of the wide empire. This induced the Tsar Samuel to liberate the Bulgarians in Moesia, who had been hastily subdued, and to restore the kingdom of Symeon to its former boundaries. However, Basil II., who was a cruel ruler, notwithstanding his monastic mode of life, had made it his object, immediately upon entering upon his government, to bring about the complete subjugation of the Bulgarians. Samuel invaded Thrace and marched upon Thessaly and Hellas, devastating the country as he went. A battle was fought on the Isker between Ichtiman and Simokov in 981, at Stopenian; Basil himself had the utmost difficulty in escaping to Philippopolis.

A peace of fifteen years succeeded, partly interrupted by a fruitless attempt to besiege Sofia (987). Meanwhile Samuel conquered the coasts of the Adriatic and made the Servian prince, John Vladimir, his vassal. In the year 996 a second war broke out against Basil II., and on this occasion the Bulgarian army was annihilated on the banks of the Spercheus. In the following years the Byzantines occupied the Bulgarian country without striking a blow. Only the fortress of Pernik, or Perinograd, on the Struma, held out in 1002 as vigorously as afterwards in 1016.

The result was that at the outbreak of the last war Samuel was in possession only of Western Macedonia, Albania, and the environs of Sofia. In the south of the passes of Klidion and Kimbalongon his army was annihilated on July 29, 1014, on the Belasitza mountain. The Tsar escaped with difficulty to Prilep. Basil II. put out the eyes of all his Bulgarian prisoners, gave every hundred of them a one-eyed man as a guide, and thus allowed them to return home. Samuel was unable to bear up under this heavy blow, and died suddenly on September 15th, 1014.

Under Samuel's son and successor, Radomir, the Greeks again invaded Bulgaria. In 1015 Radomir was murdered while hunting by his cousin John Vladislav, probably at the instigation of the Emperor Basil II. The negotiations for peace set on foot by the murdered man led to no result, and Basil declined to abandon his object. A fresh army invaded Bulgaria. In the spring of 1018, John Vladislav fell in battle before Durazzo. After a short

and desperate struggle, his son Fruzin surrendered, and was appointed commander of the court guards.

From the year 1018 onwards Bulgaria, for fully 150 years, no longer formed an obstacle to the expansion of the Byzantine Empire, which had never been more powerful in the Balkan Peninsula since the time of Marcian, Leo I., and Justinian I. The work of the great Symeon had been destroyed. Most of the Boyars were given posts at the Byzantine court by Basil. Katharina, a daughter of John Vladislav, and the last Tsarina Maria lived in Constantinople as ladies of the court, while high military posts were given to the Sismanid princes. The Bulgarian Church retained its independence, but its supreme head was no longer to be called patriarch, but archbishop. The country was divided into districts or themata, each under the government of a strategus; as these officials usually occupied their posts only for a year, they did their best to exhaust the wealth of their respective provinces with all speed. After the death of Basil

Struggles with the Turks

II. the East Roman Empire entered upon a period of decay. Peter Deljan, supposed to be the son of the unfortunate Radomir, escaped from captivity and was welcomed by the nation as Tsar in 1040. At the same time the Slavs at Durazzo proclaimed the warrior Tichomir as Tsar; however, he was soon deposed and stoned to death by the people. Deljan, as sole ruler, then undertook an expedition against Thessalonica, where Manuel Ibatzes, the chamberlain of the Emperor Michael IV., went over to the Bulgarians with the army and the imperial treasury. Epirus and Hellas, weary of the extortions of the Strategi, joined Deljan. He, however, unfortunately appointed Alusian, the younger brother of John Vladislav as co-regent in September, 1040, and by way of thanks was drugged and blinded by him on July 3rd, 1041, and sent to Byzantium. For this reason the Bulgarian revolt came to an end in December of the same year.

Immediately afterwards (1048-1053) Bulgaria became the scene of dreadful struggles with the pure Turkish race of the Pechenegs, or Patzinaks, who had long before embraced the Mohammedan faith; they had been driven out of their steppes from the Lower Danube to the Crimea by


the kindred race of the Cumanians, and had established themselves on each side of the Balkans shortly before 1048. On the further side eleven tribes were settled, about 80,000 in number, under their khan Tirach, while two tribes, amounting to 20,000 heads, had accepted baptism under their chief Kegen, received settlements in the Dobrudza, and joined the

Converting the Barbarians

Byzantines, at the end of 1048, in conquering their relatives on the other side of the Danube. The prisoners were settled by Constantine IX. Monomachos in the valleys of the western mountain district, in those of Sofia and Nis, and in Northern Macedonia. Some of them were also employed as mercenaries in Asia Minor, and in 1073 and 1086 they gave their support to Bulgarian revolts against Byzantium and the Dobrudza. It was not until April 29th, 1091, that the Byzantine armies, after suffering a series of defeats, were victorious at the battle of Lebunion, and with the help of the Cumanians were able to put an end to the devastations caused by the savage Pechenegs. During the Byzantine supremacy the sect of the Bogumiles developed a wholly unexpected vigour. Notwithstanding the repeated and cruel persecutions instituted by different emperors, the Bogumil doctrine spread westwards by way of the Byzantine settlements in Lower Italy. In Germany the adherents of this belief were known as Cathari, in Italy and Bosnia as Patarenes, in France as Albigenses. In opposition to the unlimited dualism of former times, to which the Macedonians clung tenaciously, a second party rose in Bulgaria during the military confusion of the tenth century, which was marked by a belief in a moderate form of monotheism, and explained the existence of Satan, not as a primordial being, but as a fallen angel. The Bogumil belief is of great importance in the history of human civilisation; it is, moreover, a very remarkable phenomenon that such a religious movement, originating on Bulgarian soil, should have acquired influence over the people of Western Europe. The struggle initiated by this doctrine against the Roman priesthood eventually led to liberation from the papal oppression. In this respect the Bulgarian Bogumil doctrine contained the germs of the movement that was to develop into the great Reformation.

Far-off Dim Beginnings of the Reformation

movement, originating on Bulgarian soil, should have acquired influence over the people of Western Europe. The struggle initiated by this doctrine against the Roman priesthood eventually led to liberation from the papal oppression. In this respect the Bulgarian Bogumil doctrine contained the germs of the movement that was to develop into the great Reformation.



THE LATER BULGARIAN KINGDOM AND THE TURKISH SUPREMACY

WHILE Bulgaria was exposed under the Greek yoke to disruptive forces both internal and external, the Byzantine Empire was also tottering to its fall. The Cumanians were established in the Danube territories, the islands and the shores of the Ægean Sea were devastated by the Normans and Saracens, while in Asia Minor the empire was threatened by the Seljuk power. When the Emperor Isaac II. Angelus desired to enter upon a marriage with Margareta, the daughter of the Hungarian king, Bela (1172-1196), his plans were checked by want of money. Fresh taxes were imposed, and the Bulgarians and Wallachians in particular were subjected to oppressive extortion.

Revolt Against the Greek Yoke

The dissatisfied parties were led by two brothers of an old Boyar family, Peter and Johannes Asen. John was crowned Tsar of the Bulgarians and Greeks in 1186, and an archbishop independent of the patriarch of Constantinople was set up in Tirnovo. The rebels were scattered by the Byzantines after some battles, and their leaders were forced to take refuge beyond the Danube with the Cumanians; but in 1187 Asen appeared in alliance with the revolted party at home. In the year 1187 the Byzantines had recovered the corpse of St. John or Ivan of Rila, who died in 946, a costly relic, which Bela had carried off to Gran from Serdica, or Sofia, in 1183; in 1188 they succeeded in capturing the Bulgarian Tsarina by treachery, and an armistice was concluded. On April 10th, 1195, Isaac was overthrown by his own brother Alexius III. and blinded, when the campaign against the Bulgarians once more ended without result. However, in the midst of his career, Asen I., who had made Tirnovo his capital, was killed in his palace in 1196 by the Boyar Ivanko, a mountain chieftain of Kricim in Rhodope (1195-1200); he called himself Alexius, and married the Greek princess, Theodora. Peter now took over the government in conjunction with his youngest brother,

Kalojan; but he also was murdered after a short time by one of his compatriots.

In alliance with the Cumanians, Kalojan, or Joannisz (1197-1207), made annual invasions into Thrace and Macedonia, where he supported the revolt of the Boyar Dobromir Strez, who wrested the highland of Vardar from the Byzantine Empire in 1199. In 1201 the Byzantines were obliged to conclude peace with Kalojan, and to leave in his power the districts he had conquered. The Bulgarian Empire, restored by this means, extended under his government from Belgrade to the Lower Marica and to the Black Sea, from the mouths of the Danube to the Strymon. This frontier was disturbed by the Hungarian king, Emerich (1196-1204). Although Kalojan induced the Cumanians to devastate the territory of the Serbian prince, Vlkán, who was independent of Hungary, none the less the Hungarians captured from him five bishoprics in Lower Moravia.

With the object of confirming his royal title abroad, Kalojan, in 1202, applied to Pope Innocent III. requesting a grant of the title of emperor, and of a patriarch for his kingdom independent of Constantinople. In return Bulgaria was willing to submit definitely to the papal supremacy. Innocent III. sent Cardinal Leo of Santa Croce to Bulgaria in 1203; he crowned Kalojan on November 8th, 1204, with the royal diadem, after consecrating the Archbishop Basil of Tirnovo as primate of Bulgaria on the previous day. Kalojan accepted the kingly crown, but afterwards invariably styled himself Tsar (Cesar), and arbitrarily altered the title of Primate to that of "Patriarch." This union of Bulgaria and Rome had no influence upon worship or doctrine.

Meanwhile, Kalojan's position had been entirely altered by the overthrow of the Byzantine Empire by the Latins. Count Baldwin of Flanders was crowned emperor in the church of St. Sofia at Constantinople.

Rome Patronises Bulgaria

Numerous petty kingdoms appeared in the Balkan peninsula. Kalojan's position became more dangerous every day. He was cunning enough to offer a treaty of peace to Baldwin, but the proposal was haughtily rejected by the Frank. An opportunity for a counter stroke was afforded Kalojan by the revolt of the Greek population, who offered him the imperial crown. In alliance with the Cumanians, Kalojan occupied Adrianople, and there fought a decisive battle on April 14th or 15th, 1205, with the advancing Baldwin; the Latin emperor and his army were utterly defeated. However, for thirteen months (1205-1206) the Duke of Philippopolis, Renier de Trit, held out at Stanimaka against the overwhelming forces of the enemy. Kalojan was murdered in 1207; he was one of the greatest princes of Bulgaria, notwithstanding his cruelty.

Boris II. (1207 to 1218), a nephew of Kalojan, seized the Bulgarian throne in Tirnovo, and married the widowed tsarina. The legitimate heirs to the throne, the sons of Asen, John Asen and Alexander, fled to Russia. The great empire which Kalojan had acquired and maintained with his strong hand entered upon its decline. Boris possessed his uncle's lust for conquest, but not his great generalship or his statesmanlike forethought. He became entangled in war with the Franks, who were now in possession of the greater part of the old Byzantine Empire, and was utterly defeated by the Emperor Henry at Philippopolis on July 31st, 1208; he then confined his attention entirely to the suppression of disturbances at home.

The Bogumil doctrine had obtained so firm a hold on men's minds that the people, weary of continual war and oppression, longed for peace and quiet. The Tsar's plans of conquest were opposed even by the court circles. Boris had rightly recognised the reason for the fact, and assembled a synod of clergy in Tirnovo on February 11th, 1211. The synod pronounced an anathema upon the Bogumil doctrine, and translated a legal code, written against its adherents, from the Greek; the best known adherents of the doctrine were imprisoned or banished at Boris's command. In 1213 the Emperor Henry, abandoned by all his allies, agreed to a marriage with Boris's daughter Maria, in the hope that the Bulgarian prince would support him in a campaign against the Serbs. Boris certainly equipped an auxiliary force, but was forced to send it against John

Asen, who had returned from Russia, and had collected a large following. The result was that Boris was taken prisoner and blinded in 1218; the Emperor Henry had died at Thessalonica two years previously.

John Asen II., one of the noblest characters of his time, now ascended the Bulgarian throne as tsar (1218-1241).

A Great Prince Comes to His Own His memory as a humane and politic governor still survives among the nation. The Byzantine Georgios Akropolita, who died in 1282, relates of him that all his contemporaries regarded him as a remarkable and fortunate man; "He never turned his arms upon the people at home for their destruction or stained his reputation by the murder of the Greeks, as his predecessors among the Bulgarian rulers had been wont to do. Hence he was beloved, not only by the Bulgarians, but also by the Greeks and other peoples." His efforts were directed chiefly to raising the prosperity of his country rather than to conquest; yet under his rule Bulgaria acquired an amount of territory which it never possessed either before or afterwards. A special case in point is the acquisition of the important Byzantine frontier fortress Beroë. The shores of Asen's kingdom were washed by three seas. Once again, for the first time since the days of the Tsar Samuel, all the Bulgarian Slavs were reunited under one rule; this continued until 1230. About 1220 Asen II. married Maria, the daughter of Andreas II. of Hungary, and attempted to secure the existence of his kingdom both at home and abroad by various peaceful means, especially by prudent marriages of his daughters.

Meanwhile a new state had arisen in the Pindus territory between the Gulf of Corinth and the Marica, founded by Theodore Angelus, the ruler of Epirus; within a short period he conquered Achrida, Prilep, Pelagonia, Durazzo, Corfu (1215), and Thessalonica, and in 1222 styled himself henceforward "Emperor of the Romaioi." Asen concluded a compact with Theodore, to whose brother Manuel he gave, about 1225, his illegitimate daughter Maria to wife. Notwithstanding the relationship thus brought about, Theodore soon attempted to conquer the kingdom of Asen. A decisive battle was fought in April, 1240, at the village of Klokotnica, between Philippopolis and Adrianople, where Theodore was defeated and taken prisoner.

Statesmanship of the Great John Asen II.

Adrianople, with almost the whole of Macedonia and Albania as far as Durazzo, fell into the hands of the conqueror. He set up his own son-in-law, Manuel, who now assumed the title of emperor in the remnants of the kingdom of Epirus and in Thessalonica. He secured the obedience of the Servian king, Stefan Vladislav, by giving

The Making of a Beautiful Capital

him one of his daughters to wife in 1231. After thus securing peace, John Asen II. devoted his entire attention

to the internal organisation of his kingdom. By his splendid buildings he transformed his capital into one of the most beautiful towns in the whole peninsula. In 1231 he rebuilt the fortress of Cepelarska Reka at Stenimachos, the Bulgarian inscription upon which was defaced some two centuries ago by Greek "patriots." He supported trade and commerce by conferring extensive privileges not only upon natives, but also upon foreigners, especially the people of Ragusa, who then had the whole carrying trade of the Balkan peninsula in their hands. To secure the recognition and the independence of the Bulgarian Church by the Greeks he concluded an alliance in 1234 with the Emperor John III. Dukas Vatatzes of Nicæa against the Latin Empire, and arranged a marriage between his nine-year-old daughter Helena and Theodore (the second Lascaris), the son of Vatatzes, who was eleven years of age.

The allies now devastated the country as far as Constantinople, although Asen was excommunicated in consequence by Pope Gregory IX. on May 25th, 1236. When, however, Asen recognised the growing power of his ally, he suddenly broke off the alliance with Vatatzes and brought home the daughter he had betrothed to Theodore. Irritated by the tolerance which Asen showed to the Bogumiles, and spurred on by the Latin Emperor Baldwin II., who was still a minor, Gregory IX. commanded King Bela IV. to begin a crusade against

Hungarians Attack the Bulgarians

Asen on February 27th, 1238. The Hungarians were able to occupy Wallachia Minor, and Bela assumed the title of King of Bulgaria and Cumania.

A new wave of migration then advanced. The Cumanians, driven out of their habitations by the Mongols, who were advancing from Russia, fled in seven tribes, partly

to Hungary, partly to the friendly state of Bulgaria, and partly to Thrace in Asia Minor, where settlements were assigned to ten thousand of them as military colonists by Vatatzes. One fragment only, which formed the nucleus of the mixed people of the Nogai Tartars, remained in their old home. Moldavia, Wallachia, and the northern shore of the Sea of Azov were for a long time known as Cumania. In the year 1239 Asen, strengthened by the Cumanians, marched upon Thrace, to capture the Greek citadels. There, however, he received the news of the death of his wife and son in Tirnovo of a plague, and he returned home. In the year 1240 Asen married Irene, the daughter of the Epirot Emperor Theodore Angelus, whom he had kept in confinement and had shortly before blinded; however, he died in June, 1241.

Under the successor of John Asen, Kaliman I. 1241-1246, who was a minor, the Tartars returned from Croatia and Russia by way of Servia and Bulgaria, their steps being marked by continual devastation. Kaliman died very suddenly,

The Throne Becomes Weaker

probably from poison. The former ally of John Asen, the Emperor Vatatzes of Nicæa, immediately seized the whole country of Rhodope and Northern Macedonia, while Michael II. of Epirus occupied Albania and Western Macedonia. The brother of Kaliman, Michael Asen, who was also a minor (1246-1257), could make no head against Vatatzes and concluded peace with him. In 1254 Perustica also fell, shattered by the Byzantine siege engines. Vatatzes died on October 30th, 1254, and was succeeded by his son, Theodore II. Lascaris, who had married Helena, the daughter of John Asen.


Michael Asen attempted to wrest the territory he had lost from his brother-in-law in 1246, but in 1256 was forced to conclude peace and to leave all the Bulgarian possessions in Rhodope and Macedonia to the Byzantines. The Bulgarian throne became weaker and weaker. In the year 1257 Michael Asen was overthrown by his cousin Kaliman II.; he, however, died unexpectedly shortly afterwards.

The Boyars now chose the Serb Constantine as tsar (1258-1277); he was a grandson of Stefan Nemanja, and possessed extensive territory in Bulgaria. He had married Irene, the grand-daughter

THE LATER BULGARIAN KINGDOM

of John Asen and took the name of Constantine Asen. During his government Michael VIII. Palæologus captured Constantinople in the summer of 1261 and put an end to the Frankish dominion. At that time the Tsar Constantine was forced to turn his attention to Hungary. Between 1260 and 1264 Prince Stefan, who had been entrusted with the administration of Transylvania, undertook five campaigns against the Bulgarians and withdrew to the frontier walls of Tirnovo; though he did not definitely occupy the country, still he assumed the title "King of Bulgaria" when he ascended the throne of Hungary as Stefan V. (1270-1272).

Constantine then happened to break a limb and fell seriously ill, with the result that his movements were impeded. The consequent inactivity of the Tsar proved fatal to Bulgaria. Maria Palæologa, the second wife of Constantine, who was acting as regent for her young son Michael, "born in the purple," took the power for herself in 1277. With a view to checking her most dangerous rival, the half-independent despot Jacob Svetslav, a descendant of the Russian family who had been established by Stefan V. in the Western Balkans, she invited him to Tirnovo, and recognised him at a solemn service as her "son," who was to be henceforward



CITADEL AND PALACE OF THE MEDIÆVAL KINGS OF BULGARIA AT TIRNOVO
The picturesque stronghold of Tirnovo, or Trnovo, remained the capital of the Bulgarian kingdom till the year 1393.

After the death of Irene Lascaris, the wife of Constantine, in 1270, the tsar married Maria, the niece of Michael VIII., in 1272. When he failed to obtain possession of her dowry, the towns of Mesembria and Anchialos, he entangled the Byzantine ruler in a war, which might have proved serious for East Rome had it not been for the interference of Nogai Khan, a chieftain of the "Golden Horde." Michael VIII. was the more ready to begin negotiations for peace as his allies, the Albanians of Berat (1273), had deserted, in pursuance of their Angevin policy, and a far more dangerous enemy had arisen in the person of the Angevin Charles I. of Naples, who rapidly found allies in Serbia and Bulgaria.

co-regent with her own son Michael. However, in the same year, 1277, Svetslav lost his life through the intrigues of his "mother."

The Nogai Tartars again invaded the defenceless kingdom; thereupon Haiduk The "Prophet", Ivajlo Lachanas—also known as Brdoka—originally a Pretender shepherd, played upon the Re-appears minds of the people by his prophecies, gathered a band of compatriots, and twice defeated the Tartars. He soon announced that the saints had appointed him to the throne of Bulgaria. The hard-pressed people believed him, and Boyars, and even courtiers, were numbered among his adherents. The Tsar Constantine rose from his sick-bed and marched upon him

with those who remained faithful; but Constantine's forces were scattered, and he himself was slain without being able to strike a blow in the winter of 1277. Ivajlo now ascended the Bulgarian throne as Tsar (1277-1279). These proceedings in Bulgaria had roused the greatest anxiety at the Byzantine court. The Emperor Michael hastily married his daughter Irene to a member of the family of the Asenids, who then raised a claim to the Bulgarian crown as John Asen III. Meanwhile the intriguing Maria celebrated her union with Ivajlo, and had herself crowned together with him in 1278. Attacked simultaneously by the Mongols and Byzantines, Ivajlo was unable to maintain his position, and disappeared at the beginning of 1279.

Maria, who was with child by the usurper, was sent into confinement at Adrianople. John Asen III., a feeble and subservient character, entered upon the government, while the people supported the Boyar George Terterii, who was descended from a noble Cumanian family, and related to the most powerful families of Bulgaria. With the object of securing the support of this dangerous rival, Asen III. gave him his daughter in marriage; the "Despot" Terterii was forced to send his former wife to Bulgaria and his son Svetslav—the Slav name will be observed—to Nikaia as hostages. At that point Ivajlo, who was supposed to be dead, suddenly appeared with a large following before the gates of Tirnovo. The Emperor Michael VIII. sent two armies in the summer of 1280 to the help of his hard-pressed son-in-law, but both were annihilated. Asen III. fled to Constantinople; George Terterii I. was crowned Tsar in 1280. Ivajlo fled to the south of Russia to seek help from Nogai Khan. There he met his old and unrelenting enemy John Asen III. Nogai Khan amused himself for a time by making empty promises to the rivals, until he finally beheaded Ivajlo.

Asen III. had some trouble in escaping the same fate. Charles I. of Naples found George Terterii I. a valuable help against the Byzantines. A French army, which landed on the Balkan peninsula and obtained Albanian reinforcements, was annihilated by the Greeks at Berat at the beginning of April, 1281. The Sicilian Vespers (March 30th, 1282) put an end to the further plan of Charles I. On December 11th, 1282, Michael VIII. died, and his successor, Andronicus II., concluded peace with the Bulgarian Tsar in 1248, for their common Mongolian enemy was once more threatening their frontiers. However, George Terterii was able to offer but feeble resistance to the attack of the Tartars; he was forced to conclude peace and to give one of his daughters to the son of Nogai Khan. None the less the hordes established themselves in the empire, and George Terterii was driven out of the country and imprisoned at Byzantium.

The Mongols now placed the Boyar Smilec, who had married the grand-daughter of Andronicus II., on the Bulgarian throne about 1292. Nogai Khan shortly afterwards fell in a battle against Toktu, the ruler of the "Blue Horde" in Western Kiptjak (1290-1312). His son Choki, who assumed that he had hereditary rights to Bulgaria as the stepson of Terterii, made an alliance with Theodore Svetslav, who had spent his childhood in Nikaia, and drove out Smilec. However, Svetslav captured the Tartar intruder unawares and had him strangled by Jewish executioners. His government (1295-1322) was at first by no means devoted to the works of peace. For three years he carried on

war with Byzantium and conquered some towns and fortresses on the Hæmus. Together with the tsar, his uncle Eltimir played an important part in the country as despot of Krun on the eastern slope of the Balkans. The Byzantine Empire was at this

**Mongols
Dictators in
Bulgaria**



THE BULGARIAN NATIONAL COSTUME

time hard pressed on every side. Ertogrul, the leader of the Ottomans, had founded, about 1250, a small kingdom in Bithynia, which had been extended to the shores of the Propontis by his son Osman in 1310. The second half of the reign of Svetslav, which lasted almost twenty-eight years, was a time of peace at home and abroad; in 1320 he married a grand-daughter of the old Andronicus II.

After the death of Theodore Svetslav his son George Terterii II. ascended the Bulgarian throne in 1322. In that year he occupied Philippopolis, but in 1323 the town was lost by his Russian field-marshal Ivan, owing to the treachery of the Greek citizens, and fell into the hands of Andronicus the younger. In the same year the last descendant of Terterii died.

The Boyars now chose Michael as their Tsar (1323-1330); he was the half Cuman despot of Widdin, and was a son of Sisman; with him begins the third and last dynasty of the Bulgarian kingdom at Tirnovo, that of the Sismanids. At that time, 1327, civil war was raging between Andronicus III. and his grandfather the Emperor Andronicus II., who

The Power of Bulgaria is Broken

borrowed 2,000 Cumanians from Serbia. The Tsar Michael, who, in 1325, had divorced his Servian wife Anna, and had married the widow of his predecessor, a sister of Andronicus the younger, joined first one and then another Andronicus with the object of capturing Constantinople, and thus realising the dream of the ancient Tsars. However, his plan did not succeed. Constantinople was conquered on May 24th, 1328, by Andronicus III., who deposed his grandfather, aged sixty.

To secure his kingdom for the future the Tsar Michael conceived the dangerous idea of destroying the neighbouring state, the rise of which threatened his existence. In alliance with the Byzantines, Tartars, and Wallachians he marched against Stefan Uros III. A decisive battle was fought on June 28th, 1330, at Velbuzd, at that time a Servian town. The Bulgarian army was defeated and Michael lost his life. The Servian king erected a church of the Ascension on the battlefield, and placed his sister Anna, Michael's divorced wife, and her son Sisman II. on the throne.

However, the real power of the Bulgarian kingdom was broken. Stefan Uros III. was taken prisoner and strangled, and

Stefan Dusan was crowned king on September 8th, 1331. Meanwhile the Bulgarian Boyars revolted against their Tsarina. Anna fled to Serbia and Sisman II. to the Tartars, whence he travelled to Constantinople, and finally settled in Naples under the name of Louis, where he died in 1333. The Boyars then appointed John

Alexander as Tsar (1331-1365), a nephew of the Tsar Michael, and son-in-law of the Roumanian prince, Ivanko Barasab.

He took the surname of Asen, and married his sister Helena to Stefan Dusan, who had entered upon his government almost at the same time, and thus brought about an alliance between Serbia, Bulgaria, and Bessarabia. While the Serbs overcame Macedonia, Albania, and Epirus, and the Roumanians defeated the Hungarians in the swamps of Wallachia in 1330, the Bulgarian Tsar forced the Byzantines to make peace, which was afterwards secured by a marriage between his son Michael and Maria, the daughter of Andronicus, in 1337. On June 15th, 1341, Andronicus III. died, and his son John V. Paleologus ascended the throne; the learned Viceroy, John VI. Cantacuzenos, set himself up as an opposition emperor. During a civil war in the Byzantine Empire the Tsar Alexander succeeded in considerably extending the boundaries of his state.

Meanwhile the downfall of the Byzantine Empire was accelerated by an alliance which the two conflicting emperors concluded with the individual Turkish princes, who were accustomed, under the title of "allies," to devastate every district into which they marched. At the end of 1353—a more correct date than that commonly current, 1356—the Turks for the first time gained a footing in Europe, at Tzympe on the Hellespont; in 1354 Kallipolis fell, and soon the Ottomans established themselves on the shores of the Marica.

Not only was Bulgaria likely at any moment to fall a prey to the Asiatics, but her solidarity had also been

destroyed from within by religious dissension. In the monasteries on Mount Athos there sprang up among the monks about 1346 a special form of that mysticism whose adherents were known as Hesychastes or Quietists. The monks received instruction in Bogumilism from a nun named Irene, which became the occasion of more

or less disgraceful orgies. From these excesses a revival of the remnants of heathendom was brought about by the monk Theodoretus.

Theodoretus, who possessed some knowledge of medicine, secured a large following in Bulgaria. He revived early heathen customs, in particular the veneration of the oak-tree, at the foot of which sheep and lambs were sacrificed.

Heathen Customs Revived

His medicinal treatment depended, in the first instance, upon the sacrifice of victims for the purpose of appeasing the spirits of ill-health and inducing them to look favourably upon the patients. Almost at the same time two monks appeared in Bulgaria (Lazar and Cyril), who turned the Bogumil movement into more dangerous paths by their contempt for the saints and for the Cross, and by the scorn which they poured upon labour and marriage, while another monk disseminated the common Adamite heresy.

The Tsar John Alexander had also confined his wife in a monastery, and had made the Jewess Theodora his tsarina, in consequence of which Jews obtained special privileges. As the Turks on the further side of the Balkans were extending their possessions from day to day, while in Bulgaria the Bogumils, Hesychastes, Adamites, and Jews pursued their way without let or hindrance, the tsar summoned councils (1350-1355) in which the Bogumils, Hesychastes, and Adamites were condemned and the encroachments of the Jews were limited.

John Alexander Asen died in the spring of 1365 and left behind him a disunited kingdom tottering to its fall. His son John Sisman III. (1365-1393) reigned in Tirnovo, and another son of Alexander, John Strasimir, in Widdin, while the districts of Pontus were subject, until about 1386, to the Cumanian despot Dobrotic, who had inherited the estates of his brothers Balikis and Theodore.

An Empire Tottering to its Fall After the capture of Adrianople in 1361, and Philippopolis in 1363, Murad I. transferred his capital from Brusa to "Edreneh." Danger, however, was also threatening from another quarter. Lewis I. of Hungary conquered Widdin in the summer of 1364, and carried Strasimir and his consort prisoners to Croatia; in the following year, 1366, Sisman attacked the new Hungarian province with the help of the Turks, but was beaten back. It

was not until 1369 that the Bulgarian Tsar succeeded in wresting Widdin from the Hungarians.

While the Christian rulers of the Balkan peninsula were at war with one another the newly founded Turkish state increased steadily year by year. Finally the Serb Wukashin, or Vlkasin, revolted, but his army was destroyed on the night of September 26th, 1371. Upper Macedonia was incorporated with the Ottoman Empire. The Servian dynasts were forced to serve in the Turkish army; Marko Kraljevic and Constantine of Velbuzd alone offered a temporary resistance to their new rulers. Ivanko, the son of Dobrotic, also held out about 1390 against the Ottoman advance.

In 1388 Sisman III. was forced to agree to the payment of an annual tribute. Almost at the same time Strasimir did homage to the Ottoman emir. His example was finally followed by the Kustendil despot, Constantine, the brother of John Dragas; he fell fighting against the Wallachians in 1394, and he is still remembered as the last Christian ruler of

The Turk Triumphs at Tirnovo

Velbuzd, Kratovo, Strumica and Stip. Servia was delivered up to Turkey as the result of a battle on the field of Amsel on June 15th, 1389. Turkish efforts were now concentrated upon Bulgaria. The downfall of the country was secured by the fall of Tirnovo on July 17th, 1393; John Sisman III. probably died in a Turkish prison in the citadel of Philippopolis. Old Bulgaria ceased to be an independent state.

As the Bulgarians were destined to be the rulers of the Balkan peninsula, so they were also the founders of art and literature, which they communicated to the other Slav races. Through the teaching of a native creed, Bogumilism, they brought confusion into the whole of Southern Europe, then absorbed by the Byzantine culture, with its exaggeration and decay; this culture the Bulgarians too accepted with all its traditions, and in company with it they declined.

With the first Greek woman who ascended the Bulgarian throne, in 927, the first step was taken for the introduction of Greek civilisation into Bulgaria. This dangerous influence, however, affected only the upper classes, the Boyars, and the clergy in the towns; fresh streams of national feeling watered the growth of the Bulgarian peasantry, and without this there could

have been no renaissance for Bulgaria. The interests of the dominant Boyar caste, and those of the people who were for the most part in a condition of serfdom, were naturally in diametrical opposition. Energetic tsars were generally hated by the Boyars, most of whom ruled their estates and their people exactly as they pleased. After the Ottoman invasion many Boyar families accepted Mohammedanism. This was rather a benefit to the body politic, in so far as the division between the Mohammedan nobility and the Christian people grew steadily wider; the lower classes, left to themselves, became a barrier against the extension of the Ottoman kingdom.

With the fall of the empire literary life also disappeared. Most of the work produced in the pre-Turkish period was lost. Bogumilism, however, performed the service of handing down to posterity, even under the Turkish supremacy, the written works of the Slav Church. One of the most important works of the Bogumils is said to have been "The Questions of St. John Bogoslav, which he put to the Lord on Mount Tabor." Side by side with the description of the end of the world they composed a cosmogony in which the old heathen traditions of the Ugrians were accepted and fitted on to the Bogumil teaching; from Bulgaria the work passed to Russia and Servia and to France and Italy in the Latin translation of Nazarius, a bishop of Upper Italy.

Other works ascribed to St. John were also popular. Such were "Questions concerning Adam and Abraham on the Olberg" and a "Sermon upon the Mother of God," also the apocryphal "Journey of the Mother of God in Hell," the "Story of the Twelve Fridays," the "Histories of Daniel and Samson," and a tractate on "Bad Wives," which was incorporated in the collection of the Tsar Symeon. Besides these religious works numerous romances and fairy tales of Greek, Arabic and Indian origin were widely disseminated, and were transmitted to the Slavs by Bulgarian translations. The life of Alexander the Great, the Legend of Troy, the Indian tales of the Panchatantra were widely known among the Slavs in Bulgarian translations. These religious and secular novels formed the intellectual pabulum of the Slavs in

those centuries, not only of the upper classes, but in particular of the common people. The "Sborniks" (manuscript collections) give an accurate idea of the current literature of the Bulgarians; together with fragments from Byzantine theological literature, they contain numerous apocryphal writings, fairy tales, histories of miracles, legends and essays on secular subjects. In the days of serfdom the Sborniks affected the popular mind so strongly that many of these apocryphal stories and legends received the stamp of national literature and were incorporated with native songs and ancient traditions.

Of the historical literature of that period only a few essays and fragments have been preserved—as, for instance, "An Account of the Foundation of the Patriarchate of Bulgaria" (1235); a "pomenik" of deceased tsars, patriarchs, bishops and Boyars; a "Conspectus of Peoples and Languages," wherein the people are compared with animals (from the early part of the thirteenth century); a "List of Languages and Writings." Apart from these there are also two great compilations of popular origin, the "Legends of Alexander," and even some apocryphal books; one of these includes the downfall of Constantinople (1453). The greatest historical work is the chronicle of Constantine Manasses, carried down to 1078, which was translated at the orders of the Tsar John Alexander (1331-1365), in whose reign the reformer of the church discipline, Theodosii of Tirnovo, together with his disciples Dionysii and Euthymii, composed numerous lives of national saints and letters to the ecclesiastical princes. However, in the following three centuries more manuscripts were destroyed by the Ottomans than Bulgarian industry could replace. The darkest period in the history of the Bulgarian people is the age

of the Turkish supremacy, from the end of the fifteenth century to the beginning of the national renaissance. Trade and commerce were in the hands of the Greeks, and the higher offices were almost all occupied by Mohammedans. The people existed only for the purpose of bearing the weight of taxation. Victories of the Austrian armies had aroused idle hopes in Bulgaria, and many of the inhabitants migrated in vain to the south

**Old Legends
Become National
Literature**

**The Written
Works of the
Slav Church**

**The Darkest
Period
in Bulgaria**

of Hungary. At no period, however, of the Turkish supremacy were men wanting to drive back the Turkish oppression by armed force and to continue their free life in the mountains. It was not so much robbery as revenge upon the oppressors of their co-religionists which was the life-work of these Haiduks, whose struggles and

Patriots who Lived to Kill the Turks adventures were immortalised in numerous songs, surviving even at the present day. They were knightly figures, impatient of servitude, who made it their profession to plunder and slaughter the Mohammedans, while protecting and supporting the Christians.

After the fall of the Bulgarian kingdom and of the national Church, which became wholly subject to the Greek Church, many of the Bogumils sought satisfaction for their animosity in Catholicism. Numerous Bogumils were converted by the Franciscans of Bosnia. These converts afterwards called themselves Paulicians—not to be confused with the older sect of that name—and emigrated for the most part to Roumania, Transylvania, and the south of Hungary. In the year 1688 the Emperor Leopold I. of Austria gave his support to a revolt of the Catholic Bulgarians of Ciporovci, which was, however, suppressed by the Turks; the population were driven out of their settlements and fled to Roumania. A few of them also reached Transylvania, and were settled in Deva and Alvincz. Others, again, who removed from Petikladenci at Nicopolis on the Danube in 1727 to Wallachia Minor, which was then an Austrian province, betook themselves in 1740 to the Banat of Temes in Southern Hungary, where they were known as Pavlikeni.

In 1762 the monk Paysii of Mount Athos wrote a small "Sloveno-Bulgarian History of the Bulgarian Peoples, Tsars and Saints," which has been of great importance in the modern development of the Bulgarian people. The enthusiastic patriotism which inspires every line of this little book found a ready response. A truly popular work, the "History of the Bulgarians," by Paysii, was widely disseminated in countless editions and revisions. His pupil, Stoiko, who was

afterwards Bishop of Vraca, under the name of Sofronii, continued the work of the national renaissance. The sentiments of patriotism, hatred of the Greeks, and contempt for the Turks are even more strongly marked in his writings than in those of his master. In 1802 he composed translations of Greek fables, narratives, and aphorisms. In his memoirs he drew an accurate picture of the age, about 1804. His chief work was his sermons, which, printed in 1806, formed the first book in the Bulgarian language, and for that reason is still popular.


In the year 1786 Bulgarian immigrants again appeared in Hungary, and settled for the most part in the county of Torontal. In their new home, these settlers in the mountain districts have retained their Bulgarian nationality in more or less complete purity to the present day, while the settlers in the lowlands have become a mixed people, and have adopted many of the characteristics of the Roumanians and Serbs. The fact that they have not entirely lost their characteristics amid the mixed people of their new home is largely due to the fact that, like the Balkan Bulgarians, they tenaciously clung to their ancient customs, a habit which survived the severest period of the Turkish supremacy. The custom of household

How National Customs Have Survived

communism still connects the members of a family in a corporation in which the cleverest, and not necessarily the oldest, is spokesman, manages the common property, and distributes the labour and the profits of it among the members of the family. This feeling of corporate family life has, by its persistence, given to the Bulgarian character a certain narrowness of mind and a special theory of life which deals largely with facts as they are, cherishes no presumptuous dreams of future prosperity, and regards life from an eminently practical point of view. This theory of corporate family life is also apparent in the ancient marriage customs. It was in these scenes of patriarchal family life that those epic poems arose among the Bulgarians which immortalised the national heroes, the champions of freedom, and the Haiduks.

HEINRICH VON WLISLOCKI





THE ROUMANIAN PEOPLE

STRUGGLES OF THE WALLACHIAN KINGDOM

AN infinite number of different theories, both in scientific and in pseudo-scientific circles, have continually reappeared until recent times concerning the origin of the Roumanians, a nation which has settled in smaller groups in the Balkan territories in Hungary and Transylvania, and in a coherent body in the modern kingdom of Roumania. This people is known by the Slavs as *Wlach*, *Walach*, which nearly corresponds to the Germanic "Wahl" (Welsh). The Roumanian shepherds of the mountains of *Dinai* were distinguished from the Italian townspeople of *Dalmatia* as the "Black Vlachs." Like Italian, Spanish, and French, Roumanian has descended from popular Latin, of the kind spoken by the Romanised subjects of Rome during the first six centuries of our era on the Lower Danube and in ancient *Dacia* or *Transylvania*. Hence the name *Daco-Roumanian*, to distinguish this from the other Romance languages.

Language and Early History

For the period of the colonisation of *Dacia* by the Romans, the best descriptive material is to be found in the bas-reliefs of the *Dacian* war decorating the pillar of *Trajan*.

Early history must, on the whole, be regarded as having run something like the following course: the scanty native population of *Daco-Thracian* origin coalesced with numerous soldiers and colonists, whose popular Latin soon became individual in character, but in spite of all changes preserved its fundamental romance type. In the year 697, and to some extent a century earlier, the *Finno-Ugrian* Bulgarians migrated into the country, and preserved their *Turanian* language for three centuries before they were absorbed by the mixed peoples of the *Balkan Peninsula*; during that time, the influence which they exerted upon *Albanian*, *medieval Greek*, etc., was naturally also extended to early *Roumanian*. Side by side with, and subsequent to, this influence we have to take into

account the strong and permanent influence of the *Slav* population.

The main dialect of the Roumanian language is spoken by about nine millions of people in *Moldavia* and *Wallachia*, in *Bessarabia* and *Transylvania*, in the *Banat*, in part of *Hungary* and *Bukovina*, and it alone possesses any literature; two

subordinate dialects also exist —the South, or *Macedonian*, Roumanian of the *Kutzo* Wallachians, or *Zingars*, in *Macedonia*, *Albania*, *Thessaly*, and *Epirus* —amounting to about one million people—and the half Slav *Istro-Roumanian*, which is spoken by about 3,000 people in the neighbourhood of the East coast of *Istria* and in the interior of the *Karst* range side by side with the *Croatian*, which is the dominant language.

After the extensive settlements of Roman colonists by *Trajan*, the former land of *Dacia* for many decades occupied the position of a frontier territory, or outpost, of the Roman Empire; as that empire declined to its fall, the barbarians caused increasing disturbances, which only occasionally and for short periods gave way to a sense of security, as under the Emperor *Maximian* (235-238). *Aurelian*, the "Restorer of the Empire" (270-275), was forced to abandon the further bank of the *Danube* to the *Goths*, to transport the colonists over the stream, and to form a new *Dacia* on the south. From that period the districts to the north of the

A Land Overrun with Barbarians

Lower *Danube* were invariably the object of the invading hordes of barbarians as they advanced to the south-west.

The *Huns* and *Gepids* about 450 were succeeded a century later by the *Avars* —about 555—and by the *Slavs* in different advances and attacks. Then in 679 came the *Bulgarians* (*Khazars* and *Old Zingars*), and after a hundred and fifty or two hundred years the *Magyars*, from about 840 to 860, whose

settlements, in parts at least, were only temporary.

Such fragments of Roman colonial civilisation as survived those stormy times were hard beset by the repeated raids of the Pechenegs about 900, and by the Cumanians, or Uzes, about 1050. It will be obvious that, in view of the disturbed state of the country, no detailed chronology free from suspicion can be given. It can be observed, however, in the barest outline, that, apart from the numerous invasions of the barbarians, one striking exception is to be observed, consisting in certain scanty remnants of Germanic languages, Western Gothic and Gepid, while Slav and Ural Altaic, or North Mongolian, blood was infused into the Daco-Roumanian population that remained in the plains, Bessarabia, Dobrudza, and Wallachia. The pure Daco-Roumanian nationality may have survived in a fragmentary state among the inaccessible wooded mountains of North-west Moldavia and Transylvania, also in Dacia during the period of Aurelian; these elements may have left their highlands when the country was pacified or passed north of the Danube, and again have exerted a special influence upon the motley complexion of the nation now known as Roumanian.

During the tenth and eleventh centuries it is noticeable that similar principalities, or banats, were formed in Dacia, of which those advancing too far from Transylvania into the low lands of the Theiss fell under Magyar supremacy. On the other hand, the duchies which spread to the east and south of the Carpathian Mountains were able to maintain their ground against the Pechenegs, Cumanians, and Mongols. About the middle of the fourteenth century the two kingdoms of Wallachia and Moldavia began their existence, starting from the Carpathians and continuing for

Two Kingdoms in the Carpathians

a long time in mutual independence with a history of their own. At the outset of the thirteenth century

Wallachia was in the hands of the Hungarian kings of the house of Arpad. Bela IV. gave the country, in 1247, to the Knights of St. John, with the exception of the half Cumanian domain of the "Olacus" Seneslav, who was at that time Voivode of Great Wallachia to the east of the river Olt, and with the excep-

tion also of the jurisdiction of the Voivode Latovoi, who was almost independent. When Ladislaus IV., the Cuman, ascended the throne of Hungary in 1272, while yet a minor, Litovoi and his brother attempted to shake off the burdensome obligation of yearly tribute; but Litovoi was killed about 1275, and his brother Barbat was obliged to pay a high ransom. Shortly afterwards Basarab, a grandson of the above-mentioned Seneslav, founded to the west of the Olt the principality of "Transalpina" (Hungarian-Wallachia, or Wallachia Minor) with Arges as the capital. It should be observed that Moldavia, constitutionally a state of later date, in contrast to Wallachia or the "Roumanian territory" in general, is occasionally known as Wallachia "Minor," until it was overshadowed by the older neighbour state under Alexander the Good; under Stefan the Great it is sometimes known as Bogdania—in Moldavian, Mutenia. In contrast to Moldavia, which was formed chiefly by foreign immigrants, this principality is a state which developed from its own resources. The power of

Basarab Master of Roumania

Basarab was considerably diminished by the defeat of his ally, Michael Tirnovo, at Velbuzd in 1330. However, the attempt of the Hungarian Angevin, Charles Robert I., to re-enforce a half-forgotten homage, became a total failure amid the wilderness of the Carpathian Mountains; Basarab, who died about 1340, remained master of the whole of "the Roumanian territory," which indeed became then, for the first time, the nucleus of a state in the proper sense of the word. However, this Wallachia Minor, which began its history with much promise, was soon overshadowed by Wallachia Major, and falls into the background.

Alexander, the son of Basarab, concluded an independent agreement with Lewis I. the Great at Kronstadt (1342-1382), concerning the conditions on which he held his position as voivode; however, in his own country his rule was largely disturbed by dissatisfied subjects. To his period belongs the foundation of a new principality in Moldavia, near Baia, by Bogdan. The affairs of the Balkan peninsula in his proximity induced Alexander to leave this ambitious rival in peace. In 1359 the Byzantine metropolitan, Hyacinthus, came from Vicina at the mouth of the Danube to Hungarian Wallachia as Exarch. By



A BEAUTIFUL AND HISTORIC CATHEDRAL OF ROUMANIA

This fine cathedral of Arges is the subject of various legends, but it was most probably founded by Basarab, who was founder of "Transalpina," with his capital at Arges, and died, in 1340, master of the whole of the "Roumanian Territory."

his first wife, probably a Servian or Bosnian woman, Alexander Basarab had a son, Layko, or Vladislav; afterwards, about 1350, he married a Roman Catholic, the Hungarian Clara, and died on November 16th, 1364.

Layko, who died in 1377 or between 1382 and 1385, was able to maintain his position against King Lewis; as early as 1369 he styled himself in his documents "Ladislav by the Grace of God and the King of Hungary, Voivode of Wallachia, Ban of Syrmia, and Duke of Fogaras." Fogaras was a territory in Transylvania, afterwards granted as a fief to the Voivode of Wallachia by the kings of Hungary, as it was a secure refuge in the period of Turkish invasions, which began in 1367 and 1385. Under Layko, Arges became a Roman bishopric in 1369, although the conversion desired by the Pope was not accepted on the side of the voivode. In fact, his inclination to the Greek Church was plainly apparent in the marriage of the successor Radu with Kallinikia, to whose influence is certainly

due the occurrence of more extensive ecclesiastical gifts.

The sons of this couple were the hostile brothers, Dan (ruler in October, 1385 and 1393) and Mircea the Old, or Great (1386-1418). In 1390 Mircea made a convention with the Polish king Vladislav Jagiello II., which was renewed in 1411. About 1391 he took Dobrudza and the town of Siliustria from the Bulgarians. However, in 1389 he was defeated at Kossovo with his allies, and became a semi-vassal of the Ottomans in 1391 and 1394. With the object of protecting his country from the threatened advance of the Turks, Mircea came to Transylvania in 1395, and on March 7th, at Kronstadt, concluded an offensive and defensive alliance with King Sigismund, in accordance with the terms of which he fought with the Christian army in the unfortunate battle of Nicopolis, on September 28th, 1396. Mircea was, however, now forced to recognise once again the Turkish supremacy, to abandon entirely the right bank of the Danube to

the Ottomans, and to pay the emir a yearly tribute of 3,000 red banes, or 300 silver Turkish dollars; the defiance shown by Mircea in withholding the tribute for three years was broken down in 1417.

In return the Porte guaranteed, in 1411, the free administration of the country under a voivode chosen by the inhabitants. This convention

Mircea a Great King of Wallachia was to form the basis, even in the nineteenth century, of the relations of Wallachia with Turkey, and was renewed in 1460 between the Voivode Vlad IV. and Mohammed II., according to the common account. In the struggles for the succession which broke out in 1403 upon the death of Bajazet I. Mircea supported Musa, and met with his reward when the latter was recognised as ruler of the Ottoman kingdom in February, 1411. Hence the convention of 1411 may be regarded as a friendly alliance. However, this friendly relationship between Wallachia and the Porte was not to continue permanently. In 1413 Musa fell fighting

against his brother Mohammed. The latter crushed the pretensions of the false Mustafa, who was also deceived by Mircea; he also punished the Roumanians in 1417 by subjugating their country—a process which even Jorga cannot avoid calling “complete.” He may certainly be right in regarding the agreement for tribute concluded between Bajazet and Mircea as a falsification, like that between Mohammed II. and Radu the Fair. Concerning the amount of tribute we have no certain information before 1532.

In 1413 Mircea appointed his son Mihail co-regent, and himself died on January 31st, 1418; the two princes are represented together in a tolerably well-preserved fresco in the Byzantine style in the monastery of Cozia. Mihail also died in 1420, and was succeeded by his hostile

brother Dan, the protégé of the Turks, who disappears from the scene in 1430. The Boyar Aldea, known as Alexander, who was supported by Moldavia and Turkey, struggled to secure the throne for four years, 1432–1436, and was then driven out by Vlad, the legitimate son of Mircea, who had been brought up at the court of the emperor Sigismund.

During the reign of the haughty Voivode Vlad II., known as Drakul, or devil, a period of the greatest distress and poverty passed over the country. In 1432 he was driven out of his capital, Tirgoviste, while Turkish troops devastated the districts of Burzen and of the Székler; in 1436 he even fell into the hands of the Ottomans, but was eventually able to maintain his position in isolation. In the year 1438 he guided the army of Murad to Transylvania, and styled himself Duke of Fogaras and Amlas. After the battle of Szent-Endre in 1442, the leader of the Hungarian army, Janos Hunyadi, a Roumanian of Transylvania, marched into Wallachia and forced the

Turkish vassal, Vlad Drakul, to submit; in 1443 Vlad accompanied him to Serbia.

This position of affairs was not, however, of long duration. The statement that he captured Hunyadi on his flight from the disastrous battle of Varna on November 10th, 1444, is questionable. However, the power of Hungary was so weakened that Vlad concluded a fresh peace with the Porte in 1446. This induced the Hungarian general to invade Wallachia at the end of 1446 and to confer the dignity of voivode on Vladislav, who styled himself Dan IV. Vlad Drakul was defeated at Pegovist, taken prisoner, and executed at Tirsor,

together with his son Mircea. For a long period the struggle for the dignity of prince continued between the families of Dan and Drakul. Partly as a consequence



MIRCEA: A GREAT WALLACHIAN KING Mircea, king of Wallachia, and his son are here shown in an old mosaic. His life was spent largely in fighting the Turk, and had not the Ottoman power been so strong he would have founded a great and permanent kingdom, being a diplomatist as well as a warrior. He died in 1418. His son Mihail, who succeeded, died two years later.

of Hungarian help and partly with Turkish help the voivodes succeeded one another rapidly. Dan IV. supported Hunyadi in the middle of October, 1448. with 8,000 men, in the battle on the field of Amsel, but his personal indifference to the result was punished by the confiscation of his fiefs situated beyond the Carpathians.

From 1455 or 1456 until 1462 reigned Vlad IV., the second son of Drakul; he is sufficiently characterised by his nickname "the impaler." Immediately after the death of Hunyadi in 1456 and of Ladislaus Posthumus in 1457, Vlad made an unexpected invasion into Transylvania, reduced Kronstadt to ashes, and impaled all his prisoners. For the purpose of securing his rear, he concluded an

alliance with the Porte in 1460, but in 1461 he surprised Bulgaria from pure lust of plunder and slaughter, and caused some 20,000 human beings to be impaled. To avenge this outrage the Turks marched against him in the spring of 1462 in conjunction with Stefan the Great of Moldavia, and drove him into Transylvania. The Alibeg of the Ottoman Emir, Mohammed II., placed the brother of Vlad, Radul the Fair, on the throne in the autumn of 1462, on condition of his paying a yearly tribute of 12,000 ducats; he also recognised the supremacy of the Hungarian king Matthias, who kept the hypocritical Vlad and Peter Aaron V., the Voivode of Moldavia, who had also been expelled, prisoners in Ofen. Radu was for the second time definitely driven out in the autumn of 1473 by his Moldavian neighbour, Stefan the Great; in the period of confusion which followed he soon lost his life.

His successor, Laiot, known as Basarab the Elder, lost the favour of Stefan in 1474 on account of his undue partiality for the Turks; he, too, was driven out by Moldavian and Transylvanian troops on October 20th, 1474. He again suffered this fate at the end of 1476. Vlad, the "impaler," once again took his place upon the throne of the voivodes with the help of Hungary. However, his death soon followed, and a family war continued

for two years between the Basarabs; the younger Basarab, the "little impaler," maintained himself with increasing power from 1477 to 1481. An unfrocked monk



VLAD THE IMPALER
A bloodthirsty ruler of Wallachia, whose lust of plunder gave Turkey good excuse for joining with Moldavia, in 1462, and dethroning him-

then became master of Hungarian Wallachia under the title of Vlad V. (1481-1496); he was a submissive vassal of the Porte, showing none of the desire for freedom manifested by Stefan the Great. A convention of 1482 established the river Milkov as the frontier between the two principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia.

The son and successor of Vlad, Radul IV. or V. (1496-1508), who, in many respects, is rightly styled the "Great," attempted to relieve the general distress by reforms in the administrative and ecclesiastical systems, espe-

cially directed against the encroachments of Nifon, the patriarch of Constantinople. Although he did personal homage in Constantinople in 1504, the Turks deprived him of the Danube customs receipts in 1507. Michael, or Mihnea,

A Period of Brief Reigns and Lawlessness

who was supposed to be the son of Vlad, the "impaler," reigned for two years (1508 to 1510), until he was forced to abdicate by party struggles. The leader of the opposition party, Vladut, or Vladice (Little Vlad, 1510-1512), recognised the supremacy of Hungary, was defeated by the dissatisfied Boyars who were in alliance with Mohammed of Nicopolis, and was beheaded on January 25th, 1512.

Basarab III. Neagoe (1512-1521), who was descended on his mother's side from a Boyar family of Olten, now occupied the throne of the voivodes; he was a peace-loving ruler, and gave his generous support to churches and monasteries; he dedicated, in 1517, the beautiful church of Curtea-de Arges, which was restored in 1886 under King Carol. His successors were from 1525 to 1530 mere tools in the hands of the Turks, were generally at war with one another, and usually fell by the hand of an assassin. The consciousness of national existence seemed to have wholly disappeared from the people; the nobles spoke Slavonic and also Greek, and attempted to enrich themselves in conjunction with the Turkish grandees.

Towards the end of the sixteenth century the throne of the voivodes was secured by Michael II. the Bold (1593-1601), a brilliant soldier and a dexterous politician. Between 1599 and 1601 he also occupied Transylvania and Moldavia. He was a son of the Voivode Petrascu

Successful Merchant (1554-1557), and in his youth had carried on an extensive commercial business.

Becomes King Through his wife Stanca he was related to the most powerful families, in which he found strong support against the preceding Voivode Alexander Mircea; after an unsuccessful attempt at revolt he eventually secured the throne in September, 1593, chiefly with the help of Andronicus Cantacuzenos. On November 5th, 1594, Michael concluded an alliance with Sigismund Bathori and Aaron of Moldavia, and shortly afterwards, on November 13th, massacred the Turks in Jassy and Bucharest. He then defeated several Turkish and Tartar armies in a brilliant winter campaign, and won a great victory at Kalugareni on August 23rd, 1595. The glorious deeds of this brave Wallachian resounded throughout Christian Europe during his lifetime. In 1598, he formed an alliance with the Emperor Rudolf II. against the Prince of Transylvania, who abdicated in the spring of 1599. However, when Cardinal Andreas ascended the throne, Michael, vigorously supported by the adventure-loving Cossacks of the Dnieper, invaded the country on October 17th, 1599, secured the help of the Szeklers, besieged Hermannstadt, and won a victory on October 28th on the heights of Schellenberg. Andreas Bathori was murdered while fleeing to the country of the Szeklers.

Michael advanced in triumph to Weissenburg, and was appointed imperial governor on November 20th; on May 7th, 1600, he crossed the frontiers of Moldavia. The Voivode Jeremias Mogila fled to Poland. The bold ruler seemed to have conceived the idea of securing the throne of that country for himself; even at the present day he is known by the Wallachians as King Michael—also Alexander—the Great. He made preparations

for an invasion of Poland, but he was forced to return to Weissenburg in order to negotiate with Pezzen, the ambassador of the Hungarian king, about Transylvania; on July 1st he caused himself to be proclaimed Prince of Wallachia and Moldavia and also of Transylvania in the name of Hapsburg.

Dangers, however, threatened him from another side. The Poles and the Turks were menacing his frontiers, and Sigismund Bathori was meditating an invasion of Moldavia. Transylvania itself was so entirely impoverished in consequence of Michael's continual military enterprises, that the nobles broke into open revolt against him and refused to perform military service. After a disastrous battle at Mirislav on September 18th, 1600, Michael fled, and was again defeated in his own country by the Pole Jan Zamojski, between Buzau and Plojesti; he could not even make head against Simeon Movila, who defeated him at Arges. Meanwhile the

Transylvanian nobles chose the characterless Sigismund Bathori as their ruler for the third time, on February 3rd, 1601. Michael had betaken himself to Prague on December 25th, 1600, and had there presented to the court a memorial in his own justification; he obtained 80,000 florins, and with his troops joined the army of the Austrian general, George

Basta, in Transylvania. On August 6th, 1601, the Prince of Transylvania was defeated in the battle of Goroslau; he fled to Moldavia, where he received a letter in which Michael undertook to help him to the throne if he would hand over his wife and children, who had been left as hostages in Transylvania after his fall. This piece of treachery was reported to Basta, who had Michael murdered on August 19th, 1601, in Thorda, probably in fulfilment of instructions previously received.

After Michael the Bold the position of voivode was occupied by wholly unimportant personalities. The only important ruler was Matthias Basarab (1632 to April, 1654). He defeated the Ottoman claimant Radu, the son of the Moldavian Voivode

Successful Merchant
Becomes King

Michael Suffers Defeat



MICHAEL THE BOLD
The glorious exploits against the Turks of this Roumanian prince, who ruled Wallachia from 1593 to 1601, aroused great enthusiasm throughout the Christian world at the time of their performance.



THE NATIONAL STATUE TO MICHAEL THE BOLD AT BUCHAREST

Alexander Ilias, at Bucharest. He carefully protected his boundaries against the encroachments of the Danube Turks, and took particular trouble to secure the general increase and advancement of national prosperity, while suppressing Greek influence, which had become predominant. In 1652 he founded the first printing-press, organised schools and monasteries, secured the composition of a legal code on the model of Slav and Greek compilations of the kind, and translated ecclesiastical books into Wallachian. No doubt his efforts in these directions were stimulated by the examples of the Transylvanian prince, Gabriel Bethlen of Itkar (1630-1639) and George I. Rakoczy (1631-1648), who set up Wallachian printing-presses in 1640, and published many ecclesiastical books in Wallachian.

His object was to spread the Reformation among the Wallachians; for since the catechisms of Hermannstadt in 1544 and the Old Testament of 1582, this movement had found adherents among the Roumanians of South-east Hungary. As a matter of fact his efforts led to no more permanent result than

those of John Honterus, the reformer of the Saxons of Transylvania. Neither the doctrine of Luther nor that of Calvin gained any lasting hold on the hearts of the Wallachians, but these publications gave a considerable impulse to the Roumanian written language and to intellectual life in general.

The proceedings of Matthias Basarab were successfully imitated by his contemporaries and opponents and by the Voivode of Moldavia, Basile Lupu, and one of his successors, Serban II. Cantacuzenos (1679 to November 8th, 1688). The Moldavian Logoset Eustratios had already translated the Byzantine legal code into Moldavian in 1643; in 1688 the Bible in Roumanian was printed by two laymen, the brothers Greceanu.

Side by side with these ecclesiastical works, which consisted chiefly of translations from Greek and Slav, chronicles arose by degrees, such as those of Michael of Miron and Nicolae Costin, of Grigore Ureche the "Romanist," and of Danovic, Neculcea and Axente. Under the influence of ecclesiastical literature religious lyric poetry also flourished; the chief

representatives of this were the metropolitan Dositheos of Jerusalem, Michael Halitius, the high Logosat Miron Costin who was executed by Kantemir the Old, and Theodore Corbea. However, the chief glory of Roumanian scholarship in that period is Dimitrie Kantemir (1673-1723), philosopher, poet, geographer, historian, and an intermediary between Eastern and Western science and literature.

Hard times soon put an end to these promising impulses, which spread even more vigorously to Moldavia in 1680. Under the rich Voivode Constantine Brankovan (1688-1714), who was in other respects a good ruler, disasters burst upon the country, which was transformed into a military road during the wars of Austria, Poland, and Russia with the Turks. Brankovan entered upon an alliance in 1698 and 1711 with the Tsar Peter the Great. Shortly before Easter, 1714, Brankovan was imprisoned in Bucharest, and executed in Constantinople with his four sons and his adviser. The same fate befell his successor, Stefan III. Cantacuzenos (1714 to June, 1716).

This event extinguished the last glimmer of Wallachian independence; the freely elected voivode ceased to exist, and

voivodes appointed by the Porte ruled henceforward, who brought Wallachia to the point of collapse as they had

brought Moldavia, and initiated a period of total decline from an economic point of view; the tribute at that date amounted to more than 140,000 dollars a year. The first of these foreigners, who were generally rich Greeks, was Nikolaus Mavrocordato, who had previously been prince of Moldavia on two occasions (1716-1730). The accession of this first Greek prince, who himself came from the Island of Chios and not from Phanar, forms an important epoch in the literature of Daco-Roumania, the first age of which, beginning about 1550, here comes to an end.

In the course of the eighteenth century, Russia began to interfere in the domestic affairs of the country, a process which culminated in the occupation of Wallachia by the Russians during the Russo-Turkish war of 1770. By the peace of Kutchuk-Kainardji, in 1774, Wallachia again fell under Turkish supremacy; but Russian influence kept the upper hand, and in 1781 the Porte agreed to set up a Hospodar government under the supervision of the Russian general Consul.



MATTHIAS BASARAB
After Michael the Bold, he was the only Wallachian ruler of note in the history of the nation. He reigned from 1632 to 1654, and did much for his country, founding the first printing-press in 1652.



SERVIANS REJOICING AT THE NEWS OF THE MURDER OF SULTAN MURAD



THE MOLDAVIAN PEOPLE AND THEIR STRUGGLE FOR NATIONALITY

BOUNDED on the west by the Carpathians, on the north and east by the Pruth and Russia, on the south-east by the Danube and the Dobrudza, and on the south by the Sereth, the mountainous country of Moldavia, the second division of Roumania, is especially suited for agriculture and cattle-rearing. The Roumanians and their Slavonic teachers seem to have fled to the rivers on the occupation of the country. The name appears in historical times towards the middle of the fourteenth century.

As early as 1335 Bogdan, the son of Micul, had caused the despatch of a Hungarian primate to the country, on account of his disobedience to King Charles Robert I. In 1342, when the Angevin ruler was lead, and his son, Lewis, had succeeded to the throne at the age of sixteen, Bogdan again revolted. Although the youthful king declined to acknowledge his position

Moldavia Shakes Off the Hungarian Yoke

as voivode, the rebel was supported by the Lithuanians of the Halitschland and by the Roumanian mountaineers, and was able to maintain his position in the Marmaros; in 1352 his submission caused but little change in his position: At that time this south-east corner of Europe was in a constant state of disturbance; and on the first occasion of peace Bogdan followed the example of Basarab and shook off the Hungarian yoke in 1360, to which success he was aided by the "benevolent neutrality" of Poland. About 1365 Bogdan was the undisturbed master of Moldavia.

After his death his eldest son, Latzko, ruled the country, practically in the position of a Polish vassal; in 1370 he permitted the erection of a Catholic bishopric at Sereth. After this a series of events followed which are partly shrouded in obscurity, but none the less point to a Lithuanian Ruthenian foundation for the young state. As late as the fifteenth century the language of Little Russia predominated as a means of communication.

However, Moldavia definitely shut the door in the face of Slav influence at a comparatively early period, an attitude adopted at the present time by Roumania.

Partly explained by the influence of geographical position, this fact is also due to a number of occurrences, which at that time gave Moldavia a separate position apart from the three Balkan states similar to that occupied by the modern kingdom of Roumania. There is no doubt that a considerable number of Lithuanians and Ruthenians removed to the Sereth from the district of Marmaros, together with the conqueror Bogdan. Even in the official documents of Stefan the Great, in the second half of the fifteenth century, a large number of Ruthenian names are to be observed; there, as they advanced eastward, they met with a number of settlers from Little Russia, upon whom the Wallachians looked askance as strangers. After the death of Latzko, in 1374, the Lithuanian Knez or supreme judge, George Koriatovic, was brought into the principality of Baia; he, however, soon disappeared, and was probably poisoned. Equally short was the reign of a certain usurper known as Stefan I. His son Peter (probably 1379-1388) took the oath of fidelity to the Polish king Vladislav II. Jagiello in Lemberg in 1387; he conquered Suzava, which he made his capital. His youngest brother, Roman, who immediately succeeded him—he had been co-regent from 1386 at latest—was carried off to Poland in 1393 by the orders of Vladislav, and replaced by his elder brother, Stefan III.

He was made a tributary vassal by the Hungarian king Siegmund at the end of 1394, but on January 6th, 1395, he again solemnly recognised the Polish supremacy. In the year 1400 Juga, the illegitimate son of Roman, enjoyed a short period as governor at Suzava.

Polish Supremacy in Moldavia

At the beginning of the fifteenth century the first important voivode of Moldavia

began his government; this was Alexander, the other son of Roman, who was known as the "Good" even during his lifetime. During his long reign (1401-1432) he reorganised the defences, the administration, and the military system, compiled a legal code from the "Basilika" of Leo VI., and improved the intellectual state of the people by founding schools and monasteries. Upon three occasions he took the oath of fidelity to the King of

Marks of Intellectual Progress

Poland in 1402, 1404, and 1407, on the last occasion as the first "lord" of the Moldavian territory. He married, as his third wife, Ryngalla, the sister of King Vladislav, after sending auxiliary troops to Marienburg to the help of the Poles against the German Orders. During his reign numerous settlers from Lesser Armenia migrated into the country, most of whom afterwards removed to Transylvania; at this period, also, the first gipsies appeared in the country.

Under his sons Elias and Stefan V., the supremacy of Poland was again recognised in 1433. The two step-brothers began a severe struggle for the supremacy, which ended in a division by which Stefan obtained the south, while Elias secured the north of Moldavia with Suczava. In 1442 Stefan concluded an alliance with the Hungarian general Hunyadi to oppose the Turkish danger, and in the following May, 1443, he caused his step-brother to be blinded. However, Roman II., a son of Elias, put an end to his uncle's life in the middle of July, 1447, and secured the position of voivode for himself. But in the next year, 1448, Peter IV., a son of Alexander the Good, who had fled to Hungary to Hunyadi, and had married his sister, returned to his native land with a Hungarian army and drove out Roman, who fled to Podolia to ask help from the Polish king. Roman died of poison on July 2nd, 1448. Peter

Plots and Counterplots in Moldavia

now took the oath of fidelity to King Kasimir IV., and continued to rule under Hungarian and Polish supremacy until the year 1449. Then Bogdan II., an illegitimate son of Alexander the Good, revolted on February 11th, and on July 5th, 1450, concluded two important treaties with Hunyadi, but was murdered in 1451 by the Voivode Peter V., formerly Aaron, an illegitimate son of Alexander the Good. Peter was then forced to divide the

government of Moldavia with Alexander "Olechno," a son of Elias, who had been originally supported by Poland and afterwards by Hungary; but in 1455 Alexander was poisoned by his own Boyars. Peter now ruled alone until 1457, and was able to maintain his power only by a miserable and cowardly subjection to Poland and the Turks. From 1455 the Porte was able to consider the Voivode of Moldavia, with his tribute of 2,000 Hungarian florins, as one of its permanent vassals.

After this almost uninterrupted period of party struggles for the dignity of voivode, a period of unspeakable misery for the country, an age of rest and prosperity at last dawned in the second half of the fifteenth century; henceforward Moldavia, which had hitherto been placed in the background under the title of Wallachia Minor, or Bogdania, became of more importance than the older "Roumanian" district, which had been brought low by the two Vlads, the Devil and the Impaler. The Voivode Stefan VI. (1457 to July 2nd, 1504), a son of Bogdan II., was rightly surnamed the "Great" by his people.

Moldavia Rises in Power and Importance

The miniature painting in the book of Gospels of Voronez, which remains comparatively undamaged, has preserved a not unpleasing portrait of this ruler. A brilliant general and politician, he not only extended his realm, but also removed it from the political influence of his two neighbouring states. He advanced the established church, which was dependent on the orthodox patriarch at Achrida, and the good order of which was in strong contrast to the confusion prevailing at Wallachia, founded a third bishopric at Radautz, where he also restored the old monastery church, and also built a great monastery at Putna in Bukovina.

He incorporated a Bessarabian frontier district of Wallachia with his own country, recovered Chilia in January, 1465, and in December, 1467, successfully repelled an attack of the Hungarian King Matthias, who was wounded by an arrow at Moldovabanya in the course of this campaign. Harassed by Tartar invasions, Stefan nevertheless found leisure to invade Transylvania during the Bohemian expedition of King Matthias in 1469, and to expel Radu, the Voivode of Wallachia, in 1471-1473. The Hungarian king was occupied in the west until 1475, and overlooked this

MOLDAVIA'S STRUGGLE FOR NATIONALITY

aggression, more particularly as Stefan, in alliance with the Transylvanian Szeklers of Udvarhely and Esik, had driven back a Turkish army of 120,000 men—which invaded Moldavia under Suleiman Pasha on January 10th, 1475—at Racova, and had by this means diverted the danger from Hungary. The exploit is characteristic of this glorious age in which Moldavia often formed a bulwark against the Ottomans on the south and against the assaults of neighbours on the north.

The Sultan Mohammed II. now undertook in person a punitive campaign against Moldavia, and won a victory on July 26th, 1476, in the White Valley. Stefan, however, with the help of Stefan Bathori, who was accompanied by the fugitive Vlad the Impaler, eventually drove out the hostile army and secured for Vlad the position of voivode of Wallachia. However, after the death of Vlad at the end of 1476, the new voivode of Wallachia, Basarab, the Little Impaler, made an alliance with the Turks; Stefan overthrew him on July 8th, 1481, and handed over the position of voivode to a certain Mircea. With the object of securing their connection with the Tartars in the Volga districts, the Turkish armies of Bajazet II. invaded Moldavia again in 1484, together with Tartar and Wallachian allies, and stormed Chilia and Cetatea-Albam on July 14th and August 4th.

Only by means of Polish help, which he was forced to purchase by paying a homage long refused, was Stefan able to save his country from overthrow by the enemies' bands in 1485. Turning to his own advantage the necessities of Poland, which became pressing immediately afterwards, Stefan occupied Pokutia in 1490, and even paid tribute to the Porte to secure his position, as formerly Peter Aaron had done. In 1497 the Polish King, John Albert, invaded Bukovina with the intention of incorporating the whole principality with his own empire, and besieged Suzava, the capital until 1550; by the intervention of the Voivode of Transylvania an armistice was secured, and the end of the affair was that the Polish cavalry were surprised in the forests and scattered at Cozmin on the day of St. Demeter.

In 1498, Stefan appeared in person before Lemberg, and some one hundred thousand human beings were carried into captivity in Turkey. However, on the 12th or

18th of July, 1499, Stefan dissolved his connection with the Porte and concluded a convention with Poland and Hungary, wherein he tacitly recognised the supremacy of both states over Moldavia, and undertook to oppose the progress of the Turkish armies through his country and to keep the neighbouring states informed of

The Sultan's any hostile movements on
Tribute from the part of the Turks. Stefan
the Moldavians fulfilled his obligations in 1499, when he put an end to the devastations of Balibeg, a son of Malkoch. After the death of John Albert he dissolved his connection with Poland and stirred up the Tartars against the new king, Alexander; while they devastated Podolia he occupied the Ruthenian Pokutia, and sent his Boyars and tax-gatherers to Sniatyn, Kolomea, and Halicz in 1502. This was the last success of this greatest of all Roumanians.

Stefan's son and successor, Bogdan III., known as Orbul, the "blind," the "one-eyed," or the "squint-eyed" (1504-1517), gave up his claim to Polish Pokutia in return for a promise of the hand of Elizabeth, a sister of Alexander; but he was cheated of this prize. The approach of the Turkish power induced him in 1504 to promise a yearly tribute to the sultan, consisting of 4,000 Turkish ducats, forty royal falcons, and forty Moldavian horses, in return for which, according to later reports, he was guaranteed the maintenance of Christianity; the voivodes were to be freely elected, and the country was to be self-governing in domestic affairs. This convention, which in recent times has formed the basis for the constitutional relationship of Moldavia with the Porte, was renewed by Peter Rares "the Restless" (1527-1528, and for the second time from the end of February, 1541, to September, 1546) in the year 1529; according to a document of 1532, he sent annually 120,000 aspers or 10,000 gold ducats to Constantinople. At

Moldavian a later period this tribute
Gold was considerably increased.
for Turkey With Peter Rares began the rule of the illegitimate branch of the house of Dragos, who was a natural son of Stefan the Great. The chief object of Peter after the disastrous defeat of Mohacs on August 29th, 1526, the significance of which he never understood, was to turn to his own advantage the disputes about the succession in Hungary, which had broken out

between King Ferdinand and John Zapolya; on several occasions he invaded Transylvania, inflicting appalling devastation on the country, which, in 1529, declined to accept his rule. An attempt to recover Pokutia from Poland was brought to an end by the defeat of Peter at Obertyn on August 22nd, 1531. His

**Ottoman
Oppression
in Moldavia** faithlessness brought about the fall of Aloisio Gritti, who had been sent by the sultan to

Transylvania in 1533. After the expulsion of Peter in 1538, the voivodes of Moldavia became ready tools in the hands of the Porte; provided they paid the sultan a yearly tribute, they were allowed to govern their own territory precisely as they pleased. The people groaned under the burden of heavy taxation and extortion of every kind, and attempted to secure relief by joining the party struggles set on foot by individual wealthy families, hoping also to secure some momentary relief by the murder of their masters. Thus the Voivode Stefan VIII., "the Turk," or "the Locust"—so named after a plague of locusts in the year 1538—was murdered, in 1540, after a reign of two years. His successor, Alexander III., a scion of the legitimate Dragos family from Poland, met with the same fate in the same year. The Voivode Elias II. (1546–1551), a son of Peter Rares, was ordered by the sultan to invade Transylvania in 1550, but transferred this commission to his brother Stefan, abdicated in May, 1551, and soon afterwards died as the renegade "Mohammed," governor of Silistria. His place was occupied by his brother Stefan IX., the last direct descendant of the illegitimate branch of the Dragosids, until he was murdered by the Boyars in 1553.

His opponent and successor, Peter the Stolnic, known as Alexander IV. Lapusan (1553–1561), speedily made himself highly unpopular with the Boyars by his infliction

**Moldavia
a Land of
Tragedies**

of torture and death, from the stain of which he tried to cleanse his conscience by founding a monastery at Slatina. In 1561 the Greek sailor Jakobos Basilikos seized the position of voivode, under the title of John I.; he founded a Latin school at Cotnari (East Moldavia) and a bishopric, which was naturally but short-lived. After playing the part of a tyrant for two years he was murdered in the course of a popular rising on November 5th, 1563.

During and following upon the short rule of one Stefan X. Tomsa—beheaded in Poland in 1564—Alexander IV., who had fled to Constantinople, resumed the government (1563–1568), until he gradually went blind. His son Bogdan IV. (1568–1572) was wounded by an angry nobleman while visiting his betrothed in Poland.

The sultan then appointed as Voivode of Moldavia John II., a Pole of Masovia, who had accepted the Mohammedan faith in Constantinople, where he was believed to be a descendant of Stefan IX., who had been killed in 1553. In order to secure his independence, John allied himself with Cossacks—hence his name of "rebel"—but was surrounded in Roscani, and executed on June 11th, 1574. The Cossacks, who were forced to organise under Stefan Bathori in 1576, were at that period a bold robber-tribe, feared both by the Tartar and the Ottoman; they devastated the districts on the far side of the Dniester from their islands in that river, and after 1595 sought to find opportunity for their wild military exploits, under Michael the Bold, even in Wallachia itself. At the same time, like

**The Sultan
as
Dictator** the ancient Vikings, they put a stop to all trade on the Black Sea for forty years. Peter VII. the "Lame," the son of Mircea of Wallachia, who was appointed voivode by the sultan (1574–1577), held from the first a precarious position, and was overthrown after surviving an attack from the Cossack protégé, John the "Curly"; his conqueror, the Cossack, John or Peter Potkova, "the breaker of horseshoes," in this respect a predecessor of Augustus the "Strong," reigned for a few days, and was then executed in Lemberg by the order of the Polish king Stefan Bathori (1575–1586). The sultan then, in 1577, again conferred the position of voivode on Peter VII., whom he expelled in the following year, until he restored him afterwards for the third time (1584–1592).

Moldavia was at that time a plaything in the hands of the Ottomans, who expelled and appointed voivodes as they pleased, while their deputies and their troops devastated the country in all directions. Before Peter became voivode for the third time the country had been governed, for a short period in 1578, by Alexander, a brother of Potkova, and, after a constant succession of real and

pretended claimants, by a certain Jankul the "Saxon" of Transylvania, who had used the wealth of his wife, a Palæologa of Cyprus, to induce the authorities of Constantinople to depose Peter and to confer the position of voivode of Moldavia upon himself in 1579. He became involved in a quarrel with Stefan Bathori, through his encroachments upon the Polish frontier, and was taken prisoner and beheaded in 1582. One of his successors, Aaron, who had formerly been a coachman and then a Boyar, was driven out by the Cossacks in 1591, after a reign of one year, and fled to Constantinople.

The Cossacks restored Peter in 1592; but he was captured by the Transylvanian troops of Sigismund Bathori and handed over to the sultan, who executed him. Aaron was now placed for the second time in the position of voivode (1592-1595), and pursued a foreign policy of unblushing duplicity; on November 5th, 1594, he made an alliance at Bucharest with Sigismund Bathori and with Michael of Wallachia against the Turks; however, he deserted the Wallachians, was taken as a prisoner to Alvincz by the Transylvanian troops, and died there in 1597. His successor Stefan XI. Resvan supported Sigismund Bathori in his enterprises against the Turks, but was impaled at the end of 1595 by the Polish chancellor Jan Zamoiski, who had invaded Moldavia.

In August the position of voivode was taken over by Jeremias Mogila, or Movila (1595-1608), a feeble character, who allowed the country to fall entirely under Polish supremacy. At that time Southern Moldavia had been driven to find room for 15,000 Tartar settlers; the tribute which the Khan of the Crim Tartars, who from 1475 had harassed the Russians, Poles, and Roumanians, then subject to the Ottomans, had been receiving from Moldavia since 1566, "according to ancient custom," as the price for his consideration of their frontiers, was now dropped. However, this remarkable branch of the conquering Nogais, under the "Mirzak" Kantemir, lost their independence in 1637, though their marauding raids were still

continued. It was not until the seventeenth century that a better period began to dawn; after a conspiracy of the Boyars against Alexander VII. Elias, who favoured the Greeks, and after various other confusions the Greek Albanian Vasile Lupu came to the throne (1634-1653); he founded schools and benevolent institutions, and did his best to improve the condition of the country. He was a cunning politician, and began intrigues against George Rakoczy, the ruler of Transylvania, which ended, in 1654, by his being captured himself by the Khan of Tartary, who sent him to Constantinople.

On January 8th, 1654, the Cossacks surrendered to the Russians. Moldavia, however, came under Transylvanian supremacy. The voivode Stefan XIII. (1653-1658), after secret negotiations with the Russian Tsar (1654-1656), joined the Wallachian Constantine Basarab in placing himself under the protectorate of George Rakoczy II. As he supported this ruler in an attempt to secure the crown of Poland in 1675, the sultan declared him deposed.

The following years were a period of unspeakable misery and sorrow; the last two native rulers, Stefan XIV. and XV., maintained their position with interruptions until 1680 or 1690, but between 1658 and 1712 the Turkish court, at its will and pleasure, appointed rulers from the principal Albanian or Greek families.

A new period in the history of Moldavia (1712-1822) begins with the appointment of the Phanariot class to the position of voivode; they were merchants from Constantinople, and each one of them, intent solely upon his own enrichment, did his best to reduce the country to ruin.

The Russians occupied the country between 1769 and 1774, and then conferred the dignity of voivode upon Gregor III. Ghika, who was murdered by the Jamsaries at Jassy in 1777.

After the death of Ghika the partition of Moldavia began. But of that process we have here to record only the beginning, when, in 1777, the province of Bukovina was incorporated in the Austrian dominions.

HEINRICH VON WLISLOCKI



VASILE "THE WOLF"

A ruler of Moldavia, able and cunning, but being captured by the Khan of Tartary he was delivered to the Turks in 1654.

**The Dawn
of
Better Days**



ALBANIANS: A SCATTERED RACE THEIR WARS AND THEIR RELIGIOUS BELIEFS

THE country known to us as Albania is a district about 400 miles in length and 120 in breadth upon the average, which lies on the coast of the Balkan peninsula. Of this district, the Albanians proper, a strongly-marked nationality, occupy the north; the south-east is pure Greek; while the south-west contains both races, so intermingled that the children learn both languages simultaneously. Roumanians

**Decadence of
Albanian
Independence**

inhabit the district of Pindos, and Bulgarians and Serbs the district which borders their frontiers; on the other hand, the Albanian race has also extended far beyond the frontiers of Albania. On the Shah Dagh Albanians have appropriated the whole western portion of Turkish Servia, extending to Bosnia, and inhabit the mountain region lying west and south-west of Novi Bazar. Large numbers of Albanians also dwell within the kingdom of Greece; in fact, the whole of Attica, with the exception of Athens and the Piræus, Megara, with the exception of the city, Bœotia, and the islands of Hydra and Spezzia, together with many other districts, are inhabited by them.

However, during the course of the nineteenth century the Albanian nationality in these parts has apparently suffered a considerable decrease, owing to the fact that many Albanian families have adopted Greek manners and the Greek language, as Greek is considered the more distinguished nationality. About 80,000 Albanians are settled in Italy, divided among the former provinces of Nearer and Further Calabria, Basilicata, Capitanata, Terra d'Otranto, Abruzzo Ulteriore and Sicily. The first mentioned were brought over about 1460 by Ferdinand I. to Naples. Their number was originally considerably greater, but many of them have been entirely Italianised in language, dress, and manners. Finally, three small Albanian colonies exist upon Austrian soil—one on the Save, between Shabatz and Mitrovitz, one at

Zara, and one at Pola. The Albanians are divided into two main branches, which are also distinguished from one another by language—the Toskans and the Geges. The former inhabited the south, the latter the central and northern parts of the country. Their respective dialects are so different that they have the utmost difficulty in understanding one another, and members of one branch are obliged by degrees to learn the dialect of the other. In other respects, too, a strange divergence between the two branches has existed from early times. An attempt has been made to explain the difference of dialect on the supposition that the inhabitants of the north were the Illyrians of antiquity, and those of the south the Epirots. This hypothesis is scarcely defensible. It is more probable that both branches are Thracian, and that of the two dialects, Gegish is the Thracian language as spoken by Illyrians, and Toskish is that language as spoken by Greeks; in other words, that the difference corresponds to that between Lombard and Tuscan Italian—namely, Latin in the mouth of Gauls and Latin in the mouth of Etruscans.

In respect of religion the land is again by no means uniform. The north is predominantly Roman Catholic, while in the south Greek Catholicism holds the upper hand. Mohammedanism, moreover,

**The Cross
Versus the
Crescent**

has spread throughout almost the whole country, and the number of its devotees is nearly equal to that of the Christians. The distinguished families, especially in the towns, are Mohammedans; there are, moreover, isolated country districts which are Mohammedan. It will be understood that all of these were at one time Christians, and that they have gone over to Mohammedanism in consequence of the very various forms of pressure which the Turks were able to exert at different times, even within the present

century. The only tribe which has remained pure Catholic is that of the Miridites, in the north, from the fact that every apostate was immediately forced to leave the district. There are besides districts which are Mohammedan only in seeming, and acknowledge Christianity in secret, at the present day as previously.

Although, as we have said, the Albanians are thus divided by geographical, religious, and linguistic differences, yet they form one nationality with a strongly marked national character, arising primarily from the conception of the family, which has dominated the whole life of this people. It is by the solidarity of family life that we must explain their tenacious observation of ancient customs, which accompany every detail of household life, birth, engagement, marriage and death; thus, too, is explicable that fearful scourge of this nation, the blood feud, and also the political impotence of the country in spite of the great bravery of its inhabitants.

The strongly marked conservatism apparent in all these facts has also contributed to the maintenance of numerous survivals of the old heathen popular religion side by side with the different religions which individuals have adopted as their official belief. As survivals of this nature are the belief in the Elves, a household spirit, three monsters known as Kutshreda, Sükjennesa and Ljubia, the Ore, Mauthi, Fatiles, Dive, Fljamea Kukudi, Vurvulak—known among the Geges as Ljuvgat and Karkancholi—the Shtrigea, Dramgua, and the men with tails. There is no reason to suppose that these demoniacal beings are the survivals of some old pure Albanian popular belief; they probably represent, to some degree, remnants of early Greek, Roman, Slavonic, Turkish, and perhaps gipsy superstition. The origin of the component parts of this popular belief cannot be pointed to with certainty. When we examine the appellations of these separate beings, it might be supposed that they originated from the nation from whose language they took their names; but no reliance can be placed on this theory. The Albanian vocabulary for every department of life is a motley mixture taken from all possible languages, so that it is highly probable that in mythology foreign names might often represent

native conceptions. The Elves, known as the "Happy Ones," or as the "Brides of the Mountain," display a considerable resemblance to the fairies of German mythology, who bear the same name. They are generally feminine, about the size of twelve-year-old children, of great beauty, clothed in white, and of vaporous form. They come

Survival of Albanian Mythology down in the night from the mountains to the homes of men, and invite beautiful children to dance; often, too, they take little children out of the cradles to play with them upon the roofs of the houses, but bring them back unharmed.

Similar is the character of the Mauthi, as she is called in Elbassan, who is probably to be identified with the Southern Albanian "Beauty of the Earth." She, too, is a fairy clothed in gold, with a fez adorned with precious stones; "the man who steals this is fortunate for the whole of his life." Goddesses of fate are the Ore and the Fatiles; the former goes about the country and immediately fulfils all the blessings and curses which she hears. The Fatiles are the same as the ancient Greek Moirai. The Attic Albanians have only one of these deities, who still bears the ancient name of Moira; however, all the gifts which are offered to her upon a birth in the house are tripled.

Horrible demons are the cannibal female monsters Kutshedra, Sükjennesa, and Ljubia. Connected with them is the Fljamea of Elbassan, also a female demon, who can afflict with epilepsy. The Dif, or the Dive in the plural, are giants of supernatural size, while the household spirit, the Vittore, is conceived as a brightly coloured snake, which lives in the wall of the house, and is greeted with respect and wishes of good fortune by any one of the inhabitants who catches sight of it. The Vurvulak, known in some places as vampires, are sufficiently explained by this second title. Of a similar

Scarcity of Literary Monuments nature are the Ljuvgats, "Turkish corpses with long nails, which go about in their grave clothes, devouring what they find, and strangling men," as also are the Karkantsholjes or Kukudes, the corpses of gipsies whose breath is poisonous.

The literary monuments of the people are very few; all that can be called literature is confined to translations of the Bible and similar ecclesiastical

compositions, to national songs, and a few attempts at poetry among the Italian Albanians, and in Albania itself. Among the former we may mention Girolamo de Rada (1870), who has treated of the heroic period of his nation—that is to say, the wars of Skanderbeg. The poet of Albania most famous amongst his compatriots is Nezim Bey of Bremet. He was a scholar acquainted with Arabic and Persian literature, and it was under the influence of these Oriental literatures that his poems were composed, as they indeed declare by their strong infusion of Arabic and Persian words. The spirit also is undeniably Oriental, and their similarity with the poems of Hafiz, for instance, is unmistakable. The national songs are not without a beauty which is strikingly foreign to our ideas. Our information upon the actual history of the Albanians is for the most part very fragmentary. Native historical sources there are none; we are reduced to the references derived from the history of those nations with whom the Albanians were brought into connection. Hence our chief sources are the Byzantine chroniclers, “who trouble themselves very rarely about these remote provinces.” Our earliest direct information belongs to the year 1042; at that date, after subjugating the Bulgarian revolt, Michael Paphlago, the governor of Dyrrhachium, gathered an army of 60,000 men from his province and advanced with it against the Serbs. When the Normans made their expeditions of conquest (1081–1101), the rule of the despots of Epirus from the house of the Comneni began, and it lasted until 1318.

**Albania's
Most
Famous Poet**

the wars of Skanderbeg. The poet of Albania most famous amongst his compatriots is Nezim Bey of Bremet. He was a scholar acquainted with Arabic and Persian literature, and it was under the influence of these Oriental literatures that his poems were composed, as they indeed declare by their strong infusion of Arabic and Persian words. The spirit also is undeniably Oriental, and their similarity with the poems of Hafiz, for instance, is unmistakable. The national songs are not without a beauty which is strikingly foreign to our ideas. Our information upon the actual history of the Albanians is for the most part very fragmentary. Native historical sources there are none; we are reduced to the references derived from the history of those nations with whom the Albanians were brought into connection. Hence our chief sources are the Byzantine chroniclers, “who trouble themselves very rarely about these remote provinces.” Our earliest direct information belongs to the year 1042; at that date, after subjugating the Bulgarian revolt, Michael Paphlago, the governor of Dyrrhachium, gathered an army of 60,000 men from his province and advanced with it against the Serbs. When the Normans made their expeditions of conquest (1081–1101), the rule of the despots of Epirus from the house of the Comneni began, and it lasted until 1318.

The land then fell again into the hands of the Byzantine emperors; but the restless population repeatedly rose in revolt, and the most cruel coercion failed to secure a definite pacification. In the year 1343 fresh disturbances broke out, of which the Servian king, Stefan Dusan, took advantage to conquer the whole of Albania, Thessalia and Macedonia, and assumed the corresponding title of emperor of these countries. Upon his death the Servian kingdom fell into confusion, and Nicephorus, son of the last despot, attempted to seize the government of Albania, but was defeated by the Albanians and killed in battle (1357–1358). The Albanians now fell again partly into the hands of the Servian despot Simon. As, however, he troubled himself but little about the country, the Albanians founded two practically independent provinces—a southern province under Gjinov Vayas, and a northern province under Peter Ljoshas. Then began a period of Albanian migration, during which large portions of Macedonia, Thessalia, Ætolia and Acarnania were occupied by parties starting from Durazzo. Thence the Albanians spread further to Livadia, Bœotia, Attica, South Eubœa, and the Peloponnese. After the death of Peter Ljoshas, in 1374, John Spata seized the town of Arta. His rule was a period of long struggles with different opponents, which continued almost until his death in 1400. About this time most of the country was conquered by Carlo I. Tocco, who died on July 4th, 1429, and bequeathed what he had won to his nephew Carlo II. Tocco of Cephallenia, who was obliged, however, to cede the town of Janina in 1430 to Murad II., and to acknowledge his supremacy. The process of converting the country to Mohammedanism then began, and has continued till within the last century. It was chiefly the upper classes that embraced Mohammedanism, and for this reason they were able to found native dynasties, which in some cases actually acquired hereditary rule. Of these native pashas of Janina the best known is Ali, who was born in 1741 at Tepeleni, and murdered on February 5th, 1822, in a summer-house on the lake of Janina, by Khurshid Pasha. North Albania, which had become a Servian province, has a history of its own. About the year 1250 it went over to the Catholic Church, as appears from the letters of Pope Innocent IV. The family legend of the Miridite chieftain preserves the memory of this event. The disruption from Servia, in which the noble family of the Balzen took a prominent part, occurred about 1368, and therefore

The land then fell again into the hands of the Byzantine emperors; but the restless population repeatedly rose in revolt, and the most cruel coercion failed to secure a definite pacification. In the year 1343 fresh disturbances broke out, of which the Servian king, Stefan Dusan, took advantage to conquer the whole of Albania, Thessalia and Macedonia, and assumed the corresponding title of emperor of these countries. Upon his death the Servian kingdom fell into confusion, and Nicephorus, son of the last despot, attempted to seize the government of Albania, but was defeated by the Albanians and killed in battle (1357–1358). The Albanians now fell again partly into the hands of the Servian despot Simon. As, however, he troubled himself but little about the country, the Albanians founded two practically independent provinces—a southern province under Gjinov Vayas, and a northern province under Peter Ljoshas. Then began a period of Albanian migration, during which large portions of Macedonia, Thessalia, Ætolia and Acarnania were occupied by parties starting from Durazzo. Thence the Albanians spread further to Livadia, Bœotia, Attica, South Eubœa, and the Peloponnese. After the death of Peter Ljoshas, in 1374, John Spata seized the town of Arta. His rule was a period of long struggles with different opponents, which continued almost until his death in 1400. About this time most of the country was conquered by Carlo I. Tocco, who died on July 4th, 1429, and bequeathed what he had won to his nephew Carlo II. Tocco of Cephallenia, who was obliged, however, to cede the town of Janina in 1430 to Murad II., and to acknowledge his supremacy. The process of converting the country to Mohammedanism then began, and has continued till within the last century. It was chiefly the upper classes that embraced Mohammedanism, and for this reason they were able to found native dynasties, which in some cases actually acquired hereditary rule. Of these native pashas of Janina the best known is Ali, who was born in 1741 at Tepeleni, and murdered on February 5th, 1822, in a summer-house on the lake of Janina, by Khurshid Pasha. North Albania, which had become a Servian province, has a history of its own. About the year 1250 it went over to the Catholic Church, as appears from the letters of Pope Innocent IV. The family legend of the Miridite chieftain preserves the memory of this event. The disruption from Servia, in which the noble family of the Balzen took a prominent part, occurred about 1368, and therefore



FAMOUS CHRISTIAN HERO
George Kastrioti, known as “Skanderbeg,” was the great Christian hero who waged war against the Turks for twenty years in Albania. He began his struggle in the year 1444.

phorus, son of the last despot, attempted to seize the government of Albania, but was defeated by the Albanians and killed in battle (1357–1358). The Albanians now fell again partly into the hands of the Servian despot Simon. As, however, he troubled himself but little about the country, the Albanians founded two practically independent provinces—a southern province under Gjinov Vayas, and a northern province under Peter Ljoshas. Then began a period of Albanian migration, during which large portions of Macedonia, Thessalia, Ætolia and Acarnania were occupied by parties starting from Durazzo. Thence the Albanians spread further to Livadia, Bœotia, Attica, South Eubœa, and the Peloponnese. After the death of Peter Ljoshas, in 1374, John Spata seized the town of Arta. His rule was a period of long struggles with different opponents, which continued almost until his death in 1400. About this time most of the country was conquered by Carlo I. Tocco, who died on July 4th, 1429, and bequeathed what he had won to his nephew Carlo II. Tocco of Cephallenia, who was obliged, however, to cede the town of Janina in 1430 to Murad II., and to acknowledge his supremacy. The process of converting the country to Mohammedanism then began, and has continued till within the last century. It was chiefly the upper classes that embraced Mohammedanism, and for this reason they were able to found native dynasties, which in some cases actually acquired hereditary rule. Of these native pashas of Janina the best known is Ali, who was born in 1741 at Tepeleni, and murdered on February 5th, 1822, in a summer-house on the lake of Janina, by Khurshid Pasha. North Albania, which had become a Servian province, has a history of its own. About the year 1250 it went over to the Catholic Church, as appears from the letters of Pope Innocent IV. The family legend of the Miridite chieftain preserves the memory of this event. The disruption from Servia, in which the noble family of the Balzen took a prominent part, occurred about 1368, and therefore

Then began a period of Albanian migration, during which large portions of Macedonia, Thessalia, Ætolia and Acarnania were occupied by parties starting from Durazzo. Thence the Albanians spread further to Livadia, Bœotia, Attica, South Eubœa, and the Peloponnese. After the death of Peter Ljoshas, in 1374, John Spata seized the town of Arta. His rule was a period of long struggles with different opponents, which continued almost until his death in 1400. About this time most of the country was conquered by Carlo I. Tocco, who died on July 4th, 1429, and bequeathed what he had won to his nephew Carlo II. Tocco of Cephallenia, who was obliged, however, to cede the town of Janina in 1430 to Murad II., and to acknowledge his supremacy. The process of converting the country to Mohammedanism then began, and has continued till within the last century. It was chiefly the upper classes that embraced Mohammedanism, and for this reason they were able to found native dynasties, which in some cases actually acquired hereditary rule. Of these native pashas of Janina the best known is Ali, who was born in 1741 at Tepeleni, and murdered on February 5th, 1822, in a summer-house on the lake of Janina, by Khurshid Pasha. North Albania, which had become a Servian province, has a history of its own. About the year 1250 it went over to the Catholic Church, as appears from the letters of Pope Innocent IV. The family legend of the Miridite chieftain preserves the memory of this event. The disruption from Servia, in which the noble family of the Balzen took a prominent part, occurred about 1368, and therefore

upper classes that embraced Mohammedanism, and for this reason they were able to found native dynasties, which in some cases actually acquired hereditary rule. Of these native pashas of Janina the best known is Ali, who was born in 1741 at Tepeleni, and murdered on February 5th, 1822, in a summer-house on the lake of Janina, by Khurshid Pasha. North Albania, which had become a Servian province, has a history of its own. About the year 1250 it went over to the Catholic Church, as appears from the letters of Pope Innocent IV. The family legend of the Miridite chieftain preserves the memory of this event. The disruption from Servia, in which the noble family of the Balzen took a prominent part, occurred about 1368, and therefore

**Venetian Help
Against
the Ottomans**

its own. About the year 1250 it went over to the Catholic Church, as appears

after the death of Stefan Dusan in 1355. With the year 1383 begin the invasions of the Ottomans, whom the Albanians opposed with Venetian help. Among these Turco-Albanian struggles those of Skanderbeg stand out prominently. Yban, or John George Kastrioti, was born after 1403, the son of Yban or John Kastrioti, the dynast of Mat, and of Voisava, the Servian princess of Polog. In 1423 he was carried off, with his three brothers, by the Emir Murad II. in the course of an incursion into Southern Albania, kept as a hostage for his father's fidelity, and employed in the royal Seraglio. There he was brought up in the Mohammedan faith, and given the name of Iskander or Alexander Bey, popularised as Skanderbeg. Conspicuous for his handsome form and intellectual powers, he very soon obtained a superior post in the administration. In 1442, upon the death of his father, Yban, the principality was occupied by the emir, and his brothers were killed. The revolts conducted by Arianites Com-

menus, who died in 1461, Depas, or Thopia, and Zenempissa, were crushed by the Turks.

Kastrioti concealed his thirst for vengeance, and remained in the Turkish service as if nothing had occurred. When, however, at the close of 1443 the Hungarians defeated the Turks, George escaped, with 300 Albanians, from the Turkish camp, and seized Kruja by a trick. He re-adopted Christianity, inspired his compatriots to fight for their independence, and occupied the whole district in a month. All the chiefs placed themselves under his

command, and paid tribute for the maintenance of the revolt. Skanderbeg continued the war with vigour, and in 1444, with 15,000 men, he defeated the Turkish army, 40,000 strong under Ali Pasha, and other Ottoman generals in the district of Dibra. In the year 1449 he attacked Murad with 100,000 men, but was defeated and forced to withdraw from Kruja, which he besieged.

After the death of Murad II., in 1451, he remained victorious upon the whole, notwithstanding disunion among the chieftains and several defeats which he


suffered; in the ten years' armistice of May, 1461, Albania was formally ceded to him. He showed great organising ability, and made the country a stronghold of Christianity, and his vigorous services to this faith induced Pope Pius II. to select him as general for his proposed crusade in the year 1464. The result of this movement was a further outbreak of war, and once again the Turks were defeated. But on January 17th, 1468, Skanderbeg




TYPES OF ALBANIAN MOUNTAINEERS

died at Alessio. His son being still a minor, the Turks were victorious. It cost them, however, ten years' fighting before they reconquered Kruja, on June 15th, 1478, and succeeded in bringing the land under their sway in 1479. After that date large bodies emigrated from North Albania, and the majority of the Albanian colonies in Italy belong to that period. Another part of the conquered Albanians preferred to remain upon the spot and accept Mohammedanism, while the remainder fled into the mountains.

KARL PAULI



Temple of Diocletian's palace, now Spalatro Cathedral



Temple of Rome and Augustus at Pola




Courtyard of Diocletian's palace at Spalatro



REMAINS OF THE GREAT ROMAN AMPHITHEATRE AT POLA IN AUSTRIA

MEMORIALS OF THE ROMAN OCCUPATION OF SLAVONIA



THE SOUTHERN SLAV PEOPLES

MOVEMENTS OF A WIDESPREAD RACE AND THEIR ABSORPTION INTO OTHER NATIONS

AS the history of the German races emerges from obscurity only upon their contact with the Greeks and Romans on the Rhine, on the Danube, and in the Mediterranean territories, so also the early history of the Slav races has been preserved by the Græco-Roman civilisation, which by degrees drew all peoples from darkness to light, and stirred them to new life as though by a magician's wand. It was chiefly with the Romans that the Germans came into contact by reason of their geographical position; for similar reasons the Slavs fell within the area of Greek civilisation, though here again by the intervention of the Roman Empire. Slav history is thus connected with Roman history. At the point where Slavs were the immediate neighbours of the Romans their annals reach back to the beginning of our era, though it was not until some 500 years later that the northern Slav race appeared

The Slavs' First Contact With Rome upon the scene. It was upon the Adriatic and in the river system of the Central and Lower Danube that the Slavs first came into contact with the Roman Empire; on the Adriatic and on the classical ground of the Balkan Peninsula, which was saturated with Græco-Roman civilisation, begins our earliest genuine knowledge of the Slavonic peoples.

The races which inhabited the districts on the Danube and southwards to the Peloponnesus are known in modern times as the Slovenians, Serbs, Croatians, and Bulgarians. They form collectively the South Slavonic group. As their origin is obscure, so also is their history confused; it is a history the threads of which are lost in many provinces belonging to different states, and bearing even at the present day different names; a history of tribes in which original divergences led in course of time to sharp distinctions of language, script, morals, religion and history, and which, even in political matters, are opposed as enemies.

Of their earliest history we know little enough. The Slavs were not so fortunate as the Germans, who found a historian in Tacitus as early as the first century. Modern inquirers agree upon the fact that the Slavs appeared in Europe ages ago, together with the other main European races, the Kelts, Greeks, Romans, and Germans, and that they settled in Eastern Europe some where about the spot where they are still to be found as the earliest known inhabitants. The Slavs and their settlements are known to Pliny, Tacitus and Ptolemy. More extensive accounts are given of them by the Gothic historian Jordanes and the Byzantine Procopius, both in the sixth century.

From that time onwards information as to the Slav races becomes more copious. They bear different names. The Greek and Roman authors call them Veneti, while to the Germans they are known as Wends; another form is Antes. Procopius also informs us that the Antes were anciently known as Spores, which has been connected with the name Serb. The second name for the members of this race was Slavus—with variants—the name especially current among the Byzantines. Those tribes who settled in the old Roman provinces of Pannonia, Noricum, Rhætia and Vindelicia were known collectively as Slavs or Slovenians. We hear of them in the sixth century as of some political importance, and as already waging war with the Bavarian race. It is probable that some Slav kingdoms existed in the sixth century in the modern Hungary, Slavonia, Croatia, Carinthia, Styria, Carniola, Görz, Gradiska, and on the coast line.

Bavarians at War with the Slavs century in the modern Hungary, Slavonia, Croatia, Carinthia, Styria, Carniola, Görz, Gradiska, and on the coast line.

From these Slav peoples settled on each side of the Central Danube, on the Drave and Save; many migrated southwards after the fifth and sixth centuries, and settled in the Balkan Peninsula. The

question arises whether they were the first Slav colonists in that district, or whether they found in the Balkan territories an older Slav population known under other names. On the solution of this question depends the problem of the Slav population of the Balkan Peninsula. Moreover, the Slavs from these districts were not the only members of the race who went to the Balkan territories; we find traces of Slav immigrants from Eastern and Northern Europe. Formerly the opinion was general that the immigration of the Slavs into the Balkan territories took place during the period between the fifth and seventh centuries. It is now believed that certain traces of a much earlier migration have been discovered. Evidence for this fact is to be found in the older Slav place-names. This new theory can also be harmonised with the earliest historical evidence before us, and provides a natural explanation of the fact that the Slavs suddenly appeared in these territories in such numbers that even the Byzantine emperors found themselves obliged to take measures to prevent them from over-running Greece. The theory further explains why history has nothing to tell us of any great immigration or occupation of these countries by the Slavs in historical times; only now and again does history speak of the settlement of new bands of colonists by the emperors.

So long, however, as it is impossible to ascertain the nationality of many peoples living in those districts in the Roman period, such as Thracians, Skordiskans, Dacians, Illyrians, and others, so long will this problem remain unsolved. Hence we must first decide whether they are to be regarded as "immigrants" or as "indigenous"; only then can we discuss the question of earlier or later dates. It may be noted that the inhabitants of Bosnia still display certain ethnological peculiarities which are ascribed to the Thracians and Dacians by Roman authors. Thus Pliny states that among the Dacians the men paint their bodies. Tattooing is at the present day customary among the Bosnian people. Other national characteristics also point to some relationship.

However this may be, our first knowledge of the Slavs, both in the Danube territories and in the Balkan Peninsula, is

gained from the Greeks and Romans when they established their empire in those directions. After the fall of the Roman Empire the Slavs inherited the Roman civilisation. The country was covered with towns, trading settlements, and fortresses. These territories were crossed by admirable military roads. In Thracia we find roads as early as the time of Nero, who built post-houses along them. All the emperors paid special attention to the Balkan Peninsula, as it was from there that they gained the most valuable recruits for their legions. No Roman emperor however, spread his glory so widely throughout the countries on each side of the Balkans as the conqueror of Dacia, the great Flavian, Trajan. His memory was and is still preserved among the Slavs, and his name was even added to the list of Slav deities. Bulgarian songs still sing the praises of the "Tsar Trojan." Many place-names still re-echo his name. We constantly find a Trajan's bridge, a Trajan's road, a Trajan's gate, or a Trajan's town. Trajan is also in general use as a proper name. All this is evidence

Goths and Huns in Search of Plunder

for the fact that Trajan must have come into personal contact with the Slavs. As early as the fourth century the provinces of the peninsula were wealthy and densely populated, as we are informed by the contemporary writer Eunapios. A disastrous period began for these territories in the fourth and fifth centuries, when the Goths and Huns attacked and repeatedly devastated them in the course of plundering raids; possibly these assailants included some Slavonic bands. From this time onwards the Slavs on the far side of the Danube began to grow restless, especially in the old province of Dacia, and overflowed the whole of the Balkan Peninsula as far as the Peloponnese; the Slav language was spoken at Taygetos as late as the fifteenth century.

The Byzantine emperors themselves, in their brilliant capital on the Bosphorus, were threatened with attack. At that time the Byzantine emperors had more important cares and heavier tasks than the protection of the Balkan Peninsula from these barbarians, whom they were inclined to despise: their faces, from the moment of the foundation of Constantinople, were turned towards the east. Hence, in spite of repeated defeats, the Slavs were able steadily to advance. Things became even

worse after the death of the great Justinian. John of Ephesus, a Syrian chronicler of the sixth century, relates how "in the third year after the death of the Emperor Justinian and the accession of Tiberius the Victorious, the accursed people of the Slavs entered and overran the whole of Hellas in the neighbourhood of Thessalonica and the whole of Thracia. They conquered many towns and fortresses, ravaged, burned, and devastated the country, and lived in it as freely as at home."

In the year 575 the Avars, one of the peoples of the steppes formerly called in as auxiliaries by the Byzantines, began their invasions in the Byzantine Empire, and carried their plundering raids through the Balkan territories, alone or in alliance with the Slavs. The Slavs in Illyricum and the Alpine territories soon became restless. In Dalmatia, into which they had made incursions as early as the reign of Justinian, they began to advance with great energy about 600, and drove back the Roman power, which the Avars had already enfeebled, to the coast towns, to the

Slavs at the Siege of Constantinople

mountains, and to the islands. The Græco-Roman towns of the interior were for the most part laid waste, while such new towns as Spalatro and Ragusa were founded by the fugitive Romans.

The Slav immigrants soon also learnt the art of seamanship. During the siege of Constantinople in 626, which they undertook in alliance with the Avars, they conducted the attack from the seaward side in small boats. In the year 641 certain Slavs, probably from Epirus, landed on the Italian coasts and plundered Apulia. The Slav pirates traversed the Ionian and Ægean seas, penetrating even to the Cyclades and the coast towns of Asia Minor. Al-Achtal, an Arabian writer of the seventh century, speaks of the fair-haired Slavs as a people well-known to his readers. The enterprise of the Slavs was further facilitated by the fact that the Byzantine Empire was now in difficulties with the Arabs, as it had formerly been with the Persians. Their chief attack was directed about 609 against Thessalonica, the second city in the Byzantine Empire. They repeatedly besieged this town by land and water, and on one occasion were encamped for two years before its gates. The Byzantine authorities were, however, invariably successful in saving this outpost. In the seventh century the Slav

colonisation of the Balkan Peninsula was complete, and no corner remained untouched by them. The Byzantine authors of that period refer to the Balkan territories simply as Slavina.

With regard to the influence which their change of domicile exercised upon the political development of the Slav immigrants and the course of their civilisation, we are reduced to conjecture; generalisation is easier here than detailed proof, but in this case the connection between geographical position and history is unmistakable. The position of the Balkan Peninsula, which brought the southern Slavs nearer than any other members of the race to the Græco-Roman world, was of great importance for their future development. In the course of their historical career the southern Slav tribes wavered for a long time between Italy and Byzantium, until eventually the western portion became incorporated with Roman politics and civilisation, and the eastern portion with the Byzantine world.

For other facts, however, in the life of the southern Slavs, deeper causes must be sought, originating in the configuration of the country. If we regard the peninsula of Hæmus from the hydrographical and orographical point of view, we shall immediately perceive that the configuration of the country has determined the fate of its inhabitants. As the whole of the continent is divided from west to east by a watershed which directs the rivers partly to the Baltic and partly into the Danube, so also this south-eastern peninsula has its watershed which directs the streams partly towards the north and partly southwards. As the northern mountain range has divided the peoples, as well as the waters, which lie on each side of it, so, too, the same fact is apparent in the Balkans. The northern and the southern parts of the peninsula have run a different

course of development with different results. The mountain range of the Balkans, rising to 12,146 feet, is difficult to cross, notwithstanding its thirteen passes, and many of the struggles between the northern and southern Balkan races were fought out on the ridges of these mountains. At the same time it must be said that other ethnographers have drawn different conclusions from these same orographical conditions.

Apart from these facts, the whole peninsula is divided by mountain ranges running in all directions into districts each of which with certain efforts might develop independently of others, as was the case in Western Europe. In ancient Hellas this was the fact which favoured the development of so many independent

Racial Characteristics Preserved

territories, and during the Slav period it also facilitated the rise of several kingdoms. In so far as it is unjust to regard the Balkan Peninsula as part of Eastern Europe, in the strict sense of the term, it is incorrect to call it an East European peninsula. Balkan territories are in every respect more allied to Western Europe, and are somewhat Alpine in character.

Thus the immigrant Slavs were easily able to continue their separate existence in this district, a fact which entirely corresponded with their wishes. Hence the manifold nature of the southern Slav kingdoms; for this reason, too, they were more easily accessible to influences which ran very diverse courses. Diversity of geographical configuration naturally produced diversity of civilisation; some districts lay on the main lines of communication, while others, more difficult of access because more mountainous in character, were left far behind in the march of progress. Differences of climate must also be taken into account.

Upon the whole, the magnificent position of the Balkan territories on the Mediterranean has at all periods favoured the development of the inhabitants. The fact that the Slavs here came into contact with the sea created new conditions of life and fresh needs. They learnt the art of seamanship, and rose to be a commercial nation. The southern Slavs show a different national type from the great mass of Slav nationality; their environment and their neighbours have given them a special national character. The

How did the Slavs Get Their Names?

Slav races which settled in the Balkan Peninsula were numerous. Such different names are known as Severane, Brsjakes or Berzetes, Smoljanec, Sagulates, Welesici, Dragovici, Milinci or Milenzes, Ezerites or Jeserzes, etc. In spite of numerous names applied to various Slav groups, we have practically no guide to tribal identity among them. These names are, however, of little importance for the determination of nationality. Apart from

the fact that they have often been transmitted to us in a corrupt form, their value is purely topographical and in no way ethnographical. They coincide with the names of the lakes, rivers, and mountains about which the tribes settled. The question then arises: did the tribes give their names to these mountains and rivers, or, what is more probable, did they themselves borrow the old names of these rivers, etc? The latter is the case with the names Timok = Timocane, Rorawa = Morawana, Narenta = Narentane, etc. The opinion of the Bulgarian scholar Marin St. Drinov appears to be correct, that at different times different tribes of the northern and western Slavs, or, rather, fragments of them, made settlements here; a further proof of the theory is the divergent dialects of the Bulgarian language.

Historians state that of the Slavs in the western half of the Balkans the Serbs and Croats were the most numerous, and that they alone founded kingdoms of their own side by side with the Bulgarian state. But this may mean no more than that, as in the case of Bohemia, Poland, or Russia, one small tribe was enabled,

The Kingdoms of Serbia and Croatia

by the force of some favourable circumstance, gradually to subdue other tribes, and to include them under its own name, while itself becoming denationalised by the conquered tribes. This may be true of the Serbs and Croats, as we have seen that it was of the Bulgarians. The whole group thus passed into one political unity, and then acquired some meaningless name, possibly taken from a river, mountain, lake, or town of the country, from a national leader, or perhaps from some totally different language. All, then, that can be said is this—that side by side with the Bulgarians in the east of the peninsula two important kingdoms, the Serbian and Croatian, were afterwards formed on the west; though each of these, like the Bulgarians, included several tribes.

The numerous Slav races, then, bore for the moment different names. Three of these, Bulgaria, Croatia, and Serbia, became important; and all others were included under these. The Greeks, however, gave them all collectively the one name of Slaveni, and knew the whole country as Slavina. The Eastern Roman Empire was known as Romania by the

Slavs. This name, however, they applied particularly to the Thracian plain. At the present day the mountain tribes on the borders of the Thracian plain call the inhabitants of the plain Romanec and the women Romanka, although the whole country up to the neighbourhood of Constantinople was entirely under Slav influence.

The Slavs of that period, like most of the European peoples, were at a stage of civilisation which may be described as semi-nomadic. While cattle-rearing and hunting were their main sources of food, agriculture was also carried on, and, as among the Germans, was obligatory upon the women and slaves. An historian informs us that the Avars employed the Slav women for agricultural purposes and in place of draught-animals, which was no innovation on their part. Nomadic tribes periodically deserted the lands which they had ploughed, and removed to virgin soil.

Social and also civic life in the Balkan Peninsula, and probably among all the Slavs, is founded upon the family group or household (the *sadruga*), which has survived there, as in Lithuania and Russia, to the present day, so that it cannot be regarded as a consequence of a Byzantine or Turkish system of taxation. Survivals of household organisation have also been demonstrated to exist among the Germans of that particular period. The married children do not leave the father's house, but remain together under the government of the father or patriarch. All the members of such a family bear the name of the family chief; thus the descendants of Radovan and the people of the district they inhabited were known as Radovanici. When the family had so increased as to make common life impossible some portion broke away from the union, founded a new settlement, took a new name, and formed a new *sadruga*, which, however, remained in connection with the original family and worshipped the same deity, who thus remained a common object of reverence to several branch settlements. A *sadruga* might contain from fifty to sixty members; the chief was known as *starosta*, or *starjesina*, or *gospodar*, or *wladyka*, or *djed*, or *domakin*.

The tribe originated in the union of several families. The family was administered by the elders, who apportioned the

work, performed the service of the gods during the heathen period, and represented the family in its external relations. Community of property made individual poverty impossible; those only who had been expelled from the federation of the family were abandoned. The affairs of the whole tribe were discussed by an

The Slavs assembly of the elders. The district inhabited by a tribe was known as *Zupa*, and its central point, which also contained the shrine of the gods in the heathen period, was a citadel or *grad*. One of the elders or patriarchs was chosen as governor of a *Zupa*, and was then known as the *Zupan*, or, among the Croats, as the *Ban*.

To this social organisation, which continued longer among the Slavs than among the Germans, are to be ascribed all the defects and the excellencies of the Slav tribes. The families did not readily separate from each other, but soon increased to the size of tribes. Hence, cattle-breeding and agriculture were conducted to a considerable extent under a system of communal labour and reached a high pitch of prosperity; consequently they were able easily to colonise and permanently to maintain their hold of wide tracts of country. Other conquering nations, such as the Goths and Huns, poured over the country, leaving behind them only the traces of the devastation which they had caused, and then disappeared, whereas the Slavs settled in the country which they occupied.

A further consequence was that the Slavs were in no need of extraneous labour for agricultural purposes, and therefore slavery was never so firmly rooted an institution among them as among the Germans. The Slavs usually made their slaves members of the household, as is related by the Emperor Mauricius. The Slavs were also able to carry agriculture and manufacture to a higher point. Their standard of morality was higher, owing to their close corporate life and strong family discipline, a fact which also favoured the increase of their population. On the other hand, the Germans, among whom agriculture was performed by slaves, devoted themselves entirely to hunting and military pursuits.

Still this family organisation enables us to explain why the Slavs were not successful as the founders of states. Their

The Slavs
Enjoy
Prosperity

Family Customs
in the Balkan
Peninsula

Hunting
and Military
Germans

common family life, while implying reverence for their patriarch, also produced a democratic spirit which was entirely opposed to any strict form of constitution. No family was willing to become subject to another; all families desired to be equal; one defended the freedom of another. No family chief was willing to

**Byzantine
Historians on the
Slav Character**

acknowledge the supremacy of another, nor need we feel surprise that the blood feud was an institution which flourished upon such soil. Hence, among the Slavs it was far easier for an individual to secure the supremacy over a number of families or tribes if he stood outside them and was unshackled by their discipline.

It is, therefore, no mere chance that kingdoms of any importance could be founded among the Slavs only by foreign tribes, often invited for that purpose. This peculiarity of the Slav character struck the Byzantine historians. "They have abundance of cattle and corn, chiefly millet and rye," says the Emperor Mauricius; "rulers, however, they cannot bear," he says in another place, "and they live side by side in disunion. Independence they love above all things, and decline to undergo any form of subjection." Procopius also relates in the sixth century that the Slavs declined to submit to the rule of any one man, but discussed their common affairs in council. The pride and honour of individual families was to them more important than all else. Only under pressure of direst need did the Slav tribes join in choosing a common leader, and for this reason strangers were easily able to secure dominion over them.

Concerning the religion of the southern Slavs, our sources of information have little to tell us; they were polytheists, their chief deities were the heaven and the heavenly bodies. Of Svantovit and Perun, the deities of the northern Slavs, no traces are to be found. They worshipped

**The Religion
of the
Southern Slavs**

their gods in groves, mountains, and rocks. Victims were offered to them with song. Together with the gods they revered other beings, such as the Vilen or Samovilen (in Thracia, Samodiviy), Budenice, Rojenice, Judi, Vijulici, spirits and female wizards (*brodnice*). Research, however, has not said the last word upon this point, and the personalities of many heathen gods are doubtful.

The districts south of the Danube and north of the Adriatic were under the rule of the Byzantine emperor, though Byzantine rulers were rarely able to exercise any real supremacy. Immigrant tribes from time to time nominally recognised the rights of the Byzantine emperors to these lands, and troubled themselves no further upon the matter. We may even question whether such immigrants always secured the consent of the emperor to their settlement upon Roman territory—a fact which the Byzantine historians continually reassert, for reasons easily intelligible. These peoples came into the country because they met with no resistance, and were the more readily inclined to acknowledge a vague supremacy, as they were themselves incapable of founding states.

It is not so much through their military power as through their diplomatic skill and wealth, and also through the disunion of the Slavs, that the Byzantines were able to retain, at any rate, a formal supremacy over these territories during many troublesome periods. Notwithstanding the great success of the Slav colonisation, the Slavs never succeeded in founding an independent state in the Balkan territories; on this point both they and the Germans were far inferior to the Turco-Tartar races. Apart from the fact that these latter, by their introduction of cavalry service, with the use of the stirrup, possessed more formidable forces and obtained greater military success, they had also the further advantage of possessing the ideal of a strong state, though in roughest outline.

**Where
the Slavs
Failed**

This they had learnt from the civilised nations of Asia. In Europe their appearance exercised some influence upon the military habits and constitutional organisation of the Germanic and Slav world, especially of the Goths; evidence of the fact is the migration of peoples, which was brought about by their arrival. It is not until this that the Germans and Slavs united into larger groups—that is, into states. It was, then, no mere chance that these peoples were the first to found kingdoms in the districts inhabited by the Slavs. They were the Huns, Avars, Bulgars, Chazars, Magyars, Patzinaks, Polovzes, Tartars, and Ottomans.

We know practically nothing of the relations of the Slavs to the state of the Huns. On the other hand, we learn a good deal of the political life of the Slavs in the sixth

century, when the second Turkish people, the Avars, founded a considerable empire in the district occupied by the Slavs. The supremacy of the Avars seems to have extended over the whole district of modern Hungary, Bohemia, and Moravia, the whole of Austria proper, the northern districts of the Elbe and Saale, and also southwards to the Danube over modern Dalmatia and Servia. As they were a people of giants, they were called by their neighbours simply Avars, or giants. Their rule was exceedingly oppressive. Fredegar's chronicle of the seventh century relates that the Slavs were forced to participate in every campaign of the Avars, and to fight, while the Avars drew up before the encampment. Agriculture was the sole work of the Slavs; other historians inform us that they were often used as draught-animals and beasts of burden. The Avars were the first foreign people whose permanent supremacy over the Slavs is historically established for the sixth century.

About the beginning of the seventh century the position of the Slavs improved, in consequence of a great defeat experienced by the Avars in 626. The Avar Khan had undertaken a plundering raid on the Byzantine Empire, apparently as early as 623, and besieged Constantinople, when the Emperor Heraclius began war against the Persians; the campaign must have lasted some years. At this time, about the year 623, the Slavs on the Danube in the districts of Bohemia and Moravia revolted and founded an independent kingdom under the leadership of a certain Samo. When the Avar bands before Constantinople were destroyed in 626, the Avar power was considerably weakened for a whole generation.

The Slav tribes who had been hitherto subdued were now able to assert themselves. They joined Samo, and appointed him their king in 627, the more easily to oppose the attacks of the Langobardi, Bavarians, and Avars. Then was founded the first important independent Slav kingdom known to history; it lay in the western part of the modern Austrian monarchy. Samo maintained his position until 662 (according to others, until 658)—that is to say, for thirty-five years. After his death his empire disappears from the scene. We hear later of the Karantani as waging war with the Bavarians, and finally coming under Bavarian supremacy,

and, in the eighth century, of a Slovenian kingdom in Moravia and of another in Pannonia; whence we may conclude that the kingdom of Samo had undergone a process of disruption.

The foundation of the Avar kingdom was, moreover, of importance to Slav history for another reason. The oppressive rule of the Avars induced the Slavs to abandon their homes in large bodies, to migrate northwards or southwards, and there to occupy new districts. It was, therefore, at that time that the immigration of the Slavs to the Balkan territories began upon a larger scale. In other respects also the Slavs were now able to assert themselves more strongly. The defeat of the Avars in the year 626 had been of decisive importance both for the Slavs and for the Byzantines. Whole provinces now broke away from the Avars and were occupied by the Slavs.

Thus it is no mere coincidence that at this period two numerous Slav tribes appear in the north-west of the Balkan Peninsula. We hear that the Croations, who are said, upon evidence of the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenetos, to have come from the north, defeated the Avars about the year 626, and appeared as independent inhabitants of the country which they occupied. Their territories were bounded on the north by the Save and by a line running parallel to this river from the Unna to the sea, on the west by the Adriatic, on the south by the mouth of the Cettina River and by the Lake of Imoshi, on the south-east by a line of mountains running from this lake to the sources of the Verbas, and finally on the east by the Verbas itself. Their chief centres were Biograd—the modern Zaza Vecchia—and Bihac. These boundaries exist at the present day, though their value is purely ethnographical. It must also be remembered that the whole of the territory

now occupied by the Croations and named after them belonged formerly to the Slovenians, and was called Slovenia. In course of time the Slovenian and Croatian tribes coalesced. Even at the present day a remembrance of these conditions is preserved by the name Slavonia, which denotes part of the Croatian kingdom, by the name of the Slovak tribe in Hungary, and by the old Pannonian-Slovenian kingdom. The Croations thus

Independent Slavonic State Established

The Slavs in the Balkan Territories

Union Between Slovenian and Croatian tribes

absorbed the north-west of Bosnia and Dalmatia as far as Spalatro.

The Serbs soon followed the Croatians across the Save, and, according to the Byzantine chroniclers, demanded and obtained from the emperor a

**Where Servian
Champions
Found Refuge**

place of settlement. They occupied the modern Bosnia with the exception of the

Croatian portion, which is still known as Turco-Croatia. To them also belonged the greater part of Herzegovina, Southern Dalmatia, Northern Albania, Montenegro, Old Servia (Novi-Bazar), the northern districts of the Prizrend pashalik, and the modern Servia. At the present day we find the Serbs in these territories. Here they formed several larger and smaller principalities, mutually independent, known as Zupanates.


To begin with the most southern, we have the principality of Zeta or Duklja—from Dioclea, which is named after the birthplace of the Emperor Diocletian. This was the original home of the ruling family of the Nemanjids, under whose supremacy Servia afterwards rose to the height of her power. This district was at all times a place of refuge for the champions of Servian independence. It was here that Montenegro developed, and succeeded in maintaining her freedom until our own days; it was only during the blood-stained period of Turkish supremacy that she lost some part of her independence.

From Cattaro to Ragusa extended Travunia or Konavlia, more or less corresponding with the area of the modern Trebinje in Herzegovina. From Ragusa to the Gulf of Stagno and inland as far as Narenta extended Zachluma, thus embracing a portion of Herzegovina about the Gatzko and Nevesinje. Neretva, or Paganja, extended from the gulf of Stagno to the mouth of the Cettina. The inhabitants, known as

Neretshans or Pagans, because for a long time they declined to accept Christianity, were dreaded pirates, and often fought victoriously against Venice.

To the east of Zeta, Travunia, and Zachluma lay Servia proper, the most extensive province of all, nearly corresponding to the modern Servia except for the fact that it included Bosnia, which broke away from it in course of time. Among the Zupanates belonging to Servia special mention may be made of that of Rasha or Rassa, the modern Novi-Bazar, known as Rascia in the mediæval sources

**The Slavs
Lose Their
Nationality** for the history of Western Europe. This Croatian and Servian district, the modern Istria, Bosnia, Servia, Dalmatia, Montenegro, Albania, Herzegovina—roughly a third of the Balkan Peninsula—formed the Roman province of Dalmatia, with Salona as a central administrative point; under the Byzantine Empire




SPECIMENS OF SLAVONIC JEWELLERY

these respective points bore the same name. The Slavs extended from this point over the whole peninsula, but were there to some extent deprived of their nationality. Only in Macedonia did they maintain their position, although the Bulgarian race was here again in predominance. The Croatian and Servian tribal principalities of the north-west, the chieftains of which were known as Zupans, united only in case of great danger under a high Zupan. After long struggles the position of high Zupan became permanent, and the foundation of a more important empire was thus laid. Accurate information concerning the Croatian and Servian races is, however, wanting until the second half of the eighth century, and especially until the final destruction of the Avar kingdom by Charlemagne.

When the Avar supremacy was approaching its fall, another Finno-Ugrian people, the Bulgarians, crossed the Danube, entered upon a series of conquests among the Slavs of the peninsula, and even threatened Constantinople. Their immigration is of special importance for the history of the Balkan Slavs and of the Byzantine Empire. Neither the Byzantines nor the Slavs were able to offer any resistance. The Slavs, who lacked any bond of union, repeatedly surrendered. As early as the end of the seventh century a Bulgarian state was founded in the north-east of the peninsula, and not only maintained its position against the Greeks, but also seriously threatened the old imperial city. Until 627 the Persian danger had threatened Byzantium; this was followed by the

Arab danger in 750; and now the young Bulgarian kingdom becomes prominent among the enemies of the Byzantine Empire. The boundaries of the new state rapidly increased, and by degrees most of the Balkan Slavs were federated under its supremacy. Under Bulgarian leadership the Slav tribes gradually coalesced to form one people. The higher civilisation of the



THE BEGINNING OF SLAVONIC LITERATURE

The light of religion and literature came to the Slavs from Byzantium, the apostles Constantine and Methodius, who went to Moravia in 863, inventing a script for the writing of the Slav language and translating the Gospels for the natives. This script is known as Glagolitic, and the above is a page from the beginning of St. Luke's Gospel in an ancient Glagolitic manuscript.

Slavs, however, resulted eventually in the imposition of their nationality upon the Bulgarians, who were much inferior in numbers, amounting at most to thirty or fifty thousand, including women and children; it was only their name that these

Bulgarians Adopt the Slav Language warlike conquerors gave to the state and the people. A couple of centuries later there were no longer any distinctions between Slavs and Bulgarians; all were called Bulgarians but spoke the Slav language.

About the period of the Bulgarian immigration, which closes for the moment the migrations of peoples south of the Danube, the Balkan Peninsula displayed a most motley mixture of populations. Side by side with the Romans and the Greeks, the latter of whom proudly called

themselves Romaioi, were the Slavs, who formed the majority, and among them for a considerable period remnants of the old inhabitants, the Thracians, from whom or from the Illyrians the Albanians are supposed to be descended. There are also to be found remnants of Goths and Gepids; in Croatia there were remnants of the Avars, and to

Founding the Bulgarian State these in the seventh century were added the Finno-Turkish tribe of the Bulgarians. The process of unification then began. Many tribes were absorbed by others, with the result that new nationalities were formed, such as the Roumanians. By the founding of the Bulgarian state and the imposition of the Slav nationality on the Bulgarians, the Slavs became preponderant both politically and ethnographically. Formerly the individual tribes lived in somewhat loose dependence upon Byzantium, and were the more easily able to preserve their nationality; now any member of the Slav kingdom was forced sooner or later to accept the Slav civilisation.

The Avar people had brought disaster upon the southern Slav tribes, whereas the immigration of the Bulgarians secured the predominance of the Slavs in the peninsula. The political life of the Balkan Slavs now centres round three main points—in the east the Bulgarian kingdom, in the centre the Servian, and in the west the Croatian principalities. Of Byzantine supremacy hardly a trace remained, except that a scanty tribute was transmitted to Byzantium. Only when some powerful ruler occupied the throne of Constantinople were the reins drawn tighter or did the flame of war blaze up. At a later period the dependence upon Byzantium came to an end. Some influence upon the political affairs of the north-west portion of the Balkan Peninsula was exercised by the appearance of Charles the Great, who waged

Conquests of Charles the Great war with the Eastern empire in 788 concerning certain Byzantine possessions in Italy. He conquered both Istria and Dalmatia, and the Slovenians between the Drave and the Save paid him tribute until 812, when he renounced his claims to the districts extending to the Drave, under a peace with Byzantium. At the present day monuments dating from the period of Charles' supremacy over these countries are to be found in the museum at Agram.

The position of the Slav territories brought with it the consequence that Christianity was imposed upon them from three sides: on the one hand from Aquileia by Italian priests; on the northern side from Salzburg by Germans; and, finally, from Byzantium by Greek missionaries. There were other isolated attempts, but these may be neglected.

The original dissemination of Christian doctrine is here, as in other cases, wrapt in obscurity. Some missionaries came from the Frankish kingdom. Thus Columban, according to the narrative of his biographer, Jonas, after his expulsion from Burgundy by King Theoderic about 610, is said to have conceived the plan of preaching the Gospel to the Slavs in Noricum. About 630 Bishop Amandus, of Utrecht, entering the kingdom of Samo, determined to win the martyr's crown. He was followed about 650 by St. Emmeram with a priest, by name Vitalis, who was learned in the Slav language.

More fruitful in result was the activity of Bishop Rupert, of Worms, who founded a bishopric and monastery in the Noric

The Good Work of Bishop Virgilius Juvavia, Salzburg. Henceforward the diocese of Salzburg undertook the conversion of the Alpine Slavs, naturally under the protection of the Bavarian dukes. Especially good service was done by Bishop Virgilius, who occupied the see of Salzburg between 745 and 785. He sent out capable missionaries to Karantania and built churches there. The princes of Karantania themselves saw the necessity for accepting the Christian faith; Chotimir invited Bishop Virgilius to his court, though with no result.

The mission was energetically supported by Duke Tassilo II. (748-788) of Bavaria, the first duke to rule over Karantania. He cherished the idea of shaking off the Frankish yoke, and looked to Karantania for support, which he thought could best be gained by the dissemination of Christianity. He founded monasteries, or gave leave for such foundations under the express obligation of continuing the missions. Such foundations were Innichen and Kremsmünster. After the subjugation of Tassilo by the Franks in 788, the work of conversion was completed under Bishop Arno. He received the necessary full powers from the emperor and Pope, and completed the organisation of the Church by appointing a local bishop, by name

Theodoric. Once again it was a Wendish prince, Ingo, who supported his efforts.

The patriarch of Aquileia suddenly raised an objection to these proceedings, alleging that those districts belonged to his own diocese. It is true that we know nothing of any missionary energy displayed by Aquileia in that quarter. Yet missions there must have been from Aquileia, for in 810 Charles the Great was able to secure a compromise on terms which made the Drave a frontier line for the two claimants. Thus thenceforward the Slavs were divided between two dioceses.

The whole position was altered in the course of the ninth century, when Byzantium took the work of conversion seriously in hand. The Slav nation had for a long time opposed the first Christian missions because these were supported by their princes; when, however, they observed that by the acceptance of Christianity they had lost their freedom, they changed their opinion. If it were necessary to accept Christianity at all, it was better to take it from a quarter where no danger of subjugation threatened. This was only possible

by adherence to the Greek Church. The East Roman Empire had in course of time fallen into enmity with Rome,

a dissension which extended to ecclesiastical affairs. In the ninth century Byzantium had resolved to act decisively against the West. From that period her influence increased and extended in a wide stream over the Balkan Peninsula. The Greek language, Greek writing and coinage, Greek art and literature, Greek law and military science, were disseminated among the Slavonic tribes; and of even greater importance was the missionary activity of the East Roman Church.

Of decisive importance for the fate of the Balkan Slavs and for the Slav nationality in general, indeed for Eastern Europe as a whole, was the moment when the patriarchal chair of Constantinople was occupied by Photius, one of the greatest scholars that the Byzantine state produced. Apart from the fact that he strove with all his might to further the revival of Greek antiquity and brought Byzantine culture to its zenith, his ecclesiastical policy was actuated by hostility to the Roman chair, and brought about the official division of the Byzantine Church from Rome. He won over many nations and vast tracts of country for the Byzantine

Church. During the imperial period, the Roman Empire had been divided into East and West only in respect of politics; this division was now superseded by the ecclesiastical separation. The whole of the East, with its wide northern territories, occupied by the Slavs henceforth recognised the predominance of the Byzantine

Church and sided with Constantinople in the great struggle which now began. Of the movements called forth in Europe at that time and for centuries later by the action of Photius, we can form but a vague idea in view of the scantiness of our records. A rivalry of unprecedented nature between the two worlds broke out along the whole line, and the great and vital point at issue was the question, which of the churches would be successful in winning over the yet unconverted Slavs.

To the action of this great patriarch alone the Byzantine Church owes the success which it achieved over the Romans in this struggle. In vain did Rome make the greatest efforts to maintain her position; success was possible for her only when German arms were at her disposal. Even to-day the Slavs reproach the Germans for attempting to secure their subjugation under the cloak of the Christian religion. But the German emperor and princes were only pieces upon the great chessboard, moved by unseen hands from Rome. At a later period the German princes marched eastward, not to convert, but to conquer.

Almost at this time two Slav princes sent ambassadors to Byzantium and asked that the work of conversion might begin; they were the Moravian Ratislav and the Bulgarian Boris. It is possible that the prince of the Khazars had done the same two years earlier. Photius began the work of conversion with great prudence. Two brothers from Thessalonica, learned in the Slav language and experienced in missionary work, were chosen to preach the Gospel to the Slavs. It was decided,

however, definitely to separate from Rome the nationalities won over to the Greek Church,

and for this purpose Byzantium, in opposition to the Roman use, which allowed the liturgy to be recited only in Latin, laid down the principle that each people might conduct public worship in its own language. Thus, outside the three sacred languages, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, the Slav was

recognised as of equal importance, as had been at an earlier period the Syrian, Coptic, and Armenian tongues.

Constantine and Methodius, the two Slav apostles, went forth to their destination, Moravia, in 863. They invented a special form of writing for the Slavs, that which is nowadays known as Glagolitic ;

**Apostles who
Founded Slavonic
Literature**

they translated the sacred books into the Slavonic tongue, and thus became the founders of Slavonic

literature. They organised the Slav Church, founded schools, had churches built, and travelled over the whole country, everywhere carrying the light of civilisation and of the new religion. "And full of delight were the Slavs when they heard the wonders of God in their own language," says the old Slav legend concerning Methodius.

When, shortly afterwards, divine service was recited in the Slav language in the churches of Moravia and Pannonia, the German clergy were stricken with fear, as they now saw that the East, the field of their future missionary activity, was lost to them. They expostulated forthwith both to the German emperor and to Rome, enlarging upon the danger which might threaten both powers from this side. In order that their work might not be checked at its outset, the two apostles went to Rome to explain their position and to gain confirmation for their work. Upon their return journey they entered the Pannonian kingdom at Lake Platten, where Kozel was ruler. The two brothers were able to win over the prince to the Gospel so entirely that he began to read the Slav books and ordered several youths to do the same. When the apostles of the Slavs had won over the Pope to their cause, and Methodius was made Bishop of Moravia, Kozel sent an embassy to Rome requesting that the Pope would also place his principality under the new bishop. The Pope thereupon raised Methodius to the position

**Croatians and
the Christianity
of the Slavs**

of archbishop, with a seat in Syrmium, and united the new principality to the old diocese of Syrmia.

Croatia on the Save was also placed under this Pannonian archbishopric. The Slav liturgy then extended with marvellous rapidity, and the prestige of the Bavarian clergy sank so low that their arch-priest was forced to return to Salzburg in 870.

The Bulgarian prince Boris hesitated for a long time between Rome and Byzantium ;

and it is doubtful whether his final decision in favour of Byzantium was not dictated by the political object which had influenced Ratislav, the prospect of securing his independence of Germany. Apart from the advantage conferred by the Slav liturgy, his action was decided by the further fact that so many Greek Christians were contained among his people that the acceptance of Greek Christianity seemed inevitable. Finally, he may also have acted in the interests of that Bulgarian policy which aimed at the conquest of Constantinople. For the conversion of the Bulgarians, the advice of both missionaries seems to have been sought. At the same time the Croats accepted the Slav form of Christianity. It was now impossible for the Servian tribes to stand aloof. We do not, however, know when they came over. Some are said to have accepted Christianity as early as the seventh century under the Emperor Heraclius ; but it was not until a new band of scholars and priests came into the country from Pannonia that the Slav Church became capable of development. After the death of Methodius, in 885, the Slav Church was

**Period of
Literary
Activity**

no longer able to maintain its position in Pannonia ; Svato-pluk, the successor of Ratislav, drove out the disciples of Methodius and placed his country under the German Church. The Slav clergy from Moravia found a hospitable reception in Bulgaria, and their activity created the Bulgarian Slav literature. The Bulgarian throne was then occupied by Symeon, the son of Boris (893-927), who was able to turn the knowledge and the powers of the new arrivals to the best account. He lost no time in commanding Bulgarian translations of the Greek authors, ecclesiastical as well as secular. Thus, for instance, the monk Gregor translated the chronicle of John Malala, and added to it the Old Testament history and a poem upon Alexander ; fragments only survive of the Greek original, whereas the Bulgarian translation contains the whole work.

The existence of a Slav literature, the most important of that day in Europe after the Græco-Roman, won over the whole of the Slav nationality to the Byzantine Church and facilitated its conversion. The remaining Balkan Slavs now gave in their adherence to Bulgarian literature, and Bulgaria became the middle-man of culture between Constantinople

and the northern Slavs. The Balkan Slavs gave the watchword to the other members of their great nationality. The connection of the Slavs with Greek civilisation was secured by the fact that the above-mentioned Constantine, Bishop of Velica (or Bishop Clemens of Drenovica), replaced the inconvenient Glagolitic script by an adaptation of Greek writing made for the Slavs and augmented by the addition of several new signs representing sounds peculiar to the Slav language. This was the Cyrillic writing.

A common literature, civilisation, and religion brought Greeks and Slavs closer together, until they formed one group united by a common civilisation and divided from the West. This event was of decisive influence upon the future of the whole Slav nationality. The southern Slavs in particular inherited all the advantages and all the defects of the Greek character, nor was it politically alone that they shared the fate of the Byzantine Empire. The sloth, the indifference, the stagnation, and the other defects which characterised the Greek Church are consequently reflected in the society and culture of the Slavs at every turn. The want of organising power and of discipline which characterises the Greek Church has permanently influenced the political

life of the Slavs. For the Slavs were devoid of any leading political idea, and clung to the principles of the slowly decaying Byzantine Empire. Divided as they were into a number of tribes opposed to union, they were bound, sooner or later, to fall a prey to some powerful conqueror.

The only bond of union between the Slav races in the Balkan Peninsula was Christianity and the Græco-Slav civilisation. The Bulgarian kingdom advanced with rapid strides, as it rose to power towards the gates of Byzantium, until it entered upon a mighty struggle with the Emperor John Tzimisces in 971 and was finally conquered in 1018 by Basil II.; meanwhile, the history of the Croatian and Servian tribes comes but slowly into view from the historical background of the north-west. The part played by the Servian and Croatian Zupans is but very small. For the purpose of maintaining their independence they wavered between Bulgaria and Byzantium, ranging themselves now on one side, now on the other. Many Servian and Croatian principalities were subjugated by the Bulgarians. After the conquest of Bulgaria they were forced to join the Byzantine kingdom, and to secure themselves against aggression from this side they turned to Rome.



SERVIAN BANDITS RESTING AT A MOUNTAIN INN



CROATIA AND ITS WARRIOR RACE

THE WORLD-RENOWNED REPUBLIC OF RAGUSA

THE history of Croatia begins at an earlier date than that of Servia; especially is this true of the coast land occupied by the Croats, which was also known to the Italians as Slavonia. The year 634 is the date generally given to the immigration of the Croats. They were subdued by the Franks, and after the disruption of the Carolingian Empire they submitted to the Greek Emperor Basil I. about 877. About the year 900 they once again secured their independence. Prince Muntimir is said to have laid the foundation of this success. Among the Croats of the coast land we find an independent prince as early as the ninth century, by name Borna, who bears the title Dux Liburniæ et Dalmatiæ. The central point of this duchy lay in the North about Klis, Nona, Zara Vecchia, and Knin. In the ninth century Christianity was introduced with the Slav liturgy and the

Introduction of Christianity

Glagolitic script, and in 879 a bishopric was founded at Nona by the duke Branimir. The Glagolitic script was forbidden to the Roman clergy by the Synod of Spalatro in 924, but was afterwards allowed by Innocent IV. in 1248, and is still in use in the churches in that district. In 1898 Pope Leo XIII. issued fresh regulations concerning the use of Glagolitic and of the Slav liturgy in Dalmatia and the coast land.

The Servian chieftain Michael did not secure the title of king from Gregory VII. until the eleventh century, whereas the Croatian chief Timislav was granted that title, also by Rome, as early as 926. In other respects the balance of power between Croatia and Servia on the frontier line was continually changing; at one time Servian tribes were subjugated by the Croats, and at other times Croatian districts were conquered by the Serbs.

In the tenth century Croatia became a formidable power. The islands and coast towns occupied by the Roman population paid yearly tribute to the Croatian princes with the consent of the East

Roman emperor, in order to secure immunity from attacks upon their trade; the Venetians also paid tribute to the Croats for the same reason, down to the end of the tenth century. According to Constantine Porphyrogenetos (about

Croatia's Strong Army and Navy

950), the Croats, under the princes Krjesmir and Miroslav, the successors of Timislav, were able to place in the field 100,000 infantry and 60,000 cavalry, and possessed 180 ships of war. Soon, however, Venice grew so strong that the payment of tribute was refused by the Doge Peter II. Orsello, and in the year 1000 he conquered the Croats and Narentanes and assumed the title of Duke of Dalmatia; this was the first occasion on which Venice acquired possession of the Dalmatian coast. In order to save their throne the Croatian ruling family formed an alliance with the commercial republic. Kresimir, the legitimate heir to the throne, married Hicela, the daughter of the Doge, and bore the title of King of Croatia and Dalmatia from the year 1059.

These events aroused anxiety and enmity in the Hungarian court, which found itself forestalled in its attempts to secure a footing on the Adriatic Sea and to conquer the coast of Dalmatia; the Hungarians also recognised that the Venetian republic had become a dangerous rival. The house of Arpad succeeded in negotiating a marriage between the daughter of King Geisa I. and the Croatian duke, Svonimir, who at that time, 1076, had been crowned king by the papal legate of Gregory VII., and had thus admitted

Croatia Absorbed by Hungary

his position as a vassal of the papal chair. In 1088, when Svonimir died without children, his widow is said to have called in her brother Ladislaus. He conquered the interior of Croatia in 1091, but was unable to advance to the sea, because Hungary was herself threatened at that time by the Cumanians. He entrusted the government of the conquered district

to his nephew Almus. Croatia thus became an appanage of the Hungarian Empire, whose fate it henceforward shared. Hungary was thus necessarily forced into hostility with Venice, as it was committed to an attempt to conquer the Dalmatian coast, then in Venetian hands. From this time forward that part of Croatia

**Dalmatia
an Apple
of Discord**

lying next the sea—Dalmatia—formed for centuries the apple of discord between Hungary and Venice. If Byzantium sought to assert her rights, she would have had to compose the quarrels of Hungary and Venice.

While the Servian state succeeded in maintaining its independence until 1389, the excitable, military, and highly gifted Croatian people had been made tributary to their neighbours as early as the end of the eleventh century; while Servia had been able easily to enrich herself at the expense of the declining power of Byzantium and Bulgaria, Croatia had to deal with the rising state of Hungary and with Venice, at that time the first commercial power in Europe. Notwithstanding these differences, Croatia would probably have emerged victoriously from the struggle, had she not been weakened by internal dissensions. The interior of Croatia remained united to Hungary. Venice and Hungary struggled for a long time and with varying success to secure the mastery of the Croatian seaboard which was known as Dalmatia. In the fourteenth century the Bosnian king, Tvrtko, had secured a temporary supremacy over Dalmatia and assumed the title of "Rex Croatiae et Dalmatiae." Even after his death in 1391 Bosnia retained her hold of part of Southern Dalmatia, which thenceforward bore the name of Herzegovina. In the fourteenth century other claimants for the possession of Dalmatia appeared in the Angevin dynasty of Naples, until King Ladislaus sold the province of Zadar

**Venice
Secures
Dalmatia**

to Venice for 100,000 ducats, and thus decided the struggle for Dalmatia in favour of Venice; after that period many states voluntarily submitted to the Venetian rule, while Hungarian influence steadily decreased.

The consequence was that these two related tribes entered upon divergent careers. While the Serbs came under Byzantine influence and accepted the Greek Church and civilisation, Croatia,

united to the West, lived under wholly different conditions. The frontier between the Servian and Croatian settlements is, therefore, the frontier between the East and West of Europe, between the Greek and the Roman worlds.

Different courses of development were also followed by the two parts of Croatia. While the coast line, within the area of the Roman world, shared in Roman culture and economic development, the interior of Croatia remained part of Hungary, and steadily declined in consequence.

In religious matters also the two parts of the country were divided when Ladislaus the Saint, of Hungary, founded a bishopric in Agram and made it subordinate to the archbishopric of Gran, in 1095. In the year 1153 Agram was raised to the dignity of an independent bishopric. In the diocese of Agram the Slavonic ritual was gradually driven out by the Latin, though the Slavonic maintained its ground in Dalmatia, after Innocent IV. had recognised its equality with the Latin ritual in 1248. At the present day the Slav liturgy is allowed throughout the diocese

**Croatia a
Catholic
Country**

of Zeng, while in the rest of Croatia only the epistles and the gospels may be read in the Slav tongue. In the Hungarian portion of Croatia adherents of the Eastern Church certainly maintained their existence, and even multiplied during the Turkish period after Suleiman II., owing to the influx of Bosnian and Servian fugitives; at the present day there are in the country thirteen monasteries of the eastern Greek Church. Notwithstanding this fact, Croatia has remained a distinctly Catholic country.

Among the towns, the most important, with the exception of the ancient Sissek, which dates from Roman times, was Kreutz, where the Hungarian king Koloman is said to have concluded his pact with the Croatians in 1097, and where, at a later period, the Croatian national assembly was accustomed to meet. With these exceptions, town life developed comparatively late. For example, Varasdin secured municipal privileges from Andreas II. in 1209. Bela IV. was the first to promote town life by granting new privileges, a step to which he was chiefly forced by the devastations of the Mongols in 1224. At the head of the Croatian government was a ban; this dignitary was originally



GENERAL VIEW OF THE ANCIENT CITY-STATE OF RAGUSA, IN DALMATIA

This, one of the most picturesque towns on the Dalmatian coast, had a long and remarkable history in the Middle Ages as an independent city-state under republican government. Its merchants held an extensive trade throughout the east.

equivalent to a viceroy, and has retained his prestige to our own days, notwithstanding all the restrictions which the office has undergone. In the course of time the ban was appointed by the king, on the proposal of the estates, and was solemnly inducted into Agram by their deputies, accompanied by 1,000 riders, the "army of the banate." Holding in his right hand the sceptre as the sign of his knightly power, and in his left hand the standard as the sign of military power, he took his oath to the estates in the Church of St. Mark, according to the formula dictated by the royal plenipotentiary. The powers of the ban were great. He was able to call an assembly of the estates on his own initiative, without previously securing the king's consent. He presided over the national assembly and signed its decrees.

He was the supreme judge, from whose decisions appeals might be made only to the king; he was the commander-in-chief of the collective Croatian troops, and in time of war led the army of the banate in person; coins were even struck bearing his name. In view of these facts, Lewis the Great divided Croatia between several bans in 1359; this, however, was only a temporary expedient, introduced to

provide the strong frontier government required to meet the Turkish danger.

The chief legislative body of Croatia was from ancient times the national assembly, which, previous to the union with Hungary, was summoned by the king, and after that union by the ban. It was originally held in Dalmatia, and after the transference of the central power northwards in some one or other of the Croatian towns, such as Agram, Kreutz, Warasdin, Cakathurn, or Krapina. The most important powers of the Croatian assembly enabled it to deal with questions of legislation, taxation, the levying of troops, the choice of officials, and administrative details. The attempts of Lewis the Great to unite the financial administration of Croatia with that of Hungary resulted in the revolt of Croatia after his



SEAL OF THE REPUBLIC OF RAGUSA

death; the plan was consequently abandoned by his son-in-law, King Sigismund.

Notwithstanding these privileges, Croatia never ran a steady course of development. It was a frontier land, and was involved, to its detriment, in every war. Hence it required another kind of supervision than that which Hungary was able to provide. Croatia suffered more particularly in the Turkish period, and it

then became wholly obvious that Hungary was unequal to the task of administering the country. The land became utterly desolate, and the taxable wealth of Croatia steadily declined. At a former period the county of Kreutz contained some 12,000 taxable houses, while in the sixteenth century there were hardly 3,000 to be

Turks Oust Venetians from Dalmatia

found in the whole country. In the Venetian province of Dalmatia towns and districts enjoyed a certain

measure of self-government under voivodes, rectors, and priors. Corporate life in the towns had flourished on the Adriatic since Roman times. Prosperity increased, and civilisation consequently attained a high stage of development. However, the Venetian supremacy came to an end after 1522; the decisive blow was struck in 1539, when the Ottomans seized the greater part of Dalmatia, while Venice was able to maintain her hold only of the islands. At that period Turkey was at the height of her power. Hungary herself was conquered, and in Pesth the crescent waved above the cross after 1541. Thus both parts of Croatia shared the same fate.

Only one small municipality on the extreme south of the Dalmatian coast land was able to maintain a measure of independence. This was the commercial Slav republic of Ragusa. The district of the modern Ragusa coincides with that of the Greek city-state of Epidaurus, the last mention of which occurs in the letters of Gregory I. During the Byzantine period it formed a part of the Thema of Dalmatia. After the immigration of the Slavs, the Romans, according to the account of Constantine VII. Porphyrogenetos, were driven out of the town, and founded hard by upon an inaccessible rock a new town, known in Latin as *Ragusium*, and in Slav as *Dubrovnik*. It was the seat of the Byzantine strategos, and of the bishop who was subordinate to the archbishop in Spalatro. In the twelfth century an independent archbishopric was founded here. The "Gens *Ragusæ*" became more and more independent, and at the close of the eleventh century joined the Normans in fighting against Byzantium.

At the head of this city-state of Ragusa there appeared in the twelfth century "consules" and "comites," although the district was nominally under the rule of the Byzantine "Dux *Dalmatiæ et Diocliæ*." The

town was even forced to wage war against Venice, which would have been glad to occupy Dalmatia and Ragusa. After the death of the Emperor Manuel in 1180, the general confusion of political affairs enabled Stefan Nemanja of Servia to threaten the district; the town then placed itself under the protection of the Norman kings of the Two Sicilies. After the conquest of Constantinople by the Crusaders in 1204 the Venetian fleet appeared before Ragusa, which was then forced to acquiesce in the supremacy of Venice. The people of Ragusa were left in possession of their old city government, only from this time forward a Venetian "comes" resided in the town. Under Venetian supremacy the relations of Ragusa and Servia became particularly friendly; and the rulers of the latter country several times presented the republic with important grants of land. After the death of Dusan, in the period of the war between the Magyars and Venetians for Dalmatia, Venice was forced, in 1358, to renounce her claims to the whole district between Quarnero and Albania; and Ragusa came

Great Trade of Ragusa

under Hungarian rule, until, in 1526, it was incorporated with Turkey after the battle of Mohacs. The life of the town had long ago lost its national characteristics. Shut in between two Servian tribes, the Zaclumians and Narentanes, it was open to such strong Slav influence that at the beginning of the eleventh century the Roman element was wholly in the minority.

This Slav commercial republic was known throughout the East by reason of its extensive trade; even the Arab geographer Edrisi mentions Ragusa. The series of commercial treaties concluded by the town begins with an agreement with Pisa in 1169; this was followed by one with the Ban Kulin of Bosnia in 1189, and by another with Bulgaria in 1230. Especially favourable were the privileges granted by the rulers of Servia, in return for which the people of Ragusa paid a yearly tribute—a thousand purple cloths and fifty ells of scarlet cloth every year on the day of St. Demetrius. To Stefan Dusan they paid only five hundred purple cloths, and even this he renounced in favour of the monastery of Chilandar, on Mount Athos, a regulation which remained in force until the French put an end to the republic in 1808. Bosnia received five hundred

CROATIA AND ITS WARRIOR RACE

purple cloths, and Hungary five hundred ducats. Almost the whole trade of the Balkan Peninsula was in the hands of the Ragusans, who outstripped even the Venetians and Genoese. Colonies from Ragusa were to be found in many Servian and Bulgarian towns. The flag of Ragusa was to be seen on every sea, and in every important town of the East its factories and consulates were to be found. It was not until the period of Turkish supremacy that the commerce of Ragusa began to decay, notwithstanding the various charters in the Slav language which it received from the sultans; it was forced, however, to pay a tribute of 12,500 ducats.

The prosperity of this little state naturally caused a considerable increase of culture in the fifteenth century. Mathematics and astronomy, and, later on, literature, and especially Slav poetry, were here brilliantly represented. Ragusa also exercised a strong influence upon the culture of the other Slavs in the Balkan Peninsula, and was known as the Slavonic Athens.

During the Turkish period Hungarian Croatia suffered nearly the same fate as Servia; the country became desolate. When, however, the Croats, independently



PEASANT TYPES OF CROATIA

of Hungary, raised the house of Hapsburg to the throne of Croatia in 1527, the country became of primary importance in Austrian politics; Austrian rulers recognised its value as a bulwark against the Turks. The warlike Croats soon became the most valuable support of the empire, not only against the Ottomans, but also against other powerful enemies in the west of Europe.

The fortification of the country began in the sixteenth century. The castles and citadels of the Croatian magnates were transformed into fortresses, and other strongholds were also placed along the frontier at important points. Such of the population as still remained in the district were then called in for military service, and fugitives from the neighbouring Turkish countries met with a hearty reception in Croatia.

Thus by degrees the deserted territory was repopulated. As, however, Croatia was not herself equal to these military burdens, and as, upon the other hand, neighbouring countries gained all the advantage from the military occupation of the frontier, it was only reasonable that Carniola, Styria, and Carinthia should contribute their share of the expense. Such was the beginning of the Croatian military frontier;



CROATIAN PEASANT WOMEN

at an early period Lewis I. had created a "capitanate" in Zeng, and Matthias Corvinus had settled fugitives upon the frontier.

The Archduke Charles performed valuable service in organising the military frontier of Styria. He constructed the

Fortifying the Frontiers great fortresses of Karlstadt, in 1579, and Varasdin, in 1595. The land on the far side of the Kulpa to the Adriatic Sea and

the Slavonic frontier to the Save were thus fortified and divided into two generalates; one was the Croatian, or Karlstadt, frontier, the other the Slavonic, Windish, or Varasdin frontier. The point chiefly kept in view in constructing these fortifications was the defence of the waterways, especially the lines of the Save, Kulpa, and Drave, which had long been used by the Turks. Although by the Croatian constitution the ban was the commander-in-chief of all the troops on foot in Croatia, yet the military organisation of the frontier tended to make that district immediately dependent upon the empire; both frontiers were under the administration of the Council of War at Graz.

The Croatian estates certainly objected, for they invariably regarded the military frontier as an integral part of Croatia; they secured the concession that upon occasion the authorities upon the frontier would be ordered to act in concert with the ban.

To begin with, the foreign commanders did not readily submit to these arrangements; apart from the question of the ban, the estates of Carniola and Styria also supported the independence of the military frontier, for the reason that the frontier had already become a noman's land, and was retained only by great sacrifices on the part of the monarchy, while Croatia had lost her right to it.

Notwithstanding the Croatian claims, the military frontier became a special crown land, and obtained rights

Military Service in Croatia of its own from the time of Ferdinand III. In accordance with these rights the peasants

were free, and subject to the emperor alone. From the age of eighteen every frontier inhabitant was liable to military service, and was obliged to keep himself ready to take up arms for defence. The land was divided into districts or "capitanates." Every parish chose an overseer.

All the parishes composing a "capitanate" chose their common judge, who, like the parish overseer, was obliged to be confirmed in office by those under his command. As the Greek Church numbered most adherents among the population, it obtained equal rights with the Catholic Church.

The Croatian estates organised the country between the Kulpa and Unna on similar principles, and as the ban was here commander-in-chief, this frontier was known as the frontier of the banate. In the peace of Karlovitz in 1699, when the districts of Croatia and Slavonia, once occupied by the Turks, were given back, a third generalate was instituted in Essek for the newly freed Slavonia; however, in 1745 three Slavonic counties were separated and handed over to the civil administration.

The independence of the military province of Croatia was a matter of great importance to the Austrian rulers, as here they had the entire population forming a standing army always ready for war. Hence the Emperor Charles IV. began a


Croatia UnJer Austria reorganisation of all the Croatian military frontiers. The generalate of Essek was divided into three regiments, that of

Varasdin into two, that of Karlstadt into four, and the frontier of the banate into two. In the eighteenth century military

frontiers were organised, after the manner of the Croatian, along the whole Turkish frontier as far as Transylvania, the frontier of Szekl in 1764, and that of Wallachia in 1766. In times of peace it was necessary

only to make provision for outpost duty in the cardakes standing along the Turkish frontier. Although foreign soldiers were removed from the frontier on principle, yet the official posts were for the most part occupied by foreigners, and the official language was entirely German.

Every frontier inhabitant was liable to military service from the age of seventeen to sixty. The population was secure in the possession of their land; and the military spirit of the Croatian frontier population grew even stronger. Their privileges inspired them with a decided prejudice against the régime of the banate, under which the territorial lords heavily oppressed their subjects, and the established Church was the Roman Catholic.



SERVIAN ERA OF INDEPENDENCE

SERVIA, MONTENEGRO, AND BOSNIA UNTIL THE TURKISH SUPREMACY

AFTER the conquest of Bulgaria by Byzantium and the occupation of Croatia by Hungary and Venice respectively, the Servian race alone of all Slav peoples in the Balkan Peninsula retained any kind of independence, although they were by no means as yet a united state. At all times and in all places small nations have federated only when threatened by some external danger; thus it was that the Russian and Lithuanian states arose, and such is the history of all the Western European states, and of Servia among them. Under the great Tsar Symeon Bulgaria so devastated the Servian districts that they had to be re-colonised by returning fugitives, and part of the Servian tribes were forced to recognise Bulgarian supremacy.

In the tenth century the Zupan Ceslav succeeded for the first time in uniting several Servian tribes for a common struggle against the Bulgarians. After the destruction of the Bulgarian Empire by Basil II. Byzantine supremacy over the whole peninsula was established with a vigour which had been unprecedented since the time of Justinian I., and this state of things continued, under the dynasty of the Comneni, till the end of the twelfth century. The boundless oppression of the government often, however, caused revolts among the Serbs. The High Zupan Michael applied to Rome for support, received thence the title of

**The Magyars
Take Possession
of Bosnia**

king, and maintained his independence of Byzantium for some time. The help of the Hungarians was also not despised. A prominent figure about 1120 is Uros, or Bela Uros, the Zupan of Rassa, whose family belonged to Zeta; he entered upon friendly relations with the Hungarians, married his daughter to Bela II., and helped the Magyars to secure possession of Bosnia. From the Rama, a tributary of the Narenta on the south of Bosnia,

the Arpads now took the title of "King of Rama."

Of even more importance for Servian history is the rule of the son of Uros, the famous Stefan I. Nemanja, who was also born in Zeta, the cradle of his race. Although the youngest of his family, he aimed at the principality of Rassa, and also at the general supremacy, which he was able to secure with the help of the Byzantines. Though he had been baptised into the Western Church, he underwent a repetition of the ceremony according to the customs of the Eastern Church when he had arrived in Rassa, in order to secure the favour of the clergy and the people.

**The Great
Ambitions
of Stefan I.**

In the year 1165 the Emperor Manuel I. confirmed his position as High Zupan and gave him a piece of land, in return for which Nemanja swore fidelity to him. In the year 1173 Nemanja defeated his relations and secured the obedience of the refractory Zupans. In this way he founded one uniform hereditary and independent state. That process was here completed which was going on at the same time in Bohemia, Poland, and Russia. And in these states also families began to rule according to the law of seniority—that is to say, the eldest member of the ruling family exercised a supremacy over the rest until the transition to hereditary monarchy had been completed. Princes of the royal family who had hitherto enjoyed equal rights now became officials of the royal power. In Servia this change was completed at a much earlier date than in other Slav countries.

Nemanja also took in hand the organisation of the Servian Church. Converted to the Greek faith, he built monasteries and churches, suppressed the Roman faith, and cruelly persecuted the widely-spread Bulgarian sect of the Bogumiles, with the object of securing a uniform religion throughout his own state. The

Eastern Church thus became established in Servia, and the Eastern form of worship became the national worship, so that religion and nationality formed an undivided idea. At an earlier period the Servian churches and bishoprics had been subordinate to the Roman archbishopric of Spalatro, and afterwards to that of

The First Eastern Archbishop

Antivari; now Eastern bishoprics and an archbishopric were founded for Servia alone. The king's youngest son, Rastka, was appointed the first Eastern archbishop in Servia—at the Synod of Nicæa in 1221—under the name of Sava. He divided the land into twelve bishoprics, and bestowed episcopal rank on none but Servians. Zica was made the residence of the Servian archbishops; at a later period Sava carried thither the remains of his imperial father, Nemanja, from Mount Athos; here, too, Servian kings were in future to be crowned, and this was realised in the case of Peter I. on October 9th, 1904. Sava also founded monasteries in Servia, all under the "rule" of Saint Basil, which he had found in force at Athos. He enjoyed immense prestige, and was highly honoured as the first national saint of Servia. In the year 1235 the independence of the Servian Church was recognised by the Greeks.

This ecclesiastical alliance did not, however, prevent Nemanja from attacking Byzantium when the advantage of his own state was in question. Immediately after the death of the Emperor Manuel, in 1180, he conquered, in alliance with the Hungarian king, Bela III., those Servian districts which had fallen under Byzantine supremacy. He then renewed his friendly relations with the emperor, and even secured the hand of the emperor's niece, Eudoxia, for his own son Stefan, an alliance which brought legitimacy and special prestige to his house. It seems that the ambitious Nemanja hoped to

Byzantium Weakened by Quarrels

bring Byzantium within his power. The circumstances were favourable to such an attempt. Servia was the only independent state in the Balkan Peninsula, while Byzantium was weakened by quarrels about the succession. Nemanja, however, did not feel himself sufficiently strong for the attempt. At that period the Emperor Frederick I. Barbarossa came to Nisch on his crusade. The Servian prince appeared before him, and a chronicler

assures us that Nemanja was willing to accept his country from Barbarossa as a fief. The emperor, however, who did not wish to arouse the animosity of the Greeks, declined to entertain the proposal.

In the year 1195 Nemanja, apparently with the object of securing the supremacy of his house, abdicated in favour of his eldest son Stefan, the second Nemanja, to whom he had already given the Byzantine title of despot. His second son, Vukan, received his hereditary district of Zeta. Nemanja himself retired into the monastery of Studenitza, a foundation of his own, under the title of "Symeon the Monk"; afterwards he went to Mount Athos, and died in 1200 at the monastery of Chilander, which was also of his foundation. A struggle for the succession burst out between his sons, Vukan attempting to secure support in Hungary, and especially in Rome. Stefan also made applications to that quarter, and was crowned by the papal legate in 1217; he assumed the title "King of Servia, Diocletia, Travunia, Dalmatia, and Chlum." This step, however, cost him his entire popularity in the country. The

Servia Under Hungarian Supremacy

Archbishop Sava had repeatedly interposed in the quarrels of the brothers; Stefan now asked for further action of the kind. Sava crowned him in 1222 with a crown sent by the Byzantine Empire, at a great popular assembly, at which he read before him the articles of faith of the Eastern Church. The Hungarian king, Emerich, had availed himself of these quarrels to bring Servia under his supremacy. In 1202 he occupied Servia and assumed the title of "Rex Rasciæ"; but a struggle with his brother Andreas forced him to leave Servia. Stefan maintained his position until his death, in 1224. Since that time no Servian ruler ventured to break away from the Eastern Church, although many entered into connection with Rome.

Of the descendants of Nemanja, Milutin, otherwise named Stefan IV., or Uros II. (1275 or 1281 to 1320), began a career of ruthless conquest; he had no hesitation in forwarding his plans by repeated marriages with Byzantine, Bulgarian, and Hungarian princesses, with a corresponding series of divorces. He captured Greek provinces and maintained his possession of them even after the death of the Emperor Michael VIII. Palæologus in 1282. He



AN "ORTHODOX" SERVIAN WOMAN



YOUNG WOMAN OF BOSNIA



MONTENEGRIN OF THE "OLD GUARD"



A BOSNIAN FARMER

TYPES OF BOSNIANS, SERVIANS AND MONTENEGRINS

advanced as far as Athos. He obtained Bosnia from Hungary without striking a blow, as the dowry of his first wife. He also secured the favour of the Pope, whom he was able to keep in hand with empty promises. As he had no legitimate male heirs, he conceived the idea of uniting his empire with the Byzantine, in which plan

Servia's Fame Throughout Western Europe

he was supported by the Empress Irene, his second mother-in-law. Naturally he and no other was to have been emperor, and her children were to succeed him. Under him and under his son Stefan V.—Stefan IV. if we begin the series of Stefan kings in 1222—Uros III., who bore the nickname Decanski, Servia became famous not only in the Balkan territories, but also throughout Western Europe.

Meanwhile, however, Bulgaria had recovered from her downfall at the end of the twelfth century, and was waging a successful war with Byzantium. The powerful Servian kingdom now stood in the way of her further development. A struggle between the two for supremacy could only be a question of time. In the year 1323 the Bulgarian Boyars chose the Despot Michael of Widdin as their tsar; with him begins the supremacy of the Sismanides of Widdin, the last dynasty of Tirnovo. The new tsar began friendly relations with Servia, and married Anna, the daughter of Milutin, with the object of vigorously opposing the Byzantines and other enemies. Soon, however, the situation was changed. Michael divorced Anna about 1325 and married the sister of Andronicus III. of Byzantium.

It was only by the intervention of the Servian bishop and chronicler Daniel that war with Servia was avoided on this occasion; however, in 1330 it broke out. Michael brought about a great alliance between the Byzantines, Bulgarians, Roumanians, Tartars and Bessarabians. The Servian king advanced by forced marches against the allies, and suddenly attacked them on June 28th at Velbuzd. His army included 300 German mercenaries in armour; and Dusan, the son of Stefan, fought at the head of a chosen band. The Bulgarians were routed and their camp was plundered. Stefan contented himself with raising Stefan, the son of his sister Anna, who had been divorced by Michael, to the position of tsar, as Sisman II., and evacuated Bulgaria. Servia now held the

Defeat and Plunder of Bulgarians

300 German mercenaries in armour; and Dusan, the son of Stefan, fought at the head of a chosen band. The Bulgarians were routed and their camp was plundered. Stefan contented himself with raising Stefan, the son of his sister Anna, who had been divorced by Michael, to the position of tsar, as Sisman II., and evacuated Bulgaria. Servia now held the

predominant position in the Balkan Peninsula.

Stefan, the conqueror of Velbuzd, met with a sad fate. He had been formerly blinded by his father, Milutin, and now came to a terrible end. His Boyars revolted under the leadership of Dusan and strangled him, at the age of sixty, though shortly before he had appointed his ungrateful son to the position of "younger king." Thus on September 8th, 1331, Stefan Dusan ascended the throne at the age of nineteen. Of desperate courage on the battlefield, Dusan also possessed all the qualities of a statesman. While Milutin confined his aspirations to a union of the Byzantine and Servian kingdoms, Dusan dreamed of a larger Servia which should embrace all the Balkan territories. Turning to account the weakness of the Byzantine and Bulgarian Empires he conquered Albania, Macedonia, Thessaly and Epirus between 1336 and 1340 and in 1345; even the Greeks, weary of civil war, are said to have invited his supremacy. In 1346 he assumed the title of tsar and had the youthful Uros crowned king, entrusting to him the

Zenith of Servia's Power

administration of Servia proper. In his documents we meet with the title "Stefan, Tsar and supreme ruler of Servia and Greece, of Bulgaria and Albania."

His title of emperor was also to the benefit of the Servian Church, as the previous dependency of the archbishopric of Servia upon the Byzantine patriarch was not wholly compatible with the existence of a Servian Empire. Hence in 1346 Stefan Dusan raised the Servian archbishop to the position of patriarch, notwithstanding the prohibition of the Byzantine Church. In 1352 the Servian Church was definitely separated from the Byzantine patriarchate. Henceforward twenty metropolitans and bishops were subordinate to the Servian patriarch. Servia was now at the zenith of her power. As Dusan was related to the rulers of Bessarabia and Bulgaria, he was able to form a confederation of these three kingdoms directed against Hungary and Byzantium.

The reign of Dusan was the golden age of Servia, chiefly for the reason that he provided the country with better administration and a better judicial system, and did his best to advance the civilisation and prosperity of the people. The code—sakonik or zakonik—which he left behind him, a



An episode in the life of Stefan Dusan, who is seen denouncing a traitor. Dusan succeeded to the throne of Serbia in 1331, and his name is eminent among the national heroes of his country. He is remembered especially for his successful campaigns against the Greeks, and for the code of laws which he issued in 1349 just seven years before his death.



The battlefield of Kosovo, or the "Field of the Blackbirds," is one of unhappy memory to the Serbian people, as twice in their history it was the scene of their defeat. Here Sultan Murad I. destroyed the Serbian Empire when he inflicted, in 1389, a crushing defeat on King Lazar, who was killed on the battlefield. This famous fight decided not only the fate of Serbia, but that of the races of the Balkan Peninsula. The above picture, by a Serbian artist, commemorates the second defeat, in October, 1448, when, on the same scene, Sultan Murad II. gained a great victory over John Hunyadi. The remnants of the Serbian army and fugitives are seen retreating from the fatal field.

TWO FAMOUS EPISODES IN THE HISTORY OF SERVIA

legal monument of the greatest importance, is a permanent testimony to the fame of Dusan. His conventions with Byzantium, Ragusa, and Venice proved that he also cared for the commercial prosperity of his people. The art of mining, which had been introduced under Nemanja, became so widely extended under Dusan that there

Stefan Dusan Dies on the March

were five gold and five silver mines in operation. These were worked chiefly by Saxons, whom Prince Vladimir

is said to have first brought into the country. Almost the only political mistake that can be urged against Dusan is the fact that he did not use his power to secure the possession of Bosnia, which was inhabited by a purely Servian population. As the whole of Bosnia was never entirely united with Servia, a spirit of individualism flourished in that country, which resulted, shortly after Dusan's death, in the foundation of the Bosnian kingdom under the Ban Tvrtko. Dusan's main object was the conquest of Byzantium, and chroniclers tell us of thirteen campaigns undertaken for this purpose. In 1355, when he was marching against the imperial city, he suddenly died. Had his son Stefan Uros IV. inherited his father's capacity together with his empire he would have been able to consolidate the great Servian state. Uros, however, was a weak, benevolent, and pious ruler, nicknamed by the nation "Nejaki"—that is to say, a man of no account. A revolt soon broke out. Even the first councillor of the tsar, the capable Vukasin, whom Dusan had placed at his son's side, stretched out his hand for the crown, and Uros was murdered in 1367. With him became extinct the main branch of the Nemanja dynasty, which had ruled over Servia for nearly 200 years.

In the civil war which then ensued the Servian nobility raised Lazar Grbljanovic, a brave and truthful man, to the throne. The new ruler, however, assumed the simple title of Knes or Prince. Meanwhile the political situation in the Balkans had undergone a great change. The provinces formerly conquered by Dusan had revolted. Servia herself was too small and too undeveloped to become the nucleus of a great empire, and at the same time the administration of the country was in many respects deficient.

At this juncture a great danger threatened from abroad. For a long time the

Bulgarians and Serbs had been attacking the Byzantine Empire, hoping to aggrandise themselves at her expense, without suspecting that they were attempting to sever the branch by which they themselves were supported. The Turks in Asia began their advance upon the Byzantine Empire, and no force could check them. In the fourteenth century their military fame was so firmly established that the Byzantine emperors called in their assistance against the Bulgarians and Serbs. Soon, however, it became apparent that the most serious danger threatened all these peoples from the side of the Ottomans. In the year 1361 Murad I. occupied Adrianople and made that city his capital; Thracia became a Turkish province. The Byzantines were powerless to meet the danger. Immediately afterwards, in 1366, the Bulgarian Tsar, Sisman, became a Turkish vassal; his sister Thamar entered the harem of Murad. In the year 1371 the Servian usurper, Vukasin, marched against the Turks, but was defeated in the night of September 25th and 26th, and slain, together with his brother Johannes Ugljesa. The fatal field was known as Ssirr-

Famous Fight That Settled Servia's Fate

sündighi—that is, the Servian death. Servia, however, was not yet subdued. It was not until 1386 that

Lazar was forced to become a Turkish vassal, and the Turkish danger then lay heavily upon all men's minds. To save the honour of his nation, Lazar prepared for battle, made an alliance with Bulgaria, Albania, and Bosnia, and defeated the Turkish governor at Plocnik at the time when Murad was occupied in Asia. Murad, in anger, spent a whole year in preparation, both in Asia and Europe, and marched against Servia through Philippopolis in 1389. On the feast-day of St. Veit (June 15th) was fought the battle of Kossovo, or Amsel, the famous fight which decided not only the fate of Servia but that of the races of the Balkan Peninsula, and, indeed, of South-east Europe as a whole. The Servian army was supported by the Croatian Ban, Ivan Horvat, by the Bosnians under their Voivode Vladko Hranic, by auxiliary troops of the Roumanian and Bulgarian tribes, and by Albanians. In the dawn the Emir Murad was murdered in his tent, according to Servian tradition; by Milos Obilic, who thus hoped to turn from himself the suspicion of treachery, and was cruelly murdered in consequence. The supreme command

was forthwith assumed by Bajazet I., the son of Murad. The Servians were utterly beaten; Lazar himself was captured, and was beheaded with many others beside the corpse of Murad. Serbia's future as a nation was destroyed upon that day.

Many songs and legends deplore the battle of Kossovo. It was not the superior force of the Ottomans, so the story goes, that brought about that fearful overthrow, but the treachery of a Servian leader, the godless Vuk Brankovic. In the Ottoman army was also fighting the Servian despot, or "King's Son," Marko (the son of Vukasin) of Priljep—a man of giant strength. These facts were the causes of the bitter defeat, and the Serbs fought like heroes. Even at the present day these magnificent epics form one of the chief beauties both of Slav literature and of the literature of the world; they have been admired even by Grimm and Goethe. The old, the blind, and the beggar sing at the present day in the market-place and on the roads the story of the famous old heroic legends, to the accompaniment of the *gusle*, and receive rich rewards from the people, who find in these songs a recompense and a consolation for the loss of their past glory. As the Tartars trampled upon the necks of the Russians, so also did the Turks upon the Southern Slavs. For centuries the Slav races have had to endure unspeakable barbarity at the hands of the Ottomans. Their development was arrested, and they were forced to lag behind in the march of civilisation, while at the same time they became a bulwark to the peoples of Western Europe. For this reason it is unjust to taunt them with their half-civilised condition; yet the injustice has been too often committed.

The Lost Glory of Servia

Bajazet, who was still occupied in Asia, placed Stefan, the son of Lazar, as despot on the Servian throne. Stefan was forced to pay tribute and to join in the Turkish campaigns in person at the head of his army; at Angora, in 1402, Timur himself marvelled at the bravery of the Serbs. The nation never lost the hope of recovering its old independence. Stefan turned to Hungary for support and became a Hungarian vassal, following the example of other Danube states who looked to Hungary or to Poland for help. Upon his death, in 1427, he was succeeded by George Brankovic, a son of that Brankovic to whose treachery

the defeat of 1389 was ascribed. He made his residence in Semendria on the Danube. Meanwhile all the states of the Balkans had been forced to bow beneath the Turkish yoke after suffering bloody defeats. Bulgaria fell in 1393, Then Zartum, Widdin, and Moldavia; in 1455 Byzantium itself was conquered.

The Doom of Servia

Brankovic died on December 24th, 1457, and was succeeded by his feeble son, Lazar, who died suddenly at the end of January, 1458. In 1459 Mohammed II. took over Servia as a Turkish province and divided it into pashaliks. Many of the most distinguished families were exterminated, and two hundred thousand human beings were carried into slavery. Thus the Servian state disappeared from the map of Europe. As once before, after their immigration, so also now, the Serbs were ruled from Constantinople, and it was on the Bosphorus that the fate of the Balkan territories was decided. The wave of Turkish conquest continued to spread onward. Hungary and Poland were now forced to take up arms against it, until the turn of Austria arrived. To these states the Balkan peoples without exception now turned for help. Apart from Dalmatia on the north, which was inhabited by Croats, alternately under Venetian and Hungarian supremacy, the Turks subjugated the whole of the Balkan Peninsula, and ruthlessly oppressive was their rule. As, however, they were concerned only to drain the financial resources of the peoples they conquered, and troubled themselves little about questions of religion or nationality, it was possible for the Balkan Slavs to retain their national characteristics until the hour of their liberation.

The former birthplace of the Nemanjids, Zeta, had a happier fate. This mountainous district, which took its name from the river Ceta or Cetina, once formed part of the Roman province of Dalmatia.

Zeta's Happier Fate

The Emperor Diocletian had formed a special province of Prævalis in Southern Dalmatia, with Dioclea as its centre. from which town the whole province became known as Dioclitia or Dioclea. However, in the period of the Slav Serbs it was known as Zeta, and was regarded as the original land and hereditary property of the Nemanjids. St. Sava founded a bishopric and built the monastery of St. Michael at Cattaro. Every successor

to the throne first undertook the administration of Zeta. When, however, Dusan made his son Uros king and entrusted him with the administration of Servia proper, another governor had to be found for Zeta, and he was taken from the house of Bals. After the death of Dusan the house of the Balsics consequently ruled in Zeta (1360-1421) and became involved in struggles with the distinguished family of the Cernojevic or Jurasevic in the Upper Zeta. At the outset of the fifteenth century the Venetians began to form settlements here, until eventually this Servian coast land fell into the hands of Venice, notwithstanding repeated struggles on the part of Servia. The family of Cernojevic, which had joined the side of Venice, now became supreme about 1455; Ivan Cernojevic became a vassal of Venice and received a yearly subsidy. He resided in Zabljak and founded the monastery of Cetinje in 1478 or 1485. His son George resided in Rjeka and Obod; under him in Obod the first ecclesiastical Slav books were printed between 1493 and 1495. It is at that time (first in 1435) that this country takes the name of Crnagora or Montenegro.

After the fall of the family of Cernojevic in 1528, or really as early as 1516, the country was ruled for centuries by the bishops, or Vladiks, of Cetinje. The bishop and head of the monastery of Cetinje was at the same time the lord of the country.

It is not correct to say that the Turks never ruled over Montenegro and that the people were able to maintain their freedom by heroic struggles; the fact is that the Ottoman supremacy in this mountainous district was never more than nominal,

Provinces Revolt From the Servian Empire chiefly from the fact that they could not extract much gain from the poor inhabitants. But

Montenegro was subject to the Shandshak of Skodra, and was obliged to send a yearly tribute thither, a fact which we learn from the Italian description of Mariano Bolizza of the year 1511. At that time Montenegro included ten settlements and 8,027 men capable of bearing arms.

After the death of Dusan one province after another—first Thessaly and Epirus, and then Macedonia and Albania—revolted from the Servian Empire. Even Servian tribes, who had willingly or unwillingly gathered round the throne of the Nemanjids until 1355, now followed their individual desires. This is especially true of their relations, the Bosnians, whose country had never been entirely subject to Servia. In former times Bosnia, like Hungary and Ragusa, had been subject to the Roman archbishopric of Spalatro; later, Bosnian rulers had expressly declared themselves Serbs and descendants of the Nemanjids. None the less they went their own way. Their first prince, or ban, of any reputation was Kulin (1180-1204). Naturally Hungary and Servia were rivals for the possession of Bosnia, which availed itself of these circumstances to maintain its independence. It is only on one occasion, however, that this little district secured a greater reputation; this was when favourable political circumstances allowed the Ban

Bosnia's Independent Development Tvrtko, who regarded himself as a descendant of the Nemanjids, although his family belonged to the race of Kotromanovic, to secure the throne in 1376, since which date Bosnia has been a kingdom. This separation resulted in the fact that Bosnian civilisation developed upon somewhat different lines from Servian—a fact apparent not only in the adoption of Roman ecclesiastical customs, but also in literature and even in writing. Under King Tvrtko the doctrine of the Bogumiles, transplanted from Bulgaria, extended so rapidly that it became the established religion. Thus Bosnia in this respect also displayed an individualism of its own.

The final consequence was that under the Turkish supremacy the nobles, who were accustomed to religious indifferentism, went over in a body to Mohammedanism, in order to secure their class privileges. The possession of the Balkan Peninsula was secured to the Ottomans in 1453 in consequence of the overthrow of Constantinople, but it was not until 1463 that Bosnia was incorporated with the Turkish state; many citadels of the kind numerous in Bosnia held out even till 1526.





UNDER THE HEEL OF THE TURK

THREE CENTURIES OF MISERY AND DESPAIR

AND THE LIBERATION OF THE SOUTHERN SLAVS

UNDER the Turkish supremacy the peoples of the Balkan Peninsula entered upon a period of death and national sorrow; only the vaguest recollection of a better past endured. Immediately after the conquest of a province the Ottoman administration was introduced, the country was divided into provinces, or *pashaliks*, and these into districts, or *nahias*. The head of a pashalik was a pasha or vizir entitled to an ensign of three horse-tails, while the head of a nahia was called the kadi. There were pashaliks of Servia, Bosnia, Roumelia, Scutari, Widdin, etc., and the distribution of the provinces was often changed. The duties of the Turkish officials were confined to organising or maintaining military service, to levying the taxes, and to some administration of justice.

Side by side with the Turkish officials the institution of the spahis was of great importance. Upon Ottoman principles the whole country was the property of the sultan; he divided the conquered land among individuals, who received it either as hereditary property (*zian*) or for life tenure (*timir*), and were under the obligation of giving military service in return; these individuals were known as spahis, or horsemen. Thus, for example, the pashalik of Servia was divided among about 900 spahis, who were masters both of the soil and of its inhabitants. Many

**Christian
Nobles Turn
Moslems**

Christian noble families became hereditary spahis by accepting Mohammedanism; about the middle of the seventeenth century there were in Roumelia, not including Bosnia, 1,294 spahis, who had formerly been Christian Bulgarians, Serbs, Albanians, or Greeks.

Side by side with the state administration there also existed a kind of provincial administration, which was left in the hands of the people. Every village was adminis-

tered by its judge and overseer (*scoski-knes* and *kmet*), who settled the affairs of the village and explained the traditional principles of justice, though only to those who had need of them and submitted to their decisions. They had no power to enforce execution, and dissatisfied litigants applied to the Turkish authorities. A district was also governed by the

**System of
Local
Government** *obor knes* (upper knes), originally appointed by the sultan.

Local administration went no further than this. For the most part the people submitted to the decisions of their own judges and rarely appealed to the Ottoman authorities; at the same time the kneses and upper kneses, acting as intermediaries between the populace and the Turkish authorities, protected the multitude. At a later period, however, the upper kneses became hereditary, and enjoyed such high prestige that even the Turks were forced to respect them.

Apart from this the Servian Church remained independent under the patriarch of Ipek. It should be observed that the higher clergy at that time were chiefly of Greek origin, and the patriarch of Constantinople hoped to bring the Slavs over to the Greek Church by their means. In the seventeenth century the independence of the Servian patriarchate was abolished, and the Church was placed under the patriarchate of Constantinople, as it had been before 1346. In the year 1766 the patriarchate was abolished altogether, as also was the Bulgarian patriarchate of Ochrida in 1767; bishops were now sent out from Stamboul. Only the lower clergy remained purely national and shared the sufferings of the people.

Such were the powers which determined the existence of the subjugated people. The life of the rayahs, as subjugated peoples were called, was one without law or rights, and in every respect miserable.

Particularly oppressive was the weight of taxation. First of all came the sultan's or the state tax. Next the male population were obliged to pay a poll tax of three piastres and two paras to the state chest for every person between the age of seven and sixty; this was known as the haraj. Even the priests in monasteries were not exempt from this tax. Three times a year the Turkish officials appeared in the villages, pitched their tents, and levied the haraj. The better to control the tax, a register of boys and men was kept. Besides this, married men paid an undefined tax, known as pores, twice every year, on St. George's Day and St. Demeter's day, to cover the cost of administration.

The kneses held a meeting in the central town of the nahia and estimated the yearly expenses of administration, which they then distributed among the individual inhabitants; naturally the estimate varied from year to year. Besides this the imperial exchequer collected taxes from the merchants for their shops and also from the tobacco planters; then there were customs duties, duties upon fishing, upon river traffic, etc. Besides the state taxes the rayahs had also to satisfy their territorial masters, the spahis. Every married man paid one piastre for poll tax, two piastres married tax, two piastres grazing tax (*kotar*) for the use of pasturage, one piastre meal tax per head, two piastres kettle tax for every brandy still, from four to ten paras acorn tax for every herd of swine, and finally a tenth of a field or garden produce; they were also liable to forced labour. Even the secular clergy were obliged to pay these taxes.

Naturally, the population were also obliged to provide for the support of their kneses, upper kneses and clergy. In Servia, for instance, a bishop extracted twelve piastres from every house, and on a journey through his diocese an additional

five piastres as well as his maintenance; as they were obliged to buy their office at Constantinople, they were forced to recoup themselves in this way. The priests received tithes of agricultural produce, and occasionally payments for church services.

More oppressive even than these various taxes was the administration of justice. In every nahia a kadi was the judge, who was also assisted by a musselim, as the

executor of the judicial power. Above the kadi stood the chief judge, or mollah, of the whole province. All these officials supported themselves entirely upon court fees and fines. As they were able to obtain office only by bribery, the manner in which they exercised their powers may easily be imagined. Turkish law knew no other punishment than the monetary fine, except in the case of political misdeeds; even for murder the punishment was only the price of blood. Usually the officials pursued their own interests alone, and innocent people often suffered. The musselims were especially dreaded, as they continually came into contact with the people, were acquainted with their circumstances, and consequently could easily satisfy their desires or their vengeance upon any object. Beyond all this, the evidence of a Christian was not admitted by the courts, and the Ottoman administration of justice thus became a system of torture which could be escaped only by flight.

A further torment for the Christian rayah was the presence of the regular Turkish foot soldiers, the Janissaries; these forces were originally in possession of no landed property and only obtained pay. When, however, they were sent out from Constantinople, distributed among the provinces, and secured the imperial power for themselves, they were anxious to become landowners, like the spahis, and seized with the strong hand all that pleased them. The poor rayahs had no protection against their greed; they might console themselves with the words of Virgil, "Not for yourselves, ye birds, did ye build your nests; not for yourselves, ye sheep, did ye wear your wool; not for yourselves, ye bees, did ye gather honey; not for yourselves, ye oxen, did ye draw the plough."

Especially cruel was the levy of youths, which took place every five years, to supply men for the Janissaries, who then became Mohammedans. Towns only were able to secure immunity by the payment of large sums.

Far more humiliating and intolerable was the treatment of the rayah at the hands of the Mohammedans. It was at this point that the differences between conquerors and conquered first became plainly obvious. It was a difference expressed in outward form. The clothing

THREE CENTURIES OF TURKISH OPPRESSION

of the rayahs was simple. They were not allowed to wear the kaftan or gold or silver embroidery on their clothes. They were not to inhabit beautiful houses or to keep good horses. They were forbidden to wear swords. In the town the rayah might go only on foot. If a Christian appeared before Turks, he must hide his pistols; if he met them on the road, he must alight from his horse, and stand before them if they sat. Apart from this the Turk might call any Christian from the street and force him to bring water, look after his horse, or perform any other duty. Christian women were handed over to Mohammedans without reserve if they found favour in their eyes; at a marriage the bride was concealed in a cellar with her head veiled in cloths.

The result was that the Christians fled into the inaccessible mountains and forests, and from there defended themselves against their oppressors. Their numbers steadily increased. In the Slav provinces they were known as hayduks, and in Greece as klephts. They were robbers who also robbed the Christians upon occasion. But the spirit of freedom remained alive among their numbers, and they were respected by the population as avengers of the people and champions of freedom, were protected from the pursuing Turks, and were celebrated in song as heroes. As the Christians were forbidden to bear arms, the robber Christians became the only people able to defend themselves.

Oppression of the Christians

In their misery the people found consolation in their kneses and upper kneses, in the spahis, who generally treated them mildly, and particularly in the Church. It was the monks who were popular, rather than the secular clergy. The monasteries were at that time the centres of national life. They enjoyed privileges from the state, and were less dependent upon the Ottoman authorities. The monks alone were allowed to hear confessions and to celebrate the Communion. They were the only educated class, and preserved the remnants of Slav literature. The people swarmed to the monasteries from the remotest districts, and on dedication festivals lively scenes took place. Merchants then sold their wares; lambs and pigs were roasted; and to the sound of the shepherd's pipe or bagpipe the Servian youths danced their national dance, the

kolo, which was also known in Bulgaria, and the old men sang songs of the national heroes.

The Turkish danger and the menace of a common enemy formed a point of union which united the shattered fragments of the Servian-Croatian races, not only in political, but also in literary and civilised life. The Croatians, at least, had the possibility of satisfying their feelings of revenge in battle. The Serbs, who were forbidden even to wear arms, were obliged to endure their cruel fate in silent submission. At the period when Croatia began to surround herself with frontier defences, and thereby became more capable of resistance, Turkey was at the height of her power, and the Servian race could see no gleam of hope for a better future. Hence many of them turned their backs upon their native land and fled across the frontier to the more fortunate Croatia, that they might be able, at least from that point, to wage war against their oppressors.

However, in the seventeenth century, when the political development of the Ottoman state had reached its fulness, it became manifest that its fundamental principles were suited only to military and political life, and not for social life or the advancement of culture, and that, in consequence, the Turk was unprogressive and wholly incompetent to rule over other nations. The Turkish state was founded upon theocratic principles; the Koran formed at once its Bible and its legal code. If the subjugated peoples professed some other religion they could never be full citizens of the Ottoman Empire, but would be forced to remain in a position of subjection. Meanwhile, in Western Europe, civil law, as opposed to canon law, permitted members of other communions to become full citizens, so that subject races could more easily maintain their faith and

become incorporated. In Turkey this was impossible. The Mohammedan alone was in possession of rights: the Christian rayah had no rights; his only guarantee for a better future was the downfall of the existing system. We can, then, well understand that the Christian populations were ever waiting for the moment when they would be able to shake off the oppressive yoke of Turkey. If the burden became intolerable the nation emigrated

Christians Biding Their Time

in a body. The strength of religious fanaticism among the Turks, both in past and present times, may be judged from the fact that religion rules the whole social and political life and culture of Turkey even at the present day.

In point of numbers the Slavs were superior to the Turks. The empire swarmed with Mohammedans of Slav origin, serving in the army as well as in the official bodies. According to the testimony of Paolo Giovio in 1531 and other competent authorities, almost the whole of the Janissary troops spoke Slav. Numerous Slavs rose to the position of vizir and grand vizir. Under Mohammed Sokolovic half the vizirs were Slavs in the sixteenth century. Several sultans were fully acquainted with the Slav language, and several chancellors issued Slav documents in Cyrillic writing. The Turkish Empire was, as is remarked by the Servian historian, on the road to becoming a Mohammedan-Slav empire.

These facts, however, did not improve the life of the Christian rayahs. For almost three centuries these races had groaned under the Turkish yoke. Help was to be expected only from without. The first gleam appeared between 1684 and 1686, when Austria, under Charles of Lorraine repeatedly defeated the Turkish armies and occupied several provinces. At that time the court of Vienna conceived a great plan of playing off the Balkan peoples against the Porte, and entered into relations with the patriarch of Ipek, Arsen Cernojevic, and with George Brankovic, who professed to descend from the old Servian royal family. Brankovic went to Russia with his brother in 1688 to collect money for the building of the Servian metropolitan church and to secure Russia's help for the war against the Porte; at the court of Vienna he was made viscount and then count. The

The War of Liberation Austrian commander-in-chief, Ludwig Wilhelm, Margrave of Baden, issued an appeal to the Slavs of Bosnia, Albania, and Herzegovina, to join him in war against the Turks.

The Eastern Slavs had already given their favour to Austria, when the Vienna court seized the person of George Brankovic, who had already appointed himself Despot of Illyria, Servia, Symria, Moesia, and Bosnia, and imprisoned

him first in Vienna, then in Eger, where he died in 1711. This action naturally disturbed the relations between Servia and Austria. However, the war of liberation was continued. Among the Eastern Slavs there was an old legend that some day they would be freed from the Turkish yoke by a hero who would come riding upon a camel, accompanied with foreign animals. Utilising this legend, Enea Silvio Piccolomini, the general of the Margrave of Baden, appeared among the Servian nations with camels, asses and parrots, and called them to arms. In 1690 the Emperor Leopold I. again proclaimed that he would guarantee religious and political freedom "to all the Slav peoples of the whole of Albania, Servia, Illyria, Mysia, Bulgaria, Silistria, Macedonia, and Rascia," and again called them to arms against the Turks.

In the same year 36,000 Servian and Albanian families migrated from Servia under the leadership of the patriarch Arsen Cernojevic. From Belgrade they sent the bishop of Janopol, Jesaias Diakovic, to the court of Vienna as the plenipotentiary of the "Community of Greek Raizes." The emperor issued the desired guarantees for the whole people and for the three Brankovics in a special charter of liberties. Cernojevic received a guarantee of his position of metropolitan "for the whole of Greece, Rascia, Bulgaria, Dalmatia, Bosnia, Janopol, Herzegovina, and over all the Serbs in Hungary and Croatia."

The Serbs then passed over the Save and settled chiefly in Slavonia, Symria, and in some towns of Hungary; Karlstadt was chosen as the seat of the Servian patriarch. The privileges of these immigrants were often enough disputed by the Hungarian municipal, ecclesiastical, and political authorities, but were invariably confirmed by the imperial court, which took the Serbs under its protection. Supreme successes against the Turks were secured when Prince Eugene of Savoy took the lead of the Austrian troops in July, 1697. The great victory of Zenta was the first indication of the fall of Turkish supremacy in Europe; henceforward the little state of Montenegro fought successfully against the Ottomans.

However, the first decisive effort was the Russo-Turkish war. Western Europe

Moslems of Slavonic Origin

Eye of the Russo-Turkish War



A STREET DANCE IN SERVIA IN THE MIDDLE AGES

had long striven to induce Russia to take part in the struggle. Peter the Great was the first to take action in 1711, with that campaign which roused great hopes among the Balkan Slavs. At that date the first Russian ambassador, Colonel Miloradovic, a Herzegovinian by birth, of Neretva, brought to Cetinje a letter from Peter the Great, calling upon the Montenegrins to take up arms; he met with an enthusiastic reception. Thereupon Danilo Petrovic Njegos, the metropolitan and ruler of Montenegro (1697-1735), made a journey to Russia in 1715, and received rich presents and promises of future support.

Henceforward the Southern Slavs based their hopes rather upon their compatriots and co-religionists in Russia than upon Austria. However, the campaign of 1711 was a failure; and it was not until many years afterwards that Russia undertook a second advance, under Catharine II. In 1774 Russia secured a protectorate over the Danube principalities and over all the Christians of the Greek Church. Catharine again turned her attention to the warlike state of Montenegro and sent General George Dolgoruki to Cetinje in 1769; and from 1788 to 1791 the Russian lieutenant-colonel Count Ivelic and the Austrian

THREE CENTURIES OF TURKISH OPPRESSION

major Vukasovic were working in Montenegro with similar objects.

In the seventeenth century, when it became more obvious that the Turk was not invincible, and when enthusiasm had been roused by the hope of liberation, the Southern Slavs became more convinced than before of a relationship nearer than that of fate and political alliance; the feeling of blood relationship grew strong in them, and they began to call themselves brothers and members of a Slav race. The feeling of mutual connection extended not merely to the Southern Slavs, but spread over the whole Slav world. They appealed to their Russian kinsmen for help, and authors wrote enthusiastically of a great Slav family. Austria gave some stimulus to the movement by repeatedly summoning all the Balkan Slavs to common action against the Turks.

In the history of the Austrian Slav of that period there gradually arises from the background the outline of a new southern Slav Empire which was intended to embrace all the Southern Slav races. A name was invented for it, that of Illyria. The name was chosen to secure connection with past history. Illyricum had formerly been a Roman province, including Macedonia and Greece, with Crete, Dardania, and Dacia; in 476 it was assigned to the East Roman Empire. At that moment the phrase "the Illyrian nation" meant nothing more than the peoples professing the faith of the Greek Church, and as

most of the Serbs were members of this, they also entitled themselves the "Raizes, or Illyrian nation." Now the name of Illyria was extended to include the Croatians and Slavonians. It was specially used in this sense by the Roman Church, which had not forgotten the old diocese of Illyria, and used the term to denote the Slavs in the west of the Balkan Peninsula. From this ecclesiastical use the connotation of the name was extended. In Hungary, where fugitive Serbs made common cause with the Croatians, the Illyrian question was a constant subject of discussion.

Maria Theresa protected the Croatians and Serbs from the aggressions of the Magyars, and created for the special protection of the Serbs a new administrative organ, the "Illyrian Delegation," in 1746. The court of Vienna also regarded the Hungarian Serbs as a valuable counterpoise to the Magyars. Under the Emperor Leopold II. the Illyrian national congress was held in Temesvar in 1790; demands were here issued for the separation of the Servian nation in the banat and in the bacska (voievodina), for an Illyrian chancery, for the parliamentary equality of the Servian bishops with the ecclesiastical princes of Herzegovina, and for a governor, who was to be one of the emperor's sons. How the conception of Illyria first received official extension in the age of Napoleon belongs to another period and a later volume. VLADIMIR MILKOWICZ



TYPICAL TURKISH GENTLEMAN OF THE MERCHANT CLASS

GREAT DATES IN THE HISTORY OF SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE: A.D. 500 TO 1792

A.D.		A.D.	
500	Anastasius emperor	1204	Latin empire of Byzantium till 1261
518	Justin emperor	1218	John Asen II. Tsar of Bulgaria
527	Justinian emperor	1222	Golden Bull of Hungary
529	The Justinian code issued	1241	Mongols devastate Hungary, but retire
533	Overthrow of the Vandals by Belisarius	1261	Fall of Latin empire of Byzantium; Greek dynasty restored under Michael Palaeologus; Mongol invasion of Hungary repelled by Bela IV.
552	Narses defeats the Goths in Italy	1274	League between Ladislaus of Hungary and Rudolf of Habsburg
558	Repulse of the Huns and Avars	1288	Beginning of Ottoman power
565	Justin II. emperor	1301	End of Arpad dynasty in Hungary. Othman defeats Byzantines at Nicomedia
582	Maurice emperor	1309	Charles Robert of Anjou elected king of Hungary
602	Phocas emperor	1323	Sismanid dynasty in Bulgaria till 1393
610	Heraclius emperor	1350	Predominance of Servia in the Balkans
613	Advance of Persians under Khosru	1342	Lewis the Great king of Hungary
622	Heraclius checks the Persian advance. The Hegira: date-year of Islam	1345	Servian conquests under Stefan Dusan
626	Defeat of Avars before Constantinople	1347	John Cantacuzenos joint emperor
634	Advance of the Saracen power	1356	Turks cross the Hellespont
640	Establishment of Slavs in Bosnia	1361	Turks occupy Adrianople
660	Founding of the Bulgarian kingdom	1363	Turks defeat Magyars and Slavs at Marizza
673	Saracens besiege Constantinople	1370	Lewis of Hungary elected king of Poland
712	Advance of Bulgarians	1386	Sigismund king of Hungary
717	Leo III. the Isaurian emperor	1389	Turkish victory at Kossova; subjugation of Servia and Bulgaria
725	Beginning of Iconoclastic movement	1396	Turkish victory at Nicopolis
727	Defeat of Saracens at Nicaea	1402	Overthrow of Bajazet by Tamerlane
739	Defeat of Saracens at Acroinon	1411	Sigismund of Hungary becomes German emperor [med I.]
750	Fall of Omayyad caliphate	1413	Recovery of Ottoman power under Moham-
773	Bulgarians checked	1442	Victories of Hunyadi over Turks
780	Constantine VI. emperor; Irene regent	1444	Turks defeat Hungarians at Varna
787	Second Council of Nicæa restores image-	1448	Turks defeat Hunyadi at Kossova
797	Irene empress [worship]	1449	Scanderbeg heads Albanian revolt [empire
802	Fall of Irene ends Isaurian dynasty; Nice-	1453	Capture of Constantinople; end of Byzantine
803	Treaty with Charlemagne [phorus emperor]	1456	Hunyadi defends Belgrade against Turks
813	Leo V. defeats Bulgarians	1458	Matthias Corvinus king of Hungary
820	Michael the Stammerer emperor	1461	Turks acknowledge Scanderbeg's independence
852	Boris king of Bulgaria	1467	Death of Scanderbeg
863	Christian mission of Constantine and Metho-	1477	Turks subjugate Albania
866	Final breach between Greek and Roman	1479	Turks defeated by Matthias Corvinus [tria
867	Basil I. emperor; Macedonian dynasty begins	1491	Invasion of Hungary by Maximilian of Aus-
869	Council of Constantinople	1517	Conquest of Mamelukes by Sultan Selim
886	Leo VI. emperor	1521	Suleiman the Magnificent takes Belgrade
895	Simeon king of Bulgarians	1526	Victory of Suleiman at Mohacz; Ferdinand of Austria becomes king of Hungary
912	Constantine Porphyrogenetos emperor	1534	Turkish fleets commanded by Barbarossa
917	Defeat of imperial army by Simeon of Bul-	1536	Alliance of Turks and French
926	garia, who takes the title of Tsar	1545	Ferdinand of Austria pays tribute to Turks
941	Timislav king of Croatia	1547	Treaty between Suleiman and Charles V.
963	Defeat of Russian fleet by Byzantines	1571	Overthrow of Turkish fleet at Lepanto
969	Nicephorus Phocas emperor	1593	War between Austria and Turkey
971	John Tzimisce emperor	1606	Peace of Zsitvatorok [Vizirs
994	Overthrow of Bulgaria by Tzimisce	1656	Revival of Ottoman power under the Kuprili
997	Conversion of Magyars by Adelbert	1664	Austro-Turkish war; Turks defeated at St. Gothard [Khoczim
1000	Saint Stefan duke of Hungarians	1673	John Sobieski of Poland defeats Turks at
1018	Saint Stefan king of Hungary	1675	Sobieski defeats Turks at Lemberg
1040	Subjugation of Bulgaria by Basil II.	1683	Sobieski defeats Turks before Vienna
1044	Servia established as independent	1687	Defeat of Turks at Mohacz
1052	Peter of Hungary does homage to German emperor	1697	Defeat of Turks by Prince Eugene at Zenta
1053	Independence of Hungary recognised	1699	Peace of Carlowitz
1056	Suppression of Roman Churches in the East	1711	Peter the Great, foiled by the Turks, has to accept the treaty of Pruth
1071	Macedonian dynasty ends with Theodora	1716	Final repulse of Turks by Eugene at Peter-
1076	Normans expel Byzantine rule from Italy	1737	wardain
1077	Capture of Jerusalem by Seljuk Turks	1738	Austro-Russian war with Turkey
1077	Saint Ladislaus king of Hungary	1741	Peace of Belgrade
1081	Alexius Comnenus emperor	1741	Hungary acclaims Maria Theresa
1087	Invasion of empire by Pechenegs	1774	Treaty of Kutchuk Kainardji between Turkey and Russia
1090	Annexation of Croatia by Hungary	1783	Russia annexes Crimea
1096	First Crusade	1788	Austro-Russian war with Turkey
1102	Coloman extends Hungarian kingdom	1791	Peace of Sistova
1132	Bela II. king of Hungary	1792	Treaty of Jassy
1143	Manuel I. emperor		
1144	Fall of Edessa; cause of Second Crusade		
1151	Manuel invades Hungary		
1173	Bela III. king of Hungary		
1185	Isaac Angelus emperor		
1187	Capture of Jerusalem by Saladin		
1190	Nemanja king of Servia		
1197	Asenid dynasty established in Bulgaria		
1203	Fourth Crusade; Crusaders take Byzantium		



THE STORY OF THE GIPSIES

HABITS & CUSTOMS OF A WANDERING PEOPLE

IT remains to give some account of one more people, which, coming from the East, has never found rest for the sole of its foot, but has dispersed itself over Europe, and has even crossed the ocean, and yet has retained its distinctive racial character. For more than 500 years the Gipsy people have traversed East and Central Europe, wandering restlessly from place to place. In general they live at the present day

Restless Wanderers in Europe

among nations which have long ago been definitely settled and become organised, themselves still following their peculiar nomadic manners and customs under individual tribal chiefs. Even at the date of their first appearance in Europe the gipsies were able to give no adequate account of their origin or of their first home. The names which they apply to themselves are not without importance from an historical and ethnographical point of view. They call themselves by the old Indian name of an unclean caste "rom" = man, "romni" = woman. Another self-bestowed title is "kalo" (black), the opposite term to which, "parno" (white), is applied to all non-gipsies. Finally, the gipsies also style themselves "manusch" (people), while foreigners are known as "gadsio" (strangers). Upon rare occasions, and generally only in the course of public debate, they address one another as "sinte" (comrades).

More numerous are the names applied to the gipsies by the peoples with whom they came in contact. The German word "Zigeuner" is probably derived from the Phrygian-Lycaonian sect of the "Athinganoi," mentioned at the outset of the

ninth century by such Byzantine writers as Theophanes. Another derivation is from "tsjengi"; that is, musicians, dancers, etc. A third connects it with the Cangar tribe in the Punjab. It is, however, certain that the Germans received the name from the Czechs, who took it from the Magyars; the latter got it from the Roumanians, who again borrowed it from the Bulgarians. The name "Zigeuner" became general only in Eastern Europe and Italy (zingari); other names were used by the West Europeans. The Modern Greek Tuphtes, the Spanish and Portuguese Gitano, the Flemish Egyptenær, the English gipsy, are all forms of the title Egyptian. On their arrival in Central Europe the gipsies announced themselves to be Egyptians, whence their name "pharao nepe" (Pharaoh's people), still in use among the Magyars. In the Low-German speaking countries the gipsies were originally known as Suyginer, Zigöner, or even "Hungarians," and afterwards as "Tatern" or Tartars; in France they were called Bohémiens, as they came from Bohemia with letters of protection from King Sigismund of Hungary and

The Protoges of the Bohemian King

Bohemia. Since the time of the appearance of the gipsies in Europe, the flood of theories respecting their origin and descent has mounted high. After the interesting linguistic essay of Andrew Boorde in 1542, one of the earliest dissertations "de Cingaris" is to be found in the work of the Netherland Hellenist Bonaventura Vulcanius, "De literis et lingua Getarum" (Leyden, 1542); Job Ludolf also paid some


THE STORY OF THE GIPSIES

attention to their vocabulary in the commentary to his "Ethiopian History" published in 1691. The majority of scholars agree that the name of the sect of the Athinganer, the untouched, or those of another faith, has been transferred to the gipsies (cingani). Others looked for their origin in Zeugitana, or Carthage, a province formed under Diocletian and Constantine. Others, again, identified them with the Zygians, Canaanites, Saracens, Amorites and Jews, or regarded them as the descendants of Chus, the son of Cham (Genesis x. 6).

The Hungarian chronicler Pray made a nearer guess at the truth in considering their first home to have been the former Seljuk kingdom of Rum (Iconium), as the

In the little town of Fürstenau was a gravestone, erected on the vigil of St. Sebastian (19th January), 1445, to the deceased "noble lord Sir Panuel, duke of Egypt Minor and lord of the stag's horn in that country." The coat of arms upon the stone displayed a golden eagle crowned, and above the tilting helmet a crown with a stag. Another monument with a fantastic coat of arms existed in the neighbourhood of Backnang in Württemberg dated 1453, to the "noble count Peter of Kleinschild."

There is no doubt that the gipsies had leaders, and that those who live in tents have leaders at the present day; these leaders have a distinctive sign, such as an



AN ENCAMPMENT OF THE FIRST GIPSIES IN CENTRAL EUROPE
From an engraving by Jacques Callot in 1601, now in the Dresden Cabinet of Engravings.

gipsies call themselves Rom. On their first appearance many assumed that they were pilgrims from Egypt, who were performing a seven years' penitential pilgrimage, in expiation of the refusal of their ancestors to receive the infant Christ in Egypt when he was fleeing from Herod with his parents. These and similar legends are related at the present day by wandering gipsy tribes in Hungary and in the Balkan territories. Here we have an explanation of the tenacious adherence to the belief in their Egyptian origin. The gipsy leaders also contributed to the spread of this belief; after 1400 they styled themselves "kings," "dukes," or "counts of Egypt Minor," and appeared as rulers of distinction in every district.

Legends of Nomadic Tribes

embroidered cloak, cloth, or goblet. The several tribes of the nomadic gipsies are also social units in so far as they are under the government of one voivode. In practice they are nowhere tolerated in large hordes, and have consequently broken up into smaller independent communities or societies ("mahlija," from "mahlo" = friend), under individual chieftains, the "schaibidso." In important cases these leaders appeal to the decision of the voivode, who may be spending his time with one or another tribe. The schaubidso is elected by the tribe, and the voivode confirms his appointment by eating bread and salt with him in public; he then commands the mahlija in question to regard the schaubidso as his plenipotentiary. Among the nomadic gipsies the position of voivode is hereditary

at the present day; if a minor should inherit, the position is occupied until his majority by one of his nearest relations. The installation of a voivode is a very simple ceremony. The voivode recites a form of oath, and is lifted up by his tribesmen while the women throw crab-apple seeds upon him, to keep away evil spirits. The voivode among the nomadic gipsies at the present day occupies a position which is merely honourable; formerly every mahlija paid him a yearly tribute proportioned to the position and the number of its members.

The Home of the Gipsy Tongue

Various investigators have been misled by confusing the "Romany" tongue with the "thieves' Latin" of one country or another. It was, however, long suspected, and has now been definitely proved, that the home of the gipsy language—and therefore of the gipsies—is in the north-west of India. It belongs to the same group as the Dardu languages spoken in Kafiristan, Dardistan, Kashmir, and Little Tibet.

The science of comparative philology has clearly proved the gipsies to be a branch of the Hindu nationality; it has also shown us by what route the gipsies left India, and in what countries their migrations have been interrupted for a longer or shorter period. The causes which drove the gipsies to migration, and the date at which their wanderings began, are shrouded for ever in obscurity. It is, however, tolerably certain that more than one migration took place. Possibly we have here the explanation of the fact that in many countries where they are now naturalised they are divided into two or more castes. Individual advances or disruptions may have taken place at an early date, while the first great movement or movements did not begin before the Christian era. The Persian and Armenian elements in the European dialects clearly

In League with the Arabs

show that the gipsies must have made their way first through Armenia and Persia, and have remained a considerable time in those countries. They entered Persia under the Sassanid dynasty, and were given the marshy districts on the Lower Euphrates as a settlement. They readily made common cause with the Arab conquerors; but after the death of the Caliph Mamun in 833 they left their settlements, and disturbed the country by

their plundering raids, until Ojeif ibn Ambassa was obliged to bring them to reason by force of arms.

The Armenian "Bosha"—that is, vagabonds—the gipsies of the Armenian faith (the Mohammedan gipsies of Asia Minor are known as "Chingene," or "Chinghiané"), who are chiefly to be found at Bujbat in the vilayet of Sivas, when not engaged in their favourite occupation of wandering, speak a language which possesses an unusually sparse vocabulary—about 600 words in all; no songs—but undoubtedly belongs to the Indian branch of the Aryan family of languages; their chief occupation is sieve-making. Neither in Turkish nor in Russian Armenia, whither part of them have migrated since 1828, do they bring their disputes before the state tribunals, but before the council of their elders, presided over by the Althopakal (expressly confirmed in office by the Porte; formerly called Jamadar); in Russian Armenia he is associated with an Ustadar or secular caste-chieftain. From Armenia members of the gipsy nationality may have migrated to North Africa through Syria, and thence, though

Venetians Tax the Gipsies

not before the nineteenth century, to the centre and north-west of South America, where, following the convenient waterways, they infest one republic and town after another; thus they visit Guayaquil in Ecuador every two or three years. Another and stronger division entered Europe through Phrygia and Lycaonia and across the Hellespont. Greece is to be regarded as the first European home of all the gipsies who are dispersed throughout Europe, including the Spanish. There is tolerable evidence for the presence of gipsies in Byzantium at the outset of the ninth century; and in Crete in the year 1322 we hear of them from the Franciscan Simon Simeonis.

About 1398 the Venetian governor of Nauplion, Ottaviano Burno, confirmed the privileges granted by his predecessors to John, chieftain of the Acingani. The Venetians allowed the gipsies to settle in the Peloponnese on payment of certain dues. Many ruins still known as Typhtracastron—that is, Egyptian or gipsy fortress—remain as evidence of their occupation. German travellers in the second half of the fifteenth century report the presence of these "Egyptian" settlers. In Corfu "Vageniti" were to be found before



THE BREAKING UP OF A GIPSY ENCAMPMENT

From the painting by Sir John Gilbert, by permission of the Corporation of Manchester.

1346; about 1370-1373 there was a fully organised gipsy colony, the members of which are mentioned as being in the service of the barons, Theodoros Kavasilas, Nicolà di Donato of Altavilla, and Bernard de Saint-Maurice. About 1386 a "feudum Acinganorum" was founded from this colony, first conferred upon the Baron Gianuì di Abitabulo, then in 1540 upon the scholar Antonio Eparco, who carried on a correspondence with Melanchthon; in 1563 it passed into the hands of the Count Theodoro Trivoli.

In the first half of the fourteenth century those migrations in the Balkan Peninsula took place in the course of which the Albanians occupied Attica and the Peloponnese, while numerous Armenian families settled in Moldavia and many Roumanians migrated to the slopes of Mount Pindus; at that moment a large number of the gipsies began to advance into Wallachia. They must have been settled in the country by 1370, for in 1387 the Hospodar Mircea the Old confirmed a donation of forty Zalassi, or tent, gipsies

made by the last of his predecessors, Layko (Vlad I.), to the monastery of St. Maria in Tismania (Wallachia Minor) and to that of St. Antonius, "na Vodici" and others. When Wallachia afterwards became tributary to the Turks, the gipsies may have begun to migrate in large numbers to Transylvania and Hungary. Hence they spread over the whole of Europe. It was not until 1820-1830 that Alexander Ghika relaxed the serfdom of the gipsies in Wallachia, which was finally abolished on March 3rd, 1856.

In the year 1417 the first gipsies appeared in the Hansa towns on the North Sea and the Baltic. They produced commendatory letters from the Emperor Sigismund, and repeated the story of their Egyptian origin and their seven years' penitential pilgrimage, and thus gained the support both of Church and State as well as that of private individuals. In 1418 we find them also in Switzerland.

However, this friendly reception was soon followed by persecution, in accordance with the somewhat barbarous spirit of the

age. It was not so much the actual misdeeds or the annoying presence of the strangers as their unusual customs that attracted the attention of the authorities. It was also to the prejudice of this miserable and harmless race that they came from districts more or less in possession of the Turks. They were regarded as the

**In the Service
of Christianity's
Enemies**

advance guard or as the spies of the "hereditary enemies of Christendom." Thus, the recess of 1479 of the German imperial diet proclaimed, "with regard to those who are called gipsies and constantly traverse the land, seeing that we have evidence to show that the said gipsies are the spies and scouts of the enemy of Christianity, we command that they are not to be suffered to enter or to settle in the country, and every authority shall take due measures to prevent such settlement and at the next assembly shall bring forward such further measures as may seem advisable." In the following year the diet of Freiburg declared the gipsies outlaws—that is to say, the murderer of a gipsy went unpunished.

However, the gipsies were steadily reinforced by new arrivals from Hungary, and these measures produced little effect. In any case, it was found necessary to renew them in the recess of the diets of 1500, 1544, 1548, and 1577. On September 20th, 1701, the Emperor Leopold declared that on the reappearance of the gipsies "the most drastic measures would be taken against them." A worthy counterpart to this decree is the regulation of the Count of Reuss, published on July 13th, 1711, and made more stringent on December 12th, 1713, and May 9th, 1722, to the effect that "all gipsies found in the territory of Reuss were to be shot down on the spot."

Every conceivable crime was laid to the charge of the gipsies; among other accusations it was said that they exhumed dead bodies to satisfy their craving for human flesh. In consequence of a charge of this nature, forty-five gipsies were unjustly executed in 1782 in the county of Hont in North-west Hungary. The accusation is based upon a misunderstanding of their funeral customs, in which the strongest characteristic of gipsy religious sentiment, the feeling of fear, is vigorously emphasised. In a


lonely corner of the village churchyard or at the edge of some secluded wood the corpse is interred, and the spot is marked with a curious post, shaped like a wedge, the upper end of which is hardly visible above the surface of the ground, while the lower end almost touches the head of the corpse.

This custom is connected with an older use, now disappearing, in accordance with which the relatives took away the head of the corpse after a certain time, buried it elsewhere and drove the post deep into the earth in its place—solely for the purpose of hastening the process of putrefaction. Only after complete putrefaction of the body, according to gipsy belief, can the soul enter the "kingdom of the dead," where it then lives a life analogous to that of earth. Gipsies may have been surprised in the performance of this custom, and have been consequently accused of eating the corpse.

By degrees the gipsies advanced from Germany over the neighbouring parts of East and Northern Europe. They entered

**The Last
of the
Gipsy "Kings"** Poland and Lithuania in the reign of Vladislav II. Jagellon. In 1501 King Alexander I. granted a charter to Vasil, the "woyt cyganski." The diet of 1557 ordered the expulsion of the strangers, and this decree was repeated in 1565, 1578, and 1618. The gipsies, however, found life in this country very tolerable. They were governed by a leader of their own, whose position was confirmed by the King of Poland and by Prince Radziwill in Lithuania. The last of these gipsy "kings" was Jan Marcinkiewicz, who died about 1790, and was recognised as "king" in 1778 by Karol Stanislaw Radziwill. In 1701 they were given settlements in Poland.

At the outset of the sixteenth century the gipsies entered Finland and also the north of Russia. Catharine II. put an end to their nomadic existence by settling them on the crown lands, with a guaranteed immunity from taxation for four years. Many of them are living in Bessarabia, at Bjelgorod, and in the neighbourhood of Taganrog; but these South Russian gipsies generally came into the country through Roumania, and not by the circuitous route through Poland. They met with far worse treatment in Sweden; the first mention of them in that



THE WANDERERS FROM BOHEMIA: FIRST APPEARANCE OF THE GIPSIES IN FRANCE
From the painting by Sir John Gilbert, by permission of the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool.

country belongs to 1572. In 1662 they were banished by a royal decree which ordered the execution of any gipsy who returned. A Moravian decree of 1599 is couched in similar terms. Christian III. of Denmark, where the strangers had been known since 1420, issued a decree ordering them to leave the country within three months. After Frederick II. had reiterated this order in 1561, Denmark was soon freed from the intruders.

The Wanderers in England and Scotland More fortunate was the fate of those scattered bodies who reached England about 1450 and Scotland about 1492; in spite of their proscription by Henry VIII. in 1531, and the decrees of his daughters Mary and Elizabeth, their numbers increased considerably. They were subject to a "king" from the Lee family; the last of these, King Joseph Lee, died in 1884. In 1827 a society was formed in England to improve the position of the gipsies.

In most of the Romance countries the gipsies met with an unfriendly reception so soon as they arrived. In 1422 they entered Italy (Bologna), but abandoned the country in a few years, as the clergy opposed them both in word and deed. The band which appeared in France in 1447 was allowed only five years of peace. When the gipsies plundered the little town of La Cheppe in the north-east of Châlons-sur-Marne, they were driven out by the peasants. In scattered bodies they travelled about the country until 1504. The first decree of banishment was then issued against them, and was repeated with greater stringency in 1539. Their extermination by fire and sword was decreed by the Parliament of Orléans in 1560, and was actually carried out by Louis XIII. and Louis XIV.

Only a small proportion of the gipsies were able to find refuge among the Basques, who had been visited by individual gipsies as early as 1538. But in the night of December 6th, 1802, the gipsies in that country were taken prisoners, with few exceptions, by the order of the prefect of the Basses Pyrénées and shipped to Africa. In Spain a band of gipsies appeared near Barcelona in 1447, and met with a favourable reception. They suffered little or no harm from the decree of banishment issued by Ferdinand the Catholic in 1499 and repeated in 1539, 1586, 1619, or from the prohibition of Philip IV.

Spain's Favourable Reception

in 1633, extended in 1661 and 1663, against their use of their own language and their nomadic habits. Greater, from another point of view, was the influence of the regulations of Charles III., of September 19th, 1783. To those gipsies who renounced the use of their "gerigonza" (gipsy language), wandering habits, and dress, this decree granted toleration; it threw open all offices to them, and allowed them to practise any trade, thereby furthering the process of denationalisation. In Southern Spain they continue a highly satisfactory existence at the present day.

Hungary and Transylvania formed the second resting-place, and in a sense the new home of the gipsies in Europe. They must have reached these countries shortly after 1400, for as early as 1416 gipsies from Hungary are found in Moravia, Bohemia, and Silesia, and in the rest of Germany in 1417. Those who wandered to Germany brought letters of commendation from the Hungarian Palatine Nicholas Gara to Constance, where the Emperor Sigismund was staying at that time; he was thus induced to grant them the charter

Hungarian Concessions to the Gipsies

previously mentioned — its existence is confirmed by a letter of the Hungarian Count Thurzó of the year 1616. The gipsies who were left in Hungary and Transylvania enjoyed certain privileges, like the Roumanians and Jews who possessed no land, as "serfs of the king," in so far as their settlement upon private property was conditional upon the royal consent. As armourers they also enjoyed the special favour of the ecclesiastical and secular authorities. Thus, on September 23rd, 1476, King Matthias allowed the town of Hermannstadt to employ the gipsies upon necessary works; and on April 8th, 1487, he ordered the voivode to leave undisturbed those gipsies who had been conceded to the people of Hermannstadt.

In 1496, Vladislav II. granted a charter to the voivode Thomas Polgar, whereby he and his people were to be left unmolested, as they were then preparing munitions of war for Sigismund, Bishop of Fünfkirchen. As in Poland, the dignity of gipsy king had been conferred upon nobles before 1731, so also in Transylvania and Hungary the ruler chose the chief voivode of the gipsies from the ranks of the nobility. In Transylvania the position was usually occupied by one nobleman,

THE STORY OF THE GIPSIES

and at times by two. In Hungary, on the other hand, there were always four chief voivodes, whose seats were Raab, Levá, Szatmár, and Kaschau. The gipsies were under their jurisdiction, and were obliged to pay a poll-tax of one florin a year. Under Peter Vallou, who was made chief voivode of Transylvania by Prince George Rakoczy, and even allowed to take the oath, the position was abolished by law.

From the date of their first appearance in the Theiss and Carpathian districts, the gipsies were especially famous as musicians. In this capacity they found employment at the courts of the princes and magnates; in 1525 they were even "installed" at the national assembly of Hatvan as musicians. Their yearning, heartrending melodies, composed, as it were, of passionate sighs, are played with incomparable purity, certainty and feeling. Soon this romantic people acquired a privileged position among the Hungarians; noble and citizen, peasant and student, alike delighted in the sound of a gipsy violin. These poetic nomads remain one of the most interesting features both of the Hungarian plains and of the Transylvanian forests. The fame of such gipsy musicians as Barna, Berkes, Bihari, Patikasus, Rácz, Salamon, or of the female violinist Zinka Panna, soon extended far beyond the frontiers.

Here, also in Transylvania and Hungary, are to be found the truest lyric poets among the gipsies, men living in joyful seclusion from the world, or considering the world only in the light of their own experience. The existence of a ballad poetry among the gipsies had long been denied, without due consideration of the fact that a people of such high musical talent could not fail to possess a store of ballads.

It is difficult to imagine anything more perfect than these lyrics, which are to be found among the wandering gipsies of Hungary and the Balkan territories by those who will take the pains to search. The authorship of these songs is unknown; they come forth from the people, and remain a national possession. One poetess only has left 250 gipsy poems in writing, the Servian wandering gipsy, Gima Ranjicic, who died in 1891. Beauty and education were the curse of her life. A reader of her poems published in a German trans-

lation can reconstruct a life of suffering, of desperate struggle, and unfulfilled hope. Beyond this, the intellectual achievements of the gipsies are few. Whether the Madonna painter Antonio de Solari, known as Il Zingaro (about 1382-1455), is to be accounted a gipsy is a matter of doubt. The gipsy women earn a fair amount of money by the practice of incantations, fortune-telling, fortune-telling, card play, and the like, and enjoy a reputation among the villagers as leeches and magicians. In the belief of this outcast people there are women, and sometimes men, in possession of supernatural powers, either inherited or acquired. Most of the female magicians (*chohalji*; also known as "good women," *latche romni*) have been trained by their mothers from early childhood, and have inherited the necessary prestige. They play a considerable part in all the family festivals of the wandering gipsies.

In other countries these restless strangers have been forced to settle down; but most of the gipsies in Hungary, in the Balkans (the Mohammedan *Zapóri*), and in America continue their nomadic existence at the present day, almost invariably within the limits of one country or nationality; hence they are able to maintain their ancient customs more or less unchanged. But in these countries the governments have taken a truly benevolent interest in the gipsies, and have done their best to make them a civilised race. Thus, by a regulation of November 13th, 1761, the Queen-empress Maria Theresa ordered the name "gipsy" to be changed to that of "new Hungarian" (in Magyar, *uj magyarok*) and the gipsies to be settled in the Banate. The authorities built them huts, and gave them seed, and even cattle; but as soon as the supplies were consumed the objects of this benevolence started again upon their wanderings. Only a small body remained and became a settled industrial community. On

November 29th, 1767, Maria Theresa issued another and more stringent edict, to the effect that the gipsy children were to be taken away and brought up by "Christian" people at the expense of the state, while the marriage of gipsies was absolutely prohibited. This edict produced little or no effect in comparison with the trouble involved. On October 9th, 1783, Joseph II. issued a "general regula-

The Nomads as Poets and Musicians

Money in Fortune- Telling

The Wasted Benevolence of Maria Theresa

tion" containing the following severe conditions: gipsy children were not to run about naked in public places, and were to be taken early to school and to church. All children above four years of age must be redistributed every two years among the neighbouring communities in order to secure diversity of instruction. Adults were strictly prohibited from wandering; even the settled gipsies were only to visit the yearly market under special supervision. They were forbidden to trade as horse-dealers. The use of their language was forbidden under a penalty of twenty strokes, and intermarriage was strictly prohibited.

In the first half of the nineteenth

1870. Little effect was produced by the decree of the Hungarian ministry of the interior prohibiting vagrancy, issued on July 9th, 1867. The Archduke Joseph, who was well acquainted with the nomadic gipsies, settled several families, but in less than ten years they had all deserted their new home. The gipsies have a kind of "residence" in Debreczin, formerly a pure Magyar town. A few years ago the Hungarian Government announced their intention of taking the work of settlement in hand with greater seriousness.

Numbers of gipsies settle down every year under the pressure of circumstances. Thus, not only in Hungary, but also in the other countries of Europe, with the



A GIPSY ENCAMPMENT IN SCOTLAND

From the painting by Fred Walker.

century political confusion and attempts to secure freedom so entirely occupied the attention of the state that it was impossible to deal further with the gipsy problem. Attempts to settle the gipsies were made by private individuals. Bishop John Ham opened a gipsy school at Szatmar in 1857, and the priest, Ferdinand Farkas, founded an educational institution at Neuhäusel; both experiments speedily came to an end. The efforts of the Servian government to put an end to the wanderings of the Mohammedan tent gipsies, or *gurbeti*, were more successful between 1860 and

possible exception of Roumania, the number of gipsies is decreasing every year. In 1895 there were only 12,000 in the whole of the British Islands. In Prussia, where they were left in comparative peace until the ordinance of 1872, there are hardly 11,000; noteworthy are the small colonies which have survived in Lorraine from the French period in the parishes of Barenthal, Wiesenthal, and Götzenbruck. To-day there may be about nine hundred thousand gipsies in Europe and at least as many again in the other continents of the world. HEINRICH VON WLISLOCKI

END OF FOURTH VOLUME



D
20
H376
v.4

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Santa Barbara

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW.

Series 9482

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



D 000 797 540 2

