

**ETHNOLOGICAL  
MAP OF MODERN EUROPE  
PRIMARY PEOPLES**

- BASQUES
- ARYAN PEOPLES**
- CELTS**
- LATIN BRANCH**
- FRENCH
- PORTUGUESE
- RAETIAN
- SPANIARDS**
- ITALIANS**
- GERMANIC BRANCH**
- GERMANS
- SCANDINAVIANS
- ANGLO-SAXONS
- SLAVIC BRANCH**
- 1 GREAT RUSSIANS
- LITTLE RUSSIANS
- WHITE RUSSIANS
- 2 POLES
- (CZECHS SLOVAKS AND WENDS)
- BULGARIANS
- 3 SERBIANS ETC
- SLOVENES
- LITHUANIANS
- GREEKS**
- NON ARYAN PEOPLES**
- URAL ALTAIC OR FINNO-TATAR STEMS**
- MAGYARS
- FINNIC PEOPLES
- TURKS
- TARTARS
- KALMUCKS









H. D.  
L 3254h

# HISTORY FOR READY REFERENCE

FROM THE BEST  
HISTORIANS, BIOGRAPHERS, AND SPECIALISTS

THEIR OWN WORDS IN A COMPLETE  
SYSTEM OF HISTORY

FOR ALL USES, EXTENDING TO ALL COUNTRIES AND SUBJECTS,  
AND REPRESENTING FOR BOTH READERS AND STUDENTS THE BETTER AND  
NEWER LITERATURE OF HISTORY IN THE  
ENGLISH LANGUAGE

*supplied by Nelson*  
BY  
J. N. LARNED

WITH NUMEROUS HISTORICAL MAPS FROM ORIGINAL STUDIES AND DRAWINGS BY  
ALAN C. REILEY



IN FIVE VOLUMES

VOLUME I—A TO ELBA

*37218*  
*4/1/96*

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.  
THE C. A. NICHOLS CO., PUBLISHERS  
MDCCCXCV



COPYRIGHT, 1893,  
BY J. N. LARNED.

*The Riverside Press, Cambridge, Mass., U. S. A.*  
Printed by H. O. Houghton & Company.

## PREFACE.

---

THIS work has two aims: to represent and exhibit the better Literature of History in the English language, and to give it an organized body—a system—adapted to the greatest convenience in any use, whether for reference, or for reading, for teacher, student, or casual inquirer.

The entire contents of the work, with slight exceptions readily distinguished, have been carefully culled from some thousands of books,—embracing the whole range (in the English language) of standard historical writing, both general and special: the biography, the institutional and constitutional studies, the social investigations, the archeological researches, the ecclesiastical and religious discussions, and all other important tributaries to the great and swelling main stream of historical knowledge. It has been culled as one might pick choice fruits, careful to choose the perfect and the ripe, where such are found, and careful to keep their flavor unimpaired. The flavor of the Literature of History, in its best examples, and the ripe quality of its latest and best thought, are faithfully preserved in what aims to be the garner of a fair selection from its fruits.

History as written by those, on one hand, who have depicted its scenes most vividly, and by those, on the other hand, who have searched its facts, weighed its evidences, and pondered its meanings most critically and deeply, is given in their own words. If commoner narratives are sometimes quoted, their use enters but slightly into the construction of the work. The whole matter is presented under an arrangement which imparts distinctness to its topics, while showing them in their sequence and in all their large relations, both national and international.

For every subject, a history more complete, I think, in the broad meaning of "History," is supplied by this mode than could possibly be produced on the plan of dry synopsis which is common to encyclopedic works. It holds the charm and interest of many styles of excellence in writing, and it is read in a clear light which shines directly from the pens that have made History luminous by their interpretations.

Behind the Literature of History, which can be called so in the finer sense, lies a great body of the Documents of History, which are unattractive to the casual reader, but which even he must sometimes have an urgent wish to consult. Full and carefully chosen texts of a large number of the most famous and important of such documents—charters, edicts, proclamations, petitions, covenants, legislative acts and ordinances, and the constitutions of

many countries — have been accordingly introduced and are easily to be found.

The arrangement of matter in the work is primarily alphabetical, and secondarily chronological. The whole is thoroughly indexed, and the index is incorporated with the body of the text, in the same alphabetical and chronological order.

Events which touch several countries or places are treated fully but once, in the connection which shows their antecedents and consequences best, and the reader is guided to that ampler discussion by references from each caption under which it may be sought. Economies of this character bring into the compass of five volumes a body of History that would need twice the number, at least, for equal fulness on the monographic plan of encyclopedic works.

Of my own, the only original writing introduced is in a general sketch of the history of *Europe*, and in what I have called the "*Logical Outlines*" of a number of national histories, which are printed in colors to distinguish the influences that have been dominant in them. But the extensive borrowing which the work represents has not been done in an unlicensed way. I have felt warranted, by common custom, in using moderate extracts without permit. But for everything beyond these, in my selections from books now in print and on sale, whether under copyright or deprived of copyright, I have sought the consent of those, authors or publishers, or both, to whom the right of consent or denial appears to belong. In nearly all cases I have received the most generous and friendly responses to my request, and count among my valued possessions the great volume of kindly letters of permission which have come to me from authors and publishers in Great Britain and America. A more specific acknowledgment of these favors will be appended to this preface.

The authors of books have other rights beyond their rights of property, to which respect has been paid. No liberties have been taken with the text of their writings, except to abridge by omissions, which are indicated by the customary signs. Occasional interpolations are marked by enclosure in brackets. Abridgment by paraphrasing has only been resorted to when unavoidable, and is shown by the interruption of quotation marks. In the matter of different spellings, it has been more difficult to preserve for each writer his own. As a rule this is done, in names, and in the divergences between English and American orthography; but, since much of the matter quoted has been taken from American editions of English books, and since both copyists and printers have worked under the habit of American spellings, the rule may not have governed with strict consistency throughout.

J. N. L.

THE BUFFALO LIBRARY,

Buffalo, N. Y., December, 1893.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

IN MY preface I have acknowledged in general terms the courtesy and liberality of authors and publishers, by whose permission I have used much of the matter quoted in this work. I think it now proper to make the acknowledgment more specific by naming those persons and publishing houses to whom I am in debt for such kind permissions. They are as follows:

### AUTHORS.

Prof. Evelyn Abbott; President Charles Kendall Adams; Prof. Herbert B. Adams; Prof. Joseph H. Allen; Sir William Anson, Bart.; Rev. Henry M. Baird; Mr. Hubert Howe Bancroft; Hon. S. G. W. Benjamin; Mr. Walter Besant; Prof. Albert S. Bolles; John G. Bourinot, F. S. S.; Mr. Henry Bradley; Rev. James Franck Bright; Daniel G. Britton, M. D.; Prof. William Hand Browne; Prof. George Bryce; Rt. Hon. James Bryce, M. P.; J. B. Bury, M. A.; Mr. Lucien Carr; Gen. Henry B. Carrington; Mr. John D. Champlin, Jr.; Mr. Charles Carleton Coffin; Hon. Thomas M. Cooley; Prof. Henry Coppée; Rev. Sir George W. Cox, Bart.; Gen. Jacob Dolson Cox; Mrs. Cox (for "Three Decades of Federal Legislation," by the late Hon. Samuel S. Cox); Prof. Thomas F. Crane; Rt. Rev. Mandell Creighton, Bishop of Peterborough; Hon. J. L. M. Curry; Hon. George Ticknor Curtis; Prof. Robert K. Douglas; J. A. Doyle, M. A.; Mr. Samuel Adams Drake; Sir Mount Stuart E. Grant-Duff; Hon. Sir Charles Gaven Duffy; Mr. Charles Henry Edon; Mr. Henry Sutherland Edwards; Orrin Leslie Elliott, Ph. D.; Mr. Loyal Farragut; The Ven. Frederic William Farrar, Archdeacon of Westminster; Prof. George Park Fisher; Prof. John Fiske; Mr. Wm. E. Foster; Prof. William Wardo Fowler; Prof. Edward A. Freeman; Prof. James Anthony Froude; Mr. James Gairdner; Arthur Gilman, M. A.; Mr. Parke Godwin; Mrs. M. E. Gordon (for the "History of the Campaigns of the Army of Va. under Gen. Pope," by the late Gen. George H. Gordon); Rev. Sabine Baring-Gould; Mr. Ulysses S. Grant, Jr. (for the "Personal Memoirs" of the late Gen. Grant); Mrs. John Richard Green (for her own writings and for those of the late John Richard Green); William Greswell, M. B.; Maj. Arthur Griffiths; Frederic Harrison, M. A.; Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart; Mr. William Heatun; Col. Thomas Wentworth Higginson; Prof. B. A. Hinsdale; Miss Margaret L. Hooper (for the writings of the late Mr. George Hooper); Rev. Robert F. Horton; Prof. James K. Hosmer; Col. Henry M. Hozer; Rev. William Hunt; Sir William Wilson Hunter; Prof. Edmund James; Mr. Rossiter Johnson; Mr. John Foster Kirk; The Very Rev. George William Kitchin, Dean of Winchester; Col. Thos. W. Knox; Mr. J. S. Landon; Hon. Emily Lawless; William E. H. Lecky, LL. D., D. C. L.; Mrs. Margaret Levi (for the "History of British Commerce," by the late Dr. Leone Levi); Prof. Charlton T. Lewis; The Very Rev. Henry George Liddell, Dean of Christ Church, Oxford; Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge; Richard Lodge, M. A.; Rev. W. J. Lofte; Mrs. Mary S. Long (for the "Life of General Robert E. Lee," by the late Gen. A. L. Long); Mrs. Helen Lossing (for the writings of the late Benson J. Lossing); Charles Lowe, M. A.; Charles P. Lucas, B. A.; Justin McCarthy, M. P.; Prof. John Bach McMaster; Hon. Edward McPherson, Prof. John P. Mahaffy; Capt. Alfred T. Mahan, U. S. N.; Col. George B. Malleson; Clements R. Markham, C. B., F. R. S.; Prof. David Masson; The Very Rev. Charles Merivale, Dean of Ely; Prof. John Henry Middleton; Mr. J. G. Cotton Minchin; William R. Morfill, M. A.; Rt. Hon. John Morley, M. P.; Mr. John T. Morse, Jr.; Sir William Muir; Mr. Harold Murdock; Rev. Arthur Howard Noll; Miss Kate Norgate; C. W. C. Oman, M. A.; Mr. John C. Palfrey (for "History of New England," by the late John Gorham Palfrey); Francis Parkman, LL. D.; Edward James Payne, M. A.; Charles Henry Pearson, M. A.; Mr. James Breck Perkins; Mrs. Mary E. Phelan (for the "History of Tennessee," by the late James Phelan); Col. George E. Pond; Reginald L. Poole, Ph. D.; Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole; William F. Poole, LL. D.; Maj. John W. Powell; Mr. John W. Proby; Prof. John Clark Ridpath; Hon. Ellis H. Roberts; Hon. Theodore Roosevelt; Mr. John Codman Ropes; J. H. Rose, M. A.; Prof. Josiah Royce; Rev. Philip Schaff; James Schouler, LL. D.; Hon. Carl Schurz; Mr. Eben Greenough Scott; Prof. J. R. Seeley; Prof. Nathaniel Southgate Shaler; Mr. Edward Morse Shepard; Col. M. V. Sheridan (for the "Personal Memoirs" of the late Gen. Sheridan); Mr. P. T. Sherman (for the "Memoirs" of the late Gen. Sherman); Samuel Smiles, LL. D.; Prof. Goldwin Smith; Prof. James Russell Soley; Mr. Edward Stanwood; Leslie Stephen, M. A.; H. Morse Stephens, M. A.; Mr. Simon Sterne; Charles J. Stillé, LL. D.; Sir John Strachey; Rt. Rev. William Stubbs, Bishop of Peterborough; Prof. William Graham Sumner; Prof. Frank William Tausig; Mr. William Roscoe Thayer; Prof. Robert H. Thurston; Mr. Telemachus T. Timayensis; Henry D. Trall, D. C. L.; Gen. R. de Trobriand; Mr. Bayard Tuckerman; Samuel Epes Turner, Ph. D.; Prof. Herbert Tuttle; Prof. Arminius Vambéry; Mr. Henri Van Laun; Gen. Francis A. Walker; Sir D. Mackenzie Wallace; Spencer Walpole, LL. D.; Alexander Stewart Webb, LL. D.; Mr. J. Talboys Wheeler; Mr. Arthur Silva White; Sir Monier Monier-Williams; Justin Winsor, LL. D.; Rev. Frederic C. Woodhouse; John Yeats, LL. D.; Miss Charlotte M. Yonge.

### PUBLISHERS.

London: Messrs. W. H. Allen & Co.; Asher & Co.; George Bell & Sons; Richard Bentley & Son; Bickers & Sons; A. & C. Black; Cassell & Co.; Chapman & Hall; Chatto & Windus; Thos. De La Rue & Co.; H. Grevel & Co.; Griffith, Farran & Co.; William Heinemann; Hodder & Stoughton; Sampson Low, Marston & Co.; Macmillan & Co.; Methuen & Co.; John Murray; John C. Nimmo; Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.; George Philip & Son; The Religious Tract Society; George Routledge & Sons; Seeley & Co.; Smith, Elder & Co.; Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge; Edward Stanford; Stevens & Haynes; Henry Stevens & Son; Elliot Stock; Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; The Times; T. Fisher Unwin; Ward, Lock, Bowden & Co.; Frederick Warns & Co.; Williams & Norgate.

New York: Messrs. D. Appleton & Co.; Armstrong & Co.; A. S. Barnes & Co.; The Century Co.; T. Y. Crowell & Co.; Derby & Miller; Dick & Fitzgerald; Dodd, Mead & Co.; Harper & Brothers; Henry Holt & Co.; Townsend MacCoun; G. P. Putnam's Sons; Anson D. F. Randolph & Co.; D. J. Sadler & Co.; Charles Scribner's Sons; Charles L. Webster & Co.

*Edinburgh:* Messrs. William Blackwood & Sons; W. & R. Chambers; David Douglas; Thomas Nelson & Sons; W. P. Nimmo; Hay & Mitchell; The Scottish Reformation Society.

*Philadelphia:* Messrs. L. H. Everts & Co.; J. B. Lippincott Company; Oldach & Co.; Porter & Coates.

*Boston:* Messrs. Estes & Lauriat; Houghton, Mifflin & Co.; Little, Brown & Co.; D. Lothrop Company; Roberts Brothers.

*Dublin:* Messrs. James Duffy & Co.; Hodges, Figgis & Co.; J. J. Lalor.

*Chicago:* Messrs. Callaghan & Co.; A. C. McClurg & Co.

*Cincinnati:* Messrs. Robert Clarke & Co.; Jones Brothers Publishing Co.

*Hartford, Conn.:* Messrs. O. D. Case & Co.; S. S. Scranton & Co.

*Albany:* Messrs. Joel Munsell's Sons.

*Cambridge, Eng.:* The University Press.

*Norwich, Conn.:* The Heary Bill Publishing Co.

*Oxford:* The Clarendon Press.

*Providence, R. I.:* Messrs. J. A. & R. A. Reid.

A list of books quoted from will be given in the final volume.

I am greatly indebted to the remarkable kindness of a number of eminent historical scholars, who have critically examined the proof sheets of important articles and improved them by their suggestions. My debt to Miss Ellen M. Chandler, for assistance given me in many ways, is more than I can describe.

In my publishing arrangements I have been most fortunate, and I owe the good fortune very largely to a number of friends, among whom it is just that I should name Mr. Henry A. Richmond, Mr. George E. Matthews, and Mr. John G. Milburn. There is no feature of these arrangements so satisfactory to me as that which places the publication of my book in the hands of the Company of which Mr. Charles A. Nichols, of Springfield, Massachusetts, is the head.

I think myself fortunate, too, in the association of my work with that of Mr. Alan C. Reiley, from whose original studies and drawings the greater part of the historical maps in these volumes have been produced.

J. N. LARNED.



## LIST OF MAPS AND PLANS.

Ethnographic map of Modern Europe, . . . . .	Preceding the title-page.
Map of American Discovery and Settlement, . . . . .	To follow page 46
Plan of Athens, and Harbors of Athens, . . . . .	On page 145
Plan of Athenian house, . . . . .	On page 162
Four development maps of Austria, . . . . .	To follow page 196
Ethnographic map of Austria-Hungary, . . . . .	On page 197
Four development maps of Asia Minor and the Balkan Peninsula, . . . . .	To follow page 242
Map of the Balkan and Danubian States, showing changes during the present century, . . . . .	On page 244
Map of Burgundy under Charles the Bold, . . . . .	To follow page 332
Development map showing the diffusion of Christianity, . . . . .	To follow page 432

---

## LOGICAL OUTLINES, IN COLORS.

Athenian and Greek history, . . . . .	To follow page 144
Austrian history, . . . . .	To follow page 198

---

## CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES.

The Seventeenth Century: First half and second half, . . . . .	To follow page 208
To the Peloponnesian War, and Fourth and Third Centuries, B. C., . . . . .	To follow page 166

---

## APPENDICES TO VOLUME I.

- A. Notes to Ethnographic map; by Mr. A. C. Reiley.
- B. Notes to four maps of Asia Minor and the Balkan Peninsula; by the same.
- C. Notes to map of the Balkan Peninsula in the present century; by the same.
- D. Notes to map showing the diffusion of Christianity; by the same.
- E. Notes on the American Aborigines; by Major J. W. Powell and Mr. J. Owen Dorsey, of the U. S. Bureau of Ethnology.
- F. Bibliography of America (Discovery, Exploration, Settlement, Archaeology, and Ethnology), and of Austria.



# HISTORY FOR READY REFERENCE.

**A. C. Ante Christum;** used sometimes instead of the more familiar abbreviation, B. C.—Before Christ.

**A. D. Anno Domini;** The Year of Our Lord. See ERA, CHRISTIAN.

**A. E. I. O. U.**—"The famous device of Austria, A. E. I. O. U., was first used by Frederic III. [1440-1493], who adopted it on his plate, books, and buildings. These initials stand for 'Austriae Est Imperare Orbis Universo'; or, in German, 'Alles Erdreich Ist Osterreich Unterthan': a bold assumption for a man who was not safe in an inch of his dominions."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, v. 2, p. 89, *foot-note*.

**A. H. Anno Hejiræ.** See ERA, MAHOMETAN.

**A. M. "Anno Mundi;"** the Year of the World, or the year from the beginning of the world, according to the formerly accepted chronological reckoning of Archbishop Usher and others.

**A. U. C., OR U. C. "Ab urbe condita,"** from the founding of the city; or "Anno urbis Condite," the year from the founding of the city; the Year of Rome. See ROME: B. C. 753.

**AACHEN.** See AIX-LA-CHAPELLE.

**AARAU, Peace of (1712).** See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1652-1780.

**ABE, Oracle of.** See ORACLES OF THE GREEKS.

**ABBAS I. (called The Great), Shah of Persia;** A. D. 1582-1627....**Abbas II.,** A. D. 1641-1666....**Abbas III.,** A. D. 1732-1736.

**ABBASSIDES, The rise, decline and fall of the.** See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST, &c.: A. D. 715-750; 763; and 815-945; also BAODAD: A. D. 1258.

**ABBEY.—ABBOT.—ABBESS.** See MONASTERY.

**ABDALLEES, The.** See INDIA: A. D. 1747-1761.

**ABDLMELIK, Caliph, A. D. 684-705.**

**ABD-EL-KADER, The War of the French in Algiers with.** See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1830-1846.

**ABDICATIONS, Alexander, Prince of Bulgaria.** See BULGARIA: A. D. 1878-1886....**Amadeo of Spain.** See SPAIN: A. D. 1866-1873....**Charles IV. and Ferdinand VII. of Spain.** See SPAIN: A. D. 1807-1808....**Charles V. Emperor.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1552-1561, and NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1555....**Charles X. King of France.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1815-1830....**Charles Albert, King of Sardinia.** See ITALY: A. D. 1848-1849....**Christina, Regent of Spain.** See SPAIN: A. D. 1839-1846....**Christina, Queen of Sweden.** See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1644-1697....**Diocletian, Emperor.** See ROME: A. D. 284-305....**Ferdinand, Emperor of Austria.** See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1848-1849....**Louis Bonaparte, King of Holland.** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1806-1810....**Louis Philippe.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1841-1848....**Milan, King**

**of Servia.** See SERVIA: A. D. 1882-1889....**Pedro I., Emperor of Brazil, and King of Portugal.** See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1824-1889, and BRAZIL: A. D. 1825-1865....**Ptolemy I. of Egypt.** See MACEDONIA, &c.: B. C. 297-280....**Victor Emmanuel.** See ITALY: A. D. 1820-1821....**William I., King of Holland.** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1830-1884.

**ABDUL-AZIZ, Turkish Sultan, A. D. 1861-1876.**

**ABDUL-HAMID, Turkish Sultan, A. D. 1774-1789....Abdul-Hamid II., 1876.**

**ABDUL-MEDJID, Turkish Sultan, A. D. 1839-1861.**

**ABEL, King of Denmark, A. D. 1250-1252.**

**ABENCERRAGES, The.** See SPAIN: A. D. 1238-1273, and 1476-1492.

**ABENSBURG, Battle of.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1809 (JANUARY-JUNE).

**ABERCROMBIE'S CAMPAIGN IN AMERICA.** See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1758.

**ABERDEEN MINISTRY, The.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1851-1853, and 1855.

**ABIPONES, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PAMPAS TRIBES.

**ABJURATION OF HENRY IV.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1501-1593.

**ABNAKIS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONKIN FAMILY.

**ABO, Treaty of (1743).** See RUSSIA: A. D. 1740-1762.

**ABOLITIONISM IN AMERICA, The Rise of.** See SLAVERY, NEGRO: A. D. 1828-1832; and 1840-1847.

**ABORIGINES, AMERICAN.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES.

**ABOUKIR, Naval Battle of (or Battle of the Nile).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1798 (MAY-AUGUST)....**Land-battle of (1799).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1798-1799 (AUGUST-AUGUST).

**ABRAHAM, The Plains of.** That part of the high plateau of Quebec on which the memorable victory of Wolfe was won, September 13, 1759. The plain was so called "from Abraham Martin, a pilot known as Maitre Abraham, who had owned a piece of land here in the early times of the colony."—F. Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe*, v. 2, p. 289.—For an account of the battle which gave distinction to the Plains of Abraham, see CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1759, (JUNE-SEPTEMBER).

**ABSENTEEISM IN IRELAND.**—In Ireland, "the owners of about one-half the land do not live on or near their estates, while the owners of about one fourth do not live in the country. . . . Absenteeism is an old evil, and in very early times received attention from the government. . . . Some of the disadvantages to the community arising from the absence of the more wealthy and intelligent classes are apparent to every one. Unless the landlord is utterly poverty-stricken or very unenterprising, 'there is

a great deal more going on' when he is in the country. . . . I am convinced that absenteeism is a great disadvantage to the country and the people. . . . It is too much to attribute to it all the evils that have been set down to its charge. It is, however, an important consideration that the people regard it as a grievance; and think the twenty-five or thirty millions of dollars paid every year to these landlords, who are rarely or never in Ireland, is a tax grievous to be borne."

—D. B. King, *The Irish Question*, pp. 5-11.

**ABSOROKOS, OR CROWS, THE.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINALS: STOVAN FAMILY.

**ABU-BEKR**, Caliph, A. D. 632-634.

**ABU KLEA**, Battle of (1885). See EGYPT: A. D. 1884-1885.

**ABUL ABBAS**, Caliph, A. D. 750-754.

**ABUNA OF ABYSSINIA.**—"Since the days of Prudentius [who introduced Christianity into Abyssinia in the 4th century] every orthodox Primate of Abyssinia has been consecrated by the Coptic Patriarch of the church of Alexandria, and has borne the title of Abuna"—or Abuna Salama, "Father of Peace."—II. M. Hozier, *The British Expedition to Abyssinia*, p. 4.

**ABURY, OR AVEBURY.—STONEHENGE.—CARNAC.**—"The numerous circles of stone or of earth in Britain and Ireland, varying in diameter from 30 or 40 feet up to 1,200, are to be viewed as temples standing in the closest possible relation to the burial-places of the dead. The most imposing group of remains of this kind in this country [England] is that of Avebury [Abury], near Devizes, in Wiltshire, referred by Sir John Lubbock to a late stage in the Neolithic or to the beginning of the bronze period. It consists of a large circle of unworked upright stones 1,200 feet in diameter, surrounded by a fosse, which in turn is also surrounded by a rampart of earth. Inside are the remains of two concentric circles of stone, and from the two entrances in the rampart proceeded long avenues flanked by stones, one leading to Beckhampton, and the other to West Kennett, where it formerly ended in another double circle. Between them rises Silbury Hill, the largest artificial mound in Great Britain, no less than 130 feet in height. This group of remains was at one time second to none, 'but unfortunately for us [says Sir John Lubbock] the pretty little village of Avebury [Abury], like some beautiful parasite, has grown up at the expense and in the midst of the ancient temple, and out of 650 great stones, not above twenty are still standing. In spite of this it is still to be classed among the finest ruins in Europe. The famous temple of Stonehenge on Salisbury Plain is probably of a later date than Avebury, since not only are some of the stones used in its construction worked, but the surrounding barrows are more elaborate than those in the neighbourhood of the latter. It consisted of a circle 100 feet in diameter, of large upright blocks of sarsen stone, 12 feet 7 inches high, bearing imposts dovetailed into each other, so as to form a continuous architrave. Nine feet within this was a circle of small foreign stones . . . and within this five great trilithons of sarsen stone, forming a horse-shoe; then a horse-shoe of foreign stones, eight feet high, and in the centre a slab of micaceous sandstone called the altar-stone. . . . At a distance of 100 feet from the outer line a small ramp, with a ditch

outside, formed the outer circle, 300 feet in diameter, which cuts a low barrow and includes another, and therefore is evidently of later date than some of the barrows of the district."—W. B. Dawkins, *Early Man in Britain*, ch. 10.—"Stonehenge . . . may, I think, be regarded as a monument of the Bronze Age, though apparently it was not all erected at one time, the inner circle of small, unwrought, blue stones being probably older than the rest; as regards Abury, since the stones are all in their natural condition, while those of Stonehenge are roughly hewn, it seems reasonable to conclude that Abury is the older of the two, and belongs either to the close of the Stone Age, or to the commencement of that of Bronze. Both Abury and Stonehenge were, I believe, used as temples. Many of the stone circles, however, have been proved to be burial places. In fact, a complete burial place may be described as a dolmen, covered by a tumulus, and surrounded by a stone circle. Often, however, we have only the tumulus, sometimes only the dolmen, and sometimes again only the stone circle. The celebrated monument of Carnac, in Brittany, consists of eleven rows of unheaved stones, which differ greatly both in size and height, the largest being 22 feet above ground, while some are quite small. It appears that the avenues originally extended for several miles, but at present they are very imperfect, the stones having been cleared away in places for agricultural improvements. At present, therefore, there are several detached portions, which, however, have the same general direction, and appear to have been connected together. . . . Most of the great tumuli in Brittany probably belong to the Stone Age, and I am therefore disposed to regard Carnac as having been erected during the same period."—Sir J. Lubbock, *Prehistoric Times*, ch. 5.

**ABYDOS.**—An ancient city on the Asiatic side of the Hellespont, mentioned in the Iliad as one of the towns that were in alliance with the Trojans. Originally Thracian, as is supposed, it became a colony of Miletus, and passed at different times under Persian, Athenian, Lacedæmonian and Macedonian rule. Its site was at the narrowest point of the Hellespont—the scene of the ancient romantic story of Hero and Leander—nearly opposite to the town of Sestus. It was in the near neighborhood of Abydos that Xerxes built his bridge of boats; at Abydos, Alcibiades and the Athenians won an important victory over the Peloponnesians. See GREECE: B. C. 480, and 411-407.

**ABYDOS, Tablet of.**—One of the most valuable records of Egyptian history, found in the ruins of Abydos and now preserved in the British Museum. It gives a list of kings whom Ramses II. selected from among his ancestors to pay homage to. The tablet was much mutilated when found, but another copy more perfect has been unearthed by M. Mariette, which supplies nearly all the names lacking on the first.—F. Lenormant, *Manual of Ancient Hist. of the East*, v. 1, bk. 3.

**ABYSSINIA: Embraced in ancient Ethiopia.** See ETHIOPIA.

**Fourth Century.—Conversion to Christianity.**—"Whatever may have been the effect produced in his native country by the conversion of Queen Candace's treasurer, recorded in the Acts of the Apostles [ch. VIII.], it would

appear to have been transitory; and the Ethiopian or Abyssinian church owes its origin to an expedition made early in the fourth century by Meropius, a philosopher of Tyre, for the purpose of scientific inquiry. On his voyage homewards, he and his companions were attacked at a place where they had landed in search of water, and all were massacred except two youths, *Ædesius* and *Fruventius*, the relatives and pupils of Meropius. These were carried to the king of the country, who advanced *Ædesius* to be his cup-bearer, and *Fruventius* to be his secretary and treasurer. On the death of the king, who left a boy as his heir, the two strangers, at the request of the widowed queen, acted as regents of the kingdom until the prince came of age. *Ædesius* then returned to Tyre, where he became a presbyter. *Fruventius*, who, with the help of such Christian traders as visited the country, had already introduced the Christian doctrine and worship into Abyssinia, repaired to Alexandria, related his story to *Athanasius*, and . . . *Athanasius* . . . consecrated him to the bishopric of Axum [the capital of the Abyssinian kingdom]. The church thus founded continues to this day subject to the see of Alexandria."—*J. C. Robertson, Hist. of the Christian Church, bk. 2, ch. 6.*

**6th to 16th Centuries.—Wars in Arabia.—Struggle with the Mahometans.—Isolation from the Christian world.**—"The fate of the Christian church among the Homerites in Arabia Felix afforded an opportunity for the Abyssinians, under the reigns of the Emperors Justin and Justinian, to show their zeal in behalf of the cause of the Christians. The prince of that Arabian population, *Dunaan*, or *Dsunovas*, was a zealous adherent of Judaism; and, under pretext of avenging the oppressions which his fellow-believers were obliged to suffer in the Roman empire, he caused the Christian merchants who came from that quarter and visited Arabia for the purposes of trade, or passed through the country to Abyssinia, to be murdered. *Elesbaan*, the Christian king of Abyssinia, made this a cause for declaring war on the Arabian prince. He conquered *Dsunovas*, deprived him of the government, and set up a Christian, by the name of *Abraham*, as king in his stead. But at the death of the latter, which happened soon after, *Dsunovas* again made himself master of the throne; and it was a natural consequence of what he had suffered, that he now became a fiercer and more cruel persecutor than he was before. . . . Upon this, *Elesbaan* interfered once more, under the reign of the emperor Justinian, who stimulated him to the undertaking. He made a second expedition to Arabia Felix, and was again victorious. *Dsunovas* lost his life in the war; the Abyssinian prince put an end to the ancient, independent empire of the Homerites, and established a new government favourable to the Christians."—*A. Neander, General History of the Christian Religion and Church, second period, sect. 1.*—"In the year 592, as nearly as can be calculated from the dates given by the native writers, the Persians, whose power seems to have kept pace with the decline of the Roman empire, sent a great force against the Abyssinians, possessed themselves once more of Arabia, acquired a naval superiority in the gulf, and secured the principal ports on either side of it.

It is uncertain how long these conquerors retained their acquisition; but, in all probability their ascendancy gave way to the rising greatness of the Mahometan power; which soon afterwards overwhelmed all the nations contiguous to Arabia, spread to the remotest parts of the East, and even penetrated the African deserts from Egypt to the Congo. Meanwhile Abyssinia, though within two hundred miles of the walls of Mecca, remained unconquered and true to the Christian faith; presenting a mortifying and galling object to the more zealous followers of the Prophet. On this account, implacable and incessant wars ravaged her territories. . . . She lost her commerce, saw her consequence annihilated, her capital threatened, and the richest of her provinces laid waste. . . . There is reason to apprehend that she must shortly have sunk under the pressure of repeated invasions, had not the Portuguese arrived [in the 16th century] at a seasonable moment to aid her endeavours against the Moslem chiefs."—*M. Russell, Nubia and Abyssinia, ch. 3.*—"When Nubia, which intervenes between Egypt and Abyssinia, ceased to be a Christian country, owing to the destruction of its church by the Mahometans, the Abyssinian church was cut off from communication with the rest of Christendom. . . . They [the Abyssinians] remain an almost unique specimen of a semi-barbarous Christian people. Their worship is strangely mixed with Jewish customs."—*II. F. Tozer, The Church and the Eastern Empire, ch. 5.*

**Fifteenth-Nineteenth Centuries.—European Attempts at Intercourse.—Intrusion of the Galias.—Intestine conflicts.**—"About the middle of the 15th century, Abyssinia came in contact with Western Europe. An Abyssinian convent was endowed at Rome, and legates were sent from the Abyssinian convent at Jerusalem to the council of Florence. These adhered to the Greek schism. But from that time the Church of Rome made an impress upon Ethiopia. . . . Prince Henry of Portugal . . . next opened up communication with Europe. He hoped to open up a route from the West to the East coast of Africa [see PORTUGAL: A. D. 1415-1460], by which the East Indies might be reached without touching Mahometan territory. During his efforts to discover such a passage to India, and to destroy the revenues derived by the Moors from the spice trade, he sent an ambassador named *Covillan* to the Court of Shoa. *Covillan* was not suffered to return by Alexander, the then *Negoos* [or *Negus*, or *Nagash*—the title of the Abyssinian sovereign]. He married nobly, and acquired rich possessions in the country. He kept up correspondence with Portugal, and urged Prince Henry to diligently continue his efforts to discover the Southern passage to the East. In 1498 the Portuguese effected the circuit of Africa. The Turks shortly afterwards extended their conquests towards India, where they were baulked by the Portuguese, but they established a post and a toll at *Zeyla*, on the African coast. From here they hampered and threatened to destroy the trade of Abyssinia," and soon, in alliance with the Mahometan tribes of the coast, invaded the country. "They were defeated by the *Negoos David*, and at the same time the Turkish town of *Zeyla* was stormed and burned by a Portuguese fleet." Considerable intimacy of friendly relations was maintained for some time between the

Abyssinians and the Portuguese, who assisted in defending them against the Turks. "In the middle of the 16th century . . . a migration of Gallas came from the South, and swept up to and over the confines of Abyssinia. Men of lighter complexion and fairer skin than most Africans, they were Pagau in religion and savages in customs. Notwithstanding frequent efforts to dislodge them, they have firmly established themselves. A large colony has planted itself on the banks of the Upper Takkazie, the Jidda and the Bashilo. Since their establishment here they have for the most part embraced the creed of Mahomet. The province of Shoa is but an outlier of Christian Abyssinia, separated completely from co-religionist districts by these Galla bands. About the same time the Turks took a firm hold of Massowah and of the lowland by the coast, which had hitherto been ruled by the Abyssinian Bahar Nagash. Islamism and heathenism surrounded Abyssinia, where the lamp of Christianity faintly glimmered amidst dark superstition in the deep recesses of rugged valleys." In 1558 a Jesuit mission arrived in the country and established itself at Fremona. "For nearly a century Fremona existed, and its superiors were the trusted advisors of the Ethiopian throne. . . . But the same fate which fell upon the company of Jesus in more civilized lands, pursued it in the wilds of Africa. The Jesuit missionaries were universally popular with the Negroes, but the prejudice of the people refused to recognise the benefits which flowed from Fremona." Persecution befell the fathers, and two of them won the crown of martyrdom. The Negroes, Facillidas, "sent for a Coptic Abuna [ecclesiastical primate] from Alexandria, and concluded a treaty with the Turkish governors of Massowah and Senakin to prevent the passage of Europeans into his dominions. Some Capuchin preachers, who attempted to evade this treaty and enter Abyssinia, met with cruel deaths. Facillidas thus completed the work of the Turks and the Gallas, and shut Abyssinia out from European influence and civilization. . . . After the expulsion of the Jesuits, Abyssinia was torn by internal feuds and constantly harassed by the encroachments of and wars with the Gallas. Anarchy and confusion ruled supreme. Towns and villages were burnt down, and the inhabitants sold into slavery. . . . Towards the middle of the 18th century the Gallas appear to have increased considerably in power. In the intestine quarrels of Abyssinia their alliance was courted by each side, and in their country political refugees obtained a secure asylum." During the early years of the present century, the campaigns in Egypt attracted English attention to the Red Sea. "In 1804 Lord Valentia, the Viceroy of India, sent his Secretary, Mr. Salt, into Abyssinia;" but Mr. Salt was unable to penetrate beyond Tigre. In 1810 he attempted a second mission and again failed. It was not until 1848 that English attempts to open diplomatic and commercial relations with Abyssinia became successful. Mr. Plowden was appointed consular agent, and negotiated a treaty of commerce with Ras Ali, the ruling Galla chief.—H. M. Hozier, *The British Expedition to Abyssinia*, *Intro.*

**A. D. 1854-1889.—Advent of King Theodore.**  
—His English captives and the Expedition which released them.—"Consul Plowden had

been residing six years at Massowah when he heard that the Prince to whom he had been accredited, Ras Ali, had been defeated and dethroned by an adventurer, whose name, a few years before, had been unknown outside the boundaries of his native province. This was Lij Kâsa, better known by his adopted name of Theodore. He was born of an old family, in the mountainous region of Kwara, where the land begins to slope downwards towards the Blue Nile, and educated in a convent, where he learned to read, and acquired a considerable knowledge of the Scriptures. Kâsa's convent life was suddenly put an end to, when one of those marauding Galla bands, whose ravages are the curse of Abyssinia, attacked and plundered the monastery. From that time he himself took to the life of a freebooter. . . . Adventurers flocked to his standard; his power continually increased; and in 1854 he defeated Ras Ali in a pitched battle, and made himself master of central Abyssinia." In 1855 he overthrew the ruler of Tigré. "He now resolved to assume a title commensurate with the wide extent of his dominion. In the church of Derezyg he had himself crowned by the Abuna as King of the Kings of Ethiopia, taking the name of Theodore, because an ancient tradition declared that a great monarch would some day arise in Abyssinia." Mr. Plowden now visited the new monarch, was impressed with admiration of his talents and character, and became his counsellor and friend. But in 1860 the English consul lost his life, while on a journey, and Theodore, embittered by several misfortunes, began to give rein to a savage temper. "The British Government, on hearing of the death of Plowden, immediately replaced him at Massowah by the appointment of Captain Cameron." The new Consul was well received, and was entrusted by the Abyssinian King with a letter addressed to the Queen of England, soliciting her friendship. The letter, duly despatched to its destination, was pigeon-holed in the Foreign Office at London, and no reply to it was ever made. Insulted and enraged by this treatment, and by other evidences of the indifference of the British Government to his overtures, King Theodore, in January, 1864, seized and imprisoned Consul Cameron with all his suite. About the same time he was still further offended by certain passages in a book on Abyssinia that had been published by a missionary named Stern. Stern and a fellow missionary, Rosenthal with the latter's wife, were lodged in prison, and subjected to flogging and torture. The first step taken by the British Government, when news of Consul Cameron's imprisonment reached England, was to send out a regular mission to Abyssinia, bearing a letter signed by the Queen, demanding the release of the Captives. The mission, headed by a Syrian named Rassam, made its way to the King's presence in January, 1866. Theodore seemed to be plicated by the Queen's epistle and promised freedom to his prisoners. But soon his moody mind became filled with suspicions as to the genuineness of Rassam's credentials from the Queen, and as to the designs and intentions of all the foreigners who were in his power. He was drinking heavily at the time, and the result of his "drunken cogitations was a determination to detain the mission—at any rate until by their means he should have obtained a supply of skilled artisans and machinery from England." Mr.

Rassam and his companions were accordingly put into confinement, as Captain Cameron had been. But they were allowed to send a messenger to England, making their situation known, and conveying the demand of King Theodore that a man be sent to him "who can make cannons and muskets." The demand was actually complied with. Six skilled artisans and a civil engineer were sent out, together with a quantity of machinery and other presents, in the hope that they would procure the release of the unfortunate captives at Magdala. Almost a year was wasted in these futile proceedings, and it was not until September, 1867, that an expedition consisting of 4,000 British and 8,000 native troops, under General Sir Robert Napier, was sent from India to bring the insensate barbarian to terms. It landed in Annesley Bay, and, overcoming enormous difficulties with regard to water, food-supplies and transportation, was ready, about the middle of January, 1868, to start upon its march to the fortress of Magdala, where Theodore's prisoners were confined. The distance was 400 miles, and several high ranges of mountains had to be passed to reach the interior table-land. The invading army met with no resistance until it reached the Valley of the Beshilo, when it was attacked (April 10) on the plain of Aroge or Arogi, by the whole force which Theodore was able to muster, numbering a few thousands, only, of poorly armed men. The battle was simply a rapid slaughtering of the barbaric assailants, and when they fled, leaving 700 or 800 dead and 1,500 wounded on the field, the Abyssinian King had no power of resistance left. He offered at once to make peace, surrendering all the captives in his hands; but Sir Robert Napier required an unconditional submission, with a view to displacing him from the throne, in accordance with the wish and expectation which he had found to be general in the country. Theodore refused these terms, and when (April 13) Magdala was bombarded and stormed by the British troops—slight resistance being made—he shot himself at the moment of their entrance to the place. The sovereignty he had successfully concentrated in himself for a time was again divided. Between April and June the English army was entirely withdrawn, and "Abyssinia was sealed up again from intercourse with the outer world."—*Cassell's Illustrated Hist. of Eng.*, v. 9, ch. 28.—"The task of permanently uniting Abyssinia, in which Theodore failed, proved equally impracticable to John, who came to the front, in the first instance, as an ally of the British, and afterwards succeeded to the sovereignty. By his fall (10th March, 1889) in the unhappy war against the Derwishes or Moslem zealots of the Soudan, the path was cleared for Meullek of Shoa, who enjoyed the support of Italy. The establishment of the Italians on the Red Sea littoral . . . promises a new era for Abyssinia."—T. Nöldeke, *Sketches from Eastern Hist.*, ch. 9.

ALSO IN H. A. Stern, *The Captive Missionary*.—H. M. Stanley, *Coomassie and Magdala*, pt. 2.

**ACABA, the Pledges of.** See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 600-632.

**ACADEMY, The Athenian.**—"The Academy, a public garden in the neighbourhood of Athens, was the favourite resort of Plato, and gave its name to the school which he founded. This garden was planted with lofty plane-trees,

and adorned with temples and statues; a gentle stream rolled through it."—G. H. Lewes, *Biog. Hist. of Philosophy*, 6th Epoch.—The masters of the great schools of philosophy at Athens "chose for their lectures and discussions the public buildings which were called gymnasia, of which there were several in different quarters of the city. They could only use them by the sufferance of the State, which had built them chiefly for bodily exercises and athletic feats. . . . Before long several of the schools drew themselves apart in special buildings, and even took their most familiar names, such as the Lyceum and the Academy, from the gymnasia in which they made themselves at home. Gradually we find the traces of some material provisions, which helped to define and to perpetuate the different sects. Plato had a little garden, close by the sacred Eleusinian Way, in the shady groves of the Academy, which he bought, says Plutarch, for some 3,000 drachmæ. There lived also his successors, Xenocrates and Polemon. . . . Aristotle, as we know, in later life had taught in the Lyceum, in the rich grounds near the Ilissus, and there he probably possessed the house and garden which after his death came into the hands of his successor, Theophrastus."—W. W. Capes, *University life in Ancient Athens*, pp. 31-33.—For a description of the Academy, the Lyceum, and other gymnasia of Athens, see GYMNASIA GREEK.—Concerning the suppression of the Academy, see ATHENS: A. D. 529.

**ACADIA.** See NOVA SCOTIA.

**ACADIANS, The, and the British Government.**—Their expulsion. See NOVA SCOTIA: A. D. 1713-1730; 1749-1755, and 1755.

**ACARNANIANS.** See AKARNANIANS.

**ACAWOIOS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINALS: CARIBS AND THEIR KINDRED.

**ACCAD.—ACCADIANS.** See BABYLONIA, PRIMITIVE.

**ACCOLADE.**—"The concluding sign of being dubbed or adopted into the order of knighthood was a slight blow given by the lord to the cavalier, and called the accolade, from the part of the body, the neck, whereon it was struck. . . . Many writers have imagined that the accolade was the last blow which the soldier might receive with impunity; but this interpretation is not correct, for the squire was as jealous of his honour as the knight. The origin of the accolade it is impossible to trace, but it was clearly considered symbolical of the religious and moral duties of knighthood, and was the only ceremony used when knights were made in places (the field of battle, for instance), where time and circumstances did not allow of many ceremonies."—C. Mills, *Hist. of Chivalry*, v. 1, p. 53, and foot-note.

**ACHÆAN CITIES, League of the.**—This, which is not to be confounded with the "Achaean League" of Peloponnesus, was an early League of the Greek settlements in southern Italy, or Magna Græcæ. It was "composed of the towns of Siris, Pandosia, Metabus or Metapontum, Sybaris with its offsets Posidonia and Laus, Croton, Caulonia, Temesa, Terina and Pyxus. . . . The language of Polybius regarding the Achæan symmachy in the Peloponnesus may be applied also to these Italian Achæans; 'not only did they live in federal and friendly communion, but they made use of the same laws, and the same weights, measures and coins, as well as of



the same magistrates, councillors and judges."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 1, ch. 10.

**ACHÆAN LEAGUE.** See GREECE: B. C. 280-146.

**ACHÆMENIDS, The.**—The family or dynastic name (in its Greek form) of the kings of the Persian Empire founded by Cyrus, derived from an ancestor, Achæmenes, who was probably a chief of the Persian tribe of the Pasargadae. "In the inscription of Behistun, King Darius says: 'From old time we were kings; eight of my family have been kings, I am the ninth; from very ancient times we have been kings.' He enumerates his ancestors: 'My father was Vistacpa, the father of Vistacpa was Arsama; the father of Arsama was Ariyaramna, the father of Ariyaramna was Khaispis, the father of Khaispis was Hakhmanuis; hence we are called Hakhmanuisia (Achæmenids).' In these words Darius gives the tree of his own family up to Khaispis; this was the younger branch of the Achæmenids. Teispes, the son of Achæmenes, had two sons; the elder was Cambyzes (Kambujlya) the younger Artannes; the son of Cambyzes was Cyrus (Kurus), the son of Cyrus was Cambyzes II. Hence Darius could indeed maintain that eight princes of his family had preceded him; but it was not correct to maintain that they had been kings before him and that he was the ninth king."—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, v. 5, bk. 8, ch. 3.

Also in G. Rawlinson, *Family of the Achæmenids*, app. to bk. 7 of *Herodotus*.—See, also, PERSIA, ANCIENT.

**ACHAIA.**—"Crossing the river Larissus, and pursuing the northern coast of Peloponnesus south of the Corinthian Gulf, the traveller would pass into Achaia—a name which designated the narrow strip of level land, and the projecting spurs and declivities between that gulf and the northernmost mountains of the peninsula. . . . Achæan cities—twelve in number at least, if not more—divided this long strip of land amongst them, from the mouth of the Larissus and the northwestern Cape Araxus on one side, to the western boundary of the Sikyon territory on the other. According to the accounts of the ancient legends and the belief of Herodotus, this territory had been once occupied by Ionian inhabitants, whom the Achæans had expelled."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 4 (v. 2).—After the Roman conquest and the suppression of the Achæan League, the name Achaia was given to the Roman province then organized, which embraced all Greece south of Macedonia and Epirus.—See GREECE: B. C. 280-146.—"In the Homeric poems, where . . . the 'Hellenes' only appear in one district of Southern Thessaly, the name Achæans is employed by preference as a general appellation for the whole race. But the Achæans we may term, without hesitation, a Pelasgian people, in so far, that is, as we use this name merely as the opposite of the term 'Hellenes,' which prevailed at a later time, although it is true that the Hellenes themselves were nothing more than a particular branch of the Pelasgian stock. . . . [The name of the] Achæans, after it had dropped its earlier and more universal application, was preserved as the special name of a population dwelling in the north of the Peloponnesus and the south of Thessaly."—G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State, Int.*—"The ancients regarded them

[the Achæans] as a branch of the Æolians, with whom they afterwards reunited into one national body, i. e., not as an originally distinct nationality or independent branch of the Greek people. Accordingly, we hear neither of an Achæan language nor of Achæan art. A manifest and decided influence of the maritime Greeks, wherever the Achæans appear, is common to the latter with the Æolians. Achæans are everywhere settled on the coast, and are always regarded as particularly near relations of the Ionians. . . . The Achæans appear scattered about in localities on the coast of the Ægean so remote from one another, that it is impossible to consider all bearing this name as fragments of a people originally united in one social community; nor do they in fact anywhere appear, properly speaking, as a popular body, as the main stock of the population, but rather as eminent families, from which spring heroes; hence the use of the expression 'Sons of the Achæans' to indicate noble descent."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 1, ch. 3.

Also in M. Duncker, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 1, ch. 2, and bk. 2, ch. 2.—See, also, ACHAIA, and GREECE: THE MIGRATIONS.

**A. D. 1205-1387.—Mediæval Principality.**—Among the conquests of the French and Lombard Crusaders in Greece, after the taking of Constantinople, was that of a major part of the Peloponnesus—then beginning to be called the Morea—by William de Champlitte, a French knight, assisted by Geoffrey de Villehardouin, the younger—nephew and namesake of the Marshal of Champagne, who was chronicler of the conquest of the Empire of the East. William de Champlitte was invested with this Principality of Achaia, or of the Morea, as it is variously styled. Geoffrey Villehardouin represented him in the government, as his "bailly," for a time, and finally succeeded in supplanting him. Half a century later the Greeks, who had recovered Constantinople, reduced the territory of the Principality of Achaia to about half the peninsula, and a destructive war was waged between the two races. Subsequently the Principality became a fief of the crown of Naples and Sicily, and underwent many changes of possession until the title was in confusion and dispute between the houses of Anjou, Aragon and Savoy. Before it was engulfed finally in the Empire of the Turks, it was ruined by their piracies and ravages.—G. Finlay, *Hist. of Greece from its Conquest by the Crusaders*, ch. 8.

**ACHMET I.**, Turkish Sultan, A. D. 1603-1617. . . . Achmet II., 1691-1695. . . . Achmet III., 1703-1730.

**ACHRADINA.**—A part of the ancient city of Syracuse, Sicily, known as the "outer city," occupying the peninsula north of Ortigia, the island, which was the "inner city."

**ACHRIDA, Kingdom of.**—After the death of John Zimisceus who had reunited Bulgaria to the Byzantine Empire, the Bulgarians were roused to a struggle for the recovery of their independence, under the lead of four brothers of a noble family, all of whom soon perished save one, named Samuel. Samuel proved to be so vigorous and able a soldier and had so much success that he assumed presently the title of king. His authority was established over the greater part of Bulgaria, and extended into Macedonia, Epirus and Illyria. He established his capital

at Achrída (modern Ochrida, in Albania), which gave its name to his kingdom. The suppression of this new Bulgarian monarchy occupied the Byzantine Emperor, Basil II., in wars from 981 until 1018, when its last strongholds, including the city of Achrída, were surrendered to him.—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine Empire from 718 to 1057*, bk. 2, ch. 2, sect. 2.

**ACKERMAN, Convention of (1826).** See **TURKS**: A. D. 1826-1829.

**ACOLAHUS, The.** See **MEXICO, ANCIENT: THE TOLTEC EMPIRE.**

**ACOLYTH, The.** See **VARANGIAN OF WARING GUARD.**

**ACRABA, Battle of, A. D. 633.**—After the death of Mahomet, his successor, Abu Bekr, had to deal with several serious revolts, the most threatening of which was raised by one Moselama, who had pretended, even in the life-time of the Prophet, to a rival mission of religion. The decisive battle between the followers of Moselama and those of Mahomet was fought at Acraba, near Yemama. The pretender was slain and few of his army escaped.—Sir W. Muir, *Annals of the Early Caliphate*, ch. 7.

**ACRABATTENE, Battle of.**—A sanguinary defeat of the Idumeans or Edomites by the Jews under Judas Maccabæus, B. C. 164.—Josephus, *Antiq. of the Jews*, bk. 12, ch. 8.

**ACRAGAS.** See **AGRIENTOUM.**

**ACRE (St. Jean d'Acre, or Ptolemais): A. D. 1104.**—Conquest, Pillage and Massacre by the Crusaders and Genoese. See **CRUSADES: A. D. 1104-1111.**

A. D. 1187.—Taken from the Christians by Saladin. See **JERUSALEM: A. D. 1149-1187.**

A. D. 1189-1191.—The great siege and reconquest by the Crusaders. See **CRUSADES: A. D. 1188-1192.**

A. D. 1256-1257.—Quarrels and battles between the Genoese and Venetians. See **VENICE: A. D. 1256-1257.**

A. D. 1291.—The Final triumph of the Moslems. See **JERUSALEM: A. D. 1291.**

18th Century.—Restored to Importance by Sheik Daher.—"Acre, or St. Jean d'Acre, celebrated under this name in the history of the Crusades, and in antiquity known by the name of Ptolemais, had, by the middle of the 18th century, been almost entirely forsaken, when Sheik Daher, the Arab rebel, restored its commerce and navigation. This able prince, whose sway comprehended the whole of ancient Galilee, was succeeded by the infamous tyrant, Djessar-Pasha, who fortified Acre, and adorned it with a mosque, enriched with columns of antique marble, collected from all the neighbouring cities."—M. Malte-Brun, *System of Univ. Geog.*, bk. 28 (v. 1).

A. D. 1799.—Unsuccessful Siege by Bonaparte. See **FRANCE: A. D. 1798-1799 (AUGUST-AUGUST).**

A. D. 1831-1840.—Siege and Capture by Mehemed Ali.—Recovery for the Sultan by the Western Powers. See **TURKS: A. D. 1831-1840.**

**ACROCERAUNIAN PROMONTORY.** See **KORKYRA.**

**ACROPOLIS OF ATHENS, The.**—"A road which, by running zigzag up the slope was rendered practicable for chariots, led from the lower city to the Acropolis, on the edge of the platform of which stood the Propylæa, erected

by the architect Mnesicles in five years, during the administration of Pericles. . . . On entering through the gates of the Propylæa a scene of unparalleled grandeur and beauty burst upon the eye. No trace of human dwellings anywhere appeared, but on all sides temples of more or less elevation, of Pentelle marble, beautiful in design and exquisitely delicate in execution, sparkled like piles of alabaster in the sun. On the left stood the Eretheion, or fane of Athena Pollas; to the right, that matchless edifice known as the Heecatompodon of old, but to later ages as the Parthenon. Other buildings, all holy to the eye of an Athenian, lay grouped around these master structures, and, in the open spaces between, in whatever direction the spectator might look, appeared statues, some remarkable for their dimensions, others for their beauty, and all for the legendary sanctity which surrounded them. No city of the ancient or modern world ever rivalled Athens in the riches of art. Our best filled museums, though teeming with her spoils, are poor collections of fragments compared with that assemblage of gods and heroes which peopled the Acropolis, the genuine Olympos of the arts."—J. A. St. John, *The Hellenes*, bk. 1, ch. 4.—"Nothing in ancient Greece or Italy could be compared with the Acropolis of Athens, in its combination of beauty and grandeur, surrounded as it was by temples and theatres among its rocks, and encircled by a city abounding with monuments, some of which rivalled those of the Acropolis. Its platform formed one great sanctuary, partitioned only by the boundaries of the . . . sacred portions. We cannot, therefore, admit the suggestion of Chandler, that, in addition to the temples and other monuments on the summit, there were houses divided into regular streets. This would not have been consonant either with the customs or the good taste of the Athenians. When the people of Attica crowded into Athens at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, and religious prejudices gave way, in every possible case, to the necessities of the occasion, even then the Acropolis remained uninhabited. . . . The western end of the Acropolis, which furnished the only access to the summit of the hill, was one hundred and sixty eight feet in breadth, an opening so narrow that it appeared practicable to the artists of Pericles to fill up the space with a single building which should serve the purpose of a gateway to the citadel, as well as of a suitable entrance to that glorious display of architecture and sculpture which was within the inclosure. This work [the Propylæa], the greatest production of civil architecture in Athens, which rivalled the Parthenon in felicity of execution, surpassed it in boldness and originality of design. . . . It may be defined as a wall pierced with five doors, before which on both sides were Doric hexastyle porticoes."—W. M. Leake, *Topography of Athens*, sect. 8.—See, also, **ATTICA.**

**ACT OF ABJURATION, The.** See **NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1577-1581.**

**ACT OF MEDIATION, The.** See **SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1803-1848.**

**ACT OF SECURITY.** See **SCOTLAND: A. D. 1703-1704.**

**ACT OF SETTLEMENT (English).** See **ENGLAND: A. D. 1701.**

**ACT OF SETTLEMENT (Irish).** See **IRELAND: A. D. 1660-1665.**

**ACT RESCISSORY.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1600-1660.

**ACTIUM: B. C. 434.**—Naval Battle of the Greeks.—A defeat inflicted upon the Corinthians by the Coreyrians, in the contest over Epidamnus which was the prelude to the Peloponnesian War.—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 4, ch. 1.

**B. C. 31.**—The Victory of Octavius. See **ROME: B. C. 31.**

**ACTS OF SUPREMACY.** See SUPREMACY, ACTS OF; and ENGLAND: A. D. 1527-1534; and 1559.

**ACTS OF UNIFORMITY.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1559 and 1662-1665.

**ACULCO, Battle of (1810).** See MEXICO: A. D. 1810-1819.

**ACZ, Battle of (1849).** See AUSTRIA, A. D. 1848-1849.

**ADALOALDUS, King of the Lombards,** A. D. 616-630.

**ADAMS, John, in the American Revolution.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1774 (MAY—JUNE); 1774 (SEPTEMBER); 1775 (MAY—AUGUST); 1776 (JANUARY—JUNE), 1776 (JULY). . . . In diplomatic service. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1782 (APRIL); 1782 (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER). . . . Presidential election and administration. See UNITED STATES OF AM., A. D. 1796-1801.

**ADAMS, John Quincy.**—Negotiation of the Treaty of Ghent. See UNITED STATES OF AM., A. D. 1814 (DECEMBER). . . . Presidential election and administration. See UNITED STATES OF AM., A. D. 1824-1829.

**ADAMS, Samuel, in and after the American Revolution.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1772-1773; 1774 (SEPTEMBER); 1775 (MAY); 1787-1789.

**ADDA, Battle of the (A. D. 490).** See **ROME: A. D. 488-526.**

**AD DECIMUS, Battle of (A. D. 533).** See **VANDALS: A. D. 533-584.**

**ADEL.**—**ADALING.**—**ATHEL.**—"The homestead of the original settler, his house, farm-buildings and enclosure, 'the toft and croft,' with the share of arable and appurtenant common rights, bore among the northern nations [early Teutonic] the name of Odal, or Edhel; the primitive mother village was an Athelby, or Athelham; the owner was an Athelbonde: the same word Adel or Athel signified also nobility of descent, and an Adaling was a nobleman. Primitive nobility and primitive landownership thus bore the same name."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 8, sect. 24.—See, also, **ALOD**, and **ETHEL**.

**ADELAIDE, The founding and naming of.** See AUSTRALIA: A. D. 1800-1840.

**ADELANTADOS.**—**ADELANTAMIENTOS.**—"Adelantamientos was an early term for gubernatorial districts [in Spanish America, the governors bearing the title of Adelantados], generally of undefined limits, to be extended by further conquests."—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, v. 6 (Mexico, v. 3), p. 520.

**ADEODATUS II., Pope, A. D. 672-676.**

**ADIABENE.**—A name which came to be applied anciently to the tract of country east of the middle Tigris, embracing what was originally the proper territory of Assyria, together with Arbelitis. Under the Parthian monarchy it formed a tributary kingdom, much disputed

between Parthia and Armenia. It was seized several times by the Romans, but never permanently held.—G. Rawlinson, *Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy*, p. 140.

**ADIRONDACKS, The.** See **AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ADIRONDACKS.**

**ADIS, Battle of (B. C. 256).** See **PUNIC WAR, THE FIRST.**

**ADITES, The.**—"The Cushites, the first inhabitants of Arabia, are known in the national traditions by the name of Adites, from their progenitor, who is called Ad, the grandson of Hsm."—F. Lenormant, *Manual of Ancient Hist.*, bk. 7, ch. 2.—See **ARABIA: THE ANCIENT SUCCESSION AND FUSION OF RACES.**

**ADJUTATORS.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1647 (APRIL—AUGUST).

**ADLIYAH, The.** See **ISLAM.**

**ADOLPH (of Nassau), King of Germany,** A. D. 1291-1298.

**ADOLPHUS FREDERICK, King of Sweden,** A. D. 1751-1771.

**ADOPTIIONISM.**—A doctrine, condemned as heretical in the eighth century, which taught that "Christ, as to his human nature, was not truly the Son of God, but only His son by adoption." The dogma is also known as the Felician heresy, from a Spanish bishop, Felix, who was prominent among its supporters. Charlemagne took active measures to suppress the heresy.—J. I. Mombert, *Hist. of Charles the Great*, bk. 2, ch. 12.

**ADRIA, Proposed Kingdom of.** See **ITALY: A. D. 1343-1389.**

**ADRIAN VI., Pope, A. D. 1522-1528.**

**ADRIANOPOLE.**—**HADRIANOPOLE.**—A city in Thrace founded by the Emperor Hadrian and designated by his name. It was the scene of Constantine's victory over Licinius in A. D. 323 (see **ROME: A. D. 305-323**), and of the defeat and death of Valens in battle with the Goths (see **GOths (VISIGOTHS): A. D. 378**). In 1361 it became for some years the capital of the Turks in Europe (see **TURKS: A. D. 1360-1380**). It was occupied by the Russians in 1829, and again in 1878 (see **TURKS: A. D. 1826-1829**, and **A. D. 1877-1878**), and gave its name to the Treaty negotiated in 1829 between Russia and the Porte (see **GREECE: A. D. 1821-1829**).

**ADRIATIC, The Wedding of the.** See **VENICE: A. D. 1177, and 14TH CENTURY.**

**ADRUMETUM.** See **CARTHAGE, THE DOMINION OF.**

**ADUATUCI, The.** See **BELGE.**

**ADULLAM, Cave of.**—When David had been cast out by the Philistines, among whom he sought refuge from the enmity of Saul, "his first retreat was the Cave of Adullam, probably the large cavern not far from Bethlehem, now called Khureitun. From its vicinity to Bethlehem, he was joined there by his whole family, now feeling themselves insecure from Saul's fury. . . . Besides these were outlaws from every part, including doubtless some of the original Canaanites—of whom the name of one at least has been preserved, Ahimelech the Hittite. In the vast columnar halls and arched chambers of this subterranean palace, all who had any grudge against the existing system gathered round the hero of the coming age."—Dean Stanley, *Lect's on the Hist. of the Jewish Church*, lect. 22.

**ADULLAMITES, The.** See **ENGLAND: A. D. 1865-1868.**

**ADWALTON MOOR, Battle of (A. D. 1643).**—This was a battle fought near Bradford, June 29, 1643, in the great English Civil War. The Parliamentary forces, under Lord Fairfax, were routed by the Royalists, under Newcastle.—C. R. Markham, *Life of the Great Lord Fairfax*, ch. 11.

**ÆAKIDS (Æacids).**—The supposed descendants of the demi-god Æakus, whose grandson was Achilles. (See MYRMIDONS.) Miltiades, the hero of Marathon, and Pyrrhus, the warrior King of Epirus, were among those claiming to belong to the royal race of Æakids.

**ÆDHILING.** See ETHEL.

**ÆDILES, Roman.** See ROME: B. C. 494-492.

**ÆDUI.—ARVERNI.—ALLOBROGES.**—“The two most powerful nations in Gallia were the Ædui [or Hædui] and the Arverni. The Ædui occupied that part which lies between the upper valley of the Loire and the Saone, which river was part of the boundary between them and the Sequani. The Loire separated the Ædui from the Bituriges, whose chief town was Avaricum on the site of Bourges. At this time [B. C. 121] the Arverni, the rivals of the Ædui, were seeking the supremacy in Gallia. The Arverni occupied the mountainous country of Auvergne in the centre of France and the fertile valley of the Elaver (Allier) nearly as far as the junction of the Allier and the Loire. . . . They were on friendly terms with the Allobroges, a powerful nation east of the Rhone, who occupied the country between the Rhone and the Isara (Isère). . . . In order to break the formidable combination of the Arverni and the Allobroges, the Romans made use of the Ædui, who were the enemies both of the Allobroges and the Arverni. . . . A treaty was made either at this time or somewhat earlier between the Ædui and the Roman senate, who conferred on their new Gallic friends the honourable title of brothers and kinsmen. This fraternizing was a piece of political cant which the Romans practiced when it was useful.”—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, v. 1, ch. 21.—See, also, GAULS.

**ÆGÆ.** See EDESSA (MACEDONIA).

**ÆGATIAN ISLES, Naval Battle of the (B. C. 241).** See PUNIC WAR, THE FIRST.

**ÆGEAN, The.**—“The Ægean, or White Sea, . . . as distinguished from the Euxine.”—E. A. Freeman, *Historical Geog. of Europe*, p. 413, and foot-note.

**ÆGIALEA.—ÆGIALEANS.**—The original name of the northern coast of Peloponnesus, and its inhabitants. See GREECE: THE MIORANTIDES.

**ÆGIKOREIS.** See PHYLE.

**ÆGINA.**—A small rocky island in the Saronic gulf, between Attica and Argolis. First colonized by Achæans it was afterwards occupied by Dorians (see GREECE: THE MIGRATIONS) and was unfriendly to Athens. During the sixth century B. C. it rose to great power and commercial importance, and became for a time the most brilliant center of Greek art. At the period of the Persian war, Ægina was “the first maritime power in Greece.” But the Æginetans were at that time engaged in war with Athens, as the allies of Thebes, and rather than forego their enmity, they offered submission to the Persian king. The Athenians thereupon appealed to Sparta, as the head of Greece, to interfere, and the Æginetans were compelled to

give hostages to Athens for their fidelity to the Hellenic cause. (See GREECE: B. C. 492-491.) They purged themselves to a great extent of their intended treason by the extraordinary valor with which they fought at Salamis. But the sudden pre-eminence to which Athens rose cast a blighting shadow upon Ægina, and in 429 B. C. it lost its independence, the Athenians taking possession of their discomfited rival.—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, v. 1, ch. 14.

ALSO IN G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, v. 4, ch. 36.—See, also, ATHENS: B. C. 480-480.

**B. C. 458-456.**—Alliance with Corinth in war with Athens and Megara.—Defeat and subjugation. See GREECE: B. C. 458-456.

**B. C. 431.**—Expulsion of the Æginetans from their island by the Athenians.—Their settlement at Thyrea. See GREECE: B. C. 431-429.

**B. C. 210.**—Desolation by the Romans.—The first appearance of the Romans in Greece, when they entered the country as the allies of the Ætolians, was signalized by the barbarous destruction of Ægina. The city having been taken, B. C. 210, its entire population was reduced to slavery by the Romans and the land and buildings of the city were sold to Attalus, king of Pergamus.—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of Federal Govt.*, ch. 8, sect. 2.

**ÆGINETAN TALENT.** See TALENT.

**ÆGITIUM, Battle of (B. C. 426).**—A reverse experienced by the Athenian General, Demosthenes, in his invasion of Ætolia, during the Peloponnesian War.—Thucydides, *History*, bk. 3, sect. 97.

**ÆGOSPOTAMI (Aigospotamoi), Battle of.** See GREECE: B. C. 405.

**ÆLFRED.** See ALFRED.

**ÆLIA CAPITOLINA.**—The new name given to Jerusalem by Hadrian. See JEWS: A. D. 130-134.

**ÆLIAN AND FUFIAN LAWS, The.**—

“The Ælian and Fufian laws (leges Ælia and Fufia) the age of which unfortunately we cannot accurately determine . . . enacted that a popular assembly [at Rome] might be dissolved, or, in other words, the acceptance of any proposed law prevented, if a magistrate announced to the president of the assembly that it was his intention to choose the same time for watching the heavens. Such an announcement (obnuntiatio) was held to be a sufficient cause for interrupting an assembly.”—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 6, ch. 10.

**ÆMILIAN WAY, The.**—“M. Æmilius Lepidus, Consul for the year 180 B. C. . . . constructed the great road which bore his name. The Æmilian Way led from Ariminum through the new colony of Bononia to Placentia, being a continuation of the Flaminian Way, or great north road, made by C. Flaminius in 220 B. C. from Rome to Ariminum. At the same epoch, Flaminius the son, being the colleague of Lepidus, made a branch road from Bononia across the Apennines to Arretium.”—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 5, ch. 41.

**ÆMILIANUS, Roman Emperor, A. D. 253.**

**ÆOLIANS, The.**—“The collective stock of Greek nationalities falls, according to the view of those ancient writers who laboured most to obtain an exact knowledge of ethnographic relationships, into three main divisions, Æolians,

Dorians and Ionians. . . . All the other inhabitants of Greece [not Dorians and Ionians] and of the islands included in it, are comprised under the common name of Æolians—a name unknown as yet to Homer, and which was incontestably applied to a great diversity of peoples, among which it is certain that no such homogeneity of race is to be assumed as existed among the Ionians and Dorians. Among the two former races, though even these were scarcely in any quarter completely unmixed, there was incontestably to be found a single original stock, to which others had merely been attached, and as it were engrafted, whereas, among the peoples assigned to the Æolians, no such original stock is recognizable, but on the contrary, as great a difference is found between the several members of this race as between Dorians and Ionians, and of the so-called Æolians, some stood nearer to the former, others to the latter. . . . A thorough and careful investigation might well lead to the conclusion that the Greek people was divided not into three, but into two main races, one of which we may call Ionian, the other Dorian, while of the so-called Æolians some, and probably the greater number, belonged to the former, the rest to the latter.”—G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State*, pt. 1, ch. 2.—In Greek myth, Æolus, the fancied progenitor of the Æolians, appears as one of the three sons of Hellen. Æolus is represented as having reigned in Thessaly: his seven sons were Kretheus, Sisyphus, Athamas, Salmooneus, Deion, Magnes and Perieres: his five daughters, Canace, Aleyone, Peisidike, Calyce and Permede. The fables of this race seem to be distinguished by a constant introduction of the God Poseidon, as well as by an unusual prevalence of haughty and presumptuous attributes among the Æolid heroes, leading them to affront the gods by pretences of equality, and sometimes even by defiance.”—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 1, ch. 6.—See, also, THESSALY, DORIANS AND IONIANS, and ASIA MINOR: THE GREEK COLONIES.

**ÆQUIANS, The.** See OSCANS; also LATIUM; and ROME; B. C. 458.

**ÆRARIANS.**—Roman citizens who had no political rights. See CENSORS, ROMAN.

**ÆRARIUM, The.** See FISCUS.

**ÆSOPUS INDIANS.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**ÆSTII, or ÆSTYI, The.**—“At this point [beyond the Suiones] the Suevic Sea [the Baltic], on its eastern shore, washes the tribes of the Æstii, whose rites and fashions and styles of dress are those of the Suevi, while their language is more like the British. They worship the mother of the gods and wear as a religious symbol the device of a wild boar. . . . They often use clubs, iron weapons but seldom. They are more patient in cultivating corn and other produce than might be expected from the general indolence of the Germans. But they also search the deep and are the only people who gather amber, which they call glesum.”—“The Æstii occupied that part of Prussia which is to the north-east of the Vistula. . . . The name still survives in the form Estonia.”—Tacitus, *Germany*, trans. by Church and Brodribb, with note.—See, also, PRUSSIAN LANGUAGE, THE OLD.

**ÆSYMNETÆ, An.**—Among the Greeks, an expedient “which seems to have been tried

not unfrequently in early times, for preserving or restoring tranquility, was to invest an individual with absolute power, under a peculiar title, which soon became obsolete: that of *asymneta*. At Cuma, indeed, and in other cities, this was the title of an ordinary magistracy, probably of that which succeeded the hereditary monarchy; but when applied to an extraordinary office, it was equivalent to the title of protector or dictator.”—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 10.

**ÆTHEL.—ÆTHELING.** See ÆTHEL, and ADEL.

**ÆTHELBERT, ÆTHELFRIITH, ETC.** See ÆTHELBERT, etc.

**ÆTOLIA.—ÆTOLIANS.**—“Ætolia, the country of Diomed, though famous in the early times, fell back during the migratory period almost into a savage condition, probably through the influx into it of an Illyrian population which became only partially Hellenized. The nation was divided into numerous tribes, among which the most important were the Apodoti, the Ophioneis, the Eurytanes and the Agreans. There were scarcely any cities, village life being preferred universally. . . . It was not till the wars which arose among Alexander’s successors that the Ætolians formed a real political union, and became an important power in Greece.”—G. Rawlinson, *Manual of Ancient Hist.*, bk. 3.—See also, AKARNANIANS, and GREECE: THE MIGRATIONS.

**ÆTOLIAN LEAGUE, The.**—“The Achaian and the Ætolian Leagues, had their constitutions been written down in the shape of a formal document, would have presented but few varieties of importance. The same general form of government prevailed in both; each was federal, each was democratic; each had its popular assembly, its smaller Senate, its general with large powers at the head of all. The differences between the two are merely those differences of detail which will always arise between any two political systems of which neither is slavishly copied from the other. . . . If therefore federal states or democratic states, or aristocratic states, were necessarily weak or strong, peaceful or aggressive, honest or dishonest, we should see Achaia and Ætolia both exhibiting the same moral characteristics. But history tells another tale. The political conduct of the Achaian League, with some mistakes and some faults, is, on the whole, highly honourable. The political conduct of the Ætolian League is, throughout the century in which we know it best [last half of third and first half of second century B. C.] almost always simply infamous. . . . The counsels of the Ætolian League were throughout directed to mere plunder, or, at most, to selfish political aggrandisement.”—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of Federal Govt.*, ch. 6.—The plundering aggressions of the Ætolians involved them in continual war with their Greek kindred and neighbours, and they did not scruple to seek foreign aid. It was through their agency that the Romans were first brought into Greece, and it was by their instrumentality that Antiochus fought his battle with Rome on the sacred soil of all Hellenic soil. In the end, B. C. 189, the League was stripped by the Romans of even its nominal independence and sank into a contemptible servitude.—E. A. Freeman, *The same*, ch. 7-9.

Also in C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 63-66.

**AFGHANISTAN: B. C. 330.—Conquest by Alexander the Great.—**Founding of Herat and Candahar. See MACEDONIA, &c.: B. C. 330-323; and INDIA: B. C. 327-312.

**B. C. 301-246.—In the Syriac Empire.** See SELEUCIDÆ; and MACEDONIA, &c.: 310-301 and after.

**A. D. 999-1183.—The Ghaznevide Empire.** See TURK: A. D. 999-1183; and INDIA: A. D. 977-1200.

**A. D. 13th Century.—Conquests of the Il-Khans.** See MCNOOLS: A. D. 1153-1227; and INDIA: A. D. 977-1200.

**A. D. 1380-1386.—Conquest by Timour.** See TIMOUR.

**A. D. 1504.—Conquest by Babar.** See INDIA: A. D. 1390-1605.

**A. D. 1722.—Mahmoud's conquest of Persia.** See PERSIA: A. D. 1499-1887.

**A. D. 1737-1738.—Conquest by Nadir Shah.** See INDIA: A. D. 1662-1748.

**A. D. 1747-1761.—The Empire of the Dooranie, Ahmed Abdallee.—His Conquests in India.** See INDIA: A. D. 1747-1761.

**A. D. 1803-1838.—Shah Soojah and Dost Mahomed.—English interference.**—“Shah Soojah-ool Moolk, a grandson of the illustrious Ahmed Shah, reigned in Afghanistan from 1803 till 1809. His youth had been full of trouble and vicissitude. He had been a wanderer, on the verge of starvation, a pedlar, and a bandit, who raised money by plundering caravans. His courage was lightly reputed, and it was as a mere creature of circumstance that he reached the throne. His reign was perturbed, and in 1809 he was a fugitive and an exile. Runjeet Singh, the Sikh ruler of the Punjab, defrauded him of the famous Koh-i-noor, which is now the most precious of the crown jewels of England, and plundered and imprisoned the fallen man. Shah Soojah at length escaped from Lahore. After further misfortunes he at length reached the British frontier station of Loodianah, and in 1816 became a pensioner of the East India Company. After the downfall of Shah Soojah, Afghanistan for many years was a prey to anarchy. At length in 1826, Dost Mahomed succeeded in making himself supreme at Cabul, and this masterful man thenceforward held sway until his death in 1863, uninterruptedly save during the three years of the British occupation. Dost Mahomed was neither kith nor kin to the legitimate dynasty which he displaced. His father Poyndah Khan was an able statesman and gallant soldier. He left twenty-one sons, of whom Futteh Khan was the eldest, and Dost Mahomed one of the youngest. . . . Throughout his long reign Dost Mahomed was a strong and wise ruler. His youth had been neglected and dissolute. His education was defective, and he had been addicted to wine. Once seated on the throne, the reformation of our Henry V. was not more thorough than was that of Dost Mahomed. He taught himself to read and write, studied the Koran, became scrupulously abstemious, assiduous in affairs, no longer truculent, but courteous. . . . There was a fine rugged honesty in his nature, and a streak of genuine chivalry; notwithstanding the despite he suffered at our hands, he had a real regard for the English, and his loyalty to us was broken only by his armed support of the Sikhs in the second Punjab war. The fallen Shah Soojah, from

his asylum in Loodianah, was continually intriguing for his restoration. His schemes were long inoperative, and it was not until 1833 that certain arrangements were entered into between him and the Maharaja Runjeet Singh. To an application on Shah Soojah's part for countenance and pecuniary aid, the Anglo-Indian Government replied that to afford him assistance would be inconsistent with the policy of neutrality which the Government had imposed on itself; but it unwisely contributed financially toward his undertaking by granting him four months' pension in advance. Sixteen thousand rupees formed a scant war fund with which to attempt the recovery of a throne, but the Shah started on his errand in February, 1833. After a successful contest with the Ameer of Seinde, he marched on Candahar, and besieged that fortress. Candahar was in extremity when Dost Mahomed, hurrying from Cabul, relieved it, and joining forces with its defenders, he defeated and routed Shah Soojah, who fled precipitately, leaving behind him his artillery and camp equipage. During the Dost's absence in the south, Runjeet Singh's troops crossed the Attock, occupied the Afghan province of Peshawar, and drove the Afghans into the Khyber Pass. No subsequent efforts on Dost Mahomed's part availed to expel the Sikhs from Peshawar, and suspicious of British connivance with Runjeet Singh's successful aggression, he took into consideration the policy of fortifying himself by a counter alliance with Persia. As for Shah Soojah, he had crept back to his refuge at Loodianah. Lord Auckland succeeded Lord William Bentinck as Governor-General of India in March, 1830. In reply to Dost Mahomed's letter of congratulation, his lordship wrote: 'You are aware that it is not the practice of the British Government to interfere with the affairs of other independent States;' an abstention which Lord Auckland was soon to violate. He had brought from England the feeling of disquietude in regard to the designs of Persia and Russia which the communications of our envoy in Persia had fostered in the Home Government, but it would appear that he was wholly undecided what line of action to pursue. 'Swayed,' says Durand, 'by the vague apprehensions of a remote danger entertained by others rather than himself,' he despatched to Afghanistan Captain Burnes on a nominally commercial mission, which, in fact, was one of political discovery, but without definite instructions. Burnes, an able but rash and ambitious man, reached Cabul in September, 1837, two months before the Persian army began the siege of Herat. . . . The Dost made no concealment to Burnes of his approaches to Persia and Russia, in despair of British good offices, and being hungry for assistance from any source to meet the encroachments of the Sikhs, he professed himself ready to abandon his negotiations with the western powers if he were given reason to expect countenance and assistance at the hands of the Anglo-Indian Government. . . . The situation of Burnes in relation to the Dost was presently complicated by the arrival at Cabul of a Russian officer claiming to be an envoy from the Czar, whose credentials, however, were regarded as dubious, and who, if that circumstance has the least weight, was on his return to Russia utterly repudiated by Count Nesselrode. The Dost took small account of this emissary, con-

tinuing to assure Burnes that he cared for no connection except with the English, and Burnes professed to his Government his fullest confidence in the sincerity of those declarations. But the tone of Lord Auckland's reply, addressed to the Dost, was so dictatorial and supercilious as to indicate the writer's intention that it should give offence. It had that effect, and Burnes' mission at once became hopeless. . . . The Russian envoy, who was profuse in his promises of everything which the Dost was most anxious to obtain, was received into favour and treated with distinction, and on his return journey he effected a treaty with the Candahar chiefs which was presently ratified by the Russian minister at the Persian Court. Burnes, fallen into discredit at Cabul, quitted that place in August 1838. He had not been discreet, but it was not his indiscretion that brought about the failure of his mission. A nefarious transaction, which Kaye denounces with the passion of a just indignation, connects itself with Burnes' negotiations with the Dost; his official correspondence was unscrupulously mutilated and garbled in the published Blue Book with deliberate purpose to deceive the British public. Burnes had failed because, since he had quitted India for Cabul, Lord Auckland's policy had gradually altered. Lord Auckland had landed in India in the character of a man of peace. That, so late as April 1837, he had no design of obstructing the existing situation in Afghanistan is proved by his written statement of that date, that 'the British Government had resolved decidedly to discourage the prosecution by the ex-king Shah Soojah-ool-Moolk, so long as he may remain under our protection, of further schemes of hostility against the chiefs now in power in Cabul and Candahar.' Yet, in the following June, he concluded a treaty which sent Shah Soojah to Cabul, escorted by British bayonets. Of this inconsistency no explanation presents itself. It was a far cry from our frontier on the Sutlej to Herat in the confines of Central Asia—a distance of more than 1,200 miles, over some of the most arduous marching ground in the known world. . . . Lord William Bentinck, Lord Auckland's predecessor, denounced the project as an act of incredible folly. Marquis Wellesley regarded 'this wild expedition into a distant region of rocks and deserts, of sands and ice and snow,' as an act of infatuation. The Duke of Wellington pronounced with prophetic sagacity, that the consequence of once crossing the Indus to settle a government in Afghanistan would be a perennial march into that country.—A. Forbes, *The Afghan Wars*, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: J. P. Ferrier, *Hist. of the Afghans*, ch. 10-20.—Mohan Lal, *Life of Amir Dost Mohammed Khan*, v. 1.

A. D. 1838-1842.—English invasion, and restoration of Soojah Dowlah.—The revolt at Cabul.—Horror of the British retreat.—Destruction of the entire army, save one man, only.—Sale's defence of Jellalabad.—'To approach Afghanistan it was necessary to secure the friendship of the Sikhs, who were, indeed, ready enough to join against their old enemies; and a threefold treaty was contracted between Runjeet Singh, the English, and Shah Soojah for the restoration of the banished house. The expedition—which according to the original intention was to have been carried out chiefly

by means of troops in the pay of Shah Soojah and the Sikhs—rapidly grew into an English invasion of Afghanistan. A considerable force was gathered on the Sikh frontier from Bengal; a second army, under General Keane, was to come up from Kurrachee through Sindh. Both of these armies, and the troops of Shah Soojah, were to enter the highlands of Afghanistan by the Bolan Pass. As the Sikhs would not willingly allow the free passage of our troops through their country, an additional burden was laid upon the armies,—the independent Ameers of Sindh had to be coerced. At length, with much trouble from the difficulties of the country and the loss of the commissariat animals, the forces were all collected under the command of Keane beyond the passes. The want of food permitted of no delay; the army pushed on to Candahar. Shah Soojah was declared Monarch of the southern Principality. Thence the troops moved rapidly onwards towards the more important and difficult conquest of Cabul. Ghuznee, a fortress of great strength, lay in the way. In their hasty movements the English had left their battering train behind, but the gates of the fortress were blown in with gunpowder, and by a brilliant feat of arms the fortress was stormed. Nor did the English army encounter any important resistance subsequently. Dost Mohamed found his followers deserting him, and withdrew northwards into the mountains of the Hindoo Koosh. With all the splendour that could be collected, Shah Soojah was brought back to his throne in the Bala Hissar, the fortress Palace of Cabul. . . . For the moment the policy seemed thoroughly successful. The English Ministry could feel that a fresh check had been placed upon its Russian rival, and no one dreamt of the terrible retribution that was in store for the unjust violence done to the feelings of a people. . . . Dost Mohamed thought it prudent to surrender himself to the English envoy, Sir William Macnaghten, and to withdraw with his family to the English provinces of Hindostan [November, 1840]. He was there well received and treated with liberality; for, as both the Governor-General and his chief adviser Macnaghten felt, he had not in fact in any way offended us, but had fallen a victim to our policy. It was in the full belief that their policy in India had been crowned with permanent success that the Whig Ministers withdrew from office, leaving their successors to encounter the terrible results to which it led. For while the English officials were blindly congratulating themselves upon the happy completion of their enterprise, to an observant eye signs of approaching difficulty were on all sides visible. . . . The removal of the strong rule of the Barrukzyes opened a door for undefeated hopes to many of the other families and tribes. The whole country was full of intrigues and of diplomatic bargaining, carried on by the English political agents with the various chiefs and leaders. But they soon found that the hopes excited by these negotiations were illusory. The allowances for which they had bargained were reduced, for the English envoy began to be disquieted at the vast expenses of the Government. They did not find that they derived any advantages from the establishment of the new puppet King, Soojah Dowlah; and every Mahomedan, even the very king himself,



felt disgraced at the predominance of the English Indians. But as no actual insurrection broke out, Macnaghten, a man of sanguine temperament and anxious to believe what he wished, in spite of unmistakable warnings as to the real feeling of the people, clung with almost angry vehemence to the persuasion that all was going well, and that the new King had a real hold upon the people's affection. So completely had he deceived himself on this point, that he had decided to send back a portion of the English army, under General Sale, into Hindostan. He even intended to accompany it himself to enjoy the peaceful post of Governor of Bombay, with which his successful policy had been rewarded. His place was to be taken by Sir Alexander Burnes, whose view of the troubled condition of the country underlying the comparative calm of the surface was much truer than that of Macnaghten, but who, perhaps from that very fact, was far less popular among the chiefs. The army which was to remain at Candahar was under the command of General Nott, an able and decided if somewhat irascible man. But General Elphinstone, the commander of the troops at Cabul, was of quite a different stamp. He was much respected and liked for his honourable character and social qualities, but was advanced in years, a confirmed invalid, and wholly wanting in the vigour and decision which his critical position was likely to require. The fool's paradise with which the English Envoy had surrounded himself was rudely destroyed. He had persuaded himself that the frequently recurring disturbances, and especially the insurrection of the Ghilzies between Cabul and Jellalabad, were mere local outbreaks. But in fact a great conspiracy was on foot in which the chiefs of nearly every important tribe in the country were implicated. On the evening of the 1st of November [1841] a meeting of the chiefs was held, and it was decided that an immediate attack should be made on the house of Sir Alexander Burnes. The following morning an angry crowd of assailants stormed the houses of Sir Alexander Burnes and Captain Johnson, murdering the inmates, and rifling the treasure-chests belonging to Soojah Dowlah's army. Soon the whole city was in wild insurrection. The evidence is nearly irresistible that a little decision and rapidity of action on the part of the military would have at once crushed the outbreak. But although the attack on Burnes' house was known, no troops were sent to his assistance. Indeed, that unbroken course of folly and mismanagement which marked the conduct of our military affairs throughout this crisis had already begun. Instead of occupying the fortress of the Bala Hissar, where the army would have been in comparative security, Elphinstone had placed his troops in cantonments far too extensive to be properly defended, surrounded by an entrenchment of the most insignificant character, commanded on almost all sides by higher ground. To complete the unfitness of the position, the commissariat supplies were not stored within the cantonments, but were placed in an isolated fort at some little distance. An ill-sustained and futile assault was made upon the town on the 3d of November, but from that time onwards the British troops lay with incomprehensible supineness awaiting their fate in their defenceless

position. The commissariat fort soon fell into the hands of the enemy and rendered their situation still more deplorable. Some flashes of bravery now and then lighted up the sombre scene of helpless misfortune, and served to show that destruction might even yet have been averted by a little firmness. . . . But the commander had already begun to despair, and before many days had passed he was thinking of making terms with the enemy. Macnaghten had no course open to him under such circumstances but to adopt the suggestion of the general, and attempt as well as he could by bribes, cajolery, and intrigue, to divide the chiefs and secure a safe retreat for the English. Akbar Khan, the son of Dost Mohamed, though not present at the beginning of the insurrection, had arrived from the northern mountains, and at once asserted a predominant influence in the insurgent councils. With him and with the other insurgent chiefs Macnaghten entered into an arrangement by which he promised to withdraw the English entirely from the country if a safe passage were secured for the army through the passes. . . . While ostensibly treating with the Barrukzye chiefs, he intrigued on all sides with the rival tribes. His double dealing was taken advantage of by Akbar Khan. He sent messengers to Macnaghten proposing that the English should make a separate treaty with himself and support him with their troops in an assault upon some of his rivals. The proposition was a mere trap, and the envoy fell into it. Ordering troops to be got ready, he hurried to a meeting with Akbar to complete the arrangement. There he found himself in the presence of the brother and relatives of the very men against whom he was plotting, and was seized and murdered by Akbar's own hand [December 23]. Still the General thought of nothing but surrender. The negotiations were entrusted to Major Pottinger. The terms of the chiefs gradually rose, and at length with much confusion the wretched army marched out of the cantonments [January 6, 1842], leaving behind nearly all the cannon and superfluous military stores. An Afghan escort to secure the safety of the troops on their perilous journey had been promised, but the promise was not kept. The horrors of the retreat form one of the darkest passages in English military history. In bitter cold and snow, which took all life out of the wretched Sepoys, without proper clothing or shelter, and hampered by a disorderly mass of thousands of camp-followers, the army entered the terrible defiles which lie between Cabul and Jellalabad. Whether Akbar Khan could, had he wished it, have restrained his fanatical followers is uncertain. As a fact the retiring crowd—it can scarcely be called an army—was a mere unresisting prey to the assaults of the mountaineers. Constant communication was kept up with Akbar; on the third day all the ladies and children with the married men were placed in his hands, and finally even the two generals gave themselves up as hostages, always in the hope that the remnant of the army might be allowed to escape.—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of England*, v. 4, pp. 61-66.—“Then the march of the army, without a general, went on again. Soon it became the story of a general without an army; before very long there was neither general nor army. It is idle to lengthen a tale of mere horrors. The strag-

gling remnant of an army entered the Jugdulluk Pass—a dark, steep, narrow, ascending path between crags. The miserable toilers found that the fanatical, implacable tribes had barricaded the pass. All was over. The army of Cabul was finally extinguished in that barricaded pass. It was a trap; the British were taken in it. A few mere fugitives escaped from the scene of actual slaughter, and were on the road to Jellalabad, where Sale and his little army were holding their own. When they were within sixteen miles of Jellalabad the number was reduced to six. Of these six five were killed by straggling marauders on the way. One man alone reached Jellalabad to tell the tale. Literally one man, Dr. Brydon, came to Jellalabad [January 13] out of a moving host which had numbered in all some 16,000 when it set out on its march. The curious eye will search through history or fiction in vain for any picture more thrilling than the suggestions of an awful catastrophe than that of this solitary survivor, faint and reeling on his jaded horse, as he appeared under the walls of Jellalabad, to bear the tidings of our Thermopylae of pain and shame. This is the crisis of the story. With this at least the worst of the pain and shame were destined to end. The rest is all, so far as we are concerned, reaction and recovery. Our successes are common enough; we may tell their tale briefly in this instance. The garrison at Jellalabad had received before Dr. Brydon's arrival an intimation that they were to go out and march toward India in accordance with the terms of the treaty extorted from Elphinstone at Cabul. They very properly declined to be bound by a treaty which, as General Sale rightly conjectured, had been forced from our envoy and military commander with the knives at their throats. General Sale's determination was clear and simple. 'I propose to hold this place on the part of Government until I receive its order to the contrary.' This resolve of Sale's was really the turning point of the history. Sale held Jellalabad; Nott was at Candahar. Akbar Khan besieged Jellalabad. Nature seemed to have declared herself emphatically on his side, for a succession of earthquake shocks shattered the walls of the place, and produced more terrible destruction than the most formidable guns of modern warfare could have done. But the garrison held out fearlessly; they restored the parapets, re-established every battery, retrenched the whole of the gates and built up all the breaches. They resisted every attempt of Akbar Khan to advance upon their works, and at length, when it became certain that General Pollock was forcing the Khyber Pass to come to their relief, they determined to attack Akbar Khan's army; they issued boldly out of their forts, forced a battle on the Afghan chief, and completely defeated him. Before Pollock, having gallantly fought his way through the Khyber Pass, had reached Jellalabad [April 16] the beleaguering army had been entirely defeated and dispersed. . . . Meanwhile the unfortunate Shah Soojah, whom we had restored with so much pomp of announcement to the throne of his ancestors, was dead. He was assassinated in Cabul, soon after the departure of the British, . . . and his body, stripped of its royal robes and its many jewels, was hung into a ditch."—J. McCarthy, *Hist. of our own Times*, v. 1, ch. 11.

ALSO IN J. W. Kaye, *Hist. of the War in Afghanistan*.—G. R. Gleig, *Sale's Brigade in Afghanistan*.—Lucy Sale, *Journal of the Disasters in Afghanistan*.—Mohan Lal, *Life of Dost Mohammed*, ch. 15-18 (c. 2).

A. D. 1842-1860.—The British return to Cabul.—Restoration of Dost Mahomed.—It was not till September that General Pollock "could obtain permission from the Governor-General, Lord Ellenborough, to advance against Cabul, though both he and Nott were burning to do so. When Pollock did advance, he found the enemy posted at Jugdulluck, the scene of the massacre. 'Here,' says one writer, 'the skeletons lay so thick that they had to be cleared away to allow the guns to pass. The savage grandeur of the scene rendered it a fitting place for the deed of blood which had been enacted under its horrid shade, never yet pierced in some places by sunlight. The road was strewn for two miles with mouldering skeletons like a charnel house.' Now the enemy found they had to deal with other men, under other leaders, for, putting their whole energy into the work, the British troops scaled the heights and steep ascents, and defeated the enemy in their strongholds on all sides. After one more severe fight with Akbar Khan, and all the force he could collect, the enemy were beaten, and driven from their mountains, and the force marched quietly into Cabul. Nott, on his side, started from Candahar on the 7th of August, and, after fighting several small battles with the enemy, he captured Ghuzni, where Palmer and his garrison had been destroyed. From Ghuzni General Nott brought away, by command of Lord Ellenborough, the gates of Somnauth [said to have been taken from the Hindu temple of Somnauth by Mahmoud of Ghazni, the first Mohammedan invader of India, in 1024], which formed the subject of the celebrated 'Proclamation of the Gates,' as it was called. This proclamation, issued by Lord Ellenborough, brought upon him endless ridicule, and it was indeed at first considered to be a satire of his enemies, in imitation of Napoleon's address from the Pyramids; the Duke of Wellington called it 'The Song of Triumph.' . . . This proclamation, put forth with so much flourishing of trumpets and ado, was really an insult to those whom it professed to praise, it was an insult to the Mohammedans under our rule, for their power was gone, it was also an insult to the Hindoos, for their temple of Somnauth was in ruins. These celebrated gates, which are believed to be imitations of the original gates, are now lying neglected and worm-eaten, in the back part of a small museum at Agra. But to return, General Nott, having captured Ghuzni and defeated Sultan Jan, pushed on to Cabul, where he arrived on the 17th of September, and met Pollock. The English prisoners (amongst whom were Brigadier Shelton and Lady Sale), who had been captured at the time of the massacre, were brought, or found their own way, to General Pollock's camp. General Elphinstone had died during his captivity. It was not now considered necessary to take any further steps; the bazaar in Cabul was destroyed, and on the 12th of October Pollock and Nott turned their faces southwards, and began their march into India by the Khyber route. The Afghans in captivity were sent back, and the Governor-General received the troops at

Ferozepoor. Thus ended the Afghan war of 1839-42. . . . The war being over, we withdrew our forces into India, leaving the son of Shah Soojah, Fathi Jung, who had escaped from Cabul when his father was murdered, as king of the country, a position that he was unable to maintain long, being very shortly afterwards assassinated. In 1843 Dost Mahomed, the ruler whom we had deposed, and who had been living at our expense in India, returned to Cabul and resumed his former position as king of the country, still bearing ill-will towards us, which he showed on several occasions, notably during the Sikh war, when he sent a body of his horsemen to fight for the Sikhs, and he himself marched an army through the Khyber to Peshawur to assist our enemies. However, the occupation of the Punjab forced upon Dost Mahomed the necessity of being on friendly terms with his powerful neighbour; he therefore concluded a friendly treaty with us in 1854, hoping thereby that our power would be used to prevent the intrigues of Persia against his kingdom. This hope was shortly after realized, for in 1856 we declared war against Persia, an event which was greatly to the advantage of Dost Mahomed, as it prevented Persian encroachments upon his territory. This war lasted but a short time, for early in 1857 an agreement was signed between England and Persia, by which the latter renounced all claims over Herat and Afghanistan. Herat, however, still remained independent of Afghanistan, until 1863, when Dost Mahomed attacked and took the town, thus uniting the whole kingdom, including Candahar and Afghan Turkestan, under his rule. This was almost the last act of the Ameer's life, for a few days after taking Herat he died. By his will he directed that Shere Ali, one of his sons, should succeed him as Ameer of Afghanistan. The new Ameer immediately wrote to the Governor-General of India, Lord Egin, in a friendly tone, asking that his succession might be acknowledged. Lord Egin, however, as the consequence of the Liberal policy of 'masterly inactivity' neglected to answer the letter, a neglect which cannot but be deeply regretted, as Shere Ali was at all events the de facto ruler of the country, and even had he been beaten by any other rival for the throne, it would have been time enough to acknowledge that rival as soon as he was really ruler of the country. When six months later a cold acknowledgement of the letter was given by Sir William Denison, and when a request that the Ameer made for 6,000 muskets had been refused by Lord Lawrence, the Ameer concluded that the disposition of England towards him was not that of a friend; particularly as, when later on two of his brothers revolted against him, each of them was told by the Government that he would be acknowledged for that part of the country which he brought under his power. However, after various changes in fortune, in 1869 Shere Ali finally defeated his two brothers Atzool and Azim, together with Atzool's son, Abdurrahman."—P. F. Walker, *Afghanistan*, pp. 45-51.

ALSO IN J. W. Kaye, *Hist. of the War in Afghanistan*.—G. B. Malleson, *Hist. of Afghanistan*, ch. 11.

A. D. 1869-1881.—The second war with the English and its causes.—The period of disturbance in Afghanistan, during the struggle

of Shere Ali with his brothers, coincided with the vice royalty of Lord Lawrence in India. The policy of Lord Lawrence, "sometimes slightly spoken of as masterly inactivity, consisted in holding entirely aloof from the dynastic quarrels of the Afghans . . . and in attempting to cultivate the friendship of the Ameer by gifts of money and arms, while, carefully avoiding topics of offence. . . . Lord Lawrence was himself unable to meet the Ameer, but his successor, Lord Mayo, had an interview with him at Umballah in 1869. . . . Lord Mayo adhered to the policy of his predecessor. He refused to enter into any close alliance, he refused to pledge himself to support any dynasty. But on the other hand he promised that he would not press for the admission of any English officers as Residents in Afghanistan. The return expected by England for this attitude of friendly non-interference was that every other foreign state, and especially Russia, should be forbidden to mix either directly or indirectly with the affairs of the country in which our interests were so closely involved. . . . But a different view was held by another school of Indian politicians, and was supported by men of such eminence as Sir Bartle Frere and Sir Henry Rawlinson. Their view was known as the Sindh Policy as contrasted with that of the Punjab. It appeared to them desirable that English agents should be established at Quetta, Candahar, and Herat, if not at Cabul itself, to keep the Indian Government completely informed of the affairs of Afghanistan, and to maintain English influence in the country. In 1874, upon the accession of the Conservative Ministry, Sir Bartle Frere produced a memorandum in which this policy was ably maintained. . . . A Viceroy whose views were more in accordance with those of the Government, and who was likely to be a more ready instrument in [its] hands, was found in Lord Lytton, who went to India intrusted with the duty of giving effect to the new policy. He was instructed . . . to continue payments of money, to recognise the permanence of the existing dynasty, and to give a pledge of material support in case of unprovoked foreign aggression, but to insist on the acceptance of an English Resident at certain places in Afghanistan in exchange for these advantages. . . . Lord Lawrence and those who thought with him in England prophesied from the first the disastrous results which would arise from the alienation of the Afghans. . . . The suggestion of Lord Lytton that an English Commission should go to Cabul to discuss matters of common interest to the two Governments, was calculated . . . to excite feelings already somewhat unfriendly to England. He [Shere Ali] rejected the mission, and formulated his grievances. . . . Lord Lytton waived for a time the despatch of the mission, and consented to a meeting between the Minister of the Ameer and Sir Lewis Pelly at Peshawur. . . . The English Commissioner was instructed to declare that the one indispensable condition of the Treaty was the admission of an English representative within the limits of Afghanistan. The almost piteous request on the part of the Afghans for the relaxation of this demand proved unavailing, and the sudden death of the Ameer's envoy formed a good excuse for breaking off the negotiation. Lord Lytton treated the Ameer as incorrigible, gave

him to understand that the English would proceed to secure their frontier without further reference to him, and withdrew his native agent from Cabul. While the relations between the two countries were in this uncomfortable condition, information reached India that a Russian mission had been received at Cabul. It was just at this time that the action of the Home Government seemed to be tending rapidly towards a war with Russia. . . . As the despatch of a mission from Russia was contrary to the engagements of that country, and its reception under existing circumstances were an unfriendly aspect, Lord Lytton saw his way with some plausible justification to demand the reception at Cabul of an English em'assy. He notified his intention to the Ameer, but without waiting for an answer selected Sir Neville Chamberlain as his envoy, and sent him forward with an escort of more than 1,000 men, too large, as it was observed, for peace, too small for war. As a matter of course the mission was not admitted. . . . An outcry was raised both in England and in India. . . . Troops were hastily collected upon the Indian frontier; and a curious light was thrown on what had been done by the assertion of the Premier at the Guildhall banquet that the object in view was the formation of a 'scientific frontier;' in other words, throwing aside all former pretences, he declared that the policy of England was to make use of the opportunity offered for direct territorial aggression. . . . As had been foreseen by all parties from the first, the English armies were entirely successful in their first advance [November, 1878]. . . . By the close of December Jellalabad was in the hands of Browne, the Shutargardan Pass had been surmounted by Roberts, and in January Stewart established himself in Candahar. When the resistance of his army proved ineffectual, Shere Ali had taken to flight, only to die. His refractory son Yakoob Khan was drawn from his prison and assumed the reins of government as regent. . . . Yakoob readily granted the English demands, consenting to place his foreign relations under British control, and to accept British agencies. With considerably more reluctance, he allowed what was required for the rectification of the frontier to pass into English hands. He received in exchange a promise of support by the British Government, and an annual subsidy of £100,000. On the conclusion of the treaty the troops in the Jellalabad Valley withdrew within the new frontier, and Yakoob Khan was left to establish his authority as best he could at Cabul, whither in July Cavagnari with an escort of twenty-six troopers and eighty infantry betook himself. Then was enacted again the sad story which precluded the first Afghan war. All the parts and scenes in the drama repeated themselves with curious uniformity—the English Resident with his little garrison trusting blindly to his capacity for influencing the Afghan mind, the puppet king, without the power to make himself respected, irritated by the constant presence of the Resident, the chiefs mutually distrustful and at one in nothing save their hatred of English interference, the people seething with anger against the infidel foreigner, a wild outbreak which the Ameer, even had he wished it, could not control, an attack upon the Residency and the complete destruction [Sept., 1879] after a

gallant but futile resistance of the Resident and his entire escort. Fortunately the extreme disaster of the previous war was avoided. The English troops which were withdrawn from the country were still within reach. . . . About the 24th of September, three weeks after the outbreak, the Cabul field force under General Roberts was able to move. On the 5th of October it forced its way into the Logar Valley at Charassiab, and on the 12th General Roberts was able to make his formal entry into the city of Cabul. . . . The Ameer was deposed, martial law was established, the disarmament of the people required under pain of death, and the country scoured to bring in for punishment those chiefly implicated in the late outbreak. While thus engaged in carrying out his work of retribution, the wave of insurrection closed behind the English general, communication through the Kuram Valley was cut off, and he was left to pass the winter with an army of some 8,000 men connected with India only by the Kybur Pass. . . . A new and formidable personage . . . now made his appearance on the scene. This was Abdurahman, the nephew and rival of the late Shere Ali, who upon the defeat of his pretensions had sought refuge in Turkestan, and was supposed to be supported by the friendship of Russia. The expected attack did not take place, constant reinforcements had raised the Cabul army to 20,000, and rendered it too strong to be assailed. . . . It was thought desirable to break up Afghanistan into a northern and southern province. . . . The policy thus declared was carried out. A certain Shere Ali, a cousin of the late Ameer of the same name, was appointed Wali or Governor of Candahar. In the north signs were visible that the only possible successor to the throne of Cabul would be Abdurahman. . . . The Bengal army under General Stewart was to march northwards, and, suppressing on the way the Ghuznee insurgents, was to join the Cabul army in a sort of triumphant return to Peshawur. The first part of the programme was carried out. . . . The second part of the plan was fated to be interrupted by a serious disaster which rendered it for a while uncertain whether the withdrawal of the troops from Afghanistan was possible. . . . Ayoob had always expressed his disapproval of his brother's friendship for the English, and had constantly refused to accept their overtures. Though little was known about him, rumours were afloat that he intended to advance upon Ghuznee, and join the insurgents there. At length about the middle of June [1880] his army started. . . . But before the end of June Farah had been reached and it seemed plain that Candahar would be assaulted. . . . General Burrows found it necessary to fall back to a ridge some forty-five miles from Candahar called Kush-y-Nakhud. There is a pass called Maiwand to the north of the high-road to Candahar, by which an army avoiding the position on the ridge might advance upon the city. On the 27th of July the Afghan troops were seen moving in the direction of this pass. In his attempt to stop them with his small force, numbering about 2,500 men, General Burrows was disastrously defeated. With difficulty and with the loss of seven guns, about half the English troops returned to Candahar. General Primrose, who was in command, had no

choice but to strengthen the place, submit to an investment, and wait till he should be rescued. . . . The troops at Cabul were on the point of withdrawing when the news of the disaster reached them. It was at once decided that the pick of the army under General Roberts should push forward to the beleaguered city, while General Stewart with the remainder should carry out the intended withdrawal. . . . With about 10,000 fighting men and 8,000 camp followers General Roberts brought to a successful issue his remarkable enterprise, . . . falling upon the army of the Ameer and entirely dispersing it a short distance outside the city. All those at all inclined to the forward policy clamoured for the maintenance of a British force in Candahar. But the Government firmly and decisively refused to consent to anything approaching to a permanent occupation. . . . The struggle between Abdurrahman and Ayooob continued for a while, and until it was over the English troops remained at Quetta. But when Abdurrahman had been several times victorious over his rival and in October [1881] occupied Herat, it was thought safe to complete the evacuation, leaving Abdurrahman for the time at least generally accepted as Ameer."—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng., period 4, pp. 534-544*.

ALSO IN A. Forbes, *The Afghan Wars, pt. 2.—Duke of Argyll, The Afghan Question from 1841 to 1878*.—G. B. Malletson, *The Russo-Afghan Question*.

**AFRICA: The name as anciently applied.**  
See LIBYANS.

**The Roman Province.**—"Territorial sovereignty over the whole of North Africa had doubtless already been claimed by the part of the Roman Republic, perhaps as a portion of the Carthaginian inheritance, perhaps because 'our sea' early became one of the fundamental ideas of the Roman commonwealth; and, in so far as all its coasts were regarded by the Romans even of the developed republic as their true property. Nor had this claim of Rome ever been properly contested by the larger states of North Africa after the destruction of Carthage. . . . The arrangements which the emperors made were carried out quite after the same way in the territory of the dependent princes as in the immediate territory of Rome; it was the Roman government that regulated the boundaries in all North Africa, and constituted Roman communities at its discretion, in the kingdom of Mauretania no less than in the province of Numidia. We cannot therefore speak, in the strict sense, of a Roman subjugation of North Africa. The Romans did not conquer it like the Phœnicians or the French; but they ruled over Numidia as over Mauretania, first as suzerains, then as successors of the native governments. . . . As for the previous rulers, so also doubtless for Roman civilization there was to be found a limit to the south, but hardly so for the Roman territorial supremacy. There is never mention of any formal extension or taking back of the frontier in Africa. . . . The former territory of Carthage and the larger part of the earlier kingdom of Numidia, united with it by the dictator Cæsar, or, as they also called it, the old and new Africa, formed until the end of the reign of Tiberias the province of that name [Africa], which extended from the boundary of Cyrene to

the river Ampsage, embracing the modern state of Tripoli, as well as Tunis and the French province of Constantine. . . . Mauretania was not a heritage like Africa and Numidia. . . . The Romans can scarcely have taken over the Empire of the Mauretanian kings in quite the same extent as these possessed it; but . . . probably the whole south as far as the great desert passed as imperial land."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk. 8, ch. 13*.—See, also, **CARTHAGE, NUMIDIA, and CYRENE**.

**The Mediæval City.** See **BARBARY STATES**: A. D. 1543-1560.

**Moslem conquest and Moslem States in the North.** See **MAHOMETAN CONQUEST, &c.**: A. D. 640-646; 647-709, and 908-1171; also **BARBARY STATES**; **EGYPT**: A. D. 1250-1517, and after; and **SUDAN**.

**Portuguese Exploration of the Atlantic Coast.—The rounding of the Cape.** See **PORTUGAL**: A. D. 1415-1460, and 1463-1498.

**Dutch and English Colonization.** See **SOUTH AFRICA**.

**A. D. 1787-1807.—Settlement of Sierra Leone.** See **SIERRA LEONE**.

**A. D. 1820-1822.—The founding of Liberia.** See **SLAVERY, NEGRO**: A. D. 1816-1847.

**A. D. 1884-1891.—Partition of the interior between European Powers.**—"The partition of Africa may be said to date from the Berlin Conference of 1884-85 [see **CONGO FREE STATE**]. Prior to that Conference the question of inland boundaries was scarcely considered. . . . The founding of the Congo Independent State was probably the most important result of the Conference. . . . Two months after the Conference had concluded its labours, Great Britain and Germany had a serious dispute in regard to their respective spheres of influence on the Gulf of Guinea. . . . The compromise . . . arrived at placed the Mission Station of Victoria within the German sphere of influence." The frontier between the two spheres of influence on the Bight of Biafra was subsequently defined by a line drawn, in 1886, from the coast to Yola, on the Benué. The Royal Niger Company, constituted by a royal charter, "was given administrative powers over territories covered by its treaties. The regions thereby placed under British protection . . . apart from the Oil Rivers District, which is directly administered by the Crown, embrace the coastal lands between Lagos and the northern frontier of Camarons, the Lower Niger (including territories of Sokoto, Gandu and Borgo), and the Benué from Yola to its confluence." By a Protocol signed December 24, 1885, Germany and France "defined their respective spheres of influence and action on the Bight of Biafra, and also on the Slave Coast and in Senegambia." This "fixed the inland extension of the German sphere of influence (Camarons) at 15° E. longitude, Greenwich. . . . At present it allows the French Congo territories to expand along the western bank of the M'bangi . . . provided no other tributary of the M'bangi-Congo is found to the west, in which case, according to the Berlin Treaty of 1884-85, the conventional basin of the Congo would gain an extension." On the 12th of May, 1886, France and Portugal signed a convention by which France "secured the exclusive control of both banks of the Casamanza (in Senegambia), and the Portuguese frontier in the south was advanced approximately

to the southern limit of the basin—the Casini. On the Congo, Portugal retained the Massabi district, to which France had laid claim, but both banks of the Loango were left to France." In 1884 three representatives of the Society for German Colonization—Dr. Peters, Dr. Jühlke, and Count Pfeil—quietly concluded treaties with the chiefs of Useguba, Ukami, Nguru, and Usagara, by which those territories were conveyed to the Society in question. "Dr. Peters . . . armed with his treaties, returned to Berlin in February, 1885. On the 27th February, the day following the signature of the General Act of the Berlin Conference, an Imperial Schutzbrief, or Charter of Protection, secured to the Society for German Colonization the territories . . . acquired for them through Dr. Peters' treaties; in other words, a German Protectorate was proclaimed. When it became known that Germany had seized upon the Zanzibar mainland, the indignation in colonial circles knew no bounds. . . . Prior to 1884, the continental lands facing Zanzibar were almost exclusively under British influence. The principal traders were British subjects, and the Sultan's Government was administered under the advice of the British Resident. The entire region between the Coast and the Lakes was regarded as being under the nominal suzerainty of the Sultan. . . . Still, Great Britain had no territorial claims on the dominions of the Sultan." The Sultan formally protested and Great Britain championed his cause; but to no effect. In the end the Sultan of Zanzibar yielded the German Protectorate over the four inland provinces and over Vitu, and the British and German Governments arranged questions between them, provisionally, by the Anglo-German Convention of 1886, which was afterwards superseded by the more definite Convention of July 1890, which will be spoken of below. In April 1887, the rights of the Society for German Colonization were transferred to the German East Africa Association, with Dr. Peters at its head. The British East Africa Company took over concessions that had been granted by the Sultan of Zanzibar to Sir William Mackinnon, and received a royal charter in September, 1888. In South-west Africa, "an enterprising Bremen merchant, Herr Lüderitz, and subsequently the German Consul-General, Dr. Nachtigal, concluded a series of political and commercial treaties with native chiefs, whereby a claim was instituted over Angra Pequena, and over vast districts in the Interior between the Orange River and Cape Frio. . . . It was useless for the Cape colonists to protest. On the 13th October 1884 Germany formally notified to the Powers her Protectorate over South-West Africa. . . . On 3rd August 1885 the German Colonial Company for South-West Africa was founded, and . . . received the Imperial sanction for its incorporation. But in August 1886 a new Association was formed—the German West-Africa Company—and the administration of its territories was placed under an Imperial Commissioner. . . . The intrusion of Germany into South-West Africa acted as a check upon, no less than a spur to, the extension of British influence northwards to the Zambezi. Another obstacle to this extension arose from the Boer insurrection." The Transvaal, with increased independence had adopted the title of South African Republic. "Zulu-land, having lost its independence, was partitioned: a third of its

territories, over which a republic had been proclaimed, was absorbed (October 1887) by the Transvaal; the remainder was added (14th May 1887) to the British possessions. Amatonga-land was in 1888 also taken under British protection. By a convention with the South African Republic, Britain acquired in 1884 the Crown colony of Bechuana-land; and in the early part of 1885 a British Protectorate was proclaimed over the remaining portion of Bechuana-land." Furthermore, "a British Protectorate was instituted [1885] over the country bounded by the Zambezi in the north, the British possessions in the south, 'the Portuguese province of Sofala' in the east, and the 20th degree of east longitude in the west. It was at this juncture that Mr. Cecil Rhodes came forward, and, having obtained certain concessions from Lobengula, founded the British South Africa Company. . . . On the 29th October 1889, the British South Africa Company was granted a royal charter. It was declared in this charter that 'the principal field of the operations of the British South African Company shall be the region of South Africa lying immediately to the north of British Bechuana-land, and to the north and west of the South African Republic, and to the west of the Portuguese dominions.'" No northern limit was given, and the other boundaries were vaguely defined. The position of Swazi-land was definitely settled in 1890 by an arrangement between Great Britain and the South African Republic, which provides for the continued independence of Swazi-land and a joint control over the white settlers. A British Protectorate was proclaimed over Nyassa-land and the Shiré Highlands in 1889-90. To return now to the proceedings of other Powers in Africa: "Italy took formal possession, in July 1882, of the bay and territory of Assab. The Italian coast-line on the Red Sea was extended from Ras Kasar (18° 2' N. Lat.) to the southern boundary of Raheita, towards Obok. During 1889, shortly after the death of King Johannes, Keren and Asmara were occupied by Italian troops. Menelik of Shoa, who succeeded to the throne of Abyssinia after subjugating all the Abyssinian provinces, except Tigre, dispatched an embassy to King Humbert, the result of which was that the new Negus acknowledged (20th September, 1889) the Protectorate of Italy over Abyssinia, and its sovereignty over the territories of Mas-sawa, Keren and Asmara." By the Protocols of 24th March and 15th April, 1891, Italy and Great Britain define their respective Spheres of Influence in East Africa. "But since then Italy has practically withdrawn from her position. She has absolutely no hold over Abyssinia. . . . Italy has also succeeded in establishing herself on the Somali Coast." By treaties concluded in 1889, "the coastal lands between Cape Warsheikh (about 2° 30' N. lat.), and Cape Bedwin (8° 3' N. lat.)—a distance of 450 miles—were placed under Italian protection. Italy subsequently extended (1890) her Protectorate over the Somali Coast to the Jub river. . . . The British Protectorate on the Somali Coast facing Aden, now extends from the Italian frontier at Ras Hafun to Ras Jibute (43° 15' E. long.). . . . The activity of France in her Senegambian province, . . . during the last hundred years . . . has finally resulted in a considerable expansion of her territory. . . . The French have established a claim over the country intervening between our Gold

Coast Colony and Liberia. A more precise delimitation of the frontier between Sierra Leone and Liberia resulted from the treaties signed at Monrovia on the 11th of November, 1887. In 1888 Portugal withdrew all rights over Delomé. . . . Recently, a French sphere of influence has been instituted over the whole of the Saharan regions between Algeria and Senegambia. . . . Declarations were exchanged (5th August 1890) between [France and Great Britain] with the following results: France became a consenting party to the Anglo-German Convention of 1st July 1890. (2.) Great Britain recognised a French sphere of influence over Madagascar. . . . And (3.) Great Britain recognised the sphere of influence of France to the south of her Mediterranean possessions, up to a line from Say on the Niger to Barra on Lake Tsad, drawn in such a manner as to comprise in the sphere of action of the British Niger Company all that fairly belongs to the kingdom of Sokoto." The Anglo-German Convention of July, 1890, already referred to, established by its main provisions the following definitions of territory: "The Anglo-German frontier in East Africa, which, by the Convention of 1886, ended at a point on the eastern shore of the Victoria Nyanza was continued on the same latitude across the lake to the confines of the Congo Independent State; but, on the western side of the lake, this frontier was, if necessary, to be deflected to the south, in order to include Mount M'Fumbiro within the British sphere. . . . Treaties in that district were made on behalf of the British East Africa Company by Mr. Stanley, on his return (May 1889) from the relief of Emin Pasha. . . . (2.) The southern boundary of the German sphere of influence in East Africa was recognised as that originally drawn to a point on the eastern shore of Lake Nyassa, whence it was continued by the eastern, northern, and western shores of the lake to the northern bank of the mouth of the River Songwé. From this point the Anglo-German frontier was continued to Lake Tanganika, in such a manner as to leave the Stevenson Road within the British sphere. (3.) The Northern frontier of British East Africa was defined by the Jub River and the continuous boundary of the Italian sphere of influence in Galla-land and Abyssinia up to the confines of Egypt; in the west, by the Congo State and the Congo-Nile watershed. (4.) Germany withdrew, in favor of Britain, her Protectorate over Vitu and her claims to all territories on the mainland to the north of the River Tana, as also over the islands of Patta and Manda. (5.) In South-West Africa, the Anglo-German frontier, originally fixed up to 22 south latitude, was confirmed; but from this point the boundary-line was drawn in such a manner eastward and northward as to give Germany free access to the Zambezi by the Chobe River. (6.) The Anglo-German frontier between Togo and Gold Coast Colony was fixed, and that between the Camarons and the British Niger Territories was provisionally adjusted. (7.) The Free-trade zone, defined by the Act of Berlin (1885) was recognised as applicable to the present arrangement between Britain and Germany. (8.) A British Protectorate was recognised over the dominions of the Sultan of Zanzibar within the British coastal zone and over the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba. Britain, however, undertook to use her influence to secure (what have since been acquired) corresponding advantages for

Germany within the German coastal zone and over the island of Mafia. Finally (9), the island of Heligoland, in the North Sea, was ceded by Britain to Germany." By a treaty concluded in June, 1891, between Great Britain and Portugal, "Great Britain acquired a broad central sphere of influence for the expansion of her possessions in South Africa northward and beyond the Zambezi, along a path which provides for the uninterrupted passage of British goods and British enterprise, up to the confines of the Congo Independent State and German East Africa. . . . Portugal, on the East Coast secured the Lower Zambezi from Zumbo, and the Lower Shiré from the Ruu Confluence, the entire Hinterland of Mosambique up to Lake Nyassa and the Hinterland of Sofala to the confines of the South African Republic and the Matabele kingdom. On the West Coast, Portugal received the entire Hinterland behind her provinces in Lower Guinea, up to the confines of the Congo Independent State, and the upper course of the Zambezi. . . . On May 25th 1891 a Convention was signed at Lisbon, which has put an end to the dispute between Portugal and the Congo Independent State as to the possession of Lunda. Roughly speaking, the country was equally divided between the disputants. . . . Lord Salisbury, in his negotiations with Germany and Portugal, very wisely upheld the principle of free-trade which was laid down by the Act of Berlin, 1885, in regard to the free transit of goods through territories in which two or more powers are indirectly interested."—A. S. White, *The Development of Africa, Second Ed., Rev.*, 1892.

ALSO IN: J. S. Keltie, *The Partition of Africa*, ch. 12-23.—See, also, SOUTH AFRICA, and UGANDA.

**The inhabiting races.**—The indigenous races of Africa are considered to be four in number, namely: the Negroes proper, who occupy a central zone, stretching from the Atlantic to the Egyptian Sudan, and who comprise an enormous number of diverse tribes; the Fulahs (with whom the Nubians are associated) settled mainly between Lake Chad and the Niger; the Bantus, who occupy the whole South, except its extremity, and the Hottentots who are in that extreme southern region. Some anthropologists include with the Hottentots the Bosjesmans or Bushmen. The Kafirs and Bechuannas are Bantu tribes. The North and Northeast are occupied by Semitic and Hamitic races, the latter including Abyssinians and Gallas.—A. H. Kenne, *The African Races (Stanford's Compendium: Africa, app.)*.

ALSO IN: R. Brown, *The Races of Mankind*, v. 2-3.—R. N. Cust, *Sketch of the Modern Languages of Africa*.—See, also, SOUTH AFRICA.

AGA MOHAMMED KHAN, Shah of Persia, A. D. 1795-1797.

AGADE. See BABYLONIA: THE EARLY (CHALDEAN) MONARCHY.

AGAPETUS II., Pope, A. D. 946-956.

AGAS. See SUBLIME PORTE.

AGATHO, Pope, A. D. 678-682.

AGATHOCLES, The tyranny of. See SYRACUSE: B. C. 317-289.

AGE OF STONE.—AGE OF BRONZE, &c. See STONE AGE.

AGELA.—AGELATAS.—The youths and young men of ancient Crete were publicly



trained and disciplined in divisions or companies, each of which was called an Agela, and its leader or director the Agelatas.—G. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State*, pt. 3, ch. 2.

**AGEMA, The.**—The royal escort of Alexander the Great.

**AGEN, Origin of.** See NITONNIOES.

**AGENDICUM OR AGEDINCUM.** See SENONES.

**AGER PUBLICUS.**—"Rome was always making fresh acquisitions of territory in her early history. . . . Large tracts of country became Roman land, the property of the Roman state, or public domain (ager publicus), as the Romans called it. The condition of this land, the use to which it was applied, and the disputes which it caused between the two orders at Rome, are among the most curious and perplexing questions in Roman history. . . . That part of newly-acquired territory which was neither sold nor given remained public property, and it was occupied, according to the Roman term, by private persons, in whose hands it was a Possessio. Hyginus and Steulus Flaccus represent this occupation as being made without any order. Every Roman took what he could, and more than he could use profitably. . . . We should be more inclined to believe that this public land was occupied under some regulations, in order to prevent disputes; but if such regulations existed we know nothing about them. There was no survey made of the public land which was from time to time acquired, but there were certainly general boundaries fixed for the purpose of determining what had become public property. The lands which were sold and given were of necessity surveyed and fixed by boundaries. . . . There is no direct evidence that any payments to the state were originally made by the Possessors. It is certain, however, that at some early time such payments were made, or, at least, were due to the state."—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, ch. 11.

**AGGER.** See CASTRA.

**AGGRAVIADOS, The.** See SPAIN: A. D. 1814-1827.

**AGHA MOHAMMED KHAN, Shah of Persia.** A. D. 1795-1797.

**AGHLABITE DYNASTY.** See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST AND EMPIRE: A. D. 715-750.

**AGHRIM, OR AUGHRIM, Battle of (A. D. 1691).** See IRELAND: A. D. 1689-1691.

**AGILULPHUS, King of the Lombards.** A. D. 590-616.

**AGINCOURT, Battle of (1415).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1415.

**AGINNUM.**—Modern Agen. See NITTONNIOES.

**AGNADEL, Battle of (1509).** See VENICE: A. D. 1508-1509.

**AGNATI.**—AGNATIC. See GENS, ROMAN.

**AGNIERS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: AGNIERS.

**AGORA, The.**—The public discipline enforced in ancient Sparta; the ordinances attributed to Lycurgus, for the training of the young and the regulating of the lives of citizens.—G. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State*, pt. 3, ch. 1.

**AGORA, The.**—The market-place of an ancient Greek city was, also, the centre of its political life. "Like the gymnasium, and even earlier than this, it grew into architectural splendour

with the increasing culture of the Greeks. In maritime cities it generally lay near the sea; in inland places at the foot of the hill which carried the old feudal castle. Being the oldest part of the city, it naturally became the focus not only of commercial, but also of religious and political life. Here even in Homer's time the citizens assembled in consultation, for which purpose it was supplied with seats; here were the oldest sanctuaries; here were celebrated the first festive games; here centred the roads on which the intercommunication, both religious and commercial, with neighbouring cities and states was carried on; from here started the processions which continually passed between holy places of kindred origin, though locally separated. Although originally all public transactions were carried on in these market-places, special local arrangements for contracting public business soon became necessary in large cities. At Athens, for instance, the gently rising ground of the Philopappos hill, called Pnyx, touching the Agora, was used for political consultations, while most likely, about the time of the Pisistratides, the market of Kerameikos, the oldest seat of Attic industry (lying between the foot of the Akropolis, the Areopagos and the hill of Theseus), became the agora proper, i. e., the centre of Athenian commerce. . . . The description by Vitruvius of an agora evidently refers to the splendid structures of post-Alexandrine times. According to him it was quadrangular in size [? shape] and surrounded by wide double colonades. The numerous columns carried architraves of common stone or of marble, and on the roofs of the porticoes were galleries for walking purposes. This, of course, does not apply to all market-places, even of later date; but, upon the whole, the remaining specimens agree with the description of Vitruvius."—E. Gihl and W. Koner, *Life of the Greeks and Romans*, tr. by Hueffer, pt. 1, sect. 26.—In the Homeric time, the general assembly of freemen was called the Agora.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 1, ch. 20.

**AGRÆI, The.** See AKARNANIANS.

**AGRARIAN LAWS, Roman.**—"Great mistakes formerly prevailed on the nature of the Roman laws familiarly termed Agrarian. It was supposed that by these laws all land was declared common property, and that at certain intervals of time the state resumed possession and made a fresh distribution to all citizens, rich and poor. It is needless to make any remarks on the nature and consequences of such a law; sufficient it will be to say, what is now known to all, that at Rome such laws never existed, never were thought of. The lands which were to be distributed by Agrarian laws were not private property, but the property of the state. They were, originally, those public lands which had been the domain of the kings, and which were increased whenever any city or people was conquered by the Romans; because it was an Italian practice to confiscate the lands of the conquered, in whole or in part."—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 2, ch. 8.—See ROMÉ: B. C. 376, and B. C. 133-131.

**AGRI DECUMATES, The.**—"Between the Rhine and the Upper Danube there intervenes a triangular tract of land, the apex of which touches the confines of Switzerland at Basel; thus separating, as with an enormous wedge, the provinces of Gaul and Vindelicis, and pre-

sending at its base no natural line of defence from one river to the other. This tract was, however, occupied, for the most part, by forests, and if it broke the line of the Roman defences, it might at least be considered impenetrable to an enemy. Abandoned by the warlike and predatory tribes of Germany, it was seized by wandering immigrants from Gaul, many of them Roman adventurers, before whom the original inhabitants, the Marcomanni, or men of the frontier, seem to have retreated eastward beyond the Hercynian forest. The intruders claimed or solicited Roman protection, and offered in return a tribute from the produce of the soil, whence the district itself came to be known by the title of the Agri Decumates, or Tithed Land. It was not, however, officially connected with any province of the Empire, nor was any attempt made to provide for its permanent security, till a period much later than that on which we are now engaged [the period of Augustus].—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 36.—Wurtemberg, Baden and Hohenzollern coincide with the Agri Decumates of the Roman writers.”—R. G. Latham, *Ethnology of Europe*, ch. 8.—See, also, ALEMANNI, and SUEVI.

**AGRICOLA'S CAMPAIGNS IN BRITAIN.** See BRITAIN: A. D. 78-84.

**AGRIGENTUM.**—Agragas, or Agrigentum, one of the youngest of the Greek colonies in Sicily, founded about B. C. 582 by the older colony of Gela, became one of the largest and most splendid cities of the age, in the fifth century B. C., as is testified by its ruins to this day. It was the scene of the notorious tyranny of Phalaris, as well as that of Theron. Agrigentum was destroyed by the Carthaginians, B. C. 405, and rebuilt by Timoleon, but never recovered its former importance and grandeur.—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 4, ch. 3.—See, also, PHALARIS, BRAZEN BULL OF.—Agrigentum was destroyed by the Carthaginians in 406 B. C. See SICILY: B. C. 409-405.—Rebuilt by Timoleon, it was the scene of a great defeat of the Carthaginians by the Romans, in 202 B. C. See PUNIC WAR, THE FIRST.

**AGRIPPINA AND HER SON NERO.** See ROME: A. D. 47-54, and 54-64.

**AHMED KHEL, Battle of (1880).** See AFGHANISTAN: A. D. 1869-1881.

**AIGINA.** See ÆGINA.

**AIGOSPOTAMOI, Battle of.** See GREECE: B. C. 405.

**AIGUILLON, Siege of.**—A notable siege in the "Hundred Years' War." A. D. 1346. An English garrison under the famous knight, Sir Walter Manny, held the great fortress of Aiguillon, near the confluence of the Garonne and the Lot, against a formidable French army.—J. Froissart, *Chronicles*, v. 1, bk. 1, ch. 120.

**AIX, Origin of.** See SALYES.

**AIX-LA-CHAPELLE:** The Capital of Charlemagne.—The favorite residence and one of the two capitals of Charlemagne was the city which the Germans call Aachen and the French have named Aix-la-Chapelle. "He ravished the ruins of the ancient world to restore the monumental arts. A new Rome arose in the depths of the forests of Austrasia—palaces, gates, bridges, baths, galleries, theatres, churches,—for the erection of which the mosaics and marbles of Italy were laid under tribute, and workmen summoned from all parts of Europe. It was there

that an extensive library was gathered, there that the school of the palace was made permanent, there that foreign envoys were pompously welcomed, there that the monarch perfected his plans for the introduction of Roman letters and the improvement of music."—P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul*, bk. 4, ch. 17.

**AIX-LA-CHAPELLE, Treaty of (A. D. 803).** See VENICE: A. D. 697-810.

**AIX-LA-CHAPELLE, Treaty of (A. D. 1668).** See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1668.

**AIX-LA-CHAPELLE, The Congress and Treaty which ended the War of the Austrian Succession (1748).**—The War of the Austrian Succession, which raged in Europe, and on the ocean, and in India and America, from 1740 to 1748 (see AUSTRIA: A. D. 1718-1738, 1740-1741, and after), was brought to an end in the latter year by a Congress of all the belligerents which met at Aix-la-Chapelle, in April, and which concluded its labors on the 18th of October following. "The influence of England and Holland . . . forced the peace upon Austria and Sardinia, though both were bitterly aggrieved by its conditions. France agreed to restore every conquest she had made during the war, to abandon the cause of the Stuarts, and expel the Pretender from her soil; to demolish, in accordance with earlier treaties, the fortifications of Dunkirk on the side of the sea, while retaining those on the side of the land, and to retire from the conquest without acquiring any fresh territory or any pecuniary compensation. England in like manner restored the few conquests she had made, and submitted to the somewhat humiliating condition of sending hostages to Paris as a security for the restoration of Cape Breton. . . . The disputed boundary between Canada and Nova Scotia, which had been a source of constant difficulty with France, was left altogether undefined. The Assiento treaty for trade with the Spanish colonies was confirmed for the four years it had still to run; but no real compensation was obtained for a war expenditure which is said to have exceeded sixty-four millions, and which had raised the funded and unfunded debt to more than seventy-eight millions. Of the other Powers, Holland, Genoa, and the little state of Modena retained their territory as before the war, and Genoa remained mistress of the Duchy of Finale, which had been ceded to the king of Sardinia by the Treaty of Worms, and which it had been a main object of his later policy to secure. Austria obtained a recognition of the election of the Emperor, a general guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction, and the restoration of everything she had lost in the Netherlands, but she gained no additional territory. She was compelled to confirm the cession of Silesia and Glatz to Prussia, to abandon her Italian conquests, and even to cede a considerable part of her former Italian dominions. To the bitter indignation of Maria Theresa, the Duchies of Parma, Placentia and Guastella passed to Don Philip of Spain, to revert, however, to their former possessors if Don Philip mounted the Spanish throne, or died without male issue. The King of Sardinia also obtained from Austria the territorial cessions enumerated in the Treaty of Worms [see ITALY: A. D. 1743], with the important exceptions of Placentia, which passed to Don Philip, and of Finale, which remained

with the Genoese. For the loss of these he obtained no compensation. Frederick [the Great, of Prussia] obtained a general guarantee for the possession of his newly acquired territory, and a long list of old treaties was formally confirmed. Thus small were the changes effected in Europe by so much bloodshed and treachery, by nearly nine years of wasteful and desolating war. The design of the dismemberment of Austria had failed, but no vexed questions had been set at rest. . . . Of all the ambitious projects that had been conceived during the war, that of Frederick alone was substantially realized."—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng. 18th Century*, ch. 3.—"Thus ended the War of the Austrian succession. In its origin and its motives one of the most wicked of all the many conflicts which ambition and perfidy have provoked in Europe, it excites a peculiarly mournful interest by the gross inequality in the rewards and penalties which fortune assigned to the leading actors. Prussia, Spain and Sardinia were all endowed out of the estates of the house of Hapsburg. But the electoral house of Bavaria, the most sincere and the most deserving of all the claimants to that vast inheritance, not only received no increase of territory, but even nearly lost its own patrimonial possessions. . . . The most trying problem is still that offered by the misfortunes of the Queen of Hungary [Maria Theresa]. . . . The verdict of history, as expressed by the public opinion, and by the vast majority of writers, in every country except Prussia, upholds the justice of the queen's cause and condemns the coalition that was formed against her."—H. Tuttle, *Hist. of Prussia*, 1745-1756, ch. 2.

ALSO IN W. Russell, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, pt. 2, letter 30.—W. Cox, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 108 (c. 3).—See, also, NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1745-1748.

**AIZNADIN, Battle of (A. D. 634).** See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 632-639.

**AKARNANIAN LEAGUE, The.**—"Of the Akarnanian League, formed by one of the least important, but at the same time one of the most estimable peoples in Greece . . . our knowledge is only fragmentary. The boundaries of Akarnania fluctuated, but we always find the people spoken of as a political whole. . . . Thucydides speaks, by implication at least, of the Akarnanian League as an institution of old standing in his time. The Akarnanians had, in early times, occupied the hill of Olpai as a place for judicial proceedings common to the whole nation. Thus the supreme court of the Akarnanian Union held its sittings, not in a town, but in a mountain fortress. But in Thucydides' own time Stratos had attained its position as the greatest city of Akarnania, and probably the federal assemblies were already held there. . . . Of the constitution of the League we know but little. Ambassadors were sent by the federal body, and probably, just as in the Achaian League, it would have been held to be a breach of the federal tie if any single city had entered on diplomatic intercourse with other powers. As in Achaia, too, there stood at the head of the League a General with high authority. . . . The existence of coins bearing the name of the whole Akarnanian nation shows that there was unity enough to admit of a federal coinage, though coins of particular cities also occur."—

E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of Federal Govt.*, ch. 4, sect. 1.

**AKARNANIANS (Acarnanians).**—The Akarnanians formed "a link of transition" between the ancient Greeks and their barbarous or non-Hellenic neighbours in the Epirus and beyond. "They occupied the territory between the river Achelous, the Ionian sea and the Ambrakian gulf; they were Greeks and admitted as such to contend at the Pan-Hellenic games, yet they were also closely connected with the Amphilochi and Agræi, who were not Greeks. In manners, sentiments and intelligence, they were half-Hellenic and half-Epirotic, —like the Ætolians and the Ozolian Lokrians. Even down to the time of Thucydides, these nations were subdivided into numerous petty communities, lived in unfortified villages, were frequently in the habit of plundering each other, and never permitted themselves to be unarmed. . . . Notwithstanding this state of disunion and insecurity, however, the Akarnanians maintained a loose political league among themselves. . . . The Akarnanians appear to have produced many prophets. They traced up their mythical ancestry, as well as that of their neighbours the Amphilochiants, to the most renowned prophetic family among the Grecian heroes,—Amphiarus, with his sons Alkmaon and Ampiloehus: Akarnan, the eponymous hero of the nation, and other eponymous heroes of the separate towns, were supposed to be the sons of Alkmaon. They are spoken of, together with the Ætolians, as mere rude shepherds, by the lyric poet Alkman, and so they seem to have continued with little alteration until the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, when we hear of them, for the first time, as allies of Athens and as bitter enemies of the Corinthian colonies on their coast. The contact of those colonies, however, and the large spread of Akarnanian accessible coast, could not fail to produce some effect in socializing and improving the people. And it is probable that this effect would have been more sensibly felt, had not the Akarnanians been kept back by the fatal neighbourhood of the Ætolians, with whom they were in perpetual feud,—a people the most unprincipled and unimprovable of all who bore the Hellenic name, and whose habitual faithlessness stood in marked contrast with the rectitude and steadfastness of the Akarnanian character."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 24.

**AKBAR (called The Great), Moghul Emperor or Padischah of India, A. D. 1556-1605.**

**AKHALZIKH, Siege and capture of (1828).** See TURKS: A. D. 1826-1829.

**AKKAD.—AKKADIANS.** See BABYLONIA, PRIMITIVE.

**AKKARON.** See PHILISTINES.

**AKROKERAUNIAN PROMONTORY.** See KORKYRA.

**ALABAMA: The Aboriginal Inhabitants.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINALS: APALACHES; MUSKOGEE FAMILY; CHEROKEES.

**A. D. 1539-1542.—Traversed by Hernando de Soto.** See FLORIDA: A. D. 1528-1542.

**A. D. 1629.—Embraced in the Carolina grant to Sir Robert Heath.** See AMERICA: A. D. 1629.

**A. D. 1663.—Embraced in the Carolina grant to Monk, Shaftesbury, and others.** See NORTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1663-1670.

A. D. 1702-1711.—French occupation and first settlement.—The founding of Mobile. See LOUISIANA: A. D. 1698-1712.

A. D. 1732.—Mostly embraced in the new province of Georgia. See GEORGIA: A. D. 1732-1739.

A. D. 1763.—Cession and delivery to Great Britain.—Partly embraced in West Florida. See SEVEN YEARS' WAR; and FLORIDA: A. D. 1763; and NORTHWEST TERRITORY: A. D. 1763.

A. D. 1779-1781.—Reconquest of West Florida by the Spaniards. See FLORIDA: A. D. 1779-1781.

A. D. 1783.—Mostly covered by the English cession to the United States. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1783 (SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1783-1787.—Partly in dispute with Spain. See FLORIDA: A. D. 1783-1787.

A. D. 1798-1804.—All but the West Florida District embraced in Mississippi Territory. See MISSISSIPPI: A. D. 1798-1804.

A. D. 1803.—Portion acquired by the Louisiana purchase. See LOUISIANA: A. D. 1798-1803.

A. D. 1813.—Possession of Mobile and West Florida taken from the Spaniards. See FLORIDA: A. D. 1810-1813.

A. D. 1813-1814.—The Creek War. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1813-1814 (AUGUST—APRIL).

A. D. 1817-1819.—Organized as a Territory.—Constituted a State, and admitted to the Union.—“By an act of Congress dated March 1, 1817, Mississippi Territory was divided. Another act, bearing the date March 3, thereafter, organized the western [?] eastern] portion into a Territory, to be known as Alabama, and with the boundaries as they now exist. . . . By an act approved March 2, 1819, congress authorized the inhabitants of the Territory of Alabama to form a state constitution, ‘and that said Territory, when formed into a State, shall be admitted into the Union upon the same footing as the original States.’ . . . The joint resolution of congress admitting Alabama into the Union was approved by President Monroe, December 14, 1819.”—W. Brewer, *Alabama*, ch. 5.

A. D. 1861 (January).—Secession from the Union. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (JANUARY—FEBRUARY).

A. D. 1862.—General Mitchell's Expedition. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (APRIL—MAY; ALABAMA).

A. D. 1864 (August).—The Battle of Mobile Bay.—Capture of Confederate forts and fleet. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (AUGUST; ALABAMA).

A. D. 1865 (March—April).—The Fall of Mobile.—Wilson's Raid.—End of the Rebellion. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (APRIL—MAY).

A. D. 1865-1868.—Reconstruction. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (MAY—JULY), to 1868-1870.

ALABAMA CLAIMS, The: A. D. 1862-1862.—In their Origin.—The Earlier Confederate cruisers.—Precursors of the Alabama.—The commissioning of privateers, and of more officially commanded cruisers, in the American civil war, by the government of the Southern Confederacy, was begun early in the progress of the movement of rebellion, pursuant to a proclamation issued by Jefferson

Davis on the 17th of April, 1861. “Before the close of July, 1861, more than 20 of those depre-  
dators were afloat, and had captured millions of property belonging to American citizens. The most formidable and notorious of the sea-going ships of this character, were the *Nashville*, Captain R. B. Pegram, a Virginian, who had abandoned his flag, and the *Suniter* [a regularly commissioned war vessel], Captain Raphael Semmes. The former was a side-wheel steamer, carried a crew of eighty men, and was armed with two long 12-pounder rifled cannon. Her career was short, but quite successful. She was finally destroyed by the *Montauk*, Captain Worden, in the Ogeechee River. The career of the *Suniter*, which had been a New Orleans and Havana packet steamer named *Marquis de Habana*, was also short, but much more active and destructive. She had a crew of sixty-five men and twenty-five marines, and was heavily armed. She ran the blockade at the mouth of the Mississippi River on the 30th of June, and was pursued some distance by the *Brooklyn*. She ran among the West India islands and on the Spanish Main, and soon made prizes of many vessels bearing the American flag. She was everywhere received in British Colonial ports with great favor, and was afforded every facility for her piratical operations. She became the terror of the American merchant service, and everywhere eluded National vessels of war sent out in pursuit of her. At length she crossed the ocean, and at the close of 1861 was compelled to seek shelter under British guns at Gibraltar, where she was watched by the *Tuscara*. Early in the year 1862 she was sold, and thus ended her piratical career. Encouraged by the practical friendship of the British evinced for these corsairs, and the substantial aid they were receiving from British subjects in various ways, especially through blockade-runners, the conspirators determined to procure from those friends some powerful piratical craft, and made arrangements for the purchase and construction of vessels for that purpose. Mr. Laird, a ship-builder at Liverpool and member of the British Parliament, was the largest contractor in the business, and, in defiance of every obstacle, succeeded in getting pirate ships to sea. The first of these ships that went to sea was the *Oreto*, ostensibly built for a house in Palermo, Sicily. Mr. Adams, the American minister in London, was so well satisfied from information received that she was designed for the Confederates, that he called the attention of the British government to the matter so early as the 18th of February, 1862. But nothing effective was done, and she was completed and allowed to depart from British waters. She went first to Nassau, and on the 4th of September suddenly appeared off Mobile harbor, flying the British flag and pennants. The blockading squadron there was in charge of Commander George H. Preble, who had been specially instructed not to give offense to foreign nations while enforcing the blockade. He believed the *Oreto* to be a British vessel, and while deliberating a few minutes as to what he should do, she passed out of range of his guns, and entered the harbor with a rich freight. For his seeming remissness Commander Preble was summarily dismissed from the service without a hearing—an act which subsequent events seemed to show was cruel injustice. Late in December

the *Oreto* escaped from Mobile, fully armed for a piratical cruise, under the command of John Newland Maffitt. . . . The name of the *Oreto* was changed to that of Florida."—B. J. Lossing, *Field Book of the Civil War*, v. 2, ch. 21.—The fate of the Florida is related below—A. D. 1862-1865.—R. Semmes, *Memoirs of Service Afloat*, ch. 9-26.

ALSO IN J. Davis, *Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government*, ch. 30-31 (v. 2).

**A. D. 1862-1864.—The Alabama, her career and her fate.**—"The Alabama [the second cruiser built in England for the Confederates] . . . is thus described by Semmes, her commander: 'She was of about 900 tons burden, 230 feet in length, 32 feet in breadth, 20 feet in depth, and drew, when provisioned and coaled for cruise, 15 feet of water. She was barkentine-rigged, with long lower masts, which enabled her to carry large fore and aft sails, as jibs and try-sails. . . . Her engine was of 300 horse-power, and she had attached an apparatus for condensing from the vapor of sea-water all the fresh water that her crew might require. . . . Her armament consisted of eight guns.' . . . The Alabama was built and, from the outset, was 'intended for a Confederate vessel of war.' The contract for her construction was 'signed by Captain Bullock on the one part and Messrs. Laird on the other.' . . . On the 15th of May [1862] she was launched under the name of the 290. Her officers were in England awaiting her completion, and were paid their salaries 'monthly, about the first of the month, at Fraser, Trenholm & Co.'s office in Liverpool.' The purpose for which this vessel was being constructed was notorious in Liverpool. Before she was launched she became an object of suspicion with the Consul of the United States at that port, and she was the subject of constant correspondence on his part with his Government and with Mr. Adams. . . . Early in the history of this cruiser the point was taken by the British authorities—a point maintained throughout the struggle—that they would originate nothing themselves for the maintenance and performance of their international duties, and that they would listen to no representations from the officials of the United States which did not furnish technical evidence for a criminal prosecution under the Foreign Enlistment Act. . . . At last Mr. Dudley [the Consul of the United States at Liverpool] succeeded in finding the desired proof. On the 21st day of July, he laid it in the form of affidavits before the Collector at Liverpool in compliance with the intimations which Mr. Adams had received from Earl Russell. These affidavits were on the same day transmitted by the Collector to the Board of Customs at London, with a request for instructions by telegraph, as the ship appeared to be ready for sea and might leave any hour. . . . It . . . appears that notwithstanding this official information from the Collector, the papers were not considered by the law advisers until the 28th, and that the case appeared to them to be so clear that they gave their advice upon it that evening. Under these circumstances, the delay of eight days after the 21st in the order for the detention of the vessel was, in the opinion of the United States, gross negligence on the part of Her Majesty's Government. On the 29th the Secretary of the Commission of the Customs received a telegram from

Liverpool saying that 'the vessel 290 came out of dock last night, and left the port this morning.' . . . After leaving the dock she 'proceeded slowly down the Mersey.' Both the Lairds were on board, and also Bullock. . . . The 290 slowly steamed on to Moelfra Bay, on the coast of Anglesey, where she remained 'all that night, all the next day, and the next night.' No effort was made to seize her. . . . When the Alabama left Moelfra Bay her crew numbered about 90 men. She ran part way down the Irish Channel, then round the north coast of Ireland, only stopping near the Giant's Causeway. She then made for Terceira, one of the Azores, which she reached on the 10th of August. On 18th of August, while she was at Terceira, a sail was observed making for the anchorage. It proved to be the 'Agrippina of London, Captain McQueen, having on board six guns, with ammunition, coals, stores, &c., for the Alabama.' Preparations were immediately made to transfer this important cargo. On the afternoon of the 20th, while employed discharging the bark, the screw-steamer Bahama, Captain Tessier (the same that had taken the armament to the Florida, whose insurgent ownership and character were well known in Liverpool), arrived, 'having on board Commander Raphael Semmes and officers of the Confederate States steamer Sumter.' There were also taken from this steamer two 82-pounders and some stores, which occupied all the remainder of that day and a part of the next. The 22d and 23d of August were taken up in transferring coal from the Agrippina to the Alabama. It was not until Sunday (the 24th) that the insurgents' flag was hoisted. Bullock and those who were not going in the 290 went back to the Bahama, and the Alabama, now first known under that name, went off with '26 officers and 85 men.'—*The Case of the United States before the Tribunal of Arbitration at Geneva* (42d Cong., 2d Sess., Senate Ex. Doc., No. 31, pp. 146-151).—The Alabama "arrived at Porto Praya on the 19th August. Shortly thereafter Capt. Raphael Semmes assumed command. Hoisting the Confederate flag, she cruised and captured several vessels in the vicinity of Flores. Cruising to the westward, and making several captures, she approached within 200 miles of New York; thence going southward, arrived, on the 18th November, at Port Royal, Martinique. On the night of the 19th she escaped from the harbour and the Federal steamer San Jacinto, and on the 20th November was at Blanquilla. On the 7th December she captured the steamer Ariel in the passage between Cuba and St. Domingo. On January 11th, 1863, she sunk the Federal gunboat Hatteras off Galveston, and on the 30th arrived at Jamaica. Cruising to the eastward, and making many captures, she arrived on the 10th April, at Fernando de Noronha, and on the 11th May at Bahia, where, on the 13th, she was joined by the Confederate steamer Georgina. Cruising near the line, thence southward towards the Cape of Good Hope, numerous captures were made. On the 29th July she anchored in Saldanha Bay, South Africa, and near there on the 5th August, was joined by the Confederate bark Tuscaloosa, Commander Low. In September, 1863, she was at St. Simon's Bay, and in October was in the Straits of Sunda, and up to January 20, 1864, cruised in the Bay of Bengal and vicinity, visit-

ing Singapore, and making a number of very valuable captures, including the Highlander, Sonora, etc. From this point she cruised on her homeward track via Cape of Good Hope, capturing the bark Tycoon and ship Rockingham, and arrived at Cherbourg, France, in June, 1864, where she repaired. A Federal steamer, the Kearsarge, was lying off the harbour. Capt. Semmes might easily have evaded this enemy; the business of his vessel was that of a privateer; and her value to the Confederacy was out of all comparison with a single vessel of the enemy. . . . But Capt. Semmes had been twitted with the name of 'pirate;' and he was easily persuaded to attempt an *à la tait* with the Southern Confederacy by a naval fight within sight of the French coast, which contest, it was calculated, would prove the Alabama a legitimate war vessel, and give such an exhibition of Confederate belligerency as possibly to revive the question of 'recognition' in Paris and London. These were the secret motives of the gratuitous fight with which Capt. Semmes obliged the enemy off the port of Cherbourg. The Alabama carried one 7-inch Blakely rifled gun, one 8-inch smooth-bore pivot gun, and six 33-pounders, smooth-bore, in broadside; the Kearsarge carried four broadside 33-pounders, two 11-inch and one 28-pound rifle. The two vessels were thus about equal in match and armament; and their tonnage was about the same."—E. A. Pollard, *The Lost Cause*, p. 549.—Captain Winslow, commanding the United States Steamer Kearsarge, in a report to the Secretary of the Navy written on the afternoon of the day of his battle with the Alabama, June 19, 1864, said: "I have the honor to inform the department that the day subsequent to the arrival of the Kearsarge off this port, on the 24th [14th] instant, I received a note from Captain Semmes, begging that the Kearsarge would not depart, as he intended to fight her, and would delay her but a day or two. According to this notice, the Alabama left the port of Cherbourg this morning at about half past nine o'clock. At twenty minutes past ten A. M., we discovered her steering towards us. Fearing the question of jurisdiction might arise, we steamed to sea until a distance of six or seven miles was attained from the Cherbourg break-water, when we rounded and commenced steaming for the Alabama. As we approached her, within about 1,200 yards, she opened fire, we receiving two or three broadsides before a shot was returned. The action continued, the respective steamers making a circle round and round at a distance of about 900 yards from each other. At the expiration of an hour the Alabama struck, going down in about twenty minutes afterward, carrying many persons with her." In a report two days later, Captain Winslow gave the following particulars: "Toward the close of the action between the Alabama and this vessel, all available sail was made on the former for the purpose of again reaching Cherbourg. When the object was apparent, the Kearsarge was steered across the bow of the Alabama for a raking fire; but before reaching this point the Alabama struck. Uncertain whether Captain Semmes was not using some ruse, the Kearsarge was stopped. It was seen, shortly afterward, that the Alabama was lowering her boats, and an officer came alongside in one of them to say that they had surrendered,

and were fast sinking, and begging that boats would be despatched immediately for saving life. The two boats not disabled were at once lowered, and as it was apparent the Alabama was settling, this officer was permitted to leave in his boat to afford assistance. An English yacht, the Deerhound, had approached near the Kearsarge at this time, when I hailed and begged the commander to run down to the Alabama, as she was fast sinking, and we had but two boats, and assist in picking up the men. He answered affirmatively, and steamed toward the Alabama, but the latter sank almost immediately. The Deerhound, however, sent her boats and was actively engaged, aided by several others which had come from shore. These boats were busy in bringing the wounded and others to the Kearsarge; whom we were trying to make as comfortable as possible, when it was reported to me that the Deerhound was moving off. I could not believe that the commander of that vessel could be guilty of so disgraceful an act as leaving our prisoners off, and therefore took no means to prevent it, but continued to keep our boats at work rescuing the men in the water. I am sorry to say that I was mistaken. The Deerhound made off with Captain Semmes and others, and also the very officer who had come on board to surrender."—In a still later report Captain Winslow gave the following facts: "The fire of the Alabama, although it is stated she discharged 370 or more shell and shot, was not of serious damage to the Kearsarge. Some 13 or 14 of these had taken effect in and about the hull, and 16 or 17 about the masts and rigging. The casualties were small, only three persons having been wounded. . . . The fire of the Kearsarge, although only 173 projectiles had been discharged, according to the prisoners' accounts, was terrific. One shot alone had killed and wounded 18 men, and disabled a gun. Another had entered the coal-bunkers, exploding, and completely blocking up the engine room; and Captain Semmes states that shot and shell had taken effect in the sides of his vessel, tearing large holes by explosion, and his men were everywhere knocked down."—*Rebellion Record*, v. 9, pp. 221-225.

Also in J. R. Soley, *The Blockade and the Cruisers (The Navy in the Civil War, v. 1), ch. 7*.—J. R. Soley, J. McI. Keil and J. M. Browne, *The Confederate Cruisers (Battles and Leaders, v. 3)*.—R. Semmes, *Memoirs of Service Afloat, ch. 20-55*.—J. D. Bullock, *Secret Service of the Confederate States in Europe, v. 1, ch. 5*.

A. D. 1862-1865.—Other Confederate cruisers.—"A score of other Confederate cruisers roamed the seas, to prey upon United States commerce, but none of them became quite so famous as the Sumter and the Alabama. They included the Shenandoah, which made 38 captures, the Florida, which made 36, the Tallahassee, which made 27, the Teacony, which made 15, and the Georgia, which made 10. The Florida was captured in the harbor of Bahia, Brazil, in October, 1864, by a United States man-of-war [the Wachusett, commander Collins], in violation of the neutrality of the port. For this the United States Government apologized to Brazil and ordered the restoration of the Florida to the harbor where she was captured. But in Hampton Roads she met with an accident and sank. It was generally believed that the apparent accl-

dent was contrived with the connivance, if not by direct order, of the Government. Most of these cruisers were built in British shipyards."—R. Johnson, *Short Hist. of the War of Secession*, ch. 24.—The last of the destroyers of American commerce, the *Shenandoah*, was a British merchant ship—the *Sea King*—built for the Bombay trade, but purchased by the Confederate agent, Captain Bullock, armed with six guns, and commissioned (October, 1865) under her new name. In June, 1865, the *Shenandoah*, after a voyage to Australia, in the course of which she destroyed a dozen merchant ships, made her appearance in the Northern Sea, near Behring Strait, where she fell in with the New Bedford whaling fleet. "In the course of one week, from the 21st to the 25th, twenty-five whalers were captured, of which four were ransomed, and the remaining 21 were burned. The loss on these 21 whalers was estimated at upwards of \$3,000,000, and considering that it occurred . . . two months after the Confederacy had virtually passed out of existence, it may be characterized as the most useless act of hostility that occurred during the whole war." The captain of the *Shenandoah* had news on the 23d of the fall of Richmond; yet after that time he destroyed 15 vessels. On his way southward he received information, August 2d, of the final collapse of the Confederacy. He then sailed for Liverpool, and surrendered his vessel to the British Government, which delivered her to the United States.—J. H. Seely, *The Confederate Cruisers (Battles and Leaders, v. 4)*.

**A. D. 1862-1869.—Definition of the indemnity claims of the United States against Great Britain.—First stages of the Negotiation.—The rejected Johnson-Clarendon Treaty.**—"A review of the history of the negotiations between the two Governments prior to the correspondence between Sir Edward Thornton and Mr. Fish, will show . . . what was intended by these words, 'generically known as the Alabama Claims,' used on each side in that correspondence. The correspondence between the two Governments was opened by Mr. Adams on the 20th of November, 1862 (less than four months after the escape of the *Alabama*), in a note to Earl Russell, written under instructions from the Government of the United States. In this note Mr. Adams submitted evidence of the acts of the *Alabama*, and stated: 'I have the honor to inform Your Lordship of the directions which I have received from my Government to solicit redress for the national and private injuries thus sustained.' . . . Lord Russell met this notice on the 19th of December, 1862, by a denial of any liability for any injuries growing out of the acts of the *Alabama*. . . . As new losses from time to time were suffered by individuals during the war, they were brought to the notice of Her Majesty's Government, and were lodged with the national and individual claims already preferred; but argumentative discussion on the issues involved was by common consent deferred. . . . The fact that the first claim preferred grew out of the acts of the *Alabama* explains how it was that all the claims growing out of the acts of all the vessels came to be 'generically known as the Alabama claims.' On the 7th of April, 1865, the war being virtually over, Mr. Adams renewed the discussion. He transmitted to Earl Russell an official report showing the

number and tonnage of American vessels transferred to the British flag during the war. He said: 'The United States commerce is rapidly vanishing from the face of the ocean, and that of Great Britain is multiplying in nearly the same ratio.' 'This process is going on by reason of the action of British subjects in cooperation with emissaries of the insurgents, who have supplied from the ports of Her Majesty's Kingdom all the materials, such as vessels, armament, supplies, and men, indispensable to the effective prosecution of this result on the ocean.' . . . He stated that he 'was under the painful necessity of announcing that his Government cannot avoid entailing upon the Government of Great Britain the responsibility for this damage.' Lord Russell . . . said in reply, 'I can never admit that the duties of Great Britain toward the United States are to be measured by the losses which the trade and commerce of the United States have sustained. . . . Referring to the offer of arbitration, made on the 26th day of October, 1863, Lord Russell, in the same note, said: 'Her Majesty's Government must decline either to make reparation and compensation for the captures made by the *Alabama*, or to refer the question to any foreign State.' This terminated the first stage of the negotiations between the two Governments. . . . In the summer of 1866 a change of Ministry took place in England, and Lord Stanley became Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the place of Lord Clarendon. He took an early opportunity to give an intimation in the House of Commons that, should the rejected claims be revived, the new Cabinet was not prepared to say what answer might be given them; in other words, that, should an opportunity be offered, Lord Russell's refusal might possibly be reconsidered. Mr. Seward met these overtures by instructing Mr. Adams, on the 27th of August, 1866, 'to call Lord Stanley's attention in a respectful but earnest manner, to 'a summary of claims of citizens of the United States, for damages which were suffered by them during the period of the civil war,' and to say that the Government of the United States, while it thus insists upon these particular claims, is neither desirous nor willing to assume an attitude unkind and unconciliatory toward Great Britain. . . . Lord Stanley met this overture by a communication to Sir Frederick Bruce, in which he denied the liability of Great Britain, and assented to a reference, 'provided that a fitting Arbitrator can be found, and that an agreement can be come to as to the points to which the arbitration shall apply.' . . . As the first result of these negotiations, a convention known as the Stanley-Johnson convention was signed at London on the 10th of November, 1868. It proved to be unacceptable to the Government of the United States. Negotiations were at once resumed, and resulted on the 14th of January, 1869, in the Treaty known as the Johnson-Clarendon convention [having been negotiated by Mr. Reverdy Johnson, who had succeeded Mr. Adams as United States Minister to Great Britain]. This latter convention provided for the organization of a mixed commission with jurisdiction over 'all claims on the part of citizens of the United States upon the Government of Her Britannic Majesty, including the so-called Alabama claims, and all claims on the part of subjects of Her Britannic Majesty upon

the Government of the United States which may have been presented to either government for its interposition with the other since the 26th July, 1853, and which yet remain unsettled." The Johnson-Clarendon treaty, when submitted to the Senate, was rejected by that body, in April, "because, although it made provision for the part of the Alabama claims which consisted of claims for individual losses, the provision for the more extensive national losses was not satisfactory to the Senate."—*The Argument of the United States delivered to the Tribunal of Arbitration at Geneva, June 15, 1872, Division 13, sect. 2.*

**A. D. 1869-1871.—Renewed Negotiations.**—Appointment and meeting of the Joint High Commission.—The action of the Senate in rejecting the Johnson-Clarendon treaty was taken in April, 1869, a few weeks after President Grant entered upon his office. At this time "the condition of Europe was such as to induce the British Ministers to take into consideration the foreign relations of Great Britain; and, as Lord Granville, the British Minister of Foreign Affairs, has himself stated in the House of Lords, they saw cause to look with solicitude on the uneasy relations of the British Government with the United States, and the inconvenience thereof in case of possible complications in Europe. Thus impelled, the Government dispatched to Washington a gentleman who enjoyed the confidence of both Cabinets, Sir John Rose, to ascertain whether overtures for reopening negotiations would be received by the President in spirit and terms acceptable to Great Britain. . . . Sir John Rose found the United States disposed to meet with perfect correspondence of good-will the advances of the British Government. Accordingly, on the 26th of January, 1871, the British Government, through Sir Edward Thornton, finally proposed to the American Government the appointment of a joint High Commission to hold its sessions at Washington, and there devise means to settle the various pending questions between the two Governments affecting the British possessions in North America. To this overture Mr. Fish replied that the President would with pleasure appoint, as invited, Commissioners on the part of the United States, provided the deliberations of the Commissioners should be extended to other differences,—that is to say, to include the differences growing out of incidents of the late Civil War. . . . The British Government promptly accepted this proposal for enlarging the sphere of the negotiation." The joint High Commission was speedily constituted, as proposed, by appointment of the two governments, and the promptitude of proceeding was such that the British commissioners landed at New York in twenty-seven days after Sir Edward Thornton's suggestion of January 26th was made. They sailed without waiting for their commissions, which were forwarded to them by special messenger. The High Commission was made up as follows: "On the part of the United States were five persons,—Hamilton Fish, Robert C. Schenck, Samuel Nelson, Ebenezer Rockwood Hoar, and George H. Williams,—eminently fit representatives of the diplomacy, the bench, the bar, and the legislature of the United States: on the part of Great Britain, Earl De Grey, and Ripon, President of the Queen's Council; Sir Stafford Northcote, Ex-Minister and actual Mem-

ber of the House of Commons; Sir Edward Thornton, the universally respected British Minister at Washington; Sir John [A.] Macdonald, the able and eloquent Premier of the Canadian Dominion; and, in revival of the good old time, when learning was equal to any other title of public honor, the Universities in the person of Professor Montague Bernard. . . . In the face of many difficulties, the Commissioners, on the 8th of May, 1871, completed a treaty [known as the Treaty of Washington], which received the prompt approval of their respective Governments."—C. Cushing, *The Treaty of Washington*, pp. 18-20, and 11-13.

Also in A. Lang, *Life, Letters, and Diaries of Sir Stafford Northcote, First Earl of Iddesleigh*, ch. 12 (v. 2).—A. Badeau, *Grant in Peace*, ch. 25.

**A. D. 1871.—The Treaty of Washington.**—The treaty signed at Washington on the 8th day of May, 1871, and the ratifications of which were exchanged at London on the 17th day of the following June, set forth its principal agreements in the first two articles as follows: "Whereas differences have arisen between the Government of the United States and the Government of Her Britannic Majesty, and still exist, growing out of the acts committed by the several vessels which have given rise to the claims generically known as the 'Alabama Claims'; and whereas Her Britannic Majesty has authorized Her High Commissioners and Plenipotentiaries to express in a friendly spirit, the regret felt by Her Majesty's Government for the escape, under whatever circumstances, of the Alabama and other vessels from British ports, and for the depredations committed by those vessels: Now, in order to remove and adjust all complaints and claims on the part of the United States and to provide for the speedy settlement of such claims which are not admitted by Her Britannic Majesty's Government, the high contracting parties agree that all the said claims, growing out of acts committed by the aforesaid vessels, and generically known as the 'Alabama Claims,' shall be referred to a tribunal of arbitration to be composed of five Arbitrators, to be appointed in the following manner, that is to say: One shall be named by the President of the United States; one shall be named by Her Britannic Majesty; His Majesty the King of Italy shall be requested to name one; the President of the Swiss Confederation shall be requested to name one; and His Majesty the Emperor of Brazil shall be requested to name one. . . . The Arbitrators shall meet at Geneva, in Switzerland, at the earliest convenient day after they shall have been named, and shall proceed impartially and carefully to examine and decide all questions that shall be laid before them on the part of the Governments of the United States and Her Britannic Majesty respectively. All questions considered by the tribunal, including the final award, shall be decided by a majority of all the Arbitrators. Each of the high contracting parties shall also name one person to attend the tribunal as its Agent to represent it generally in all matters connected with the arbitration." Articles 3, 4 and 5 of the treaty specify the mode in which each party shall submit its case. Article 6 declares that, "In deciding the matters submitted to the Arbitrators, they shall be governed by the following three rules, which are agreed upon by the high contracting parties as rules to be taken as applicable to the case, and



by such principles of international law not inconsistent therewith as the Arbitrators shall determine to have been applicable to the case: A neutral Government is bound—First, to use due diligence to prevent the fitting out, arming, or equipping, within its jurisdiction, of any vessel which it has reasonable ground to believe is intended to cruise or to carry on war against a Power with which it is at peace; and also to use like diligence to prevent the departure from its jurisdiction of any vessel intended to cruise or carry on war as above, such vessel having been specially adapted, in whole or in part, within such jurisdiction, to warlike use. Secondly, not to permit or suffer either belligerent to make use of its ports or waters as the base of naval operations against the other, or for the purpose of the renewal or augmentation of military supplies or arms, or the recruitment of men. Thirdly to exercise due diligence in its own ports and waters, and, as to all persons within its jurisdiction, to prevent any violation of the foregoing obligations and duties. Her Britannic Majesty has commanded her High Commissioners and Plenipotentiaries to declare that Her Majesty's Government cannot assent to the foregoing rules as a statement of principles of international law which were in force at the time when the claims mentioned in Article 1 arose, but that Her Majesty's Government, in order to evince its desire of strengthening the friendly relations between the two countries and of making satisfactory provision for the future, agrees that in deciding the questions between the two countries arising out of those claims, the Arbitrators should assume that Her Majesty's Government had undertaken to act upon the principles set forth in these rules. And the high contracting parties agree to observe these rules as between themselves in future, and to bring them to the knowledge of other maritime powers, and to invite them to accede to them." Articles 7 to 17, inclusive, relate to the procedure of the tribunal of arbitration, and provide for the determination of claims, by assessors and commissioners, in case the Arbitrators should find any liability on the part of Great Britain and should not award a sum in gross to be paid in settlement thereof. Articles 18 to 25 relate to the Fisheries. By Article 18 it is agreed that in addition to the liberty secured to American fishermen by the convention of 1818, "of taking, curing and drying fish on certain coasts of the British-North American colonies therein defined, the inhabitants of the United States shall have, in common with the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, the liberty for [a period of ten years, and two years further after notice given by either party of its wish to terminate the arrangement] . . . to take fish of every kind, except shell fish, on the sea-coasts and shores, and in the bays, harbours and creeks, of the provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and the colony of Prince Edward's Island, and of the several islands thereunto adjacent, without being restricted to any distance from the shore, with permission to land upon the said coasts and shores and islands, and also upon the Magdalen Islands, for the purpose of drying their nets and curing their fish; provided that, in so doing, they do not interfere with the rights of private property, or with British fishermen, in the peaceable use of any part of the said

coasts in their occupancy for the same purpose. It is understood that the above-mentioned liberty applies solely to the sea-fishery, and that the salmon and shad fisheries, and all other fisheries in rivers and the mouths of rivers, are hereby reserved exclusively for British fishermen." Article 19 secures to British subjects the corresponding rights of fishing, &c., on the eastern sea-coasts and shores of the United States north of the 39th parallel of north latitude. Article 20 reserves from these stipulations the places that were reserved from the common right of fishing under the first article of the treaty of June 5, 1854. Article 21 provides for the reciprocal admission of fish and fish oil into each country from the other, free of duty (excepting fish of the inland lakes and fish preserved in oil). Article 22 provides that, "Inasmuch as it is asserted by the Government of Her Britannic Majesty that the privileges accorded to the citizens of the United States under Article XVIII of this treaty are of greater value than those accorded by Articles XIX and XXI of this treaty to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, and this assertion is not admitted by the Government of the United States, it is further agreed that Commissioners shall be appointed to determine . . . the amount of any compensation which in their opinion, ought to be paid by the Government of the United States to the Government of Her Britannic Majesty." Article 23 provides for the appointment of such Commissioners, one by the President of the United States, one by Her Britannic Majesty, and the third by the President and Her Majesty conjointly; or, failing of agreement within three months, the third Commissioner to be named by the Austrian Minister at London. The Commissioners to meet at Halifax, and their procedure to be as prescribed and regulated by Articles 24 and 25. Articles 26 to 31 define certain reciprocal privileges accorded by each government to the subjects of the other, including the navigation of the St. Lawrence, Yukon, Porcupine and Stikine Rivers, Lake Michigan, and the Welland, St. Lawrence and St. Clair Flats canals; and the transportation of goods in bond through the territory of one country into the other without payment of duties. Article 32 extends the provisions of Articles 18 to 25 of the treaty to Newfoundland if all parties concerned enact the necessary laws, but not otherwise. Article 33 limits the duration of Articles 18 to 25 and Article 30, to ten years from the date of their going into effect, and "further until the expiration of two years after either of the two high contracting parties shall have given notice to the other of its wish to terminate the same." The remaining articles of the treaty provide for submitting to the arbitration of the Emperor of Germany the Northwestern water-boundary question (in the channel between Vancouver's Island and the continent)—to complete the settlement of Northwestern boundary disputes.—*Treaties and Conventions between the U. S. and other Powers (ed. of 1880), pp. 478-493.*

ALSO IN C. Cushing, *The Treaty of Washington*, app.

A. D. 1871-1872.—The Tribunal of Arbitration at Geneva, and its Award.—"The appointment of Arbitrators took place in due course, and with the ready good-will of the three neutral governments. The United States ap-

pointed Mr. Charles Francis Adams; Great Britain appointed Sir Alexander Cockburn; the King of Italy named Count Frederic Sclopis; the President of the Swiss Confederation, Mr. Jacob Stempfli; and the Emperor of Brazil, the Baron d'Itajubá. Mr. J. C. Bancroft Davis was appointed Agent of the United States, and Lord Tenterden of Great Britain. The Tribunal was organized for the reception of the case of each party, and held its first conference [at Geneva, Switzerland] on the 15th of December, 1871, Count Sclopis being chosen to preside. "The printed Case of the United States, with accompanying documents, was filed by Mr. Bancroft Davis, and the printed Case of Great Britain, with documents, by Lord Tenterden. The Tribunal made regulation for the filing of the respective Counter-Cases on or before the 15th day of April next ensuing, as required by the Treaty; and for the convening of a special meeting of the Tribunal, if occasion should require; and then, at a second meeting, on the next day, they adjourned until the 15th of June next ensuing, subject to a prior call by the Secretary, if there should be occasion." The sessions of the Tribunal were resumed on the 15th of June, 1872, according to the adjournment, and were continued until the 14th of September following, when the decision and award were announced, and were signed by all the Arbitrators except the British representative, Sir Alexander Cockburn, who dissented. It was found by the Tribunal that the British Government had "failed to use due diligence in the performance of its neutral obligations" with respect to the cruisers Alabama and Florida, and the several tenders of those vessels; and also with respect to the Shenandoah after her departure from Melbourne, Feb. 18, 1865, but not before that date. With respect to the Georgia, the Sumter, the Nashville, the Tallahassee and the Chickamauga, it was the finding of the Tribunal that Great Britain had not failed to perform the duties of a neutral power. So far as relates to the vessels called the Sallie, the Jefferson Davis, the Music, the Boston, and the V. H. Joy, it was the decision of the Tribunal that they ought to be excluded from consideration for want of evidence. "So far as relates to the particulars of the indemnity claimed by the United States, the costs of pursuit of Confederate cruisers" are declared to be "not, in the judgment of the Tribunal, properly distinguishable from the general expenses of the war carried on by the United States," and "there is no ground for awarding to the United States any sum by way of indemnity under this head." A similar decision put aside the whole consideration of claims for "prospective cargoes." Finally, the award was rendered in the following language: "Whereas, in order to arrive at an equitable compensation for the damages which have been sustained, it is necessary to set aside all double claims for the same losses, and all claims for 'gross freights' so far as they exceed 'net freights;' and whereas it is just and reasonable to allow interest at a reasonable rate; and whereas, in accordance with the spirit and letter of the Treaty of Washington, it is preferable to adopt the form of adjudication of a sum in gross, rather than to refer the subject of compensation to further discussion and deliberation to a Board of Assessors, as provided by Article X of the said

Treaty: The Tribunal, making use of the authority conferred upon it by Article VII of the said Treaty, by a majority of four voices to one, awards to the United States the sum of fifteen millions five hundred thousand Dollars in gold as the indemnity to be paid by Great Britain to the United States for the satisfaction of all the claims referred to the consideration of the Tribunal, conformably to the provisions contained in Article VII of the aforesaid Treaty." It should be stated that the so-called "indirect claims" of the United States, for consequential losses and damages, growing out of the encouragement of the Southern Rebellion, the prolongation of the war, &c., were dropped from consideration at the outset of the session of the Tribunal, in June, the Arbitrators agreeing then in a statement of opinion to the effect that "these claims do not constitute, upon the principles of international law applicable to such cases, good foundation for an award of compensation or computation of damages between nations." This declaration was accepted by the United States as decisive of the question, and the hearing proceeded accordingly.—C. Cushing, *The Treaty of Washington*.

ALSO IN F. Wharton, *Digest of the International Law of the U. S.*, ch. 21 (v. 3).

**ALACAB, OR TOLOSO, Battle of (1212).** See ALMOHADES, and SPAIN: A. D. 1146-1232.

**ALADSHA, Battles of (1877).** See TURKS: A. D. 1877-1878.

**ALAMANCE, Battle of (1771).** See NORTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1766-1771.

**ALAMANNI.** See ALEMANNI.

**ALAMO, The massacre of the (1836).** See TEXAS: A. D. 1824-1836.

**ALAMOOT, OR ALAMOUT, The castle of.**—The stronghold of the "Old Man of the Mountain," or Sheikh of the terrible order of the Assassins, in northern Persia. Its name signifies "the Eagle's nest," or "the Vulture's nest." See ASSASSINS.

**ALANS, OR ALANI, The.**—"The Alani are first mentioned by Dionysius the geographer (B. C. 30-10) who joins them with the Dacl and the Tauri, and again places them between the latter and the Agathyrsi. A similar position (in the south of Russia in Europe, the modern Ukraine) is assigned to them by Pliny and Josephus. Seneca places them further west upon the Ister. Ptolemy has two bodies of Alani, one in the position above described, the other in Seythia within the Imaus, north and partly east of the Caspian. It must have been from these last, the successors, and, according to some, the descendants of the ancient Massagete, that the Alani came who attacked Pacorus and Tiridates [in Media and Armenia, A. D. 75]. . . . The result seems to have been that the invaders, after ravaging and harrying Media and Armenia at their pleasure, carried off a vast number of prisoners and an enormous booty into their own country."—G. Rawlinson, *Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy*, ch. 17.—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 6, note H.—"The first of this [the Tartar] race known to the Romans were the Alani. In the fourth century they pitched their tents in the country between the Volga and the Tanais, at an equal distance from the Black Sea and the Caspian."—J. C. L. Sismond, *Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 3.

A. D. 376.—Conquest by the Huns. See GOTHIS (VISIGOTHIS): A. D. 376.

A. D. 406-409.—Final Invasion of Gaul. See GAUL: A. D. 406-409.

A. D. 409-414.—Settlement in Spain. See SPAIN: A. D. 409-414.

A. D. 429.—With the Vandals in Africa. See VANDALS: A. D. 429-439.

A. D. 451.—At the Battle of Chalons. See HUNS: A. D. 451.

ALARCOS, Battle of (A. D. 1195). See ALMOHADES.

ALARIC'S RAVAGES IN GREECE AND CONQUEST OF ROME. See GOTHIS: A. D. 395; 400-403, and ROME: A. D. 408-410.

ALARODIANS. — IBERIANS. — COLCHIANS.—"The Alarodians of Herodotus, joined with the Sapeires . . . are almost certainly the inhabitants of Armenia, whose Semitic name was Urarda, or Ararat. 'Alarud,' indeed, is a mere variant form of 'Ararud,' the l and r being undistinguishable in the old Persian, and 'Ararud' serves determinately to connect the Ararat of Scripture with the Urarde, or Umrtha of the Inscriptions. . . . The name of Ararat is constantly used in Scripture, but always to denote a country rather than a particular mountain. . . . The connexion . . . of Urarda with the Babylonian tribe of Akkad is proved by the application in the inscriptions of the ethnic title of Burbur (?) to the Armenian king . . . ; but there is nothing to prove whether the Burbur or Akkad of Babylonia descended in a very remote age from the mountains to colonize the plains, or whether the Urardians were refugees of a later period driven northward by the growing power of the Semites. The former supposition, however, is most in conformity with Scripture, and incidentally with the tenor of the inscriptions."—H. C. Rawlinson, *Hist. of Herodotus*, bk. 7, app. 3.—"The broad and rich valley of the Kur, which corresponds closely with the modern Russian province of Georgia, was [anciently] in the possession of a people called by Herodotus Sapeires or Sapeires, whom we may identify with the Iberians of later writers. Adjoining upon them towards the south, probably in the country about Erivan, and so in the neighbourhood of Ararat, were the Alarodians, whose name must be connected with that of the great mountain. On the other side of the Sapeirian country, in the tracts now known as Mingrelia and Iauerith, regions of a wonderful beauty and fertility, were the Colchians,—dependents, but not exactly subjects, of Persia."—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: Persia*, ch. 1.

ALASKA: A. D. 1867.—Purchase by the United States.—As early as 1859 there were unofficial communications between the Russian and American governments, on the subject of the sale of Alaska by the former to the latter. Russia was more than willing to part with a piece of territory which she found difficulty in defending, in war; and the interests connected with the fisheries and the fur-trade in the north-west were disposed to promote the transfer. In March, 1867, definite negotiations on the subject were opened by the Russian minister at Washington, and on the 23d of that month he received from Secretary Seward an offer, subject to the President's approval, of \$7,200,000, on condition

that the cession be "free and unencumbered by any reservations, privileges, franchises, grants, or possessions by any associated companies, whether corporate or incorporate, Russian, or any other." "Two days later an answer was returned, stating that the minister believed himself authorized to accept these terms. On the 29th final instructions were received by cable from St. Petersburg. On the same day a note was addressed by the minister to the secretary of state, informing him that the tsar consented to the cession of Russian America for the stipulated sum of \$7,200,000 in gold. At four o'clock the next morning the treaty was signed by the two parties without further phrase or negotiation. In May the treaty was ratified, and on June 20, 1867, the usual proclamation was issued by the president of the United States." On the 18th of October, 1867, the formal transfer of the territory was made, at Sitka, General Rousseau taking possession in the name of the Government of the United States.—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, v. 28, ch. 28.

ALSO IN W. H. Dall, *Alaska and its Resources*, pt. 2, ch. 2.—For some account of the aboriginal inhabitants, see AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ESKIMAUAN FAMILY and ATHAPASCAN FAMILY.

ALATOONA, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER: GEORGIA).

ALBA.—Alban Mount.—"Cantons . . . having their rendezvous in some stronghold, and including a certain number of clanships, form the primitive political unities with which Italian history begins. At what period, and to what extent, such cantons were formed in Latium, cannot be determined with precision; nor is it a matter of special historical interest. The isolated Alban range, that natural stronghold of Latium, which offered to settlers the most wholesome air, the freshest springs, and the most secure position, would doubtless be first occupied by the new comers. Here accordingly, along the narrow plateau above Palazuola, between the Alban lake (Lago di Castello) and the Alban mount (Monte Cavo) extended the town of Alba, which was universally regarded as the primitive seat of the Latin stock, and the mother-city of Rome, as well as of all the other Old Latin communities. Here, too, on the slopes lay the very ancient Latin canton-centres of Lanuvium, Aricia, and Tusculum. . . . All these cantons were in primitive times politically sovereign, and each of them was governed by its prince with the co-operation of the council of elders and the assembly of warriors. Nevertheless the feeling of fellowship based on community of descent and of language not only pervaded the whole of them, but manifested itself in an important religious and political institution—the perpetual league of the collective Latin cantons. The presidency belonged originally, according to the universal Italian as well as Hellenic usage, to that canton within whose bounds lay the meeting-place of the league; in this case it was the canton of Alba. . . . The communities entitled to participate in the league were in the beginning thirty. . . . The rendezvous of this union was, like the Pambœotia and the Panionia among the similar confederacies of the Greeks, the 'Latin festival' (feriæ Latine) at which, on the Mount of Alba, upon a day annually appointed by the chief

magistrate for the purpose, an ox was offered in sacrifice by the assembled Latin stock to the 'Latin god' (Jupiter Latiaris).—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 1, ch. 3.

ALSO IN Sir W. Gell, *Topog. of Rome*, v. 1.  
**ALBA DE TORMES, Battle of.** See SPAIN: A. D. 1809 (AUGUST—NOVEMBER).

**ALBAIS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PAMPAS TRIBES.

**ALBAN, Kingdom of.** See ALBION; also, SCOTLAND: 8TH—9TH CENTURIES.

**ALBANI, The.** See BRITAIN, TRIBES OF CELTIC.

**ALBANIANS: Ancient.** See EPIRUS and ILLYRIANS.

**Mediæval.**—"From the settlement of the Servian Slavonians within the bounds of the empire [during the reign of Heraclius, first half of the seventh century], we may . . . venture to date the earliest encroachments of the Illyrian or Albanian race on the Hellenic population. The Albanians or Arnauts, who are now called by themselves Skiptars, are supposed to be remains of the great Thracian race which, under various names, and more particularly as Patonians, Epirots and Macedonians, take an important part in early Grecian history. No distinct trace of the period at which they began to be co-proprietors of Greece with the Hellenic race can be found in history. . . . It seems very difficult to trace back the history of the Greek nation without suspecting that the germs of their modern condition, like those of their neighbours, are to be sought in the singular events which occurred in the reign of Heraclius."—G. Finlay, *Greece Under the Romans*, ch. 4, s. c. 6.

**A. D. 1443-1457.—Scanderbeg's War with the Turks.**—"John Castriot, Lord of Emalthis (the modern district of Moghlena) [in Epirus or Albania] had submitted, like the other petty despots of those regions, to Amurath early in his reign, and had placed his four sons in the Sultan's hands as hostages for his fidelity. Three of them died young. The fourth, whose name was George, pleased the Sultan by his beauty, strength and intelligence. Amurath caused him to be brought up in the Mahometan creed; and, when he was only eighteen, conferred on him the government of one of the Sanjaks of the empire. The young Albanian proved his courage and skill in many exploits under Amurath's eye, and received from him the name of Iskanderbeg, the lord Alexander. When Joha Castriot died, Amurath took possession of his principalities and kept the son constantly employed in distant wars. Scanderbeg brooded over this injury; and when the Turkish armies were routed by Hunyades in the campaign of 1443, Scanderbeg determined to escape from his side and assume forcible possession of his patrimony. He suddenly entered the tent of the Sultan's chief secretary, and forced that functionary, with the poniard at his throat, to write and seal a formal order to the Turkish commander of the strong city of Croia, in Albania, to deliver that place and the adjacent territory to Scanderbeg, as the Sultan's viceroy. He then stabbed the secretary and hastened to Croia, where his stratagem gained him instant admittance and submission. He now publicly abjured the Mahometan faith, and declared his intention of defending the creed of his forefathers, and restoring the independence of his

native land. The Christian population flocked readily to his banner and the Turks were massacred without mercy. For nearly twenty-five years Scanderbeg contended against all the power of the Ottomans, though directed by the skill of Amurath and his successor Mahomet, the conqueror of Constantinople."—Sir E. S. Creasy, *Hist. of the Ottoman Turks*, ch. 4.—"Scanderbeg died a fugitive at Lissus on the Venetian territory [A. D. 1467]. His sepulchre was soon violated by the Turkish conquerors; but the janizaries, who wore his bones encased in a bracelet, declared by this superstitious amulet their involuntary reverence for his valour. . . . His infant son was saved from the national shipwreck; the Castriots were invested with a Neapolitan dukedom, and their blood continues to flow in the noblest families of the realm."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 67.

ALSO IN A. Lamartine, *Hist. of Turkey*, bk. 11, s. c. 11-25.

**A. D. 1694-1696.—Conquests by the Venetians.** See TURKS: A. D. 1684-1696.

**ALBANY, N. Y.: A. D. 1623.—The first Settlement.**—In 1614, the year after the first Dutch traders had established their operations on Manhattan Island, they built a trading house, which they called Fort Nassau, on Castle Island, in the Hudson River, a little below the site of the present city of Albany. Three years later this small fort was carried away by a flood and the island abandoned. In 1623 a more important fortification, named Fort Orange, was erected on the site afterwards covered by the business part of Albany. That year, "about eighteen families settled themselves at Fort Orange, under Adriaen Joris, who 'staid with them all winter,' after sending his ship home to Holland in charge of his son. As soon as the colonists had built themselves 'some huts of bark' around the fort, the Mahikanders or River Indians [Mohicans], the Mohawks, the Oneidas, the Onondagas, the Cayugas, and the Senecas, with the Mahawawa or Ottawawa Indians, 'came and made covenants of friendship . . . and desired that they might come and have a constant free trade with them, which was concluded upon.'"—J. R. Brodhead, *Hist. of the State of N. Y.*, v. 1, pp. 55 and 151.

**A. D. 1630.—Embraced in the land-purchase of Patroon Van Rensselaer.** See NEW YORK: A. D. 1621-1636.

**A. D. 1664.—Occupied and named by the English.** See NEW YORK: A. D. 1664.

**A. D. 1673.—Again occupied by the Dutch.** See NEW YORK: A. D. 1673.

**A. D. 1754.—The Colonial Congress and its plans of Union.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1754.

**ALBANY AND SCHENECTADY RAILROAD OPENING.** See STEAM LOCOMOTION ON LAND.

**ALBANY REGENCY, The.** See NEW YORK: A. D. 1823.

**ALBEMARLE, The Ram, and her destruction.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (APRIL—MAY: NORTH CAROLINA), and (OCTOBER: N. CAROLINA).

**ALBERONI** See the Spanish Ministry of. See SPAIN: A. D. 1713-1735; and ITALY: A. D. 1715-1735.

**ALBERT, King of Sweden, A. D. 1365-1388.** . . . Albert, Elector of Brandenburg, A. D. 1470-1486. . . Albert I., Duke of Austria and King of Germany, A. D. 1298-1308. . . Albert II., Duke of Austria, King of Hungary and Bohemia, A. D. 1437-1440; King of Germany, A. D. 1438-1440.

**ALBERTA, The District of.** See NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES OF CANADA.

**ALBERTINE LINE OF SAXONY.** See SAXONY: A. D. 1180-1553.

**ALBICI, The.**—A Gallic tribe which occupied the hills above Massilia (Marseilles) and who are described as a savage people even in the time of Caesar, when they helped the Massiliots to defend their city against him.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, v. 5, ch. 4.

**ALBIGENSES, OR ALBIGEOIS, The.**—“Nothing is more curious in Christian history than the vitality of the Manichean opinions. That wild, half poetic, half rationalistic theory of Christianity, . . . appears almost suddenly in the 12th century, in living, almost irresistible power, first in its intermediate settlement in Bulgaria, and on the borders of the Greek Empire, then in Italy, in France, in Germany, in the remotest West, at the foot of the Pyrenees. . . . The chief seat of these opinions was the south of France. Innocent III., on his accession, found not only these daring insurgents scattered in the cities of Italy, even, as it were, at his own gates (among his first acts was to subdue the Paterines of Viterbo), he found a whole province, a realm, in some respects the richest and noblest of his spiritual domain, absolutely dis severed from his Empire, in almost universal revolt from Latin Christianity. . . . In no [other] European country had the clergy so entirely, or it should seem so deservedly, forfeited its authority. In none had the Church more absolutely ceased to perform its proper functions.”—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, bk. 9, ch. 8.—“By mere chance, the sects scattered in South France received the common name of Albigenses, from one of the districts where the agents of the church who came to combat them found them mostly to abound,—the district around the town of Albi, or Alby; and by this common name they were well known from the commencement of the thirteenth century. Under this general denomination parties of different tenets were comprehended together, but the Catharists seem to have constituted a predominant element among the people thus designated.”—A. Neander, *Gen. Hist. of the Christian Rel. and Ch.*, 5th ser., div. 2, sect. 4, pt. 3.—“Of the sectaries who shared the errors of Gnosticism and Manichæism and opposed the Catholic Church and her hierarchy, the Albigenses were the most thorough and radical. Their errors were, indeed, partly Gnostic and partly Manichean, but the latter was the more prominent and fully developed. They received their name from a district of Languedoc, inhabited by the Albigensis and surrounding the town of Albi. They are called Cathari and Patarini in the acts of the Council of Clermont (A. D. 1163), and in those of the third Lateran (Pavliani (i. e., Pauliciani). Like the Cathari, they also held that the evil spirit created all visible things.”—J. Alzog, *Manual of Univ. Ch. Hist.*, period 2, epoch 2, pt. 1, ch. 3, sect. 236.—“The imputations of

irreligion, heresy, and shameless debauchery, which have been cast with so much bitterness on the Albigenses by their persecutors, and which have been so zealously denied by their apologists, are probably not ill founded, if the word Albigenses be employed as synonymous with the words Provençaux or Languedocians; for they were apparently a race among whom the hallowed charities of domestic life, and the reverence due to divine ordinances and the homage due to divine truth, were often impaired, and not seldom extinguished, by ribald jests, by infidel scoffings, and by heart-hardening impurities. Like other voluptuaries, the Provençaux (as their remaining literature attests) were accustomed to find matter for merriment in vices which would have moved wise men to tears. But if by the word Albigenses be meant the Vaudois, or those followers (or associates) of Peter Waldo who revived the doctrines against which the Church of Rome directed her censures, then the accusation of dissoluteness of manners may be safely rejected as altogether calumnious, and the charge of heresy may be considered, if not as entirely unfounded, yet as a cruel and injurious exaggeration.”—Sir J. Stephen, *Lect. on the Hist. of France*, lect. 7.

Also in L. Mariotti, *Frà Dolcino and his Times*.—See, also, *Paulicians, and Catharists*.

**A. D. 1209.—The First Crusade.**—Pope “Innocent III., in organizing the persecution of the Catharists [or Catharists], the Patarins, and the Pauvres de Lyons, exercised a spirit, and displayed a genius similar to those which had already elevated him to almost universal dominion; which had enabled him to dictate at once to Italy and to Germany; to control the kings of France, of Spain, and of England; to overthrow the Greek Empire, and to substitute in its stead a Latin dynasty at Constantinople. In the zeal of the Cistercian Order, and of their Abbot, Arnaud Amalric; in the fiery and unwearied preaching of the first Inquisitor, the Spanish Missionary, Dominic; in the remorseless activity of Fouquet, Bishop of Toulouse; and above all, in the strong and un pitying arm of Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, Innocent found ready instruments for his purpose. Thus aided, he communicated Raymond of Toulouse [A. D. 1207], as Chief of the Heretics, and he promised remission of sins, and all the privileges which had hitherto been exclusively conferred on adventurers in Palestine, to the champions who should enroll themselves as Crusaders in the far more easy enterprise of a Holy War against the Albigenses. In the first invasion of his territories [A. D. 1209], Raymond VI. gave way before the terrors excited by the 800,000 fanatics who precipitated themselves on Languedoc; and loudly declaring his personal freedom from heresy, he surrendered his chief castles, underwent a humiliating penance, and took the cross against his own subjects. The brave resistance of his nephew Raymond Roger, Viscount of Beziers, deserved but did not obtain success. When the crusaders surrounded his capital, which was occupied by a mixed population of the two Religions, a question was raised how, in the approaching sack, the Catholics should be distinguished from the Heretics. ‘Kill them all,’ was the ferocious reply of Amalric; ‘the Lord will easily know His own.’ In compliance with this advice, not one human being within the walls was permitted to survive;

and the tale of slaughter has been variously estimated, by those who have perhaps exaggerated the numbers, at 60,000, but even in the extenuating despatch, which the Abbot himself addressed to the Pope, at not fewer than 15,000. Raymond Roger was not included in this fearful massacre, and he repulsed two attacks upon Carcassonne, before a treacherous breach of faith placed him at the disposal of de Montfort, by whom he was poisoned after a short imprisonment. The removal of that young and gallant Prince was indeed most important to the ulterior project of his captor, who aimed at permanent establishment in the South. The family of de Montfort had ranked among the nobles of France for more than two centuries; and it is traced by some writers through an illegitimate channel even to the throne: but the possessions of Simon himself were scanty; necessity had compelled him to sell the County of Evreux to Philippe Auguste; and the English Earldom of Leicester which he inherited maternally, and the Lordship of a Castle about ten leagues distant from Paris, formed the whole of his revenues."—E. Smedley, *Hist. of France*, ch. 4.

ALSO IN J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Hist. of the Crusades agst the Albigenes*, ch. 1.—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, bk. 9, ch. 8.—J. Alzog, *Man. of Univers. Church Hist.*, period 2, epoch 2, pt. 1, ch. 3.—See, also, INQUISITION: A. D. 1203-1525.

A. D. 1210-1213.—The Second Crusade.—“The conquest of the Viscounty of Beziers had rather inflamed than satiated the cupidity of De Montfort and the fanaticism of Amalric [legate of the Pope] and of the monks of Citeaux. Raymond, Count of Toulouse, still possessed the fairest part of Languedoc, and was still suspected or accused of affording shelter, if not countenance, to his heretical subjects. . . . The unhappy Raymond was . . . again excommunicated from the Christian Church, and his dominions offered as a reward to the champions who should execute her sentence against him. To earn that reward De Montfort, at the head of a new host of Crusaders, attracted by the promise of earthly spoils and of heavenly blessedness, once more marched through the devoted land [A. D. 1210], and with him advanced Amalric. At each successive conquest, slaughter, rapine, and woes such as may not be described tracked and polluted their steps. Heretics, or those suspected of heresy, wherever they were found, were compelled by the legate to ascend vast piles of burning fagots. . . . At length the Crusaders reached and laid siege to the city of Toulouse. . . . Throwing himself into the place, Raymond . . . succeeded in repulsing De Montfort and Amalric. It was, however, but a temporary respite, and the prelude to a fearful destruction. From beyond the Pyrenees, at the head of 1,000 knights, Pedro of Arragon had marched to the rescue of Raymond, his kinsman, and of the counts of Foix and of Comminges, and of the Viscount of Béarn, his vassals; and their united forces came into communication with each other at Muret, a little town which is about three leagues distant from Toulouse. There, also, on the 12th of September [A. D. 1213], at the head of the champions of the Cross, and attended by seven bishops, appeared Simon de Montfort in full military array. The battle which followed was fierce, short and decisive. . . . Don Pedro

was numbered with the slain. His army, deprived of his command, broke and dispersed, and the whole of the infantry of Raymond and his allies were either put to the sword, or swept away by the current of the Garonne. Toulouse immediately surrendered, and the whole of the dominions of Raymond submitted to the conquerors. At a council subsequently held at Montpellier, composed of five archbishops and twenty-eight bishops, De Montfort was unanimously acknowledged as prince of the fief and city of Toulouse, and of the other counties conquered by the Crusaders under his command.”—Sir J. Stephen, *Lect's on the Hist. of France*, lect. 7.

ALSO IN J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Hist. of Crusades agst the Albigenes*, ch. 2.

A. D. 1217-1229.—The Renewed Crusades.—Dissolution of the County of Toulouse.—Pacification of Languedoc.—“The cruel spirit of De Montfort would not allow him to rest quiet in his new Empire. Violence and persecution marked his rule; he sought to destroy the Provençal population by the sword or the stake, nor could he bring himself to tolerate the libelles of the citizens of Toulouse. In 1217 the Toulousans again revolted, and war once more broke out betwixt Count Raymond and Simon de Montfort. The latter formed the siege of the capital, and was engaged in repelling a sally, when a stone from one of the walls struck him and put an end to his existence. . . . Amaury de Montfort, son of Simon, offered to cede to the king all his rights in Languedoc, which he was unable to defend against the old house of Toulouse. Philip [Augustus] hesitated to accept the important cession, and left the rival houses to the continuance of a struggle carried feebly on by either side.” King Philip died in 1223 and was succeeded by a son, Louis VIII., who had none of his father's reluctance to join in the grasping persecution of the unfortunate people of the south. Amaury de Montfort had been fairly driven out of old Simon de Montfort's conquests, and he now sold them to King Louis for the office of constable of France. “A new crusade was preached against the Albigenes; and Louis marched towards Languedoc at the head of a formidable army in the spring of the year 1226. The town of Avignon had preferred to the crusaders the facilities of crossing the Rhone under her walls, but refused entry within them to such a host. Louis having arrived at Avignon, insisted on passing through the town: the Avignonnais shut their gates, and defied the monarch, who instantly formed the siege. One of the rich municipalities of the south was almost a match for the king of France. He was kept three months under its walls; his army a prey to famine, to disease and to the assaults of a brave garrison. The crusaders lost 20,000 men. The people of Avignon at length submitted, but on no dishonourable terms. This was the only resistance that Louis experienced in Languedoc. . . . All submitted. Louis retired from his facile conquest; he himself, and the chiefs of his army stricken by an epidemic which had prevailed in the conquered regions. The monarch's feeble frame could not resist it; he expired at Montpellier, in Auvergne, in November, 1226.” Louis VIII. was succeeded by his young son, Louis IX. (Saint Louis), then a boy, under the regency of his energetic and capable mother, Blanche of

Castile. "The termination of the war with the Albigenses, and the pacification, or it might be called the acquisition, of Languedoc, was the chief act of Queen Blanche's regency. Louis VIII. had overrun the country without resistance in his last campaign; still, at his departure, Raymond VI. again appeared, collected soldiers and continued to struggle against the royal lieutenant. For upward of two years he maintained himself; the attention of Blanche being occupied by the league of the barons against her. The successes of Raymond VII., accompanied by cruelties, awakened the vindictive zeal of the pope. Languedoc was threatened with another crusade; Raymond was willing to treat, and make considerable cessions, in order to avoid such extremities. In April, 1229, a treaty was signed: in it the rights of De Montfort were passed over. About two-thirds of the domains of the count of Toulouse were ceded to the king of France; the remainder was to fall, after Raymond's death, to his daughter Jeanne, who by the same treaty was to marry one of the royal princes: heirs failing then, it was to revert to the crown [which it did in 1271]. On these terms, with the humiliating addition of a public penance, Raymond VII. once more was allowed peaceable possession of Toulouse, and of the part of his domains reserved to him. Alphonse, brother of Louis IX., married Jeanne of Toulouse soon after, and took the title of count of Poitiers; that province being ceded to him in apanage. Robert, another brother, was made count of Artois at the same time. Louis himself married Margaret, the eldest daughter of Raymond Berenger, count of Provence."—E. E. Crowe, *Hist. of France*, v. 1, ch. 2-3.—"The struggle ended in a vast increase of the power of the French crown, at the expense alike of the house of Toulouse and of the house of Aragon. The dominions of the count of Toulouse were divided. A number of fiefs, Beziers, Narbonne, Nîmes, Albi, and some other districts were at once annexed to the crown. The capital itself and its county passed to the crown fifty years later. . . . The name of Toulouse, except as the name of the city itself, now passed away, and the new acquisitions of France came in the end to be known by the name of the tongue which was common to them with Aquitaine and Imperial Burgundy [Provence]. Under the name of Languedoc they became one of the greatest and most valuable provinces of the French kingdom."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. Geog. of Europe*, ch. 9.

**The brutality and destructiveness of the Crusades.**—"The Church of the Albigenses had been drowned in blood. These supposed heretics had been swept away from the soil of France. The rest of the Languedocian people had been overwhelmed with calamity, slaughter, and devastation. The estimates transmitted to us of the numbers of the invaders and of the slain are such as almost surpass belief. We can neither verify nor correct them; but we certainly know that, during a long succession of years, Languedoc had been invaded by armies more numerous than had ever before been brought together in European warfare since the fall of the Roman empire. We know that these hosts were composed of men inflamed by bigotry and unrestrained by discipline; that they had neither military pay nor magazines; that they provided for all their wants by the sword,

living at the expense of the country, and seizing at their pleasure both the harvests of the peasants and the merchandise of the citizens. More than three-fourths of the landed proprietors had been despoiled of their fiefs and castles. In hundreds of villages, every inhabitant had been massacred. . . . Since the sack of Rome by the Vandals, the European world had never mourned over a national disaster so wide in its extent or so fearful in its character."—Sir J. Stephen, *Lects. on the Hist. of France*, lect. 7.

**ALBION.**—"The most ancient name known to have been given to this island [Britain] is that of Albion. . . . There is, however, another allusion to Britain which seems to carry us much further back, though it has usually been ill understood. It occurs in the story of the labours of Hercules, who, after securing the cows of Geryon, comes from Spain to Liguria, where he is attacked by two giants, whom he kills before making his way to Italy. Now, according to Pomponius Mela, the names of the giants were Albion and Bergyon, which one may, without much hesitation, restore to the forms of Albion and Iberion, representing, undoubtedly, Britain and Ireland, the position of which in the sea is most appropriately symbolized by the story making them sons of Neptune or the sea-god. . . . Even in the time of Pliuy, Albion, as the name of the island, had fallen out of use with Latin authors; but not so with the Greeks, or with the Celts themselves, at any rate those of the Goidelic branch; for they are probably right who suppose that we have but the same word in the Irish and Scotch Gaelic Alba, genitive Alban, the kingdom of Alban or Scotland beyond the Forth. Albion would be a form of the name according to the Brythonic pronunciation of it. . . . It would thus appear that the name Albion is one that has retreated to a corner of the island, to the whole of which it once applied."—J. Rhys, *Celtic Britain*, ch. 6.

ALSO IN E. Guest, *Origines Celticae*, ch. 1.—See SCOTLAND: 8TH-9TH CENTURIES.

**ALBIS, The.**—The ancient name of the river Elbe.

**ALBOIN, King of the Lombards, A. D. 560-573.**

**ALCALDE.**—**ALGUAZIL.**—**CORREGIDOR.**—"The word alcalde is from the Arabic 'al cadi,' the judge or governor. . . . Alcalde mayor signifies a judge, learned in the law, who exercises [in Spain] ordinary jurisdiction, civil and criminal, in a town or district." In the Spanish colonies the Alcalde mayor was the chief judge. "Irving (Columbus, ff. 331) writes erroneously alguazil mayor, evidently confounding the two offices. . . . An alguacil mayor, was a chief constable or high sheriff." "Corregidor, a magistrate having civil and criminal jurisdiction in the first instance ('nisi prius') and gubernatorial inspection in the political and economical government in all the towns of the district assigned to him."—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, v. 1, pp. 297 and 250, foot-notes.

**ALCANIZ, Battle of.** See SPAIN: A. D. 1809 (FEBRUARY—JUNE).

**ALCANTARA, Battle of the (1580).** See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1579-1580.

**ALCANTARA, Knights of.**—"Towards the close of Alfonso's reign [Alfonso VIII. of Castile and Leon, who called himself 'the Em-

peror, A. D. 1126-1157], may be assigned the origin of the military order of Alcantara. Two cavaliers of Salamanca, don Suero and don Gomez, left that city with the design of choosing and fortifying some strong natural frontier, whence they could not only arrest the continual incursions of the Moors, but make hostile irruptions themselves into the territories of the misbelievers. Proceeding along the banks of the Coales, they fell in with a hermit, Amando by name, who encouraged them in their patriotic design and recommended the neighbouring hermitage of St. Julian as an excellent site for a fortress. Having examined and approved the situation, they applied to the bishop of Salamanca for permission to occupy the place: that permission was readily granted: with his assistance, and that of the hermit Amando, the two cavaliers erected a castle around the hermitage. They were now joined by other nobles and by more adventurers, all eager to acquire fame and wealth in this life, glory in the next. Hence the foundation of an order which, under the name, first, of St. Julian, and subsequently of Alcantara, rendered good service alike to king and church."—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of Spain and Portugal*, bk. 3, sect. 2, ch. 1, div. 2.

**ALCAZAR, OR "THE THREE KINGS,"** Battle of (1578 or 1579). See MAROCCO: THE ARAB CONQUEST AND SINCE.

**ALCIBIADES,** The career of. See GREECE: B. C. 421-418, and 411-407; and ATHENS: B. C. 415, and 413-411.

**ALCLYDE.**—Rhydderch, a Cumbrian prince of the sixth century who was the victor in a civil conflict, "fixed his head-quarters on a rock in the Clyde, called in the Welsh Alciud [previously a Roman town known as Theodosia], whence it was known to the English for a time as Alclyde; but the Goildels called it Dumbretan, or the fortress of the Brythons, which has prevailed in the slightly modified form of Dumbarton. . . . Alclyde was more than once destroyed by the Northmen."—J. Rhys, *Celtic Britain*, ch. 4.—See, also, CUMBRIA.

**ALCMÆONIDS,** The curse and banishment of the. See ATHENS: B. C. 612-595.

**AL COLEA,** Battle of (1868). See SPAIN: A. D. 1866-1873.

**ALDIE,** Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (JUNE—JULY: PENNSYLVANIA).

**ALDINE PRESS,** The. See PRINTING AND THE PRESS: A. D. 1469-1515.

**ALEMANNIA: The Mediæval Duchy.** See GERMANY: A. D. 843-962.

**ALEMANNI, OR ALAMANNI: A. D. 213.**—Origin and first appearance.—"Under Antoninus, the Son of Severus, a new and more severe war once more (A. D. 213) broke out in Rætia. This also was waged against the Chatti; but by their side a second people is named, which we here meet for the first time—the Alamanni. Whence they came, we know not. According to a Roman writing a little later, they were a conflux of mixed elements; the appellation also seems to point to a league of communities, as well as the fact that, afterwards, the different tribes comprehended under this name stand forth—more than is the case among the other great Germanic peoples—in their separate character, and the Juthungi, the Lentienses, and other Alamannic peoples not seldom act inde-

pendently. But that it is not the Germans of this region who here emerge, allied under the new name and strengthened by the alliance, is shown as well by the naming of the Alamanni along side of the Chatti, as by the mention of the unwonted skilfulness of the Alamanni in equestrian combat. On the contrary, it was certainly, in the main, hordes coming on from the East that lent new strength to the almost extinguished German resistance on the Rhine; it is not improbable that the powerful Semones, in earlier times dwelling on the middle Elbe, of whom there is no further mention after the end of the second century, furnished a strong contingent to the Alamanni."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 8, ch. 4.—"The standard quotation respecting the derivation of the name from 'al'—'all' and 'n'—'man', so that the word (somewhat exceptionably) denotes 'men of all sorts,' is from Agathias, who quotes Asinius Quadratus. . . . Notwithstanding this, I think it is an open question, whether the name may not have been applied by the truer and more unequivocal Germans of Suabia and Franconia, to certain less definitely Germanic allies from Wurtemberg and Baden, in the Decumates Agri—parts which may have supplied a Gallic, a Gallo-Roman, or even a Slavonic element to the confederacy; in which case, a name so German as to have given the present French and Italian name for Germany, may, originally, have applied to a population other than Germanic. I know the apparently paradoxical elements in this view; but I also know that, in the way of etymology, it is quite as safe to translate 'all' by 'alii' as by 'omnes': and I cannot help thinking that the 'al-' in Ale-manni is the 'al-' in 'alir-arto' (a foreigner or man of another sort), 'el-benzo' (an alien), and 'all-hund' (captivity in foreign land).—Grimm, *ii.* 628.—Rech-salterth, p. 359. And still more satisfied am I that the 'al-' in Ale-manni is the 'al-' in Alsatia—'el-sass'—'all-satz'—'foreign settlement.' In other words, the prefix in question is more probably the 'al-' in 'el-se', than the 'al-' in 'all.' Little, however, of importance turns on this. The locality of the Alamanni was the parts about the Limes Romanus, a boundary which, in the time of Alexander Severus, Niebuhr thinks they first broke through. Hence they were the Marchmen of the frontier, whoever those Marchmen were. Other such Marchmen were the Suevi; unless, indeed, we consider the two names as synonymous. Zeuss admits that, between the Suevi of Suabia, and the Alamanni, no tangible difference can be found."—R. G. Latham, *The Germania of Tacitus; Epilegomena*, sect. 11.

ALSO IN T. Smith, *Arminius*, pt. 2, ch. 1.—See, also, SUEVI, and BAVARIANS.

**A. D. 259.—Invasion of Gaul and Italy.**—The Alamanni, "hovering on the frontiers of the Empire. . . . increased the general disorder that ensued after the death of Decius. They inflicted severe wounds on the rich provinces of Gaul; they were the first who removed the veil that covered the feeble majesty of Italy. A numerous body of the Alamanni penetrated across the Danube and through the Rætian Alps into the plains of Lombardy, advanced as far as Ravenna and displayed the victorious banners of barbarians almost in sight of Rome [A. D. 259]. The insult and the danger



rekindled in the senate some sparks of their ancient virtue. Both the Emperors were engaged in far distant wars—Valerian in the East and Galienus on the Rhine." The senators, however, succeeded in confronting the audacious invaders with a force which checked their advance, and they "retired into Germany laden with spoil."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 10.

**A. D. 270.—Invasion of Italy.**—Italy was invaded by the Alemanni, for the second time, in the reign of Aurelian, A. D. 270. They ravaged the provinces from the Danube to the Po, and were retreating, laden with spoils, when the vigorous Emperor intercepted them, on the banks of the former river. Half the host was permitted to cross the Danube; the other half was surprised and surrounded. But these last, unable to regain their own country, broke through the Roman lines at their rear and sped into Italy again, spreading havoc as they went. It was only after three great battles,—one near Placentia, in which the Romans were almost beaten, another on the Metaurus (where Hasdrubal was defeated), and a third near Pavia,—that the Germanic invaders were destroyed.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 11.

**A. D. 355-361.—Repulse by Julian.** See GAUL: A. D. 355-361.

**A. D. 365-367.—Invasion of Gaul.**—The Alemanni invaded Gaul in 365, committing widespread ravages and carrying away into the forests of Germany great spoil and many captives. The next winter they crossed the Rhine, again, in still greater numbers, defeated the Roman forces and captured the standards of the Herulian and Batavian auxiliaries. But Valentinian was now Emperor, and he adopted energetic measures. His lieutenant Jovinus overcame the invaders in a great battle fought near Chalons and drove them back to their own side of the river boundary. Two years later, the Emperor, himself, passed the Rhine and inflicted a memorable chastisement on the Alemanni. At the same time he strengthened the frontier defenses, and, by diplomatic arts, fomented quarrels between the Alemanni and their neighbors, the Burgundians, which weakened both.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 25.

**A. D. 378.—Defeat by Gratian.**—On learning that the young Emperor Gratian was preparing to lead the military force of Gaul and the West to the help of his uncle and colleague, Valens, against the Goths, the Alemanni swarmed across the Rhine into Gaul. Gratian instantly recalled the legions that were marching to Pannonia and encountered the German invaders in a great battle fought near Argentaria (modern Colmar) in the month of May, A. D. 378. The Alemanni were routed with such slaughter that no more than 5,000 out of 40,000 to 70,000, are said to have escaped. Gratian afterwards crossed the Rhine and humbled his troublesome neighbors in their own country.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 26.

**A. D. 496-504.—Overthrow by the Franks.**—"In the year 496 A. D. the Salians [Salian Franks] began that career of conquest which they followed up with scarcely any intermission until the death of their warrior king. The Alemanni, extending themselves from their origi-

nal seats on the right bank of the Rhine, between the Main and the Danube, had pushed forward into Germanica Prima, where they came into collision with the Frankish subjects of King Sigebert of Cologne. Clovis flew to the assistance of his kinsman and defeated the Alemanni in a great battle in the neighbourhood of Zulpich [called, commonly, the battle of Tolbiac]. He then established a considerable number of his Franks in the territory of the Alemanni, the traces of whose residence are found in the names of Franconia and Frankfort."—W. C. Perry, *The Franks*, ch. 2.—"Clovis had been intending to cross the Rhine, but the hosts of the Alamanni came upon him, as it seems, unexpectedly and forced a battle on the left bank of the river. He seemed to be overmatched, and the horror of an impending defeat overshadowed the Frankish king. Then, in his despair, he bethought himself of the God of Clotilda [his queen, a Burgundian Christian princess, of the orthodox or Catholic faith]. Raising his eyes to heaven, he said: 'Oh Jesus Christ, whom Clotilda declares to be the Son of the living God, who art said to give help to those who are in trouble and who trust in Thee, I humbly beseech Thy succour! I have called on my gods and they are far from my help. If Thou wilt deliver me from mine enemies, I will believe in Thee, and be baptised in Thy name.' At this moment, a sudden change was seen in the fortunes of the Franks. The Alamanni began to waver, they turned, they fled. Their king, according to one account was slain; and the nation seems to have accepted Clovis as its over-lord." The following Christmas day Clovis was baptised at Reims and 3,000 of his warriors followed the royal example. "In the early years of the new century, probably about 503 or 504, Clovis was again at war with his old enemies, the Alamanni. . . . Clovis moved his army into their territories and won a victory much more decisive, though less famous than that of 496. This time the angry king would make no such easy terms as he had done before. From their pleasant dwellings by the Main and the Neckar, from all the valley of the Middle Rhine, the terrified Alamanni were forced to flee. Their place was taken by Frankish settlers, from whom all this district received in the Middle Ages the name of the Duchy of Francia, or, at a rather later date, that of the Circle of Francoenia. The Alamanni, with their wives and children, a broken and dispirited host, moved southward to the shores of the Lake of Constance and entered the old Roman province of Rhetia. Here they were on what was held to be, in a sense, Italian ground; and the arm of Theodorie, as ruler of Italy, as successor to the Emperors of the West, was stretched forth to protect them. . . . Eastern Switzerland, Western Tyrol, Southern Baden and Württemberg and Southwestern Bavaria probably formed this new Alamannia, which will figure in later history as the 'Ducatus Alamannie,' or the Circle of Swabia.—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders*, bk. 4, ch. 9.

ALSO IN P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul*, bk. 3, ch. 11.—See, also, SUEVI: A. D. 400-500; and FRANKS: A. D. 481-511.

**A. D. 528-729.—Struggles against the Frank Dominion.** See GERMANY: A. D. 481-768.

**A. D. 547.—Final subjection to the Franks.** See BAVARIA: A. D. 547.

**ALEPPO: A. D. 638-969.**—Taken by the Arab followers of Mahomet in 638, this city was recovered by the Byzantines in 969. See *BYZANTINE EMPIRE: A. D. 963-1025*.

**A. D. 1260.**—**Destruction by the Mongols.**—The Mongols, under Khulagu, or Houlagou, brother of Mangu Khan, having overrun Mesopotamia and extinguished the Caliphate at Bagdad, crossed the Euphrates in the spring of 1260 and advanced to Aleppo. The city was taken after a siege of seven days and given up for five days to pillage and slaughter. "When the carnage ceased, the streets were cumbered with corpses. . . . It is said that 100,000 women and children were sold as slaves. The walls of Aleppo were razed, its mosques destroyed, and its gardens ravaged." Damascus submitted and was spared. Khulagu was meditating, it is said, the conquest of Jerusalem, when news of the death of the Great Khan called him to the East.—H. H. Howorth, *Hist. of the Mongols*, pp. 209-211.

**A. D. 1401.**—**Sack and Massacre by Timour.** See *TIMOUR*.

**ALESIA, Siege of, by Cæsar.** See *GAUL: B. C. 58-51*.

**ALESSANDRIA: The creation of the city (1168).** See *ITALY: A. D. 1174-1183*.

**ALEUTS, The.** See *AMERICAN ABORIGINALS: ESKIMO*.

**ALEXANDER the Great, B. C. 334-323.**—**Conquests and Empire.** See *MACEDONIA, &c., B. C. 334-330*, and after. . . . **Alexander, King of Poland, A. D. 1501-1507.** . . . **Alexander, Prince of Bulgaria.—Abduction and Abdication.** See *BULGARIA: A. D. 1878-1886*. . . . **Alexander I., Czar of Russia, A. D. 1801-1825.** . . . **Alexander I., King of Scotland, A. D. 1107-1124.** . . . **Alexander II., Pope, A. D. 1061-1073.** . . . **Alexander II., Czar of Russia, A. D. 1855-1881.** . . . **Alexander II., King of Scotland, A. D. 1214-1249.** . . . **Alexander III., Pope, A. D. 1159-1181.** . . . **Alexander III., Czar of Russia, A. D. 1881—.** . . . **Alexander III., King of Scotland, A. D. 1249-1286.** . . . **Alexander IV., Pope, A. D. 1254-1261.** . . . **Alexander V., Pope, A. D. 1409-1410** (elected by the Council of Pisa). . . . **Alexander VI., Pope, A. D. 1492-1503.** . . . **Alexander VII., Pope, A. D. 1655-1667.** . . . **Alexander VIII., Pope, A. D. 1689-1691.** . . . **Alexander Severus, Roman Emperor, A. D. 222-235.**

**ALEXANDRIA: B. C. 332.**—**The Founding of the City.**—"When Alexander reached the Egyptian military station at the little town or village of Rhakotis, he saw with the quick eye of a great commander how to turn this petty settlement into a great city, and to make its roadstead, out of which ships could be blown by a change of wind, into a double harbour roomy enough to shelter the navies of the world. All that was needed was to join the island by a mole to the continent. The site was admirably secure and convenient, a narrow strip of land between the Mediterranean and the great inland Lake Mareotis. The whole northern side faced the two harbours, which were bounded east and west by the mole, and beyond by the long, narrow rocky island of Pharos, stretching parallel with the coast. On the south was the inland port of Lake Mareotis. The length of the city was more than three miles, the breadth more than three-quarters of a mile; the mole was above three-quarters of

a mile long and six hundred feet broad; its breadth is now doubled, owing to the silting up of the sand. Modern Alexandria until lately only occupied the mole, and was a great town in a corner of the space which Alexander, with large provision for the future, measured out. The form of the new city was ruled by that of the site, but the fancy of Alexander designed it in the shape of a Macedonian cloak or chlamys, such as a national hero wears on the coins of the kings of Macedonia and his ancestors. The situation is excellent for commerce. Alexandria, with the best Egyptian harbour on the Mediterranean, and the inland port connected with the Nile streams and canals, was the natural emporium of the Indian trade. Port Said is superior now, because of its grand artificial port and the advantage for steamships of an unbroken sea-route."—R. S. Poole, *Cities of Egypt*, ch. 12.—See, also, *MACEDONIA, &c.*: B. C. 334-330; and *EGYPT: B. C. 332*.

**Reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, B. C. 282-246.**—**Greatness and splendor of the City.—Its Commerce.—Its Libraries.—Its Museum.—Its Schools.**—Ptolemy Philadelphus, son of Ptolemy Soter, succeeded to the throne of Egypt in 282 B. C. when his father retired from it in his favor, and reigned until 246 B. C. "Alexandria, founded by the great conqueror, increased and beautified by Ptolemy Soter, was now far the greatest city of Alexander's Empire. It was the first of those new foundations which are a marked feature in Hellenism; there were many others of great size and importance—above all, Antioch, then Seleucia on the Tigris, then Nicomedia, Nicea, Apamea, which lasted; besides such as Lysimachæa, Antigonæa, and others, which early disappeared. . . . Alexandria was the model for all the rest. The intersection of two great principal thoroughfares, adorned with colonnades for the footways, formed the centre point, the omphalos of the city. The other streets were at right angles with these thoroughfares, so that the whole place was quite regular. Counting its old part, Rhakotis, which was still the habitation of native Egyptians, Alexandria had five quarters, one at least devoted to Jews who had originally settled there in great numbers. The mixed population there of Macedonians, Greeks, Jews, and Egyptians gave a peculiarly complex and variable character to the population. Let us not forget the vast number of strangers from all parts of the world whom trade and politics brought there. It was the great mart where the wealth of Europe and of Asia changed hands. Alexander had opened the sea-way by exploring the coasts of Media and Persia. Caravans from the head of the Persian Gulf, and ships on the Red Sea, brought all the wonders of Ceylon and China, as well as of Further India, to Alexandria. There, too, the wealth of Spain and Gaul, the produce of Italy and Macedonia, the amber of the Baltic and the salt fish of Pontus, the silver of Spain and the copper of Cyprus, the timber of Macedonia and Crete, the pottery and oil of Greece—a thousand imports from all the Mediterranean—came to be exchanged for the spices of Arabia, the splendid birds and embroideries of India and Ceylon, the gold and ivory of Africa, the antelopes, the apes, the leopards, the elephants of tropical climes. Hence the enormous wealth of the Lagidæ, for in addition to the marvellous fertility and great population—it is said

to have been seven millions — of Egypt, they made all the profits of this enormous carrying trade. We gain a good idea of what the splendours of the capital were by the very full account preserved to us by Athenæus of the great feast which inaugurated the reign of Philadelphus. . . . All this seems idle pomp, and the doing of an idle sybarite. Philadelphus was anything but that. . . . It was he who opened up the Egyptian trade with Italy, and made Puteoli the great port for ships from Alexandria, which it remained for centuries. It was he who explored Ethiopia and the southern parts of Africa, and brought back not only the curious fauna to his zoological gardens, but the first knowledge of the Troglodytes for men of science. The cultivation of science and of letters too was so remarkably one of his pursuits that the progress of the Alexandria of his day forms an epoch in the world's history, and we must separate his University and its professors from this summary, and devote to them a separate section. . . . The history of the organization of the University and its staff is covered with almost impenetrable mist. For the Museum and Library were in the strictest sense what we should now call an University, and one, too, of the Oxford type, where learned men were invited to take Fellowships, and spend their learned leisure close to observatories in science, and a great library of books. Like the mediæval universities, this endowment of research naturally turned into an engine for teaching, as all who desired knowledge flocked to such a centre, and persuaded the Fellow to become a Tutor. The model came from Athens. There the schools, beginning with the Academy of Plato, had a fixed property — a home with its surrounding garden, and in order to make this foundation sure, it was made a shrine where the Muses were worshipped, and where the head of the school, or a priest appointed, performed stated sacrifices. This, then, being held in trust by the successors of the donor, who bequeathed it to them, was a property which it would have been sacrilegious to invade, and so the title Museum arose for a school of learning. Demetrius the Phalerean, the friend and protector of Theophrastus, brought this idea with him to Alexandria, when his namesake drove him into exile [see GREECE: B. C. 307-197] and it was no doubt his advice to the first Ptolemy which originated the great foundation, though Philadelphus, who again exiled Demetrius, gets the credit of it. The pupil of Aristotle moreover impressed on the king the necessity of storing up in one central repository all that the world knew or could produce, in order to ascertain the laws of things from a proper analysis of detail. Hence was founded not only the great library, which in those days had a thousand times the value a great library has now, but also observatories, zoological gardens, collections of exotic plants, and of other new and strange things brought by exploring expeditions from the furthest regions of Arabia and Africa. This library and museum proved indeed a home for the Muses, and about it a most brilliant group of students in literature and science was formed. The successive librarians were Zenodotus, the grammarian or critic; Callimachus, to whose poems we shall presently return; Eratosthenes, the astronomer, who originated the process by which the size of the earth is determined to-day; Apollonius the Rhodian, disciple and enemy of

Callimachus; Aristophanes of Byzantium, founder of a school of philological criticism; and Aristarchus of Samos, reputed to have been the greatest critic of ancient times. The study of the text of Homer was the chief labour of Zenodotus, Aristophanes, and Aristarchus, and it was Aristarchus who mainly fixed the form in which the Iliad and Odyssey remain to this day. . . . The vast collections of the library and museum actually determined the whole character of the literature of Alexandria. One word sums it all up — erudition, whether in philosophy, in criticism, in science, even in poetry. Strange to say, they neglected not only oratory, for which there was no scope, but history, and this we may attribute to the fact that history before Alexander had no charms for Hellenism. Mythical lore, on the other hand, strange uses and curious words, were departments of research dear to them. In science they did great things, so did they in geography. . . . But were they original in nothing? Did they add nothing of their own to the splendid record of Greek literature? In the next generation came the art of criticism, which Aristarchus developed into a real science, and of that we may speak in its place; but even in this generation we may claim for them the credit of three original, or nearly original, developments in literature — the pastoral idyll, as we have it in Theocritus; the elegy, as we have it in the Roman imitators of Philetas and Callimachus; and the romance, or love story, the parent of our modern novels. All these had early prototypes in the folk songs of Sicily, in the love songs of Minnermus and of Antimachus, in the tales of Miletus, but still the revival was fairly to be called original. Of these the pastoral idyll was far the most remarkable, and laid hold upon the world for ever." — J. P. Mahaffy, *The Story of Alexander's Empire*, ch. 13-14. — "There were two Libraries of Alexandria under the Ptolemies, the larger one in the quarter called the Bruchium, and the smaller one, named 'the daughter,' in the Serapeum, which was situated in the quarter called Ithacotis. The former was totally destroyed in the conflagration of the Bruchium during Cæsar's Alexandrian War [see below: B. C. 48-47]; but the latter, which was of great value, remained uninjured (see Matter, *Histoire de l'École d'Alexandrie*, vol. 1, p. 133 seq., 237 seq.) It is not stated by any ancient writer where the collection of Pergamus [see PENNUM] was placed, which Antony gave to Cleopatra (Plutarch, Anton., c. 58); but it is most probable that it was deposited in the Bruchium, as that quarter of the city was now without a library, and the queen was anxious to repair the ravages occasioned by the civil war. If this supposition is correct, two Alexandrian libraries continued to exist after the time of Cæsar, and this is rendered still more probable by the fact that during the first three centuries of the Christian era the Bruchium was still the literary quarter of Alexandria. But a great change took place in the time of Aurelian. This Emperor, in suppressing the revolt of Firmus in Egypt, A. D. 273 [see below: A. D. 273] is said to have destroyed the Bruchium; and though this statement is hardly to be taken literally, the Bruchium ceased from this time to be included within the walls of Alexandria, and was regarded only as a suburb of the city. Whether the great library in the Bruchium with the museum and its other

literary establishments, perished at this time, we do not know; but the Serapeum for the next century takes its place as the literary quarter of Alexandria, and becomes the chief library in the city. Hence later writers erroneously speak of the Serapeum as if it had been from the beginning the great Alexandrian library. . . . Gibbon seems to think that the whole of the Serapeum was destroyed [A. D. 389, by order of the Emperor Theodosius—see below]; but this was not the case. It would appear that it was only the sanctuary of the god that was levelled with the ground, and that the library, the halls and other buildings in the consecrated ground remained standing long afterwards."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 28. *Notes by Dr. William Smith.*—Concerning the reputed final destruction of the library by the Moslems, see below: A. D. 641-646.

ALSO IN O. Deleplere, *Historical Difficulties*, ch. 3.—S. Sharpe, *Hist. of Egypt*, ch. 7, 8 and 12.—See, also, NEOPLATONICS.

**B. C. 48-47.—Cæsar and Cleopatra.—The Rising against the Romans.—The Siege.—Destruction of the great Library.—Roman victory.**—From the battle field of Pharsalia (see *ROME*: B. C. 48) Pompeius fled to Alexandria in Egypt, and was treacherously murdered as he stepped on shore. Cæsar arrived a few days afterwards, in close pursuit, and shed tears, it is said, on being shown his rival's mangled head. He had brought scarcely more than 3,000 of his soldiers with him, and he found Egypt in a turbulent state of civil war. The throne was in dispute between children of the late king, Ptolemæus Auletes. Cleopatra, the elder daughter, and Ptolemæus, a son, were at war with one another, and Arsinoë, a younger daughter, was ready to put forward claims (see *Egypt*: B. C. 80-48). Notwithstanding the insignificance of his force, Cæsar did not hesitate to assume to occupy Alexandria and to adjudicate the dispute. But the fascinations of Cleopatra (then twenty years of age) soon made him her partisan, and her scarcely disguised lover. This aggravated the irritation which was caused in Alexandria by the presence of Cæsar's troops, and a furious rising of the city was provoked. He fortified himself in the great palace, which he had taken possession of, and which commanded the causeway to the island, Pharos, thereby commanding the port. Destroying a large part of the city in that neighborhood, he made his position exceedingly strong. At the same time he seized and burned the royal fleet, and thus caused a conflagration in which the greater of the two priceless libraries of Alexandria—the library of the Museum—was, much of it, consumed. [See above: B. C. 282-246.] By such measures Cæsar withstood, for several months, a siege conducted on the part of the Alexandrians with great determination and animosity. It was not until March, B. C. 47, that he was relieved from his dangerous situation, by the arrival of a faithful ally, in the person of Mithridates, king of Pergamus, who led an army into Egypt, reduced Pelusium, and crossed the Nile at the head of the Delta. Ptolemæus advanced with his troops to meet this new invader and was followed and overtaken by Cæsar. In the battle which then occurred the Egyptian army was utterly routed and Ptolemæus perished in the Nile. Cleopatra was then

married, after the Egyptian fashion, to a younger brother, and established on the throne, while Arsinoë was sent a prisoner to Rome.—A. Hirtius, *The Alexandrian War*.

ALSO IN G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, r. 5, ch. 20.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 18.—S. Sharpe, *Hist. of Egypt*, ch. 12. A. D. 116.—**Destruction of the Jews.** See *Jews*: A. D. 116.

**A. D. 215.—Massacre by Caracalla.**—"Caracalla was the common enemy of mankind. He left the capital (and he never returned to it) about a year after the murder of Geta [A. D. 213]. The rest of his reign [four years] was spent in the several provinces of the Empire, particularly those of the East, and every province was, by turns, the scene of his rapine and cruelty. . . . In the midst of peace, and upon the slightest provocation, he issued his commands at Alexandria, Egypt [A. D. 215], for a general massacre. From a secure post in the temple of Serapis, he viewed and directed the slaughter of many thousand citizens, as well as strangers, without distinguishing either the number or the crime of the sufferers."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 6.

**A. D. 260-272.—Tumults of the Third Century.**—"The people of Alexandria, a various mixture of nations, united the vanity and inconsistency of the Greeks with the superstition and obstinacy of the Egyptians. The most trifling occasion, a transient scarcity of flesh or lentils, the neglect of an accustomed salutation, a mistake of precedence in the public baths, or even a religious dispute, were at any time sufficient to kindle a sedition among that vast multitude, whose resentments were furious and implacable. After the captivity of Valerian [the Roman Emperor, made prisoner by Sapor, king of Persia, A. D. 260] and the insolence of his son had relaxed the authority of the laws, the Alexandrians abandoned themselves to the ungoverned rage of their passions, and their unhappy country was the theatre of a civil war, which continued (with a few short and suspicious truces) above twelve years. All intercourse was cut off between the several quarters of the afflicted city, every street was polluted with blood, every building of strength converted into a citadel; nor did the tumult subside till a considerable part of Alexandria was irretrievably ruined. The spacious and magnificent district of Bruchion, with its palaces and museum, the residence of the kings and philosophers of Egypt, is described, above a century afterwards, as already reduced to its present state of dreary solitude."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 10.

**A. D. 273.—Destruction of the Bruchion by Aurelian.**—After subduing Palmyra and its Queen Zenobia, A. D. 272, the Emperor Aurelian was called into Egypt to put down a rebellion there, headed by one Firmus, a friend and ally of the Palmyrene queen. Firmus had great wealth, derived from trade, and from the paper-manufacture of Egypt, which was mostly in his hands. He was defeated and put to death. "To Aurelian's war against Firmus, or to that of Probus a little before in Egypt, may be referred the destruction of Bruchion, a great quarter of Alexandria, which according to Ammianus Marcellinus, was ruined under Aurelian and remained deserted ever afterwards."—J. B. L. Crevier, *Hist. of the Roman Emperors*, bk. 27.

**A. D. 296.—Siege by Diocletian.**—A general revolt of the African provinces of the Roman Empire occurred A. D. 296. The barbarous tribes of Ethiopia and the desert were brought into alliance with the provincials of Egypt, Cyrenaica, Carthage and Mauritania, and the flame of war was universal. Both the emperors of the time, Diocletian and Maximian, were called to the African field. "Diocletian, on his side, opened the campaign in Egypt by the siege of Alexandria, cut off the aqueducts which conveyed the waters of the Nile into every quarter of that immense city, and, rendering his camp impregnable to the sallies of the besieged multitude, he pushed his reiterated attacks with caution and vigor. After a siege of eight months, Alexandria, wasted by the sword and by fire, implored the clemency of the conqueror, but it experienced the full extent of his severity. Many thousands of the citizens perished in a promiscuous slaughter, and there were few obnoxious persons in Egypt who escaped a sentence either of death or at least of exile. The fate of Busiris and of Coptos was still more melancholy than that of Alexandria; those proud cities . . . were utterly destroyed."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 13.

**A. D. 365.—Great Earthquake.** See EARTHQUAKE IN THE ROMAN WORLD: A. D. 365.

**A. D. 389.—Destruction of the Serapeum.**—"After the edicts of Theodosius had severely prohibited the sacrifices of the pagans, they were still tolerated in the city and temple of Serapis. . . . The archiepiscopal throne of Alexandria was filled by Theophilus, the perpetual enemy of peace and virtue; a bold, bad man, whose hands were alternately polluted with gold and with blood. His pious indignation was excited by the honours of Serapis. . . . The votaries of Serapis, whose strength and numbers were much inferior to those of their antagonists, rose in arms [A. D. 389] at the instigation of the philosopher Olympius, who exhorted them to die in the defence of the altars of the gods. These pagan fanatics fortified themselves in the temple, or rather fortress, of Serapis; repelled the besiegers by daring sallies and a resolute defence; and, by the inhuman cruelties which they exercised on their Christian prisoners, obtained the last consolation of despair. The efforts of the prudent magistrate were usefully exerted for the establishment of a truce till the answer of Theodosius should determine the fate of Serapis." The judgment of the emperor condemned the great temple to destruction and it was reduced to a heap of ruins. "The valuable library of Alexandria was pillaged or destroyed; and, near twenty years afterwards, the appearance of the empty shelves excited the regret and indignation of every spectator whose mind was not totally darkened by religious prejudice."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 28.—Gibbon's statement as to the destruction of the great library in the Serapeum is called in question by his learned annotator, Dr. Smith. See above: B. C. 282-246.

**A. D. 413-415.—The Patriarch Cyril and his Mobs.**—"His voice [that of Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, A. D. 412-444] inflamed or appeased the passions of the multitude; his commands were blindly obeyed by his numerous and fanatic parabolani, familiarized in their daily office with scenes of death; and the præfects of

Egypt were awed or provoked by the temporal power of these Christian pontiffs. Ardent in the prosecution of heresy, Cyril auspiciously opened his reign by oppressing the Novatians, the most innocent and harmless of the sectaries. . . . The toleration, and even the privileges of the Jews, who had multiplied to the number of 40,000, were secured by the laws of the Cæsars and Ptolemies, and a long prescription of 700 years since the foundation of Alexandria. Without any legal sentence, without any royal mandate, the patriarch, at the dawn of day, led a seditious multitude to the attack of the synagogues. Unarmed and unprepared, the Jews were incapable of resistance; their houses of prayer were levelled with the ground, and the episcopal warrior, after rewarding his troops with the plunder of their goods, expelled from the city the remnant of the misbelieving nation. Perhaps he might plead the insolence of their prosperity, and their deadly hatred of the Christians, whose blood they had recently shed in a malicious or accidental tumult. Such crimes would have deserved the animadversions of the magistrate; but in this promiscuous outrage the innocent were confounded with the guilty."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 47.—"Before long the adherents of the archbishop were guilty of a more atrocious and unprovoked crime, of the guilt of which a deep suspicion attached to Cyril. All Alexandria respected, honoured, took pride in the celebrated Hypatia. She was a woman of extraordinary learning; in her was centred the lingering knowledge of that Alexandrian Platonism cultivated by Plotinus and his school. Her beauty was equal to her learning; her modesty commended both. . . . Hypatia lived in great intimacy with the præfect Orestes; the only charge whispered against her was that she encouraged him in his hostility to the patriarch. . . . Some of Cyril's ferocious partisans seized this woman, dragged her from her chariot, and with the most revolting indecency tore her clothes off and then rent her limb from limb."—I. H. Millman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, bk. 2, ch. 3.

ALSO IN C. Kingsley, *Hypatia*.

**A. D. 616.—Taken by Chosroes.** See EGYPT: A. D. 616-628.

**A. D. 641-646.—The Moslem Conquest.**—The precise date of events in the Moslem conquest of Egypt, by Amru, lieutenant of the Caliph Omar, is uncertain. Sir Wm. Muir fixes the first surrender of Alexandria to Amru in A. D. 641. After that it was reoccupied by the Byzantines either once or twice, on occasions of neglect by the Arabs, as they pursued their conquests elsewhere. The probability seems to be that this occurred only once, in 646. It seems also probable, as remarked by Sir W. Muir, that the two sieges on the taking and retaking of the city—641 and 646—have been much confused in the scanty accounts which have come down to us. On the first occasion Alexandria would appear to have been generously treated; while, on the second, it suffered pillage and its fortifications were destroyed. How far there is truth in the commonly accepted story of the deliberate burning of the great Alexandrian Library—or so much of it as had escaped destruction at the hands of Roman generals and Christian patriarchs—is a question still in dispute. Gibbon discredited the story, and Sir William Muir, the latest of

students in Mahometan history, declines even the mention of it in his narrative of the conquest of Egypt. But other historians of repute maintain the probable accuracy of the tale told by Abulpharagus—that Caliph Omar ordered the destruction of the Library, on the ground that, if the books in it agreed with the Koran they were useless, if they disagreed with it they were pernicious.—See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 640-646.

A. D. 815-823.—Occupied by piratical Saracens from Spain. See CRETE: A. D. 823.

A. D. 1798.—Captured by the French under Bonaparte. See FRANCE: A. D. 1798 (MAY—AUGUST).

A. D. 1801-1802.—Battle of French and English.—Restoration to the Turks. See FRANCE: A. D. 1801-1802.

A. D. 1807.—Surrendered to the English.—The brief occupation and humiliating capitulation. See TURKS: A. D. 1806-1807.

A. D. 1840.—Bombardment by the English. See TURKS: A. D. 1831-1840.

A. D. 1882.—Bombardment by the English fleet.—Massacre of Europeans.—Destruction. See EGYPT: A. D. 1875-1882, and 1882-1883.

ALEXANDRIA, LA., The Burning of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MARCH—MAY; LOUISIANA).

ALEXANDRIA VA., A. D. 1861 (May).—Occupation by Union troops.—Murder of Colonel Ellsworth. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (MAY; VIRGINIA).

ALEXANDRIAN TALENT. See TALENT.

ALEXIS, Czar of Russia, A. D. 1645-1676.

ALEXIUS I. (Comnenus), Emperor in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), A. D. 1081-1118.

...Alexius II. (Comnenus), Emperor in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), A. D. 1181-1183.

...Alexius III. (Angelus), Emperor in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), A. D. 1195-1203.

...Alexius IV. (Angelus), Emperor in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), A. D. 1203-1204.

...Alexius V. (Ducas), Emperor in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), A. D. 1204.

ALFONSO I., King of Aragon and Navarre, A. D. 1104-1134.

...Alfonso I., King of Castile, A. D. 1072-1109; and VI. of Leon, A. D. 1065-1109.

...Alfonso I., King of Leon and the Asturias, or Oviedo, A. D. 730-757.

...Alfonso I., King of Portugal, A. D. 1112-1185.

...Alfonso I., King of Sicily, A. D. 1416-1458.

...Alfonso II., King of Aragon, A. D. 1163-1196.

...Alfonso II., King of Castile, A. D. 1126-1157.

...Alfonso II., King of Leon and the Asturias, or Oviedo, A. D. 791-842.

...Alfonso II., King of Naples, A. D. 1494-1495.

...Alfonso II., King of Portugal, A. D. 1211-1223.

...Alfonso III., King of Aragon, A. D. 1285-1291.

...Alfonso III., King of Castile, A. D. 1158-1214.

...Alfonso III., King of Leon and the Asturias, or Oviedo, A. D. 806-910.

...Alfonso III., King of Portugal, A. D. 1244-1279.

...Alfonso IV., King of Aragon, A. D. 1327-1336.

...Alfonso IV., King of Leon and the Asturias, or Oviedo, A. D. 925-930.

...Alfonso IV., King of Portugal, A. D. 1323-1357.

...Alfonso V., King of Aragon and I. of Sicily, A. D. 1416-1458; I. of Naples, A. D. 1443-1458.

...Alfonso V., King of Leon and the Asturias, or Oviedo, A. D. 909-1027.

...Alfonso V., King of Portugal, A. D. 1438-1481.

...Alfonso VI., King of Portugal, A. D. 1066-1067.

...Alfonso VII., King of Leon, A. D. 1109-1126.

...Alfonso VIII., King of Leon, A. D. 1126-1157.

...Alfonso IX., King of Leon, A. D. 1188-1230.

...Alfonso X., King of Leon and Castile, A. D. 1232-1284.

...Alfonso XI., King of Leon and Castile, A. D. 1312-1350.

...Alfonso XII., King of Spain, A. D. 1874-1885.

ALFORD, Battle of (A. D. 1645). See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1644-1645.

ALFRED, called the Great, King of Wessex, A. D. 871-901.

ALGIE'S AND ALGERIA.—The term Algiers literally signifies 'the island,' and was derived from the original construction of its harbour, one side of which was separated from the land.—M. Russell, *Hist. of the Barbary States*, p. 314.—For history, see BARBARY STATES.

ALGIHED, The.—The term by which a war is proclaimed among the Mahometians to be a Holy War.

ALGONKINS, OR ALGONQUINS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONKIN FAMILY.

ALGUAZIL. See ALCALDE.

ALHAMA, The taking of. See SPAIN: A. D. 1476-1492.

ALHAMBRA, The building of the. See SPAIN: A. D. 1238-1273.

ALI, Caliph, A. D. 655-661.

ALIA, Battle of the (B. C. 390). See ROME: B. C. 390-347.

ALIBAMU, OR ALIBAMONS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: MUSKHOGEE FAMILY.

ALIEN AND SEDITION LAWS, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1798.

ALIGARH, Battle of (1803). See INDIA: A. D. 1798-1805.

ALIWAL, Battle of (1846). See INDIA: A. D. 1845-1849.

ALJUBAROTA, Battle of (1385). See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1383-1385, and SPAIN: A. D. 1368-1470.

ALKMAAR, Siege by the Spaniards and successful defense (1573). See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1573-1574.

ALKMAR, Battle of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1790 (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER).

"ALL THE TALENTS," The Ministry of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1801-1806, and 1806-1812.

ALLEGHANS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALLEGHANS.

ALLEMAGNE.—The French name for Germany, derived from the confederation of the Alemanni. See ALEMANNI: A. D. 213.

ALLEN, Ethan, and the Green Mountain Boys. See VERMONT, A. D. 1749-1774.

And the Capture of Fort Ticonderoga. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775 (MAY).

ALLERHEIM, Battle of (or Second battle of Nördlingen, — 1645). See GERMANY: A. D. 1640-1645.

ALLERTON, Isaac, and the Plymouth Colony. See MASSACHUSETTS (PLYMOUTH): A. D. 1623-1629, and after.

ALLIANCE, "the Farmers'." See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1877-1891.

ALLOBROGES, Conquest of the.—The Allobroges (see ÆDUI; also GAULS) having sheltered the chiefs of the Salves, when the lat-

ter succumbed to the Romans, and having refused to deliver them up, the proconsul Cn. Domitius marched his army toward their country, B. C. 121. The Allobroges advanced to meet him and were defeated at Vindalium, near the junction of the Sorgues with the Rhone, and not far from Avignon, having 20,000 men slain and 3,000 taken prisoners. The Arverni, who were the allies of the Allobroges, then took the field, crossing the Cevennes mountains and the river Rhone with a vast host, to attack the small Roman army of 30,000 men, which had passed under the command of Q. Fabius Maximus Emilianus. On the 8th of August, B. C. 121, the Gaulish horde encountered the legions of Rome, at a point near the junction of the Isere and the Rhone, and were routed with such enormous slaughter that 150,000 are said to have been slain or drowned. This battle settled the fate of the Allobroges, who surrendered to Rome without further struggle; but the Arverni were not pursued. The final conquest of that people was reserved for Cæsar.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, c. 1, ch. 21.

**ALMA, Battle of the.** See RUSSIA: A. D. 1854 (SEPTEMBER).

**ALMAGROS AND PIZARROS, The quarrel of the.** See PERU: A. D. 1533-1548.

**ALMANZA, Battle of (A. D. 1707).** See SPAIN: A. D. 1707.

**ALMENARA, Battle of (A. D. 1710).** See SPAIN: A. D. 1707-1710.

**ALMOHADES, The.**—The empire of the Almoravides, in Morocco and Spain, which originated in a Moslem missionary movement, was overturned in the middle of the twelfth century by a movement of somewhat similar nature. The agitating cause of the revolution was a religious teacher named Mahomet ben Abdallah, who rose in the reign of Ali (successor to the great Almoravide prince, Joseph), who gained the odor of sanctity at Morocco and who took the title of Al Mehdi, or El Mahdi, the Leader, "giving himself out for the person whom many Mahometans expect under that title. As before, the sect grew into an army, and the army grew into an empire. The new dynasty were called Almohades from Al Mehdi, and by his appointment a certain Abdelmumen was elected Caliph and Commander of the Faithful. Under his vigorous guidance the new kingdom rapidly grew, till the Almohades obtained quite the upper hand in Africa, and in 1146 they too passed into Spain. Under Abdelmumen and his successors, Joseph and Jacob Almanson, the Almohades entirely supplanted the Almoravides, and became more formidable foes than they had been to the rising Christian powers. Jacob Almanson won in 1195 the terrible battle of Alarcos against Alfonso of Castile, and carried his conquests deep into that kingdom. His fame spread through the whole Moslem world. . . . With Jacob Almanson perished the glory of the Almohades. His successor, Mahomet, lost in 1211 [June 16] the great battle of Alcab or Tolosa against Alfonso, and that day may be said to have decided the fate of Mahometanism in Spain. The Almohade dynasty gradually declined. . . . The Almohades, like the Ommiads and the Almoravides, vanish from history amidst a scene of confusion the details of which it were hopeless to attempt to remember."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. and Conquests of the Saracens*, lect. 5.

ALSO IN II. Coppée, *Conquest of Spain by the Arab-Moors*, bk. 8, ch. 4.—See, also, SPAIN: A. D. 1146-1233.

**ALMONACID, Battle of.** See SPAIN: A. D. 1809 (AUGUST-NOVEMBER).

**ALMORAVIDES, The.**—During the confusions of the 11th century in the Moslem world, a missionary from Kairwan—one Abdallah—preaching the faith of Islam to a wild tribe in Western North Africa, created a religious movement which "naturally led to a political one." "The tribe now called themselves Almoravides, or more properly Morabethah, which appears to mean followers of the Marabout or religious teacher. Abdallah does not appear to have himself claimed more than a religious authority, but their princes Zachariah and Abu Bekr were completely guided by his counsels. After his death Abu Bekr founded in 1070 the city of Morocco. There he left as his lieutenant his cousin Joseph, who grew so powerful that Abu Bekr, by a wonderful exercise of moderation, abdicated in his favour, to avoid a probable civil war. This Joseph, when he had become lord of most part of Western Africa, was requested, or caused himself to be requested, to assume the title of Emir al Momenin, Commander of the Faithful. As a loyal subject of the Caliph of Bagdad, he shrunk from such sacrilegious usurpation, but he did not scruple to style himself Emir Al Muslemin, Commander of the Moslems. . . . The Almoravide Joseph passed over into Spain, like another Tarik; he vanquished Alfonso [the Christian prince of the rising kingdom of Castile] at Zalacca [Oct. 23, A. D. 1086] and then converted the greater portion of Mahometan Spain into an appendage to his own kingdom of Morocco. The chief position to escape was the kingdom of Zaragoza, the great out-post of the Saracens in north-eastern Spain. . . . The great cities of Andalusia were all brought under a degrading submission to the Almoravides. Their dynasty however was not of long duration, and it fell in turn [A. D. 1147] before one whose origin was strikingly similar to their own" [the Almohades].—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. and Conquests of the Saracens*, lect. 5.

ALSO IN II. Coppée, *Conquest of Spain by the Arab-Moors*, bk. 8, ch. 2 and 4.—See, also, PORTUGAL: EARLY HISTORY.

**ALOD.—ALODIAL.**—"It may be questioned whether any etymological connexion exists between the words odal and alod, but their signification applied to land is the same: the alod is the hereditary estate derived from primitive occupation; for which the owner owes no service except the personal obligation to appear in the host and in the council. . . . The land held in full ownership might be either an ethel, an inherited or otherwise acquired portion of original allotment; or an estate created by legal process out of public land. Both these are included in the more common term alod; but the former looks for its evidence in the pedigree of its owner or in the witness of the community, while the latter can produce the charter or book by which it is created, and is called boeland. As the primitive allotments gradually lost their historical character, as the primitive modes of transfer became obsolete, and the use of written records took their place, the ethel is lost sight of in the bookland. All the land that is not so ac-

counted for is folcland, or public land."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 3, sect. 24, and ch. 5, sect. 36.—"Alodial lands are commonly opposed to beneficiary or feudal; the former being strictly proprietary, while the latter depended upon a superior. In this sense the word is of continual recurrence in ancient histories, laws and instruments. It sometimes, however, bears the sense of inheritance. . . . Hence, in the charters of the eleventh century, hereditary fiefs are frequently termed alodia."—H. Hallam, *Middle Ages*, ch. 2, pt. 1, note.

ALSO IN J. M. Kemble, *The Saxons in England*, bk. 1, ch. 11.—See, also, FOLCLAND.

**ALP ARSLAN**, Seljouk Turkish Sultan, A. D. 1063-1073.

**ALPHONSO**. See ALFONSO.

**ALSACE**.—**ALSATIA**: The Name. See ALEMANNI: A. D. 213.

A. D. 843-870.—Included in the Kingdom of Lorraine. See LORRAINE: A. D. 843-870.

10th Century.—Joined to the Empire. See LORRAINE: A. D. 911-980.

10th Century.—Origin of the House of Hapsburg. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1246-1282.

A. D. 1525.—Revolt of the Peasants. See GERMANY: A. D. 1524-1525.

A. D. 1621-1622.—Invasions by Mansfeld and his predatory army. See GERMANY: A. D. 1621-1623.

A. D. 1636-1639.—Invasion and conquest by Duke Bernhard of Weimar.—Richelieu's appropriation of the conquest for France. See GERMANY: A. D. 1634-1639.

A. D. 1648.—Cession to France in the Peace of Westphalia. See GERMANY: A. D. 1648.

A. D. 1659.—Renunciation of the claims of the King of Spain. See FRANCE: A. D. 1659-1661.

A. D. 1674-1678.—Ravaged in the Campaigns of Turenne and Condé. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1674-1678.

A. D. 1679-1681.—Complete Absorption in France.—Assumption of entire Sovereignty by Louis XIV.—Encroachments of the Chamber of Reanexion.—Seizure of Strasburg.—Overthrow of its independence as an Imperial City. See FRANCE: A. D. 1679-1681.

A. D. 1744.—Invasion by the Austrians. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1743-1744.

A. D. 1871.—Ceded to the German Empire by France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1871 (JANUARY—MAY).

1871-1879.—Organization of government as a German Imperial Province. See GERMANY: A. D. 1871-1879.

**ALTA CALIFORNIA**.—Upper California. See CALIFORNIA: A. D. 1543-1781.

**ALTENHEIM**, Battle of (A. D. 1675). See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1674-1678.

**ALTENHOVEN**, Battle of (1793). See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (FEBRUARY—APRIL).

**ALTHING**, The. See THING; also, NORMANS.—NORTHMEN: A. D. 860-1100; and SCANDINAVIAN STATES (DENMARK—IRELAND): A. D. 1840-1874.

**ALTIS** The. See OLYMPIC FESTIVAL.

**ALTMARCK**. See BRANDENBURG: A. D. 1142-1152.

**ALTONA**: A. D. 1713.—Etrned by the Swedes. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1707-1718.

**ALTOPASCIO**, Battle of (1325). See ITALY: A. D. 1313-1330.

**ALVA IN THE NETHERLANDS**. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1566-1568 to 1573-1574.

**AMADEO**, King of Spain, A. D. 1871-1873.

**AMAHUACA**, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINALS: ANDESAINS.

**AMALASONTHA**, Queen of the Ostrogoths. See ROME: A. D. 535-553.

**MALEKITES**, The.—"The Amalekites were usually regarded as a branch of the Edomites or 'Red-skins'. Amalek, like Kenaz, the father of the Kenizzites or 'Hunters', was the grandson of Esau (Gen. 36: 12, 16). He thus belonged to the group of nations,—Edomites, Ammonites, and Moabites,—who stood in a relation of close kinship to Israel. But they had preceded the Israelites in dispossessing the older inhabitants of the land, and establishing themselves in their place. The Edomites had partly destroyed, partly amalgamated the Ilorites of Mount Seir (Deut. 2: 12); the Moabites had done the same to the Emin, 'a people great and many, and tall as the Anakim' (Deut. 2: 10), while the Ammonites had extirpated and succeeded to the Rephaim or 'Giants', who in that part of the country were termed Zanzumim (Deut. 2: 20; Gen. 14: 5). Edom however stood in a closer relation to Israel than its two more northerly neighbours. . . . Separate from the Edomites or Amalekites were the Kenites or wandering 'smiths.' They formed an important Guild in an age when the art of metallurgy was confined to a few. In the time of Saul we hear of them as camping among the Amalekites (I. Sam. 15: 6). . . . The Kenites . . . did not constitute a race, or even a tribe. They were, at most, a caste. But they had originally come, like the Israelites or the Edomites, from those barren regions of Northern Arabia which were peopled by the Menti of the Egyptian inscriptions. Racially, therefore, we may regard them as allied to the descendants of Abraham. While the Kenites and Amalekites were thus Semite in their origin, the Ilivites or 'Villagers' are specially associated with Amorites."—A. H. Sayce, *Races of the Old Test.*, ch. 6.

ALSO IN H. Ewald, *Hist. of Israel*, bk. 1, sect. 4.—See, also, ARABIA.

**AMALFI**.—"It was the singular fate of this city to have filled up the interval between two periods of civilization, in neither of which she was destined to be distinguished. Scarcely known before the end of the sixth century, Amalfi ran a brilliant career, as a free and trading republic [see ROME: A. D. 554-800], which was checked by the arms of a conqueror in the middle of the twelfth. . . . There must be, I suspect, some exaggeration about the commerce and opulence of Amalfi, in the only age when she possessed any at all."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 9, pt. 1, with note.—"Amalfi and Atrani lie close together in two . . . ravines, the mountains almost arching over them, and the sea washing their very house-walls. . . . It is not easy to imagine the time when Amalfi and Atrani were one town, with docks and arsenals and harbourage for their associated fleets, and when these little communities were second in importance to no naval power of



Christian Europe. The Byzantine Empire lost its hold on Italy during the eighth century; and after this time the history of Calabria is mainly concerned with the republics of Naples and Amalfi, their conflict with the Lombard dukes of Benevento, their opposition to the Saracens, and their final subjugation by the Norman conquerors of Sicily. Between the year 839 A. D., when Amalfi freed itself from the control of Naples and the yoke of Benevento, and the year 1131, when Roger of Hauteville incorporated the republic in his kingdom of the Two Sicilies, this city was the foremost naval and commercial port of Italy. The burghers of Amalfi elected their own doge; founded the Hospital of Jerusalem, whence sprang the knightly order of S. John; gave their name to the richest quarter in Palermo; and owned trading establishments or factories in all the chief cities of the Levant. Their gold coinage of 'tari' formed the standard of currency before the Florentines had stamped the lily and S. John upon the Tuscan florin. Their shipping regulations supplied Europe with a code of maritime laws. Their scholars, in the darkest depths of the dark ages, prized and copied a famous copy of the *Pandects* of Justinian, and their seamen deserved the fame of having first used, if they did not actually invent, the compass. . . . The republic had grown and flourished on the decay of the Greek Empire. When the hard-handed race of Hauteville absorbed the heritage of Greeks and Lombards and Saracens in Southern Italy [see ITALY (Southern); A. D. 1000-1090], these adventurers succeeded in annexing Amalfi. But it was not their interest to extinguish the state. On the contrary, they relied for assistance upon the navies and the armies of the little commonwealth. New powers had meanwhile arisen in the North of Italy, who were jealous of rivalry upon the open seas; and when the Neapolitans resisted King Roger in 1135, they called Pisa to their aid, and sent her fleet to destroy Amalfi. The ships of Amalfi were on guard with Roger's navy in the Bay of Naples. The armed citizens were, under Roger's orders, at Aversa. Meanwhile the home of the republic lay defenceless on its mountain-girdled seaboard. The Pisans sailed into the harbour, sacked the city and carried off the famous *Pandects* of Justinian as a trophy. Two years later they returned, to complete the work of devastation. Amalfi never recovered from the injuries and the humiliation of these two attacks. It was ever thus that the Italians, like the children of the dragon's teeth which Cadmus sowed, consumed each other.—J. A. Symonds, *Sketches and Studies in Italy*, pp. 2-4.

**AMALINGS, OR AMALS.**—The royal race of the ancient Ostragoths, as the Balthei or Balthingi were of the Visigoths, both claiming a descent from the gods.

**AMAZIGH, The.** See LIBYANS.

**AMAZONS.**—"The Amazons, daughters of Arès and Harmonia, are both early creations, and frequent reproductions, of the ancient epic. . . . A nation of courageous, hardy and indefatigable women, dwelling apart from men, permitting only a short temporary intercourse for the purpose of renovating their numbers, and burning out their right breast with a view of enabling themselves to draw the bow freely,—this was at once a general type stimulating to the fancy of the poet, and a theme eminently popular with

his hearers. Nor was it at all repugnant to the faith of the latter—who had no recorded facts to guide them, and no other standard of credibility as to the past except such poetical narratives themselves—to conceive communities of Amazons as having actually existed in anterior time. Accordingly we find these warlike females constantly reappearing in the ancient poems, and universally accepted as past realities. In the *Iliad*, when Priam wishes to illustrate emphatically the most numerous host in which he ever found himself included, he tells us that it was assembled in Phrygia, on the banks of the Sangarius, for the purpose of resisting the formidable Amazons. When Bellerophon is to be employed on a deadly and perilous undertaking, by those who indirectly wish to procure his death, he is despatched against the Amazons. . . . The Argonautic heroes find the Amazons on the river Thermodon in their expedition along the southern coast of the Euxine. To the same spot Herakles goes to attack them, in the performance of the ninth labour imposed upon him by Eurystheus, for the purpose of procuring the girdle of the Amazonian queen, Hippolyte; and we are told that they had not yet recovered from the losses sustained in this severe aggression when Theseus also assaulted and defeated them, carrying off their queen Antiope. This injury they avenged by invading Attica . . . and penetrated even into Athens itself: where the final battle, hard-fought and at one time doubtful, by which Theseus crushed them, was fought—in the very heart of the city. Attic antiquaries confidently pointed out the exact position of the two contending armies. . . . No portion of the ante-historical epic appears to have been more deeply worked into the national mind of Greece than this invasion and defeat of the Amazons. . . . Their proper territory was asserted to be the town and plain of Themiskyra, near the Grecian colony of Amisus, on the river Thermodon [northern Asia Minor], a region called after their name by Roman historians and geographers. . . . Some authors placed them: 3: Libya or Ethiopia."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 1, ch. 11.

**AMAZONS RIVER, Discovery and Naming of the.**—The mouth of the great river of South America was discovered in 1500 by Pinzon, or Pinçon (see AMERICA; A. D. 1499-1500), who called it 'Santa Maria de la Mar Dulce' (Saint Mary of the Fresh-Water Sea). "This was the first name given to the river, except that older and better one of the Indians, 'Purana,' the Sea; afterwards it was Marañon and Rio das Amazonas, from the female warriors that were supposed to live near its banks. . . . After Pinçon's time, there were others who saw the fresh-water sea, but no one was hardy enough to venture into it. The honor of its real discovery was reserved for Francisco de Orelluna; and he explored it, not from the east, but from the west, in one of the most daring voyages that was ever recorded. It was accident rather than design that led him to it. After . . . Pizarro had conquered Peru, he sent his brother Gonzalo, with 340 Spanish soldiers, and 4,000 Indians, to explore the great forest east of Quito, 'where there were cinnamon trees.' The expedition started late in 1539, and it was two years before the starved and ragged survivors returned to Quito. In the course of their wanderings they had struck the river Cocco; building here a brig-

antique, they followed down the current, a part of them in the vessel, a part on shore. After a while they met some Indians, who told them of a rich country ten days' journey beyond—a country of gold, and with plenty of provisions. Gonzalo placed Orellana in command of the brigantine, and ordered him, with 50 soldiers, to go on to this gold-land, and return with a load of provisions. Orellana arrived at the mouth of the Coco in three days, but found no provisions; and he considered that if he should return with this news to Pizarro, he would not reach him in a year, on account of the strong current, and that if he remained where he was, he would be of no use to the one or to the other. Not knowing how long Gonzalo Pizarro would take to reach the place, without consulting any one he set sail and prosecuted his voyage onward, intending to ignore Gonzalo, to reach Spain, and obtain that government for himself. Down the Napo and the Amazons, for seven months, these Spaniards floated to the Atlantic. At times they suffered terribly from hunger: "There was nothing to eat but the skins which formed their girdles, and the leather of their shoes, boiled with a few herbs." When they did get food they were often obliged to fight hard for it; and again they were attacked by thousands of naked Indians, who came in canoes against the Spanish vessel. At some Indian villages, however, they were kindly received and well fed, so they could rest while building a new and stronger vessel. . . . On the 26th of August, 1541, Orellana and his men sailed out to the blue water without either pilot, compass, or anything useful for navigation; nor did they know what direction they should take." Following the coast, they passed inside of the Island of Trinidad, and so at length reached Cubagua in September. From the king of Spain Orellana received a grant of the land he had discovered; but he died while returning to it, and his company was dispersed. It was not a very reliable account of the river that was given by Orellana and his chronicler, Padre Carabajal. So Herrera tells their story of the warrior females, and very properly adds: "Every reader may believe as much as he likes."—II. H. Smita, *Brazil, the Amazons, and the Coast*, ch. 1.—In ch. 18 of this same work "The Amazon Myth" is discussed at length, with the reports and opinions of numerous travellers, both early and recent, concerning it.—Mr. Southey had so much respect for the memory of Orellana that he made an effort to restore that bold but unprincipled discoverer's name to the great river. "He discarded Maranon, as having too much resemblance to Maranham, and Amazon, as being founded upon fiction and at the same time inconvenient. Accordingly, in his map, and in all his references to the great river he denominates it Orellana. This decision of the poet-laureate of Great Britain has not proved authoritative in Brazil. O Amazonas is the universal appellation of the great river among those who float upon its waters and who live upon its banks. . . . Pará, the aboriginal name of this river, was more appropriate than any other. It signifies 'the father of waters.' . . . The origin of the name and mystery concerning the female warriors, I think, has been solved within the last few years by the intrepid Mr. Wallace. . . . Mr. Wallace, I think, shows conclusively that Friar Gaspar [Carabajal] and his companions saw Indian male

warriors who were attired in habiliments such as Europeans would attribute to women. . . . I am strongly of the opinion that the story of the Amazons has arisen from these feminine-looking warriors encountered by the early voyagers."—J. C. Fletcher and D. P. Kidder, *Brazil and the Brazilians*, ch. 27.

ALSO IN A. R. WALLACE, *Travels on the Amazon and Rio Negro*, ch. 17.—R. Southey, *Hist. of Brazil*, ch. 4 (v. 1).

**AMAZULUS, OR ZULUS.**—The Zulu War. See SOUTH AFRICA: THE ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS; and the same: A. D. 1877-1879.

**AMBACTI.**—"The Celtic aristocracy [of Gaul] . . . developed the system of retainers, that is, the privilege of the nobility to surround themselves with a number of hired mounted servants—the ambacti as they were called—and thereby to form a state within a state; and, resting on the support of these troops of their own, they defied the legal authorities and the common levy and practically broke up the commonwealth. . . . This remarkable word [ambacti] must have been in use as early as the sixth century of Rome among the Celts in the valley of the Po. . . . It is not merely Celtic, however, but also German, the root of our 'Amt,' as indeed the retainer-system itself is common to the Celts and the Germans. It would be of great historical importance to ascertain whether the word—and therefore the thing—came to the Celts from the Germans or to the Germans from the Celts. If, as is usually supposed, the word is originally German and primarily signified the servant standing in battle 'against the back' ('and'—against, 'bak'—'back') of his master, this is not wholly irreconcilable with the singularly early occurrence of the word among the Celts. . . . It is . . . probable that the Celts, in Italy as in Gaul, employed Germans chiefly as those hired servants-at-arms. The 'Swiss guard' would therefore in that case be some thousands of years older than people suppose."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 5, ch. 7, and foot-note.

**AMBARRI, The.**—A small tribe in Gaul which occupied anciently a district between the Saone, the Rhone and the Ain.—Napoleon III., *Hist. of Cesar*, bk. 3, ch. 2, note.

**AMBIANI, The.** See BELGÆ.

**AMBITUS.**—Bribery at elections was termed ambitus among the Romans, and many unavailing laws were enacted to check it.—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq.*, ch. 9.

**AMBIVARETI, The.**—A tribe in ancient Gaul which occupied the left bank of the Meuse, to the south of the marsh of Peel.—Napoleon III., *Hist. of Cesar*, bk. 3, ch. 2, note.

**AMBLEVE, Battle of (716.)** See FRANKS (MEROVINGIAN EMPIRE): A. D. 511-752.

**AMBOISE, Conspiracy or Tumult of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1559-1561.

**AMBOISE, Edict of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1560-1563.

**AMBOYNA, Massacre of.** See INDIA: A. D. 1690-1702.

**AMBRACIA (Ambrakia).** See KORKYRA.

**AMBRONES, The.** See CIMBRI AND TEUTONES: B. C. 113-102.

**AMBROSIAN CHURCH.**—**AMBROSIAN CHANT.** See MILAN: A. D. 374-397.


**AMEIXAL, OR ESTREMOS, Battle of (1663).** See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1637-1668.

## AMERICA.

**The Name.** See below: A. D. 1500-1514.

**Prehistoric.**—“Widely scattered throughout the United States, from sea to sea, artificial mounds are discovered, which may be enumerated by the thousands or hundreds of thousands. They vary greatly in size; some are so small that a half-dozen laborers with shovels might construct one of them in a day, while others cover acres and are scores of feet in height. These mounds were observed by the earliest explorers and pioneers of the country. They did not attract great attention, however, until the science of archeology demanded their investigation. Then they were assumed to furnish evidence of a race of people older than the Indian tribes. Pseud-archeologists descanted on the Mound-builders that once inhabited the land, and they told of swarming populations who had reached a high condition of culture, erecting temples, practicing arts in the metals, and using hieroglyphs. So the Mound-builders formed the theme of many an essay on the wonders of ancient civilization. The research of the past ten or fifteen years has put this subject in a proper light. First, the annals of the Columbian epoch have been carefully studied, and it is found that some of the mounds have been constructed in historical time, while early explorers and settlers found many actually used by tribes of North American Indians; so we know that many of them were builders of mounds. Again, hundreds and thousands of these mounds have been carefully examined, and the works of art found therein have been collected and assembled in museums. At the same time, the works of art of the Indian tribes, as they were produced before modification by European culture, have been assembled in the same museums, and the two classes of collections have been carefully compared. All this has been done with the greatest painstaking, and the Mound-builder's arts and the Indian's arts are found to be substantially identical. No fragment of evidence remains to support the figment of theory that there was an ancient race of Mound-builders superior in culture to the North American Indians. . . . That some of these mounds were built and used in modern times is proved in another way. They often contain articles manifestly made by white men, such as glass beads and copper ornaments. . . . So it chanced that to-day unskilled archeologists are collecting many beautiful things in copper, stone, and shell which were made by white men and traded to the Indians. Now, some of these things are found in the mounds; and bird pipes, elephant pipes, banner stones, copper spear heads and knives, and machine-made wampum are collected in quantities and sold at high prices to wealthy amateurs. . . . The study of these mounds, historically and archeologically, proves that they were used for a variety of purposes. Some were for sepulchre, and such are the most common and widely scattered. Others were used as artificial hills on which to build communal houses. . . . Some of the very large mounds were sites of large communal houses in which entire tribes dwelt. There is still a third class . . . constructed as places for public assembly. . . . But to explain the mounds and their uses would expand this article into a book.

It is enough to say that the Mound-builders were the Indian tribes discovered by white men. It may well be that some of the mounds were erected by tribes extinct when Columbus first saw these shores, but they were kindred in culture to the peoples that still existed. In the southwestern portion of the United States, conditions of aridity prevail. Forests are few and are found only at great heights. . . . The tribes lived in the plains and valleys below, while the highlands were their hunting grounds. The arid lands below were often naked of vegetation; and the ledges and cliffs that stand athwart the lands, and the canyon walls that inclose the streams, were everywhere quarries of loose rock, lying in blocks ready to the builder's hand. Hence these people learned to build their dwellings of stone; and they had large communal houses, even larger than the structures of wood made by the tribes of the east and north. Many of these stone pueblos are still occupied, but the ruins are scattered wide over a region of country embracing a little of California and Nevada, much of Utah, most of Colorado, the whole of New Mexico and Arizona, and far southward toward the Isthmus. . . . No ruin has been discovered where evidences of a higher culture are found than exists in modern times at Zuni, Oraibi, or Laguna. The earliest may have been built thousands of years ago, but they were built by the ancestors of existing tribes and their congeners. A careful study of these ruins, made during the last twenty years, abundantly demonstrates that the pueblo culture began with rude structures of stone and brush, and gradually developed, until at the time of the exploration of the country by the Spaniards, beginning about 1540, it had reached its highest phase. Zuni [in New Mexico] has been built since, and it is among the largest and best villages ever established within the territory of the United States without the aid of ideas derived from civilized men.” With regard to the ruins of dwellings found sheltered in the craters of extinct volcanoes, or on the shelves of cliffs, or otherwise contrived, the conclusion to which all recent archeological study tends is the same. “All the stone pueblo ruins, all the clay ruins, all the cliff dwellings, all the crater villages, all the cavate chambers, and all the tufa-block houses are fully accounted for without resort to hypothetical peoples inhabiting the country anterior to the Indian tribes. . . . Pre-Columbian culture was indigenous; it began at the lowest stage of savagery and developed to the highest, and was in many places passing into barbarism when the good queen sold her jewels.”—Major J. W. Powell, *Prehistoric Man in America; in "The Forum," January, 1890.*—“The writer believes . . . that the majority of American archeologists now see no sufficient reason for supposing that any mysterious superior race has ever lived in any portion of our continent. They find no archeological evidence proving that at the time of its discovery any tribe had reached a stage of culture that can properly be called civilization. Even if we accept the exaggerated statements of the Spanish conquerors, the most intelligent and advanced peoples found here were only semi-barbarians, in the stage of transition from the stone to the bronze age, possessing no



# AMERICA.

Showing the more important of the Journeys of Discovery and Early Settlements.

REFERENCE TO JOURNEYS.

- Columbus -----
- Vesputch -----
- John Cabot -----
- Balboa -----
- Ponce de Leon -----
- Cortes +++++
- Pizarro +++++
- Qurtier +++++
- De Soto +++++
- Cronado +++++
- Champlain -----
- La Salle -----
- Hudson -----

Scale of Statute Miles.  
 0 100 200 300 400 500 600 700 800 900 1000

The Matthews-Northrup Co., Buffalo, N. Y.

110° 100° Longitude West 90° from Greenwich 80° 70°



written language, or what can properly be styled an alphabet, and not yet having even learned the use of beasts of burden."—H. W. Haynes, *Prehistoric Archaeology of N. Am.* (v. 1, ch. 6, of "Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am."),—"It may be premised . . . that the Spanish adventurers who thronged to the New World after its discovery found the same race of Red Indians in the West India Islands, in Central and South America, in Florida and in Mexico. In their mode of life and means of subsistence, in their weapons, arts, usages and customs, in their institutions, and in their mental and physical characteristics, they were the same people in different stages of advancement. . . . There was neither a political society, nor a state, nor any civilization in America when it was discovered; and, excluding the Eskimos, but one race of Indians, the Red Race."—L. H. Morgan, *Houses and House-life of the American Aborigines: Contributions to N. A. Ethnology*, v. 5, ch. 10.—"We have in this country the conclusive evidence of the existence of man before the time of the glaciers, and from the primitive conditions of that time, he has lived here and developed, through stages which correspond in many particulars to the Homeric age of Greece."—F. W. Putnam, *Rept. Peabody Museum of Archaeology*, 1886.

ALSO IN L. Carr, *The Mounds of the Mississippi Valley*.—C. Thomas, *Barial Mounds of the Northern Sections of the U. S.: Annual Rept. of the Bureau of Ethnology*, 1883-84.—Marquis de Nadailac, *Prehistoric America*.—J. Fiske, *The Discovery of America*, ch. 1.—See, also, MEXICO; PERU; and AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALLEGHANS, CHEEKOES, and MAYAS.

**10th-11th Centuries.**—**Supposed Discoveries by the Northmen.**—The fact that the Northmen knew of the existence of the Western Continent prior to the age of Columbus, was prominently brought before the people of this country in the year 1837, when the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries at Copenhagen published their work on the Antiquities of North America, under the editorial supervision of the great Icelandic scholar, Professor Rafn. But we are not to suppose that the first general account of these voyages was then given, for it has always been known that the history of certain early voyages to America by the Northmen were preserved in the libraries of Denmark and Iceland. . . . Yet, owing to the fact that the Icelandic language, though simple in construction and easy of acquisition, was a tongue not understood by scholars, the subject has until recent years been suffered to lie in the background, and permitted, through a want of interest, to share in a measure the treatment meted out to vague and uncertain reports. . . . It now remains to give the reader some general account of the contents of the narratives which relate more or less to the discovery of the western continent. . . . The first extracts given are very brief. They are taken from the "Laudnamá Book," and relate to the report in general circulation, which indicated one Gunniborn as the discoverer of Greenland, an event which has been fixed at the year 876. . . . The next narrative relates to the rediscovery of Greenland by the outlaw, Eric the Red, in 983, who there passed three years in exile, and afterwards returned to Iceland. About the year 986, he brought out to Greenland a considerable colony

of settlers, who fixed their abode at Brattahlid, in Ericsfiord. Then follow two versions of the voyage of Blarne Herulfson, who, in the same year, 986, when sailing for Greenland, was driven away during a storm, and saw a new land at the southward, which he did not visit. Next is given three accounts of the voyage of Leif, son of Eric the Red, who in the year 1000 sailed from Brattahlid to find the land which Blarne saw. Two of these accounts are hardly more than notices of the voyage, but the third is of considerable length, and details the successes of Leif, who found and explored this new land, where he spent the winter, returning to Greenland the following spring [having named different regions which he visited Helluland, Markland and Vinland, the latter name indicative of the finding of grapes]. After this follows the voyage of Thorvald Ericson, brother of Leif, who sailed to Vinland from Greenland, which was the point of departure in all these voyages. This expedition was begun in 1003, and it cost him his life, as an arrow from one of the natives pierced his side, causing death. Thorstein, his brother, went to seek Vinland, with the intention of bringing home his body, but failed in the attempt. The most distinguished explorer was Thorfinn Karlsefuc, the Hopeful, an Icelander whose genealogy runs back in the old Northern annals, through Danish, Swedish, and even Scotch and Irish ancestors, some of whom were of royal blood. In the year 1006 he went to Greenland, where he met Gudrid, widow of Thorstein, whom he married. Accompanied by his wife, who urged him to the undertaking, he sailed to Vinland in the spring of 1007, with three vessels and 160 men, where he remained three years. Here his son Snorre was born. He afterwards became the founder of a great family in Iceland, which gave the island several of its first bishops. Thorfinn finally left Vinland because he found it difficult to sustain himself against the attacks of the natives. The next to undertake a voyage was a wicked woman named Freydis, a sister to Leif Ericson, who went to Vinland in 1011, where she lived a time with her two ships, in the same places occupied by Leif and Thorfinn. Before she returned, she caused the crew of one ship to be cruelly murdered, assisting in the butchery with her own hands. After this we have what are called the Minor Narratives, which are not essential.—B. F. De Costa, *Pre-Columbian Discovery of Am., General Introd.*—By those who accept fully the claims made for the Northmen, as discoverers of the American continent in the voyages believed to be authentically narrated in these sagas, the Helluland of Leif is commonly identified with Newfoundland, Markland with Nova Scotia, and Vinland with various parts of New England, Massachusetts Bay, Cape Cod, Nantucket Island, Martha's Vineyard, Buzzard's Bay, Narragansett Bay, Mount Hope Bay, Long Island Sound, and New York Bay are among the localities supposed to be recognized in the Norse narratives, or marked by some traces of the presence of the Viking explorers. Prof. Gustav Storm, the most recent of the Scandinavian investigators of this subject, finds the Helluland of the sagas in Labrador or Northern Newfoundland, Markland in Newfoundland, and Vinland in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton Island.—G. Storm, *Studies of the Vineland Voyages*.—"The only dis-

credit which has been thrown upon the story of the Vinland voyages, in the eyes either of scholars or of the general public, has arisen from the eager credulity with which ingenious antiquarians have now and then tried to prove more than facts will warrant. . . . Archaeological remains of the Northmen abound in Greenland, all the way from Immaritinek to near Cape Farewell; the existence of one such relic on the North American continent has never yet been proved. Not a single vestige of the Northmen's presence here, at all worthy of credence, has ever been found. . . . The most convincing proof that the Northmen never founded a colony in America, south of Davis Strait, is furnished by the total absence of horses, cattle and other domestic animals from the soil of North America until they were brought hither by the Spanish, French and English settlers."—J. Fiske, *The Discovery of America*, ch. 2.—"What Leif and Karlsefne knew they experienced," writes Prof. Justin Winsor, "and what the sagas tell us they underwent, must have just the difference between a crisp narrative of personal adventure and the oft-repeated and embellished story of a fireside narrator, since the traditions of the Norse voyages were not put in the shape of records till about two centuries had elapsed, and we have no earlier manuscript of such a record than one made nearly two hundred years later still. . . . A blending of history and myth prompts Horn to say that 'some of the sagas were doubtless originally based on facts, but the telling and retelling have changed them into pure myths.' The unsympathetic stranger sees this in stories that the patriotic Scandinavians are over-anxious to make appear as genuine chronicles. . . . The weight of probability is in favor of a Northman descent upon the coast of the American mainland at some point, or at several, somewhere to the south of Greenland; but the evidence is hardly that which attaches to well established historical records. . . . There is not a single item of all the evidence thus advanced from time to time which can be said to connect by archaeological traces the presence of the Northmen on the soil of North America south of Davis' Straits." Of other imagined pre-Columbian discoveries of America, by the Welsh, by the Arabs, by the Basques, &c., the possibilities and probabilities are critically discussed by Prof. Winsor in the same connection.

—J. Winsor, *Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am.*, v. 1, ch. 2, and *Critical Notes to the same*.

Also in Bryant and Gay, *Popular Hist. of the U. S.*, ch. 3.—E. F. Slafter, *Ed. Voyages of the Northmen to Am.* (Prince Soc., 1877).—The same, *Discovery of Am. by the Northmen* (N. H. Hist. Soc., 1888).—N. L. Bennish, *Discovery of Am. by the Northmen*.—A. J. Weise, *Discoveries of Am.*, ch. 1.

**A. D. 1484-1492.—The great project of Columbus, and the sources of its inspiration.—His seven years' suit at the Spanish Court.—His departure from Palos.**—"All attempts to diminish the glory of Columbus' achievement by proving a previous discovery whose results were known to him have signally failed. . . . Columbus originated no new theory respecting the earth's form or size, though a popular idea has always prevailed, notwithstanding the statements of the best writers to the contrary, that he is entitled to the glory of the theory as well

as to that of the execution of the project. He was not in advance of his age, entertained no new theories, believed no more than did Prince Henry, his predecessor, or Toscanelli, his contemporary; nor was he the first to conceive the possibility of reaching the east by sailing west. He was however the first to act in accordance with existing beliefs. The Northmen in their voyages had entertained no ideas of a New World, or of an Asia to the West. To knowledge of theoretical geography, Columbus added the skill of a practical navigator, and the iron will to overcome obstacles. He sailed west, reached Asia as he believed, and proved old theories correct. There seem to be two undecided points in that matter, neither of which can ever be settled. First, did his experience in the Portuguese voyages, the perusal of some old author, or a hint from one of the few men acquainted with old traditions, first suggest to Columbus his project? . . . Second, to what extent did his voyage to the north [made in 1477, probably with an English merchantman from Bristol, in which voyage he is believed to have visited Iceland] influence his plan? There is no evidence, but a strong probability, that he heard in that voyage of the existence of land in the west. . . . Still, his visit to the north was in 1477, several years after the first formation of his plan, and any information gained at the time could only have been confirmatory rather than suggestive."—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, v. 1, *summary app. to ch. 1*.—"Of the works of learned men, that which, according to Ferdinand Columbus, had most weight with his father, was the 'Cosmographia' of Cardinal Aliaco. Columbus was also confirmed in his views of the existence of a western passage to the Indies by Paulo Toscanelli, the Florentine philosopher, to whom much credit is due for the encouragement he afforded to the enterprise. That the notices, however, of western lands were not such as to have much weight with other men, is sufficiently proved by the difficulty which Columbus had in contending with adverse geographers and men of science in general, of whom he says he never was able to convince any one. After a new world had been discovered, many scattered indications were then found to have foreshown it. One thing which cannot be denied to Columbus is that he worked out his own idea himself. . . . He first applied himself to his countrymen, the Genoese, who would have nothing to say to his scheme. He then tried the Portuguese, who listened to what he had to say, but with bad faith sought to anticipate him by sending out a caravel with instructions founded upon his plan. . . . Columbus, disgusted at the treatment he had received from the Portuguese Court, quitted Lisbon, and, after visiting Genoa, as it appears, went to see what favour he could meet with in Spain, arriving at Palos in the year 1485." The story of the long suit of Columbus at the Court of Ferdinand and Isabella; of his discouragement and departure, with intent to go to France; of his recall by command of Queen Isabella; of the tedious hearings and negotiations that now took place; of the lofty demands adhered to by the confident Genoese, who required "to be made an admiral at once, to be appointed viceroy of the countries he should discover, and to have an eighth of the profits of the expedition;" of his second rebuff,

his second departure for France, and second recall by Isabella, who finally put her heart into the enterprise and persuaded her more skeptical consort to assent to it—the story of those seven years of the struggle of Columbus to obtain means for his voyage is familiar to all readers. “The agreement between Columbus and their Catholic highnesses was signed at Santa Fé on the 17th of April, 1492; and Columbus went to Palos to make preparation for his voyage, bearing with him an order that the two vessels which that city furnished annually to the crown for three months should be placed at his disposal. . . . The Pinzons, rich men and skilful mariners of Palos, joined in the undertaking, subscribing an eighth of the expenses; and thus, by these united exertions, three vessels were manned with 90 mariners, and provisioned for a year. At length all the preparations were complete, and on a Friday (not inauspicious in this case), the 31 of August, 1492, after they had all confessed and received the sacrament, they set sail from the bar of Saltes, making for the Canary Islands.”—Sir A. Helps, *The Spanish Conquest in America*, bk. 2, ch. 1.

ALSO IN J. Winsor, *Christopher Columbus*, ch. 5-9, and 20.

A. D. 1492.—The First Voyage of Columbus.—Discovery of the Bahamas, Cuba and Hayti.—The three vessels of Columbus were called the Santa Maria, the Pinta and the Niña. “All had forecables and high poops, but the ‘Santa Maria’ was the only one that was decked amidships, and she was called a ‘nao’ or ship. The other two were caravels, a class of small vessels built for speed. The ‘Santa Maria,’ as I gather from scattered notices in the letters of Columbus, was of 120 to 130 tons, like a modern coasting schooner, and she carried 70 men, much crowded. Her sails were a foresail and a foretop-sail, a sprit-sail, a mainsail with two bonnets, and maintop sail, a mizzen, and a boat’s sail were occasionally hoisted on the poop. The ‘Pinta’ and ‘Niña’ only had square sails on the foremast and lateen sails on the main and mizzen. The former was 50 tons, the latter 40 tons, with crews of 20 men each. On Friday, the 3d of August, the three little vessels left the haven of Palos, and this memorable voyage was commenced. . . . The expedition proceeded to the Canary Islands, where the rig of the ‘Pinta’ was altered. Her lateen sails were not adapted for running before the wind, and she was therefore fitted with square sails, like the ‘Santa Maria.’ Repairs were completed, the vessels were filled up with wood and water at Gomera, and the expedition took its final departure from the island of Gomera, one of the Canaries, on September 6th, 1492. . . . Columbus had chosen his route most happily, and with that fortunate prevision which often waits upon genius. From Gomera, by a course a little south of west, he would run down the trades to the Bahama Islands. From the parallel of about 30° N. nearly to the equator there is a zone of perpetual winds—namely, the north-east trade winds—always moving in the same direction, as steadily as the current of a river, except where they are turned aside by local causes, so that the ships of Columbus were steadily carried to their destination by a law of nature which, in due time, revealed itself to that close observer of her secrets. The

constancy of the wind was one cause of alarm among the crews, for they began to murmur that the provisions would all be exhausted if they had to beat against these unceasing winds on the return voyage. The next event which excited alarm among the pilots was the discovery that the compasses had more than a point of easterly variation. . . . This was observed on the 17th of September, and about 300 miles westward of the meridian of the Azores, when the ships had been eleven days at sea. Soon afterwards the voyagers found themselves surrounded by masses of seaweed, in what is called the Sargasso Sea, and this again aroused their fears. They thought that the ships would get entangled in the beds of weed and become immovable, and that the beds marked the limit of navigation. The cause of this accumulation is well known now. If bits of cork are put into a basin of water, and a circular motion given to it, all the corks will be found crowding together towards the centre of the pool where there is the least motion. The Atlantic Ocean is just such a basin, the Gulf Stream is the whirl, and the Sargasso Sea is in the centre. There Columbus found it, and there it has remained to this day, moving up and down and changing its position according to seasons, storms and winds, but never altering its mean position. . . . As day after day passed, and there was no sign of land, the crews became turbulent and mutinous. Columbus encouraged them with hopes of reward, while he told them plainly that he had come to discover India, and that, with the help of God, he would persevere until he found it. At length, on the 11th of October, towards ten at night, Columbus was on the poop and saw a light. . . . At two next morning, land was distinctly seen. . . . The island, called by the natives Guanahani, and by Columbus San Salvador, has now been ascertained to be Watling Island, one of the Bahamas, 14 miles long by 6 broad, with a brackish lake in the centre, in 24° 10' 30" north latitude. . . . The difference of latitude between Gomera and Watling Island is 235 miles. Course, W. 5° S.; distance 3,114 miles; average distance made good daily, 85'; voyage 35 days. . . . After discovering several smaller islands the fleet came in sight of Cuba on the 27th October, and explored part of the northern coast. Columbus believed it to be Cipango, the island placed on the chart of Toscanelli, between Europe and Asia. . . . Crossing the channel between Cuba and St. Domingo [or Hayti], they anchored in the harbour of St. Nicholas Mole on December 4th. The natives came with presents and the country was enchanting. Columbus . . . named the island ‘Española’ [or Hispaniola]. But with all this peaceful beauty around him he was on the eve of disaster.” The Santa Maria was drifted by a strong current upon a sand bank and hopelessly wrecked. “It was now necessary to leave a small colony on the island. . . . A fort was built and named ‘La Navidad,’ 39 men remaining behind supplied with stores and provisions,” and on Friday, Jan. 4, 1493, Columbus began his homeward voyage. Weathering a dangerous gale, which lasted several days, his little vessels reached the Azores Feb. 17, and arrived at Palos March 15, bearing their marvellous news.—C. R. Markham, *The Sea Fathers*, ch. 2.—The same, *Life of Columbus*, ch. 5.—The statement above that the island of the Bahamas on which



Columbus first landed, and which he called San Salvador, "has now been ascertained to be Watling Island" seems hardly justified. The question between Watling Island, San Salvador or Cat Island, Sumana, or Attwood's Cay, Mariguana, the Grand Turk, and others is still in dispute. Professor Justin Winsor says "the weight of modern testimony seems to favor Watling's Island;" but at the same time he thinks it "probable that men will never quite agree which of the Bahamas it was upon which these startled and exultant Europeans first stepped."—J. Winsor, *Christopher Columbus*, ch. 9.—The same, *Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am.*, v. 2, ch. 1, note B.—Professor John Fiske, says: "All that can be positively asserted of Guanahani is that it was one of the Bahamas; there has been endless discussion as to which one, and the question is not easy to settle. Perhaps the theory of Captain Gustavus Fox, of the United States Navy, is on the whole best supported. Captain Fox maintains that the true Guanahani was the little island now known as Samana or Attwood's Cay."—J. Fiske, *The Discovery of America*, ch. 5 (e. 1).

ALSO IN *U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, Rept.*, 1880, app. 18.

**A. D. 1493.—Papal grant of the New World to Spain.**—"Spain was at this time concerned with the Pope about a most momentous matter. The Genoese, Cristoforo Colombo, arrived at the Spanish court in March, 1493, with the astounding news of the discovery of a new continent. . . . Ferdinand and Isabella thought it wise to secure a title to all that might ensue from their new discovery. The Pope, as Vicar of Christ, was held to have authority to dispose of lands inhabited by the heathen; and by papal Bulls the discoveries of Portugal along the African coast had been secured. The Portuguese showed signs of urging claims to the New World, as being already conveyed to them by the papal grants previously issued in their favor. To remove all cause of dispute, the Spanish monarchs at once had recourse to Alexander VI., who issued two Bulls on May 4 and 5 [1493] to determine the respective rights of Spain and Portugal. In the first, the Pope granted to the Spanish monarchs and their heirs all lands discovered or hereafter to be discovered in the western ocean. In the second, he defined his grant to mean all lands that might be discovered west and south of an imaginary line, drawn from the North to the South Pole, at the distance of a hundred leagues westward of the Azores and Cape de Verd Islands. In the light of our present knowledge we are amazed at this simple means of disposing of a vast extent of the earth's surface." Under the Pope's stupendous patent, Spain was able to claim every part of the American Continent except the Brazilian coast.—M. Creighton, *Hist. of the Papacy during the Reformation*, bk. 5, ch. 6 (e. 3).

ALSO IN E. G. Bourne, *The Demarcation Line of Pope Alexander VI.* (*Fate Rev.*, May, 1892).—J. Fiske, *The Discovery of America*, ch. 6 (e. 1).—J. Gordon, *The Bulls distributing America* (*Am. Soc. of Ch. Hist.*, v. 4).—See, also, below: A. D. 1494.

**A. D. 1493-1496.—The Second Voyage of Columbus.—Discovery of Jamaica and the Caribbees.—Subjugation of Hispaniola.**—"The departure of Columbus on his second voyage of discovery presented a brilliant contrast to his gloomy embarkation at Palos. On

the 25th of September [1493], at the dawn of day, the bay of Cadiz was whitened by his fleet. There were three large ships of heavy burden and fourteen caravels. . . . Before sunrise the whole fleet was under way." Arrived at the Canaries on the 1st of October, Columbus purchased there calves, goats, sheep, hogs, and fowls, with which to stock the island of Hispaniola; also "seeds of oranges, lemons, bergamots, melons, and various orchard fruits, which were thus first introduced into the islands of the west from the Islesperides or Fortunate Islands of the Old World." It was not until the 13th of October that the fleet left the Canaries, and it arrived among the islands since called the Lesser Antilles or Caribbees, on the evening of Nov. 2. Sailing through this archipelago, discovering the larger island of Porto Rico on the way, Columbus reached the eastern extremity of Hispaniola or Hayti on the 22d of November, and arrived on the 27th at La Navidad, where he had left a garrison ten months before. He found nothing but ruin, silence and the marks of death, and learned, after much inquiry, that his unfortunate men, losing all discipline after his departure, had provoked the natives by rapacity and licentiousness until the latter rose against them and destroyed them. Abandoning the scene of this disaster, Columbus found an excellent harbor ten leagues east of Monte Christi and there he began the founding of a city which he named Isabella. "Isabella at the present day is quite overgrown with forests, in the midst of which are still to be seen, partly standing, the pillars of the church, some remains of the king's storehouses, and part of the residence of Columbus, all built of hewn stone." While the foundations of the new city were being laid, Columbus sent back part of his ships to Spain, and undertook an exploration of the interior of the island—the mountains of Cibao—where abundance of gold was promised. Some gold washings were found—far too scanty to satisfy the expectations of the Spaniards; and, as want and sickness soon made their appearance at Isabella, discontent was rife and mutiny afoot before the year had ended. In April, 1494, Columbus set sail with three caravels to revisit the coast of Cuba, for a more extended exploration than he had attempted on the first discovery. "He supposed it to be a continent, and the extreme end of Asia, and if so, by following its shores in the proposed direction he must eventually arrive at Cathay and those other rich and commercial, though semi-barbarous countries, described by Marco Polo." Reports of gold led him southward from Cuba until he discovered the island which he called Santiago, but which has kept its native name, Jamaica, signifying the Island of Springs. Disappointed in the search for gold, he soon returned from Jamaica to Cuba and sailed along its southern coast to very near the western extremity, confirming himself and his followers in the belief that they skirted the shores of Asia and might follow them to the Red Sea, if their ships and stores were equal to so long a voyage. "Two or three days' further sail would have carried Columbus round the extremity of Cuba; would have dispelled his illusion, and might have given an entirely different course to his subsequent discoveries. In his present conviction he lived and died; believing to his last hour that Cuba was the extremity of

the Asiatic continent." Returning eastward, he visited Jamaica again and purposed some further exploration of the Caribbee Islands, when his toils and anxieties overcame him. "He fell into a deep lethargy, resembling death itself. His crew, alarmed at this profound torpor, feared that death was really at hand. They abandoned, therefore, all further prosecution of the voyage; and spreading their sails to the east wind so prevalent in those seas, bore Columbus back, in a state of complete insensibility, to the harbor of Isabella,"—Sept. 4. Recovering consciousness, the admiral was rejoiced to find his brother Bartholomew, from whom he had been separated for years, and who had been sent out to him from Spain, in command of three ships. Otherwise there was little to give pleasure to Columbus when he returned to Isabella. His followers were again disorganized, again at war with the natives, whom they plundered and licentiously abused, and a mischief-making priest had gone back to Spain, along with certain intriguing officers, to make complaints and set enmities astir at the court. Involved in war, Columbus prosecuted it relentlessly, reduced the island to submission and the natives to servitude and misery by heavy exactions. In March 1496 he returned to Spain, to defend himself against the machinations of his enemies, transferring the government of Hispaniola to his brother Bartholomew.—W. Irving, *Life and Voyages of Columbus*, bk. 6-8 (p. 1-2).

ALSO IN H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, v. 1, ch. 2.—J. Winsor, *Christopher Columbus*, ch. 12-14.

**A. D. 1494.—The Treaty of Tordesillas.—Amended Partition of the New World between Spain and Portugal.**—"When speaking or writing of the conquest of America, it is generally believed that the only title upon which were based the conquests of Spain and Portugal was the famous Papal Bull of partition of the Ocean, of 1493. Few modern authors take into consideration that this Bull was amended, upon the petition of the King of Portugal, by the [Treaty of Tordesillas], signed by both powers in 1494, augmenting the portion assigned to the Portuguese in the partition made between them of the Continent of America. The arc of meridian fixed by this treaty as a dividing line, which gave rise, owing to the ignorance of the age, to so many diplomatic congresses and interminable controversies, may now be traced by any student of elementary mathematics. This line . . . runs along the meridian of 47° 32' 56" west of Greenwich. . . . The name Brazil, or 'terra del Brazil,' at that time [the middle of the 16th century] referred only to the part of the continent producing the dye wood so-called. Nearly two centuries later the Portuguese advanced toward the South, and the name Brazil then covered the new possessions they were acquiring."—L. L. Dominguez, *Introd. to "The Conquest of the River Plate"* (*Uaklyt Soc. Pub. No. 81*).

**A. D. 1497.—Discovery of the North American Continent by John Cabot.**—"The achievement of Columbus, revealing the wonderful truth of which the germ may have existed in the imagination of every thoughtful mariner, won [in England] the admiration which belonged to genius that seemed more divine than human; and 'there was great talk of it in all the court of

Henry VII.' A feeling of disappointment remained, that a series of disasters had defeated the wish of the illustrious Genoese to make his voyage of essay under the flag of England. It was, therefore, not difficult for John Cabot, a denizen of Venice, residing at Bristol, to interest that politic king in plans for discovery. On the 5th of March, 1496, he obtained under the great seal a commission empowering himself and his three sons, or either of them, their heirs, or their deputies, to sail into the eastern, western, or northern sea with a fleet of five ships, at their own expense, in search of islands, provinces, or regions hitherto unseen by Christian people; to affix the banners of England on city, island, or continent; and, as vassals of the English crown, to possess and occupy the territories that might be found. It was further stipulated in this 'most ancient American State paper of England,' that the patentees should be strictly bound, on every return, to land at the port of Bristol, and to pay to the king one-fifth part of their gains; while the exclusive right of frequenting all the countries that might be found was reserved to them and to their assigns, without limit of time. Under this patent, which, at the first direction of English enterprise toward America, embodied the worst features of monopoly and commercial restriction, John Cabot, taking with him his son Sebastian, embarked in quest of new islands and a passage to Asia by the north-west. After sailing prosperously, as he reported, for 700 leagues, on the 24th day of June, early in the morning, almost fourteen months before Columbus on his third voyage came in sight of the main, and more than two years before Amerigo Vespucci sailed west of the Canaries, he discovered the western continent, probably in the latitude of about 56° degrees, among the dismal cliffs of Labrador. He ran along the coast for many leagues, it is said even for 300, and landed on what he considered to be the territory of the Grand Cham. But he encountered no human being, although there were marks that the region was inhabited. He planted on the land a large cross with the flag of England, and, from affection for the republic of Venice, he added the banner of St. Mark, which had never been borne so far before. On his homeward voyage he saw on his right hand two islands, which for want of provisions he could not stop to explore. After an absence of three months the great discoverer re-entered Bristol harbor, where due honors awaited him. The king gave him money, and encouraged him to continue his career. The people called him the great admiral; he dressed in silk; and the English, and even Venetians who chanced to be at Bristol, ran after him with such zeal that he could enlist for a new voyage as many as he pleased. . . . On the third day of the month of February next after his return, 'John Kaboto, Venecian,' accordingly obtained a power to take up ships for another voyage, at the rates fixed for those employed in the service of the king, and once more to set sail with as many companions as would go with him of their own will. With this license every trace of John Cabot disappears. He may have died before the summer; but no one knows certainly the time or the place of his end, and it has not even been ascertained in what country this finder of a continent first saw the light."—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S. of Am.* (Author's last Revision),

pt. 1, ch. 1.—In the Critical Essay appended to a chapter on the voyages of the Cabots, in the *Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am.*, there is published, for the first time, an English translation of a dispatch from Raimondo de Soncino, envoy of the Duke of Milan to Henry VII., written Aug. 24, 1497, and giving an account of the voyage from which 'Master John Cabot,' 'a Venetian fellow,' had just returned. This paper was brought to light in 1865, from the State Archives of Milan. Referring to the dispatch, and to a letter, also quoted, from the 'Venetian Calendars,' written Aug. 23, 1497, by Lorenzo Pasqualigo, a merchant in London, to his brothers in Venice, Mr. Charles Deane says: "These letters are sufficient to show that North America was discovered by John Cabot, the name of Sebastian being nowhere mentioned in them, and that the discovery was made in 1497. The place which he first sighted is given on the map of 1544 [a map of Sebastian Cabot, discovered in Germany in 1843] as the north part of Cape Breton Island, on which is inscribed 'prima tierra vista,' which was reached, according to the Legend, on the 24th of June. Pasqualigo, the only one who mentions it, says he coasted 300 leagues. Mr. Brevoort, who accepts the statement, thinks he made the periplus of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, passing out at the Straits of Belle Isle, and thence home. . . . The extensive sailing up and down the coast described by chroniclers from conversations with Sebastian Cabot many years afterwards, though apparently told as occurring on the voyage of discovery—as only one voyage is ever mentioned—must have taken place on a later voyage."—C. Deane, *Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am.*, v. 3, ch. 1, *Crit. Essay*.

Also in R. Biddle, *Memoir of Sebastian Cabot*, ch. 1-8.

A. D. 1497-1498.—The first Voyage of Americus Vesputius.—Misunderstandings and disputes concerning it.—Vindication of the Florentine navigator.—His exploration of 4,000 miles of continental coast.—"Our information concerning Americus Vesputius, from the early part of the year 1496 until after his return from the Portuguese to the Spanish service in the latter part of 1504, rests primarily upon his two famous letters; the one addressed to his old patron Lorenzo di Pier Francesco de' Medici (a cousin of Lorenzo the Magnificent) and written in March or April, 1503, giving an account of his third voyage; the other addressed to his old school-fellow Piero Soderini [then Gonfaloniere of Florence] and dated from Lisbon, September 4, 1504, giving a brief account of four voyages which he had made under various commanders in the capacity of astronomer or pilot. These letters . . . became speedily popular, and many editions were published, more especially in France, Germany, and Italy. . . . The letter to Soderini gives an account of four voyages in which the writer took part, the first two in the service of Spain, the other two in the service of Portugal. The first expedition sailed from Cadiz May 10, 1497, and returned October 15, 1498, after having explored a coast so long as to seem unquestionably that of a continent. This voyage, as we shall see, was concerned with parts of America not visited again until 1513 and 1517. It discovered nothing that was calculated to invest it with much importance in Spain, though it by no means passed without

notice there, as has often been wrongly asserted. Outside of Spain it came to attract more attention, but in an unfortunate way, for a slight but very serious error in proof-reading or editing, in the most important of the Latin versions, caused it after a while to be practically identified with the second voyage, made two years later. This confusion eventually led to most outrageous imputations upon the good name of Americus, which it has been left for the present century to remove. The second voyage of Vesputius was that in which he accompanied Alonso de Ojeda and Juan de la Costa, from May 20, 1499, to June, 1500. They explored the northern coast of South America from some point on what we would now call the north coast of Brazil, as far as the Pearl Coast visited by Columbus in the preceding year; and they went beyond, as far as the Gulf of Maracaiho. Here the squadron seems to have become divided, Ojeda going over to Hispaniola in September, while Vesputius remained cruising till February. . . . It is certainly much to be regretted that in the narrative of his first expedition, Vesputius did not happen to mention the name of the chief commander. . . . However . . . he was writing not for us, but for his friend, and he told Soderini only what he thought would interest him. . . . Of the letter to Soderini the version which has played the most important part in history is the Latin one first published at the press of the little college at Saint-Dié in Lorraine, April 25 (vij K<sup>l</sup> Maij), 1507. . . . It was translated, not from an original text, but from an intermediate French version, which is lost. Of late years, however, we have detected, in an excessively rare Italian text, the original from which the famous Lorraine version was ultimately derived. . . . If now we compare this primitive text with the Latin of the Lorraine version of 1507, we observe that, in the latter, one proper name—the Indian name of a place visited by Americus on his first voyage—has been altered. In the original it is 'Lariab;' in the Latin it has become 'Parias.' This looks like an instance of injudicious editing on the part of the Latin translator, although, of course, it may be a case of careless proof-reading. Lariab is a queer-looking word. It is no wonder that a scholar in his study among the mountains of Lorraine could make nothing of it. If he had happened to be acquainted with the language of the Huastecas, who dwell at that time about the river Panuco—fierce and dreaded enemies of their southern neighbours the Aztecs—he would have known that names of places in that region were apt to end in ab. . . . But as such facts were quite beyond our worthy translator's ken, we cannot much blame him if he felt that such a word as Lariab needed doctoring. Parias (Paria) was known to be the native name of a region on the western shores of the Atlantic, and so Lariab became Parias. As the distance from the one place to the other is more than two thousand miles, this little emendation shifted the scene of the first voyage beyond all recognition, and cast the whole subject into an outer darkness where there has been much groaning and gnashing of teeth. Another curious circumstance came in to confirm this error. On his first voyage, shortly before arriving at Lariab, Vesputius saw an Indian town built over the water, 'like Venice.' He counted 44 large wooden houses, 'like barracks,' supported on huge tree-

trunks and communicating with each other by bridges that could be drawn up in case of danger. This may well have been a village of communal houses of the Chontals on the coast of Tabasco; but such villages were afterwards seen on the Gulf of Maracaibo, and one of them was called Venezuela, or 'Little Venice,' a name since spread over a territory nearly twice as large as France. So the amphibious town described by Vesputius was incontinently moved to Maracaibo, as if there could be only one such place, as if that style of defensive building had not been common enough in many ages and in many parts of the earth, from ancient Switzerland to modern Siam. . . . Thus in spite of the latitudes and longitudes distinctly stated by Vesputius in his letter, did Lariab and the little wooden Venice get shifted from the Gulf of Mexico to the northern coast of South America. Now there is no question that Vesputius in his second voyage, with Ojeda for captain, did sail along that coast, visiting the gulfs of Paria and Maracaibo. This was in the summer of 1499, one year after a part of the same coast had been visited by Columbus. Hence in a later period, long after the actors in these scenes had been gathered unto their fathers, and when people had begun to wonder how the New World could ever have come to be called America instead of Columbia, it was suggested that the first voyage described by Vesputius must be merely a clumsy and fictitious duplicate of the second, and that he invented it and thrust it back from 1499 to 1497, in order that he might be accredited with 'the discovery of the continent' one year in advance of his friend Columbus. It was assumed that he must have written his letter to Soderini with the base intention of supplanting his friend, and that the shabby device was successful. This explanation seemed so simple and intelligible that it became quite generally adopted, and it held its ground until the subject began to be critically studied, and Alexander von Humboldt showed, about sixty years ago, that the first naming of America occurred in no such way as had been supposed. As soon as we refrain from projecting our modern knowledge of geography into the past, as soon as we pause to consider how these great events appeared to the actors themselves, the absurdity of this accusation against Amerigo becomes evident. We are told that he falsely pretended to have visited Paria and Maracaibo in 1497, in order to claim priority over Columbus in the discovery of 'the continent.' What continent? When Vesputius wrote that letter to Soderini, neither he nor anybody else suspected that what we now call America had been discovered. The only continent of which there could be any question, so far as supplanting Columbus was concerned, was Asia. But in 1504 Columbus was generally supposed to have discovered the continent of Asia, by his new route, in 1492. . . . It was M. Varnhagen who first turned inquiry on this subject in the right direction. . . . Having taken a correct start by simply following the words of Vesputius himself, from a primitive text, without reference to any preconceived theories or traditions, M. Varnhagen finds that Amerigo in his first voyage made land on the northern coast of Honduras; "that he sailed around Yucatan, and found his aquatic village of communal houses, his little wooden Venice, on the shore of Tabasco. Thence,

after a fight with the natives in which a few tawny prisoners were captured and carried on board the caravels, Vesputius seems to have taken a straight course to the Huasteca country by Tampico, without touching at points in the region subject or tributary to the Aztec confederacy. This Tampico country was what Vesputius understood to be called Lariab. He again gives the latitude definitely and correctly as 23° N., and he mentions a few interesting circumstances. He saw the natives roasting a "dreadfully ugly animal," of which he gives what seems to be "an excellent description of the iguana, the flesh of which is to this day an important article of food in tropical America. . . . After leaving this country of Lariab the ships kept still to the northwest for a short distance, and then followed the windings of the coast for 870 leagues. . . . After traversing the 870 leagues of crooked coast, the ships found themselves 'in the finest harbour in the world' [which M. Varnhagen supposed, at first, to have been in Chesapeake Bay, but afterwards reached conclusions pointing to the neighbourhood of Capo Cafaveral, on the Florida coast]. It was in June, 1498, thirteen months since they had started from Spain. . . . They spent seven-and-thirty days in this unrivalled harbour, preparing for the home voyage, and found the natives very hospitable. These red men courted the aid of the white strangers," in an attack which they wished to make upon a fierce race of cannibals, who inhabited certain islands some distance out to sea. The Spaniards agreed to the expedition, and sailed late in August, taking seven of the friendly Indians for guides. "After a week's voyage they fell in with the islands, some peopled, others uninhabited, evidently the Bermudas, 600 miles from Cape Hatteras as the crow flies. The Spaniards landed on an island called Ili, and had a brisk fight," resulting in the capture of more than 200 prisoners. Seven of these were given to the Indian guides, who paddled home with them. "We also [wrote Vesputius] set sail for Spain, with 232 prisoners, slaves; and arrived in the port of Cadiz on the 15th day of October, 1498, where we were well received and sold our slaves. . . . The obscurity in which this voyage has so long been enveloped is due chiefly to the fact that it was not followed up till many years had elapsed, and the reason for this neglect impresses upon us forcibly the impossibility of understanding the history of the Discovery of America unless we bear in mind all the attendant circumstances. One might at first suppose that a voyage which revealed some 4,000 miles of the coast of North America would have attracted much attention in Spain and have become altogether too famous to be soon forgotten. Such an argument, however, loses sight of the fact that these early voyagers were not trying to 'discover America.' There was nothing to astonish them in the existence of 4,000 miles of coast line on this side of the Atlantic. To their minds it was simply the coast of Asia, about which they knew nothing except from Marco Polo, and the natural effect of such a voyage as this would be simply to throw discredit upon that traveller."—J. Fiske, *The Discovery of America*, ch. 7 (p. 2).

ALSO IN: C. E. Lester and A. Foster, *Life and Voyages of Americus Vesputius*, pt. 1, ch. 7.—J. Winsor, *Christopher Columbus*, ch. 15.

**A. D. 1498.—Voyage and Discoveries of Sebastian Cabot.**—The ground of English claims in the New World.—“The son of John Cabot, Sebastian, is not mentioned in this patent [issued by Henry VII., Feb. 3, 1498], as he had been in that of 1496. Yet he alone profited by it. For the father is not again mentioned in connection with the voyage. . . . Sebastian was now, if Humboldt's supposition is true that he was born in 1477, a young man of about 20 or 21 years of age. And as he had become proficient in astronomy and mathematics, and had gained naval experience in the voyage he had made in company with his father; and as he knew better than any one else his father's views, and also the position of the newly discovered regions, he may now have well appeared to Henry as a fit person for the command of another expedition to the northwest. Two ships, manned with 300 mariners and volunteers, were ready for him early in the spring of 1498; and he sailed with them from Bristol, probably in the beginning of the month of May. We have no certain information regarding his route. But he appears to have directed his course again to the country which he had seen the year before on the voyage with his father, our present Labrador. He sailed along the coast of this country so far north that, even in the month of July, he encountered much ice. Observing at the same time, to his great displeasure, that the coast was trending to the east, he resolved to give up a further advance to the north, and returned in a southern direction. At Newfoundland, he probably came to anchor in some port, and refreshed his men, and refitted his vessels after their Arctic hardships. . . . He probably was the first fisherman on the banks or shores of Newfoundland, which through him became famous in Europe. Sailing from Newfoundland southwest, he kept the coast in view as much as possible, on his right side, ‘always with the intent to find a passage and open water to India.’ . . . After having rounded Cape Cod, he must have felt fresh hope. He saw a coast running to the west, and open water before him in that direction. It is therefore nearly certain that he entered somewhat that broad gulf, in the interior corner of which lies the harbor of New York. . . . From a statement contained in the work of Peter Martyr it appears . . . certain that Cabot landed on some places of the coast along which he sailed. This author, relating a conversation which he had with his friend Cabot, on the subject of his voyage of 1498, says that Cabot told him ‘he had found on most of the places copper or brass among the aborigines.’ . . . From another authority we learn that he captured some of these aborigines and brought them to England, where they lived and were seen a few years after his return by the English chronicler, Robert Fabian. It is not stated at what place he captured those Indians; but it was not customary with the navigators of that time to take on board the Indians until near the time of their leaving the country. Cabot's Indians, therefore, were probably captured on some shore south of New York harbor. . . . The southern terminus of his voyage is pretty well ascertained. He himself informed his friend Peter Martyr, that he went as far south as about the latitude of the Strait of Gibraltar, that is . . . say, about 36° north latitude, which is near that of Cape Hatteras. . . . On their return from their first voyage of 1497,

the Cabots believed that they had discovered portions of Asia and so proclaimed it. But the more extensive discoveries of the second voyage corrected the views of Sebastian, and revealed to him nothing but a wild and barbarous coast, stretching through 80 degrees of latitude, from 67½° to 36°. The discovery of this impassable barrier across his passage to Cathay, as he often complained, was a sore displeasure to him. Instead of the rich possessions of China, which he hoped to reach, he was arrested by a New found land, savage and uncultivated. A spirited German author, Dr. G. M. Asher, in his life of Henry Hudson, published in London in 1860, observes: ‘The displeasure of Cabot involves the scientific discovery of a new world. He was the first to recognize that a new and unknown continent was lying, as one vast barrier, between Western Europe and Eastern Asia.’ . . . When Cabot made proposals in the following year, 1499, for another expedition to the same regions, he was supported neither by the king nor the merchants. For several years the scheme for the discovery of a north-western route to Cathay was not much favored in England. Nevertheless, the voyage of this gifted and enterprising youth along the entire coast of the present United States, nay along the whole extent of that great continent, in which now the English race and language prevail and flourish, has always been considered as the true beginning, the foundation and cornerstone, of all the English claims and possessions in the northern half of America.”—J. G. Kohl, *Hist. of the Discovery of Maine*, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: R. Biddle, *Memoir of Sebastian Cabot*, ch. 1-10.—J. F. Nicholls, *Life of Sebastian Cabot*, ch. 5.

**A. D. 1498-1505.—The Third and Fourth Voyages of Columbus.**—Discovery of Trinidad, the northern coast of S. America, the shores of Central America and Panama.—When Columbus reached Spain in June, 1496, “Ferdinand and Isabella received him kindly, gave him new honors and promised him other outfits. Enthusiasm, however, baddied out and delays took place. The reports of the returning ships did not correspond with the pictures of Marco Polo, and the new-found world was thought to be a very poor India after all. Most people were of this mind; though Columbus was not disheartened, and the public treasury was readily opened for a third voyage. Coronel sailed early in 1498 with two ships, and Columbus followed with six, embarking at San Lucas on the 30th of May. He now discovered Trinidad (July 31), which he named either from its three peaks, or from the Holy Trinity; struck the northern coast of South America, and skirted what was later known as the Pearl coast, going as far as the Island of Margarita. He wondered at the roaring fresh waters which the Orinoco pours into the Gulf of Pearls, as he called it, and he half believed that its exuberant tide came from the terrestrial paradise. He touched the southern coast of Hayti on the 30th of August. Here already his colonists had established a fortified post, and founded the town of Santo Domingo. His brother Bartholomew had ruled energetically during the Admiral's absence, but he had not prevented a revolt, which was headed by Roldan. Columbus on his arrival found the insurgents still defiant, but he was able after a while to reconcile them, and he even succeeded

in attaching Roldan warmly to his interests. Columbus' absence from Spain, however, left his good name without sponsors; and to satisfy detractors, a new commissioner was sent over with enlarged powers, even with authority to supersede Columbus in general command, if necessary. This emissary was Francisco de Bobadilla, who arrived at Santo Domingo with two caravels on the 23d of August, 1500, finding Diego in command, his brother, the Admiral, being absent. An issue was at once made. Diego refused to accede to the commissioner's orders till Columbus returned to judge the case himself; so Bobadilla assumed charge of the crown property violently, took possession of the Admiral's house, and when Columbus returned, he with his brother was arrested and put in irons. In this condition the prisoners were placed on shipboard, and sailed for Spain. The captain of the ship offered to remove the manacles; but Columbus would not permit it, being determined to land in Spain bound as he was; and so he did. The effect of his degradation was to his advantage; sovereigns and people were shocked at the sight; and Ferdinand and Isabella hastened to make amends by receiving him with renewed favor. It was soon apparent that everything reasonable would be granted him by the monarchs, and that he could have all he might wish short of receiving a new lease of power in the islands, which the sovereigns were determined to see pacified at least before Columbus should again assume government of them. The Admiral had not forgotten his vow to wrest the Holy Sepulchre from the Infidel; but the monarchs did not accede to his wish to undertake it. Disappointed in this, he proposed a new voyage; and getting the royal countenance for this scheme, he was supplied with four vessels of from fifty to seventy tons each. . . . He sailed from Cadiz, May 9, 1502, accompanied by his brother Bartholomew and his son Fernando. The vessels reached San Domingo June 29. Bobadilla, whose rule of a year and a half had been an unhappy one, had given place to Nicholas de Ovando; and the fleet which brought the new governor — with Maldonado, Las Casas and others — now lay in the harbor waiting to receive Bobadilla for the return voyage. Columbus had been instructed to avoid Hispaniola; but now that one of his vessels leaked, and he needed to make repairs, he sent a boat ashore, asking permission to enter the harbor. He was refused, though a storm was impending. He sheltered his vessels as best he could, and rode out the gale. The fleet which had on board Bobadilla and Roldan, with their ill-gotten gains, was wrecked, and these enemies of Columbus were drowned. The Admiral found a small harbor where he could make his repairs; and then, July 14, sailed westward to find, as he supposed, the richer portions of India. . . . A landing was made on the coast of Honduras, August 14. Three days later the explorers landed again fifteen leagues farther east, and took possession of the country for Spain. Still east they went; and, in gratitude for safety after a long storm, they named a cape which they rounded, *Gracias à Dios* — a name still preserved at the point where the coast of Honduras begins to trend southward. Columbus was now lying ill on his bed, placed on deck, and was half the time in reverie. Still the vessels coasted south,"

along and beyond the shores of Costa Rica; then turned with the bend of the coast to the north-east, until they reached Porto Bello, as we call it, where they found houses and orchards, and passed on "to the farthest spot of Bastidas' exploring, who had, in 1501, sailed westward along the northern coast of South America." There turning back, Columbus attempted to found a colony at Veraguas, on the Costa Rica coast, where signs of gold were tempting. But the gold proved scanty, the natives hostile, and the Admiral, withdrawing his colony, sailed away. "He abandoned one worm-eaten caravel at Porto Bello, and, reaching Jamaica, beached two others. A year of disappointment, grief, and want followed. Columbus clung to his wrecked vessels. His crew alternately mutinied at his side, and roved about the island. Ovando, at Hispaniola, heard of his straits, but only tardily and scantily relieved him. The discontented were finally humbled; and some ships, despatched by the Admiral's agent in Santo Domingo, at last reached him and brought him and his companions to that place, where Ovando received him with ostentatious kindness, lodging him in his house till Columbus departed for Spain, Sept. 12, 1504." Arriving in Spain in November, disheartened, broken with disease, neglected, it was not until the following May that he had strength enough to go to the court at Segovia, and then only to be coldly received by King Ferdinand — Isabella being dead. "While still hope was deferred, the infirmities of age and a life of hardships brought Columbus to his end; and on Ascension Day, the 20th of May, 1506, he died, with his son Diego and a few devoted friends by his bedside."—*J. Winsor, Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v. 2, ch. 1.*

ALSO IN: H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States, v. 1, ch. 2 and 4.*—W. Irving, *Life and Voyages of Columbus, bk. 10-18 (v. 2).*

**A. D. 1490-1500.—The Voyages and Discoveries of Ojeda and Pinzon.—The Second Voyage of Amerigo Vespucci.**—One of the most daring and resolute of the adventurers who accompanied Columbus on his second voyage (in 1493) was Alonso de Ojeda. Ojeda quarrelled with the Admiral and returned to Spain in 1498. Soon after arrival, "he was provided by the Bishop Fonseca, Columbus' enemy, with a fragment of the map which the Admiral had sent to Ferdinand and Isabella, showing the discoveries which he had made in his last voyage. With this assistance Ojeda set sail for South America, accompanied by the pilot, Juan de la Cosa, who had accompanied Columbus in his first great voyage in 1492, and of whom Columbus complained that, 'being a clever man, he went about saying that he knew more than he did,' and also by Amerigo Vespucci. They set sail on the 20th of May, 1499, with four vessels, and after a passage of 27 days came in sight of the continent, 200 leagues east of the Orinoco. At the end of June, they landed on the shores of Surinam, in six degrees of north latitude, and proceeding west saw the mouths of the Essequibo and Orinoco. Passing the Boca del Drago of Trinidad, they coasted westward till they reached the Capo de la Vela in Granada. It was in this voyage that was discovered the Gulf to which Ojeda gave the name of Venezuela, or Little Venice, on account of the cabins built on piles over the water, a mode of life which brought to

his mind the water-city of the Adriatic. From the American coast Ojeda went to the Caribbee Islands, and on the 5th of September reached Yaguimo, in Hispaniola, where he raised a revolt against the authority of Columbus. His plans, however, were frustrated by Roldan and Escobar, the delegates of Columbus, and he was compelled to withdraw from the island. On the 5th of February, 1500, he returned, carrying with him to Cadiz an extraordinary number of slaves, from which he realized an enormous sum of money. At the beginning of December, 1499, the same year in which Ojeda set sail on his last voyage, another companion of Columbus, in his first voyage, Vicente Yañez Pinzon, sailed from Paños, was the first to cross the line on the American side of the Atlantic, and on the 20th of January, 1500, discovered Cape St. Augustine, to which he gave the name of Cabo Santa Maria de la Consolacion, whence returning northward he followed the westerly trending coast, and so discovered the mouth of the Amazon, which he named Paricuru. Within a month after his departure from Paños, he was followed from the same port and on the same route by Diego de Lepe, who was the first to discover, at the mouth of the Oronoco, by means of a closed vessel, which only opened when it reached the bottom of the water, that, at a depth of eight fathoms and a half, the two lowest fathoms were salt water, but all above was fresh. Lepe also made the observation that beyond Cape St. Augustine, which he doubled, as well as Pinzon, the coast of Brazil trended south-west.—H. H. Major, *Life of Prince Henry of Portugal*, ch. 19.

Also 18: W. Irving, *Life and Voyages of Columbus*, v. 3, ch. 1-3.

**A. D. 1500.—Voyages of the Cortereals to the far North, and of Bastidas to the Isthmus of Darien.**—"The Portuguese did not overlook the north while making their important discoveries to the south. Two vessels, probably in the spring of 1500, were sent out under Gaspar Cortereal. No journal or chart of the voyage is now in existence, hence little is known of its object or results. Still more dim is a previous voyage ascribed by Cordeiro to João Vaz Cortereal, father of Gaspar. . . . Touching at the Azores, Gaspar Cortereal, possibly following Cabot's charts, struck the coast of Newfoundland north of Cape Race, and sailing north discovered a land which he called Terra Verde, perhaps Greenland, and was stopped by ice at a river which he named Rio Nevado, whose location is unknown. Cortereal returned to Lisbon before the end of 1500. . . . In October of this same year Rodrigo de Bastidas sailed from Cadiz with two vessels. Touching the shores of South America near Isla Verde, which lies between Gundulape and the main land, he followed the coast westward to El Retrete, or perhaps Nombre de Dios on the Isthmus of Darien, in about 9° 30' north latitude. Returning he was wrecked on Española toward the end of 1501, and reached Cadiz in September, 1502. This being the first authentic voyage by Europeans to the territory herein defined as the Pacific States, such incidents as are known will be given hereafter."—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, v. 1, p. 113.—"We have Las Casas's authority for saying that Bastidas was a humane man toward the Indians. Indeed, he afterwards lost his life by this humanity; for, when governor of Santa

Martha, not consenting to harass the Indians, he so alienated his men that a conspiracy was formed against him, and he was murdered in his bed. The renowned Vasco Nuñez [de Balboa] was in this expedition, and the knowledge he gained there had the greatest influence on the fortunes of his varied and eventful life."—Sir A. Helys, *Spanish Conquest in Am.*, bk. 5, ch. 1.

Also 18: J. G. Kohl, *Hist. of the Discovery of Maine*, ch. 5.—H. Biddle, *Memoir of Sebastian Cabot*, bk. 2, ch. 3-5.—See, also, **NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1501-1578.**

**A. D. 1500-1514.—Voyage of Cabral.—The Third Voyage of Americus Vesputius.—Exploration of the Brazilian coast for the King of Portugal.—Curious evolution of the continental name "America."**—"Affairs now became curiously complicated. King Emanuel of Portugal intrusted to Pedro Alvarez de Cabral the command of a fleet for Hindustan, to follow up the work of Gama and establish a Portuguese centre of trade on the Malabar coast. This fleet of 13 vessels, carrying about 1,200 men, sailed from Lisbon March 9, 1500. After passing the Cape Verde Islands, March 22, for some reason not clearly known, whether driven by stormy weather or seeking to avoid the calms that were apt to be troublesome on the Guinea coast, Cabral took a somewhat more westerly course than he realized, and on April 22, after a weary progress averaging less than 60 miles per day, he found himself on the coast of Brazil not far beyond the limit reached by Lepe. . . . Approaching it in such a way Cabral felt sure that this coast must fall to the east of the papal meridian. Accordingly on May day, at Porto Seguro in latitude 16° 30' S., he took formal possession of the country for Portugal, and sent Gaspar de Lemos in one of his ships back to Lisbon with the news. On May 23 Cabral weighed anchor and stood for the Cape of Good Hope. . . . Cabral called the land he had found Vera Cruz, a name which presently became Santa Cruz; but when Lemos arrived in Lisbon with the news he had with him some gorgeous parquets, and among the earliest names on old maps of the Brazilian coast we find 'Land of Parquets' and 'Land of the Holy Cross.' The land lay obviously so far to the east that Spain could not deny that at last there was something for Portugal out in the 'ocean sea.' Much interest was felt at Lisbon. King Emanuel began to prepare an expedition for exploring this new coast, and wished to secure the services of some eminent pilot and cosmographer familiar with the western waters. Overtures were made to Americus, a fact which proves that he had already won a high reputation. The overtures were accepted, for what reason we do not know, and soon after his return from the voyage with Ojeda, probably in the autumn of 1500, Americus passed from the service of Spain into that of Portugal. . . . On May 14, 1501, Vesputius, who was evidently principal pilot and guiding spirit in this voyage under unknown skies, set sail from Lisbon with three caravels. It is not quite clear who was chief captain, but M. Varnhagen has found reasons for believing that it was a certain Don Nuno Manuel. The first halt was made on the African coast at Cape Verde, the first week in June. . . . After 67 days of 'the vilest weather ever seen by man' they reached the coast of Brazil in latitude about 5° S., on the evening

of the 16th of August, the festival-day of San Roque, whose name was accordingly given to the cape before which they dropped anchor. From this point they slowly followed the coast to the southward, stopping now and then to examine the country. . . . It was not until All Saints day, the first of November, that they reached the bay in latitude 13° S., which is still known by the name which they gave it, *Bahia de Todos Santos*. On New Year's day, 1502, they arrived at the noble bay where 54 years later the chief city of Brazil was founded. They would seem to have mistaken it for the mouth of another huge river, like some that had already been seen in this strange world; for they called it *Rio de Janeiro* (River of January). Thence by February 15 they had passed Cape Santa Maria, when they left the coast and took a southeasterly course out into the ocean. Amerigo gives no satisfactory reason for this change of direction. . . . Perhaps he may have looked into the mouth of the river *La Plata*, which is a bay more than a hundred miles wide; and the sudden westward trend of the shore may have led him to suppose that he had reached the end of the continent. At any rate, he was now in longitude more than twenty degrees west of the meridian of Cape San Roque, and therefore unquestionably out of Portuguese waters. Clearly there was no use in going on and discovering lands which could belong only to Spain. This may account, I think, for the change of direction." The voyage southeastwardly was pursued until the little fleet had reached the icy and rocky coast of the island of South Georgia, in latitude 54° S. It was then decided to turn homeward. "Vespucius . . . headed straight N. N. E. through the huge ocean, for Sierra Leone, and the distance of more than 4,000 miles was made — with wonderful accuracy, though Vespucius says nothing about that — in 33 days. . . . Thence, after some further delay, to Lisbon, where they arrived on the 7th of September, 1502. . . . Among all the voyages made during that eventful period there was none that as a feat of navigation surpassed this third of Vespucius, and there was none, except the first of Columbus, that outranked it in historical importance. For it was not only a voyage into the remotest stretches of the Sea of Darkness, but it was preëminently an incursion into the antipodal world of the Southern hemisphere. . . . A coast of continental extent, beginning so near the meridian of the Cape Verde islands and running southwesterly to latitude 35° S. and perhaps beyond, did not fit into anybody's scheme of things. . . . It was land unknown to the ancients, and Vespucius was right in saying that he had beheld there things by the thousand which Pliny had never mentioned. It was not strange that he should call it a 'New World,' and in meeting with this phrase, on this first occasion in which it appears in any document with reference to any part of what we now call America, the reader must be careful not to clothe it with the meaning which it wears in our modern eyes. In using the expression 'New World' Vespucius was not thinking of the Florida coast which he had visited on a former voyage, nor of the 'islands of India' discovered by Columbus, nor even of the Pearl Coast which he had followed after the Admiral in exploring. The expression occurs in his letter to Lorenzo

de'Medici, written from Lisbon in March or April, 1503, relating solely to this third voyage. The letter begins as follows: 'I have formerly written to you at sufficient length about my return from those new countries which in the ships and at the expense and command of the most gracious King of Portugal we have sought and found. It is proper to call them a new world.' Observe that it is only the new countries visited on this third voyage, the countries from Cape San Roque southward, that Vespucius thinks it proper to call a new world, and here is his reason for so calling them: 'Since among our ancestors there was no knowledge of them, and to all who hear of the affair it is most novel. For it transcends the ideas of the ancients, since most of them say that beyond the equator to the south there is no continent, but only the sea which they called the Atlantic, and if any of them asserted the existence of a continent there, they found many reasons for refusing to consider it a habitable country. But this last voyage of mine has proved that this opinion of theirs was erroneous and in every way contrary to the facts.' . . . This expression 'Novus Mundus,' thus occurring in a private letter, had a remarkable career. Early in June, 1503, about the time when Amerigo was starting on his fourth voyage, Lorenzo died. By the beginning of 1504, a Latin version of the letter [translated by Giovanni Giocondo] was printed and published, with the title 'Mundus Novus.' . . . The little four-leaved tract, 'Mundus Novus,' turned out to be the great literary success of the day. M. Harisse has described at least eleven Latin editions probably published in the course of 1504, and by 1506 not less than eight editions of German versions had been issued. Intense curiosity was aroused by this announcement of the existence of a populous land beyond the equator and unknown (could such a thing be possible) to the ancients, — who did know something, at least, about the eastern parts of the Asiatic continent which Columbus was supposed to have reached. The "Novus Mundus," so named, began soon to be represented on maps and globes, generally as a great island or quasi-continent lying on and below the equator. "Europe, Asia and Africa were the three parts of the earth [previously known], and so this opposite region, hitherto unknown, but mentioned by Mela and indicated by Ptolemy, was the Fourth Part. We can now begin to understand the intense and wildly absorbing interest with which people read the brief story of the third voyage of Vespucius, and we can see that in the nature of that interest there was nothing calculated to bring it into comparison with the work of Columbus. The two navigators were not regarded as rivals in doing the same thing, but as men who had done two very different things; and to give credit to one was by no means equivalent to withholding credit from the other." In 1507, Martin Waldseemüller, professor of geography at Saint-Dié, published a small treatise entitled "Cosmographie Introductio," with that second of the two known letters of Vespucius — the one addressed to Soderini, of which an account is given above (A. D. 1497-1498) — appended to it. "In this rare book occurs the first suggestion of the name America. After having treated of the division of the earth's inhabited surface into three parts — Europe, Asia, and Africa — Waldseemüller



speaks of the discovery of a Fourth Part," and says: "Wherefore I do not see what is rightly to hinder us from calling it Amerige or America, i. e., the land of Americus, after its discoverer Americus, a man of sagacious mind, since both Europe and Asia have got their names from women." . . . Such were the winged words but for which, as M. Harisse reminds us, the western hemisphere might have come to be known as Atlantis, or Ilesperides, or Santa Cruz, or New India, or perhaps Columbia. . . . In about a quarter of a century the first stage in the development of the naming of America had been completed. That stage consisted of five distinct steps: 1. Americus called the regions visited by him beyond the equator 'a new world' because they were unknown to the ancients; 2. Giocondo made this striking phrase 'Mundus Novus' into a title for his translation of the letter. . . . ; 3. the name Mundus Novus got placed upon several maps as an equivalent for Terra Sanctæ Crucis, or what we call Brazil; 4. the suggestion was made that Mundus Novus was the Fourth Part of the earth, and might properly be named America after its discoverer; 5. the name America thus got placed upon several maps [the first, so far as known, being a map ascribed to Leonardo da Vinci and published about 1514, and the second a globe made in 1515 by Johann Schöner, at Nuremberg] as an equivalent for what we call Brazil, and sometimes came to stand alone as an equivalent for what we call South America, but still signified only a part of the dry land beyond the Atlantic to which Columbus had led the way. . . . This wider meaning [of South America] became all the more firmly established as its narrower meaning was usurped by the name Brazil. Three centuries before the time of Columbus the red dye-wood called brazil-wood was an article of commerce, under that same name, in Italy and Spain. It was one of the valuable things brought from the East, and when the Portuguese found the same dye-wood abundant in those tropical forests that had seemed so beautiful to Vespuccius, the name Brazil soon became fastened upon the country and helped to set free the name America from its local associations." When, in time, and by slow degrees, the great fact was learned, that all the lands found beyond the Atlantic by Columbus and his successors, formed part of one continental system, and were all to be embraced in the conception of a New World, the name which had become synonymous with New World was then naturally extended to the whole. The evolutionary process of the naming of the western hemisphere as a whole was thus made complete in 1541, by Mercator, who spread the name America in large letters upon a globe which he constructed that year, so that part of it appeared upon the northern and part upon the southern continent.—J. Fiske, *The Discovery of America*, ch. 7 (p. 2).

ALSO IN: W. B. Seafie, *America: Its Geographical History*, sect. 4.—R. H. Major, *Life of Prince Henry of Portugal*, ch. 19.—J. Winsor, *Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am.*, v. 2, ch. 2, notes.—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, v. 1, pp. 99-112, and 123-125.

A. D. 1501-1504.—Portuguese, Norman and Breton fishermen on the Newfoundland Banks. See NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1501-1578.

A. D. 1502.—The Second Voyage of Ojeda.—The first voyage of Alonzo de Ojeda, from which he returned to Spain in June 1500, was profitable to nothing but his reputation as a bold and enterprising explorer. By way of reward, he was given "a grant of land in Hispaniola, and likewise the government of Coquibacoa, which place he had discovered [and which he had called Venezuela]. He was authorized to fit out a number of ships at his own expense and to prosecute discoveries on the coast of Terra Firma. . . . With four vessels, Ojeda set sail for the Canaries, in 1502, and thence proceeded to the Gulf of Paria, from which locality he found his way to Coquibacoa. Not liking this poor country, he sailed on to the Bay of Honda, where he determined to found his settlement, which was, however, destined to be of short duration. Provisions very soon became scarce; and one of his partners, who had been sent to procure supplies from Jamaica, failed to return until Ojeda's followers were almost in a state of mutiny. The result was that the whole colony set sail for Hispaniola, taking the governor with them in chains. All that Ojeda gained by his expedition was that he at length came off winner in a lawsuit, the costs of which, however, left him a ruined man."—R. G. Watson, *Spanish and Portuguese S. Am.*, bk. 1, ch. 1.

A. D. 1503-1504.—The Fourth Voyage of Americus Vespuccius.—First Settlement in Brazil.—In June, 1503, "Amerigo sailed again from Lisbon, with six ships. The object of this voyage was to discover a certain island called Meleha, which was supposed to lie west of Calicut, and to be as famous a mart in the commerce of the Indian world as Cadiz was in Europe. They made the Cape de Verdes, and then, contrary to the judgment of Vespucci and of all the fleet, the Commander persisted in standing for Serra Leon." The Commander's ship was lost, and Vespucci, with one vessel, only, reached the coast of the New World, finding a port which is thought to have been Bahia. Here "they waited above two months in vain expectation of being joined by the rest of the squadron. Having lost all hope of this they coasted on for 260 leagues to the Southward, and there took port again in 18° S. 35' W. of the meridian of Lisbon. Here they remained five months, upon good terms with the natives, with whom some of the party penetrated forty leagues into the interior; and here they erected a fort, in which they left 24 men who had been saved from the Commander's ship. They gave them 12 guns, besides other arms, and provisions for six months; then loaded with brazil [wood], sailed homeward and returned in safety. . . . The honour, therefore, of having formed the first settlement in this country is due to Amerigo Vespucci. It does not appear that any further attention was as this time paid to it. . . . But the cargo of brazil which Vespucci had brought home tempted private adventurers, who were content with peaceful gains, to trade thither for that valuable wood; and this trade became so well known, that in consequence the coast and the whole country obtained the name of Brazil, notwithstanding the holier appellation [Santa Cruz] which Cabral had given it."—R. Southey, *Hist. of Brazil*, v. 1, ch. 1.

A. D. 1509-1511.—The Expeditions of Ojeda and Nicuesa to the Isthmus.—The Set-

tlement at Darien. — "For several years after his ruinous, though successful lawsuit, we lose all traces of Alonzo de Ojeda, excepting that we are told he made another voyage to Coquibacoa [Venezuela], in 1505. No record remains of this expedition, which seems to have been equally unprofitable with the preceding, for we find him, in 1508, in the island of Hispaniola as poor in purse, though as proud in spirit, as ever. . . . About this time the cupidity of King Ferdinand was greatly excited by the accounts by Columbus of the gold mines of Veragua, in which the admiral fancied he had discovered the Anrea Chersonesus of the ancients, whence King Solomon procured the gold used in building the temple of Jerusalem. Subsequent voyagers had corroborated the opinion of Columbus as to the general riches of the coast of Terra Firma; King Ferdinand resolved, therefore, to found regular colonies along that coast, and to place the whole under some capable commander." Ojeda was recommended for this post, but found a competitor in one of the gentlemen of the Spanish court, Diego de Nicuesa. "King Ferdinand avoided the dilemma by favoring both; not indeed by furnishing them with ships and money, but by granting patents and dignities, which cost nothing, and might bring rich returns. He divided that part of the continent which lies along the Isthmus of Darien into two provinces, the boundary line running through the Gulf of Uraba. The eastern part, extending to Cape de la Vela, was called New Andalusia, and the government of it given to Ojeda. The other to the west [called Castilla del Oro], including Veragua, and reaching to Cape Gracias a Dios, was assigned to Nicuesa. The island of Jamaica was given to the two governors in common, as a place whence to draw supplies of provisions." Slender means for the equipment of Ojeda's expedition were supplied by the veteran pilot, Juan de la Cosa, who accompanied him as his lieutenant. Nicuesa was more amply provided. The rival armaments arrived at San Domingo about the same time (in 1509), and much quarreling between the two commanders ensued. Ojeda found a notary in San Domingo, Martin Fernandez de Enciso, who had money which he consented to invest in the enterprise, and who promised to follow him with an additional ship-load of recruits and supplies. Under this arrangement Ojeda made ready to sail in advance of his competitor, embarking Nov. 10, 1509. Among those who sailed with him was Francisco Pizarro, the future conqueror of Peru. Ojeda, by his energy, gained time enough to nearly ruin his expedition before Nicuesa reached the scene; for, having landed at Carthagena, he made war upon the natives, pursued them recklessly into the interior of the country, with 70 men, and was overwhelmed by the desperate savages, escaping with only one companion from their poisoned arrows. His faithful friend, the pilot, Juan de la Cosa, was among the slain, and Ojeda himself, hiding in the forest, was nearly dead of hunger and exposure when found and rescued by a searching party from his ships. At this juncture the fleet of Nicuesa made its appearance. Jealousies were forgotten in a common rage against the natives and the two expeditions were joined in an attack on the Indian villages which spared nothing. Nicuesa then proceeded to Veragua, while Ojeda founded a town, which he called San Sebastian,

at the east end of the Gulf of Uraba. Incessantly harassed by the natives, terrified by the effects of the poison which these used in their warfare, and threatened with starvation by the rapid exhaustion of its supplies, the settlement lost courage and hope. Enciso and his promised ship were waited for in vain. At length there came a vessel which certain piratical adventurers at Hispaniola had stolen, and which brought some welcome provisions, eagerly bought at an exorbitant price. Ojeda, half recovered from a poisoned wound, which he had treated heroically with red-hot plates of iron, engaged the pirates to convey him to Hispaniola, for the procuring of supplies. The voyage was a disastrous one, resulting in shipwreck on the coast of Cuba and a month of desperate wandering in the morasses of the island. Ojeda survived all these perils and sufferings, made his way to Jamaica, and from Jamaica to San Domingo, found that his partner Enciso had sailed for the colony long before, with abundant supplies, but could learn nothing more. Nor could he obtain for himself any means of returning to San Sebastian, or of dispatching relief to the place. Sick, penniless and disheartened, he went into a convent and died. Meantime the despairing colonists at San Sebastian waited until death had made them few enough to be all taken on board of the two little brigantines which were left to them; then they sailed away, Pizarro in command. One of the brigantines soon went down in a squall; the other made its way to the harbor of Carthagena, where it found the tardy Enciso, searching for his colony. Enciso, under his commission, now took command, and insisted upon going to San Sebastian. There the old experiences were soon renewed, and even Enciso was ready to abandon the deadly place. The latter had brought with him a needy cavalier, Vasco Nuñez de Balboa—so needy that he smuggled himself on board Enciso's ship in a cask to escape his creditors. Vasco Nuñez, who had coasted this region with Bastidas, in 1500, now advised a removal of the colony to Darien, on the opposite coast of the Gulf of Uraba. His advice, which was followed, proved good, and the hopes of the settlers were raised; but Enciso's modes of government proved irksome to them. Then Balboa called attention to the fact that, when they crossed the Gulf of Uraba, they passed out of the territory covered by the patent to Ojeda, under which Enciso was commissioned, and into that granted to Nicuesa. On this suggestion Enciso was promptly deposed and two alcaldes were elected, Balboa being one. While events in one corner of Nicuesa's domain were thus establishing a colony for that ambitious governor, he himself, at the other extremity of it, was faring badly. He had suffered hardships, separation from most of his command and long abandonment on a desolate coast; had rejoined his followers after great suffering, only to suffer yet more in their company, until less than one hundred remained of the 700 who sailed with him a few months before. The settlement at Veragua had been deserted, and another, named Nombre de Dios undertaken, with no improvement of circumstances. In this situation he was rejoiced, at last, by the arrival of one of his lieutenants, Rodrigo de Colmenares, who came with supplies. Colmenares brought tidings, moreover, of the prosperous colony at Darien, which he had discovered on his way, with an invitation to

Nicuesa to come and assume the government of it. He accepted the invitation with delight; but, alas! the community at Darien had repented of it before he reached them, and they refused to receive him when he arrived. Permitted finally to land, he was seized by a treacherous party among the colonists — to whom Balboa is said to have opposed all the resistance in his power — was put on board of an old and crazy brigantine, with seventeen of his friends, and compelled to take an oath that he would sail straight to Spain. "The frail bark set sail on the first of March, 1511, and steered across the Caribbean Sea for the island of Hispaniola, but was never seen or heard of more."—W. Irving, *Life and Voyages of Columbus and his Companions*, v. 3.

ALSO IN H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, v. 1, ch. 6.

A. D. 1511.—The Spanish conquest and occupation of Cuba. See CUBA: A. D. 1511.

A. D. 1512.—The Voyage of Ponce de Leon in quest of the Fountain of Youth, and his Discovery of Florida.—"Whatever may have been the Southernmost point reached by Cabot in coasting America on his return, it is certain that he did not land in Florida, and that the honour of first exploring that country is due to Juan Ponce de Leon. This cavalier, who was governor of Puerto Rico, induced by the vague traditions circulated by the natives of the West Indies, that there was a country in the north possessing a fountain whose waters restored the aged to youth, made it an object of his ambition to be the first to discover this marvellous region. With this view, he resigned the governorship, and set sail with three caravels on the 3d of March 1512. Steering N.  $\frac{1}{2}$  N., he came upon a country covered with flowers and verdure; and as the day of his discovery happened to be Palm Sunday, called by the Spaniards 'Pasqua Florida,' he gave it the name of Florida from this circumstance. He landed on the 2d of April, and took possession of the country in the name of the king of Castile. The warlike people of the coast of Cautio (a name given by the Indians to all the country lying between Cape Cañaveral and the southern point of Florida) soon, however, compelled him to retreat, and he pursued his exploration of the coast as far as 30° 8' north latitude, and on the 8th of May doubled Cape Cañaveral. Then retracing his course to Puerto Rico, in the hope of finding the island of Bimini, which he believed to be the Land of Youth, and described by the Indians as opposite to Florida, he discovered the Bahamas, and some other islands, previously unknown. Bad weather compelling him to put into the isle of Guanima to repair damages, he despatched one of his caravels, under the orders of Juan Perez de Ortubia and of the pilot Anton de Alaminos, to gain information respecting the desired land, which he had as yet been totally unable to discover. He returned to Puerto Rico on the 21st of September; a few days afterwards, Ortubia arrived also with news of Bimini. He reported that he had explored the island, — which he described as large, well wooded, and watered by numerous streams, — but he had failed in discovering the fountain. Oriedo places Bimini at 40 leagues west of the island of Bahama. Thus all the advantages which Ponce de Leon promised himself from this voyage turned to the profit of geography: the title of 'Adelantado of Bimini and

Florida,' which was conferred upon him, was purely honorary; but the route taken by him in order to return to Puerto Rico, showed the advantage of making the homeward voyage to Spain by the Bahama Channel."—W. B. Rye, *Introd. to "Discovery and Conquest of Terra Florida, by a gentleman of Elvas"* (*Hakluyt Soc.*, 1851).

ALSO IN G. R. Fairbanks, *Hist. of Florida*, ch. 1.

A. D. 1513-1517.—The discovery of the Pacific by Vasco Nuñez de Balboa.—Pedrarias Dávila on the Isthmus.—With Enciso deposed from authority and Nicuesa sent adrift, Vasco Nuñez de Balboa seems to have easily held the lead in affairs at Darien, though not without much opposition; for faction and turbulence were rife. Enciso was permitted to carry his grievances and complaints to Spain, but Balboa's colleague, Zamudio, went with him, and another comrade proceeded to Hispaniola, both of them well-furnished with gold. For the quest of gold had succeeded at last. The Darien adventurers had found considerable quantities in the possession of the surrounding natives, and were gathering it with greedy hands. Balboa held the prudence to establish friendly relations with one of the most important of the neighboring caciques, whose comely daughter he wedded—according to the easy customs of the country—and whose ally he became in wars with the other caciques. By gift and tribute, therefore as well as by plunder, he harvested more gold than any before him had found since the ransacking of the New World began. But what they obtained seemed little compared with the treasures reported to them as existing beyond the near mountains and toward the south. One Indian youth, son of a friendly cacique, particularly excited their imaginations by the tale which he told of another great sea, not far to the west, on the southward-stretching shores of which were countries that teemed with every kind of wealth. He told them, however, that they would need a thousand men to fight their way to this Sea. Balboa gave such credence to the story that he sent envoys to Spain to solicit forces from the king for an adequate expedition across the mountains. They sailed in October, 1512, but did not arrive in Spain until the following May. They found Balboa in much disfavor at the court. Enciso and the friends of the unfortunate Nicuesa had unitedly ruined him by their complaints, and the king had caused criminal proceedings against him to be commenced. Meantime, some inkling of these hostilities had reached Balboa, himself, conveyed by a vessel which bore to him, at the same time, a commission as captain-general from the authorities in Hispaniola. He now resolved to become the discoverer of the ocean which his Indian friends described, and of the rich lands bordering it, before his enemies could interfere with him. "Accordingly, early in September, 1513, he set out on his renowned expedition for finding 'the other sea,' accompanied by 190 men well armed, and by dogs, which were of more avail than men, and by Indian slaves to carry the burdens. He went by sea to the territory of his father-in-law, King Careta, by whom he was well received, and accompanied by whose Indians he moved on into Poncha's territory." Quieting the fears of this cacique, he passed his country without fighting. The next chief encountered, named Quarecua, attempted resistance, but was routed, with a great slaughter of his

people, and Balboa pushed on. "On the 25th of September, 1513, he came near to the top of a mountain from whence the South Sea was visible. The distance from Poncha's chief town to this point was forty leagues, reckoned then six days' journey; but Vasco Nuñez and his men took twenty-five days to accomplish it, as they suffered much from the roughness of the ways and from the want of provisions. A little before Vasco Nuñez reached the height, Quarequa's Indians informed him of his near approach to the sea. It was a sight in beholding which, for the first time, any man would wish to be alone. Vasco Nuñez bade his men sit down while he ascended, and then, in solitude, looked down upon the vast Pacific—the first man of the Old World, so far as we know, who had done so. Falling on his knees, he gave thanks to God for the favour shown to him in his being permitted to discover the Sea of the South. Then with his hand he beckoned to his men to come up. When they had come, both he and they knelt down and poured forth their thanks to God. He then addressed them. . . . Having . . . addressed his men, Vasco Nuñez proceeded to take formal possession, on behalf of the kings of Castile, of the sea and of all that was in it; and in order to make memorials of the event, he cut down trees, formed crosses, and heaped up stones. He also inscribed the names of the monarchs of Castile upon great trees in the vicinity." Afterwards, when he had descended the western slope and found the shore, "he entered the sea up to his thighs, having his sword on, and with his shield in his hand; then he called the by-standers to witness how he touched with his person and took possession of this sea for the kings of Castile, and declared that he would defend the possession of it against all comers. After this, Vasco Nuñez made friends in the usual manner, first conquering and then negotiating with" the several chiefs or caciques whose territories came in his way. He explored the Gulf of San Miguel, finding much wealth of pearls in the region, and returned to Darien by a route which crossed the isthmus considerably farther to the north, reaching his colony on the 29th of January, 1514, having been absent nearly five months. "His men at Darien received him with exultation, and he lost no time in sending his news, 'such signal and new news,' . . . to the King of Spain, accompanying it with rich presents. His letter, which gave a detailed account of his journey, and which, for its length, was compared by Peter Martyr to the celebrated letter that came to the senate from Tiberius, contained in every page thanks to God that he had escaped from such great dangers and labours. Both the letter and the presents were intrusted to a man named Arbolanche, who deputed from Darien about the beginning of March, 1514. . . . Vasco Nuñez's messenger, Arbolanche, reached the court of Spain too late for his master's interests." The latter had already been superseded in the Government, and his successor was on the way to take his authority from him. The new governor was one Pedrarias De Avila, or Davila, as the name is sometimes written;—an envious and malignant old man, under whose rule on the isthmus the destructive energy of Spanish conquest rose to its meanest and most heartless and brainless development. Conspicuously exposed as he was to the jealousy and hatred of Pedra-

rias, Vasco Nuñez was probably doomed to ruin, in some form, from the first. At one time, in 1510, there seemed to be a promise for him of alliance with his all-powerful enemy, by a marriage with one of the governor's daughters, and he received the command of an expedition which again crossed the isthmus, carrying ships, and began the exploration of the Pacific. But circumstances soon arose which gave Pedrarias an opportunity to accuse the explorer of treasonable designs and to accomplish his arrest—Francisco Pizarro being the officer fitly charged with the execution of the governor's warrant. Brought in chains to Acla, Vasco Nuñez was summarily tried, found guilty and led forth to swift death, laying his head upon the block (A. D. 1517). "Thus perished Vasco Nuñez de Balboa, in the forty-second year of his age, the man who, since the time of Columbus, had shown the most statesmanlike and warriorlike powers in that part of the world, but whose career only too much resembles that of Ojeda, Nicuesa, and the other unfortunate commanders who devastated those beautiful regions of the earth."—Sir A. Helps, *Spanish Conquest in Am.*, bk. 6 (c. 1).—"If I have applied strong terms of denunciation to Pedrarias Dávila, it is because he unquestionably deserves it. He is by far the worst man who came officially to the New World during its early government. In this all authorities agree. And all agree that Vasco Nuñez was not deserving of death."—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, v. 1, ch. 8-12 (foot-note, p. 458).

ALSO IN W. Irving, *Life and Voyages of Columbus and his Companions*, v. 3.

A. D. 1515.—Discovery of La Plata by Juan de Solís. See PARAGUAY: A. D. 1515-1537.

A. D. 1517-1518.—The Spaniards find Mexico.—"An hidalgo of Cuba, named Hernandez de Cordova, sailed with three vessels on an expedition to one of the neighbouring Bahama Islands, in quest of Indian slaves (Feb. 8, 1517). He encountered a succession of heavy gales which drove him far out of his course, and at the end of three weeks he found himself on a strange and unknown coast. On landing and asking the name of the country, he was answered by the natives 'Tectelan,' meaning 'I do not understand you,' but which the Spaniards, misinterpreting into the name of the place, easily corrupted into Yucatan. Some writers give a different etymology. . . . Bernal Diaz says the word came from the vegetable 'yuca' and 'tale,' the name for a hillock in which it is planted. . . . M. Waldeck finds a much more plausible derivation in the Indian word 'Ouyouekatan,' 'listen to what they say.' . . . Cordova had landed on the north-eastern end of the peninsula, at Cape Catoche. He was astonished at the size and solid materials of the buildings constructed of stone and lime, so different from the frail tenements of reeds and rushes which formed the habitations of the Islanders. He was struck, also, with the higher cultivation of the soil, and with the delicate texture of the cotton garments and gold ornaments of the natives. Everything indicated a civilization far superior to anything he had before witnessed in the New World. He saw the evidence of a different race, moreover, in the warlike spirit of the people. . . . Wherever they landed they were met with the most deadly hostility. Cordova himself, in one of his

skirmishes with the Indians, received more than a dozen wounds, and one only of his party escaped unhurt. At length, when he had coasted the peninsula as far as Campeachy, he returned to Cuba, which he reached after an absence of several months. . . . The reports he had brought back of the country, and, still more, the specimens of curiously wrought gold, convinced Velasquez [governor of Cuba] of the importance of this discovery, and he prepared with all despatch to avail himself of it. He accordingly fitted out a little squadron of four vessels for the newly discovered lands, and placed it under the command of his nephew, Juan de Grijalva, a man on whose probity, prudence, and attachment to himself he knew he could rely. The fleet left the port of St. Jago de Cuba, May 1, 1518. . . . Grijalva soon passed over to the continent and coasted the peninsula, touching at the same places as his predecessor. Everywhere he was struck, like him, with the evidences of a higher civilization, especially in the architecture; as he well might be, since this was the region of those extraordinary remains which have become recently the subject of so much speculation. He was astonished, also, at the sight of large stone crosses, evidently objects of worship, which he met with in various places. Reminded by these circumstances of his own country, he gave the peninsula the name New Spain, a name since appropriated to a much wider extent of territory. Wherever Grijalva landed, he experienced the same unfriendly reception as Cordova, though he suffered less, being better prepared to meet it." He succeeded, however, at last, in opening a friendly conference and traffic with one of the chiefs, on the Rio de Tabasco, and "had the satisfaction of receiving, for a few worthless toys at J trinkets, a rich treasure of jewels, gold ornaments and vessels, of the most fantastic forms and workmanship. Grijalva now thought that in this successful traffic—successful beyond his most sanguine expectations—he had accomplished the chief object of his mission." He therefore dispatched Alvarado, one of his captains, to Velasquez, with the treasure acquired, and continued his voyage along the coast, as far as the province of Panuco, returning to Cuba at the end of about six months from his departure. "On reaching the Island, he was surprised to learn that another and more formidable armament had been fitted out to follow up his own discoveries, and to find orders at the same time from the governor, couched in no very courteous language, to repair at once to St. Jago. He was received by that personage, not merely with coldness, but with reproaches, for having neglected so fair an opportunity of establishing a colony in the country he had visited."—W. H. Prescott, *Conquest of Mexico*, bk. 2, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: C. St. J. Fancourt, *Hist. of Yucatan*, ch. 1-2.—Bernal Diaz del Castillo, *Memoirs*, v. 1, ch. 2-19.

**A. D. 1519-1524.**—The Spanish Conquest of Mexico. See MEXICO: A. D. 1519-1524.

**A. D. 1519-1524.**—The Voyage of Magellan and Sebastian del Cano.—The New World passed and the Earth circumnavigated.—The Congress at Badajos.—Fernando Magellan, or Magalhães, was "a disaffected Portuguese gentleman who had served his country for five years in the Indies under Albuquerque, and understood

well the secrets of the Eastern trade. In 1517, conjointly with his geographical and astronomical friend, Ruy Falerio, another unrequited Portuguese, he offered his services to the Spanish court. At the same time these two friends proposed, not only to prove that the Moluccas were within the Spanish lines of demarkation, but to discover a passage thither different from that used by the Portuguese. Their schemes were listened to, adopted and carried out. The Straits of Magellan were discovered, the broad South Sea was crossed, the Ladrões and the Philippines were inspected, the Moluccas were passed through, the Cape of Good Hope was doubled on the homeward voyage, and the globe was circumnavigated, all in less than three years, from 1519 to 1522. Magellan lost his life, and only one of his five ships returned [under Sebastian del Cano] to tell the marvelous story. The magnitude of the enterprise was equalled only by the magnitude of the results. The globe for the first time began to assume its true character and size in the minds of men, and the minds of men began soon to grasp and utilize the results of this circumnavigation for the enlargement of trade and commerce, and for the benefit of geography, astronomy, mathematics, and the other sciences. This wonderful story, is it not told in a thousand books? . . . The Portuguese in India and the Spiceisles, as well as at home, now seeing the inevitable conflict approaching, were thoroughly aroused to the importance of maintaining their rights. They openly asserted them, and pronounced this trade with the Moluccas by the Spanish an encroachment on their prior discoveries and possession, as well as a violation of the Papal Compact of 1494, and prepared themselves energetically for defense and offense. On the other hand, the Spaniards as openly declared that Magellan's fleet carried the first Christians to the Moluccas and by friendly intercourse with the kings of those islands, reduced them to Christian subjection and brought back letters and tribute to Cæsar. Hence these kings and their people came under the protection of Charles V. Besides this, the Spaniards claimed that the Moluccas were within the Spanish half, and were therefore doubly theirs. . . . Matters thus waxing hot, King John of Portugal begged Charles V. to delay dispatching his new fleet until the disputed points could be discussed and settled. Charles, who boasted that he had rather be right than rich, consented, and the ships were staid. These two Christian princes, who owned all the newly discovered and to be discovered parts of the whole world between them by deed of gift of the Pope, agreed to meet in Congress at Badajos by their representatives, to discuss and settle all matters in dispute about the division of their patrimony, and to define and stake out their lands and waters, both parties agreeing to abide by the decision of the Congress. Accordingly, in the early spring of 1524, up went to this little border town four-and-twenty wise men, or thereabouts, chosen by each prince. They comprised the first judges, lawyers, mathematicians, astronomers, cosmographers, navigators and pilots of the land, among whose names were many honored now as then—such as Fernando Columbus, Sebastian Cabot, Estevan Gomez, Diego Ribero, etc. . . . The debates and proceedings of this Congress, as reported by Peter Martyr, Oviedo, and Gomara, are very amusing,

but no regular joint decision could be reached, the Portuguese declining to subscribe to the verdict of the Spaniards, inasmuch as it deprived them of the Moluccas. So each party published and proclaimed its own decision after the Congress broke up in confusion on the last day of May, 1524. It was, however, tacitly understood that the Moluccas fell to Spain, while Brazil, to the extent of two hundred leagues from Cape St. Augustine, fell to the Portuguese. . . . However, much good resulted from this first geographical Congress. The extent and breadth of the Pacific were appreciated, and the influence of the Congress was soon after seen in the greatly improved maps, globes, and charts.—H. Stevens, *Hist. and Geog. Notes*, 1453-1530.—“For three months and twenty days he [Magellan] sailed on the Pacific and never saw inhabited land. He was compelled by famine to strip off the pieces of skin and leather wherewith his rigging was here and there bound, to soak them in the sea and then soften them with warm water, so as to make a wretched food; to eat the sweepings of the ship and other loathsome matter; to drink water gone putrid by keeping; and yet he resolutely held on his course, though his men were dying daily. . . . In the whole history of human undertakings there is nothing that exceeds, if indeed there is anything that equals, this voyage of Magellan’s. That of Columbus dwindles away in comparison. It is a display of superhuman courage, superhuman perseverance.”—J. W. Draper, *Hist. of the Intellectual Development of Europe*, ch. 19.—“The voyage [of Magellan] . . . was doubtless the greatest feat of navigation that has ever been performed, and nothing can be imagined that would surpass it except a journey to some other planet. It has not the unique historic position of the first voyage of Columbus, which brought together two streams of human life that had been disjoined since the Glacial Period. But as an achievement in ocean navigation that voyage of Columbus sinks into insignificance by the side of it, and when the earth was a second time encompassed by the greatest English sailor of his age, the advance in knowledge, as well as the different route chosen, had much reduced the difficulty of the performance. When we consider the frailness of the ships, the immeasurable extent of the unknown, the mutinies that were prevented or quelled, and the hardships that were endured, we can have no hesitation in speaking of Magellan as the prince of navigators.”—J. Fiske, *The Discovery of America*, ch. 7 (v. 2).

Also in Lord Stanley of Alderley, *The First Voyage round the World* (*Illustrated Soc.*, 1874).—R. Kerr, *Collection of Voyages*, v. 10.

**A. D. 1519-1525.—The Voyages of Garay and Ayllon.—Discovery of the mouth of the Mississippi.—Exploration of the Carolina Coast.**—In 1519, Francisco de Garay, governor of Jamaica, who had been one of the companions of Columbus on his second voyage, having heard of the riches and beauty of Yucatan, “at his own charge sent out four ships well equipped, and with good pilots, under the command of Alvarez Alonso de Pineda. His professed object was to search for some strait, west of Florida, which was not yet certainly known to form a part of the continent. The strait having been sought for in vain, his ships turned

toward the west, attentively examining the ports, rivers, inhabitants, and everything else that seemed worthy of remark; and especially noticing the vast volume of water brought down by one very large stream. At last they came upon the track of Cortes near Vera Cruz. . . . The carefully drawn map of the pilots showed distinctly the Mississippi, which, in this earliest authentic trace of its outlet, bears the name of the Espiritu Santo. . . . But Garay thought not of the Mississippi and its valley; he coveted access to the wealth of Mexico; and, in 1523, lost fortune and life ingloriously in a dispute with Cortes for the government of the country on the river Panuco. A voyage for slaves brought the Spaniards in 1520 still farther to the north. A company of seven, of whom the most distinguished was Lucas Vasquez de Ayllon, fitted out two slave ships from St. Domingo, in quest of laborers for their plantations and mines. From the Bahama Islands they passed to the coast of South Carolina, which was called Chicora. The Combahee river received the name of Jordan; the name of St. Helena, whose day is the 18th of August, was given to a cape, but now belongs to the sound.” Luring a large number of the confiding natives on board their ships the adventurers treacherously set sail with them; but one of the vessels foundered at sea, and most of the captives on the other sickened and died. Vasquez de Ayllon was rewarded for his treacherous exploit by being authorized and appointed to make the conquest of Chicora. “For this bolder enterprise the undertaker wasted his fortune in preparations; in 1525 his largest ship was stranded in the river Jordan; many of his men were killed by the natives; and he himself escaped only to suffer from the consciousness of having done nothing worthy of honor. Yet it may be that ships, sailing under his authority, made the discovery of the Chesapeake and named it the bay of St. Mary; and perhaps even entered the bay of Delaware, which, in Spanish geography, was called St. Christopher’s.”—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S.*, pt. 1, ch. 2.

Also in H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, v. 4, ch. 11, and v. 5, ch. 6-7.—W. G. Simms, *Hist. of S. Carolina*, bk. 1, ch. 1.

**A. D. 1523-1524.—The Voyages of Verrazano.**—First undertakings of France in the New World.—“It is constantly admitted in our history that our kings paid no attention to America before the year 1523. Then Francis I., wishing to excite the emulation of his subjects in regard to navigation and commerce, as he had already so successfully in regard to the sciences and fine arts, ordered John Verrazani, who was in his service, to go and explore the New Lands, which began to be much talked of in France. . . . Verrazani was accordingly sent, in 1523, with four ships to discover North America; but our historians have not spoken of his first expedition, and we should be in ignorance of it now, had not Ramusio preserved in his great collection a letter of Verrazani himself, addressed to Francis I. and dated Dieppe, July 8, 1524. In it he supposes the king already informed of the success and details of the voyage, so that he contents himself with stating that he sailed from Dieppe in four vessels, which he had safely brought back to that port. In January, 1524, he sailed with two ships, the Dauphine and the Normande, to

cruise against the Spaniards. Towards the close of the same year, or early in the next, he again fitted out the Dauphine, on which, embarking with 50 men and provisions for eight months, he first sailed to the island of Madeira."—Father Charlevoix, *Hist. of New France* (trans. by J. G. Shea), bk. 1.—"On the 17th of January, 1524, he [Verrazano] parted from the 'Isles desertas,' a well-known little group of islands near Madeira, and sailed at first westward, running in 25 days 500 leagues, with a light and pleasant easterly breeze, along the northern border of the trade winds, in about 30° N. His track was consequently nearly like that of Columbus on his first voyage. On the 14th of February he met 'with as violent a hurricane as any ship ever encountered.' But he weathered it, and pursued his voyage to the west, 'with a little deviation to the north'; when, after having sailed 24 days and 400 leagues, he deserted a new country which, as he supposed, had never before been seen either by modern or ancient navigators. The country was very low. From the above description it is evident that Verrazano came in sight of the east coast of the United States about the 10th of March, 1524. He places his land-fall in 31° N., which is the latitude of Cape Fear." He first sailed southward, for about 50 leagues, he states, looking for a harbor and finding none. He then turned northward. "I infer that Verrazano saw little of the coast of South Carolina and nothing of that of Georgia, and that in these regions he can, at most, be called the discoverer only of the coast of North Carolina. . . . He rounded Cape Hatteras, and at a distance of about 50 leagues came to another shore, where he anchored and spent several days. . . . This was the second principal landing-place of Verrazano. If we reckon 50 leagues from Cape Hatteras, it would fall somewhere upon the east coast of Delaware, in latitude 38° N., where, by some authors, it is thought to have been. But if, as appears most likely, Verrazano reckoned his distance here, as he did in other cases, from his last anchoring, and not from Cape Hatteras, we must look for his second landing somewhere south of the entrance to Chesapeake Bay, and near the entrance to Albemarle Sound. And this better agrees with the 'sail of 100 leagues' which Verrazano says he made from his second to his third landing-place, in New York Bay. . . . He found at this third landing station an excellent berth, where he came to anchor, well-protected from the winds, . . . and from which he ascended the river in his boat into the interior. He found the shores very thickly settled, and as he passed up half a league further, he discovered a most beautiful lake . . . of three leagues in circumference. Here, more than 30 canoes came to him with a multitude of people, who seemed very friendly. . . . This description contains several accounts which make it still more clear that the Bay of New York was the scene of these occurrences."—Verrazano's anchorage having been at Gravesend Bay, the river which he entered being the Narrows, and the lake he found being the Inner Harbor. From New York Bay Verrazano sailed eastward, along the southern shore of Long Island, and following the New England coast, touching at or describing points which are identified with Narragansett Bay and Newport, Block Island or Martha's Vineyard, and Portsmouth. His coasting voyage was pursued as far

as 50° N., from which point he sailed homeward. "He entered the port of Dieppe early in July, 1524. His whole exploring expedition, from Madeira and back, had accordingly lasted but five and a half months."—J. G. Kohl, *Hist. of the Discovery of Maine* (Me. Hist. Soc. Coll., 2d Series, v. 1), ch. 8.

ALSO IN G. Dexter, *Cortereal, Verrazano, &c.* (Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v. 4, ch. 1).—*Relation of Verrazano* (N. Y. Hist. Soc. Coll., v. 1, and N. S., v. 1).—J. C. Brevoort, *Verrazano the Navigator*.

A. D. 1524-1528.—The Explorations of Pizarro and Discovery of Peru.—"The South Sea having been discovered, and the inhabitants of Tierra Firme having been conquered and pacified, the Governor Pedrarias de Avila founded and settled the cities of Panama and of Nata, and the town of Nombre de Dios. At this time the Captain Francisco Pizarro, son of the Captain Gonzalo Pizarro, a knight of the city of Truxillo, was living in the city of Panama; possessing his house, his farm and his Indians, as one of the principal people of the land, which indeed he always was, having distinguished himself in the conquest and settling, and in the service of his Majesty. Being at rest and in repose, but full of zeal to continue his labours and to perform other more distinguished services for the royal crown, he sought permission from Pedrarias to discover that coast of the South Sea to the eastward. He spent a large part of his fortune on a good ship which he built, and on necessary supplies for the voyage, and he set out from the city of Panama on the 14th day of the month of November, in the year 1524. He had 112 Spaniards in his company, besides some Indian servants. He commenced a voyage in which they suffered many hardships, the season being winter and unpropitious." From this unsuccessful voyage, during which many of his men died of hunger and disease, and in the course of which he found no country that tempted his cupidity or his ambition, Pizarro returned after some months to "the land of Panama, landing at an Indian village near the island of Pearls, called Chuchama. Thence he sent the ship to Panama, for she had become unseaworthy by reason of the teredo; and all that had befallen was reported to Pedrarias, while the Captain remained behind to refresh himself and his companions. When the ship arrived at Panama it was found that, a few days before, the Captain Diego de Almagro had sailed in search of the Captain Pizarro, his companion, with another ship and 70 men." Almagro and his party followed the coast until they came to a great river, which they called San Juan [a few miles north of the port of Buenaventura, in New Granada]. . . . They there found signs of gold, but there being no traces of the Captain Pizarro, the Captain Almagro returned to Chuchama, where he found his comrade. They agreed that the Captain Almagro should go to Panama, repair the ships, collect more men to continue the enterprise, and defray the expenses, which amounted to more than 10,000 castellanos. At Panama much obstruction was caused by Pedrarias and others, who said that the voyage should not be persisted in, and that his Majesty would not be served by it. The Captain Almagro, with the authority given him by his comrade, was very constant in prosecuting the work

he had commenced, and . . . Pedrarias was forced to allow him to engage men. He set out from Panama with 110 men; and went to the place where Pizarro waited with another 50 of the first 110 who sailed with him, and of the 70 who accompanied Almagro when he went in search. The other 130 were dead. The two captains, in their two ships, sailed with 160 men, and coasted along the land. When they thought they saw signs of habitations, they went on shore in three canoes they had with them, rowed by 60 men, and so they sought for provisions. They continued to sail in this way for three years, suffering great hardships from hunger and cold. The greater part of the crews died of hunger, inasmuch that there were not 50 surviving, and during all those three years they discovered no good land. All was swamp and inundated country, without inhabitants. The good country they discovered was as far as the river San Juan, where the Captain Pizarro remained with the few survivors, sending a captain with the smaller ship to discover some good land further along the coast. He sent the other ship, with the Captain Diego de Almagro to Panama to get more men." At the end of 70 days, the exploring ship came back with good reports, and with specimens of gold, silver and cloths, found in a country further south. "As soon as the Captain Almagro arrived from Panama with a ship laden with men and horses, the two ships, with their commanders and all their people, set out from the river San Juan, to go to that newly-discovered land. But the navigation was difficult; they were detained so long that the provisions were exhausted, and the people were obliged to go on shore in search of supplies. The ships reached the bay of San Mateo, and some villages to which the Spaniards gave the name of Santiago. Next they came to the villages of Tacamez [Atacames, on the coast of modern Ecuador], on the sea coast further on. These villages were seen by the Christians to be large and well peopled; and when 90 Spaniards had advanced a league beyond the villages of Tacamez, more than 10,000 Indian warriors encountered them; but seeing that the Christians intended no evil, and did not wish to take their goods, but rather to treat them peacefully, with much love, the Indians desisted from war. In this land there were abundant supplies, and the people led well-ordered lives, the villages having their streets and squares. One village had more than 2,000 houses, and others were smaller. It seemed to the captains and to the other Spaniards that nothing could be done in that land by reason of the smallness of their numbers, which rendered them unable to cope with the Indians. So they agreed to load the ships with the supplies to be found in the villages, and to return to an island called Gallo, where they would be safe until the ships arrived at Panama with the news of what had been discovered, and to apply to the Governor for more men, in order that the Captains might be able to continue their undertaking, and conquer the land. Captain Almagro went in the ships. Many persons had written to the Governor entreating him to order the crews to return to Panama, saying that it was impossible to endure more hardships than they had suffered during the last three years. The Governor ordered that all those who wished to go to Panama might do

so, while those who desired to continue the discoveries were at liberty to remain. Sixteen men stayed with Pizarro, and all the rest went back in the ships to Panama. The Captain Pizarro was on that island for five months, when one of the ships returned, in which he continued the discoveries for a hundred leagues further down the coast. They found many villages and great riches; and they brought away more specimens of gold, silver, and cloths than had been found before, which were presented by the natives. The Captain returned because the time granted by the governor had expired, and the last day of the period had been reached when he entered the port of Panama. The two Captains were so ruined that they could no longer prosecute their undertaking. . . . The Captain Francisco Pizarro was only able to borrow a little more than 1,000 castellanos among his friends, with which sum he went to Castile, and gave an account to his Majesty of the great and signal services he had performed."—F. de Xeres (Sec. of Pizarro), *Account of the Province of Cuzco*; tr. and ed. by C. R. Markham (*Hakluyt Soc.*, 1872).

ALSO IN: W. H. Prescott, *Hist. of the Conquest of Peru*, bk. 2, ch. 2-4 (v. 1).

A. D. 1525.—The Voyage of Gomez. See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): THE NAMES.

A. D. 1526-1531.—Voyage of Sebastian Cabot and attempted colonization of La Plata. See PARAGUAY: A. D. 1515-1557.

A. D. 1528-1542.—The Florida Expeditions of Narvaez and Hernando de Soto.—Discovery of the Mississippi. See FLORIDA: A. D. 1528-1542.

A. D. 1531-1533.—Pizarro's Conquest of Peru. See PERU: A. D. 1528-1531, and 1531-1533.

A. D. 1533.—Spanish Conquest of the Kingdom of Quito. See ECUADOR.

A. D. 1534-1535.—Exploration of the St. Lawrence to Montreal by Jacques Cartier.—"At last, ten years after [the voyages of Verrazano], Philip Chabot, Admiral of France, induced the king [Francis I.] to resume the project of founding a French colony in the New World whence the Spaniards daily drew such great wealth; and he presented to him a Captain of St. Malo, by name Jacques Cartier, whose merit he knew, and whom that prince accepted. Cartier having received his instructions, left St. Malo the 2d of April, 1534, with two ships of 60 tons and 123 men. He steered west, inclining slightly north, and had such fair winds that, on the 10th of May, he made Cape Bonavista, in Newfoundland, at 46° north. Cartier found the land there still covered with snow, and the shore fringed with ice, so that he could not or dared not stop. He ran down six degrees south-southeast, and entered a port to which he gave the name of St. Catharine. Thence he turned back north. . . . After making almost the circuit of Newfoundland, though without being able to satisfy himself that it was an island, he took a southerly course, crossed the gulf, approached the continent, and entered a very deep bay, where he suffered greatly from heat, whence he called it Chaleurs Bay. He was charmed with the beauty of the country, and well pleased with the Indians that he met and with whom he exchanged some goods for furs. . . . On leaving this bay, Cartier visited a good part of the coasts around the gulf, and took possession of the coun-



try in the name of the most Christian king, as Verazani had done in all the places where he landed. He set sail again on the 15th of August to return to France, and reached St. Malo safely on the 5th of September. . . . On the report which he made of his voyage, the court concluded that it would be useful to France to have a settlement in that part of America; but no one took this affair more to heart than the Vice-Admiral Charles de Mont, Sieur de la Mailleaye. This noble obtained a new commission for Cartier, more ample than the first, and gave him three ships well equipped. This fleet was ready about the middle of May, and Cartier . . . embarked on Wednesday the 19th." His three vessels were separated by violent storms, but found one another, near the close of July, in the gulf which was their appointed place of rendezvous. "On the 1st of August bad weather drove him to take refuge in the port of St. Nicholas, at the mouth of the river on the north. Here Cartier planted a cross, with the arms of France, and remained until the 7th. This port is almost the only spot in Canada that has kept the name given by Cartier. . . . On the 10th the three vessels re-entered the gulf, and in honor of the saint whose feast is celebrated on that day, Cartier gave the gulf the name of St. Lawrence; or rather he gave it to a bay lying between Anticosti Island and the north shore, whence it extended to the whole gulf of which this bay is part; and because the river, before that called River of Canada, empties into the same gulf, it insensibly acquired the name of St. Lawrence, which it still bears. . . . The three vessels . . . ascended the river, and on the 1st of September they entered the river Saguenay. Cartier merely reconnoitered the mouth of this river, and . . . hastened to seek a port where his vessels might winter in safety. Eight leagues above Isle aux Coudres he found another much larger and handsomer island, all covered with trees and vines. He called it Bacelus Island, but the name has been changed to Isle d'Orleans. The author of the relation to this voyage, printed under the name of Cartier, pretends that only here the country begins to be called Canada. But he is surely mistaken; for it is certain that from the earliest times the Indians gave this name to the whole country along the river on both sides, from its mouth to the Saguenay. From Bacelus Island, Cartier proceeded to a little river which is ten leagues off, and comes from the north; he called it Rivière de Ste Croix, because he entered it on the 14th of September (Feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross); but it is now commonly called Rivière de Jacques Cartier. The day after his arrival he received a visit from an Indian chief named Donnacona, whom the author of the relation of that voyage styles Lord of Canada. Cartier treated with this chief by means of two Indians whom he had taken to France the year before, and who knew a little French. They informed Donnacona that the strangers wished to go to Hochelaga, which seemed to trouble him. Hochelaga was a pretty large town, situated on an island now known under the name of Island of Montreal. Cartier had heard much of it, and was loth to return to France without seeing it. The reason why this voyage troubled Donnacona was that the people of Hochelaga were of a different nation from his, and that he wished to profit exclusively by the advantages which he

hoped to derive from the stay of the French in his country." Proceeding with one vessel to Lake St. Pierre, and thence in two boats, Cartier reached Hochelaga Oct. 2. "The shape of the town was round, and three rows of palisades inclosed in it about 50 tunnel shaped cabins, each over 50 paces long and 14 or 15 wide. It was entered by a single gate, above which, as well as along the first palisade, ran a kind of gallery, reached by ladders, and well provided with pieces of rock and pebbles for the defence of the place. The inhabitants of the town spoke the Huron language. They received the French very well. . . . Cartier visited the mountain at the foot of which the town lay, and gave it the name of Mont Royal, which has become that of the whole Island [Montreal]. From it he discovered a great extent of country, the sight of which charmed him. . . . He left Hochelaga on the 5th of October, and on the 11th arrived at Sainte Croix." Wintering at this place, where his crews suffered terribly from the cold and from scurvy, he returned to France the following spring. "Some authors . . . pretend that Cartier, disgusted with Canada, dissuaded the king, his master, from further thoughts of it; and Champlain seems to have been of that opinion. But this does not agree with what Cartier himself says in his memoirs. . . . Cartier in vain extolled the country which he had discovered. His small returns, and the wretched condition to which his men had been reduced by cold and scurvy, persuaded most that it would never be of any use to France. Great stress was laid on the fact that he nowhere saw any appearance of mines; and then, even more than now, a strange land which produced neither gold nor silver was reckoned as nothing."—Father Charlevoix, *Hist. of New France (trans. by J. G. Shea), bk. 1.*

ALSO IN: R. Kerr, *General Coll. of Voyages, pt. 2, bk. 2, ch. 12 (v. 6).*—F. X. Garneau, *Hist. of Canada, v. 1, ch. 2.*

A. D. 1535-1540.—Introduction of Printing in Mexico. See PRINTING, &c.: A. D. 1535-1700.

A. D. 1535-1550.—Spanish Conquests in Chile. See CHILE: A. D. 1450-1724.

A. D. 1536-1538.—Spanish Conquests of New Granada. See COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1536-1731.

A. D. 1541-1603.—Jacques Cartier's last Voyage.—Abortive attempts at French Colonization in Canada.—"Jean François de la Roque, lord of Roberval, a gentleman of Picardy, was the most earnest and energetic of those who desired to colonize the lands discovered by Jacques Cartier. . . . The title and authority of lieutenant-general was conferred upon him; his rule to extend over Canada, Hochelaga, Saguenay, Newfoundland, Bile Isle, Carpon, Labrador, La Grand Baye, and Bacelus, with the delegated rights and powers of the Crown. This patent was dated the 15th of January, 1540. Jacques Cartier was named second in command. . . . Jacques Cartier sailed on the 23d of May, 1541, having provisioned his fleet for two years." He remained on the St. Lawrence until the following June, seeking vainly for the fabled wealth of the land of Saguenay, finding the Indians strongly inclined to a treacherous hostility, and suffering severe hardships during the winter. Entirely discouraged and disgusted, he abandoned his under-

taking early in the summer of 1542, and sailed for home. In the road of St. John's, Newfoundland, Cartier met his tardy chief, Roberval, just coming to join him; but no persuasion could induce the disappointed explorer to turn back. "To avoid the chance of an open rupture with Roberval, the lieutenant silently weighed anchor during the night, and made all sail for France. This inglorious withdrawal from the enterprise paralyzed Roberval's power, and deferred the permanent settlement of Canada for generations then unborn. Jacques Cartier died soon after his return to Europe." Roberval proceeded to Canada, built a fort at Ste Croix, four leagues west of Orleans, sent back two of his three ships to France, and remained through the winter with his colony, having a troubled time. There is no certain account of the ending of the enterprise, but it ended in failure. For half a century afterwards there was little attempt made by the French to colonize any part of New France, though the French fisheries on the Newfoundland Bank and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence were steadily growing in activity and importance. "When, after fifty years of civil strife, the strong and wise sway of Henry IV. restored rest to troubled France, the spirit of discovery again arose. The Marquis de la Roche, a Breton gentleman, obtained from the king, in 1598, a patent granting the same powers that Roberval had possessed." But La Roche's undertaking proved more disastrous than Roberval's had been. Yet, there had been enough of successful fur-trading opened to stimulate enterprise, despite these misfortunes. "Private adventurers, unprotected by any special privilege, began to barter for the rich peltries of the Canadian hunters. A wealthy merchant of St. Malo, named Pontgravé, was the boldest and most successful of these traders; he made several voyages to Tadoussac, at the mouth of the Saguenay, bringing back each time a rich cargo of rare and valuable furs." In 1600, Pontgravé effected a partnership with one Chauvin, a naval captain, who obtained a patent from the king giving him a monopoly of the trade; but Chauvin died in 1602 without having succeeded in establishing even a trading post at Tadoussac. De Chatte, or De Chastes, governor of Dieppe, succeeded to the privileges of Chauvin, and founded a company of merchants at Ronen [1603] to undertake the development of the resources of Canada. It was under the auspices of this company that Samuel Champlain, the founder of New France, came upon the scene.—E. Warburton, *The Conquest of Canada*, v. 1, ch. 2-3.

ALSO IN: F. Parkman, *Pioneers of France in the New World: Champlain*, c. 1-2.

**A. D. 1562-1567.—The slave trading Voyages of John Hawkins.—Beginnings of English Enterprise in the New World.**—"The history of English America begins with the three slave-trading voyages of John Hawkins, made in the years 1562, 1564, and 1567. Nothing that Englishmen had done in connection with America, previously to those voyages, had any result worth recording. England had known the New World nearly seventy years, for John Cabot reached it shortly after its discovery by Columbus; and, as the tidings of the discovery spread, many English adventures crossed the Atlantic to the American coast. As years passed, and the excitement of novelty

subsided, the English voyages to America had become fewer and fewer, and at length ceased altogether. It is easy to account for this. There was no opening for conquest or plunder, for the Tudors were at peace with the Spanish sovereigns; and there could be no territorial occupation, for the Papal title of Spain and Portugal to the whole of the new continent could not be disputed by Catholic England. No trade worth having existed with the natives; and Spain and Portugal kept the trade with their own settlers in their own hands. . . . As the plantations in America grew and multiplied, the demand for negroes rapidly increased. The Spaniards had no African settlements, but the Portuguese had many, and, with the aid of French and English adventurers, they procured from these settlements slaves enough to supply both themselves and the Spaniards. But the Brazilian plantations grow so fast, about the middle of the century, that they absorbed the entire supply, and the Spanish colonists knew not where to look for negroes. The penury of slaves in the Spanish Indies became known to the English and French captains who frequented the Guinea coast; and John Hawkins, who had been engaged from boyhood in the trade with Spain and the Canaries, resolved in 1562 to take a cargo of negro slaves to Hispaniola. The little squadron with which he executed this project was the first English squadron which navigated the West Indian seas. This voyage opened those seas to the English. England had not yet broken with Spain and the law excluding English vessels from trading with the Spanish colonies was not strictly enforced. The trade was profitable, and Hawkins found no difficulty in disposing of his cargo to great advantage. A meagre note . . . from the pen of Hakluyt contains all that is known of the first American voyage of Hawkins. In its details it must have closely resembled the second voyage. In the first voyage, however, Hawkins had no occasion to carry his wares further than three ports on the northern side of Hispaniola. These ports, far away from San Domingo, the capital, were already well known to the French smugglers. He did not venture into the Caribbean Sea; and having loaded his ships with their return cargo, he made the best of his way back. In his second voyage . . . he entered the Caribbean Sea, still keeping, however, at a safe distance from San Domingo, and sold his slaves on the mainland. This voyage was on a much larger scale. . . . Having sold his slaves in the continental ports [South American], and loaded his vessels with hides and other goods bought with the produce, Hawkins determined to strike out a new path and sail home with the Gulf-stream, which would carry him northwards past the shores of Florida. Sparke's narrative . . . proves that at every point in these expeditions the Englishman was following in the track of the French. He had French pilots and seamen on board, and there is little doubt that one at least of these had already been with Laudonnière in Florida. The French seamen guided him to Laudonnière's settlement, where his arrival was most opportune. They then pointed him the way by the coast of North America, then universally known in the mass as New France, to Newfoundland, and thence, with the prevailing westerly winds, to Europe. This was the

pioneer voyage made by Englishmen along coasts afterwards famous in history through English colonization. . . . The extremely interesting narrative . . . given . . . from the pen of John Sparke, one of Hawkins' gentlemen companions . . . contains the first information concerning America and its natives which was published in England by an English eye-witness." Hawkins planned a third voyage in 1566, but the remonstrances of the Spanish king caused him to be stopped by the English court. He sent out his ships, however, and they came home in due time richly freighted, — from what source is not known. "In another year's time the aspect of things had changed." England was venturing into war with Spain, "and Hawkins was now able to execute his plans without restraint. He founded a permanent fortified factory on the Guinea coast, where negroes might be collected all the year round. Thence he sailed for the West Indies a third time. Young Francis Drake sailed with him in command of the 'Judith,' a small vessel of fifty tons." The voyage had a prosperous beginning and a disastrous ending. After disposing of most of their slaves, they were driven by storms to take refuge in the Mexican port of Vera Cruz, and there they were attacked by a Spanish fleet. Drake in the "Judith" and Hawkins in another small vessel escaped. But the latter was overcrowded with men and obliged to put half of them ashore on the Mexican coast. The majority of those left on board, as well as a majority of Drake's crew, died on the voyage home, and it was a miserable remnant that landed in England, in January, 1569.—E. J. Payne, *Voyages of the Elizabethan Seamen to Am.*, ch. 1.

ALSO IX: *The Hawkins Voyages*; ed. by C. R. Markham (*Hakluyt Soc.*, No. 57).—R. Southey, *Lives of the British Admirals*, v. 3.

#### A. D. 1572-1580.—The Piratical Adventures of Drake and his Encompassing of the World.

"Francis Drake, the first of the English Lancers, was one of the twelve children of Edward Drake of Tavistock, in Devonshire, a staunch Protestant, who had fled his native place to avoid persecution, and had then become a ship's chaplain. Drake, like Columbus, had been a seaman by profession from boyhood; and . . . had served as a young man, in command of the Judith, under Hawkins. . . . Hawkins had confined himself to smuggling; Drake advanced from this to piracy. This practice was authorized by law in the middle ages for the purpose of recovering debts or damages from the subjects of another nation. The English, espec. ally those of the west country, were the most formidable pirates in the world; and the whole nation was by this time roused against Spain, in consequence of the ruthless war waged against Protestantism in the Netherlands by Philip II. Drake had accounts of his own to settle with the Spaniards. Though Elizabeth had not declared for the revolted States, and pursued a shifting policy, her interests and theirs were identical; and it was with a view of cutting off those supplies of gold and silver from America which enabled Philip to bribe politicians and pay soldiers, in pursuit of his policy of aggression, that the famous voyage was authorized by English statesmen. Drake had recently made more than one successful

voyage of plunder to the American coast." In July, 1572, he surprised the Spanish town of Nombre de Dios, which was the shipping port on the northern side of the Isthmus for the treasures of Peru. His men made their way into the royal treasure-house, where they laid hands on a heap of bar-silver, 70 feet long, 10 wide, and 10 high; but Drake himself had received a wound which compelled the pirates to retreat with no very large part of the splendid booty. In the winter of 1573, with the help of the runaway slaves on the Isthmus, known as Cimarrones, he crossed the Isthmus, looked on the Pacific ocean, approached within sight of the city of Panama, and waylaid a transportation party conveying gold to Nombre de Dios; but was disappointed of his prey by the excited conduct of some of his men. When he saw, on this occasion, the great ocean beyond the Isthmus, "Drake then and there resolved to be the pioneer of England in the Pacific; and on this resolution he solemnly besought the blessing of God. Nearly four years elapsed before it was executed; for it was not until November, 1577, that Drake embarked on his famous voyage, in the course of which he proposed to plunder Peru itself. The Peruvian ports were unfortified. The Spaniards knew them to be by nature absolutely secured from attack on the north; and they never dreamed that the English pirates would be daring enough to pass the terrible straits of Magellan and attack them from the south. Such was the plan of Drake; and it was executed with complete success." He sailed from Plymouth, Dec. 13, 1577, with a fleet of four vessels, and a pinnace, but lost one of the six before he had entered the Pacific, in a storm which drove him southward, and which made him the discoverer of Cape Horn. Another of his ships, separated from the squadron, returned home, and a third, while attempting to do the same, was lost in the river Plate. Drake, in his own vessel, the Golden Hind, proceeded to the Peruvian coasts, where he cruised until he had taken and plundered a score of Spanish ships. "Laden with a rich booty of Peruvian treasure he deemed it unsafe to return by the way that he came. He therefore resolved to strike across the Pacific, and for this purpose made the latitude in which this voyage was usually performed by the Spanish government vessels which sailed annually from Acapulco to the Philippines. Drake thus reached the coast of California, where the Indians, delighted beyond measure by presents of clothing and trinkets, invited him to remain and rule over them. Drake took possession of the country in the name of the Queen, and refitted his vessel in preparation for the unknown perils of the Pacific. The place where he landed must have been either the great bay of San Francisco [per contra, see CALIFORNIA: A. D. 1846-1847] or the small bay of Bodega, which lies a few leagues further north. The great seaman had already coasted five degrees more to the northward before finding a suitable harbour. He believed himself to be the first European who had coasted these shores; but it is now well known that Spanish explorers had preceded him. Drake's circumnavigation of the globe was thus no deliberate feat of seamanship, but the necessary result of circumstances. The voyage made in more than one way a great epoch in English nautical history." Drake

reached Plymouth on his return Sept. 26, 1580.—E. J. Payne, *Voyages of the Elizabethan Seamen*, pp. 141-143.

ALSO IN F. Fletcher, *The World Encompassed by Sir F. Drake* (Hakluyt Soc., 1851).—J. Barrow, *Life of Drake*.—R. Southey, *Lives of British Admirals*, v. 3.

A. D. 1580.—The final founding of the City of Buenos Ayres. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1580-1777.

A. D. 1583.—The Expedition of Sir Humphrey Gilbert.—Formal possession taken of Newfoundland.—In 1578, Sir Humphrey Gilbert, an English gentleman, of Devonshire, whose younger half-brother was the more famous Sir Walter Raleigh, obtained from Queen Elizabeth a charter empowering him, for the next six years, to discover "such remote heathen and barbarous lands, not actually possessed by any Christian prince or people," as he might be shrewd or fortunate enough to find, and to occupy the same as their proprietor. Gilbert's first expedition was attempted the next year, with Sir Walter Raleigh associated in it; but misfortunes drove back the adventurers to port, and Spanish intrigue prevented their sailing again. "In June, 1583, Gilbert sailed from Cawsand Bay with five vessels, with the general intention of discovering and colonizing the northern parts of America. It was the first colonizing expedition which left the shores of Great Britain; and the narrative of the expedition by Hayes, who commanded one of Gilbert's vessels, forms the first page in the history of English colonization. Gilbert did no more than go through the empty form of taking possession of the island of Newfoundland, to which the English name formerly applied to the continent in general . . . was now restricted. . . . Gilbert dallied here too long. When he set sail to cross the Gulf of St. Lawrence and take possession of Cape Breton and Nova Scotia the season was too far advanced; one of his largest ships went down with all on board, including the Hungarian scholar Parmentius, who had come out as the historian of the expedition; the stores were exhausted and the crews dispirited, and Gilbert resolved on sailing home, intending to return and prosecute his discoveries the next spring. On the home voyage the little vessel in which he was sailing foundered; and the pioneer of English colonization found a watery grave. . . . Gilbert was a man of courage, piety, and learning. He was, however, an indifferent seaman, and quite incompetent for the task of colonization to which he had set his hand. The misfortunes of his expedition induced Amadas and Barlow, who followed in his steps, to abandon the northward voyage and sail to the shores intended to be occupied by the easier but more circuitous route of the Canaries and the West Indies."—E. J. Payne, *Voyages of the Elizabethan Seamen*, pp. 173-174.—"On Monday, the 9th of September, in the afternoon, the frigate [the 'Squirrel'] was near cast away, oppressed by waves, yet at that time recovered; and giving forth signs of joy, the general, sitting abaft with a book in his hand, cried out to us in the 'Hind' (so oft as we did approach within hearing), 'We are as near to heaven by sea as by land,' reiterating the same speech, well besecning a soldier resolute in Jesus Christ, as I can testify he was. On the same Monday night, about twelve o'clock, or not

long after, the frigate being ahead of us in the 'Golden Hind,' suddenly her lights were out, whereof as it were in a moment we lost the sight, and withal our watch cried the General was cast away, which was too true; for in that moment the frigate was devoured and swallowed up by the sea. Yet still we looked out all that night and ever after, until we arrived upon the coast of England. . . . In great torment of weather and peril of drowning it pleased God to send safe home the 'Golden Hind,' which arrived in Palmonth on the 22d of September, being Sunday."—E. Hayes, *A Report of the Voyage by Sir Humphrey Gilbert* (reprinted in Payne's *Voyages*).

ALSO IN E. Edwards, *Life of Raleigh*, v. 1, ch. 5.—R. Hakluyt, *Principal Navigations*; ed. by E. Goldsmid, v. 12.

A. D. 1584-1586.—Raleigh's First Colonizing attempts and failures.—"The task in which Gilbert had failed was to be undertaken by one better qualified to carry it out. If any Englishman in that age seemed to be marked out as the founder of a colonial empire, it was Raleigh. Like Gilbert, he had studied books; like Drake he could rule men. . . . The associations of his youth, and the training of his early manhood, fitted him to sympathize with the aims of his half-brother Gilbert, and there is little reason to doubt that Raleigh had a share in his undertaking and his failure. In 1584 he obtained a patent precisely similar to Gilbert's. His first step showed the thoughtful and well-planned system on which he began his task. Two ships were sent out, not with any idea of settlement, but to examine and report upon the country. Their commanders were Arthur Barlow and Philip Amidas. To the former we owe the extant record of the voyage: the name of the latter would suggest that he was a foreigner. Whether by chance or design, they took a more southerly course than any of their predecessors. On the 2d of July the presence of shallow water, and a smell of sweet flowers, warned them that land was near. The promise thus given was amply fulfilled upon their approach. The sight before them was far different from that which had met the eyes of Hore and Gilbert. Instead of the bleak coast of Newfoundland, Barlow and Amidas looked upon a scene which recall the softness of the Mediterranean. . . . Coasting along for about 120 miles, the voyagers reached an inlet and with some difficulty entered. They then solemnly took possession of the land in the Queen's name, and then delivered it over to Raleigh according to his patent. They soon discovered that the land upon which they had touched was an island about 20 miles long, and not above six broad, named, as they afterwards learnt, Roanoke. Beyond, separating them from the mainland, lay an enclosed sea, studded with more than a hundred fertile and well-wooded islets." The Indians proved friendly, and were described by Barlow as being "most gentle, loving and faithful, void of all guile and treason, and such as live after the manner of the golden age." "The report which the voyagers took home spoke as favourably of the land itself as of its inhabitants. . . . With them they brought two of the savages, named Wanchese and Mianco. A probable tradition tells us that the queen herself named the country Virginia, and that Raleigh's knighthood was the reward and ac-

knowledge of his success. On the strength of this report Raleigh at once made preparations for a settlement. A fleet of seven ships was provided for the conveyance of 108 settlers. The fleet was under the command of Sir Richard Grenville, who was to establish the settlement and leave it under the charge of Ralph Lane. . . . On the 9th of April [1585] the emigrants set sail." For some reason not well explained, the fleet made a circuit to the West Indies, and loitered for five weeks at the island of St. John's and at Hispaniola, reaching Virginia in the last days of June. Quarrels between the two commanders, Grenville and Lane, had already begun, and both seemed equally ready to provoke the enmity of the natives. In August, after exploring some sixty miles of the coast, Grenville returned to England, promising to come back the next spring with new colonists and stores. The settlement, thus left to the care of Lane, was established "at the north-east corner of the island of Roanoke, whence the settlers could command the strait. There, even now, choked by vines and underwood, and here and there broken by the crumbling remains of an earthen bastion, may be traced the outlines of the ditch which enclosed the camp, some forty yards square, the home of the first English settlers in the New World. Of the doings of the settlers during the winter nothing is recorded, but by the next spring their prospects looked gloomy. The Indians were no longer friends. . . . The settlers, unable to make fishing weirs, and without seed corn, were entirely dependent on the Indians for their daily food. Under these circumstances, one would have supposed that Lane would have best employed himself in guarding the settlement and improving its condition. He, however, thought otherwise, and applied himself to the task of exploring the neighbouring territory." But a wide combination of hostile Indian tribes had been formed against the English, and their situation became from day to day more imperilled. At the beginning of June, 1586, Lane fought a bold battle with the savages and routed them; but no sign of Grenville appeared and the prospect looked hopeless. Just at this juncture, a great English fleet, sailing homewards from a piratical expedition to the Spanish Main, under the famous Captain Drake, came to anchor at Roanoke and offered succor to the disheartened colonists. With one voice they petitioned to be taken to England, and Drake received the whole party on board his ships. "The help of which the colonists had despaired was in reality close at hand. Scarcely had Drake's fleet left the coast when a ship well furnished by Raleigh with needful supplies, reached Virginia, and after searching for the departed settlers returned to England. About a fortnight later Grenville himself arrived with three ships. He spent some time in the country exploring, searching for the settlers, and at last, unwilling to lose possession of the country, landed fifteen men at Roanoke well supplied for two years, and then set sail for England, plundering the Azores, and doing much damage to the Spaniards."—J. A. Doyle, *The English in America: Virginia, &c., ch. 4.*—"It seems to be generally admitted that, when Lane and his company went back to England, they carried with them tobacco as one of the products of the country, which they presented to Raleigh, as the planter of the colony, and by him it was brought

into use in England, and gradually in other European countries. The authorities are not entirely agreed upon this point. Josselyn says: 'Tobacco first brought into England by Sir John Hawkins, but first brought into use by Sir Walter Raleigh many years after.' Again he says: 'Now (say some) Tobacco was first brought into England by Mr. Ralph Lane, out of Virginia. Others will have Tobacco to be first brought into England from Peru, by Sir Francis Drake's Mariners.' Camden fixes its introduction into England by Ralph Lane and the men brought back with him in the ships of Drake. He says: 'And these men which were brought back were the first that I know of, which brought into England that Indian plant which they call Tobacco and Nicotia, and use it against crudities, being taught it by the Indians.' Certainly from that time it began to be in great request, and to be sold at a high rate. . . . Among the 108 men left in the colony with Ralph Lane in 1585 was Mr. Thomas Hariot, a man of a strongly mathematical and scientific turn, whose services in this connection were greatly valued. He remained there an entire year, and went back to England in 1586. He wrote out a full account of his observations in the *New World*."—L. N. Tarbox, *Sir Walter Raleigh and his Colony* (Prince Soc., 1884).

ALSO IN T. Hariot, *Brief and true Report* (Reprinted in above-named Prince Soc. Publication).—F. L. Hawks, *Hist. of N. Carolina*, v. 1 (containing reprints of Lane's Account, Hariot's Report, &c.—Original Doe's ed. by E. E. Hale (*Archæologia Americana*, v. 4).

A. D. 1587-1590.—The Lost Colony of Roanoke.—End of the Virginia Undertakings of Sir Walter Raleigh.—"Raleigh, undismayed by losses, determined to plant an agricultural state; to send emigrants with their wives and families, who should make their homes in the New World; and, that life and property might be secured, in January, 1587, he granted a charter for the settlement, and a municipal government for the city of 'Raleigh.' John White was appointed its governor; and to him, with eleven assistants, the administration of the colony was intrusted. Transport ships were prepared at the expense of the proprietary; 'Queen Elizabeth, the godmother of Virginia,' declined contributing 'to its education.' Embarking in April, in July they arrived on the coast of North Carolina; they were saved from the dangers of Cape Fear; and, passing Cape Hatteras, they hastened to the isle of Roanoke, to search for the handful of men whom Grenville had left there as a garrison. They found the tenements deserted and overgrown with weeds; human bones lay scattered on the field where wild deer were reposing. The fort was in ruins. No vestige of surviving life appeared. The instructions of Raleigh had designated the place for the new settlement on the bay of Chesapeake. But Fernando, the naval officer, eager to renew a profitable traffic in the West Indies, refused his assistance in exploring the coast, and White was compelled to remain on Roanoke. . . . It was there that in July the foundations of the city of Raleigh were laid." But the colony was doomed to disaster from the beginning, being quickly involved in warfare with the surrounding natives. "With the retreating ship White embarked for England, un-

der the excuse of interceding for re-enforcements and supplies. Yet, on the 18th of August, nine days previous to his departure, his daughter Eleanor Dare, the wife of one of the assistants, gave birth to a female child, the first offspring of English parents on the soil of the United States. The infant was named from the place of its birth. The colony, now composed of 89 men, 17 women, and two children, whose names are all preserved, might reasonably hope for the speedy return of the governor, as he left with them his daughter and his grandchild, Virginia Dare. The farther history of this plantation is involved in gloomy uncertainty. The inhabitants of 'the city of Raleigh,' the emigrants from England and the first-born of America, awaited death in the land of their adoption. For, when White reached England, he found its attention absorbed by the threats of an invasion from Spain. . . . Yet Raleigh, whose patriotism did not diminish his generosity, found means, in April 1588, to despatch White with supplies in two vessels. But the company, desiring a gainful voyage rather than a safe one, ran in chase of prizes, till one of them fell in with men of war from Rochelle, and, after a bloody fight, was boarded and rifled. Both ships were compelled to return to England. The delay was fatal: the English kingdom and the Protestant reformation were in danger; nor could the poor colonists of Roanoke be again remembered till after the discomfiture of the Invincible Armada. Even then Sir Walter Raleigh, who had already incurred a fruitless expense of £40,000, found his impaired fortune insufficient for further attempts at colonizing Virginia. He therefore used the privilege of his patent to endow a company of merchants and adventurers with large concessions. Among the men who thus obtained an assignment of the proprietary's rights in Virginia is found the name of Richard Hakluyt; it connects the first efforts of England in North Carolina with the final colonization of Virginia. The colonists at Roanoke had emigrated with a charter; the instrument of March, 1589, was not an assignment of Raleigh's patent, but the extension of a grant, already held under its sanction by increasing the number to whom the rights of that charter belonged. More than another year elapsed before White could return to search for his colony and his daughter; and then the island of Roanoke was a desert. An inscription on the bark of a tree painted to Croatan; but the season of the year and the dangers from storms were pleaded as an excuse for an immediate return. The conjecture has been hazarded that the deserted colony, neglected by their own countrymen, were hospitably adopted into the tribe [the Croatans] of Mattaras Indians. Raleigh long cherished the hope of discovering some vestiges of their existence, and sent at his own charge, and, it is said, at five several times, to search for his liege men. But imagination received no help in its attempts to trace the fate of the colony of Roanoke."—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S.*, pt. 1, ch. 5 (v. 1).—"The Croatans or to-day claim descent from the lost colony. Their habits, disposition and mental characteristics show traces both of savage and civilized ancestors. Their language is the English of 300 years ago, and their names are in many cases the same as those borne by the original colonists. No other theory of their origin has been advanced."—S. B. Weeks, *The Lost Colony of*

*Roanoke (Am. Hist. Ass'n Papers, v. 5, pt. 4).*—"This last expedition [of White, searching for his lost colony] was not despatched by Raleigh, but by his successors in the American patent. And our history is now to take leave of that illustrious man, with whose schemes and enterprises it ceases to have any further connexion. The ardour of his mind was not exhausted, but diverted by a multiplicity of new and not less arduous undertakings. . . . Desirous, at the same time, that a project which he had carried so far should not be entirely abandoned, and hoping that the spirit of commerce would preserve an intercourse with Virginia that might terminate in a colonial establishment, he consented to assign his patent to Sir Thomas Smith, and a company of merchants in London, who undertook to establish and maintain a traffic between England and Virginia. . . . It appeared very soon that Raleigh had transferred his patent to hands very different from his own. . . . Satisfied with a paltry traffic carried on by a few small vessels, they made no attempt to take possession of the country; and at the period of Elizabeth's death, not a single Englishman was settled in America."—J. Grahame, *Hist. of the Rise and Progress of the U. S. of N. Am.* till 1688, ch. 1.

ALSO IN W. Stith, *Hist. of Va.*, bk. 1.—F. L. Hawks, *Hist. of N. C.*, v. 1, Nos. 7-8.

A. D. 1602-1605.—**The Voyages of Gosnold, Pring, and Weymouth.**—**The First Englishmen in New England.**—Bartholomew Gosnold was a West-of-England mariner who had served in the expeditions of Sir Walter Raleigh to the Virginia coast. Under his command, in the spring of 1602, "with the consent of Sir Walter Raleigh, and at the cost, among others, of Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton, the accomplished patron of Shakespeare, a small vessel, called the Concord, was equipped for exploration in 'the north part of Virginia,' with a view to the establishment of a colony. At this time, in the last year of the Tudor dynasty, and nineteen years after the fatal termination of Gilbert's enterprise, there was no European inhabitant of North America, except those of Spanish birth in Florida, and some twenty or thirty French, the miserable relics of two frustrated attempts to settle what they called New France. Gosnold sailed from Falmouth with a company of thirty-two persons, of whom eight were seamen, and twenty were to become planters. Taking a straight course across the Atlantic, instead of the indirect course by the Canaries and the West Indies which had been hitherto pursued in voyages to Virginia, at the end of seven weeks he saw land in Massachusetts Bay, probably near what is now Salem Harbor. Here a boat came off, of Basque build, manned by eight natives, of whom two or three were dressed in European clothes, indicating the presence of earlier foreign voyagers in these waters. Next he stood to the southward, and his crew took great quantities of codfish by a head land, . . . led by him for that reason Cape Cod, the name which it retains. Gosnold, Brereton, and three others, went on shore, the first Englishmen who are known to have set foot upon the soil of Massachusetts. . . . Sounding his way cautiously along, first in a southerly, and then in a westerly direction, and probably passing to the south of Nantucket, Gosnold next landed on a small island, now

called No Man's Land. To this he gave the name of Martha's Vineyard, since transferred to the larger island further north. . . . South of Buzzard's Bay, and separated on the south by the Vineyard Sound from Martha's Vineyard, is scattered the group denoted on modern maps as the Elizabeth Islands. The southwesternmost of these, now known by the Indian name of Cuttyhunk, was denominated by Gosnold Elizabeth Island. . . . Here Gosnold found a pond two miles in circumference, separated from the sea on one side by a beach thirty yards wide, and enclosing 'a rocky islet, containing near an acre of ground, full of wood and rubbish.' This islet was fixed upon for a settlement. In three weeks, while a part of the company were absent on a trading expedition to the mainland, the rest dug and stoned a cellar, prepared timber and built a house, which they fortified with palisades, and thatched with sedge. Proceeding to make an inventory of their provisions, they found that, after supplying the vessel, which was to take twelve men on the return voyage, there would be a sufficiency for only six weeks for the twenty men who would remain. A dispute arose upon the question whether the party to be left behind would receive a share in the proceeds of the cargo of cedar, sassafras, furs, and other commodities which had been collected. A small party, going out in quest of shell-fish, was attacked by some Indians. With men having already, it is likely, little stomach for such cheerless work, these circumstances easily led to the decision to abandon for the present the scheme of a settlement, and in the following month the adventurers sailed for England, and, after a voyage of five weeks, arrived at Exmouth. . . . The expedition of Gosnold was pregnant with consequences, though their development was slow. The accounts of the hitherto unknown country, which were circulated by his company on their return, excited an earnest interest."

The next year (April, 1603), Martin Pring or Pryme was sent out, by several merchants of Bristol, with two small vessels, seeking cargoes of sassafras, which had acquired a high value on account of supposed medicinal virtues. Pring coasted from Maine to Martha's Vineyard, secured his desired cargoes, and gave a good account of the country. Two years later (March, 1605), Lord Southampton and Lord Wardour sent a vessel commanded by George Weymouth to reconnoitre the same coast with an eye to settlements. Weymouth ascended either the Kennebec or the Penobscot river some 50 or 60 miles and kidnapped five natives. "Except for this, and for some addition to the knowledge of the local geography, the voyage was fruitless."

—J. G. Palfrey, *Hist. of N. Eng.*, v. 1, ch. 2.  
ALSO IN *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 3d Series, v. 8 (1843).—J. McKeen, *On the Voyage of Geo. Weymouth (Maine Hist. Soc. Coll.*, v. 5).

**A. D. 1603-1608.**—The First French Settlements in Acadia. See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1603-1605, and 1606-1608.

**A. D. 1607.**—The founding of the English Colony of Virginia, and the failure in Maine. See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1606-1607, and after; and MAINE: A. D. 1607-1608.

**A. D. 1607-1608.**—The First Voyages of Henry Hudson.—"The first recorded voyage made by Henry Hudson was undertaken . . . for the Muscovy or Russia Company [of Eng-

land]. Departing from Gravesend the first of May, 1607, with the intention of sailing straight across the north pole, by the north of what is now called Greenland, Hudson found that this land stretched further to the eastward than he had anticipated, and that a wall of ice, along which he coasted, extended from Greenland to Spitzbergen. Forced to relinquish the hope of finding a passage in the latter vicinity, he once more attempted the entrance of Davis' Straits by the north of Greenland. This design was also frustrated and he apparently renewed the attempt in a lower latitude and nearer Greenland on his homeward voyage. In this cruise Hudson attained a higher degree of latitude than any previous navigator. . . . He reached England on his return on the 15th September of that year [1607]. . . . On the 23d of April, 1608, Henry Hudson commenced his second recorded voyage for the Muscovy or Russia Company, with the design of 'finding a passage to the East Indies by the north-east. . . . On the 3d of June, 1608, Hudson had reached the most northern point of Norway, and on the 11th was in latitude 75° 24', between Spitzbergen and Nova Zembla.' Failing to pass to the north-east beyond Nova Zembla, he returned to England in August.—J. M. Read, Jr., *Hist. Inquiry Concerning Henry Hudson*, pp. 133-138.

ALSO IN G. M. Asher, *Henry Hudson, the Navigator (Hakluyt Soc.*, 1890).

**A. D. 1608-1616.**—Champlain's Explorations in the Valley of the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes. See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1608-1611, and 1611-1616.

**A. D. 1609.**—Hudson's Voyage of Discovery for the Dutch.—"The failure of two expeditions daunted the enterprise of Hudson's employers [the Muscovy Company, in England], they could not doubt the courage of the great navigator, who was destined to become the rival of Smith and of Champlain. He longed to tempt once more the dangers of the northern seas; and, repairing to Holland, he offered, in the service of the Dutch East India Company, to explore the icy wastes in search of the coveted passage. The voyage of Smith to Virginia stimulated desire; the Zealanders, fearing the loss of treasure, objected; but, by the influence of Balhazar Moucheron, the directors for Amsterdam resolved on equipping a small vessel of discovery; and, on the 4th day of April, 1609, the 'Crescent' [for 'Half-Moon, as the name of the little ship is more commonly translated], commanded by Hudson, and manned by a mixed crew of Englishmen and Hollanders, his son being of the number, set sail for the north-western passage. Masses of ice impeded the navigation towards Nova Zembla; Hudson, who had examined the maps of John Smith of Virginia, turned to the west; and passing beyond Greenland and Newfoundland, and running down the coast of Acadia, he anchored, probably, in the mouth of the Penobscot. Then, following the track of Gosnold, he came up on the promontory of Cape Cod, and, believing himself its first discoverer, gave it the name of New Holland. Long afterwards, it was claimed as the north-eastern boundary of New Netherlands. From the sands of Cape Cod, he steered a southerly course till he was opposite the entrance into the bay of Virginia, where Hudson remembered that his countrymen were planted. Then turning again to

the north, he discovered the Delaware Bay, examined its currents and its soundings, and, without going on shore, took note of the aspect of the country. On the 3d day of September, almost at the time when Champlain was invading New York from the north, less than five months after the truce with Spain, which gave the Netherlands a diplomatic existence as a state, the 'Crescent' anchored within Sandy Hook, and from the neighboring shores, that were crowned with 'goodly oaks,' attracted frequent visits from the natives. After a week's delay, Hudson sailed through the Narrows, and at the mouth of the river anchored in a harbor which was pronounced to be very good for all winds. . . . Ten days were employed in exploring the river; the first of Europeans, Hudson went sounding his way above the Highlands, till at last the 'Crescent' had sailed some miles beyond the city of Hudson, and a boat had advanced a little beyond Albany. Frequent intercourse was held with the astonished natives [and two battles fought with them]. . . . Having completed his discovery, Hudson descended the stream to which time has given his name, and on the 4th day of October, about the season of the return of John Smith to England, he set sail for Europe. . . . A happy return voyage brought the 'Crescent' into Dartmouth. Hudson forwarded to his Dutch employers a brilliant account of his discoveries; but he never revisited the lands which he eulogized; and the Dutch East-India Company refused to search further for the north-western passage."—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S.*, ch. 15 (or pt. 2, ch. 12 of "Author's Last Revision").

ALSO IN H. R. CLEVELAND, *Life of Henry Hudson* (*Lib. of Am. Biog.*, v. 10), ch. 3-4.—R. Juet, *Journal of Hudson's Voyage* (*N. Y. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, Second Series, v. 1).—J. V. Yates and J. W. Moulton, *Hist. of the State of N. Y.*, pt. 1.

A. D. 1610-1614.—The Dutch occupation of New Netherland, and Block's coasting exploration. See NEW YORK; A. D. 1610-1614.

A. D. 1614-1615.—The Voyages of Capt. John Smith to North Virginia.—The Naming of the country New England.—"From the time of Capt. Smith's departure from Virginia [see VIRGINIA; A. D. 1607-1610], till the year 1614, there is a chasm in his biography. . . . In 1614, probably by his advice and at his suggestion, an expedition was fitted out by some London merchants, in the expense of which he also shared, for the purposes of trade and discovery in New England, or, as it was then called, North Virginia. . . . In March, 1614, he set sail from London with two ships, one commanded by himself, and the other by Captain Thomas Hunt. They arrived, April 30th, at the island of Manhegin, on the coast of Maine, where they built seven boats. The purposes for which they were sent were to capture whales and to search for mines of gold or copper, which were said to be there, and, if these failed, to make up a cargo of fish and furs. Of mines, they found no indications, and they found whale-fishing a 'costly conclusion;' for, although they saw many, and chased them too, they succeeded in taking none. They thus lost the best part of the fishing season; but, after giving up their gigantic game, they diligently employed the months of July and

August in taking and curing codfish, an humble, but more certain prey. While the crew were thus employed, Captain Smith, with eight men in a small boat, surveyed and examined the whole coast, from Penobscot to Cape Cod, trafficking with the Indians for furs, and twice fighting with them, and taking such observations of the prominent points as enabled him to construct a map of the country. He then sailed for England, where he arrived in August, within six months after his departure. He left Captain Hunt behind him, with orders to dispose of his cargo of fish in Spain. Unfortunately, Hunt was a sordid and unprincipled miscreant, who resolved to make his countrymen odious to the Indians, and thus prevent the establishment of a permanent colony, which would diminish the large gains he and a few others derived by monopolizing a lucrative traffic. For this purpose, having decoyed 24 of the natives on board his ship, he carried them off and sold them as slaves in the port of Malaga. . . . Captain Smith, upon his return, presented his map of the country between Penobscot and Cape Cod to Prince Charles (afterwards Charles I.), with a request that he would substitute others, instead of the 'barbarous names' which had been given to particular places. Smith himself gave to the country the name of New England, as he expressly states, and not Prince Charles, as is commonly supposed. . . . The first port into which Captain Smith put on his return to England was Plymouth. There he related his adventures to some of his friends, 'who,' he says, 'as I supposed, were interested in the dead patient of this unregarded country.' The Plymouth Company of adventurers to North Virginia, by flattering hopes and large promises, induced him to engage his services to them." Accordingly in March, 1615, he sailed from Plymouth, with two vessels under his command, bearing 16 settlers, besides their crew. A storm dismasted Smith's ship and drove her back to Plymouth. "His consort, commanded by Thomas Dermer, meanwhile proceeded on her voyage, and returned with a profitable cargo in August; but the object, which was to effect a permanent settlement, was frustrated. Captain Smith's vessel was probably found to be so much shattered as to render it inexpedient to repair her; for we find that he set sail a second time from Plymouth, on the 24th of June, in a small bark of 60 tons, manned by 30 men, and carrying with him the same 16 settlers he had taken before. But an evil destiny seemed to hang over this enterprise, and to make the voyage a succession of disasters and disappointments." It ended in Smith's capture by a piratical French fleet and his detention for some months, until he made a daring escape in a small boat. "While he had been detained on board the French pirate, in order, as he says, 'to keep my perplexed thoughts from too much meditation of my miserable estate,' he employed himself in writing a narrative of his two voyages to New England, and an account of the country. This was published in a quarto form in June, 1616. . . . Captain Smith's work on New England was the first so recommended that country as a place of settlement."—G. S. Hillard, *Life of Capt. John Smith* (ch. 14-15).

ALSO IN Capt. John Smith, *Description of N. Eng.*



A. D. 1619.—Introduction of negro slavery into Virginia. See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1619.

A. D. 1620.—The Planting of the Pilgrim Colony at Plymouth, and the Chartering of the Council for New England. See MASSACHUSETTS (PLYMOUTH COLONY): A. D. 1620; and NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1620-1623.

A. D. 1620.—Formation of the Government of Rio de La Plata. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1580-1777.

A. D. 1621.—Conflicting claims of England and France on the North-eastern coast.—Naming and grant: of Nova Scotia. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1621-1641.

A. D. 1629.—The Carolina grant to Sir Robert Heath.—“Sir Robert Heath, attorney-general to Charles I., obtained a grant of the lands between the 35th [36th?] degree of north latitude to the river St. Matheo. His charter bears date of October 5, 1629. . . . The tenure is declared to be as ample as any bishop of Durham [Palatine], in the kingdom of England, ever held and enjoyed, or ought or could of right have held and enjoyed. Sir Robert, his heirs and assigns, are constituted the true and absolute lords and proprietors, and the country is erected into a province by the name of Carolina [or Carolana], and the islands are to be called the Carolina islands. Sir Robert conveyed his right some time after to the earl of Arundel. This nobleman, it is said, planted several parts of his acquisition, but his attempt to colonize was checked by the war with Scotland, and afterwards the civil war. Lord Maltravers, who soon after, on his father's death, became earl of Arundel and Sussex . . . made no attempt to avail himself of the grant. . . . Sir Robert Heath's grant of land, to the southward of Virginia, perhaps the most extensive possession ever owned by an individual, remained for a long time almost absolutely waste and uncultivated. This vast extent of territory occupied all the country between the 30th and 36th degrees of northern latitude, which embraces the present states of North and South Carolina, Georgia, [Alabama], Tennessee, Mississippi, and, with very little exceptions, the whole state of Louisiana, and the territory of East and West Florida, a considerable part of the state of Missouri, the Mexican provinces of Texas, Chihuahua &c. The grantee had taken possession of the country, soon after he had obtained his title, which he afterwards had conveyed to the earl of Arundel. Henry lord Maltravers appears to have obtained some aid from the province of Virginia in 1639, at the desire of Charles I., for the settlement of Carolana, and the country had since become the property of a Dr. Cox; yet, at this time, there were two points only in which incipient English settlements could be discerned; the one on the northern shore of Albemarle Sound and the streams that flow into it. The population of it was very thin, and the greatest portion of it was on the north-east bank of Chowan river. The settlers had come from that part of Virginia now known as the County of Nansemond. . . . They had been joined by a number of Quakers and other sectaries, whom the spirit of intolerance had driven from New England, and some emigrants from Bermudas. . . . The other settlement of the English was at the mouth of Cape Fear river; . . . those who composed it had come thither from New England

in 1659. Their attention was confined to rearing cattle. It cannot now be ascertained whether the assignees of Carolana ever surrendered the charter under which it was held, nor whether it was considered as having become vacated or obsolete by non-user, or by any other means.”—F. X. Martin, *Hist. of N. Carolina*, v. 1, ch. 5 and 7.

A. D. 1629.—The Royal Charter to the Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1623-1629, THE DORCHESTER COMPANY.

A. D. 1629-1631.—The Dutch occupation of the Delaware. See DELAWARE: A. D. 1629-1631.

A. D. 1629-1632.—English Conquest and brief occupation of New France. See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1628-1632.

A. D. 1632.—The Charter to Lord Baltimore and the founding of Maryland. See MARYLAND: A. D. 1632, and A. D. 1633-1637.

A. D. 1638.—The planting of a Swedish Colony on the Delaware. See DELAWARE: A. D. 1638-1640.

A. D. 1639-1700.—The Buccaneers and their piratical warfare with Spain.—“The 17th century gave birth to a class of rovers wholly distinct from any of their predecessors in the annals of the world, differing as widely in their plans, organization and exploits as in the principles that governed their actions. . . . After the native inhabitants of Haiti had been exterminated, and the Spaniards had sailed farther west, a few adventurous men from Normandy settled on the shores of the island, for the purpose of hunting the wild bulls and hogs which roamed at will through the forests. The small island of Tortugas was their market; thither they repaired with their salted and smoked meat, their hides, &c., and disposed of them in exchange for powder, lead, and other necessities. The places where these semi-wild hunters prepared the slaughtered carcasses were called ‘boucans,’ and they themselves became known as Buccaneers. Probably the world has never before or since witnessed such an extraordinary association as theirs. Unburdened by women-folk or children, these men lived in couples, reciprocally rendering each other services, and having entire community of property—a condition termed by them *matelotage*, from the word ‘matelot,’ by which they addressed one another. . . . A man on joining the fraternity completely merged his identity. Each member received a nickname, and no attempt was ever made to inquire into his antecedents. When one of their number married, he ceased to be a buccaneer, having forfeited his membership by so civilized a proceeding. He might continue to dwell on the coast, and to hunt cattle, but he was no longer a ‘matelot’—as a Benedict he had degenerated to a ‘colonist.’ . . . Uncouth and lawless though the buccaneers were, the sinister signification now attaching to their name would never have been merited had it not been for the unreasoning jealousy of the Spaniards. The hunters were actually a source of profit to that nation, yet from an insane antipathy to strangers the dominant race resolved or exterminating the settlers. Attacked whilst dispersed in pursuit of their avocations, the latter fell easy victims; many of them were wantonly massacred, others dragged into slavery. . . . Breathing hatred and vengeance, ‘the

brethren of the coast' united their scattered forces, and a war of horrible reprisals commenced. Fresh troops arrived from Spain, whilst the ranks of the buccaneers were filled by adventurers of all nations, allured by love of plunder, and fired with indignation at the cruelties of the aggressors. . . . The Spaniards, utterly failing to oust their opponents, hit upon a new expedient, so short-sighted that it reflects but little credit on their statesmanship. This was the extermination of the horned cattle, by which the buccaneers derived their means of subsistence; a general slaughter took place, and the breed was almost extirpated. . . . The puffed-up arrogance of the Spaniard was curbed by no prudent consideration; calling upon every saint in his calendar, and raining curses on the heretical buccaneers, he deprived them of their legitimate occupation, and created wilfully a set of desperate enemies, who harassed the colonial trade of an empire already betraying signs of feebleness with the pertia city of wolves, and who only desisted when her commerce had been reduced to insignificance. . . . Devoured by an undying hatred of their assailants, the buccaneers developed into a new association—the freebooters."—C. H. Eden, *The West Indies*, ch. 3.—"The monarchs both of England and France, but especially the former, connived at and even encouraged the freebooters [a name which the pronunciation of French sailors transformed into 'filibusters,' while that corruption became Anglicized in its turn and produced the word filibusters], whose services could be obtained in time of war, and whose actions could be disavowed in time of peace. Thus buccaneer, filibuster, and sea-rover, were for the most part at leisure to hunt wild cattle, and to pillage and massacre the Spaniards wherever they found an opportunity. When not on some marauding expedition, they followed the chase." The piratical buccaneers were first organized under a leader in 1639, the islet of Tortuga being their favorite rendezvous. "So rapid was the growth of their settlements that in 1641 we find governors appointed, and at San Christobal a governor-general named De Poincey, in charge of the French filibusters in the Indies. During that year Tortuga was garrisoned by French troops, and the English were driven out, both from that islet and from Santo Domingo, securing harborage elsewhere in the islands. Nevertheless corsairs of both nations often made common cause. . . . In [1651] Tortuga was again recaptured by the Spaniards, but in 1660 fell once more into the hands of the French; and in their conquest of Jamaica in 1655 the British troops were re-embodied by a large party of buccaneers." The first of the more famous buccaneers, and apparently the most ferocious among them all, was a Frenchman called François L'Olonnois, who harried the coast of Central America between 1660-1665 with six ships and 700 men. At the same time another buccaneer named Mauvelt, was rising in fame, and with him, as second in command, a Welshman, Henry Morgan, who became the most notorious of all. In 1668, Morgan attacked and captured the strong town of Portobello, on the Isthmus, committing indescribable atrocities. In 1671 he crossed the Isthmus, defeated the Spaniards in battle and gained possession of the great and wealthy city of Panama—the largest and richest in the New

World, containing at the time 30,000 inhabitants. The city was pillaged, fired and totally destroyed. The exploits of this ruffian and the stolen riches which he carried home to England soon afterward, gained the honors of knighthood for him, from the worthy hands of Charles II. In 1680, the buccaneers under one Coxon again crossed the Isthmus, seized Panama, which had been considerably rebuilt, and captured there a Spanish fleet of four ships, in which they launched themselves upon the Pacific. From that time their plundering operations were chiefly directed against the Pacific coast. Towards the close of the 17th century, the war between England and France, and the Bourbon alliance of Spain with France, brought about the discouragement, the decline and finally the extinction of the buccaneer organization.—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States: Central Am.*, v. 2, ch. 26-30.

ALSO IN W. Thornbury, *The Buccaneers*.—A. O. Exquemelin, *Hist. of the Buccaneers*.—J. Burney, *Hist. of the Buccaneers of Am.*—See, also, JAMAICA: A. D. 1655-1796.

A. D. 1655.—Submission of the Swedes on the Delaware to the Dutch. See DELAWARE: A. D. 1640-1656.

A. D. 1663.—The grant of the Carolinas to Monk, Clarendon, Shaftesbury, and others. See NORTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1663-1670.

A. D. 1664.—English conquest of New Netherland. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1664.

A. D. 1673.—The Dutch reconquest of New Netherland. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1673.

A. D. 1673-1682.—Discovery and exploration of the Mississippi, by Marquette and La Salle.—Louisiana named and possessed by the French. See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1634-1673, and 1660-1687.

A. D. 1674.—Final surrender of New Netherland to the English. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1674.

A. D. 1681.—The proprietary grant to William Penna. See PENNSYLVANIA: A. D. 1681.

A. D. 1680-1697.—The first Inter-Colonial War: King William's War (The war of the League of Augsburg). See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1689-1690; 1692-1697; also, NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1694-1697.

A. D. 1690.—The first Colonial Congress. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1690; also, CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1689-1690.

A. D. 1698-1712.—The French colonization of Louisiana.—Broad claims of France to the whole Valley of the Mississippi. See LOUISIANA: A. D. 1698-1712.

A. D. 1700-1735.—The Spread of French occupation in the Mississippi Valley and on the Lakes. See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1700-1735.

A. D. 1702.—Union of the two Jerseys as a royal province. See NEW JERSEY: A. D. 1688-1788.

A. D. 1702-1713.—The Second Inter-Colonial War: Queen Anne's War (The War of the Spanish Succession).—Final acquisition of Nova Scotia by the English. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1702-1710; CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1711-1713.

A. D. 1713.—Division of territory between England and France by the Treaty of Utrecht. See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1711-1713.

A. D. 1729.—End of the proprietary government in North Carolina. See NORTH CAROLINA; A. D. 1688-1729.

A. D. 1732.—The colonization of Georgia by General Oglethorpe. See GEORGIA; A. D. 1732-1739.

A. D. 1744-1748.—The Third Inter-Colonial War: King George's War (The War of the Austrian Succession). See NEW ENGLAND; A. D. 1744; 1745; and 1745-1748.

A. D. 1748-1760.—Unsettled boundary disputes of England and France.—The fourth and last inter-colonial war, called the French and Indian War (The Seven Years War of Europe).—English Conquest of Canada. See CANADA (NEW FRANCE); A. D. 1750-1753; 1760; NOVA SCOTIA; A. D. 1749-1755; 1755; OHIO (VALLEY); A. D. 1748-1754; 1754; 1755; CAPE BRETON ISLAND; A. D. 1758-1760.

A. D. 1749.—Introduction of negro slavery into Georgia. See GEORGIA; A. D. 1735-1749.

A. D. 1750-1753.—Dissensions among the English Colonies on the eve of the great French War. See UNITED STATES OF AM.; A. D. 1750-1753.

A. D. 1754.—The Colonial Congress at Albany.—Franklin's Plan of Union. See UNITED STATES OF AM.; A. D. 1754.

A. D. 1763.—The Peace of Paris.—Canada, Cape Breton, Newfoundland, and Louisiana east of the Mississippi (except New Orleans)

ceded by France to Great Britain.—West of the Mississippi and New Orleans to Spain.—Florida by Spain to Great Britain. See SEVEN YEARS WAR.

A. D. 1763-1764.—Pontiac's War. See PONTIAC'S WAR.

A. D. 1763-1766.—Growing discontent of the English Colonies.—The question of taxation.—The Stamp Act and its repeal. See UNITED STATES OF AM.; A. D. 1760-1775, to 1766.

A. D. 1766-1769.—Spanish occupation of New Orleans and Western Louisiana, and the revolt against it. See LOUISIANA; A. D. 1766-1768, and 1769.

A. D. 1775-1783.—Independence of the English colonies achieved. See UNITED STATES OF AM.; A. D. 1775 (APRIL) to 1783 (SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1776.—Erection of the Spanish Viceroyalty of Buenos Ayres. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC; A. D. 1780-1777.

A. D. 1810-1816.—Revolt, independence and Confederation of the Argentine Provinces. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC; A. D. 1806-1820.

A. D. 1818.—Chilean independence achieved. See CHILE; A. D. 1810-1818.

A. D. 1820-1821.—Independence Acquired by Mexico and the Central American States. See MEXICO; A. D. 1820-1826, and CENTRAL AMERICA; A. D. 1821-1871.

A. D. 1824.—Peruvian independence won at Ayacucho. See PERU; A. D. 1820-1826.

## AMERICAN ABORIGINES.

**Linguistic Classification.**—In the Seventh Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology (for 1885-86, published in 1891), Major J. W. Powell, the Director of the Bureau, has given a classification of the languages of the North American aborigines based upon the most recent investigations. The following is a list of families of speech, or linguistic stocks, which are defined and named: "Adizaa [identified since the publication of this list as being but part of the Caddoan stock].—Algonquian.—Athapascan.—Attaapan.—Beothukan.—Caddoan.—Chimakuan.—Chimarian.—Chimmeyan.—Chinookan.—Chitimachan.—Chumashan.—Coahuiltecan.—Copchan.—Costanoan.—Eskimuan.—Esselenian.—Iroquoian.—Kalapooian.—Karankawan.—Keresan.—Kiowan.—Kituanihan.—Kohschan.—Kulanapan.—Kusan.—Lutunian.—Mariposan.—Moquechuman.—Muskogean.—Natchezan.—Palaibnihan.—Piman.—Pujunan.—Quoratean.—Salinan.—Salishan.—Sastean.—Shahaptian.—Shoshonean.—Siouan.—Skittagetan.—Tahkiman.—Tahoan.—Timuquanan.—Tonikan.—Tonkawan.—Uchean.—Wailatpanan.—Wakshian.—Washoan.—Weitspekan.—Wishoskan.—Yokonan.—Yanan.—Yukian.—Yuman.—Zuñian."—These families are severally defined in the summary of information given below, and the relations to them of all tribes having any historical importance are shown by cross-references and otherwise; but many other groupings and associations, and many tribal names not scientifically recognized, are likewise exhibited here, for the reason that they have a significance in history and are the subjects of frequent allusion in literature.

**Abipones.** See below: PAMPAS TRIBES.

**Abnakis, or Abenagues, or Taranteens.**—"The Abnakis were called Taranteens by the English, and Owemagungas by the New Yorkers. . . . We must admit that a large portion of the North American Indians were called Abnakis, if not by themselves, at least by others. This word Abnaki is found spelt Abenagues, Abenaki, Wapanachki, and Wabenakies by different writers of various nations, each adopting the manner of spelling according to the rules of pronunciation of their respective native languages. . . . The word generally received is spelled thus, Abnaki, but it should be 'Wānānāghi,' from the Indian word 'wanbanban,' designating the people of the Aurora Borealis, or in general, of the place where the sky commences to appear white at the breaking of the day. . . . It has been difficult for different writers to determine the number of nations or tribes comprehended under this word Abnaki. It being a general word, by itself designates the people of the east or northeast. . . . We find that the word Abnaki was applied in general, more or less, to all the Indians of the East, by persons who were not much acquainted with the aborigines of the country. On the contrary, the early writers and others well acquainted with the natives of New France and Acadia, and the Indians themselves, by Abnakis always pointed out a particular nation existing north-west and south of the Kennebec river, and they never designated any other people of the Atlantic shore, from Cape Jattaras to Newfoundland. . . . The Abnakis had five great villages, two amongst the French colonies, which must be the village of St. Joseph or Sillery, and that of St. Francis de Sales, both in Canada, three on the head waters,

or along three rivers, between Acadia and New England. These three rivers are the Kennebec, the Androscoggin, and the Saco. . . . The nation of the Abnakis bear evident marks of having been an original people in their name, manners, and language. They show a kind of civilization which must be the effect of antiquity, and of a past flourishing age."—E. Vernet, *The Abnaki Indians (Maine Hist. Soc. Coll., v. 6)*.—See, also, below: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.—For some account of the war of the Abnakis, with the New England colonies, see CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1689-1690, and 1692-1697; NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1675 (JULY—SEPT.); 1702-1710, 1711-1713; and NOVA SCOTIA: A. D. 1713-1730.

**Absarokas, Upsarokas, or Crows.** See below: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Acarwois.** See below: CARIBS AND THEIR KINDRED.

**Acolhuas.** See MEXICO, A. D. 1325-1502.  
**Adais.**—These Indians were a "tribe who, according to Dr. Sibley, lived about the year 1800 near the old Spanish fort or mission of Adaise, 'about 40 miles from Natchitoches, below the Yattassers, on a lake called Lac Macdon, which communicates with the division of Red River that passes by Bayou Pierre' [Lewis and Clarke]. A vocabulary of about 250 words is all that remains to us of their language, which according to the collector, Dr. Sibley, 'differs from all others, and is so difficult to speak or understand that no nation can speak ten words of it. . . . A recent comparison of this vocabulary by Mr. Gatschet, with several Caddoan dialects, has led to the discovery that a considerable percentage of the Adai words have a more or less remote affinity with Caddoan, and he regards it as a Caddoan dialect."—J. W. Powell, *Sixteenth An. Report, Bureau of Ethnology*, pp. 45-46.—See preceding page.

**Adirondacks.**—"This is a term bestowed by the Iroquois, in derision, on the tribes who appear, at an early day, to have descended the Utawas river, and occupied the left banks of the St. Lawrence, above the present site of Quebec, about the close of the 15th century. It is said to signify men who eat trees, in allusion to their using the bark of certain trees for food, when reduced to straits, in their war excursions. The French, who entered the St. Lawrence from the gulf, called the same people Algonquins—a generic appellation, which has been long employed and come into universal use, among historians and philologists. According to early accounts, the Adirondacks had preceded the Iroquois in arts and attainment."—H. R. Schoolcraft, *Notes on the Iroquois*, ch. 5.—See, also, below: IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY: THEIR CONQUESTS, &c.

**Æsopus Indians.** See below: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Agniers.**—Among several names which the Mohawks (see below: IROQUOIS) bore in early colonial history was that of the Agniers.—F. Parkman, *The Conspiracy of Pontiac*, v. 1, p. 9, *foot-note*.

**Albais.** See below: PAMPAS TRIBES.  
**Aleuts.** See below: ESKIMAUAN FAMILY.  
**Algonquian (Algonkin) Family.**—"About the period 1500-1600, those related tribes whom we now know by the name of Algonkins were at the height of their prosperity. They occupied the

Atlantic coast from the Savannah river on the south to the strait of Belle Isle on the north. . . . The dialects of all these were related, and evidently at some distant day had been derived from the same primitive tongue. Which of them had preserved the ancient forms most closely, it may be premature to decide positively, but the tendency of modern studies has been to assign that place to the Cree—the northernmost of all. We cannot erect a genealogical tree of these dialects. . . . We may, however, group them in such a manner as roughly to indicate their relationship. This I do"—in the following list: "Cree.—Old Algonkin.—Montagnais.—Chippeway, Ottawa, Pottawattonic, Miami, Peoria, Pca, Piankishaw, Kaskaskin, Menominee, Sac, Fox, Kickapoo.—Sheshatapoosh, Secoffee, Micmic, Mellseeet, Etechemin, Abnaki.—Mohegan, Massachusetts, Shawnee, Minsi, Unami, Unalachtigo [the last three named forming, together, the nation of the Lenape or Delawares], Nanticoke, Powhatan, Pampticoke.—Blackfoot, Gros Ventre, Sheyenne. . . . All the Algonkin nations who dwelt north of the Potomac, on the east shore of Chesapeake Bay, and in the basins of the Delaware and Hudson rivers, claimed near kinship and an identical origin, and were at times united into a loose, defensive confederacy. By the western and southern tribes they were collectively known as Wapanachkik—'those of the eastern region'—which in the form Abnaki is now confined to the remnant of a tribe in Maine. . . . The members of the confederacy were the Mohegans (Mahicanni) of the Hudson, who occupied the valley of that river to the falls above the site of Albany, the various New Jersey tribes, the Delawares proper on the Delaware river and its branches, including the Minsi or Monseys, among the mountains, the Nanticokes, between Chesapeake Bay and the Atlantic, and the small tribe called Canai, Kanawhas or Ganawese, whose towns were on tributaries of the Potomac and Patuxent. . . . Linguistically, the Mohegans were more closely allied to the tribes of New England than to those of the Delaware Valley. Evidently, most of the tribes of Massachusetts and Connecticut were comparatively recent offshoots of the parent stem on the Hudson, supposing the course of migration had been eastward. . . . The Nanticokes occupied the territory between Chesapeake Bay and the ocean, except its southern extremity, which appears to have been under the control of the Powhatan tribe of Virginia."—D. G. Brinton, *The Lenape and their Legends*, ch. 1-2.—"Mohegans, Munsees, Manhattans, Metöacs, and other affiliated tribes and bands of Algonquin lineage, inhabited the banks of the Hudson and the islands, bay and seaboard of New York, including Long Island, during the early periods of the rise of the Iroquois Confederacy. . . . The Mohegans finally retired over the Highlands east of them into the valley of the Housatonic. The Munsees and Nanticokes retired to the Delaware river and reunited with their kindred, the Lenapes, or modern Delawares. The Manhattans, and numerous other bands and sub-tribes, melted away under the influence of liquor and died in their tracks."—H. R. Schoolcraft, *Notes on the Iroquois*, ch. 5.—"On the basis of a difference in dialect, that portion of the Algonquin Indians which dwelt in New England has been classed in two divisions, one consisting of those who in-

\* See Note, Appendix E.

habited what is now the State of Maine, nearly up to its western border, the other consisting of the rest of the native population. The Maine Indians may have been some 15,000 in number, or somewhat less than a third of the native population of New England. That portion of them who dwelt furthest towards the east were known by the name of Etchemins. The Abenquils, including the Tarratines, hunted on both sides of the Penobscot, and westward as far as the Saco, if not quite to the Piscataqua. The tribes found in the rest of New England were designated by a greater variety of names. The home of the Penacook or Pawtucket Indians was in the southeast corner of what is now New Hampshire and the contiguous region of Massachusetts. Next dwelt the Massachusetts tribe, along the bay of that name. Then were found successively the Pokanokets, or Wampanoags, in the southeasterly region of Massachusetts, and by Buz-zard's and Narragansett Bays; the Narragansetts, with a tributary race called Nyantics in what is now the western part of the State of Rhode Island; the Pequots, between the Narragansetts and the river formerly called the Pequot River, now the Thames; and the Mohegans, spreading themselves beyond the River Connecticut. In the central region of Massachusetts were the Nipmucks, or Nipucts; and along Cape Cod were the Nausetts, who appeared to have owed some fealty to the Pokanokets. The New England Indians exhibited an inferior type of humanity. . . . Though fleet and agile when excited to some occasional effort, they were found to be incapable of continuous labor. Heavy and phlegmatic, they scarcely wept or smiled."—J. G. Palfrey, *Compendious Hist. of N. Eng.*, bk. 1, ch. 3 (p. 1).—"The valley of the 'Cahohataeca,' or Mauritius River [i. e., the Hudson River, as now named] at the time Hudson first ascended its waters, was inhabited, chiefly, by two aboriginal races of Algonquin lineage, afterwards known among the English colonists by the generic names of Mohegans and Mincees. The Dutch generally called the Mohegans, Mahicans; and the Mincees, Saahikans. These two tribes were subdivided into numerous minor bands, each of which had a distinctive name. The tribes on the east side of the river were generally Mohegans; those on the west side, Mincees. They were hereditary enemies. . . . Long Island, or 'Sewan-lucky,' was occupied by the savage tribe of Metowacks, which was subdivided into various clans. . . . Staten Island, on the opposite side of the bay, was inhabited by the Monatons. . . . Inland, to the west, lived the Raritans and the Hackinsucks; while the regions in the vicinity of the well-known 'Highlands,' south of Sandy Hook, were inhabited by a band or sub-tribe called the Nevesincks or Navisinks. . . . To the south and west, covering the centre of New Jersey, were the Aquanachukes and the Stanke-kans; while the valley of the Delaware, northward from the Schuylkill, was inhabited by various tribes of the Lenape race. . . . The island of the Manhattans" was occupied by the tribe which received that name (see MANHATTAN). On the shores of the river, above, dwelt the Tappans, the Weckquaesgeeks, the Sint Sings, "whose chief village was named Ossin-Sing, or 'the Place of Stones,'" the Puchami, the Waorin-acks, the Wappingers, and the Waronawankongs.

"Further north, and occupying the present counties of Ulster and Greene, were the Minqua clans of Minnesincks, Nanticokes, Mincees, and Delawares. These clans had pressed onward from the upper valley of the Delaware. . . . They were generally known among the Dutch as the Esopus Indians."—J. R. Brodhead, *Hist. of the State of N. Y.*, v. 1, ch. 3.—"The area formerly occupied by the Algonquian family was more extensive than that of any other linguistic stock in North America, their territory reaching from Labrador to the Rocky Mountains, and from Churchill River of Hudson Bay as far south at least as Pamlico Sound of North Carolina. In the eastern part of this territory was an area occupied by Iroquoian tribes, surrounded on almost all sides by their Algonquian neighbors. On the south the Algonquian tribes were bordered by those of Iroquoian and Siouan (Catawba) stock, on the southwest and west by the Musk-hogean and Siouan tribes, and on the northwest by the Kitnuahan and the great Athapascan families, while along the coast of Labrador and the eastern shore of Hudson Bay they came in contact with the Eskimo, who were gradually retreating before them to the north. In Newfoundland they encountered the Beothukan family, consisting of but a single tribe. A portion of the Shawnee at some early period had separated from the main body of the tribe in central Tennessee and pushed their way down to the Savannah River in South Carolina, where, known as Savannahs, they carried on destructive wars with the surrounding tribes until about the beginning of the 18th century they were finally driven out and joined the Delaware in the north. Soon afterwards the rest of the tribe was expelled by the Cherokee and Chieasa, who thenceforward claimed all the country stretching north to the Ohio River. The Cheyenne and Arapaho, two allied tribes of this stock, had become separated from their kindred on the north and had forced their way through hostile tribes across the Missouri to the Black Hills country of South Dakota, and more recently into Wyoming and Colorado, thus forming the advance guard of the Algonquian stock in that direction, having the Siouan tribes behind them and those of the Shoshonean family in front. [The following are the] principal tribes: Abnaki, Algonquin, Arapaho, Cheyenne, Jonoy, Cree, Delaware, Fox, Illinois, Kickapoo, Mahican, Massachusetts, Menominee, Miami, Micmac, Mohegan, Montagnais, Montauk, Munsee, Nanticoke, Narragansett, Nauset, Nipmuc, Ojibwa, Ottawa, Pamlico, Penacook, Pequot, Piankishaw, Pottawotomi, Powhatan, Sac, Shawnee, Siksika, Wampanoag, Wappinger. The present number of the Algonquian stock is about 95,600, of whom about 60,000 are in Canada and the remainder in the United States."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Report, Bureau of Ethnology*, pp. 47-48.

ALSO IN J. W. De Forest, *Hist. of the Indians of Connecticut*.—A. Gallatin, *Synopsis of the Indian Tribes (Archæologia Americana, v. 2)*, intro., sect. 2.—S. G. Drake, *Aboriginal Races of N. Am.*, bk. 2-3.—See, also, below: DELAWARES; HOHUKANS; SHAWANEESE; SUSQUEHANNAS; OJIBWAS; ILLINOIS.—FOR THE INDIAN WARS OF NEW ENGLAND, see NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1637 (THE PEQUOT WAR); A. D. 1674-1675 to 1676-1678 (KING PHILIP'S WAR).—See, also, PONTIAC'S WAR.

**Alibamus, or Alabamas.** See below: MUSKOGEAN FAMILY.

**Alleghans, or Allegewi, or Talligewi.**—"The oldest tribe of the United States, of which there is a distinct tradition, were the Alleghans. The term is perpetuated in the principal chain of mountains traversing the country. This tribe, at an antique period, had the seat of their power in the Ohio Valley and its confluent streams, which were the sites of their numerous towns and villages. They appear originally to have borne the name of All, or Alleg, and hence the names of Talligewi and Allegewi. (Trans. Am. Phi. Soc., vol. 1.) By adding to the radical of this word the particle 'hany' or 'ghany,' meaning river, they described the principal scene of their residence—namely, the Alleghany, or River of the Alleghans, now called Ohio. The word Ohio is of Iroquois origin, and of a far later period; having been bestowed by them after their conquest of the country, in alliance with the Lenapee, or ancient Delawares. (Phi. Trans.) The term was applied to the entire river, from its confluence with the Mississippi, to its origin in the broad spurs of the Alleghanics, in New York and Pennsylvania. . . . There are evidences of antique labors in the alluvial plains and valleys of the Scioto, Miami, and Muskingum, the Wabash, Kaskaskia, Cuhokia, and Illinois, denoting that the ancient Alleghans, and their allies and confederates, cultivated the soil, and were semi-agriculturists. These evidences have been traced, at late periods, to the fertile table-lands of Indiana and Michigan. The tribes lived in fixed towns, cultivating extensive fields of the zea-maize; and also, as denoted by recent discoveries, . . . of some species of beans, vines, and esculents. They were, in truth, the mound builders."—H. R. Schoolcraft, *Information respecting the Indian Tribes*, pt. 5, p. 133.—This conclusion, to which Mr. Schoolcraft had arrived, that the ancient Alleghans or Talligewi were the mound builders of the Ohio Valley is being sustained by later investigators, and seems to have become an accepted opinion among those of highest authority. The Alleghans, moreover, are being identified with the Cherokees of later times, in whom their race, once supposed to be extinct, has apparently survived; while the fact, long suspected, that the Cherokee language is of the Iroquois family is being proved by the latest studies. According to Indian tradition, the Alleghans were driven from their ancient seats, long ago, by a combination against them of the Lenape (Delawares) and the Mengwe (Iroquois). The route of their migrations is being traced by the character of the mounds which they built, and of the remains gathered from the mounds. "The general movement [of retreat before the Iroquois and Lenape] . . . must have been southward, . . . and the exit of the Ohio mound-builders was, in all probability, up the Kanawah Valley on the same line that the Cherokees appear to have followed in reaching their historical locality. . . . If the hypothesis here advanced be correct, it is apparent that the Cherokees entered the immediate valley of the Mississippi from the northwest, striking it in the region of Iowa."—C. Thomas, *The Problem of the Ohio Mounds* (Bureau of Ethnology, 1889).

ALSO IN THE SAME, *Burial Mounds of the Northern Sections of the U. S.* (Fifth An. Rept.

of the Bureau of Ethnology, 1883-84).—J. Heckewelder, *Acct. of the Indian Nations*, ch. 1.—See, below: CHEROKEES, and INDOUOS CONFEDERACY; also AMERICA, PREHISTORIC.

**Amahuacas.** See below: ANDESIAN.

**Andastes.** See below: SESQUEHANNAS.

**Andesians.**—"The term Andesians or Antesians, is used with geographical rather than ethnological limits, and embraces a number of tribes. First of these are the Cofan in Ecuador, east of Chimborazo. They fought valiantly against the Spaniards, and in times past killed many of the missionaries sent among them. Now they are greatly reduced and have become more gentle. The Huamaboya are their near neighbors. The Jivara, west of the river Pastaca, are a warlike tribe, who, possibly through a mixture of Spanish blood, have a European cast of countenance and a beard. The half Christian Napo or Quijo and their peaceful neighbors, the Zaporo, live on the Rio Napo. The Yameo, living on the lower Chambya and crossing the Marañon, wandering as far as Saryacu, have a clearer complexion. The Pacamora and the Yugarzongo live on the Marañon, where it leaves its northerly course and bends toward the east. The Cochiquima live on the lower Yavari; the Mayoruna, or Barbudo, on the middle Ucayali beside the Campo and Cochibo, the most terrible of South American Indians; they dwell in the woods between the Tapiche and the Marañon, and like the Jivara have a beard. The Pano, who formerly dwelt in the territory of Laguna, but who now live in villages on the upper Ucayali, are Christians. . . . Their language is the principal one on the river, and it is shared by seven other tribes called collectively by the missionaries Manioto or Mayno. . . . Within the woods on the right bank live the Amahuaca and Shacaya. On the north they join the Remo, a powerful tribe who are distinguished from all the others by the custom of tattooing. Outside this Pano linguistic group stand the Campa, Campo, or Antis on the east slope of the Peruvian Cordillera at the source of the Rio Beni and its tributaries. The Chontaquiros, or Piru, now occupy almost entirely the bank of the Ucayali below the Pachilia. The Mojos or Moxos live in the Bolivian province of Moxos with the small tribes of the Baure, Itonana, Pacaguara. A number of smaller tribes belonging to the Antesian group need not be enumerated. The late Professor James Orton described the Indian tribes of the territory between Quito and the river Amazon. The Napo approach the type of the Quichua. . . . Among all the Indians of the Provincia del Oriente, the tribe of Jivaro is one of the largest. These people are divided into a great number of sub-tribes. All of these speak the clear musical Jivaro language. They are muscular, active men. . . . The Morona are cannibals in the full sense of the word. . . . The Campo, still very little known, is perhaps the largest Indian tribe in Eastern Peru, and, according to some, is related to the Inca race, or at least with their successors. They are said to be cannibals, though James Orton does not think this possible. . . . The nearest neighbors of the Campo are the Chontakiro, or Chontaquiro, or Chonquiro, called also Piru, who, according to Paul Marcoy, are said to be of the same origin with the Campo, but the language is wholly different. . . . Among the Pano people are the wild Conibo; they are

the most interesting, but are passing into extinction."—*The Standard Natural History* (J. S. Kingsley, ed.), v. 6, pp. 227-231.

**Apache Group.**—Under the general name of the Apaches "I include all the savage tribes roaming through New Mexico, the north-western portion of Texas, a small part of northern Mexico, and Arizona. . . . Owing to their roving proclivities and incessant raids they are led first in one direction and then in another. In general terms they may be said to range about as follows: The Comanches, Jettans, or Naumi, consisting of three tribes, the Comanches proper, the Yamparacks, and Tenawas, inhabiting northern Texas, eastern Chihuahua, Nuevo Leon, Coahuila, Durango, and portions of south-western New Mexico, by language allied to the Shoshone family; the Apaches, who call themselves Shis Inday, or 'men of the woods,' and whose tribal divisions are the Chiricanguis, Coyoteros, Faraones, Gileños, Lipanes, Llaneros, Mescaleros, Mimbrenos, Natages, Pelones, Pinalenos, Tejuas, Tontos, and Vaqueros, roaming over New Mexico, Arizona, North-western Texas, Chihuahua and Sonora, and who are allied by language to the great Tinnch family; the Navajos, or Tenuai, 'men,' as they designate themselves, having linguistic affinities with the Apache nation, with which they are sometimes classed, living in and around the Sierra de los Mimbres; the Mojaves, occupying both banks of the Colorado in Mojave Valley; the Hualapais, near the head-waters of Bill Williams Fork; the Yumas, on the east bank of the Colorado, near its junction with the Rio Gila; the Cosminos, who, like the Hualapais, are sometimes included in the Apache nation, ranging through the Mogollon Mountains; and the Yampais, between Bill Williams Fork and the Rio Hassayampa. . . . The Apache country is probably the most desert of all. . . . In both mountain and desert the fierce, rapacious Apache, inured from childhood to hunger and thirst, and heat and cold, finds safe retreat. . . . The Pueblos . . . are nothing but partially reclaimed Apaches or Comanches."—H. H. Baneroff, *Native Races of the Pacific States*, v. 1, ch. 5.—Dr. Brinton prefers the name Yuma for the whole of the Apache Group, confining the name Apache (that being the Yuma word for "fighting men") to the one tribe so called. "It has also been called the Katchan or Cuchan stock."—D. G. Brinton, *The American Race*, p. 109.—See, also, below: ATHAPASCAN FAMILY.

**Apalaches.**—"Among the aboriginal tribes of the United States perhaps none is more enigmatical than the Apalaches. They are mentioned as an important nation by many of the early French and Spanish travellers and historians, their name is preserved by a bay and river on the shores of the Gulf of Mexico, and by the great eastern coast range of mountains, and has been applied by ethnologists to a family of cognate nations that found their hunting grounds from the Mississippi to the Atlantic and from the Ohio river to the Florida Keys; yet, strange to say, their own race and place have been but guessed at." The derivation of the name of the Apalaches "has been a 'questio vexata' among Indianologists." We must "consider it an indication of ancient connections with the southern continent, and in itself a paru Carib word. 'Apállehé' in the Tamanaca dialect of the

Guaranay stem on the Orinoco signifies 'man,' and the earliest application of the name in the northern continent was as the title of the chief of a country, 'l'homme par excellence,' and hence, like very many other Indian tribes (Apaches, Lenni Lenape, Illinois), his subjects assumed by eminence the proud appellation of 'The Men.' . . . We have . . . found that though no general migration took place from the continent southward, nor from the islands northward, yet there was a considerable intercourse in both directions; that not only the natives of the greater and lesser Antilles and Yucatan, but also members of the Guaranay stem of the southern continent, the Caribs proper, crossed the Straits of Florida and founded colonies on the shores of the Gulf of Mexico; that their customs and language became to a certain extent grafted upon those of the early possessors of the soil; and to this foreign language the name Apalache belongs. As previously stated, it was used as a generic title, applied to a confederation of many nations at one time under the domination of one chief, whose power probably extended from the Alleghany mountains on the north to the shore of the Gulf; that it included tribes speaking a tongue closely akin to the Choktah is evident from the fragments we have remaining. . . . The location of the tribe in after years is very uncertain. Dumont placed them in the northern part of what is now Alabama and Georgia, near the mountains that bear their name. That a portion of them did live in this vicinity is corroborated by the historians of South Carolina, who say that Colonel Moore, in 1703, found them 'between the head-waters of the Savannah and Altamaha.' . . . According to all the Spanish authorities, on the other hand, they dwelt in the region of country between the Sawannee and Appalachiola rivers—yet must not be confounded with the Apalachicolas. . . . They certainly had a large and prosperous town in this vicinity, said to contain 1,000 warriors. . . . I am inclined to believe that these were different branches of the same confederacy. . . . In the beginning of the 18th century they suffered much from the devastations of the English, French and Creeks. . . . About the time Spain regained possession of the soil, they migrated to the West and settled on the Bayou Rapide of Red River. Here they had a village numbering about 50 souls."—D. G. Brinton, *Notes on the Floridian Peninsula*, ch. 2.—See, also, below: MUSKHOGEAN FAMILY.

**Apelousas.** See TEXAS: THE ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

**Araicu.** See below: GUCK OR COCO GROUP.

**Arapahoes.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Araucanians.** See CHILE.

**Arawaks, or Araucas.** See below: CARIBS AND THEIR KINDRED.

**Accunas.** See below: CARIBS AND THEIR KINDRED.

**Arikaras.** See below: PAWNEE (CADDON) FAMILY.

**Arkansas.** See below: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Assiniboins.** See below: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Athapascan Family.**—**Chippewyans.**—**Tinnch.**—**Sarcees.**—"This name [Athapascans or Athabascans] has been applied to a class of tribes who are situated north of the great Churchill river, and north of the source of the fork of the Saskatchewan, extending westward

till within about 150 miles of the Pacific Ocean. . . . The name is derived, arbitrarily, from Lake Athabasca, which is now more generally called the Lake of the Hills. Surrounding this lake extends the tribe of the Chippewyans, a people so-called by the Kenistenos and Chipewas, because they were found to be clothed, in some primary encounter, in the scanty garb of the fisher's skin. . . . We are informed by Mackenzie that the territory occupied by the Chippewyans extends between the parallels of 60° and 65° north and longitudes from 100° to 110° west."—H. R. Schoolcraft, *Information Respecting the Indian Tribes*, pt. 5, p. 172.—"The Timneh may be divided into four great families of nations; namely, the Chippewyans, or Athabascas, living between Hudson Bay and the Rocky Mountains; the Taculies, or Carriers, of New Caledonia or North-western British America; the Kutchins, occupying both banks of the Upper Yukon and its tributaries, from near its mouth to the Mackenzie River, and the Kenai, inhabiting the interior from the lower Yukon to Copper River."—H. H. Bancroft, *The Native Races of the Pacific States*, ch. 2.—"The Indian tribes of Alaska and the adjacent region may be divided into two groups. . . . 1. Timneh—Chippewyans of authors. . . . Father Petitot discusses the terms Athabascas, Chipewyans, Montagnais, and Timneh as applied to this group of Indians. . . . This great family includes a large number of American tribes extending from near the mouth of the Mackenzie south to the borders of Mexico. The Apaches and Navajos belong to it, and the family seems to intersect the continent of North America in a northerly and southerly direction, principally along the flanks of the Rocky Mountains. . . . The designation [Timneh] proposed by Messrs. Ross and Gibbs has been accepted by most modern ethnologists. . . . 2. T'linkets," which family includes the Yakutats and other groups.—W. H. Dall, *Tribes of the Extreme Northwest (Contributions to N. Am. Ethnology, v. 1)*.—"Wherever found, the members of this group present a certain family resemblance. In appearance they are tall and strong, the forehead low with prominent superciliary ridges, the eyes slightly oblique, the nose prominent but wide toward the base, the mouth large, the hands and feet small. Their strength and endurance are often phenomenal, but in the North, at least, their longevity is slight, few living beyond fifty. Intellectually they rank below most of their neighbors, and nowhere do they appear as fosters of the germs of civilization. Where, as among the Navajos, we find them having some repute for the mechanical arts, it turns out that this is owing to having captured and adopted the members of more gifted tribes. . . . Agriculture was not practised either in the north or south, the only exception being the Navajos, and with them the inspiration came from other stocks. . . . The most cultured of their bands were the Navajos, whose name is said to signify 'large cornfields,' from their extensive agriculture. When the Spaniards first met them in 1541 they were tillers of the soil, erected large granaries for their crops, irrigated their fields by artificial water courses or acequias, and lived in substantial dwellings, partly underground; but they had not then learned the art of weaving the celebrated 'Navajo blankets,' that being a later

acquisition of their artisans."—D. G. Brinton, *The American Race*, pp. 69-72.—See, above, APACHE GROUP, and BLACKFEET.

**Atsinas (Caddoes).**\* See below: BLACKFEET.  
**Attacapan Family.**—"Derivation: From a Choctaw word meaning 'man-eater.' Little is known of the tribe, the language of which forms the basis of the present family. The sole knowledge possessed by Gallatin was derived from a vocabulary and some scanty information furnished by Dr. John Sibley, who collected his material in the year 1805. Gallatin states that the tribe was reduced to 50 men. . . . Mr. Gatschet collected some 2,000 words and a considerable body of text. His vocabulary differs considerably from the one furnished by Dr. Sibley and published by Gallatin. . . . The above material seems to show that the Attacapa language is distinct from all others, except possibly the Chitimachan."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Report, Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 57.

**Aymarás.** See PERU.

**Aztecs** See below: MAYAS; also MEXICO: A. D. 1325-1502; and AZTEC AND MAYA PICTURE WRITING.

**Bakairi.** See below: CARIBS.

**Balchitzs.** See below: PAMPAZ TRIBES.

**Bannacks.** See below: SUOIONEAN FAMILY.

**Barbudo.** See above: ANDESIANS.

**Baré.** See below GUCK OR COCO GROUP.

**Baure.** See above: ANDESIANS.

**Beothukan Family.**—The Beothuk were a tribe, now extinct, which is believed to have occupied the whole of Newfoundland at the time of its discovery. What is known of the language of the Beothuk indicates no relationship to any other American tongue.—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 57.

**Biloxis.** See below: SUOIAN FAMILY.

**Blackfeet, or Siksikas.**\*—"The tribe that wandered the furthest from the primitive home of the stock [the Algonquian] were the Blackfeet, or Siska, which word has this signification. It is derived from their earlier habitat in the valley of the Red river of the north, where the soil was dark and blackened their mocassins. Their bands include the Blood or Kenai and the Piegan Indians. Half a century ago they were at the head of a confederacy which embraced these and also the Sarcee (Timné) and the Atsina (Caddo) nations, and numbered about 30,000 souls. They have an interesting mythology and an unusual knowledge of the constellations."—D. G. Brinton, *The American Race*, p. 79.—See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY; and below: FLATHEADS.

**Blood, or Kenai Indians.** See above: BLACKFEET.

**Botocudos.** See below: TUPI.—GUARANI.—TUPUYAS.

**Briulé.** See below: SUOIAN FAMILY.

**Caddoan Family.** See below: PAWNEE (CADDOAN) FAMILY; see, also, TEXAS: THE ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

**Cakchiquels.** See below: QUICHES, and MAYAS.

**Calusa.** See below: TUMEQUANAN FAMILY.

**Cambas, or Campo, or Campa.** See above: ANDESIANS; also, BOLIVIA: ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

**Cañares.** See ECUADOR.

**Canas.** See PERU.

**Canichanas.** See BOLIVIA: ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

\* See Note, Appendix E.



**Caniengas.** See below: INOQUIOS CONFEDERACY.

**Cariay.** See below: GUCK OR COCO GROUP.

**Caribs and their Kindred.**—"The warlike and unyielding character of these people, so different from that of the pusillanimous nations around them, and the wide scope of their enterprises and wanderings, like those of the nomad tribes of the Old World, entitle them to distinguished attention. . . . The traditional accounts of their origin, though of course extremely vague, are yet capable of being verified to a great degree by geographical facts, and open one of the rich veins of curious inquiry and speculation which abound in the New World. They are said to have migrated from the remote valleys embosomed in the Appalachian mountains. The earliest accounts we have of them represent them with weapons in their hands, continually engaged in wars, winning their way and shifting their abode, until, in the course of time, they found themselves at the extremity of Florida. Here, abandoning the northern continent, they passed over to the Lucayos [Bahamas], and thence gradually, in the process of years, from island to island of that vast verdant chain, which links, as it were, the end of Florida to the coast of Paria, on the southern continent. The archipelago extending from Porto Rico to Tobago was their stronghold, and the island of Guadalupe in a manner their citadel. Hence they made their expeditions, and spread the terror of their name through all the surrounding countries. Swarms of them landed upon the southern continent, and overran some parts of terra firma. Traces of them have been discovered far in the interior of that vast country through which flows the Oronoko. The Dutch found colonies of them on the banks of the Ikouteka, which empties into the Surinam; along the Esquibi, the Maroni, and other rivers of Guayana; and in the country watered by the windings of the Cayenne."—W. Irving, *Life and Voyages of Columbus*, bk. 6, ch. 3 (s. 1).—"To this account [substantially as given above] of the origin of the Insular Charaibes, the generality of historians have given their assent; but there are doubts attending it that are not easily solved. If [they migrated from Florida, the imperfect state and natural course of their navigation induce a belief that traces of them would have been found on those islands which are near to the Florida shore; yet the natives of the Bahamas, when discovered by Columbus, were evidently a similar people to those of Hispaniola. Besides, it is sufficiently known that there existed anciently many numerous and powerful tribes of Charaibes on the southern peninsula, extending from the river Oronoko to Essequibe, and throughout the whole province of Surinam, even to Brazil, some of which still maintain their independency. . . . I incline therefore to the opinion of Martyr, and conclude that the islanders were rather a colony from the Charaibes of South America, than from any nation of the North. Rochefort admits that their own traditions referred constantly to Guiana."—B. Edwards, *Hist. of Brit. Colonies in the W. Indies*, bk. 1, ch. 2.—"The Carabisce, Carabeesi, Charaibes, Caribs, or Galibis, originally occupied [in Guiana] the principal rivers, but as the Dutch encroached upon their possessions they retired inland, and are now daily dwindling away. According to Mr. Hillhouse, they

could formerly muster nearly 1,000 fighting men, but are now [1855] scarcely able to raise a tenth part of that number. . . . The smaller islands of the Caribbean Sea were formerly thickly populated by this tribe, but now not a trace of them remains."—H. G. Dalton, *Hist. of British Guiana*, v. 1, ch. 1.—E. F. in Thurn, *Among the Indians of Guiana*, ch. 6.—"Recent researches have shown that the original home of the stock was south of the Amazon, and probably in the highlands at the head of the Tapajoz river. A tribe, the Bakairi, is still resident there, whose language is a pure and archaic form of the Carib tongue."—D. G. Brinton, *Races and Peoples*, p. 268.—"Related to the Caribs stand a long list of small tribes. . . . all inhabitants of the great primeval forest in and near Guiana. They may have characteristic differences, but none worthy of mention are known. In bodily appearance, according to all accounts, these relatives of the Caribs are beautiful. In Georgetown the Araucacs [or Arawaks] are celebrated for their beauty. They are slender and graceful, and their features handsome and regular, the face having a Grecian profile, and the skin being of a reddish cast. A little farther inland we find the Macushi [or Mæusis], with a lighter complexion and a Roman nose. These two types are repeated in other tribes, except in the Tarumi, who are decidedly ugly. In mental characteristics great similarity prevails."—*The Standard Natural History* (J. S. Kingsley, ed.), p. 237.—"The Arawaks occupied on the continent the area of the modern Guiana, between the Corentyn and the Pomeroon rivers, and at one time all the West Indian Islands. From some of them they were early driven by the Caribs, and within 40 years of the date of Columbus' first voyage the Spanish had exterminated nearly all on the islands. Their course of migration had been from the interior of Brazil northward; their distant relations are still to be found between the headwaters of the Paraguay and Selingu rivers."—D. G. Brinton, *Races and Peoples*, p. 268-269.—"The Kâpohn (Acawoios, Walkas, &c.) claim kindred with the Caribs. . . . The Acawoios, though resolute and determined, are less hasty and impetuous than the Caribs. . . . According to their tradition, one of their hordes removed [to the Upper Demerera] . . . from the Masaruni. The Parawianas, who originally dwelt on the Demerera, having been exterminated by the continual incursions of the Caribs, the Walka-Acawoios occupied their vacant territory. . . . The Macusis . . . are supposed by some to have formerly inhabited the banks of the Orinoco. . . . As they are industrious and unwarlike, they have been the prey of every savage tribe around them. The Wapisiamas are supposed to have driven them northward and taken possession of their country. The Brazilians, as well as the Caribs, Acawoios, &c., have long been in the habit of enslaving them. . . . The Areeunas have been accustomed to descend from the higher lands and attack the Macusis. . . . This tribe is said to have formerly dwelt on the banks of the Uaupes or Ucauari, a tributary of the Rio Negro. . . . The Waraus appear to have been the most ancient inhabitants of the land. Very little, however, can be gleaned from their respecting their early history. . . . The Tivitvas, mentioned by Raleigh, were probably a branch of the Waraus, whom he calls Quarawetes."—

W. H. Brett, *Indian Tribes of Guiana*, pt. 2, ch. 13.

**Caripuna.** See below: GUCK ON COCO GROUP.  
**Cat Nation, or Eries.** See below: HURONS, &c., and IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY: THEIR CONQUESTS, &c.

**Catawbas, or Kataba.** See below: SIOUXAN FAMILY; also, YMUQUASAN.

**Cayugas.** See below: IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY.

**Chancas.** See PERU.

**Chapas, or Chapanecs.** See below: ZAPOTECS, ETC.

**Cherokees.**—"The Cherokee tribe has long been a puzzling factor to students of ethnology and North American languages. Whether to be considered an abnormal offshoot from one of the well-known Indian stocks or families of North America, or the remnant of some undetermined or almost extinct family which has merged into another, appear to be questions yet unsettled."

—C. Thomas, *Burial Mounds of the Northern Sections of the U. S.* (*Fifth Annual Rept. of the Bureau of Ethnology*, 1893-4).—Facts which tend to identify the Cherokees with the ancient "mound-builders" of the Ohio Valley—the Alleghans or Talligewi of Indian tradition—are set forth by Prof. Thomas in a later paper, on the "Problem of the Ohio Mounds, published by the Bureau of Ethnology in 1889 [see above: ALLEGHANS] and in a little book published in 1890, entitled "The Cherokees in Pre-Columbian Times." "The Cherokee nation has probably occupied a more prominent place in the affairs and history of what is now the United States of America, since the date of the early European settlements, than any other tribe, nation, or confederacy of Indians, unless it be possible to except the powerful and warlike league of the Iroquois or Six Nations of New York. It is almost certain that they were visited at a very early period [1540] following the discovery of the American continent by that daring and enthusiastic Spaniard, Fernando de Soto. . . . At the time of the English settlement of the Carolinas the Cherokees occupied a diversified and well-watered region of country of large extent upon the waters of the Catawba, Broad, Saluda, Keowee, Tugaloo, Savannah, and Coosa rivers on the east and south, and several tributaries of the Tennessee on the north and west. . . . In subsequent years, through frequent and long continued conflicts with the ever advancing white settlements, and the successive treaties whereby the Cherokees gradually yielded portions of their domain, the location and names of their towns were continually changing until the final removal of the nation [1836-1839] west of the Mississippi. . . . This removal turned the Cherokees back in the calendar of progress and civilization at least a quarter of a century. The hardships and exposures of the journey, coupled with the fevers and malaria of a radically different climate, cost the lives of perhaps 10 per cent. of their total population. The animosities and turbulence born of the treaty of 1835 not only occasioned the loss of many lives, but rendered property insecure, and in consequence diminished the zeal and industry of the entire community in its accumulation. A brief period of comparative quiet, however, was again characterized by an advance toward a higher civilization. Five years after their removal we find from the re-

port of their agent that they are again on the increase in population. . . . With the exception of occasional drawbacks—the result of civil feuds—the progress of the nation in education, industry and civilization continued until the outbreak of the rebellion. At this period, from the best attainable information, the Cherokees numbered 21,000 souls. The events of the war brought to them more of desolation and ruin than perhaps to any other community. Raided and sacked alternately, not only by the Confederates and Union forces, but by the vindictive ferocity and hate of their own factional divisions, their country became a blackened and desolate waste. . . . The war over, and the work of reconstruction commenced, found them numbering 14,000 impoverished, heart-broken, and revengeful people. . . . To-day their country is more prosperous than ever. They number 22,000, a greater population than they have had at any previous period, except perhaps just prior to the date of the treaty of 1835, when those east added to those west of the Mississippi are stated to have aggregated nearly 25,000 people. To-day they have 2,300 scholars attending 75 schools, established and supported by themselves at an annual expense to the nation of nearly \$100,000. To-day, 13,000 of their people can read and 18,000 can speak the English language. To-day, 5,000 brick, frame and log-houses are occupied by them, and they have 64 churches with a membership of several thousand. They cultivate 100,000 acres of land and have an additional 150,000 fenced. . . . They have a constitutional form of government predicated upon that of the United States. As a rule their laws are wise and beneficent and are enforced with strictness and justice. . . . The present Cherokee population is of a composite character. Remnants of other nations or tribes [Delawares, Shawnees, Creeks, Natchez] have from time to time been absorbed and admitted to full participation in the benefits of Cherokee citizenship."—C. C. Royce, *The Cherokee Nation of Indians* (*Fifth Annual Rept. of the Bureau of Ethnology*, 1883-84).—This elaborate paper by Mr. Royce is a narrative in detail of the official relations of the Cherokees with the colonial and federal governments, from their first treaty with South Carolina, in 1721, down to the treaty of April 27, 1868.—"As early as 1798 Barton compared the Cherokee language with that of the Iroquois and stated his belief that there was a connection between them. . . . Mr. Hale was the first to give formal expression to his belief in the affinity of the Cherokee to Iroquois. Recently extensive Cherokee vocabularies have come into possession of the Bureau of Ethnology, and a careful comparison of them with ample Iroquois material has been made by Mr. Hewitt. The result is convincing proof of the relationship of the two languages."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept. of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 77.\*

ALSO IN: S. G. Drake, *The Aboriginal Races of N. Am.*, bk. 4, ch. 13-16.—See, above: ALLEGHANS.—See, also, for an account of the Cherokee War of 1759-1761, SOUTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1759-1761; and for "Lord Dunmore's War," OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1774.

**Cheyennes, or Shyennecs.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Chibchas.**—The most northerly group of the tribes of the Andes "are the Cundinamarca of

\* See Note, Appendix E.

the table lands of Bogota. At the time of the conquest the watershed of the Magdalena was occupied by the Chibcha, or, as they were called by the Spaniards, Muyscas. At that time the Chibcha were the most powerful of all the autochthonous tribes, had a long history behind them, were well advanced toward civilization, to which numerous antiquities bear witness. The Chibcha of to-day no longer speak the well-developed and musical language of their forefathers. It became extinct about 1730, and it can now only be inferred from existing dialects of it; these are the languages of the Taricco, a tribe dwelling north of Bogota, and of the Itoco Indians who live in the neighborhood of the celebrated Emerald mines of Muzo."—*The Standard Natural History* (J. S. Kingsley, ed.) v. 6, p. 215.—"As potters and goldsmiths they [the Chibcha] ranked among the finest on the continent."—D. G. Brinton, *Races and Peoples*, p. 272.—See, also, COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1536-1731.

**Chicasas.** See below: MUSKIOGEAN FAMILY; also, LOUISIANA: A. D. 1719-1750.

**Chichimecs.** See MEXICO: A. D. 1325-1502.

**Chimaknan Family.**—"The Chimaknan are said to have been formerly one of the largest and most powerful tribes of Puget Sound. Their warlike habits early tended to diminish their numbers, and when visited by Gibbs in 1854 they counted only about 70 individuals. This small remnant occupied some 15 small lodges on Port Townsend Bay."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Report, Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 62.

**Chimarikan Family.**—"According to Powers, this family was represented, so far as known, by two tribes in California, one the Chi-mi-la-kwe, living on New River, a branch of the Trinity, the other the Chimariko, residing upon the Trinity itself from Burnt Ranch up to the mouth of North Fork, California. The two tribes are said to have been as numerous formerly as the Hupa, by whom they were overcome and nearly exterminated. Upon the arrival of the Americans only 25 of the Chimakhwe were left."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Report, Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 63.

**Chinantecs.** See below: ZAPOTEC, ETC.

**Chinookan Family.**—"The banks of the Columbia, from the Grand Dalles to its mouth, belong to the two branches of the Tsinuk [or Chinook] nation, which meet in the neighborhood of the Kowlitz River, and of which an almost nominal remnant is left. . . . The position of the Tsinuk previous to their depopulation was, as at once appears, most important, occupying both sides of the great artery of Oregon for a distance of 200 miles, they possessed the principal thoroughfare between the interior and the ocean, boundless resources of provisions of various kinds, and facilities for trade almost unequalled on the Pacific."—G. Gibbs, *Tribes of West Washington and N. W. Oregon* (Contrib. to N. A. Ethnology, v. 1), p. 164.—See, also, below: FLATHEADS.

**Chippewas.** See below: OJIBWAS; and above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Chippewyan.** See below: ATHAPASCAN FAMILY.

**Choctaws.** See below: MUSKIOGEAN FAMILY.

**Chontals and Popolocas.**—"According to the census of 1880 there were 31,000 Indians in Mexico belonging to the Familia Chontal. No such family exists. The word 'chontalli' in the

Nahuatl language means simply 'stranger,' and was applied by the Nahuas to any people other than their own. According to the Mexican statistics, the Chontals are found in the states of Mexico, Puebla, Oaxaca, Guerrero, Tabasco, Guatemala and Nicaragua. A similar term is 'popoloca,' which in Nahuatl means a coarse fellow, one speaking badly, that is, broken Nahuatl. The Popolocas have also been erected into an ethnic entity by some ethnographers, with as little justice as the Chontalls. They are stated to have lived in the provinces of Puebla, Oaxaca, Vera Cruz, Mechoacan and Guatemala."—D. G. Brinton, *The American Race*, pp. 146-153.

**Chontaquiros.** See above: ANDESANS.

**Chumashan Family.**—"Derivation: From Chumash, the name of the Santa Rosa Islanders. The several dialects of this family have long been known under the group or family name, 'Santa Barbara,' which seems first to have been used in a comprehensive sense by Latham in 1856, who included under it three languages, viz.: Santa Barbara, Santa Inez, and San Luis Obispo. The term has no special pertinence as a family designation, except from the fact that the Santa Barbara Mission, around which one of the dialects of the family was spoken, is perhaps more widely known than any of the others."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Report, Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 67.

**Cliff-dwellers.** See AMERICA: PREHISTORIC.

**Coahuiltecan Family.**—"Derivation: From the name of the Mexican State Coahuila. This family appears to have included numerous tribes in southwestern Texas and in Mexico. . . . A few Indians still survive who speak one of the dialects of this family, and in 1886 Mr. Gatschet collected vocabularies of two tribes, the Comecrudo and Cotoname, who live on the Rio Grande, at Las Prietas, State of Tamaulipas."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Report, Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 68.

**Coajiro, or Guajira.**—"An exceptional position is taken, in many respects, by the Coajiro, or Guajira, who live on the peninsula of the same name on the northwestern boundary of Venezuela. Bounded on all sides by so-called civilized peoples, this Indian tribe is known to have maintained its independence, and acquired the well-deserved reputation for cruelty, a tribe which, in many respects, can be classed with the Apaches and Comanches of New Mexico, the Araucanians of Chili, and the Guaycara and Guarni on the Parana. The Coajiro are mostly large, with chestnut-brown complexion and black, sleek hair. While all the other coast tribes have adopted the Spanish language, the Coajiro have preserved their own speech. They are the especial foes of the other peoples. No one is given entrance into their land, and they live with their neighbors, the Venezuelans, in constant hostilities. They have fine horses, which they know how to ride excellently. . . . They have numerous herds of cattle. . . . They follow agriculture a little."—*The Standard Natural History* (J. S. Kingsley, ed.), v. 6, p. 243.

**Cochibo.** See above: ANDESANS.

**Cochicaima.** See above: ANDESANS.

**Coco Group.** See below: GUCK OR COCO GROUP.

**Conocons.** See below: MARIPOSAN FAMILY.

**Cofan.** See above: ANDESANS.

**Colles.** See PERU.

**Comanche.** See below: SHOSHONEAN FAMILY, and KIOUAN FAMILY; and above: APACHE GROUP.

**Conestogas.** See below: SUSQUEHANNAS.

**Conibo.** See above: ANDESIANS.

**Conoys.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Copehan Family.**—"The territory of the Copehan family is bounded on the north by Mount Shasta and the territory of the Sastean and Lutunian families, on the east by the territory of the Palaiuhian, Yanan, and Panjuan families, and on the south by the bays of San Pablo and Suisun and the lower waters of the Sacramento."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 69.

**Costanoan Family.**—"Derivation: From the Spanish *costano*, 'coast-men.' Under this group name Latham included five tribes . . . which were under the supervision of the Mission Dolores. . . . The territory of the Costanoan family extends from the Golden Gate to a point near the southern end of Monterey Bay. . . . The surviving Indians of the once populous tribes of this family are now scattered over several counties and probably do not number, all told, over 30 individuals, as was ascertained by Mr. Henshaw in 1888. Most of these are to be found near the towns of Santa Cruz and Monterey."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 71.

**Creek Confederacy.—Creek Wars.** See below: MUSKOGEEAN FAMILY; also UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1813-1814 (AUGUST-APRIL); and FLORIDA: A. D. 1816-1818.

**Crees.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Crytans.** See AMERICA: A. D. 1587-1590.

**Crows (Upsarokas, or Absarokas).** See below: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Cuatós.** See below: PAMPAS TRIBES.

**Cunimare.** See below: GUCK OR COCO GROUP.

**Cuyriri or Kiriri.** See below: GUCK OR COCO GROUP.

**Dakotas, or Dacotahs, or Dahcotas.** See below: SIOUAN FAMILY and PAWNEE (CADDON) FAMILY.

**Delawares, or Lenape.**—"The proper name of the Delaware Indians was and is *Lenapé* (ā as in father, é as a lu mate). . . . The Lenape were divided into three sub-tribes:—1. The Minsi, Monseys, Monthreys, Munsees, or Minsinks. 2. The Unami or Wonameys. 3. The Unalachtigo. No explanation of these designations will be found in Heckewelder or the older writers. From investigations among living Delawares, carried out at my request by Mr. Horatio Hale, it is evident that they are wholly geographical, and refer to the location of these sub-tribes on the Delaware river. . . . The Minsi lived in the mountainous region at the head waters of the Delaware, above the Forks or junction of the Lehigh river. . . . The Unamis' territory on the right bank of the Delaware river extended from the Lehigh Valley southward. It was with them and their southern neighbors, the Unalachtigos, that Penn dealt for the land ceded to him in the Indian deed of 1682. The Minsis did not take part in the transaction, and it was not until 1737 that the Colonial authorities treated directly with the latter for the cession of their territory. The Unalachtigo or Turkey totem had its principal seat on the affluents of the Delaware

near where Wilmington now stands."—D. G. Brinton, *The Lenape and Their Legends*, ch. 3.—"At the . . . time when William Penn landed in Pennsylvania, the Delawares had been subjugated and made women by the Five Nations. It is well known that, according to that Indian mode of expression, the Delawares were henceforth prohibited from making war, and placed under the sovereignty of the conquerors, who did not even allow sales of land, in the actual possession of the Delawares, to be valid without their approbation. William Penn, his descendants, and the State of Pennsylvania, accordingly, always purchased the right of possession from the Delawares, and that of Sovereignty from the Five Nations. . . . The use of arms, though from very different causes, was equally prohibited to the Delawares and to the Quakers. Thus the colonization of Pennsylvania and of West New Jersey by the British, commenced under the most favorable auspices. Peace and the utmost harmony prevailed for more than sixty years between the whites and the Indians; for these were for the first time treated, not only justly, but kindly, by the colonists. But, however gradually and peaceably their lands might have been purchased, the Delawares found themselves at last in the same situation as all the other Indians, without lands of their own, and therefore without means of subsistence. They were compelled to seek refuge on the waters of the Susquehanna, as tenants at will, on lands belonging to their hated conquerors, the Five Nations. Even there and on the Juniata they were encroached upon. . . . Under those circumstances, many of the Delawares determined to remove west of the Alleghany Mountains, and, about the year 1740-50, obtained from their ancient allies and uncles, the Wyandots, the grant of a derelict tract of land lying principally on the Muskingum. The great body of the nation was still attached to Pennsylvania. But the grounds of complaint increased. The Delawares were encouraged by the western tribes, and by the French, to shake off the yoke of the Six Nations, and to join in the war against their allies, the British. The greater settlements of Pennsylvania were accordingly attacked both by the Delawares and the Shawnoes. And, although peace was made with them at Easton in 1763, and the conquest of Canada put an end to the general war, both the Shawnoes and Delawares removed altogether in 1765 beyond the Alleghany Mountains. . . . The years 1765-1795 are the true period of the power and importance of the Delawares. United with the Shawnoes, who were settled on the Scioto, they sustained during the Seven Years' War the declining power of France, and arrested for some years the progress of the British and American arms. Although a portion of the nation adhered to the Americans during the War of Independence, the main body, together with all the western nations made common cause with the British. And, after the short truce which followed the treaty of 1783, they were again at the head of the western confederacy in their last struggle for independence. Placed by their geographical situation in the front of battle, they were, during those three wars, the aggressors, and, to the last moment, the most active and formidable enemies of America. The decisive victory of General Wayne (1794), dissolved the confederacy; and the Delawares were the greatest sufferers by the

treaty of Greenville of 1795." After this, the greater part of the Delawares were settled on White River, Indiana, "till the year 1819, when they finally ceded their claim to the United States. Those residing there were then reduced to about 800 souls. A number . . . had previously removed to Canada; and it is difficult to ascertain the situation or numbers of the residue at this time [1836]. Those who have lately removed west of the Mississippi are, in an estimate of the War Department, computed at 400 souls. Former emigrations to that quarter had however taken place, and several small dispersed bands are, it is believed, united with the Senecas and some other tribes."—A. Gallatin, *Synopsis of the Indian Tribes (Archeologia Americana, v. 2), introd., sect. 2.*—See, above: ALIQUOQUIAN FAMILY; below: SHAWANEESE, and PAWNEE (CADDOAN) FAMILY.—Also, PONTIAC'S WAR; UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1765–1768; and MOHAWAN BRETTEN; and, for an account of "Lord Dunmore's War," see OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1774.

**Eries.** See below: IROQUOIS, &c., and IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY: THEIR CONQUESTS, &c.

**Eskimauan Family.**—"Save a slight intermixture of European settlers, the Eskimo are the only inhabitants of the shores of Arctic America, and of both sides of Davis Strait and Baffin Bay, including Greenland, as well as a tract of about 400 miles on the Behring Strait coast of Asia. Southward they extend as far as about 50° N. L. on the eastern side, 60° on the western side of America, and from 55° to 60° on the shores of Hudson Bay. Only on the west the Eskimo near their frontier are interrupted on two small spots of the coast by the Indians, named Kennayans and Ugalenzes, who have there advanced to the sea-shore for the sake of fishing. These coasts of Arctic America, of course, also comprise all the surrounding islands. Of these, the Aleutian Islands form an exceptional group; the inhabitants of these on the one hand distinctly differing from the coast people here mentioned, while on the other they show a closer relationship to the Eskimo than any other nation. The Aleutians, therefore, may be considered as only an abnormal branch of the Eskimo nation. . . . As regards their northern limits, the Eskimo people, or at least remains of their habitations, have been found nearly as far north as any Arctic explorers have hitherto advanced; and very possibly bands of them may live still farther to the north, as yet quite unknown to us. . . . On comparing the Eskimo with the neighbouring nations, their physical complexion certainly seems to point at an Asiatic origin; but, as far as we know, the latest investigations have also shown a transitional link to exist between the Eskimo and the other American nations, which would sufficiently indicate the possibility of a common origin from the same continent. As to their mode of life, the Eskimo decidedly resemble their American neighbours. . . . With regard to their language, the Eskimo also appear akin to the American nations in regard to its decidedly polysynthetic structure. Here, however, on the other hand, we meet with some very remarkable similarities between the Eskimo idiom and the language of Siberia, belonging to the Altaic or Finnish group. . . . According to the Sagas of the Icelanders, they were already met with on the east coast of Greenland about the year 1000,

and almost at the same time on the east coast of the American continent. . . . Between the years 1000 and 1300 they do not seem to have occupied the land south of 65° N. L. on the west coast of Greenland, where the Scandinavian colonies were then situated. But the colonists seem to have been aware of their existence in higher latitudes, and to have lived in fear of an attack by them, since, in the year 1266, an expedition was sent out for the purpose of exploring the abodes of the Skraelings, as they were called by the colonists. . . . About the year 1450, the last accounts were received from the colonies, and the way to Greenland was entirely forgotten in the mother country. . . . The features of the natives in the Southern part of Greenland indicate a mixed descent from the Scandinavians and Eskimo, the former, however, not having left the slightest sign of any influence on the nationality or culture of the present natives. In the year 1585, Greenland was discovered anew by John Davis, and found inhabited exclusively by Eskimo."—H. Rink, *Tales and Traditions of the Eskimo, introd. and ch. 6.*—The same, *The Eskimo tribes.*—"In 1869, I proposed for the Aleuts and people of Innuit stock collectively the term Orarians, as indicative of their coastwise distribution, and as supplying the need of a general term to designate a very well-defined race. . . . The Orarians are divided into two well-marked groups, namely the Innuits, comprising all the so-called Eskimo and Tshkis, and the Aleuts."—W. H. Dall, *Tribes of the Extreme Northwest (Contrib. to N. A. Ethnology, v. 1), pt. 1.*

**Esselenian Family.**—"The present family was included by Latham in the heterogeneous group called by him Salinas. . . . The term Salinan [is now] restricted to the San Antonio and San Miguel languages, leaving the present family . . . [to be] called Esselenian, from the name of the single tribe Esselen, of which it is composed. . . . The tribe or tribes composing this family occupied a narrow strip of the California coast from Monterey Bay south to the vicinity of the Santa Lucia Mountain, a distance of about 50 miles."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology, pp. 75–76.*

**Etchemins.** See above: ALIQUOQUIAN FAMILY.

**Enrocs, or Yuroks.** See below: MODOCS, &c.

**Five Nations.** See below: IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY.

**Flatheads (Salishan Family).\***—"The name Flathead was commonly given to the Choctaws, though, says Du Pratz, he saw no reason why they should be so distinguished, when the practice of flattening the head was so general. And in the enumeration just cited [Documentary Hist. of N. Y., v. 1, p. 24] the next paragraph . . . is: 'The Flatheads, Cherakis, Chienchas, and Totiris are included under the name of Flatheads by the Iroquois.'—M. F. Force, *Some Early Notices of the Indians of Ohio, p. 32.*—"The Salish . . . are distinctively known as Flatheads, though the custom of deforming the cranium is not confined to them."—D. G. Brinton, *The American Race, p. 107.*—"In . . . early times the hunters and trappers could not discover why the Blackfeet and Flatheads [of Montana] received their respective designations, for the feet of the former are no more inclined to sable than any other part of the body, while the heads of the latter possess their fair proportion of

\* See Note, Appendix E.

rotundity. Indeed it is only below the falls and rapids that real Flatheads appear, and at the mouth of the Columbia that they flourish most supernaturally. The tribes who practice the custom of flattening the head, and who lived at the mouth of the Columbia, differed little from each other in laws, manners or customs, and were composed of the Cathlamets, Killmucks, Chatsops, Chinooks and Chilts. The abominable custom of flattening their heads prevails among them all."—P. Ronan, *Hist. Sketch of the Flat-head Indian Nation*, p. 17.—In Major Powell's linguistic classification, the "Salishan Family" (Flathead) is given a distinct place.—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept. of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 102.

**Fox Indians.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, and below: SACS, &c.—For an account of the massacre of Fox Indians at Detroit in 1712, see CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1711-1713.—For an account of the Black Hawk War, see Illinois: A. D. 1832.

**Fuegians.** See below: PATAGONIANS.

**Gausarapos or Guachies.** See below: PAMPAS TRIBES.

**Gês Tribes.** See below: TUPL.—GUARANI.—TUPUAS.

**Gros Ventres (Minnetaree; Hidatsa)\*** See below: HIDATSA; also, above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Guaicarus.** See below: PAMPAS TRIBES.

**Guajira.** See above: COAJIRO.

**Guanas.** See below: PAMPAS TRIBES.

**Guarani.** See below: TUPL.

**Guayanas.** See below: PAMPAS TRIBES.

**Guck or Coco Group.**—An extensive linguistic group of tribes in Brazil, on and north of the Amazon, extending as far as the Orinoco, has been called the Guck, or Coco group. There is no common name for the group, that here used meaning a father's brother, a very important personage in these tribes. The Guck group embraces a large number of tribes. . . . We need enumerate but few. The Cuyriri or Kiriri (also known as Salaja, Pimenteiros, etc.), number about 3,000. Some of them are half civilized, some are wild, and, without restraint, wander about, especially in the mountains in the Province of Pernambuco. The Arauc five on the lower Amazon and the Tocantins. Next come the Manaos, who have a prospect of maintaining themselves longer than most tribes. With them is connected the legend of the golden lord who washed the gold dust from his limbs in a lake [see EL DONADO]. . . . The Uirina, Baré, and Carlay live on the Rio Negro, the Cunimaré on the Jurua, the Maranhá on the Jutay. Whether the Chamico on the right bank of the Paraguay, belong to the Guck is uncertain. Among the tribes which, though very much mixed, are still to be enumerated with the Guck, are the Tecuna and the Passé. In language the Tecunas show many similarities to the Gês; they live on the western borders of Brazil, and extend in Equador to the Pastaga. Among them occur peculiar masques which strongly recall those found on the northwest coast of North America. . . . In the same district belong the Uaupe, who are noticeable from the fact that they live in barracks, indeed the only tribe in South America in which this custom appears. The communal houses of the Uaupe are called 'malloca'; they are buildings of about 120 feet long, 75 feet wide, and 30

high, in which live a band of about 100 persons in 12 families, each of the latter, however, in its own room. . . . Finally, complex tribes of the most different nationality are comprehended under names which indicate only a common way of life, but are also incorrectly used as ethnographic names. These are Caripuna, Mura, and Miranha, all of whom live in the neighborhood of the Madeira River. Of the Caripuna or Jaûn-Avô (both terms signify 'watermen'), who are mixed with Quichua blood, it is related that they not only ate human flesh, but even cured it for preservation. . . . Formerly the Mura . . . were greatly feared; this once powerful and populous tribe, however, was almost entirely destroyed at the end of the last century by the Mundruco; the remnant is scattered. . . . The Mura are the gypsies among the Indians on the Amazon; and by all the other tribes they are regarded with a certain degree of contempt as pariahs. . . . Much to be feared, even among the Indians, are also the Miranha (i. e., rovers, vagabonds), a still populous tribe on the right bank of the Japura, who seem to know nothing but war, robbery, murder, and man-hunting."—*The Standard Natural History* (J. S. Kingsley, ed.), v. 6, pp. 245-248.

Also in F. Keller, *The Amazon and Madeira Rivers*, ch. 2 and 6.—H. W. Bates, *A Naturalist on the River Amazons*, ch. 7-13.

**Gauchies.** See below: PAMPAS TRIBES.

**Hackinsacks.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Haidas.** See below: SKITTAGETAN FAMILY.

**Hidatsa, or Minnetaree, or Grosventres\*:**—"The Hidatsa, Minnetaree, or Grosventre Indians, are one of the three tribes which at present inhabit the permanent village at Fort Berthold, Dakota Territory, and hunt on the waters of the Upper Missouri and Yellowstone Rivers, in Northwestern Dakota and Eastern Montana. The history of this tribe is . . . intimately connected with that of the politically allied tribes of the Aricarees and Mandans." The name, Grosventres, was given to the people of this tribe "by the early French and Canadian adventurers. The same name was applied also to a tribe, totally distinct from these in language and origin, which lives some hundreds of miles west of Fort Berthold; and the two nations are now distinguished from one another as Grosventres of the Missouri and Grosventres of the Prairie. . . . Edward Umfreville, who traded on the Saskatchewan River from 1784 to 1787, . . . remarks: . . . 'They [the Canadian French] call them Grosventres, or Big-Bellies; and without any reason, as they are as comely and as well made as any tribe whatever.' . . . In the works of many travellers they are called Minnetaree, a name which is spelled in various ways. . . . This, although a Hidatsa word, is the name applied to them, not by themselves, but by the Mandans; it signifies 'to cross the water,' or 'they crossed the water.' . . . Hidatsa was the name of the village on Knife River farthest from the Missouri, the village of those whom Lewis and Clarke considered the Minnetaree proper." It is the name "now generally used by this people to designate themselves."—W. Matthews, *Ethnography and Philology of the Hidatsa Indians*, pt. 1-2 (*U. S. Geolog. and Geog. Survey, F. V. Hayden, Mis. Pub.*, No. 7).—See also, below: SIOUAN FAMILY.

\* See Note, Appendix E.

**Hitchitis.** See below: MUSKHOEAN FAMILY.  
**Horikans.**—North of the Mohicans, who occupied the east bank of the Hudson River opposite Albany, and covering the present counties of Columbia and Rensselaer, dwelt the Algonkin tribe of Horikans, "whose hunting grounds appear to have extended from the waters of the Connecticut, across the Green Mountains, to the borders of that beautiful lake [named Lake George by the too loyal Sir William Johnson] which might now well bear their sonorous name."—J. R. Brodhead, *Hist. of the State of N. Y.*, p. 77.

**Huamaboya.** See above: ANDESIANS.  
**Huancas.** See PERU.  
**Huastecs.** See below: MAYAS.  
**Huecos, or Wacos.** See below: PAWNEE (CADDISAN) FAMILY.  
**Humas, or Oumas.** See below: MUSKHOEAN FAMILY.

**Hupas.\*** See below: MODocs, &c.  
**Hurons, or Wyandots.—Neutral Nation.—Eries.**—"The peninsula between the Lakes Huron, Erie, and Ontario was occupied by two distinct peoples, speaking dialects of the Iroquois tongue. The Hurons or Wyandots, including the tribe called by the French the Dionondadies, or Tobacco Nation, dwelt among the forests which bordered the eastern shores of the fresh water sea to which they have left their name; while the Neutral Nation, so called from their neutrality in the war between the Hurons and the Five Nations, inhabited the northern shores of Lake Erie, and even extended their eastern flank across the strait of Niagara. The population of the Hurons has been variously stated at from 10,000 to 30,000 souls, but probably did not exceed the former estimate. The Franciscans and the Jesuits were early among them, and from their descriptions it is apparent that, in legends, and superstitions, manners and habits, religious observances and social customs, they were closely assimilated to their brethren of the Five Nations. . . . Like the Five Nations, the Wyandot: were in some measure an agricultural people; they bartered the surplus products of their maize fields to surrounding tribes, usually receiving fish in exchange; and this traffic was so considerable that the Jesuits styled their country the Granary of the Algonquins. Their prosperity was rudely broken by the hostilities of the Five Nations; for though the conflicting parties were not ill matched in point of numbers, yet the united counsels and ferocious energies of the confederacy swept all before them. In the year 1649, in the depth of winter, their warriors invaded the country of the Wyandots, stormed their largest villages, and involved all within in indiscriminate slaughter. The survivors fled in panic terror, and the whole nation was broken and dispersed. Some found refuge among the French of Canada, where, at the village of Lorette, near Quebec, their descendants still remain; others were incorporated with their conquerors, while others again fled northward, beyond Lake Superior, and sought an asylum among the wastes which bordered on the north-eastern lands of the Dacotah. Driven back by those fierce bison-hunters, they next established themselves about the outlet of Lake Superior, and the shores and islands in the northern parts of Lake Huron. Thence, about the year 1680, they descended to Detroit, where they formed a per-

manent settlement, and where, by their superior valor, capacity and address, they soon acquired an ascendancy over the surrounding Algonquins. The ruin of the Neutral Nation followed close on that of the Wyandots, to whom, according to Jesuit authority, they bore an exact resemblance in character and manners. The Senecas soon found means to pick a quarrel with them; they were assailed by all the strength of the insatiable confederacy, and within a few years their destruction as a nation was complete."—F. Parkman, *The Conspiracy of Pontiac*, ch. 1.—The same, *The Jesuits in North America*, ch. 1.—"The first in this locality [namely, the western extremity of the State of New York, on and around the site of the city of Buffalo], of whom history makes mention, were the Attiowandorok, or Neutral Nation, called Kah-kwas by the Senecas. They had their council-fires along the Niagara, but principally on its western side. Their hunting grounds extended from the Genesee nearly to the eastern shores of Lake Huron, embracing a wide and important territory. . . . They are first mentioned by Champlain during his winter visit to the Hurons in 1615. . . . but he was unable to visit their territory. . . . The peace which this peculiar people had so long maintained with the Iroquois was destined to be broken. Some jealousies and collisions occurred in 1647, which culminated in open war in 1650. One of the villages of the Neutral Nation, nearest the Senecas and not far from the site of our city [Buffalo], was captured in the autumn of the latter year, and another the ensuing spring. So well-directed and energetic were the blows of the Iroquois, that the total destruction of the Neutral Nation was speedily accomplished. . . . The survivors were adopted by their conquerors. . . . A long period intervened between the destruction of the Neutral Nation and the permanent occupation of their country by the Senecas,"—which latter event occurred after the expulsion of the Senecas from the Genesee Valley, by the expedition under General Sullivan, in 1779, during the Revolutionary War. "They never, as a nation, resumed their ancient seats along the Genesee, but sought and found a new home on the secluded banks and among the basswood forests of the Dó-syo-wá, or Buffalo Creek, whence they had driven the Neutral Nation 130 years before. . . . It has been assumed by many writers that the Kah-kwas and Eries were identical. This is not so. The latter, according to the most reliable authorities, lived south of the western extremity of Lake Erie until they were destroyed by the Iroquois in 1655. The Kah-kwas were exterminated by them as early as 1651. On Coronelli's map, published in 1688, one of the villages of the latter, called 'Kahoungoga, a destroyed nation,' is located at or near the site of Buffalo."—O. H. Marshall, *The Niagara Frontier*, pp. 5-8, and *foot-note*.—"Westward of the Neutrals, along the Southeastern shores of Lake Erie, and stretching as far east as the Genesee river, lay the country of the Eries, or, as they were denominated by the Jesuits, 'La Nation Chat,' or Cat Nation, who were also a member of the Huron-Iroquois family. The name of the beautiful lake on whose margin our city [Buffalo] was cradled is their most enduring monument, as Lake Huron is that of the generic stock. They were called the Cat Nation either because that

\* See Note, Appendix E.

interesting but mischievous animal, the raccoon, which the holy fathers erroneously classed in the feline gens, was the totem of their leading clan, or sept, or in consequence of the abundance of that mammal within their territory."—W. C. Bryant, *Interesting Archaeological Studies in and about Buffalo*, p. 12.—Mr. Schoolcraft either identifies or confuses the Eries and the Neutral Nation.—H. R. Schoolcraft, *Sketch of the Hist. of the Ancient Eries (Information Respecting the Indian Tribes, pt. 4, p. 197)*.

ALSO IN J. G. Shea, *Inquiries Respecting the lost Neutral Nation (same, pt. 4, p. 204)*.—D. Wilson, *The Huron-Iroquois of Canada (Trans. Royal Soc. of Canada, 1884)*.—P. D. Clarke, *Origin and Traditional Hist. of the Wyandottes*.—W. Ketchum, *Hist. of Buffalo*, v. 1, ch. 1-2.—N. B. Craig, *The Olden Time*, v. 1, p. 225.—See below: IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY; also, CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1608-1611; 1611-1616; 1634-1652; 1640-1700.—See, also, PONTIAC'S WAR, and for an account of "Lord Dunmore's War," see OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1774.

**Illinois and Miamis.**—"Passing the country of the Lenape and the Shawanoes, and descending the Ohio, the traveller would have found its valley chiefly occupied by two nations, the Miamis or Twighwees, on the Wabash and its branches, and the Illinois, who dwelt in the neighborhood of the river to which they have given their name, while portions of them extended beyond the Mississippi. Though never subjugated, as were the Lenape, both the Miamis and the Illinois were reduced to the last extremity by the repeated attacks of the Five Nations; and the Illinois, in particular, suffered so much by these and other wars, that the population of ten or twelve thousand, ascribed to them by the early French writers, had dwindled, during the first quarter of the eighteenth century, to a few small villages."—F. Parkman, *Conspiracy of Pontiac*, ch. I.—See, also, above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY; and below: SACS, &c.; also CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1669-1687.

**Incas, or Yncas.** See PERU.

**Innuits.** See above: ESKIMAUAN.

**Iowas.** See below: SIOUAN FAMILY, and PAWNEE (CADDON) FAMILY.

**Iroquois Confederacy.—Iroquoian Family.**—"At the outset of the 16th Century, when the five tribes or nations of the Iroquois confederacy first became known to European explorers, they were found occupying the valleys and uplands of northern New York, in that picturesque and fruitful region which stretches westward from the head-waters of the Hudson to the Genesee. The Mohawks, or Caniagas—as they should properly be called—possessed the Mohawk River, and covered Lake George and Lake Champlain with their flotillas of large canoes, managed with the boldness and skill which, hereditary in their descendants, make them still the best boatmen of the North American rivers. West of the Caniagas the Oneidas held the small river and lake which bear their name. . . . West of the Oneidas, the imperious Onondagas, the central and, in some respects, the ruling nation of the League, possessed the two lakes of Onondaga and Skaneateles, together with the common outlet of this inland lake system, the Oswego River to its issue into Lake Ontario. Still proceeding westward, the lines of trail and river led to the long and winding stretch of Lake Cayuga, about which were clustered the

towns of the people who gave their name to the lake; and beyond them, over the wide expanse of hills and dales surrounding Lakes Seneca and Canandaigua, were scattered the populous villages of the Senecas, more correctly called Sonontwanias, or Mountaineers. Such were the names and abodes of the allied nations, members of the far-famed Kanonsionni, or League of United Households, who were destined to become for a time the most notable and powerful community among the native tribes of North America. The region which has been described was not, however, the original seat of those nations. They belonged to that linguistic family which is known to ethnologists as the Huron-Iroquois stock. This stock comprised the Hurons or Wyandots, the Atti-wandaronks or Neutral Nation, the Iroquois, the Eries, the Audastes or Conestogas, the Tuscaroras and some smaller bands. The tribes of this family occupied a long irregular area of inland territory, stretching from Canada to North Carolina. The northern nations were all clustered about the great lakes; the southern bands held the fertile valleys bordering the head-waters of the rivers which flowed from the Allegheny mountains. The languages of all these tribes showed a close affinity. . . . The evidence of language, so far as it has yet been examined, seems to show that the Huron clans were the older members of the group; and the clear and positive traditions of all the surviving tribes, Hurons, Iroquois, and Tuscarora, point to the lower St. Lawrence as the earliest known abode of their stock. Here the first explorer, Cartier, found Indians of this stock at Hochelag., and Stadaconé, now the sites of Montreal and Quebec. . . . As their numbers increased, dissensions arose. The hive swarmed, and band after band moved off to the west and south. As they spread they encountered people of other stocks, with whom they had frequent wars. Their most constant and most dreaded enemies were the tribes of the Algonkin family, a fierce and restless people, of northern origin, who everywhere surrounded them. At one period, however, if the concurrent traditions of both Iroquois and Algonkins can be believed, these contending races for a time stayed their strife, and united their forces in an alliance against a common and formidable foe. This foe was the nation, or perhaps the confederacy, of the Alligewi or Talligewi, the semi-civilized 'Mound-builders' of the Ohio Valley, who have left their name to the Allegheny river and mountains, and whose vast earthworks are still, after half-a-century of study, the perplexity of archaeologists. A desperate warfare ensued, which lasted about a hundred years, and ended in the complete overthrow and destruction, or expulsion, of the Alligewi. The survivors of the conquered people fled southward. . . . The time which has elapsed since the overthrow of the Alligewi is variously estimated. The most probable conjecture places it at a period about a thousand years before the present day. It was apparently soon after their expulsion that the tribes of the Huron-Iroquois and the Algonkin stocks scattered themselves over the wide region south of the Great Lakes, thus left open to their occupancy."—H. Hale, *Introduct. to Iroquois Book of Rites*.—After the coming of the Europeans into the New World, the French were the first to be involved in hostilities with the Iroquois, and their early wars with them produced a hatred



which could never be extinguished. Hence the English were able to win the alliance of the Five Nations, when they struggled with France for the mastery of the North American continent, and they owed their victory to that alliance, probably, more than to any other single cause. England still retained the faithful friendship and alliance of the Iroquois when she came to a struggle with her own colonies, and all the tribes except the Oneidas were in arms against the Americans in the Revolutionary War. "With the restoration of peace, the political transactions of the League were substantially closed. This was, in effect, the termination of their political existence. The jurisdiction of the United States was extended over their ancient territories, and from that time forth they became dependent nations. During the progress of the Revolution, the Mohawks abandoned their country and removed to Canada, finally establishing themselves partly upon Grand River, in the Niagara peninsula, and partly near Kingston, where they now reside upon two reservations secured to them by the British government. . . . The policy of the State of New York [toward the Iroquois nations] was ever just and humane. Although their country, with the exception of that of the Oneidas, might have been considered as forfeited by the event of the Revolution, yet the government never enforced the rights of conquest, but extinguished the Indian title to the country by purchase, and treaty stipulations. A portion of the Oneida nation [who had sold their lands to the State, from time to time, excepting one small reservation] emigrated to a reservation on the river Thames in Canada, where about 400 of them now [1851] reside. Another and a larger band removed to Green Bay, in Wisconsin, where they still make their homes to the number of 700. But a small part of the nation have remained around the seat of their ancient council-fire . . . near Oneida Castle, in the county of Oneida." The Onondagas "still retain their beautiful and secluded valley of Onondaga, with sufficient territory for their comfortable maintenance. About 150 Onondagas now reside with the Senecas; another party are established on Grand River, in Canada, and a few have removed to the west. . . . In the brief space of twelve years after the first house of the white man was erected in Cayuga county (1789) the whole nation [of the Cayugas] was uprooted and gone. In 1795, they ceded, by treaty, all their lands to the State, with the exception of one reservation, which they finally abandoned about the year 1800. A portion of them removed to Green Bay, another to Grand River, and still another, and a much larger band, settled at Sandusky, in Ohio, from whence they were removed by government, a few years since, into the Indian territory, west of the Mississippi. About 120 still reside among the Senecas, in western New York. . . . The Tuscaroras, after removing from the Oneida territory, finally located near the Niagara river, in the vicinity of Lewiston, on a tract given to them by the Senecas. . . . The residue of the Senecas are now shut up within three small reservations, the Tomawanda, the Cattaraugus and the Allegany, which, united, would not cover the area of one of the lesser counties of the State."—L. H. Morgan, *The League of the Iroquois*, bk. 1, ch. 1.—"The Indians of the State of New York number about 5,000, and occupy lands to the estimated extent

of 87,677 acres. With few exceptions, these people are the direct descendants of the native Indians, who once possessed and controlled the soil of the entire State."—*Rept. of Special Com. to Investigate the Indian Problem of the State of N. Y.*, 1889.—H. R. Schoolcraft, *Notes on the Iroquois*.—F. Parkman, *The Conspiracy of Pontiac*, ch. 1.—C. Colden, *Hist. of the Five Indian Nations*.—J. Fiske, *Discovery of America*, ch. 1.—In 1715 the Five Nations of the Iroquois Confederacy became Six Nations, by the admission of the Tuscaroras, from N. Carolina.—See below: IROQUOIS TRIBES OF THE SOUTH.—On the relationship between the Iroquois and the Cherokees, see above: CHEROKEES.

**Iroquois Confederacy.—Their Name.**—"The origin and proper meaning of the word Iroquois are doubtful. All that can be said with certainty is that the explanation given by Charlevoix cannot possibly be correct. The name of Iroquois, he says, is purely French, and has been formed from the term 'hiro,' 'I have spoken,' a word by which these Indians close all their speeches, and 'koué,' which, when long drawn out, is a cry of sorrow, and when briefly uttered is an exclamation of joy. . . . But . . . Champlain had learned the name from his Indian allies before he or any other Frenchman, so far as is known, had ever seen an Iroquois. It is probable that the origin of the word is to be sought in the Huron language: yet, as this is similar to the Iroquois tongue, an attempt may be made to find a solution in the latter. According to Bruyas, the word 'garokwa' meant a pipe, and also a piece of tobacco, — and, in its verbal form, to smoke. This word is found, somewhat disguised by aspirates, in the Book of Rites, — denighroghkwayen, — 'let us two smoke together.' . . . In the indeterminate form the verb becomes 'ierokwa,' which is certainly very near to Iroquois. It might be rendered 'they who smoke,' or 'they who use tobacco,' or, briefly, 'the Tobacco People.' This name, the Tobacco Nation ('Nation du Petum') was given by the French, and probably also by the Algonkins, to one of the Huron tribes, the Tionontoué," noted for the excellent tobacco which they raised and sold. The Iroquois were equally well known for their cultivation of this plant, of which they had a choice variety."—H. Hale, *Iroquois Book of Rites*, app., note A.

**Iroquois Confederacy.—Their conquests and wide dominion.**—"The project of a League [among the 'Five Nations' of the Iroquois] originated with the Onondagas, among whom it was first suggested, as a means to enable them more effectually to resist the pressure of contiguous nations. The epoch of its establishment, cannot now be decisively ascertained; although the circumstances attending its formation are still preserved by tradition with great minuteness. These traditions all refer to the northern shore of the Onondaga lake, as the place where the Iroquois chiefs assembled in general congress, to agree upon the terms and principles of the compact. . . . After the formation of the League, the Iroquois rose rapidly in power and influence. . . . With the first consciousness of rising power, they turned their long-cherished resentment upon the Adirondacks, who had oppressed them in their infancy as a nation, and had expelled them from their country, in the first struggle for the ascendancy.

... At the era of French discovery (1535), the latter nation [the Adirondacks] appear to have been dispossessed of their original country, and driven down the St. Lawrence as far as Quebec. . . . A new era commenced with the Iroquois upon the establishment of the Dutch trading-post at Orange, now Albany, in 1615. . . . Friendly relations were established between the Iroquois and the Dutch, which continued without interruption until the latter surrendered their possessions upon the Hudson to the English in 1664. During this period a trade sprang up between them in furs, which the Iroquois exchanged for European fabrics, but more especially for fire-arms, in the use of which they were afterwards destined to become so expert. The English, in turn, cultivated the same relations of friendship. . . . With the possession of fire-arms commenced not only the rapid elevation, but absolute supremacy, of the Iroquois over other Indian nations. In 1643, they expelled the Neutral Nation from the Niagara peninsula and established a permanent settlement at the mouth of that river. They nearly exterminated, in 1653, the Eries, who occupied the south side of Lake Erie, and from thence east to the Genesee, and thus possessed themselves of the whole area of western New York, and the northern part of Ohio. About the year 1670, after they had finally completed the dispersion and subjugation of the Adirondacks and Hurons, they acquired possession of the whole country between lakes Huron, Erie and Ontario, and of the north bank of the St. Lawrence, to the mouth of the Ottawa river, near Montreal. . . . They also made constant incursions upon the New England Indians. . . . In 1680, the Senecas with 600 warriors invaded the country of the Illinois, upon the borders of the Mississippi, while La Salle was among the latter. . . . At various times, both before and after this period, the Iroquois turned their warfare against the Cherokees upon the Tennessee, and the Catawbas in South Carolina. . . . For about a century, from the year 1600 to the year 1700, the Iroquois were involved in an almost uninterrupted warfare. At the close of this period, they had subdued and held in nominal subjection all the principal Indian nations occupying the territories which are now embraced in the states of New York, Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, the northern and western parts of Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, Northern Tennessee, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, a portion of the New England States, and the principal part of Upper Canada. Over these nations, the haughty and imperious Iroquois exercised a constant supervision. If any of them became involved in domestic difficulties, a delegation of chiefs went among them and restored tranquillity, prescribing at the same time their future conduct."—L. H. Morgan, *League of the Iroquois*, bk. 1, ch. 1.—"Their [the Iroquois's] war-parties roamed over half America, and their name was a terror from the Atlantic to the Mississippi; but when we ask the numerical strength of the dreaded confederacy, when we discover that, in the days of their greatest triumphs, their united cantons could not have mustered 4,000 warriors, we stand amazed at the folly and dissension which left so vast a region the prey of a handful of bold marauders. Of the cities and villages now so thickly scattered over the lost domain of the Iroquois, a single one might

boast a more numerous population than all the five united tribes."—F. Parkman, *The Conspiracy of Pontiac*, ch. 1.

**Iroquois Confederacy: A. D. 1608-1700.**—**Their wars with the French.** See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1608-1611; 1611-1616; 1634-1652; 1640-1700; 1696.

**Iroquois Confederacy: A. D. 1648-1649.**—**Their destruction of the Hurons and the Jesuit Missions.** See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1634-1652; also, above, HURONS.

**Iroquois Confederacy: A. D. 1684-1744.**—**Surrenders and conveyances to the English.** See NEW YORK: A. D. 1684, and 1726; VIRGINIA: A. D. 1744; OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1748-1754; UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1765-1768.

**Iroquois Confederacy: A. D. 1778-1779.**—**Their part in the War of the American Revolution.** See UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: A. D. 1778 (JUNE—NOVEMBER) and (JULY); and 1779 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER).

**Iroquois Tribes of the South.\***—"The southern Iroquois tribes occupied Chowan River and its tributary streams. They were bounded on the east by the most southerly Lenoape tribes, who were in possession of the low country along the sea shores, and those of Albemarle and Pamlico Sounds. Towards the south and the west they extended beyond the river Neuse. They appear to have been known in Virginia, in early times, under the name of Monacans, as far north as James River. . . . Lawson, in his account of the North Carolina Indians, enumerates the Chowans, the Meherrins, and the Nottoways, as having together 95 warriors in the year 1708. But the Meherrins or Tuteloos and the Nottoways inhabited respectively the two rivers of that name, and were principally seated in Virginia. We have but indistinct notices of the Tuteloos. . . . It appears by Beverly that the Nottoways had preserved their independence and their numbers later than the Powhatans, and that, at the end of the 17th century, they had still 130 warriors. They do not appear to have migrated from their original seats in a body. In the year 1820, they are said to have been reduced to 27 souls, and were still in possession of 7,000 acres in Southampton county, Virginia, which had been at an early date reserved for them. . . . The Tuscaroras were by far the most powerful nation in North Carolina, and occupied all the residue of the territory in that colony, which has been described as inhabited by Iroquois tribes. Their principal seats in 1708 were on the Neuse and the Taw or Tar rivers, and according to Lawson they had 1,200 warriors in fifteen towns." In 1711 the Tuscaroras attacked the English colonists, massacring 130 in a single day, and a fierce war ensued. "In the autumn of 1712, all the inhabitants south and southwest of Chowan River were obliged to live in forts; and the Tuscaroras expected assistance from the Five Nations. This could not have been given without involving the confederacy in a war with Great Britain; and the Tuscaroras were left to their own resources. A force, consisting chiefly of southern Indians under the command of Colonel Moore, was again sent by the government of South Carolina to assist the northern Colonies. He besieged and took a fort of the Tuscaroras. . . . Of 800 prisoners 600 were given up to the southern Indians, who carried them to South Carolina to sell them as

\* See Note, Appendix E.

slaves. The Eastern Tuscaroras, whose principal town was on the Tnw, twenty miles above Washington, immediately made peace, and a portion was settled a few years after north of the Roanoke, near Windsor, where they continued till the year 1803. But the great body of the nation removed in 1714-15 to the Five Nations, was received as the Sixth, and has since shared their fate."—A. Gallatin, *Synopsis of the Indian Tribes (Archæologia Americana, v. 2), introd., sect. 2.*

ALSO IN J. W. Moore, *Hist. of N. Carolina, r. 1, ch. 3.*—See, also, above: IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY.

**Itocos.** See above: CHIRICHAS.

**Itonamos, or Itonomos.** See above: ANDESIANS; also BOLIVIA: ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

**Jivara, or Jivaro.** See above: ANDESIANS.

**Kah-kwas.** See above: IUKONS, &c.

**Kalappoian Family.**—"Under this family name Seouler places two tribes, the Kalappoian, inhabiting 'the fertile Willamut plains' and the Yamkallie, who live 'more in the interior, towards the sources of the Willamut River.' . . . The tribes of the Kalappoian family inhabited the valley of Willamette River, Oregon, above the falls."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology, p. 81.*

**Kanawhas, or Ganawese.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Kansas, or Kaws.** See below: SIOUAN.

**Kâpohn.** See above: CARIBS AND THEIR KINDRED.

**Karankawan Family.**—"The Karankawa formerly dwelt upon the Texan coast, according to Sibley, upon an island or peninsula in the Bay of St. Bernard (Matagorda Bay). . . . In 1884 Mr. Gatschet found a Tonkawent Fort Griffin, Texas, who claimed to have formerly lived among the Karankawa. From him a vocabulary of twenty-five terms was obtained, which was all of the language he remembered. The vocabulary . . . such as it is, represents all of the language that is extant. Judged by this vocabulary the language seems to be distinct not only from the Atakapa but from all others."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Report, Bureau of Ethnology, p. 82.*

**Karoks, or Cahrocs.** See below: MODOCS.

**Kaskaskias.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Kaus, or Kwokwoos.** See below: KUSAN FAMILY.

**Kaws, or Kansas.** See below: SIOUAN.

**Kenai, or Blood Indians.\*** See above: BLACK-FEET.

**Keresan Family.**—"The . . . pueblos of Keresan stock . . . are situated in New Mexico on the upper Rio Grande, on several of its small western affluents, and on the Jemez and San José, which also are tributaries of the Rio Grande."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology, p. 83.*—See PUEBLO.

**Kikapoos.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, and below: SACS, &c., and PAWNEE (CADDON) FAMILY.

**Kiowan Family.**—"Derivation: From the Kiowa word Kó-i, plural Kó-igu, meaning 'Káyowé man.' The Comanche term káyowé means 'rat.' The author who first formally separated this family appears to have been Turner. . . . Turner, upon the strength of a vocabulary furnished by Lieut. Whipple, dissents from the opinion expressed by Pike and

others to the effect that the language is of the same stock as the Comanche, and, while admitting that its relationship to Comanche is greater than to any other family, thinks that the likeness is merely the result of long intercommunication. His opinion that it is entirely distinct from any other language has been indorsed by Buschmann and other authorities. The family is represented by the Kiowa tribe. So intimately associated with the Comanches have the Kiowa been since known to history that it is not easy to determine their pristine home. . . . Pope definitely locates the Kiowa in the valley of the Upper Arkansas, and of its tributary, the Purgatory (Las Animas) River. This is in substantial accord with the statements of other writers of about the same period. Schermerhorn (1812) places the Kiowa on the heads of the Arkansas and Platte. Earlier still they appear upon the headwaters of the Platte."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Report, Bureau of Ethnology, p. 84.*

**Kiriri, Cuyriri.** See above: GUCK OR COCO GROUP.

**Kitunahan Family.**—"This family was based upon a tribe variously termed Kitunaha, Kutcnay, Cootenai, or Flatbow, living on the Kootenay River, a branch of the Columbia in Oregon."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology, p. 85.*

**Klamaths.** See below: MODOCS.

**Koluschan Family.**—"Derivation: From the Aleut word kolosh, or more properly, kaluga, meaning 'dish,' the allusion being to the dish-shaped lip ornaments. This family was based by Gallatin upon the Koluschen tribe (the Tshinkitani of Marchand), 'who inhabit the islands and the [Pacific] coast from the 60th to the 55th degree of north latitude.'"—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology, p. 86.*

**Kulanapan Family.**—"The main territory of the Kulanapan family is bounded on the west by the Pacific Ocean, on the east by the Yukian and Copelan territories, on the north by the watershed of the Russian River, and on the south by a line drawn from Bodega Head to the southwest corner of the Yukian territory, near Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology, p. 88.*

**Kusan Family.\***—"The 'Kaus or Kwokwoos' tribe is merely mentioned by Hale as living on a river of the same name between the Umqua and the Clamct."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology, p. 89.*

**Kwokwoos.** See above: KUSAN FAMILY.

**Lenape.** See above: DELAWARES.

**Machicuis.** See below: PAMPAS TRIBES.

**Macushi.** See above: CARIBS AND THEIR KINDRED.

**Manaos.** See above: GUCK OR COCO GROUP.

**Mandans, or Mandanes.** See below: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Manhattans.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, and, also, MANHATTAN ISLAND.

**Manioto, or Mayno.** See above: ANDESIANS.

**Mapochins.** See CHILE: A. D. 1450-1724.

**Maranha.** See above: GUCK OR COCO GROUP.

**Maricopas.** See below: PUEBLOS.

**Mariposan Family.**—"Derivation: A Spanish word meaning 'butterfly,' applied to a county in

\* See Note, Appendix E.

California and subsequently taken for the family name. Latham mentions the remnants of three distinct bands of the Coconoon, each with its own language, in the north of Mariposa County. These are classed together under the above name. More recently the tribes speaking languages allied to the Coconon have been treated of under the family name Yokut. As, however, the stock was established by Latham on a sound basis, his name is here restored."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 90.

**Mascoutins, or Mascontens.** See below: SACS, &c.

**Massachusetts.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Mataguayas.** See BOLIVIA: ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

**Mayas.**—"In his second voyage, Columbus heard vague rumors of a mainland westward from Jamaica and Cuba, at a distance of ten days' journey in a canoe. . . . During his fourth voyage (1503-4), when he was exploring the Gulf southwest from Cuba, he picked up a canoe laden with cotton clothing variously dyed. The natives in it gave him to understand that they were merchants, and came from a land called Maia. This is the first mention in history of the territory now called Yucatan, and of the race of the Mayas; for although a province of similar name was found in the western extremity of the island of Cuba, the similarity was accidental, as the evidence is conclusive that no colony of the Mayas was found on the Antilles. . . . Maya was the patril name of the natives of Yucatan. It was the proper name of the northern portion of the peninsula. No single province bore it at the date of the Conquest, and probably it had been handed down as a generic term from the period, about a century before, when this whole district was united under one government. . . . Whatever the primitive meaning and first application of the name Maya, it is now used to signify specifically the aborigines of Yucatan. In a more extended sense, in the expression 'the Maya family,' it is understood to embrace all tribes, wherever found, who speak related dialects presumably derived from the same ancient stock as the Maya proper. . . . The total number of Indians of pure blood speaking the Maya proper may be estimated as nearly or quite 200,000, most of them in the political limits of the department of Yucatan; to these should be added nearly 100,000 of mixed blood, or of European descent, who use the tongue in daily life. For it forms one of the rare examples of American languages possessing vitality enough not only to maintain its ground, but actually to force itself on European settlers and supplant their native speech. . . . The Mayas did not claim to be autochthones. Their legends referred to their arrival by the sea from the East, in remote times, under the leadership of Itzamna, their hero-god, and also to a less numerous immigration from the West, which was connected with the history of another hero-god, Kukul Can. The first of these appears to be wholly mythical. . . . The second tradition deserves more attention from the historian. . . . It cannot be denied that the Mayas, the Kiches [or Quiches] and the Cakchiquels, in their most venerable traditions, claimed to have migrated from the north or west from some part of the present country of Mexico. These tra-

ditions receive additional importance from the presence on the shores of the Mexican Gulf, on the waters of the river Panuco, north of Vera Cruz, of a prominent branch of the Maya family, the Huastecs. The idea suggests itself that these were the rear-guard of a great migration of the Maya family from the north toward the south. Support is given to this by the dialect, which is most closely akin to that of the . . . sals of Tabasco, the nearest Maya race to the south of them, and also by very ancient traditions of the Aztecs. It is noteworthy that these two partially civilized races, the Mayas and the Aztecs, though differing radically in language, had legends which claimed a community of origin in some indefinitely remote past. We find these on the Maya side narrated in the sacred book of the Kiches, the Popol Vuh, in the Cakchiquel 'Records of Tecpan Atillan,' and in various pure Maya sources. . . . The annals of the Aztecs contain frequent allusions to the Huastecs."—D. G. Brinton, *The Maya Chronicles, introd.*—"Closely enveloped in the dense forests of Chiapas, Guatemala, Yucatan, and Honduras, the ruins of several ancient cities have been discovered, which are far superior in extent and magnificence to any seen in Aztec territory, and of which a detailed description may be found in the fourth volume of this work. Most of these cities were abandoned and more or less unknown at the time of the [Spanish] Conquest. They bear hieroglyphic inscriptions apparently identical in character; in other respects they resemble each other more than they resemble the Aztec ruins—or even other and apparently later works in Guatemala and Honduras. All these remains bear evident marks of great antiquity. . . . I deem the grounds sufficient . . . for accepting this Central American civilization of the past as a fact, referring it not to an extinct ancient race, but to the direct ancestors of the peoples still occupying the country with the Spaniards, and applying to it the name Maya as that of the language which has claims as strong as any to be considered the mother tongue of the linguistic family mentioned. . . . There are no data by which to fix the period of the original Maya empire, or its downfall or breaking up into rival factions by civil and foreign wars. The cities of Yucatan, as is clearly shown by Mr. Stephens, were, many of them, occupied by the descendants of the builders down to the conquest, and contain some remnants of wood-work still in good preservation, although some of the structures appear to be built on the ruins of others of a somewhat different type. Palenque and Copan, on the contrary, have no traces of wood or other perishable material, and were uninhabited and probably unknown in the 16th century. The loss of the key to what may have been an advanced system of hieroglyphics, while the spoken language survived, is also an indication of great antiquity, confirmed by the fact that the Quiché structures of Guatemala differed materially from those of the more ancient epoch. It is not likely that the Maya empire in its integrity continued later than the 3d or 4th century, although its cities may have been inhabited much later, and I should fix the epoch of its highest power at a date preceding rather than following the Christian era."—H. H. Bancroft, *Native Races of the Pacific States*, v. 2, ch. 2; v. 4, ch. 3-6; v. 5, ch. 11-13.

Also in Marquis de Nadallne, *Prehistoric America*, ch. 6-7.—J. L. Stephens, *Incidents of Travel in Yucatan; and Travel in Central America*, etc.—B. M. Norman, *Rambles in Yucatan*.—D. Charnay, *Ancient Cities of the New World*.—See, also, MEXICO: ANCIENT, and AZTEC AND MAYA PICTURE-WRITING.

**Mayoruna, or Barbudo.** See above: ANDESIANS.

**Menominees.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, and SACS, &c.

**Metóacs.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Miamis, or Twightwees.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, ILLINOIS, and SACS, &c.

**Micmacs.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Mingoes.**—"The name of Mingo, or Mengwe, by which the Iroquois were known to the Delawares and the other southern Algonkins, is said to be a contraction of the Lenape word 'Mangongwi,' meaning the 'People of the Springs.' The Iroquois possessed the head-waters of the rivers which flowed through the country of the Delawares."—H. Hale, *The Iroquois Book of Rites*, app., note A.

**Minneconjou.** See below: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Minnetarees.\*** See above: HIDATSA; and below: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Minquas.** See below: SUSQUEHANNAS; and above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Minis, Munsees, or Minisinks.** See above: DELAWARES, and ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Miranha.** See above: CUCK OR COCO GROUP.

**Missouris.** See below: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Mixes.** See below: ZAPOTECs, ETC.

**Mixtecs.** See below: ZAPOTECs, ETC.

**Mocovis.** See below: PAMPAS TRIBES.

**Modocs (Klamaths) and their California and Oregon neighbors.\***—"The principal tribes occupying this region [of Northern California from Rogue River on the north to the Eel River, south] are the Klamaths, who live on the head waters of the river and on the shores of the lake of that name; the Modocs, on Lower Klamath Lake and along Lost River; the Shastas, to the south-west of the Lakes; the Pit River Indians; the Euroes, on the Klamath River between Weitspek and the coast; the Cahroes, on the Klamath River from a short distance above the junction of the Trinity to the Klamath Mountains; the Hoopahs [or Hupahs, a tribe of the Athapascan Family] in Hoopah Valley on the Trinity near its junction with the Klamath; numerous tribes on the coast from Eel River and Humboldt Bay north, such as the Weeyots, Wallies, Tolewahs, etc., and the Rogue River Indians, on and about the river of that name. The Northern Californians are in every way superior to the central and southern tribes."—H. H. Bancroft, *The Native Races of the Pacific States*, v. 1, ch. 4.—"On the Klamath there live three distinct tribes, called the Yí-rok, Ká-rok, and Mó-dok, which names are said to mean, respectively, 'down the river,' 'up the river,' and 'head of the river.' . . . The Karok are probably the finest tribe in California. . . . Hoopa Valley, on the Lower Trinity, is the home of [the Hí-pá]. Next after the Ká-rok they are the finest race in all that region, and they even excel them in their statecraft, and in the singular influence, or perhaps brute force, which they exercise over the vicinal tribes. They are the Romans of Northern California in their valor and their wide-reaching dominions;

they are the French in the extended diffusion of their language." The Modoks, "on the whole . . . are rather a cloddish, indolent, ordinarily good-natured race, but treacherous at bottom, sullen when angered, notorious for keeping Punic faith. But their bravery nobody can impeach or deny; their heroic and long defense of their stronghold against the appliances of modern civilized warfare, including that arm so awful to savages—the artillery—was almost the only feature that lent respectability to their wretched tragedy of the Lava Beds [1873]."—S. Powers, *Tribes of California (Contributions to N. A. Ethnology, v. 3), ch. 1, 7, and 27.*—"The home of the Klamath tribe of southwestern Oregon lies upon the eastern slope of the southern extremity of the Cascade Range, and very nearly coincides with what we may call the head waters of the Klamath River, the main course of which lies in Northern California. . . . The main seat of the Modoc people was the valley of Lost River, the shores of Tule and of Little Klamath Lake. . . . The two main bodies forming the Klamath people are (1) the Klamath Lake Indians; (2) the Modoc Indians. The Klamath Lake Indians number more than twice as many as the Modoc Indians. They speak the northern dialect and form the northern chieftaincy. . . . The Klamath people possess no historic traditions going further back in time than a century, for the simple reason that there was a strict law prohibiting the mention of the person or acts of a deceased individual by using his name. . . . Our present knowledge does not allow us to connect the Klamath language genealogically with any of the other languages compared, but . . . it stands as a linguistic family for itself."—A. S. Gatschet, *The Klamath Indians (Contributions to N. A. Ethnology, v. 2, pt. 1).*—In Major Powell's linguistic classification, the Klamath and Modoc dialects are embraced in a family called the Lutuamian Family, derived from a Pit River word signifying "lake;" the Yuroks in a family called the Weitspekan; and the Pit River Indian dialects are provisionally set apart in a distinct family named the Palahmian Family.—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Report, Bureau of Ethnology, pp. 89 and 97.*

**Mohaves (Mojaves).** See above: APACHE GROUP.

**Mohawks.** See above: IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY.

**Mohegans, or Mahicans.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY; and below: STOCKBRIDGE INDIANS; also, NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1637.

**Montagnais.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY; and ATHAPASCAN FAMILY.

**Montauks.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Moquejunnan Family.**—"Derivation: From the river and hill of the same name in Calaveras County, California. . . . It was not until 1856 that the distinctness of the linguistic family was fully set forth by Latham. Under the head of Moquelumne, this author gathers several vocabularies representing different languages and dialects of the same stock. These are the Talutit of Hale, the Tuolumne from Schoolcraft, the Sonoma dialects as represented by the Tshokoyem vocabulary, the Chocoyem and Youklusome paternosters, and the Olmentke of Kostromonov in Bler's Beiträge. . . . The Moquelumnan family occupies the territory bounded

\* See Note, Appendix E.

on the north by the Cosumne River, on the south by the Fresno River, on the east by the Sierra Nevada, and on the west by the San Joaquin River, with the exception of a strip on the east bank occupied by the Cholovone. A part of this family occupies also a territory bounded on the south by San Francisco Bay."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology*, pp. 92-93.

**Moquis.** See below: PUEBLOS.

**Morona.** See above: ANDESIANS.

**Moxos, or Mojos.** See above: ANDESIANS; also, BOLIVIA: ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

**Mundurucú.** See below: TUPI.

**Munsees.** See above: DELAWARES, and ALGONQUIAN FAMILY; also MANHATTAN ISLAND.

**Mura.** See above: GUCK or COCO GROUP.

**Muskogean, or Maskoki Family.**—"Among the various nationalities of the Gulf territories the Maskoki family of tribes occupied a central and commanding position. Not only the large extent of territory held by them, but also their numbers, their prowess in war, and a certain degree of mental culture and self-esteem made of the Maskoki one of the most important groups in Indian history. From their ethnologic condition of later times, we infer that these tribes have extended for many centuries back in time from the Atlantic to the Mississippi and beyond that river, and from the Appalachian ridge to the Gulf of Mexico. With short intermissions they kept up warfare with all the circumjacent Indian communities, and also among each other. . . . The irresolute and egotistic policy of these tribes often caused serious difficulties to the government of the English and French colonies, and some of them constantly wavered in their adhesion between the French and the English cause. The American government overcame their opposition easily whenever a conflict presented itself (the Seminole War forms an exception), because, like all the Indians, they never knew how to unite against a common foe. The two main branches of the stock, the Creek and the Cha'hta [or Choctaw] Indians, were constantly at war, and the remembrance of their deadly conflicts has now passed to their descendants in the form of folk lore. . . . The only characteristic by which a subdivision of the family can be attempted, is that of language. Following their ancient topographic location from east to west, we obtain the following synopsis: First branch, or Maskoki proper: The Creek, Maskokálgi or Maskoki proper, settled on Coosa, Tallapoosa, Upper and Middle Chatahuchi rivers. From these branched off by segmentation the Creek portion of the Seminoles, of the Yamassi and of the little Yamacraw community. Second, or Appalachian branch: This southeastern division, which may be called also 'a parte potiori' the Hitchiti connection, anciently comprised the tribes on the Lower Chatahuchi river, and, east from there, the extinct Apalach, the Mikasuki, and the Hitchiti portion of the Seminoles, Yamassi and Yamacraws. Third, or Alibamu branch, comprised the Alibamu villages on the river of that name; to them belonged the Koasáti and Witumka on Coosa river, its northern affluent. Fourth, Western or Cha'hta [Choctaw] branch: From the main people, the Cha'hta, set. d in the middle portions of the State of Mississippi, the Chicasa, Pascagoula, Biloxi, Huma, and other tribes once became separated through

segmentation. The strongest evidence for a community of origin of the Maskoki tribes is furnished by the fact that their dialects belong to one linguistic family. . . . Maskóki, Maskógi, Isti Maskóki, designates a single person of the Creek tribe, and forms, as a collective plural, Maskokálgi, the Creek community, the Creek people, the Creek Indians. English authors write this name Muscogee, Muskogee, and its plural Muscognee. The first syllable, as pronounced by the Creek Indians, contains a clear short a. . . . The accent is usually laid on the middle syllable: Maskóki, Maskógi. None of the tribes are able to explain the name from their own language. . . . Why did the English colonists call them Creek Indians? Because, when the English traders entered the Maskoki country from Charleston or Savannah, they had to cross a number of streams or creeks, especially between the Chatahuchi and Savannah rivers. Gallatin thought it probable that the inhabitants of the country adjacent to Savannah river were called Creeks from an early time. . . . In the southern part of the Cha'hta territory several tribes, represented to be of Cha'hta lineage, appear as distinct from the main body, and are always mentioned separately. The French colonists, in whose annals they figure extensively, call them Mobilians, Tohomies, Pascogoulas, Biloxis, Mougoulachas, Bayogoulas and Humas (Oumas). They have all disappeared in our epoch, with the exception of the Biloxi [Major Powell, in the Seventh Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology, places the Biloxi in the Siouan Family],\* of whom scattered remnants live in the forests of Louisiana, south of the Red River."—A. S. Gatschet, *A Migration Legend of the Creek Indians*, v. 1, pt. 1.—"The Uchees and the Natches, who are both incorporated in the [Muskogee or Creek] confederacy, speak two distinct languages altogether different from the Muskogee. The Natches, a residue of the well-known nation of that name, came from the banks of the Mississippi, and joined the Creeks less than one hundred years ago. The original seats of the Uchees were east of the Coosa and probably of the Chatahoochee; and they consider themselves as the most ancient inhabitants of the country. They may have been the same nation which is called Apalaches in the accounts of De Soto's expedition. . . . The four great Southern nations, according to the estimates of the War Department . . . consist now [1836] of 67,000 souls, viz.: The Cherokees, 15,000; the Choctaws (18,500), the Chicassas (5,500), 24,000; the Muskogees, Seminoles, and Hitchittes, 20,000; the Uchees, Alibamons, Coosadas, and Natches, 2,000. The territory west of the Mississippi, given or offered to them by the United States in exchange for their lands east of that river, contains 40,000,000 acres, exclusively of what may be allotted to the Chicassas."—A. Gallatin, *Synopsis of the Indian Tribes (Archæologia Americana, v. 2), sect. 3.*—See below: SEMINOLES.

**Musquito, or Mosquito Indians.**—"That portion of Honduras known as the Musquito Coast derived its name, not from the abundance of those troublesome insects, but from a native tribe who at the discovery occupied the shore near Blewfield Lagoon. They are an intelligent people, short in stature, unusually dark in color, with finely cut features, and small straight noses—not at all negroid, except where there has been an admixture of blood. They number

\* See Note, Appendix E.

about 6,000, many of whom have been partly civilized by the efforts of missionaries, who have reduced the language to writing and published in it a number of works. The Tunjulas are one of the sub-tribes of the Musquitos."—D. G. Brinton, *The American Race*, p. 162.—See, also, NICARAGUA: A. D., 1850.

**Nahuas.** See MEXICO, ANCIENT: THE MAYA AND NAHUA PEOPLES.

**Naticokes.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Napo.** See above: ANDESIANS.

**Narragansetts.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY; also RHODE ISLAND: A. D. 1636; and NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1637; 1674-1675; 1675; and 1676-1678.

**Natchezan Family.**—When the French first entered the lower Mississippi valley, they found the Natchez [Na'hitchi] occupying a region of country that now surrounds the city which bears their name. "By the persevering curiosity of Gallatin, it is established that the Natchez were distinguished from the tribes around them less by their customs and the degree of their civilization than by their language, which, as far as comparisons have been instituted, has no etymological affinity with any other whatever. Here again the imagination too readily invents theories; and the tradition has been widely received that the dominion of the Natchez once extended even to the Wabash. History knows them only as a feeble and inconsiderable nation, who in the 18th century attached themselves to the confederacy of the Creeks."—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S. (Author's last rev.)*, v. 2, p. 97.—"Chateaubriand, in his charming romances, and some of the early French writers, who often drew upon their fancy for their facts, have thrown an interest around the Natchez, as a semi-civilized and noble race, that has passed into history. We find no traces of civilization in their architecture, or in their social life and customs. Their religion was brutal and bloody, indicating an Aztec origin. They were perfidious and cruel, and if they were at all superior to the neighboring tribes it was probably due to the district they occupied—the most beautiful, healthy and productive in the valley of the Mississippi—and the influence of its attractions in substituting permanent for temporary occupation. The residence of the grand chief was merely a spacious cabin, of one apartment, with a mat of basket work for his bed and a log for his pillow. . . . Their government was an absolute despotism. The supreme chief was master of their labor, their property, and their lives. . . . The Natchez consisted exclusively of two classes—the Blood Royal and its connexions and the common people, the Mich-i-mioki-quippe, or Sinkarids. The two classes understood each other, but spoke a different dialect. Their customs of war, their treatment of prisoners, their ceremonies of marriage, their feasts and fasts, their sorceries and witchcraft, differed very little from other savages. Father Charlevoix, who visited Natchez in 1721, saw no evidences of civilization. Their villages consisted of a few cabins, or rather ovens, without windows and roofed with matting. The house of the Sun was larger, plastered with mud, and a narrow bench for a seat and bed. No other furniture in the mansion of this grand dignitary, who has been described

by imaginative writers as the peer of Montezuma!"—J. F. H. Claiborne, *Mississippi*, v. 1, ch. 4.—In 1729, the Natchez, maddened by insolent oppressions, planned and executed a general massacre of the French within their territory. As a consequence, the tribe was virtually exterminated within the following two years.—C. Gayarre, *Louisiana, its Colonial Hist. and Romance*, 2d series, lect. 3 and 5.—"The Na'hitchi, according to Gallatin, a residue of the well-known nation of that name, came from the banks of the Mississippi, and joined the Creek less than one hundred years ago. The seashore from Mobile to the Mississippi was then inhabited by several small tribes, of which the Na'hitchi was the principal. Before 1730 the tribe lived in the vicinity of Natchez, Miss., along St. Catherine Creek. After their dispersion by the French in 1730 most of the remainder joined the Chickasaw and afterwards the Upper Creek. They are now in Creek and Cherokee Nations, Indian Territory. The linguistic relations of the language spoken by the Taensa tribe have long been in doubt, and it is possible they will ever remain so."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept.*, Bureau of Ethnology, p. 96.—See LOUISIANA: A. D. 1719-1750.—See, also, above: MUSKINGOAN FAMILY.

**Natchitoches.\*** See TEXAS: THE ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

**Nausets.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Navajos.** See above: ATHAPASCAN FAMILY, and APACHE GROUP.

**Neutral Nation.** See above: HURONS, &c.; and IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY: THEIR CONQUESTS, &c.

**Nez Percés, or Sahaptins.**—"The Sahaptins or Nez Percés [the Shahaptian Family in Major Powell's classification], with their allied tribes, occupied the middle and upper valley of the Columbia and its affluents, and also the passes of the mountains. They were in contiguity with the Shoshones and the Algonkin Blackfeet, thus holding an important position, intermediate between the eastern and the Pacific tribes. Having the commercial instinct of the latter, they made good use of it."—D. G. Brinton, *The American Race*, p. 167.

Also in J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept. of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 106.

**Niniquillas.** See below: PAMPAS TRIBES.

**Nipmucs, or Nipnets.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY; also, NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1674-1675; 1675; and 1676-1678 (KING PHILIP'S WAR).

**Nootkas.** See below: WAKASHAN FAMILY.

**Nottoways.** See above: IROQUOIS TRIBES OF THE SOUTH.

**Nyantics.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Ogalalas.** See below: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Ojibwas, or Chippewas.**—"The Ojibways, with their kindred, the Pottawatimics, and their friends the Ottawas,—the latter of whom were fugitives from the eastward, whence they had fled from the wrath of the Iroquois,—were banded into a sort of confederacy. They were closely allied in blood, language, manners and character. The Ojibways, by far the most numerous of the three, occupied the Lake of Lake Superior, and extensive adjacent regions. In their boundaries, the career of Iroquois conquest found at length a check. The fugitive Wyandots sought refuge in the Ojibway hunting grounds; and tradition relates that, at the

\* See Note, Appendix E.

outlet of Lake Superior, an Iroquois war-party once encountered a disastrous repulse. In their mode of life, they were far more rude than the Iroquois, or even the southern Algonquin tribes."—F. Parkman, *Conspiracy of Pontiac*, ch. 1.—"The name of the tribe appears to be recent. It is not met with in the older writers. The French, who were the earliest to meet them, in their tribal sent at the falls or Sault de Ste Marie, named them Saulteur, from this circumstance. McKenzie uses the term 'Jibway,' as the equivalent of this term, in his voyages. They are referred to, with little difference in the orthography, in General Washington's report, in 1754, of his trip to Le Benf, on Lake Erie; but are first recognized, among our treaty-tribes, in the general treaty of Greenville, of 1794, in which, with the Ottawas they ceded the island of Michilimackinac, and certain dependencies, conceded by them at former periods to the French. . . . The Chippewas are conceded, by writers on American philology . . . to speak one of the purest forms of the Algonquin."—H. R. Schoolcraft, *Information respecting the Hist., Condition and Prospects of the Indian Tribes*, pt. 5, p. 142.

ALSO IN G. Copway, *The Ojibway Nation*.—J. G. Kohl, *Kitchi-gami*.—See, also, PONTIAC'S WAR; and above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Omahas.** See below: SIOUAN FAMILY, and PAWNEE (CADDOAN) FAMILY.

**Oneidas.** See above: IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY.

**Onondagas.** See above: IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY.

**Orejones.** See below: PAMPAS TRIBES.

**Osages.** See below: SIOUAN FAMILY, and PAWNEE (CADDOAN) FAMILY.

**Otoes, or Ottoes.** See below: SIOUAN FAMILY, and PAWNEE (CADDOAN) FAMILY.

**Otomis.**—"According to Aztec tradition, the Otomis were the earliest owners of the soil of Central Mexico. Their language was at the conquest one of the most widely distributed of any in this portion of the continent. Its central regions were the States of Queretaro and Guanajuato. . . . The Otomis are below the average stature, of dark color, the skull markedly dolichocephalic, the nose short and flattened, the eyes slightly oblique."—D. G. Brierton, *The American Race*, p. 135.

**Ottawas.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, and OJIBWAS.—See, also, PONTIAC'S WAR.

**Pacaguara.** See above: ANDESIANS.

**Pacamora.** See above: ANDESIANS.

**Pamlicoos.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Pampas Tribes.**—"The chief tribe of the Pampas Indians was entitled Querandis by the Spaniards, although they called themselves Pehuelches for Puelts—that is, the Easterns]. Various segments of these, under different names, occupied the immense tract of ground, between the river Parana and the republic of Chili. The Querandis . . . were the great opponents to settlement of the Spaniards in Buenos Ayres. . . . The Ancas or Aracanos Indians [see CHILE] resided on the west of the Pampas near Chili, and from time to time assisted the Querandis in transporting stolen cattle across the Cordilleras. The southern part of the Pampas was occupied by the Balchitas, Ubilches, Telnmelches, and others, all of whom were branches of the original Quelches horde. The Guarani In-

dians were the most famous of the South American races. . . . Of the Guayanas horde there were several tribes— independent of each other, and speaking different idioms, although having the same title of race. Their territory extended from the river Guarani, one of the affluents into the Uruguay, for many leagues northwards, and stretched over to the Parana opposite the city of Corpus Christi. They were some of the most vigorous opponents of the Spanish invaders. . . . The Nallicurgas Indians, who lived up to near 21° S. lat. were reputed to dwell in caves, to be very limited in number, and to go entirely naked. The Gausarapos, or Guachies dwelt in the marshy districts near where the river Gausarapo, or Guachie, has its source. This stream enters from the east into the Paraguay at 19° 16' 30" S. lat. . . . The Cutos lived inside of a lake to the west of the river Paraguay, and constituted a very small tribe. . . . The Orejones dwelt on the eastern brows of the mountains of Santa Lucia or San Fernando—close to the western side of Paraguay river. . . . Another tribe, the Niniquillas, had likewise the names of Potreiros, Simanos, Barcenos, and Lathanos. They occupied a forest which began at about 19° S. lat., some leagues backward from the river Paraguay, and separated the Gran Chaco from the province of Los Chiquitos in Peru. . . . The Guanas Indians were divided into eight separate segments, for each of which there was a particular and different name. They lived between 20° and 22° of S. lat. in the Gran Chaco to the west of Paraguay, and they were not known to the Spaniards till the latter crossed the last-named river in 1673. . . . The Albiais and Payaguas Indians . . . in former times, were the chief tribes of the Paraguay territory. . . . The Albiais were styled Machicuis and Enimgas by other authors. At the time of the Spaniards' arrival here, the Albiais occupied the Gran Chaco side of the river Paraguay from 20° to 22° S. lat. Here they entered into a treaty offensive and defensive with the Payaguas. . . . The joined forces of Albiais and Payaguas had managed to extend their territory in 1673 down to 24° 7' S. on the eastern side of Paraguay river. . . . The Albiais were a very tall and muscular race of people. . . . The Payaguas Indians, before and up to, as well as after, the period of the conquest, were sailors, and domineered over the river Paraguay. . . . The Guaicurus lived on the Chaco side of Paraguay river and subsisted entirely by hunting. From the barbarous custom which their women had of inducing abortion to avoid the pain or trouble of child-bearing, they became exterminated soon after the conquest. . . . The Tobas, who have also the titles of Natecut and Yncuanabaité, were among the best fighters of the Indians. They occupy the Gran Chaco, chiefly on the banks of the river Vermejo, and between that and the Pilcomayo. Of these there are some remains in the present day. . . . The Mocovis are likewise still to be found in the Chaco. . . . The Abipones, who were also styled Ecusgna and Quiabunabaité, lived in the Chaco, so low down as 28° south. This was the tribe with whom the Jesuits incorporated, when they erected the city of San Geronimo, in the Gran Chaco, and nearly opposite Goya, in 1748."—T. J. Hutchison, *The Parana*, ch. 6-7.—"The Abipones inhabit [in the 18th century] the province Chaco, the centre of all Paraguay; they have no



fixed abodes, nor any boundaries, except what fear of their neighbours has established. They roam extensively in every direction, whenever the opportunity of attacking their enemies, or the necessity of avoiding them renders a journey advisable. The northern shore of the Rio Grande or Bermejo, which the Indians call Ihaté, was their native land in the last century [the 17th]. Thence they removed, to avoid the war carried on against Chaco by the Spaniards . . . and, migrating towards the south, took possession of a valley formerly held by the Calchaquis. . . . From what region their ancestors came there is no room for conjecture."—M. Dobrizhoffer, *Acct. of the Abipones*, v. 2, ch. 1.—"The Abipones are in general above the middle stature, and of a robust constitution. In summer they go quite naked; but in winter cover themselves with skins. . . . They paint themselves all over with different colours."—Fathé. Charlevoix, *Hist. of Paraguay*, bk. 7 (r. 1).

ALSO IN *The Standard Natural History* (J. S. Kingsley, ed.), v. 6, pp. 256-262.—See, also, below: TUPL.—GUARANI.

**Pampticokes.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Pano.** See above: ANDESIANS.

**Papagos.** See below: PIMAN FAMILY, and PUEBLOS.

**Parawianas.** See above: CARIBS AND THEIR KINDRED.

**Pascougulas.** See above: MUSKOGEAN FAMILY.

**Passé.** See above: GUCK OR COCO GROUP.

**Patagonians and Fuegians.**—"The Patagonians call themselves Chonek or Tzoueca, or Inaken (men, people), and by their Pampean neighbors are referred to as Tehmel-Che, southerners. They do not, however, belong to the Aucasian stock, nor do they resemble the Pampeans physically. They are celebrated for their stature, many of them reaching from six to six feet four inches in height, and built in proportion. In color they are a reddish brown, and have aquiline noses and good foreheads. They care little for a sedentary life, and roam the coast as far north as the Rio Negro. . . . On the inhospitable shores of Tierra del Fuego there dwell three nations of diverse stock, but on about the same plane of culture. One of these is the Yabgans, or Yapoos, on the Beagle Canal; the second is the Onas or Aonlk, to the north and east of these; and the third the Aliculfus, to the north and west. . . . The opinion has been advanced by Dr. Deniker of Paris, that the Fuegians represent the oldest type or variety of the American race. He believes that at one time this type occupied the whole of South America south of the Amazon, and that the Tapuyas of Brazil and the Fuegians are its surviving members. This interesting theory demands still further evidence before it can be accepted."—D. G. Brinton, *The American Race*, pp. 327-332.

**Pawnee Family** (named "Caddoan" by Major Powell).—"The Pawnee Family, though some of its branches have long been known, is perhaps in history and language one of the least understood of the important tribes of the West. In both respects it seems to constitute a distinct group. During recent years its extreme northern and southern branches have evinced a tendency to blend with surrounding stocks; but the central branch, constituting the

Pawnee proper, maintains still in its advanced decadence a bold line of demarcation between itself and all adjacent tribes. The members of the family are: The Pawnees, the Arikaras, the Caddos, the Huecos or Wacos, the Keechie, the Tawaconies, and the Pawnee Piets or Wichitas. The last five may be designated as the Southern or Red River branches. At the date of the Louisiana purchase the Caddos were living about 40 miles northwest of where Shreveport now stands. Five years earlier their residence was upon Clear Lake, in what is now Caddo Parish. This spot they claimed was the place of their nativity, and their residence from time immemorial. . . . They have a tradition that they are the parent stock, from which all the southern branches have sprung, and to some extent this claim has been recognized. . . . The five [southern] bands are now all gathered upon a reserve secured for them in the Indian Territory by the Government. . . . In many respects, their method of building lodges, their equestrianism, and certain social and tribal usages, they quite closely resemble the Pawnees. Their connection, however, with the Pawnee family, not till recently [ever mentioned, is mainly a matter of vague conjecture. . . . The name Pawnee is most probably derived from 'párk-I,' a horn; and seems to have been once used by the Pawnees themselves to designate their peculiar scalp-lock. From the fact that this was the most noticeable feature in their costume, the name came naturally to be the denominative term of the tribe. The word in this use once probably embraced the Wichitas (i. e., Pawnee Piets) and the Arikaras. . . . The true Pawnee territory till as late as 1833 may be described as extending from the Niobrara south to the Arkansas. They frequently hunted considerably beyond the Arkansas; tradition says as far as the Canadian. . . . On the east they claimed to the Missouri, though in eastern Nebraska, by a sort of tacit permit, the Otoes, Poncas, and Omahas along that stream occupied lands extending as far west as the Elkhorn. In Kansas, also, east of the Big Blue, they had ceased to exercise any direct control, as several remnants of tribes, the Wyandots, Delawares, Kickapoos, and Iowas, had been settled there and were living under the guardianship of the United States. . . . On the west their grounds were marked by no natural boundary, but may perhaps be described by a line drawn from the mouth of Snake River on the Niobrara southwest to the North Platte, thence south to the Arkansas. . . . It is not to be supposed, however, that they held altogether undisturbed possession of this territory. On the north they were incessantly harassed by various bands of the Dakotas, while upon the south the Osages, Comanches, Cheyennes, Arapahoes and Kiowas (the last three originally northern tribes) were equally relentless in their hostility. . . . In 1833 the Pawnees surrendered to the United States their claim upon all the above described territory lying south of the Platte. In 1858 all their remaining territory was ceded, except a reserve 30 miles long and 15 wide upon the Loup Fork of the Platte, its eastern limit beginning at Beaver Creek. In 1874 they sold this tract and removed to a reserve secured for them by the Government in the Indian Territory, between the Arkansas and Cimarron at their junction."—J. B. Dunbar, *The Pawnee Indians* (*Mag. of Am. Hist.*, April, 1880, v. 4).

ALSO IN G. B. Grinnell, *Pawnee Hero Stories*.  
—D. G. Brinton, *The American Race*, pp. 95-97.  
—J. W. Powell, *Seventh An. Rept. of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 59.—See, also, above: ADAIS and BLACKFEET.

**Pagaguas.** See above: PAMPAS TRIBES.  
**Pehuelches, or Puelts.** See above: PAMPAS TRIBES.

**Penacooks, or Pawtucket Indians.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Peorias.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Pequots.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY; and below: SHAWANESE; also, NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1637.

**Piankishaws.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, and SACS, &c.

**Piegans.** See above: BLACKFEET.

**Piman Family.**—"Only a small portion of the territory occupied by this family is included within the United States, the greater portion being in Mexico, where it extends to the Gulf of California. The family is represented in the United States by three tribes, Pima alta, Sobaiipuri, and Papago. The former have lived for at least two centuries with the Maricopa on the Gila River about 160 miles from the mouth. The Sobaiipuri occupied the Santa Cruz and San Pedro Rivers, tributaries of the Gila, but are no longer known. The Papago territory is much more extensive and extends to the south across the border."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology*, pp. 98-99.—See below: PUEBLOS.

**Pimenteirias.** See above: GUCK OR COCO GROUP.

**Piru.** See above: ANDESIANS.

**Pit River Indians.** See above: MODOCS (KLAMATHS), &c.

**Piutes.** See below: SHOSHONEAN FAMILY.

**Pokanokets, or Wampanoags.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY; also, NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1674-1675; 1675; 1676-1678 (KING PHILIP'S WAR).

**Ponkas, or Puncas.** See below: SIOUAN FAMILY; and above: PAWNEE (CADDOAN) FAMILY.

**Popolocas.** See above: CHONTALS.

**Pottawatomes.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, OJIBWAS, and SACS, &c.

**Powhatan Confederacy.**—"At the time of the first settlement by the Europeans, it has been estimated that there were not more than 20,000 Indians within the limits of the State of Virginia. Within a circuit of 60 miles from Jamestown, Captain Smith says there were about 5,000 souls, and of these scarce 1,500 were warriors. The whole territory between the mountains and the sea was occupied by more than 40 tribes, 30 of whom were united in a confederacy under Powhatan, whose dominions, hereditary and acquired by conquest, comprised the whole country between the rivers James and Potomac, and extended into the interior as far as the falls of the principal rivers. Campbell, in his History of Virginia, states the number of Powhatan's subjects to have been 8,000. Powhatan was a remarkable man; a sort of savage Napoleon, who, by the force of his character and the superiority of his talents, had raised himself from the rank of a petty chieftain to something of imperial dignity and power. He had two places of abode, one called Powhatan, where Richmond now stands, and the other at Werowocomoco, on the north side of York River, within

the present county of Gloucester. . . . Besides the large confederacy of which Powhatan was the chief, there were two others, with which that was often at war. One of these, called the Mannahoens, consisted of eight tribes, and occupied the country between the Rappahannock and York rivers; the other, consisting of five tribes, was called the Monaccans, and was settled between York and James rivers above the Falls. There were also, in addition to these, many scattering and independent tribes."—G. S. Hillard, *Life of Capt. John Smith (Library of Am. Biog.)*, ch. 4.—"The English invested savage life with all the dignity of European courts. Powhatan was styled 'King,' or 'Emperor,' his principal warriors were lords of the kingdom, his wives were queens, his daughter was a 'princess,' and his cabins were his various seats of residence. . . . In his younger days Powhatan had been a great warrior. Hereditarily, he was the chief or werowance of eight tribes; through conquest his dominions had been extended. . . . The name of his nation and the Indian appellation of the James River was Powhatan. He himself possessed several names."—E. Eggleston and L. E. Seelye, *Pocahontas*, ch. 3.

ALSO IN Capt. John Smith, *Description of Virginia, and General Historie of Va. (Arber's reprint of Works, pp. 65 and 360)*.—See, also, above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Puans.** See below: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Pueblos.**—"The non-nomadic semi-civilized town and agricultural peoples of New Mexico and Arizona. . . . I call the Pueblos, or Towns-people, from pueblo, town, population, people, a name given by the Spaniards to such inhabitants of this region as were found, when first discovered, permanently located in comparatively well-built towns. Strictly speaking, the term Pueblos applies only to the villagers settled along the banks of the Rio Grande del Norte and its tributaries between latitudes 34° 45' and 36° 30', and although the name is employed as a general appellation for this division, it will be used, for the most part, only in its narrower and popular sense. In this division, besides the before mentioned Pueblos proper, are embraced the Moquis, or villagers of eastern Arizona, and the non-nomadic agricultural nations of the lower Gila river,—the Pimas, Maricopas, Papagos, and cognate tribes. The country of the Towns-people, if we may credit Lieutenant Simpson, is one of 'almost universal barrenness,' yet interspersed with fertile spots; that of the agricultural nations, though dry, is more generally productive. The fame of this so-called civilization reached Mexico at an early day. . . . In exaggerated rumors of great cities to the north, which prompted the expeditions of Marco de Niza in 1539, of Coronado in 1540, and of Espejo in 1586 [1583]. These adventurers visited the north in quest of the fabulous kingdoms of Quivira, Tontontec, Marata and others, in which great riches were said to exist. The name of Quivira was afterwards applied by them to one or more of the pueblo cities. The name Cibola, from 'Cibolo,' Mexican bull, 'bos bison,' or wild ox of New Mexico, where the Spaniards first encountered buffalo, was given to seven of the towns which were afterwards known as the Seven Cities of Cibola. But most of the villages known at the present day were mentioned in the reports or the early expeditions by their present names.

. . . The towns of the Pueblos are essentially unique, and are the dominant feature of these aboriginals. Some of them are situated in valleys, others on mesas; sometimes they are planted on elevations almost inaccessible, reached only by artificial grades, or by steps cut in the solid rock. Some of the towns are of an elliptical shape, while others are square, a town being frequently but a block of buildings. Thus a Pueblo consists of one or more squares, each enclosed by three or four buildings of from 300 to 400 feet in length, and about 150 feet in width at the base, and from two to seven stories of from eight to nine feet each in height. . . . The stories are built in a series of gradations or retreating surfaces, decreasing in size as they rise, thus forming a succession of terraces. In some of the towns these terraces are on both sides of the building; in others they face only towards the outside; while again in others they are on the inside. These terraces are about six feet wide, and extend around the three or four sides of the square, forming a walk for the occupants of the story resting upon it, and a roof for the story beneath; so with the stories above. As there is no inner communication with one another, the only means of mounting to them is by ladders which stand at convenient distances along the several rows of terraces, and they may be drawn up at pleasure, thus cutting off all unwelcome intrusion. The outside walls of one or more of the lower stories are entirely solid, having no openings of any kind, with the exception of, in some towns, a few loopholes. . . . To enter the rooms on the ground floor from the outside, one must mount the ladder to the first balcony or terrace, then descend through a trap door in the floor by another ladder on the inside. . . . The several stories of these huge structures are divided into multitudinous compartments of greater or less size, which are apportioned to the several families of the tribe."—H. H. Bancroft, *Native Races of the Pacific States*, v. 1, ch. 5.—"There can be no doubt that Cibola is to be looked for in New Mexico. . . . We cannot . . . refuse to adopt the views of General Simpson and of Mr. W. W. H. Davis, and to look at the pueblo of Zuñi as occupying, if not the actual site, at least one of the sites within the tribal area of the Seven Cities of Cibola. Nor can we refuse to identify Tusayan with the Moqui district, and Acoeco with Acoma."—A. F. Baudelier, *Hist. Introd. to Studies among the Sedentary Indians of N. Mexico (Papers of the Archaeolog. Inst. of Am.: Am. Series, v. 1)*.

Also in J. H. Simpson, *The March of Coronado*.—L. H. Morgan, *Houses and House-life of the Am. Aborigines (Contributions to N. Am. Ethnology, v. 4)*, ch. 6.—F. H. Cushing, *My Adventures in Zuñi (Century, v. 3-4)*.—The same, *Fourth Annual Rept. of the Bureau of Ethnology (1882-83)*, pp. 473-480.—F. W. Blackmar, *Spanish Institutions of the Southwest*, ch. 10.—See, also, AMERICA, PREHISTORIC, and above: PIMAN FAMILY, and KERESAN FAMILY.

**Pujunan Family.**—"The following tribes were placed in this group by Latham: Pujuni, Secumne, Tsamak of Hale, and the Cushman of Schoolcraft. The name adopted for the family is the name of a tribe given by Hale. This was one of the two races into which, upon the information of Captain Sutter as derived by Mr. Dana, all the Sacramento tribes were believed to

be divided. 'These races resembled one another in every respect but language.' . . . The tribes of this family have been carefully studied by Powers, to whom we are indebted for most all we know of their distribution. They occupied the eastern bank of the Sacramento in California, beginning some 80 or 100 miles from its mouth, and extended northward to within a short distance of Pit River."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology*, pp. 99-100. **Puncas, or Ponkas.** See below: SIOUAN FAMILY; and above: PAWNEE (CADDOAN) FAMILY.

**Purumancians.** See CHILE: A. D. 1450-1724.

**Quapaws.** See below: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Queiches.** See above: PAMPAS TRIBES.

**Querandis, or Pehuelches, or Puelts.** See above: PAMPAS TRIBES.

**Quiches.—Cakchiquels.**—"Of the ancient races of America, those which approached the nearest to a civilized condition spoke related dialects of a tongue, which from its principal members has been called the Maya-Quiche linguistic stock. Even to-day, it is estimated that half a million persons use these dialects. They are scattered over Yucatan, Guatemala, and the adjacent territory, and one branch formerly occupied the hot lowlands on the Gulf of Mexico, north of Vera Cruz. The so-called 'metropolitan' dialects are those spoken relatively near the city of Guatemala, and include the Cakchiquel, the Quiche, the Pokonchi and the Tzutuhil. They are quite closely allied, and are mutually intelligible, resembling each other about as much as did in ancient Greece the Attic, Ionic and Doric dialects. . . . The civilization of these people was such that they used various mnemonic signs, approaching our alphabet, to record and recall their mythology and history. Fragments, more or less complete, of these traditions have been preserved. The most notable of them is the national legend of the Quiches of Guatemala, the so-called Popol Vuh. It was written at an unknown date in the Quiche dialect, by a native who was familiar with the ancient records."—D. G. Brinton, *Essays of an Americanist*, p. 104.

ALSO IN THE same, *Annals of the Cakchiquels*.—H. H. Bancroft, *Native Races of the Pacific States*, ch. 11.—See, also, above: MAYAS.

**Quichuas.** See PERU.

**Quijo.** See above: ANDESIANS.

**Quoratean Family.**—"The tribes occupy both banks of the lower Klamath from a range of hills a little above Happy Camp to the junction of the Trinity, and the Salmon River from its mouth to its sources. On the north, Quoratean tribes extended to the Athapascan territory near the Oregon line."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 101.

**Rapid Indians.**—A name applied by various writers to the Arapahoes, and other tribes.

**Raritans.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Remo.** See above: ANDESIANS.

**Rogue River Indians.\*** See above: MODOCS, ETC.

**Rucanas.** See PERU.

**Sabaja.** See above: GUCK on COCO GROUP. **Sacs (Sauks), Foxes, etc.**—"The Sauks or Saukies (White Clay), and Foxes or Outagamies, so called by the Europeans and Algonkians, but whose true name is Musquakkluk (Red Clay), are in fact but one nation. The French missionaries

\* See Note, Appendix B.

on coming first in contact with them, in the year 1665, at once found that they spoke the same language, and that it differed from the Algonkin, though belonging to the same stock; and also that this language was common to the Kickapoos, and to those Indians they called Maskontens. This last nation, if it ever had an existence as a distinct tribe, has entirely disappeared. But we are informed by Charlevoix, and Mr. Schoolcraft corroborates the fact, that the word 'Mascontack' means a country without woods, a prairie. The name Mascontens was therefore used to designate 'prairie Indians.' And it appears that they consisted principally of Sanks and Kickapoos, with an occasional mixture of Potowotamies and Miamis, who probably came there to hunt the Buffalo. The country assigned to those Mascontens lay south of the Fox River of Lak Michigan and west of Illinois River. . . . When first discovered, the Sanks and Foxes had their seats toward the southern extremity of Greer Bay, on Fox River, and generally farther east than the country which they lately occupied. . . . By the treaty of 1804, the Sanks and Foxes ceded to the United States all their lands east of . . . the Mississippi. . . . The Kickapoos by various treaties, 1809 to 1819, have also ceded all their lands to the United States. They claimed all the country between the Illinois River and the Wabash, north of the parallel of latitude passing by the mouth of the Illinois and south of the Kankakee River. . . . The territory claimed by the Miamis and Piankishaws may be generally stated as having been bounded eastwardly by the Maumee River of Lake Erie, and to have included all the country drained by the Wabash. The Piankishaws occupied the country bordering on the Ohio."—A. Gallatin, *Synopsis of the Indian Tribes (Archæologia Americana, v. 2), introd., sect. 2.*—The Mascoutens, or Mascoutins, "seldom appear alone, but almost always in connection with their kindred, the Ottagamies or Foxes and the Kickapoos, and like them bear a character for treachery and deceit. The three tribes may have in earlier days formed the Fire-Nation [of the early French writers], but, as Gallatin observes in the *Archæologia Americana*, it is very doubtful whether the Mascoutins were ever a distinct tribe. If this be so, and there is no reason to reject it, the disappearance of the name will not be strange."—J. G. Shea, *Brief Researches Respecting the Mascoutins (Schoolcraft's Information Respecting Indian Tribes, pt. 4, p. 245).*—See above, ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.—For an account of the Black Hawk War see Illinois, A. D. 1832.

**Sahaptins.** See above: NEZ PERCÉS.

**Salinan Family.**—This name is given by Major Powell to the San Antonio and San Miguel dialects spoken by two tribes on the Salinas River, Monterey County, California.—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Report, Bureau of Ethnology, p. 101.*—See ESSELENIAN FAMILY.

**Salishan Family.** See above: FLATHEADS.

**Sanhikans, or Mincees.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Sans Arcs.** See below: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Santees.\*** See below: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Sarce (Tinneh).\*** See above: BLACKFEET.

**Sastean Family.**—"The single tribe upon the language of which Hale based his name was located by him to the southwest of the Lutanami or Klamath tribes. . . . The former territory of

the Sastean family is the region drained by the Klamath River and its tributaries from the western base of the Cascade range to the point where the Klamath flows through the ridge of hills east of Happy Camp, which forms the boundary between the Sastean and the Quoratean families. In addition to this region of the Klamath, the Shasta extended over the Siskiyou range northward as far as Ashland, Oregon."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology, p. 106.*

**Savannahs.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Seminoles.**—"The term 'semanóle,' or 'isti Simanóle,' signifies 'separatish' or 'runaway,' and as a tribal name points to the Indians who left the Creek, especially the Lower Creek settlements, for Florida, to live, hunt, and fish there in independence. The term does not mean 'wild,' 'savage,' as frequently stated; if applied now in this sense to animals, it is because of its original meaning, 'what has become a runaway.' . . . The Seminoles of modern times are a people compounded of the following elements: separatists from the Lower Creek and Hitchiti towns; remnants of tribes partly civilized by the Spaniards; Yamassi Indians, and some negroes. . . . The Seminoles were always regarded as a sort of outcasts by the Creek tribes from which they had seceded, and no doubt there were reasons for this. . . . These Indians showed, like the Creeks, hostile intentions towards the thirteen states during and after the Revolution, and conjointly with the Upper Creeks on Tallapoosa river concluded a treaty of friendship with the Spaniards at Pensacola in May, 1784. Although under Spanish control, the Seminoles entered into hostilities with the Americans in 1793 and 1812. In the latter year Payne miko ['King Payne'] was killed in a battle at Alachua, and his brother, the influential Bowllegs, died soon after. These unruly tribes surprised and massacred American settlers on the Satilla river, Georgia, in 1817, and another conflict began, which terminated in the destruction of the Mikasuki and Suwanee river towns of the Seminoles by General Jackson, in April, 1818. [See FLORIDA: A. D. 1816-1818.] After the cession of Florida, and its incorporation into the American Union (1819), the Seminoles gave up all their territory by the treaty of Fort Moultrie, Sept. 18th, 1823, receiving in exchange goods and annuities. When the government concluded to move these Indians west of the Mississippi river, a treaty of a conditional character was concluded with them at Payne's landing, in 1832. The larger portion were removed, but the more stubborn part dissented, and thus gave origin to one of the gravest conflicts which ever occurred between Indians and whites. The Seminole war began with the massacre of Major Dade's command near Wahoo swamp, December 28th, 1835, and continued with unabated fury for five years, entailing an immense expenditure of money and lives. [See FLORIDA: A. D. 1835-1843.] A number of Creek warriors joined the hostile Seminoles in 1836. A census of the Seminoles taken in 1823 gave a population of 3,899, with 800 negroes belonging to them. The population of the Seminoles in the Indian Territory amounted to 2,067 in 1881. . . . There are some Seminoles now in Mexico, who went there with their negro slaves."—A. S. Gatschet, *A Migration Legend of the Creek Indians, v. 1, pt. 1, sect. 2.*—"Ever since the first settlement of the Indians in Florida

\* See Note, Appendix E.

they have been engaged in a strife with the whites. . . . In the unanimous judgment of unprejudiced writers, the whites have ever been in the wrong.—D. G. Brinton, *Notes on the Floridian Peninsula*, p. 148.—“There were in Florida, October 1, 1880, of the Indians commonly known as Seminole, 208. They constituted 37 families, living in 23 camps, which were gathered into five widely separated groups or settlements. . . . This people our Government has never been able to conciliate or to conquer. . . . The Seminole have always lived within our borders as aliens. It is only of late years, and through natural necessities, that any friendly intercourse of white man and Indian has been secured. . . . The Indians have appropriated for their service some of the products of European civilization, such as weapons, implements, domestic utensils, fabrics for clothing, &c. Mentally, excepting a few religious ideas which they received long ago from the teaching of Spanish missionaries, and, in the southern settlements, excepting some few Spanish words, the Seminole have accepted and appropriated practically nothing from the white man.”—C. MacCauley, *The Seminole Indians of Florida (Fifth An. Rept. of the Bureau of Ethnology, 1883-84)*, introd. and ch. 4.

ALSO IN J. T. Sprague, *The Florida War*.—S. G. Drake, *The Aboriginal Races of N. Am.*, bk. 4, ch. 6-21.—See, also, above: MUSKOGEOAN FAMILY.

**Senecas; their name.**—“How this name originated is a ‘vexata questio’ among Indo-antiquarians and etymologists. The least plausible supposition is, that the name has any reference to the morrist Seneca. Some have supposed it to be a corruption of the Dutch term for vermillion, cinabar, or cinnabar, under the assumption that the Senecas, being the most warlike of the Five Nations, used that pigment more than the others, and thus gave origin to the name. This hypothesis is supported by no authority. . . . The name ‘Senecas’ first appears on a Dutch map of 1610, and again on Jean de Laet’s map of 1633. . . . It is claimed by some that the word may be derived from ‘Sinnekox,’ the Algonquin name of a tribe of Indians spoken of in Wassenaar’s History of Europe, on the authority of Peter Barentz, who traded with them about the year 1620. . . . Without assuming to solve the mystery, the writer contents himself with giving some data which may possibly aid others in arriving at a reliable conclusion. [Here follows a discussion of the various forms of name by which the Senecas designated themselves and were known to the Hurons, from whom the Jesuits first heard of them.] By dropping the neuter prefix O, the national title became ‘Nan-do-wah-gah,’ or ‘The great hill people,’ as now used by the Senecas. . . . If the name Seneca can legitimately be derived from the Seneca word ‘Nan-do-wah-gah’ . . . it can only be done by prefixing ‘Son,’ as was the custom of the Jesuits, and dropping all unnecessary letters. It would then form the word ‘Son-non-do-wa-ga,’ the first two and last syllables of which, if the French sounds of the letters are given, are almost identical in pronunciation with Seneca. The chief difficulty, however, would be in the disposal of the two superfluous syllables. They may have been dropped in the process of contraction so common

in the composition of Indian words—a result which would be quite likely to occur to a Seneca name, in its transmission through two other languages, the Mohawk and the Dutch. The foregoing queries and suggestions are thrown out for what they are worth, in the absence of any more reliable theory.”—O. I. Marshall, *Historical Writings*, p. 231.—See above: IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY, and HURONS, &c.—See, also, PONTIAC’S WAR, and for an account of Sullivan’s expedition against the Senecas, see UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1779 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER).

**Shacaya.** See above: ANDESIANS.

**Shahaptian Family.** See above: NEZ PERCES.

**Shastas.** See above: SASTEAN FAMILY.

**Shawanees, Shawnees, or Shawanoes.**—“Adjacent to the Lenape [or Delawares—see above], and associated with them in some of the most notable passages of their history, dwelt the Shawanoes, the Chaouanons of the French, a tribe of bold, roving, and adventurous spirit. Their eccentric wanderings, their sudden appearances and disappearances, perplex the antiquary, and defy research; but from various scattered notices, we may gather that at an early period they occupied the valley of the Ohio; that, becoming embroiled with the Five Nations, they shared the defeat of the Andastes, and about the year 1673 fled to escape destruction. Some found an asylum in the country of the Lenape, where they lived tenants at will of the Five Nations; others sought refuge in the Carolinas and Florida, where, true to their native instincts, they soon came to blows with the owners of the soil. Again, turning northwards, they formed new settlements in the valley of the Ohio, where they were now suffered to dwell in peace, and where, at a later period, they were joined by such of their brethren as had found refuge among the Lenape.”—F. Parkman, *The Conspiracy of Pontiac*, ch. 1.—“The Shawnees were not found originally in Ohio, but migrated there after 1750. They were called Chaouanons by the French and Shawanoes by the English. The English name Shawano changed to Shawance, and recently to Shawnee. Chaouanon and Shawano are obviously attempts to represent the same sound by the orthography of the two respective languages. . . . Much industry has been used by recent writers, especially by Dr. Brinton, to trace this nomadic tribe to its original home; but I think without success. . . . We first find the Shawano in actual history about the year 1660, and living along the Cumberland river, or the Cumberland and Tennessee. Among the conjectures as to their earlier history, the greatest probability lies for the present with the earliest account—the account given by Perrot, and apparently obtained by him from the Shawanoes themselves, about the year 1680—that they formerly lived by the lower lakes, and were driven thence by the Five Nations.”—M. F. Force, *Some Early Notices of the Indians of Ohio*.—“Their [the Shawnees’] dialect is more akin to the Mohegan than to the Delaware, and when, in 1692, they first appeared in the area of the Eastern Algonkin Confederacy, they came as the friends and relatives of the former. They were divided into four bands”—Piqua, properly Pikoweu, Mequachake, Kiscapokoke, Chillicothe. “Of these, that which settled in Pennsylvania was the Pikoweu, who occupied

and gave their name to the Pequa valley in Lancaster county. According to ancient Mohegan tradition, the New England Pequots were members of this band."—D. G. Brinton, *The Lenape and their Legends*, ch. 2.—The same, *The Shawnees and their Migrations* (*Hist. Mag.*, v. 10, 1866).—"The Shawanese, whose villages were on the western bank [of the Susquehanna] came into the valley [of Wyoming] from their former localities, at the 'forks of the Delaware' (the junction of the Delaware and Lehigh, at Easton), to which point they had been induced at some remote period to emigrate from their earlier home, near the mouth of the river Wabash, in the 'Ohio region,' upon the invitation of the Delawares. This was Indian diplomacy, for the Delawares were desirous (not being upon the most friendly terms with the Mingos, or Six Nations) to accumulate a force against those powerful neighbors. But, as might be expected, they did not long live in peace with their new allies. . . . The Shawanese [about 1755, or soon after] were driven out of the valley by their more powerful neighbors, the Delawares, and the conflict which resulted in their leaving it grew out of, or was precipitated by, a very trifling incident. While the warriors of the Delawares were engaged upon the mountains in a hunting expedition, a number of squaws or female Indians from Maughawauwame were gathering wild fruits along the margin of the river below the town, where they found a number of Shawanese squaws and their children, who had crossed the river in their canoes upon the same business. A child belonging to the Shawanese having taken a large grasshopper, a quarrel arose among the children for the possession of it, in which their mothers soon took part. . . . The quarrel became general. . . . Upon the return of the warriors both tribes prepared for battle. . . . The Shawanese . . . were not able to sustain the conflict, and, after the loss of about half their tribe, the remainder were forced to flee to their own side of the river, shortly after which they abandoned their town and removed to the Ohio." This war between the Delawares and Shawanese has been called the Grasshopper War.—L. H. Miner, *The Valley of Wyoming*, p. 32.—See, also, above, ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, and DELAWARES.—See, also, PONTIAC'S WAR; UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1765-1768; and (for an account of "Lord Dunmore's War") see OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1774.

**Sheep eaters (Tukuarika).** See below: SHOSHONEAN FAMILY.

**Shyennes.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.  
**Shoshonean Family.**—"This important family occupied a large part of the great interior basin of the United States. Upon the north Shoshonean tribes extended far into Oregon, meeting Shalapiant territory on about the 44th parallel or along the Blue Mountains. Upon the northeast the eastern limits of the pristine habitat of the Shoshonean tribes are unknown. The narrative of Lewis and Clarke contains the explicit statement that the Shoshoni bands encountered upon the Jefferson River, whose summer home was upon the head waters of the Columbia, formerly lived within their own recollection in the plains to the east of the Rocky Mountains, whence they were driven to their mountain retreats by the Minnetaree (Aztina), who had obtained firearms. . . . Later a divi-

sion of the Bannock held the finest portion of Southwestern Montana, whence apparently they were being pushed westward across the mountains by Blackfeet. Upon the east the Tukuarika or Sheep eaters held the Yellowstone Park country, where they were bordered by the Siouan territory, while the Washaki occupied southwestern Wyoming. Nearly the entire mountainous part of Colorado was held by the several bands of the Ute, the eastern and southeastern parts of the State being held respectively by the Arapaho and Cheyenne (Algonquian), and the Kniwoe (Kiowan). To the southeast the Ute country included the northern drainage of the San Juan, extending further east a short distance into New Mexico. The Comanche division of the family extended farther east than any other. . . . Bourgomet found a Comanche tribe on the upper Kansas River in 1724. According to Pike the Comanche territory bordered the Kalowe on the north, the former occupying the head waters of the Upper Red River, Arkansas and Rio Grande. How far to the southward Shoshonean tribes extended at this early period is not known, though the evidence tends to show that they raided far down into Texas, to the territory they have occupied in more recent years, viz., the extensive plains from the Rocky Mountains eastward into Indian Territory and Texas to about 97°. Upon the south Shoshonean territory was limited generally by the Colorado River . . . while the Tusayan (Moki) had established their seven pueblos . . . to the east of the Colorado Chiquito. In the southwest Shoshonean tribes had pushed across California, occupying a wide band of country to the Pacific."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology*, pp. 109-110.—"The Pah Utes occupy the greater part of Nevada, and extend southward. . . . The Pi Utes or Pintes inhabit Western Utah, from Oregon to New Mexico. . . . The Gosh Utes [Gosuites] inhabit the country west of Great Salt Lake, and extend to the Pah Utes."—H. H. Bancroft, *Native Races of the Pacific States*, v. 1, ch. 4.

**Siksikas, or Sisikas.** See above: BLACKFEET.  
**Siouan Family.**—**Sioux.**—"The nations which speak the Sioux language may be considered, in reference both to their respective dialects and to their geographical position, as consisting of four subdivisions, viz., the Winnabagoes; the Sioux proper and the Assinibois; the Minnetaree group; and the Osages and other southern kindred tribes. The Winnabagoes, so called by the Algonkins, but called Puans and also Othchagras by the French, and Horoje ('fish eaters') by the Omahaws and other southern tribes, call themselves Hochngornah, or the 'Trout' nation. The Green Bay of Lake Michigan derives its French name from theirs (Baye des Puans). . . . According to the War Department they amount [1836] to 4,600 souls, and appear to cultivate the soil to a considerable degree. Their principal seats are on the Fox River of Lake Michigan, and towards the heads of the Rock River of the Mississippi. . . . The Sioux proper, or Nandowessies, names given to them by the Algonkins and the French, call themselves Dahcotas, and sometimes 'Ochente Shakouas,' or the Seven Fires, and are divided into seven bands or tribes, closely connected together, but apparently independent of each other. They do not appear to have been known to the French

\* See Note, Appendix E.

before the year 1660. . . . The four most eastern tribes of the Dahotas are known by the name of the Mendewahktonak, or 'Gens du Lac,' Wahkpaton and Wahkpakotanon, or 'People of the Leaves,' and Sisltoons. . . . The three westerly tribes, the Yanktons, the Yanktonnais, and the Teton, wander between the Mississippi and the Missouri. . . . The Assiniboits (Stone Indians), as they are called by the Aigonkins, are a Dahcota tribe separated from the rest of the nation, and on that account called Hoha or 'Rebels,' by the other Sioux. They are said to have made part originally of the Yanktons. . . . Another tribe, called Sheyennes or Cheyennes, were at no very remote period seated on the left bank of the Red River of Lake Winnepik. . . . Carver reckons them as one of the Sioux tribes; and Mackenzie informs us that they were driven away by the Sioux. They now [1836] live on the headwaters of the river Sheyenne, a south-western tributary of the Missouri. . . . I have been, however, assured by a well-informed person who travels with them that they speak a distinct language, for which there is no European interpreter. . . . The Minetares (Minetaree and Minetaries) consist of three tribes, speaking three different languages, which belong to a common stock. Its affinities with the Dahcota are but remote, but have appeared sufficient to entitle them to be considered as of the same family. Two of those tribes, the Mandanes, whose number does not exceed 1,500, and the stationary Minetares, amounting to 3,000 souls, including those called Amawahaws, cultivate the soil, and live in villages situated on or near the Missouri, between 47° and 48° north latitude. . . . The third Minetaree tribe, is that known by the name of the Crow or Upsaroka [or Absaroka] nation, probably the Kecheetsas of Lewis and Clarke. They are an erratic tribe, who hunt south of the Missouri, between the Little Missouri and the southeastern branches of the Yellowstone River. . . . The southern Sioux consist of eight tribes, speaking four, or at most five, kindred dialects. Their territory originally extended along the Mississippi, from below the mouth of the Arkansas to the forty-first degree of north latitude. . . . Their hunting grounds extend as far west as the Stony Mountains; but they all cultivate the soil, and the most westerly village on the Missouri is in about 100° west longitude. The three most westerly tribes are the Quappas or Arkansas, at the mouth of the river of that name, and the Osages and Kansas, who inhabited the country south of the Missouri and of the river Kansas. . . . The Osages, properly Wausashe, were more numerous and powerful than any of the neighbouring tribes, and perpetually at war with all the other Indians, without excepting the Kansas, who speak the same dialect with themselves. They were originally divided into Great and Little Osages; but about forty years ago almost one-half of the nation, known by the name of Chaneeers, or Clermont's Band, separated from the rest, and removed to the river Arkansas. The villages of those several subdivisions are now [1836] on the headwaters of the river Osage, and of the Verdigris, a northern tributary stream of the Arkansas. They amount to about 5,000 souls, and have ceded a portion of their lands to the United States, reserving to themselves a territory on the Arkansas, south of 38° north latitude, extending from 95°

to 100° west longitude, on a breadth of 45 to 50 miles. The territory allotted to the Cherokees, the Creeks and the Choctaws lies south of that of the Osage. . . . The Kansas, who have always lived on the river of that name, have been at peace with the Osage for the last thirty years, and intermarry with them. They amount to 1,500 souls, and occupy a tract of about 3,000,000 acres. . . . The five other tribes of this subdivision are the Ioways, or Pahoja (Grey Snow), the Missouris or Ne'jehé, the Ottcos, or Wah-tootahh, the Omahaws, or Mahas, and the Puncas. . . . All the nations speaking languages belonging to the Great Sioux Family may . . . be computed at more than 50,000 souls."—A. Gallatin, *Synopsis of the Indian Tribes (Archæologia Americana, v. 2), sect. 4.*—"Owing to the fact that 'Sioux' is a word of reproach and means snake or enemy, the term has been discarded by many later writers as a family designation, and 'Dakota,' which signifies friend or ally, has been employed in its stead. The two words are, however, by no means properly synonymous. The term 'Sioux' was used by Gallatin in a comprehensive or family sense and was applied to all the tribes collectively known to him to speak kindred dialects of a widespread language. It is in this sense only, as applied to the linguistic family, that the term is here employed. The term 'Dahcota' (Dakota) was correctly applied by Gallatin to the Dakota tribes proper as distinguished from the other members of the linguistic family who are not Dakotas in a tribal sense. The use of the term with this signification should be perpetuated. It is only recently that a definite decision has been reached respecting the relationship of the Catawba and Woccon, the latter an extinct tribe known to have been linguistically related to the Catawba. Gallatin thought that he was able to discern some affinities of the Catawban language with 'Muskhogee and even with Choctaw,' though these were not sufficient to induce him to class them together. Mr. Gatschet was the first to call attention to the presence in the Catawba language of a considerable number of words having a Siouan affinity. Recently Mr. Dorsey has made a critical examination of all the Catawba linguistic material available, which has been materially increased by the labors of Mr. Gatschet, and the result seems to justify its inclusion as one of the dialects of the widespread Siouan family." The principal tribes in the Siouan Family named by Major Powell are the Dakota (including Santee, Sisseton, Wahpeton, Yankton, Yanktonnais, Teton, — the latter embracing Brulé, Sans Arcs, Blackfeet, Minneconjou, Two Kettles, Ogulala, Uncpapa, Assiniboin, Omaha, Ponca, Kaw, Osage, Quapaw, Iowa, Otee, Missouri, Winnebago, Mandan, Gros Ventres, Crow, Tutelo, Biloxi (see MUSKOGEEAN FAMILY), Catawba and Woccon.—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept. of the Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 112.

ALSO IN J. O. Dorsey, *Migrations of Siouan Tribes (American Naturalist, v. 20, March)*.—The same, *Biloxi Indians of Louisiana (V.-I. address A. A. S., 1893)*.—See, above: HIDATSA.

Sissetons. See above SIOUAN FAMILY.

Six Nations. See above: IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY.

Skittagetan Family.—"A family designation . . . retained for the tribes of the Queen

Charlotte Archipelago which have usually been called Haida. From a comparison of the vocabularies of the Haida language with others of the neighboring Kolušan family, Dr. Franz Boas is inclined to consider that the two are genetically related. The two languages possess a considerable number of words in common, but a more thorough investigation is requisite for the settlement of the question."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 120.

**Snakes.** See above: SHOSHONEAN FAMILY.

**Stockbridge Indians.**—"The Stockbridge Indians were originally a part of the Housatannuck Tribe [Mohegans], to whom the Legislature of Massachusetts granted or secured a township [afterward called Stockbridge] in the year 1736. Their number was increased by Wappingers and Mohikanders, and perhaps also by Indians belonging to several other tribes, both of New England and New York. Since their removal to New Stockbridge and Brotherton, in the western parts of New York, they have been joined by Mohegans and other Indians from East Connecticut, and even from Rhode Island and Long Island."—A. Gallatin, *Synopsis of Indian Tribes (Archæologia Americana*, v. 2), p. 35.

ALSO IN A. Holmes, *Annals of Am.*, 1736 (v. 2).  
—S. G. Drake, *Aboriginal Races*, p. 15.

**Susquehannas, or Andastes, or Conestogas.**—"Dutch and Swedish writers speak of a tribe called Minquas; . . . the French in Canada . . . make frequent allusions to the Gandastogué (more briefly Andastés), a tribe friendly to their allies, the Hurons, and sturdy enemies of the Iroquois; later still Pennsylvania writers speak of the Conestogas, the tribe to which Logan belonged, and the tribe which perished at the hands of the Paxton boys. Although Gallatin in his map, followed by Bancroft, placed the Andastés near Lake Erie, my researches led me to correct this, and identify the Susquehannas, Minqua, Andastés or Gandastogué, and Conestogas as being all the same tribe, the first name being apparently an appellation given them by the Virginia tribes; the second that given them by the Algonquins on the Delaware; while Gandastogué as the French, or Conestoga as the English wrote it, was their own tribal name, meaning cabin-pole men, Natio Peticarum, from 'Andasta,' a cabin-pole. . . . Prior to 1600 the Susquehannas and the Mohawks . . . came into collision, and the Susquehannas nearly exterminated the Mohawks in a war which lasted ten years." In 1647 they offered their aid to the Hurons against the Iroquois, having 1,300 warriors trained to the use of fire-arms by three Swedish soldiers; but the proposed alliance failed. During the third quarter of the 17th century they seem to have been in almost continuous war with the Five Nations, until, in 1675, they were completely overthrown. A party of about 100 retreated into Maryland and became involved there in a war with the colonists and were destroyed. "The rest of the tribe, after making overtures to Lord Baltimore, submitted to the Five Nations, and were allowed to retain their ancient grounds. When Pennsylvania was settled, they became known as Conestogas, and were always friendly to the colonists of Penn., as they had been to the Dutch and Swedes. In 1701 Canoodagtoh, their king, made a treaty with Penn., and in the document they are styled Minquas, Conestogas, or

Susquehannas. They appear as a tribe in a treaty in 1742, but were dwindling away. In 1703 the feeble remnant of the tribe became involved in the general suspicion entertained by the colonists against the red men, arising out of massacres on the borders. To escape danger the poor creatures took refuge in Lancaster jail, and here they were all butchered by the Paxton boys, who burst into the place. Parkman, in his *Conspiracy of Pontiac*, p. 414, details the sad story. The last interest of this unfortunate tribe centres in Logan, the friend of the white man, whose speech is so familiar to all, that we must regret that it has not sustained the historical scrutiny of Brantz Mayer (*Tahgahjute; or Logan and Capt. Michael Cresap, Maryland Hist. Soc., May, 1851; and Sto. Albany, 1867*). Logan was a Conestoga, in other words a Susquehanna."—J. G. Shea, *Note 46 to George Aloop's Character of the Province of Maryland (Gottschall's Bibliotheca Americana*, 5).—See, also, above: IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY.

**Tachies.** See TEXAS: THE ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS AND THE NAME.

**Taculies.** See below: ATHAPASCAN FAMILY.

**Taensas.** See NATCHEESAN FAMILY.

**Takilmán Family.**\*—"This name was proposed by Mr. Gatschet for a distinct language spoken on the coast of Oregon about the lower Rogue River."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 121.

**Talligewi.** See above: ALLEGHANS.

**Tañón Family.**—"The tribes of this family in the United States resided exclusively upon the Rio Grande and its tributary valleys from about 33° to about 36°."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 122.

**Tappans.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Taranteens or Tarratines.** See above: ANAKIS; also, ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Tarasans.**—"The Tarasans, so called from Taras, the name of a tribal god, had the reputation of being the tallest and handsomest people of Mexico. They were the inhabitants of the present State of Michoacan, west of the valley of Mexico. According to their oldest traditions, or perhaps those of their neighbors, they had migrated from the north in company with, or about the same time as, the Aztecs. For some 300 years before the conquest they had been a sedentary, semi-civilized people, maintaining their independence, and progressing steadily in culture. When first encountered by the Spaniards they were quite equal and in some respects ahead of the Nahuas. . . . In their costume the Tarasans differed considerably from their neighbors. The feather garments which they manufactured surpassed all others in durability and beauty. Cotton was, however, the usual material."—D. G. Brinton, *The American Race*, p. 136.

**Tarumi.** See above: CARIBS AND THEIR KINDRED.

**Tecuna.** See above: GÜCK OR COCO G'OUF.

**Tehuel Che.** See above: PATAAGONIANS.

**Telmelches.** See above: PAMPAS TRIBES.

**Tequestas.** See below: TIMUQUANAN FAMILY.

**Tetons.** See above: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Teutecas, or Tenez.** See below: ZAPOTECAS, ETC.

**Timuquanan Family.**—The Tequestas.—"Beginning at the southeast, we first meet the historic Timucua family, the tribes of which are extinct at the present time. . . . In the 16th

\* See Note, Appendix E.



century the Timucua inhabited the northern and middle portion of the peninsula of Florida, and although their exact limits to the north are unknown, they held a portion of Florida bordering on Georgia, and some of the coast islands in the Atlantic ocean. . . . The people received its name from one of their villages called Timagoua. . . . The name means 'lord,' 'ruler,' 'master' ('atimuca,' waited upon, 'nuen,' by servants, 'atl'), and the people's name is written Atimuca early in the 18th century. . . . The languages spoken by the Calusa and by the people next in order, the Tequesta, are unknown to us. . . . The Calusa held the southwestern extremity of Florida, and their tribal name is left recorded in Calusahatchi, a river south of Tampa bay. . . . Of the Tequesta people on the southeastern end of the peninsula we know still less than of the Calusa Indians. There was a tradition that they were the same people which lived the Bahama or Lucayo Islands."—A. S. Acheson, *A Migration Legend of the Creek Indians*, v. 1, p. 1.

**Tinneh.** See above: ATHAPASCAN FAMILY.

**Tivitivas.** See above: CARIB AND THEIR KINDRED.

**Tlascalans.** See MEXICO: A. D. 1519 (JUNE—OCTOBER).

**Tlinkets.** See above: ATHAPASCAN FAMILY.

**Tobacco Nation.** See above: IBERONS; and INDIAN CONFEDERACY: THEIR NAME.

**Tobas.** See above: PAMPAS TRIBE.

**Toltacs.** See MEXICO, ANCIENT.

**Tonikan Family.**—"The Tonika are known to have occupied three localities: First, on the Lower Yazoo River (1700); second, east shore of Mississippi River (about 1704); third, in Avoyelles Parish, Louisiana (1817). Near Marksville, the county seat of that parish, about twenty-five are now living."—J. W. Powell, *Sixteenth Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 125.

**Tonkawan Family.**—"The Tonkawa were a migratory people and a colluvies gentium, whose earliest habitat is unknown. Their first mention occurs in 1719; at that time and ever since they roamed in the western and southern parts of what is now Texas."—J. W. Powell, *Sixteenth Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 126.

**Tontos.** See above: APACHE GROUP.

**Toromonos.** See BOLIVIA: ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

**Totonacos.**—"The first natives whom Cortes met on landing in Mexico were the Totonacos. They occupied the territory of Totonacapan, now included in the State of Vera Cruz. According to traditions of their own, they had resided there 800 years, most of which time they were independent, though a few generations before the arrival of the Spaniards they had been subjected by the arms of the Montezumas. . . . Sahagun describes them as almost white in color, their heads artificially deformed, but their features regular and handsome. Robes of cotton beautifully dyed served them for garments, and their feet were covered with sandals. . . . These people were highly civilized. Cempoalla, their capital city, was situated about five miles from the sea, at the junction of two streams. Its houses were of brick and mortar, and each was surrounded by a small garden, at the foot of which a stream of fresh water was conducted. . . . The affinities of the Totonacos are difficult to make out. . . . Their language has many words

from Maya roots, but it has also many more from the Nahuatl."—D. G. Brinton, *The American Race*, p. 139.

**Tuknarika.** See above: SHOSHONEAN FAMILY.

**Tupi.—Guarani.—Tupuyas.**—"The first Indians with whom the Portuguese came in contact, on the discovery of Brazil, called themselves Tupinama, a term derived by Barnhagen from Tupi and Mba, something like warrior or nobleman; by Martius from Tupi and Anamba (relative) with the signification 'belonging to the Tupi tribe.' These Tupi dwell on the east coast of Brazil, and with their language the Portuguese were soon familiar. It was found especially serviceable as a means of communication with other tribes, and this led the Jesuits later to develop it as much as possible, and introduce it as a universal language of intercourse with the Savages. Thus the 'lingua geral Brasileira' arose, which must be regarded as a Tupi with a Portuguese pronunciation. The result was a surprising one, for it really succeeded in forming, for the tribes of Brazil, divided in language, a universal means of communication. Without doubt the wide extent of the Tupi was very favorable, especially since on this side of the Andes, as far as the Caribbean Sea, the continent of South America was overrun with Tupi hordes. . . . Von Martius has endeavored to trace their various migrations and abodes, by which they have acquired a sort of ubiquity in tropical South America. . . . This history . . . leads to the supposition that, had the discovery been delayed a few centuries, the Tupi might have become the lords of eastern South America, and have spread a higher culture over that region. The Tupi family may be divided, according to their fixed abodes, into the southern, northern, eastern, western, and central Tupi; all these are again divided into a number of smaller tribes. The southern Tupi are usually called Guarani (warriors), a name which the Jesuits first introduced. It cannot be determined from which direction they came. The greatest number are in Paraguay and the Argentine province of Corrientes. The Jesuits brought them to a very high degree of civilization. The eastern Tupi, the real Tupinamba, are scattered along the Atlantic coast from St. Catherina Island to the mouth of the Amazon. They are a very weak tribe. They say they came from the south and west. The northern Tupi are a weak and widely scattered remnant of a large tribe, and are now in the province of Para, on the island of Marajo, and along both banks of the Amazon. . . . It is somewhat doubtful if this peaceable tribe are really Tupi. . . . The central Tupi live in several free hordes between the Tocantins and Madeira. . . . Cutting off the heads of enemies is in vogue among them. . . . The Mundrucu are especially the head-hunting tribe. The western Tupi all live in Bolivia. They are the only ones who came in contact with the Inca empire, and their character and manners show the influence of this. Some are a picture of idyllic gayety and patriarchal mildness."—*The Standard Natural Hist.* (J. S. Kingsley, ed.) v. 6, pp. 248-249.—"In frequent contiguity with the Tupis was another stock, also widely dispersed through Brazil, called the Tupuyas, of whom the Botocondos in eastern Brazil are the most prominent tribe. To them also belong the Ges nations, south of the lower Amazon, and others. They

are on a low grade of culture, going quite naked, not cultivating the soil, ignorant of pottery, and with poorly made canoes. They are dolichocephalic, and must have inhabited the country a long time."—D. G. Brinton, *Races and Peoples*, pp. 269-270.

**Turiero.** See above: CHIBCHAS.

**Tuscaroras.** See above: IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY, and IROQUOIS TRIBES OF THE SOUTH.

**Tuteloos.** See above: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Twightwees, or Miamis.** See above: ILLINOIS.

**Two Kettles.** See above: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Uaupa.** See above: GUCK OR COCO GROUP.

**Uchean Family.**—"The pristine homes of the Yuchi are not now traceable with any degree of certainty. The Yuchi are supposed to have been visited by De Soto during his memorable march, and the town of Cofitachiqui chronicled by him, is believed by many investigators to have stood at Silver Bluff, on the left bank of the Savannah, about 25 miles below Augusta. If, as is supposed by some authorities, Cofitachiqui was a Yuchi town, this would locate the Yuchi in a section which, when first known to the whites, was occupied by the Shawnee. Later the Yuchi appear to have lived somewhat farther down the Savannah."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 126.

**Uihliches.** See above: PAMPAS TRIBES.

**Uirima.** See above: GUCK OR COCO GROUP.

**Uncpapas.** See above: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Upsarokas, or Absarokas, or Crows.** See above: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Utahs.** See above: SHOSHONEAN FAMILY.

**Wabenaics, or Abnakis.** See above: ANNARIS.

**Wacos, or Huacos.** See above: PAWNEE (CADDOAN) FAMILY.

**Wahpctons.** See above: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Wailatpuan Family.**—"Hale established this family and placed under it the Cailloux or Cayase or Willetpoos, and the Molele. Their headquarters as indicated by Hale are the upper part of the Walla Walla River and the country about Mount Hood and Vancouver."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Report, Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 127.

**Waikas.** See above: CARIBS AND THEIR KINDRED.

**Wakashan Family.**—"The above family name was based upon a vocabulary of the Wakash Indians, who, according to Gallatin, 'inhabit the island on which Nootka Sound is situated.' . . . The term 'Wakash' for this group of languages has since been generally ignored, and in its place Nootka or Nootka-Columbian has been adopted. . . . Though by no means as appropriate a designation as could be found, it seems clear that for the so-called Wakash, Newitsee, and other allied languages usually assembled under the Nootka family, the term Wakash of 1836 has priority and must be retained."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Report, Bureau of Ethnology*, pp. 129-130.

**Wampanoags, or Pokanokets.** See above: POKANOKETS.

**Wapisianas.** See above: CARIBS AND THEIR KINDRED.

**Wappingers.** See above: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**Waraus.** See above: CARIBS AND THEIR KINDRED.

**Washakis.** See above: SHOSHONEAN FAMILY.

**Washoan Family.**—"This family is represented by a single well known tribe, whose range extended from Reno, on the line of the Central Pacific Railroad, to the lower end of Carson Valley."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Report, Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 131.

**Wichitas, or Pawnee Picts.** See above: PAWNEE (CADDOAN) FAMILY.

**Winnebagoes.** See above: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Wishoskan Family.**—"This is a small and obscure linguistic family and little is known concerning the dialects composing it or of the tribes which speak it. . . . The area occupied by the tribes speaking dialects of this language was the coast from a little below the mouth of Eel River to a little north of Mad River, including particularly the country about Humboldt Bay."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Report, Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 133.

**Witunkas.** See above: MUSKHOGEAN FAMILY.

**Woccons.** See above: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Wyandots.** See above: IUROONS.

**Yamasis and Yamacraws.** See above: MUSKHOGEAN FAMILY.

**Yamco.** See above: ANDESIANS.

**Yanan Family.**—"The eastern boundary of the Yanan territory is formed by a range of mountains a little west of Lassen Butte and terminating near Pit River; the northern boundary by a line running from northeast to southwest, passing near the northern side of Round Mountain, three miles from Pit River. The western boundary from Redding southward is on an average 10 miles to the east of the Sacramento. North of Redding it averages double that distance or about 20 miles."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Report, Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 135.

**Yanktons and Yanktonnais.** See above: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**Yncas, or Incas.** See PERU.

**Yuchi.** See above: UCHEAN FAMILY.

**Yuguarzongo.** See above: ANDESIANS.

**Yukian Family.**—"Round Valley, California, subsequently made a reservation to receive the Yuki and other tribes, was formerly the chief seat of the tribes of the family, but they also extended across the mountains to the coast."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Report, Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 136.

**Yuman Family.**—"The center of distribution of the tribes of this family is generally considered to be the lower Colorado and Gila Valleys."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Report, Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 137.—See above: APACHE GROUP.

**Yuncas.** See PERU.

**Yuroks or Eurocs.** See above: MODOCS, &c.

**Zaporo.** See above: ANDESIANS.

**Zapotecs, Mixtecs, Zoques, Mixes, etc.**—"The greater part of Gaxaca [Mexico] and the neighboring regions are still occupied by the Zapoteces, who call themselves Didja-za. There are now about 265,000 of them, about 50,000 of whom speak nothing but their native tongue. In ancient times they constituted a powerful independent state, the citizens of which seem to have been quite as highly civilized as any member of the Aztec family. They were agricultural and sedentary, living in villages and constructing buildings of stone and mortar. The

most remarkable, but by no means the only specimens of these still remaining are the ruins of Mitha. . . . The Mixtecs adjoined the Zapotecs to the west, extending along the coast of the Pacific to about the present port of Acapulco. In culture they were equal to the Zapotecs. . . . The mountain regions of the isthmus of Tehuantepec and the adjacent portions of the states of Chiapas and Oaxaca are the habitats of the Zoques, Mixes, and allied tribes. The early historians draw a terrible picture of their valor, savagery and cannibalism, which reads more like tales to deter the Spaniards from approaching their domains than truthful accounts. However this may be, they have been for hundreds of years a peaceful, ignorant, timid part of the population, homely, lazy and drunken. . . . The faint traditions of these peoples pointed to the South for their origin. . . . The Chinantecs inhabited Chinantla, which is a part of the state of Oaxaca. . . . The Chinantecs had been reduced by the Aztecs and severely oppressed by them. Hence they welcomed the Spaniards as deliverers. . . . Other names by which they are mentioned are Tenez and Teutecans. . . . In speaking of the province of Chiapas the historian Herrera informs us that it derived its name from the pueblo so-called, 'whose inhabitants were the most remarkable in New Spain for their traits and inclinations.' They had early acquired the art of horsemanship, they were skillful in all kinds of music, excellent painters, carried on a variety of arts, and were withal very courteous to each other. One tradition was that they had reached Chiapas from Nicaragua. . . . But the more authentic legend of the Chapas or Chapanecs, as they were properly called from their totemic bird the Chapa, the red macaw, recited that the whole stock moved down from a northern latitude, following down the Pacific coast until they came to Soconusco, where they divided, one part entering the mountains of Chiapas, the other proceeding on to Nicaragua."—D. G. Brinton, *The American Race*, pp. 140-146.

Also in A. Baudelier, *Rept. of Archaeological Tour in Mexico*.

**Zoques.**—See above: ZAPOTECES, ETC.

**Zufian Family.**—"Derivation: From the Coehltl term *Suinyl*, said to mean 'the people of the long nails,' referring to the surgeons of Zufi who always wear some of their nails very long (Cushing)."—J. W. Powell, *Seventh Annual Report, Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 138.—See, above, PUEBLOS; also, AMERICA: PREHISTORIC.

**AMERICAN CIVIL WAR.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1860 (NOVEMBER)—DECEMBER, and after.—**Statistics of.** See same: A. D. 1865 (MAY).

**AMERICAN KNIGHTS, Order of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (OCTOBER).

**AMERICAN PARTY, The.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1852.

**AMERICAN SYSTEM, The.** See TARIFF LEGISLATION (UNITED STATES): A. D. 1816-1824.

**AMHERST, Lord, The Indian Administration of.** See INDIA: A. D. 1823-1833.

**AMHERST'S CAMPAIGNS IN AMERICA.** See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1758 to 1760.

**AMICITIE.** See GUILDS OF FLANDERS.

**AMIDA, Sieges of.**—The ancient city of Amida, now Diarbekr, on the right bank of the Upper Tigris was thrice taken by the Persians from the Romans, in the course of the long wars between the two nations. In the first instance, A. D. 359, it fell after a terrible siege of seventy-three days, conducted by the Persian king Sapor in person, and was given up to pillage and slaughter, the Roman commanders crucified and the few surviving inhabitants dragged to Persia as slaves. The town was then abandoned by the Persians, reoccupied by the Romans and recovered its prosperity and strength, only to pass through a similar experience again in 502 A. D., when it was besieged for eighty days by the Persian king Kobad, carried by storm, and most of its inhabitants slaughtered or enslaved. A century later, A. D. 605, Shosroes took Amida once more, but with less violence.—G. Rawlinson, *Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy*, ch. 9, 19 and 24.—See, also, PERSIA: A. D. 236-627.

**AMIENS.—Origin of name.** See BELGIE. A. D. 1597.—**Surprise by the Spaniards.—Recovery by Henry IV.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1593-1598.

A. D. 1870.—**Taken by the Germans.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1870-1871.

**AMIENS, The Mise of.** See OXFORD, PROVISIONS OF.

**AMIENS, Treaty of (1527).**—Negotiated by Cardinal Wolsey, between Henry VIII. of England and Francis I. of France, establishing an alliance against the Emperor, Charles V. The treaty was sealed and sworn to in the cathedral church at Amiens, Aug. 18, 1527.—J. S. Brewer, *Reign of Henry VIII.*, v. 2, ch. 26 and 28.

**AMIENS, Treaty of (1801).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1801-1802.

**AMIN AL, Caliph,** A. D. 809-813.

**AMIR.**—An Arabian title, signifying chief or ruler.

**AMISIA, The.**—The ancient name of the river Ems.

**AMISUS, Siege of.**—The siege of Amisus by Lucullus was one of the important operations of the Third Mithridatic war. The city was on the coast of the Black Sea, between the rivers Halys and Lycus; it is represented in site by the modern town of Samsoun. Amisus, which was besieged in 73 B. C. held out until the following year. Tyranno the grammarian was among the prisoners taken and sent to Rome.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, v. 3, ch. 1 and 2.

**AMMANN.**—This is the title of the Mayor or President of the Swiss Communal Council or Gemeinderath. See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1848-1890.

**AMMON, The Temple and Oracle of.**—The Ammonium or Oasis of Ammon, in the Libyan desert, which was visited by Alexander the Great, has been identified with the oasis now known as the Oasis of Siwah. "The Oasis of Siwah was first visited and described by Browne in 1792; and its identity with that of Ammon fully established by Major Rennell ('Geog. of Herodotus,' pp. 577-591). . . . The site of the celebrated temple and oracle of Ammon was first discovered by Mr. Hamilton in 1817." Its famous oracle was frequently visited by Greeks from Cyrene, as well as from other parts of the Hellenic world, and it vied in reputation with those of Delphi

and Dodona."—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Arcient Geog.*, ch. 8, sect. 1, and ch. 12, sect. 1, and note E. —An expedition of 50,000 men sent by Cambyse to Ammon, B. C. 525, is said to have perished in the desert, to the last man. See EGYPT: B. C. 525-432.

**AMMONITES, The.**—According to the narrative in Genesis xix: 30-39, the Ammonites were descended from Ben-Ammi, son of Lot's second daughter, as the Moabites came from Moab, the eldest daughter's son. The two people are much associated in Biblical history. "It is hard to avoid the conclusion that, while Moab was the settled and civilized half of the nation of Lot, the Bene Ammon formed its predatory and Bedonin section."—G. Grove, *Dict. of the Bible.*—See JEWS: THE EARLY HEBREW HISTORY; also, MOABITES.

**AMMONITI, OR AMMONIZIONI, The.** See FLORENCE: A. D. 1358.

**AMORIAN DYNASTY, The.** See BYZANTINE EMPIRE: A. D. 820-1057.

**AMORIAN WAR, The.**—The Byzantine Emperor, Theophilus, in war with the Saracens, took and destroyed, with peculiar animosity, the town of Zapetra or Sozopetra, in Syria, which happened to be the birthplace of the reigning caliph, Motassem, son of Haroun Alraschid. The caliph had condescended to intercede for the place, and his enemy's conduct was personally insulting to him, as well as atrociously inhumane. To avenge the outrage he invaded Asia Minor, A. D. 838, at the head of an enormous army, with the special purpose of destroying the birthplace of Theophilus. The unfortunate town which suffered that distinction was Amorium in Phrygia,—whence the ensuing war was called the Amorian War. Attempting to defend Amorium in the field, the Byzantines were hopelessly defeated, and the doomed city was left to its fate. It made an heroic resistance for fifty-five days, and the siege is said to have cost the caliph 70,000 men. But he entered the place at last with a merciless sword, and left a heap of ruins for the monument of his revenge.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 52.

Also in G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine Empire, from 716 to 1057*, bk. 1, ch. 3, sect. 2.

**AMORITES, The.**—"The Hittites and Amorites were . . . mingled together in the mountains of Palestine like the two races which ethnologists tell us go to form the modern Kelt. But the Egyptian monuments teach us that they were of very different origin and character. The Hittites were a people with yellow skins and 'Mongoloid' features, whose receding foreheads, oblique eyes, and protruding upper jaws, are represented as faithfully on their own monuments as they are on those of Egypt, so that we cannot accuse the Egyptian artists of caricaturing their enemies. If the Egyptians have made the Hittites ugly, it was because they were so in reality. The Amorites, on the contrary, were a tall and handsome people. They are depicted with white skins, blue eyes, and reddish hair, all the characteristics, in fact, of the white race. Mr. Petrie points out their resemblance to the Dardanians of Asia Minor, who form an intermediate link between the white-skinned tribes of the Greek seas and the fair-complexioned Libyans of Northern Africa. The latter are still found in large numbers in the mountainous regions which stretch eastward from Morocco, and are usually

known among the French under the name of Kabyles. The traveller who first meets with them in Algeria cannot fail to be struck by their likeness to a certain part of the population in the British Isles. Their clear-white freckled skins, their blue eyes, their golden-red hair and tall stature, remind him of the fair Kelts of an Irish village; and when we find that their skulls, which are of the so-called dolichocephalic or 'long-headed' type, are the same as the skulls discovered in the prehistoric cromlechs of the country they still inhabit, we may conclude that they represent the modern descendants of the white-skinned Libyans of the Egyptian monuments. In Palestine also we still come across representatives of a fair-complexioned blue-eyed race, in whom we may see the descendants of the ancient Amorites, just as we see in the Kabyles the descendants of the ancient Libyans. We know that the Amorite type continued to exist in Judah long after the Israelitish conquest of Canaan. The captives taken from the southern cities of Judah by Shishak in the time of Rehoboam, and depicted by him upon the walls of the great temple of Karnak, are people of Amorite origin. Their 'regular profile of sub-aquiline cast,' as Mr. Tomkins describes it, their high cheek-bones and nasal expression, are the features of the Amorites, and not of the Jews. Tallness of stature has always been a distinguishing characteristic of the white race. Hence it was that the Anakim, the Amorite inhabitants of Hebron, seemed to the Hebrew spies to be as giants, while they themselves were but 'as grasshoppers' by the side of them (Num. xiii: 33). After the Israelitish invasion remnants of the Anakim were left in Gaza and Gath and Ashkelon (Josh. xi: 22), and in the time of David, Goliath of Gath and his gigantic family were objects of dread to their neighbors (2 Sam. xxi: 15-22). It is clear, then, that the Amorites of Canaan belonged to the same white race as the Libyans of Northern Africa, and like them preferred the mountains to the hot plains and valleys below. The Libyans themselves belonged to a race which can be traced through the peninsula of Spain and the western side of France into the British Isles. Now it is curious that wherever this particular branch of the white race has extended it has been accompanied by a particular form of cromlech, or sepulchral chamber built of large uncut stones. . . . It has been necessary to enter at this length into what has been discovered concerning the Amorites by recent research, in order to show how carefully they should be distinguished from the Hittites with whom they afterwards intermingled. They must have been in possession of Palestine long before the Hittites arrived there. They extended over a much wider area."—A. H. Sayce, *The Hittites*, ch. 1.

**AMPHIKTYONIC COUNCIL.**—"An Amphiktyonic, or, more correctly, an Amphiktyonic, body was an assembly of the tribes who dwelt around any famous temple, gathered together to manage the affairs of that temple. There were other Amphiktyonic Assemblies in Greece [besides that of Delphi], amongst which that of the isle of Kalauria, off the coast of Argolis, was a body of some celebrity. The Amphiktyons of Delphi obtained greater importance than any other Amphiktyons only because of the greater importance of the Delphic sanctuary, and because it incidentally hap-

pened that the greater part of the Greek nation had some kind of representation among them. But that body could not be looked upon as a perfect representation of the Greek nation which, to postpone other objections to its constitution, found no place for so large a fraction of the Hellenic body as the Arkadians. Still the Amphiktyons of Delphi undoubtedly came nearer than any other existing body to the character of a general representation of all Greece. It is therefore easy to understand how the religious functions of such a body might incidentally assume a political character. . . . Once or twice then, in the course of Grecian history, we do find the Amphiktyonic body acting with real dignity in the name of united Greece. . . . Though the list of members of the Council is given with some slight variations by different authors, all agree in making the constituent members of the union tribes and not cities. The representatives of the Ionic and Doric races sat and voted as single members, side by side with the representatives of petty peoples like the Magnésians and Phthiôtic Achaians. When the Council was first formed, Dorians and Ionians were doubtless mere tribes of northern Greece, and the prodigious development of the Doric and Ionic races in after times made no difference in its constitution. . . . The Amphiktyonic Council was not exactly a diplomatic congress, but it was much more like a diplomatic congress than it was like the governing assembly of any commonwealth, kingdom, or federation. The Pylagoroi and Hieronônones were not exactly Ambassadors, but they were much more like Ambassadors than they were like members of a British Parliament or even an American Congress. . . . The nearest approach to the Amphiktyonic Council in modern times would be if the College of Cardinals were to consist of members chosen by the several Roman Catholic nations of Europe and America."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of Federal Govt.*, v. 1, ch. 3.

**AMPHILOCHIANS, The.** See **AKARNANIANS.**

**AMPHIPOLIS.**—This town in Macedonia, occupying an important situation on the eastern bank of the river Strymon, just below a small lake into which it widens near its mouth, was originally called "The Nine Ways," and was the scene of a horrible human sacrifice made by Xerxes on his march into Greece.—Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 15.—It was subsequently taken by the Athenians. B. C. 437, and made a capital city by them [see **ATHENS**; B. C. 440–437], dominating the surrounding district, its name being changed to Amphipolis. During the Peloponnesian War (B. C. 424), the able Lacedæmonian general, Brasidas, led a small army into Macedonia and succeeded in capturing Amphipolis, which caused great dismay and discouragement at Athens. Thucydides, the historian, was one of the generals held responsible for the disaster and he was driven as a consequence into the fortunate e. de which produced the composition of his history. Two years later the Athenian demagogue-leader, Cleon, took command of an expedition sent to recover Amphipolis and other points in Macedonia and Thrace. It was disastrously beaten and Cleon was killed, but Brasidas fell likewise in the battle. Whether Athens suffered more from her defeat than Sparta from her victory is a question.—Thucy-

dides, *History*, bk. 4, sect. 102–135, bk. 5, sect. 1–11.—See, also, **ATHENS**: B. C. 460–454, and **GREECE**: B. C. 424–421.—Amphipolis was taken by Philip of Macedon, B. C. 358.—See **GREECE**: B. C. 359–358.

**AMPHISSA, Siege and Capture by Philip of Macedon (B. C. 339–338).** See **GREECE**: B. C. 357–330.

**AMPHITHEATRES, Roman.**—"There was hardly a town in the [Roman] empire which had not an amphitheatre large enough to contain vast multitudes of spectators. The savage excitement of gladiatorial combats seems to have been almost necessary to the Roman legionaries in their short intervals of inaction, and was the first recreation for which they provided in the places where they were stationed. . . . Gladiatorial combats were held from early times in the Forum, and wild beasts hunted in the Circus; but until Curio built his celebrated double theatre of wood, which could be made into an amphitheatre by turning the two semi-circular portions face to face, we have no record of any special building in the peculiar form afterwards adopted. It may have been, therefore, that Curio's mechanical contrivance first suggested the elliptical shape. . . . As specimens of architecture, the amphitheatres are more remarkable for the mechanical skill and admirable adaptation to their purpose displayed in them, than for any beauty of shape or decoration. The hugest of all, the Coliseum, was ill-proportioned and unpleasing in its lines when entire."—R. Burn, *Rome and the Campagna*, introd.

**AMPHORA.—MODIUS.**—"The [Roman] unit of capacity was the Amphora or Quadrantal, which contained a cubic foot . . . equal to 5.687 imperial gallons, or 5 gallons, 2 quarts, 1 pint, 2 gills, nearly. The Amphora was the unit for both liquid and dry measures, but the latter was generally referred to the Modius, which contained one-third of an Amphora. . . . The Culeus was equal to 20 Amphore."—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq.*, ch. 13.

**AMRITSAR.** See **SIKITS.**

**AMSTERDAM: The rise of the city.**—"In 1205 a low and profitless marsh upon the coast of Holland, not far from the confines of Utrecht, had been partially drained by a dam raised upon the hitherto squandered stream of the Amstel. Near this dam a few huts were tenanted by poor men who earned a scanty livelihood by fishing in the Zuyder Sea; but so uninviting seemed that barren and desolate spot, that a century later Amstel-dam was still an obscure seafaring town, or rather hamlet. Its subsequent progress was more rapid. The spirit of the land was stirring within it, and every portion of it thrilled with new energy and life. Some of the fugitive artisans from Flanders saw in the thriving village safety and peace, and added what wealth they had, and what was better, their manufacturing intelligence and skill, to the humble hamlet's store. Amsteldam was early admitted to the fellowship of the Hanse League; and, in 1342, having outgrown its primary limits, required to be enlarged. For this an expensive process, that of driving piles into the swampy plain, was necessary; and to this circumstance, no doubt, it is owing that the date of each successive enlargement has been so accurately recorded."—W. T. McCullagh, *Industrial History of Three Nations*, vol. 2, ch. 9.

**AMT.—AMTER.** See **FANDINAVIAN STATES**—**DENMARK**—**ICELAND**): A. D. 1849-1874; and the same (**NORWAY**): A. D. 1814-1815.

**AMURATH I.**, Turkish Sultan, A. D. 1350-1389.... **Amurath II.**, A. D. 1421-1451.... **Amurath III.**, A. D. 1574-1595.... **Amurath IV.**, A. D. 1623-1640.

**AMYCLÆ**, *The Silence of.*—Amyclæ was the chief city of Laconia while that district of Peloponnesus was occupied by the Achæans, before the Doric invasion and before the rise of Sparta. It maintained its independence against the Doric Spartans for a long period, but succumbed at length under circumstances which gave rise to a proverbial saying among the Greeks concerning "the silence of Amyclæ." "The peace of Amyclæ, we are told, had been so often disturbed by false alarms of the enemy's approach, that at length a law was passed forbidding such reports, and the silent city was taken by surprise."—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 7.

**AMYTHAONIDÆ**, *The.* See **ΑΥΘΟΙΣ**.—**ARCOLIS**.

**AN, The City of.** See **ON**.

**ANABAPTISTS OF MÜNSTER.**— "Münster is a town in Westphalia, the seat of a bishop, walled round, with a noble cathedral and many churches; but there is one peculiarity about Münster that distinguishes it from all other old German towns; it has not one old church spire in it. Once it had a great many. How comes it that it now has none? In Münster lived a draper, Knipperdolling by name, who was much excited over the doctrines of Luther, and he gathered many people in his house, and spoke to them bitter words against the Pope, the bishops, and the clergy. The bishop at this time was Francis of Waldeck, a man much inclined himself to Lutheranism; indeed, later, he proposed to suppress Catholicism in the diocese, as he wanted to seize on it and appropriate it as a possession to his family. Moreover, in 1544, he joined the Protestant princes in a league against the Catholics; but he did not want things to move too fast, lest he should not be able to secure the wealthy See as personal property. Knipperdolling got a young priest, named Rottmann, to preach in one of the churches against the errors of Catholicism, and he was a man of such fiery eloquence that he stirred up a mob which rushed through the town, wrecking the churches. The mob became daily more daring and threatening. They drove the priests out of the town, and some of the wealthy citizens fled, not knowing what would follow. The bishop would have yielded to all the religious innovations if the rioters had not threatened his temporal position and revenue. In 1532 the pastor, Rottmann, began to preach against the baptism of infants. Luther wrote to him remonstrating, but in vain. The bishop was not in the town; he was at Minden, of which See he was bishop as well. Finding that the town was in the hands of Knipperdolling and Rottmann, who were confiscating the goods of the churches, and excluding those who would not agree with their opinions, the bishop advanced to the place at the head of some soldiers. Münster closed its gates against him. Negotiations were entered into; the Landgrave of Hesse was called in as pacificator, and articles of agreement were drawn up and signed. Some of the churches were given

to the Lutherans, but the Cathedral was reserved for the Catholics, and the Lutherans were forbidden to molest the latter, and disturb their religious services. The news of the conversion of the city of Münster to the gospel spread, and strangers came to it from all parts. Among these was a tailor of Leyden, called John Hockelson. Rottmann now threw up his Lutheranism and proclaimed himself opposed to many of the doctrines which Luther still retained. Amongst other things he rejected was infant baptism. This created a split among the reformed in Münster, and the disorders broke out afresh. The mob now fell on the cathedral and drove the Catholics from it, and would not permit them to worship in it. They also invaded the Lutheran churches, and filled them with uproar. On the evening of January 28, 1534, the Anabaptists stretched chains across the streets, assembled in armed bands, closed the gates and placed sentinels in all directions. When day dawned there appeared suddenly two men dressed like Prophets, with long ragged beards and flowing mantles, staff in hand, who paced through the streets solemnly in the midst of the crowd, who bowed before them and saluted them as Enoch and Elias. These men were John Bockelson, the tailor, and one John Mattheson, head of the Anabaptists of Holland. Knipperdolling at once associated himself with them, and shortly the place was a scene of the wildest ecstasies. Men and women ran about the streets screaming and leaping, and crying out that they saw visions of angels with swords drawn urging them on to the extermination of Lutherans and Catholics alike. . . . A great number of citizens were driven out, on a bitter day, when the land was covered with snow. Those who lagged were beaten; those who were sick were carried to the market-place and re-baptized by Rottmann. . . . This was too much to be borne. The bishop raised an army and marched against the city. Thus began a siege which was to last sixteen months, during which a multitude of untrained fanatics, commanded by a Dutch tailor, held out against a numerous and well-armed force. Thenceforth the city was ruled by divine revelations, or rather, by the crazes of the diseased brains of the prophets. One day they declared that all the officers and magistrates were to be turned out of their offices, and men nominated by themselves were to take their places; another day Mattheson said it was revealed to him that every book in the town except the Bible was to be destroyed; accordingly all the archives and libraries were collected in the market-place and burnt. Then it was revealed to him that all the spires were to be pulled down; so the church towers were reduced to stumps, from which the enemy could be watched and whence cannon could play on them. One day he declared he had been ordered by Heaven to go forth, with promise of victory, against the besiegers. He dashed forth at the head of a large band, but was surrounded and he and his band slain. The death of Mattheson struck dismay into the hearts of the Anabaptists, but John Bockelson took advantage of the moment to establish himself as head. He declared that it was revealed to him that Mattheson had been killed because he had disobeyed the heavenly command, which was to go forth with few. Instead of that he had gone with many. Bockelson said he had

been ordered in vision to marry Mattheson's widow and assume his place. It was further revealed to him that Münster was to be the heavenly Zion, the capital of the earth, and he was to be king over it. . . . Then he had another revelation that every man was to have as many wives as he liked, and he gave himself sixteen wives. This was too outrageous for some to endure, and a plot was formed against him by a blacksmith and about 200 of the more respectable citizens, but it was frustrated and led to the seizure of the conspirators and the execution of a number of them. . . . At last, on midsummer eve, 1536, after a siege of sixteen months, the city was taken. Several of the citizens, unable longer to endure the tyranny, cruelty and abominations committed by the king, helped the soldiers of the prince-bishop to climb the walls, open the gates, and surprise the city. A desperate hand-to-hand fight ensued; the streets ran with blood. John Bockelson, instead of leading his people, hid himself, but was caught. So was Knipperdolling. When the prince was in his hands the prince-bishop entered. John of Leyden and Knipperdolling were cruelly tortured, their flesh plucked off with red-hot pincers, and then a dagger was thrust into their hearts. Finally, their bodies were hung in iron cages to the tower of a church in Münster. Thus ended this hideous drama, which produced an indescribable effect throughout Germany. Münster, after this, in spite of the desire of the prince-bishop to establish Lutheranism, reverted to Catholicism, and remains Catholic to this day."—S. Baring-Gould, *The Story of Germany*, ch. 36.

Also in the same, *Historic Oddities and Strange Events, 2d Series*.—L. von Ranke, *Hist. of the Reformation in Germany*, bk. 6, ch. 9 (n. 3).—C. Beard, *The Reformation* (Hibbert Lects., 1883), lect. 6.

**ANAHUAC.**—"The word Anahuac signifies 'near the water.' It was, probably, first applied to the country around the lakes in the Mexican Valley, and gradually extended to the remoter regions occupied by the Aztecs, and the other semi-civilized races. Or, possibly, the name may have been intended, as Veytia suggests (*Hist. Antiq.*, lib. 1, cap. 1), to denote the land between the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific."—W. H. Prescott, *Conquest of Mexico*, bk. 1, ch. 1, note 11.—See MEXICO: A. D. 1325-1502.

**ANAKIM, The.** See HORITES, and AMORITES.

**ANAKTORIUM.** See KORKYIA.

**ANAPA: A. D. 1828.**—Siege and Capture.—Cession to Russia. See TURKS: A. D. 1826-1829.

**ANARCHISTS.**—"The anarchists are . . . a small but determined band. . . . Although their programme may be found almost word for word in Proudhon, they profess to follow more closely Bakounine, the Russian nihilist, who separated himself from Marx and the Internationals, and formed secret societies in Spain, Switzerland, France, and elsewhere, and thus propagated nihilistic views; for anarchy and nihilism are pretty much one and the same thing when nihilism is understood in the older, stricter sense, which does not include, as it does in a larger and more modern sense, those who are simply political and constitutional reformers. Like prince Krapotkine, Bakounine

came of an old and prominent Russian family; like him, he revolted against the cruelties and injustices he saw about him; like him, he despaired of peaceful reform, and concluded that no great improvement could be expected until all our present political, economic, and social institutions were so thoroughly demolished that of the old structure not one stone should be left on another. Out of the ruins a regenerated world might arise. We must be purged as by fire. Like all anarchists and true nihilists, he was a thorough pessimist, as far as our present manner of life was concerned. Reaction against conservatism carried him very far. He wished to abolish private property, state, and inheritance. Equality is to be carried so far that all must wear the same kind of clothing, no difference being made even for sex. Religion is an excoriation of the brain, and should be abolished. Fire, dynamite, and assassination are approved of by at least a large number of the party. They are brave men, and fight for their faith with the devotion of martyrs. Imprisonment and death are counted but as rewards. . . . Forty-seven anarchists signed a declaration of principles, which was read by one of their number at their trial at Lyons. . . . 'We wish liberty [they declared] and we believe its existence incompatible with the existence of any power whatsoever, whatever its origin and form—whether it be selected or imposed, monarchical or republican—whether inspired by divine right or by popular right, by anointment or universal suffrage. . . . The best governments are the worst. The substitution, in a word, in human relations, of free contract perpetually revisable and dissoluble, is our ideal.'"—R. T. Ely, *French and German Socialism in Modern Times*, ch. 8.—"In anarchism we have the extreme antithesis of socialism and communism. The socialist desires so to extend the sphere of the state that it shall embrace all the more important concerns of life. The communist, at least of the older school, would make the sway of authority and the routine which follows therefrom universal. The anarchist, on the other hand, would banish all forms of authority and have only a system of the most perfect liberty. The anarchist is an extreme individualist. . . . Anarchism, as a social theory, was first elaborately formulated by Proudhon. In the first part of his work, 'What is Property?' he briefly stated the doctrine and gave it the name 'anarchy,' absence of a master or sovereign. . . . About 12 years before Proudhon published his views, Josiah Warren reached similar conclusions in America."—H. L. Osgood, *Scientific Anarchism* (*Pol. Sci. Quart.*, Mar., 1889), pp. 1-2.—See, also, Nihilism.

**ANARCHISTS, The Chicago.** See CHICAGO: A. D. 1886-1887.

**ANASTASIUS I., Roman Emperor (Eastern.)** A. D. 491-518. . . . **Anastasius II.**, A. D. 713-716.

**ANASTASIUS III., Pope.** A. D. 911-915. . . . **Anastasius IV., Pope.**, A. D. 1153-1154.

**ANATOLIA.** See ASIA MINOR.

**ANCALITES, The.**—A tribe of ancient Britons whose home was near the Thames.

**ANCASTER, Origin of.** See CAUSEMENT.

**ANCHORITES.—HERMITS.**—"The fertile and peaceable lowlands of England . . . offered few spots sufficiently wild and lonely for the habitation of a hermit; those, therefore,

who wished to retire from the world into a more strict and solitary life than that which the monastery afforded were in the habit of immuring themselves, as anchorites, or in old English 'Ankers,' in little cells of stone, built usually against the wall of a church. There is nothing new under the sun; and similar anchorites might have been seen in Egypt, 500 years before the time of St. Antony, immured in cells in the temples of Isis or Serapis. It is only recently that antiquaries have discovered how common this practice was in England, and how frequently the traces of these cells are to be found about our parish churches."—C. Kingsley, *The Hermits*, p. 329.—The term anchorites is applied, generally, to all religious ascetics who lived in solitary cells.—J. Bingham, *Antiq. of the Christian Ch.*, bk. 7, ch. 1, sect. 4.—"The essential difference between an anker or anchorite and a hermit appears to have been that, whereas the former passed his whole life shut up in a cell, the latter, although leading indeed a solitary life, wandered about at liberty."—R. R. Sharpe, *Int. to "Calendar of Wills in the Court of Husting, London,"* v. 2, p. xxi.

**ANCIENT REGIME.**—The political and social system in France that was destroyed by the Revolution of 1789 is commonly referred to as the "ancien régime." Some writers translate this in the literal English form—"the ancient regime;" others render it more appropriately, perhaps, the "old regime." Its special application is to the state of things described under FRANCE: A. D. 1789.

**ANCIENTS, The Council of the.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1795 (JUNE—SEPTEMBER).

**ANCRUM, Battle of.**—A success obtained by the Scots over an English force making an incursion into the border districts of their country A. D. 1544.—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland*, ch. 35 (n. 3).

**ANDALUSIA: The name.**—"The Vandals, . . . though they passed altogether out of Spain, have left their name to this day in its southern part, under the form of Andalusia, a name which, under the Saracen conquerors, spread itself over the whole peninsula."—E. A. Freeman, *Historical Geog. of Europe*, ch. 4, sect. 3.—See, also: VANDALS: A. D. 428.—Roughly speaking, Andalusia represents the country known to the ancients, first, as Tartessus, and, later, as Turdetania.

**ANDAMAN ISLANDERS, The.** See INDIA: THE AOROHAIAN INHABITANTS.

**ANDASTES, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SUSQUEHANNA.

**ANDECAVI.**—The ancient name of the city of Angers, France, and of the tribe which occupied that region. See VENETI OF WESTERN GAUL.

**ANDERIDA.—ANDERIDA SYLVA.—ANDREDSWALD.**—A great forest which anciently stretched across Surrey, Sussex and into Kent (southeastern England) was called Anderida Sylva by the Romans and Andredswald by the Saxons. It coincided nearly with the tract of country called in modern times the Weald of Kent, to which it gave its name of the Wald or Weald. On the southern coast-border of the Anderida Sylva the Romans established the important fortress and port of Anderida, which has been identified with modern Pevensey. Here the Romano-Britons made an obstinate stand

against the Saxons, in the fifth century, and Anderida was only taken by Ælle after a long siege. In the words of the Chronicle, the Saxons "slew all that were therein, nor was there henceforth one Briton left."—J. R. Green, *The Making of Eng.*, ch. 1.

ALSO IN T. Wright, *Celt, Roman, and Saxon*, ch. 5.

**ANDERSON, Major Robert.**—Defense of Fort Sumter. See UNITED STATES OF AM., A. D. 1860 (DECEMBER); 1861 (MARCH—APRIL).

**ANDERSONVILLE PRISON-PENS.** See PRISONS AND PRISON-PENS, CONFEDERATE.

**ANDES, OR ANDI, OR ANDECAVI, The.** See VENETI OF WESTERN GAUL.

**ANDESIANS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ANDESIANS.

**ANDRÉ, Major John, The Capture and execution of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM., A. D. 1780 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER).

**ANDREW I., King of Hungary, A. D. 1046-1060. . . Andrew II., King of Hungary, A. D. 1204-1235. . . Andrew III., King of Hungary, A. D. 1290-1301.**

**ANDRONICUS I., Emperor in the East (Byzantine or Greek), A. D. 1183-1185. . . Andronicus II. (Palæologus), Greek Emperor of Constantinople, A. D. 1282-1328. . . Andronicus III. (Palæologus), A. D. 1328-1341.**

**ANDROS, Governor, New England and New York under.** See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1686; MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1671-1686; and 1686-1689; NEW YORK: A. D. 1688; and CONNECTICUT: A. D. 1685-1687.

**ANDROS, Battle of (B. C. 407).** See GREECE: B. C. 411-407.

**ANGELIQUE, La Mère.** See PORT ROYAL AND THE JANSENISTS: A. D. 1602-1660.

**ANGERS, Origin of.** See VENETI OF WESTERN GAUL.

**ANGEVIN KINGS AND ANGEVIN EMPIRE.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1154-1189.

**ANGHIARI, Battle of (1425).** See ITALY: A. D. 1412-1447.

**ANGLES AND JUTES, The.**—The mention of the Angles by Tacitus is in the following passage: "Next [to the Langobardi] come the Reudigni, the Aviones, the Anglii, the Varini, the Eudoses, the Suardones, and Nuthones, who are fenced in by rivers or forests. None of these tribes have any noteworthy feature, except their common worship of Ertha, or mother-Earth, and their belief that she interposes in human affairs, and visits the nations in her car. In an island of the ocean there is a sacred grove, and within it a consecrated chariot, covered over with a garment. Only one priest is permitted to touch it. He can perceive the presence of the goddess in this sacred recess, and walks by her side with the utmost reverence as she is drawn along by heifers. It is a season of rejoicing, and festivity reigns wherever she deigns to go and he received. They do not go to battle or wear arms; every weapon is under lock; peace and quiet are welcomed only at these times, till the goddess, weary of human intercourse, is at length restored by the same priest to her temple. Afterwards the car, the vestments, and, if you like to believe it, the divinity herself, are purified in a secret lake. Slaves perform the rite, who are instantly swallowed up by its waters. Hence arises a mysterious terror and a pious ignorance concerning the nature of that which is seen only by men doomed



to die. This branch indeed of the Suevi stretches into the remoter regions of Germany."—Tacitus, *Germany; trans. by Chureh and Brodrick, ch. 40.*—"In close neighbourhood with the Saxons in the middle of the fourth century were the Angli, a tribe whose origin is more uncertain and the application of whose name is still more a matter of question. If the name belongs, in the pages of the several geographers, to the same nation, it was situated in the time of Tacitus east of the Elbe; in the time of Ptolemy it was found on the middle Elbe, between the Thuringians to the south and the Varini to the north; and at a later period it was forced, perhaps by the growth of the Thuringian power, into the neck of the Cimbric peninsula. It may, however, be reasonably doubted whether this hypothesis is sound, and it is by no means clear whether, if it be so, the Angli were not connected more closely with the Thuringians than with the Saxons. To the north of the Angli, after they had reached their Schleswig home, were the Jutes, of whose early history we know nothing, except their claims to be regarded as kinsmen of the Goths and the close similarity between their descendants and the neighbour Frisians."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng., v. 1, ch. 3.*—"Important as are the Angles, it is not too much to say that they are only known through their relations to us of England, their descendants; indeed, without this paramount fact, they would be liable to be confused with the Frisians, with the Old Saxons, and with even Slavonians. This is chiefly because there is no satisfactory trace or fragment of the Angles of Germany within Germany; whilst the notices of the other writers of antiquity tell us as little as the one we find in Tacitus. And this notice is not only brief but complicated. . . . I still think that the Angli of Tacitus were—1: The Angles of England; 2: Occupants of the northern parts of Hanover; 3: At least in the time of Tacitus; 4: And that to the exclusion of any territory in Hoistein, which was Frisian to the west, and Slavonic to the east. Still the question is one of great magnitude and numerous complications."—R. G. Latham, *The Germany of Tacitus; Epitome, sect. 49.*

ALSO IN J. M. Lappenberg, *Hist. of Eng. under the Anglo-Saxon Kings, v. 1, pp. 80-95.*—See, also, AVIONES, and SAXONS.—The conquests and settlements of the Jutes and the Angles in Britain are described under ENGLAND; A. D. 410-473, and 547-633.

ANGLESEA, Ancient. See MONA, MONAPIA, and NORMANS: 8TH-9TH CENTURIES.

ANGLO-SAXON.—A term which may be considered as a compound of Angle and Saxon, the names of the two principal Teutonic tribes which took possession of Britain and formed the English nation by their ultimate union. As thus regarded and used to designate the race, the language and the institutions which resulted from that union, it is only objectionable, perhaps, as being superfluous, because English is the accepted name of the people of England and all pertaining to them. But the term Anglo-Saxon has also been more particularly employed to designate the Early English people and their language, before the Norman Conquest, as though they were Anglo-Saxon at that period and became English afterwards. Modern historians are protesting strongly against this use of the term. Mr. Freeman (*Norman Conquest, v.*

1, note A), says: "The name by which our forefathers really knew themselves and by which they were known to other nations was English and no other. 'Angli,' 'Engle,' 'Angel-cyn,' 'Englisc,' are the true names by which the Teutons of Britain knew themselves and their language. . . . As a chronological term, Anglo-Saxon is equally objectionable with Saxon. The 'Anglo-Saxon period,' as far as there ever was one, is going on still. I speak therefore of our forefathers, not as 'Saxons,' or even as 'Anglo-Saxons,' but as they spoke of themselves, as Englishmen—'Angli,' 'Engle,'—'Angel-cyn.'"—See, also, SAXONS, and ANGLES AND JUTES.

ANGLON, Battle of.—Fought in Armenia, A. D. 543, betw. the Romans and the Persians, with disaster to the former.—G. Rawlinson, *Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy, ch. 20.*

ANGORA, Battle of (1402). See TIMOUR—also, TUNKS: A. D. 1380-1403.

ANGOSTURA, OR BUENA VISTA, Battle of. See MEXICO: A. D. 1846-1847.

ANGRIVARII, The.—The Angrivarii were one of the tribes of ancient Germany. Their settlements "were to the west of the Weser (Visurgis) in the neighbourhood of Minden and Herford, and thus coincide to some extent with Westphalia. Their territory was the scene of Varus's defeat. It has been thought that the name of this tribe is preserved in that of the town Engern."—A. J. Church and W. J. Brodrick, *Tacitus's Germany, notes.*—See, also, BRUCTERI.

ANL.—Storming of the Turks (1064). See TUNKS: A. D. 1063-1073.

ANILLEROS, The. See SPAIN: A. D. 1814-1827.

ANJOU: Creation of the County.—Origin of the Plantagenets.—"It was the policy of this unfairly depreciated sovereign [Charles the Bald, grandson of Charlemagne, who received in the dismemberment of the Carolingian Empire the Neustrian part, out of which was developed the modern kingdom of France, and who reigned from 840 to 877], to recruit the falling ranks of the false and degenerate Frankish aristocracy, by calling up to his peerage the wise, the able, the honest and the bold of ignoble birth. . . . He sought to surround himself with new men, the men without ancestry; and the earliest historian of the House of Anjou both describes this system and affords the most splendid example of the theory adopted by the king. Pre-eminent amongst these parvenus was Torquatius or Torulfus, an Armorican peasant, a very rustic, a backwoodsman, who lived by hunting and such like occupations, almost in solitude, cultivating his 'quillcts,' his 'cueillettes,' of land, and driving his own oxen, harnessed to his plough. Torquatius entered or was invited into the service of Charles-le-Chauve, and rose high in his sovereign's confidence: a prudent, a bold, and a good man. Charles appointed him Forester of the forest called 'the Blackbird's Nest,' the 'nid du merle,' a pleasant name, not the less pleasant for its familiarity. This happened during the conflicts with the Northmen. Torquatius served Charles strenuously in the wars, and obtained great authority. Tertullus, son of Torquatius, inherited his father's energies, quick and acute, patient of fatigue, ambitious and aspiring; he became the liegeman of Charles; and his marriage with Petronilla the King's cousin, Count

Hugh the Abbot's daughter, introduced him into the very circle of the royal family. Château Landon and other benefices in the Gastinois were acquired by him, possibly as the lady's dowry. Seneschal also was Tertullus of the same ample Gastinois territory. Ingelger, son of Tertullus and Petronilla, appears as the first hereditary Count of Anjou Outre-Maine.—Marquis, Consul or Count of Anjou,—for all these titles are assigned to him. Yet the ploughman Torquatius must be reckoned as the primary Plantageat: the rustic Torquatius founded that brilliant family."—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and England*, bk. 1, ch. 3.

ALSO IN K. Norgate, *England under the Angevin Kings*, v. 1, ch. 2.

**A. D. 987-1129.**—The greatest of the old Counts.—"Fulc Nerra, Fulc the Black [A. D. 987-1040] is the greatest of the Angevins, the first in whom we can trace that marked type of character which their house was to preserve with a fatal constancy through two hundred years. He was without natural affection. In his youth he burned a wife at the stake, and legend told how he led her to her doom decked out in his gayest attire. In his old age he waged his bitterest war against his son, and exacted from him when vanquished a humiliation which men reserved for the deadliest of their foes. 'You are conquered, you are conquered!' shouted the old man in fierce exultation, as Geoffry, bridled and saddled like a beast of burden, crawled for pardon to his father's feet. . . . But neither the wrath of Heaven nor the curses of men broke with a single mishap the fifty years of his success. At his accession Anjou was the least important of the greater provinces of France. At his death it stood, if not in extent, at least in real power, first among them all. . . . His overthrow of Brittany on the field of Conquerreux was followed by the gradual absorption of Southern Touraine. . . . His great victory at Pontlevoy crushed the rival house of Blois; the seizure of Saumur completed his conquests in the South, while Northern Touraine was won bit by bit till only Tours resisted the Angevin. The treacherous seizure of its Count, Herbert Wake-dog, left Maine at his mercy ere the old man bequeathed his unfinished work to his son. As a warrior, Geoffry Martel was hardly inferior to his father. A decisive overthrow wrested Tours from the Count of Blois; a second left Poitou at his mercy; and the seizure of Le Mans brought him to the Norman border. Here . . . his advance was checked by the genius of William the Conqueror, and with his death the greatness of Anjou seemed for the time to have come to an end. Stripped of Maine by the Normans, and weakened by internal dissensions, the weak and profligate administration of Fulc Rechin left Anjou powerless against its rivals along the Seine. It woke to fresh energy with the accession of his son, Fulc of Jerusalem. . . . Fulc was the one enemy whom Henry the First really feared. It was to disarm his restless hostility that the King yielded to his son, Geoffry the Handsome, the hand of his daughter Matilda."—J. R. Green, *A Short History of the English People*, ch. 2, sect. 7.

ALSO IN K. Norgate, *England under the Angevin Kings*, v. 1, ch. 2-4.

**A. D. 1154.**—The Counts become Kings of England. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1154-1189.

**A. D. 1204.**—Wrested from the English King John. See FRANCE: A. D. 1180-1224.

**A. D. 1206-1442.**—English attempts to recover the county.—The Third and Fourth Houses of Anjou.—Creation of the Dukedom.—King John, of England, did not voluntarily submit to the sentence of the peers of France which pronounced his forfeiture of the fiefs of Anjou and Maine, "since he invaded and had possession of Angers again in 1206, when, Gothic-like, he demolished its ancient walls. He lost it in the following year, and . . . made no further attempt upon it until 1213. In that year, having collected a powerful army, he landed at Rochelle, and actually occupied Angers, without striking a blow. But . . . the year 1214 beheld him once more in retreat from Anjou, never to reappear there, since he died on the 19th of October, 1216. In the person of King John ended what is called the 'Second House of Anjou.' In 1204, after the confiscations of John's French possessions, Philipp Augustus established hereditary seneschals in that part of France, the first of whom was the tutor of the unfortunate Young Arthur [of Brittany], named William des Roches, who was in fact Count in all except the name, over Anjou, Maine, and Touraine, owing allegiance only to the crown of France. The Seneschal, William des Roches, died in 1222. His son-in-law, Amaury de Craon, succeeded him," but was soon afterwards taken prisoner during a war in Brittany and incarcerated. Henry III. of England still claimed the title of Count of Anjou, and in 1230 he "disembarked a considerable army at St. Malo, in the view of reconquering Anjou, and the other forfeited possessions of his crown. Louis IX., then only fifteen years old . . . advanced to the attack of the allies; but in the following year a peace was concluded, the province of Guienne having been ceded to the English crown. In 1241, Louis gave the counties of Poitou and Auvergne to his brother Alphonso; and, in the year 1246, he invested his brother Charles, Count of Provence, with the counties of Anjou and Maine, thereby annulling the rank and title of Seneschal, and instituting the Third House of Anjou. Charles I., the founder of the proud fortunes of this Third House, was ambitious in character, and events long favoured his ambition. Count of Provence, through the inheritance of his consort, had not long been invested with Anjou and Maine, ere he was invited to the conquest of Sicily [see ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1250-1298]." The Third House of Anjou ended in the person of John, who became King of France in 1350. In 1356 he invested his son Louis with Anjou and Maine, and in 1360 the latter was created the first Duke of Anjou. The Fourth House of Anjou, which began with this first Duke, came to an end two generations later with René, or Regnier,—the "good King René" of history and story, whose kingdom was for the most part a name, and who is best known to English readers, perhaps, as the father of Margaret of Anjou, the stout-hearted queen of Henry VI. On the death of his father, Louis, the second duke, René became by his father's will Count of Guise, his elder brother, Louis, inheriting the dukedom. In 1434 the brother died without issue and René succeeded him in Anjou, Maine and Provence. He had already become Duke of Bar, as the adopted heir of his great-uncle, the cardinal-

duke, and Duke of Lorraine (1430), by designation of the late Duke, whose daughter he had married. In 1435 he received from Queen Joanna of Naples the doubtful legacy of that distracted kingdom, which she had previously bequeathed first, to Alphonso of Aragon, and afterwards—revoking that testament—to René's brother, Louis of Anjou. King René enjoyed the title during his life-time, and the actual kingdom for a brief period; but in 1442 he was expelled from Naples by his competitor Alphonso (see ITALY: A. D. 1412-1447).—M. A. Hookham, *Life and Times of Margaret of Anjou, introd. and ch. 1-2.*

**ANJOU, The English House of.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1155-1189.

**ANJOU, The Neapolitan House of:** A. D. 1266.—Conquest of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. See ITALY: A. D. 1250-1268.

A. D. 1282.—Loss of Sicily.—Retention of Naples. See ITALY: A. D. 1282-1300.

A. D. 1310-1382.—Possession of the Hungarian throne. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1301-1442.

A. D. 1370-1384.—Acquisition and loss of the crown of Poland. See POLAND: A. D. 1333-1572.

A. D. 1381-1384.—Claims of Louis of Anjou.—His expedition to Italy and his death. See ITALY: A. D. 1343-1389.

A. D. 1386-1399.—Renewed contest for Naples.—Defeat of Louis II. by Ladislas. See ITALY: A. D. 1386-1414.

A. D. 1423-1442.—Renewed contest for the crown of Naples.—Defeat by Alfonso of Aragon and Sicily. See ITALY: A. D. 1412-1447.

**ANKENDORFF, Battle of.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1807 (FEBRUARY—JUNE).

**ANKERS.** See ANCHORITES.

**ANNA, Czarina of Russia,** A. D. 1730-1740.

**ANNALES MAXIMI, The.** See FASTI.

**ANNAM:** A. D. 1882-1885.—War with France.—French protectorate accepted. See FRANCE: A. D. 1875-1889.

**ANNAPOLIS ROYAL, NOVA SCOTIA:** Change of name from Port Royal (1710). See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1702-1710.

**ANNATES, OR FIRST-FRUITS.**—"A practice had existed for some hundreds of years, in all the churches of Europe, that bishops and archbishops, on presentation to their sees, should transmit to the pope, on receiving their bulls of investiture, one year's income from their new preferments. It was called the payment of Annates, or first-fruits, and had originated in the time of the crusades, as a means of providing a fund for the holy wars. Once established it had settled into custom, and was one of the chief resources of the papal revenue."—J. A. Froude. *History of England, ch. 4.*—"The claim [by the pope] to the first-fruits of bishoprics and other promotions was apparently first made in England by Alexander IV. in 1250, for five years; it was renewed by Clement V. in 1306, to last for two years; and it was in a measure successful. By John XXII. it was claimed throughout Christendom for three years, and met with universal resistance. . . . Stoutly contended as it was in the Council of Constance, and frequently made the subject of debate in parliament and council the demand must have been regularly complied

with."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch. 19, sect. 718.*—See also, **QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.**

**ANNE, Queen of England,** A. D. 1702-1714.

**ANNE OF AUSTRIA, Queen-regent of France.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1642-1643, to 1651-1653.

**ANNE BOLEYN, Marriage, trial and execution of.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1527-1534, and 1536-1543.

**ANSAR, The.** See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 609-632.

**ANSIBARII, The.** See FRANKS: ORIGIN, &c.

**ANSPACH, Creation of the Margravate.** See GERMANY: 13TH CENTURY. . . . Separation from the Electorate of Brandenburg. See BRANDENBURG: A. D. 1417-1640.

**ANTALCIDAS, Peace of (B. C. 387).** See GREECE: B. C. 399-387.

**ANTES, The.** See SLAVONIC PEOPLES.

**ANTESIGNANI, The.**—"In each cohort [of the Roman legion, in Cæsar's time] a certain number of the best men, probably about one-fourth of the whole detachment, was assigned as a guard to the standard, from whence they derived their name of Antesignani."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch. 15.*

**ANTHEMIUS, Roman Emperor (Western),** A. D. 467-472.

**ANTHESTERIA, The.** See DIONYSIA AT ATHENS.

**ANTI-CORN-LAW LEAGUE.** See TARIFF LEGISLATION (ENGLAND): A. D. 1836-1839, and 1845-1846.

**ANTI-FEDERALISTS.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1789-1792.

**ANTI-MASONIC PARTY, American.** See NEW YORK: A. D. 1820-1832.

**ANTI-MASONIC PARTY, Mexican.** See MEXICO: A. D. 1822-1828.

**ANTI-RENTERS.—ANTI-RENT WAR.** See LIVINGSTON MANOR.

**ANTI-SLAVERY MOVEMENTS.** See SLAVERY, NEGRO.

**ANTIETAM, OR SHARPSBURG, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (SEPTEMBER: MARYLAND).

**ANTIGONEA.** See MANTINEA: B. C. 222.

**ANTIGONID KINGS, The.** See GREECE: B. C. 307-197.

**ANTIGONUS, and the wars of the Diadochi.** See MACEDONIA: B. C. 323-316; 315-310; 310-301.

**ANTIGONUS GONATUS, The wars of.** See MACEDONIA: B. C. 277-244.

**ANTILLES.—ANTILIA.**—"Familiar as is the name of the Antilles, few are aware of the antiquity of the word; while its precise significance sets etymology at defiance. Common consent identified the Antilla of legend with the Isle of the Seven Cities. In the year 734, says the story, the Arabs having conquered most of the Spanish peninsula, a number of Christian emigrants, under the direction of seven holy bishops, among them the archbishop of Oporto, sailed westward with all that they had, and reached an island where they founded seven towns. Arab geographers speak of an Atlantic island called in Arabic El-tennyn, or Al-tin (Isle of Serpents), a name which may possibly have become by corruption Antilla. . . . The seven bishops were believed in the 16th century to be still represented by their successors, and to preside over a numerous and wealthy people. Most

geographers of the 15th century believed in the existence of Antilia. It was represented as lying west of the Azores. . . . As soon as it became known in Europe that Columbus had discovered a large island, Española was at once identified with Antilia, . . . and the name . . . has ever since been applied generally to the West Indian islands."—E. J. Payne, *Hist. of the New World called America*, v. 1, p. 98.—See, also, WEST INDIES.

**ANTINOMIAN CONTROVERSY IN PURITAN MASSACHUSETTS.** See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1636-1638.

**ANTIOCH: Founding of the City.** See SELEUCIDÆ; and MACEDONIA, &c.: B. C. 310-301.

**A. D. 36-400.**—The Christian Church. See CHRISTIANITY, EARLY.

**A. D. 115.**—Great Earthquake.—"Early in the year 115, according to the most exact chronology, . . . the splendid capital of Syria was visited by an earthquake, one of the most disastrous apparently of all the similar inflictions from which that luckless city has periodically suffered. . . . The calamity was enhanced by the presence of unusual crowds from all the cities of the east, assembled to pay homage to the Emperor [Trajan], or to take part in his expedition [of conquest in the east]. Among the victims were many Romans of distinction. . . . Trajan, himself, only escaped by creeping through a window."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 63.

**A. D. 260.**—Surprise, massacre and pillage by Sapor, King of Persia. See PERSIA: A. D. 226-627.

**A. D. 526.**—Destruction by Earthquake.—During the reign of Justinian (A. D. 518-565) the cities of the Roman Empire "were overwhelmed by earthquakes more frequent than at any other period of history. Antioch, the metropolis of Asia, was entirely destroyed, on the 20th of May, 526, at the very time when the inhabitants of the adjacent country were assembled to celebrate the festival of the Ascension; and it is affirmed that 250,000 persons were crushed by the fall of its sumptuous edifices."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 10.

ALSO IN: E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 43.

**A. D. 540.**—Stormed, pillaged and burned by Chosroes, the Persian King. See PERSIA: A. D. 226-627.

**A. D. 638.**—Surrender to the Arabs. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 632-639.

**A. D. 969.**—Recapture by the Byzantines.—After having remained 328 years in the possession of the Saracens, Antioch was retaken in the winter of A. D. 969 by the Byzantine Emperor, Nicephorus Phokas, and became again a Christian city. Three years later the Moslems made a great effort to recover the city, but were defeated. The Byzantine arms were at this time highly successful in the never ending Saracen war, and John Zimiskes, successor of Nicephorus Phokas, marched triumphantly to the Tigris and threatened even Bagdad. But most of the conquests thus made in Syria and Mesopotamia were not lasting.—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine Empire*, A. D. 716-1007, bk. 2, ch. 2.—See BYZANTINE EMPIRE, A. D. 963-1025.

**A. D. 1097-1098.**—Siege and capture by the Crusaders. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1096-1099.

**A. D. 1099-1144.**—Principality. See JERUSALEM: A. D. 1099-1144.

**A. D. 1268.**—Extinction of the Latin Principality.—Total destruction of the city.—Antioch fell, before the arms of Bibars, the Sultan of Egypt and Syria, and the Latin principality was bloodily extinguished, in 1268. "The first seat of the Christian name was despoiled by the slaughter of seventeen, and the captivity of one hundred, thousand of her inhabitants." This fate befell Antioch only twenty-three years before the last vestige of the conquests of the crusaders was obliterated at Acre—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 59.—"The sultan halted for several weeks in the plain, and permitted his soldiers to hold a large market, or fair, for the sale of their booty. This market was attended by Jews and pedlars from all parts of the East. . . . 'It was,' says the Cadi Mohieddin, 'a fearful and heart-rending sight. Even the hard stones were softened with grief.' He tells us that the captives were so numerous that a fine hearty boy might be purchased for twelve pieces of silver, and a little girl for five. When the work of pillage had been completed, when all the ornaments and decorations had been carried away from the churches, and the lead torn from the roofs, Antioch was fired in different places, amid the loud thrilling shouts of 'Allah Acbar,' 'God is Victorious.' The great churches of St. Paul and St. Peter burnt with terrific fury for many days, and the vast and venerable city was left without a habitation and without an inhabitant."—C. G. Addison, *The Knights Templars*, ch. 6.

**ANTIOCHUS SOTER, AND ANTIOCHUS THE GREAT.** See SELEUCIDÆ, THE: B. C. 281-224, and 224-187.

**ANTIPATER, and the wars of the Diadochi.** See MACEDONIA: B. C. 323-316.

**ANTIUM.**—"Antium, once a flourishing city of the Volsci, and afterwards of the Romans, their conquerors, is at present reduced to a small number of inhabitants. Originally it was without a port; the harbour of the Antiates having been the neighbouring indentation in the coast of Ceno, now Nettuno, distant more than a mile to the eastward. . . . The princies of the ancient Antiates all proceeded from Ceno, or Cerio, where they had 22 long ships. These Numictus took; . . . some were taken to Rome and their rostra suspended in triumph in the Forum. . . . It [Antium] was reckoned 260 stadia, or about 32 miles, from Ostia."—Sir W. Gell, *Topog. of Rome*, v. 1.

**ANTIUM, Naval Battle of (1378).** See VENICE: A. D. 1378-1379.

**ANTIVESTÆUM.** See BRITAIN, TRIBES OF CELTIC.

**ANTOINE DE BOURBON, King of Navarre.** A. D. 1555-1557.

**ANTONINES, The.** See ROME: A. D. 138-180.

**ANTONINUS, Marcus Aurelius, Roman Emperor.** A. D. 161-180.

**ANTONINUS PIUS, Roman Emperor.** A. D. 138-161.

**ANTONY, Mark, and the Second Triumvirate.** See ROME: B. C. 44 to 31.

**ANTRUSTIONES.**—In the Salic law, of the Franks, there is no trace of any recognized order of nobility, "We meet, however, with

several titles denoting temporary rank, derived from offices political and judicial, or from a position about the person of the king. Among these the Antrustiones, who were in constant attendance upon the king, played a conspicuous part. . . . Antrustiones and Convivæ Regis [Romans who held the same position] are the predecessors of the Vassal Dominici of later times, and like these were bound to the king by an especial oath of personal and perpetual service. They formed part, as it were, of the king's family, and were expected to reside in the palace, where they superintended the various departments of the royal household."—W. C. Perry, *The Franks*, ch. 10.

**ANTWERP:** The name of the City.—Its commercial greatness in the 16th century.—"The city was so ancient that its genealogist, with ridiculous gravity, ascended to a period two centuries before the Trojan war, and discovered a giant, rejoicing in the classic name of Antigonus, established on the Scheldt. This patriarch exacted one half the merchandise of all navigators who passed his castle, and was accustomed to amputate and cast into the river the right hands of those who infringed this simple tariff. Thus 'h' d-werpen, 'hand-throwing, became Antwerp, and hence, two hands, in the escutcheon of the city, were ever held up in heraldic attestation of the truth. The giant was, in his turn, thrown into the Scheldt by a hero, named Brabo, from whose exploits Brabant derived its name. . . . But for these antiquarian researches, a simpler derivation of the name would seem 'an t' werf,' 'on the wharf.' It had now [in the first half of the 16th century] become the principal entrepôt and exchange of Europe. . . . the commercial capital of the world. . . . Venice, Nuremberg, Augsburg, Bruges, were sinking, but Antwerp, with its deep and convenient river, stretched its arm to the ocean and caught the golden prize, as it fell from its sister cities' grasp. . . . No city, except Paris, surpassed it in population, none approached it in commercial splendor."—J. L. Motley, *The Rise of the Dutch Republic*, *Hist. Introd.*, sect. 13.

**A. D. 1313.**—Made the Staple for English trade. See STAPLE.

**A. D. 1566.**—Riot of the Image-breakers in the Churches. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1566-1568.

**A. D. 1576.**—The Spanish Fury. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1575-1577.

**A. D. 1577.**—Deliverance of the city from its Spanish garrison.—Demolition of the Citadel. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1577-1581.

**A. D. 1583.**—Traacherous attempt of the Duke of Anjou.—The French Fury. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1581-1584.

**A. D. 1584-1585.**—Siege and reduction by Alexander Farnese, Duke of Parma.—The downfall of prosperity. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1584-1585.

**A. D. 1648.**—Sacrificed to Amsterdam in the Treaty of Münster.—Closing of the Scheldt. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1646-1648.

**A. D. 1706.**—Surrendered to Marlborough and the Allies. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1706-1707.

**A. D. 1746-1748.**—Taken by the French and restored to Austria. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1746-1747; and AIX-LA-CHAPELLE: THE CONGRESS,

**A. D. 1832.**—Siege of the Citadel by the French.—Expulsion of the Dutch garrison. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1830-1832.

**APACHES, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: APACHE GROUP, and ATHAPASCAN FAMILY.  
**APALACHES, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: APALACHES.

**APAMEA.**—Apamea, a city founded by Seleucus Nicator on the Euphrates, the site of which is occupied by the modern town of Bir, and became, in Strabo's time (near the beginning of the Christian Era) one of the principal centers of Asiatic trade, second only to Ephesus. Thapsacus, the former customary crossing-place of the Euphrates, had ceased to be so, and the passage was made at Apamea. A place on the opposite bank of the river was called Zeugma, or "the bridge." Bir "is still the usual place at which travellers proceeding from Antioch or Aleppo towards Bagdad cross the Euphrates."—E. H. Bumbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 22, sect. 1 (p. 2, pp. 298 and 317).

**APANAGE.** See APPANAGE.

**APATURIA, The.**—An annual family festival of the Athenians, celebrated for three days in the early part of the month of October (Pyaneisioo). "This was the characteristic festival of the Ionic race; handed down from a period anterior to the constitution of Kleisthenes, and to the ten new tribes each containing so many demes, and bringing together the citizens in their primitive unions of family, gens, phratry, etc., the aggregate of which had originally constituted the four Ionic tribes, now superannuated. At the Apaturia, the family ceremonies were gone through; marriages were enrolled, acts of adoption were promulgated and certified, the names of youthful citizens first entered on the gentle and phratric roll; sacrifices were jointly celebrated by these family assemblages to Zeus Phratrius, Athênê, and other deities, accompanied with much festivity and enjoyment."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 64 (v. 7).

**APELLA, The.** See SPARTA: THE CONSTITUTION, &c.

**APELOUSAS, The.** See TEXAS: THE ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

**APHEK, Battle of.**—A great victory won by Ahab, king of Israel over Benhadad, king of Damascus.—I. Ewald, *Hist. of Israel*, bk. 4, sect. 1.

**APODECTÆ, The.**—"When Aristotle speaks of the officers of government to whom the public revenues were delivered, who kept them and distributed them to the several administrative departments, these are called, he adds, apodectæ and treasurers. In Athens the apodectæ were ten in number, in accordance with the number of the tribes. They were appointed by lot. . . . They had in their possession the lists of the debtors of the state, received the money which was paid in, entered an account of it and noted the amount in arrear, and in the council house in the presence of the council, erased the names of the debtors who had paid the demands against them from the list, and deposited this again in the archives. Finally, they, together with the council, apportioned the sums received."—A. Boeckh, *Public Economy of Athens* (tr. by Lamb), bk. 2, ch. 4.

**APOLLONIA IN ILLYRIA, The Founding of.** See KORKYRA.

**APOSTASION.** See POLETÆ.

**APOSTOLIC MAJESTY:** Origin of the Title. See HUNGARY: A. D. 972-1114.

**APPANAGE.**—"The term appanage denotes the provision made for the younger children of a king of France. This always consisted of lands and feudal superiorities held of the crown by the tenure of peage. It is evident that this usage, as it produced a new class of powerful feudatories, was hostile to the interests and policy of the sovereign, and retarded the subjugation of the ancient aristocracy. But an usage coeval with the monarchy was not to be abrogated, and the scarcity of money rendered it impossible to provide for the younger branches of the royal family by any other means. It was restrained however as far as circumstances would permit."

—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 1, p. 2.—"From the words 'ad' and 'panis,' meaning that it was to provide bread for the person who held it. A portion of appanage was now given to each of the king's younger sons, which descended to his direct heirs, but in default of them reverted to the crown."—T. Wright, *Hist. of France*, v. 1, p. 308, note.

**APPIAN WAY, The** Appius Claudius, called the Blind, who was censor at Rome from 312 to 308 B. C. [see ROME: B. C. 312], constructed during that time "the Appian road, the queen of roads, because the Latin road, passing by Tusculum, and through the country of the Hernicans, was so much endangered, and had not yet been quite recovered by the Romans: the Appian road, passing by Terracina, Fundi and Mola, to Capua, was intended to be a shorter and safer one. . . . The Appian road, even if Appius did carry it as far as Capua, was not executed by him with that splendour for which we still admire it in those parts which have not been destroyed intentionally: the closely joined polygons of basalt, which thousands of years have not been able to displace, are of a somewhat later origin. Appius commenced the road because there was actual need for it; in the year A. U. 457 [B. C. 297] peperino, and some years later basalt (silex) was first used for paving roads, and, at the beginning, only on the small distance from the Porta Capena to the temple of Mars, as we are distinctly told by Livy. Roads constructed according to artistic principles had previously existed."—B. G. Niebuhr, *Lect. on the Hist. of Rome*, lect. 45.

Also in: Sir W. Gell, *Topog. of Rome*, v. 1.—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome*, v. 1, p. 251.

**APPOMATTOX COURT HOUSE, Lee's Surrender at.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (APRIL: VIRGINIA).

**APULEIAN LAW.** See MAJESTAS.

**APULIA:** A. D. 1042-1127.—Norman conquest and Dukedom.—Union with Sicily. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1000-1090, and 1081-1194.

**APULIANS, The.** See SABINES; also, SAMNITES.

**AQUÆ SEXTIÆ.** See SALYES.

**AQUÆ SEXTIÆ, Battle of.** See CIMBRI AND TEUTONES: B. C. 113-102.

**AQUÆ SOLIS.**—The Roman name of the long famous watering-place known in modern England as the city of Bath. It was splendidly adorned in Roman times with temples and other edifices.—T. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon*, ch. 5.

**AQUIDAY, OR AQUETNET.**—The native name of Rhode Island. See RHODE ISLAND: A. D. 1638-1640.

**AQUILA, Battle of (1424).** See ITALY: A. D. 1412-1447.

**AQUILEIA.**—Aquileia, at the time of the destruction of that city by the Huns, A. D. 452, was, "both as a fortress and a commercial emporium, second to none in Northern Italy. It was situated at the northernmost point of the gulf of Hadria, about twenty miles northwest of Trieste, and the place where it once stood is now in the Austrian dominions, just over the border which separates them from the kingdom of Italy. In the year 181 B. C. a Roman colony had been sent to this far corner of Italy to serve as an outpost against some intrusive tribes, called by the vague name of Gauls. . . . Possessing a good harbour, with which it was connected by a navigable river, Aquileia gradually became the chief entrepôt for the commerce between Italy and what are now the Illyrian provinces of Austria."—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders*, bk. 2, ch. 4.

**A. D. 238.—Siege by Maximin.** See ROME: A. D. 238.

**A. D. 388.—Overthrow of Maximus by Theodosius.** See ROME: A. D. 379-395.

**A. D. 452.—Destruction by the Huns.** See HUNS: A. D. 452; also, VENICE: A. D. 452.

**AQUITAINE: The ancient tribes.**—The Roman conquest of Aquitania was achieved, B. C. 56, by one of Caesar's lieutenants, the Younger Crassus, who first brought the people called the Sotiates to submission and then defeated their combled neighbors in a murderous battle, where three-fourths of them are said to have been slain. The tribes which then submitted "were the Tarbelli, Bigerriones, Preciani, Vocates, Turusates, Elusates, Garites, Ausci, Garumni, Sibuzates and Cocosates. The Tarbelli were in the lower basin of the Adour. Their chief place was on the site of the hot springs of Dax. The Bigerriones appear in the name Bigorre. The chief place of the Elusates was Elusa, Eause; and the town of Auch on the river Gers preserves the name of the Ausci. The names Garites, if the name is genuine, and Garumni contain the same element, Gar, as the river Garumna [Garonne] and the Gers. It is stated by Walckenaer that the inhabitants of the southern part of Les Landes are still called Cousiots. Cocosca, Causseque, is twenty-four miles from Dax on the road from Dax to Bordenux."—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, v. 4, ch. 6.—"Before the arrival of the brachycephalic Ligurian race, the Iberians ranged over the greater part of France. . . . If, as seems probable, we may identify them with the Aquitani, one of the three races which occupied Gaul in the time of Caesar, they must have retreated to the neighbourhood of the Pyrenees before the beginning of the historic period."—I. Taylor, *Origin of the Aryans*, ch. 2, sect. 5.

—In **Caesar's time.** See GAUL DESCRIBED BY CAESAR.

**Settlement of the Visigoths.** See GOTHS (VISIGOTHS): A. D. 400-419.

**A. D. 567.—Divided between the Merovingian Kings.** See FRANKS: A. D. 511-752.

**A. D. 681-768.—The independent Dukes and their subjugation.**—"The old Roman

Aquitania, in the first division of the spoils of the Empire, had fallen to the Visigoths, who conquered it without much trouble. In the struggle between them and the Merovingians, it of course passed to the victorious party. But the quarrels, so fiercely contested between the different members of the Frank monarchy, prevented them from retaining a distant possession within their grasp; and at this period [681-718, when the Mayors of the Palace, Pepin and Carl, were gathering the reins of government over the three kingdoms—Austrasia, Neustria and Burgundy—into their hands], Eudo, the duke of Aquitaine, was really an independent prince. The population had never lost its Roman character; it was, in fact, by far the most Romanized in the whole of Gaul. But it had also received a new element in the Vascones or Gascons [see *BASQUES*], a tribe of Pyrenean mountaineers, who descending from their mountains, advanced towards the north until their progress was checked by the broad waters of the Garonne. At this time, however, they obeyed Eudo. "This duke of Aquitaine, Eudo, allied himself with the Neustrians against the ambitious Austrasian Mayor, Carl Martel, and shared with them the crushing defeat at Soissons, A. D. 718, which established the Hammerer's power. Eudo acknowledged allegiance and was allowed to retain his dukedom. But, half-a-century afterwards, Carl's son, Pepin, who had pushed the 'fainéant' Merovingians from the Frank throne and seated himself upon it, fought a nine years' war with the then duke of Aquitaine, to establish his sovereignty. "The war, which lasted nine years [760-768], was signalized by frightful ravages and destruction of life upon both sides, until, at last, the Franks became masters of Berri, Auvergne, and the Limousin, with their principal cities. The able and gallant Guaiifer [or Waifer] was assassinated by his own subjects, and Pepin had the satisfaction of finally uniting the grand-duchy of Aquitaine to the monarchy of the Franks."—J. G. Sheppard, *Fall of Rome*, lect. 8.

ALSO IN: P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul*, ch. 14-15.—W. H. Perry, *The Franks*, ch. 5-6.

**A. D. 732.—Ravaged by the Moslems.** See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 715-732.

**A. D. 781.—Erected into a separate kingdom by Charlemagne.**—In the year 781 Charlemagne erected Italy and Aquitaine into separate kingdoms, placing his two infant sons, Pepin and Ludwig or Louls on their respective thrones. "The kingdom of Aquitaine embraced Vasconia [Gascony], Septimania, Aquitaine proper (that is, the country between the Garonne and the Loire) and the county, subsequently the duchy, of Toulouse. Nominally a kingdom, Aquitaine was in reality a province, entirely dependent on the central or personal government of Charles. . . . The nominal designations of king and kingdom might gratify the feelings of the Aquitanians, but it was a scheme contrived for holding them in a state of absolute dependence and subordination."—J. I. Mombert, *Hist. of Charles the Great*, bk. 2, ch. 11.

**A. D. 843.—In the division of Charlemagne's Empire.** See FRANCE: A. D. 843.

**A. D. 884-1151.—The end of the nominal kingdom.—The disputed Ducal Title.**—"Curloman [who died 884], son of Louis the Stam-

merer, was the last of the Carolingians who bore the title of king of Aquitaine. This vast state ceased from this time to constitute a kingdom. It had for a lengthened period been divided between powerful families, the most illustrious of which are those of the Counts of Toulouse, founded in the ninth century by Fredelon, the Counts of Poitiers, the Counts of Auvergne, the Marquises of Septimania or Gothia, and the Dukes of Gascony. King Eudes had given William the Pius, Count of Auvergne, the investiture of the duchy of Aquitaine. On the extinction of that family in 928, the Counts of Toulouse and those of Poitou disputed the prerogatives and their quarrel stained the south with blood for a long time. At length the Counts of Poitou acquired the title of Duke of Aquitaine or Guyenne [or Guienne,—supposed to be a corruption of the name of Aquitaine, which came into use during the Middle Ages], which remained in their house up to the marriage of Eleanor of Aquitaine with Henry Plantagenet I. [Henry II., King of England (1151)].—E. De Bonnechose, *Hist. of France*, bk. 2, ch. 3, foot-note.—"The duchy Aquitaine, or Guyenne, as held by Eleanor's predecessors, consisted, roughly speaking, of the territory between the Loire and the Garonne. More exactly, it was bounded on the north by Anjou and Touraine, on the east by Berry and Auvergne, on the south-east by the Quercy or County of Cahors, and on the south-west by Gascony, which had been united with it for the last hundred years. The old Karolingian kingdom of Aquitania had been of far greater extent; it had, in fact, included the whole country between the Loire, the Pyrenees, the Rhone and the ocean. Over all this vast territory the Counts of Poitou asserted a theoretical claim of overlordship by virtue of their ducal title; they had, however, a formidable rival in the house of the Counts of Toulouse."—K. Norgate, *England under the Angevin Kings*, v. 1, ch. 10.—See, also, *TOULOUSE: 10TH AND 11TH CENTURIES.*

**A. D. 1137-1152.—Transferred by marriage from the crown of France to the crown of England.**—In 1137, "the last of the old line of the dukes of Aquitaine—William IX., son of the gay crusader and troubadour: whom the Red King had hoped to succeed—died on a pilgrimage at Compostella. His only son was already dead, and before setting out for his pilgrimage he did what a greater personage had done ten years before: with the consent of his barons, he left the whole of his dominions to his daughter. Moreover, he bequeathed the girl herself as wife to the young king Louis [VII.] of France. This marriage more than doubled the strength of the French crown. It gave to Louis absolute possession of all western Aquitaine, or Guyenne as it was now beginning to be called; that is the counties of Poitou and Gascony, with the immediate overlordship of the whole district lying between the Loire and the Pyrenees, the Rhone and the ocean:—a territory five or six times as large as his own royal domain and over which his predecessors had never been able to assert more than the merest shadow of a nominal superiority." In 1152 Louis obtained a divorce from Eleanor, surrendering all the great territory which she had added to his dominions, rather than maintain an unhappy union. The same year the gay duchess was wedded to Henry Plantagenet, then Duke of Normandy, afterwards

Henry II. King of England. By this marriage Aquitaine became joined to the crown of England and remained so for three hundred years.—K. Norgate, *England under the Angevin Kings*, v. 1, ch. 8.

**12th Century.**—The state of the southern parts. See PROVENÇE: A. D. 1179-1207.

**A. D. 1366-1453.**—Full sovereignty possessed by the English Kings.—The final conquest and union with France.—“By the Peace of Bretigny [see FRANCE: A. D. 1337-1360] Edward III. resigned his claims on the crown of France; but he was recognized in return as independent Prince of Aquitaine, without any homage or superiority being reserved to the French monarch. When Aquitaine therefore was conquered by France, partly in the 14th, fully in the 15th century [see FRANCE: A. D. 1431-1453], it was not the ‘reunion’ of a forfeited fief, but the absorption of a distinct and sovereign state. The feelings of Aquitaine itself seem to have been divided. The nobles to a great extent, though far from universally, preferred the French connexion. It better fell in with their notions of chivalry, feudal dependency, and the like; the privileges too which French law conferred on noble birth would make their real interests lie that way. But the great cities and, we have reason to believe, the mass of the people, also, clung faithfully to their ancient Dukes; and they had good reason to do so. The English Kings, both by habit and by interest, naturally protected the municipal liberties of Bourdeaux and Bayonne, and exposed no part of their subjects to the horrors of French taxation and general oppression.”—E. A. Freeman, *The Franks and the Gauls* (*Historical Essays*, 1st Series, No. 7).

**AQUITANI, The.** See IDEMIANS, THE WESTERN.

**ARABIA.—ARABS: The Name.**—“There can be no doubt that the name of the Arabs was . . . given from their living at the westernmost part of Asia; and their own word ‘Gharb,’ the ‘West,’ is another form of the original Semitic name Arab.”—G. Rawlinson, *Notes to Herodotus*, v. 2, p. 71.

**The ancient succession and fusion of Races.**—“The population of Arabia, after long centuries, more especially after the propagation and triumph of Islamism, became uniform throughout the peninsula. . . . But it was not always thus. It was very slowly and gradually that the inhabitants of the various parts of Arabia were fused into one race. . . . Several distinct races successively immigrated into the peninsula and remained separate for many ages. Their distinctive characteristics, their manners and their civilisation prove that these nations were not all of one blood. Up to the time of Mahomet, several different languages were spoken in Arabia, and it was the introduction of Islamism alone that gave predominance to that one amongst them now called Arabic. The few Arabian historians deserving of the name, who have used any discernment in collecting the traditions of their country, Ibn Khaldoun, for example, distinguish three successive populations in the peninsula. They divide these primitive, secondary, and tertiary Arabs into three divisions, called Ariba, Motareba, and Mostareba. . . . The Ariba were the first and most ancient inhabitants of Arabia. They consisted prin-

cipally of two great nations, the Adites, sprung from Ham, and the Amalika of the race of Aram, descendants of Shem, mixed with nations of secondary importance, the Thamudites of the race of Ham, and the people of the Tasm, and Jadis, of the family of Aram. The Motareba were tribes sprung from Joktan, son of Eber, always in Arabian tradition called Kahtan. The Mostareba of more modern origin were Ismaelitic tribes. . . . The Cushites, the first inhabitants of Arabia, are known in the national traditions by the name of Adites, from their progenitor, who is called Ad, the grandson of Ham. All the accounts given of them by Arab historians are but fanciful legends. . . . In the midst of all the fabulous traits with which these legends abound, we may perceive the remembrance of a powerful empire founded by the Cushites in very early ages, apparently including the whole of Arabia Felix, and not only Yemen proper. We also find traces of a wealthy nation, constructors of great buildings, with an advanced civilisation analogous to that of Chaldea, professing a religion similar to the Babylonian; a nation, in short, with whom material progress was allied to great moral depravity and obscene rites. . . . It was about eighteen centuries before our era that the Joktanites entered Southern Arabia. . . . According to all appearances, the invasion, like all events of a similar nature, was accomplished only by force. . . . After this invasion, the Cushite element of the population, being still the most numerous, and possessing great superiority in knowledge and civilisation over the Joktanites, who were still almost in the nomadic state, soon recovered the moral and material supremacy, and political dominion. A new empire was formed in which the power still belonged to the Sa’vans of the race of Cush. . . . Little by little the new nation of Ad was formed. The centre of its power was the country of Sheba proper, where, according to the tenth chapter of Genesis, there was no primitive Joktanite tribe, although in all the neighbouring provinces they were already settled. . . . It was during the first centuries of the second Adite empire that Yemen was temporarily subjected by the Egyptians, who called it the land of Pun. . . . Conquered during the minority of Thothmes III., and the regency of the Princess Hatasa, Yemen appears to have been lost by the Egyptians in the troublous times at the close of the eighteenth dynasty. Ramses II. recovered it almost immediately after he ascended the throne, and it was not till the time of the effeminate kings of the twentieth dynasty, that this splendid ornament of Egyptian power was finally lost. . . . The conquest of the land of Pun under Hatasa is related in the elegant bas-reliefs of the temple of Deir-el-Bahari, at Thebes, published by M. Duemichen. . . . The bas-reliefs of the temple of Deir-el-Bahari afford undoubted proofs of the existence of commerce between India and Yemen at the time of the Egyptian expedition under Hatasa. It was this commerce, much more than the fertility of its own soil and its natural productions, that made Southern Arabia one of the richest countries in the world. . . . For a long time it was carried on by land only, by means of caravans crossing Arabia; for the navigation of the Red Sea, much more difficult and dangerous than that of the Indian Ocean, was not attempted till some centuries later. . . .



The caravans of myrrh, incense, and balm crossing Arabia towards the land of Canaan are mentioned in the Bible, in the history of Joseph, which belongs to a period very near to the first establishment of the Canaanites in Syria. As soon as commercial towns arose in Phœnicia, we find, as the prophet Ezekiel said, 'The merchants of Sheba and Raamah, they were thy merchants: they occupied in thy fairs with chief of all spices, and with all precious stones and gold.' . . . A great number of Phœnician merchants, attracted by this trade, established themselves in Yemen, Hadramaut, Oman, and Bahrein. Phœnician factories were also established at several places on the Persian Gulf, amongst others in the islands of Tylos and Arvad, formerly occupied by their ancestors. . . . This commerce, extremely flourishing during the nineteenth dynasty, seems, together with the Egyptian dominion in Yemen, to have ceased under the feeble and inactive successors of Ramses III. . . . Nearly two centuries passed away, when Hiram and Solomon despatched vessels down the Red Sea. . . . The vessels of the two monarchs were not content with doing merely what had once before been done under the Egyptians of the nineteenth dynasty, namely, fetching from the ports of Yemen the merchandise collected there from India. They were much bolder, and their enterprise was rewarded with success. Profiting by the regularity of the monsoons, they fetched the products of India at first hand, from the very place of their shipment in the ports of the land of Ophir, or Abhira. These distant voyages were repeated with success as long as Solomon reigned. The vessels going to Ophir necessarily touched at the ports of Yemen to take in provisions and await favourable winds. Thus the renown of the two allied kings, particularly of the power of Solomon, was spread in the land of the Adites. This was the cause of the journey made by the queen of Sheba to Jerusalem to see Solomon. . . . The sea voyages to Ophir, and even to Yemen, ceased at the death of Solomon. The separation of the ten tribes, and the revolutions that simultaneously took place at Tyre, rendered any such expeditions impracticable. . . . The empire of the second Adites lasted ten centuries, during which the Joktanite tribes, multiplying in each generation, lived amongst the Cushite Sabæans. . . . The assimilation of the Joktanites to the Cushites was so complete that the revolution which gave political supremacy to the descendants of Joktan over those of Cush produced no sensible change in the civilisation of Yemen. But although using the same language, the two elements of the population of Southern Arabia were still quite distinct from each other, and antagonistic in their interests. . . . Both were called Sabæans, but the Bible always carefully distinguishes them by a different orthography. . . . The majority of the Sabæan Cushites, however, especially the superior castes, refused to submit to the Joktanite yoke. A separation, therefore, took place, giving rise to the Arab proverb, 'divided as the Sabæans,' and the mass of the Adites emigrated to another country. According to M. Caussin de Perceval, the passage of the Sabæans into Abyssinia is to be attributed to the consequences of the revolution that established Joktanite supremacy in Yemen. . . . The date of the passage of the

Sabæans from Arabia into Abyssinia is much more difficult to prove than the fact of their having done so. . . . Yarub, the conqueror of the Adites, and founder of the new monarchy of Joktanite Arabs, was succeeded on the throne by his son, Yashdjob, a weak and feeble prince, of whom nothing is recorded, but that he allowed the chiefs of the various provinces of his states to make themselves independent. Abd Shems, surnamed Sheba, son of Yashdjob, recovered the power his predecessors had lost. . . . Abd Shems had several children, the most celebrated being Himyer and Kahlan, who left a numerous posterity. From these two personages were descended the greater part of the Yemenite tribes, who still existed at the time of the rise of Islamism. The Himyarites seem to have settled in the towns, whilst the Kahlanites inhabited the country and the deserts of Yemen. . . . This is the substance of all the information given by the Arab historians."—F. Lenormant and E. Chevallier, *Manual of Ancient Hist. of the East*, bk. 7, ch. 1-2 (c. 2).

**Sabæans, The.**—"For some time past it has been known that the Himyarite inscriptions fall into two groups, distinguished from one another by phonological and grammatical differences. One of the dialects is philologically older than the other, containing fuller and more primitive grammatical forms. The inscriptions in this dialect belong to a kingdom the capital of which was at Ma'in, and which represents the country of the Mincans of the ancients. The inscriptions in the other dialect were engraved by the princes and people of Sabā, the Sheba of the Old Testament, the Sabæans of classical geography. The Sabæan kingdom lasted to the time of Mohammed, when it was destroyed by the advancing forces of Islam. Its rulers for several generations had been converts to Judaism, and had been engaged in almost constant warfare with the Ethiopic kingdom of Axum, which was backed by the influence and subsidies of Rome and Byzantium. Dr. Glaser seeks to show that the founders of this Ethiopic kingdom were the Habāsa, or Abyssinians, who migrated from Himyar to Africa in the second or first century B. C.; when we first hear of them in the inscriptions they are still the inhabitants of Northern Yemen and Mahrah. More than once the Axumites made themselves masters of Southern Arabia. About A. D. 300, they occupied its ports and islands, and from 350 to 378 even the Sabæan kingdom was tributary to them. Their last successes were gained in 525, when, with Byzantine help, they conquered the whole of Yemen. But the Sabæan kingdom, in spite of its temporary subjection to Ethiopia, had long been a formidable State. Jewish colonies settled in it, and one of its princes became a convert to the Jewish faith. His successors gradually extended their dominion as far as Ormuz, and after the successful revolt from Axum in 378, brought not only the whole of the southern coast under their sway, but the western coast as well, as far north as Mekka. Jewish influence made itself felt in the future birthplace of Mohammed, and thus introduced those ideas and beliefs which subsequently had so profound an effect upon the birth of Islam. The Byzantines and Axumites endeavoured to counteract the influence of Judaism by means of Christian colonies and proselytism. The result was a conflict between Sabā and its

assailants, which took the form of a conflict between the members of the two religions. A violent persecution was directed against the Christians of Yemen, avenged by the Ethiopian conquest of the country and the removal of its capital to San'a. The intervention of Persia in the struggle was soon followed by the appearance of Mohammedanism upon the scene, and Jew, Christian, and Parsi were alike overwhelmed by the flowing tide of the new creed. The epigraphic evidence makes it clear that the origin of the kingdom of Sabá went back to a distant date. Dr. Glaser traces its history from the time when its princes were still but Makârib, or 'Priests,' like Jethro, the Priest of Midian, through the ages when they were 'kings of Sabá,' and later still 'kings of Sabá and Raïdân,' to the days when they claimed imperial supremacy over all the principalities of Southern Arabia. It was in this later period that they dated their inscriptions by an era, which, as Halévy first discovered, corresponds to 115 B. C. One of the kings of Sabá is mentioned in an inscription of the Assyrian king Sargon (B. C. 715), and Dr. Glaser believes that he has found his name in a 'Himyaritic' text. When the last priest, Samah'all Darralh, became king of Sabá, we do not yet know, but the age must be sufficiently remote, if the kingdom of Sabá already existed when the Queen of Sheba came from Ophir to visit Solomon. The visit need no longer cause astonishment, notwithstanding the long journey by land which lay between Palestine and the south of Arabia. . . . As we have seen, the inscriptions of Ma'in set before us a dialect of more primitive character than that of Sabá. Hitherto it had been supposed, however, that the two dialects were spoken contemporaneously, and that the Minæan and Sabæan kingdoms existed side by side. But geography offered difficulties in the way of such a belief, since the seats of Minæan power were embedded in the midst of the Sabæan kingdom, much as the fragments of Creomarty are embedded in the midst of other countries. Dr. Glaser has now made it clear that the old supposition was incorrect, and that the Minæan kingdom preceded the rise of Sabá. We can now understand why it is that neither in the Old Testament nor in the Assyrian inscriptions do we hear of any princes of Ma'in, and that though the classical writers are acquainted with the Minæan people they know nothing of a Minæan kingdom. The Minæan kingdom, in fact, with its culture and monuments, the relics of which still survive, must have flourished in the grey dawn of history, at an epoch at which, as we have hitherto imagined, Arabia was the home only of nomad barbarism. And yet in this remote age alphabetic writing was already known and practised, the alphabet being a modification of the Phœnician written vertically and not horizontally. To what an early date are we referred for the origin of the Phœnician alphabet itself! The Minæan Kingdom must have had a long existence. The names of thirty-three of its kings are already known to us. . . . A power which reached to the borders of Palestine must necessarily have come into contact with the great monarchies of the ancient world. The army of Ælius Gallus was doubtless not the first which had sought to gain possession of the cities and spice-gardens of the south. One such invasion is alluded to in an inscription which was copied by

M. Halévy. . . . But the epigraphy of ancient Arabia is still in its infancy. The inscriptions already known to us represent but a small proportion of those that are yet to be discovered. . . . The dark past of the Arabian peninsula has been suddenly lighted up, and we find that long before the days of Mohammed it was a land of culture and literature, a seat of powerful kingdoms and wealthy commerce, which cannot fail to have exercised an influence upon the general history of the world."—A. H. Sayce, *Ancient Arabia* (Contemp. Rev., Dec., 1889).

**6th Century.**—Partial conquest by the Abyssinians. See ABYSSINIA: 6TH TO 16TH CENTURIES.

**A. D. 609-632.**—Mahomet's conquest. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 609-632.

**A. D. 1517.**—Brought under the Turkish sovereignty. See TURKS: A. D. 1481-1520.

**ARABS, Conquests of the.** See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST.

**ARACAN, English acquisition of.** See INDIA: A. D. 1823-1833.

**ARACHOTI, The.**—A people who dwelt anciently in the Valley of the Arghandab, or Urgundab, in eastern Afghanistan. Herodotus gave them the tribal name of "Pactyes," and the modern Afghans, who call themselves "Pashtun" and "Pakhtun," signifying "mountaineers," are probably derived from them.—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, bk. 7, ch. 1.

**ARAGON: A. D. 1035-1258.**—Rise of the kingdom. See SPAIN: A. D. 1035-1258.

**A. D. 1133.**—Beginning of popular representation in the Cortes.—The Monarchical constitution. See CORTES, THE EARLY SPANISH.

**A. D. 1218-1238.**—The first oath of allegiance to the king.—Conquest of Balearic Islands.—Subjugation of Valencia. See SPAIN: A. D. 1212-1238.

**A. D. 1410-1475.**—The Castilian dynasty.—Marriage of Ferdinand with Isabella of Castile. See SPAIN: A. D. 1368-1479.

**A. D. 1516.**—The crown united with that of Castile by Joanna, mother of Charles V. See SPAIN: A. D. 1496-1517.

**ARAIKU, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: GUCK OR COCO GROUP.

**ARAM.—ARAM NAHARAIM.—ARAM ZOBAB.—ARAMEANS.** See SEMITES; also, SEMITIC LANGUAGES.

**ARAMBEC.** See NORUMBECA.

**ARAPAHOES, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, and PAWNEE (CADDOAN) FAMILY.

**ARAR, The.**—The ancient name of the river Saone, in France.

**ARARAT.—URARDA.** See ALAHOBIANS. **ARATOS, and the Achaian League.** See GREECE: B. C. 280-146.

**ARAUCANIANS, The.** See CHILE.

**ARASIO.**—A Roman colony was founded by Augustus at Arasio, which is represented in name and site by the modern town of Orange, in the department of Vaucluse, France, 18 miles north of Avignon.—P. Goodwin, *Hist. of France: Anc. Gaul*, bk. 2, ch. 5.

**ARASIO, Battle of (B. C. 105).** See Cimbri and TETTONES: B. C. 113-102.

**ARAVISCI AND OSI, The.**—"Whether . . . the Aravisci migrated into Pannonia from

the Osi, a German race, or whether the Osi came from the Aravisel into Germany, as both nations still retain the same language, institutions and customs, is a doubtful matter."—"The locality of the Aravisel was the extreme north-eastern part of the province of Pannonia, and would thus stretch from Vienna (Vindobona), eastwards to Raab (Arrabo), taking in a portion of the south-west of Hungary. . . . The Osi seem to have dwelt near the sources of the Oder and the Vistula. They would thus have occupied a part of Gallicia."—Tacitus, *Germany, trans. by Church and Brodrick, with geo. notes.*

**ARAWAKS, OR ARAUCAS, T<sup>he</sup>.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: CARIBS.

**ARAXES, The.**—This name seems to have been applied to a number of Asiatic streams in ancient times, but is connected most prominently with an Armenian river, now called the Aras, which flows into the Caspian.

**ARBAS, Battle of.**—One of the battles of the Romans with the Persians in which the former suffered defeat. Fought A. D. 581.—G. Rawlinson, *Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy, ch. 22.*

**ARBELA, or GAUGAMELA, Battle of (B. C. 331).** See MACEDONIA: B. C. 334-330.

**ARCADIA.**—The central district of Peloponnesus, the great southern peninsula of Greece—a district surrounded by a singular mountain circle. "From the circle of mountains which has been pointed out, all the rivers of any note take their rise, and from it all the mountainous ranges diverge, which form the many headlands and points of Peloponnesus. The interior part of the country, however, has only one opening towards the western sea, through which all its waters flow united in the Alpheus. The peculiar character of this inland tract is also increased by the circumstance of its being intersected by some lower secondary chains of hills, which compel the waters of the valleys nearest to the great chains either to form lakes, or to seek a vent by subterraneous passages. Hence it is that in the mountainous district in the northeast of Peloponnesus many streams disappear and again emerge from the earth. This region is Arcadia; a country consisting of ridges of hills and elevated plains, and of deep and narrow valleys, with streams flowing through channels formed by precipitous rocks; a country so manifestly separated by nature from the rest of Peloponnesus that, although not politically united, it was always considered in the light of a single community. Its climate was extremely cold; the atmosphere dense, particularly in the mountains to the north; the effect which this had on the character and dispositions of the inhabitants has been described in a masterly manner by Polybius, himself a native of Arcadia."—C. O. Müller, *Hist. and Antiq. of the Doric Race, bk. 1, ch. 4.*—"The later Roman poets were wont to speak of Arcadia as a smiling land, where grassy vales, watered by gentle and pellucid streams, were inhabited by a race of primitive and picturesque shepherds and shepherdesses, who divided their time between tending their flocks and making love to one another in the most tender and romantic fashion. This idyllic conception of the country and the people is not to be traced in the old Hellenic poets, who were better acquainted with the actual facts of the case. The Arcadians were sufficiently primitive, but there was very

little that was graceful or picturesque about their land or their lives."—C. H. Hanson, *The Land of Greece, pp. 381-382.*

**B. C. 371-362.**—The union of Arcadian towns.—Restoration of Mantinea.—Building of Megalopolis.—Alliance with Thebes.—Wars with Sparta and Elis.—Disunion.—Battle of Mantinea. See GREECE: B. C. 371, and 371-362.

**B. C. 338.**—Territories restored by Philip of Macedonia. See GREECE: B. C. 357-336.

**B. C. 243-146.**—In the Achaian League. See GREECE: B. C. 280-146.

**ARCADIUS, Roman Emperor (Eastern), A. D. 395-408.**

**ARCHIPELAGO, The.** Dukes of the. See NAXOS: THE MEDIEVAL DUKEDOM.

**ARCHON.** See ATHIENS: FROM THE DORIAN MIGRATION TO B. C. 683.

**ARCIS-SUR-AUBE, Battle of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (JANUARY-MARCH).

**ARCOLA, Battle of (1796).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1796-1797 (OCTOBER-APRIL).

**ARCOT: A. D. 1751.**—Capture and defence by Clive. See INDIA: A. D. 1743-1752.

**A. D. 1780.**—Siege and capture by Hyder Ali. See INDIA: A. D. 1780-1783.

**ARDEN, Forest of.**—The largest forest in early Britain, which covered the greater part of modern Warwickshire and "of which Shakespeare's Arden became the dwindled representative."—J. R. Green, *The Making of England, ch. 7.*

**ARDENNES, Forest of.**—"In Caesar's time there were in [Gaul] very extensive forests, the largest of which was the Arduenna (Ardenes), which extended from the banks of the lower Rhine probably as far as the shores of the North Sea."—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v. 3, ch. 22.*—"Ardenes is the name of one of the northern French departments which contains a part of the forest Ardenes. Another part is in Luxemburg and Belgium. The old Celtic name exists in England in the Arden of Warwickshire."—*The same, v. 4, ch. 14.*

**ARDRI, OR ADRIGH, The.** See TUATH.

**ARDSHIR, OR ARTAXERXES, Founding of the Sassanian monarchy by.** See PERSIA: B. C. 150-A. D. 230.

**ARECOMICI, The.** See VOICÆ.

**ARECUNAS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: CARIBS AND THEIR KINDRED.

**AREIOS.** See ARIA.

**ARELATE: The ancient name of Arles.**—The territory covered by the old kingdom of Arles is sometimes called the Arelate. See BRUNOUDY: A. D. 1127-1378, and SALLYES.

**ARENGO, The.** See SAN MARINO, THE REPUBLIC OF.

**AREOPAGUS, The.**—"Whoever [in ancient Athens] was suspected of having blood upon his hands had to abstain from approaching the common altars of the land. Accordingly, for the purpose of judgments concerning the guilt of blood, choice had been made of the barren, rocky height which lies opposite the ascent to the citadel. It was dedicated to Ares, who was said to have been the first who was ever judged here for the guilt of blood; and to the Erinyes, the dark powers of the guilt-stained conscience. Here, instead of a single judge, a

college of twelve men of proved integrity conducted the trial. If the accused had an equal number of votes for and against him, he was acquitted. The court on the hill of Ares is one of the most ancient institutions of Athens, and none achieved for the city an earlier or more widely-spread recognition."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 2, ch. 2.—"The Areopagus, or, as it was interpreted by an ancient legend, Mars' Hill, was an eminence on the western side of the Acropolis, which from time immemorial had been the seat of a highly revered court of criminal justice. It took cognizance of charges of wilful murder, maiming, poisoning and arson. Its forms and modes of proceeding were peculiarly rigid and solemn. It was held in the open air, perhaps that the judges might not be polluted by sitting under the same roof with the criminals. . . . The venerable character of the court seems to have determined Solon to apply it to another purpose; and, without making any change in its original jurisdiction, to erect it into a supreme council, invested with a superintending and controlling authority, which extended over every part of the social system. He constituted it the guardian of the public morals and religion, to keep watch over the education and conduct of the citizens, and to protect the State from the disgrace or pollution of wantonness and profaneness. He armed it with extraordinary powers of interfering in pressing emergencies, to avert any sudden and imminent danger which threatened the public safety. The nature of its functions rendered it scarcely possible precisely to define their limits; and Solon probably thought it best to let them remain in that obscurity which dignifies whatever is indistinct. . . . It was filled with archons who had discharged their office with approved fidelity, and they held their seats for life."—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, v. 1, ch. 11.—These enlarged functions of the Areopagus were withdrawn from it in the time of Pericles, through the agency of Ephialtes, but were restored, about B. C. 400, after the overthrow of the Thirty.—"Some of the writers of antiquity ascribed the first establishment of the senate of Areopagus to Solon. . . . But there can be little doubt that this is a mistake, and that the senate of Areopagus is a primordial institution of immemorial antiquity, though its constitution as well as its functions underwent many changes. It stood at first alone as a permanent and collegiate authority, originally by the side of the kings and afterwards by the side of the archons: it would then of course be known by the title of The Boule,—the senate, or council; its distinctive title 'senate of Areopagus,' borrowed from the place where its sittings were held, would not be bestowed until the formation by 'Solon of the second senate, or council, from which there was need to discriminate it.'"—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 10 (v. 3).—See, also, ATHENS: B. C. 477-462, and 460-454.

**ARETHUSA, Fountain of.** See SYRACUSE.  
**AREVACÆ, The.**—One of the tribes of the Iberians in ancient Spain. Their chief town, Cantania, was the stronghold of Celtiberian resistance to the Roman conquest. See NUMANTIAN WAR.

**ARGAËIS, The.** See PHYLÆ.

**ARGAUM, Battle of (1803).** See INDIA: A. D. 1798-1805.

**ARGENTARIA, Battle of (A. D. 378).** See ALEMANNI: A. D. 378.

**ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: Aboriginal inhabitants.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES; TUPÍ.—GUARANI.

**A. D. 1515-1557.—Discovery, exploration and early settlement on La Plata.—First founding of Buenos Ayres.** See PARAGUAY: A. D. 1515-1557.

**A. D. 1580-1777.—The final founding of the City of Buenos Ayres.—Conflicts of Spain and Portugal on the Plata.—Creation of the Viceroyalty of Buenos Ayres.**—"In the year 1580 the foundations of a bustling city were laid at Buenos Ayres by De Garay on the same situation as had twice previously been chosen—namely, by Mendoza, and by Cabeza de Vaca, respectively. The same leader had before this founded the settlement of Sante Fé on the Paraná. The site selected for the future capital of the Pampas is probably one of the worst ever chosen for a city . . . has probably the worst harbour in the world for a large commercial town. . . . Notwithstanding the inconvenience of its harbour, Buenos Ayres soon became the chief commercial entrepôt of the Valley of the Plata. The settlement was not effected without some severe fighting between De Garay's force and the Querandies. The latter, however, were effectually quelled. . . . The Spaniards were now nominally masters of the Río de La Plata, but they had still to apprehend hostilities on the part of the natives between their few and fur-distant settlements [concerning which see PARAGUAY: A. D. 1515-1557]. Of this liability De Garay himself was to form a lamentable example. On his passage back to Asuncion, having incautiously landed to sleep near the ruins of the old fort of San Espiritu, he was surprised by a party of natives and murdered, with all his companions. The death of this brave Biscayan was mourned as a great loss by the entire colony. The importance of the cities founded by him was soon apparent; and in 1620 all the settlements south of the confluence of the rivers Parana and Paraguay were formed into a separate, independent government, under the name of Río de La Plata, of which Buenos Ayres was declared the capital. This city likewise became the seat of a bishopric. . . . The merchants of Seville, who had obtained a monopoly of the supply of Mexico and Peru, regarded with much jealousy the prospect of a new opening for the South American trade by way of La Plata," and procured restrictions upon it which were relaxed in 1618 so far as to permit the sending of two vessels of 100 tons each every year to Spain, but subject to a duty of 50 per cent. "Under this miserable commercial legislation Buenos Ayres continued to languish for the first century of its existence. In 1715, after the treaty of Utrecht, the English . . . obtained the 'asiento' or contract for supplying Spanish colonies in America with African slaves, in virtue of which they had permission to form an establishment at Buenos Ayres, and to send thither annually four ships with 1,200 negroes, the value of which they might export in produce of the country. They were strictly forbidden to introduce other goods than those necessary for their own establishments; but under the temptation of gain on the one side and of demand on the other, the asiento ships naturally became the means of transacting a consider-

able contraband trade. . . . The English were not the only smugglers in the river Plate. By the treaty of Utrecht, the Portuguese had obtained the important settlement of Colonia [the first settlement of the Banda Oriental—or 'Eastern Border'—afterwards called Uruguay] directly facing Buenos Ayres. . . . The Portuguese, . . . not contented with the possession of Colonia . . . commenced a more important settlement near Monte Video. From this place they were dislodged by Zavala (Governor of Buenos Ayres), who, by order of his government, proceeded to establish settlements at that place and at Maldonado. Under the above-detailed circumstances of contention . . . was founded the healthy and agreeable city of Monte Video. . . . The inevitable consequence of this state of things was fresh antagonism between the two countries, which it was sought to put an end to by a treaty between the two nations concluded in 1750. One of the articles stipulated that Portugal should cede to Spain all of her establishments on the eastern bank of the Plata; in return for which she was to receive the seven missionary towns [known as the 'Seven Reductions'] on the Uruguay. But . . . the inhabitants of the Missions naturally rebelled against the idea of being handed over to a people known to them only by their slave-dealing atrocities. . . . The result was that when 2,000 natives had been slaughtered [in the war known as the War of the Seven Reductions] and their settlements reduced to ruins, the Portuguese repudiated the compact, as they could no longer receive their equivalent, and they still therefore retained Colonia. When hostilities were renewed in 1762, the governor of Buenos Ayres succeeded in possessing himself of Colonia; but in the following year it was restored to the Portuguese, who continued in possession until 1777, when it was definitely ceded to Spain. The continual encroachments of the Portuguese in the Rio de La Plata, and the impunity with which the contraband trade was carried on, together with the questions to which it constantly gave rise with foreign governments, had long shown the necessity for a change in the government of that colony; for it was still under the superintendance of the Viceroy of Peru, residing at Lima, 3,000 miles distant. The Spanish authorities accordingly resolved to give fresh force to their representatives in the Rio de La Plata; and in 1776 they took the important resolution to sever the connection between the provinces of La Plata and the Viceroyalty of Peru. The former were now erected into a new Viceroyalty, the capital of which was Buenos Ayres. . . . To this Viceroyalty was appointed Don Pedro Cevallos, a former governor of Buenos Ayres. . . . The first act of Cevallos was to take possession of the island of St. Katherine, the most important Portuguese possession on the coast of Brazil. Proceeding thence to the Plate, he razed the fortifications of Colonia to the ground, and drove the Portuguese from the neighbourhood. In October of the following year, 1777, a treaty of peace was signed at St. Ildefonso, between Queen Maria of Portugal and Charles III. of Spain, by virtue of which St. Katherine's was restored to the latter country, whilst Portugal withdrew from the Banda Oriental or Uruguay, and relinquished all pretensions to the right of navigating the Rio de La Plata and its affluents beyond its own frontier line. . . . The Viceroyalty of Buenos Ayres was sub-divided

into the provinces of—(1.) Buenos Ayres, the capital of which was the city of that name, and which comprised the Spanish possessions that now form the Republic of Uruguay, as well as the Argentine provinces of Buenos Ayres, Santa Fé, Entre Rios, and Corrientes; (2.) Paraguay, the capital of which was Asuncion, and which comprised what is now the Republic of Paraguay; (3.) Tucuman, the capital of which was St. Iago del Estero, and which included what are to-day the Argentine provinces of Cordova, Tucuman, St. Iago, Sulta, Catamarca, Rioja, and Jujuy; (4.) Las Charcas or Potosi, the capital of which was La Plata, and which now forms the Republic of Bolivia; and (5.) Chiquito or Cuyo, the capital of which was Mendoza, and in which were comprehended the present Argentine provinces of St. Luiz, Mendoza, and St. Juan."—R. G. Watson, *Spanish and Portuguese South America*, v. 2, ch. 13-14.

ALSO IN: E. J. Payne, *History of European Colonies*, ch. 17.—S. H. Wilcocke, *Hist. of the Viceroyalty of Buenos Ayres*.

**A. D. 1806-1820.—The English invasion.—The Revolution.—Independence achieved.—Confederation of the Provinces of the Plate River and its dissolution.**—"The trade of the Plate River had enormously increased since the substitution of register ships for the annual flotilla, and the erection of Buenos Ayres into a viceroyalty in 1778; but it was not until the war of 1797 that the English became aware of its real extent. The British cruisers had enough to do to maintain the blockade; and when the English learned that millions of hides were rotting in the warehouses of Monte Video and Buenos Ayres, they concluded that the people would soon see that their interests would be best served by submission to the great naval power. The peace put an end to these ideas; but Pitt's favourite project for destroying Spanish influence in South America by the English arms was revived and put in execution soon after the opening of the second European war in 1803. In 1806 . . . he sent a squadron to the Plate River, which offered the best point of attack to the British fleet, and the road to the most promising of the Spanish colonies. The English, under General Beresford, though few in number, soon took Buenos Ayres, for the Spaniards, terrified at the sight of British troops, surrendered without knowing how insignificant the invading force really was. When they found this out, they mustered courage to attack Beresford in the citadel; and the English commander was obliged to evacuate the place. The English soon afterwards took possession of Monte Video, on the other side of the river. Here they were joined by another squadron, who were under orders, after reducing Buenos Ayres, to sail round the Horn, to take Valparaiso, and establish posts across the continent connecting that city with Buenos Ayres, thus executing the long-cherished plan of Lord Anson. Buenos Ayres was therefore invested a second time. But the English land forces were too few for their task. The Spaniards spread all round the city strong breastworks of oxhides, and collected all their forces for its defence. Buenos Ayres was stormed by the English at two points on the 5th of July, 1807; but they were unable to hold their ground against the unceasing fire of the Spaniards, who were greatly superior in numbers, and the next day

they capitulated, and agreed to evacuate the province within two months. The English had imagined that the colonists would readily flock to their standard, and throw off the yoke of Spain. This was a great mistake; and it needed the events of 1808 to lead the Spanish colonists to their independence. . . . In 1810, when it came to be known that the French armies had crossed the Sierra Morena, and that Spain was a conquered country, the colonists would no longer submit to the shadowy authority of the colonial officers, and elected a junta of their own to carry on the Government. Most of the troops in the colony went over to the cause of independence, and easily overcame the feeble resistance that was made by those who remained faithful to the regency in the engagement of Las Piedras. The leaders of the revolution were the advocate Castell and General Belgrano; and under their guidance scarcely any obstacle stopped its progress. They even sent their armies at once into Upper Peru and the Banda Oriental, and their privateers carried the Independent flag to the coasts of the Pacific; but these successes were accompanied by a total anarchy in the Argentine capital and provinces. The most intelligent and capable men had gone off to fight for liberty elsewhere; and even if they had remained it would have been no easy task to establish a new government over the scattered and half-civilized population of this vast country. . . . The first result of independence was the formation of a not very intelligent party of country proprietors, who knew nothing of the mysteries of politics, and were not ill-content with the existing order of things. The business of the old viceregal government was delegated to a supreme Director; but this functionary was little more than titular. How limited the aspirations of the Argentines at first were may be gathered from the instructions with which Belgrano and Rivadavia were sent to Europe in 1814. They were to go to England, and ask for an English protectorate; if possible under an English prince. They were next to try the same plan in France, Austria, and Russia, and lastly in Spain itself; and if Spain still refused, were to offer to renew the subjection of the colony, on condition of certain specified concessions being made. This was indeed a strange contrast to the lofty aspirations of the Colombians. On arriving at Rio, the Argentine delegates were assured by the English minister, Lord Strangford, that, as things were, no European power would do anything for them; nor did they succeed better in Spain itself. Meanwhile the government of the Buenos Ayres junta was powerless outside the town, and the country was fast lapsing into the utmost disorder and confusion. At length, when Government could hardly be said to exist at all, a general congress of the provinces of the Plate River assembled at Tucuman in 1810. It was resolved that all the states should unite in a confederation to be called the United Provinces of the Plate River; and a constitution was elaborated, in imitation of the famous one of the United States, providing for two legislative chambers and a president. . . . The influence of the capital, of which all the other provinces were keenly jealous, predominated in the congress; and Pueyrredon, an active Buenos Ayres politician, was made supreme Director of the

Confederation. The people of Buenos Ayres thought their city destined to exercise over the rural provinces a similar influence to that which Athens, under similar circumstances, had exercised in Greece; and able Buenos Ayreans like Pueyrredon, San Martin, and Rivadavia, now became the leaders of the unitary party. The powerful provincials, represented by such men as Lopez and Quiroga, soon found out that the Federal scheme meant the supremacy of Buenos Ayres, and a political change which would deprive them of most of their influence. The Federal system, therefore, could not be expected to last very long; and it did in fact collapse after four years. Artigas led the revolt in the Banda Oriental [now Uruguay], and the Riverine Provinces soon followed the example. For a long time the provinces were practically under the authority of their local chiefs, the only semblance of political life being confined to Buenos Ayres itself."—E. J. Payne, *Hist. of European Colonies*, ch. 17. ALSO IN: M. G. Mulhall, *The English in S. America*, ch. 10-13, and 16-18.—J. Miller, *Memoirs of General Miller*, ch. 3 (p. 1).—T. J. Page, *La Plata, the Argentine Confederation and Paraguay*, ch. 31.

**A. D. 1819-1874.—Anarchy, civil war, despotism.—The long struggle for order and Confederation.**—"A new Congress met in 1819 and made a Constitution for the country, which was never adopted by all the Provinces. Pueyrredon resigned, and on June 10th, 1819, José Rondeau was elected, who, however, was in no condition to pacify the civil war which had broken out during the government of his predecessors. At the commencement of 1830, the last 'Director General' was overthrown; the municipality of the city of Buenos-Aires seized the government; the Confederation was declared dissolved, and each of its Provinces received liberty to organize itself as it pleased. This was anarchy officially proclaimed. After the fall in the same year of some military chiefs who had seized the power, Gen. Martin Rodriguez was named Governor of Buenos-Aires, and he succeeded in establishing some little order in this chaos. He chose M. J. Garcia and Bernardo Rivadavia—one of the most enlightened Argentines of his times—as his Ministers. This administration did a great deal of good by exchanging conventions of friendship and commerce, and entering into diplomatic relations with foreign nations. At the end of his term General Las Heras—9th May, 1834—took charge of the government, and called a Constituent Assembly of all the Provinces, which met at Buenos-Aires, December 16th, and elected Bernardo Rivadavia President of the newly Confederated Republic on the 7th February, 1825. This excellent Argentine, however, found no assistance in the Congress. No understanding could be come to on the form or the test of the Constitution, nor yet upon the place of residence for the national Government. Whilst Rivadavia desired a centralized Constitution—called here 'unitarian'—and that the city of Buenos-Aires should be declared capital of the Republic, the majority of Congress held a different opinion, and this divergence caused the resignation of the President on the 5th July, 1827. After this event, the attempt to establish a Confederation which would include all the Provinces was considered as defeated, and each Province went on its own way, whilst Buenos-

Aires elected Manuel Dorrego, the chief of the federal party, for its Governor. He was inaugurated on the 15th August, 1827, and at once undertook to organize a new Confederation of the Provinces, opening relations to this end with the Government of Cordoba, the most important Province of the interior. He succeeded in reestablishing repose in the interior, and was instrumental in preserving a general peace, even beyond the limits of his young country. The Emperor of Brazil did not wish to acknowledge the rights of the United Provinces over the Cisplatine province, or Banda Oriental [now Uruguay]. He wished to annex it to his empire, and declared war to the Argentine Republic on the 10th of December, 1826. An army was soon organized by the latter, under the command of General Alvear, which on the 20th of February, 1827, gained a complete victory over the Brazilian forces—twice their number—at the plains of Ituzaingó, in the Brazilian province of Rio Grande do Sul. The navy of the Argentines also triumphed on several occasions, so that when England offered her intervention, Brazil renounced all claim to the territory of Uruguay by the convention of the 27th August, 1828, and the two parties agreed to recognize and to maintain the neutrality and independence of that country. Dorrego, however, had but few sympathies in the army, and a short time after his return from Brazil, the soldiers under Lavalle rebelled and forced him to fly to the country on the 1st December of the same year. There he found aid from the Commander General of the country districts, Juan Manuel Rosas, and formed a small battalion with the intention of marching on the city of Buenos-Aires. But Lavalle triumphed, took him prisoner, and shot him without trial on the 13th December. . . . Not only did the whole interior of the province of Buenos-Aires rise against Lavalle, under the direction of Rosas, but also a large part of other Provinces considered this event as a declaration of war, and the National Congress, then assembled at Santa-Fé, declared Lavalle's government illegal. The two parties fought with real fury, but in 1829, after an interview between Rosas and Lavalle, a temporary reconciliation was effected. . . . The legislature of Buenos-Aires, which had been convoked on account of the reconciliation between Lavalle and Rosas, elected the latter as Governor of the Province, on December 6th, 1829, and accorded to him extraordinary powers. . . . During this the first period of his government he did not appear in his true nature, and at its conclusion he refused a re-election and retired to the country. General Juan R. Balcarce was then—17th December, 1832—named Governor, but could only maintain himself some eleven months: Viamont succeeded him, also for a short time only. Now the moment had come for Rosas. He accepted the almost unlimited Dictatorship which was offered to him on the 7th March, 1835, and reigned in a horrible manner, like a madman, until his fall. Several times the attempt was made to deliver Buenos-Aires from his terrible yoke, and above all the devoted and valiant efforts of General Lavalle deserve to be mentioned; but all was in vain; Rosas remained unshaken. Finally, General Justo José De Urquiza, Governor of the province of Entre-Rios, in alliance with the province of Corrientes

and the Empire of Brazil, rose against the Dictator. He first delivered the Republic of Uruguay, and the city of Monte-Video—the asylum of the adversaries of Rosas—from the army which besieged it, and thereafter passing the great river Paraná, with a relatively large army, he completely defeated Rosas at Monte-Caseros, near Buenos-Aires, on the 3rd February, 1852. During the same day, Rosas sought and received the protection of an English war-vessel which was in the road of Buenos-Aires, in which he went to England, where he still [1876] resides. Meantime Urquiza took charge of the Government of the United Provinces, under the title of 'Provisional Director,' and called a general meeting of the Governors at San Nicolás, a frontier village on the north of the province of Buenos-Aires. This assemblage confirmed him in his temporary power, and called a National Congress which met at Santa-Fé and made a National Constitution under date of 25th May, 1853. By virtue of this Constitution the Congress met again the following year at Paraná, a city of Entre-Rios, which had been made the capital, and on the 5th May, elected General Urquiza the first President of the Argentine Confederation. . . . The important province of Buenos-Aires, however, had taken no part in the deliberations of the Congress. Previously, on the 11th September 1852, a revolution against Urquiza, or rather against the Provincial Government in alliance with him, had taken place and caused a temporary separation of the Province from the Republic. Several efforts to pacify the disputes utterly failed, and a battle took place at Cepeda in Santa-Fé, wherein Urquiza, who commanded the provincial troops, was victorious, although his success led to no definite result. A short time after, the two armies met again at Pavón—near the site of the former battle—and Buenos-Aires won the day. This secured the unity of the Republic of which the victorious General Bartolomé Mitre was elected President for six years from October, 1862. At the same time the National Government was transferred from Paraná to Buenos-Aires, and the latter was declared the temporary capital of the Nation. The Republic owes much to the Government of Mitre, and it is probable that he would have done more good, if war had not broken out with Paraguay, in 1865 [see PARAGUAY]. The Argentines took part in it as one of the three allied States against the Dictator of Paraguay, Francisco Solano Lopez. On the 12th October, 1868, Domingo Faustino Sarmiento succeeded Gen. Mitre in the Presidency. . . . The 12th October, 1874, Dr. Nicolas Avellaneda succeeded him in the Government."—R. Napp, *The Argentine Republic*, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: D. F. Sarmiento, *Life in the Argentine Republic in the Days of the Tyrants*.—J. A. King, *Twenty-four years in the Argentine Republic*.

A. D. 1880-1891.—The Constitution and its working.—Governmental corruption.—The Revolution of 1890, and the financial collapse.—“The Argentine constitutional system in its outward form corresponds closely to that of the United States. . . . But the inward grace of enlightened public opinion is lacking, and political practice falls below the level of a self-governing democracy. Congress enacts laws, but the President as commander-in-chief of the

army, and as the head of a civil service dependent upon his will and caprice, possesses absolute authority in administration. The country is governed by executive decrees rather than by constitutional laws. Elections are carried by military pressure and manipulation of the civil service. . . . President Roca [who succeeded Avellaneda in 1880] virtually nominated, and elected his brother-in-law, Juárez Cónan, as his successor. President Juárez set his heart upon controlling the succession in the interest of one of his relatives, a prominent official; but was forced to retire before he could carry out his purpose. . . . Nothing in the Argentine surprised me more than the boldness and freedom with which the press attacked the government of the day and exposed its corruption. . . . The government paid no heed to these attacks. Ministers did not trouble themselves to repel charges affecting their integrity. . . . This wholesome criticism from an independent press had one important effect. It gave direction to public opinion in the capital, and involved the organization of the Unión Cívica. If the country had not been on the verge of a financial revulsion, there might not have been the revolt against the Juárez administration in July, 1890; but with ruin and disaster confronting them, men turned against the President whose incompetence and venality would have been condoned if the times had been good. The Unión Cívica was founded when the government was charged with maladministration in sanctioning an illegal issue of \$40,000,000 of paper money. . . . The government was suddenly confronted with an armed coalition of the best battalions of the army, the entire navy, and the Unión Cívica. The manifesto issued by the Revolutionary Junta was a terrible arraignment of the political crimes of the Juárez Government. . . . The revolution opened with every prospect of success. It failed from the incapacity of the leaders to co-operate harmoniously. On July 19, 1890, the defection of the army was discovered. On July 26 the revolt broke out. For four days there was bloodshed without definite plan or purpose. No determined attack was made upon the government palace. The fleet opened a fantastic bombardment upon the suburbs. There was inexplicable mismanagement of the insurgent forces, and on July 29 an ignominious surrender to the government with a proclamation of general amnesty. General Roca remained behind the scenes, apparently master of the situation, while President Juárez had fled to a place of refuge on the Rosario railway, and two factions of the army were playing at cross purposes, and the police and the volunteers of the Unión Cívica were shooting women and children in the streets. Another week of hopeless confusion passed, and General Roca announced the resignation of President Juárez and the succession of vice-President Pellegrini. Then the city was illuminated, and for three days there was a pantomimium of popular rejoicing over a victory which nobody except General Roca understood. . . . In June, 1891, the deplorable state of Argentine finance was revealed in a luminous statement made by President Pellegrini. . . . All business interests were stagnant. Immigration had been diverted to Brazil. . . . All industries were prostrated except politics, and the pernicious activity displayed by factions was an evil augury

for the return of prosperity. . . . During thirty years the country has trebled its population, its increase being relatively much more rapid than that of the United States during the same period. The estimate of the present population [1892] is 4,000,000 in place of 1,160,000 in 1857. . . . Disastrous as the results of political government and financial disorder have been in the Argentine, its ultimate recovery by slow stages is probable. It has a magnificent railway system, an industrious working population recruited from Europe, and nearly all the material appliances for progress."—I. N. Ford, *Tropical America*, ch. 6.—See CONSTITUTION, ARGENTINE.

**A. D. 1892.—Presidential Election.**—Dr. Luis Saenz-Pena, former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and reputed to be a man of great integrity and ability, was chosen President, and inaugurated October 12, 1892.

**ARGINUSAE, Battle of.** See GREECE: B. C. 406.

**ARGONAUTIC EXPEDITION, The.**—"The ship *Argo* was the theme of many songs during the oldest periods of the Grecian Epic, even earlier than the *Odyssey*. The king *Ætês*, from whom she is departing, the hero *Jasôn*, who commands her, and the goddess *Hêrê*, who watches over him, enabling the *Argo* to traverse distances and to escape dangers which no ship had ever before encountered, are all circumstances briefly glanced at by *Odysseus* in his narrative to *Aïkinous*. . . . *Jasôn*, commanded by *Pelias* to depart in quest of the golden fleece belonging to the speaking ram which had carried away *Phryxus* and *Hellê*, was encouraged by the oracle to invite the noblest youth of Greece to his aid, and fifty of the most distinguished amongst them obeyed the call. *Hêraklês*, *Thêseus*, *Telamôn* and *Pêleus*, *Kastor* and *Pollux*, *Idas* and *Lynekus*—*Zêtês* and *Kalaïs*, the winged sons of *Boreas*—*Meleager*, *Amphiaraus*, *Kêphêus*, *Laertês*, *Autolykus*, *Menêtês*, *Aktor*, *Erginus*, *Euphêmus*, *Ankêus*, *Pœas*, *Periklymenus*, *Augeas*, *Eurytus*, *Admêtus*, *Akastus*, *Kaênens*, *Euryalus*, *Pênêlêôs* and *Lêitus*, *Askalaphus* and *Ialmenus*, were among them. . . . Since so many able men have treated it as an undisputed reality, and even made it the pivot of systematic chronological calculations, I may here repeat the opinion long ago expressed by *Heyne*, and even indicated by *Burmann*, that the process of dissecting the story, in search of a basis of fact, is one altogether fruitless."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, v. 1, pt. 1, ch. 13.—"In the rich cluster of myths which surround the captain of the *Argo* and his fellows are preserved to us the whole life and doings of the Greek maritime tribes, which gradually united all the coasts with one another, and attracted Hellenes dwelling in the most different seats into the sphere of their activity. . . . The *Argo* was said to have weighed anchor from a variety of ports—from *Iolcus* in *Thessaly*, from *Anthedon* and *Siphê* in *Boeotia*: the home of *Jason* himself was on *Mount Pelion* by the sea, and again on *Lemnos* and in *Corinth*: a clear proof of how homogeneous were the influences running on various coasts. However, the myths of the *Argo* were developed in the greatest completeness on the *Pagasean gulf*, in the seats of the *Minyi*; and they are the first with whom a perceptible movement of the *Pelasgian* tribes beyond the sea—in



other words, a Greek history in Europe — begins." — E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 1, ch. 2-3.

**ARGOS.—ARGOLIS.—ARGIVES.**—"No district of Greece contains so dense a succession of powerful citadels in a narrow space as Argolis [the eastern peninsular projection of the Peloponnesus]. Lofty Larissa, apparently designed by nature as the centre of the district, is succeeded by Mycenæ, deep in the recess of the land; at the foot of the mountain lies Midea, at the brink of the sea-coast Tiryns; and lastly, at a farther distance of half an hour's march, Nauplia, with its harbour. This succession of ancient fastnesses, whose indestructible structure of stone we admire to this day [see Schliemann's '*Mycenæ*' and '*Tiryns*'] is clear evidence of mighty conflicts which agitated the earliest days of Argos; and proves that in this one plain of Inachus several principalities must have arisen by the side of one another, each putting its confidence in the walls of its citadel; some, according to their position, maintaining an intercourse with other lands by sea, others rather a connection with the inland country. The evidence preserved by these monuments is borne out by that of the myths, according to which the dominion of Danaus is divided among his successors. Exiled Prætus is brought home to Argos by Lycian bands, with whose help he builds the coast-fortress of Tiryns, where he holds sway as the first and mightiest in the land. . . . The other line of the Danaïde is also intimately connected with Lycia; for Perseus. . . [who] on his return from the East founds Mycenæ, as the new regal seat of the united kingdom of Argos, is himself essentially a Lycian hero of high, belonging to the religion of Apollo. . . . Finally, Heracles himself is connected with the family of the Persæide, as a prince born on the Trynthis fastness. . . . During these divisions in the house of Danaus, and the misfortunes befalling that of Prætus, foreign families acquire influence and dominion in Argos: these are of the race of Æolus, and originally belong to the harbour-country of the western coast of Peloponnesus—the Amythaonidæ. . . . While the dominion of the Argive land was thus subdivided, and the native warrior nobility subsequently exhausted itself in savage internal feuds, a new royal house succeeded in grasping the supreme power and giving an entirely new importance to the country. This house was that of the Tantalidæ [or PELOPIDS, which see], united with the forces of Achaean population. . . . The residue of fact is, that the ancient dynasty, connected by descent with Lycia, was overthrown by the house which derived its origin from Lydia. . . . The poetic myths, abhorring long rows of names, mention three princes as ruling here in succession, one leaving the sceptre of Pelops to the other, viz., Atreus, Thyestes and Agamemnon. Mycenæ is the chief seat of their rule, which is not restricted to the district of Argos." — E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 1, ch. 3.—After the Doric invasion of the Peloponnesus (see GREECE: THE MIGRATIONS; also, DORIANS AND IONIANS), Argos appears in Greek history as a Doric state, originally the foremost one in power and influence, but humiliated after long years of rivalry by her Spartan neighbours. "Argos never forgot that she had once been the chief power in the peninsula, and her feeling towards Sparta was that of a jealous

but impotent competitor. By what steps the decline of her power had taken place, we are unable to make out, nor can we trace the succession of her kings subsequent to Pheldon [8th century B. C.]. . . . The title [of king] existed (though probably with very limited functions) at the time of the Persian War [B. C. 490-479]. . . . There is some ground for presuming that the king of Argos was even at that time a Herakleid—since the Spartans offered to him a third part of the command of the Hellenic force, conjointly with their own two kings. The conquest of Thyreates by the Spartans [about 547 B. C.] deprived the Argæans of a valuable portion of their Perloëkis, or dependent territory. But Orneæ and the remaining portion of Kynuria still continued to belong to them; the plain round their city was very productive; and, except Sparta, there was no other power in Peloponnesus superior to them. Mykenæ and Tiryns, nevertheless, seem both to have been independent states at the time of the Persian War, since both sent contingents to the battle of Platea, at a time when Argos held aloof and rather favoured the Persians." — G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 8 (c. 2).

**B. C. 496-421.—Calamitous War with Sparta.—Non-action in the Persian War.—Slow recovery of the crippled State.**—"One of the heaviest blows which Argos ever sustained at the hand of her traditional foe befell her about 496 B. C., six years before the first Persian invasion of Greece. A war with Sparta having broken out, Cleomenes, the Lacedæmonian king, succeeded in landing a large army, in vessels he had extorted from the Æginetans, at Nauplia, and ravaged the Argive territory. The Argæans mustered all their forces to resist him, and the two armies encamped opposite each other near Tiryns. Cleomenes, however, contrived to attack the Argæans at a moment when they were unprepared, making use, if Herodotus is to be credited, of a stratagem which proves the extreme incapacity of the opposing generals, and completely routed them. The Argæans took refuge in a sacred grove, to which the remorseless Spartans set fire, and so destroyed almost the whole of them. No fewer than 6,000 of the citizens of Argos perished on this disastrous day. Cleomenes might have captured the city itself; but he was, or affected to be, hindered by unfavourable omens, and drew off his troops. The loss sustained by Argos was so severe as to reduce her for some years to a condition of great weakness; but this was at the time a fortunate circumstance for the Hellenic cause, inasmuch as it enabled the Lacedæmonians to devote their whole energies to the work of resistance to the Persian invasion without fear of enemies at home. In this great work Argos took no part, on the occasion of either the first or second attempt of the Persian kings to bring Hellas under their dominion. Indeed, the city was strongly suspected of 'medising' tendencies. In the period following the final overthrow of the Persians, while Athens was pursuing the splendid career of aggrandisement and conquest that made her the foremost state in Greece, and while the Lacedæmonians were paralyzed by the revolt of the Messenians, Argos regained strength and influence, which she at once employed and increased by the harsh policy . . . of depopulating Mycenæ and Tiryns, while she compelled

several other semi-independent places in the Argolid to acknowledge her supremacy. During the first eleven years of the Peloponnesian war, down to the peace of Nicias (421 B. C.), Argos held aloof from all participation in the struggle, adding to her wealth and perfecting her military organization. As to her domestic conditions and political system, little is known; but it is certain that the government, unlike that of other Dorian states, was democratic in its character, though there was in the city a strong oligarchic and philo-Laconian party, which was destined to exercise a decisive influence at an important crisis."

—C. H. Hanson, *The Land of Greece*, ch. 10.

ALSO IN: G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 36 (c. 4).

**B. C. 421-418.**—League formed against Sparta.—Outbreak of War.—Defeat at Mantinea.—Revolution in the Oligarchic and Spartan interest. See GREECE: B. C. 421-418.

**B. C. 395-387.**—Confederacy against Sparta.—The Corinthian War.—Peace of Antalcidas. See GREECE: B. C. 399-387.

**B. C. 371.**—Mob outbreak and massacre of chief citizens. See GREECE: B. C. 371-362.

**B. C. 338.**—Territories restored by Philip of Macedonia. See GREECE: B. C. 357-336.

**B. C. 271.**—Repulse and death of Pyrrhus, king of Epirus. See MACEDONIA: B. C. 277-244.

**B. C. 229.**—Liberated from Macedonian control. See GREECE: B. C. 280-146.

**A. D. 267.**—Ravaged by the Goths. See GOTHS: A. D. 258-267.

**A. D. 395.**—Plundered by the Goths. See GOTHS: A. D. 395.

**A. D. 1463.**—Taken by the Turks, retaken by the Venetians. See GREECE: A. D. 1454-1479.

**A. D. 1686.**—Taken by the Venetians. See TURKS: A. D. 1684-1696.

**ARGYRASPIDES, The.**—"He [Alexander the Great] then marched into India, that he might have his empire bounded by the ocean, and the extreme parts of the East. That the equipments of his army might be suitable to the glory of the Expedition, he mounted the trappings of the horses and the arms of the soldiers with silver, and called a body of his men, from having silver shields, Argyraspides."—Justin, *History* (trans. by J. S. Watson), bk. 12, ch. 7.

ALSO IN: C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 58.

—See, also, MACEDONIA: B. C. 323-316.

**ARGYRE.** See CHRYSÆ.

**ARIA.—AREIOS.—AREIANS.**—The name by which the Herind and its valley, the district of modern Herat, was known to the ancient Greeks. Its inhabitants were known as the Arelans.—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiq.*, bk. 7, ch. 1.

**ARIANA.**—"Strabo uses the name Ariana for the land of all the nations of Iran, except that of the Medes and Persians, i. e., for the whole eastern half of Iran"—Afghanistan and Beloochistan.—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, v. 5, bk. 7, ch. 1.

**ARIANISM.—ARIANS.**—From the second century of its existence, the Christian church was divided by bitter controversies touching the mystery of the Trinity. "The word Trinity is found neither in the Holy Scriptures nor in the writings of the first Christians; but it had been employed from the beginning of the second cen-

tury, when a more metaphysical turn had been given to the minds of men, and theologians had begun to attempt to plain the divine nature. . . . The Founder of the new religion, the Being who had brought upon earth a divine light, was he God, was he man, was he of an intermediate nature, and, though superior to all other created beings, yet himself created? This latter opinion was held by Arius, an Alexandrian priest, who maintained it in a series of learned controversial works between the years 318 and 325. As soon as the discussion had quitted the walls of the schools, and been taken up by the people, mutual accusations of the gravest kind took the place of metaphysical subtleties. The orthodox party reproached the Arians with blaspheming the deity himself, by refusing to acknowledge him in the person of Christ. The Arians accused the orthodox of violating the fundamental law of religion, by rendering to the creature the worship due only to the Creator. . . . It was difficult to decide which numbered the largest body of followers; but the ardent enthusiastic spirits, the populace in all the great cities (and especially at Alexandria) the women, and the newly-founded order of the monks of the desert . . . were almost without exception partisans of the faith which has since been declared orthodox. . . . Constantine thought this question of dogma might be decided by an assembly of the whole church. In the year 325, he convoked the council of Nice [see NICEÆA, COUNCIL OF], at which 300 bishops pronounced in favour of the equality of the Son with the Father, or the doctrine generally regarded as orthodox, and condemned the Arians to exile and their books to the flames."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 4.—"The victorious faction [at the Council of Nice] . . . anxiously sought for some irreconcilable mark of distinction, the rejection of which might involve the Arians in the guilt and consequences of heresy. A letter was publicly read and ignominiously torn, in which their patron, Eusebius of Nicomedia, ingeniously confessed that the admission of the homoousion, or consubstantial, a word already familiar to the Platonists, was incompatible with the principles of their theological system. The fortunate opportunity was eagerly embraced. . . . The consubstantiality of the Father and the Son was established by the Council of Nice, and has been unanimously received as a fundamental article of the Christian faith by the consent of the Greek, the Latin, the Oriental and the Protestant churches." Notwithstanding the decision of the Council of Nice against it, the heresy of Arius continued to gain ground in the East. Even the Emperor Constantine became friendly to it, and the sons of Constantine, with some of the later emperors who followed them on the eastern throne, were ardent Arians in belief. The Homoousians, or orthodox, were subjected to persecution, which was directed with special bitterness against their great leader, Athanasius, the famous bishop of Alexandria. But Arianism was weakened by hair-splitting distinctions, which resulted in many diverging creeds. "The sect which asserted the doctrine of a 'similar substance' was the most numerous, at least in the provinces of Asia. . . . The Greek word which was chosen to express this mysterious resemblance bears so close an affinity to the orthodox symbol, that the

profane of every age have derided the furious contests which the difference of a single diphthong excited between the Homousians and the Homolousians." The Latin churches of the West, with Rome at their head, remained generally firm in the orthodoxy of the Homousian creed. But the Goths, who had received their Christianity from the East, tinctured with Arianism, carried that heresy westward, and spread it among their barbarian neighbors—Vandals, Burgundians and Sueves—through the influence of the Gothic Bible of Ulfilas, which he and his missionary successors bore to the Teutonic peoples. "The Vandals and Ostrogoths persevered in the profession of Arianism till the final ruin [A. D. 533 and 553] of the kingdoms which they had founded in Africa and Italy. The barbarians of Gaul submitted [A. D. 507] to the orthodox dominion of the Franks; and Spain was restored to the Catholic Church by the voluntary conversion of the Visigoths [A. D. 589]."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 21 and 37.—Theodosius formally proclaimed his adhesion to Trinitarian orthodoxy by his celebrated edict of A. D. 380, and commanded its acceptance in the Eastern Empire. See **ROME**: A. D. 379-395.—A. Neander, *Gen. Hist. of Christ. Rel. and Ch.*, trans. by Torrey, v. 2, sect. 4.

ALSO IN: J. Alzog, *Manual of Univ. Ch. Hist.*, sect. 110-114.—W. G. T. Shedd, *Hist. of Christ. Doctrine*, bk. 3.—J. H. Newman, *Arians of the Fourth Century*.—A. P. Stanley, *Lects. on the Hist. of the East. Ch.*, lects. 3-7.—J. A. Dorner, *Hist. of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, div. 1 (v. 2).—See also, **GOTHUS**: A. D. 341-381; **FRANKS**: A. D. 481-511; also, **GOTHUS (VISIGOTHUS)**: A. D. 507-509.

**ARICA, Battle of (1880).** See **CHILE**: A. D. 1833-1884.

**ARICIA, Battle of.**—A victory won by the Romans over the Auruncians, B. C. 407, which summarily ended a war that the latter had declared against the former.—Livy, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 2, ch. 26.

**ARICIAN GROVE, The.**—The sacred grove at Aricia (one of the towns of old Latium, near Alba Longa) was the center and meeting-place of an early league among the Latin peoples, about which little is known.—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 2, ch. 8.—Sir W. Gell, *Topog. of Rom.*, v. 1.—"On the northern shore of the lake [of Nemi] right under the precipitous cliffs on which the modern village of Nemi is perched, stood the sacred grove and sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis, or Diana of the Wood. . . . The site was excavated in 1885 by Sir John Saville Lumley, English ambassador at Rome. For a general description of the site and excavations, see the *Athenaeum*, 10th October, 1885. For details of the finds see 'Bulletino dell' Instituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica,' 1885. . . . The lake and the grove were sometimes known as the lake and grove of Aricia. But the town of Aricia (the modern La Riccia) was situated about three miles off, at the foot of the Alban Mount. . . . According to one story, the worship of Diana at Nemi was instituted by Orestes, who, after killing Thoas, King of the Tauric Chersonese (the Crimea), fled with his sister to Italy, bringing with him the image of the Tauric Diana. . . . Within the sanctuary at Nemi grew a certain tree, of which no branch might be broken.

Only a runaway slave was allowed to break off, if he could, one of its boughs. Success in the attempt entitled him to fight the priest in single combat, and if he slew him he reigned in his stead with the title of Klug of the Wood (Klug Nemorensis). Tradition averred that the fateful branch was that Golden Bough which, at the Sibyl's bidding, Aeneas plucked before he essayed the perilous journey to the world of the dead. . . . This rule of succession by the sword was observed down to imperial times; for amongst his other freaks Caligula, thinking that the priest of Nemi had held office too long, hired a more stalwart ruffian to slay him."—J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, ch. 1, sect. 1.

**ARICONIUM.**—A town of Roman Britain which appears to have been the principal mart of the iron manufacturing industry in the Forest of Dean.—T. Wright, *The Celt, the Roman and the Saxon*, p. 161.

**ARI, The.** See **LYGIANS**.

**ARIKARAS, The.** See **AMERICAN ABORIGINES**: **PAWNU (CADDON) FAMILY**.

**ARIMINUM.**—The Roman colony, planted in the third century B. C., which grew into the modern city of Rimini. See **ROME**: B. C. 295-191.—When Cæsar entered Italy as an invader, crossing the frontier of Cisalpine Gaul—the Rubicon—his first movement was to occupy Ariminum. He halted there for two or three weeks, making his preparations for the civil war which he had now entered upon and waiting for the two legions that he had ordered from Gaul.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 14.

**ARIOVALDUS, King of the Lombards,** A. D. 626-638.

**ARISTEIDES, Ascendancy of.** See **ATHENS**: B. C. 477-462.

**ARISTOCRACY.—OLIGARCHY.**—"Aristocracy signifies the rule of the best men. If, however, this epithet is referred to an absolute ideal standard of excellence, it is manifest that an aristocratical government is a mere abstract notion, which has nothing in history, or in nature, to correspond to it. But if we content ourselves with taking the same terms in a relative sense, . . . aristocracy . . . will be that form of government in which the ruling few are distinguished from the multitude by illustrious birth, hereditary wealth, and personal merit. . . . Whenever such a change took place in the character or the relative position of the ruling body, that it no longer commanded the respect of its subjects, but found itself opposed to them, and compelled to direct its measures chiefly to the preservation of its power, it ceased to be, in the Greek sense an aristocracy; it became a faction, an oligarchy."—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 10.

**ARISTOMNEAN WAR.** See **MESSENIAN WARS**, **FIRST AND SECOND**.

**ARIZONA: The Name.**—"Arizona, probably Arizonac in its original form, was the native and probably Pima name of the place—of a hill, valley, stream, or some other local feature—just south of the modern boundary, in the mountains still so called, on the headwaters of the stream flowing past Saric, where the famous Planchas de Plata mine was discovered in the middle of the 18th century, the name being first known to Spaniards in that connection and being applied to the mining camp or real de minas. The aboriginal meaning of the term is not

known, though from the common occurrence in this region of the prefix 'ari,' the root 'son,' and the termination 'ac,' the derivation ought not to escape the research of a competent student. Such guesses as are extant, founded on the native tongues, offer only the barest possibility of a partial and accidental accuracy; while similar derivations from the Spanish are extremely absurd. . . . The name should properly be written and pronounced Arisona, as our English sound of the z does not occur in Spanish."—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, v. 12, p. 520.

**Aboriginal Inhabitants.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PUEBLOS, APACHE GROUP, SHOSHONEAN FAMILY, AND UTAHS.

**A. D. 1848.**—**Partial acquisition from Mexico.** See MEXICO: A. D. 1848.

**A. D. 1853.**—**Purchase by the United States of the southern part from Mexico.**—**The Gadsden Treaty.**—"On December 30, 1853, James Gadsden, United States minister to Mexico, concluded a treaty by which the boundary line was moved southward so as to give the United States, for a monetary consideration of \$10,000,000, all of modern Arizona south of the Gila, an effort so to fix the line as to include a port on the gulf being unsuccessful. . . . On the face of the matter this Gadsden treaty was a tolerably satisfactory settlement of a boundary dispute, and a purchase by the United States of a route for a southern railroad to California."—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, v. 12, ch. 20.

**ARKANSAS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SHOSHONEAN FAMILY.

**ARKANSAS: A. D. 1542.**—**Entered by Hernando de Soto.** See FLORIDA: A. D. 1528-1542.

**A. D. 1803.**—**Embraced in the Louisiana Purchase.** See LOUISIANA: A. D. 1798-1803.

**A. D. 1819-1836.**—**Detached from Missouri.**—**Organized as a Territory.**—**Admitted as a State.**—"Preparatory to the assumption of state government, the limits of the Missouri Territory were restricted on the south by the parallel of 36° 30' north. The restriction was made by an act of Congress, approved March 3, 1819, entitled an 'Act establishing a separate territorial government in the southern portion of the Missouri Territory.' The portion thus separated was subsequently organized into the second grade of territorial government, and Colonel James Miller, a meritorious and distinguished officer of the Northwestern army, was appointed first governor. This territory was known as the Arkansas Territory, and, at the period of its first organization, contained an aggregate of nearly 14,000 inhabitants. Its limits comprised all the territory on the west side of the Mississippi between the parallels 33° and 36° 30', or between the northern limit of Louisiana and the southern boundary of the State of Missouri. On the west it extended indefinitely to the Mexican territories, at least 550 miles. The Post of Arkansas was made the seat of the new government. The population of this extensive territory for several years was comprised chiefly in the settlements upon the tributaries of White River and the St. Francis; upon the Mississippi, between New Madrid and Point Chicot; and upon both sides of the Arkansas River, within 100 miles of its mouth, but especially in

the vicinity of the Post of Arkansas. . . . So feeble was the attraction in this remote region for the active, industrious, and well-disposed portion of the western pioneers, that the Arkansas Territory, in 1830, ten years after its organization, had acquired an aggregate of only 30,388 souls, including 4,576 slaves. . . . The western half of the territory had been erected, in 1824, into a separate district, to be reserved for the future residence of the Indian tribes, and to be known as the Indian Territory. From this time the tide of emigration began to set more actively into Arkansas, as well as into other portions of the southwest. . . . The territory increased rapidly for several years, and the census of 1835 gave the whole number of inhabitants at 58,134 souls, including 9,630 slaves. Thus the Arkansas Territory in the last five years had doubled its population. . . . The people, through the General Assembly, made application to Congress for authority to establish a regular form of state government. The assent of Congress was not withheld, and a Convention was authorized to meet at Little Rock on the first day of January, 1836, for the purpose of forming and adopting a State Constitution. The same was approved by Congress, and on the 13th of June following the State of Arkansas was admitted into the Federal Union as an independent state, and was, in point of time and order, the twenty-fifth in the confederacy. . . . Like the Missouri Territory, Arkansas had been a slaveholding country from the earliest French colonies. Of course, the institution of negro slavery, with proper checks and limits, was sustained by the new Constitution."—J. W. Monette, *Discovery and Settlement of the Valley of the Mississippi*, bk. 5, ch. 17 (v. 2).—See, also, UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1818-1821.

**A. D. 1861 (March).**—**Secession voted down.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (MARCH—APRIL).

**A. D. 1861 (April).**—**Governor Rector's reply to President Lincoln's call for troops.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (APRIL).

**A. D. 1862 (January—March).**—**Advance of National forces into the State.**—**Battle of Pea Ridge.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JANUARY—MARCH; MISSOURI—ARKANSAS).

**A. D. 1862 (July—September).**—**Progress of the Civil War.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JULY—SEPTEMBER; MISSOURI—ARKANSAS).

**A. D. 1862 (December).**—**The Battle of Prairie Grove.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER; MISSOURI—ARKANSAS).

**A. D. 1863 (January).**—**The capture of Arkansas Post from the Confederates.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (JANUARY—ARKANSAS).

**A. D. 1863 (July).**—**The defence of Helena.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (JULY: ON THE MISSISSIPPI).

**A. D. 1863 (August—October).**—**The breaking of Confederate authority.**—**Occupation of Little Rock by National forces.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (AUGUST—OCTOBER: ARKANSAS—MISSOURI).

**A. D. 1864 (March—October).**—**Last important operations of the War.**—**Price's Raid.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MARCH—OCTOBER: ARKANSAS—MISSOURI).

**A. D. 1864.**—First steps toward Reconstruction. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863-1864 (DECEMBER—JULY).

**A. D. 1865-1868.**—Reconstruction completed. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (MAY—JULY), to 1868-1870.

**ARKITES, The.**—A Canaanite tribe who occupied the plain north of Lebanon.

**ARKWRIGHT'S SPINNING MACHINE, OR WATER-FRAME, The invention of.** See COTTON MANUFACTURE.

**ARLES: Origin.** See SALVES.  
**A. D. 411.**—Double siege. See BRITAIN: A. D. 407.

**A. D. 425.**—Besieged by the Goths. See GOTHIS (VISIGOTHIS): A. D. 410-451.

**A. D. 508-510.**—Siege by the Franks.—After the overthrow of the Visigothic kingdom of Toulouse, A. D. 507, by the victory of Clovis, king of the Franks, at Vouclan, near Poitiers, "the great city of Arles, once the Roman capital of Gaul, maintained a gallant defence against the united Franks and Burgundians, and saved for generations the Visigothic rule in Provence and southern Languedoc. Of the siege, which lasted apparently from 508 to 510, we have some graphic details in the life of St. Caesarius, Bishop of Arles, written by his disciples." The city was relieved in 510 by an Ostrogothic army, sent by king Theodoric of Italy, after a great battle in which 30,000 Franks were reported to be slain. "The result of the battle of Arles was to put Theodoric in secure possession of all Provence and of so much of Languedoc as was needful to ensure his access to Spain"—where the Ostrogothic king, as guardian of his infant grandson, Amalric, was taking care of the Visigothic kingdom.—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders*, bk. 4, ch. 9.

**A. D. 933.**—Formation of the kingdom. See BURGUNDY: A. D. 843-933.

**A. D. 1032-1378.**—The breaking up of the kingdom and its gradual absorption in France. See BURGUNDY: A. D. 1032, and 1137-1378.

**1092-1207.**—The gay court of Provence. See PROVENCE: A. D. 942-1092, and 1170-1207.

**ARMADA, The Spanish.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1588.

**ARMAGEDDON.** See MEGIDDO.

**ARMAGH, St. Patrick's School at.** S IRELAND: 5th to 8th CENTURIES.

**ARMAGNAC, The counts of.** See FRANC: A. D. 1327.

**ARMAGNACS.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1380-1415, and 1415-1419.

**ARMENIA.**—"Almost immediately to the west of the Caspian there rises a high table-land diversified by mountains, which stretches eastward for more than eighteen degrees, between the 37th and 41st parallels. This highland may properly be regarded as a continuation of the great Iranian plateau, with which it is connected at its southeastern corner. It comprises a portion of the modern Persia, the whole of Armenia, and most of Asia Minor. Its principal mountain ranges are latitudinal, or from west to east, only the minor ones taking the opposite or longitudinal direction. . . . The heart of the mountain-region, the tract extending from the district of Erivan on the east to the upper course of the Kizil-Irmak river and the vicinity of Sivas upon

the west, was, as it still is, Armenia. Amidst these natural fastnesses, in a country of lofty ridges, deep and narrow valleys, numerous and copious streams, and occasional broad plains—a country of rich pasture grounds, productive orchards, and abundant harvests—this interesting people has maintained itself almost unchanged from the time of the early Persian kings to the present day. Armenia was one of the most valuable portions of the Persian empire, furnishing, as it did, besides stone and timber, and several most important minerals, an annual supply of 20,000 excellent horses to the stud of the Persian king."—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: Persia*, ch. 1.—Before the Persians established their sovereignty over the country, "it seems certain that from one quarter or another Armenia had been Arianized; the old Turanian character had passed away from it; immigrants had flocked in and a new people had been formed—the real Armenians of later times, and indeed of the present day." Submitting to Alexander, on the overthrow of the Persian monarchy, Armenia fell afterwards under the yoke of the Seleucide, but gained independence about 190 B. C., or earlier. Under the influence of Parthia, a branch of the Parthian royal family, the Arsacids, was subsequently placed on the throne and a dynasty established which reigned for nearly six hundred years. The fourth of these kings, Tigranes, who occupied the throne in the earlier part of the last century B. C., placed Armenia in the front rank of Asiatic kingdoms and in powerful rivalry with Parthia. Its subsequent history is one of many wars and invasions and much buffeting between Romans, Parthians, Persians, and their successors in the conflicts of the eastern world. The part of Armenia west of the Euphrates was called by the Romans Armenia Minor. For a short period after the revolt from the Seleucid monarchy, it formed a distinct kingdom called Sophene.—G. Rawlinson, *Sixth and Seventh Great Oriental Monarchies*.

**B. C. 69-68.**—War with the Romans.—Great defeat at Tigranocerta.—Submission to Rome. See ROME: B. C. 78-68, and 69-63.

**A. D. 115-117.**—Annexed to the Roman Empire by Trajan and restored to independence by Hadrian. See ROME: A. D. 96-138.

**A. D. 422 (?)**—Persian Conquest.—Becomes the satrapy of Persarmenia. See PERSIA: A. D. 226-627.

**A. D. 1016-1073.**—Conquest and devastation by the Seljuk Turks. See TURKS (SELJUKS): A. D. 1004-1063, and 1063-1073.

**12th-14th Centuries.**—The Mediæval Christian Kingdom.—"The last decade of the 12th century saw the establishment of two small Christian kingdoms in the Levant, which long outlived all other relics of the Crusades except the military orders; and which, with very little help from the West, sustained a hazardous existence in complete contrast with almost everything around them. The kingdoms of Cyprus and Armenia have a history very closely intertwined, but their origin and most of their circumstances were very different. By Armenia as a kingdom is meant little more than the ancient Cilicia, the land between Taurus and the sea, from the frontier of the principality of Antioch, eastward, to Kelenderis or Paleopolis, a little beyond Seleucia; this territory, which was computed to contain 16 days' journey in length,

measured from four miles of Antioch, by two in breadth, was separated from the Greater Armenia, which before the period on which we are now employed had fallen under the sway of the Seljuks, by the ridges of Taurus. The population was composed largely of the sweepings of Asia Minor, Christian tribes which had taken refuge in the mountains. Their religion was partly Greek, partly Armenian. . . . Their rulers were princes descended from the house of the Bagratide, who had governed the Greater Armenia as kings from the year 885 to the reign of Constantine Monomachus, and had then merged their hazardous independence in the mass of the Greek Empire. After the seizure of Asia Minor by the Seljuks, the few of the Bagratide who had retained possession of the mountain fastnesses of Cilicia or the strongholds of Mesopotamia, acted as independent lords, showing little respect for Byzantium save where there was something to be gained. . . . Rupin of the Mountain was prince [of Cilicia] at the time of the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin; he died in 1189, and his successor, Leo, or Livon, after having successfully courted the favour of pope and emperor, was recognised as king of Armenia by the emperor Henry VI., and was crowned by Conrad of Wittelsbach, Archbishop of Mainz, in 1198. The dynasty ended with Leo IV., whose "whole reign was a continued struggle against the Moslems," and who was assassinated about 1342. "The five remaining kings of Armenia sprang from a branch of the Cypriot house of Lusignan [see CYPRUS: A. D. 1192-1489] and were little more than Latin exiles in the midst of several strange populations all alike hostile."—W. Stubbs, *Lects. on the Study of Medieval and Modern Hist.*, lect. 8.

**A. D. 1623-1635.**—Subjugated by Persia and regained by the Turks. See TURKS: A. D. 1623-1640.

**ARMENIAN CHURCH, The.**—The church of the Armenians is "the oldest of all national churches. They were converted by St. Gregory, called 'The Illuminator,' who was a relative of Dertad or Tiridates, their prince, and had been forced to leave the country at the same time with him, and settled at Caesarea in Cappadocia, where he was initiated into the Christian faith. When they returned, both prince and people embraced the Gospel through the preaching of Gregory, A. D. 276, and thus presented the first instance of an entire nation becoming Christian. . . . By an accident they were unrepresented at [the Council of] Chalcedon [A. D. 451], and, owing to the poverty of their language in words serviceable for the purposes of theology, they had at that time but one word for Nature and Person, in consequence of which they misunderstood the decision of that council [that Christ possessed two natures, divine and human, in one Person] with sufficient clearness. . . . It was not until eighty-four years had elapsed that they finally adopted Eutychianism [the doctrine that the divinity is the sole nature in Christ], and an anathema was pronounced on the Chalcedonian decrees (536)."—H. F. Tozer, *The Church and the Eastern Empire*, ch. 5.—"The religion of Armenia could not derive much glory from the learning or the power of its inhabitants. The royalty expired with the origin of their schism; and their Christian kings, who arose and fell in

the 13th century on the confines of Cilicia, were the clients of the Latins and the vassals of the Turkish sultan of Iconium. The helpless nation has seldom been permitted to enjoy the tranquillity of servitude. From the earliest period to the present hour, Armenia has been the theatre of perpetual war; the lands between Tauris and Erivan were despoiled by the cruel policy of the Sopes; and myriads of Christian families were transplanted, to perish or to propagate in the distant provinces of Persia. Under the rod of oppression, the zeal of the Armenians is fervent and intrepid; they have often preferred the crown of martyrdom to the white turban of Mahomet; they devoutly hate the error and idolatry of the Greeks."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 47.

**ARMINIANISM.** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1603-1619.

**ARMINIUS, The Deliverance of Germany by.** See GERMANY: B. C. 8-A. D. 11.

**ARMORIAL BEARINGS, Origin of.**—"As to armorial bearings, there is no doubt that emblems somewhat similar have been immemorially used both in war and peace. The shields of ancient warriors, and devices upon coins or seals, bear no distant resemblance to modern blazonry. But the general introduction of such bearings, as hereditary distinctions, has been sometimes attributed to tournaments, wherein the champions were distinguished by fanciful devices; sometimes to the crusades, where a multitude of all nations and languages stood in need of some visible token to denote the banners of their respective chiefs. In fact, the peculiar symbols of heraldry point to both these sources and have been borrowed in part from each. Hereditary arms were perhaps scarcely used by private families before the beginning of the thirteenth century. From that time, however, they became very general."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 2, pt. 2.

**ARMORICA.**—The peninsular projection of the coast of Gaul between the mouths of the Seine and the Loire, embracing modern Brittany, and a great part of Normandy, was known to the Romans as Armorica. The most important of the Armorican tribes in Cæsar's time was that of the Veneti. "In the fourth and fifth centuries, the northern coast from the Loire to the frontier of the Netherlands was called 'Tractus Aremoricus,' or Aremorica, which in Celtic signifies 'maritime country.' The commotions of the third century, which continued to increase during the fourth and fifth, repeatedly drove the Romans from that country. French antiquaries imagine that it was a regularly constituted Gallic republic, of which Clovis had the protectorate, but this is wrong."—B. G. Niebuhr, *Lects. on Ancient Ethnography and Geog.*, v. 2, p. 318.

ALSO IN: E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, v. 2, p. 235.—See, also, VENETI OF WESTERN GAUL, and IBERIANS, THE WESTERN.

**ARMSTRONG, General John, and the Newburgh Addresses.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1782-1783. . . **Secretary of War.**—Plan of descent on Montreal. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1813 (OCTOBER—NOVEMBER).

**ARMY, The Legal Creation of the British.** See MUTINY ACTS.

**ARMY PURCHASE, Abolition of.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1871.

**ARNÆANS, The.** See GREECE: THE MIGRATIONS.

**ARNAULD, Jacqueline Marie, and the Monastery of Port Royal.** See PORT ROYAL and the JANSENISTS: A. D. 1602-1660.

**ARNAUTS, The.** See ALBANIANS, MEDLEVAL.

**ARNAY-LE-DUC, Battle of (1570).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1563-1570.

**ARNOLD, Benedict, and the American Revolution.** See CANADA: A. D. 1775-1776; and UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775 (MAY); 1777 (JULY—OCTOBER); 1780 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER); 1780-1781; 1781 (JANUARY—MAY); 1781 (MAY—OCTOBER).

**ARNOLD OF BRESCIA, The Republic of.** See ROME: A. D. 1145-1155.

**ARNOLD VON WINKELRIED, at the Battle of Sempach.** See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1386-1388.

**ARNULF, King of the East Franks (Germany), A. D. 888-899; King of Italy and Emperor, A. D. 894-899.**

**AROGI, Battle of (1868).** See ADYSSINIA: A. D. 1854-1889.

**ARPAD, Dynasty of.** See HUNGARIANS: RAVAGES IN EUROPE; and HUNGARY: A. D. 972-1114; 1114-1301.

**ARPAD, Siege of.**—Conducted by the Assyrian Conqueror Tiglath-Pileser, beginning B. C. 742 and lasting two years. The fall of the city brought with it the submission of all northern Syria.—A. H. Sayce, *Assyria*, ch. 2.

**ARQUES, Battles at (1589).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1589-1590.

**ARRABIATI, The.** See FLORENCE: A. D. 1490-1498.

**ARRAPACHITIS.** See JEWS: THE EARLY HEBREW HISTORY.

**ARRAPAHOS, The.** See AMERICAN INDIANS: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**ARRAS: Origin.** See BELGÆ.  
A. D. 1583.—Submission to Spain. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1584-1585.

A. D. 1654.—Unsuccessful Siege by the Spaniards under Condé. See FRANCE: A. D. 1653-1656.

**ARRAS, Treaties of (1415 and 1435).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1380-1415, and 1431-1453.

**ARRETIUM, Battle of (B. C. 285).** See ROME: B. C. 295-191.

**ARROW HEADED WRITING.** See CUNEIFORM WRITING.

**ARSACIDÆ, The.**—The dynasty of Parthian kings were so called, from the founder of the line, Arsaces, who led the revolt of Parthia from the rule of the Syrian Seleucidae and raised himself to the throne. According to some ancient writers Arsaces was a Bactrian; according to others a Scythian.—G. Rawlinson, *Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy*, ch. 3.

**ARSEN.**—In one of the earlier raids of the Seljukian Turks into Armenia, in the eleventh century the city of Arsen was destroyed. "It had long been the great city of Eastern Asia Minor, the centre of Asiatic trade, the depot for merchandise transmitted overland from Persia and India to the Eastern Empire and Europe generally. It was full of warehouses belonging to Armenians and Syrians and is said to have contained 800 churches and 300,000 people. Having failed to capture the city, Togrul's general succeeded in burning it. The destruction of so much wealth struck a fatal blow at

Armenian commerce."—E. Pears, *The Fall of Constantinople*, ch. 2.

**ARSENE, Lake.**—An ancient name of the Lake of Van, which is also called Thopitis by Strabo.—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 22, sect. 1.

**ARTABA, The.** See EPHAI.

**ARTAXATA.**—The ancient capital of Armenia, said to have been built under the superintendence of Hannibal, while a refugee in Armenia. At a later time it was called Neronia, in honor of the Roman Emperor Nero.

**ARTAXERXES LONGIMANUS, King of Persia, B. C. 465-423. . . . Artaxerxes Mnemon, King of Persia, B. C. 405-359. . . .**

**Artaxerxes Ochus, King of Persia, B. C. 359-338. . . . Artaxerxes, or Ardshir, Founder of the Sassanian monarchy.** See PERSIA: B. C. 150-A. D. 226.

**ARTEMISIUM, Sea fights at.** See GREECE: B. C. 480.

**ARTEMITA.** See DASTAGERD.

**ARTEVELD, Jacques and Philip Van:** Their rise and fall in Ghent. See FLANDERS: A. D. 1335-1337, to 1382.

**ARTHUR, King, and the Knights of the Round Table.**—"On the difficult question, whether there was a historical Arthur or not, . . . a word or two must now be devoted . . . ; and here one has to notice in the first place that Welsh literature never calls Arthur a gwledig or prince but emperor, and it may be inferred that his historical position, in case he had such a position, was that of one filling, after the departure of the Romans, the office which under them was that of the Comes Britannia or Count of Britain. The officer so called had a roving commission to defend the Province wherever his presence might be called for. The other military captains here were the Dux Britanniarum, who had charge of the forces in the north and especially on the Wall, and the Comes Littoris Saxonie [Count of the Saxon Shore], who was entrusted with the defence of the south-eastern coast of the Island. The successors of both these captains seem to have been called in Welsh gwledigs or princes. So Arthur's suggested position as Comes Britannia would be in a sense superior to theirs, which harmonizes with his being called emperor and not gwledig. The Welsh have borrowed the Latin title of imperator, 'emperor,' and made it into 'amherawdyr,' later 'amherawdwr,' so it is not impossible, that when the Roman imperator ceased to have anything more to say to this country, the title was given to the highest officer in the island, namely the Comes Britannia, and that in the words 'Yr Amherawdyr Arthur,' 'the Emperor Arthur,' we have a remnant of our insular history. If this view be correct, it might be regarded as something more than an accident that Arthur's position relatively to that of the other Brythonic princes of his time is exactly given by Nennius, or whoever it was that wrote the *Historia Brittonum* ascribed to him: there Arthur is represented fighting in company with the kings of the Brythons in defence of their common country, he being their leader in war. If, as has sometimes been argued, the uncle of Maglocunus or Maelgwn, whom the latter is accused by Gilda of having slain and superseded, was no other than Arthur, it would supply one reason why that writer called Maelgwn 'insu-

laris draco,' 'the dragon or war-captain: of the island,' and why the latter and his successors after him were called by the Welsh not gwledigs but kings, though their great ancestor Cunedu was only a gwledig. On the other hand the way in which Gildas alludes to the uncle of Madgwn without even giving his name, would seem to suggest that in his estimation at least he was no more illustrious than his predecessors in the position which he held, whatever that may have been. How then did Arthur become famous above them, and how came he to be the subject of so much story and romance? The answer, in short, which one has to give to this hard question must be to the effect, that besides a historic Arthur there was a Brythonic divinity named Arthur, after whom the man may have been called, or with whose name his, in case it was of a different origin, may have become identical in sound owing to an accident of speech; for both explanations are possible, as we shall attempt to show later. Leaving aside for a while the man Arthur, and assuming the existence of a god of that name, let us see what could be made of him. Mythologically speaking he would probably have to be regarded as a Culture Hero; for, a model king and the institutor of the Knighthood of the Round Table, he is represented as the leader of expeditions to the isles of Hades, and as one who stood in somewhat the same kind of relation to Gwalchmei as Gwydion did to Ilen. It is needless here to dwell on the character usually given to Arthur as a ruler: he with his knights around him may be compared to Conchobar, in the midst of the Champions of Emain Macha, or Woden among the Anses at Valhalla, while Arthur's Knights are called those of the Round Table, around which they are described sitting; and it would be interesting to understand the signification of the term Round Table. On the whole it is the table, probably, and not its roundness that is the fact to which to call attention, as it possibly means that Arthur's court was the first early court where those present sat at a table at all in Britain. No such thing as a common table figures at Conchobar's court or any other described in the old legends of Ireland, and the same applies, we believe, to those of the old Norsemen. The attribution to Arthur of the first use of a common table would fit in well with the character of a Culture Hero which we have ventured to ascribe to him, and it derives countenance from the pretended history of the Round Table; for the Arthurian legend traces it back to Arthur's father, Uthr Bendragon, in whom we have under one of his many names the king of Hades, the realm whence all culture was fabled to have been derived. In a wider sense the Round Table possibly signified plenty or abundance, and might be compared with the table of the Ethiopians, at which Zeus and the other gods of Greek mythology used to feast from time to time.—J. Rhys, *Studies in the Arthurian Legend*, ch. 1.—See, also CUMRHA.

**ARTHUR, Chester A.**—Election to Vice-Presidency.—Succession to the Presidency. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1880 and 1881.

**ARTI OF FLORENCE.** See FLORENCE: A. D. 1250-1293.

**ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION (American).** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777-1781, and 1788-1787.

**ARTICLES OF HENRY, The.** See POLAND: A. D. 1573.

**ARTOIS, The House of.** See BOURBON, THE HOUSE OF.

**ARTOIS: A. D. 1529.**—Pretensions of the King of France to Suzerainty resigned. See ITALY: A. D. 1527-1529.

**ARTYNI.** See DEMURGI.

**ARVADITES, The.**—The Canaanite inhabitants of the island of Aradus, or Arvad, and who also held territory on the main land.—F. Lenormant, *Manual of Ancient Hist.*, bk. 6, ch. 1.

**ARVERNI, The.** See AEDUI; also, GAULS, and ALLIOMAGES.

**ARX, The.** See CAPITOLINE HILL; also GENS, ROMAN.

**ARXAMUS, Battle of.**—One of the defeats sustained by the Romans in their wars with the Persians. Battle fought A. D. 603.—G. Rawlinson, *Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy*, ch. 24.

**ARYANS.—ARYAS.**—"This family (which is sometimes called Japhetic, or descendants of Japhet) includes the Hindus and Persians among Asiatic nations, and almost all the peoples of Europe. It may seem strange that we English should be related not only to the Germans and Dutch and Scandinavians, but to the Russians, French, Spanish, Romans and Greeks as well; stranger still that we can claim kinship with such distant peoples as the Persians and Hindus. . . . What seems actually to have been the case is this: In distant ages, somewhere about the rivers Oxus and Jaxartes, and on the north of that mountainous range called the Hindoo-Koosh, dwelt the ancestors of all the nations we have enumerated, forming at this time a single and united people, simple and primitive in their way of life, but yet having enough of a common national life to preserve a common language. They called themselves Aryas or Aryans, a word which, in its very earliest sense, seems to have meant those who move upwards, or straight; and hence, probably, came to stand for the noble race as compared with other races on whom, of course, they would look down. . . . As their numbers increased, the space wherein they dwelt became too small for them who had out of one formed many different peoples. Then began a series of migrations, in which the collection of tribes who spoke one language and formed one people started off to seek their fortune in new lands. . . . First among them, in all probability, started the Kelts or Celts, who, travelling perhaps to the South of the Caspian and the North of the Black Sea, found their way to Europe and spread far on to the extreme West. . . . Another of the great families who left the Aryan home was the Pelasgic or the Græco-Italic. These, journeying along first Southwards and then to the West, passed through Asia Minor, on to the countries of Greece and Italy, and in time separated into those two great peoples, the Greeks (or Hellenes, as they came to call themselves), and the Romans. . . . Next we come to two other great families of nations who seem to have taken the same route at first, and perhaps began their travels together as the Greeks and Romans did. These are the Teutons and the Slaves. . . . The word Slave comes from Slawan, which in old Slavonian meant to speak, and was given by the Slavonians to themselves as the people who could speak in



opposition to other nations whom, as they were not able to understand them, they were pleased to consider as dumb. The Greek word barbaroi (whence our barbarians) arose in obedience to a like prejudice, only from an imitation of babbling such as is made by saying 'bar-bar-bar.'—C. F. Keary, *Dawn of History*, ch. 4.—The above passage sets forth the older theory of an Aryan family of nations as well as of languages in its unqualified form. Its later modifications are indicated in the following: "The discovery of Sanserit and the further discovery to which it led, that the languages now variously known as Aryan, Aryanic, Indo-European, Indo-Germanic, Indo-Celtic and Japhetic are closely akin to one another, spread a spell over the world of thought which cannot be said to have yet wholly passed away. It was hastily argued from the kinship of their languages to the kinship of the nations that spoke them. . . . The question then arises as to the home of the 'hoethnos,' or parent tribe, before its dispersion and during the pro-ethnic period, at a time when as yet there was neither Greek nor Hindoo, neither Celt nor Teuton, but only an undifferentiated Aryan. Of course, the answer at first was—where could it have been but in the East. And at length the glottologist found it necessary to shift the cradle of the Aryan race to the neighbourhood of the Oxus and the Jaxartes, so as to place it somewhere between the Caspian Sea and the Himalayas. Then Doctor Latham boldly raised his voice against the Asiatic theory altogether, and stated that he regarded the attempt to deduce the Aryans from Asia as resembling an attempt to derive the reptiles of this country from those of Iceland. Afterwards Benfey argued, from the presence in the vocabulary common to the Aryan languages of words for bear and wolf, for birch and beech, and the absence of certain others, such as those for lion, tiger and palm, that the original home of the Aryans must have been within the temperate zone in Europe. . . . As might be expected in the case of such a difficult question, those who are inclined to believe in the European origin of the Aryans are by no means agreed among themselves as to the spot to be fixed upon. Latham placed it east, or south-east of Lithuania, in Podolia, or Volhynia; Benfey had in view a district above the Black Sea and not far from the Caspian; Peschel fixed on the slopes of the Caucasus; Cuno on the great plain of Central Europe; Fligier on the southern part of Russia; Pöschel on the tract between the Niemen and the Dnieper; L. Geiger on central and western Germany; and Penka on Scandinavia."—J. Rhys, *Race Theories* (in *New Princeton Rev.*, Jan., 1888).—"Aryan, in scientific language, is utterly inapplicable to race. It means language, and nothing but language; and, if we speak of Aryan race at all, we should know that it means no more than  $\times +$  Aryan speech. . . . I have declared again and again that if I say Aryans, I mean neither blood nor bones, nor hair nor skull; I mean simply those who speak an Aryan language. The same applies to Hindus, Greeks, Romans, Germans, Celts and Slaves. . . . In that sense, and in that sense only, do I say that even the blackest Hindus represent an earlier stage of Aryan speech and thought than the fairest Scandinavians. . . . If an answer must be given as to the place where our Aryan ancestors dwelt before their separation,

whether in large swarms of millions, or in a few scattered tents and huts, I should still say, as I said forty years ago, 'Somewhere in Asia,' and no more."—F. Max Müller, *Biog. of Words and Home of the Aryans*, ch. 6.—The theories which dispute the Asiatic origin of the Aryans are strongly presented by Canon Taylor in *The Origin of the Aryans*, by G. H. Rendall, in *The Cradle of the Aryans*, and by Dr. O. Schrader in *Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan Peoples*.—See, also, INDIA: THE ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS, and THE IMMIGRATION AND CONQUESTS OF THE ARYANS.

**AS.—LIBRA.—DENARIUS.—SESTERTIUS.**—"The term As [among the Romans] and the words which denote its divisions, were not confined to weight alone, but were applied to measures of length and capacity also, and in general to any object which could be regarded as consisting of twelve equal parts. Thus they were commonly used to denote shares into which an inheritance was divided." As a unit of weight the As, or Libra, "occupied the same position in the Roman system as the pound does in our own. According to the most accurate researches, the As was equal to about 11½ oz. avoirdupois, or 7375 of an avoirdupois pound." It "was divided into 12 equal parts called uncia, and the uncia was divided into 24 equal parts called scrupula." "The As, regarded as a coin [of copper] originally weighed, as the name implies, one pound, and the smaller copper coins these fractions of the pound denoted by their names. By degrees, however, the weight of the As, regarded as a coin, was greatly diminished. We are told that, about the commencement of the first Punic war, it had fallen from 12 ounces to 2 ounces; in the early part of the second Punic war (B. C. 217), it was reduced to one ounce; and not long afterwards, by a Lex Papiria, it was fixed at half-an-ounce, which remained the standard ever after." The silver coins of Rome were the Denarius, equivalent (after 217 B. C.) to 16 Asses; the Quinarius and the Sestertius, which became, respectively, one half and one fourth of the Denarius in value. The Sestertius, at the close of the Republic, is estimated to have been equivalent in value to two pence sterling of English money. The coinage was debased under the Empire. The principal gold coin of the Empire was the Denarius Aureus, which passed for 25 silver Denarii.—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq.*, ch. 13.

**ASCALON, Battle of (A. D. 1099).** See JERUSALEM: A. D. 1099-1144.

**ASCANIENS, The.** See BRANDENBURG: A. D. 923-1142.

**ASCULUM, Battle of (B. C. 279).** See ROME: B. C. 282-275.

**ASCULUM, Massacre at.** See ROME: B. C. 90-88.

**ASHANTEE WAR, The (1874).** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1872-1880.

**ASHBURN TREATY, The.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1842.

**ASHDOD.** See PHILISTINES.

**ASHRAF, Shah of Persia, A. D. 1725-1730.**

**ASHTI, Battle of (1818).** See INDIA: A. D. 1816-1819.

**ASIA: The Name.**—"There are grounds for believing Europe and Asia to have originally

signified 'the west' and 'the east' respectively. Both are Semitic terms, and probably passed to the Greeks from the Phœnicians. . . . The Greeks first applied the title [Asia] to that portion of the eastern continent which lay nearest to them, and with which they became first acquainted—the coast of Asia Minor opposite the Cyclades; whence they extended it as their knowledge grew. Still it had always a special application to the country about Ephesus."—G. Rawlinson, *Notes to Herodotus*, v. 3, p. 33.

**ASIA: The Roman Province (so called).**—"As originally constituted, it corresponded to the dominions of the kings of Pergamum . . . left by the will of Attalus III. to the Roman people (B. C. 133). . . . It included the whole of Mysia and Lydia, with Æolis, Ionia and Caria, except a small part which was subject to Rhodes, and the greater part, if not the whole, of Phrygia. A portion of the last region, however, was detached from it."—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 20, sect. 1.

**ASIA, Central.—Mongol Conquest.** See **MONGOLS**.

**Turkish Conquest.** See **TURKS**.

**Russian Conquests.** See **RUSSIA**: A. D. 1859-1876, and 1869-1881.

**ASIA MINOR.**—"The name of Asia Minor, so familiar to the student of ancient geography, was not in use either among Greek or Roman writers until a very late period. Orosius, who wrote in the fifth century after the Christian era, is the first extant writer who employs the term in its modern sense."—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 7, sect. 2.—The name Anatolia, which is of Greek origin, synonymous with "The Levant," signifying "The Sunrise," came into use among the Byzantines, about the 10th century, and was adopted by their successors, the Turks.

**Earlier Kingdoms and People.** See **PHRYGIANS** AND **MYSIANS**.—**LYDIANS**.—**CARIANS**.—**LYCIANS**.—**BITHYNIANS**.—**PONTUS (CAPPADOCIA)**.—**PAPHLAGONIANS**.—**TROJA**.

**The Greek Colonies.**—"The tumult which had been caused by the irruption of the Thesprotians into Thessaly and the displacement of the population of Greece [see **GREECE: THE MIGRATION, &c.**] did not subside within the limits of the peninsula. From the north and the south those inhabitants who were unable to maintain their ground against the incursions of the Thessalians, Armaeans, or Dorians, and preferred exile to submission, sought new homes in the islands of the Aegean and on the western coast of Asia Minor. The migrations continued for several generations. When at length they came to an end, and the Anatolian coast from Mount Ida to the Triopian headland, with the adjacent islands, was in the possession of the Greeks, three great divisions or tribes were distinguished in the new settlements: Dorians, Ionians, and Aeolians. In spite of the presence of some alien elements, the Dorians and Ionians of Asia Minor were the same tribes as the Dorians and Ionians of Greece. The Aeolians, on the other hand, were a composite tribe, as their name implies. . . . Of these three divisions the Aeolians lay farthest to the north. The precise limits of their territory were differently fixed by different authorities. . . . The Aeolic cities fell into two groups: a northern, of which Lesbos was the centre, and a southern, composed of the cities in

the immediate neighbourhood of the Hermus, and founded from Cyme. . . . The northern group included the islands of Tenedos and Lesbos. In the latter there were originally six cities: Methymna, Mytilene, Pyrrha, Eresus, Arisba, and Antissa, but Arisba was subsequently conquered and enslaved by Mytilene. . . . The second great stream of migration proceeded from Athens [after the death of Codrus—see **ATHENS: FROM THE DORIAN MIGRATION TO B. C. 683**—according to Greek tradition, the younger sons of Codrus leading these Ionian colonists across the Aegean, first to the Carian city of Miletus—see **MILETUS**,—which they captured, and then to the conquest of Ephesus and the island of Samos]. . . . The colonies spread until a dodecapolis was established, similar to the union which the Ionians had founded in their old settlements on the northern shore of Peloponnesus. In some cities the Ionian population formed a minority. . . . The colonisation of Ionia was undoubtedly, in the main, an achievement of emigrants from Attica, but it was not accomplished by a single family, or in the space of one life-time. . . . The two most famous of the Ionian cities were Miletus and Ephesus. The first was a Carian city previously known as Anactoria. . . . Ephesus was originally in the hands of the Leleges and the Lydians, who were driven out by the Ionians under Androclus. The ancient sanctuary of the tutelary goddess of the place was transformed by the Greeks into a temple of Artemis, who was here worshipped as the goddess of birth and productivity in accordance with Oriental rather than Hellenic ideas." The remaining Ionic cities and islands were Myus (named from the mosquitoes which infested it, and which finally drove the colony to abandon it), Priene, Erythrae, Clazomene, Teos, Phocaea, Colophon, Lebedus, Samos and Chios. "Chios was first inhabited by Cretans . . . and subsequently by Carians. . . . Of the manner in which Chios became connected with the Ionians the Chians could give no clear account. . . . The southern part of the Anatolian coast, and the southern-most islands in the Aegean were colonised by the Dorians, who wrested them from the Phœnician or Carian occupants. Of the islands, Crete is the most important. . . . Crete was one of the oldest centres of civilisation in the Aegean [see **CRETE**]. . . . The Dorian colony in Rhodes, like that in Crete, was ascribed to the band which left Argos under the command of Althameuz. . . . Other islands colonised by the Dorians were Thera, . . . Melos, . . . Carpathus, Calydnæ, Nisyros, and Cos. . . . From the islands, the Dorians spread to the mainland. The peninsula of Cnidus was perhaps the first settlement. . . . Halicarnassus was founded from Troezen, and the Ionian element must have been considerable. . . . Of the Dorian cities, six united in the common worship of Apollo on the headland of Triopium. These were Lindus, Ialysus, and Camirus in Rhodes, Cos, and, on the mainland, Halicarnassus and Cnidus. . . . The territory which the Aeolians acquired is described by Herodotus as more fertile than that occupied by the Ionians, but of a less excellent climate. It was inhabited by a number of tribes, among which the Troes or Teucri were the chief. . . . In Homer the inhabitants of the city of the Troad are Dardani or Troes, and the name Teucri does not occur. In historical times the Gergithes,

who dwelt in the town of the same name . . . near Lampsacus, and also formed the subject population of Miletus, were the only remnants of this once famous nation. But their former greatness was attested by the Homeric poems, and the occurrence of the name Gergithians at various places in the Troad [see ΤΡΩΑΔΑ]. To this tribe belonged the Troy of the Grecian epic, the site of which, so far as it represents any historical city, is fixed at Hisarlık. In the Iliad the Trojan empire extends from the Aeseopus to the Calcus; it was divided—or, at least, later historians speak of it as divided—into principalities which recognised Priam as their chief. But the Homeric descriptions of the city and its eminence are not to be taken as historically true. Whatever the power and civilisation of the ancient stronghold exhumed by Dr. Schliemann may have been, it was necessary for the epic poet to represent Priam and his nation as a dangerous rival in wealth and arms to the great kings of Mycenae and Sparta. . . . The traditional dates fix these colonies [of the Greeks in Asia Minor] in the generations which followed the Trojan war. . . . We may suppose that the colonisation of the Aegean and of Asia Minor by the Greeks was coincident with the expulsion of the Phoenicians. The greatest extension of the Phoenician power in the Aegean seems to fall in the 15th century B. C. From the 13th it was gradually on the decline, and the Greeks were enabled to secure the trade for themselves. . . . By 1100 B. C. Asia Minor may have been in the hands of the Greeks, though the Phoenicians still maintained themselves in Rhodes and Cyprus. But all attempts at chronology are illusory.”—E. Abbott, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 4 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 2, ch. 3 (v. 1).—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 13-15.—J. A. Cramer, *Geog. and Hist. Description of Asia Minor*, sect. 8 (v. 1).—See, also, MILETUS, PHOENICIANS.

**B. C. 724-539.**—Prosperity of the Greek Colonies.—Their Submission to Cræsus, King of Lydia, and their conquest and annexation to the Persian Empire.—“The Grecian colonies on the coast of Asia early rose to wealth by means of trade and manufactures. Though we have not the means of tracing their commerce, we know that it was considerable, with the mother country, with Italy, and at length Spain, with Phœnicia and the interior of Asia, whence the productions of India passed to Greece. The Milesians, who had fine woolen manufactures, extended their commerce to the Euxine, on all sides of which they founded factories, and exchanged their manufactures and other goods with the Scythians and the neighbouring peoples, for slaves, wool, raw hides, bees-wax, flax, hemp, pitch, etc. There is even reason to suppose that, by means of caravans, their traders bartered their wares not far from the confines of China [see MILETUS].

. . . But while they were advancing in wealth and prosperity, a powerful monarchy formed itself in Lydia, of which the capital was Sardes, a city at the foot of Mount Tmolus.” Gyges, the first of the Mermnad dynasty of Lydian kings (see LYDIANS), whose reign is supposed to have begun about B. C. 724, “turned his arms against the Ionian cities on the coast. During a century and a half the efforts of the Lydian monarchs to reduce these states were unavailing. At length (O1. 55) [B. C. 548] the celebrated Cræsus

mounted the throne of Lydia, and he made all Asia this side of the River Halys (Lyca and Cilicia excepted) acknowledge his dominion. The Aœolian, Ionian and Dorian cities of the coast all paid him tribute; but, according to the usual rule of eastern conquerors, he meddled not with their political institutions, and they might deem themselves fortunate in being insured against war by the payment of an annual sum of money. Cræsus, moreover, cultivated the friendship of the European Greeks.” But Cræsus was overthrown, B. C. 544, by the conquering Cyrus and his kingdom of Lydia was swallowed up in the great Persian empire then taking form [see PERSIA: B. C. 549-521]. Cyrus, during his war with Cræsus, had tried to entice the Ionians away from the latter and win them to an alliance with himself. But they incurred his resentment by refusing. “They and the Aœlians now sent ambassadors, praying to be received to submission on the same terms as those on which they had obeyed the Lydian monarch; but the Milesians alone found favour: the rest had to prepare for war. They repaired the walls of their towns, and sent to Sparta for aid. Aid, however, was refused; but Cyrus, being called away by the war with Babylonia, neglected them for the present. Three years afterwards (O1. 59, 2), Harpagus, who had saved Cyrus in his infancy from his grandfather Astyages, came as governor of Lydia. He instantly prepared to reduce the cities of the coast. Town after town submitted. The Teians abandoned theirs, and retired to Abdera in Thrace; the Phocæans, getting on shipboard, and vowing never to return, sailed for Corsica, and being there harassed by the Carthagenians and Tyrrhenians, they went to Rhegium in Italy, and at length founded Massalia (Marseilles) on the coast of Gaul. The Grecian colonies thus became a part of the Persian empire.”—T. Keightley, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 1, ch. 9.

ALSO IN: Herodotus, *Hist.*, tr. and ed. by G. Rawlinson, bk. 1, and app.—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, bk. 8, ch. 6-7 (v. 6).

**B. C. 501-493.**—The Ionian revolt and its suppression. See PERSIA: B. C. 521-493.

**B. C. 479.**—Athens assumes the protection of Ionia. See ATHENS: B. C. 479-478.

**B. C. 477.**—Formation of Confederacy of Delos. See GREECE: B. C. 478-477.

**B. C. 413.**—Tribute again demanded from the Greeks by the Persian King.—Conspiracy against Athens. See GREECE: B. C. 413.

**B. C. 413-412.**—Revolt of the Greek cities from Athens.—Intrigues of Alcibiades. See GREECE: B. C. 413-412.

**B. C. 412.**—Re-submission to Persia. See PERSIA: B. C. 486-405.

**B. C. 401-400.**—Expedition of Cyrus the Younger, and Retreat of the Ten Thousand. See PERSIA: B. C. 401-400.

**B. C. 399-387.**—Spartan war with Persia in behalf of the Greek cities.—Their abandonment by the Peace of Antalcidas. See GREECE: B. C. 399-387.

**B. C. 334.**—Conquest by Alexander the Great. See MACEDONIA: B. C. 334-330.

**B. C. 301.**—Mostly annexed to the Thracian Kingdom of Lysimachus. See MACEDONIA, &c.: B. C. 310-301.

**B. C. 281-224.**—Battle-ground of the warring monarchies of Syria and Egypt.—Changes of masters. See SELEUCIDÆ.

**B. C. 191.**—First Entrance of the Romans.—Their defeat of Antiochus the Great.—Their expansion of the kingdom of Pergamum and the Republic of Rhodes. See SELEUCIDÆ: B. C. 224-187.

**B. C. 120-65.**—Mithridates and his kingdom.—Massacre of Italians.—Futile revolt from Rome.—Complete Roman Conquest. See MITHRIDATIC WARS; also ROME: B. C. 78-68, and 69-63.

**A. D. 292.**—Diocletian's seat of Empire established at Nicomedia. See ROME: A. D. 284-305.

**A. D. 602-628.**—Persian invasions.—Deliverance by Heraclius. See ROME: A. D. 565-628.

**A. D. 1063-1092.**—Conquest and ruin by the Seljuk Turks. See TURKS (SELJUKS): A. D. 1063-1073; and 1073-1092.

**A. D. 1097-1149.**—Wars of the Crusaders. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1096-1099; and 1147-1149.

**A. D. 1204-1261.**—The Empire of Nicæa and the Empire of Trebizond. See GREEK EMPIRE OF NICÆA.

**ASIENTO, OR ASSIENTO, The.** See SLAVERY: A. D. 1698-1776; UTRECHT: A. D. 1712-1714; AIX-LA-CHAPELLE, THE CONGRESS OF; ENGLAND: A. D. 1730-1741; and GEORGIA: A. D. 1738-1743.

**ASKELON.** See PHILISTINES.  
**ASKLEPIADS.**—"Throughout all the historical ages [of Greece] the descendants of Asklepius [or Esculapius] were numerous and widely diffused. The many families or gentes called Asklepiads, who devoted themselves to the study and practice of medicine, and who principally dwelt near the temples of Asklepius, whither sick and suffering men came to obtain relief—all recognized the god, not merely as the object of their common worship, but also as their actual progenitor."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 1, ch. 9.

**ASMONEANS, The.** See JEWS: B. C. 166-40.

**ASOPIA.** See SICYON.

**ASOV.** See AZOF.

**ASPADAN.**—The ancient name of which that of Ispahan is a corrupted form.—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: Media*, ch. 1.  
**ASPERN-ESSLINGEN (OR THE MARCHFELD), Battle of.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1809 (JANUARY—JUNE).

**ASPIS, The.** See PHALANX.

**ASPROMONTE, Defeat of Garibaldi at (1862).** See ITALY: A. D. 1862-1866.

**ASSAM, English Acquisition of.** See INDIA: A. D. 1823-1833.

**ASSANDUN, Battle of.**—The sixth and last battle, A. D. 1016, between Edmund Ironsides, the English King, and his Danish rival, Cnut, or Canute, for the Crown of England. The English were terribly defeated and the flower of their nobility perished on the field. The result was a division of the kingdom; but Edmund soon died, or was killed. Ashington, in Essex, was the battle-ground. See ENGLAND: A. D. 979-1016.

**ASSASSINATIONS, Notable.**—**Abbas, Pasha of Egypt.** See EGYPT: A. D. 1840-1863. ....**Alexander II. of Russia.** See RUSSIA: A. D. 1879-1881. ....**Beatoun, Cardinal.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1546. ....**Becket, Thomas.**

See ENGLAND: A. D. 1162-1170. ....**Buckingham.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1628. ....**Cæsar.** See ROME: B. C. 44. ....**Capo d'Istrea, Count, President of Greece.** See GREECE: A. D. 1830-1863. ....**Cavendish, Lord Frederick, and Burke, Mr.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1882. ....**Concini.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1610-1619. ....**Danilo, Prince of Montenegro (1860).** See MONTENEGRO. ....**Darnley.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1561-1568. ....**Francis of Guise.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1560-1563. ....**Garfield, President.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1881. ....**Gustavus III. of Sweden.** See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1720-1792. ....**Henry of Guise.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1584-1589. ....**Henry III. of France.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1584-1589. ....**Henry IV. of France.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1599-1600. ....**Hipparchus.** See ATHENS: B. C. 560-510. ....**John, Duke of Burgundy.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1415-1419. ....**Kleber, General.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1800 (JANUARY—JUNE). ....**Kotzebue.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1817-1820. ....**Lincoln, President.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (APRIL 14TH). ....**Marat.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (JULY). ....**Mayo, Lord.** See INDIA: A. D. 1863-1876. ....**Murray, The Regent.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1561-1568. ....**Omar, Caliph.** See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST, &c.: A. D. 661. ....**Paul, Czar of Russia.** See RUSSIA: A. D. 1801. ....**Perceval, Spencer.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1808-1812. ....**Peter III.** See RUSSIA: A. D. 1761-1762. ....**Philip of Macedon.** See GREECE: B. C. 357-336. ....**Prim, General (1870).** See SPAIN: A. D. 1866-1873. ....**Rizzio.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1561-1568. ....**Rossi, Count.** See ITALY: A. D. 1848-1849. ....**Wallenstein (1634).** See GERMANY: A. D. 1632-1634. ....**William the Silent.** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1581-1584. ....**Witt, John and Cornelius de.** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1672-1674.

**ASSASSINS, The.**—"I must here speak with the brevity which my limits prescribe of that wonderful brotherhood of the Assassins, which during the 12th and 13th centuries spread such terror through all Asia, Mussulman and Christian. Their deeds should be studied in Von Hammer's history of their order, of which however there is an excellent analysis in Taylor's History of Mohammedanism. The word Assassin, it must be remembered, in its ordinary signification, is derived from this order, and not the reverse. The Assassins were not so called because they were murderers, but murderers are called assassins because the Assassins were murderers. The origin of the word Assassin has been much disputed by oriental scholars; but its application is sufficiently written upon the Asiatic history of the 12th century. The Assassins were not, strictly speaking, a dynasty, but rather an order, like the Templars; only the office of Grand-Master, like the Caliphate, became hereditary. They were originally a branch of the Egyptian Ishmaelites [see MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 908-1171] and at first professed the principles of that sect. But there can be no doubt that their inner doctrine became at last a mere negation of all religion and all morality. 'To believe nothing and to dare everything' was the summary of their teaching. Their exoteric principle, addressed to the non-initiated members of the order, was simple blind obedience to the will of their superiors. If the Assassin was ordered to take off a Caliph or a Sultan by the dagger or the bowl.

the deed was done; if he was ordered to throw himself from the ramparts, the deed was done likewise. . . . Their founder was Hassan Sabah, who, in 1090, shortly before the death of Malek Shah, seized the castle of Alamout—the Vulture's nest—in northern Persia, whence they extended their possessions over a whole chain of mountain fortresses in that country and in Syria. The Grand-Master was the Sheikh-ul-Jelal, the famous Old Man of the Mountain, at whose name Europe and Asia shuddered.—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. and Conquests of the Saracens, lect. 4.*—"In the Fatimid Khalif of Egypt, they [the Assassins, or Ismailites of Syria and Persia] beheld an incarnate deity. To kill his enemies, in whatever way they best could, was an action, the merit of which could not be disputed, and the reward for which was certain." Hasan Sabah, the founder of the Order, died at Alamout A. D. 1124. "From the day he entered Alamout until that of his death—a period of thirty-five years—he never emerged, but upon two occasions, from the seclusion of his house. Pitiless and inscrutable as Destiny, he watched the troubled world of Oriental politics, himself invisible, and whenever he perceived a formidable foe, caused a dagger to be driven into his heart." It was not until more than a century after the death of its founder that the fearful organization of the Assassins was extinguished (A. D. 1257) by the same flood of Mongol invasion which swept Bagdad and the Caliphate out of existence.—R. D. Osborn, *Islam under the Khalifs of Bagdad, pt. 3, ch. 3.*—W. C. Taylor, *Hist. of Mohammedanism and its Sects, ch. 9.*—The Assassins were rooted out from all their strongholds in Kuthistan and the neighboring region, and were practically exterminated, in 1257, by the Mongols under Khulagu, or Houlagou, brother of Mongu Khan, the great sovereign of the Mongol Empire, then reigning. Alamout, the Vulture's Nest, was demolished.—II. H. Howorth, *Hist. of the Mongols, part 1, p. 193; and part 3, pp. 91-103.*—See **BAODAD**: A. D. 1258.

**ASSAYE, Battle of (1803).** See **INDIA**: A. D. 1798-1805.

**ASSEMBLY OF THE NOTABLES IN FRANCE (1787).** See **FRANCE**: A. D. 1774-1788.

**ASSENISIPIA, The proposed State of.** See **NORTHWEST TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1784.

**ASSIDEANS, The.** See **CHASIDIM, The.**

**ASSIENTO, The.** See **ASIENTO.**

**ASSIGNATS.** See **FRANCE**: A. D. 1789-1791; 1794-1795 (JULY—APRIL); 1795 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER).

**ASSINARUS, Athenian defeat and surrender at.** See **SYRACUSE**: B. C. 415-413.

**ASSINIBOIA.** See **NORTHWEST TERRITORIES OF CANADA.**

**ASSINIBOINS, The.** See **AMERICAN INDIANS: SIOUAN FAMILY.**

**ASSIZE, The Bloody.** See **ENGLAND**: A. D. 1685 (SEPTEMBER).

**ASSIZE OF BREAD AND ALE.**—The Assize of Bread and Ale was an English ordinance or enactment, dating back to the time of Henry III. in the 13th century, which fixed the price of those commodities by a scale regulated according to the market prices of wheat, barley and oats. "The Assize of bread was re-enacted so lately as the beginning of the last century and

was only abolished in London and its neighbourhood about thirty years ago"—that is, early in the present century.—G. L. Craik, *Hist. of British Commerce, v. 1, p. 137.*

**ASSIZE OF CLARENDON, The.** See **ENGLAND**: A. D. 1162-1170.

**ASSIZE OF JERUSALEM, The.**—"No sooner had Godfrey of Bouillon [elected King of Jerusalem, after the taking of the Holy City by the Crusaders, A. D. 1099] accepted the office of supreme magistrate than he solicited the public and private advice of the Latin pilgrims who were the best skilled in the statutes and customs of Europe. From these materials, with the counsel and approbation of the Patriarch and barons, of the clergy and laity, Godfrey composed the Assize of Jerusalem, a precious monument of feudal jurisprudence. The new code, attested by the seals of the King, the Patriarch, and the Viscount of Jerusalem, was deposited in the holy sepulchre, enriched with the improvements of succeeding times, and respectfully consulted as often as any doubtful question arose in the tribunals of Palestine. With the kingdom and city all was lost; the fragments of the written law were preserved by jealous tradition and variable practice till the middle of the thirteenth century. The code was restored by the pen of John d'Idella, Count of Jaffa, one of the principal feudatories; and the final revision was accomplished in the year thirteen hundred and sixty-nine, for the use of the Latin kingdom of Cyprus."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch. 58.*

**ASSIZES.**—"The formal edicts known under the name of Assizes, the Assizes of Clarendon and Northampton, the Assize of Arms, the Assize of the Forest, and the Assizes of Measures, are the only relics of the legislative work of the period [reign of Henry II. in England]. These edicts are chiefly composed of new regulations for the enforcement of royal justice. . . . In this respect they strongly resemble the capitularies of the Frank Kings, or, to go farther back, the edicts of the Roman prætors. . . . The term Assize, which comes into use in this meaning about the middle of the twelfth century, both on the continent and in England, appears to be the proper Norman name for such edicts. . . . In the 'Assize of Jerusalem' it simply means a law; and the same in Henry's legislation. Secondly, it means a form of trial established by the particular law, as the Great Assize, the Assize of Mort d'Ancester; and thirdly the court held to hold such trials, in which sense it is commonly used at the present day."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch. 13.*

**ASSUR.** See **ASSYRIA.**

**ASSYRIA.**—For matter relating to Assyrian history, the reader is referred to the caption **SEMITES**, under which it will be given. The subject is deferred to that part of this work which will go later into print, for the reason that every month is adding to the knowledge of the students of ancient oriental history and clearing away disputed questions. It is quite possible that the time between the publication of our first volume and our fourth or fifth may make important additions to the scanty literature of the subject in English. Modern excavation on the sites of the ancient cities in the East, bringing to light large library collections of inscribed clay tablets,—sacred and historical writings, official records,

business contracts and many varieties of inscriptions,—have almost revolutionized the study of ancient history and the views of antiquity derived from it. "M. Botta, who was appointed French consul at Mosul in 1842, was the first to commence excavations on the sites of the buried cities of Assyria, and to him is due the honour of the first discovery of her long lost palaces. M. Botta commenced his labours at Kouyunjik, the large mound opposite Mosul, but he found here very little to compensate for his labours. New at the time to excavations, he does not appear to have worked in the best manner; M. Botta at Kouyunjik contented himself with sinking pits in the mound, and on these proving unproductive abandoning them. While M. Botta was excavating at Kouyunjik, his attention was called to the mounds of Khorsabad by a native of the village on that site; and he sent a party of workmen to the spot to commence excavation. In a few days his perseverance was rewarded by the discovery of some sculptures, after which, abandoning the work at Kouyunjik, he transferred his establishment to Khorsabad and thoroughly explored that site. . . . The palace which M. Botta had discovered . . . is one of the most perfect Assyrian buildings yet explored, and forms an excellent example of Assyrian architecture. Beside the palace on the mound of Khorsabad, M. Botta also opened the remains of a temple, and a grand porch decorated by six winged bulls. . . . The operations of M. Botta were brought to a close in 1845, and a splendid collection of sculptures and other antiquities, the fruits of his labours, arrived in Paris in 1846 and was deposited in the Louvre. Afterwards the French Government appointed M. Place consul at Mosul, and he continued some of the excavations of his predecessor. . . . Mr. Layard, whose attention was early turned in this direction, visited the country in 1840, and afterwards took a great interest in the excavations of M. Botta. At length, in 1845, Layard was enabled through the assistance of Sir Stratford Canning to commence excavations in Assyria himself. On the 8th of November he started from Mosul, and descended the Tigris to Nimroud. . . . Mr. Layard has described in his works with great minuteness his successive excavations, and the remarkable and interesting discoveries he made. . . . After making these discoveries in Assyria, Mr. Layard visited Babylonia, and opened trenches in several of the mounds there. On the return of Mr. Layard to England, excavations were continued in the Euphrates valley under the superintendence of Colonel (now Sir Henry) Rawlinson. Under his directions, Mr. Hormuzd Rassam, Mr. Loftus, and Mr. Taylor excavated various sites and made numerous discoveries, the British Museum receiving the best of the monuments. The materials collected in the national museums of France and England, and the numerous inscriptions published, attracted the attention of the learned, and very soon considerable light was thrown on the history, language, manners, and customs of ancient Assyria and Babylonia."—G. Smith, *Assyrian Discoveries*, ch. 1.—"One of the most important results of Sir A. H. Layard's explorations at Nineveh was the discovery of the ruined library of the ancient city, now buried under the mounds of Kouyunjik. The broken clay tablets belonging to this library not only furnished the student with an immense mass of literary matter,

but also with direct aids towards a knowledge of the Assyrian syllabary and language. Among the literature represented in the library of Kouyunjik were lists of characters, with their various phonetic and ideographic meanings, tables of synonyms, and catalogues of the names of plants and animals. This, however, was not all. The inventors of the cuneiform system of writing had been a people who preceded the Semites in the occupation of Babylonia, and who spoke an agglutinative language utterly different from that of their Semitic successors. These Accadians, as they are usually termed, left behind them a considerable amount of literature, which was highly prized by the Semitic Babylonians and Assyrians. A large portion of the Ninevite tablets, accordingly, consists of interlinear or parallel translations from Accadian into Assyrian, as well as of reading books, dictionaries, and grammars, in which the Accadian original is placed by the side of its Assyrian equivalent. . . . The bilingual texts have not only enabled scholars to recover the long-forgotten Accadian language; they have also been of the greatest possible assistance to them in their reconstruction of the Assyrian dictionary itself. The three expeditions conducted by Mr. George Smith [1873-1876], as well as the later ones of Mr. Hormuzd Rassam, have added largely to the stock of tablets from Kouyunjik originally acquired for the British Museum by Sir A. H. Layard, and have also brought to light a few other tablets from the libraries of Babylonia."—A. H. Sayce, *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments*, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: The Second Monarchy*, ch. 9.—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, bks 3-4.—Geo. Smith, *Ancient Hist. from the Monuments: Assyria*.—See, also, BABYLONIA and SEMITES.

**ASSYRIA, Eponym Canon of.**—"Just as there were archons at Athens and consuls at Rome who were elected annually, so among the Assyrians there was a custom of electing one man to be over the year, whom they called 'limu,' or 'eponym.' . . . Babylonian and Assyrian documents were more generally dated by the names of these eponyms than by that of the reigning King. . . . In 1862 Sir Henry Rawlinson discovered the fragment of the eponym canon of Assyria. It was one of the grandest and most important discoveries ever made, for it has decided definitely a great many points which otherwise could never have been cleared up. Fragments of seven copies of this canon were found, and from these the chronology of Assyria has been definitely settled from B. C. 1330 to about B. C. 620."—E. A. W. Budge, *Babylonian Life and History*, ch. 3.

**ASTOLF, King of the Lombards, A. D. 749-759.**

**ASTRAKHAN: The Khanate.** See **MONGOLS: A. D. 1238-1391.**

**A. D. 1569.**—**Russian repulse of the Turks.** See **RUSSIA: A. D. 1569-1571.**

**ASTURIANS, The.** See **CANTABRIANS.**

**ASTURIANS: Resistance to the Moorish Conquest.** See **SPAIN: A. D. 713-737.**

**ASTY, OR ASTU, The.**—The ancient city of Athens proper, as distinguished from its connected harbors, was called the Asty, or Astu.—J. A. St. John, *The Hellenes*, bk. 1, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: W. M. Lenke, *Topography of Athens*, sect. 10.—See, also, **ATHENS: AREA, &c.**

**ASTYNOMI.**—Certain police officials in ancient Athens, ten in number. "They were charged with all that belongs to street supervision, e. g., the cleansing of the streets, for which purpose the coprologi, or street-sweepers, were under their orders; the securing of morality and decent behaviour in the streets."—G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State*, pt. 3, ch. 3.

**ASUNCIÓN: A. D. 1537.**—The founding of the city. See PARAGUAY: A. D. 1515-1557.

**ATABEGS, ATTABEGS, OR ATTABECKS.**—"From the decline of the dynasty of Seljook to the conquest of Persia by Hulakoo Khan, the son of Chenghiz, a period of more than a century, that country was distracted by the contests of petty princes, or governors, called Atabegs, who, taking advantage of the weakness of the last Seljookian monarchs, and of the distractions which followed their final extinction, established their authority over some of the finest provinces of the Empire. Many of these petty dynasties acquired such a local fame as, to this day, gives an importance to their memory with the inhabitants of the countries over which they ruled. . . . The word Attabeg is Turkish: it is a compound word of 'atta,' master, or tutor, and 'beg,' lord; and signifies a governor, or tutor, of a lord or prince."—Sir J.

Malcolm, *Hist. of Persia*, v. 1, ch. 9.—"It is true that the Atabeks appear but a short space as actors on the stage of Eastern history; but these 'tutors of princes' occupy a position neither insignificant nor unimportant in the course of events which occurred in Syria and Persia at the time they flourished."—W. H. Morley, *Preface to Mirkhond's Hist. of the Atabeks.*—See, also, SALADIN, THE EMPIRE OF.

**ATAHUALPA, The Inca.** See PERU: A. D. 1531-1533.

**ATELIERS NATIONAUX OF 1848, AT PARIS.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1848 (FEBRUARY—MAY), and (APRIL—DECEMBER).

**ATHABASCA, The District of.** See NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES OF CANADA.

**ATHABASCANS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ATHAPASCAN FAMILY.

**ATHALAYAS.** See SARDINIA, THE ISLAND: NAME AND EARLY HISTORY.

**ATHEL.**—**ATHELING.**—**ATHEL-BONDE.** See ADEL.

**ATHENRY, Battle of.**—The most desperate battle fought by the Irish in resisting the English conquest of Ireland. They were terribly slaughtered and the chivalry of Connaught was crushed. The battle occurred Aug. 10, A. D. 1316.—M. Haverty, *Hist. of Ireland*, p. 282.

## ATHENS.

**The Preëminence of Athens.**—"When we speak of Greece we think first of Athens. . . . To citizens and to strangers by means of epic recitations and dramatic spectacles, she presented an idealised image of life itself. She was the home of new ideas, the mother-city from which poetry, eloquence, and philosophy spread to distant lands. While the chief dialects of Greece survive, each not as a mere dialect but as the language of literature,—a thing unknown in the history of any other people,—the Attic idiom, in which the characteristic elements of other dialects met and were blended, has become to us, as it did to the ancients, the very type of Hellenic speech. Athens was not only the 'capital of Greece,' the 'school of Greece;' it deserves the name applied to it in an epitaph on Euripides: 'his country is Athens, Greece of Greece.' The rays of the Greek genius here found a centre and a focus."—S. H. Butcher, *Some Aspects of the Greek Genius*, pp. 38-39.—"Our interest in ancient history, it may be said, lies not in details but in large masses. It matters little how early the Arcadians acquired a political unity or what Nabis did to Mycenæ; that which interests us is the constitution of Athens, the repulse of Persia, the brief bloom of Thebes. Life is not so long that we can spend our days over the unimportant fates of uninteresting tribes and towns."

**Area and Population.**—"The entire circuit of the Asty [the lower city, or Athens proper], Long Walls and maritime city, taken as one inclosure, is equal to about 17 English miles, or 148 stades. This is very different from the 200 stades which Dion Chrysostom states to have been the circumference of the same walls, an estimate exceeding by more than 20 stades even the sum of the peripheries of the Asty and Peiræic towns, according to the numbers of Thucydides. . . . Rome was circular, Syracuse

triangular, and Athens consisted of two circular cities, joined by a street of four miles in length,—a figure, the superficies of which was not more than the fourth part of that of a city of an equal circumference, in a circular form. Hence, when to Rome within the walls were added suburbs of equal extent, its population was greater than that of all Attica. That of Athens, although the most populous city in Greece, was probably never greater than 200,000."—W. M. Leake, *Topography of Athens*, sect. 10.

**Ionian Origin.** See DORIANS AND IONIANS.

**The Beginning of the city-state.**—**How Attica was absorbed in its capital.**—"In the days of Cecrops and the first kings [see ATTICA] down to the reign of Theseus, Attica was divided into communes, having their own town-halls and magistrates. Except in case of alarm the whole people did not assemble in council under the king, but administered their own affairs, and advised together in their several townships. Some of them at times even went to war with him, as the Eleusinians under Eumolpus with Erectheus. But when Theseus came to the throne, he, being a powerful as well as a wise ruler, among other improvements in the administration of the country, dissolved the councils and separate governments, and united all the inhabitants of Attica in the present city, establishing one council and town-hall. They continued to live on their own lands, but he compelled them to resort to Athens as their metropolis, and henceforward they were all inscribed in the roll of her citizens. A great city thus arose which was handed down by Theseus to his descendants, and from his day to this the Athenians have regularly celebrated the national festival of the Synœcia, or 'union of the communes' in honour of the goddess Athênê. Before his time, what is now the Acropolis and the ground lying under it to the south was the





# A Logical Outline of Athenian and Greek History

IN WHICH THE DOMINANT CONDITIONS AND  
INFLUENCES ARE DISTINGUISHED BY COLORS.

*Physical or material.*  
**Ethnological.**

**Social and political.**  
**Intellectual, moral and**

**religious.**

**Foreign.**

The most capable people of early times, placed in the most favorable environment that the world in those times could offer them, worked out a civilization — perfected in all refinements except the moral — which has been the admiration and the marvel of later days.

Under modern conditions, the country of the Greeks gives no marked advantage to its inhabitants; but in the age of fiercer struggles, when war among men was tribal, universal, and hand to hand, and when the larger possibilities of pacific intercourse were bounded by one small sea, its intersecting mountains, its separated valleys and plains, its penetrating gulf and bays, its clustered peninsulas in peninsulas, were helpful beyond measure to their social and political advance. In no other region of Europe could the independent city-states of ancient Hellas have grown up in shelter so safe, under skies so kindly, amid influences from the outer world so urgent and so strong.

It is reasonable to say that these happy conditions had much to do with the shaping of the character and career of the Greek people as a whole. But they differed very greatly from one another in their various political groups, and by differences that cannot be traced to varied surroundings of earth, or air, or sea, or human neighborhood. When every circumstance which distinguishes Athens in situation from Sparta, or from Corinth, or from Argos, has been weighed and reckoned, the Athenian is still parted from the Spartan, from the Corinthian and from the Argive, by a distinction which we name and do not explain by calling it family or race.

At some time in the unknown past, there had been a parting of kindred among the ancestors of the Greeks, and the current of descent ran, for many centuries, perhaps, in two clearly divided streams, which acquired (in what manner, who can guess?) very different characteristics and qualities in their course. Then, in time, the great migrations, which are at the beginning of the traditions of the Greeks, brought these two branches of the race (the Doric and the Ionic, as they are named) into contact again, and associated them in a common career. In the inherited nature of the race (the Doric and the Ionic, as they are named) thing which made them more sensitive to the finer delights of the mind, and prepared them to be more easily moved by every impulse toward philosophy and art, from the civilizations that were older than their own. In the Dorians there was less of this. They shared in equal measure, perhaps, the keen, clear Greek intellect, but they narrowed it to commoner aims.

It is possible that all which the Athenians came to be, their elder kindred, the Achæans, might have been. Their peninsula of Argolis is the peninsula of Aïttea in duplicate, — washed by the same waves, and reaching out to the same eastern world. They were first to touch hands with Phœnicia and with Egypt, and first to borrow arts and ideas from Memphis and Tyre. But their civilization, which they had raised to the height which Homer portrays, was overwhelmed by the Doric conquest; and the fact that these invaders, succeeding to the same vantage ground, remained as poor in culture as the Argives and their final masters, the Spartans, appear to have been, gives evidence of the strange difference that was rooted in the constitution of the two branches of the race.

By force of this difference, the Spartans formed their state upon the grim lines of a military camp, and took leadership among the Greeks in practical affairs; the Athenians adorned a free city with great and beautiful works, made it hospitable to all genius and all the knowledge of the time, and created a capital for the civilization of the ancient world.

In all the Greek communities there was a primitive stage at which kings ruled over them in a patriarchal way. In most

*The Land.*

**Ioniæ and Dorians.**

**Achæans.—Mycæna.**

**Sparta.—Athens.**

of them, the kingship surrendered to an oligarchy, — the oligarchy, in time, was overthrown by some bold adventurer, who led a rising of the people and snatched power in the turmoil to make himself a "tyrant," — and the tyrant in his turn fell, after no long reign. In Athens, that course of revolution was run; but it did not end as with the rest. The Athenian tyranny gave way to the purest democracy that has ever had trial in the world.

*H. C. 510.*  
*Athenian democracy.*

That this Athenian democracy was wise in itself may be open to doubt; but it produced wise men, and, for the century of its great career, it was wonderfully led. How far that came to it from superiority of race, and how far as the fruitage of free institutions, no man can say; but the succession of statesmen who raised Athens to her pitch of greatness, without shattering the government of the people by the people, has no parallel in the annals of so small a state.

Sparta, not Athens, was the military head of Greece; but when a great emergency came upon the whole Greek world, it was the larger intelligence and higher spirit of the Attic state which inspired and guided the defence of the land and drove the Persian back.

*H. C. 403-470.*  
*The Persian War.*

Making prompt use of the ascendancy she had won in the Persian War, Athens rose rapidly in power and wealth. Under the guise of a federation of the Ionian cities of the islands and of Asia Minor, she created an empire subject to her rule. She commanded the sea with superior fleets, and became first in commerce, as she was first in knowledge, in politics and in arts. Her coffers overflowed with the riches poured into them by her tribute-gatherers and her men of trade, and she employed them with a noble prodigality upon her temples and the buildings of the state. Her abounding genius yielded fruits, in learning, letters, and art, which surpass the whole experience of the world, before and since, when measured against the smallness of the numbers from which they came.

*H. C. 477.*  
*Confederacy of Delos.*

*H. C. 445-420.*  
*Age of Pericles.*

But the power attained by the Athenian democracy was arrogantly and harshly used; its sovereignty was exercised without generosity or restraint. It provoked the hatred of its subjects, and the bitter jealousy of rival states. Hence war in due time was inevitable, and Athens, alone in the war, was thrown down from her high estate. The last of the Great leaders of her golden age died when her need of him was greatest, and her citizens were given over to demagogues who beguiled them to the ruin of the republic.

*H. C. 431-404.*  
*Peloponnesian War.*

Sparta regained the supremacy in Greece, and her rude domination, imposed upon all, was harder to bear than the superiority of Athens had been. Under the lead of Epaminondas of Thebes — the most high-souled statesman who ever swayed the Hellenic race — the Spartan yoke was broken.

*H. C. 404-370.* *Sparta.*  
*H. C. 370-302.* *Thebes.*

But, in breaking it, all unity in Hellas was destroyed, and all hope of resistance to any common foe. The foe who first appeared was the half-Greek Macedonian, King Philip, who subdued the whole peninsula with ease, and found none to defend it so heroically as the orator Demosthenes.

*H. C. 358.*  
*Macedonian supremacy.*

But the subjugated Greeks were not yet at the end of their career. With Philip's great son they went forth to a new and higher destiny than the building of petty states. Unwittingly he made conquest of an empire for them, and not for himself. They Hellenized it from the Euxine to the Nile. In Egypt, in Syria, and in Asia Minor, they entered and took possession of every field of activity, and put their impress on every movement of thought. Their philosophy and their literature fed all the intellectual hunger of the age; their energy was its civilizing force.

*H. C. 334-323.*  
*Alexander's conquests*  
*— Hellenization of the East.*

Then the Romans came, to conquer and be conquered by the spirit of Athenian Greece, and to do for Europe, in the West, what the Macedonians had done in the East. They effaced Greece from history, in the political sense; but they knecled to her teaching, and became the servants of her civilization, to carry it wherever the Roman eagles went.

*H. C. 107-146.*  
*Roman conquest.*


A little later, when that civilization was changed by the transforming spirit of the Gospel of Christ, it did not cease to be essentially Greek; for Hellenism and Hebraism were fused in the theology of the rising Christian Church, and Greek thought ruled mankind again in an altered phase.

*Christianty.*

At last, when Roman imperialism was driven from the West, Greece drew it to herself, and reigned in the great name of Rome, and fought gloriously with barbarians and with infidels for a thousand adored years, defending the Christian world till it grew strong and stood in peril no more.


*A. D. 470-1453.*  
*The Eastern Empire.*





PLAN OF ATHENS.

*From "Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens," by Jane E. Harrison and Margaret de G. Verrall.*



city. Many reasons may be urged in proof of this statement."—Thucydides, *History* (*Jozeff's trans.*), bk. 2, sect. 15.

ALSO IN: M. Duncker, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 3, ch. 7 (v. 2).

From the Dorian Migration to B. C. 683.—End of kingship and institution of the Archons.—At the epoch of the Boeotian and Dorian migrations (see GREECE: THE MIGRATIONS), Attica was flooded by fugitives, both from the north and from the Peloponnesus. "But the bulk of the refugees passed on to Asia, and built up the cities of Ionia. . . . When the swarms of emigrants cleared off, and Athens is again discernible, the crown has passed from the old royal house of the Cecropidae to a family of exiles from Peloponnesus. . . . A generation later the Dorian invasion, which had overwhelmed Coriath and torn away Megara from the Attic dominion, swept up to the very gates of Athens. An oracle declared that the city would never fall if its ruler perished by the hand of the invaders; therefore King Codrus disguised himself as a peasant, set out for the Dorian camp, struck down the first man he met, and was himself slain by the second. The invasion failed, and the Athenians, to perpetuate the memory of their monarch's patriotism, would not allow the title of 'king' to be borne by the descendants who succeeded him on the throne, but changed the name to 'archon,' or 'ruler.' . . . These legends evidently cover some obscure changes in the internal history of Attica."—C. W. C. Oman, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 11.—"After the death of Codrus the nobles, taking advantage, perhaps, of the opportunity afforded by the dispute between his sons, are said to have abolished the title of king, and to have substituted for it that of Archon. This change, however, seems to have been important, rather as it indicated the new, precarious tenure by which the royal power was held, than as it immediately affected the nature of the office. It was, indeed, still held for life; and Medon, the son of Codrus, transmitted it to his posterity. . . . After twelve reigns, ending with that of Alcmæon [B. C. 752], the duration of the office was limited to ten years; and through the guilt or calamity of Hippomenes, the fourth decennial archon, the house of Medon was deprived of its privilege, and the supreme magistracy was thrown open to the whole body of nobles. This change was speedily followed by one much more important. . . . The duration of the archonship was again reduced to a single year [B. C. 683]; and, at the same time, its branches were severed and distributed among nine new magistrates. Among these, the first in rank retained the distinguishing title of the Archon, and the year was marked by his name. He represented the majesty of the state, and exercised a peculiar jurisdiction—that which had belonged to the king as the common parent of his people, the protector of families, the guardian of orphans and heiresses, and of the general rights of inheritance. For the second archon the title of king [basileus], if it had been laid aside, was revived, as the functions assigned to him were those most associated with ancient recollections. He represented the king as the high-priest of his people; he regulated the celebration of the mysteries and the most solemn festivals; decided all causes which affected the interests of religion. . . . The third

archon bore the title of Polemarch, and filled the place of the king as the leader of his people in war, and the guardian who watched over its security in time of peace. . . . The remaining six archons received the common title of thesmothetes, which literally signifies legislators, and was probably applied to them as the judges who determined the great variety of causes which did not fall under the cognizance of their colleagues; because, in the absence of a written code, those who declare and interpret the laws may be properly said to make them."—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 11.—"We are in no condition to determine the civil classification and political constitution of Attica, even at the period of the Archonship of Kreon, 683 B. C., when authentic Athenian chronology first commences, much less can we pretend to any knowledge of the anterior centuries. . . . All the information which we possess respecting that old polity is derived from authors who lived after all or most of these great changes [by Solon, and later]—and who, finding no records, nor anything better than current legends, explained the foretime as well as they could by guesses more or less ingenious, generally attached to the dominant 'legendary names.'"—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 10.

ALSO IN: G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State*, pt. 3, ch. 3.—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 3, ch. 7 (v. 2).

B. C. 624.—Under the Draconian Legislation.—"Drako was the first thesmothet, who was called upon to set down his thesmoi [ordinances and decisions] in writing, and thus to invest them essentially with a character of more or less generality. In the later and better-known times of Athenian law, we find these archons deprived in great measure of their powers of judging and deciding, and restricted to the task of first hearing of parties and collecting the evidence, next, of introducing the matter for trial into the appropriate dikastery, over which they presided. Originally, there was no separation of powers; the archons both judged and administered. . . . All of these functionaries belonged to the Eupatrids, and all of them doubtless acted more or less in the narrow interest of their order; moreover, there was ample room for favoritism in the way of connivance as well as antipathy on the part of the archons. That such was decidedly the case, and that discontent began to be serious, we may infer from the duty imposed on the thesmothet Drako, B. C. 624, to put in writing the thesmoi or ordinances, so that they might be 'shown publicly' and known beforehand. He did not meddle with the political constitution, and in his ordinances Aristotle finds little worthy of remark except the extreme severity of the punishments awarded: petty thefts, or even proved idleness of life, being visited with death or disfranchisement. But we are not to construe this remark as demonstrating any special inhumanity in the character of Drako, who was not invested with the large power which Solon afterwards enjoyed, and cannot be imagined to have imposed upon the community severe laws of his own invention. . . . The general spirit of penal legislation had become so much milder, during the two centuries which followed, that these old ordinances appeared to Aristotle intolerably rigorous."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 10 (p. 3).

**B. C. 612-595.—Conspiracy of Cylon.—Banishment of the Alcæonids.**—The first attempt at Athens to overturn the oligarchical government and establish a personal tyranny was made, B. C. 612, by Cylon (Kylon), a patrician, son-in-law of the tyrant of Megara, who was encouraged and helped in his undertaking by the latter. The conspiracy failed miserably. The partisans of Cylon, blockaded in the acropolis, were forced to surrender; but they placed themselves under the protection of the goddess Minerva and were promised their lives. More effectually to retain the protection of the goddess until their escape was effected, they attached a cord to her altar and held it in their hands as they passed out through the midst of their enemies. Unhappily the cord broke, and the archon Megacles at once declared that the safeguard of Minerva was withdrawn from them, whereupon they were massacred without mercy, even though they fled to the neighboring altars and clung to them. The treachery and bad faith of this cruel deed does not seem to have disturbed the Athenian people, but the sacrilege involved in it caused horror and fear when they had had time to reflect upon it. Megacles and his whole family—the Alcæonids as they were called, from the name of one of their ancestors—were held accountable for the affront to the gods and were considered polluted and accursed. Every public calamity was ascribed to their sin, and at length, after a solemn trial, they were banished from the city (about 596 or 595 B. C.), while the dead of the family were disinterred and cast out. The ramifications of this affair exercised an important influence on the course of events, which opened the way for Solon and his constitutional reforms.—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 11.

ALSO IN: G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 10.

**B. C. 610-586.—Struggle with Megara for Salamis.—Cirrhean or First Sacred War.**—“The petty state of Megara, which, since the earlier ages, had, from the dependent of Athens, grown up to the dignity of her rival, taking advantage of the internal dissensions in the latter city, succeeded in wresting from the Athenian government the isle of Salamis. It was not, however, without bitter and repeated struggles that Athens at last submitted to the surrender of the isle. But, after signal losses and defeats, as nothing is ever more odious to the multitude than unsuccessful war, so the popular feeling was such as to induce the government to enact a decree by which it was forbidden, upon pain of death, to propose reasserting the Athenian claims. . . . Many of the younger portion of the community, pining at the dishonour of their country, and eager for enterprise, were secretly inclined to countenance any stratagem that might induce the reversal of the decree. At this time there went a report through the city that a man of distinguished birth . . . had incurred the consecrating misfortune of insanity. Suddenly this person appeared in the market place, wearing the peculiar badge [a cap] that distinguished the sleek. . . . Ascending the stone from which the heralds made their proclamations, he began to recite aloud a poem upon the loss of Salamis, boldly reproving the cowardice of the people, and inciting them again to war. His supposed insanity protected him from the law—his rank, reputation, and the circumstance of his being himself a

native of Salamis, conspired to give to his exhortation a powerful effect, and the friends he had secured to back his attempt loudly proclaimed their applauding sympathy with the spirit of the address. The name of the pretended madman was Solon, son of Exceestides, the descendant of Codrus. . . . The stratagem and the eloquence of Solon produced its natural effect upon his spirited and excitable audience, and the public enthusiasm permitted the oligarchical government to propose and effect the repeal of the law. An expedition was decreed and planned, and Solon was invested with its command. It was but a brief struggle to recover the little island of Salamis. . . . But the brave and resolute Megarians were not men to be disheartened by a single reverse; they persisted in the contest—losses were sustained on either side, and at length both states agreed to refer their several claims on the sovereignty of the island to the decision of Spartan arbiters. And this appeal from arms to arbitration is a proof how much throughout Greece had extended that spirit of civilisation which is but an extension of the sense of justice. . . . The arbitration of the umpires in favour of Athens only suspended hostilities; and the Megarians did not cease to watch (and shortly afterwards they found) a fitting occasion to regain a settlement so tempting to their ambition. The credit acquired by Solon in this expedition was shortly afterwards greatly increased in the estimation of Greece. In the Bay of Corinth was situated a town called Cirrha, inhabited by a fierce and lawless race, who, after devastating the sacred territories of Delphi, sacrilegiously besieged the city itself, in the desire to possess themselves of the treasures which the plety of Greece had accumulated in the Temple of Apollo. Solon appeared at the Amphictyonic council, represented the sacrilege of the Cirrheans, and persuaded the Greeks to arm in defence of the altars of their tutelary god [B. C. 595]. Clisthenes, the tyrant of Sicyon, was sent as commander-in-chief against the Cirrheans; and (according to Plutarch) the records of Delphi inform us that Alcæon was the leader of the Athenians. The war [known as the First Sacred War] was not very successful at the onset, the oracle of Apollo was consulted, and the answer makes one of the most amusing anecdotes of priestcraft. The besiegers were informed by the god that the place would not be reduced until the waves of the Cirrhean Sea washed the territories of Delphi. The reply perplexed the army; but the superior sagacity of Solon was not slow in discovering that the holy intention of the oracle was to appropriate the lands of the Cirrheans to the profit of the temple. He therefore advised the besiegers to attack and to conquer Cirrha, and to dedicate its whole territory to the service of the god. The advice was adopted—Cirrha was taken [B. C. 586]; it became thenceforth the arsenal of Delphi, and the insulted deity had the satisfaction of seeing the sacred lands washed by the waves of the Cirrhean Sea. . . . The Pythian games commenced, or were revived, in celebration of this victory of the Pythian god.”—Sir E. Bulwer Lytton, *Athens: Its Rise and Fall*, bk. 2, ch. 1.—See, also, DELPHI.

**B. C. 594.—The Constitution of Solon.—The Council of Four Hundred.**—“Solon, Archon Ol. 46, 1, was chosen mediator. Equity and moderation are described by the ancients as

the characteristics of his mind; he determined to abolish the privileges of particular classes, and the arbitrary power of officers, and to render all the participaters in civil and political freedom equal in the eye of the law, at the same time ensuring to every one the integrity of those rights to which his real merits entitled him; on the other hand, he was far from contemplating a total subversion of existing regulations. . . . Whatever was excellent in prescription was incorporated with the new laws and thereby stamped afresh; but prescription as such, with the exception of some unwritten religious ordinances of the Eumolpids, was deprived of force. The law was destined to be the sole centre, whence every member of the political community was to derive a fixed rule of conduct."—W. Wachsmuth, *Historical Antiquities of the Greeks*, sect. 46 (n. 1).—"The factions, to allay the reviving animosities of which was Solon's immediate object, had, at that time, formed parties corresponding to the geographical division of the country, which we have already adverted to; the Pedieæ, or inhabitants of the lowlands, insisted on a strict oligarchy; the Parali, on the coast, who, did we not find the Alcmaeonid Megacles at their head, might be considered the wealthier portion of the people, wished for a mixed constitution; but the Diacrii or Hyperacrii [of the mountainous district] formed the great majority, who, in their impoverished state, looked for relief only from a total revolution. Solon might, had he so chosen, have made himself tyrant by heading this populace; but he preferred acting as mediator, and with this view caused himself to be elected archon, B. C. 594, as being an Eupatrid of the house . . . of Codrus."—C. F. Hermann, *Manual of the Political Antiquities of Greece*, ch. 5, sect. 106.—"The chief power was vested in the collective people; but in order that it might be exercised with advantage it was necessary that they should be endowed with common rights of citizenship. Solon effected this by raising the lower class from its degradation, and by subjecting to legal control those who had till now formed the governing order, as well as by rendering the liberty of both dependent upon the law. . . . This change was brought about by two ordinances, which must not be regarded as mere remedies for the abuses of that period, but as the permanent basis of free and legal citizenship. The one was the *Seisachtheia*; this was enacted by Solon to afford relief to oppressed debtors, by reducing their debts in amount, and by raising the value of money in the payment of interest and principal; at the same time he abrogated the former rigorous law of debt by which the freeman might be reduced to servitude, and thus secured to him the unmolested possession of his legal rights. . . . A second ordinance enjoined, that their full and entire rights should be restored to all citizens who had incurred *Atimia*, except to absolute criminals. This was not only destined to heal the wounds which had been caused by the previous dissensions, but as till that time the law of debt had been able to reduce citizens to *Atimia*, and the majority of the *Atimoi* pointed out by Solon were slaves for debt, that declaration stood in close connection with the *Seisachtheia*, and had the effect of a proclamation from the state of its intention to guarantee the validity of the new citizenship.

. . . The right of naturalization was granted by Solon to deserving aliens, when 6,000 citizens declared themselves in favour of the measure, but these new citizens were likewise deficient in a few of the privileges of citizenship. . . . The statement that Solon received a great many foreigners as citizens, and every artisan that presented himself, appears highly improbable, as Solon was the first legislator who systematically regulated the condition of the *Metæci*. The *Metæci* . . . probably took the place of the former *Demiurgi*; their position was one of suzerainty, but the protection of the laws was guaranteed them. . . . The servile order, exclusively consisting of purchased aliens and their descendants, did not, as a body, stand in direct relation with the state; individual slaves became the property of individual citizens, but a certain number were employed by the state as clerks, etc., and were abandoned to the arbitrary pleasure of their oppressive taskmasters. . . . Those who were manumitted stood upon the footing of *Metæci*; the citizens who enfranchised them becoming their *Prostatæ*. . . . Upon attaining the age of puberty, the sons of citizens entered public life under the name of *Ephæbi*. The state gave them two years for the full development of their youthful strength. . . . Upon the expiration of the second, and according to the most authentic accounts, in their eighteenth year, they received the shield and spear in the popular assembly; complete armour being given to the sons of those who had fallen in battle, and in the temple of *Agraulos* took the oath of young citizens, the chief obligations of which concerned the defence of their country, and then for the space of one or two years performed military service in the Attic border fortresses under the name of *Peripoli*. The ceremony of arming them was followed by enrolment in the book which contained the names of those who had attained majority; this empowered the young citizen to manage his own fortune, preside over a household, enter the popular assembly, and speak. When he asserted the last right, viz., the *Isegoria*, *Parrhesia*, he was denominated *Rhetor*, and this appellation denoted the difference between him and the silent member of the assembly, the *Idiotes*. . . . Upon attaining his 30th year, the citizen might assert his superior rights; he was qualified for a member of the sworn tribunal entitled *Heliæa*. . . . The word *Hellast* does not merely signify a judge; but the citizen who has fully attained maturity. . . . The judges of the courts of the *Dietæta* and *Epheta*, which existed without the circle of the ordinary tribunals, were required to be still older men than the *Hellasts*, viz., 50 or 60 years of age. Solon appointed gradations in the rights of citizenship, according to the conditions of a census in reference to offices of state. . . . Upon the principle of a conditional equality of rights, which assigns to every one as much as he deserves, and which is highly characteristic of Solon's policy in general, he instituted four classes according to a valuation; these were the *Pentacosiomedimi* [whose land yielded 500 measures of wheat or oil], the *Hippesi* [horsemen], the *Zeugite* [owners of a yoke of mules], and the *Thetes* [or laborers]. The valuation, however, only affected that portion of capital from which contributions to the state-burdens were required, consequently, according to

Böckh, a taxable capital. . . . The Thetes, the last of these classes, were not regularly summoned to perform military service, but only exercised the civic right as members of the assembly and the law-courts; . . . the highest class exclusively supplied the superior offices, such as the archonship, and through this the council of the Areopagus. . . . In lieu of the former council of administration, of which no memorial has been preserved, Solon instituted a Council of four hundred citizens taken from the first three classes, 100 from every Phyle, of which no person under 30 years of age could be a member. The appointments were renewed annually; the candidates underwent an examination, and such as were deemed eligible drew lots."—W. Wachsmuth, *Historical Antiquities of the Greeks*, sect. 46-47 (p. 1).

ALSO IN: G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State*, pt. 3, ch. 3, sect. 4.—E. Abbott, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 11, ch. 3.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 11.—Plutarch, *Solon*.—Aristotle, *On the Const. of Athens* (tr. by E. Poste), ch. 5-13.—See, also, *AREOPAGUS*, *PRYTANES*, *HELLIA*, and *DEBT*.

**B. C. 560-510.**—The tyranny of the Pisistratids.—“The constitution which he [Solon] framed was found to be insufficient even in his own life-time. . . . The poor citizens were still poor, in spite of the Seisachtheia and the reform of the constitution. At the same time the admission of the lowest class in the scale of property to the rights of Athenian citizenship, and the authority given to the General Assembly, had thrown a power into the hands of the masses which filled the more conservative citizens with resentment and alarm. And so the old party quarrels, which had divided Attica before the reforms of Solon, reappeared after them with even greater violence. The men of the plain were led by Miltiades, a grandson of the tyrant of Corinth, and Lycurgus, the son of Aristoloidas; the men of the shore by Megacles, the Alcmaeonid, who had recently strengthened the position of his family by his marriage with Agariste, the daughter of Cleisthenes of Sicyon. At the head of the mountaineers stood Pisistratus, a descendant of the royal stock of Nestor, who . . . had greatly distinguished himself in the Salaminian war. As he possessed property in the neighborhood of Marathon, Pisistratus may have been intimately known to the inhabitants of the adjacent hills. . . . Solon watched the failure of his hopes with the deepest distress. He endeavoured to recall the leaders of the contending parties to a sense of their duty to the country, and to soothe the bitterness of their followers. With a true instinct he regarded Pisistratus as by far the most dangerous of the three. Pisistratus was an approved general, and the faction which he led was composed of poor men who had nothing to lose. . . . Pisistratus met the vehement expressions of Solon by driving wounded into the market-place. The people's friend had suffered in the people's cause; his life was in danger. The incident roused the Athenians to an unusual exercise of political power. Without any previous discussion in the Council, a decree was passed by the people allowing Pisistratus to surround himself with a body-guard of fifty men, and to arm them with clubs. Thus protected, he threw off all disguises, and established himself in the Acropolis as tyrant of Athens [B. C. 560]. . . .

Herodotus tells us that Pisistratus was a just and moderate ruler. He did not alter the laws or remove the existing forms of government. The Council was still elected, the Assembly continued to meet, though it is improbable that either the one or the other was allowed to extend its functions beyond domestic affairs. The archons still continued to be the executive magistrates of the city, and cases of murder were tried, as of old, at the Areopagus. The tyrant contented himself with occupying the Acropolis with his troops and securing important posts in the administration for his family or his adherents." Twice, however, Pisistratus was driven from power by the combination of his opponents, and into exile, for four years in the first instance and for ten years in the last; but Athens was compelled to re-<sup>re-</sup>cept him for a ruler in the end. "Pisistratus remained in undisturbed possession of the throne till his death in 527 B. C. He was succeeded by his eldest son Hippias, with whom Hipparchus and Thersites, his younger sons, were associated in the government." But these younger tyrants soon made themselves intolerably hateful, and a conspiracy formed against them by Harmodius and Aristogeiton was successful in taking the life of Hipparchus. Four years later, in 510 B. C., with the help of Delphi and Sparta, Hippias was driven from the city. Cleisthenes, at the head of the exiled Alcmaeonids, was the master-spirit of the revolution, and it was under his guidance that the Athenian democratic constitution was reorganized.—E. Abbott, *Hist. of Greece*, v. 1, ch. 15.

ALSO IN: G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 11 and 30.

**B. C. 510-507.**—The constitution of Cleisthenes.—Advance of democracy.—“The expulsion of the Pisistratids left the democratic party, which had first raised them to power, without a leader. The Alcmaeonids had always been considered as its adversaries, though they were no less opposed to the faction of the nobles, which seems at this time to have been headed by Isagoras. . . . Cleisthenes found himself, as his party had always been, unable to cope with it; he resolved, therefore, to shift his ground, and to attach himself to that popular cause which Pisistratus had used as the stepping stone of his ambition. His aims, however, were not confined to a temporary advantage over his rivals; he planned an important change in the constitution, which should forever break the power of his whole order, by dissolving some of the main links by which their sway was secured. For this purpose, having gained the confidence of the commonalty and obtained the sanction of the Delphic oracle, he abolished the four ancient tribes, and made a fresh geographical division of Attica into ten new tribes, each of which bore a name derived from some Attic hero. The ten tribes were subdivided into districts of various extent, called demes, each containing a town or village. . . . Cleisthenes appears to have preserved the ancient piratries; but as they were now left insulated by the abolition of the tribes to which they belonged, they lost all political importance. . . . Cleisthenes at the same time increased the strength of the commonalty by making a great many new citizens, and he is said to have enfranchised not only aliens—these both residents and adventurers from abroad—but slaves. . . . The whole frame of the state was reorganized to correspond



with the new division of the country. The Senate of the Four Hundred was increased to Five Hundred, that fifty might be drawn from each tribe, and the rotation of the presidency was adapted to this change, the fifty councillors of each tribe filling that office for thirty-five or thirty-six days in succession, and nine councillors being elected one from each of the other tribes to preside at the Council and the Assembly of the People, which was now called regularly four times in the month, certain business being assigned to each meeting. The *Helica* was also distributed into ten courts; and the same division henceforth prevailed in most of the public offices, though the number of the archons remained unchanged. To Cleisthenes also is ascribed the formal institution of the ostracism. . . . These changes, and the influence they acquired for their author, reduced the party of Isagoras to utter weakness, and they saw no prospect of maintaining themselves but by foreign aid." Isagoras, accordingly, applied for help to Cleomenes, one of the kings of Sparta, who had already interfered in Athenian affairs by assisting at the expulsion of the Pisistratidæ. Cleomenes responded by coming to Athens with a small force [B. C. 508], which sullied to overawe the people, and, assuming dictatorial authority, he established Isagoras in power, with an attempted rearrangement of the government. "He began by banishing 700 families designated by Isagoras, and then proceeded to suppress the Council of the Five Hundred, and to lodge the government in the hands of Three Hundred of his friend's partisans. When, however, the councillors resisted this attempt, the people took heart, and, Cleomenes and Isagoras having occupied the citadel, rose in a body and besieged them there. As they were not prepared to sustain a siege, they capitulated on the third day; Cleomenes and Isagoras were permitted to depart with the Lacedæmonian troops, but they were compelled to abandon their adherents to the mercy of their enemies. All were put to death, and Cleisthenes and the 700 banished families returned triumphantly to Athens." Cleomenes soon afterwards raised a force with which to subdue Athens and restore Isagoras. The Athenians in their alarm sent an embassy to Sardis to solicit the protection of the Persians. Fortunately, nothing came of it, and Cleomenes was so much opposed in his project, by the Corinthians and other allies of Sparta, that he had to give it up.—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 11.

ALSO IN: G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 31.—E. Abbott, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 15.—Aristotle on the *Const. of Athens* (tr. by E. Poste), ch. 20-22.

**B. C. 509-506.—Hostile undertakings of Cleomenes and Sparta.—Help solicited from the Persian king.—Subjection refused.—Failure of Spartan schemes to restore tyranny.—Protest of the Corinthians.—Successful war with Thebes and Chalcis.**—"With Sparta it was obvious that the Athenians now had a deadly quarrel, and on the other side they knew that Hippias was seeking to precipitate on them the power of the Persian king. It seemed therefore to be a matter of stern necessity to anticipate the intrigues of their banished tyrant; and the Athenians accordingly sent ambassadors to Sardis to make an independent alliance with the Persian despot. The envoys, on being

brought into the presence of Artaphernes, the Satrap of Lydia, were told that Darius would admit them to an alliance if they would give him earth and water,—in other words, if they would acknowledge themselves his slaves. To this demand of absolute subjection the envoys gave an assent which was indignantly repudiated by the whole body of Athenian citizens. . . . Foiled for the time in his efforts, Kleomenes was not cast down. Regarding the Kleisthenian constitution as a personal insult to himself, he was resolved that Isagoras should be despot of Athens. Summoning the allies of Sparta [including the Boeotian League headed by Thebes, and the people of Chalcis in Eubœa], he led them as far as Eleusis, 12 miles only from Athens, without informing them of the purpose of the campaign. He had no sooner confessed it than the Corinthians, declaring that they had been brought away from home on an unrighteous errand, went back, followed by the other Spartan King, Demaratos, the son of Ariston; and this conflict of opinion broke up the rest of the army. This discomfiture of their enemy seemed to inspire fresh strength into the Athenians, who won a series of victories over the Boiotians and Eubolians"—completely overthrowing the latter—the Chalcidians—taking possession of their city, and making it a peculiar colony and dependency of Athens.—See KLEOMENES. The anger of Kleomenes "on being discomfited at Eleusis by the defection of his own allies was heightened by indignation at the discovery that in driving out his friend Hippias he had been simply the tool of Kleisthenes and of the Delphian priestess whom Kleisthenes had bribed. It was now clear to him and to his countrymen that the Athenians would not acquiesce in the predominance of Sparta, and that if they retained their freedom, the power of Athens would soon be equal to their own. Their only safety lay, therefore, in providing the Athenians with a tyrant. An invitation was, therefore, sent to Hippias at Sigeion, to attend a congress of the allies at Sparta, who were summoned to meet on the arrival of the exiled despot." The appointed congress was held, and the Spartans besought their allies to aid them in humbling the Athenian Democracy, with the object of restoring Hippias to power. But again the Corinthians protested, bluntly suggesting that if the Spartans thought tyranny a good thing they might first try it for themselves. Hippias, speaking in his own behalf, attempted to convince them that the time was coming "in which they would find the Athenians a thorn in their side. For the present his exhortations were thrown away. The allies protested unanimously against all attempts to interfere with the internal administration of any Hellenic city; and the banished tyrant went back disappointed to Sigeion."—G. W. Cox, *The Greeks and the Persians*, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 31 (p. 4).

**B. C. 501-490.—Aid to Ionians against Persia.—Provocation of King Darius.—His wrath and attempted vengeance.—The first Persian invasions.—Battle of Marathon.**—"It is undeniable that the extension of the Persian dominion over Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt gave a violent check to the onward movement of Greek life. On the other hand, it seemed as if the great

enterprise of Darius Hystaspis against the Scythians ought to have united the Greeks and Persians. It was of a piece with the general policy of Darius that, after defeating so many other adversaries, he undertook to prevent for all succeeding time a repetition of those incursions with which, some centuries before, the Scythians had visited Asia and the civilized world. He possessed authority enough to unite the different nations which obeyed his sceptre in a great campaign against the Scythians. . . . The Greeks were his best allies in his campaign; they built him the bridge by which he crossed the Bosphorus, and also the bridge of boats over the Danube by which he made his invasion into the enemy's territory. The result was not one which could properly be called unfortunate; yet it was certainly of a very doubtful character. . . . A great region, in which they had already obtained very considerable influence, was closed to them once more. The Persian army brought the populations upon the Strymon, many in number and individually weak, under the dominion of Persia; and even Amyntas, the king of Macedonia, one of a race of rulers of Greek origin, was compelled to do homage to the Great King. Thus the movement which had thrust back the Greeks from Egypt and Asia Minor made advances even into the regions of Europe which bordered upon Northern Hellas. It was an almost inevitable consequence of this that the Greeks were menaced and straitened even in their proper home. A pretext and opportunity for an attack upon the Greek islands was presented to the Persians by the questions at issue between the populations of the cities and the tyrants. . . . The instrument by whom the crisis was brought about was not a person of any great importance. It is not always great natures, or natures strong in the consciousness of their own powers, that bring on such conflicts; this is sometimes the work of those flexible characters which, being at the point of contact between the opposing forces, pass from one side to the other. Such a character was Aristagoras of Miletus. . . . Morally contemptible, but gifted intellectually with a range of ideas of unlimited extent, Aristagoras made for himself an imperishable name by being the first to entertain the thought of a collective opposition to the Persians on the part of all the Greeks, even contemplating the possibility of waging a great and successful offensive war upon them. . . . He announced in Miletus his own resignation of power and the restoration to the people of their old laws. . . . A general overthrow of tyranny ensued [B. C. 501], involving a revolt from Persia, and Strategoi were everywhere appointed. The supreme power in the cities was based upon a good understanding between the holders of power and the Persians; the fact that one of these rulers found the authority of the Persians intolerable was the signal for a universal revolt. Aristagoras himself voluntarily renounced the tyranny, the other tyrants were compelled to take the same course; and thus the cities, assuming at the same time a democratic organization, came into hostility with Persia. . . . The cities and islands which had so often been forced to submission could not hope to resist the Persians by their own unaided efforts. Even Aristagoras could not have expected so much. . . . He visited Lakdemonon, the strongest of the Greek powers, in person, and en-

deavored to carry her with him in his plans. . . . Rejected by Sparta, Aristagoras betook himself to Athens. . . . The Athenians granted Aristagoras twenty ships, to which the Eretrians, from friendship to Miletus, added five more. The courage of the Ionians was thus revived, and an attack upon the Persian dominion commenced, directed, not indeed against Susa, but against Sardis, in their immediate neighborhood, the capital of the satrapy which imposed on them their heaviest burdens. . . . By the burning of Sardis, in which a sanctuary of Kybele had been destroyed, the Syrian nations had been outraged in the person of their gods. We know that it was part of the system of the Persians to take the gods of a country under their protection. Nor would the great king who thought himself appointed to be master of the world fail to resent an invasion of his dominions as an insult calling for revenge. The hostile attempts of the Ionians made no great impression upon him, but he asked who were the Athenians, of whose share in the campaign he had been informed. They were foreigners, of whose power the king had scarcely heard. . . . The enterprise of Aristagoras had meanwhile caused general commotion. He had by far the larger part of Cyprus, together with the Carians, on his side. All the country near the Propontis and the Hellespont was in revolt. The Persians were compelled to make it their first concern to suppress this insurrection, a task which, if attempted by sea, did not promise to be an easy one. In their first encounter with the Phœnicians the Ionians had the advantage. When, however, the forces of the great empire were assembled, the insurrection was everywhere put down. . . . It must be reckoned among the consequences of the battle of Lade, by which the combination against the Persian empire had been annihilated, that King Darius, not content with having consolidated his dominion in Ionia, once more resumed the plan of pushing forward into Europe, of which his enterprise against the Scythians formed part. With the execution of this project he commissioned one of the principal persons of the empire and the court, . . . Mardonius by name, whom he united to his family by marrying him to his daughter. . . . This general crossed the Hellespont with a large army, his fleet always accompanying him along the shore whilst he pushed on by the mainland. He once more subdued Macedonia, probably the districts which had not yet, like the Macedonian king, been brought into subjection, and gave out that his aim was directed against Eretria and Athens, the enemies of the king. . . . In the stormy waters near Mount Athos, which have always made the navigation of the Ægean difficult, his fleet suffered ship-wreck. But without naval supports he could not hope to gain possession of an island and a maritime town situated on a promontory. Even by land he encountered resistance, so that he found it advisable to postpone the further execution of his undertakings to another time. . . . In order to subdue the recalcitrants, especially Athens and Eretria, another attempt was organized without delay. Under two generals, one of whom, Datis, was a Mede, the other, Artaphernes, the son of the satrap of Sardis of the same name, and brother of the Darius who was in alliance with Hippas, a maritime expedition was undertaken for the immediate subjugation of the

islands and the maritime districts. It was not designed for open hostility against the Greeks in general. . . . Their design was to utilize the internal dissensions of Greece in conquering the principal enemies upon whom the Great King had sworn vengeance, and presenting them as captives at his feet. The project succeeded in the case of Eretria. In spite of a brave resistance it fell by treachery into their hands, and they could avenge the sacrilege committed at Sardis by plundering and devastating Grecian sanctuaries. They expected now to be able to overpower Athens also without much trouble. . . . It was a circumstance of great value to the Athenians that there was a man amongst them who was familiar with the Persian tactics. This was Miltiades, the son of Kimon. . . . Although a Thracian prince, he had never ceased to be a citizen of Athens. Here he was impeached for having held a tyranny, but was acquitted and chosen strategus, for the democracy could not reject a man who was so admirably qualified to be at their head in the interchange of hostilities with Persia. Miltiades was conducting his own personal quarrel in undertaking the defence of Attica. The force of the Persians was indeed incomparably the larger, but the plains of Marathon, on which they were drawn up, prevented their proper deployment, and they saw with astonishment the Athenian hoplites displaying a front as extended as their own. These troops now rushed upon them with an impetus which grew swifter at every moment. The Persians easily succeeded in breaking through the centre of the Athenian army; but that was of no moment, for the strength of the onset lay in the two wings, where now began a hand-to-hand fight. The Persian sword, formidable elsewhere, was not adapted to do good service against the bronze armor and the spear of the Hellenes. On both flanks the Athenians obtained the advantage, and now attacked the Persian centre, which was not able to withstand the onslaught of men whose natural vigor was heightened by gymnastic training. The Persians, to their misfortune, had calculated upon desertion in the ranks of their opponents; foiled in this hope, they retreated to the shore and to their ships. Herodotus intimates that the Persians had secret intelligence with a party in Athens, and took their course round the promontory of Sunium toward the city, in the hope of surprising it. But when they came to anchor the Athenians had arrived also, and they saw themselves once more confronted by the victors of Marathon."—L. von Ranke, *Universal History*, ch. 6.

ALSO IN: Herodotus, *History*, bk. 6.—V. Durny, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 16 (v. 2).—See, also, PERSIA: B. C. 521-493, and GREECE: B. C. 492-491, and 490.

**B. C. 489-480.—Condemnation and death of Miltiades.—The Æginetan war.—Naval power created by Themistocles.**—The victory of Marathon was chiefly due to Miltiades; it was he who brought on the engagement, and he was chief in command on the day when the battle was fought. Such a brilliant success greatly improved his position in the city, and excited in his enemies a still deeper hatred. Ever on the watch for an opportunity to pull down their rival, it was not long before they found one. Soon after his victory, Miltiades came before the Athenians with a request that a

squadron of 70 ships might be placed at his disposal. The purpose for which he required them he would not disclose, though pledging his word that the expedition would add largely to the wealth and prosperity of the city. The request being granted, he sailed with the ships to Piræus, an island which at this time was subject to Persia. From the Piræus he demanded 100 talents, and when they refused to pay he blockaded the city. So vigorous and successful was the resistance offered that, after a long delay, Miltiades, himself dangerously wounded, was compelled to return home. His enemies, with Xanthippus at their head, at once attacked him for misconduct in the enterprise. . . . Miltiades was unable to reply in person; he was carried into court, while his friends pleaded his cause. The sentence was given against him, but the penalty was reduced from death to a fine of 50 talents. So large a sum was more than even Miltiades could pay; he was thrown into prison as a public debtor, where he soon died from the mortification of his wound. . . . His condemnation was one in a long series of similar punishments. The Athenians never learnt to be just to those who served them, or to distinguish between treachery and errors of judgment. . . . We have very little information about the state of Athens immediately after the battle of Marathon. So far as we can tell, for the chronology is most uncertain, she was now engaged in a war with Ægina. . . . Meanwhile, a man was rising to power, who may be said to have created the history of Athens for the rest of the century,—Themistocles, the son of Neocles. . . . On the very day of Marathon, Themistocles had probably made up his mind that the Persians would visit Greece again. What was to keep them away, so long as they were masters of the Ægean? . . . With an insight almost incredible he perceived that the Athenians could become a maritime nation; that Athens possesses harbours large enough to receive an enormous fleet, and capable of being strongly fortified; that in possession of a fleet she could not only secure her own safety, but stand forth as a rival power to Sparta. But how could Themistocles induce the Athenians to abandon the line in which they had been so successful for a mode of warfare in which even Miltiades had failed? After the fall of the great general, the conduct of affairs was in the hands of Xanthippus . . . and Aristides. . . . They were by no means prepared for the change which Themistocles was meditating. This is more especially true of Aristides. He had been a friend of Clisthenes, he was known as an admirer of Spartan customs. . . . He had been second in command at Marathon, and was now the most eminent general at Athens. From him Themistocles could only expect the most resolute opposition. Xanthippus and Aristides could reckon on the support of old traditions and great connections. Themistocles had no support of the kind. He had to make his party. . . . Conscious of their own position, Aristides and Xanthippus looked with contempt upon the knot of men who began to gather round their unmanly and uncultivated leader. And they might, perhaps, have maintained their position if it had not been for the Æginetan war. That unlucky struggle had begun, soon after the reforms of Clisthenes, with an unprovoked attack of the Æginetans on the

coast of Attica (506 B. C.), [Ægina being allied with Thebes in the war mentioned above—B. C. 509-506]. It was renewed when the Æginetans gave earth and water to the heralds of Darius in 491, and though suspended at the time of the Persian invasion, it broke out again with renewed ferocity soon afterwards. The Æginetans had the stronger fleet, and defeated the Athenian ships. "Such experiences naturally caused a change in the minds of the Athenians. . . . It was clear that the old arrangements for the navy were quite inadequate to the task which was now required of them. Yet the leaders of the state made no proposals." Themistocles now "came forward publicly with proposals of naval reform, and, as he expected, he drew upon himself the strenuous opposition of Aristides. . . . It was clear that nothing decisive could be done in the Æginetan war unless the proposals of Themistocles were carried; it was equally clear that they never would be carried while Aristides and Xanthippos were at hand to oppose them. Under these circumstances recourse was had to the safety-valve of the constitution. Ostracism was proposed and accepted; and in this manner, by 483 B. C., Themistocles had got rid of both of his rivals in the city. He was now master of the situation. The only obstacle to the realization of his plans was the expense involved in building ships. And this he was able to meet by a happy accident, which brought into the treasury at this time a large surplus from the silver mines from Laurium. . . . By the summer of 480, the Athenians . . . were able to launch 180 vessels, besides providing 20 for the use of the Chalcidians of Eubœa. . . . At the same time Themistocles set about the fortification of the Peireus. . . . Could he have carried the Athenians with him, he would have made the Peireus the capital of the country, in order that the ships and the city might be in close connection. But for this the people were not prepared."—E. Abbott, *Pericles and the Golden Age of Athens*, ch. 2.

Also in: Plutarch, *Aristides*.—*Themistocles*.

B. C. 481-479.—Congress at Corinth.—Organized Hellenic Union, under the headship of Sparta. See GREECE: B. C. 481-479.

B. C. 480-479.—The second Persian invasion.—*Thermopylæ*, *Artemisium*, *Salamis*, *Platæa*.—*Abandonment of the City*.—"The last days of Darius were clouded by the disaster of Marathon; 'that battle formed the turning point of his good fortune,' and it would seem that the news of it led to several insurrections, particularly that of Egypt; but they were soon put down. Darius died (Olymp. 73, 3), and Xerxes, who succeeded him, was prevented from taking revenge on the Athenians by the revolt of Egypt, which engaged his attention during the first years of his reign. But he completely conquered the insurgents after they had maintained themselves about four or five years; and he then made preparations for that vengeance on Athens for which his barbarian pride was longing. The account of the three years' preparations of Xerxes, how he assembled his army in Asia Minor, how he made a bridge across the Hellespont, how he cut a canal through the isthmus of Mount Athos to prevent his fleet being destroyed by storms—all this is known to every one who has read Herodotus. History is here so much interwoven with poetry, that they can no longer

be separated. . . . The Greeks awaited the attack (Olymp. 75, 1), 'but they were not agreed among themselves. The Argives from hatred of Sparta joined the Persians, and the miserable Boeotians likewise supported them. The others kept together only from necessity; and without the noble spirit of the Athenians Greece would have been lost, and that from the most paltry circumstances. A dispute arose as to who was to be honoured with the supreme command; the Athenians gave way to all, for their only desire was to save Greece. Had the Persians moved on rapidly, they would have met with no resistance, but they proceeded slowly, and matters turned out differently.' A Greek army was encamped at Tempe, at the entrance of Thessaly, and at first determined on defending Thessaly. But they must have seen that they could be entirely surrounded from Upper Thessaly; and when they thus discovered the impossibility of stopping the Persians, they retreated. The narrative now contains one inconceivable circumstance after another. . . . It is inconceivable that, as the Greeks did make a stand at Thermopylæ, no one else took his position there except King Leonidas and his Spartans, excluding even the Lacedæmonians, for the Greeks held at home! Only 1,000 Phocians occupied the heights, though that people might surely have furnished 10,000 men; 400 of the Boeotians were posted in the rear, as a sort of hostages, as Herodotus remarks, and 700 Thespians. Where were all the rest of the Greeks? . . . Countless hosts are invading Greece; the Greeks want to defend themselves, and are making active preparations at sea; but on land hundreds of thousands are met by a small band of Peloponnesians, 700 Thespians, 400 Thebans as hostages, and 1,000 Phocians, stationed on the heights! A pass is occupied, but only that one, and the others are left unguarded. . . . All this is quite unintelligible; it would almost appear as if there had been an intention to sacrifice Leonidas and his men; but we cannot suppose this. These circumstances alone suggest to us, that the numbers of the Persian army cannot have been as great as they are described; but even if we reduce them to an immense extent, it still remains inconceivable why they were not opposed by greater numbers of the Greeks, for as afterwards they ventured to attack the Persians in the open field, it was certainly much more natural to oppose them while marching across the heights. But however this may be, it is an undoubted fact, that Leonidas and his Spartans fell in the contest, of which we may form a conception from the description of Herodotus, when after a resistance of three days they were surrounded by the Persians. A few of the Spartans escaped on very excusable grounds, but they were so generally despised, that their life became unendurable, and they made away with themselves. This is certainly historical. . . . After the victory of Thermopylæ all Hellas lay open before the Persians, and they now advanced towards Athens, a distance which they could march in a few days. Thebes opened her gates, and joyfully admitted them from hatred of Athens. Meantime a portion of the army appeared before Delphi. It is almost inconceivable that the Persians did not succeed in taking the temple. . . . The miracles by which the temple is said to have been saved, are repeated in the same manner during the attack of

the Gauls. But the temple of Delphi was certainly not plundered.' . . . The city of Athens had in the meantime been abandoned by all the people; the defenceless had taken refuge in the small island of Salamis, or of Troezen, and all the Athenians capable of bearing arms embarked in the fleet. . . . The Persians thus took Athens without any resistance. . . . During the same days on which the battle of Thermopylae was fought, the Greek fleet was engaged in two indecisive but glorious battles near the promontory of Artemisium. In a third the Persians gained the upper hand, and when the Greeks at the same time heard of the defeat at Thermopylae, they withdrew, and doubling Cape Sunium sailed towards Salamis. God sent them a storm whereby the Persians in their pursuit suffered shipwreck. . . . While the Greek fleet was stationed in the channel between the island of Salamis and Attica, towards Piræus, discord broke out among the Greeks. The Peloponnesians thought only of themselves; they had fortified the Isthmus; there they were assembled, and there they wanted to offer resistance to the Persians. In their folly they forgot, that if the enemy with his superior fleet, should turn against Peloponnesus, they might land wherever they liked. . . . But Themistocles now declared, that all the hopes of the Athenians were directed towards the recovery of their own city; that, if the Peloponnesians should sacrifice them, and, thinking of themselves only, should abandon Attica to the barbarians, the Athenians would not be so childish as to sacrifice themselves for them, but would take their women and children on board their ships, and sail far away from the Persians to the island of Sardinia, or some other place where Greek colonies were established; that there they would settle as a free people, and abandon Peloponnesus to its fate; and that then the peninsula would soon be in the hands of the enemy. This frightened the Peloponnesians, and they resolved to stand by Athens. It is evident that, throughout that time, Themistocles had to struggle with the most intolerable difficulties, which the allies placed in his way, as well as with their jealousy, meanness, and insolence. 'The rudeness of the Spartans and Corinthians is nowhere more strongly contrasted with the refinement of the Athenians, than on that occasion.' But after he had tried everything, and overcome by every possible means a hundred different difficulties, he yet saw, that he could not rely on the perseverance of the Peloponnesians, and that they would turn to the Isthmus as soon as Xerxes should proceed in that direction. He accordingly induced the Persian king, by a false message, to surround the Greek fleet, for the purpose of cutting off the retreat of the Peloponnesians. He declared himself ready to deliver the whole of the Greek fleet into his hands. This device was quite to the mind of the Persians; Xerxes believed him, and followed his advice. When Themistocles was thus sure of the Peloponnesians, the ever-memorable battle of Salamis commenced, which is as certainly historical as that of Cannæ, or any modern battle, 'whatever the numbers may be.' The battle proceeded somewhat in the manner of the battle of Leipzig: when the issue was decided, a portion of those who ought to have joined their countrymen before, made common cause with the Greeks. . . . Their accession increased the victory of the Greeks. . . . Certain as the battle of Salamis is, all the accounts

of what took place after it, are very doubtful. This much is certain, that Xerxes returned, 'leaving a portion of his army under Mardonius in Greece; . . . Winter was now approaching, and Mardonius withdrew from ravaged Attica, taking up his winter-quarters partly in Thessaly and partly in Boeotia. . . . The probability is, that the Athenians remained the winter in Salamis in sheds, or under the open sky. Mardonius offered to restore to them Attica uninjured, so far as it had not already been devastated, if they would conclude peace with him. They might at that time have obtained any terms they pleased, if they had abandoned the common cause of the Greeks; and the Persians would have kept the peace; for when they concluded treaties they observed them; they were not faithless barbarians. But on this occasion again, we see the Athenian people in all its greatness and excellence; it scorned such a peace, and preferred the good of the Peloponnesians. . . . Mardonius now again advanced towards Athens; the Spartans, who ought to have proceeded towards Cithæron, had not arrived, and thus he again took possession of Attica and ravaged it completely. At length, however (Olymp. 75, 2), the Athenians prevailed upon the Peloponnesians to leave the Isthmus, and they gradually advanced towards Boeotia. There the battle of Plataeæ was fought. . . . In regard to the accounts of this battle, it is historically certain that it was completely won by the Greeks, and that the remnants of the Persian army retreated without being vigorously pursued. It must have reached Asia, but it then disappears. It is also historically certain, that Pausanias was the commander of the allied army of the Greeks. . . . After their victory, the Greeks advanced towards Thebes. In accordance with a vow which they had made before the war, Thebes ought to have been destroyed by the Greeks. But their opinions were divided. . . . On the same day on which the battle of Plataeæ was fought, the allied Greeks gained as complete a victory at sea. . . . After this victory of Mycale, the Ionian cities revolted against the Persians.'—B. G. Niebuhr, *Lectures on Ancient History*, v. 1, lects. 37 and 38.

Also in: Herodotus, *History*; trans. and ed. by H. Rawlinson, bk. 7 (c. 4).—Plutarch, *Themistocles*.—G. W. Cox, *The Greeks and Persians* B. C. 479-478.—Protection of Ionia assumed.—Siege and capture of Sestus.—Rebuilding and enlargement of the city and its walls.—Interference of Sparta foiled by Themistocles.—'The advantages obtained by the Hellenes (in their war with Persia) came upon them so unexpectedly as to find them totally unprepared, and accordingly embarrassed by their own victories. What was to be done with Ionia? Was the whole country to be admitted into the Hellenic confederation? Too great a responsibility would, in the opinion of the Peloponnesians, be incurred by such a step. . . . It would be better to sacrifice the country, and establish the Ionians in settlements in other parts, at the expense of those who had favoured the Medes, i. e., of the Argives, Bœotians, Locrians, and Thessalians. . . . The Athenians, on the other hand, espoused the cause of the cities. . . . Ionia ought to be a bulwark against the Barbarians, and to belong to the Hellenes. . . . The Athenians found a support in the feeling

prevalent among the Ionians, who were naturally opposed to any forced settlement. Accordingly, in the first instance, Samos, Lesbos, Chios, and a number of other island-towns, were admitted into the confederation, . . . and a new Hellas was formed, a Greek empire comprehending both sides of the sea. Considerations of caution made it necessary, above all, to secure the passage from Asia to Europe; for it was universally believed that the bridge over the Hellespont was either still in existence or had been restored. When it was found to have been destroyed, the Peloponnesians urged the termination of the campaign. . . . The Athenians, on the other hand, declared themselves resolved . . . not to leave unfinished what they had begun. Sestus, the strongest fortress on the Hellespont, ought not to be left in the hands of the enemy; an attack on it ought to be risked without delay, before the city had prepared for a siege. They allowed the Peloponnesians to take their departure, and under the command of Nauthippus united with the ships of the Ionians and Hellespontians for the purpose of new undertakings." The Persians in Sestus resisted obstinately, enduring a long siege, but were forced to surrender at last. "Meanwhile, the main point consisted in the Athenians having remained alone in the field, in their having fraternized with the Ionians as one naval power, and having after such successes attained to a confidence in victory, to which no enterprise any longer seemed either too distant or too difficult. Already they regarded their city as the centre of the coast-lands of Greece. But what was the condition of this city of Athens itself? A few fragments of the ancient city wall, a few scattered houses, which had served the Persian commanders as their quarters, were yet standing; the rest was ashes and ruins. After the battle of Plataea the inhabitants had returned from Salmis, Træzene, and Ægina; not even the fleet and its crews were at hand to afford them assistance. They endeavoured to make shift as best they could, to pass through the trials of the winter. As soon as the spring arrived, the restoration of the city was commenced with all possible activity. . . . But even now it was not the comforts of domesticity which occupied their thoughts, but, above all, the city as a whole and its security. To Themistocles, the founder of the port-town, public confidence was in this matter properly accorded." It was not possible "to carry out a new and regular plan for the city; but it was resolved to extend its circumference beyond the circle of the ancient walls, . . . so as to be able, in case of a future siege, to offer a retreat to the country-population within the capital itself. . . . But the Athenians were not even to be permitted to build their walls undisturbed; for, as soon as their grand plan of operations became known, the envy and insidious jealousy of their neighbours broke out afresh. . . . The Peloponnesian states, above all Ægina and Cerinth, hastened to direct the attention of Sparta to the situation of affairs. . . . As at Sparta city walls were objected to on principle, and as no doubts prevailed with regard to the fact that a well-fortified town was impregnable to the military art of the Peloponnesians, it was actually resolved at any price to prevent the building of the walls in Attica." But, for shame's sake, the interference undertaken by Sparta was put upon the ground that in the event of a future

invasion of the country, only the peninsula could be successfully defended; that central Greece would necessarily be abandoned to the enemy; and that every fortified city in it would furnish him a dangerous base. "At such a crisis craft alone could be of avail. When the Spartans made their imperious demand at Athens, Themistocles ordered the immediate cessation of building operations, and with assumed submissiveness, promised to present himself at Sparta, in order to pursue further negotiations in person. On his arrival there, he allowed one day after the other to go by, pretending to be waiting for his fellow envoys." In the meantime, all Athens was toiling night and day at the walls, and time enough was gained by the audacious duplicity of Themistocles to build them to a safe height for defence. "The enemies of Athens saw that their design had been foiled, and were forced to put the best face upon their discomfiture. They now gave out that they had intended nothing beyond good advice."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 3, ch. 2 (p. 2).

ALSO IN G. W. COX, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 2, ch. 7-8 (p. 1-2).

**B. C. 478-477.—Alienation of the Asiatic Greeks from Sparta.—Formation of the Confederacy of Delos.—The founding of Athenian Empire.** See GREECE: B. C. 478-477.

**B. C. 477-462.—Constitutional gains for the democracy.—Ascendency of Aristideus.—Declining popularity and ostracism of Themistocles.—The sustentation of the commons.—The stripping of power from the Areopagus.**—At the time when the Confederacy of Delos was formed, "the Persians still held not only the important posts of Eion on the Strymon and Doriskus in Thrace, but also several other posts in that country which are not specified to us. We may thus understand why the Greek cities on and near the Chalkidic peninsula . . . were not less anxious to seek protection in the bosom of the new confederacy than the Dorian islands of Rhodes and Cos, the Ionic islands of Samos and Chios, the Æolic Lesbos and Tenedos, or continental towns such as Miletus and Byzantium. . . . Some sort of union, organised and obligatory upon each city, was indispensable to the safety of all. Indeed, even with that aid, at the time when the Confederacy of Delos was first formed, it was by no means certain the Asiatic enemy would be effectually kept out, especially as the Persians were strong not merely from their own force, but also from the aid of internal parties in many of the Grecian states—traitors within, as well as exiles without. Among these traitors, the first in rank as well as the most formidable, was the Spartan Pausanias." Pausanias, whose treasonable intrigues with the Persian king began at Byzantium (See GREECE: B. C. 478-477) was convicted some nine or ten years later, and suffered a terrible fate, being shut within a temple to which he had fled, and starved. "His treasonable projects implicated and brought to disgrace a man far greater than himself—the Athenian Themistocles. . . . The charge [against Themistocles] of collusion with the Persians connects itself with the previous movement of political parties. . . . The rivalry of Themistocles and Aristideus had been greatly appeased by the invasion of Xerxes, which had imposed upon both the pre-emptory necessity of

cooperation against a common enemy. And apparently it was not resumed during the times which immediately succeeded the return of the Athenians to their country; at least we hear of both in effective service and in prominent posts. Themistokles stands forward as the contriver of the city walls and architect of Peiræus; Aristoteles is commander of the fleet and first organiser of the Confederacy of Delos. Moreover we seem to detect a change in the character of the latter. He had ceased to be the champion of Athenian old-fashioned landed interest, against Themistokles as the originator of the maritime innovations. Those innovations had now, since the battle of Salamis, become an established fact. . . . From henceforth the fleet is endeared to every man as the gran' force, offensive and defensive, of the state, in which character all the political leaders agree in accepting it. . . . The triremes, and the men who manned them, taken collectively, were now the determining element in the state. Moreover, the men who manned them had just returned from Salamis, fresh from a scene of trial and danger, and from a harvest of victory, which had equalized for the moment all Athenians as sufferers, as combatants, and as patriots. . . . The political change arising from hence in Athens was not less important than the military. 'The maritime multitude, authors of the victory of Salamis,' and instruments of the new vocation at Athens as head of the Delian Confederacy, appear now ascendant in the political constitution also; not in any way as a separate or privileged class, but as leavening the whole mass, strengthening the democratic sentiment, and protesting against all recognised political inequalities. . . . Early after the return to Attica, the Kleisthenian constitution was enlarged as respects eligibility to the magistracy. According to that constitution, the fourth or last class on the Solonian census, including the considerable majority of freemen, were not admissible to offices of state, though they possessed votes in common with the rest; no person was eligible to be a magistrate unless he belonged to one of the three higher classes. This restriction was now annulled and eligibility extended to all the citizens. We may appreciate the strength of feeling with which such reform was demanded when we find that it was proposed by Aristoteles. . . . The popularity thus ensured to him, probably heightened by some regret for his previous ostracism, was calculated to acquire permanence from his straightforward and incorruptible character, now brought into strong relief by his function as assessor to the new Delian Confederacy. On the other hand, the ascendancy of Themistokles, though so often exalted by his unrivalled political genius and daring, as well as by the signal value of his public recommendations, was as often overthrown by his duplicity of means and unprincipled thirst for money. New political opponents sprung up against him, men sympathising with Aristoteles. . . . Of these the chief were Kimon [Cimon], (son of Miltiades), and Alkmeon." In 471 B. C. Themistokles was sent into exile by a vote of ostracism, and retired to Argos. Five years later he was accused of complicity in the treasonable intrigues of Pausanias, and fled to the court of the Persian king, where he spent the remainder of his days. "Aristoteles died about three or four years after

the ostracism of Themistokles."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 44 (n. 5).—The constitutional effects of the Persian war, and the political situation of Athens immediately after the war, are represented somewhat differently from the account above, in the lately discovered work on the Constitution of Athens which is attributed to Aristotle. The following is quoted from one of the translations of the latter: "After the Median war the council of Areopagus [See *AREOPAGUS*] recovered strength and ruled the state, not that any law conferred the hegemony on them, but because the aristocratic party had the credit of the victory at Salamis. For when the generals had despaired of the country and proclaimed a *saue qui peut*, the Areopagus raised funds, gave every man eight drachmas (6s. 6d.) and induced them to man the ships. In consequence of this public service the Ecclesia yielded the ascendancy to the Areopagus, and public affairs were admirably administered during the following epoch. For they acquired the art of war, made their name honoured throughout the Hellenic world, and possessed themselves of the sovereignty of the sea with the consent of Lakedaimon. At this time the leaders of the commons were Aristoteles, son of Lusimachos, and Themistokles, son of Neokles; the latter studious of the arts of war, the former reputed eminent in statesmanship and honest beyond his contemporaries; which characters made their countrymen employ the one as a general, the other as a councillor. The rebuilding of the walls of Athens was their joint work, though they were otherwise at feud. The detachment of the Ionians from Persia and the formation of an alliance with Sparta were due to the counsels of Aristoteles, who seized the opportunity afforded by the discredit cast on the Lakonians by the conduct of Pausanias. He too originally apportioned, two years after the battle of Salamis, in the archonship of Timosthenes (478 B. C.), the contribution to be paid by the islanders. . . . Subsequently, when lofty thoughts filled every bosom and wealth was accumulating, Aristoteles advised them to administer the hegemony with their own hands, to leave their country occupations and fix their domicile in the city. Sustentation, he promised, would be provided for all, either as soldiers or sailors in active service, or as troops in garrison or as public servants; and then they could increase the vigour of their imperial sway. They followed his advice, and, taking the rule into their own hands, reduced their allies to the position of vassals, except the Chians, Lesbians, and Samians, whom they kept as satellites of their power, and permitted to retain their own constitutions and to rule their own dependencies; and they provided for their own sustentation by the method which Aristoteles indicated; for in the end the public revenues, the taxes and the tributes of the allies gave maintenance to more than 20,000. There were 6,000 dicasts or jurors, 1,600 archers, 1,200 cavalry, 500 senators, 500 soldiers of the dockyard garrison, 50 city guards, 700 home magistrates, 700 foreign magistrates, 2,500 heavy armed soldiers (this was their number at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war), 4,000 sailors manning 20 guardships, 2,000 sailors appointed by lot, manning 20 tribute-collecting ships, and in addition to these the Prutaneion, the orphans, the gaolers; and all

these persons were maintained at the expense of the national treasury. The sustentation of the commons was thus secured. The 17 years which followed the Median war were about the period during which the country continued under the ascendancy of the Areopagus, though its aristocratic features were gradually on the wane. When the masses had grown more and more preponderant, Ephialtes, son of Sophonides, reputed incorruptible in his loyalty to democracy, became leader of the commons, and began to attack the Areopagus. First, he put to death many of its members, by impeaching them of offences committed in their administration. Afterwards in the archonship of Konon (462 B. C.) he despoiled the council itself of all its more recently acquired attributes, which were the keystone of the existing constitution, and distributed them among the Senate of 500, the Ecclesia, and the courts of law. In this work he had the co-operation of Themistokles, who was himself an Areopagite, but expecting to be impeached for treasonable correspondence with Persia, . . . Ephialtes and Themistokles kept accusing the Areopagus before the Senate of 500, and again before the commons, till finally they stripped it of all its principal functions. The assassination of Ephialtes by the instrumentality of Aristodikos of Tanagra followed not long after. Such were the circumstances of the overthrow of the Areopagus. After this the degradation of the constitution proceeded without intermission from the eagerness of politicians to win popular favour; and at the same time there happened to be no organizer of the aristocratic party, whose head, Kimon, the son of Miltiades, was too young for some years to enter political life; besides which their ranks were much devastated by war. Expeditionary forces were recruited by conscription; and as the generals had no military experience and owed their appointment to the reputation of their ancestors, each expedition entailed the sacrifice of 2,000 or 3,000 lives, chiefly of the noblest sons of Athens, whether belonging to the wealthy classes or to the commons.—Aristotle, *On the Constitution of Athens* (tr. by E. Poste,) ch. 23-26.—On the above, Dr. Abbott comments as follows: "So much of this account as refers to Themistocles may be at once dismissed as unhistorical. . . . If the evidence of Thucydides is to count for anything, it is quite certain that Themistocles finally left Greece for Persia about 466 B. C. . . . Plutarch says not a word about Themistocles. But the remainder of the account [of the attack on the Areopagus] is supported by all our authorities—if indeed it is not merely repeated by them."—E. Abbott, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 11, sect. 5.

ALSO IN J. P. Mahaffy, *Problems in Greek History* p. 96.—Plutarch, *Themistocles*.

See, also, below: B. C. 466-454.

**B. C. 470-466.—Continued war against the Persians.—Kimon's victories at the Eurymedon.—Revolt and subjugation of Naxos.**—Under the guidance of Athens, the war against the Persians was continued. Kimon [Kimon] sailed with a fleet to the coast of Thrace, and laid siege to Eion on the Strymon [B. C. 470]. The Persian garrison made a gallant defence; and finally Boges, the governor, rather than surrender, cast all his gold and silver into the river; and, having raised a huge pile of wood,

slew his wives, children and slaves, and hid their bodies on it; then setting fire to it, he flung himself into the flames: the garrison surrendered at discretion. Doriscus was attacked in vain, but all the other Persian garrisons in Europe were reduced. Kimon then, as executor of an Amphictyonic decree, turned his arms against the pirate Dolopians of the Isle of Scyros, whom he expelled, and filled the island with Athenian colonists. On this occasion he sought and found (as was supposed) the bones of the hero Theseus, who had died in this island 800 years before; and he brought them in his own trireme to Athens,—an act which gained him great favour with the people. By this time, some of the confederates were grown weary of war, and began to murmur at the tolls and expense to which it put them. The people of Naxos were the first who positively refused to contribute any longer; but the Athenians, who had tasted of the sweets of command, would not now permit the exercise of free will to their allies. Kimon appeared (O. 78,3) [B. C. 466] with a large fleet before Naxos; the Naxians defended themselves with vigour, but were at length forced to submit; and the Athenians had the hardihood to reduce them to the condition of subjects to Athens—an example which they soon followed in other cases. . . . After the reduction of Naxos, Kimon sailed over to the coast of Asia, and learning that the Persian generals had assembled a large fleet and army in Pamphylia, he collected a fleet of 200 triremes at Cnidus, with which he proceeded to the coast of that country, and laid siege to the city of Phaselis, which, though Greek, obeyed the Persian monarch. Having reduced it to submission, he resolved to proceed and attack the Persian fleet and army, which he learned were lying at the river Eurymedon. On his arrival, the Persian fleet, of 350 triremes, fearing at first to fight till 80 Phœnician vessels, which they were expecting, should come up, kept in the river; but finding that the Greeks were preparing to attack, they put out to sea and engaged them. The action did not continue long: the Barbarians fled to the land; 200 ships fell into the hands of the victors, and several were destroyed. Without a moment's delay, Kimon disembarked his men, and led them against the land forces: the resistance of the Persians was obstinate for some time, but at last they turned and fled, leaving their camp a prey to the conquerors; and Kimon had thus the rare glory of having gained two important victories in the one day. Hearing then that the 80 Phœnician vessels were at Hydros, in the Isle of Cyprus, he immediately sailed thither and took or destroyed the whole of them. The victory on the Eurymedon may be regarded as the termination of the conflict between Greece and Persia. The year after it (O. 78,4) [B. C. 465], Xerxes was assassinated, and the usual confusion took place in the court of Susa."—T. Keightley, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 1, ch. 13.

ALSO IN W. W. Lloyd, *The Age of Pericles*, ch. 27 (v. 1).

See also PERSIA: B. C. 486-405.

**B. C. 466-454.—Leadership in the Delian confederacy changed to sovereignty.—Revolt and subjugation of Thasos.—Help to Sparta and its ungracious requital.—Fall and exile of Kimon.—Rise of Pericles and the democratic anti-Spartan policy.—Removal of the**



federal treasury from Delos.—Building the Long Walls.—“It was now evident to the whole body of the allies of Athens that by joining the league they had provided themselves with a mistress rather than a leader. . . . Two years after the reduction of Naxos another powerful island-state broke out into rebellion against the supremacy of Athens. The people of Thasos had from very early times possessed territory on the mainland of Thrace opposite to their island. By holding this coast-slip they engrossed the trade of the Valley of the Strymon, and held the rich gold mines of Mount Pangæus. But the Athenians, after the capture of Eion, set themselves to develop that port as the commercial centre of Thrace. . . . A spot called ‘The Nine Ways,’ . . . where that great river first begins to broaden out into its estuary, but can still be spanned by a bridge, was the chosen site of a fortress to secure the hold of Athens on the land. But the native Thracian tribes banded themselves together, and fell upon the invaders with such desperation that . . . the Athenian armies were defeated. . . . It was probably the discouragement which this defeat caused at Athens that emboldened Thasos to declare her secession from the Confederacy of Delos. She wished to save her Thracian trade, before Athens could make another attempt to divert it from her. The Thasians did not rely on their own resources alone; they enlisted the Thracians and Macedonians of the mainland, and sent to Sparta to endeavour to induce the Spartans to declare war on Athens.” The Spartans were well disposed to take up the cause of the Thasians; but at that moment they were overwhelmed by the calamity of the frightful Earthquake of 464, instantly followed by the rising of the Helots and the third Messenian war (See MESSENIAN WAR, THE THIRD). “The island-state was therefore left to its own resources; and these were so considerable that she held out against the force of the Athenian confederacy for two whole years. . . . She was obliged at last to surrender to Cimon [B. C. 463], whose army had long been lying before her walls. Like Naxos, she was punished for her defection by the loss of her war-fleet and her fortifications, and the imposition of a fine of many talents. Still more galling must have been the loss of her trade with Thrace, which now passed entirely into Athenian hands. . . . The Spartans were still engaged in a desperate struggle with their revolted subjects when the siege of Thasos came to an end. Cimon, who was now at the height of his reputation and power, saw with distress the troubles of the city he so much admired. He set himself to persuade the Athenians that they ought to forego old grudges, and secure destruction the state which had shared with them the glory of the Persian war. . . . His pleading was bitterly opposed by the anti-Spartan party at Athens, headed by two statesmen, Ephialtes and Pericles, who had already come into notice as antagonists of Cimon. But the more generous and unwise policy prevailed, and 4,000 hoplites were sent to the aid of Sparta [B. C. 462]. This army was pursued by misfortune; it was so unsuccessful in attacking Ithome that the Spartans attributed its failure to ill will rather than ill luck. They, therefore, began to treat their allies with marked discourtesy, and at last sent

them home without a word of thanks, merely stating that their services could be of no further use [See MESSENIAN WAR, THE THIRD]. This rudeness and ingratitude fully justified the anti-Spartan party at Athens. . . . Cimon was now no longer able to deal with the policy of the state as he chose, and the conduct of affairs began to pass into the hands of men whose foreign and domestic policy were alike opposed to all his views. Ephialtes and Pericles proceeded to form alliances abroad with all the states which were ill disposed toward Sparta, and at home to commence a revision of the constitution. They were determined to carry out to its furthest logical development the democratic tendency which Cleisthenes had introduced into the Athenian polity. Of Ephialtes, the son of Sophonides, comparatively little is known. But Pericles . . . was the son of Xanthippus, the accuser of Miltiades in 489, B. C., and the victor of Mycale and Sestos; while, on his mother's side, he came of the blood of the Alcmaeonidae. Pericles was staid, self-contained, and haughty—a strange chief for the popular party. But his relationship to Cleisthenes, and the enmity which existed between his house and that of Cimon, urged him to espouse the cause of democracy. . . . While Cimon had Greece in his mind, Pericles could only think of Athens, and the temper of the times was favourable to the narrower policy. . . . The first aim which Pericles and Ephialtes set before themselves was; the cutting down of the power of the Areopagus [See above: B. C. 477-462]. That body had since the Persian war become the stronghold of the Conservative and philo-Laconian party. . . . Ephialtes took the lead in the attack on the Areopagus. He chose a moment when Cimon was away at sea, bent on assisting a rebellion against the Great King which had broken out in Egypt. After a violent struggle, he succeeded in carrying a law which deprived the Areopagus of its ancient censorial power, and reduced it to a mere court to try homicides. . . . When Cimon came home from Egypt he was wildly enraged. . . . Recourse was had to the test of ostracism. It decided against Cimon, who therefore went into banishment [B. C. 459]. But this wrong against the greatest general of Athens was, not long after, avenged by an over-zealous and unscrupulous friend. Ephialtes was slain by assassins in his own house. . . . The immediate result of this murder was to leave Pericles in sole and undivided command of the democratic party. The foreign policy of Pericles soon began to involve Athens in troubles at home. He concluded alliances with Argos and Thessaly, both states at variance with Sparta, and thereby made a collision with the Lacedæmonian confederacy inevitable. He gave still more direct offence to Corinth, one of the most powerful members of that confederacy, by concluding a close alliance with Megara. . . . In Bœotia, too, he stirred up enmity, by giving an active support to the democratic party in that country. These provocations made a war inevitable. In 458 B. C. the storm burst. . . . At the moment of the outbreak of the first important naval war which she had to wage with a Greek enemy since the formation of her empire, Athens took two important steps. The first was destined to guard against the risk of misfortunes by sea; it consisted in the transference from Delos to Athens

[dated by different authorities between 461 and 454 B. C.] of the central treasury of the confederacy. . . . It was not long before the Athenians came to regard the treasury as their own, and to draw upon it for purely Attic needs, which had no connection with the welfare of the other confederates. . . . The second important event of the year 458 B. C. was the commencement of the famous 'Long Walls' of Athens [See LONG WALLS]. . . . When they were finished Athens, Peiræus, and Phalerum, formed the angles of a vast fortified triangle, while the space between them, a considerable expanse of open country, could be utilized as a place of refuge for the population of Attica, and even for their flocks and herds."—C. W. C. Oman, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 23-24.

Also in E. Abbott, *Pericles and the Golden Age of Athens*, ch. 5-6.—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 17 (c. 3).—Plutarch, *Cimon*; *Pericles*.

**B. C. 460-449.—Disastrous expedition to Egypt.—Attacks on the Peloponnesian Coast.—Recall of Cimon.—His last enterprise against the Persians.—The disputed Peace of Cimon or Callias.—Five years truce with Sparta.**—"Inarus, king of some of the Libyan tribes on the western border of Egypt, had excited an insurrection there against the Persians [about 460 B. C.], and his authority was acknowledged throughout the greater part of the country. Artaxerxes sent his brother Achæmenes with a great army to quell this rebellion. An Athenian armament of 200 galleys was lying at the time off Cyprus, and Inarus sent to obtain its assistance. The Athenian commanders, whether following their own discretion, or after orders received from the king, quitted Cyprus, and having joined with the insurgents, enabled them to defeat Achæmenes, who fell in the battle by the hand of Inarus. They then sailed up the Nile to Memphis, where a body of Persians, and some Egyptians, who still adhered to their cause were in possession of one quarter of the city, called White Castle. The rest was subject to Inarus, and there the Athenians stationed themselves, and besieged the Persians. . . . Artaxerxes sent a Persian, named Megabazus, to Sparta, with a sum of money, to be employed in bribing the principal Spartans to use their influence, so as to engage their countrymen in an expedition against Attica. Megabazus did not find the leading Spartans unwilling to receive his money; but they seem to have been unable to render him the service for which it was offered. Ithome still held out; and Sparta had probably not yet sufficiently either recovered her strength or restored internal tranquility, to venture on the proposed invasion. Some rumours of this negotiation may have reached Athens, and have quickened the energy with which Pericles now urged the completion of the long walls. . . . But among his opponents there was a faction who viewed the progress of this great work in a different light from Cimon, and saw in it, not the means of securing the independence of Athens, but a bulwark of the hated commonalty. They too would have gladly seen an invading army in Attica, which might assist them in destroying the work and its authors." This party was accused of sympathy with the Spartan expedition which came to the help of Doris against the Phocians in 457 B. C., and which defeated the Athenians at Tanagra (See GREECE: B. C. 458-

(456). In 455, "the Spartans were reminded that they were also liable to be attacked at home. An Athenian armament of 50 galleys, and, if we may trust Diodorus, with 4,000 heavy armed troops on board, sailed round Peloponnesus under Tolmides, burnt the Spartan arsenal at Gythium, took a town named Chalcis belonging to the Corinthians, and defeated the Sicyonians, who attempted to oppose the landing of the troops. But the most important advantage gained in the expedition was the capture of Naupactus, which belonged to the Ozolian Locrians, and now fell into the hands of the Athenians at a very seasonable juncture. The third Messenian war had just come to a close. The brave defenders of Ithome had obtained honourable terms. . . . The besieged were permitted to quit Peloponnesus with their families, on condition of being detained in slavery if they ever returned. Tolmides now settled the homeless wanderers in Naupactus. . . . But these successes were counterbalanced by a reverse which befel the arms of Athens this same year in another quarter. After the defeat of Achæmenes, Artaxerxes, disappointed in his hopes of assistance from Sparta, . . . raised a great army, which he placed under the command of an abler general, Megabazus, son of Zopyrus. Megabazus defeated the insurgents and their allies, and forced the Greeks to evacuate Memphis, and to take refuge in an island of the Nile, named Prosopitis, which contained a town called Byblus, where he besieged them for 18 months. At length he resorted to the contrivance of turning the stream. . . . The Greek galleys were all left aground, and were fired by the Athenians themselves, that they might not fall into the enemy's hands. The Persians then marched into the island over the dry bed of the river: the Egyptians in dismay abandoned their allies, who were overpowered by numbers and almost all destroyed. . . . Inarus himself was betrayed into the hands of the Persians and put to death. . . . Egypt . . . was again reduced under the Persian yoke, except a part of the Delta, where another pretender, named Amyrtes, who assumed the title of king . . . maintained himself for several years against the power of the Persian monarchy. But the misfortune of the Athenians did not end with the destruction of the great fleet and army which had been first employed in the war. They had sent a squadron of 50 galleys to the relief of their countrymen, which, arriving before the news of the recent disaster had reached them, entered the Meudesian branch of the Nile. They were here surprised by a combined attack of the Persian land force and a Phœnician fleet, and but few escaped to bear the mournful tidings to Athens. Yet even after this calamity we find the Athenians, not suing for peace, but bent on extending their power, and annoying their enemies." Early in 454 they sent an expedition into Thessaly, to restore a ruler named Orestes, who had been driven out. "But the superiority of the Thessalians in cavalry checked all their operations in the field; they failed in an attempt upon Pharsalus, and were at length forced to retire without having accomplished any of their ends. It was perhaps to soothe the public disappointment that Pericles shortly afterwards embarked at Pegæ with 1,000 men, and, coasting the south side of the Corinthian gulf made a

descent on the territory of Sicyon, and roused the Sicyon force sent to oppose his landing. He then . . . laid siege to the town of Cœniadæ. . . . This attempt, however, proved unsuccessful; and the general result of the campaign seems not to have been on the whole advantageous or encouraging. . . . It seems to have been not long after the events which have been just related that Cimon was recalled from his exile; and the decree for that purpose was moved by Pericles himself;—a fact which seems to intimate that some change had taken place in the relations or the temper of parties at Athens. . . . The three years next following Cimon's return, as we have fixed its date [B. C. 454 or 453], passed, happily for his contemporaries, without affording any matter for the historian; and this pause was followed by a five years' truce [with Sparta], in the course of which Cimon embarked in his last expedition, and died near the scene of his ancient glory. The pretender Amyrteus had solicited succour from the Athenians. . . . Cimon was appointed to the command of a fleet of 200 galleys, with which he sailed to Cyprus, and sent a squadron of 60 to the assistance of Amyrteus, while he himself with the rest laid siege to Citium. Here he was carried off by illness, or the consequences of a wound; and the armament was soon after compelled, by want of provisions, to raise the siege. But Cimon's spirit still animated his countrymen, who, when they had sailed away with his remains, fell in with a great fleet of Phœnician and Cilician galleys, near the Cyprian Salamis, and, having completely defeated them, followed up their naval victory with another which they gained on shore, either over the troops which had landed from the enemy's ships, or over a land force by which they were supported. After this they were joined by the squadron which had been sent to Egypt, and which returned, it would appear, without having achieved any material object, and all sailed home (B. C. 449). In after-times Cimon's military renown was enhanced by the report of a peace [sometimes called the Peace of Cimon, and sometimes the Peace of Callias], which his victories had compelled the Persian king to conclude on terms most humiliating to the monarchy. Within less than a century after his death it was, if not commonly believed, confidently asserted, that by this treaty, negotiated, as it was supposed, by Callias, son of Hipponicus, the Persians had agreed to abandon at least the military occupation of Asia Minor, to the distance of three days' journey on foot, or one on horseback, from the coast, or, according to another account, the whole peninsula west of the Helles, and to abstain from passing the mouth of the Bosphorus and the Chelchidonian Islands, on the coast of Lycia, or the town of Phaselis, into the Western Sea. The mercifulness of Thucydides on so important a transaction would be enough to render the whole account extremely suspicious."—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 17 (p. 3). Mr. Grote accepts the Peace of Cimon as an historical fact; Prof. Curtius rejects it.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 45 (p. 5).—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 3, ch. 2 (p. 2).

**B. C. 458-456.—War for Megara with Corinth and Ægina.—Victories of Myronides.—Siege and conquest of Ægina.—Collision with the Spartans in Bœotia.—Defeat at Tanagra.**

**—Overthrow of the Thebans.—Recovered Ascendency.** See GREECE: B. C. 458-456.

**B. C. 449-445.—Hostile revolution in Bœotia.—Defeat at Coroneia.—Revolt of Eubœa and Megara.—The thirty years' truce.—Territorial losses.—Spartan recognition of the Delian Confederacy.** See GREECE: B. C. 449-445.

**B. C. 445-431.—Supremacy of Pericles and the popular arts by which he attained it.—The splendor of Athens and grandeur of the Athenian Empire under his rule.**—"The conclusion of peace left the Athenians to their confederacy and their internal politics. . . . After the death of Cimon the oligarchical party at Athens had been led by Thucydides, the son of Melesias, a man of high character and a kinsman of Cimon. . . . Hitherto the members had sat here or there in the assembly as they pleased; now they were combined into a single body, and sat in a special place. Such a consolidation was doubtless needed if the party was to hold its own against Pericles, who was rapidly carrying all before him. For years past he had provided a subsistence for many of the poorer citizens by means of his numerous colonies—no fewer than 5,000 Athenians must have been sent out to the 'cleruchies' in the interval between 453 B. C. and 444 B. C. The new system of juries [See DICASTERIA] had also been established on the fall of the Areopagus, and the jurymen were paid—a second source of income to the poor. Such measures were beyond anything that the private liberality of Cimon—splendid as it was—could achieve; and on Cimon's death no other aristocrat came forward to aid his party with his purse. Pericles did not stop here. Since the cessation of the war with Persia there had been fewer drafts on the public purse, and the contributions of the allies were accumulating in the public treasury. A scrupulous man would have regarded the surplus as the money of the allies. . . . Pericles took another view. He plainly told the Athenians that so long as the city fulfilled the contract made with the allied cities, and kept Persian vessels from their shores, the surplus was at the disposal of Athens. Acting on this principle, he devoted a part of it to the embellishment of the city. With the aid of Pheidias, the sculptor, and Ictinus, the architect, a new temple began to rise on the Acropolis in honour of Athena—the celebrated Parthenon or 'Virgin's Chamber' [See ΠΑΡΘΕΝΩΝ]. . . . Other public buildings were also begun about this time. Athens was in fact a vast workshop, in which employment was found for a great number of citizens. Nor was this all. . . . For eight months of the year 60 ships were kept at sea with crews on board, in order that there might be an ample supply of practical seamen. . . . Thus by direct or indirect means Pericles made the state the paymaster of a vast number of citizens, and the state was practically himself, with these paid citizens at his back. At the same time the public festivals of the city were enlarged and adorned with new splendour. . . . That all might attend the theatre in which the plays were acted, Pericles provided that every citizen should receive from the state a sum sufficient to pay the charge demanded from the spectators by the lessee [See ΔΙΟΜΟΛΥ]. We may look on these measures as the arts of a demagogue. . . . Or we may say that Pericles

was able to gratify his passion for art at the expense of the Athenians and their allies. Neither of these views is altogether untenable; and both are far from including the whole truth. Pericles . . . was, if we please to say it, a demagogue and a connoisseur. But he was something more. Looking at the whole evidence before us with impartial eyes, we cannot refuse to acknowledge that he cherished aspirations worthy of a great statesman. He sincerely desired that every Athenian should owe to his city the blessing of an education in all that was beautiful, and the opportunity of a happy and useful life. . . . The oligarchs determined to pull down Pericles, if it were possible. . . . They proposed, in the winter of 445 B. C., that there should be an ostracism in the city. The people agreed, and the usual arrangements were made. But when the day came for decision, in the spring of 444 B. C., the sentence fell, not on Pericles, but on Thucydides. The sentence left no doubt about the feeling of the Athenian people, and it was accepted as final. Thucydides disappeared from Athens, and for the next fifteen years Pericles was master of the city. . . . While Athens was active, organizing her confederacy and securing her communication with the north, the Peloponnesians had allowed the years to pass in apathy and inattention. At length they awoke to a sense of the situation. It was clear that Athens had abandoned all idea of war with Persia, and that the confederacy of Delos was transformed into an Athenian empire, of whose forces the great city was absolutely mistress. And meanwhile in visible greatness Athens had become far the first city in Greece."—E. Abbott, *Pericles*, ch. 10-11.—"A rapid glance will suffice to show the eminence which Athens had attained over the other states of Greece. She was the head of the Ionian League—the mistress of the Grecian seas; with Sparta, the sole rival that could cope with her armies and arrest her ambition, she had obtained a peace; Corinth was humbled—Ægina ruined—Megara had shrunk into her dependency and garrison. The states of Læotia had received their very constitution from the hands of an Athenian general—the democracies planted by Athens served to make liberty itself subservient to her will, and involved in her safety. She had remedied the sterility of her own soil by securing the rich pastures of the neighbouring Eubœa. She had added the gold of Thasos to the silver of Laurion, and established a footing in Thessaly which was at once a fortress against the Asiatic arms and a mart for Asiatic commerce. The fairest lands of the opposite coast—the most powerful islands of the Grecian seas—contributed to her treasury, or were almost legally subjected to her revenge. . . . In all Greece, Myronides was perhaps the ablest general—Pericles . . . was undoubtedly the most highly educated, cautious and commanding statesman. . . . In actual possession of the tribute of her allies, Athens acquired a new right to its collection and its management, and while she devoted some of the treasures to the maintenance of her strength, she began early to uphold the prerogative of appropriating a part to the enhancement of her splendour. . . . It was now [about B. C. 444] resolved to make Athens also the seat and centre of the judicial authority. The subject-allies were compelled, if not on minor, at least on all important cases,


to resort to Athenian courts of law for justice. And thus Athens became, as it were, the metropolis of the allies. . . . Before the Persian war, and even scarcely before the time of Cimon, Athens cannot be said to have eclipsed her neighbours in the arts and sciences. She became the centre and capital of the most polished communities of Greece, and she drew into a focus all the Grecian intellect; she obtained from her dependents the wealth to administer the arts, which universal traffic and intercourse taught her to appreciate; and thus the Odeon, and the Parthenon, and the Propylæa arose. During the same administration, the fortifications were completed, and a third wall, parallel and near to that uniting Piræus with Athens, consummated the works of Themistocles and Cimon, and preserved the communication between the two-fold city, even should the outer walls fall into the hands of an enemy."—E. G. Bulwer-Lytton, *Athens: Its Rise and Fall*, bk. 4, ch. 5, bk. 5, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: W. W. Lloyd, *The Age of Pericles*, —Plutarch, *Pericles*.

**B. C. 445-429.—The Age of Pericles: Art.**—"The Greeks . . . were industrious, commercial, sensitive to physical and moral beauty, eager for discussion and controversy; they were proud of their humanity, and happy in the possession of their poets, their historians, their orators and artists. It is singular, in the history of nations, to meet with a people distinguished at once by mercantile aptitude, and by an exquisite feeling and sympathy for works of art; to see the vanity of wealth compatible with a nice discernment for the true principles of taste; to behold a nation, inconstant in ideas, inconceivably fierce in prejudices, worshipping a man one day and proscribing him the next, yet at the same time progressing with unheard-of rapidity; within the space of a few years traversing all systems of philosophy, all forms of government, laying the foundations of all sciences, making war on all its neighbors, yet, in the midst of this chaos of ideas, systems, and passions, developing art steadily and with calm intelligence, giving to it novelty, originality, and beauty, while preserving it pure from the aberrations and caprices of what we now call fashion. At the time of the battle of Salamis, 480 B. C., Athens had been destroyed, its territory ravaged, and the Athenians had nothing left but their ships; yet so great was the activity of this commercial but artistic people, that, only twenty years afterwards, they had built the Parthenon."—E. E. Viollet-le-Duc, *Discourses on Architecture*, p. 65.

**B. C. 445-429.—The Age of Pericles: Domestic life.—The Athenian house.**—"For any one coming from Asia it seemed as if in entering Athens he was coming into an ant's nest. Possessing, at the epoch of its greatest power, the three ports of Munychia, Phaleron and the Piræus, it covered a district whose circumference measured two hundred stadia (twenty-four miles). But it was around the Acropolis that the houses were crowded together and the population always in activity. There wagons were passing to and fro, filled with merchandise from the ports or conveying it thither. The streets and public places in which people passed their lives presented a busy and noisy scene. Strangers, who came to buy or to sell, were continually entering or leaving the shops and places of manufacture, and slaves were carrying messages or

burdens. Women as well as men were to be seen in the streets, going to the markets, the public games and the meetings of corporate bodies. From the earliest hours of the day large numbers of peasants might be seen bringing in vegetables, fruit and poultry, and crying their wares in the streets. Houses of the higher class occupied the second zone; they generally possessed a garden and sometimes outbuildings of considerable extent. Around them were to be seen clients and parasites, waiting for the hour when the master should make his appearance; and whiling away the time discussing the news of the day, repeating the rumours, true or false, that were current in the city; getting the slaves to talk, and laughing among themselves at the strangers that happened to be passing, or addressing them with a view to make fun of their accent, garb or dress. The house of Chremylus, recently built in that second zone, was a subject of remark for all the idlers. Chremylus, who had lately become wealthy by means of commerce, and of certain transactions of more or less creditable character in the colonies, was an object of envy and criticism to most people, and of admiration for some who did justice to his intelligence and energy. He enjoyed a certain degree of influence in the public assemblies — thanks to his liberality; while he took care to secure the good graces of the archons and to enrich the temples.



PLAN OF ATHENIAN HOUSE.

We have [in the accompanying figure] the ground-plan of the residence of this Athenian citizen. The entrance *x* opens on the public road. The site is bounded on either side by narrow streets. This entrance *x* opens on the court *O*, which is surrounded by porticoes. At *A* is the porter's lodge, and at *B* the rooms for the slaves, with kitchen at *C* and latrines at *a*.

From this first court, in the centre of which is a small fountain with a basin which receives the rain water, the passage *D* leads into the inner court *E*, which is larger and is likewise surrounded by porticoes. At *G* is the reception room, at *H* the strong room for valuables, and at *S* the private altar. At *F* is a large storeroom containing provisions and wine; and at *I* the small dining room (triclinium); the cooking-room for the family being at *J* with latrines at *b*. The large triclinium is at *K*. The passage *m* admits to the gymnasium, containing the bedrooms *P* along the portico *M*, a common room for the women, with its small enclosed garden, and closets at *e*. The quarters for visitors are entered by the passage *t*, and consist of bedrooms *V*, a portico *T*, a small garden and closets *f*. At *d* is an opening into the lane for the servants, when required. The gardens extend in the direction *Z*. This house is situated on the slopes of the hill which to the south-west looks towards the Acropolis; thus it is sheltered from the violent winds which sometimes blow from this quarter. From the large dining-hall and from the terrace *L*, which adjoins it, there is a charming prospect; for, above the trees of the garden is seen the city overlooked by the Acropolis, and towards the left the hill of the Areopagus. From this terrace *L* there is a descent to the garden by about twelve steps. The position was chosen with a view to protection against the sun's heat and the troublesome winds. From the portico of the gymnasium are seen the hills extending towards the north, covered with houses surrounded by olive-trees; and in the background Mount Pentelicus. . . . In the dwelling of Chremylus the various departments were arranged at the proprietor's discretion, and the architect only conformed to his instructions. Thus the front part of the house is assigned to the external relations of the owner. In this court *O* assemble the agents or factors who come to give an account of the commissions they have executed, or to receive orders. If the master wishes to speak to any of them, he takes him into his reception room; his bedchamber being at *R*, he can easily repair to that reception-room or to the gymnasium reserved for the women and younger children. If he entertains friends, they have their separate apartments, which are shut off, not being in communication with the first court except through the passage *t*. All that part of the habitation which is beyond the wide entrance-hall *D* is consecrated to domestic life; and only the intimate friends of the family are admitted into the second court; for example, if they are invited to a banquet,—which is held in the great hall *K*. The master usually takes his meals with his wife and one or two members of his family who live in the house, in the smaller room *I*, the couches of which will hold six persons; whereas fifteen guests can be accommodated on the couches of the great hall *K*. Chremylus has spared nothing to render his house one of the most sumptuous in the city. The columns of Pentelican marble support architraves of wood, surmounted by friezes and cornices overlaid with stucco and ornamented with delicate painting. Everywhere the walls are coated with fine smooth plaster, adorned with paintings; and the ceilings are of timber artistically wrought and coloured." —E. Viollet-le-Duc, *The Habitations of Man in all Ages*, ch. 17.

**B. C. 445-429.—The Age of Pericles: Law and its Administration.—Contrast with the Romans.**—"It is remarkable . . . that the 'equality' of laws on which the Greek democracies prided themselves—that equality which, in the beautiful drinking-song of Callistratus, Harmodius and Aristogiton are said to have given to Athens—had little in common with the 'equity' of the Romans. The first was an equal administration of civil laws among the citizens, however limited the class of citizens might be; the last implied the applicability of a law, which was not civil law, to a class which did not necessarily consist of citizens. The first excluded a despot; the last included foreigners, and for some purposes slaves. . . . There are two special dangers to which law, and society which is held together by law, appear to be liable in their infancy. One of them is that law may be too rapidly developed. This occurred with the codes of the more progressive Greek communities, which embarrassed themselves with astonishing facility from cumbersome forms of procedure and needless terms of art, and soon ceased to attach any superstitious value to rigid rules and prescriptions. It was not for the ultimate advantage of mankind that they did so, though the immediate benefit conferred on their citizens may have been considerable. One of the rarest qualities of national character is the capacity for applying and working out the law, as such, at the cost of constant miscarriages of abstract justice, without at the same time losing the hope or the wish that law may be conformed to a higher ideal'. The Greek intellect, with all its nobility and elasticity, was quite unable to confine itself within the strait waistcoat of a legal formula; and, if we may judge them by the popular courts of Athens, of whose workings we possess accurate knowledge, the Greek tribunals exhibited the strongest tendency to confound law and fact. The remains of the Orators and forensic commonplaces preserved by Aristotle in his Treatise on Rhetoric, show that questions of pure law were constantly argued on every consideration which could possibly influence the mind of the judges. No durable system of jurisprudence could be produced in this way. A community which never hesitated to relax rules of written law whenever they stood in the way of an ideally perfect decision on the facts of particular cases, would only, if it bequeathed any body of judicial principles to posterity, bequeath one consisting of the ideas of right and wrong which happened to be prevalent at the time. Such jurisprudence would contain no framework to which the more advanced conceptions of subsequent ages could be fitted. It would amount at best to a philosophy, marked with the imperfections of the civilisation under which it grew up. . . . The other liability to which the infancy of society is exposed has prevented or arrested the progress of far the greater part of mankind. The rigidity of primitive law, arising chiefly from its earlier association and identification with religion, has chained down the mass of the human race to those views of life and conduct which they entertained at the time when their usages were first consolidated into a systematic form. There were one or two races exempted by a marvellous fate from this calamity, and grafts from these stocks have fertilised a few

modern societies; but it is still true that, over the larger part of the world, the perfection of law has always been considered as consisting in adherence to the ground plan supposed to have been marked out by the original legislator. If intellect has in such cases been exercised on jurisprudence, it has uniformly prided itself on the subtle perversity of the conclusions it could build on ancient texts without discoverable departure from their literal tenour. I know no reason why the law of the Romans should be superior to the laws of the Hindus, unless the theory of Natural Law had given it a type of excellence different from the usual one."—H. S. Maine, *Ancient Law*, ch. 3-4.—"But both the Greek and the English trial by jury were at one time the great political safeguard against state oppression and injustice; and, owing to this origin, free nations become so attached to it that they are blind to its defects. And just as Ireland would now benefit beyond conception by the abolition of the jury system, so the secured Athenian (or any other) democracy would have thriven better had its laws been administered by courts of skilled judges. For these large bodies of average citizens, who, by the way, were not like our jurymen, unwilling occupants of the jury-box, but who made it a paid business and an amusement, did not regard the letter of the law. They allowed actions barred by the reasonable limits of time; they allowed arguments totally beside the question, though this too was illegal, for there was no competent judge to draw the line; they allowed hearsay evidence, though that too was against the law; indeed the evidence produced in most of the speeches is of the loosest and poorest kind. Worse than all, there were no proper records kept of their decisions, and witnesses were called in to swear what had been the past decisions of a jury sitting in the same city, and under the same procedure. This is the more remarkable, as there were state archives, in which the decrees of the popular assembly were kept. . . . There is a most extraordinary speech of Lysias against a man called Nichomachus, who was appointed to transcribe the laws of Solon in four months, but who kept them in his possession for six years, and is accused of having so falsified them as to have substituted himself for Solon. Hence there can have been no recognized duplicate extant, or such a thing could not be attempted. So again, in the Trapeziticus of Isocrates, it is mentioned as a well known fact, that a certain Pythodorus was convicted of tampering with state-documents, signed and sealed by the magistrates, and deposited in the Acropolis. All these things meet us in every turn in the court speeches of the Attic orators. We are amazed at seeing relationships proved in will cases by a man coming in and swearing that such a man's father had told him that his brother was married to such a woman, of such a house. We find the most libellous charges brought against opponents on matters totally beside the question at issue, and even formal evidence of general bad character admitted. We find some speakers in consequence treating the jury with a sort of mingled deference and contempt which is amusing. 'On the former trial of this case,' they say, 'my opponent managed to tell you many well devised lies; of course you were deceived, how could it be other-

wise, and you made a false decision; or else, 'You were so puzzled that you got at variance with one another, you voted at sixes and sevens, and by a small majority you came to an absurd decision.' 'But I think you know well,' says Isocrates, 'that the city has often repented so bitterly ere this for decisions made in passion and without evidence, as to desire after no long interval to punish those who misled it, and to wish those who had been calumniated were more than restored to their former prosperity. Keeping these facts before you, you ought not to be hasty in believing the prosecutors, nor to hear the defendants with interruption and ill temper. For it is a shame to have the character of being the gentlest and most humane of the Greeks in other respects, and yet to act contrary to this reputation in the trials which take place here. It is a shame that in other cities, when a human life is at stake, a considerable majority of votes is required for conviction, but that among you those in danger do not even get an equal chance with their false accusers. You swear indeed once a year that you will attend to both plaintiff and defendant, but in the interval only keep your oath so far as to accept whatever the accusers say, but you sometimes will not let those who are trying to refute them utter even a single word. You think those cities uninhabitable, in which citizens are executed without trial, and forget that those who do not give both sides a fair hearing are doing the very same thing.'—J. P. Mahaffy, *Social Life in Greece*, ch. 13.

**B. C. 445-429.—The Age of Pericles: Political life.—The democracy.**—"The real life of Athens lasted at the most for 200 years: and yet there are moments in which all that we have won by the toils of so many generations seems as if it would be felt to be but a small thing beside a single hour of Periklēs. The Democracy of Athens was in truth the noblest fruit of that self-developing power of the Greek mind which worked every possession of the common heritage into some new and more brilliant shape, but which learned nothing, nothing of all that formed its real life and its real glory, from the Barbarians of the outer world. Men tell us that Greece learned this or that mechanical invention from Phœnicia or Egypt or Assyria. Be it so; but stand in the *Phnyx*; listen to the contending orators; listen to the ambassadors of distant cities; listen to each side as it is fairly hearkened to, and see the matter in hand decided by the peaceful vote of thousands—here at least of a truth is something which Athens did not learn from any Assyrian despot or from any Egyptian priest. And we, children of the common stock, sharers in the common heritage, as we see man, Aryan man, in the full growth of his noblest type, we may feel a thrill as we think that Kleisthenēs and Periklēs were, after all, men of our own blood—as we think that the institutions which grew up under their hands and the institutions under which we ourselves are living are alike branches sprung from one stock, portions of one inheritance in which Athens and England have an equal right. In the Athenian Democracy we see a popular constitution taking the form which was natural for such a constitution to take when it was able to run its natural course in a commonwealth which consisted only of a single city. Wherever the Assembly really remains, in truth

as well as in name, an Assembly of the whole people in their own persons, it must in its own nature be sovereign. It must, in the nature of things, delegate more or less of power to magistrates and generals; but such power will be simply delegated. Their authority will be a mere trust from the sovereign body, and to that sovereign body they will be responsible for its exercise. That is to say, one of the original elements of the State, the King or chief, now represented by the elective magistracy, will lose its independent powers, and will sink to a body who have only to carry out the will of the sovereign Assembly. So with another of the original elements, the Council. This body too loses its independent being; it has no ruling or checking power; it becomes a mere Committee of the Assembly, chosen or appointed by lot to put measures into shape for more easy discussion in the sovereign body. As society becomes more advanced and complicated, the judicial power can no longer be exercised by the Assembly itself, while it would be against every democratic instinct to leave it in the arbitrary power of individual magistrates. Other Committees of the Assembly, Juries on a gigantic scale, with a presiding magistrate as chairman rather than as Judge, are therefore set apart to decide causes and to sit in judgment on offenders. Such is pure Democracy, the government of the whole people and not of a part of it only, as carried out in its full perfection in a single city. It is a form of government which works up the faculties of man to a higher pitch than any other; it is the form of government which gives the freest scope to the inborn genius of the whole community and of every member of it. Its weak point is that it works up the faculties of man to a pitch so high that it can hardly be lasting, that its ordinary life needs an enthusiasm, a devotion too highly strung to be likely to live through many generations. Athens in the days of her glory, the Athens of Periklēs, was truly 'the roof and crown of things'; her democracy raised a greater number of human beings to a higher level than any government before or since; it gave freer play than any government before or since to the personal gifts of the foremost of mankind. But against the few years of Athenian glory we must set the long ages of Athenian decline. Against the city where Periklēs was General we must set the city where Hadrian was Archon. On the Assemblies of other Grecian cities it is hardly needful to dwell. Our knowledge of their practical working is slight. We have one picture of a debate in the popular Assembly of Sparta, an Assembly none the less popular in its internal constitution because it was the assembly of what, as regarded the excluded classes of the State, was a narrow oligarchy. We see that there, as might be looked for, the chiefs of the State, the Kings, and yet more the Ephors, spoke with a degree of official, as distinguished from personal, authority which fell to the lot of no man in the Assembly of Athens. Periklēs reigned supreme, not because he was one of Ten Generals, but because he was Periklēs. . . . In the *Ekklesia* which listened to Periklēs and Dēmostenēs we feel almost as much at home as in an institution of our own hand and our own times. At least we ought to feel at home there; for we have the full materials for calling up the political life of Athens in all its fullness, and within our own times one of the

greatest minds of our own or of any age has given its full strength to clear away the mists of error and calumny which so long shrouded the parent state of justice and freedom. Among the contemporaries and countrymen of Mr. Grote it is shame indeed if men fail to see in the great Democracy the first state which taught mankind that the voice of persuasion could be stronger than a despot's will, the first which taught that disputes could be settled by a free debate and a free vote which in other lands could have been decided only by the banishment or massacre of the weaker side. . . . It must be constantly borne in mind that the true difference between an aristocratic and a democratic government, as those words were understood in the politics of old Greece, lies in this. In the Democracy all citizens, all who enjoy civil rights, enjoy also political rights. In the aristocracy political rights belong to only a part of those who enjoy civil rights. But, in either case, the highest authority of the State is the general Assembly of the whole ruling body, whether that ruling body be the whole people or only a part of it. . . . The slaves and strangers who were shut out at Athens were, according to Greek ideas, no Athenians; but every Athenian had his place in the sovereign assembly of Athens, while every Corinthian had not his place in the sovereign assembly of Corinth. But the aristocratic and the democratic commonwealth both agreed in placing the final authority of the State in the general Assembly of all who enjoy the highest franchise. . . . The people, of its own will, placed at its head men of the same class as those who in the earlier state of things had ruled it against its will. Periklēs, Nikias, Alkibiadēs, were men widely differing in character, widely differing in their relations to the popular government. But all alike were men of ancient birth, who, as men of ancient birth, found their way, almost as a matter of course, to those high places of the State to which Kleōn found his way only by a strange freak of fortune. At Rome we find quite another story. There, no less than at Athens, the moral influence of nobility survived its legal privileges; but, more than this, the legal privileges of the elder nobility were never wholly swept away, and the inherent feeling of respect for illustrious birth called into being a younger nobility by its side. At Athens one stage of reform placed a distinction of wealth instead of a distinction of birth; another stage swept away the distinction of wealth also. But the reform, at each of its stages, was general; it affected all offices alike, save those sacred offices which still remained the special heritage of certain sacred families. . . . In an aristocratic commonwealth there is no room for Periklēs; there is no room for the people that harkened to Periklēs; but in men of the second order, skilful conservative administrators, men able to work the system which they find established, no form of government is so fertile. . . . But everywhere we learn the same lesson, the inconsistency of commonwealths which boast themselves of their own freedom and exalt themselves at the cost of the freedom of others."—E. A. Freeman, *Comparative Politics*, lect. 5-6.—"Dēmōs was himself King, Minister, and Parliament. He had his smaller officials to carry out the necessary details of public business, but he was most undoubtedly his own First Lord of the Treasury, his own Foreign Secretary, his own

Secretary for the Colonies. He himself kept up a personal correspondence both with foreign potentates and with his own officers on foreign service; the 'despatches' of Nikias and the 'notes' of Philip were alike addressed to no officer short of the sovereign himself; he gave personal audience to the ambassadors of other states, and clothed his own with just so great or so small a share as he deemed good of his own boundless authority. He had no need to entrust the care of his thousand dependencies to the mysterious working of a Foreign Office; he himself sat in judgment upon Mitylenian rebels; he himself settled the allotment of lands at Chalkis or Amphipolis; he decreed by his own wisdom what duties should be levied at the Sound of Byzantium; he even ventured on a task of which two-and-twenty ages have not lessened the difficulty, and undertook, without the help of a Lord High Commissioner, to adjust the relations and compose the seditious oven of Korkyra and Zakynthos. He was his own Lord High Chancellor, his own Lord Primate, his own Commander-in-Chief. He listened to the arguments of Kleōn on behalf of a measure, and to the arguments of Nikias against it, and he ended by bidding Nikias to go and carry out the proposal which he had denounced as extravagant or unjust. He listened with approval to his own 'explanations'; he passed votes of confidence in his own policy; he advised himself to give his own royal assent to the bills which he had himself passed, without the form of a second or third reading, or the vain ceremony of moving that the Prytaneis do leave their chairs. . . . We suspect that the average Athenian citizen was, in political intelligence, above the average English Member of Parliament. It was this concentration of all power in an aggregate of which every citizen formed a part, which is the distinguishing characteristic of true Greek democracy. Florence had nothing like it; there has been nothing like it in the modern world; the few pure democracies which have lingered on to our own day have never had such mighty questions hid before them, and have never had such statesmen and orators to lead them. The great Democracy has had no fellow; but the political lessons which it teaches are none the less lessons for all time and for every land and people."—E. A. Freeman, *Historical Essays* (v. 2): *The Athenian Democracy*. "The individual freedom which was enjoyed at Athens and which is extolled by Pericles was plainly an exception to the common usage of Greece, and is so regarded in the Funeral Speech. The word 'freedom,' it should be remembered, bore an ambiguous meaning. It denoted on the one hand political independence,—the exercise of sovereign power by the State and of political rights by the citizens. In this sense every Greek citizen could claim it as his birthright. Even the Spartans could tell the Persian Hydarnes that he had not, like them, tasted of freedom, and did not know whether it was sweet or not. But the word also denoted personal and social liberty,—freedom from the excessive restraints of law, the absence of a tyrannous public opinion and of intolerance between man and man. Pericles claims for Athens 'freedom' in this double sense. But freedom so far as it implies the absence of legal interference in the private concerns of life was but little known except at Athens."—S. H. Batcher, *Some Aspects of Greek Genius*, pp.



70-71.—“To Athens . . . we look . . . for an answer to the question, What does history teach in regard to the virtue of a purely democratic government? And here we may safely say that, under favourable circumstances, there is no form of government which, while it lasts, has such a virtue to give scope to a vigorous growth and luxuriant fritage of various manhood as a pure democracy. . . . But it does not follow that, though in this regard it has not been surpassed by any other form of government, it is therefore absolutely the best of all forms of government. . . . Neither, on the other hand, does it follow from the shortness of the bright reign of Athenian democracy — not more than 200 years from Clisthenes to the Macedonians — that all democracies are short-lived, and must pay, like dissipated young gentlemen, with premature decay for the feverish abuse of their vital force. Possible no doubt it is, that if the power of what we may call a sort of Athenian Second Chamber, the Areopagus, instead of being weakened as it was by Aristides and Pericles, had been built up according to the idea of Æschylus and the intelligent aristocrats of his day, such a body, armed, like our House of Lords, with an effective negative on all outbursts of popular rashness, might have prevented the ambition of the Athenians from launching on that famous Syracusan expedition which exhausted their force and maimed their action for the future. But the lesson taught by the short-lived glory of Athens, and its subjugation under the rough foot of the astute Macedonian, is not that democracies, under the influence of faction, and, it may be, not free from venality, will sell their liberties to a strong neighbour — for a aristocratic Poland did this in a much more blushing way than democratic Greece — but that any loose aggregate of independent States, given more to quarrel amongst themselves than to unite against a common enemy, whether democratic, or aristocratic, or monarchical in their form of government, cannot in the long run maintain their ground against the firm policy and the well-massed force of a strong monarchy. Athens was blotted out from the map of free peoples at Cheronca, not because the Athenian people had too much freedom, but because the Greek States had too little unity. They were used by Philip exactly in the same way that Napoleon used the German States at the commencement of the present century.”—J. S. Blackie, *What does History Teach?* pp. 28-31.—“In Herodotus you have the beginning of the age of discussion. . . . The discourses on democracy, aristocracy, and monarchy, which he puts into the mouth of the Persian conspirators when the monarchy was vacant, have justly been called absurd, as speeches supposed to have been spoken by those persons. No Asiatic ever thought of such things. You might as well imagine Saul or David speaking them as those to whom Herodotus attributes them. They are Greek speeches, full of free Greek discussions, and suggested by the experience, already considerable, of the Greeks in the results of discussion. The age of debate is beginning, and even Herodotus, the least of a wrangler of any man, and the most of a sweet and simple narrator, felt the effect. When we come to Thucydides, the results of discussion are as full as they have ever been; his light is pure, ‘dry light,’ free from the ‘humours’ of habit, and purged from consecrated usage. As

Grote’s history often reads like a report to Parliament, so half Thucydides reads like a speech, or materials for a speech, in the Athenian Assembly.”—W. Bagehot, *Physics and Politics*, pp. 170-171.

**B. C. 440-437.—New settlements of Klerouchoi.—The founding of Amphipolis.—Revolt and subjugation of Samos.**—“The great aim of Athens over the whole area occupied by her confederacy. The establishment of settlers or Klerouchoi [see KLERUCHI], who retained their rights as Athenian citizens, had answered so well in the Lelantian plain of Eubœa that it was obviously good policy to extend the system. The territory of Hestiana in the north of Eubœa and the islands of Lemnos, Imbros, and Skyros, were thus occupied; and Pericles himself led a body of settlers to the Thracian Chersonesos where he repaired the old wall at the neck of the peninsula, and even to Sinope which now became a member of the Athenian alliance. A generation had passed from the time when Athens lost 10,000 citizens in the attempt to found a colony at the mouth of the Strymon. The task was now undertaken successfully by Hagnon, and the city came into existence which was to be the cause of disaster to the historian Thucydides and to witness the death of Brasidas and of Kleon [see AMPURITIS]. . . . Two years before the founding of Amphipolis, Samos revolted from Athens. . . . In this revolt of Samos the overt action comes from the oligarchs who had seized upon the Ionian town of Priene, and defeated the Milesians who opposed them. The latter appealed to the Athenians, and received not only their aid but that of the Samian demos. The latter now became the ruling body in the island, fifty men and fifty boys being taken from the oligarchic families and placed as hostages in Lemnos, which, as we have seen, was now wholly occupied by Athenian Klerouchoi. But the Samian exiles (for many had fled rather than live under a democracy), entered into covenant with Pis-southines, the Sardinian satrap, crossed over to Samos and seized the chief men of the demos, then falling on Lemnos succeeded in stealing away the hostages; and, having handed over to Pisouthines the Athenian garrison at Samos, made ready for an expedition against Miletos. The tidings that Byzantion had joined in this last revolt left to the Athenians no room to doubt the gravity of the crisis. A fleet of sixty ships was dispatched to Samos under Pericles and nine other generals, of whom the poet Sophokles is said to have been one. Of these ships sixteen were sent, some to gather the allies, others to watch for the Phœnician fleet which they believed to be off the Karian coast advancing to the aid of the Samian oligarchs. With the remainder Pericles did not hesitate to engage the Samian fleet of seventy ships which he encountered on its return from Miletos off the island of Tragia. The Athenians gained the day; and Samos was blockaded by land and sea. But no sooner had Pericles sailed with sixty ships to meet the Phœnician fleet, than the Samians, making a vigorous sally, broke the lines of the besiegers and for fourteen days remained masters of the sea. The return of Pericles changed the face of things. Soon after the resumption of the siege the arrival of sixty fresh ships from Athens under five Strategoi in two detachments,

# TO THE END OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR.

## CONTEMPORANEOUS EVENTS.

- B. C.**
- 776.** Beginning of the Olympiads.
- 753.** The founding of Rome.\*
- 745.** First war between Sparta and Messenia.
- 734.** Founding of Syracuse by Greeks from Corinth.
- 722.** Overthrow of the kingdom of Israel by the Assyrians.—Captivity of the Ten Tribes.
- 685.** The second war between Messenia and Sparta.
- 624.** Supposed date of the legislation of Draco, at Athens.\*
- 612.** Conspiracy of Cylon at Athens.
- 608.** Accession of Nebuchadnezzar in Babylonia.
- 606.** Destruction of Nineveh and overthrow of the Assyrian empire by the Medes.\*
- 598.** Invasion of Palestine by Nebuchadnezzar.
- 594.** The Constitution of Solon adopted at Athens.
- 586.** Capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar.—End of the kingdom of Judah and exile of the remnant of the people to Babylon.
- 560.** Tyranny of Pisistratus established at Athens.
- 549.** Overthrow of the Median monarchy by Cyrus, and founding of the Persian.
- 546.** Overthrow of Croesus and the kingdom of Lydia by Cyrus, king of Persia.
- 538.** Conquest of Babylon by Cyrus.
- 529.** Death of Cyrus and accession of Cambyses, to the throne of Persia.
- 525.** Conquest of Egypt by Cambyses king of Persia.—Birth of Æschylus (d. 456).
- 521.** Accession of Darius I., king of Persia.
- 516.** Invasion of Scythia by Darius, king of Persia.\*
- 510.** Expulsion of the Pisistratids from Athens.
- 509.** Expulsion of the Tarquins from Rome.\*—Founding of the Republic (Roman chronology).
- 508.** Political reorganization of Athens by Cleisthenes.
- 500.** Rising of the Greek colonies in Ionia, against the Persians.
- 493.** League of the Romans and Latins.
- 492.** First secession of the Roman Plebeians.—Creation of the Tribunes of the People.
- 490.** First Persian expedition against Greece.—Their defeat at Marathon.
- 489.** Condemnation and death of Miltiades at Athens.\*
- 486.** Accession of Xerxes to the throne of Persia.
- 480.** Second Persian invasion of Greece.—Thermopylæ.—Artemisium.—Salamis.—Retreat of Xerxes.—Carthaginian invasion of Sicily.—Battle of Himera.—Birth of Euripides.\*
- 479.** Battles of Plataea and Mycale and end of the Persian invasion of Greece.
- 478.** Beginning of the tyranny of Hieron at Syracuse.
- 477.** Formation of the Confederacy of Delos, under Athens.
- 466.** Naval victory of the Greeks over the Persians at Æmyrmedon.—Outbreak of the Plague at Rome.—Revolt of Naxos from the Delian Confederacy.—Fall of the tyrants at Syracuse.
- 464.** Great earthquake at Sparta.—Rising of the Helots; beginning of third Messenian War.
- 458.** Commencement of the Long Walls of Athens.
- 457.** Beginning of war of Corinth, Sparta, and Ægina with Athens.—Battle of Tanagra.
- 450.** End of war against Athens.—Framing of the Twelve Tables of the Roman Law.—The Decemvirs at Rome.—Birth of Alcibiades\* (d. 404).
- 447.** Defeat of the Athenians by the Bœotians at Coronæ.
- 445.** Conclusion of the Thirty Years Peace between Athens and Sparta and their allies.—Ascendancy of Pericles at Athens.—Peace of Callias between Greece and Persia.—Birth of Xenophon.\*
- 444.** Creation of Consular Tribunes at Rome.—Exile of Thucydides from Athens.
- 432.** Complaints against Athens.—Peloponnesian Congress at Sparta.—Revolt of Potidæa.
- 431.** Beginning of the Peloponnesian War.—Invasion of Attica.
- 430.** Second invasion of Attica.—The Plague at Athens.
- 429.** Death of Pericles at Athens.—Capture of Potidæa.—Birth of Plato (d. 347).
- 427.** Destruction of Plataea by the Peloponnesians.—Massacre at Coreyra.
- 425.** Surrender of Spartans to the Athenians at Sphacteria.—Accession of Xerxes II., king of Persia.
- 421.** Peace of Nicias between Athens and Sparta, ending first period of Peloponnesian War.
- 415.** Expedition of the Athenians against Syracuse.—Mutilation of the Hermæ at Athens.—Accusation and flight of Alcibiades.
- 413.** Disaster to the Athenians before Syracuse.—Renewal of the Peloponnesian War.
- 411.** Oligarchical revolution at Athens.—The Four Hundred and their fall.—Recall of Alcibiades.
- 409.** Carthaginian invasion of Sicily.
- 406.** Victory of the Athenians over the Peloponnesians in the battle of Arginusæ.—Execution of the generals at Athens.
- 405.** Defeat of the Athenians at Aigospotamoi.—Successful revolt of the Egyptians against the Persians, and independence established.
- 404.** Fall of Athens.—End of the Peloponnesian War.
- 400.** Retreat of the Ten Thousand under Xenophon.—Birth of Timoleon\* (c. 337).

\* Uncertain date.

## FOURTH AND THIRD CENTURIES, B. C.

### CONTEMPORANEOUS EVENTS.

- B. C.**
- 399.** Condemnation and death of Socrates at Athens.—War of Sparta with Persia.
- 395.** League of Greek cities against Sparta.—The Corinthian War.
- 390.** Rome destroyed by the Gauls.
- 387.** Peace of Antalcidas between the Greeks and Persians.
- 384.** Birth of Aristotle (d. 323).
- 383.** Betrayal of Thebes to Sparta.—War of Syracuse with Carthage.
- 379.** Overthrow of the Olynthian League by Sparta.—Deliverance of Thebes.
- 371.** Defeat of Sparta at Leuctra.—Ascendancy of Thebes.—Arcadian Union.
- 367.** Adoption of the Licinian Laws at Rome.
- 362.** Victory and death of Epaminondas at Mantinea.
- 359.** Accession of Philip to the throne of Macedonia.
- 357.** Outbreak of the Ten Years Sacred War in Greece.
- 356.** Burning of the Temple of Diana at Ephesus.—Birth of Alexander the Great (d. 323).
- 353.** Final conquest of Egypt by the Persians.
- 352.** Interference of Philip of Macedonia in the Greek Sacred War.—First Philippic of Demosthenes.
- 343.** Deliverance of Syracuse by Timoleon.—First Samnite War in Italy.
- 338.** League of Greek cities against Philip of Macedonia.—His victory at Charonea.—His domination established.—Subjugation of the Latins by Rome.
- 336.** Assassination of Philip of Macedonia, and accession of Alexander the Great.
- 335.** Revolt of Thebes.—Alexander's destruction of the city.
- 334.** Alexander's expedition against Persia.—His victory at the Granicus.
- 333.** Alexander's victory over the Persians at Issus.
- 332.** Alexander's sieges of Tyre and Gaza, conquest of Egypt and founding of Alexandria.
- 331.** Alexander's victory at Arbela.—Overthrow of the Persian empire.
- 326.** Alexander in India.—Defeat of Porus.—Beginning of second Samnite War in Italy.
- 323.** Death of Alexander the Great at Babylon.—Partition of his dominion among the generals.—Revolt in Greece.—The Lamian War.
- 322.** Subjugation of Athens by the Macedonians.—Death of Demosthenes.
- 321.** Beginning of the Wars of the Successors of Alexander.—Founding of the kingdom of the Ptolemies in Egypt.—Defeat of the Romans by the Samnites at the Caudine Forks.
- 317.** Execution of Ptoleion at Athens.
- 307.** Athens under the rule of Demetrius Poliorcetes.
- 306.** Royal titles assumed by Antigonus (as king of Asia), Ptolemy, in Egypt, Seleucus Nicator, in Syria, Lysimachus, in Thrace, and Cassander, in Macedonia.
- 305.** Siege of Rhodes by Demetrius Poliorcetes.
- 301.** Battle of Ipsus.—Overthrow and death of Antigonus.
- 298.** Beginning of third Samnite War.
- 295.** Roman defeat of the Gauls at Sentinum.
- 287.** Birth of Archimedes\* (d. 212).
- 286.** Adoption of the Hortensian Laws at Rome.
- 280.** Invasion of Italy by Pyrrhus, king of Epirus.—Invasion of Greece by the Gauls.—Rise of the Achaean League.
- 278.** Pyrrhus in Sicily, in war against Carthage.
- 275.** Defeat of Pyrrhus at Beneventum.
- 264.** Beginning of the first Punic War between Rome and Carthage.
- 263.** Athens captured by Antigonus Gonatus.
- 255.** Defeat and capture of Regulus in Africa.
- 250.** Founding of the kingdom of Parthia by Arsaces.\*
- 241.** End of the first Punic War.—Roman conquest of Sicily.—Revolt of the Carthaginian mercenaries.
- 227.** War of Sparta with the Achaean League.
- 222.** Roman conquest of Cisalpine Gaul completed.
- 221.** Battle of Sellasia.—Sparta crushed by the king of Macedonia.
- 213.** Beginning of the second Punic War between Rome and Carthage.—Hannibal in Italy.
- 217.** Hannibal's defeat of the Romans at the Trasimene Lake.—Coele-Syria and Palestine ceded to Egypt by Antiochus the Great.
- 216.** Great defeat of the Romans by Hannibal at Cannæ.
- 214.** Beginning of war between Rome and Macedonia.
- 212.** Siege and reduction of Syracuse by the Romans.
- 211.** Hannibal at the Roman gates.
- 207.** Defeat of Hasdrubal on the Metaurus.
- 205.** End of first Macedonian War.
- 202.** Scipio's decisive victory at Zama, in Africa, ending the second Punic War.
- 201.** Subjection of the Jews to the Seleucid monarchy.
- 200.** Roman declaration of war against the king of Macedonia.

\* Uncertain date.

with thirty from Chios and Lesbos, damped the energy of the Samian oligarchs; and an unsuccessful effort at sea was followed by their submission in the ninth month after the beginning of the revolt, the terms being that they should raze their walls, give hostages, surrender their ships, and pay the expenses of the war. Following their example, the Byzantines also made their peace with Athens. The Phenician fleet never came. . . . The Athenians escaped at the same time a far greater danger nearer home. The Samians, like the men of Thasos, had applied for aid to the Spartans, who, no longer pressed by the Helot war, summoned a congress of their allies to discuss the question. For the truce which had still five-and-twenty years to run Sparta cared nothing, but she encountered an opposition from the Corinthians which perhaps she now scarcely expected. . . . The Spartans were compelled to give way; and there can be no doubt that when some years later the Corinthians claimed the gratitude of the Athenians for this decision, they took credit for an act of good service singularly opportune. Had they voted as Sparta wished, Athens might by the extension of revolt amongst her allied cities have been reduced now to the condition to which, in consequence perhaps of this respite, she was not brought until the lifetime of a generation had been spent in desperate warfare."—G. W. Cox, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 3, ch. 1 (p. 2).

**B. C. 431.—Beginning of the Peloponnesian War.—Its Causes.**—"In B. C. 431 the war broke out between Athens and the Peloponnesian League, which, after twenty-seven years, ended in the ruin of the Athenian empire. It began through a quarrel between Corinth and Kerkyra, in which Athens assisted Kerkyra. A congress was held at Sparta; Corinth and other States complained of the conduct of Athens, and war was decided on. The real cause of the war was that Sparta and its allies were jealous of the great power that Athens had gained [see GREECE: B. C. 435-432 and 432-431]. A far greater number of Greek States were engaged in this war than had ever been engaged in a single undertaking before. States that had taken no part in the Persian war were now fighting on one side or the other. Sparta was an oligarchy, and the friend of the nobles everywhere; Athens was a democracy, and the friend of the common people; so that the war was to some extent a struggle between these classes all over Greece, and often within the same city walls the nobles and the people attacked one another, the nobles being for Sparta and the people for Athens. On the side of Sparta, when the war began, there was all Peloponnesus except Argos and Achaëa, and also the oligarchical Boeotian League under Thebes besides Phokis, Lokris, and other States west of them. They were very strong by land, but the Corinthians alone had a good fleet. Later on we shall see the powerful State of Syracuse with its navy, acting with Sparta. On the side of Athens there were almost all the Ægean islands, and a great number of the Ægean coast towns as well as Kerkyra and certain States in the west of Greece. The Athenians had also made alliance with Sitalkes, the barbarian king of the interior of Thraë. Athens was far stronger by sea than Sparta, but had not such a strong land army. On the other hand it had a large treasure, and a

system of taxes, while the Spartan League had little or no money."—C. A. Fyfe, *Hist. of Greece (History Primers)*, p. 84.—The Ionian cities, called "allies" of Athens, were subjects in reality, and held in subjection by tyrannical measures which made the yoke odious, as is plainly explained by Xenophon, who says: "Some person might say, that it is a great support to the Athenians that their allies should be in a condition to contribute money to them. To the plebeians, however, it seems to be of much greater advantage that every individual of the Athenians should get some of the property of the allies, and that the allies themselves should have only so much as to enable them to live and to till the ground, so that they may not be in a condition to form conspiracies. The people of Athens seem also to have acted injudiciously in this respect, that they oblige their allies to make voyages to Athens for the decision of their lawsuits. But the Athenians consider only, on the other hand, what benefits to the state of Athens are attendant on this practice; in the first place they receive their dues throughout the year from the prytaneta; in the next place, they manage the government of the allied states while sitting at home, and without sending out ships; they also support suitors of the lower orders, and ruin those of an opposite character in their courts of law; but if each state had its own courts, they would, as being hostile to the Athenians, be the ruin of those who were most favourable to the people of Athens. In addition to these advantages, the Athenian people have the following profits from the courts of justice for the allies being at Athens: first of all the duty of the hundredth on what is landed at the Peireus affords a greater revenue to the city; next, whoever has a lodging-house makes more money by it, as well as whoever has cattle or slaves for hire; and the heralds, too, are benefited by the visits of the allies to the city. Besides, if the allies did not come to Athens for law, they would honour only such of the Athenians as were sent over the sea to them, as generals, and captains of vessels, and ambassadors; but now every individual of the allies is obliged to flatter the people of Athens, knowing that on going to Athens he must gain or lose his cause according to the decision, not of other judges, but of the people, as is the law of Athens; and he is compelled, too, to use supplication before the court, and, as any one of the people enters, to take him by the hand. By these means the allies are in consequence rendered much more the slaves of the Athenian people."—Xenophon, *On the Athenian Government (Minor Works, trans. by Rev. J. S. Watson)*, p. 235.—The revolt of these coerced and hostile "allies," upon the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, was inevitable.—The prominent events of the Peloponnesian war, in which most of the Greek States were involved, are properly narrated in their connection with Greek history at large (see GREECE: B. C. 431-429, and after). In this place it will only be necessary to take account of the consequences of the war as they affected the remarkable city and people whose superiority had occasioned it by challenging and somewhat offensively provoking the jealousy of their neighbors.

**B. C. 431.—Peloponnesian invasions of Attica.—Siege of Athens.**—"While the Pelo-

ponnesians were gathering at the Isthmus, and were still on their way, but before they entered Attica, Pericles, the son of Xanthippus, who was one of the ten Athenian generals, . . . repeated [to the Athenians] his previous advice; they must prepare for war and bring their property from the country into the city; they must defend their walls but not go out to battle; they should also equip for service the fleet in which lay their strength. . . . The citizens were persuaded, and brought into the city their children and wives, their household goods, and even the wood-work of their houses, which they took down. Their flocks and beasts of burden they conveyed to Eubœa and the adjacent islands. The removal of the inhabitants was painful; for the Athenians had always been accustomed to reside in the country. Such a life had been characteristic of them more than of any other Hellenic people, from very early times. . . . When they came to Athens, only a few of them had houses or could find homes among friends or kindred. The majority took up their abode in the vacant spaces of the city, and in the temples and shrines of heroes. . . . Many also established themselves in the turrets of the walls, or in any other place which they could find; for the city could not contain them when they first came in. But afterwards they divided among them the Long Walls and the greater part of the Piræus. At the same time the Athenians applied themselves vigorously to the war, summoning their allies, and preparing an expedition of 100 ships against the Peloponnese. While they were thus engaged, the Peloponnesian army was advancing; it arrived first of all at Oenoe," where Archidamus, the Spartan king, wasted much time in a fruitless siege and assault. "At last they marched on, and about the eighteenth day after the entry of the Thebans into Plataea, in the middle of the summer, when the corn was in full ear, invaded Attica. . . . They encamped and ravaged, first of all, Eleusis and the plain of Thria. . . . At Acharnæ they encamped, and remained there a considerable time, ravaging the country." It was the expectation of Archidamus that the Athenians would be provoked to come out and meet him in the open field; and that, indeed, they were eager to do; but the prudence of their great leader held them back. "The people were furious with Pericles, and, forgetting all his previous warnings, they abused him for not leading them to battle." But he was vindicated by the result. "The Peloponnesians remained in Attica as long as their provisions lasted, and then, taking a new route, retired through Boœtia. . . . On their return to Peloponnese the troops dispersed to their several cities." Meantime the Athenian and allied fleets were ravaging the Peloponnesian coast. "In the same summer [B. C. 431] the Athenians expelled the Aeginetans and their families from Aegina, alleging that they had been the main cause of the war. . . . The Lacedæmonians gave the Aeginetan exiles the town of Thyrea to occupy and the adjoining country to cultivate. . . . About the end of the summer the entire Athenian force, including the metics, invaded the territory of Megara. . . . After ravaging the greater part of the country they retired. They repeated the invasion, sometimes with cavalry, sometimes with the whole Athenian army, every year during the war until Nisæa was taken [B. C. 424]."—Thucy-

dides, *History*; trans. by B. Jowett, bk. 2, sect. 13-31 (v. 1).

**B. C. 430.**—The funeral oration of Pericles.—During the winter of the year B. C. 431-430, "in accordance with an old national custom, the funeral of those who first fell in this war was celebrated by the Athenians at the public charge. The ceremony is as follows: Three days before the celebration they erect a tent in which the bones of the dead are laid out, and every one brings to his own dear any offering which he pleases. At the time of the funeral the bones are placed in chests of cypress wood, which are conveyed on hearses; there is one chest for each tribe. They also carry a single empty litter decked with a pall for all whose bodies are missing, and cannot be recovered after the battle. The procession is accompanied by any one who chooses, whether citizen or stranger, and the female relatives of the deceased are present at the place of interment and make lamentation. The public sepulchre is situated in the most beautiful spot outside the walls; there they always bury those who fall in war; only after the battle of Marathon the dead, in recognition of their pre-eminent valour, were interred on the field. When the remains have been laid in the earth, some man of known ability and high reputation, chosen by the city, delivers a suitable oration over them; after which the people depart. Such is the manner of interment; and the ceremony was repeated from time to time throughout the war. Over those who were the first buried Pericles was chosen to speak. At the fitting moment he advanced from the sepulchre to a lofty stage, which had been erected in order that he might be heard as far as possible by the multitude, and spoke as follows:—"Most of those who have spoken here before me have commended the lawgiver who added this oration to our other funeral customs; it seemed to them a worthy thing that such an honour should be given at their burial to the dead who have fallen on the field of battle. But I should have preferred that, when men's deeds have been brave, they should be honoured in deed only, and with such an honour as this public funeral, which you are now witnessing. Then the reputation of many would not have been imperilled on the eloquence or want of eloquence of one, and their virtues believed or not as he spoke well or ill. For it is difficult to say neither too little nor too much; and even moderation is apt not to give the impression of truthfulness. The friend of the dead who knows the facts is likely to think that the words of the speaker fall short of his knowledge and of his wishes; another who is not so well informed, when he hears of anything which surpasses his own powers, will be envious and will suspect exaggeration. Mankind are tolerant of the praises of others so long as each hearer thinks that he can do as well or nearly as well himself, but, when the speaker rises above him, jealousy is aroused and he begins to be incredulous. However, since our ancestors have set the seal of their approval upon the practice, I must obey, and to the utmost of my power shall endeavour to satisfy the wishes and beliefs of all who hear me. I will speak first of our ancestors, for it is right and becoming that now, when we are lamenting the dead, a tribute should be paid to their memory. There has never been a time when they did not inhabit this land, which by their valour

they have handed down from generation to generation, and we have received from them a free state. But if they were worthy of praise, still more were our fathers who added to their inheritance, and after many a struggle transmitted to us their sons this great empire. And we ourselves assembled here to-day, who are still most of us in the vigour of life, have chiefly done the work of improvement, and have richly endowed our city with all things, so that she is sufficient for herself both in peace and war. Of the military exploits by which our various possessions were acquired, or of the energy with which we or our fathers drove back the tide of war, Hellenic or Barbarian, I will not speak; for the tale would be long and is familiar to you. But before I praise the dead, I should like to point out by what principles of action we rose to power, and under what institutions and through what manner of life our empire became great. For I conceive, that such thoughts are not unsuited to the occasion, and that this numerous assembly of citizens and strangers may profitably listen to them. Our form of government does not enter into rivalry with the institutions of others. We do not copy our neighbours, but are an example to them. It is true that we are called a democracy, for the administration is in the hands of the many and not of the few. But while the law secures equal justice to all alike in their private disputes, the claim of excellence is also recognised; and when a citizen is in any way distinguished, he is preferred to the public service, not as a matter of privilege, but as the reward of merit. Neither is poverty a bar, but a man may benefit his country whatever be the obscurity of his condition. There is no exclusiveness in our public life, and in our private intercourse we are not suspicious of one another, nor angry with our neighbour if he does what he likes; we do not put on sour looks at him which, though harmless, are not pleasant. While we are thus unconstrained in our private intercourse, a spirit of reverence pervades our public acts; we are prevented from doing wrong by respect for authority and for the laws, having an especial regard to those which are ordained for the protection of the injured as well as to those unwritten laws which bring upon the transgressor of them the reprobation of the general sentiment. And we have not forgotten to provide for our weary spirits many relaxations from toil; we have regular games and sacrifices throughout the year; at home the style of our life is refined; and the delight which we daily feel in all these things helps to banish melancholy. Because of the greatness of our city the fruits of the whole earth flow in upon us; so that we enjoy the goods of other countries as freely as of our own. Then, again, our military training is in many respects superior to that of our adversaries. Our city is thrown open to the world, and we never expel a foreigner or prevent him from seeing or learning anything of which the secret if revealed to an enemy might profit him. We rely not upon management or trickery, but upon our own hearts and hands. And in the matter of education, whereas they from early youth are always undergoing laborious exercises which are to make them brave, we live at ease, and yet are equally ready to face the Lacedæmonians come into Attica not by themselves, but with their whole confederacy following; we go alone into a neighbour's country;

and although our opponents are fighting for their homes and we on a foreign soil we have seldom any difficulty in overcoming them. Our enemies have never yet felt our united strength; the care of a navy divides our attention, and on land we are obliged to send our own citizens everywhere. But they, if they meet and defeat a part of our army, are as proud as if they had routed us all, and when defeated they pretend to have been vanquished by us all. If then we prefer to meet danger with a light heart but without laborious training, and with a courage which is gained by habit and not enforced by law, are we not greatly the gainers? Since we do not anticipate the pain, although, when the hour comes, we can be as brave as those who never allow themselves to rest; and thus too our city is equally admirable in peace and in war. For we are lovers of the beautiful, yet simple in our tastes, and we cultivate the mind without loss of manliness. Wealth we employ, not for talk and ostentation, but when there is a real use for it. To avow poverty with us is no disgrace; the true disgrace is in doing nothing to avoid it. An Athenian citizen does not neglect the state because he takes care of his own household; and even those of us who are engaged in business have a very fair idea of politics. We alone regard a man who takes no interest in public affairs, not as a harmless, but as a useless character; and if few of us are originators, we are all sound judges of a policy. The great impediment to action is, in our opinion, not discussion, but the want of that knowledge which is gained by discussion preparatory to action. For we have a peculiar power of thinking before we act and of acting too, whereas other men are courageous from ignorance but hesitate upon reflection. And they are surely to be esteemed the bravest spirits who, having the clearest sense both of the pains and pleasures of life, do not on that account shrink from danger. In doing good, again, we are unlike others; we make our friends by conferring, not by receiving favours. Now he who confers a favour is the firmer friend, because he would fain by kindness keep alive the memory of an obligation; but the recipient is colder in his feelings, because he knows that in requiting another's generosity he will not be winning gratitude but only paying a debt. We alone do good to our neighbours not upon a calculation of interest, but in the confidence of freedom and in a frank and fearless spirit. To sum up; I say that Athens is the school of Hellas, and that the individual Athenian in his own person seems to have the power of adapting himself to the most varied forms of action with the utmost versatility and grace. This is no passing and idle word, but truth and fact; and the assertion is verified by the position to which these qualities have raised the state. For in the hour of trial Athens alone among her contemporaries is superior to the report of her. No enemy who comes against her is indignant at the reverses which he sustains at the hands of such a city; no subject complains that his masters are unworthy of him. And we shall assuredly not be without witnesses; there are mighty monuments of our power which will make us the wonder of this and of succeeding ages; we shall not need the praises of Homer or of any other panegyrist whose poetry may please for the moment, although his representation of the facts will not bear the light of day. For we

have compelled every land and every sea to open a path for our valour, and have everywhere planted eternal memorials of our friendship and of our ermy. Such is the city for whose sake these men nobly fought and died; they could not bear the thought that she might be taken from them; and every one of us who survive should gladly toll on her behalf. I have dwelt upon the greatness of Athens because I want to show you that we are contending for a higher prize than those who enjoy none of these privileges, and to establish by manifest proof the merit of these men whom I am now commemorating. Their loftiest praise has been already spoken. For in magnifying the city I have magnified them, and men like them whose virtues made her glorious. And of how few Hellenes can it be said as of them, that their deeds when weighed in the balance have been found equal to their fame! Methinks that a death such as theirs has given the true measure of a man's worth; it may be the first revelation of his virtues, but is at any rate their final seal. For even those who come short in other ways may justly plead the valour with which they have fought for their country; they have blotted out the evil with the good, and have benefited the state more by their public services than they have injured her by their private actions. None of these men were enervated by wealth or hesitated to resign the pleasures of life; none of them put off the evil day in the hope, natural to poverty, that a man, though poor, may one day become rich. But, deeming that the punishment of their enemies was sweeter than any of these things, and that they could fall in no nobler cause, they determined at the hazard of their lives to be honourably avenged, and to leave the rest. They resigned to hope their unknown chance of happiness; but in the face of death they resolved to rely upon themselves alone. And when the moment came they were minded to resist and suffer, rather than to fly and save their lives; they ran away from the word of dishonour, but on the battle-field their feet stood fast, and in an instant, at the height of their fortune, they passed away from the scene, not of their fear, but of their glory. Such was the end of these men; they were worthy of Athens, and the living need not desire to have a more heroic spirit although they may pray for a less fatal issue. The value of such a spirit is not to be expressed in words. Any one can discourse to you for ever about the advantages of a brave defence which you know already. But instead of listening to him I would have you day by day fix your eyes upon the greatness of Athens, until you become filled with the love of her; and when you are impressed by the spectacle of her glory reflect that this empire has been acquired by men who knew their duty and had the courage to do it; who in the hour of conflict had the fear of dishonour always present to them, and who, if ever they failed in an enterprise, would not allow their virtues to be lost to their country, but freely gave their lives to her as the fairest offering which they could present at her feast. The sacrifice which they collectively made was individually repaid to them; for they received again each one for himself a praise which grows not old, and the noblest of all sepulchres — I speak not of that in which their remains are laid, but of that in which their glory survives, and is proclaimed always and on every fitting occasion

both in word and deed. For the whole earth is the sepulchre of famous men; not only are they commemorated by columns and inscriptions in their own country, but in foreign lands there dwells also an unwritten memorial of them, graven not on stone but in the hearts of men. Make them your examples, and esteeming courage to be freedom and freedom to be happiness, do not weigh too nicely the perils of war. The unfortunate who has no hope of a change for the better has less reason to throw away his life than the prosperous who, if he survive, is always liable to a change for the worse, and to whom any accidental fall makes the most serious difference. To a man of spirit, cowardice and disaster coming together are far more bitter than death striking him unperceived at a time when he is full of courage and animated by the general hope. Wherefore I do not now commiserate the parents of the dead who stand here; I would rather comfort them. You know that your life has been passed amid manifold vicissitudes; and that they may be deemed fortunate who have gained most honour, whether an honourable death like theirs, or an honourable sorrow like yours, and whose days have been so ordered that the term of their happiness is likewise the term of their life. I know how hard it is to make you feel this, when the good fortune of others will too often remind you of the gladness which once lightened your hearts. And sorrow is felt at the want of those blessings, not which a man never knew, but which were a part of his life before they were taken from him. Some of you are of an age at which they may hope to have other children, and they ought to bear their sorrow better; not only will the children who may hereafter be born make them forget their own lost ones, but the city will be doubly a gainer. She will not be left desolate, and she will be safer. For a man's counsel cannot have equal weight or worth, when he alone has no children to risk in the general danger. To those of you who have passed their prime I say: "Congratulate yourselves that you have been happy during the greater part of your days; remember that your life of sorrow will not last long, and be comforted by the glory of those who are gone. For the love of honour alone is ever young, and not riches, as some say, but honour is the delight of men when they are old and useless." To you who are the sons and brothers of the departed, I see that the struggle to emulate them will be an arduous one. For all men praise the dead, and, however pre-eminent your virtue may be, hardly will you be thought, I do not say to equal, but even to approach them. The living have their rivals and detractors but when a man is out of the way, the honour and good-will which he receives is unalloyed. And, if I am to speak of womanly virtues to those of you who will henceforth be widows, let me sum them up in one short admonition: To a woman not to show more weakness than is natural to her sex is a great glory, and not to be talked about for good or for evil among men. I have paid the required tribute, in obedience to the law, making use of such fitting words as I had. The tribute of deeds has been paid in part; for the dead have been honourably interred, and it remains only that their children should be maintained at the public charge until they are grown up: this is the solid prize with which, as with a garland, Athens crowns

her sons living and dead, after a struggle like theirs. For where the rewards of virtue are greatest, there the noblest citizens are enlisted in the service of the state. And now, when you have duly lamented, every one his own dead, you may depart.' Such was the order of the funeral celebrated in this winter, with the end of which ended the first year of the Peloponnesian War."—Thucydides, *History*, trans. by B. Jowett, v. 1, bk. 2, sect. 34-47.

**B. C. 430-429.—The Plague in the city.—Death of Pericles.—Capture of Potidæa.**—“As soon as the summer returned [B. C. 430] the Peloponnesians . . . invaded Attica, where they established themselves and ravaged the country. They had not been there many days when the plague broke out at Athens for the first time. . . . The disease is said to have begun south of Egypt in Æthiopia; thence it descended into Egypt and Libya, and after spreading over the greater part of the Persian Empire, suddenly fell upon Athens. It first attacked the inhabitants of the Piræus, and it was supposed that the Peloponnesians had poisoned the cisterns, no conduits having as yet been made there. It afterwards reached the upper city, and then the mortality became far greater. As to its probable origin or the causes which might or could have produced such a disturbance of nature, every man, whether a physician or not, will give his own opinion. But I shall describe its actual course, and the symptoms by which any one who knows them beforehand may recognize the disorder should it ever reappear. For I was myself attacked, and witnessed the sufferings of others. The season was admitted to have been remarkably free from ordinary sickness; and if anybody was already ill of any other disease, it was absorbed in this. Many who were in perfect health, all in a moment, and without any apparent reason, were seized with violent heats in the head and with redness and inflammation of the eyes. Internally the throat and tongue were quickly suffused with blood and the breath became unnatural and fetid. There followed sneezing and hoarseness; in a short time the disorder, accompanied by a violent cough, reached the chest; then fastening lower down, it would move the stomach and bring on all the vomits of bile to which physicians have ever given names; and they were very distressing. . . . The body externally was not so very hot to the touch, nor yet pale; it was a livid colour inclining to red, and breaking out in pustules and ulcers. But the internal fever was intense. . . . The disorder which had originally settled in the head passed gradually through the whole body, and, if a person got over the worst, would often seize the extremities and leave its mark, attacking the privy parts and the fingers and toes; and some escaped with the loss of these, some with the loss of their eyes. . . . The crowding of the people out of the country into the city aggravated the misery; and the newly-arrived suffered most. . . . The mortality among them was dreadful and they perished in wild disorder. The dead lay as they had died, one upon another, while others hardly alive wallowed in the streets and crawled about every fountain craving for water. The temples in which they lodged were full of the corpses of those who died in them; for the violence of the calamity was such that men, not knowing where

to turn, grew reckless of all law, human and divine. . . . The pleasure of the moment and any sort of thing which conduced to it took the place both of honour and of expediency. No fear of God or law of man deterred a criminal.” Terrified by the plague, when they learned of it, the Peloponnesians retreated from Attica, after ravaging it for forty days; but, in the meantime, their own coasts had been ravaged, as before, by the Athenian fleet. And now, being once more relieved from the presence of the enemy, though still grievously afflicted by the plague, the Athenians turned upon Pericles with complaints and reproaches, and imposed a fine upon him. They also sent envoys to Sparta, with peace proposals which received no encouragement. But Pericles spoke calmly and wisely to the people, and they acknowledged their sense of dependence upon him by re-electing him general and committing again “all their affairs to his charge.” But he was stricken next year with the plague, and, lingering for some weeks in broken health, he died in the summer of 429 B. C. By his death the republic was given over to striving demagogues and factions, at just the time when a capable brain and hand were needed in its government most. The war went on, acquiring more ferocity of temper with every campaign. It was especially embittered in the course of the second summer by the execution, at Athens, of several Lacedæmonian envoys who were captured while on their way to solicit help from the Persian king. One of these unfortunate envoys was Aristeus, who had organized the defence of Potidæa. That city was still holding out against the Athenians, who blockaded it obstinately, although their troops suffered frightfully from the plague. But in the winter of 430-429 B. C. they succumbed to starvation and surrendered their town, being permitted to depart in search of a new home. Potidæa was then peopled anew, with colonists.—Thucydides, *History*, tr. by Jowett, bk. 2, sect. 8-13.

Also see: E. Abbott, *Pericles and the Golden Age of Athens*, ch. 13-15.—W. W. Lloyd, *The Age of Pericles*, ch. 64 (v. 2).—L. Whibley, *Political Parties in Athens during the Peloponnesian War*.—W. Wachsmuth, *Hist. Antiquities of the Greeks*, sects. 62-64 (v. 2).

**B. C. 429-421.—After Pericles.—The rise of the Demagogues.**—“When Pericles rose to power it would have been possible to frame a Pan-Hellenic union, in which Sparta and Athens would have been the leading states; and such a dualism would have been the best guarantee for the rights of the smaller cities. When he died there was no policy left but war with Sparta, and conquest in the West. And not only so, but there was no politician who could adjust the relations of domestic war and foreign conquest. The Athenians passed from one to the other, as they were addressed by Cleon or Alcibiades. We cannot wonder that the men who lived in those days of trouble spoke bitterly of Pericles, holding him accountable for the miseries which fell upon Athens. Other statesmen had bequeathed good laws, as Solon and Clisthenes, or the memory of great achievements, as Themistocles or Cimon, but the only changes which Pericles had introduced were thought, not without reason, to be changes for the worse; and he left his country involved in a ruinous war.”—E.



Abbott, *Pericles and the Golden Age of Athens*, pp. 362-363.—“The moral change which had . . . befallen the Attic community had, it is true, even during the lifetime of Pericles, manifested itself by means of sufficiently clear premonitory signs; but Pericles had, notwithstanding, up to the days of his last illness, remained the centre of the state; the people had again and again returned to him, and by subordinating themselves to the personal authority of Pericles had succeeded in recovering the demeanor which befitted them. But now the voice was hushed, which had been able to sway the unruly citizens, even against their will. No other authority was in existence—no aristocracy, no official class, no board of experienced statesmen—nothing, in fact, to which the citizens might have looked for guidance and control. The multitude had recovered absolute independence, and in proportion as, in the interval, readiness of speech and sophistic versatility had spread in Athens, the number had increased of those who now put themselves forward as popular speakers and leaders. But as, among all these, none was capable of leading the multitude after the fashion of Pericles, another method of leading the people, another kind of demagoguery, sprung into existence. Pericles stood above the multitude. . . . His successors were obliged to adopt other means; in order to acquire influence, they took advantage not so much of the strong as of the weak points in the character of the citizens, and achieved popularity by flattering their inclinations, and endeavoring to satisfy the cravings of their baser nature. . . . Now for the first time, men belonging to the lower class of citizens thrust themselves forward to play a part in politics,—men of the trading and artisan class, the culture and wealth of which had so vigorously increased at Athens. . . . The office of general frequently became a post of martyrdom; and the bravest men felt that the prospect of being called to account as to their campaigns by cowardly demagogues, before a capricious multitude, disturbed the straightforward joyousness of their activity, and threw obstacles in the way of their successes. . . . On the orators’ tribune the contrast was more striking. Here the first prominent successor of Pericles was a certain Euerates, a rude and uneducated man, who was ridiculed on the comic stage as the ‘boar’ or ‘bear of Melite’ (the name of the district to which he belonged), a dealer in tow and mill-owner, who only for a short space of time took the lead in the popular assembly. His place was taken by Lysicles, who had acquired wealth by the cattle-trade. . . . It was not until after Lysicles, that the demagogues attained to power who had first made themselves a name by their opposition against Pericles, and, among them, Cleon was the first who was able to maintain his authority for a longer period of time; so that it is in his proceedings during the ensuing years of the war that the whole character of the new demagoguery first thoroughly manifests itself.”—E. C. *Review, History of Greece*, v. 3, ch. 2.—“The characters of the military commander and the political leader were gradually separated. The first germs of this division we find in the days of Kimón and Periklēs. Kimón was no mean politician; but his real genius clearly called him to warfare with the Barbarian. Periklēs was an able and successful general; but in him the

military character was quite subordinate to that of the political leader. It was a wise compromise which entrusted Kimón with the defence of the state abroad and Periklēs with its management at home. After Periklēs the separation widened. We nowhere hear of Dēmostenēs and Phormiôn as political leaders; and even in Nikias the political is subordinate to the military character. Kleôn, on the other hand, was a politician but not a soldier. But the old notion of combining military and political position was not quite lost. It was still deemed that he who proposed a warlike expedition should himself, if it were needful, be able to conduct it. Kleôn in an evil hour was tempted to take on himself military functions; he was forced into command against Spakhtería; by the able and loyal help of Dēmostenēs he acquitted himself with honour. But his head was turned by success; he aspired to independent command; he measured himself against the mighty Brasidas; and the fatal battle of Amphipolis was the result. It now became clear that the Demagogue and the General must commonly be two distinct persons. The versatile genius of Alkibiadēs again united the two characters; but he left no successor. . . . A Demagogue then was simply an influential speaker of popular politics. Dēmostenēs is commonly distinguished as an orator, while Kleôn is branded as a Demagogue; but the position of the one was the same as the position of the other. The only question is as to the wisdom and honesty of the advice given either by Kleôn or by Dēmostenēs.”—E. A. Freeman, *Historical Essays*, 2d ser., pp. 138-140.

**B. C. 429-427.—Fate of Plataea.—Phormiō's Victories.—Revoit of Lesbos.—Siege of Mitylene.—Cleon's bloody decree and its reversal.** See GREECE: B. C. 429-427.

**B. C. 425.—Seizure of Pylus by Demosthenes, the general.—Spartans entrapped and captured at Spakhteria.—Peace pleaded for and refused.** See GREECE: B. C. 425.

**B. C. 424-406.—Socrates as soldier and citizen.—The trial of the Generals.**—“Socrates was born very shortly before the year 469 B. C. His father, Sophroniscus, was a sculptor, his mother, Phænarete, a midwife. Nothing definite is known of his moral and intellectual development. There is no specific record of him at all until he served at the siege of Potidea (432 B. C.—429 B. C.) when he was nearly forty years old. All that we can say is that his youth and manhood were passed in the most splendid period of Athenian or Greek history. . . . As a boy he received the usual Athenian liberal education, in music and gymnastic, an education, that is to say, mental and physical. He was fond of quoting from the existing Greek literature, and he seems to have been familiar with it, especially with Homer. He is represented by Xenophon as repeating Prodicus' fable of the choice of Hercules at length. He says that he was in the habit of studying with his friends ‘the treasures which the wise men of old have left us in their books’: collections, that is, of the short and pithy sayings of the seven sages, such as ‘know thyself’; a saying, it may be noticed, which lay at the root of his whole teaching. And he had some knowledge of mathematics, and of science, as it existed in those days. He understood something of astronomy and of advanced geometry; and he

was acquainted with certain, at any rate, of the theories of his predecessors in philosophy, the Physical or Cosmic philosophers, such as Heraclitus and Parmenides, and, especially, with those of Anaxagoras. But there is no trustworthy evidence which enables us to go beyond the bare fact that he had such knowledge. . . . All then that we can say of the first forty years of Socrates' life consists of general statements like these. During these years there is no specific record of him. Between 433 B. C. and 429 B. C. he served as a common soldier at the siege of Potidæa, an Athenian dependency which had revolted, and surpassed every one in his powers of enduring hunger, thirst, and cold, and all the hardships of a severe Thracian winter. At this siege we hear of him for the first time in connection with Alcibiades, whose life he saved in a skirmish, and to whom he eagerly relinquished the prize of valour. In 431 B. C. the Peloponnesian War broke out, and in 424 B. C. the Athenians were disastrously defeated and routed by the Thebans at the battle of Delium. Socrates and Laches were among the few who did not yield to panic. They retreated together steadily, and the resolute bearing of Socrates was conspicuous to friend and foe alike. Had all the Athenians behaved as he did, says Laches, in the dialogue of that name, the defeat would have been a victory. Socrates fought bravely a third time at the battle of Amphipolis [422 B. C.] against the Peloponnesian forces, in which the commander on both sides, Cleon and Brasidas, were killed; but there is no record of his specific services on that occasion. About the same time that Socrates was displaying conspicuous courage in the cause of Athens at Delium and Amphipolis, Aristophanes was holding him up to hatred, contempt, and ridicule in the comedy of the *Clouds* [B. C. 423]. . . . The *Clouds* is his protest against the immorality of free thought and the Sophists. He chose Socrates for his central figure, chiefly, no doubt, on account of Socrates' well-known and strange personal appearance. The grotesque ugliness, and flat nose, and prominent eyes, and Silenus-like face, and shabby dress, might be seen every day in the streets, and were familiar to every Athenian. Aristophanes cared little—probably he did not take the trouble to find out—that Socrates' whole life was spent in fighting against the Sophists. It was enough for him that Socrates did not accept the traditional beliefs, and was a good centre-piece for a comedy. . . . The *Clouds*, it is needless to say, is a gross and absurd libel from beginning to end: but Aristophanes hit the popular conception. The charges which he made in 423 B. C. stuck to Socrates to the end of his life. They are exactly the charges made by popular prejudice, against which Socrates defends himself in the first ten chapters of the *Apology*, and which he says have been so long 'in the air.' He formulates them as follows: 'Socrates is an evil doer who busies himself with investigating things beneath the earth and in the sky, and who makes the worse appear the better reason, and who teaches others these same things.' . . . For sixteen years after the battle of Amphipolis we hear nothing of Socrates. The next events in his life, of which there is a specific record, are those narrated by himself in the twentieth chapter of the *Apology*. They illustrate, as he meant them to illustrate,

his invincible moral courage. . . . In 406 B. C. the Athenian fleet defeated the Lacedæmonians at the battle of Arginusæ, so called from some small islands off the south-east point of Lesbos. After the battle the Athenian commanders omitted to recover the bodies of their dead, and to save the living from off their disabled enemies. The Athenians at home, on hearing of this, were furious. The due performance of funeral rites was a very sacred duty with the Greeks; and many citizens mourned for friends and relatives who had been left to drown. The commanders were immediately recalled, and an assembly was held in which they were accused of neglect of duty. They defended themselves by saying that they had ordered certain inferior officers (amongst others, their accuser Thera-menes) to perform the duty, but that a storm had come on which had rendered the performance impossible. The debate was adjourned, and it was resolved that the Senate should decide in what way the commanders should be tried. The Senate resolved that the Athenian people, having heard the accusation and the defence, should proceed to vote forthwith for the acquittal or condemnation of the eight commanders collectively. The resolution was grossly unjust, and it was illegal. It substituted a popular vote for a fair and formal trial. . . . Socrates was at that time a member of the Senate, the only office that he ever filled. The Senate was composed of five hundred citizens, elected by lot, fifty from each of the ten tribes, and holding office for one year. The members of each tribe held the Prytany, that is, were responsible for the conduct of business, for thirty-five days at a time, and ten out of the fifty were *proedri* or presidents every seven days in succession. Every bill or motion was examined by the *proedri* before it was submitted to the Assembly, to see if it were in accordance with law; if it was not, it was quashed: one of the *proedri* presided over the Senate and the Assembly each day, and for one day only: he was called the *Epistates*: it was his duty to put the question to the vote. In short he was the speaker. . . . On the day on which it was proposed to take a collective vote on the acquittal or condemnation of the eight commanders, Socrates was *Epistates*. The proposal was, as we have seen, illegal: but the people were furious against the accused, and it was a very popular one. Some of the *proedri* opposed it before it was submitted to the Assembly, on the ground of its illegality; but they were silenced by threats and subsided. Socrates alone refused to give way. He would not put a question which he knew to be illegal, to the vote. Threats of suspension and arrest, the clamour of an angry people, the fear of imprisonment or death, could not move him. . . . But his authority lasted only for a day; the proceedings were adjourned, a more pliant *Epistates* succeeded him, and the generals were condemned and executed."—F. J. Church, *Introd. to Trial and Death of Socrates*, pp. 9-23.—See, also, GREECE: B. C. 406.

**B. C. 421.**—End of the first period of the Peloponnesian War.—The Peace of Nicias.—The first stage of the Peloponnesian war came to an end just ten years after the invasion of Attica by Archidamus in 431 B. C. Its results had been almost purely negative; a vast quan-

tity of blood and treasure had been wasted on each side, but to no great purpose. The Athenian naval power was unimpaired, and the confederacy of Delos, though shaken by the successful revolt of Amphipolis and the Thracian towns, was still left subsisting. On the other hand, the attempts of Athens to accomplish anything on land had entirely failed, and the defensive policy of Pericles had been so far justified. Well would it have been for Athens if her citizens had taken the lesson to heart, and contented themselves with having escaped so easily from the greatest war they had ever known.—C. W. C. Oman, *Hist. of Greece*, p. 341.—“The treaty called since ancient times the Peace of Nicias . . . put an end to the war between the two Greek confederations of states, after it had lasted for rather more than ten years, viz., from the attack of the Boeotians upon Plataea, Ol. lxxvii. (beginning of April B. C. 431) to Ol. lxxxix. 3 (towards the middle of April B. C. 421). The war was for this reason known under the name of the Ten Years' War, while the Peloponnesians called it the Attic War. Its end constituted a triumph for Athens; for all the plans of the enemies who had attacked her had come to naught; Sparta had been unable to fulfill a single one of the promises with which she had entered upon the war, and was ultimately forced to acknowledge the dominion of Athens in its whole extent,—notwithstanding all the mistakes and misgivings, notwithstanding all the calamities attributable, or not, to the Athenians themselves: the resources of offence and defence which the city owed to Pericles had therefore proved their excellence, and all the fury of her opponents had wasted itself against her in vain. Sparta herself was satisfied with the advantages which the peace offered to her own city and citizens; but great was the discontent among her confederates, particularly among the secondary states, who had originally occasioned the war and obliged Sparta to take part in it. Even after the conclusion of the peace, it was impossible to induce Thebes and Corinth to accede to it. The result of the war to Sparta was therefore the dissolution of the confederation at whose head she had begun the war; she felt herself thereby placed in so dangerously isolated a position, that she was obliged to fall back upon Athens in self-defence against her own confederates. Accordingly the Peace of Nicias was in the course of the same year converted into a fifty years' alliance, under the terms of which Sparta and Athens contracted the obligation of mutual assistance against any hostile attack.”—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 4, ch 2 (v. 3).—See, also, GREECE: B. C. 421-421.

**B. C. 421-418.**—New combinations.—Conflicting alliances with Sparta and the Argive Confederacy.—Rising influence of Alcibiades.—War in Argos and Arcadia.—Battle of Mantinea. See GREECE: B. C. 421-418.

**B. C. 416.**—Siege and conquest of Melos.—Massacre of the inhabitants. See GREECE: B. C. 416.

**B. C. 415.**—The expedition against Syracuse.—Mutilation of the Hermai (Hermai).—A quarrel having broken out in Sicily, between the cities of Segesta and Selinous, the latter obtained aid from Syracuse. Upon this, Segesta, having vainly sought help from Carthage, ap-

pealed to Athens, where the exiled Sicilians were numerous. Alcibiades had been one of the most urgent for the attack upon Melos, and he did not lose the present opportunity to incite the Athenians to an enterprise of much greater importance, and where he hoped to be in command. . . . All men's minds were filled with ambitious hopes. Everywhere, says Plutarch, were to be seen young men in the gymnasia, old men in workshops and public places of meeting, drawing the map of Sicily, talking about the sea that surrounds it, the goodness of its harbors, its position opposite Africa. Established there, it would be easy to cross over and subjugate Carthage, and extend their sway as far as the Pillars of Hercules. The rich did not approve of this rashness, but feared if they opposed it that the opposite faction would accuse them of wishing to avoid the service and costs of arming galleys. Nicias had more courage; even after the Athenians had appointed him general, with Alcibiades and Lamachos, he spoke publicly against the enterprise, showed the imprudence of going in search of new subjects when those they already had were at the moment in a state of revolt, as in Chalkidike, or only waited for a disaster to break the chain which bound them to Athens. He ended by reproaching Alcibiades for plunging the republic, to gratify his personal ambition, into a foreign war of the greatest danger. . . . One of the demagogues, however, replied that he would put an end to all this hesitation, and he proposed and secured the passage of a decree giving the generals full power to use all the resources of the city in preparing for the expedition (March 24, 415 B. C.) Nicias was completely in the right. The expedition to Sicily was impolitic and foolish. In the Aegean Sea lay the empire of Athens, and there only it could lie, within reach, close at hand. Every acquisition westward of the Peloponnesos was a source of weakness. Syracuse, even if conquered, would not long remain subject. Whatever might be the result of the expedition, it was sure to be disastrous in the end. . . . An event which took place shortly before the departure of the fleet (8-9 June) threw terror into the city: one morning the hermai throughout the city were seen to have been mutilated. . . . These Hermai, or half-statues of the god Hermes, were blocks of marble about the height of the human figure. The upper part was cut into a head, face, neck and bust; the lower part was left as a quadrangular pillar, broad at the base, without arms, body, or legs, but with the significant mark of the male sex in front. They were distributed in great numbers throughout Athens, and always in the most conspicuous situations; standing beside the outer doors of private houses as well as of temples, near the most frequented porticoes, at the intersection of cross ways, in the public agora. . . . The religious feelings of the Greeks considered the god to be planted or domiciled where his statue stood, so that the companionship, sympathy, and guardianship of Hermes became associated with most of the manifestations of conjunct life at Athens,—political, social, commercial, or gymnastic. . . . To all pious minds the city seemed menaced with great misfortunes unless the anger of Heaven should be appeased by a sufficient expiation. While Alcibiades had many partisans, he had also violent enemies. Not long before this time Hyper-

bolos, a contemptible man, had almost succeeded in obtaining his banishment; and he had escaped this danger only by uniting his party with that of Nikias, and causing the demagogue himself to suffer ostracism. The affair of the hermal appeared to his adversaries a favourable occasion to repeat the attempt made by Ilyperbolos, and we have good reason to believe in a political machination, seeing this same populace applaud, a few months later, the impious audacity of Aristophanes in his comedy of *The Birds*. An inquiry was set on foot, and certain metoikoi and slaves, without making any deposition as to the hermal, recalled to mind that before this time some of these statues had been broken by young men after a night of carousal and intoxication, thus indirectly attacking Alkibiades. Others in set terms accused him of having at a banquet parodied the Eleusinian Mysteries; and men took advantage of the superstitious terrors of the people to awake their political anxieties. It was repeated that the breakers of sacred statues, the profaners of mysteries, would respect the government even less than they had respected the gods, and it was whispered that not one of these crimes had been committed without the participation of Alkibiades; and in proof of this men spoke of the truly aristocratic license of his life. Was he indeed the author of this sacrilegious freak? To believe him capable of it would not be to calumniate him. Or, on the other hand, was it a scheme planned to do him injury? Although proofs are lacking, it is certain that among the rich, upon whom rested the heavy burden of the naval expenses, a plot had been formed to destroy the power of Alkibiades, and perhaps to prevent the sailing of the fleet. The demagogue who had intoxicated the people with hope, were for the expedition; but the popularity of Alkibiades was obnoxious to them: a compromise was made between the two factions, as is often done in times when public morality is enfeebled, and Alkibiades found himself threatened on all sides. . . . Urging as a pretext the dangers of delay in sending off the expedition, they obtained a decree that Alkibiades should embark at once, and that the question of his guilt or innocence should be postponed until after his return. It was now the middle of summer. The day appointed for departure, the whole city, citizens and foreigners, went out to Peiræicus at daybreak. . . . At that moment the view was clearer as to the doubts and dangers, and also the distance of the expedition; but all eyes were drawn to the immense preparations that had been made, and confidence and pride consoled those who were about to part.—V. Duray, *Hist. of the Greek People*, ch. 25, sect. 2 (v. 3).

ALSO IN: Thucydides, *History*, bk. 6, sect. 27-28.—G. W. Cox, *The Athenian Empire*, ch. 5.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 53 (v. 7).

**B. C. 415-413.—Fatal end of the expedition against Syracuse.**—"Alkibiades was called back to Athens, to take his trial on a charge of impiety. . . . He did not go back to Athens for his trial, but escaped to Peloponnesos, where we shall hear from him again. Meanwhile the command of the Athenian force in Sicily was left practically in the hands of Nikias. For Nikias could always act well when he did act; but it was very hard to make him act; above all on an errand which he hated. One might say that Syracuse was saved through the delays of Nikias.

He now went off to petty expeditions in the west of Sicily, under cover of settling matters at Segesta. . . . The Syracusans by this time quite despised the invaders.' Their horsemen rode up to the camp of the Athenians at Katane, and asked them if they had come into Sicily merely to sit down there as colonists. . . . The winter (B. C. 415-414) was chiefly spent on both sides in sending embassies to and fro to gain allies. Nikias also sent home to Athens, asking for horsemen and money, and the people, without a word of rebuke, voted him all that he asked. . . . But the most important embassy of all was that which the Syracusans sent to Corinth and Sparta. Corinth zealously took up the cause of her colony and pleaded for Syracuse at Sparta. And at Sparta Corinth and Syracuse found a helper in the banished Athenian Alkibiadês, who was now doing all that he could against Athens. . . . He told the Spartans to occupy a fortress in Attica, which they soon afterwards did, and a great deal came of it. But he also told them to give vigorous help to Syracuse, and above all things to send a Spartan commander. The mere name of Sparta went for a great deal in those days; but no man could have been better chosen than the Spartan who was sent. He was Gylippos, the deliverer of Syracuse. He was more like an Athenian than a Spartan, quick and ready of resource, which few Spartans were. . . . And now at last, when the spring came (414) Nikias was driven to do something. . . . The Athenians . . . occupied all that part of the hill which lay outside the walls of Syracuse. They were joined by their horsemen, Greek and Sikel, and after nearly a year, the siege of Syracuse really began. The object of the Athenians now was to build a wall across the hill and to carry it down to the sea on both sides. Syracuse would thus be hemmed in. The object of the Syracusans was to build a cross-wall of their own, which should hinder the Athenian wall from reaching the two points it aimed at. This they tried more than once; but in vain. There were several fights on the hill, and at last there was a fight of more importance on the lower ground by the Great Harbour. . . . The Syracusans were defeated, as far as fighting went; but they gained far more than they lost. For Lamachos was killed, and with him all vigour passed away from the Athenian camp. At the same moment the Athenian fleet sailed into the Great Harbour, and a Syracusan attack on the Athenian works on the hill was defeated. Nikias remained in command of the invaders; but he was grievously sick, and for once in his life his head seems to have been turned by success. He finished the wall on the south side; but he neglected to finish it on the north side also, so that Syracuse was not really hemmed in. But the hearts of the Syracusans sank. . . . It was at this darkest moment of all that deliverance came. . . . A Corinthian ship, under its captain Gongylos, sailed into the Little Harbour. He brought the news that other ships were on their way from Peloponnesos to the help of Syracuse, and, yet more, that a Spartan general was actually in Sicily, getting together a land force for the same end. As soon as the good news were heard, there was no more talk of surrender. . . . And one day the Athenian camp was startled by the appearance of a Lacedæmonian herald, offering them a truce of five days, that they might get them

out of Sicily with bag and baggage. Gylippos was now on the hill. He of course did not expect that the Athenian army would really go away in five days. But it was a great thing to show both to the besiegers and to the Syracusans that the deliverer had come, and that deliverance was beginning. Nikias had kept such bad watch that Gylippos and his troops had come up the hill and the Syracusans had come out and met them, without his knowledge. The Spartan, as a matter of course, took the command of the whole force; he offered battle to the Athenians, which they refused; he then entered the city. The very next day he began to carry out his scheme. This was to build a group of forts near the western end of the hill, and to join them to the city by a wall running east and west, which would hinder the Athenians from ever finishing their wall to the north. Each side went on building, and some small actions took place. . . . Another winter (B. C. 414-413) now came on, and with it much sending of envoys. Gylippos went about Sicily collecting fresh troops. . . . Meanwhile Nikias wrote a letter to the Athenian people. . . . This letter came at a time when the Lacedæmonian alliance had determined to renew the war with Athens, and when they were making everything ready for an invasion of Attica. To send out a new force to Sicily was simple madness. We hear nothing of the debates in the Athenian assembly, whether any one argued against going on with the Sicilian war, and whether any demagogue laid any blame on Nikias. But the assembly voted that a new force equal to the first should be sent out under Dêmostenês, the best soldier in Athens, and Eurymedôn. . . . Meanwhile the Syracusans were strengthened by help both in Sicily and from Peloponnêsos. Their main object now was to strike a blow at the fleet of Nikias before the new force came. . . . It had been just when the Syracusans were most downcast that they were cheered by the coming of the Corinthians and of Gylippos. And just now that their spirits were highest, they were dashed again by the coming of Dêmostenês and Eurymedôn. A fleet as great as the first, seventy-five ships, carrying 5,000 heavy-armed and a crowd of light troops of every kind, sailed into the Great Harbour with all warlike pomp. The Peloponnesians were already in Attica; they had planted a Peloponnesian garrison there, which brought Athens to great straits; but the fleet was sent out to Syracuse all the same. Dêmostenês knew what to do as well as Lamachos had known. He saw that there was nothing to be done but to try one great blow, and, if that failed, to take the fleet home again. . . . The attack was at first successful, and the Athenians took two of the Syracusan forts. But the Thespians allies of Syracuse stood their ground, and drove the assailants back. Utter confusion followed. . . . The last chance was now lost, and Dêmostenês was eager to go home. But Nikias would stay on. . . . When sickness grew in the camp, when fresh help from Sicily and the great body of the allies from Peloponnêsos came into Syracuse, he at last agreed to go. Just at that moment the moon was eclipsed. . . . Nikias consulted his soothsayers, and he gave out that they must stay twenty-nine days, another full revolution of the moon. This resolve was the destruction of the besieging army. . . . It was

felt on both sides that all would turn on one more fight by sea, the Athenians striving to get out of the harbour, and the Syracusans striving to keep them in it. The Syracusans now blocked up the mouth of the harbour by mooring vessels across it. The Athenians left their position on the hill, a sign that the siege was over, and brought their whole force down to the shore. It was no time now for any skillful manoeuvres; the chief thing was to make the sea-fight as much as might be like a land-fight, a strange need for Athenians. . . . The last fight now began, 110 Athenian ships against 80 of the Syracusans and their allies. Never before did so many ships meet in so small a space. . . . The fight was long and confused; at last the Athenians gave way and fled to the shore. The battle and the invasion were over. Syracuse was not only saved; she had begun to take vengeance on her enemies. . . . The Athenians waited one day, and then set out, hoping to make their way to some safe place among the friendly Sikels in the inland country. The sick had to be left behind. . . . On the sixth day, after frightful toil, they determined to change their course. . . . They set out in two divisions, that of Nikias going first. Much better order was kept in the front division and by the time Nikias reached the river, Dêmostenês was six miles behind. . . . In the morning a Syracusan force came up with the frightful news that the whole division of Dêmostenês were prisoners. . . . The Athenians tried in vain to escape in the night. The next morning they set out, harassed as before, and driven wild by intolerable thirst. They at last reached the river Assinaros, which runs by the present town of Noto. There was the end. . . . The Athenians were so maddened by thirst that, though men were falling under darts and the water was getting muddy and bloody, they thought of nothing but drinking. . . . No further terms were made; most of the horsemen contrived to cut their way out; the rest were made prisoners. Most of them were embezzled by Syracusans as their private slaves; but about 7,000 men out of the two divisions were led prisoners into Syracuse. They were shut up in the stone-quarries, with no further heed than to give each man daily half a slave's allowance of food and drink. Many died; many were sold; some escaped, or were set free; the rest were after a while taken out of the quarries and set to work. The generals had made no terms for themselves. Hermokratês wished to keep them as hostages against future Athenian attempts against Sicily. Gylippos wished to take them in triumph to Sparta. The Corinthians were for putting them to death; and so it was done. . . . So ended the Athenian invasion of Sicily, the greatest attempt ever made by Greeks against Greeks, and that which came to the most utter failure."—E. A. Freeman, *The Story of Sicily*, pp. 117-137.

ALSO IN: *Thucydides, History*; trans. by B. Jowett, bk. 6-7 (v. 1).—See, also, SYRACUSE: B. C. 415-413.

B. C. 413-412.—Consequences of the Sicilian Expedition.—Spartan alliance with the Persians.—Plotting of Alcibiades.—The Decelias War.—"At Athens, where, even before this, every one had been in the most anxious suspense, the news of the loss of the expedition produced a consternation, which was certainly greater than

that at Rome after the battle of Cannæ, or that in our own days, after the battle of Jena. . . . 'At least 40,000 citizens, allies and slaves, had perished; and among them there may easily have been 10,000 Athenian citizens, most of whom belonged to the wealthier and higher classes. The flower of the Athenian people was destroyed, as at the time of the plague. It is impossible to say what amount of public property may have been lost; the whole fleet was gone.' The consequences of the disaster soon shewed themselves. It was to be foreseen that Chios, which had long been wavering, and whose disposition could not be trusted, would avail itself of this moment to revolt; and the cities in Asia, from which Athens derived her large revenues, were expected to do the same. It was, in fact, to be foreseen, that the four islands of Lesbos, Chios, Samos, and Rhodes, would instantly revolt. The Spartans were established at Decelea, in Attica itself, and thence ravaged the country far and wide; so that it was impossible to venture to go to the coast without a strong escort. Although there were many districts in which no Spartan was seen from one year's end to the other, yet there was no safety anywhere, except in fortified places, 'and the Athenians were constantly obliged to guard the walls of their city; and this state of things had already been going on for the last twelve months.' In this fearful situation, the Athenian people showed the same firmness as the Romans after the battle of Cannæ. Had they but had one great man among them, to whom the state could have been entrusted, even more might perhaps have been done; but it is astonishing that, although there was no such man, and although the leading men were only second or third-rate persons, yet so many useful arrangements were made to meet the necessities of the case. . . . The most unfortunate circumstance for the Athenians was, that Alcibiades, now an enemy of his country, was living among the Spartans; for he introduced into the undertakings of the Spartans the very element which before they had been altogether deficient in, namely energy and elasticity; he urged them on to undertakings, and induced them now to send a fleet to Ionia. . . . Erythrae, Teos, and Miletus, one after another, revolted to the Peloponnesians, who now concluded treaties with Tissaphernes in the name of the king of Persia—Darius was then king—and in his own name as satrap; and in this manner they sacrificed to him the Asiatic Greeks. . . . The Athenians were an object of antipathy and implacable hatred to the Persians; they had never doubted that the Athenians were their real opponents in Greece, and were afraid of them; but they did not fear the Spartans. They knew that the Athenians would take from them not only the islands, but the towns on the main land, and were in great fear of their maritime power. Hence they joined the Spartans; and the latter were not ashamed of negotiating a treaty of subsidies with the Persians, in which Tissaphernes, in the king's name, promised the assistance of the Phoenician fleet; and large subsidies, as pay for the army. . . . In return for this, they renounced, in the name of the Grecians, all claims to independence for the Greek cities in Asia."—B. C. Niebuhr, *Lectures on Ancient History*, v. 2, lects. 53 and 54.—See, also, GREECE: B. C. 413-412.

ALSO IN: G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 61 (v. 7).

B. C. 413-412.—Revolt of Chios, Miletus, Lesbos and Rhodes from Athens.—Revolution of Samos. See GREECE: B. C. 413.

B. C. 413-411.—The Probuli.—Intrigues of Alcibiades.—Conspiracy against the Constitution.—The Four Hundred and the Five Thousand.—Immediately after the dreadful calamity at Syracuse became known, "extraordinary measures were adopted by the people; a number of citizens of advanced age were formed into a deliberative and executive body under the name of Probuli, and empowered to fit out a fleet. Whether this laid the foundation for oligarchical machinations or not, those aged men were unable to bring back men's minds to their former course; the prosecution of the Hermocopide had been most mischievous in its results; various secret associations had sprung up and conspired to reap advantage to themselves from the distress and embarrassment of the state; the indignation caused by the infuriated excesses of the people during that trial, possibly here, as frequently happened in other Grecian states, determined the more respectable members of the community to guard against the recurrence of similar scenes in future, by the establishment of an aristocracy. Lastly, the watchful malice of Alcibiades, who was the implacable enemy of that populace, to whose blind fury he had been sacrificed, baffled all attempts to restore confidence and tranquillity, and there is no doubt that, whilst he kept up a correspondence with his partisans at home, he did everything in his power to increase the perplexity and distress of his native city from without, in order that he might be recalled to provide for its safety and defence. A favourable opportunity for the execution of his plans presented itself in the fifth year of his exile, O. 92, 1; 411. B. C.; as he had incurred the suspicion of the Spartans, and stood high in the favour of Tissaphernes, the Athenians thought that his intercession might enable them to obtain assistance from the Persian king. The people in Athens were headed by one of his most inveterate enemies, Androcles; and he well knew that all attempts to effect his return would be fruitless, until this man and the other demagogues were removed. Hence Alcibiades entered into negotiations with the commanders of the Athenian fleet at Samos, respecting the establishment of an oligarchical constitution, not from any attachment to that form of government in itself, but solely with the view of promoting his own ends. Phrynichus and Pisander were equally insincere in their co-operation with Alcibiades. . . . Their plan was that the latter should reconcile the people to the change in the constitution which he wished to effect, by promising to obtain them the assistance of the great king; but they alone resolved to reap the benefit of his exertions. Pisander took upon himself to manage the Athenian populace. It was in truth no slight undertaking to attempt to overthrow a democracy of a hundred and twenty years' standing, and of intense development; but most of the able bodied citizens were absent with the fleet, whilst such as were still in the city were confounded by the imminence of the danger from without; on the other hand, the prospect of succour from the Persian king doubtless had some weight with them, and they possibly felt some symptoms of returning affection for their former favourite Alcibiades. Nevertheless, Pisan-

der and his accomplices employed craft and perfidy to accomplish their designs; the people were not persuaded or convinced, but entrapped into compliance with their measures. Pisander gained over to his purpose the above named clubs, and induced the people to send him with ten plenipotentiaries to the navy at Samos. In the mean time the rest of the conspirators prosecuted the work of remodelling the constitution."—W. Wachsmuth, *Hist. Antiquities of the Greeks*, v. 2, pp. 252-255.—The people, or an assembly cleverly made up and manipulated to represent the people, were induced to vote all the powers of government into the hands of a council of Four Hundred, of which council the citizens apportioned only five members. Those five chose ninety-five more, to make one hundred, and each of that hundred then chose three colleagues. The conspirators thus easily made up the Four Hundred to their liking, from their own ranks. This council was to convene an assembly of Five Thousand citizens, whenever it saw fit to do so. But when news of this constitutional change reached the army at Samos, where the Athenian headquarters for the Ionian war were fixed, the citizen soldiers refused to submit to it—repudiated it altogether—and organized themselves as an independent state. The ruling spirit among them was Thrasybulus, and his influence brought about a reconciliation with Alcibiades, then an exile sheltered at the Persian court. Alcibiades was recalled by the army and placed at its head. Presently a reaction at Athens ensued, after the oligarchical party had given signs of treasurable communication with Sparta, and in June the people assembled in the Pnyx and reasserted their sovereignty. "The Council was deposed, and the supreme sovereignty of the state restored to the people—not, however, to the entire multitude; for the principle was retained of reserving full civic rights to a committee of men of a certain amount of property; and, as the Decs of the Five Thousand had never been drawn up, it was decreed, in order that the desired end might be speedily reached, to follow the precedent of similar institutions in other states and to constitute all Athenians able to furnish themselves with a complete military equipment from their own resources, full citizens, with the rights of voting and participating in the government. Thus the name of the Five Thousand had now become a very inaccurate designation; but it was retained, because men had in the last few months become habituated to it. At the same time, the abolition of pay for civic offices and functions was decreed, not merely as a temporary measure, but as a fundamental principle of the new commonwealth, which the citizens were bound by a solemn oath to maintain. This reform was, upon the whole, a wise combination of aristocracy and democracy; and, according to the opinion of Thucydides, the best constitution which the Athenians had hitherto possessed. On the motion of Critias, the recall of Alcibiades was decreed about the same time; and a deputation was despatched to Samos, to accomplish the union between army and city."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 4, ch. 5.—Most of the leaders of the Four Hundred fled to the Spartan camp at Decelia. Two were taken, tried and executed.—Thucydides, *History*, bk. 8, sect. 48-97.—See, also, GREECE: B. C. 413-412.

ALSO IN: V. Duruy, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 26 (v. 3).

B. C. 411-407.—Victories at Cynossema and Abydos.—Exploits of Alcibiades.—His triumphal return.—His appointment to command.—His second deposition and exile. See GREECE: B. C. 411-407.

B. C. 406.—The Peloponnesian War: Battle and victory of Arginusæ.—Condemnation and execution of the Generals. See GREECE: B. C. 406; and above: B. C. 424-406.

B. C. 405.—The Peloponnesian War: Decisive defeat at Aigospotamoi. See GREECE: B. C. 405.

B. C. 404.—The Surrender to Lysander.—After the battle of Ægospotami (August, B. C. 405), which destroyed their navy, and cut off nearly all supplies to the city by sea, as the Spartans at Decelia had long cut off supplies upon the land side, the Athenians had no hope. They waited in terror and despair for their enemies to close in upon them. The latter were in no haste, for they were sure of their prey. Lysander, the victor at Ægospotami, came leisurely from the Hellespont, receiving on his way the surrender of the cities subject or allied to Athens, and placing Spartan harbormasters and garrisons in them, with the local oligarchs established uniformly in power. About November he reached the Saronic gulf and blockaded the Athenian harbor of Piræus, while an overwhelming Peloponnesian land force, under the Lacedæmonian king Pausanias, arrived simultaneously in Attica and occupied at the gates of the city. The Athenians had no longer any power except the power to endure, and that they exercised for more than three months, mainly resisting the demand that their Long Walls—the walls which protected the connection of the city with its harbors—should be thrown down. But when famine had thinned the ranks of the citizens and broken the spirit of the survivors, they gave up. "There was still a high-spirited minority who entered their protest and preferred death by famine to such insupportable disgrace. The large majority, however, accepted them [the terms] and the acceptance was made known to Lysander. It was on the 16th day of the Attic month Munychion,—about the middle or end of March,—that this victorious commander sailed into the Pelæus, twenty-seven years, almost exactly, after the surprise of Plataea by the Thebans, which opened the Peloponnesian War. Along with him came the Athenian exiles, several of whom appear to have been serving with his army and assisting him with their counsel."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 65 (v. 8).—The Long Walls and the fortifications of Piræus were demolished, and then followed the organization of an oligarchical government at Athens, resulting in the reign of terror under "The Thirty."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 4, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: Xenophon, *Hellenics*, bk. 2, ch. 2.—Plutarch, *Lysander*.

B. C. 404-403.—The tyranny of the Thirty.—The Year of Anarchy.—In the summer of B. C. 404, following the siege and surrender of Athens, and the humiliating close of the long Peloponnesian War, the returned leaders of the oligarchical party, who had been in exile, succeeded with the help of their Spartan friends, in overthrowing the democratic constitution of the city and establishing themselves in power. The revolution was accomplished at a public assem-

bly of citizens, in the presence of Lysander, the victorious Lacedæmonian admiral, whose fleet in the Piræus lay ready to support his demands. "In this assembly, Dracontidas, a scoundrel upon whom repeated sentences had been passed, brought forward a motion, proposing the transfer of the government into the hands of Thirty persons; and Theramenes supported this proposal which he declared to express the wishes of Sparta. Even now, these speeches produced a storm of indignation; after all the acts of violence which Athens had undergone, she yet contained men outspoken enough to venture to defend the constitution, and to appeal to the fact that the capitulation sanctioned by both parties contained no provision as to the internal affairs of Athens. But, hereupon, Lysander himself came forward and spoke to the citizens without reserve, like one who was their absolute master. . . . By such means the motion of Dracontidas was passed; but only a small number of unpatriotic and cowardly citizens raised their hands in token of assent. All better patriots contrived to avoid participation in this vote. Next, ten members of the government were chosen by Critias and his colleagues [the Critias of Plato's Dialogues, pupil of Socrates, and now the violent and blood-thirsty leader of the anti-democratic revolution], ten by Theramenes, the confidential friend of Lysander, and finally ten out of the assembled multitude, probably by a free vote; and this board of Thirty was hereupon established as the supreme government authority by a resolution of the assembly present. Most of the members of the new government had formerly been among the Four Hundred, and had therefore long pursued a common course of action." The Thirty Tyrants so placed in power were masters of Athens for eight months, and executed their will without conscience or mercy, having a garrison of Spartan soldiers in the Acropolis to support them. They were also sustained by a picked body of citizens, "the Three Thousand," who bore arms while other citizens were stripped of every weapon. Large numbers of the more patriotic and high-spirited Athenians had escaped from their unfortunate city and had taken refuge, chiefly at Thebes, the old enemy of Athens, but now sympathetic in her distress. At Thebes these exiles organized themselves under Thrasylbulus and Anytus, and determined to expel the tyrants and to recover their homes. They first seized a strong post at Phyle, in Attica, where they gained in numbers rapidly, and from which point they were able in a few weeks to advance and occupy the Piræus. When the troops of The Thirty came out to attack them, they drew back to the adjacent height of Munychia and there fought a battle which delivered their city from the Tyrants. Critias, the master-spirit of the usurpation, was slain; the more violent of his colleagues took refuge at Eleusis, and Athens, for a time, remained under the government of a new oligarchical Board of Ten; while Thrasylbulus and the democratic liberators maintained their headquarters at Munychia. All parties waited the action of Sparta. Lysander, the Spartan general, marched an army into Attica to restore the tyranny which was of his own creating; but one of the two Spartan kings, Pausanias, intervened, assumed the command in his own person, and applied his efforts to the arranging of peace

between the Athenian parties. The result was a restoration of the democratic constitution of the Attic state, with some important reforms. Several of The Thirty were put to death,—treacherously, it was said,—but an amnesty was extended to all their partisans. The year in which they and The Ten controlled affairs was termed in the official annals of the city the Year of Anarchy, and its magistrates were not recognized.—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 4, ch. 5, and bk. 5, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: Xenophon, *Hellenica*, bk. 2, ch. 3-4.—C. Sankey, *The Spartan and Theban Supremacies*, ch. 2-3

**B. C. 395-387.**—Confederacy against Sparta.—Alliance with Persia.—The Corinthian War.—Conon's rebuilding of the Long Walls.—Athenian independence restored.—The Peace of Antalcidas. See GREECE: B. C. 390-387.

**B. C. 378-371.**—Brief alliance with Thebes against Sparta. See GREECE: B. C. 379-371.

**B. C. 378-357.**—The New Confederacy and the Social War.—Upon the Liberation of Thebes and the sign that began to appear of the decline of Spartan power,—during the year of the archonship of Nausinicus, B. C. 378-7, which was made memorable at Athens by various movements of political regeneration,—the organization of a new Confederacy was undertaken, analogous to the Confederacy of Delos, formed a century before. Athens was to be, "not the ruling capital, but only the directing city in possession of the primacy, the seat of the federal council. . . . Callistratus was in a sense the Aristides of the new confederation and doubtless did much to bring about an agreement; it was likewise his work that, in place of the 'tributes' of odious memory, the payments necessary to the existence of the confederation were introduced under the gentler name of 'contributions.' . . . Amicable relations were resumed with the Cyclades, Rhodes and Perinthus; in other words, the ancient union of navies was at once renewed upon a large scale and in a wide extent. Even such states joined it as had hitherto never stood in confederate relations with Athens, above all Thebes."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 6, ch. 1.—This second confederacy renewed much of the prosperity and influence of Athens for a brief period of about twenty years. But in 357 B. C., four important members of the Confederacy, namely, Chios, Cos, Rhodes, and Byzantium leagued themselves in revolt, with the aid of Mausolus, prince of Caria, and an inglorious war ensued, known as the Social War, which lasted three years. Athens was forced at last to assent to the secession of the four revolted cities and to recognize their independence, which greatly impaired her prestige and power, just at the time when she was called upon to resist the encroachments of Philip of Macedonia.—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 42.

**B. C. 370-362.**—Alliance with Sparta against Thebes.—Battle of Mantinea. See GREECE: B. C. 371-362.

**B. C. 359-338.**—The collision with Philip of Macedon.—The Policy of Demosthenes and Policy of Phocion.—"A new period opens with the growth of the Macedonian power under Philip (359-336 B. C.) We are here chiefly concerned to notice the effect on the City-State [of Athens], not only of the strength and policy of this new power, but also of the efforts of the



Greeks themselves to counteract it. At the time of Philip's accession the so-called Theban supremacy had just practically ended with the death of Epaminondas. There was now a kind of balance of power between the three leading States, Sparta, Athens, and Thebes, no one of which was greatly stronger than the others; and such a balance could easily be worked upon by any great power from without. Thus when Macedon came into the range of Greek politics, under a man of great diplomatic as well as military capacity, who, like a Czar of to-day, wished to secure a firm footing on the sea-board of the Ægean [see GREECE: B. C. 359-358], she found her work comparatively easy. The strong imperial policy of Philip found no real antagonist except at Athens. Weak as she was, and straitened by the break-up of her new confederacy, Athens could still produce men of great talent and energy; but she was hampered by divided counsels. Two Athenians of this period seem to represent the currents of Greek political thought, now running in two different directions. Demosthenes represents the cause of the City-State in this age, of a union, that is, of perfectly free Hellenic cities against the common enemy. Phocion represents the feeling, which seems to have been long growing up among thinking men at Athens, that the City-State was no longer what it had been, and could no longer stand by itself; that what was needed was a general Hellenic peace, and possibly even an arbiter from without, an arbiter not wholly un-Hellenic like the Persian, yet one who might succeed in stilling the fatal jealousies of the leading States. . . . The efforts of Demosthenes to check Philip fall into two periods divided by the peace of Philocrates in 346 B. C. In the first of these he is acting chiefly with Athens alone; Philip is to him not so much the common enemy of Greece as the dangerous rival of Athens in the north. His whole mind was given to the internal reform of Athens so as to strengthen her against Philip. In her relation to other Greek States he perhaps hardly saw beyond a balance of power. . . . After 346 his Athenian feeling seems to become more distinctly Hellenic. But what could even such a man as Demosthenes do with the Hellas of that day? He could not force on the Greeks a real and permanent union; he could but urge new alliances. His strength was spent in embassies with this object, embassies too often futile. No alliance could save Greece from the Macedonian power, as subsequent events plainly showed. What was needed was a real federal union between the leading States, with a strong central controlling force; and Demosthenes' policy was hopeless just because Athens could never be the centre of such a union, nor could any other city. Demosthenes is thus the last, and in some respects the most heroic champion of the old Greek instinct for autonomy. He is the true child of the City-State, but the child of its old age and decrepitude. He still believes in Athens, and it is on Athens that all his hopes are based. He looks on Philip as one who must inevitably be the foe alike of Athens and of Greece. He seems to think that he can be beaten off as Xerxes was, and to forget that even Xerxes almost triumphed over the divisions of the Greek States, and that Philip is a nearer, a more prominent, and a far less barbarian foe. . . . Phocion was

the somewhat odd exponent of the practical side of a school of thought which had been gaining strength in Greece for some time past. This school was now brought into prominence by the rise of Macedon, and came to have a marked influence on the history of the City-State. It began with the philosophers, and with the idea that the philosopher may belong to the world as well as to a particular city. . . . Athens was far more open to criticism now than in the days of Pericles; and a cynical dislike betrays itself in the Republic for the politicians of the day and their tricks, and a longing for a strong government of reason. . . . Aristotle took the facts of city life as they were and showed how they might be made the most of. . . . To him Macedon was assuredly not wholly barbarian; and war to the death with her kings could not have been to him as natural or desirable as it seemed to Demosthenes. And though he has nothing to tell us of Macedon, we can hardly avoid the conclusion that his desire was for peace and internal reform, even if it were under the guarantee of the northern power. . . . Of this philosophical view of Greek politics Phocion was in a manner the political exponent. But his policy was too much a negative one; it might almost be called one of indifference, like the feeling of Lessing and Goethe in Germauy's most momentous period. So far as we know, Phocion never proposed an alliance of a durable kind, either Athenian or Hellenic, with Macedon; he was content to be a purely restraining influence. Athens had been constantly at war since 432; her own resources were of the weakest; there was little military skill to be found in her, no reserve force, much talk, but little solid courage. Athens was vulnerable at various points, and could not possibly defend more than one at a time, therefore Phocion despaired of war, and the event proved him right. The faithfulness of the Athenians towards him is a proof that they also instinctively felt that he was right. But he was wanting on the practical and creative side, and never really dominated either Athens, Greece, or Philip. . . . A policy of resistance found the City-State too weak to defend itself; a policy of inaction would land it in a Macedonian empire which would still further weaken its remaining vitality. The first policy, that of Demosthenes, did actually result in disaster and the presence of Macedonian garrisons in Greek cities. The second policy then took its place, and initiated a new era for Greece. After the fatal battle of Chæronea (338 B. C.) Philip assumed the position of leader of the Greek cities."—W. W. Fowler, *The City-State of the Greeks and Romans*, ch. 10.—See, also, GREECE: 357-336.

**B. C. 340.—Alliance with Byzantium against Philip of Macedon.** See GREECE: B. C. 340.

**B. C. 336-322.—End of the Struggle with the Macedonians.—Fall of Democracy.—Death of Demosthenes.—Athenian decline.**—"An unexpected incident changes the whole aspect of things. Philip falls the victim of assassination; and a youth, who as yet is but little known, is his successor. Immediately Demosthenes institutes a second alliance of the Greeks; but Alexander suddenly appears before Thebes; the terrible vengeance which he here takes, instantly destroys the league; Demosthenes, Lycurgus, and several of their support-

ers, are required to be delivered up; but Demades is at that time able to settle the difficulty and to appease the king. His strength was therefore enfeebled as Alexander departed for Asia; he begins to raise his head once more when Sparta attempts to throw off the yoke; but under Antipater he is overpowered. Yet it was about this very time that by the most celebrated of his discourses he gained the victory over the most eloquent of his adversaries; and Æschines was forced to depart from Athens. But this seems only to have the more embittered his enemies, the leaders of the Macedonian party; and they soon found an opportunity of preparing his downfall. When Hierax, a fugitive from the army of Alexander, came with his treasures to Athens, and the question arose, whether he could be permitted to remain there, Demosthenes was accused of having been corrupted by his money, at least to be silent. This was sufficient to procure the imposition of a fine; and as this was not paid, he was thrown into prison. From thence he succeeded in escaping; but to the man who lived only for his country, exile was no less an evil than imprisonment. He resided for the most part in Ægina and at Trœzen, from whence he looked with moist eyes toward the neighbouring Attica. Suddenly and unexpectedly a new ray of light broke through the clouds. Tidings were brought, that Alexander was dead. The moment of deliverance seemed at hand; the excitement pervaded every Grecian state; the ambassadors of the Athenians passed through the cities; Demosthenes joined himself to the number and exerted all his eloquence and power to unite them against Macedonia. In requital for such services, the people decreed his return; and years of sufferings were at last followed by a day of exalted compensation. A galley was sent to Ægina to bring back the advocate of liberty. . . . It was a momentary glimpse of the sun, which still darker clouds were soon to conceal. Antipater and Craterus were victorious; and with them the Macedonian party in Athens; Demosthenes and his friends were numbered among the accused, and at the instigation of Demades were condemned to die. . . . Demosthenes had escaped to the island Calauria in the vicinity of Trœzen; and took refuge in the temple of Neptune. It was to no purpose that Archias, the satellite of Antipater, urged him to surrender himself under promise of pardon. He pretended he wished to write something; bit the quill, and swallowed the poison contained in it."—A. H. L. Heeren, *Reflections on the Politics of Ancient Greece*, trans. by G. Bancroft, pp. 278-280.—See, also, on the "Lamian War," the suppression of Democracy at Athens, and the expulsion of poor citizens, GREECE: B. C. 323-322.—"With the decline of political independence, . . . the mental powers of the nation received a fatal blow. No longer knit together by a powerful esprit de corps, the Greeks lost the habit of working for the common weal; and, for the most part, gave themselves up to the petty interests of home life and their own personal troubles. Even the better disposed were too much occupied in opposing the low tone and corruption of the times, to be able to devote themselves, in their moments of relaxation, to a free and speculative consideration of things. What could be expected in such an age, but that philosophy would take a decidedly practical

turn, if indeed it were studied at all? And yet such were the political antecedents of the Stoic and Epicurean systems of philosophy. . . . Stoic apathy, Epicurean self-satisfaction, and Sceptic imperturbability, were the doctrines which responded to the political helplessness of the age. They were the doctrines, too, which met with the most general acceptance. The same political helplessness produced the sinking of national distinctions in the feeling of a common humanity, and the separation of morals from politics which characterise the philosophy of the Alexandrian and Roman period. The barriers between nations, together with national independence, had been swept away. East and West, Greeks and barbarians, were united in large empires, being thus thrown together, and brought into close contact on every possible point. Philosophy might teach that all men were of one blood, that all were equally citizens of one empire, that morality rested on the relation of man to his fellow men, independently of nationalities and of social ranks; but in so doing she was only explicitly stating truths which had been already realised in part, and which were in part corollaries from the existing state of society."—E. Zeller, *The Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics*, pp. 16-18.—"What we have said concerning the evidence of comely about the age of the first Diadochi amounts to this: Menander and his successors — they lasted barely two generations — printed in a few stereotypes a small and very worthless society at Athens. There was no doubt a similar set of people at Corinth, at Thebes, possibly even in the city of Lycurgus. These people, idle, for the most part rich, and in good society, spent their earlier years in debauchery, and their later in sentimental reflections and regrets. They had no serious object in life, and regarded the complications of a love affair as more interesting than the rise and fall of kingdoms or the gain and loss of a nation's liberty. They were like the people of our day who spend all their time reading novels from the libraries, and who can tolerate these eternal variations in twaddle not only without disgust but with interest. They were surrounded with slaves, on the whole more intelligent and interesting, for in the first place slaves were bound to exercise their brains, and in the second they had a great object — liberty — to give them a keen pursuit in life. The relations of the sexes in this set or portion of society were bad, owing to the want of education in the women, and the want of earnestness in the men. As a natural consequence a class was found, apart from household slaves, who took advantage of these defects, and, bringing culture a fascinate unprincipled men, established those relations which brought estrangements, if not ruin, into the home life of the day."—J. P. Mahaffy, *Greek Life and Thought*, pp. 123-124.—"The amount of Persian wealth poured into Greece by the accidents of the conquest, not by its own industries, must have produced a revolution in prices not since equalled except by the influx of the gold of the Aztecs and Incas into Spain. I have already pointed out how this change must have pressed upon poor people in Greece who did not share in the plunder. The price of even necessary and simple things must have often risen beyond their means. For the adventurers brought home large fortunes, and the traders

and purveyors of the armies made them; and with these Eastern fortunes must have come in the taste for all the superior comforts and luxuries which they found among the Persian grandees. Not only the appointments of the table, in the way of plate and pottery, but the very tastes and flavours of Greek cookery must have profited by comparison with the knowledge of the East. So also the furniture, especially in carpets and hangings, must have copied Persian fashion, just as we still affect oriental stuffs and designs. It was not to be expected that the example of so many regal courts and so much royal ceremony should not affect those in contact with them. These influences were not only shown in the vulgar 'braggart captain,' who came to show off his sudden wealth in impudent extravagance among his old townspeople, but in the ordinary life of rich young men. So I imagine the personal appointments of Alcibiades, which were the talk of Greece in his day, would have appeared poor and mean beside those of Artus, or of the generation which preceded him. Pictures and statues began to adorn private houses, and not temples and public buildings only—a change beginning to show itself in Demosthenes's day, but coming in like a torrent with the opening of Greece to the Eastern world. It was noticed that Phocion's house at Athens was modest in size and furniture, but even this was relieved from shabbiness by the quaint wall decoration of shining plates of bronze—a fashion dating from prehistoric times, but still admired for its very antiquity.—J. P. Mahaffy, *Greek Life and Thought*, pp. 105-106.—“The modern historians of Greece are much divided on the question where a history of Hellas ought to end. Curtius stops with the battle of Chæronia and the prostration of Athens before the advancing power of Macedon. Grote narrates the campaigns of Alexander, but stops short at the conclusion of the Lamian War, when Greece had in vain tried to shake off the supremacy of his generals. Thirlwall brings his narrative down to the time of Mummius, the melancholy sack of Corinth and the constitution of Achaia as a Roman province. Of these divergent views we regard that of the German historian as the most correct. . . . The historic sense of Grote did not exclude prejudices, and in this case he was probably led astray by political bias. At the close of his ninety-sixth chapter, after mentioning the embassies sent by the degenerate Athenians to King Ptolemy, King Lysimachus, and Antipater, he throws down his pen in disgust, ‘and with sadness and humiliation brings his narrative to a close.’ Athens was no longer free and no longer dignified, and so Mr. Grote will have done with Greece at the very moment when the new Comedy was at its height, when the Museum was founded at Alexandria, when the plays of Euripides were acted at Babylon and Cabul, and every Greek soldier of fortune carried a diadem in his baggage. Surely the historian of Greece ought either to have stopped when the iron hand of Philip of Macedon put an end to the liberties and the political wranglings of Hellas, or else persevered to the time when Rome and Parthia crushed Greek power between them, like a ship between two icebergs. No doubt his reply would be, that he declined to regard the triumph abroad of Macedonian arms as a continuation of the history of Hellas. . . .

The truth is, that the history of Greece consists of two parts, in every respect contrasted one with the other. The first recounts the stories of the Persian and Peloponnesian wars, and ends with the destruction of Thebes and the subjugation of Athens and Sparta. The Hellas of which it speaks is a cluster of autonomous cities in the Peloponnesus, the Islands, and Northern Greece, together with their colonies scattered over the coasts of Italy, Sicily, Thrace, the Black Sea, Asia Minor, and Africa. These cities were only to be independent, or at most to lord it over one another. Their political institutions, their religious ceremonies, their customs, are civic and local. Language, commerce, a common Pantheon, and a common art and poetry are the ties that bind them together. In its second phase, Greek history begins with the expedition of Alexander. It reveals to us the Greek as everywhere lord of the barbarian, as founding kingdoms and federal systems, as the instructor of all mankind in art and science, and the spreader of civil and civilized life over the known world. In the first period of her history Greece is forming herself, in her second she is educating the world. We will venture to borrow from the Germans a convenient expression, and call the history of independent Greece the history of Hellas, that of imperial Greece the history of Hellenism. . . . The Athens of Pericles was dictator among the cities which had joined her alliance. Corinth, Sparta, Thebes, were each the political head of a group of towns, but none of the three admitted these latter to an equal share in their councils, or adopted their political views. Even in the Olynthian League, the city of Olynthus occupied a position quite superior to that of the other cities. But the Greek cities had not tried the experiment of an alliance on equal terms. This was now attempted by some of the leading cities of the Peloponnesus, and the result was the Achaean League, whose history sheds a lustre on the last days of independent Greece, and whose generals will bear comparison with the statesmen of any Greek Republic [see GREECE: B. C. 290-146]. . . . On the field of Sellasia the glorious hopes of Cleomenes were wrecked, and the recently reformed Sparta was handed over to a succession of bloodthirsty tyrants, never again to emerge from obscurity. But to the Achaean themselves the interference of Macedon was little less fatal. Henceforth a Macedonian garrison occupied Corinth, which had been one of the chief cities of the League; and King Antigonos Dosis was the recognized arbiter in all disputes of the Peloponnesian Greeks. . . . In Northern Greece a strange contrast presented itself. The historic races of the Athenians and Boeotians languished in peace, obscurity, and luxury. With them every day saw something added to the enjoyments and elegancies of life, and every day politics drifted more and more into the background. On the other hand, the rude semi-Greeks of the West, Aetolians, Acarnanians, and Epirotes, to whose manhood the repulse of the Gauls was mainly due, came to the front and showed the bold spirit of Greeks divorced from the finer faculties of the race. The Acarnanians formed a league somewhat on the pinn of the Achaean. But they were overshadowed by their neighbors the Aetolians, whose union was of a different character. It was the first time that there had

been formed in Hellas a state framed in order to prey upon its neighbours. . . . In the course of the Peloponnesian War Greek religion began to lose its hold on the Greeks. This was partly the work of the sophists and philosophers, who sought more lofty and moral views of Deity than were furnished by the tales of popular mythology. Still more it resulted from growing materialism among the people, who saw more and more of their immediate and physical needs, and less and less of the underlying spiritual elements in life. But though philosophy and materialism had made the religion of Hellas paler and feebler, they had not altered its nature or expanded it. It still remained essentially national, almost tribal. When, therefore, Greeks and Macedonians suddenly found themselves masters of the nations of the East, and in close contact with a hundred forms of religion, an extraordinary and rapid change took place in their religious ideas. In religion, as in other matters, Egypt set to the world the example of prompt fusion of the ideas of Greeks and natives. . . . Into Greece proper, in return for her population which flowed out, there flowed in a crowd of foreign deities. Isis was especially welcomed at Athens, where she found many votaries. In every cult the more mysterious elements were made more of, and the brighter and more materialistic side passed by. Old statues which had fallen somewhat into contempt in the days of Pheidias and Praxiteles were restored to their places and received extreme veneration, not as beautiful, but as old and strange. On the coins of the previous period the representations of deities had been always the best that the die-cutter could frame, taking as his models the finest contemporary sculpture; but henceforth we often find them strange, uncouth figures, remnants of a period of struggling early art, like the Apollo at Anycleæ, or the Hera of Samos. . . . In the intellectual life of Athens there was still left vitality enough to formulate the two most complete expressions of the ethical ideas of the times, the doctrines of the Stoics and the Epicureans, towards one or the other of which all educated minds from that day to this have been drawn. No doubt our knowledge of these doctrines, being largely drawn from the Latin writers and their Greek contemporaries, is somewhat coloured and unjust. With the Romans a system of philosophy was considered mainly in its bearing upon conduct, whence the ethical elements in Stoicism and Epicureanism have been by their Roman adherents so thrust into the foreground, that we have almost lost sight of the intellectual elements, which can have had little less importance in the eyes of the Greeks. Notwithstanding, the rise of the two philosophies must be held to mark a new era in the history of thought, an era when the importance of conduct was for the first time recognized by the Greeks. It is often observed that the ancient Greeks were more modern than our own ancestors of the Middle Ages. But it is less generally recognized how far more modern than the Greeks of Pericles were the Greeks of Aratus. In very many respects the age of Hellenism and our own age present remarkable similarity. In both there appears a sudden increase in the power over material nature, arising alike from the greater accessibility of all parts of the world

and from the rapid development of the sciences which act upon the physical forces of the world. In both this spread of science and power acts upon religion with a dissolving and, if we may so speak, centrifugal force, driving some men to take refuge in the most conservative forms of faith, some to fly to new creeds and superstitions, some to drift into unmeasured scepticism. In both the facility of moving from place to place, and finding a distant home, tends to dissolve the closeness of civic and family life, and to make the individual rather than the family of the city the unit of social life. And in the family relations, in the character of individuals, in the state of morality, in the condition of art, we find at both periods similar results from the similar causes we have mentioned."—P. Gardner, *New Chapters in Greek History*, ch. 15.

**B. C. 317-316.**—Siege by Polysperchon.—Democracy restored.—Execution of Phocion.—Demetrius of Phaleron at the head of the government. See GREECE: B. C. 321-312.

**B. C. 307-197.**—Under Demetrius Poliorcetes and the Antigonids. See GREECE: B. C. 307-197.

**B. C. 288-263.**—Twenty years of Independence.—Siege and subjugation by Antigonus Gonatas.—When Demetrius Poliorcetes lost the Macedonian throne, B. C. 288, his feeble Athenian subjects and late worshippers rose against his authority, drove his garrisons from the Museum and the Piræus and abolished the priesthood they had consecrated to him. Demetrius gathered an army from some quarter and laid siege to the city, but without success. The Athenians went so far as to invite Pyrrhus, the warrior king of Epirus, to assist them against him. Pyrrhus came and Demetrius retired. The dangerous ally contented himself with a visit to the Acropolis as a worshipper, and left Athens in possession, undisturbed, of her freshly gained freedom. It was enjoyed after a fashion for twenty years, at the end of which period, B. C. 268, Antigonus Gonatas, the son of Demetrius, having regained the Macedonian crown, reasserted his claim on Athens, and the city was once more besieged. The Lacedæmonians and Ptolemy of Egypt both gave some ineffectual aid to the Athenians, and the siege, interrupted on several occasions, was prolonged until B. C. 263, when Antigonus took possession of the Acropolis, the fortified Museum and the Piræus as a master (see MACEDONIA, &c.: B. C. 277-244). This was sometimes called the Chremonidean War, from the name of a patriotic Athenian who took the most prominent part in the long defence of his city.—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 61.

**B. C. 229.**—Liberation by the Achaian League. See GREECE: B. C. 280-146.

**B. C. 200.**—Vandalism of the second Macedonian Philip.—In the year B. C. 200 the Macedonian king, Philip, made an attempt to surprise Athens and failed. "He then encamped in the outskirts, and proceeded to wreak his vengeance on the Athenians, as he had indulged it at Thermus and Pergamus. He destroyed or defaced all the monuments of religion and of art, all the sacred and pleasant places which adorned the suburbs. The Academy, the Lyceum, and Cynosarges, with their temples, schools, groves and gardens, were all wasted with fire. Not even the sepulchres were spared."—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 64.

**B. C. 197-A. D. 138.—Under Roman rule.**—“Athens . . . affords the disheartening picture of a commonwealth pampered by the supreme power, and financially as well as morally ruled. By rights it ought to have found itself in a flourishing condition. . . . No city of antiquity elsewhere possessed a domain of its own, such as was Attica, of about 700 square miles. . . . But even beyond Attica they retained what they possessed, as well after the Mithridatic War, by favour of Sulla, as after the Pluralsian battle, in which they had taken the side of Pompeius, by the favour of Caesar;—he asked them only how often they would still ruin themselves and trust to be saved by the renown of their ancestors. To the city there still belonged not merely the territory, formerly possessed by Hallartus, in Bœotia, but also on their own coast Salamis, the old starting-point of their dominion of the sea, and in the Thracian Sea the lucrative islands Scyros, Lemnos, and Imbros, as well as Delos in the Aegean. . . . Of the further grants, which they had the skill to draw by flattery from Antoninus, Augustus, against whom they had taken part, took from them certainly Aegina and Eretria in Eubœa, but they were allowed to retain the smaller islands of the Thracian Sea. . . . Hadrian, moreover, gave to them the best part of the great island of Cephalonia in the Ionian Sea. It was only by the Emperor Severus, who bore them no good will, that a portion of these extraneous possessions was withdrawn from them. Hadrian further granted to the Athenians the delivery of a certain quantity of grain at the expense of the empire, and by the extension of this privilege, hitherto reserved for the capital, acknowledged Athens, as it were, as another metropolis. Not less was the blissful institute of alimentary endowments, which Italy had enjoyed since Trajan’s time, extended by Hadrian to Athens, and the capital requisite for this purpose certainly presented to the Athenians from his purse. . . . Yet the community was in constant distress.”—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 8, ch. 7.

ALSO IN: J. P. Mahaffy, *The Greek World under Roman sway*.—See, also, GREECE: B. C. 146-A. D. 180.

**B. C. 87-86.—Siege and capture by Sulla.—Massacre of citizens.—Pillage and depopulation.—Lasting injuries.**—The early successes of Mithridates of Pontus, in his savage war with the Romans, included a general rising in his favor among the Greeks [see MITHRIDATIC WARS], supported by the fleets of the Pontic king and by a strong invading army. Athens and the Piræus were the strongholds of the Greek revolt, and at Athens an adventurer named Ariston, bringing from Mithridates a body-guard of 2,000 soldiers, made himself tyrant of the city. A year passed before Rome, distracted by the beginnings of civil war, could effectively interfere. Then Sulla came (B. C. 87) and laid siege to the Piræus, where the principal Pontic force was lodged, while he shut up Athens by blockade. In the following March, Athens was starved to such weakness that the Romans entered almost unopposed and killed and plundered with no mercy; but the buildings of the city suffered little harm at their hands. The siege of the Piræus was carried on for some weeks longer, until Sulla had driven the Pontic forces from every part except Munychia, and that they evacu-

ated in no long time.—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 7, ch. 17.—“Athens was . . . taken by assault. . . . The majority of the citizens was slain; the carnage was so fearfully great as to become memorable even in that age of bloodshed; the private movable property was seized by the soldiery, and Sulla assumed some merit to himself for not committing the rifled houses to the flames. . . . The fate of the Piræus, which he utterly destroyed, was more severe than that of Athens. From Sulla’s campaign in Greece the commencement of the ruin and depopulation of the country is to be dated. The destruction of property caused by his ravages in Attica was so great that Athens from that time lost its commercial as well as its political importance. The race of Athenian citizens was almost extirpated, and a new population, composed of a heterogeneous mass of settlers, received the right of citizenship.”—G. Finlay, *Greece under the Romans*, ch. 1.

**A. D. 54 (?).—The Visit of St. Paul.—Planting of Christianity.**—“When the Jews of Thessalonica had knowledge that the word of God was proclaimed of Paul at Berea also, they came thither likewise, stirring up and troubling the multitude. And then immediately the brethren sent forth Paul to go as far as to the sea: and Silas and Timotheus abode there still. But they that conducted Paul brought him as far as Athens; and receiving a commandment unto Silas and Timotheus that they should come to him with all speed, they departed. Now while Paul waited for them at Athens, his spirit was provoked within him, as he beheld the city full of idols. So he reasoned in the synagogue with the Jews, and the devout persons, and in the market place every day with them that met with him. And certain also of the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers encountered him. And some said, what would this babbling say? other some, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods: because he preached Jesus and the resurrection. And they took hold of him, and brought him unto the Areopagus, saying, May we know what this new teaching is, which is spoken by thee? For thou bringest certain strange things to our ears: we would know therefore what these things mean. (Now all the Athenians and the strangers sojourning there spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or to hear some new thing.) And Paul stood in the midst of the Areopagus, and said, Ye men of Athens, in all things I perceive that ye are somewhat superstitious. For as I passed along and observed the objects of your worship, I found also an altar with this inscription, ‘To an Unknown God.’ What therefore ye worship in ignorance, this set I forth unto you. . . . Now when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked; but others said, We will hear thee concerning this yet again. Thus Paul went out from among them. Howbeit certain men clave unto him, and believed: among whom also was Dionysius the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, and others with them.”—*Acts of the Apostles, Revised Version*, ch. 17.—“Consider the difficulties which must have beset the planting of the Church in Athens. If the burning zeal of the great Apostle ever permitted him to feel diffidence in addressing an assembly, he may well have felt it when he addressed on Mars’ Hill for the first time an Athenian crowd. No doubt the Athens of his time was in her decay, inferior in opulence and grandeur to many younger cities.

Yet even to a Jew, provided he had received some educational impressions beyond the fanatical shibboleths of Pharisaism, there was much in that wonderful centre of intelligence to shake his most inveterate prejudices and inspire him with unwilling respect. Shorn indeed of her political greatness, deprived even of her philosophical supremacy, she still shone with a brilliant after-glow of æsthetic and intellectual prestige. Her monuments flashed on the visitor memories recent enough to dazzle his imagination. Her schools claimed and obtained even from Emperors the homage due to her unique past. Recognising her as the true nurse of Hellenism and the chief missionary of human refinement, the best spirits of the age held her worthy of admiring love not unmingled with awe. As the seat of the most brilliant and popular university, young men of talent and position flocked to her from every quarter, studied for a time within her colonnades, and carried thence the recollection of a culture which was not always deep, not always erudite, but was always and genuinely Attic. To subject to the criticism of this people a doctrine professing to come direct from God, a religion and not a philosophy, depending not on argument but on revelation, was a task of which the difficulties might seem insuperable. When we consider what the Athenian character was, this language will not seem exaggerated. Keen, subtle, capricious, satirical, sated with ideas, eager for novelty, yet with the eagerness of amused frivolity, not of the truth-seeker: critical by instinct, exquisitely sensitive to the ridiculous or the absurd, disputatious, ready to listen, yet impatient of all that was not wit, satisfied with everything in life except its shortness, and therefore hiding all references to this unwelcome fact under a veil of complacent euphemism — where could a more uncongenial soil be found for the seed of the Gospel? . . . To an Athenian the Jew was not so much an object of hatred (as to the Roman), nor even of contempt (as to the rest of mankind), as of absolute indifference. He was simply ignored. To the eclectic philosophy which now dominated the schools of Athens, Judaism alone among all human opinions was as if non-existent. That Athenians should be convinced by the philosophy of a Jew would be a proposition expressible in words but wholly destitute of meaning. On the other hand, the Jew was not altogether unimpaired by Greek thought. Wide apart as the two minds were, the Hebrew proved not insensible to the charm of the Hellenic; witness the Epistle to the Hebrews, witness Philo, witness the intrusion of Greek methods of interpretation even into the text-books of Rabbinitism. And it was Athens, as the quintessence of Hellas, Athens as represented by Socrates, and still more by Plato, which had gained this subtle power. And just as Judæa alone among all the Jewish communities retained its exclusiveness wholly unimpaired by Hellenism, so Athens, more than any Pagan capital, was likely to ignore or repel a faith coming in the garb of Judaism. And yet within less than a century we find this faith so well established there as to yield to the Church the good fruits of martyrdom in the person of its bishop, and of able defences in the person of three of its teachers. The early and the later fortunes of the Athenian Church are buried in oblivion; it comes but for a brief period before the scene of history. But

the underlying interest of that one dramatic moment when Paul proclaimed a bodily resurrection to the authors of the conception of a spiritual immortality, will always cause us to linger with a strange sympathy over every relic of the Christianity of Athens."—C. T. Cruttwell, *A Literary History of Early Christianity*, v. 1, bk. 3, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, *Life and Letters of St. Paul*, v. 1, ch. 10.—F. C. Baur, *Paul*, pt. 1, ch. 7 (p. 1).—On the inscription, see E. de Pressensé, *The Early Years of Christianity: The Apostolic Era*, bk. 2, ch. 1.

**A. D. 125-134.**—The works of Hadrian.—The Emperor Hadrian interested himself greatly in the venerable decaying capital of the Greeks, which he visited, or resided in, for considerable periods, several times, between A. D. 125 and 134. These visits were made important to the city by the great works of rebuilding which he undertook and supervised. Large parts of the city are thought to have been reconstructed by him, "in the open and luxurious style of Antioch and Ephesus." One quarter came to be called "Hadrianapolis," as though he had created it. Several new temples were erected at his command; but the greatest of the works of Hadrian at Athens was the completing of the vast national temple, the Olympieum, the beginning of which dated back to the age of Pisistratus, and which Augustus had put his hand to without finishing.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 66.

**A. D. 267.**—Capture of, by the Goths. See **Goths**: A. D. 258-267.

**A. D. 395.**—Surrender to Alaric and the Goths.—When the Goths under Alaric invaded and ravaged Greece, A. D. 395, Athens was surrendered to them, on terms which saved the city from being plundered. "The fact that the depredations of Alaric hardly exceeded the ordinary license of a rebellious general, is . . . perfectly established. The public buildings and monuments of ancient splendour suffered no wanton destruction from his visit; but there can be no doubt that Alaric and his troops levied heavy contributions on the city and its inhabitants."—G. Finlay, *Greece under the Romans*, ch. 2, sect. 8.

ALSO IN: E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 30.—See, also, **Goths**: A. D. 395, **ALARIC'S INVASION OF GREECE**.

**A. D. 529.**—Suppression of the Schools by Justinian.—"The Attic schools of rhetoric and philosophy maintained their superior reputation from the Peloponnesian War to the reign of Justinian. Athens, though situate in a barren soil, possessed a pure air, a free navigation, and the monuments of ancient art. That sacred retirement was seldom disturbed by the business of trade or government; and the last of the Athenians were distinguished by their lively wit, the purity of their taste and language, their social manners, and some traces, at least in discourse, of the magnanimity of their fathers. In the suburbs of the city, the Academy of the Platonists, the Lyceum of the Peripatetics, the Portico of the Stoics and the Garden of the Epicureans were planted with trees and decorated with statues; and the philosophers, instead of being immured in a cloister, delivered their instructions in spacious and pleasant walks, which, at different hours, were consecrated to the exercises of the mind and body. The genius of the founders still lived in those venerable seats. . . .

The schools of Athens were protected by the wisest and most virtuous of the Roman princes. . . . Some vestige of royal bounty may be found under the successors of Constantine. . . . The golden chain, as it was fondly styled, of the Platonian succession, continued . . . to the edict of Justinian [A. D. 529] which imposed a perpetual silence on the schools of Athens, and excited the grief and indignation of the few remaining votaries of Greek science and superstition."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 40.

**A. D. 1205.—The founding of the Latin Dukedom.**—"The portion of Greece lying to the south of the kingdom of Saloniki was divided by the Crusaders [after their conquest of Constantinople, A. D. 1204—see BYZANTINE EMPIRE: A. D. 1203-1204] among several great feudatories of the Empire of Romania. . . . The lords of Boudouritza, Salona, Negropont, and Athens are alone mentioned as existing to the north of the isthmus of Corinth, and the history of the petty sovereigns of Athens can alone be traced in any detail. . . . Otho de la Roche, a Burgundian nobleman, who had distinguished himself during the siege of Constantinople, marched southward with the army of Boniface the king-marguis, and gained possession of Athens in 1205. Thebes and Athens had probably fallen to his share in the partition of the Empire, but it is possible that the king of Saloniki may have found means to increase his portion, in order to induce him to do homage to the crown of Saloniki for this addition. At all events, it appears that Otho de la Roche did homage to Boniface, either as his immediate superior, or as viceroy for the Emperor of Romania. . . . Though the Byzantine aristocracy and dignified clergy were severe sufferers by the transference of the government into the hands of the Franks, the middle classes long enjoyed peace and security. . . . The social civilization of the inhabitants, and their ample command of the necessaries and many of the luxuries of life, were in those days as much superior to the condition of the citizens of Paris and London as they are now inferior. . . . The city was large and wealthy, the country thickly covered with villages, of which the ruins may still be traced in spots affording no indications of Hellenic sites. . . . The trade of Athens was considerable, and the luxury of the Athenian ducal court was celebrated in all the regions of the West where chivalry flourished."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of Greece from its Conquest by the Crusaders*, ch. 7.

ALSO IN: C. C. Felton, *Greece, Ancient and Modern 4th Course*, lect. 5.

**ATHERTON GAG, The.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1836.

**ATHLONE, Siege of (A. D. 1691).** See IRELAND: A. D. 1689-1691.

**ATHRAVAS.** See MAGIANS.

**ATIMIA.**—The perdition of Atimia, under ancient Athenian law, was the loss of civic rights.—G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State*, pt. 3, ch. 3.

**ATIMUCA, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: TIMUCA.

**ATLANTA: A. D. 1864 (May—September).**—Sherman's advance to the city.—Its siege and capture. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MAY: GEORGIA); and (MAY—SEPTEMBER: GEORGIA).

**A. D. 1311-1456.—Under the Catalans and the Florentines.** See CATALAN GRAND COMPANY.

**A. D. 1456.—The Turks in possession.**—Athens was not occupied by the Turks until three years after the conquest of Constantinople (see CONSTANTINOPLE: A. D. 1453). In the meantime the reign of the Florentine dukes of the house of Acciaïoli came to a tragical close. The last of the dukes, Maurice Acciaïoli died, leaving a young son and a young widow, the latter renowned for her beauty and her talents. The duchess, whom the will of her husband had made regent, married a comely Venetian named Palmerio, who was said to have poisoned his wife in order to be free to accept her hand. Thereupon a nephew of the late duke, named Franco, stirred up insurrections at Athens and fled to Constantinople to complain to the sultan, Mahomet II. "The sultan, glad of all pretexts that coloured his armed intervention in the affairs of these principalities, ordered Omar, son of Tourakhan, chief of the permanent army of the Peloponnesus, to take possession of Athens, to dethrone the duchess and to confine her sons in his prisons of the citadel of Megara." This was done; but Palmerio, the duchess's husband, made his way to the sultan and interceded in her behalf. "Mahomet, by the advice of his viziers, feigned to listen equally to the complaints of Palmerio, and to march to reestablish the legitimate sovereignty. But already Franco, entering Megara under the auspices of the Ottomans, had strangled both the duchess and her son. Mahomet, advancing in turn to punish him for his vengeance, expelled Franco from Athens on entering it, and gave him, in compensation, the inferior and dependent principality of Thebes, in Boeotia. The sultan, as lettered as he was warlike, evinced no less pride and admiration than Sylla at the sight of the monuments of Athens. 'What gratitude,' exclaimed he before the Parthenon and the temple of Theseus, 'do not religion and the Empire owe to the son of Tourakhan, who has made them a present of these spoils of the genius of the Greeks.'"—A. Lamartine, *Hist. of Turkey*, bk. 13, sect. 10-12.

**A. D. 1466.—Capture and plundering by the Venetians.** See GREECE: A. D. 1454-1479.

**A. D. 1687.—Siege, bombardment and capture by the Venetians.—Destructive explosion in the Parthenon.** See TURKS: A. D. 1684-1696.

**A. D. 1821-1829.—The Greek revolution and war of independence.—Capture by the Turks.** See GREECE: A. D. 1821-1829.

**A. D. 1864 (September).—Exclusive military occupation of the city.—Removal of inhabitants.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER: GEORGIA).

**A. D. 1864 (November).—Destruction of the city.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (NOVEMBER—DECEMBER: GEORGIA).

**ATLANTIC OCEAN: The name.**—The Atlantic Ocean is mentioned by that name in a single passage of Herodotus; "but it is clear, from the incidental way in which it [the name] is here introduced, that it was one well known in his day."—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 7, sect. 1, note.—For a sketch of the history of the modern use of the name, see PACIFIC OCEAN.

**ATREBATES, The.**—This name was borne by a tribe in ancient Belgic Gaul, which occupied modern Artois and part of French Flanders, and, also, by a tribe or group of tribes in Britain, which dwelt in a region between the Thames and the Severn. The latter was probably a colony from the former. See BELGÆ; also BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.

**ATROPATENE. — MEDIA ATROPATENE.**—"Atropatene, as a name for the Alpine land in the northwest of Iran (now Aderbeïjan), came into use in the time of the Greek Empire [Alexander's]; at any rate we cannot trace it earlier. 'Athrapaiti' means 'lord of fire;' 'Athrapata,' 'one protected by fire;' in the remote mountains of this district the old fire-worship was preserved with peculiar zeal under the Seleucids."—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, bk. 7, ch. 4.—Atropatene "comprises the entire basin of Lake Urumiyeh, together with the country intervening between that basin and the high mountain chain which curves round the southwestern corner of the Caspian."—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: Media*, ch. 1.—Atropatene was "named in honour of the satrap Atropates, who had declared himself king after Alexander's death."—J. P. Mahaffy, *Story of Alexander's Empire*, ch. 12.

**ATSINAS.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: BLACKFEET.

**ATTABEGS.** See ATABEGS.

**ATTACAPAN FAMILY, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ATTACAPAN FAMILY.

**ATTAMAN, or HETMAN.** See COSSACKS.

**ATTECOTTI, The.** See OTADENI; also, BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.

**ATTIC SALT.**—Thyme was a favorite condiment among the ancient Greeks, "which throve nowhere else so well as in Attica. Even salt was seasoned with thyme. Attic salt, however, is famed rather in the figurative than in the literal sense, and did not form an article of trade."—G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State*, pt. 3, ch. 3.

**ATTIC TALENT.** See TALENT.

**ATTIC WAR, The.** See TEN YEARS' WAR.

**ATTICA.**—"It forms a rocky peninsula, separated from the mainland by trackless mountains, and jutting so far out into the Eastern Sea that it lay out of the path of the tribes moving from north to south. Hence the migratory passages which agitated the whole of Hellas left Attica untouched, and for this reason Attic history is not divided into such marked epochs as that of Peloponncsus; it possesses a superior unity, and presents an uninterrupted development of conditions of life native in their origin to the land. . . . On the other hand Attica was perfectly adapted by nature for receiving immigrants from the sea. For the whole country, as its name indicates, consists of coast-land; and the coast abounds in harbours, and on account of the depth of water in the roads is everywhere accessible; while the best of its plains open towards the coast and invite the mariner to land. The first landings by which the monotonous conditions of the age of the Pelasgians were interrupted where those of the Phœnicians, who domesticated the worship of Aphrodite, as well as that of the Tyrian Melcar on the coasts. Afterwards the tribes of the shores of Asia Minor came across; in the first

place the Carians, who introduced the worship of the Carian Zeus and Posidon, and were followed by Cretans, Lycians, Dardanians and Old Ionians. The population became mixed. . . . This first epoch of the national history the ancients connected with the name of Cœrops. It forms the transition from the life of rural districts and villages to that of a state. Attica has become a land with twelve citadels, in each of which dwells a chieftain or king, who has his domains, his suite, and his subjects. Every twelfth is a state by itself, with its separate public hall and common hearth. If under these circumstances a common national history was to be attained to, one of the twelve towns, distinguished by special advantages of situation, would have to become the capital. And to such a position undeniable advantages entitled the city whose seat was in the plain of the Cephissus. . . . Into the centre of the entire plain advances from the direction of Hymettus a group of rocky heights, among them an entirely separate and mighty block which, with the exception of a narrow access from the west, offers on all sides vertically precipitous walls, surmounted by a broad level sufficiently roomy to afford space for the sanctuaries of the national gods and the habitations of the national rulers. It seems as if nature had designedly placed this rock in this position as the ruling castle and the centre of the national history. This is the Acropolis of Athens, among the twelve castles of the land that which was preëminently named after the national king Cœrops. . . . So far from being sufficiently luxurious to allow even the idle to find easy means of sustenance, the Attic soil was stony, devoid of a sufficient supply of water, and for the most part only adapted to the cultivation of barley; everywhere . . . labour and a regulated industry were needed. But this labour was not unremunerative. Whatever orchard and garden fruits prospered were peculiarly delicate and agreeable to the taste; the mountain-herbs were nowhere more odourous than on Hymettus; and the sea abounded with fish. The mountains, not only by the beauty of their form invest the whole scenery with a certain nobility, but in their depths lay an abundance of the most excellent building-stone and silver ore; in the lowlands was to be found the best kind of clay for purposes of manufacture. The materials existed for all arts and handicrafts; and finally Attica rejoiced in what the ancients were wise enough to recognize as a special favour of Heaven, a dry and transparent atmosphere, by its peculiar clearness productive of bodily freshness, health and elasticity, while it sharpened the senses, disposed the soul to cheerfulness and aroused and animated the powers of the mind. Such were the institutions of the land which was developing the germs of its peculiar history at the time when the [Dorian] migrations were agitating the whole mainland. Though Attica was not herself overrun by hostile multitudes, yet about the same time she admitted manifold accessions of foreign population in smaller groups. By this means she enjoyed all the advantages of an invigorating impulse without exposing herself to the evils of a violent revolution. . . . The immigrants who domesticated themselves in Attica were . . . chiefly families of superior eminence, so that Attica gained not only in numbers of population, but also in materials of



culture of every description."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 2, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: J. I. Lockhart, *Attica and Athens*.—See, also, ATHENS: THE BEGINNING.

**ATTILA'S CONQUESTS AND EMPIRE.** See HUNS.

**ATTIOUANDARONK, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: HURONS, &c.

**ATTYADÆ, The.**—The first dynasty of the kings of Lydia, claimed to be sprung from Attyas, son of the god Manes.—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, bk. 4, ch. 17.

**AUBAINE, The right of.**—"A prerogative by which the Kings of France claimed the property of foreigners who died in their kingdom without being naturalized." It was suppressed by Colbert, in the reign of Louis XIV.—J. A. Blanqui, *Hist. of Pol. Economy in Europe*, p. 285.

**AUCH: Origin of the name.** See AQUITAINE: THE ANCIENT TRIBES.

**AUCKLAND, Lord, The Indian Administration of.** See INDIA: A. D. 1836-1845.

**AUDENARDE.** See OUDINARDE.

**AUDIENCIAS.**—"For more than two centuries and a half the whole of South America, except Brazil, settled down under the colonial government of Spain, and during the greater part of that time this vast territory was under the rule of the Viceroy of Peru residing at Lima. The impossibility of conducting an efficient administration from such a centre . . . at once became apparent. Courts of justice called Audiencias were, therefore, established in the distant provinces, and their presidents, sometimes with the title of captains-general, had charge of the executive under the orders of the Viceroy. The Audiencia of Charcas (the modern Bolivia) was established in 1559. Chile was ruled by captains-general, and an Audiencia was established at Santiago in 1568. In New Grenada the president of the Audiencia, created in 1564, was also captain-general. The Audiencia of Quito, also with its president as captain-general, dated from 1542; and Venezuela was under a captain-general."—C. R. Markham, *Colonial Hist. of S. Am. (Narratives and Critical Hist. of Am., v. 8, p. 295)*.

**AUERSTADT, Battle of.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1806 (OCTOBER).

**AUGEREAU, Marshal, Campaigns of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1797 (SEPTEMBER); GERMANY: A. D. 1806 (OCTOBER); SPAIN: A. D. 1809 (FEBRUARY—JUNE); and RUSSIA: A. D. 1812 (JUNE—SEPTEMBER); 1813 (AUGUST), (OCTOBER), (OCTOBER—DECEMBER).

**AUGHRIM, OR AGHRIM, Battle of (A. D. 1691).** See IRELAND: A. D. 1689-1691.

**AUGSBURG: Origin.** See AUGUSTA VINDELICORUM.

**A. D. 955.—Great defeat of the Hungarians.** See HUNGARIANS: A. D. 934-955.

**A. D. 1530.—Sitting of the Diet.—Signing and reading of the Protestant Confession of Faith.—The Imperial Decree condemning the Protestants.** See PAPACY: A. D. 1530-1531.

**A. D. 1555.—The Religious Peace concluded.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1552-1561.

**A. D. 1646.—Unsuccessful siege by Swedes and French.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1646-1648.

**A. D. 1686-1697.—The League and the War of the League.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1686; and FRANCE: A. D. 1689-1690, and after.

**A. D. 1703.—Taken by the French.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1703.

**A. D. 1801-1803.—One of six free cities which survived the Peace of Luneville.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1801-1803.

**A. D. 1806.—Loss of municipal freedom.—Absorption in the kingdom of Bavaria.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1805-1806.

**AUGURS.—PONTIFICES.—FETTERED.**—"There was . . . enough of priesthood and of priests in Rome. Those, however, who had business with a god resorted to the god, and not to the priest. Every suppliant and inquirer addressed himself directly to the divinity . . . ; no intervention of a priest was allowed to conceal or to obscure this original and simple relation. But it was no easy matter to hold converse with a god. The god had his own way of speaking, which was intelligible only to those acquainted with it; but one who did rightly understand it knew not only how to ascertain, but also how to manage, the will of the god, and even in case of need to overreach or to constrain him. It was natural, therefore, that the worshipper of the god should regularly consult such men of skill and listen to their advice; and thence arose the corporations or colleges of men specially skilled in religious lore, a thoroughly national Italian institution, which had a far more important influence on political development than the individual priests or priesthoods. These colleges have been often, but erroneously, confounded with the priesthoods. The priesthoods were charged with the worship of a specific divinity. . . . Under the Roman constitution and that of the Latin communities in general there were originally but two such colleges: that of the augurs and that of the pontifices. The six augurs were skilled in interpreting the language of the gods from the flight of birds; an art which was prosecuted with great earnestness and reduced to a quasi-scientific system. The five 'bridge builders' (pontifices) derived their name from their function, as sacred as it was politically important, of conducting the building and demolition of the bridge over the Tiber. They were the Roman engineers, who understood the mystery of measures and numbers; whence there devolved upon them also the duties of managing the calendar of the state, of proclaiming to the people the time of new and full moon and the days of festivals, and of seeing that every religious and every judicial act took place on the right day. . . . Thus they acquired (although not probably to the full extent till after the abolition of the monarchy) the general oversight of Roman worship and of whatever was connected with it. [The president of their college was called the Pontifex Maximus.] . . . They themselves described the sum of their knowledge as 'the science of things divine and human.' . . . By the side of these two oldest and most eminent corporations of men versed in spiritual lore may be to some extent ranked the college of the twenty state-heralds (fetiales, of uncertain derivation) destined as a living repository to preserve traditionally the remembrance of the treaties concluded with neighboring communities, to pronounce an authoritative opinion on alleged infractions of treatyrights, and in case of need to demand satisfaction and declare war."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 1, ch. 12.

ALSO IN: E. Guhl and W. Koner, *Life of the Greeks and Romans*, sect. 103.—See, also, AUSPICES, and FETIALES.

**AUGUSTA TREVIRORUM.** See TRÈVES, ORIGIN OF.

**AUGUSTA VEROMANDUORUM.**—Modern St. Quentin. See BELGÆ.

**AUGUSTA VINDELICORUM.**—"Augusta Vindeborum is the modern Augsburg, founded, it may be supposed, about the year 740 [B. C. 14] after the conquest of Rætia by Drusus. . . . The Itineraries represent it as the centre of the roads from Verona, Strimlun, and Treviri."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 30, note.

**AUGUSTODUNUM.**—The Emperor Augustus changed the name of Bibracte in Gaul to Augustodunum, v. This time has corrupted, since to Autun.

**AUGUSTONOMETUM.** See GERGOVIA OF THE ARVERN.

**AUGUSTUS.**—**AUGUSTA:** The Title.—"Octavius [see ROME: B. C. 31-14] had warily declined any of the recognized designations of sovereign rule. Antonius had abolished the dictatorship; his successor respected the acclamations with which the people had greeted this decree. The voices which had saluted Cæsar with the title of king were peremptorily commanded to be dumb. Yet Octavius was fully aware of the influence which attached to distinctive titles of honour. While he scrupulously renounced the names upon which the breath of human jealousy had blown, he conceived the subtler policy of creating another for himself, which borrowing its original splendour from his own character, should reflect upon him an untarnished lustre. . . . The epithet Augustus . . . had never been borne by any man before. . . . But the adjunct, though never given to a man, had been applied to things most noble, most venerable and most divine. The rites of the gods were called august, the temples were august; the word itself was derived from the holy auguries by which the divine will was revealed; it was concerted with the favour and authority of Jove himself. . . . The illustrious title was bestowed upon the heir of the Cæsarian Empire in the middle of the month of January, 727 [B. C. 27], and thenceforth it is by the name of Augustus that he is recognized in Roman history."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 30.—"When Octavianus had firmly established his power and was now left without a rival, the Senate, being desirous of distinguishing him by some peculiar and emphatic title, decreed, in B. C. 27, that he should be styled Augustus, an epithet properly applicable to some object demanding respect and veneration beyond what is bestowed upon human things. . . . This being an honorary appellation . . . it would, as a matter of course, have been transmitted by inheritance to his immediate descendants. . . . Claudius, although he could not be regarded as a descendant of Octavianus, assumed on his accession the title of Augustus, and his example was followed by all succeeding rulers . . . who communicated the title of Augusta to their consorts."—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq.*, ch. 5.—See, also, ROME: B. C. 31-A. D. 14.

**AULA REGIA, The.** See CURIA REGIS OF THE NORMAN KINGS.

**AULDEARN, Battle of (A. D. 1645).** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1644-1645.

**AULERCI, The.**—The Aulerer were an extensive nation in ancient Gaul which occupied the country from the lower course of the Seine to the Mayenne. It was subdivided into three great tribes—the Aulerer Cenomanni, Aulerer Diablintes and Aulerer Ebuoriques.—Napoleon III., *Hist. of Cæsar*, bk. 3, ch. 2.

**AULIC COUNCIL, The.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1493-1519.

**AUMALE, Battle of (1592).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1591-1593.

**AUNEAU, Battle of (1587).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1584-1589.

**AURANGZEB, Moghul Emperor, or Padishah of India, A. D. 1658-1707.**

**AURA', Battle of (1365).** See BRITTANY: A. D. 1341-1365.

**AURELIAN, Roman Emperor.** A. D. 270-275.

**AURELIAN ROAD, The.**—One of the great Roman roads of antiquity, which ran from Rome to Pisa and Luna.—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 4, ch. 11.

**AURELIO, King of Leon and the Asturias, or Oviedo, A. D. 768-774.**

**AURUNCANS, The.** See AUSONIANS; also OSCANS.

**AUSCI, The.** See AQUITAINE, THE ANCIENT TRIBES.

**AUSGLEICH, The.** See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1866-1867.

**AUSONIANS, OR AURUNCANS, The.**—A tribe of the ancient Volscians, who dwelt in the lower valley of the Liris, and who are said to have been exterminated by the Romans, B. C. 314.—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 3, ch. 10.—See, also, OSCANS.

**AUSPICES, Taking the.**—"The Romans, in the earlier ages of their history, never entered upon any important business whatsoever, whether public or private, without endeavouring, by means of divination, to ascertain the will of the gods in reference to the undertaking. . . . This operation was termed 'sumere auspicia,' and if the omens proved unfavourable the business was abandoned or deferred. . . . No meeting of the Comitia Curjata nor of the Comitia Centuriata could be held unless the auspices had been previously taken. . . . As far as public proceedings were concerned, no private individual, even among the patricians, had the right of taking auspices. This duty devolved upon the supreme magistrate alone. . . . In an army this power belonged exclusively to the commander-in-chief; and hence all achievements were said to be performed under his auspices, even although he were not present. . . . The objects observed in taking these auspices were birds, the class of animals from which the word is derived ('Auspicium ab ave spicienda'). Of these, some were believed to give indications by their flight . . . others by their notes or cries . . . while a third class consisted of chickens ('pulli') kept in cages. When it was desired to obtain an omen from these last, food was placed before them, and the manner in which they comported themselves was closely watched. . . . The manner of taking the auspices previous to the Comitia was as follows:—The magistrate who was to preside at the assembly arose immediately after midnight on the day for which it had been summoned, and called upon an augur to assist him. . . . With his aid a region of the sky and

a space of ground, within which the auspices were observed, were marked out by the divining staff ('lituus') of the augur. . . . This operation was performed with the greatest care. . . . In making the necessary observations, the president was guided entirely by the augur, who reported to him the result."—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Rom. Antiq.*, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 6, ch. 13. —See, also, AUGUR.

**AUSTERLITZ, Battle of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1805 (MARCH—DECEMBER).

**AUSTIN, Stephen F., and the settlement of Texas.** See TEXAS: A. D. 1810-1835.

**AUSTIN CANONS, OR CANONS OF ST. AUGUSTINE.**—

"About the middle of the 11th century an attempt had been made to redress the balance between the regular and secular clergy, and restore to the latter the influence and consideration in spiritual matters which they had, partly by their own fault, already to a great extent lost. Some earnest and thoughtful spirits, distressed at once by the abuse of monastic privileges and by the general decay of ecclesiastical order, sought to effect a reform by the establishment of a stricter and better organized discipline in those cathedral and other churches which were served by colleges of secular priests. . . . Towards the beginning of the twelfth century the attempts at canonical reform issued in the form of what was virtually a new religious order, that of the Augustinians, or Canons Regular of the order of S. Augustine. Like the monks and unlike the secular canons, from whom they were carefully distinguished, they had not only their table and dwelling but all things in common, and were bound by a vow to the observance of their rule, grounded upon a passage in one of the letters of that great father of the Latin Church from whom they took their name. Their scheme was a compromise between the old-fashioned system of canons and that of the monastic confraternities; but a compromise leaning strongly towards the monastic side. . . . The Austin canons, as they were commonly called, made their way across the channel in Henry's reign."—K. Norgate, *England under the Angevin Kings*, v. 1, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: E. L. Cutts, *Scenes and Characters of the Middle Ages*, ch. 3.

**AUSTRALIA: A. D. 1601-1800.**—**Discovery and early exploration.**—The founding of the penal colonies at Sydney and Norfolk Island.—"Australia has had no Columbus. It is even doubtful if the first navigators who reached her shores set out with any idea of discovering a great south land. At all events, it would seem, their achievements were so little esteemed by themselves and their countrymen that no means were taken to preserve their names in connexion with their discoveries. Holland long had the credit of bringing to light the existence of that island-continent, which until recent years was best known by her name. In 1661, however, Mr. Major, to whom we are indebted for more recent research upon the subject, produced evidence which appeared to demonstrate that the Portuguese had reached the shores of Australia in 1601, five years before the Dutch yacht *Duyphen*, or *Dove*,—the earliest vessel whose name has been handed down,—sighted, about March, 1606, what is believed to have been the coast near Cape York. Mr. Major,

in a learned paper read before the Society of Antiquaries in 1872, indicated the probability that the first discovery was made 'in or before the year 1531.' The dates of two of the six maps from which Mr. Major derives his information are 1531 and 1542. The latter clearly indicates Australia, which is called *Jave la Grande*. New Zealand is also marked."—F. P. Labilliere, *Early Hist. of the Colony of Victoria*, ch. 1.—In 1606, De Quiros, a Spanish navigator, sailing from Peru, across the Pacific, reached a shore which stretched so far that he took it to be a continent. "He called the place 'Tierra Australis de Espritu Santo,' that is 'Southern Land of the Holy Spirit.' It is now known that this was not really a continent, but merely one of the New Hebrides Islands, and more than a thousand miles away from the mainland. . . . In after years, the name he had invented was divided into two parts; the island he had really discovered being called *Espritu Santo*, while the continent he thought he had discovered was called *Terra Australis*. This last name was shortened by another discoverer—Flinders—to the present term *Australia*." After the visit to the Australian coast of the small Dutch ship, the "*Dove*," it was touched, during the next twenty years, by a number of vessels of the same nationality. "In 1622 a Dutch ship, the '*Leeuwin*,' or '*Lioness*,' sailed along the southern coast, and its name was given to the southwest cape of Australia. . . . In 1628 General Carpenter sailed completely round the large Gulf to the north, which has taken its name from this circumstance. Thus, by degrees, all the northern and western, together with part of the southern shores, came to be roughly explored, and the Dutch even had some idea of colonizing this continent. . . . During the next fourteen years we hear no more of voyages to Australia; but in 1642 Antony Van Diemen, the Governor of the Dutch possessions in the East Indies, sent out his friend Abel Jansen Tasman, with two ships, to make discoveries in the South Seas." Tasman discovered the island which he called Van Diemen's Land, but which has since been named in his own honor—Tasmania. "This he did not know to be an island; he drew it on his maps as if it were a peninsula belonging to the mainland of Australia." In 1699, the famous buccancer, William Dampier, was given the command of a vessel sent out to the southern seas, and he explored about 900 miles of the north-western coast of Australia; but the description which he gave of the country did not encourage the adventurous to seek fortune in it. "We hear of no further explorations in this part of the world until nearly a century after; and, even then, no one thought of sending out ships specially for the purpose. But in the year 1770 a series of important discoveries were indirectly brought about. The Royal Society of London, calculating that the planet Venus would cross the disc of the sun in 1769, persuaded the English Government to send out an expedition to the Pacific Ocean for the purpose of making observations on this event which would enable astronomers to calculate the distance of the earth from the sun. A small vessel, the '*Endeavour*,' was chosen; astronomers with their instruments embarked, and the whole placed under the charge of" the renowned sailor, Captain James Cook. The astronomical purposes of the expedition

were satisfactorily accomplished at Otahelie, and Captain Cook then proceeded to an exploration of the shores of New Zealand and Australia. Having entered a fine bay on the south-eastern coast of Australia, "he examined the country for a few miles inland, and two of his scientific friends—Sir Joseph Banks and Dr. Solander—made splendid collections of botanical specimens. From this circumstance the place was called Botany Bay, and its two head-lands received the names of Cape Banks and Cape Solander. It was here that Captain Cook . . . took possession of the country on behalf of His Britannic Majesty, giving it the name 'New South Wales,' on account of the resemblance of its coasts to the southern shores of Wales. Shortly after they had set sail from Botany Bay they observed a small opening in the land, but Cook did not stay to examine it, merely marking it on his chart as Port Jackson, in honour of his friend Sir George Jackson. . . . The reports brought home by Captain Cook completely changed the beliefs current in those days with regard to Australia. . . . It so happened that, shortly after Cook's return, the English nation had to deal with a great difficulty in regard to its criminal population. In 1776 the United States declared their independence, and the English then found they could no longer send their convicts over to Virginia, as they had formerly done. In a short time the goals of England were crowded with felons. It became necessary to select a new place of transportation; and, just as this difficulty arose, Captain Cook's voyages called attention to a land in every way suited for such a purpose, both by reason of its fertility and of its great distance. Viscount Sydney, therefore, determined to send out a party to Botany Bay, in order to found a convict settlement there; and in May, 1787, a fleet was ready to sail." After a voyage of eight months the fleet arrived at Botany Bay, in January, 1788. The waters of the Bay were found to be too shallow for a proper harbour, and Captain Phillip, the appointed Governor of the settlement, set out, with three boats, to search for something better. "As he passed along the coast he turned to examine the opening which Captain Cook had called Port Jackson, and soon found himself in a winding channel of water, with great cliffs frowning overhead. All at once a magnificent prospect opened on his eyes. A harbour, which is, perhaps, the most beautiful and perfect in the world, stretched before him far to the west, till it was lost on the distant horizon. It seemed a vast maze of winding waters, dotted here and there with lovely islets. . . . Captain Phillip selected, as the place most suitable to the settlement, a small inlet, which, in honour of the Minister of State, he called Sydney Cove. It was so deep as to allow vessels to approach within a yard or two of the shore." Great difficulties and sufferings attended the founding of the penal settlement, and many died of actual starvation as well as of disease; but in twelve years the population had risen to between 6,000 and 7,000 persons. Meantime a branch colony had been established on Norfolk Island. In 1792 Governor Phillip, broken in health, had resigned, and in 1795 he had been succeeded by Governor Hunter. "When Governor Hunter arrived, in 1795, he brought with him, on board his ship, the 'Reliance,' a young surgeon, George Bass,

and a midshipman called Matthew Flinders. They were young men of the most admirable character. . . . Within a month after their arrival they purchased a small boat about eight feet in length, which they christened the 'Tom Thumb.' Its crew consisted of themselves and a boy to assist." In this small craft they began a survey of the coast, usefully charting many miles of it. Soon afterwards, George Bass, in an open whale-boat, pursued his explorations southwards, to the region now called Victoria, and through the straits which bear his name, thus discovering the fact that Van Diemen's Land, or Tasmania, is an island, not a peninsula. In 1798, Bass and Flinders, again associated and furnished with a small sloop, sailed round and surveyed the entire coast of Van Diemen's Land. Bass now went to South America and there disappeared. Flinders was commissioned by the British Government in 1800 to make an extensive survey of the Australian coasts, and did so. Returning to England with his maps, he was taken prisoner on the way by the French and held in captivity for six years, while the fruits of his labor were stolen. He died a few years after being released.—A. and G. Sutherland, *Hist. of Australia*, ch. 1-3.

ALSO IN: G. W. Rusden, *Hist. of Australia*, ch. 1-3 (e. 1).

**A. D. 1800-1840.—Beginning of the Prosperity of New South Wales.—Introduction of sheep-farming.—The founding of Victoria and South Australia.**—"For twenty years and more no one at home gave a thought to New South Wales, or 'Botany Bay,' as it was still erroneously called, unless in vague horror and compassion for the poor creatures who lived there in exile and starvation. The only civilizing element in the place was the presence of a devoted clergyman named Johnson, who had voluntarily accompanied the first batch of convicts. . . . Colonel Lachlan Macquarie entered on the office of governor in 1810, and ruled the settlement for twelve years. His administration was the first turning point in its history. . . . Macquarie saw that the best and cheapest way of ruling the convicts was to make them freemen as soon as possible. Before his time, the governors had looked on the convicts as slaves, to be worked for the profit of the government and of the free-settlers. Macquarie did all he could to elevate the class of emancipists, and to encourage the convicts to persevere in sober industry in the hope of one day acquiring a respectable position. He began to discontinue the government farms, and to employ the convicts in road-making, so as to extend the colony in all directions. When he came to Sydney, the country more than a day's ride from the town was quite unknown. The growth of the settlement was stopped on the west by a range called the Blue Mountains, which before his time no one had succeeded in crossing. But in 1813, there came a drought upon the colony; the cattle, on which everything depended, were unable to find food. Macquarie surmised that there must be plenty of pasture on the plains above the Blue Mountains; he sent an exploring party, telling them that a pass must be discovered. In a few months, not only was this task accomplished, and the vast and fertile pastures of Bathurst reached, but a road 130 miles long was made, connecting them with Sydney. The Lachlan and Macquarie rivers were

traced out to the west of the Blue Mountains. Besides this, coal was found at the mouth of the Hunter river, and the settlement at Newcastle formed. . . . When it became known that the penal settlement was gradually becoming a free colony, and that Sydney and its population were rapidly changing their character, English and Scotch people soon bethought them of emigrating to the new country. Macquarie returned home in 1822, leaving New South Wales four times as populous, and twenty times as large as when he went out, and many years in advance of what it might have been under a less able and energetic governor. The discovery of the fine pastures beyond the Blue Mountains settled the destiny of the colony. The settlers came up thither with their flocks long before Macquarie's road was finished; and it turned out that the downs of Australia were the best sheep-walks in the world. The sheep thrives better there, and produces finer and more abundant wool, than anywhere else. John Macarthur, a lieutenant in the New South Wales corps, had spent several years in studying the effect of the Australian climate upon the sheep; and he rightly surmised that the staple of the colony would be its fine wool. In 1803, he went to England and procured some pure Spanish merino sheep from the flock of George III. . . . The Privy Council listened to his wool projects, and he received a large grant of land. Macarthur had found out the true way to Australian prosperity. When the great upland pastures were discovered, the merino breed was well established in the colony; and the sheep-owners, without waiting for grants, spread with their flocks over immense tracts of country. This was the beginning of what is called squatting. The squatters afterwards paid a quit-rent to the government and thus got their runs, as they called the great districts where they pastured their flocks, to a certain extent secured to them. . . . Hundreds upon hundreds of square miles of the great Australian downs were now explored and stocked with sheep for the English wool-market. . . . It was in the time of Macquarie's successor, Sir Thomas Brisbane, that the prospects of New South Wales became generally known in England. Free emigrants, each bringing more or less capital with him, now poured in; and the demand for labour became enormous. At first the penal settlements were renewed as depots for the supply of labour, and it was even proposed that the convicts should be sold by auction on their arrival; but in the end the influx of free labourers entirely altered the question. In Brisbane's time, and that of his successor, Sir Ralph Darling, wages fell and work became scarce in England; and English working men now turned their attention to Australia. Hitherto the people had been either convicts or free settlers of more or less wealth, and between these classes there was great bitterness of feeling, each, naturally enough, thinking that the colony existed for their own exclusive benefit. The free labourers who now poured in greatly contributed in course of time to fusing the population into one. In Brisbane's time, trial by jury and a free press were introduced. The finest pastures in Australia, the Darling Downs near Moreton Bay, were discovered and settled [1825]. The rivers which pour into Moreton Bay were explored; one of them was named the Brisbane, and a few miles from its mouth the town of the same name

was founded. Brisbane is now the capital of the colony of Queensland; and other explorations in his time led to the foundation of a second independent colony. The Macquarie was traced beyond the marshes, in which it was supposed to lose itself, and named the Darling; and the Murray river was discovered [1820]. The tracing out of the Murray river by the adventurous traveller Sturt, led to a colony on the site which he named South Australia. In Darling's time, the Swan River Colony, now called Western Australia, was commenced. Darling . . . was the first to sell the land at a small fixed price, on the system adopted in America. . . . Darling returned to England in 1831; and the six-years administration of his successor, Sir Richard Bourke, marks a fresh turning-point in Australian history. In his time the colony threw off two great offshoots, Port Phillip, on which now stands the great city of Melbourne, had been discovered in 1802, and in the next year the government sent thither a convict colony. This did not prosper, and this fine site was neglected for thirty years. When the sudden rise of New South Wales began, the squatters began to settle to the west and north of Port Phillip; and the government at once sent an exploring party, who reported most favourably of the country around. In 1836, Governor Bourke founded a settlement in this new land, which had been called, from its rich promise, Australia Felix; and under his directions the site of a capital was laid out, to be called Melbourne, in honour of the English Prime Minister. This was in 1837, so that the beginning of the colony corresponds nearly with that of Queen Victoria's reign; a circumstance which afterwards led to its being named Victoria. Further west still, a second new colony arose about this time on the site discovered by Sturt in 1829. This was called South Australia, and the first governor arrived there at the end of the year 1836. The intended capital was named Adelaide, in honour of the Queen of William IV. Both the new colonies were commenced on a new system, called from its inventor the Wakefield system, but the founders of South Australia were able to carry it out most effectually, because they were quite independent of the experience and the prejudices of the Sydney government. Mr. Wakefield was an ingenious man and a clever writer. . . . His notion was that the new colonies ought to be made 'fairly to represent English society.' His plan was to arrest the strong democratic tendencies of the new community, and to reproduce in Australia the strong distinction of classes which was found in England. He wanted the land sold as dear as possible, so that labourers might not become land-owners; and the produce of the land was to be applied in tempting labourers to emigrate with the prospect of better wages than they got at home. A Company was easily formed to carry out these ideas in South Australia. . . . Like the settlement of Carolina as framed by Locke and Somers, it was really a plan for getting the advantages of the colony into the hands of the non-labouring classes; and by the natural laws of political economy, it failed everywhere. Adelaide became the scene of an Australian 'bubble.' The land-jobbers and money-lenders made fortunes; but the people who emigrated, mostly belonging to the middle and upper

classes, found the scheme to be a delusion. Land rapidly rose in value, and as rapidly sank; and lots for which the emigrants had paid high prices became almost worthless. The labourers emigrated elsewhere, and so did those of the capitalists who had anything left. . . . The depression of South Australia, however, was but temporary. It contains the best corn land in the whole island; and hence it of course soon became the chief source of the food supply of the neighbouring colonies, besides exporting large quantities of corn to England. It contains rich mines of copper, and produces large quantities of wool."—E. J. Phyne, *Hist. of European Colonies*, ch. 12.

ALSO IN: G. W. Rusden, *Hist. of Australia*, v. 1-2.

**A. D. 1839-1855.—Progress of the Port Phillip District.—Its Separation from New South Wales and erection into the colony of Victoria.—Discovery of Gold.—Constitutional organization of the colony.**—In 1839 the population of Port Phillip amounted to nearly 6,000, and was being rapidly augmented from without. The sheep in the district exceeded half a million, and of cattle and horses the numbers were in proportion equally large. The place was daily growing in importance. The Home Government therefore decided to send an officer, with the title of Superintendent, to take charge of the district, but to act under the Governor of New South Wales. Charles Joseph La Trobe, Esq., was appointed to this office. . . . He arrived at Melbourne on the 30th September, 1839. Soon after this all classes of the new community appear to have become affected by a mania for speculation. . . . As is always the case when speculation takes the place of steady industry, the necessities of life became fabulously dear. Of money there was but little, in consideration of the amount of business done, and large transactions were effected by means of paper and credit. From highest to lowest, all lived extravagantly. . . . Such a state of things could not last forever. In 1842, by which time the population had increased to 24,000, the crash came. . . . From this depression the colony slowly recovered, and a sounder business system took the place of the speculative one. . . . All this time, however, the colony was a dependency of New South Wales, and a strong feeling had gained ground that it suffered in consequence. . . . A cry was raised for separation. The demand was, as a matter of course, resisted by New South Wales, but as the agitation was carried on with increased activity, it was at last yielded to by the Home authorities. The vessel bearing the intelligence arrived on the 11th November, 1850. The news soon spread, and great was the satisfaction of the colonists. Rejoicings were kept up in Melbourne for five consecutive days. . . . Before, however, the separation could be legally accomplished, it was necessary that an Act should be passed in New South Wales to settle details. . . . The requisite forms were at length given effect to, and, on the 1st July, 1851, a day which has ever since been scrupulously observed as a public holiday, it was proclaimed that the Port Phillip district of New South Wales had been erected into a separate colony to be called Victoria, after the name of Her Most Gracious Majesty. At the same time the Superintendent, Mr. C. J. La Trobe, was raised to the rank of Lieutenant-

Governor. At the commencement of the year of separation the population of Port Phillip numbered 70,000, the sheep 6,000,000, the cattle 380,000. . . . In a little more than a month after the establishment of Victoria as an independent colony, it became generally known that rich deposits of gold existed within its borders. . . . The discovery of gold . . . in New South Wales, by Hargreaves, in February, 1851, caused numbers to emigrate to that colony. This being considered detrimental to the interests of Victoria, a public meeting was held in Melbourne on the 9th of June, at which a 'gold-discovery committee' was appointed, which was authorized to offer rewards to any that should discover gold in remunerative quantities within the colony. The colonists were already on the alert. At the time this meeting was held, several parties were out searching for, and some had already found gold. The precious metal was first discovered at Clunes, then in the Yarra ranges at Anderson's Creek soon after at Buninyong and Ballarat, shortly afterwards at Mount Alexander, and eventually at Bendigo. The deposits were found to be richer and to extend over a wider area than any which had been discovered in New South Wales. Their fame soon spread to the adjacent colonies, and thousands hastened to the spot. . . . When the news reached home, crowds of emigrants from the United Kingdom hurried to our shores. Inhabitants of other European countries quickly joined in the rush. Americans from the Atlantic States were not long in following. Stalwart Californians left their own gold-yielding rocks and placers to try their fortunes at the Southern Eldorado. Last of all, swarms of Chinese arrived, eager to take in the general scramble for wealth. . . . The important position which the Australian colonies had obtained in consequence of the discovery of gold, and the influx of population consequent thereon, was the occasion of the Imperial Government determining in the latter end of 1853 that each colony should be invited to frame such a Constitution for its government as its representatives might deem best suited to its own peculiar circumstances. The Constitution framed in Victoria, and afterwards approved by the British Parliament, was avowedly based upon that of the United Kingdom. It provided for the establishment of two Houses of Legislature, with power to make laws, subject to the assent of the Crown as represented generally by the Governor of the colony; the Legislative Council, or Upper House, to consist of 30, and the Legislative Assembly, or Lower House, to consist of 60 members. Members of both Houses to be elective and to possess property qualifications. Electors of both Houses to possess either property or professional qualifications [the property qualification of members and electors of the Lower House has since been abolished]. . . . The Upper House not to be dissolved, but five members to retire every two years, and to be eligible for re-election. The Lower House to be dissolved every five years [since reduced to three], or oftener, at the discretion of the Governor. Certain officers of the Government, four at least of whom should have seats in Parliament, to be deemed 'Responsible Ministers.' . . . This Constitution was proclaimed in Victoria on the 23d November, 1853."—H. H. Hayter, *Notes on the Colony of Victoria*, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: F. P. Lablilliere, *Early Hist. of the Colony of Victoria*, v. 2.—W. Westgarth, *First Twenty Years of the Colony of Victoria*.

**A. D. 1859.—Separation of the Moreton Bay District from New South Wales.—Its erection into the colony of Queensland.**—"Until December, 1859, the north-west portion of the Fifth Continent was known as the Moreton Bay district, and belonged to the colony of New South Wales; but at that date it had grown so large that it was erected into a separate and independent colony, under the name of Queensland. It lies between lat. 10° 43' S. and 29° S., and long. 138° and 153° E., bounded on the north by Torres Straits; on the north-east by the Coral Sea; on the east by the South Pacific; on the south by New South Wales and South Australia; on the west by South Australia and the Northern Territory; and on the north-west by the Gulf of Carpentaria. It covers an area . . . twenty times as large as Ireland, twenty-three times as large as Scotland, and eleven times the extent of England. . . . Numerous good harbours are found, many of which form the outlets of navigable rivers. The principal of these [is] Moreton Bay, at the head of which stands Brisbane, the capital of the colony. . . . The mineral wealth of Queensland is very great, and every year sees it more fully developed. . . . Until the year 1867, when the Gympie field was discovered, gold mining as an industry was hardly known."—C. II. Eden, *The Fifth Continent*, ch. 10.

**A. D. 1885-1892.—Proposed Federation of the Colonies.**—"It has been a common saying in Australia that our fellow countrymen in that part of the world did not recognise the term 'Australian;' each recognised only his own colony and the empire. But the advocates of combination for certain common purposes achieved a great step forward in the formation of a 'Federal Council' in 1885. It was to be only a 'Council,' its decisions having no force over any colony unless accepted afterwards by the colonial Legislature. Victoria, Queensland, Tasmania, and West Australia joined, New South Wales, South Australia, and New Zealand standing out, and, so constituted, it met twice. The results of the deliberations were not unsatisfactory, and the opinion that the move was in the right direction rapidly grew. In February of 1890 a Federation Conference, not private but representative of the different Governments, was called at Melbourne. It adopted an address to the Queen declaring the opinion of the conference to be that the best interests of the Australian colonies require the early formation of a union under the Crown into one Government, both legislative and executive. Events proceed quickly in Colonial History. In the course of 1890 the hesitation of New South Wales was finally overcome; powerful factors being the weakening of the Free Trade position at the election of 1890, the report of General Edwards on the Defences, and the difficulties about Chinese immigration. A Convention accordingly assembled at Sydney in March, 1891, which agreed upon a Constitution to be recommended to the several Colonies."—A. Caldecott, *English Colonization and Empire*, ch. 7, sect. 2.—"On Monday, March 2nd, 1891, the National Australasian Convention met at the Parliament House, Sydney, New South Wales, and was attended by seven representatives from each Colony, except New Zealand, which only sent

three. Sir Henry Parkes (New South Wales) was elected President of the Convention, and Sir Samuel Griffith (Queensland), Vice-President. A series of resolutions, moved by Sir Henry Parkes, occupied the attention of the Convention for several days. These resolutions set forth the principles upon which the Federal Government should be established, which were to the effect that the powers and privileges of existing Colonies should be kept intact, except in cases where surrender would be necessary in order to form a Federal Government; that intercolonial trade and intercourse should be free; that power to impose Customs duties should rest with the Federal Government and Parliament; and that the naval and military defence of Australia should be entrusted to the Federal Forces under one command. The resolutions then went on to approve of a Federal Constitution which should establish a Federal Parliament to consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives; that a Judiciary, to consist of a Federal Supreme Court, to be a High Court of Appeal for Australia, should be established; and that a Federal Executive, consisting of a Governor-General, with responsible advisers, should be constituted. These resolutions were discussed at great length, and eventually were adopted. The resolutions were then referred to three Committees chosen from the delegates, one to consider Constitutional Machinery and the distribution of powers and functions; one to deal with matters relating to Finance, Taxation, and Trade Regulations; and the other to consider the question of the establishment of a Federal Judiciary. A draft Bill, to constitute the Commonwealth of Australia, was brought up by the first mentioned of these Committees, and after full consideration was adopted by the Convention, and it was agreed that the Bill should be presented to each of the Australian Parliaments for approval and adoption. On Thursday, April 9th, the Convention closed its proceedings. The Bill to provide for the Federation of the Australasian colonies entitled 'A Bill to constitute a Commonwealth of Australia,' which was drafted by the National Australasian Convention, has been introduced into the Parliaments of most of the colonies of the group, and is still (October, 1892), under consideration. In Victoria it has passed the Lower House with some amendments."—*Statesman's Year-book*, 1893, p. 308.

**A. D. 1890.—New South Wales and Victoria.**—"New South Wales bears to Victoria a certain statistical resemblance. The two colonies have [1890] about the same population, and, roughly speaking, about the same revenues, expenditure, debt and trade. In each, a great capital collects in one neighbourhood more than a third of the total population. . . . But . . . considerable differences lie behind and are likely to develop in the future. New South Wales, in the opinion of her enemies, is less enterprising than Victoria, and has less of the go-ahead spirit which distinguishes the Melbourne people. On the other hand she possesses a larger territory, abundant supplies of coal, and will probably, in consequence, a greater future. Although New South Wales is three and a half times as large as Victoria, and has the area of the German Empire and Italy combined, she is of course much smaller than the three other but as yet less important colonies of the Australian continent [namely

Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia]. As the country was in a large degree settled by assisted emigrants, of whom something like half altogether have been Irish, while the English section was largely composed of Chartists, . . . the legislation of New South Wales has naturally shown signs of its origin. Manhood suffrage was carried in 1858; the abolition of primogeniture in 1862; safe and easy transfer of land through the machinery of the Torrens Act in the same year; and also the abolition of state aid to religion. A public system of education was introduced, with other measures of democratic legislation. . . . Public education, which in Victoria is free, is still paid for by fees in New South Wales, though children going to or returning from school are allowed to travel free by railway. In general it may be said that New South Wales legislation in recent times has not been so bold as the legislation of Victoria. . . . The land of New South Wales has to a large extent come into the hands of wealthy persons who are becoming a territorial aristocracy. This has been the effect firstly of grants and of squatting legislation, then of the perversion of the Act of 1861 [for 'Free Selection before Survey'] to the use of those against whom it had been aimed, and finally of natural causes — soil, climate and the lack of water. . . . The traces of the convict element in New South Wales have become very slight in the national character. The prevailing cheerfulness, running into fickleness and frivolity, with a great deal more vivacity than exists in England, does not suggest in the least the intermixture of convict blood. It is a natural creation of the climate, and of the full and varied life led by colonists in a young country. . . . A population of an excellent type has swallowed up not only the convict element, but also the unstable and thriftless element shipped by friends in Britain to Sydney or to Melbourne. The ne'er-do-weels were either somewhat above the average in brains, as was often the case with those who recovered themselves and started life afresh, or people who drank themselves to death and disappeared and left no descendants. The convicts were also of various classes; some of them were men in whom crime was the outcome of restless energy, as, for instance, in many of those transported for treason and for manslaughter; while some were people of average morality ruined through companions, wives, or sudden temptation, and some persons of an essentially depraved and criminal life. The better classes of convicts, in a new country, away from their old companions and old temptations, turned over a new leaf, and their abilities and their strong vitality, which in some cases had wrought their ruin in the old world, found healthful scope in subduing to man a new one. Crime in their cases was an accident, and would not be transmitted to the children they left behind them. On the other hand, the genuine criminal, and also the drunken ne'er-do-weels, left no children. Drink and vice among the 'assigned servants' class of convicts, and an absence of all facilities for marriage, worked them off the face of the earth, and those who had not been killed before the gold discovery generally drank themselves to death upon the diggings."—Sir C. W. Dilke, *Problems of Greater Britain*, pt. 2, ch. 2.

**AUSTRASIA AND NEUSTRIA, OR NEUSTRASIA.**—"It is conjectured by Luden, with great probability, that the Ripuarians were originally called the 'Eastern' people to distinguish them from the Salian Franks who lived to the West. But when the old home of the conquerors on the right bank of the Rhine was united with their new settlements in Gaul, the latter, as it would seem, were called Neustria or Neustrasia (New Lands); while the term Austrasia came to denote the original seats of the Franks, on what we now call the German bank of the Rhine. The most important difference between them (a difference so great as to lead to their permanent separation into the kingdoms of France and Germany by the treaty of Verdun) was this: that in Neustria the Frankish element was quickly absorbed by the mass of Gallo-Romanism by which it was surrounded; while in Austrasia, which included the ancient seats of the Frankish conquerors, the German element was wholly predominant. The import of the word Austrasia (Austria, Austrirancia) is very fluctuating. In its widest sense it was used to denote all the countries incorporated into the Frankish Empire, or even held in subjection to it, in which the German language and population prevailed; in this acceptation it included therefore the territory of the Alemanni, Bavarians, Thuringians, and even that of the Saxons and Frises. In its more common and proper sense it meant that part of the territory of the Franks themselves which was not included in Neustria. It was subdivided into Upper Austrasia on the Moselle, and Lower Austrasia on the Rhine and Meuse. Neustria (or, in the fulness of the monkish Latinity, Neustrasia) was bounded on the north by the ocean, on the south by the Loire, and on the southwest [southeast?] towards Burgundy by a line which, beginning below Gen on the Loire, ran through the rivers Loing and Yonne, not far from their sources, and passing north of Auxerre and south of Troyes, joined the river Aube above Arcis."—W. C. Perry, *The Franks*, ch. 3.—"The northeastern part of Gaul, along the Rhine, together with a slice of ancient Germany, was already distinguished, as we have seen, by the name of the Eastern Kingdom, or Oster-rike, Latinized into Austrasia. It embraced the region first occupied by the Ripuarian Franks, and where they still lived the most compactly and in the greatest number. . . . This was, in the estimation of the Franks, the kingdom by eminence, while the rest of the north of Gaul was simply not it—'ne-oster-rike,' or Neustria. A line drawn from the mouth of the Scheldt to Cambrai, and thence across the Marne at Chateau-Thierry to the Aube of Bar-sur-Aube, would have separated the one from the other, Neustria comprising all the northwest of Gaul, between the Loire and the ocean, with the exception of Brittany. This had been the first possession of the Salian Franks in Gaul. . . . To such an extent had they been absorbed and influenced by the Roman elements of the population, that the Austrasians scarcely considered them Franks, while they, in their turn, regarded the Austrasians as the merest untutored barbarians."—P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul*, bk. 3, ch. 13, with note.

ALSO IN: E. A. Freeman, *Hist. Geog. of Europe*, ch. 5, sect. 5.—See, also, FRANKS (MEROVINGIAN EMPIRE): A. D. 511-752.



## AUSTRIA.



**The Name.**—"The name of Austria, Oesterreich—Ostrich as our forefathers wrote it—is, naturally enough, a common name for the eastern part of any kingdom. The Frankish kingdom of the Merwings had its Austria; the Italian kingdom of the Lombards had its Austria also. We are half inclined to wonder that the name was never given in our own island either to Essex or to East-Anglia. But, while the other Austrias have passed away, the Oesterreich, the Austria, the Eastern mark, of the German kingdom, its defence against the Magyar invader, has lived on to our own times. It has not only lived on, but it has become one of the chief European powers. And it has become so by a process to which it would be hard to find a parallel."—E. A. Freeman, *The Historical Geography of Europe*, v. 1, ch. 8, p. 305.

**The birthplace.**—"On the disputed frontier, in the zone of perpetual conflict, were formed and developed the two states which, in turn, were to dominate over Germany, namely, Austria and Prussia. Both were born in the midst of the enemy. The cradle of Austria was the Eastern march, established by Charlemagne on the Danube, beyond Bavaria, at the very gate through which have passed so many invaders from the Orient. . . . The cradle of Prussia was the march of Brandenburg, between the Elbe and the Oder, in the region of the exterminated Slavs."—E. Lavisse, *General View of the Political History of Europe*, ch. 3, sect. 13.

**The Singularity of Austrian history.**—"A power which is not a national power."—"It is by no means an easy task to tell the story of the various lands which have at different times come under the dominion of Austrian princes, the story of each land by itself, and the story of them all in relation to the common power. A continuous narrative is impossible. . . . Much mischief has been done by one small fashion of modern speech. It has within my memory become usual to personify nations and powers on the smallest occasions in a way which was formerly done only in language more or less solemn, rhetorical or poetical. We now talk every moment of England, France, Germany, Russia, Italy, as if they were persons. And as long as it is only England, France, Germany, Russia, or Italy of which we talk in this way, no practical harm is done; the thing is a mere question of style. For those are all national powers. . . . But when we go on to talk in this way of 'Austria,' of 'Turkey,' direct harm is done; thought is confused, and facts are misrepresented. . . . I have seen the words 'Austrian national honour.' I have come across people who believed that 'Austria' was one land inhabited by 'Austrians,' and that 'Austrians' spoke the 'Austrian' language. All such phrases are misapplied. It is to be presumed that in all of them 'Austria' means something more than the true Austria, the archduchy; what is commonly meant by them is the whole dominions of the sovereign of Austria. People fancy that the inhabitants of those dominions have a common being, a common interest, like that of the people of England, France, or Italy. . . . There is no Austrian language, no Austrian nation; therefore there can be no such thing as 'Austrian national honour.' Nor can there be an 'Austrian policy' in

the same sense in which there is an English or a French policy, that is, a policy in which the English or French government carries out the will of the English or French nation. . . . Such phrases as 'Austrian interests,' 'Austrian policy,' and the like, do not mean the interests or the policy of any land or nation at all. They simply mean the interests and policy of a particular ruling family, which may often be the same as the interests and wishes of particular parts of their dominions, but which can never represent any common interest or common wish on the part of the whole. . . . We must ever remember that the dominions of the House of Austria are simply a collection of kingdoms, duchies, etc., brought together by various accidental causes, but which have nothing really in common, no common speech, no common feeling, no common interest. In one case only, that of the Magyars in Hungary, does the House of Austria rule over a whole nation; the other kingdoms, duchies, etc., are only parts of nations, having no tie to one another, but having the closest ties to other parts of their several nations which lie close to them, but which are under other governments. The only bond among them all is that a series of marriages, wars, treaties, and so forth, have given them a common sovereign. The same person is king of Hungary, Archduke of Austria, Count of Tyrol, Lord of Trieste, and a hundred other things. That is all. . . . The growth and the abiding dominion of the House of Austria is one of the most remarkable phenomena in European history. Powers of the same kind have arisen twice before; but in both cases they were very short-lived, while the power of the House of Austria has lasted for several centuries. The power of the House of Anjou in the twelfth century, the power of the House of Burgundy in the fifteenth century, were powers of exactly the same kind. They too were collections of scraps, with no natural connexion, brought together by the accidents of warfare, marriage, or diplomacy. Now why is it that both these powers broke in pieces almost at once, after the reigns of two princes in each case, while the power of the House of Austria has lasted so long? Two causes suggest themselves. One is the long connexion between the House of Austria and the Roman Empire and kingdom of Germany. So many Austrian princes were elected Emperors as to make the Austrian House seem something great and imperial in itself. I believe that this cause has done a good deal towards the result; but I believe that another cause has done yet more. This is that, though the Austrian power is not a national power, there is, as has been already noticed, a nation within it. While it contains only scraps of other nations, it contains the whole of the Magyar nation. It thus gets something of the strength of a national power. . . . The kingdom of Hungary is an ancient kingdom, with known boundaries which have changed singularly little for several centuries; and its connexion with the archduchy of Austria and the kingdom of Bohemia is now of long standing. Anything beyond this is modern and shifting. The so-called 'empire of Austria' dates only from the year 1804. This is one of the simplest matters in the world, but one which is constantly forgotten. . . . A smaller point on which con-






**HABSBURG POSSESSIONS FROM 1690 TO 1803.**  
 SHOWING GAINS AND LOSSES DURING THIS PERIOD.


POSSESSIONS PRIOR TO 1690  
 ACQUISITIONS IN 1699  
 ACQUISITIONS AFTER 1699 TO 1803.  
 LOSSES DURING THIS PERIOD SHOWN BY THE BORDER COLORS



**HABSBURG POSSESSIONS IN 1810.**  
 SHOWING CHANGES DURING THE PRESENT CENTURY.

POSSESSIONS IN 1810  
 RECOVERED 1814-1815  
 ACQUIRED AFTER 1815  
 LOSSES DURING THIS PERIOD SHOWN BY THE BORDER COLORS.





fusion also prevails is this. All the members of the House of Austria are commonly spoken of as archdukes and archduchesses. I feel sure that many people, if asked the meaning of the word archduke, would say that it was the title of the children of the 'Emperor of Austria,' as grandduke is used in Russia, and prince in most countries. In truth, archduke is the title of the sovereign of Austria. He has not given it up; for he calls himself Archduke of Austria still, though he calls himself 'Emperor of Austria' as well. But by German custom, the children of a duke or count are all called dukes and counts for ever and ever. In this way the Prince of Wales is called 'Duke of Saxony,' and in the same way all the children of an Archduke of Austria are archdukes and archduchesses. Formally and historically then, the taking of an hereditary imperial title by the Archduke of Austria in 1804, and the keeping of it after, the

growth, ages in which the idea of right, as embodied in law, was the leading idea of statesmen, and the idea of rights justified or justifiable by the letter of law, was a profound influence with politician . . . The house of Austria . . . lays thus the foundation of that empire which is to be one of the great forces of the next age; not by fraud, not by violence, but here by a politic marriage, here by a well advocated inheritance, here by a claim on an imperial fief forfeited or escheated; honestly where the letter of the law is in her favour, by chicanery it may be here and there, but that a chicanery that wears a specious garb of right. The imperial idea was but a small influence compared with the superstructure of right, inheritance, and suzerainty, that legal instincts and a general acquiescence in legal forms had raised upon it."—W. Stubbs, *Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Medieval and Modern History*, pp. 209-215.



prince who took it had ceased in 1800 to be King of Germany and Roman Emperor-elect, was a sheer and shameless imposture. But it is an imposture which has thoroughly well served its ends."—E. A. Freeman, *Preface to Leger's History of Austro-Hungary*.—"Medieval History is a history of rights and wrongs; modern History as contrasted with medieval divides itself into two portions; the first a history of powers, forces, and dynasties; the second, a history in which ideas take the place of both rights and forces. . . . Austria may be regarded as representing the more ancient form of right. . . . The middle ages proper, the centuries from the year 1000 to the year 1500, from the Emperor Henry II. to the Emperor Maximilian, were ages of legal

**The Races.**—"The ethnical elements of the population are as follows (1890 for Austria and 1880 for Hungary) on the basis of language:—Austria (1890): German 8,461,580; Bohemian, Moravian and Slovak 5,472,871; Polish 3,719,232; Ruthenian 3,105,221; Slovene 1,176,672; Serbian and Croatian 644,926; Italian and Latin 675,305; Roumanian 209,110; Magyar 8,139. Hungary (1880): German 1,972,115; Bohemian, Moravian and Slovak 1,892,806; Ruthenian 300,051; Slovene 86,401; Serbian and Croatian 2,359,708; Roumanian 2,423,387; Magyar 6,478,711; Gipsies 82,250; Others 83,940."—*Statesman's Year-Book*, 1893; ed. by J. S. Keltie.

A. D. 805-1246.—The Rise of the Margravate, and the creation of the Duchy, under the

**Babenbergs.—Changing relations to Bavaria.**—End of the Babenberg Dynasty.—"Austria, as is well known, is but the Latin form of the German Oesterreich, the kingdom of the east [see above: AESTRASIA]. This celebrated historical name appears for the first time in 996, in a document signed by the emperor Otto III. ('in regione vulgari nomine Oesterichi'). The land to which it is there applied was created a march after the destruction of the Avar empire [805], and was governed like all the other German marches. Politically it was divided into two margravates; that of Friuli, including Friuli properly so called, Lower Pannonia to the south of the Drave, Carinthia, Istria, and the interior of Dalmatia—the sea-coast having been ceded to the Eastern emperor;—the eastern margravate comprising Lower Pannonia to the north of the Drave, Upper Pannonia, and the Ostmark properly so called. The Ostmark included the Traungau to the east of the Enns, which was completely German, and the Grunzvittigau. . . . The early history of these countries lacks the unity of interest which the fate of a dynasty or a nation gives to those of the Magyar and the Czech. They form but a portion of the German kingdom, and have no strongly marked life of their own. The march, with its varying frontier, had not even a geographical unity. In 876, it was enlarged by the addition of Bavaria; in 890, it lost Pannonia, which was given to Brasclav, the Croat prince, in return for his help against the Magyars, and in 937, it was destroyed and absorbed by the Magyars, who extended their frontier to the river Enns. After the battle of Lechfeld or Augsburg (955), Germany and Italy being no longer exposed to Hungarian invasions, the march was re-constituted and granted to the margrave Burkhard, the brother-in-law of Henry of Bavaria. Leopold of Babenberg succeeded him (973), and with him begins the dynasty of Babenberg, which ruled the country during the time of the Premyslides [in Bohemia] and the house of Arpad [in Hungary]. The Babenbergs derived their name from the castle of Babenberg, built by Henry, margrave of Nordgau, in honor of his wife, Bala, sister of Henry the Fowler. It reappears in the name of the town of Bamberg, which now forms part of the kingdom of Bavaria. . . . Though not of right an hereditary office, the margravate soon became so, and remained in the family of the Babenbergs the march was so important a part of the empire that no doubt the emperor was glad to make the defence of this exposed district the especial interest of one family. . . . The marriages of the Babenbergs were fortunate; in 1138 the brother of Leopold [Fourth of that name in the Margravate] Conrad of Hohenstaufen, Duke of Franconia, was made emperor. It was now that the struggle began between the house of Hohenstaufen and the great house of Welf [or Guelph: See GUELFs AND GIBELINES] whose representative was Henry the Proud, Duke of Saxony and Bavaria. Henry was defeated in the unequal strife, and was placed under the ban of the Empire, while the duchy of Saxony was awarded to Albert the Bear of Brandenburg, and the duchy of Bavaria fell to the share of Leopold IV. (1138). Henry the Proud died in the following year, leaving behind him a son under age, who was known later on as Henry the Lion. His uncle Welf would not submit to the forfeiture by his house of their old dominions, and marched

against Leopold to reconquer Bavaria, but he was defeated by Conrad at the battle of Weinsberg (1140). Leopold died shortly after this victory, and was succeeded both in the duchy of Bavaria and in the margravate of Austria by his brother, Henry II." Henry II. endeavored to strengthen himself in Bavaria by marrying the widow of Henry the Proud, and by extorting from her son, Henry the Lion, a renunciation of the latter's rights. But Henry the Lion afterwards repudiated his renunciation, and in 1156 the German diet decided that Bavaria should be restored to him. Henry of Austria was wisely persuaded to yield to the decision, and Bavaria was given up. "He lost nothing by this unwilling act of disinterestedness, for he secured from the emperor considerable compensation. From this time forward, Austria, which had been largely increased by the addition of the greater part of the lands lying between the Enns and the Inn, was removed from its almost nominal subjection to Bavaria and became a separate duchy [Henry II. being the first hereditary Duke of Austria]. An imperial edict, dated the 21st of September, 1156, declares the new duchy hereditary even in the female line, and authorizes the dukes to absent themselves from all diets except those which were held in Bavarian territory. It also permits them, in case of a threatened extinction of their dynasty, to propose a successor. . . . Henry II. was one of the founders of Vienna. He constructed a fortress there, and, in order to civilize the surrounding country, sent for some Scotch monks, of whom there were many at this time in Germany." In 1177 Henry II. was succeeded by Leopold V., called the Virtuous. "In his reign the duchy of Austria gained Styria, an important addition to its territory. This province was inhabited by Slovenes and Germans, and took its name from the castle of Steyer, built in 980 by Otokar III., count of the Traungau. In 1056, it was created a margravate, and in 1150 it was enlarged by the addition of the counties of Maribor (Marburg) and Cilly. In 1180, Otokar VI. of Styria (1164-1192) obtained the hereditary title of duke from the Emperor in return for his help against Henry the Lion." Dying without children, Otokar made Leopold of Austria his heir. "Styria was annexed to Austria in 1192, and has remained so ever since. . . . Leopold V. is the first of the Austrian princes whose name is known in Western Europe. He joined the third crusade," and quarrelled with Richard Coeur de Lion at the siege of St. Jean d' Acre. Afterwards, when Richard, returning home by the Adriatic, attempted to pass through Austrian territory incognito, Leopold revenged himself by seizing and imprisoning the English king, finally selling his royal captive to a still meaner Emperor for 20,000 marks. Leopold VI. who succeeded to the Austrian duchy in 1198, did much for the commerce of his country. "He made Vienna the staple town, and lent a sum of 30,000 marks of silver to the city to enable it to increase its trade. He adorned it with many new buildings, among them the Neue Burg." His son, called Frederick the Fighter (1230-1246) was the last of the Babenberg dynasty. His hand was against all his neighbors, including the Emperor Frederick II., and their hands were against him. He perished in June, 1246, on the banks of the Leitha, while at war with the Hungarians.—L. Leger, *Hist. of Austro-Hungary*, ch. 9.





# A Logical Outline of Austrian History

*Physical or material.  
Ethnological.*

*Social and political.  
Intellectual, moral and  
religious,  
Foreign.*

IN WHICH THE DOMINANT CONDITIONS AND

INFLUENCES ARE DISTINGUISHED BY COLORS.

The history of Austria, so far as it has importance, is unique in being the history of a Family and not the history of a State,—the history of a Dynastic and not of a National Power. Territorially, the name was attached, until 1806, to an incon-siderable arch-duchy, on the Danube, in that corner of Teutonic Europe where the Germans of the Middle Ages fought back the Turanian races and the Slaves. Dynamically, it became connected, in the 13th century, with a House, then insignificant, in Alsace, and to the future remarkable fortunes of that House the territory so named contributed little more than a strong central position and a capital town.

Rodolph, Count of Hapsburg, with whom the importance of Austrian history begins, was elected Emperor in 1272, for the reason that his possessions were small and the resoluteness of his character was unknown. He disappointed the Electors by increasing the weight and reviving the power of the Imperial office, which they had not at all desired, and he used its power vigorously for the benefit of himself and his own. The King of Bohemia resisted him and was defeated and slain; and a part of the dominions which the Bohemian king had acquired, including Austria (then a duchy), Carniola and Styria, was appropriated by Rodolph, for his sons. The House of Hapsburg thus became the House of Austria, and its history is what bears the name of Austrian history from that time until 1806.

The Hapsburg family has never produced men of the higher intellectual powers, or the higher qualities of any kind; but a remarkable vitality has been proved in it, and a politic self-seeking capability, which has never, perhaps, persisted through so many generations in any other line. It owes to these qualities the acquisition, again and again, of the elective Imperial crown, until that crown settled, at last, upon the heirs of the House, in practically hereditary succession, despite the wish of the princes of Germany to keep it shifting among the weaker members of their order, and despite the rivalry of greater houses with ambitious like its own. The prestige of the splendid Imperial title, and the influence derived from the theoretical functions of the Emperor—small as the actual powers that he held might be—were instruments of policy which the Austrian princes knew how to use with enormous effect. Austrian marriages and Austrian diplomacy, often alluded to as examples of luck and craft in political affairs, show, rather, it may be, the consistent calculation and sagacity with which the House of Austria has pursued its aims.

By marriages, by diplomacy, and by pressures brought to bear from the headship of the Empire, the family plucked, one by one, the coronets of Tyrol and Carinthia (1363), Franche-Comté and Flanders, with the Low Countries entire (1477), and the crowns of Spain, Naples, Sicily and Sardinia (1516), Bohemia (including Moravia), and Hungary (1526). Its many domains were never moulded into one, but have been, from first to last, the carefully distinguished emblems of so many separate sovereignties, united in no way but by homage to a common prince.

The one most fortunate acquisition of the House, which has given most stability to the heterogeneous structure of its power, in the judgment of the ablest among modern historians, is the Hungarian crown. Its Burgundian and Spanish mar-riages, which brought to it the rich Netherlands and the vast realm of Ferdinand and Isabella, brought also a division of the Family, and the rooting of a second stem in Spain; and while its grandeur among the dynasties of Europe was augmented, the real gain of the House in its older seat was small.

9th Century.

The March.

A. D. 1272.

Rodolph of Hapsburg  
Emperor.

A. D. 1282.

The House in possession.

A. D. 1438.

The Imperial Crown.

A. D. 1363—1526.

Enlarging of crowns  
and coronets.

A. D. 1516.

The branch in Spain.

the real gain of the House in its older seat was small. But the Kingdom of Hungary has been a mass of very concrete political power in its hands, and has supplied in some degree the weight of nationality that was otherwise wanting in the dominions of the House.

The mixture of races under the Austrian sovereigns is the most extraordinary in Europe. Their possessions exactly cover that part of the continent in which its earlier and later invaders fought longest and most; where the struggle between them was fiercest, and where they mingled their settlements together. The Slavic peoples are predominant in numbers; the Germans are scarcely more than one-fourth of the whole; and yet, until recent years, the Austrian power figured chiefly as a German power in European politics, and took leadership in Germany itself. This position accrued to it through the persisting, potent influence of the Imperial title which the Archdukes of Austria bore, with mediæval fictions from Rome and from Germany woven together and clinging around it; and through the broken and divided condition of the German land, where petty courts and princelings disputed precedence with one another, and none could lead. When time raised up one strong and purely German kingdom, to rally and encourage a German sentiment of nationality, then Austria — expelled by it from the Teutonic circle — first found her true place in the politics of Europe.

For Germany the relationship was never a fortunate one. Alien interests came constantly between the Emperors and the Empire — the proper subject of their care, — and they were drawn to alien sympathies by their connection with Spain. They inherited the hateful temper of the Spanish Church, and fought the large majority of their German lieges, on the questions of the Reformation, for a century and a half. Among the combatants of the frightful "Thirty Years War" they were chiefly responsible for the death and ruin spread over the face of Germanic Europe. At no time did Germany find leading or strength in her nominal Emperors, nor in the states making up the hereditary possessions of their House. In the dark days when the sword of Napoleon threatened every neighbor of France, they deserted their station of command. It was the time which the head of the House of Austria chose for abolishing the crown of the Holy Roman Empire — that lingering fiction of history, — and yet assuming to be an Emperor still — the Emperor of an Empire which rested on the small duchy of Austria for its name.

The renunciation was timely; for now, when Germany rose to break the yoke of Napoleon, she found leadership within her own family of states. Then began the transformation in Germanic Europe which extinguished, after half a century, the last remains of the false relations to it of the Austrian House. Prussia opened her eyes to the new conditions of the age; set the schoolmaster at work among her children; made herself an example and a stimulus to all her neighbors. The Family which called itself Austria did otherwise. It was blind, and it preferred blindness. It read lessons in nothing but the Holy Alliance and the Treaty of Vienna. It listened to no teacher but Metternich. It made itself the resurrectionist of a dead Past in all the graveyards of Feudal Europe, and was hated for half a century as the supporter and champion of every hateful thing in government. It had won Lombardy and Venice by its double traffic with Napoleon and with those who cast Napoleon down; and it enraged the whole civilized world by the cold brutality of its oppressions there.

Events in due time brought the two "systems" of domestic polity — the Prussian and the Austrian — to account, and weighed them together. As a consequence, it happens to-day that the House of Austria has neither place nor voice in the political organization of Germany; has no footing in Italy; has no dignities of tyranny in its dominions; has no disciples of Metternich among its statesmen. Its face and its feet are now turned quite away from the paths of ambition and of policy which it trod so long. It has learned, and is learning, so fast that it may yet be a teacher in the school of liberal politics which it entered so late. It has set Hungary by the side of Austria, treading the one great nation of its subjects no longer under foot. It sees its interests and recognizes its duties in that quarter of Europe to which History and Geography have been pointing from Vienna and Buda-Pesth since the days of Charlemagne. Its mission in Europe is to command the precarious future of the southeastern states, so far as may be, and to guard them against the dangerous Muscovite, until they grow in civilization and strength and are united as one Power. In this mission it is the ally and the colleague of both Germany and Italy, and the three Powers are united by stronger bonds than were possible before each stood free.

### The mixture of races.

A. D. 1524 — 1531.

The Reformation.

A. D. 1618 — 1648.

Thirty Years War.

A. D. 1806. — End of the Holy Roman Empire.

A. D. 1815 — 1860.

Policy of Metternich

vs. policy of Stein.

A. D. 1859.

Loss of Lombardy.

A. D. 1860.

Seven Weeks War.

Loss of Venice.


A. D. 1867.

Austro-Hungarian

Empire.

A. D. 1882.

The Triple Alliance.



ALSO IN: E. F. Henderson, *Select Hist. Doct. of the Middle Ages*, bk. 2, no. 7.

**A. D. 1246-1282.**—Rodolph of Hapsburg and the acquisition of the Duchy for his family.—“The House of Austria owes its origin and power to Rodolph of Hapsburg, son of Albert IV. count of Hapsburg. The Austrian genealogists, who have taken indefatigable but ineffectual pains to trace his illustrious descent from the Romans, carry it with great probability to Ethico, duke of Alsace, in the seventh century, and unquestionably to Guntram the Rich, count of Alsace and Brisgau, who flourished in the tenth.” A grandson of Guntram, Werner by name, “became bishop of Strasburg, and on an eminence above Windisch, built the castle of Hapsburg [‘Hablechtburg’ ‘the castle of vultures’], which became the residence of the future counts, and gave a new title to the descendants of Guntram. . . . The successors of Werner increased their family inheritance by marriages, donations from the Emperors, and by becoming prefects, advocates, or administrators of the neighbouring abbeys, towns, or districts, and his grand-son, Albert III., was possessor of no inconsiderable territories in Suabia, Alsace, and that part of Switzerland which is now called the Argau, and held the landgraviate of Upper Alsace. His son, Rodolph, received from the Emperor, in addition to his paternal inheritance, the town and district of Lauffenburgh, an imperial city on the Rhine. He acquired also a considerable accession of territory by obtaining the advocacy of Uri, Schwytz, and Underwalden, whose natives laid the foundation of the Helvetic Confederacy, by their union against the oppressions of feudal tyranny.”—W. Cox, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 1.—“On the death of Rodolph in 1232 his estates were divided between his sons Albert IV. and Rodolph II.; the former receiving the landgraviate of Upper Alsace, and the county of Hapsburg, together with the patrimonial castle; the latter, the counties Rheinfelden and Lauffenburgh, and some other territories. Albert espoused Hedwige, daughter of Ulrich, count of Kyburg; and from this union sprang the great Rodolph, who was born on the 1st of May 1218, and was presented at the baptismal font by the Emperor Frederic II. On the death of his father Albert in 1240, Rodolph succeeded to his estates; but the greater portion of these were in the hands of his paternal uncle, Rodolph of Lauffenburgh; and all he could call his own lay within sight of the great hall of his castle. . . . His disposition was wayward and restless, and drew him into repeated contests with his neighbours and relations. . . . In a quarrel with the Bishop of Basle, Rodolph led his troops against that city, and burnt a convent in the suburbs, for which he was excommunicated by Pope Innocent IV. He then entered the service of Ottocar II. King of Bohemia, under whom he served, in company with the Teutonic Knights, in his wars against the Prussian pagans; and afterwards against Bela IV. King of Hungary.” The surprising election, in 1272, of this little known count of Hapsburg, to be King of the Romans, with the substance if not the title of the imperial dignity, which that election carried with it, was due to a singular friendship which he had acquired some fourteen years before. When Archbishop Werner, Elector of Mentz, was on his way to Rome

in 1259, to receive the pallium, he “was escorted across the Alps by Rodolph of Hapsburg, and under his protection secured from the robbers who beset the passes. Charmed with the affability and frankness of his protector, the Archbishop conceived a strong regard for Rodolph;” and when, in 1272, after the Great Interregnum [see GERMANY; A. D. 1250-1272], the German Electors found difficulty in choosing an Emperor, the Elector of Mentz recommended his friend of Hapsburg as a candidate. “The Electors are described by a contemporary as desiring an Emperor but detesting his power. The comparative lowliness of the Count of Hapsburg recommended him as one from whom their authority stood in little jeopardy; but the claims of the King of Bohemia were vigorously urged; and it was at length agreed to decide the election by the voice of the Duke of Bavaria. Lewis without hesitation nominated Rodolph. . . . The early days of Rodolph’s reign were disturbed by the continuance of Ottocar, King of Bohemia. That Prince . . . persisted in refusing to acknowledge the Count of Hapsburg as his sovereign. Possessed of the duchies of Austria, Styria, Carniola and Carinthia, he might rely upon his own resources; and he was fortified in his resistance by the alliance of Henry, Duke of Lower Bavaria. But the very possession of these four great fiefs was sufficient to draw down the envy and distrust of the other German Princes. To all these territories, indeed, the title of Ottocar was sufficiently disputable. On the death of Frederic II. fifth duke of Austria [and last of the Babenberg dynasty] in 1246, that duchy, together with Styria and Carniola, was claimed by his niece Gertrude and his sister Margaret. By a marriage with the latter, and a victory over Bela IV. King of Hungary, whose uncle married Gertrude, Ottocar obtained possession of Austria and Styria; and in virtue of a purchase from Ulrich, Duke of Carinthia and Carniola, he possessed himself of those duchies on Ulrich’s death in 1269, in defiance of the claims of Philipp, brother of the late Duke. Against so powerful a rival the Princes assembled at Augsburg readily voted succours to Rodolph; and Ottocar having refused to surrender the Austrian dominions, and even hanged the heralds who were sent to pronounce the consequent sentence of proscription, Rodolph with his accustomed promptitude took the field [1276], and founded his enemy by a rapid march upon Austria. In his way he surprised and vanquished the rebel Duke of Bavaria, whom he compelled to join his forces; he besieged and reduced to the last extremity the city of Vienna; and had already prepared a bridge of boats to cross the Danube and invade Bohemia, when Ottocar arrested his progress by a message of submission. The terms agreed upon were severely humiliating to the proud soul of Ottocar,” and he was soon in revolt again, with the support of the Duke of Bavaria. Rodolph marched against him, and a desperate battle was fought at Marschfeld, August 26, 1278, in which Ottocar, deserted at a critical moment by the Moravian troops, was defeated and slain. “The total loss of the Bohemians on that fatal day amounted to more than 14,000 men. In the first moments of his triumph, Rodolph designed to appropriate the dominions of his deceased

enemy. But his avidity was restrained by the Princes of the Empire, who interposed on behalf of the son of Ottocar; and Wenceslaus was permitted to retain Bohemia and Moravia. The projected union of the two families was now renewed; Judith of Hapsburg was affianced to the young King of Bohemia; whose sister Agnes was married to Rodolph, youngest son of the King of the Romans." In 1282, Rodolph, "after satisfying the several claimants to those territories by various cessions of lands . . . obtained the consent of a Diet held at Augsburg to the settlement of Austria, Styria, and Carniola, upon his two surviving sons; who were accordingly jointly invested with those duchies with great pomp and solemnity; and they are at this hour enjoyed by the descendants of Rodolph of Hapsburg."—Sir R. Comyn, *Hist. of the Western Empire*, ch. 14.

ALSO IN: J. Planta, *Hist. of the Helvetic Confederacy*, bk. 1, ch. 5 (p. 1).

**A. D. 1282-1315.**—Relations of the House of Hapsburg to the Swiss Forest Cantons.—The Tell Legend.—The Battle of Morgarten. See SWITZERLAND: THE THREE FOREST CANTONS.

**A. D. 1290.**—Beginning of Hapsburg designs upon the crown of Hungary. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1114-1301.

**A. D. 1291-1349.**—Loss and recovery of the imperial crown.—Liberation of Switzerland.—Conflict between Frederick and Lewis of Bavaria.—The imperial crown lost once more.—Rudolf of Hapsburg desired the title of King of the Romans for his son. "But the electors already found that the new house of Austria was becoming too powerful, and they refused. On his death, in fact, in 1291, a prince from another family, poor and obscure, Adolf of Nassau, was elected after an interregnum of ten months. His reign of six years is marked by two events; he sold himself to Edward I. in 1294, against Philip the Fair, for 100,000 pounds sterling, and used the money in an attempt to obtain in Thuringia a principality for his family as Rudolf had done in Austria. The electors were displeased and chose Albert of Austria to succeed him, who conquered and killed his adversary at Gölheim, near Worms (1298). The ten years reign of the new king of the Romans showed that he was very ambitious for his family, which he wished to establish on the throne of Bohemia, where the Slavonic dynasty had lately died out, and also in Thuringia and Meissen, where he lost a battle. He was also bent upon extending his rights, and even unjustly—in Alsace and Switzerland—and it proved an unfortunate venture for him. For, on the one hand, he roused the three Swiss cantons of Uri, Schwytz, and Unterwalden to revolt; on the other hand, he roused the wrath of his nephew John of Swabia, whom he defrauded of his inheritance (domains in Switzerland, Swabia, and Alsace). As he was crossing the Reuss, John thrust him through with his sword (1308). The assassin escaped. One of Albert's daughters, Agnes, dowager queen of Hungary, had more than a thousand innocent people killed to avenge the death of her father. The greater part of the present Switzerland had been originally included in the Kingdom of Burgundy, and was ceded to the empire, together with that kingdom, in 1033. A feudal nobility, lay and ecclesiastic, had gained a firm footing

there. Nevertheless, by the 12th century the cities had risen to some importance. Zurich, Basel, Bern, and Freiburg had an extensive commerce and obtained municipal privileges. Three little cantons, far in the heart of the Swiss mountains, preserved more than all the others their indomitable spirit of independence. When Albert of Austria became Emperor [King?] he arrogantly tried to encroach upon their independence. Three heroic mountaineers, Werner Stauffacher, Arnold of Melchthal, and Walter Fürst, each with ten chosen friends, conspired together at Rütli, to throw off the yoke. The tyranny of the Austrian bailiff Gessler, and William Tell's well-aimed arrow, if tradition is to be believed, gave the signal for the insurrection [see SWITZERLAND: THE THREE FOREST CANTONS]. Albert's violent death left to Leopold, his successor in the duchy of Austria, the care of repressing the rebellion. He failed and was completely defeated at Morgarten (1315). That was Switzerland's field of Marathon. . . . When Rudolf of Hapsburg was chosen by the electors, it was because of his poverty and weakness. At his death accordingly they did not give their votes for his son Albert. . . . Albert, however, succeeded in overthrowing his rival. But on his death they were firm in their decision not to give the crown for a third time to the new and ambitious house of Hapsburg. They likewise refused, for similar reasons, to accept Charles of Valois, brother of Philip the Fair, whom the latter tried to place on the imperial throne, in order that he might indirectly rule over Germany. They supported the Count of Luxemburg, who became Henry VII. By choosing emperors [Kings?] who were poor, the electors placed them under the temptation of enriching themselves at the expense of the empire. Adolf failed, it is true, in Thuringia, but Rudolf gained Austria by victory; Henry succeeded in Bohemia by means of marriage, and Bohemia was worth more than Austria at that time because, besides Moravia, it was made to cover Silesia and a part of Lusatia (Oberlausitz). Henry's son, John of Luxemburg, married the heiress; to that royal crown. As for Henry himself he remained as poor as before. He had a vigorous, restless spirit, and went to try his fortunes on his own account beyond the Alps. . . . He was seriously threatening Naples, when he died either from some sickness or from being poisoned by a Dominican in partaking of the host (1313). A year's interregnum followed; then two emperors [Kings?] at once: Lewis of Bavaria and Frederick the Fair, son of the Emperor Albert. After eight years of war, Lewis gained his point by the victory of Mühlhof (1322), which delivered Frederick into his hands. He kept him in captivity for three years, and at the end of that time became reconciled with him, and they were on such good terms that both bore the title of King and governed in common. The fear inspired in Lewis by France and the Holy See dictated this singular agreement. Henry VII. had revived the policy of interference by the German emperors in the affairs of Italy, and had kindled again the quarrel with the Papacy which had long appeared extinguished. Lewis IV. did the same. . . . While Boniface VIII. was making war on Philip the Fair, Albert allied himself with him; when, on the other hand, the Papacy was reduced to the state of a

servile auxiliary to France, the Emperor returned to his former hostility. When ex-communicated by Pope John XXII., who wished to give the empire to the king of France, Charles IV., Lewis IV. made use of the same weapons. . . . Tired of a crown loaded with anxieties, Lewis of Bavaria was finally about to submit to the Pope and abdicate, when the electors perceived the necessity of supporting their Emperor and of formally releasing the supreme power from foreign dependency which brought the whole nation to shame. That was the object of the Pragmatic Sanction of Frankfort, pronounced in 1338 by the Diet, on the report of the electors. . . . The king of France and Pope Clement VI., whose claims were directly affected by this declaration, set up against Lewis IV. Charles of Luxemburg, son of John the Blind, who became king of Bohemia in 1346, when his father had been killed fighting on the French side at the battle of Crécy. Lewis died the following year. He had gained possession of Brandenburg and the Tyrol for his house, but it was unable to retain possession of them. The latter county reverted to the house of Austria in 1363. The electors most hostile to the French party tried to put up, as a rival candidate to Charles of Luxemburg, Edward III., king of England, who refused the empire; then they offered it to a brave knight, Gunther of Schwarzburg, who died, perhaps poisoned, after a few months (1349). The king of Bohemia then became Emperor as Charles IV. by a second election."—V. Duruy, *The History of the Middle Ages*, bk. 9, ch. 30.—See, also, GERMANY: A. D. 1314-1347.

**A. D. 1330-1364.**—Forged charters of Duke Rudolf.—The Privilegium Majus.—His assumption of the Archducal title.—Acquisition of Tyrol.—Treaties of inheritance with Bohemia and Hungary.—King John, of Bohemia, had married his second son, John Henry, at the age of eight, to the afterwards notable Margaret Maultasche (Pouchmouth), daughter of the duke of Tyrol and Carinthia, who was then twelve years old. He hoped by this means to reunite those provinces to Bohemia. To thwart this scheme, the Emperor, Louis of Bavaria, and the two Austrian princes, Albert the Wise and Otto the Gay, came to an understanding. "By the treaty of Hagenau (1330), it was arranged that on the death of duke Henry, who had no male heirs, Carinthia should become the property of Austria, Tyrol that of the Emperor. Henry died in 1335, whereupon the Emperor, Louis of Bavaria, declared that Margaret Maultasche had forfeited all rights of inheritance, and proceeded to assign the two provinces to the Austrian princes, with the exception of some portion of the Tyrol which devolved on the house of Wittelsbach. Carinthia alone, however, obeyed the Emperor; the Tyrolese nobles declared for Margaret, and, with the help of John of Bohemia, this princess was able to keep possession of this part of her inheritance. . . . Carinthia also did not long remain in the undisputed possession of Austria. Margaret was soon divorced from her very youthful husband (1342), and shortly after married the son of the Emperor Louis of Bavaria, who hoped to be able to invest his son, not only with Tyrol, but also with Carinthia, and once more we find the houses of Hapsburg and Luxemburg united by a common interest. . . . When . . . Charles IV. of Bohemia was chosen em-

peror, he consented to leave Carinthia in the possession of Austria. Albert did homage for it. . . . According to the wish of their father, the four sons of Albert reigned after him; but the eldest, Rudolf IV., exercised executive authority in the name of the others [1358-1365]. . . . He was only 19 when he came to the throne, but he had already married one of the daughters of the Emperor Charles IV. Notwithstanding this family alliance, Charles had not given Austria such a place in the Golden Bull [see GERMANY: A. D. 1347-1402] as seemed likely to secure either her territorial importance or a proper position for her princes. They had not been admitted into the electoral college of the Empire, and yet their scattered possessions stretched from the banks of the Leitha to the Rhine. . . . These grievances were enhanced by their feeling of envy towards Bohemia, which had attained great prosperity under Charles IV. It was at this time that, in order to increase the importance of his house, Rudolf, or his officers of state, had recourse to a measure which was often employed in that age by princes, religious bodies, and even by the Holy See. It was pretended that there were in existence a whole series of charters which had been granted to the house of Austria by various kings and emperors, and which secured to their princes a position entirely independent of both empire and Emperor. According to these documents, and more especially the one called the 'privilegium majus,' the duke of Austria owed no kind of service to the empire, which was, however, bound to protect him; . . . he was to appear at the diets with the title of archduke, and was to have the first place among the electors. . . . Rudolf pretended that these documents had just come to light, and demanded their confirmation from Charles IV., who refused it. Nevertheless on the strength of these lying charters, he took the title of palatine archduke, without waiting to ask the leave of Charles, and used the royal insignia. Charles IV., who could not fail to be irritated by these pretensions, in his turn revived the claims which he had inherited from Premysl Otokar II. to the lands of Austria, Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola. These claims, however, were simply theoretical, and no attempt was made to enforce them, and the mediation of Louis the Great, King of Hungary, finally led to a treaty between the two princes, which satisfied the ambition of the Habsburgs (1364). By this treaty, the houses of Habsburg in Austria and of Luxemburg in Bohemia each guaranteed the inheritance of their lands to the other, in case of the extinction of either of the two families, and the estates of Bohemia and Austria ratified this agreement. A similar compact was concluded between Austria and Hungary, and thus the boundaries of the future Austrian state were for the first time marked out. Rudolf himself gained little by these long and intricate negotiations, Tyrol being all he added to his territory. Margaret Maultasche had married her son Meinhard to the daughter of Albert the Wise, at the same time declaring that, in default of heirs male to her son, Tyrol should once more become the possession of Austria, and it did so in 1363. Rudolf immediately set out for Botzen, and there received the homage of the Tyrolese nobles. . . . The acquisition of Tyrol was most important to Austria. It united Austria Proper with the old possessions of the Habsburgs in Western Ger-

many, and opened the way to Italy. Margaret Maultasche died at Vienna in 1369. The memory of this restless and dissolute princess still survives among the Tyrolese."—L. Leger, *Hist. of Austria-Hungary*, pp. 143-148.

**A. D. 1386-1388.—Defeats by the Swiss at Sempach and Naefels.** See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1386-1388.

**A. D. 1437-1516.—Contests for Hungary and Bohemia.—The right of Succession to the Hungarian Crown secured.**—"Europe would have had nothing to fear from the Barbarians, if Hungary had been permanently united to Bohemia, and had held them in check. But Hungary interfered both with the independence and the religion of Bohemia. In this way they weakened each other, and in the 15th century wavered between the two Slavonic and German powers on their borders (Poland and Austria) [see HUNGARY: A. D. 1301-1442, and 1442-1458]. United under a German prince from 1455 to 1458, separated for a time under national sovereigns (Bohemia until 1471, Hungary until 1490), they were once more united under Polish princes until 1526, at which period they passed definitively into the hands of Austria. After the reign of Ladislas of Austria, who won so much glory by the exploits of John Hunniades, George Podiebrad obtained the crown of Bohemia, and Matthias Corvinus, the son of Hunniades, was elected King of Hungary (1458). These two princes opposed successfully the chimerical pretensions of the Emperor Frederick III. Podiebrad protected the Hussites and incurred the enmity of the Popes. Matthias victoriously encountered the Turks and obtained the favour of Paul II., who offered him the crown of Podiebrad, his father-in-law. The latter opposed to the hostility of Matthias the alliance of the King of Poland, whose eldest son, Ladislas, he designated as his successor. At the same time, Casimir, the brother of Ladislas, endeavoured to take from Matthias the crown of Hungary. Matthias, thus pressed on all sides, was obliged to renounce the conquest of Bohemia, and content himself with the provinces of Moravia, Silesia, and Lusatia, which were to return to Ladislas if Matthias died first (1475-1478). The King of Hungary compensated himself at the expense of Austria. On the pretext that Frederick III. had refused to give him his daughter, he twice invaded his states and retained them in his possession [see HUNGARY: A. D. 1471-1487]. With this great prince Christendom lost its chief defender, Hungary her conquests and her political preponderance (1490). The civilization which he had tried to introduce into his kingdom was deferred for many centuries. . . . Ladislas of Poland, King of Bohemia, having been elected King of Hungary, was attacked by his brother John Albert, and by Maximilian of Austria, who both pretended to that crown. He appeased his brother by the cession of Silesia (1491), and Maximilian by vesting in the House of Austria the right of succession to the throne of Hungary, in case he himself should die without male issue. Under Ladislas, and under his son Louis II., who succeeded him while still a child, in 1516 Hungary was ravaged with impunity by the Turks."—J. Michelet, *A Summary of Modern History*, ch. 4.—See, also, BOHEMIA: A. D. 1458-1471.

**A. D. 1438-1493.—The Imperial Crown lastingly regained.—The short reign of Albert II.,**

**and the long reign of Frederick III.**—"After the death of Sigismund, the prince, in 1438, elected an emperor [king?] from the house of Austria, which, with scarcely any intermission, has ever since occupied the ancient throne of Germany. Albert II. of Austria, who, as son-in-law of the late Emperor Sigismund, had become at the same time King of Hungary and Bohemia, was a well-meaning, distinguished prince, and would, without doubt, have proved of great benefit to the empire; but he died . . . in the second year of his reign, after his return from an expedition against the Turks. . . . In the year 1431, during the reign of Sigismund, a new council was assembled at Basle, in order to carry on the work of reforming the church as already commenced at Constance. But this council soon became engaged in many perplexing controversies with Pope Eugene IV. . . . The Germans, for a time, took no part in the dispute; at length, however, under the Emperor [King?] Albert II., they formally adopted the chief decrees of the council of Basle, at a diet held at Mentz in the year 1439. . . . Amongst the resolutions then adopted were such as materially circumscribed the existing privileges of the pope. . . . These and other decisions, calculated to give important privileges and considerable independence to the German church, were, in a great measure, annulled by Albert's cousin and successor, Duke Frederick of Austria, who was elected by the princes after him in the year 1440, as Frederick III. . . . Frederick, the emperor, was a prince who meant well but, at the same time, was of too quiet and easy a nature; his long reign presents but little that was calculated to distinguish Germany or add to its renown. From the east the empire was endangered by the approach of an enemy—the Turks, against whom no precautionary measures were adopted. They, on the 29th of May, 1453, conquered Constantinople. . . . They then made their way towards the Danube, and very nearly succeeded also in taking Hungary [see HUNGARY: A. D. 1442-1458]. . . . The Hungarians, on the death of the son of the Emperor Albert II., Wladislas Posthumus, in the year 1457, without leaving an heir to the throne, chose Matthias, the son of John Corvianus, as king, being resolved not to elect one from amongst the Austrian princes. The Bohemians likewise selected a private nobleman for their king, George Padriabrad [or Podiebrad], and thus the Austrian house found itself for a time rejected from holding possession of either of these countries. . . . In Germany, meantime, there existed numberless contests and feuds; each party considered only his own personal quarrels. . . . The emperor could not give any weight to public measures; scarcely could he maintain his dignity amongst his own subjects. The Austrian nobility were even bold enough to send challenges to their sovereign; whilst the city of Vienna revolted, and his brother Albert, taking pleasure in this disorder, was not backward in adding to it. Things even went to such an extremity, that, in 1463, the Emperor Frederick, together with his consort and son, Maximilian, then four years of age, was besieged by his subjects in his own castle of Vienna. A plebeian burgher, named Holzer, had placed himself at the head of the insurgents, and was made burgomaster, whilst Duke Albert came to Vienna personally to superintend the siege of the castle, which was intrenched and bombarded. . . . The

German princes, however, could not witness with indifference such disgraceful treatment of their emperor, and they assembled to liberate him. George Padriabrad, King of Bohemia, was the first who hastened to the spot with assistance, set the emperor at liberty, and effected a reconciliation between him and his brother. The emperor, however, was obliged to resign to him, for eight years, Lower Austria and Vienna. Albert died in the following year. . . . In the Germanic empire, the voice of the emperor was as little heeded as in his hereditary lands. . . . The feudal system raged under Frederick's reign to such an extent, that it was pursued even by the lower classes. Thus, in 1471, the shoeblacks in Leipsic sent a challenge to the university of that place; and the bakers of the Cent Palatine Lewis, and those of the Margrave of Baden defied several imperial cities in Swabia. The most important transaction in the reign of Frederick, was the union which he formed with the house of Burgundy, and which laid the foundation for the greatness of Austria. . . . In the year 1486, the whole of the assembled princes, influenced especially by the representations of the faithful and now venerable Albert, called the Achilles of Brandenburg, elected Maximilian, the emperor's son, King of Rome. Indeed, about this period a changed and improved spirit began to show itself in a remarkable degree in the minds of many throughout the empire, so that the profound contemplator of coming events might easily see the dawn of a new era. . . . These last years were the best in the whole life of the emperor, and yielded to him in return for his many sufferings that tranquillity which was so well merited by his faithful generous disposition. He died on the 10th of August, 1493, after a reign of 54 years. The emperor lived long enough to obtain, in the year 1490, the restoration of his hereditary estates by the death of King Matthias, by means of a compact made with Wladislaus, his successor."—F. Kohlrausch, *History of Germany*, ch. 14.—See GERMANY: A. D. 1347-1493.

**A. D. 1468.—Invasion by George Podiebrad of Bohemia.—The crusade against him.** See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1458-1471.

**A. D. 1471-1491.—Hungarian invasion and capture of Vienna.—Treaty of Presburg.—Succession to the throne of Hungary secured.**—"George, King of Bohemia, expired in 1471; and the claims of the Emperor and King of Hungary being equally disregarded, the crown was conferred on Wladislaus, son of Casimir IV. King of Poland, and grandson of Albert II. To this election Frederic long persisted in withholding his assent; but at length he determined to crush the claim of Matthias by formally investing Wladislaus with the kingdom and electorate of Bohemia, and the office of imperial cup-bearer. In revenge for this affront, Matthias marched into Austria: took possession of the fortresses of the Danube; and compelled the Emperor to purchase a cessation of hostilities by undertaking to pay an hundred thousand golden florins, one-half of which was disbursed by the Austrian states at the appointed time. But as the King of Hungary still delayed to yield up the captured fortresses, Frederic refused all further payment; and the war was again renewed. Matthias invaded and ravaged Austria; and though he experienced formidable resistance from several towns, his arms were

crowned with success, and he became master of Vienna and Neustadt. Driven from his capital the terrified Emperor was reduced to the utmost distress, and wandered from town to town and from convent to convent, endeavouring to arouse the German States against the Hungarians. Yet even in this exigency his good fortune did not wholly forsake him; and he availed himself of a Diet at Franfort to procure the election of his son Maximilian as King of the Romans. To this Diet, however, the King of Bohemia received no summons, and therefore protested against the validity of the election. A full apology and admission of his right easily satisfied Wladislaus, and he consented to remit the fine which the Golden Bull had fixed as the penalty of the omission. The death of Matthias Corvinus in 1490, left the throne of Hungary vacant, and the Hungarians, influenced by their widowed queen, conferred the crown upon the King of Bohemia, without listening to the pretensions of Maximilian. That valorous prince, however, sword in hand, recovered his Austrian dominions; and the rival kings concluded a severe contest by the treaty of Presburg, by which Hungary was for the present secured to Wladislaus; but on his death without heirs was to vest in the descendants of the Emperor."—Sir R. Comyn, *The History of the Western Empire*, ch. 28 (v. 2).—See HUNGARY: A. D. 1471-1487, and 1487-1526.

**A. D. 1477-1495.—Marriage of Maximilian with Mary of Burgundy.—His splendid dominion.—His joyous character.—His vigorous powers.—His ambitions and aims.**—"Maximilian, who was as active and enterprising as his father was indolent and timid, married at eighteen years of age, the only daughter of Charles the Bold, duko of Burgundy [see NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1477]. She brought him Flanders, Franche-Comté, and all the Low Countries. Louis XI, who disputed some of these territories, and who, on the death of the duke, had seized Burgundy, Picardy, Ponthieu, and Artois, as fiefs of France, which could not be possessed by a woman, was defeated by Maximilian at Guinegate; and Charles VIII, who renewed the same claims, was obliged to conclude a disadvantageous peace." Maximilian succeeded to the imperial throne on the death of his father in 1493.—W. Russell, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, letter 49 (v. 1).—"Between the Alps and the Bohemian frontier, the mark Austria was first founded round and about the castles of Krems and Melk. Since then, beginning first in the valley towards Bavaria and Hungary, and coming to the House of Habsburg, it had extended across the whole of the northern slope of the Alps until where the Slavish, Italian, and German tongues part, and over to Alsace; thus becoming an archduchy from a mark. On all sides the Archdukes had claims; on the German side to Switzerland, on the Italian to the Venetian possessions, and on the Slavish to Bohemia and Hungary. To such a pitch of greatness had Maximilian by his marriage with Maria of Burgundy brought the heritage received from Charles the Bold. True to the Netherlanders' greeting, in the inscription over their gates, 'Thou art our Duke, fight our battle for us,' war was from the first his hand-craft. He adopted Charles the Bold's hostile attitude towards France; he saved the greater part of his inheritance from the schemes of Louis XI. Day and night it was his whole



thought, to conquer it entirely. But after Maria of Burgundy's premature death, revolution followed revolution, and his father Frederick being too old to protect himself, it came about that in the year 1488 he was ousted from Austria by the Hungarians, whilst his son was kept a prisoner in Bruges by the citizens, and they had even to fear the estrangement of the Tyrol. Yet they did not lose courage. At this very time the father denoted with the vowels, A. E. I. O. U. ('Alles Erdreich ist Oesterreich unterthan'—All the earth is subject to Austria), the extent of his hopes. In the same year, his son negotiated for a Spanish alliance. Their real strength lay in the imperial dignity of Maximilian, which they had from the German Empire. As soon as it began to bestir itself, Maximilian was set at liberty; as soon as it supported him in the persons of only a few princes of the Empire, he became lord in his Netherlands. . . . Since then his plans were directed against Hungary and Burgundy. In Hungary he could gain nothing except securing the succession to his house. But never, frequently as he concluded peace, did he give up his intentions upon Burgundy. . . . Now that he had allied himself with a Sforza, and had joined the Liga, now that his father was dead, and the Empire was pledged to follow him across the mountains, and now, too, that the Italian complications were threatening Charles, he took fresh hope, and in this hope he summoned a Diet at Worms. Maximilian was a prince of whom, although many portraits have been drawn, yet there is scarcely one that resembles another, so easily and entirely did he suit himself to circumstances. . . . His soul is full of motion, of joy in things, and of plans. There is scarcely anything that he is not capable of doing. In his mind he is a good screener, in his armoury the best plater, capable of instructing others in new inventions. With musket in hand, he defests his best marksman, George Parkhard; with heavy cannon, which he has shown how to cast, and has placed on wheels, he comes as a rule nearest the mark. He commands seven captains in their seven several tongues; he himself chooses and mixes his food and medicines. In the open country, he feels himself happiest. . . . What really distinguishes his public life is that presentiment of the future greatness of his dynasty which he has inherited of his father, and the restless striving to attain all that devolved upon him from the House of Burgundy. All his policy and all his schemes were concentrated, not upon his Empire, for the real needs of which he evinced little real care, and not immediately upon the welfare of his hereditary lands, but upon the realization of that sole idea. Of it all his letters and speeches are full. . . . In March, 1495, Maximilian came to the Diet at Worms. . . . At this Reichstag the King gained two momentous prospects. In Wurtemberg there had sprung of two lines two counts of quite opposite characters. . . . With the elder, Maximilian now entered into a compact. Wurtemberg was to be raised to a dukedom—an elevation which excluded the female line from the succession—and, in the event of the stock failing, was to be a 'widow's portion' of the realm to the use of the Imperial Chamber. Now as the sole hopes of this family centred in a weakling of a boy, this arrangement held out to Maximilian and his successors the prospect of acquiring a

splendid country. Yet this was the smaller of his two successes. The greater was the espousal of his children, Philip and Margaret, with the two children of Ferdinand the Catholic, Juana and Juan, which was here settled. This opened to his house still greater expectations,—it brought him at once into the most intimate alliance with the Kings of Spain. These matters might possibly, however, have been arranged elsewhere. What Maximilian really wanted in the Reichstag at Worms was the assistance of the Empire against the French with its world-renowned and much-envied soldiery. For at this time in all the wars of Europe, German auxiliaries were decisive. . . . If Maximilian had united the whole of this power in his hand, neither Europe nor Asia would have been able to withstand him. But God disposed that it should rather be employed in the cause of freedom than oppression. What an Empire was that which in spite of its vast strength allowed its Emperor to be expelled from his heritage, and did not for a long time take steps to bring him back again? If we examine the constitution of the Empire, not as we should picture it to ourselves in Henry III.'s time, but as it had at length become—the legal independence of the several estates, the emptiness of the imperial dignity, the elective-ness of a head, that afterwards exercised certain rights over the electors,—we are led to inquire not so much into the causes of its disintegration, for this concerns us little, as into the way in which it was held together. What welded it together, and preserved it, would (leaving tradition and the Pope out of the question) appear, before all else, to have been the rights of individuals, the unions of neighbours, and the social regulations which universally obtained. Such were those rights and privileges that not only protected the citizen, his guild, and his quarter of the town against his neighbours and more powerful men than himself, but which also endowed him with an inner independence. . . . Next, the unions of neighbours. These were not only leagues of cities and peasantry, expanded from ancient fraternities—for who can tell the origin of the Hansa, or the earliest treaty between Uri and Schwyz?—into large associations, or of knights, who strengthened a really insignificant power by confederations of neighbours, but also of the princes, who were bound together by joint inheritances, mutual expectancies, and the ties of blood, which in some cases were very close. This ramification, dependent upon a supreme power and confirmed by it, bound neighbour to neighbour; and, whilst securing to each his privilege and his liberty, blended together all countries of Germany in legal bonds of union. But it is only in the social regulations that the unity was really perceptible. Only as long as the Empire was an actual reality, could the supreme power of the Electors, each with his own special rights, be maintained; only so long could dukes and princes, bishops and abbots hold their neighbours in due respect, and through court offices and hereditary services, through the dignity of their independent position give their vassals a peculiar position to the whole. Only so long could the cities enjoying immediateness under the Empire, carefully directed into free and imperial cities, be not merely protected, but also assured of a participation in the government of the whole. Under this sanctified and

traditional system of suzerainty and vassalage all were happy and contented, and bore a love to it such as is cherished towards a native town or a father's house. For some time past, the House of Austria had enjoyed the foremost position. It also had a union, and, moreover, a great faction on its side. The union was the Swabian League. Old Suabia was divided into three leagues.—the league of the peasantry (the origin of Switzerland); the league of the knights in the Black Forest, on the Kocher, the Neckar, and the Danube; and the league of the cities. The peasantry were from the first hostile to Austria. The Emperor Frederick brought it to pass that the cities and knights, that had from time out of mind lived in feud, bound themselves together with several princes, and formed, under his protection, the league of the land of Suabia. But the party was scattered throughout the whole Empire."—L. von Ranke, *History of the Latin and Teutonic Nations*, bk. 1, ch. 3.

A. D. 1493-1519.—The Imperial reign of Maximilian.—Formation of the Circle of Austria.—The Aulic Council. See GERMANY: A. D. 1493-1519.

A. D. 1496-1499.—The Swabian War with the Swiss Confederacy and the Graubunden, or Grey Leagues (Grisons).—Practical independence of both acquired. See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1396-1499.

A. D. 1496-1526.—Extraordinary aggrandizement of the House of Austria by its marriages.—The Heritage of Charles V.—His cession of the German inheritance to Ferdinand.—The division of the House into Spanish and German branches.—Acquisition of Hungary and Bohemia.—In 1496, Philip the Fair, son of Maximilian, Archduke and Emperor, by his marriage with Mary of Burgundy, "espoused the Infanta of Spain, daughter of Ferdinand [of Aragon] and Isabella of Castile. They had two sons, Charles and Ferdinand, the former of whom, known in history by the name of Charles V., inherited the Low Countries in right of his father, Philip (1506). On the death of Ferdinand, his maternal grandfather (1516), he became heir to the whole Spanish succession, which comprehended the kingdoms of Spain, Naples, Sicily, and Sardinia, together with Spanish America. To these vast possessions were added his patrimonial dominions in Austria, which were transmitted to him by his paternal grandfather, the Emperor Maximilian I. About the same time (1519), the Imperial dignity was conferred on this prince by the electors [see GERMANY: A. D. 1519]; so that Europe had not seen, since the time of Charlemagne, a monarchy so powerful as that of Charles V. This Emperor concluded a treaty with his brother Ferdinand; by which he ceded to him all his hereditary possessions in Germany. The two brothers thus became the founders of the two principal branches of the House of Austria, viz., that of Spain, which began with Charles V. (called Charles I. of Spain), and ended with Charles II. (1700); and that of Germany, of which Ferdinand I. was the ancestor, and which became extinct in the male line in the Emperor Charles VI. (1740). These two branches, closely allied to each other, acted in concert for the advancement of their reciprocal interests; more-over they gained each their own separate advantages by the marriage connexions which they

formed. Ferdinand I. of the German line married Anne (1521), sister of Louis King of Hungary and Bohemia, who having been slain by the Turks at the battle of Mohacs (1526), these two kingdoms devolved to Ferdinand of the House of Austria. Finally, the marriage which Charles V. contracted with the Infanta Isabella, daughter of Emmanuel, King of Portugal, procured Philip II. of Spain, the son of that marriage, the whole Portuguese monarchy, to which he succeeded on the death of Henry, called the Cardinal (1580). So vast an aggrandisement of power alarmed the Sovereigns of Europe."—C. W. Koch, *The Revolutions of Europe, period 6.*

ALSO IN: W. COXE, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 25 and 27 (v. 1).—W. Robertson, *Hist. of the Reign of Charles V.*, bk. 1.—See, also, SPAIN: A. D. 1496-1517.

A. D. 1519.—Death of Maximilian.—Election of Charles V., "Emperor of the Romans." See GERMANY: A. D. 1519.

A. D. 1519-1555.—The imperial reign of Charles V.—The objects of his policy.—His conflict with the Reformation and with France.—"Charles V. did not receive from nature all the gifts nor all the charms she can bestow, nor did experience give him every talent; but he was equal to the part he had to play in the world. He was sufficiently great to keep his many-jewelled diadem. . . . His ambition was cold and wise. The scope of his ideas, which are not quite easy to divine, was vast enough to control a state composed of divers and distant portions, so as to make it always very difficult to amalgamate his armies, and to supply them with food, or to procure money. Indeed its very existence would have been exposed to permanent danger from powerful coalitions, had Francis I. known how to place its most vulnerable points under a united pressure from the armies of France, of England, of Venice, and of the Ottoman Empire. Charles V. attained his first object when he prevented the French monarch from taking possession of the inheritance of the house of Anjou, at Naples, and of that of the Viscontis at Milan. He was more successful in stopping the march of Solyman into Austria than in checking the spread of the Reformation in Germany. . . . Charles V. had four objects very much at heart: he wished to be the master in Italy, to check the progress of the Ottoman power in the west of Europe, to conquer the King of France, and to govern the Germanic body by dividing it, and by making the Reformation a religious pretext for oppressing the political defenders of that belief. In three out of four of these objects he succeeded. Germany alone was not conquered: if she was beaten in battle, neither any political triumph nor any religious results ensued. In Germany, Charles V. began his work too late, and acted too slowly; he undertook to subdue it at a time when the abettors of the Reformation had grown strong, when he himself was growing weaker. . . . Like many other brilliant careers, the career of Charles V. was more successful and more striking at the commencement and the middle than at the end, of its course. At Madrid, at Cambray, at Nice, he made his rival bow down his head. At Crespy he again forced him to obey his will, but as he had completely made up his mind to have peace, Charles dictated it, in some manner, to his own detriment. At Passau he had to yield to the terms of his enemy

—of an enemy whom Charles V. encountered in his old age, and when his powers had decayed. Although it may be said that the extent and the power of the sovereignty which Charles V. left to his successor at his death were not diminished, still his armies were weakened, his finances were exhausted, and the country was wreny of the tyranny of the imperial lieutenants. The supremacy of the empire in Germany, for which he had struggled so much, was as little established at the end as at the beginning of his reign; religious unity was solemnly destroyed by the 'Recess' of Augsburg. But that which marks the position of Charles V. as the representative man of his epoch, and as the founder of the policy of modern times, is that, wherever he was victorious, the effect of his success was to crush the last efforts of the spirit of the middle ages, and of the independence of nations. In Italy, in Spain, in Germany, and in the Low Countries, his triumphs were so much gain to the cause of absolute monarchy and so much loss to the liberty derived from the old state of society. Whatever was the character of liberty in the middle ages—whether it were contested or incomplete, or a mockery—it played a greater part than in the four succeeding centuries. Charles V. was assuredly one of those who contributed the most to found and consolidate the political system of modern governments. His history has an aspect of grandeur. Had Francis I. been as sagacious in the closet as he was bold in the field, by a vigorous alliance with England, with Protestant Germany, and with some of the republics of Italy, he might perhaps have balanced and controlled the power of Charles V. But the French monarch did not possess the foresight and the solid understanding necessary to pursue such a policy with success. His rival, therefore, occupies the first place in the historical picture of the epoch. Charles V. had the sentiment of his position and of the part he had to play."—J. Van Praet, *Essays on the Political History of the 15th, 16th, and 17th Centuries*, pp. 190-194.—See, also, GERMANY: A. D. 1519 to 1552-1561, and FRANCE: A. D. 1520-1523, to 1547-1559.

**A. D. 1525-1527.—Successful Contest for the Hungarian and Bohemian Crowns.**—In Hungary, under King Matthias the house of Zapolya, so called from a Slavonic village near Poschega, whence it originated, rose to peculiar eminence. To this house, in particular, King Wladislas had owed his accession to the throne; whence, however, it thought itself entitled to claim a share in the sovereign power, and even a sort of prospective right to the throne. Its members were the wealthiest of all the magnates; they possessed seventy-two castles. . . . It is said that a prophecy early promised the crown to the young John Zapolya. Possessed of all the power conferred by his rich inheritance, Count of Zips, and Woiwode of Transylvania, he soon collected a strong party around him. It was he who mainly persuaded the Hungarians, in the year 1505, to exclude all foreigners from the throne by a formal decree; which, though they were not always able to maintain in force, they could never be induced absolutely to revoke. In the year 1514 the Woiwode succeeded in putting down an exceedingly formidable insurrection of the peasants with his own forces; a service which the lesser nobility prized the more highly, because

it enabled them to reduce the peasantry to a still harder state of servitude. His wish was, on the death of Wladislas, to become Gubernator of the kingdom, to marry the deceased king's daughter Anne, and then to await the course of events. But he was here encountered by the policy of Maximilian. Anne was married to the Archduke Ferdinand; Zapolya was excluded from the administration of the kingdom; even the vacant Palatinate was refused him and given to his old rival Stephen Bathory. He was highly incensed. . . . But it was not till the year 1525 that Zapolya got the upper hand at the Rakosch. . . . No one entertained a doubt that he aimed at the throne. . . . But before anything was accomplished—on the contrary, just as these party conflicts had thrown the country into the utmost confusion, the mighty enemy, Soliman, appeared on the frontiers of Hungary, determined to put an end to the anarchy. . . . In his prison at Madrid, Francis I. had found means to entreat the assistance of Soliman; urging that it well becomed a great emperor to succour the oppressed. Plans were laid at Constantinople, according to which the two sovereigns were to attack Spain with a combined fleet, and to send armies to invade Hungary and the north of Italy. Soliman, without any formal treaty, was by his position an ally of the Ligue, as the king of Hungary was, of the emperor. On the 23d of April, 1526, Soliman, after visiting the graves of his forefathers and of the old Moslem martyrs, marched out of Constantinople with a mighty host, consisting of about a hundred thousand men, and incessantly strengthened by fresh recruits on its road. . . . What power had Hungary, in the condition we have just described, of resisting such an attack? . . . The young king took the field with a following of not more than three thousand men. . . . He proceeded to the fatal plain of Mohacz, fully resolved with his small band to await in the open field the overwhelming force of the enemy. . . . Personal valour could avail nothing. The Hungarians were immediately thrown into disorder, their best men fell, the others took to flight. The young king was compelled to flee. It was not even granted him to die in the field of battle; a far more miserable end awaited him. Mounted behind a Silesian soldier, who served him as a guide, he had already been carried across the dark waters that divide the plain; his horse was already climbing the bank, when he slipped, fell back, and buried himself and his rider in the morass. This rendered the defeat decisive. . . . Soliman had gained one of those victories which decide the fate of nations during long epochs. . . . That two thrones, the succession to which was not entirely free from doubt, had thus been left vacant, was an event that necessarily caused a great agitation throughout Christendom. It was still a question whether such a European power as Austria would continue to exist;—a question which it is only necessary to state, in order to be aware of its vast importance to the fate of mankind at large, and of Germany in particular. . . . The claims of Ferdinand to both crowns, unquestionable as they might be in reference to the treaties with the reigning houses, were opposed in the nations themselves, by the right of election and the authority of considerable rivals. In Hungary, as soon as the Turks had retired, John Zapolya appeared with the fine

army which he had kept back from the conflict; the fall of the king was at the same time the fall of his adversaries. . . . Even in Tokay, however, John Zapolya was saluted as king. Meanwhile, the dukes of Bavaria conceived the design of getting possession of the throne of Bohemia. . . . Nor was it in the two kingdoms alone that these pretenders had a considerable party. The state of politics in Europe was such as to insure them powerful supporters abroad. In the first place, Francis I. was intimately connected with Zapolya; in a short time a delegate from the pope was at his side, and the Germans in Rome maintained that Clement assisted the faction of the Weiwoide with money. Zapolya sent an agent to Venice with a direct request to be admitted a member of the Ligue of Cognac. In Bohemia, too, the French had long had devoted partisans. . . . The consequences that must have resulted, had this scheme succeeded, are so incalculable, that it is not too much to say they would have completely changed the political history of Europe. The power of Bavaria would have outweighed that of Austria in both German and Slavonian countries, and Zapolya, thus supported, would have been able to maintain his station; the Ligue, and with it high ultra-montane opinions would have held the ascendancy in eastern Europe. Never was there a project more pregnant with danger to the growing power of the house of Austria. Ferdinand behaved with all the prudence and energy which that house has so often displayed in difficult emergencies. For the present, the all-important object was the crown of Bohemia. . . . All his measures were taken with such skill and prudence, that on the day of election, though the Bavarian agent had, up to the last moment, not the slightest doubt of the success of his negotiations, an overwhelming majority in the three estates elected Ferdinand to the throne of Bohemia. This took place on the 23d October, 1526. . . . On his brother's birth-day, the 24th of February, 1527, Ferdinand was crowned at Prague. . . . The affairs of Hungary were not so easily or so peacefully settled. . . . At first, when Zapolya came forward, full armed and powerful out of the general desolation, he had the uncontested superiority. The capital of the kingdom sought his protection, after which he marched to Stuhlweissenburg, where his partisans bore down all attempts at opposition: he was elected and crowned (11th of November, 1526); in Croatia, too, he was acknowledged king at a diet; he filled all the numerous places, temporal and spiritual, left vacant by the disaster of Mohacz, with his friends. . . . [But] the Germans advanced without interruption; and as soon as it appeared possible that Ferdinand might be successful, Zapolya's followers began to desert him. . . . Never did the German troops display more bravery and constancy. They had often neither meat nor bread, and were obliged to live on such fruits as they found in the gardens: the inhabitants were wavering and uncertain—they submitted, and then revolted again to the enemy; Zapolya's troops, aided by their knowledge of the ground, made several very formidable attacks by night; but the Germans evinced, in the moment of danger, the skill and determination of a Roman legion: they showed, too, a noble constancy under difficulties and privations. At Tokay they defeated Zapolya and compelled him

to quit Hungary. . . . On the 3d November, 1527, Ferdinand was crowned in Stuhlweissenburg: only five of the magnates of the kingdom adhered to Zapolya. The victory appeared complete. Ferdinand, however, distinctly felt that this appearance was delusive. . . . In Bohemia, too, his power was far from secure. His Bavarian neighbours had not relinquished the hope of driving him from the throne at the first general turn of affairs. The Ottomans, meanwhile, acting upon the persuasion that every land in which the head of their chief had rested belonged of right to them, were preparing to return to Hungary; either to take possession of it themselves, or at first, as was their custom, to bestow it on a native ruler—Zapolya, who now eagerly sought an alliance with them—as their vassal."—L. Von Ranke, *History of the Reformation in Germany*, bk. 4, ch. 4 (p. 2).

**A. D. 1564-1618.—The tolerance of Maximilian II.—The bigotry and tyranny of Rodolph and Ferdinand II.—Prelude to the Thirty Years War.**—"There is no period connected with these religious wars that deserves more to be studied than these reigns of Ferdinand I., Maximilian [the Second], and those of his successors who preceded the thirty years' war. We have no sovereign who exhibited that exercise of moderation and good sense which a philosopher would require, but Maximilian; and he was immediately followed by princes of a different complexion. . . . Nothing could be more complete than the difficulty of toleration at the time when Maximilian reigned; and if a mild policy could be attended with favourable effects in his age and nation, there can be little fear of the experiment at any other period. No party or person in the state was then disposed to tolerate his neighbour from any sense of the justice of such forbearance, but from motives of temporal policy alone. The Lutherans, it will be seen, could not bear that the Calvinists should have the same religious privileges with themselves. The Calvinists were equally opinionated and unjust; and Maximilian himself was probably tolerant and wise, chiefly because he was in his real opinions a Lutheran, and in outward profession, as the head of the empire, a Roman Catholic. For twelve years, the whole of his reign, he preserved the religious peace of the community, without destroying the religious freedom of the human mind. He supported the Roman Catholics, as the predominant party, in all their rights, possessions, and privileges; but he protected the Protestants in every exercise of their religion which was then practicable. In other words, he was as tolerant and just as the temper of society then admitted, and more so than the state of things would have suggested. . . . The merit of Maximilian was but too apparent the moment that his son Rodolph was called upon to supply his place. . . . He always left the education of his son and successor too much to the discretion of his bigoted consort. Rodolph, his son, was therefore as ignorant and furious on his part as were the Protestants on theirs; he had immediate recourse to the usual expedients—force, and the execution of the laws to the very letter. . . . After Rodolph comes Matthias, and, unhappily for all Europe, Bohemia and the empire fell afterwards under the management of Ferdinand II. Of the different Austrian princes, it is the reign of Ferdinand

II. that is more particularly to be considered. Such was the arbitrary nature of his government over his subjects in Bohemia, that they revolted. They elected for their king the young Elector Palatine, hoping thus to extricate themselves from the bigotry and tyranny of Ferdinand. This crown so offered was accepted; and, in the event, the cause of the Bohemians became the cause of the Reformation in Germany, and the Elector Palatine the hero of that cause. It is this which gives the great interest to this reign of Ferdinand II., to these concerns of his subjects in Bohemia, and to the character of this Elector Palatine. For all these events and circumstances led to the thirty years' war."—W. Smyth, *Lectures on Modern History*, v. 1, lect. 13.—See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1611-1618, and GERMANY: A. D. 1618-1620.

**A. D. 1567-1660.—Struggles of the Hapsburg House in Hungary and Transylvania to establish rights of sovereignty.—Wars with the Turks.** See HUNGARY: A. D. 1567-1604, and 1606-1660.

**A. D. 1618-1648.—The Thirty Years War.—The Peace of Westphalia.**—"The thirty years' war made Germany the centre-point of European politics. . . . No one at its commencement could have foreseen the duration and extent. But the train of war was everywhere laid, and required only the match to set it going; more than one war was joined to it, and swallowed up in it; and the melancholy truth, that war feeds itself, was never more clearly displayed. . . . Though the war, which first broke out in Bohemia, concerned only the house of Austria, yet by its originating in religious disputes, by its peculiar character as a religious war, and by the measures adopted both by the insurgents and the emperor, it acquired such an extent, that even the quelling of the insurrection was insufficient to put a stop to it. . . . Though the Bohemian war was apparently terminated, yet the flame had communicated to Germany and Hungary, and new fuel was added by the act of proscription promulgated against the elector Frederic and his adherents. From this the war derived that revolutionary character, which was henceforward peculiar to it; it was a step that could not but lead to further results, for the question of the relations between the emperor and his states, was in a fair way of being practically considered. New and bolder projects were also formed in Vienna and Madrid, where it was resolved to renew the war with the Netherlands. Under the present circumstances, the suppression of the Protestant religion and the overthrow of German and Dutch liberty appeared inseparable; while the success of the imperial arms, supported as they were by the league and the co-operation of the Spaniards, gave just grounds for hope. . . . By the carrying of the war into Lower Saxony, the principal seat of the Protestant religion in Germany (the states of which had appointed Christian IV. of Denmark, as duke of Holstein, head of their confederacy), the northern states had already, though without any beneficial result, been involved in the strife, and the Danish war had broken out. But the elevation of Albert of Wallenstein to the dignity of duke of Friedland and imperial general over the army raised by himself, was of considerably more importance, as it affected the whole course and character of the war. From this time the

war was completely and truly revolutionary. The peculiar situation of the general, the manner of the formation as well as the maintenance of his army, could not fail to make it such. . . . The distinguished success of the imperial arms in the north of Germany unveiled the daring schemes of Wallenstein. He did not come forward as conqueror alone, but, by the investiture of Mecklenburg as a state of the empire, as a ruling prince. . . . But the elevation and conduct of this *novus homo*, exasperated and annoyed the Catholic no less than the Protestant states, especially the league and its chief; all implored peace, and Wallenstein's discharge. Thus, at the diet of the electors at Augsburg, the emperor was reduced to the alternative of resigning him or his allies. He chose the former. Wallenstein was dismissed, the majority of his army disbanded, and Tilly nominated commander-in-chief of the forces of the emperor and the league. . . . On the side of the emperor sufficient care was taken to prolong the war. The refusal to restore the unfortunate Frederic, and even the sale of his upper Palatine to Bavaria, must with justice have excited the apprehensions of the other princes. But when the Jesuits finally succeeded, not only in extorting the edict of restitution, but also in causing it to be enforced in the most odious manner, the Catholic states themselves saw with regret that peace could no longer exist. . . . The greater the success that attended the house of Austria, the more actively foreign policy laboured to counteract it. England had taken an interest in the fate of Frederic V. from the first, though this interest was evinced by little beyond fruitless negotiations. Denmark became engaged in the quarrel mostly through the influence of this power and Holland. Richelieu, from the time he became prime minister of France, had exerted himself in opposing Austria and Spain. He found employment for Spain in the contests respecting Veltelin, and for Austria soon after, by the war of Mantua. Willingly would he have detached the German league from the interest of the emperor; and though he failed in this, he procured the fall of Wallenstein. . . . Much more important, however, was Richelieu's influence on the war, by the essential share he had in gaining Gustavus Adolphus' active participation in it. . . . The nineteen years of his [Gustavus Adolphus'] reign which had already elapsed, together with the Polish war, which lasted nearly that time, had taught the world but little of the real worth of this great and talented hero. The decisive superiority of Protestantism in Germany, under his guidance, soon created a more just knowledge, and at the same time showed the advantages which must result to a victorious supporter of that cause. . . . The battle at Leipzig was decisive for Gustavus Adolphus and his party, almost beyond expectation. The league fell asunder; and in a short time he was master of the countries from the Baltic to Bavaria, and from the Rhine to Bohemia. . . . But the misfortunes and death of Tilly brought Wallenstein again on the stage as absolute commander-in-chief, bent on plans not a whit less extensive than those he had before formed. No period of the war gave promise of such great and rapid successes or reverses as the present, for both leaders were determined to effect them; but the victory of

# SEVENTEENTH CENTURY: FIRST HALF.

## CONTEMPORANEOUS EVENTS.

- A. D.**  
**1602.** Chartering of Dutch East India Company.—First acting of Shakespeare's "Hamlet."  
**1603.** Death of Queen Elizabeth of England and accession of James I.  
**1605.** Gunpowder plot of English Catholics.—Publication of Bacon's "Advancement of Learning," and part I of Cervantes' "Don Quixote."  
**1606.** Charter granted to the London and Plymouth companies, for American colonization.—Organization of the Independent church of Brownists at Scrooby, England.  
**1607.** Settlement of Jamestown, Virginia.—Migration of Scrooby Independents to Holland.  
**1609.** Settlement of the exiled Pilgrims of Scrooby at Leyden.—Construction of the telescope by Galileo and discovery of Jupiter's moons.\*  
**1610.** Assassination of Henry IV. of France and accession of Louis XIII.  
**1611.** Publication in England of the King James or Authorized version of the Bible.  
**1614.** Last meeting of the States General of France before the Revolution.  
**1615.** Appearance at Frankfort-on-the-Main of the first known weekly newspaper.  
**1616.** Opening of war between Sweden and Poland.—Death of Shakespeare and Cervantes.  
**1618.** Rising of Protestants in Bohemia, beginning the Thirty Years War.  
**1619.** Trial and execution of John of Barneveldt.—Introduction of slavery in Virginia.  
**1620.** Decisive defeat of the Protestants of Bohemia in the battle of the White Mountain.—Rising of the French Huguenots at Rochelle.—Migration of the Pilgrims from Leyden to America.  
**1621.** Formation of the Dutch West India Company.—The first Thanksgiving Day in New England.  
**1622.** Appearance of the first known printed newspaper in England—"The Weekly Newes."  
**1624.** Beginning of Richelieu's ministry, in France.  
**1625.** Death of James I., of England, and accession of Charles I.; beginning of the English struggle between King and Parliament.—Engagement of Wallenstein and his army in the service of the Emperor against the Protestants.  
**1627.** Alliance of England with the French Huguenots.—Siege of Rochelle by Richelieu.  
**1628.** Passage by the English Parliament of the act called the Petition of Right.—Assassination of the duke of Buckingham.—Surrender of Rochelle to Richelieu.—Publication of Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood.  
**1629.** Tumult in the English Parliament, dissolution by the king and arrest of Elliot and others.  
**1630.** Appearance in Germany of Gustavus Adolphus, king of Sweden, as the champion of Protestantism.—Settlement of the colony of Massachusetts Bay, in New England, and founding of Boston.—The Day of the Dupes in France.  
**1631.** Siege, capture and sack of Magdeburg by the imperial general, Tilly.—Defeat of Tilly on the Breitenfeld, at Leipzig, by Gustavus Adolphus.  
**1632.** Defeat and death of Tilly.—Victory and death of Gustavus Adolphus at Lützen.—Patent to Lord Baltimore by James I., of England, granting him the territory in America called Maryland.—First Jesuit mission to Canada.  
**1634.** Assassination of Wallenstein.—Levy of Ship-money in England.  
**1635.** First settlements in the Connecticut valley.  
**1636.** Banishment of Roger Williams from Massachusetts, and his founding of Providence.  
**1637.** The Pequot War in New England.—Introduction of Laud's Service-book in Scotland; tumult in St. Giles' church.  
**1638.** Banishment of Anne Hutchinson from Massachusetts.—Rising in Scotland against the Service-book; organization of the Tables; signing of the National Covenant.  
**1639.** The First Bishops' War of the Scotch with King Charles I.  
**1640.** Meeting of the Long Parliament in England.—Recovery of independence by Portugal.  
**1641.** Impeachment and execution of Strafford and adoption of the Grand Remonstrance by the English Parliament.—Catholic rising in Ireland and alleged massacres of Protestants.  
**1642.** King Charles' attempt, in England, to arrest the Five Members, and opening of the Civil War at Edgehill.—Conspiracy of Cinq Mars in France.—Death of Cardinal Richelieu.  
**1643.** Meeting of the Westminster Assembly of Divines.—Subscription of the Solemn League and Covenant between the Scotch and English nations.—Siege of Gloucester and first battle of Newbury.—Death of Louis XIII. of France and accession of Louis XIV.  
**1644.** Battles of Marston Moor and the second Newbury, in the English civil war.  
**1645.** Oliver Cromwell placed second in command of the English Parliamentary army.—His victory at Naseby.—Exploits of Montrose in Scotland.  
**1646.** Adoption of Presbyterianism by the English Parliament.—Surrender of King Charles to the Scottish army.  
**1647.** Surrender of King Charles by the Scots to the English, and his seizure by the Army.  
**1648.** The second Civil War in England.—Cromwell's victory at Preston.—Treaty of Newport with the king.—Grand Army Remonstrance, and Pride's Purge of Parliament.—Last campaigns of the Thirty Years War.—Peace of Westphalia; cession of Alsace to France.  
**1649.** Trial and execution of King Charles I., of England, and establishment of the Commonwealth.—Campaign of Cromwell in Ireland.—First civil war of the Fronde in France.  
**1650.** Charles II. in Scotland.—War between the English and the Scotch.—Victory of Cromwell at Dunbar.—The new Fronde in France, in alliance with Spain.

## SEVENTEENTH CENTURY: SECOND HALF.

### CONTEMPORANEOUS EVENTS.

#### A. D.

- 1651.** Invasion of England by Charles II. and the Scots; Cromwell's victory at Worcester; complete conquest of Scotland.
- 1652.** Victorious naval war of the English with the Dutch.—End of the Fronde.—Institution of the Libereur Veto in Poland.
- 1653.** Expulsion of "the Rump" by Cromwell, and establishment of the Protectorate in England.—Adoption of the Instrument of Government.—Return of Mazarin to power in France.—The Cromwellian settlement of Ireland.
- 1654.** Incorporation of Scotland with the English Commonwealth, under Cromwell.—Peace between the English and Dutch.—Conquest of Nova Scotia by the New England colonists.
- 1655.** Alliance of England and France against Spain.—English conquest of Jamaica.
- 1656.** Beginning of the persecution of the Quakers in Massachusetts.
- 1658.** Capture of Dunkirk from the Spaniards and possession given by the French to the English.—Death of Cromwell and succession of his son Richard as Protector.
- 1659.** Meeting of a new Parliament in England; its dissolution; resuscitation and re-expulsion of the Rump, and formation of a provisional government by the Army.
- 1660.** March of the English army under Monk from Scotland to London.—Call of a new Parliament by Monk, and restoration of the monarchy, in the person of Charles II.
- 1661.** Restoration of the Church of England and ejection of 2,000 nonconformist ministers.—Personal assumption of government by Louis XIV. in France.—Beginning of the ministry of Colbert.
- 1662.** Sale of Dunkirk to France by Charles II.—Restoration of episcopacy in Scotland and persecution of the Covenanters.
- 1664.** Seizure of New Netherland (henceforth New York) by the English from the Dutch and grant of the province to the duke of York.—Grant of New Jersey to Berkeley and Carteret.
- 1665.** Outbreak of the great Plague in London.—Formal declarations of war between the English and the Dutch.
- 1666.** The great fire in London.—Tremendous naval battles between Dutch and English and defeat of the former.
- 1667.** Ravages by a Dutch fleet in the Thames.—Peace treaties of Breda, between England, Holland, France and Denmark.—War of Louis XIV., called the War of the Queen's Rights, in the Spanish Netherlands.
- 1668.** Triple alliance of England, Holland and Sweden against France.
- 1669.** First exploring journey of La Salle from the St. Lawrence to the West.
- 1670.** Treaty of the king of England with Louis XIV. of France, betraying his allies, the Dutch, and engaging to profess himself a Catholic.
- 1672.** Alliance of England and France against the Dutch.—Restoration of the Stadtholdership in Holland to the Prince of Orange, and murder of the DeWitts.
- 1673.** Recovery of New Netherland by the Dutch from the English.
- 1674.** Treaty of Westminster, restoring peace between the Dutch and English and ceding New Netherland to the latter.
- 1675.** War with the Indians in New England, known as King Philip's War.
- 1678.** Pretended Popish Plot in England.—Treaties of Nimwegen.
- 1679.** Passage of the Habeas Corpus Act in England.—Oppression of Scotland and persecution of the Covenanters.—Defeat of Claverhouse at Drumclog.—Defeat of Covenanters at Bothwell Bridge.
- 1680.** First naming of the Whig and Tory parties in England.
- 1681.** Merciless despotism of the duke of York in Scotland.—Beginning of "dragonnade" persecution of Protestants in France.—Grant of Pennsylvania by Charles II. to William Penn.
- 1682.** Exploration of the Mississippi to its mouth by La Salle.
- 1683.** The Rye-house Plot, and execution of Lord Russell and Algernon Sidney, in England.—Great invasion of Hungary and Austria by the Turks; their siege of Vienna, and the deliverance of the city by John Sobieski, king of Poland.—Establishment of a penny post in London.
- 1685.** Death of Charles II., king of England, and accession of his brother James II., an avowed Catholic.—Rebellion of the duke of Monmouth.—Revocation of the Edict of Nantes by Louis XIV. of France.
- 1686.** Consolidation of New England under a royal governor-general.—League of Augsburg against Louis XIV. of France.
- 1688.** Declaration of Indulgence by James II. of England, and imprisonment and trial of the seven bishops for refusing to publish it.—Invitation to William and Mary of Orange to accept the English crown.—Arrival in England of the Prince of Orange and flight of James.
- 1689.** Completion of the English Revolution.—Settlement of the crown on William and Mary.—Passage of the Toleration Act and the Bill of Rights.—Landing of James II. in Ireland and war in that island; siege and successful defense of Londonderry.
- 1690.** The first congress of the American colonies.—Battle of the Boyne in Ireland.
- 1692.** The Salem Witchcraft madness in Massachusetts.—Massacre of Glencoe in Scotland.
- 1695.** Passage of the first of the Penal Laws, oppressing Catholics in Ireland.
- 1697.** Peace of Ryswick.—Cession of Strasburg and restoration of Acadia to France.
- 1699.** Peace of Carlowitz, between Turkey, Russia, Poland, Venice, and the Emperor.
- 1700.** Prussia raised in rank to a kingdom.—First campaigns of Charles XII. of Sweden.

Lützen, while it cost Gustavus his life, prepared the fall of Wallenstein. . . . Though the fall of Gustavus Adolphus frustrated his own private views, it did not those of his party. . . . The school of Gustavus produced a number of men, great in the cabinet and in the field; yet it was hard, even for an Oxenstierna, to preserve the importance of Sweden unimpaired; and it was but partially done by the alliance of Heilbronn. . . . If the forces of Sweden overrun almost every part of Germany in the following months, under the guidance of the pupils of the king, Bernard of Weimar and Gustavus Horn, we must apparently attribute it to Wallenstein's intentional inactivity in Bohemia. The distrust of him increased in Vienna the more, as he took but little trouble to diminish it; and though his fall was not sufficient to atone for treachery, if proved, it was for his equivocal character and imprudence. His death probably saved Germany from a catastrophe. . . . A great change took place upon the death of Wallenstein; as a prince of the blood, Ferdinand, king of Hungary and Bohemia, obtained the command. Thus an end was put to plans of revolutions from this quarter. But in the same year the battle of Nordlingen gave to the imperial arms a sudden preponderance, such as it had never before acquired. The separate peace of Saxony with the emperor at Prague, and soon after an alliance, were its consequences; Sweden driven back to Pomerania, seemed unable of herself, during the two following years, to maintain her ground in Germany: the victory of Wittstock turned the scale in her favour. . . . The war was prolonged and greatly extended by the active share taken in it by France: first against Spain, and soon against Austria. . . . The German war, after the treaty with Bernhard of Weimar, was mainly carried on by France, by the arming of Germans against Germans. But the pupil of Gustavus Adolphus preferred to fight for himself rather than others, and his early death was almost as much coveted by France as by Austria. The success of the Swedish arms revived under Baner. . . . At the general diet, which was at last convened, the emperor yielded to a general amnesty, or at least what was so designated. But when at the meeting of the ambassadors of the leading powers at Hamburg, the preliminaries were signed, and the time and place of the congress of peace fixed, it was deferred after Richelieu's death, (who was succeeded by Mazarin), by the war, which both parties continued, in the hope of securing better conditions by victory. A new war broke out in the north between Sweden and Denmark, and when at last the congress of peace was opened at Munster and Osnabruck, the negotiations dragged on for three years. . . . The German peace was negotiated at Munster between the emperor and France, and at Osnabruck between the emperor and Sweden; but both treaties, according to express agreement, Oct. 24, 1648, were to be considered as one, under the title of the Westphalian."—A. H. L. Heeren, *A Manual of the History of the Political System of Europe and its Colonies*, pp. 91-99.—"The Peace of Westphalia has met manifold hostile comments, not only in earlier, but also in later, times. German patriots complained that by it the unity of the Empire was rent; and indeed the connection of the States, which even before was loose, was relaxed

to the extreme. This was, however, an evil which could not be avoided, and it had to be accepted in order to prevent the French and Swedes from using their opportunity for the further enslavement of the land. . . . The religious parties also made objections to the peace. The strict Catholics condemned it as a work of inexcusable and arbitrary injustice. . . . The dissatisfaction of the Protestants was chiefly with the recognition of the Ecclesiastical Reservation. They complained also that their brethren in the faith were not allowed the free exercise of their religion in Austria. Their hostility was limited to theoretical discussions, which soon ceased when Louis XIV. took advantage of the preponderance which he had won to make outrageous assaults upon Germany, and even the Protestants were compelled to acknowledge the Emperor as the real defender of German independence."—A. Grimley, *History of the Thirty Years' War*, v. 2, ch. 10, sect. 4.—See, also, GERMANY: A. D. 1618-1630, to 1648; FRANCE: A. D. 1624-1626; and ITALY: A. D. 1627-1631.

A. D. 1621.—Formal establishment of the right of primogeniture in the Archducal Family. See GERMANY: A. D. 1636-1637.

A. D. 1624-1626.—Hostile combinations of Richelieu.—The Valtelline war in Northern Italy. See FRANCE: A. D. 1624-1626.

A. D. 1627-1631.—War with France over the succession to the Duchy of Mantua. See ITALY: A. D. 1627-1631.

A. D. 1660-1664.—Renewed war with the Turks.—Help from France.—Battle and victory of St. Gothard.—Twenty years truce. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1660-1664.

A. D. 1668-1683.—Increased oppression and religious persecution in Hungary. Revolt of Tekeli.—The Turks again called in.—Mustapha's great invasion and siege of Vienna.—Deliverance of the city by John Sobieski. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1668-1683.

A. D. 1672-1714.—The wars with Louis XIV. of France: War of the Grand Alliance.—Peace of Ryswick.—"The leading principle of the reign [in France] of Louis XIV. . . . is the principle of war with the dynasty of Charles V.—the elder branch of which reigned in Spain, while the descendants of the younger branch occupied the imperial throne of Germany. . . . At the death of Mazarin, or to speak more correctly, immediately after the death of Philip IV., . . . the early ambition of Louis XIV. sought to prevent the junior branch of the Austrian dynasty from succeeding to the inheritance of the elder branch. He had no desire to see reconstituted under the imperial sceptre of Germany the monarchy which Charles V. had at one time wished to transmit entire to his son, but which, worn out and weakened, he subsequently allowed without regret to be divided between his son and his brother. Before making war upon Austria, Louis XIV. cast his eyes upon a portion of the territory belonging to Spain, and the expedition against Holland, begun in 1672 [see NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1672-1674, and 1674-1678], for the purpose of absorbing the Spanish provinces by overwhelming them, opened the series of his vast enterprises. His first great war was, historically speaking, his first great fault. He failed in his object: for at the end of six campaigns, during



which the French armies obtained great and deserved success, Holland remained unconquered. Thus was Europe warned that the lust of conquest of a young monarch, who did not himself possess military genius, but who found in his generals the resources and ability in which he was himself deficient, would soon threaten her independence. Condé and Turenne, after having been rebellious subjects under the Regency, were about to become the first and the most illustrious lieutenants of Louis XIV. Europe, however, though warned, was not immediately ready to defend herself. It was from Austria, more directly exposed to the dangers of the great war now commencing, that the first systematic resistance ought to have come. But Austria was not prepared to play such a part; and the Emperor Leopold possessed neither the genius nor the wish for it. He was, in fact, nothing more than the nominal head of Germany. . . . Such was the state of affairs in Europe when William of Orange first made his appearance on the stage. . . . The old question of supremacy, which Louis XIV. wished to fight out as a duel with the House of Austria, was now about to change its aspect, and, owing to the presence of an unexpected genius, to bring into the quarrel other powers besides the two original competitors. The foe of Louis XIV. ought by rights to have been born on the banks of the Danube, and not on the shores of the North Sea. In fact, it was Austria that at that moment most needed a man of genius, either on the throne or at the head of affairs. The events of the century would, in this case, doubtless have followed a different course; the war would have been less general, and the maritime nations would not have been involved in it to the same degree. . . . The treaties of peace would have been signed in some small place in France or Germany, and not in two towns and a village in Holland, such as Nimeguen, Ryswick, and Utrecht. . . . William of Orange found himself in a position soon to form the Triple Alliance which the very policy of Louis XIV. suggested. For France to attack Holland, when her object was eventually to reach Austria, and keep her out of the Spanish succession, was to make enemies at one and the same time of Spain, of Austria, and of Holland. But if it afterwards required considerable efforts on the part of William of Orange to maintain this alliance, it demanded still more energy to extend it. It formed part of the Stadtholder's ulterior plans to combine the union between himself and the two branches of the Austrian family, with the old Anglo-Swedish Triple Alliance, which had just been dissolved under the strong pressure brought to bear on it by Louis XIV. . . . Louis XIV., whose finances were exhausted, was very soon anxious to make peace, even on the morrow of his most brilliant victories; whilst William of Orange, beaten and retreating, ardently desired the continuance of the war. . . . The Peace of Nimeguen was at last signed, and by it were secured to Louis XIV. Franche-Comté, and some important places in the Spanish Low Countries on his northern frontier [see NIMEGUEN, PEACE OF]. This was the culminating point of the reign of Louis XIV. Although the coalition had prevented him from attaining the full object of his designs against the House of Austria, which had been to absorb by conquest so much of the territory

belonging to Spain as would secure him against the effect of a will preserving the whole inheritance intact in the family, yet his armies had been constantly successful, and many of his opponents were evidently tired of the struggle. . . . Some years passed thus, with the appearance of calm. Europe was conquered; and when peace was broken, because, as was said, the Treaty of Nimeguen was not duly executed, the events of the war were for some time neither brilliant or important, for several campaigns began and ended without any considerable result. . . . At length Louis XIV. entered on the second half of his reign, which differed widely from the first. . . . During this second period of more than thirty years, which begins after the Treaty of Nimeguen and lasts till the Peace of Utrecht, events succeed each other in complete logical sequence, so that the reign presents itself as one continuous whole, with a regular movement of ascension and decline. . . . The leading principle of the reign remained the same; it was always the desire to weaken the House of Austria, or to secure an advantageous partition of the Spanish succession. But the Emperor of Germany was protected by the coalition, and the King of Spain, whose death was considered imminent, would not make up his mind to die. . . . During the first League, when the Prince of Orange was contending against Louis XIV. with the co-operation of the Emperor of Germany, of the King of Spain, and of the Electors on the Rhine, the religious element played only a secondary part in the war. But we shall see this element make its presence more manifest. . . . Thus the influence of Protestant England made itself more and more felt in the affairs of Europe, in proportion as the government of the Stuarts, from its violence, its unpopularity, and from the opposition offered to it, was approaching its end. . . . The second coalition was neither more united nor more firm than the first had been; but, after the expulsion of the Stuarts, the germs of dissolution no longer threatened the same dangers. . . . The British nation now made itself felt in the balance of Europe, and William of Orange was for the first time in his life successful in war at the head of his English troops. . . . This was the most brilliant epoch of the life of William III. . . . He was now at the height of his glory, after a period of twenty years from his start in life, and his destiny was accomplished; so that until the Treaty of Ryswick, which in 1698 put an end to his hostilities with France, and brought about his recognition as King of England by Louis XIV., not much more was left for him to gain; and he had the skill to lose nothing. . . . The negotiations for the Treaty of Ryswick were conducted with less ability and boldness, and concluded on less advantageous terms, than the Truce of Ratisbon or the Peace of Nimeguen. Nevertheless, this treaty, which secured to Louis the possession of Strasbourg, might, particularly as age was now creeping on him, have closed his military career without disgrace, if the eternal question, for the solution of which he had made so many sacrifices, and which had always held the foremost place in his thoughts, had not remained as unsettled and as full of difficulty as on the day when he had mounted the throne. Charles II. of Spain was not dead, and the question of the Spanish succession, which had so actively

employed the armies of Louis XIV., and taxed his diplomacy, was as undecided as at the beginning of his reign. Louis XIV. saw two alternatives before him: a partition of the succession between the Emperor and himself (a solution proposed thirty years before as a means to avoid war), or else a will in favour of France, followed of course by a recommencement of general hostilities. . . . Louis XIV. proposed in succession two schemes, not, as thirty years before, to the Emperor, but to the King of England, whose power and whose genius rendered him the arbiter of all the great affairs of Europe. . . . In the first of the treaties of partition, Spain and the Low Countries were to be given to the Prince of Bavaria; in the second, to the Archduke Charles. In both, France obtained Naples and Sicily for the Dauphin. . . . Both these arrangements . . . suited both France and England as a pacific solution of the question. . . . But events, as we know, deranged all these calculations, and Charles II., who, by continuing to live, had disappointed so much impatient expectation, by his last will provoked a general war, to be carried on against France by the union of England with the Empire and with Holland—a union which was much strengthened under the new dynasty, and which afterwards embraced the northern states of Germany. . . . William III. died at the age of fifty-two, on the 9th of March, 1702, at the beginning of the War of Succession. After him, the part he was to have played was divided. Prince Eugene, Marlborough, and Helmsius (the Grand Pensionary) had the conduct of political and especially of military affairs, and acted in concert. The disastrous consequences to France of that war, in which William had no part, are notorious. The battles of Blenheim, of Ramillies, and of Oudenarde brought the allied armies on the soil of France, and placed Louis XIV. on the verge of ruin.—J. Van Praet, *Essays on the Political History of the 15th, 16th, and 17th Centuries*, pp. 390-414 and 441-455.

ALSO IN: H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV.*, v. 2, ch. 2 and 4-6.—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 5, ch. 5-6 (v. 3).—See, also, GERMANY: A. D. 1686; and FRANCE: A. D. 1689-1690 to 1697.

A. D. 1683-1687.—Merciless suppression of the Hungarian revolt.—The crown of Hungary made hereditary in the House of Hapsburg. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1683-1687.

A. D. 1683-1699.—Expulsion of the Turks from Hungary.—The Peace of Carlowitz. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1683-1699.

A. D. 1699-1711.—Suppression of the Revolt under Rakoczy in Hungary. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1699-1718.

A. D. 1700.—Interest of the Imperial House in the question of the Spanish Succession. See SPAIN: A. D. 1698-1700.

A. D. 1701-1713.—The War of the Spanish Succession. See GERMANY: A. D. 1702, to 1704; ITALY: A. D. 1701-1713; SPAIN: A. D. 1702, to 1707-1710, and NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1702-1704, to 1710-1712.

A. D. 1711.—The War of the Spanish Succession.—Its Circumstances changed.—“The death of the Emperor Joseph I., who expired April 17, 1711, at the age of thirty-two, changed the whole character of the War of the Spanish Succession. As Joseph left no male heirs, the

hereditary dominions of the House of Austria devolved to his brother, the Archduke Charles; and though that prince had not been elected King of the Romans, and had therefore to become a candidate for the imperial crown, yet there could be little doubt that he would attain that dignity. Hence, if Charles should also become sovereign of Spain and the Indies, the vast empire of Charles V. would be again united in one person; and that very evil of an almost universal monarchy would be established, the prevention of which had been the chief cause for taking up arms against Philip V. . . . After an interregnum of half a year, during which the affairs of the Empire had been conducted by the Elector Palatine and the Elector of Saxony, as imperial vicars for South and North Germany, the Archduke Charles was unanimously named Emperor by the Electoral College (Oct. 12th). . . . Charles . . . received the imperial crown at Frankfurt, Dec. 23d, with the title of Charles VI.”—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 5, ch. 6 (v. 3).

A. D. 1713-1714.—Ending of the War of the Spanish Succession.—The Peace of Utrecht and the Treaty of Rastadt.—Acquisition of the Spanish Netherlands, Naples and Milan. See UTRACHT: A. D. 1712-1714.

A. D. 1713-1719.—Continued differences with Spain.—The Triple Alliance.—The Quadruple Alliance. See SPAIN: A. D. 1713-1725.

A. D. 1714.—The Desertion of the Catalans. See SPAIN: A. D. 1713-1714.

A. D. 1714-1718.—Recovery of Belgrade and final expulsion of the Turks from Hungary. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1699-1718.

A. D. 1718-1738.—The question of the Succession.—The Pragmatic Sanction of Charles VI., and its guarantee by the Powers.—“On the death [A. D. 1711] of Joseph, the hopes of the house of Austria and the future destiny of Germany rested on Charles [then, as titular king of Spain, Charles III., ineffectually contesting the Spanish throne with the Bourbon heir, Philip V.; afterwards, as Emperor, Charles VI.] who was the only surviving male of his illustrious family. By that event the houses of Austria, Germany and Europe were placed in a new and critical situation. From a principle of mistaken policy the succession to the hereditary dominions had never been established according to an invariable rule; for it was not clearly ascertained whether males of the collateral branches should be preferred to females in lineal descent, an uncertainty which had frequently occasioned many vehement disputes. To obviate this evil, as well as to prevent future disputes, Leopold [father of Joseph and Charles] had arranged the order of succession: to Joseph he assigned Hungary and Bohemia, and the other hereditary dominions; and to Charles the crown of Spain, and all the territories which belonged to the Spanish inheritance. Should Joseph die without issue male, the whole succession was to descend to Charles, and in case of his death, under similar circumstances, the Austrian dominions were to devolve on the daughters of Joseph in preference to those of Charles. This family compact was signed by the two brothers in the presence of Leopold. Joseph died without male issue; but left two daughters.” He was succeeded by Charles in accordance with the compact. “On

the 2nd of August, 1718, soon after the signature of the Quadruple Alliance, Charles promulgated a new law of succession for the inheritance of the house of Austria, under the name of the Pragmatic Sanction. According to the family compact formed by Leopold, and confirmed by Joseph and Charles, the succession was entailed on the daughters of Joseph in preference to the daughters of Charles, should they both die without issue male. Charles, however, had scarcely ascended the throne, though at that time without children, than he reversed this compact, and settled the right of succession, in default of his male issue, first on his daughters, then on the daughters of Joseph, and afterwards on the queen of Portugal and the other daughters of Leopold. Since the promulgation of that decree, the Empress had borne a son who died in his infancy, and three daughters, Maria Theresa, Maria Anne and Maria Amella. With a view to insure the succession of these daughters, and to obviate the dangers which might arise from the claims of the Josephine archduchesses, he published the Pragmatic Sanction, and compelled his nieces to renounce their pretensions on their marriages with the electors of Saxony and Bavaria. Aware, however, that the strongest renunciations are disregarded, he obtained from the different states of his extensive dominions the acknowledgement of the Pragmatic Sanction, and made it the great object of his reign, to which he sacrificed every other consideration, to procure the guaranty of the European powers." This guaranty was obtained in treaties with the several powers, as follows: Spain in 1725; Russia, 1726, renewed in 1733; Prussia, 1728; England and Holland, 1731; France, 1738; the Empire, 1732. The inheritance which Charles thus endeavored to secure to his daughter was vast and imposing. "He was by election Emperor of Germany, by hereditary right sovereign of Hungary, Transylvania, Bohemia, Austria, Styria, Carinthia and Carniola, the Tyrol, and the Brisgau, and he had recently obtained Naples and Sicily, the Milanese and the Netherlands."—W. Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 80, 84-85 (v. 3).—"The Pragmatic Sanction, though framed to legalize the accession of Maria Theresa, excludes the present Emperor's daughters and his grandchild by postponing the succession of females to that of males in the family of Charles VI."—J. D. Bourc. *The Heritage of the Hapsburgs* (Fortnigh Rev., March, 1880).

ALSO IN: H. Tuttk. *Hist. of Prussia*, 1740-1745, ch. 2.—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of the Germanic Empire*, bk. 3, ch. 3 (v. 3).

A. D. 1719.—Sardinia ceded to the Duke of Savoy in exchange for Sicily. See SPAIN: A. D. 1713-1725; and ITALY: A. D. 1715-1735.

A. D. 1731.—The second Treaty of Vienna with England and Holland. See SPAIN: A. D. 1726-1731.

A. D. 1732-1733.—Interference in the election of the King of Poland. See POLAND: A. D. 1732-1733.

A. D. 1733-1735.—The war of the Polish Succession.—Cession of Naples and Sicily to Spain, and Lorraine and Bar to France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1733-1735, and ITALY: A. D. 1715-1735.

A. D. 1737-1739.—Unfortunate war with the Turks, in alliance with Russia.—Humiliating

peace of Belgrade.—Surrender of Belgrade, with Servia, and part of Bosnia. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1725-1739.

A. D. 1740 (October).—Treachery among the Guarantors of the Pragmatic Sanction.—The inheritance of Marie Theresa disputed.

—"The Emperor Charles VI. . . died on the 20th of October, 1740. His daughter Maria Theresa, the heiress of his dominions with the title of Queen of Hungary, was but twenty-three years of age, without experience or knowledge of business; and her husband Francis, the titular Duke of Lorraine and reigning Grand Duke of Tuscany, deserved the praise of amiable qualities rather than of commanding talents. Her Ministers were timorous, irresolute, and useless: 'I saw them in despair,' writes Mr. Robinson, the British envoy, 'but that very despair was not capable of rendering them bravely desperate.' The treasury was exhausted, the army dispersed, and no General risen to replace Eugene. The succession of Maria Theresa was, indeed, cheerfully acknowledged by her subjects, and seemed to be secured amongst foreign powers by their guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction; but it soon appeared that such guarantees are mere worthless parchments where there is strong temptation to break and only a feeble army to support them. The principal claimant to the succession was the Elector of Bavaria, who maintained that the will of the Emperor Ferdinand the First devised the Austrian states to his daughter, from whom the Elector descended, on failure of male lineage. It appeared that the original will in the archives at Vienna referred to the failure, not of the male but of the legitimate issue of his sons; but this document, though ostentatiously displayed to all the Ministers of state and foreign ambassadors, was very far from inducing the Elector to desist from his pretensions. As to the Great Powers—the Court of France, the old ally of the Bavarian family, and mindful of its injuries from the House of Austria, was eager to exalt the first by the depression of the latter. The Bourbons in Spain followed the direction of the Bourbons in France. The King of Poland and the Empress of Russia were more friendly in their expressions than in their designs. An opposite spirit pervaded England and Holland, where motives of honour and of policy combined to support the rights of Maria Theresa. In Germany itself the Elector of Cologne, the Bavarian's brother, warmly espoused his cause; and 'the remaining Electors,' says Chesterfield, 'like electors with us, thought it a proper opportunity of making the most of their votes,—and all at the expense of the helpless and abandoned House of Austria.' The first blow, however, came from Prussia, where the King Frederick William had died a few months before, and been succeeded by his son Frederick the Second; a Prince surnamed the Great by poets."—Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713-1783, ch. 23 (v. 3).—"The elector of Bavaria acted in a prompt, honest, and consistent manner. He at once lodged a protest against any disposition of the hereditary estates to the prejudice of his own rights; insisted on the will of Ferdinand I.; and demanded the production of the original text. It was promptly produced. But it was found to convey the succession to the heirs of his daughter, the ancestress of the

elector, not, as he contended, on the failure of male heirs, but in the absence of more direct heirs born in wedlock. Maria Theresa could, however, trace her descent through nearer male heirs, and had, therefore, a superior title. Charles Albert was in any event only one of several claimants. The King of Spain, a Bourbon, presented himself as the heir of the Hapsburg emperor Charles V. The King of Sardinia alleged an ancient marriage contract, from which he derived a right to the duchy of Milan. Even August of Saxony claimed territory by virtue of an antiquated title, which, it was pretended, the renunciation of his wife could not affect. All these were, however, mere vultures compared to the eagle [Frederick of Prussia] which was soon to descend upon its prey."—H. Tuttle, *Hist. of Prussia*, 1740-1745, ch. 2.

**A. D. 1740 (October—November).—The War of the Succession.—Conduct of Frederick the Great as explained by himself.**—"This Pragmatic Sanction had been guaranteed by France, England, Holland, Sardinia, Saxony, and the Roman empire; nay by the late King Frederic William [of Prussia] also, on condition that the court of Vienna would secure to him the succession of Juliers and Berg. The emperor promised him the eventual succession, and did not fulfil his engagements; by which the King of Prussia, his successor, was freed from this guarantee, to which his father, the late king, had pledged himself, conditionally. . . . Frederic I., when he erected Prussia into a kingdom, had, by that vain grandeur, planted the scion of ambition in the bosom of his posterity; which, soon or late, must fructify. The monarchy he had left to his descendants was, if I may be permitted the expression, a kind of hermaphrodite, which was rather more an electorate than a kingdom. Fame was to be acquired by determining the nature of this being; and this sensation certainly was one of those which strengthened so many motives, conspiring to engage the king in grand enterprises. If the acquisition of the dutchy of Berg had not even met with almost insurmountable impediments, it was in itself so small that the possession would add little grandeur to the house of Brandenburg. These reflections occasioned the king to turn his views toward the house of Austria, the succession of which would become matter of litigation, at the death of the emperor, when the throne of the Caesars should be vacant. That event must be favourable to the distinguished part which the king had to act in Germany, by the various claims of the houses of Saxony and Bavaria to these states; by the number of candidates which might canvass for the Imperial crown; and by the projects of the court of Versailles, which, on such an occasion, must naturally profit by the troubles that the death of Charles VI. could not fail to excite. This accident did not long keep the world in expectation. The emperor ended his days at the palace La Favorite, on the 26th [20th] day of October, 1740. The news arrived at Rheinsberg when the king was ill of a fever. . . . He immediately resolved to reclaim the principalities of Silesia; the rights of his house to which [long dormant, the claim dating back to a certain covenant of heritage-brotherhood with the duke of Liegnitz, in 1537, which the emperor of that day caused to be annulled by the States of Bohemia] were incontestable; and he prepared, at the same time, to support these pre-

tensions, if necessary, by arms. This project accomplished all his political views; it afforded the means of acquiring reputation, of augmenting the power of the state, and of terminating what related to the litigious succession of the dutchy of Berg. . . . The state of the court of Vienna, after the death of the emperor, was deplorable. The finances were in disorder; the army was ruined and discouraged by ill success in its wars with the Turks; the ministry disunited, and a youthful inexperienced princess at the head of the government, who was to defend the succession from all claimants. The result was that the government could not appear formidable. It was besides impossible that the king should be destitute of allies. . . . The war which he might undertake in Silesia was the only offensive war that could be favoured by the situation of his states, for it would be carried on upon his frontiers, and the Oder would always furnish him with a sure communication. . . . Add to these reasons, an army fit to march, a treasury ready prepared, and, perhaps, the ambition of acquiring renown. Such were the causes of the war which the king declared against Maria Theresa of Austria, queen of Hungary and Bohemia."—Frederick II. (Frederick the Great), *Hist. of My Own Times: Posthumous Works* (trans. by Holcroft), v. 1, ch. 1-2.

**A. D. 1740-1741.—The War of the Succession: Faithlessness of the King of Prussia.—The Macaulay verdict.**—"From no quarter did the young queen of Hungary receive stronger assurances of friendship and support than from the King of Prussia. Yet the King of Prussia, the 'Anti-Machiavel,' had already fully determined to commit the great crime of violating his plighted faith, of robbing the ally whom he was bound to defend, and of plunging all Europe into a long, bloody, and desolating war, and all this for no end whatever except that he might extend his dominions and see his name in the gazettes. He determined to assemble a great army with speed and secrecy, to invade Silesia before Maria Theresa should be apprized of his design, and to add that rich province to his kingdom. . . . Without any declaration of war, without any demand for reparation, in the very act of pouring forth compliments and assurances of good will, Frederic commenced hostilities. Many thousands of his troops were actually in Silesia before the Queen of Hungary knew that he had set up any claim to any part of her territories. At length he sent her a message which could be regarded only as an insult. If she would but let him have Silesia, he would, he said, stand by her against any power which should try to deprive her of her other dominions: as if he was not already bound to stand by her, or as if his new promise could be of more value than the old one. It was the depth of winter. The cold was severe, and the roads deep in mire. But the Prussians pressed on. Resistance was impossible. The Austrian army was then neither numerous nor efficient. The small portion of that army which lay in Silesia was unprepared for hostilities. Glogau was blockaded; Breslau opened its gates; Ohlau was evacuated. A few scattered garrisons still held out; but the whole open country was subjugated: no enemy ventured to encounter the king in the field; and, before the end of January, 1741, he returned to receive the congratula-

tions of his subjects at Berlin. Had the Silesian question been merely a question between Frederic and Maria Theresa it would be impossible to acquit the Prussian king of gross perfidy. But when we consider the effects which his policy produced, and could not fail to produce, on the whole community of civilized nations; we are compelled to pronounce a condemnation still more severe. . . . The selfish rapacity of the king of Prussia gave the signal to his neighbours. . . . The evils produced by this wickedness were felt in lands where the name of Prussia was unknown; and, in order that he might rob a neighbour whom he had promised to defend, black men fought on the coast of Coromandel, and red men scalped each other by the great lakes of North America. Silesia had been occupied without a battle; but the Austrian troops were advancing to the relief of the fortresses which still held out. In the spring Frederic rejoined his army. He had seen little of war, and had never commanded any great body of men in the field. . . . Frederic's first battle was fought at Mollwitz [April 10, 1741], and never did the career of a great commander open in a more inauspicious manner. His army was victorious. Not only, however, did he not establish his title to the character of an able general, but he was so unfortunate as to make it doubtful whether he possessed the vulgar courage of a soldier. The cavalry, which he commanded in person, was put to flight. Unaccustomed to the tumult and carnage of a field of battle, he lost his self-possession, and listened too readily to those who urged him to save himself. His English gray carried him many miles from the field, while Schwerin, though wounded in two places, manfully upheld the day. The skill of the old Field-Marshal and the steadiness of the Prussian battalions prevailed, and the Austrian army was driven from the field with the loss of 8,000 men. The news was carried late at night to a mill in which the king had taken shelter. It gave him a bitter pang. He was successful; but he owed his success to dispositions which others had made, and to the valour of men who had fought while he was flying. So unpromising was the first appearance of the greatest warrior of that age."—Lord Macaulay, *Frederic the Great (Essays, v. 4)*.

**A. D. 1741 (April—May).—The War of the Succession: French responsibility.—The Carlyle verdict.**—"The battle of Mollwitz went off like a signal shot among the Nations; intimating that they were, one and all, to go battling. Which they did, with a witness; making a terrible thing of it, over all the world, for above seven years to come. . . . Not that Mollwitz kindled Europe; Europe was already kindled for some two years past;—especially since the late Kaiser died, and his Pragmatic Sanction was superadded to the other troubles afoot. But ever since that image of Jenkins's Ear had at last blazed up in the slow English brain, like a fiery constellation or Sign in the Heavens, symbolic of such injustices and unendurabilities, and had lighted the Spanish-English War [see ENGLAND: A. D. 1739-1741], Europe was slowly but pretty surely taking fire. France 'could not see Spain humbled,' she said; England (in its own dim feeling, and also in the fact of things), could not do at all without considerably humbling Spain. France, endlessly interested in that

Spanish-English matter, was already sending out fleets, firing shots,—almost, or altogether, putting her hand in it. 'In which case, will not, must not, Austria help us?' thought England,—and was asking, daily, at Vienna . . . when the late Kaiser died. . . . But if not as cause, then as signal, or as signal and cause together (which it properly was), the Battle of Mollwitz gave the finishing stroke and set all in motion. . . . For directly on the back of Mollwitz, there ensued, first, an explosion of Diplomatic activity, such as was never seen before; Excellencies from the four winds taking wing towards Friedrich; and talking and insinuating, and fencing and furling, after their sort, in that Silesian camp of his, the centre being there. A universal rookery of Diplomats, whose loud cackle is now as if gone mad to us; their work wholly fallen putrescent and avoidable, dead to all creatures. And secondly, in the train of that, there ensued a universal European War, the French and the English being chief parties in it; which abounds in battles and feats of arms, spirited but delirious, and cannot be got stilled for seven or eight years to come; and in which Friedrich and his War swim only as an intermittent Episode henceforth. . . . The first point to be noted is, Where did it originate? To which the answer mainly is . . . with MONSEIGNEUR, the Maréchal de Belleisle principally; with the ambitious cupidities and baseless vanities of the French Court and Nation, as represented by Belleisle. . . . The English-Spanish War had a basis to stand on in this Universe. The like had the Prussian-Austrian one; so all men now admit. If Friedrich had not business there, what man ever had in an enterprise he ventured on? Friedrich, after such trial and proof as has seldom been, got his claims on Schlesien allowed by the Destinies. . . . Friedrich had business in this War; and Maria Theresa versus Friedrich had likewise cause to appear in Court, and do her utmost pleading against him. But if we ask, What Belleisle or France and Louis XV. had to do there? the answer is rigorously Nothing. Their own windy vanities, ambitions, sanctioned not by fact and the Almighty Powers, but by Phantasm and the babble of Versailles; transcendent self-conceit, intrinsically insane; pretensions over their fellow-creatures which were without basis anywhere in Nature, except in the French brain; it was this that brought Belleisle and France into a German War. And Belleisle and France having gone into an Anti-Pragmatic War, the unlucky George and his England were dragged into a Pragmatic one,—quitting their own business, on the Spanish Main, and hurrying to Germany,—in terror as in Doomsday, and zeal to save the Keystone of Nature there. That is the notable point in regard to this War: That France is to be called the author of it, who, alone of all the parties, had no business there whatever."—T. Carlyle, *Hist. of Friedrich II., bk. 12, ch. 11 (v. 4)*.—See, also, FRANCE: A. D. 1733.

**A. D. 1741 (May—June).—Mission of Belleisle.—The thickening of the Plot.**—"The defeat of Maria Theresa's only army [at Mollwitz] swept away all the doubts and scruples of France. The fiery Belleisle had already set out upon his mission to the various German courts, armed with powers which were reluctantly granted by the cardinal [Fleury, the French minister], and were promptly enlarged by the ambassador to

suit his own more ambitious views of the situation. He travelled in oriental state. . . . The almost royal pomp with which he strode into the presence of princes of the blood, the copious eloquence with which he pleaded his cause, . . . were only the outward decorations of one of the most iniquitous schemes ever devised by an unscrupulous diplomacy. The scheme, when stripped of all its details, did not indeed at first appear absolutely revolting. It proposed simply to secure the election of Charles Albert of Bavaria as emperor, an honor to which he had a perfect right to aspire. But it was difficult to obtain the votes of certain electors without offering them the prospect of territorial gains, and impossible for Charles Albert to support the imperial dignity without greater revenues than those of Bavaria. It was proposed, therefore, that provinces should be taken from Maria Theresa herself, first to purchase votes against her own husband, and then to swell the income of the successful rival candidate. The three episcopal electors were first visited, and subjected to various forms of persuasion,—bribes, flattery, threats,—until the effects of the treatment began to appear; the count palatine was devoted to France; and these four with Bavaria made a majority of one. But that was too small a margin for Belleisle's aspirations, or even for the safety of his project. The four remaining votes belonged to the most powerful of the German states, Prussia, Hanover, Saxony and Bohemia. . . . Bohemia, if it voted at all, would of course vote for the grand-duke Francis [husband of Maria Theresa]. Saxony and Hanover were already negotiating with Maria Theresa; and it was well understood that Austria could have Frederick's support by paying his price." Austria refused to pay the price, and Frederick signed a treaty with the king of France at Breslau on the 4th of June, 1741. "The essence of it was contained in four secret articles. In these the king of Prussia renounced his claim to Jülich-Berg in behalf of the house of Sulzbach, and agreed to give his vote to the elector of Bavaria for emperor. The king of France engaged to guarantee Prussia in the possession of Lower Silesia, to send within two months an army to the support of Bavaria, and to provoke an immediate rupture between Sweden and Russia."—H. Tuttle, *Hist. of Prussia*, 1740-1745, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: W. Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 99 (r. 3).

**A. D. 1741 (June—September).—Maria Theresa and the Hungarians.**—"During these anxious summer months Maria Theresa and the Austrian court had resided mainly at Presburg, in Hungary. Here she had been occupied in the solution of domestic as well as international problems. The Magyars, as a manly and chivalrous race, had been touched by the perilous situation of the young queen; but, while ardently protesting their loyalty, insisted not the less on the recognition of their own inalienable rights. These had been inadequately observed in recent years, and in consequence no little disaffection prevailed in Hungary. The magnates resolved, therefore, as they had resolved at the beginning of previous reigns, to demand the restoration of all their rights and privileges. But it does not appear that they wished to take any ungenerous advantage of the sex or the necessities of Maria Theresa. They were argu-

mentative and stubborn, yet not in a bargaining, mercenary spirit. They accepted in June a qualified compliance with their demands; and when on the 25th of that month the queen appeared before the diet to receive the crown of St. Stephen, and, according to custom, waved the great sword of the kingdom toward the four points of the compass, toward the north and the south, the east and the west, challenging all enemies to dispute her right, the assembly was carried away by enthusiasm, and it seemed as if an end had forever been put to constitutional technicalities. Such was, however, not the case. After the excitement caused by the dramatic coronation had in a measure subsided, the old contentions revived, as bitter and vexatious as before. These concerned especially the manner in which the administration of Hungary should be adjusted to meet the new state of things. Should the chief political offices be filled by native Hungarians, as the diet demanded? Could the co-regency of the grand-duke, which was ardently desired by the queen, be accepted by the Magyars? For two months the dispute over these problems raged at Presburg, until finally Maria Theresa herself found a bold, ingenious, and patriotic solution. The news of the Franco-Bavarian alliance and the fall of Passau determined her to throw herself completely upon the gallantry and devotion of the Magyars. It had long been the policy of the court of Vienna not to entrust the Hungarians with arms. . . . But Maria Theresa had not been robbed, in spite of her experience with France and Prussia, of all her faith in human nature. She took the responsibility of her decision, and the result proved that her insight was correct. On the 11th of September she summoned the members of the diet before her, and, seated on the throne, explained to them the perilous situation of her dominions. The danger, she said, threatened herself, and all that was dear to her. Abandoned by all her allies, she took refuge in the fidelity and the ancient valor of the Hungarians, to whom she entrusted herself, her children, and her empire. Here she broke into tears, and covered her face with her *Landkerchief*. The diet responded to this appeal by proclaiming the 'insurrection' or the equipment of a large popular force for the defence of the queen. So great was the enthusiasm that it nearly swept away even the original aversion of the Hungarians to the grand-duke Francis, who, to the queen's delight, was finally, though not without some murmurs, accepted as co-regent. . . . This uprising was organized not an hour too early, for dangers were pressing upon the queen from every side."—H. Tuttle, *Hist. of Prussia*, 1740-1745, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: Duc de Broglie, *Frederick the Great and Maria Theresa*, ch. 4 (v. 2).

**A. D. 1741 (August—November).—The French-Bavarian onset.**—"France now began to act with energy. In the month of August [1741] two French armies crossed the Rhine, each about 40,000 strong. The first marched into Westphalia, and frightened George II. into concluding a treaty of neutrality for Hanover, and promising his vote to the Elector of Bavaria. The second advanced through South Germany on Passau, the frontier city of Bavaria and Austria. As soon as it arrived on German soil, the French officers assumed the blue and white cockade of

Bavaria, for it was the cue of France to appear only as an auxiliary, and the nominal command of her army was vested in the Elector. From Passau the French and Bavarians passed into Upper Austria, and on Sept. 11 entered its capital, Linz, where the Elector assumed the title of Archduke. Five days later Saxony joined the allies. Sweden had already declared war on Russia. Spain trumped up an old claim and attacked the Austrian dominions in Italy. It seemed as if Belleisle's schemes were about to be crowned with complete success. Had the allies pushed forward, Vienna must have fallen into their hands. But the French did not wish to be too victorious, lest they should make the Elector too powerful, and so independent of them. Therefore, after six weeks' delay, they turned aside to the conquest of Bohemia."—F. W. Longman, *Frederick the Great and the Seven Years War*, ch. 4, sect. 4.—"While . . . a portion of the French troops, under the command of the Count de Segur, was left in Upper Austria, the remainder of the allied army turned towards Bohemia; where they were joined by a body of Saxons, under the command of Count Rutowsky. They took Prague by assault, on the night of the 25th of November, while the Grand Duke of Tuscany, the husband of Maria Theresa, was marching to his relief. In Prague, 3,000 prisoners were taken. The elector of Bavaria hastened there, upon hearing of the success of his arms, was crowned King of Bohemia, during the month of December, and received the oath of fidelity from the constituted authorities. But while he was thus employed, the Austrian general, Khevenhuller, had driven the Count de Segur out of Austria, and had himself entered Bavaria; which obliged the Bavarian army to abandon Bohemia and hasten to the defence of their own country."—Lord Dover, *Life of Frederick II.*, bk. 2, ch. 2 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: Frederick II., *Hist. of My Own Times* (*Posthumous Works*, v. 1, ch. 5).

**A. D. 1741 (October).—Secret Treaty with Frederick.—Lower Silesia conceded to him.—Austrian success.**—By October, 1741, the fortunes of Maria Theresa had sunk to the lowest ebb, but a great revulsion speedily set in. The martial enthusiasm of the Hungarians, the subsidy from England, and the brilliant military talents of General Khevenhuller, restored her armies. Vienna was put in a state of defence, and at the same time jealousies and suspicion made their way among the confederates. The Electors of Bavaria and Saxony were already in some degree divided; and the Germans, and especially Frederick, were alarmed by the growing ascendancy, and irritated by the haughty demeanour of the French. In the moment of her extreme depression, the Queen consented to a concession which England had vainly urged upon her before, and which laid the foundation of her future success. In October 1741 she entered into a secret convention with Frederick [called the convention of Ober-Schnellendorf], by which that astute sovereign agreed to desert his allies, and desist from hostilities, on condition of ultimately obtaining Lower Silesia, with Breslau and Neisse. Every precaution was taken to ensure secrecy. It was arranged that Frederick should continue to besiege Neisse, that the town should ultimately be surrendered to him, and that his troops should then retire into winter quarters, and take no further part in the war. As the

sacrifice of a few more lives was perfectly indifferent to the contracting parties, and in order that no one should suspect the treachery that was contemplated, Neisse, after the arrangement had been made for its surrender, was subjected for four days and four nights to the horrors of bombardment. Frederick, at the same time talked, with his usual cynical frankness, to the English ambassador about the best way of attacking his allies the French; and observed, that if the Queen of Hungary prospered, he would perhaps support her, if not—everyone must look for himself. He only assented verbally to this convention, and, no doubt, resolved to await the course of events, in order to decide which Power it was his interest finally to betray; but in the meantime the Austrians obtained a respite, which enabled them to throw their whole forces upon their other enemies. Two brilliant campaigns followed. The greater part of Bohemia was recovered by an army under the Duke of Lorraine, and the French were hemmed in at Prague; while another army, under General Khevenhuller, invaded Upper Austria, drove 10,000 French soldiers within the walls of Linz, blockaded them, defeated a body of Bohemians who were sent to the rescue, compelled the whole French army to surrender, and then, crossing the frontier, poured in a restless torrent over Bavaria. The fairest plains of that beautiful land were desolated by hosts of irregular troops from Hungary, Croatia, and the Tyrol; and on the 12th of February the Austrians marched in triumph into Munich. On that very day the Elector of Bavaria was crowned Emperor of Germany, at Frankfurt, under the title of Charles VII., and the imperial crown was thus, for the first time, for many generations, separated from the House of Austria."—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng.*, 18th Century, ch. 3 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: F. Von Raumer, *Contributions to Modern Hist.: Fred'k II. and his Times*, ch. 13-14.

**A. D. 1741-1743.—Successes in Italy.** See ITALY: A. D. 1741-1743.

**A. D. 1742 (January—May).—Frederick breaks faith again.—Battle of Chotusitz.**—The Queen of Hungary had assembled in the beginning of the year two considerable armies in Moravia and Bohemia, the one under Prince Lobkowitz, to defend the former province, and the other commanded by Prince Charles of Lorraine, her brother-in-law. This young Prince possessed as much bravery and activity as Frederick, and had equally with him the talent of inspiring attachment and confidence. . . . Frederick, alarmed at these preparations and the progress of the Austrians in Bavaria, abruptly broke off the convention of Ober-Schnellendorf, and recommenced hostilities. . . . The King of Prussia became apprehensive that the Queen of Hungary would again turn her arms to recover Silesia. He therefore dispatched Marshal Schwerin to seize Olmutz and lay siege to Glatz, which surrendered after a desperate resistance on the 9th of January. Soon after this event, the King rejoined his army, and endeavoured to drive the Austrians from their advantageous position in the southern parts of Bohemia, which would have delivered the French troops in the neighbourhood and checked the progress of Khevenhuller in Bavaria. The king advanced to Iglau, on the frontiers of Bohemia, and, oc-

cupying the banks of the Taya, made irruptions into Upper Austria, his hussars spreading terror even to the gates of Vienna. The Austrians drew from Bavaria a corps of 10,000 men to cover the capital, while Prince Charles of Lorraine, at the head of 50,000 men, threatened the Prussian magazines in Upper Silesia, and by this movement compelled Frederick to detach a considerable force for their protection, and to evacuate Moravia, which he had invaded. Broglie, who commanded the French forces in that country, must now have fallen a sacrifice, had not the ever-active King of Prussia brought up 30,000 men, which, under the Prince of Anhalt-Dessau, entering Bohemia, came up with Prince Charles at Czaslau, about thirty-five miles from Prague, before he could form a junction with Prince Lobkowitz. Upon this ensued [May 17, 1742] what is known in history as the battle of Czaslau [also, and more commonly, called the battle of Chotusitz]. . . . The numbers in the two armies were nearly equal, and the action was warmly contested on both sides. . . . The Prussians remained masters of the field, with 18 cannon, two pairs of colours and 1,200 prisoners; but they indeed paid dearly for the honour, for it was computed that their loss was equal to that of their enemy, which amounted to 7,000 men on either side; while the Prussian cavalry, under Field-Marshal Buddenbroch, was nearly ruined. . . . Although in this battle the victory was, without doubt, on the side of the Prussians, yet the immediate consequences were highly favourable to the Queen of Hungary. The King was disappointed of his expected advantages, and conceived a disgust to the war. He now lowered his demands and made overtures of accommodation, which, on the 11th of June, resulted in a treaty of peace between the two crowns, which was signed at Breslau under the mediation of the British Ambassador.—Sir E. Cust, *Annals of the Wars of the 18th Century*, v. 2, p. 19.

ALSO IN: T. Carlyle, *Hist. of Frederick II. of Prussia*, bk. 13, ch. 13 (p. 5).

**A. D. 1742 (June).—Treaty of Breslau with the King of Prussia.**—"The following are the preliminary articles which were signed at Breslau: 1. The queen of Hungary ceded to the king of Prussia Upper and Lower Silesia, with the principality of Glatz; except the towns of Troppau, Jaegendorff and the high mountains situated beyond the Oppa. 2. The Prussians undertook to repay the English 1,700,000 crowns; which sum was a mortgage loan on Silesia. The remaining articles related to a suspension of arms, an exchange of prisoners, and the freedom of religion and trade. Thus was Silesia united to the Prussian States. Two years were sufficient for the conquest of that important province. The treasures which the late king had left were almost expended; but provinces that do not cost more than seven or eight millions are cheaply purchased."—Frederic II., *Hist. of My Own Times (Posthumous Works, v. 1)*, ch. 6.

**A. D. 1742 (June—December).—Expulsion of the French from Bohemia.—Belleisle's retreat from Prague.**—"The Austrian arms began now to be successful in all quarters. Just before the signature of the preliminaries, Prince Lobkowitz, who was stationed at Budweiss with 10,000 men, made an attack on Frauenberg; Broglie and Belleisle advanced from Piseck to relieve the town, and a combat took place at Sahay, in

which the Austrians were repulsed with the loss of 500 men. This trifling affair was magnified into a decisive victory. . . . Marshal Broglie, elated with this advantage, and relying on the immediate junction of the King of Prussia, remained at Frauenberg in perfect security. But his expectations were disappointed; Frederic had already commenced his secret negotiations, and Prince Charles was enabled to turn his forces against the French. Being joined by Prince Lobkowitz, they attacked Broglie, and compelled him to quit Frauenberg with such precipitation that his baggage fell into the hands of the light troops, and the French retreated towards Branau, harassed by the Croats and other irregulars. . . . The Austrians, pursuing their success against the French, drove Broglie from Branau, and followed him to the walls of Prague, where he found Belleisle. . . . After several consultations, the two generals called in their posts, and secured their army partly within the walls and partly within a peninsula of the Moldau. . . . Soon afterwards the duke of Lorraine joined the army [of Prince Charles], which now amounted to 70,000 men, and the arrival of the heavy artillery enabled the Austrians to commence the siege."—W. Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 102 (p. 3).—"To relieve the French at Prague, Marshal Maillebois was directed to advance with his army from Westphalia. At these tidings Prince Charles changed the siege of Prague to a blockade, and marching against his new opponents, checked their progress on the Bohemian frontier; the French, however, still occupying the town of Egra. It was under these circumstances that Belleisle made his masterly and renowned retreat from Prague. In the night of the 16th of December, he secretly left the city at the head of 11,000 foot and 3,000 horse, having deceived the Austrians' vigilance by the feint of a general forage in the opposite quarter; and pushed for Egra through a hostile country, destitute of resources and surrounded by superior enemies. His soldiers, with no other food than frozen bread, and compelled to sleep without covering on the snow and ice, perished in great numbers; but the gallant spirit of Belleisle triumphed over every obstacle; he struck through morasses almost untrdden before, offered battle to Prince Lobkowitz, who, however, declined engaging, and at length succeeded in reaching the other French army with the flower of his own. The remnant left at Prague, amounting only to 6,000 men, seemed an easy prey; yet their threat of firing the city, and perishing beneath its ruins, and the recent proof of what despair can do, obtained for them honourable terms, and the permission of rejoining their comrades at Egra. But in spite of all this skill and courage in the French invaders, the final result to them was failure; nor had they attained a single permanent advantage beyond their own safety in retreat. Maillebois and De Broglie took up winter quarters in Bavaria, while Belleisle led back his division across the Rhine; and it was computed that, of the 35,000 men whom he had first conducted into Germany, not more than 8,000 returned beneath his banner."—Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713–1783, ch. 24 (p. 3).—"Thus, at the termination of the campaign, all Bohemia was regained, except Egra; and on the 12th of May, 1743, Maria Theresa was soon afterwards crowned at Prague, to the recovery of which, says her



great rival, her firmness had more contributed than the force of her arms. The only reverse which the Austrians experienced in the midst of their successes was the temporary loss of Bavaria, which, on the retreat of Kevenhuller, was occupied by marshal Seckendorf; and the Emperor made his entry into Munich on the 2d of October."—W. COXE, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 103 (v. 3).

**A. D. 1743.—England drawn into the conflict.—The Pragmatic Army.—The Battle of Dettingen.**—"The cause of Maria Theresa had begun to excite a remarkable enthusiasm in England. . . . The convention of neutrality entered into by George II. in September 1741, and the extortion of his vote for the Elector of Bavaria, properly concerned that prince only as Elector of Hanover; yet, as he was also King of England, they were felt as a disgrace by the English people. The elections of that year went against Walpole, and in February 1743 he found himself compelled to resign. He was succeeded in the administration by Pulteney, Earl of Bath, though Lord Carteret was virtually prime minister. Carteret was an ardent supporter of the cause of Maria Theresa. His accession to office was immediately followed by a large increase of the army and navy; five millions were voted for carrying on the war, and a subsidy of £500,000 for the Queen of Hungary. The Earl of Stair, with an army of 16,000 men, afterwards reinforced by a large body of Hanoverians and Hessians in British pay, was despatched into the Netherlands to cooperate with the Dutch. But though the States-General, at the instance of the British Cabinet, voted Maria Theresa a subsidy, they were not yet prepared to take an active part in a war which might ultimately involve them in hostilities with France. The exertions of the English ministry in favour of the Queen of Hungary had therefore been confined during the year 1742 to diplomacy, and they had helped to bring about . . . the Peace of Breslau. In 1743, the Emperor, Charles VII., regained possession of Bavaria and returned to Munich, but only to be driven out again by the Austrians in June. The Bavarians were badly beaten at Simbach (May 9), and Munich was taken (June 12) after a short bombardment. "Charles VII. was now again obliged to fly, and took refuge at Augsburg. At his command, Seckendorf [his general] made a convention with the Austrians at the village of Niederschönfeld, by which he agreed to abandon to them Bavaria, on condition that Charles's troops should be allowed to occupy unmolested quarters between Franconia and Suabia. Maria Theresa seemed at first indisposed to ratify even terms so humiliating to the Emperor. She had become perhaps a little too much exalted by the rapid turn of fortune. She had caused herself to be crowned in Prague. She had received the homage of the Austrians, and entered Vienna in a sort of triumph. She now dreamt of nothing less than conquering Lorraine for herself, Alsace for the Empire; of hurling Charles VII. from the Imperial throne, and placing on it her own consort." She was persuaded, however, to consent at length to the terms of the Niederschönfeld convention. "Meanwhile the allied army of English and Germans, under the Earl of Stair, nearly 40,000 strong, which, from its destined object, had assumed the name of the 'Pragmatic

Army,' had crossed the Meuse and the Rhine in March and April, with a view to cut off the army of Bavaria from France. George II. had not concealed his intention of breaking the Treaty of Hanover of 1741, alleging as a ground that the duration of the neutrality stipulated in it had not been determined; and on June 19th he had joined the army in person. He found it in a most critical position. Lord Stair, who had never distinguished himself as a general, and was now falling into dotage, had led it into a narrow valley near Aseffenburg, between Mount Spessart and the river Main; while Marshal Noailles [commanding the French], who had crossed the Rhine towards the end of April, by seizing the principal fords of the Main, both above and below the British position, had cut him off both from his magazines at Hanau, and from the supplies which he had expected to procure in Franconia. Nothing remained but for him to fight his way back to Hanau." In the battle of Dettingen, which followed (June 27), all the advantages of the French in position were thrown away by the ignorant impetuosity of the king's nephew, the Duke of Grammont, who commanded one division, and they suffered a severe defeat. "The French are said to have lost 8,000 men and the British half that number. It is the last action in which a king of England has fought in person. But George II., or rather Lord Stair, did not know how to profit by his victory. Although the Pragmatic Army was joined after the battle of Dettingen by 15,000 Dutch troops, under Prince Maurice of Nassau, nothing of importance was done during the remainder of the campaign."—T. H. DYER, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 6, ch. 4 (v. 3).

ALSO IN: W. COXE, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 104 (v. 3).—Sir E. CUST, *Annals of the Wars of the 18th Century*, v. 2, pp. 30-36.—Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713-1783, ch. 25 (v. 3).

**A. D. 1743.—Treaty of Worms with Sardinia and England.**—See ITALY: A. D. 1743.

**A. D. 1743 (October).**—**The Second Bourbon Family Compact.**—See FRANCE: A. D. 1743 (OCTOBER).

**A. D. 1743-1744.—The Prussian King strikes in again.—The Union of Frankfurt.—Siege and capture of Prague.**—"Everywhere Austria was successful, and Frederick had reason to fear for himself unless the tide of conquest could be stayed. He explains in the 'Histoire de Mon Temps' that he feared lest France should abandon the cause of the Emperor, which would mean that the Austrians, who now boldly spoke of compensation for the war, would turn their arms against himself. . . . France was trembling, not for her conquests, but for her own territory. After the battle of Dettingen, the victorious Anglo-Hanoverian force was to cross the Rhine above Mayence and march into Alsace, while Prince Charles of Lorraine, with a strong Austrian army, was to pass near Basle and occupy Lorraine, taking up his winter quarters in Burgundy and Champagne. The English crossed without any check and moved on to Worms, but the Austrians failed in their attempt. Worms became a centre of intrigue, which Frederick afterwards called 'Cette abyme de mauvaïse fol.' The Dutch were persuaded by Lord Carteret to join the English, and they did at last send 14,000 men, who were never of

the least use. Lord Carteret also detached Charles Emanuel, King of Sardinia, from his French leanings, and persuaded him to enter into the Austro-English alliance [by the treaty of Worms, Sept. 13, 1743, which conceded to the King of Sardinia Fiume, the city of Placentia, with some other small districts and gave him command of the allied forces in Italy]. It was clear that action could not be long postponed, and Frederick began to recognize the necessity of a new war. His first anxiety was to guard himself against interference from his northern and eastern neighbours. He secured, as he hoped, the neutrality of Russia by marrying the young princess of Anhalt-Zerbst, afterwards the notorious Empress Catherine, with the Grand-Duke Peter of Russia, nephew and heir to the reigning Empress Elizabeth. . . . Thus strengthened, as he hoped, in his rear and flank, and having made the commencement of a German league called the Union of Frankfurt, by which Hesse and the Palatinate agreed to join Frederick and the Kaiser, he concluded on the 5th of June, 1744, a treaty which brought France also into this alliance. It was secretly agreed that Frederick was to invade Bohemia, conquer it for the Kaiser, and have the districts of Königgrätz, Bunzlau, and Leitmeritz to repay him for his trouble and costs; while France, which was all this time at war with Austria and England, should send an army against Prince Charles and the English. . . . The first stroke of the coming war was delivered by France. Louis XV. sent a large army into the Netherlands under two good leaders, Noailles and Maurice de Saxe. Urged by his mistress, the Duchesse de Châteauneux, he joined it himself early, and took the nominal command early in June. . . . The towns [Menin, Ypres, Fort Knoque, Furnes] rapidly fell before him, and Marshal Wade, with the Anglo-Dutch-Hanoverian army, sat still and looked at the success of the French. But on the night of the 30th June—1st July, Prince Charles crossed the Rhine by an operation which is worth the study of military students, and invaded Alsace, the French army of observation falling back before him. Louis XV. hurried back to interpose between the Austrians and Paris. . . . Maurice de Saxe was left in the Netherlands with 45,000 men. Thus the French army was paralysed, and the Austrian army in its turn was actually invading France. At this time Frederick struck in. He sent word to the King that, though all the terms of their arrangement had not yet been fulfilled, he would at once invade Bohemia, and deliver a stroke against Prague which would certainly cause the retreat of Prince Charles with his 70,000 men. If the French army would follow Prince Charles in his retreat, Frederick would attack him, and between France and Prussia the Austrian army would certainly be crushed, and Vienna be at their mercy. This was no doubt an excellent plan of campaign, but, like the previous operations concerted with Proglia, it depended for success upon the good faith of the French, and this turned out to be a broken reed. On the 7th of August the Prussian ambassador at Vienna gave notice of the Union of Frankfurt and withdrew from the court of Austria; and on the 15th the Prussian army was put in march upon Silesia [opening what is called the Second Silesian War]. Frederick's forces moved in

three columns, the total strength being over 80,000. . . . Maria Theresa was now again in great danger, but as usual retained her high courage, and once more called forth the enthusiasm of her Hungarian subjects, who sent swarms of wild troops, horse and foot, to the seat of war. . . . On the 1st of September the three columns met before Prague, which had better defences than in the last campaign, and a garrison of some 16,000 men. . . . During the night of the 9th the bombardment commenced. . . . and on the 16th the garrison surrendered. Thus, one month after the commencement of the march Prague was captured, and the campaign opened with a brilliant feat of arms.—Col. C. B. Brackenbury, *Frederick the Great*, ch. 7.

ALSO IN: W. Russell, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, pt. 2, letter 28.—F. Von Rauner, *Contributions to Modern Hist.*: *Frederk. II. and his Times*, ch. 17-19.

A. D. 1744-1745.—Frederick's retreat and fresh triumph.—Austria recovers the imperial crown.—Saxony subdued.—The Peace of Dresden.—After the reduction of Prague, Frederick, "in deference to the opinion of Marshal Belleisle, but against his own judgment, advanced into the south of Bohemia with the view of threatening Vienna. He thus exposed himself to the risk of being cut off from Prague. Yet even so he would probably have been able to maintain himself if the French had fulfilled their engagements. But while he was conquering the districts of the Upper Moldau, the Austrian army returned unimpaired from Alsace. The French had allowed it to cross the Rhine unmolested, and had not made the slightest attempt to harass its retreat [but applied themselves to the siege and capture of Freiburg]. They were only too glad to get rid of it themselves. In the ensuing operations Frederick was completely outmanoeuvred. Traun [the Austrian general], without risking a battle, forced him back towards the Silesian frontier. He had to choose between abandoning Prague and abandoning his communications with Silesia, and as the Saxons had cut off his retreat through the Electorate, there was really no choice in the matter. So he fell back on Silesia, abandoning Prague and his heavy artillery. The retreat was attended with considerable loss. Frederick was much struck with the skill displayed by Traun, and says, in his 'Histoire de mon Temps,' that he regarded this campaign as his school in the art of war and M. de Traun as his teacher. The campaign may have been an excellent lesson in the art of war, but in other respects it was very disastrous to Frederick. He had drawn upon himself the whole power of Austria, and had learnt how little the French were to be depended upon. His prestige was dimmed by failure, and even in his own army doubts were entertained of his capacity. But, bad as his position already was, it became far worse when the unhappy Emperor died [Jan. 20, 1745], worn out with disease and calamity. This event put an end to the Union of Frankfurt. Frederick could no longer claim to be acting in defence of his oppressed sovereign; the ground was cut from under his feet. Nor was there any longer much hope of preventing the Imperial Crown from reverting to Austria. The new Elector of Bavaria was a fierce boy. In this altered state of affairs he sought to make peace. But Maria Theresa would not let him

off so easily. In order that she might use all her forces against him, she granted peace to Bavaria, and gave back to the young elector his hereditary dominions, on condition of his resigning all claim to hers and promising to vote for her husband as Emperor. While Frederick thus lost a friend in Bavaria, Saxony threw herself completely into the arms of his enemy, and united with Austria in a treaty [May 18] which had for its object, not the reconquest of Silesia merely, but the partition of Prussia and the reduction of the king to his ancient limits as Margrave of Brandenburg. Saxony was then much larger than it is now, but it was not only the number of troops it could send into the field that made its hostility dangerous. It was partly the geographical position of the country, which made it an excellent base for operations against Prussia, but still more the alliance that was known to subsist between the Elector (King Augustus III. of Poland) and the Russian Court. It was probable that a Prussian invasion of Saxony would be followed by a Russian invasion of Prussia. Towards the end of May, the Austrian and Saxon army, 75,000 strong, crossed the Giant Mountains and descended upon Silesia. The Austrians were again commanded by Prince Charles, but the wise head of Traun was no longer there to guide him. . . . The encounter took place at Hohenfriedberg [June 5], and resulted in a complete victory for Prussia. The Austrians and Saxons lost 9,000 killed and wounded, and 7,000 prisoners, besides 66 cannons and 73 flags and standards. Four days after the battle they were back again in Bohemia. Frederick followed, not with the intention of attacking them again, but in order to cut the country bare, so that it might afford no sustenance to the enemy during the winter. For his own part he was really anxious for peace. His resources were all but exhausted, while Austria was fed by a constant stream of English subsidies. As in the former war, England interposed with her good offices, but without effect; Maria Theresa was by no means disheartened by her defeat, and refused to hear of peace till she had tried the chances of battle once more. On Sept. 13 her husband was elected Emperor by seven votes out of nine, the dissentients being the King of Prussia and the Elector Palatine. This event raised the spirits of the Empress-Queen, as Maria Theresa was henceforward called, and opened a wider field for her ambition. She sent peremptory orders to Prince Charles to attack Frederick before he retired from Bohemia. A battle was accordingly fought at Sohr [Sept. 30], and again victory rested with the Prussians. The season was now far advanced, and Frederick returned home expecting that there would be no more fighting till after the winter. Such however, was far from being the intention of his enemies." A plan for the invasion of Brandenburg by three Austrian and Saxon armies, simultaneously, was secretly concerted; but Frederick had timely warning of it and it was frustrated by his activity and energy. On the 23d of November he surprised and defeated Prince Charles at Hengersdorf. "Some three weeks afterwards [Dec. 15] the Prince of Dessau defeated a second Saxon and Austrian army at Kesselsdorf, a few miles from Dresden. This victory completed the subjugation of Saxony and put an end to the war. Three days after Kesselsdorf, Frederick

entered Dresden, and astonished every one by the graciousness of his behaviour and by the moderation of his terms. From Saxony he exacted no cession of territory, but merely a contribution of 1,000,000 thalers (£150,000) towards the expenses of the war. From Austria he demanded a guarantee of the treaty of Breslau, in return for which he agreed to recognize Francis as Emperor. Peace was signed [at Dresden] on Christmas Day."—F. W. Longman, *Frederick the Great and the Seven Years War*, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: T. Carlyle, *Hist. of Frederick II.*, bk. 15, ch. 3-15 (v. 4).—Lord Dover, *Life of Frederick II.*, bk. 2, ch. 3-5 (v. 1).

A. D. 1745.—Overwhelming disasters in Italy. See ITALY: A. D. 1745.

A. D. 1745 (May).—Reverses in the Netherlands.—Battle of Fontenoy. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1745.

A. D. 1745 (September-October).—The Consort of Maria Theresa elected and crowned Emperor.—Rise of the new House of Hapsburg-Lorraine.—Francis of Lorraine, Grand Duke of Tuscany and husband of Maria Theresa, was elected Emperor, at Frankfurt, Sept. 13, 1745, and crowned Oct. 1, with the title of Francis I. "Thus the Empire returned to the New House of Austria, that of Hapsburg-Lorraine, and France had missed the principal object for which she had gone to war." By the treaties signed at Dresden, Dec. 25, between Prussia, Austria and Saxony, Frederick, as Elector of Brandenburg, assented to and recognized the election of Francis, against which he and the Elector Palatine had previously protested.—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 6, ch. 4 (v. 3).

A. D. 1746-1747.—Further French conquests in the Netherlands.—Lombardy recovered.—Genoa won and lost. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1746-1747; and ITALY: A. D. 1746-1747.

A. D. 1748 (October).—Termination and results of the War of the Succession. See AIX-LE-CHAPELLE, THE CONGRESS OF.

A. D. 1755-1763.—The Seven Years War.—Since the conquest of Silesia by Frederick the Great of Prussia, "he had cast off all reserve. In his extraordinary Court at Potsdam this man of wit and war laughed at God, and at his brother philosophers and sovereigns; he ill-treated Voltaire, the chief organ of the new opinions; he wounded kings and queens with his epigrams; he believed neither in the beauty of Madam de Pompadour nor in the poetical genius of the Abbé Bernis, Prime Minister of France. The Empress thought the moment favourable for the recovery of Silesia; she stirred up Europe, especially the queens; she persuaded the Queen of Poland and the Empress of Russia; she paid court to the mistress of Louis XV. The monstrous alliance of France with the ancient state of Austria against a sovereign who maintained the equilibrium of Germany united all Europe against him. England alone supported him and gave him subsidies. She was governed at that time by a gouty lawyer, the famous William Pitt, afterwards Lord Chatham, who misled himself by his eloquence and by his hatred of the French. England wanted two things; the maintenance of the balance of power in Europe, and the destruction

of the French and Spanish colonies. Her griefs were serious; the Spaniards had ill-treated her smugglers and the French wanted to prevent her from settling on their territory in Canada. In India, La Bourdonnais and his successor Duplex threatened to found a great empire in the face of the English. As a declaration of war the English confiscated 300 French ships (1756). The marvel of the war was to see this little kingdom of Prussia, interposed between the huge powers of Austria, France, and Russia, run from one to the other, and defy them all. This was the second period of the art of war. The unskillful adversaries of Frederick thought that he owed all his success to the precision of the manoeuvres of the Prussian soldiers, to their excellent drill and rapid firing. Frederick had certainly carried the soldier machine to perfection. This was capable of imitation: the Czar Peter III. and the Count of St. Germain created military automatons by means of the lash. But they could not imitate the quickness of his manoeuvres; the happy arrangement of his marches, which gave him great facility for moving and concentrating large masses, and directing them on the weak points of the enemy. In this terrible chase given by the large unwieldy armies of the allies to the agile Prussians, one cannot help noticing the amusing circumspection of the Austrian tacticians and the stupid folly of the fine gentlemen who led the armies of France. The Fabius of Austria, the sage and heavy Daun, was satisfied with a war of positions; he could not find encampments strong enough or mountains sufficiently inaccessible; his stationary troops were always beaten by Frederick. To begin with, he freed himself from the enmity of Saxony. He did not hurt, he only disarmed her. He struck his next blow in Bohemia. Repulsed by the Austrians, and abandoned by the English army, which determined at Kloster-seven to fight no more, threatened by the Russians, who were victorious at Joergendorf, he passed into Saxony and found the French and Imperialists combined there. Prussia was surrounded by four armies. Frederick fancied himself lost and determined on suicide. He wrote to his sister and to d'Argens announcing his intention. There was only one thing which frightened him: it was, that when once he was dead the great distributor of glory — Voltaire — might make free with his name: he wrote an epistle to disarm him. . . . Having written this epistle he defeated the enemy at Rosbach. The Prince of Soubise, who thought that he fled, set off rashly in pursuit; then the Prussians unmasked their batteries, killed 3,000 men, and took 7,000 prisoners. In the French camp were found an army of cooks, actors, hair-dressers; a number of parrots, parasols, and huge cases of lavender-water, &c. (1757). None but a tactician could follow the King of Prussia in this series of brilliant and skillful battles. The Seven Years' War, however varied its incidents, was a political and strategical war: it has not the interest of the wars for ideas, the struggles for religion and for freedom of the 16th century and of our own time. The defeat of Rosbach was followed by another at Creveld, and by great reverses balanced by small advantages; the total ruin of the French navy and colonies; the English masters of the ocean and conquerors of India; the exhaustion and humili-

ation of old Europe in the presence of young Prussia. This is the history of the Seven Years' War. It was terminated under the ministry of the Duke of Choiseul," by the Peace of Hubertsburg and the Peace of Paris.—J. Michelet, *A Summary of Modern History*, pp. 300-302.—See GERMANY: A. D. 1755-1756, to 1763; and, also, SEVEN YEARS' WAR.

A. D. 1772-1773.—The First Partition of Poland. See POLAND: A. D. 1763-1773.

A. D. 1777-1779.—The question of the Bavarian Succession. See BAVARIA: A. D. 1777-1779.

A. D. 1782-1811.—Abolition of Serfdom. See SLAVERY, MEDIEVAL: GERMANY.

A. D. 1787-1791.—War with the Turks.—Treaty of Sistova.—Slight Acquisitions of Territory. See TURKS: A. D. 1776-1792.

A. D. 1790-1797.—Death of Joseph II. and Leopold II.—Accession of Francis II.—The Coalition against and war with revolutionary France, to the Peace of Campo Formio.—"It is a mistake to imagine that the European Powers attacked the Revolution in France. It was the Revolution which attacked them. The diplomatists of the 18th century viewed at first with cynical indifference the meeting of the States-General at Versailles. . . . The two points which occupied the attention of Europe in 1780 were the condition of Poland and the troubles in the East. The ambitious designs of Catherine and the assistance lent to them by Joseph threatened the existence of the Turkish Empire, irritated the Prussian Court, and awakened English apprehensions, always sensitive about the safety of Stamboul. Poland, the battle-field of cynical diplomacy, torn by long dissensions and ruined by a miserable constitution, was vainly endeavouring, under the jealous eyes of her great neighbours, to avert the doom impending, and to reassert her ancient claim to a place among the nations of the world. But Russia had long since determined that Poland must be a vassal State to her or cease to be a State at all, while Prussia, driven to face a hard necessity, realised that a strong Poland and a strong Prussia could not exist together, and that if Poland ever rose again to power, Prussia must bid good-bye to unity and greatness. These two questions to the States involved seemed to be of far more moment than any political reform in France, and engrossed the diplomatists of Europe until the summer of 1791. In February, 1790, a new influence was introduced into European politics by the death of the Emperor Joseph and the accession of his brother, Leopold II. Leopold was a man of remarkable ability, no enthusiast and no dreamer, thoroughly versed in the selfish traditions of Austrian policy and in some of the subtleties of Italian statecraft, discerning, temperate, resolute and clear-headed, quietly determined to have his own way, and generally skilful enough to secure it. Leopold found his new dominions in a state of the utmost confusion, with war and rebellion threatening him on every side. He speedily set about restoring order. He repealed the unpopular decrees of Joseph. He conciliated or repressed his discontented subjects. He gradually re-established the authority of the Crown. . . . Accordingly, the first eighteen months of Leopold's reign were occupied with his own immediate interests, and at the end of that time his success

was marked. Catherine's vast schemes in Turkey had been checked. War had been averted. Poland had been strengthened by internal changes. Prussia had been conciliated and outmanœuvred, and her influence had been impaired. At last, at the end of August, 1791, the Emperor was free to face the French problem, and he set out for the Castle of Pillnitz to meet the King of Prussia and the Emigrant leaders at the Saxon Elector's Court. For some time past the restlessness of the French Emigrants had been causing great perplexity in Europe. Received with open arms by the ecclesiastical princes of the Rhine, by the Electors of Mayence and Trèves, they proceeded to agitate busily for their own restoration. . . . The object of the Emigrants was to bring pressure to bear at the European Courts, with the view of inducing the Powers to intervene actively in their behalf. . . . After his escape from France, in June, 1790, the Comte de Provence established his Court at Coblenz, where he was joined by his brother the Comte d'Artois, and where, on the plea that Louis was a prisoner, he claimed the title of Regent, and assumed the authority of King. The Court of the two French princes at Coblenz represented faithfully the faults and follies of the Emigrant party. But a more satisfactory spectacle was offered by the camp at Worms, where Condé was bravely trying to organise an army to fight against the Revolution in France. To Condé's standard looked the more patriotic Emigrants. . . . But the German Princes in the neighbourhood looked with disfavour on the Emigrant army. It caused confusion in their dominions, and it drew down on them the hostility of the French Government. The Emperor joined them in protesting against it. In February, 1792, Condé's army was compelled to abandon its camp at Worms, and to retire further into Germany. The Emperor was well aware of the reckless selfishness of the Emigrant princes. He had as little sympathy with them as his sister. He did not intend to listen to their demands. If he interfered in France at all, it would only be in a cautious and tentative manner, and in order to save Marie Antoinette and her husband. Certainly he would not undertake a war for the restoration of the Ancien Régime. . . . Accordingly, the interviews at Pillnitz came to nothing. . . . Early in March, 1792, Leopold suddenly died. His heir Francis, unrestrained by his father's tact and moderation, assumed a different tone and showed less patience. The chances of any effective pressure from the Powers declined, as the prospect of war rose on the horizon. Francis's language was sufficiently sharp to give the Assembly the pretext which it longed for, and on the 20th April, Louis, amid general enthusiasm, came down to the Assembly and declared war against Austria. The effects of that momentous step no comment can exaggerate. It ruined the best hopes of the Revolution, and prepared the way for a military despotism in the future."—C. E. Mallet, *The French Revolution*, ch. 7.—See FRANCE: A. D. 1790-1791; 1791 (JULY-DECEMBER); 1791-1792; 1792 (APRIL-JULY), and (SEPTEMBER-DECEMBER); 1792-1793 (DECEMBER-FEBRUARY); 1793 (FEBRUARY-APRIL), and (JULY-DECEMBER); 1794 (MARCH-JULY); 1794-1795 (OCTOBER-MAY); 1795 (JUNE-DECEMBER); 1796 (APRIL-OCTOBER); and 1796-1797 (OCTOBER-APRIL).

A. D. 1794-1796.—The Third partition of Poland.—Austrian share of the spoils. See POLAND: A. D. 1793-1796.

A. D. 1797 (October).—Treaty of Campo-Formio with France.—Cession of the Netherlands and Lombard provinces.—Acquisition of Venice and Venetian territories. See FRANCE: A. D. 1797 (MAY-OCTOBER).

A. D. 1798-1806.—Congress of Rastadt.—Second Coalition against France.—Peace of Luneville.—Third Coalition.—Ulm and Austerlitz.—Peace of Presburg.—Extinction of the Holy Roman Empire.—Birth of the Empire of Austria.—"When Bonaparte sailed for Egypt he had left a congress at Rastadt discussing means for the execution of certain articles in the treaty of Campo Formio which were to establish peace between France and the Empire. . . . Though openly undertaking to invite the Germans to a congress in order to settle a general peace on the basis of the integrity of the Empire, the Emperor agreed in secret articles to use his influence to procure for the Republic the left bank of the Rhine with the exception of the Prussian provinces, to join with France in obtaining compensation in Germany for those injured by this change, and to contribute no more than his necessary contingent if the war were prolonged. The ratification of these secret provisions had been extorted from the Congress by threats before Bonaparte had left; but the question of indemnification had progressed no farther than a decision to secularise the ecclesiastical states for the purpose, when extravagant demands from the French deputies brought negotiation to a deadlock. Meanwhile, another coalition war had been brewing. Paul I. of Russia had regarded with little pleasure the doings of the Revolution, and when his protégés, the knights of St. John of Jerusalem, had been deprived of Malta by Bonaparte on his way to Egypt, when the Directory established by force of arms a Helvetic republic in Switzerland, when it found occasion to carry off the Pope into exile and erect a Roman republic, he abandoned the cautious and self-seeking policy of Catherine, and cordially responded to Pitt's advances for an alliance. At the same time Turkey was compelled by the invitation of Egypt to ally itself for once with Russia. Austria, convinced that the French did not intend to pay a fair price for the treaty of Campo Formio, also determined to renew hostilities; and Naples, exasperated by the sacrilege of a republic at Rome, and alarmed by French aggressiveness, enrolled itself in the league. The Neapolitan king, indeed, opened the war with some success, before he could receive support from his allies; but he was soon vanquished by the French, and his dominions were converted into a Parthenopean republic. Austria, on the contrary, awaited the arrival of the Russian forces; and the general campaign began early in 1799. The French, fighting against such generals as the Archduke Charles and the Russian Suvaroff, without the supervision of Carnot or the strategy and enterprise of Bonaparte, suffered severe reverses and great privations. Towards the end the Russian army endured much hardship on account of the selfishness of the Austrian cabinet; and this caused the Tsar, who thought he had other reasons for discontent, to withdraw his troops from the field. When Bonaparte was made First Consul the

military position of France was, nevertheless, very precarious. . . . The Roman and Cisalpine republics had fallen. The very congress at Rastadt had been dispersed by the approach of the Austrians; and the French emissaries had been sabred by Austrian troopers, though how their insolence came to be thus foully punished has never been clearly explained. At this crisis France was rescued from foreign foes and domestic disorders by its most successful general. . . . In the campaign which followed, France obtained signal satisfaction for its elagium. Leaving Moreau to carry the war into Germany, Bonaparte suddenly crossed the Alps, and defeated the Austrians on the plain of Marengo. The Austrians, though completely cowed, refrained from concluding a definite peace out of respect for their engagements with England; and armistices, expiring into desultory warfare, prolonged the contest till Moreau hid the way open to Vienna, by winning a splendid triumph at Hohenlinden. A treaty of peace was finally concluded at Lunéville, when Francis II. pledged the Empire to its provisions on the ground of the consents already given at Rastadt. In conformity with the treaty of Campo Formio, Austria retained the boundary of the Adige in Italy; France kept Belgium and the left bank of the Rhine; and the princes, dispossessed by the cessions, were promised compensation in Germany; while Tuscany was given to France to sell to Spain at the price of Parma, Louisiana, six ships of the line, and a sum of money. Shortly afterwards peace was extended to Naples on easy terms. . . . The time was now come for the Revolution to complete the ruin of the Holy Roman Empire. Pursuant to the treaty of Lunéville, the German Diet met at Regensburg to discuss a scheme of compensation for the dispossessed rulers. Virtually the meeting was a renewal of the congress of Rastadt. . . . At Rastadt the incoherence and disintegration of the venerable Empire had become painfully apparent. . . . When it was known that the head of the nation, who had guaranteed the integrity of the Empire in the preliminaries of Leoben, and had renewed the assurance when he convoked the assembly, had in truth betrayed the stranger nearly all the left bank of the Rhine,—the German rulers greedily hastened to secure every possible trifle in the scramble of redistribution. The slow and wearisome debates were supplemented by intrigues of the most degraded nature. Conscious that the French Consul could give a casting vote on any disputed question, the princes found no indignity too shameful, no trick too base, to obtain his favour. . . . The First Consul, on his side, prosecuted with a duplicity and address, heretofore unequalled, the traditional policy of France in German affairs. . . . Feigning to take into his counsels the young Tsar, whose convenient friendship was thus easily obtained on account of his family connections with the German courts, he drew up a scheme of indemnification and presented it to the Diet for endorsement. In duo time a servile assent was given to every point which concerned the two autocrats. By this settlement, Austria and Prussia were more equally balanced against one another, the former being deprived of influence in Western Germany, and the latter finding in more convenient situations a rich

recompense for its cessions on the Rhine; while the middle states, Bavaria, Baden, and Würtemberg, received very considerable accessions of territory. But if Bonaparte dislocated yet further the political structure of Germany, he was at least instrumental in removing the worst of the anachronisms which stilled the development of improved institutions among a large division of its people. The same measure which brought German separatism to a climax, also extinguished the ecclesiastical sovereignties and nearly all the free cities. That these strongholds of priestly obscurantism and bourgeois apathy would some day be invaded by their more ambitious and active neighbours, had long been apparent. . . . And war was declared when thousands of British subjects visiting France had already been ensnared and imprisoned. . . . Pitt had taken the conduct of the war out of the hands of Addington's feeble ministry. Possessing the confidence of the powers, he rapidly concluded offensive alliances with Russia, Sweden, and Austria, though Prussia obstinately remained neutral. Thus, by 1805, Napoleon had put to hazard all his lately won power in a conflict with the greater part of Europe. The battle of Cape Trafalgar crushed for good his maritime power, and rendered England safe from direct attack. The campaign on land, however, made him master of central Europe. Bringing the Austrian army in Germany to an inglorious capitulation at Ulm, he marched through Vienna, and, with inferior forces won in his best style the battle of Austerlitz against the troops of Francis and Alexander. The action was decisive. The allies thought not of renewing the war with the relays of troops which were hurrying up from North and South. Prussia and Austria alike wished to be rid of their ill-fated connection. The Emperor Alexander silently returned home, pursued only by Napoleon's flattering tokens of esteem; the Emperor Francis accepted the peace of Presburg, which deprived his house of the ill-gotten Venetian States, Tyrol, and its more distant possessions in Western Germany; the King of Prussia, who had been on the point of joining the coalition with a large army if his mediation were unsuccessful, was committed to an alliance with the conqueror by his terrified negotiator. And well did Napoleon appear to make the fruits of victory compensate France for its exertions. The empire was not made more unwieldy in bulk, but its dependents, Bavaria, Würtemberg, and Baden, received considerable accessions of territory, and the two first were raised to the rank of kingdoms; while the Emperor's Italian principality, which he had already turned into a kingdom of Italy to the great disgust of Austria, was increased by the addition of the ceded Venetian lands. But the full depth of Europe's humiliation was not experienced till the two following years. In 1806 an Act of Federation was signed by the kings of Bavaria and Würtemberg, the Elector of Baden, and thirteen minor princes which united them into a league under the protection of the French Emperor. The objects of this confederacy, known as the Rheinbund were defence against foreign aggression and the exercise of complete autonomy at home. . . . Already the consequences of the Peace of Lunéville had induced the ruling Hapsburg to assure his equality with

the sovereignties of France and Russia by taking the imperial title in his own right; and before the Confederation of the Rhine was made public he formally renounced his office of elective Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire and released from allegiance to him all the states and princes of the Reich. The triumph of the German policy of the Consulate was complete."—A. Weir, *The Historical Basis of Modern Europe*, ch. 4.—See, also, FRANCE: A. D. 1798-1799, to 1805, and GERMANY: A. D. 1801-1803, to 1805-1806.

**A. D. 1809-1814.**—The second struggle with Napoleon and the second defeat.—The Marriage alliance.—The Germanic War of Liberation.—The final alliance and the overthrow of the Corsican.—"On the 12th of July, 1806, fourteen princes of the south and west of Germany united themselves into the confederation of the Rhine, and recognised Napoleon as their protector. On the 1st of August, they signified to the diet of Ratisbon their separation from the Germanic body. The Empire of Germany ceased to exist, and Francis II. abdicated the title by proclamation. By a convention signed at Vienna, on the 15th of December, Prussia exchanged the territories of Anspach, Cleves and Neufchâtel for the electorate of Hanover. Napoleon had all the west under his power. Absolute master of France and Italy, as emperor and king, he was also master of Spain, by the dependence of that court; of Naples and Holland, by his two brothers; of Switzerland, by the act of mediation; and in Germany he had at his disposal the kings of Bavaria and Wurtemberg, and the confederation of the Rhine against Austria and Prussia. . . . This encroaching progress gave rise to the fourth coalition. Prussia, neutral since the peace of Bâle, had, in the last campaign, been on the point of joining the Austro-Russian coalition. The rapidity of the emperor's victories had alone restrained her; but now, alarmed at the aggrandizement of the empire, and encouraged by the fine condition of her troops, she league'd with Russia to drive the French from Germany. . . . The campaign opened early in October. Napoleon, as usual, overwhelmed the coalition by the promptitude of his marches and the vigour of his measures. On the 14th of October, he destroyed at Jena the military monarchy of Prussia, by a decisive victory. . . . The campaign in Poland was less rapid, but as brilliant as that of Prussia. Russia, for the third time, measured its strength with France. Conquered at Zurich and Austerlitz, it was also defeated at Eylau and Friedland. After these memorable battles, the emperor Alexander entered into a negotiation, and concluded at Tilsit, on the 21st of June, 1807, an armistice which was followed by a definitive treaty on the 7th of July. The peace of Tilsit extended the French domination on the continent. Prussia was reduced to half its extent. In the south of Germany, Napoleon had instituted the two kingdoms of Bavaria and Wurtemberg against Austria; further to the north, he created the two feudatory kingdoms of Saxony and Westphalia against Prussia. . . . In order to obtain universal and uncontested supremacy, he made use of arms against the continent, and the cessation of commerce against England. But in forbidding to the continental states all communication with England, he was preparing new difficulties for himself, and soon added to the animosity of

opinion excited by his despotism, and the hatred of states produced by his conquering domination, the exasperation of private interests and commercial suffering occasioned by the blockade. . . . The expedition of Portugal in 1807, and the invasion of Spain in 1808, began for him and for Europe a new order of events. . . . The reaction manifested itself in three countries, hitherto allies of France, and it brought on the fifth coalition. The court of Rome was dissatisfied; the peninsula was wounded in its national pride by having imposed upon it a foreign king; in its usages, by the suppression of convents, of the Inquisition, and of the grandees; Holland suffered in its commerce from the blockade, and Austria supported impatiently its losses and subordinate condition. England, watching for an opportunity to revive the struggle on the continent, excited the resistance of Rome, the peninsula, and the cabinet of Vienna. . . . Austria . . . made a powerful effort, and raised 530,000 men, comprising the Landwehr, and took the field in the spring of 1809. The Tyrol rose, and King Jerome was driven from his capital by the Westphallians; Italy wavered; and Prussia only waited till Napoleon met with a reverse, to take arms; but the emperor was still at the height of his power and prosperity. He hastened from Madrid in the beginning of February, and directed the members of the confederation to keep their contingents in readiness. On the 12th of April he left Paris, passed the Rhine, plunged into Germany, gained the victories of Eckmühl and Essling, occupied Vienna a second time on the 15th of May, and overthrew this new coalition by the battle of Wagram, after a campaign of four months. . . . The peace of Vienna, of the 11th of October, 1809, deprived the house of Austria of several more provinces, and compelled it again to adopt the continental system. . . . Napoleon, who seemed to follow a rash but inflexible policy, deviated from his course about this time by a second marriage. He divorced Josephine that he might give an heir to the empire, and married, on the 1st of April, 1810, Marie-Louise, arch-duchess of Austria. This was a decided error. He quitted his position and his post as a parvenu and revolutionary monarch, opposing in France the ancient courts as the republic had opposed the ancient governments. He placed himself in a false situation with respect to Austria, which he ought either to have crushed after the victory of Wagram, or to have relinquished in its possessions after his marriage with the arch-duchess. . . . The birth, on the 20th of March, 1811, of a son, who received the title of king of Rome, seemed to consolidate the power of Napoleon, by securing to him a successor. The war in Spain was prosecuted with vigour during the years 1810 and 1811. . . . While the war was proceeding in the peninsula with advantage, but without any decided success, a new campaign was preparing in the north. Russia perceived the empire of Napoleon approaching its territories. . . . About the close of 1810, it increased its armies, renewed its commercial relations with Great Britain, and did not seem indisposed to a rupture. The year 1811 was spent in negotiations which led to nothing, and preparations for war were made on both sides. . . . On the 9th of March, Napoleon left Paris. . . . During several months he fixed his court at Dresden, where the emperor of

Austria, the king of Prussia, and all the sovereigns of Germany, came to bow before his high fortune. On the 22nd of June, war was declared against Russia. . . . Napoleon, who, according to his custom, wished to finish all in one campaign, advanced at once into the heart of Russia, instead of prudently organizing the Polish barrier against it. His army amounted to about 500,000 men. He passed the Niemen on the 24th of June; took Wilna, and Witepsk, defeated the Russians at Astrowno, Polotsk, Mohilow Smolensko, at the Moskowa, and on the 14th of September, made his entry into Moscow. . . . Moscow was burned by its governor. . . . The emperor ought to have seen that this war would not terminate as the others had done; yet, conqueror of the foe, and master of his capital, he conceived hopes of peace which the Russians skilfully encouraged. Winter was approaching, and Napoleon prolonged his stay at Moscow for six weeks. He delayed his movements on account of the deceptive negotiations of the Russians; and did not decide on a retreat till the 19th of October. This retreat was disastrous, and began the downfall of the empire. . . . The cabinet of Berlin began the defections. On the 1st of March, 1813, it joined Russia and England, which were forming the sixth coalition. Sweden acceded to it soon after; yet the emperor, whom the confederate power thought prostrated by the last disaster, opened the campaign with new victories. The battle of Lutzen, won by conscripts, on the 2nd of May, the occupation of Dresden; the victory of Bautzen, and the war carried to the Elbe, astonished the coalition. Austria, which, since 1810, had been on a footing of peace, was resuming arms, and already meditating a change of alliance. She now proposed herself as a mediatrix between the emperor and the confederates. Her mediation was accepted; an armistice was concluded at Plesswitz, on the 4th of June, and a congress assembled at Prague to negotiate peace. It was impossible to come to terms. . . . Austria joined the coalition, and war, the only means of settling this great contest, was resumed. The emperor had only 280,000 men against 530,000. . . . Victory seemed, at first, to second him. At Dresden he defeated the combined forces; but the defeats of his lieutenants deranged his plans. . . . The princes of the confederation of the Rhine chose this moment to desert the cause of the empire. A vast engagement having taken place at Leipzig between the two armies, the Saxons and Wurtembergers passed over to the enemy on the field of battle. This defection to the strength of the coalesced powers, who had learned a more compact and skilful mode of warfare, obliged Napoleon to retreat, after a struggle of three days. . . . The empire was invaded in all directions. The Austrians entered Italy; the English, having made themselves masters of the peninsula during the last two years, had passed the Bidasson, under general Wellington, and appeared on the Pyrenees. Three armies pressed on France to the east and north. . . . Napoleon was . . . obliged to submit to the conditions of the allied powers; their pretensions increased with their power. . . . On the 11th of April, 1814, he renounced for himself and children the thrones of France and Italy, and received in exchange for his vast sovereignty, the limits of which had extended from Cadiz to the

Baltic Sea, the little Island of Elba."—P. A. Mignet, *History of the French Revolution*, ch. 15. —See GERMANY: A. D. 1800 (JANUARY—JUNE), to 1813; RUSSIA: A. D. 1812; and FRANCE: A. D. 1810-1812 to 1814.

A. D. 1814.—Restored rule in Northern Italy. See ITALY: A. D. 1814-1815.

A. D. 1814-1815.—Treaties of Paris and Congress of Vienna.—Readjustment of French boundaries.—Recovery of the Tyrol from Bavaria and Lombardy in Italy.—Acquisition of the Venetian states. See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (APRIL—JUNE), and 1815 (JULY—NOVEMBER); also VIENNA, THE CONGRESS OF.

A. D. 1814-1820.—Formation of the Germanic Confederation. See GERMANY: A. D. 1814-1820.

A. D. 1815.—The Holy Alliance. See HOLY ALLIANCE.

A. D. 1815.—Return of Napoleon from Elba.—The Quadruple Alliance.—The Waterloo Campaign and its results. See FRANCE: A. D. 1814-1815.

A. D. 1815-1835.—Emperor Francis, Prince Metternich, and "the system."—"After the treaty of Vienna in 1809, and still more conspicuously after the pacification of Europe, the political wisdom of the rulers of Austria inclined them ever more and more to the maintenance of that state of things which was known to friends and foes as the System. But what was the System? It was the organisation of doing nothing. It cannot even be said to have been reactionary: it was simply inactionary. . . . 'Mark time in place' was the word of command in every government office. The bureaucracy was engaged from morning to night in making work, but nothing ever came of it. Not even were the liberal innovations which had lasted through the reign of Leopold got rid of. Everything went on in the confused, unfinished, and ineffective state in which the great war had found it. Such was the famous System which was venerated by the ultra-Tories of every land, and most venerated where it was least understood. Two men dominate the history of Austria during this unhappy time—men who, though utterly unlike in character and intellect, were nevertheless admirably fitted to work together, and whose names will be long united in an unenviable notoriety. These were the Emperor Francis and Prince Metternich. The first was the evil genius of internal politics; the second exercised a hardly less baneful influence over foreign affairs. . . . For the external policy of Prince Metternich, the first and most necessary condition was, that Austria should give to Europe the impression of fixed adherence to the most extreme Conservative views. So for many years they worked together, Prince Metternich always declaring that he was a mere tool in the hands of his master, but in reality far more absolute in the direction of his own department than the emperor was in his. . . . Prince Metternich had the power of making the most of all he knew, and constantly left upon persons of real merit the impression that he was a man of lofty aspirations and liberal views, who forced himself to repress such tendencies in others because he thought that their repression was a sine qua non for Austria. The men of ability, who knew him intimately, thought less well of him. To them he appeared vain and superficial, with



much that recalled the French noblesse of the old régime in his way of looking at things, and emphatically wanting in every element of greatness. With the outbreak of the Greek insurrection in 1821, began a period of difficulty and complications for the statesmen of Austria. There were two things of which they were mortally afraid—Russia and the revolution. Now, if they assisted the Greeks, they would be playing into the hands of the second; and if they opposed the Greeks, they would be likely to embroil themselves with the first. The whole art of Prince Metternich was therefore exerted to keep things quiet in the Eastern Peninsula, and to postpone the intolerable 'question d'Orient.' Many were the shifts he tried, and sometimes, as just after the accession of Nicholas, his hopes were very high. All was, however, in vain. England and Russia settled matters behind his back; and although the tone which the publicists in his pay adopted towards the Greeks became more favourable in 1826-7, the battle of Navarino was a sad surprise and mortification to the wily chancellor. Not less annoying was the commencement of hostilities on the Danube between Russia and the Porte. The reverses with which the great neighbour met in his first campaign cannot have been otherwise than pleasing at Vienna. But the unfortunate success which attended his arms in the second campaign soon turned ill-dissembled joy into ill-concealed sorrow, and the treaty of Adrianople at once lowered Austria's prestige in the East, and deposed Metternich from the commanding position which he had occupied in the councils of the Holy Allies. It became, indeed, ever more and more evident in the next few years that the age of Congress politics, during which he had been the observed of all observers, was past and gone, that the diplomatic period had vanished away, and that the military period had begun. The very form in which the highest international questions were debated was utterly changed. At Vienna, in 1814, the diplomatists had been really the primary, the sovereigns only secondary personages; while at the interview of Münchengratz, between Nicholas and the Emperor Francis, in 1833, the great autocrat appeared to look upon Prince Metternich as hardly more than a confidential clerk. The dull monotony of servitude which oppressed nearly the whole of the empire was varied by the agitations of one of its component parts. When the Hungarian Diet was dissolved in 1812, the emperor had solemnly promised that it should be called together again within three years. Up to 1815, accordingly, the nation went on giving extraordinary levies and supplies without much opposition. When, however, the appointed time was fulfilled, it began to murmur. . . . Year by year the agitation went on increasing, till at last the breaking out of the Greek revolution, and the threatening appearance of Eastern politics, induced Prince Metternich to join his entreaties to those of many other counsellors, who could not be suspected of the slightest leaning to constitutional views. At length the emperor yielded, and in 1825 Presburg was once more filled with the best blood and most active spirits of the land, assembled in parliament. Long and stormy were the debates which ensued. Bitter was, from time to time, the vexation of the emperor, and great was the excitement

throughout Hungary. In the end, however, the court of Vienna triumphed. Hardly any grievances were redressed, while its demands were fully conceded. The Diet of 1825 was, however, not without fruit. The discussion which took place advanced the political education of the people, who were brought back to the point where they stood at the death of Joseph II.—that is, before the long wars with France had come to distract their attention from their own affairs. . . . The slumbers of Austria were not yet over. The System dragged its slow length along. Little or nothing was done for the improvement of the country. Klebelsberg administered the finances in an easy and careless manner. Conspiracies and risings in Italy were easily checked, and batches of prisoners sent off from time to time to Mantua or Spielberg. Austrian influence rose ever higher and higher in all the petty courts of the Peninsula. . . . In other regions Russia or England might be willing to thwart him, but in Italy Prince Metternich might proudly reflect that Austria was indeed a 'great power.' The French Revolution of 1830 was at first alarming; but when it resulted in the enthronement of a dynasty which called to its aid a 'cabinet of repression,' all fears were stilled. The Emperor Francis continued to say, when any change was proposed, 'We must sleep upon it,' and died in 1835 in 'the abundance of peace.'—M. E. Grant Duff, *Studies in European Politics*, pp. 140-149.—See, also, GERMANY: A. D. 1819-1847.

**A. D. 1815-1846.—Gains of the Hapsburg monarchy.—Its aggressive absolutism.—Death of Francis I.—Accession of Ferdinand I.—Suppression of revolt in Galicia.—Extinction and annexation of the Republic of Cracow.**—"In the new partition of Europe, arranged in the Congress of Vienna [see VIENNA, THE CONGRESS OF], Austria received Lombardy and Venice under the title of a Lombardo-Venetian kingdom, the Illyrian provinces also as a kingdom, Venetian Dalmatia, the Tirol, Vorarlberg, Salzburg, the Innviertel and Hausruckviertel, and the part of Galicia ceded by her at an earlier period. Thus, after three and twenty years of war, the monarchy had gained a considerable accession of strength, having obtained, in lieu of its remote and unprofitable possessions in the Netherlands, territories which consolidated its power in Italy, and made it as great in extent as it had been in the days of Charles VI., and far more compact and defensible. The grand duchies of Modena, Parma, and Placentia, were moreover restored to the collateral branches of the house of Hapsburg. . . . After the last fall of Napoleon . . . the great powers of the continent . . . constituted themselves the champions of the principle of absolute monarchy. The maintenance of that principle ultimately became the chief object of the so-called Holy Alliance established in 1816 between Russia, Austria and Prussia, and was pursued with remarkable steadfastness by the Emperor Francis and his minister, Prince Metternich [see HOLY ALLIANCE]. . . . Thenceforth it became the avowed policy of the chief sovereigns of Germany to maintain the rights of dynasties in an adverse sense to those of their subjects. The people, on the other hand, deeply resented the breach of those promises which had been so lavishly made to them on the general summons to the war of

liberation. Disaffection took the place of that enthusiastic loyalty with which they had bled and suffered for their native princes; the secret societies, formed with the concurrence of their rulers, for the purpose of throwing off the yoke of the foreigner, became ready instruments of sedition. . . . In the winter of 1819, a German federative congress assembled at Vienna. In May of the following year it published an act containing closer definitions of the Federative Act, having for their essential objects the exclusion of the various provincial Diets from all positive interference in the general affairs of Germany, and an increase of the power of the princes over their respective Diets, by a guarantee of aid on the part of the confederates" (see GERMANY: A. D. 1814-1820). During the next three years, the powers of the Holy Alliance, under the lead of Austria, and acting under a concert established at the successive congresses of Troppau, Laybach and Verona (see VERONA, CONGRESS OF), interfered to put down popular risings against the tyranny of government in Italy and Spain, while they discouraged the revolt of the Greeks (see ITALY: A. D. 1820-1821; and SPAIN: A. D. 1814-1827). "The commotions that pervaded Europe after the French Revolution of 1830 affected Austria only in her Italian dominions, and there but indirectly, for the imperial authority remained undisputed in the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom. But the duke of Modena and the archduke of Parma were obliged to quit those states, and a formidable insurrection broke out in the territory of the Church. An Austrian army of 18,000 men quickly put down the insurgents, who rose again, however, as soon as it was withdrawn. The pope again invoked the aid of Austria, whose troops entered Bologna in January, 1832, and established themselves there in garrison. Upon this, the French immediately sent a force to occupy Ancona, and for a while a renewal of the oft-repeated conflict between Austria and France on Italian ground seemed inevitable; but it soon appeared that France was not prepared to support the revolutionary party in the pope's dominions, and that danger passed away. The French remained for some years in Ancona, and the Austrians in Bologna and other towns of Romagna. This was the last important incident in the foreign affairs of Austria previous to the death of the Emperor Francis I. on the 2nd of March, 1835, after a reign of 43 years. . . . The Emperor Francis was succeeded by his son, Ferdinand I., whose accession occasioned no change in the political or administrative system of the empire. Incapacitated, by physical and mental infirmity, from labouring as his father had done in the business of the state, the new monarch left to Prince Metternich a much more unrestricted power than that minister had wielded in the preceding reign. . . . The province of Galicia began early in the new reign to occasion uneasiness to the government. The Congress of Vienna had constituted the city of Cracow an independent republic—a futile representative of that Polish nationality which had once extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea. After the failure of the Polish insurrection of 1831 against Russia, Cracow became the focus of fresh conspiracies, to put an end to which the city was occupied by a mixed force of Russians, Prussians, and Austrians; the two former were

soon withdrawn, but the latter remained until 1840. When they also had retired, the Polish propaganda was renewed with considerable effect. An insurrection broke out in Galicia in 1846, when the scantiness of the Austrian military force in the province seemed to promise it success. It failed, however, as all previous efforts of the Polish patriots had failed, because it rested on no basis of popular sympathy. The nationality for which they contended had ever been of an oligarchical pattern, hostile to the freedom of the middle and lower classes. The Galician peasants had no mind to exchange the yoke of Austria, which pressed lightly upon them, for the feudal oppression of the Polish nobles. They turned upon the insurgents and slew or took them prisoners, the police inciting them to the work by publicly offering a reward of five florins for every suspected person delivered up by them, alive or dead. Thus the agents of a civilized government became the avowed instigators of an inhuman 'jacquerie.' The houses of the landed proprietors were sacked by the peasants, their inmates were tortured and murdered, and bloody anarchy raged throughout the land in the prostituted name of loyalty. The Austrian troops, at last restored order; but Szela, the leader of the sanguinary marauders, was thanked and highly rewarded in the name of his sovereign. In the same year the three protecting powers, Austria, Russia, and Prussia, took possession of Cracow, and, ignoring the right of the other parties to the treaty of Vienna to concern themselves about the fate of the republic, they announced that its independence was annulled, and that the city and territory of Cracow were annexed to, and forever incorporated with, the Austrian monarchy. From this time forth the political atmosphere of Europe became more and more loaded with the presages of the storm that burst in 1848."—W. K. Kelly, *Continuation of Coxe's Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 5-6.

**A. D. 1815-1849.—Arrangements in Italy of the Congress of Vienna.—Heaviness of the Austrian yoke.—The Italian risings.**—"By the treaty of Vienna (1815), the . . . entire kingdom of Venetian-Lombardy was handed over to the Austrians; the duchies of Modena, Reggio, with Massa and Carrara, given to Austrian princes; Parma, Piacenza, and Guastalla to Napoleon's queen, Maria Luisa, because she was an Austrian princess; the grand-duchy of Tuscany to Ferdinand III. of Austria; the duchy of Lucca to a Bourbon. Rome and the Roman states were restored to the new Pope, Pius VII.; Sicily was united to Naples under the Bourbons, and later deprived of her constitution, despite the promised protection of England; the Canton Ticino, though strictly Italian, annexed to the Swiss Confederation; the little republic of St. Marino left intact, even as the principality of Monaco. England retained Malta; Corsica was left to France. Italy, so Metternich and Europe fondly hoped, was reduced to a geographical expression. Unjust, brutal, and treacherous as was that partition, at least it taught the Italians that 'who would be free himself must strike the blow.' It united them into one common hatred of Austria and Austrian satellites. By substituting papal, Austrian, and Bourbon despotism for the free institutions, codes, and constitutions of the Napoleonic era, it taught them the difference

between rule and misrule. Hence the demand of the Neapolitans during their first revolution (1820) was for a constitution; that of the Piedmontese and Lombards (1821) for a constitution and war against Austria. The Bourbons swore and forswore, and the Austrians 'restored order' in Naples. The Piedmontese, who had not concerted their movement until Naples was crushed—after the abdication of Victor Emmanuel I., the granting of the constitution by the regent Charles Albert, and its abrogation by the new king Charles Felix—saw the Austrians enter Piedmont, while the leaders of the revolution went out into exile [see ITALY: A. D. 1820-1821]. But those revolutions and those failures were the beginning of the end. The will to be independent of all foreigners, the thirst for freedom, was universal; the very name of empire or of emperor, was rendered ridiculous, reduced to a parody—in the person of Ferdinand of Austria. But one illusion remained—in the liberating virtues of France and the French; this had to be dispelled by bitter experience, and for it substituted the new idea of one Italy for the Italians, a nation united, independent, free, governed by a president or by a king chosen by the sovereign people. The apostle of this idea, to which for fifty years victims and martyrs were sacrificed by thousands, was Joseph Mazzini; its champion, Joseph Garibaldi. By the genius of the former, the prowess of the latter, the abnegation, the constancy, the tenacity, the iron will of both, all the populations of Italy were subjugated by that idea; philosophers demonstrated it, poets sung it, pious Christian priests proclaimed it, statesmen found it confronting their negotiations, baffling their half-measures."—J. W. V. Marlo, *Introduction to Autobiography of Garibaldi*.—See ITALY: A. D. 1830-1832, and 1848-1849.

**A. D. 1835.—Accession of the Emperor Ferdinand I.**

**A. D. 1839-1840.—The Turko-Egyptian question and its settlement.—Quadruple Alliance.** See TURKS: A. D. 1831-1846.

**A. D. 1848.—The Germanic revolutionary rising.—National Assembly at Frankfort.—Archduke John elected Administrator of Germany.**—"When the third French Revolution broke out, its influence was immediately felt in Germany. The popular movement this time was very different from any the Governments had hitherto had to contend with. The people were evidently in earnest, and resolved to obtain, at whatever cost, their chief demands. . . . The Revolution was most serious in the two great German States, Prussia and Austria. . . . It was generally hoped that union as well as freedom was now to be achieved by Germany; but, as Prussia and Austria were in too much disorder to do anything, about 500 Germans from the various States met at Frankfort, and on March 21 constituted themselves a provisional Parliament. An extreme party wished the assembly to declare itself permanent; but to this the majority would not agree. It was decided that a National Assembly should be elected forthwith by the German people. The Confederate Diet, knowing that the provisional Parliament was approved by the nation, recognized its authority. Through the Diet the various Governments were communicated with, and all of them agreed to make arrangements for the elections. . . . The National Assembly was opened in Frankfort on

May 18, 1848. It elected the Archduke John of Austria as the head of a new provisional central Government. The choice was a happy one. The Archduke was at once acknowledged by the different governments, and on July 12 the President of the Confederate Diet formally made over to him the authority which had hitherto belonged to the Diet. The Diet then ceased to exist. The Archduke chose from the Assembly seven members, who formed a responsible ministry. The Assembly was divided into two parties, the Right and the Left. These again were broken up into various sections. Much time was lost in useless discussions, and it was soon suspected that the Assembly would not in the end prove equal to the great task it had undertaken."—J. Sime, *History of Germany*, ch. 19, sects. 8-11.—See GERMANY: A. D. 1848 (MARCH—SEPTEMBER).

**A. D. 1848 (December).—Accession of the Emperor Francis Joseph I.**

**A. D. 1848-1849.—Revolutionary risings.—Bombardment of Prague and Vienna.—Abdication of the Emperor Ferdinand.—Accession of Francis Joseph.—The Hungarian struggle for independence.**—"The rise of national feeling among the Hungarian, Slavonic, and Italian subjects of the House of Hapsburg was not the only difficulty of the Emperor Ferdinand I. Vienna was then the gayest and the dearest centre of fashion and luxury in Europe, but side by side with wealth there seethed a mass of wretched poverty; and the protective trade system of Austria so increased the price of the necessaries of life that bread-riots were frequent. . . . The university students were foremost in the demand for a constitution and for the removal of the rigid censorship of the press and of all books. So, when the news came of the flight of Louis Philippe from Paris [see FRANCE: A. D. 1841-1848, and 1848] the students as well as the artisans of Vienna rose in revolt (March 13, 1848), the latter breaking machinery and attacking the houses of unpopular employers. A deputation of citizens clamoured for the resignation of the hated Metternich: his house was burnt down, and he fled to England. A second outbreak of the excited populace (May 15, 1848), sent the Emperor Ferdinand in helpless flight to Innsprück in Tyrol; but he returned when they avowed their loyalty to his person, though they detested the old bureaucratic system. Far more complicated, however, were the race jealousies of the Empire. The Slavs of Bohemia . . . had demanded of Ferdinand the union of Bohemia, Moravia, and Austrian Silesia in Estates for those provinces, and that the Slavs should enjoy equal privileges with the Germans. After an unsatisfactory answer had been received, they convoked a Slavonic Congress at Prague. . . . But while this Babel of tongues was seeking for a means of fusion, Prince Windischgrätz was assembling Austrian troops around the Bohemian capital. Fights in the streets led to a bombardment of the city, which Windischgrätz soon entered in triumph. This has left a bitterness between the Tsechs or Bohemians and the Germans which still divides Bohemia socially and politically. . . . The exciting news of the spring of 1848 had made the hot Asiatic blood of the Magyars boil; yet even Kossuth and the democrats at first only demanded the abolition of Metternich's system in favour of a representative gov-

ernment. . . . Unfortunately Kossuth claimed that the Magyar laws and language must now be supreme, not only in Hungary proper, but also in the Hungarian 'crown lands' of Dalmatia, Croatia, and Slavonia, and the enthusiastic Magyars wished also to absorb the ancient principality of Transylvania; but this again was stoutly resisted by the Roumanians, Slavs, and Saxons of that little known corner of Europe, and their discontent was fanned by the court of Vienna. Jellachich, the Ban or Governor of Croatia, headed this movement, which aimed at making Agram the capital of the southern Slavs. Their revolt against the Hungarian ministry of Batthyanyi was at first disavowed in June, 1848, but in October was encouraged, by the perfidious government of Vienna. A conference between Batthyanyi and Jellachich ended with words of defiance: 'Then we must meet on the Drave' said the Hungarian. 'No, on the Danube,' retorted the champion of the Slavs. The vacillating Ferdinand annulled his acceptance of the new Hungarian constitution and declared Jellachich dictator of Hungary. His tool was unfortunate. After crossing the Drave, the Slavs were defeated by the brave Hungarian 'honveds' (defenders); and as many as 9,000 were made prisoners. Unable to subdue Hungary, Jellachich turned aside towards Vienna to crush the popular party there. For the democrats, exasperated by the perfidious policy of the government, had, on October 6, 1848, risen a third time: the war-minister, Latour, had been hanged on a lamp-post, and the emperor again fled from his turbulent capital to the ever-faithful Tyrolese. But now Jellachich and Windischgrätz bombarded the rebellious capital. It was on the point of surrendering when the Hungarians appeared to aid the city; but the levies raised by the exertions of Kossuth were this time outmanœuvred [and defeated] by the imperialists at Schwechat (October 30, 1848), and on the next day Vienna surrendered. Blum, a delegate from Saxony [to the German Parliament of Frankfurt, who had come on a mission of mediation to Vienna, but who had taken a part in the fighting], and some other democrats, were shot. By this clever but unscrupulous use of race jealousy the Viennese Government seemed to have overcome Bohemians, Italians, Hungarians, and the citizens of its own capital in turn; while it had diverted the southern Slavonians from hostility to actual service on its side. . . . The weak health and vacillating spirit of Ferdinand did not satisfy the knot of courtiers of Vienna, who now, flushed by success, sought to concentrate all power in the Viennese Cabinet. Worn out by the excitements of the year and by the demands of these men, Ferdinand, on December 2, 1848, yielded up the crown, not to his rightful successor, his brother, but to his nephew, Francis Joseph. He, a youth of eighteen, ascended the throne so rudely shaken, and still, in spite of almost uniform disaster in war, holds sway over an empire larger and more powerful than he found it in 1848. The Hungarians refused to recognise the young sovereign thus forced upon them; and the fact that he was not crowned at Presburg with the sacred iron crown of St. Stephen showed that he did not intend to recognise the Hungarian constitution. Austrian troops under Windischgrätz entered Buda-Pesth, but the Hungarian patriots

withdrew from their capital to organize a national resistance; and when the Austrian Government proclaimed the Hungarian constitution abolished and the complete absorption of Hungary in the Austrian Empire, Kossuth and his colleagues retorted by a Declaration of Independence (April 24, 1849). The House of Hapsburg was declared banished from Hungary, which was to be a republic. Kossuth, the first governor of the new republic, and Görgei, its general, raised armies which soon showed their prowess." The first important battle of the war had been fought at Kapolna, on the right bank of the Theiss, on the 26th of February, 1849, Görgei and Dembinski commanding the Hungarians and Windischgrätz leading the Austrians. The latter won the victory, and the Hungarians retreated toward the Theiss. About the middle of March, Görgei resumed the offensive, advancing toward Pesth, and encountered the Austrians at Isaszeg, where he defeated them in a hard-fought battle, — or rather in two battles which are sometimes called by different names; viz., that of Tapio Biske fought April 4th, and that of Godollo, fought on the 5th. It was now the turn of the Austrians to fall back, and they concentrated behind the Rakos, to cover Pesth. The Hungarian general passed round their left, carried Waitzen by storm, forced them to evacuate Pesth and to retreat to Presburg, abandoning the whole of Hungary with the exception of a few fortresses, which they held. The most important of these fortresses, that of Buda, the "twin-city," opposite Pesth on the Danube, was besieged by the Hungarians and carried by storm on the 21st of May. "In Transylvania, too, the Hungarians, under the talented Polish general Bem, overcame the Austrians, Slavonians, and Roumanians in many brilliant encounters. But the proclamation of a republic had alienated those Hungarians who had only striven for their old constitutional rights, so quarrels arose between Görgei and the ardent democrat Kossuth. Worse still, the Czar Nicholas, dreading the formation of a republic near his Polish provinces sent the military aid which Francis Joseph in May 1849 implored. Soon 80,000 Russians under Paskiewitch poured over the northern Carpathians to help the beaten Austrians, while others overpowered the gallant Bem in Transylvania. Jellachich with his Croats again invaded South Hungary, and Haynau, the scourge of Lombardy, marched on the strongest Hungarian fortress, Komorn, on the Danube." The Hungarians, overpowered by the combination of Austrians and Russians against them, were defeated at Pered, June 21; at Aez, July 3; at Komorn, July 11; at Waitzen, July 16; at Tzombor, July 20; at Segesvar, July 31; at Debreczin, August 2; at Szegedin, August 4; at Temeşvar, August 10. "In despair Kossuth handed over his dictatorship to his rival Görgei, who soon surrendered at Vlagos with all his forces to the Russians (August 13, 1849). About 5,000 men with Kossuth, Bem, and other leaders, escaped to Turkey. Even there Russia and Austria sought to drive them forth; but the Porte, upheld by the Western Powers, maintained its right to give sanctuary according to the Koran. Kossuth and many of his fellow-exiles finally sailed to England [and afterwards to America], where his majestic eloquence aroused deep sympathy for the afflicted country.

Many Hungarian patriots suffered death. All rebels had their property confiscated, and the country was for years ruled by armed force, and its old rights were abolished."—J. H. Rose, *A Century of Continental History*, ch. 31.

ALSO IN: Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1815-1852, ch. 55.—A. Görgel, *My Life and Acts in Hungary*.—General Klapka, *Memoirs of the War of Independence in Hungary*.—Count Hartig, *Genesis of the Revolution in Austria*.—W. H. Stiles, *Austria in 1848-49*.

**A. D. 1848-1849.—Revolt in Lombardy and Venetia.—War with Sardinia.—Victories of Radetzky.—Italy vanquished again.** See ITALY: A. D. 1848-1849.

**A. D. 1848-1850.—Failure of the movement for Germanic national unity.—End of the Frankfort Assembly.**—"Frankfort had become the centre of the movement. The helpless Diet had acknowledged the necessity of a German parliament, and had summoned twelve men of confidence charged with drawing up a new imperial constitution. But it was unable to supply what was most wanted—a strong executive. . . . Instead of establishing before all a strong executive able to control and to realise its resolutions, the Assembly lost months in discussing the fundamental rights of the German people, and thus was overwhelmed by the events. In June, Prince Windischgrätz crushed the insurrection at Prague; and in November the anarchy which had prevailed during the whole summer at Berlin was put down, when Count Brandenburg became first minister. . . . Schwarzenberg [at Vienna] declared as soon as he had taken the reins, that his programme was to maintain the unity of the Austrian empire, and demanded that the whole of it should enter into the Germanic confederation. This was incompatible with the federal state as contemplated by the National Assembly, and therefore Gagern, who had become president of the imperial ministry [at Frankfort], answered Schwarzenberg's programme by declaring that the entering of the Austrian monarchy with a majority of non-German nationalities into the German federal state was an impossibility. Thus nothing was left but to place the King of Prussia at the head of the German state. But in order to win a majority for this plan Gagern found it necessary to make large concessions to the democratic party, amongst others universal suffrage. This was not calculated to make the offer of the imperial crown acceptable to Frederic William IV., but his principal reason for declining it was, that he would not exercise any pressure on the other German sovereigns, and that, notwithstanding Schwarzenberg's haughty demeanour, he could not make up his mind to exclude Austria from Germany. After the refusal of the crown by the king, the National Assembly was doomed; it had certainly committed great faults, but the decisive reason of its failure was the lack of a clear and resolute will in Prussia. History, however, teaches that great enterprises, such as it was to unify an empire dismembered for centuries, rarely succeed at the first attempt. The capital importance of the events of 1848 was that they had made the German unionist movement an historical fact; it could never be effaced from the annals, that all the German governments had publicly acknowledged that tendency as legitimate, the direction for the future was

given, and even at the time of failure it was certain, as Stockmar said, that the necessity of circumstances would bring forward the man who, profiting by the experiences of 1848, would fulfil the national aspirations."—F. H. Geffcken, *The Unity of Germany (English Historical Rev., Apr. 7, 1891)*.—See GERMANY: A. D. 1848-1850.

**A. D. 1849-1850.—The Return to pure Absolutism.—Bureaucracy triumphant.**—"The two great gains which the moral earthquake of 1848 brought to Austria were, that through wide provinces of the Empire, and more especially in Hungary, it swept away the sort of semi-vassalage in which the peasantry had been left by the Urbarium of Maria Theresa [an edict which gave to the peasants the right of moving from place to place, and the right of bringing up their children as they wished, while it established in certain courts the trial of all suits to which they were parties], and other reforms akin to or founded upon it, and introduced modern in the place of middle-age relations between the two extremes of society. Secondly, it overthrew the policy of do-nothing—a surer guarantee for the continuance of abuses than even the determination, which soon manifested itself at headquarters, to make the head of the state more absolute than ever. After the taking of Vienna by Windischgrätz, the National Assembly had, on the 15th of November 1848, been removed from the capital to the small town of Kremsier, in Moravia. Here it prolonged an ineffective existence till March 1849, when the court camarilla felt itself strong enough to put an end to an inconvenient censor, and in March 1849 it ceased to exist. A constitution was at the same time promulgated which contained many good provisions, but which was never heartily approved by the ruling powers, or vigorously carried into effect—the proclamation of a state of siege in many cities, and other expedients of authority in a revolutionary period, easily enabling it to be set at naught. The successes of the reaction in other parts of Europe, and, above all, the coup d'état in Paris, emboldened Schwarzenberg to throw off the mask; and on the last day of 1851 Austria became once more a pure despotism. The young emperor had taken 'Viribus unitis' for his motto; and his advisers interpreted those words to mean that Austria was henceforward to be a state as highly centralised as France—a state in which the minister at Vienna was absolutely to govern everything from Salzburg to the Iron Gate. The hand of authority had been severely felt in the pre-revolutionary period, but now advantage was to be taken of the revolution to make it felt far more than ever. In Hungary, for example, . . . it was fondly imagined that there would be no more trouble. The old political division into counties was swept away; the whole land was divided into five provinces; and the courtiers might imagine that from henceforth the Magyars would be as easily led as the inhabitants of Upper Austria. These delusions soon became general, but they owed their origin partly to the enthusiastic ignorance of those who were at the head of the army, and partly to two men"—Prince Schwarzenberg and Alexander Bach. Of the latter, the "two leading ideas were to cover the whole empire with a German bureaucracy, and to draw closer the ties which connected the court of Vienna with that of Rome.

... If absolutism in Austria had a fair trial from the 31st of December 1851 to the Italian war, it is to Bach's that it was owing; and if it utterly and ludicrously failed, it is lie more than any other man who must bear the blame. Already, in 1849, the bureaucracy had been reorganised, but in 1852 new and stricter regulations were introduced. Everything was determined by precise rules—even the exact amount of hair which the employé was permitted to wear upon his face. Hardly any question was thought sufficiently insignificant to be decided upon the spot. The smallest matters had to be referred to Vienna. . . . We can hardly be surprised that the great ruin of the Italian war brought down with a crash the whole edifice of the reaction."—M. E. G. Duff, *Studies in European Politics*, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: L. Leger, *Hist. c. Austro-Hungary*, ch. 33.

**A. D. 1853.—Commercial Treaty with the German Zollverein.** See TARIFF LEGISLATION (GERMANY): A. D. 1853-1892.

**A. D. 1853-1856.—Attitude in the Crimean War.** See RUSSIA: A. D. 1853-1854, to 1854-1856.

**A. D. 1856-1859.—The war in Italy with Sardinia and France.—Reverses at Magenta and Solferino.—Peace of Villafranca.—Surrender of Lombardy.**—"From the wars of 1848-9 the King of Sardinia was looked upon by the moderate party as the champion of Italian freedom. Charles Albert had failed; yet his son would not, and indeed could not, go back, though, when he began his reign, there were many things against him. . . . Great efforts were made to win him over to the Austrian party, but the King was neither cast down by defeat and distrust nor won over by soft words. He soon showed that, though he had been forced to make a treaty with Austria, yet he would not cast in his lot with the oppression of Italy. He made Massimo d'Azeglio his chief Minister, and Camillo Benso di Cavour his Minister of Commerce. With the help of these two men he honestly carried out the reforms which had been granted by his father, and set new ones on foot. . . . The quick progress of reform frightened Count Massimo d'Azeglio. He retired from office in 1853, and his place was taken by Count Cavour, who made a coalition with the democratic party in Piedmont headed by Urbano Rattazzi. The new chief Minister began to work not only for the good of Piedmont but for Italy at large. The Milanese still listened to the hopes which Mazzini held out, and could not quietly bear their subjection. Count Cavour indignantly remonstrated with Radetzky for his harsh government. . . . The divi: ion and slavery of Italy had shut her out from European politics. Cavour held that, if she was once looked upon as an useful ally, then her deliverance might be hastened by foreign interference. The Sardinian army had been brought into good order by Alfonso della Marmora; and was ready for action. In 1855, Sardinia made alliance with England and France, who were at war with Russia; for Cavour looked on that power as the great support of the system of despotism on the Continent, and held that it was necessary for Italian freedom that Russia should be humbled. The Sardinian army was therefore sent to the Crimea, under La Marmora, where it did good

service in the battle of Tchernaya. . . . The next year the Congress of Paris was held to arrange terms of peace between the allies and Russia, and Cavour took the opportunity of laying before the representatives of the European powers the unhappy state of his countrymen. . . . In December, 1851, Louis Napoleon Buonaparte, the President of the French Republic, seized the government, and the next year took the title of Emperor of the French. He was anxious to weaken the power of Austria, and at the beginning of 1859 it became evident that war would soon break out. As a sign of the friendly feeling of the French Emperor towards the Italian cause, his cousin, Napoleon Joseph, married Clotilda, the daughter of Victor Emmanuel. Count Cavour now declared that Sardinia would make war on Austria, unless a separate and national government was granted to Lombardy and Venetia, and unless Austria promised to meddle no more with the rest of Italy. On the other hand, Austria demanded the disarmament of Sardinia. The King would not listen to this demand, and France and Sardinia declared war against Austria. The Emperor Napoleon declared that he would free Italy from the Alps to the Adriatic. . . . The Austrian army crossed the Ticino, but was defeated by the King and General Cialdini. The French victory of Magenta, on June 4th forced the Austrians to retreat from Lombardy. . . . On June 24th the Austrians, who had crossed the Mincio, were defeated at Solferino by the allied armies of France and Sardinia. It seemed as though the French Emperor would keep his word. But he found that if he went further, Prussia would take up the cause of Austria, and that he would have to fight on the Rhine as well as on the Adige. When, therefore, the French army came before Verona, a meeting was arranged between the two Emperors. This took place at Villafranca, and there Buonaparte, without consulting his ally, agreed with Francis Joseph to favour the establishment of an Italian Confederation. . . . Austria gave up to the King of Sardinia Lombardy to the west of Mincio. But the Grand Duke of Tuscany and the Duke of Modena were to return to their States. The proposed Confederation was never made, for the people of Tuscany, Modena, Parma, and Romagna sent to the King to pray that they might be made part of his Kingdom, and Victor Emmanuel refused to enter on the scheme of the French Emperor. In return for allowing the Italians of Central Italy to shake off the yoke, Buonaparte asked for Savoy and Nizza. . . . The King . . . consented to give up the 'glorious cradle of his Monarchy' in exchange for Central Italy."—W. A. Hunt, *History of Italy*, ch. 11.

ALSO IN: J. W. Probyn, *Italy from 1815 to 1890*, ch. 9-10.—C. de Mazade, *Life of Count Cavour*, ch. 2-7.—See, also, ITALY: A. D. 1856-1859, and 1859-1861.

**A. D. 1862-1866.—The Schleswig-Holstein question.—Quarrel with Prussia.—The humiliating 5 ven Weeks War.**—Conflict with Prussia grew out of the complicated Schleswig-Holstein question, reopened in 1862 and provisionally settled by a delusive arrangement between Prussia and Austria, into which the latter was artfully drawn by Prince Bismarck. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (DENMARK): A. D. 1848-1862, and GERMANY: A. D. 1861-1866. No sooner was the war

with Denmark over, than "Prussia showed that it was her intention to annex the newly acquired duchies to herself. This Austria could not endure, and accordingly, in 1866, war broke out between Austria and Prussia. Prussia sought alliance with Italy, which she stirred up to attack Austria in her Italian possessions. The Austrian army defeated the Italian at Eustazza [or Custozza (see ITALY: A. D. 1862-1866)]; but the fortunes of war were against them in Germany. Allied with the Austrians were the Saxons, the Bavarians, the Württembergers, Baden and Hesse, and Hanover. The Prussians advanced with their chief army into Bohemia with the utmost rapidity, dreading lest the Southern allies should march north to Hanover, and cut the kingdom in half, and push on to Berlin. The Prussians had three armies, which were to enter Bohemia and effect a junction. The Elbe army under the King, the first army under Prince Frederick Charles, and the second army under the Crown Prince. The Elbe army advanced across Saxony by Dresden. The first army was in Lusatia, at Reichenberg, and the second army in Silesia at Heisse. They were all to meet at Gitschin. The Austrian army under General Benedek was at Königgrätz, in Eastern Bohemia. . . . As in the wars with Napoleon, so was it now; the Austrian generals . . . never did the right thing at the right moment. Benedek did indeed march against the first army, but too late, and when he found it was already through the mountain door, he retreated, and so gave time for the three armies to concentrate upon him. The Elbe army and the first met at Mönchengrätz, and defeated an Austrian army there, pushed on, and drove them back out of Gitschin on Königgrätz. . . . The Prussians pushed on, and now the Elbe army went to Smidar, and the first army to Hertzitz, whilst the second army, under the Crown Prince, was pushing on, and had got to Gmüdlitz. The little river Bistritz is crossed by the high road to Königgrätz. It runs through swampy ground, and forms little marshy pools or lakes. To the north of Königgrätz a little stream of much the same character dribbles through bogs into the Elbe. . . . But about Chlum, Nedelitz and Lippa is terraced high ground, and there Benedek planted his cannon. The Prussians advanced from Smidar against the left wing of the Austrians, from Hertzitz against the centre, and the Crown Prince was to attack the right wing. The battle began on the 3d of July, at 7 o'clock in the morning, by the simultaneous advance of the Elbe and the first army upon the Bistritz. At Sadowa is a wood, and there the battle raged most fiercely. . . . Two things were against the Austrians; first, the incompetence of their general, and, secondly, the inferiority of their guns. The Prussians had what are called needle-guns, breech-loaders, which are fired by the prick of a needle, and for the rapidity with which they can be fired far surpassed the old-fashioned muzzle-loaders used by the Austrians. After this great battle, which is called by the French and English the battle of Sadowa (Sadówa, not Sadówa, as it is erroneously pronounced), but which the Germans call the battle of Königgrätz, the Prussians marched on Vienna, and reached the Marchfeld before the Emperor Francis Joseph would come to terms. At last, on the 23d of August, a peace which gave a crushing preponderance in Germany to

Prussia, was concluded at Prague."—S. Baring-Gould, *The Story of Germany*, pp. 390-394.—See GERMANY: A. D. 1866.

A. D. 1866.—The War in Italy.—Loss of Venetia. See ITALY: A. D. 1862-1866.

A. D. 1866-1867.—Concession of nationality to Hungary.—Formation of the dual Austro-Hungarian Empire.—"For twelve years the name of Hungary, as a State, was erased from the map of Europe. Bureaucratic Absolutism ruled supreme in Austria, and did its best to obliterate all Hungarian institutions. Germanisation was the order of the day, the German tongue being declared the exclusive language of official life as well as of the higher schools. Government was carried on by means of foreign, German, and Czech officials. No vestige was left, not only of the national independence, but either of Home Rule or of self-government of any sort; the country was divided into provinces without regard for historical traditions; in short, an attempt was made to wipe out every trace denoting the existence of a separate Hungary. All ranks and classes opposed a sullen passive resistance to these attacks against the existence of the nation; even the sections of the nationalities which had rebelled against the enactments of 1848, at the instigation of the reactionary Camarilla, were equally disaffected in consequence of the short-sighted policy of despotical centralisation. . . . Finally, after the collapse of the system of Absolutism in consequence of financial disasters and of the misfortunes of the Italian War of 1859, the Hungarian Parliament was again convoked; and after protracted negotiations, broken off and resumed again, the impracticability of a system of provincial Federalism having been proved in the meantime, and the defeat incurred in the Prussian War of 1866 having demonstrated the futility of any reconstruction of the Empire of Austria in which the national aspirations of Hungary were not taken into due consideration—an arrangement was concluded under the auspices of Francis Deák, Count Andrassy, and Count Beust, on the basis of the full acknowledgment of the separate national existence of Hungary, and of the continuity of its legal rights. The idea of a centralised Austrian Empire had to give way to the dual Austro-Hungarian monarchy, which is in fact an indissoluble federation of two equal States, under the common rule of a single sovereign, the Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary, each of the States having a constitution, government, and parliament of its own, Hungary especially retaining, with slight modifications, its ancient institutions remodelled in 1848. The administration of the foreign policy, the management of the army, and the disbursement of the expenditure necessary for these purposes, were settled upon as common affairs of the entire monarchy, for the management of which common ministers were instituted, responsible to the two delegations, co-equal committees of the parliaments of Hungary and of the Cisleithanian (Austrian) provinces. Elaborate provisions were framed for the smooth working of these common institutions, for giving weight to the constitutional influence, even in matters of common policy, of the separate Cisleithanian and Hungarian ministries, and for rendering their responsibility to the respective Parliaments an earnest and solid reality. The financial questions pending in the two inde-

pendent and equal States were settled by a compromise; measures were taken for the equitable arrangement of all matters which might arise in relation to interests touching both States, such as duties, commerce, and indirect taxation, all legislation on these subjects taking place by means of identical laws separately enacted by the Parliament of each State. . . . Simultaneously with these arrangements the political differences between Hungary and Croatia were compromised by granting provincial Home Rule to the latter. . . . Thus the organisation of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy on the basis of dualism, and the compromise entered into between the two halves composing it, whilst uniting for the purposes of defence the forces of two States of a moderate size and extent into those of a great empire, able to cope with the exigencies of an adequate position amongst the first-class Powers of Europe, restored also to Hungary its independence and its unfettered sovereignty in all internal matters."—A. Pulszky, *Hungary (National Life and Thought, lect. 3)*.—"The Ausgleich, or agreement with Hungary, was arranged by a committee of 67 members of the Hungarian diet, at the head of whom was the Franklin of Hungary, Francis Deak, the true patriot and inexorable legislator, who had taken no part in the revolutions, but who had never given up one of the smallest of the rights of his country. . . . On the 8th of June [1867], the emperor Francis Joseph was crowned with great pomp at Pesth. On the 28th of the following June, he approved the decisions of the diet, which settled the position of Hungary with regard to the other countries belonging to his majesty, and modified some portions of the laws of 1848. . . . Since the Ausgleich the empire has consisted of two parts. . . . For the sake of clearness, political language has been increased by the invention of two new terms, Cisleithania and Transleithania, to describe the two groups, separated a little below Vienna by a small affluent of the Danube, called the Leitha—a stream which never expected to become so celebrated."—L. Leger, *Hist. of Austro-Hungary, ch. 35*.

ALSO IN: Francis Deak, *A Memoir, ch. 26-31*.—Count von Beust, *Memoirs, v. 2, ch. 38*.—L. Felbermann, *Hungary and its People, ch. 5*.

A. D. 1866-1887.—The Austro-Hungarian Empire.—Its new national life.—Its difficulties and promises.—Its ambitions and aims in Southeastern Europe.—"Peace politicians may say that a war always does more harm than good to the nations which engage in it. Perhaps it always does, at any rate, morally speaking, to the victors; but that it does not to the vanquished, Austria stands as a living evidence. Finally excluded from Italy and Germany by the campaign of 1866, she has cast aside her dream of foreign domination, and has set herself manfully to the task of making a nation out of the various conflicting nationalities over which she presides. It does not require much insight to perceive that as long as she held her position in Germany this fusion was hopeless. The overwhelming preponderance of the German element made any approach to a reciprocity of interests impossible. The Germans always were regarded as sovereigns, the remaining nationalities as subjects; it was for these to command, for those to obey. In like manner, it

was impossible for the Austrian Government to establish a mutual understanding with a population which felt itself attracted—alike by the ties of race, language, and geographical position—to another political union. Nay more, as long as the occupation of the Italian provinces remained as a blot on the Imperial escutcheon, it was impossible for the Government to command any genuine sympathy from any of its subjects. But with the close of the war with Prussia these two difficulties—the relations with Germany and the relations with Italy—were swept away. From this time forward Austria could appear before the world as a Power binding together for the interests of all, a number of petty nationalities, each of which was too feeble to maintain a separate existence. In short, from the year 1866 Austria had a *raison d'être*, whereas before she had none. . . . Baron Beust, on the 7th of February, 1867, took office under Franz Joseph. His programme may be stated as follows. He saw that the day of centralism and imperial unity was gone past recall, and that the most liberal Constitution in the world would never reconcile the nationalities to their present position, as provinces under the always detested and now despised Empire. But then came the question—Granted that a certain disintegration is inevitable, how far is this disintegration to go? Beust proposed to disarm the opposition of the leading nationality by the gift of an almost complete independence, and, resting on the support thus obtained, to gain time for conciliating the remaining provinces by building up a new system of free government. It would be out of place to give a detailed account of the well-known measure which converted the 'Austrian empire' into the 'Austro-Hungarian monarchy.' It will be necessary, however, to describe the additions made to it by the political machinery. The Hungarian Reichstag was constructed on the same principle as the Austrian Reichsrath. It was to meet in Pesth, as the Reichsrath at Vienna, and was to have its own responsible ministers. From the members of the Reichsrath and Reichstag respectively were to be chosen annually sixty delegates to represent Cisleithanian and sixty to represent Hungarian interests—twenty being taken in each case from the Upper, forty from the Lower House. These two 'Delegations,' whose votes were to be taken, when necessary, collectively, though each Delegation sat in a distinct chamber, owing to the difference of language, formed the Supreme Imperial Assembly, and met alternate years at Vienna and Pesth. They were competent in matters of foreign policy, in military administration, and in Imperial finance. At their head stood three Imperial ministers—the Reichskanzler, who presided at the Foreign Office, and was ex officio Prime Minister, the Minister of War, and the Minister of Finance. These three ministers were independent of the Reichsrath and Reichstag, and could only be dismissed by a vote of want of confidence on the part of the Delegations. The 'Ausgleich' or scheme of federation with Hungary is, no doubt, much open to criticism, both as a whole and in its several parts. It must always be borne in mind that administratively and politically it was a retrogression. At a time in which all other European nations—notably North Germany—were simplifying and unifying their political



systems, Austria was found doing the very reverse. . . . The true answer to these objections is, that the measure of 1867 was constructed to meet a practical difficulty. Its end was not the formation of a symmetrical system of government, but the pacification of Hungary. . . . The internal history of the two halves of the empire flows in two different channels. Graf Andrássy, the Hungarian Premier, had a comparatively easy task before him. There were several reasons for this. In the first place, the predominance of the Magyars in Hungary was more assured than that of the Germans in Cisleithania. It is true that they numbered only 5,000,000 out of the 16,000,000 inhabitants; but in these 5,000,000 were included almost all the rank, wealth, and intelligence of the country. Hence they formed in the Reichstag a compact and homogeneous majority, under which the remaining Slovaks and Croats soon learnt to range themselves. In the second place, Hungary had the great advantage of starting in a certain degree afresh. Her government was not bound by the traditional policy of former Vienna ministries, and . . . it had managed to keep its financial credit unimpaired. In the third place, as those who are acquainted with Hungarian history well know, Parliamentary institutions had for a long time flourished in Hungary. Indeed the Magyars, who among their many virtues can hardly be credited with the virtue of humility, assert that the world is mistaken in ascribing to England the glory of having invented representative government, and claim this glory for themselves. Hence one of the main difficulties with which the Cisleithanian Government had to deal was already solved for Graf Andrássy and his colleagues."—*Austria since Salvoa (Quarterly Review, v. 131, pp. 90-95)*.—"It is difficult for any one except an Austro-Hungarian statesman to realise the difficulties of governing the Dual Monarchy. Cisleithania has, as is well-known, a Reichsrath and seventeen Provincial Diets. The two Austrias, Styria, Carinthia, and Salzburg present no difficulties, but causes of trouble are abundant in the other districts. The Emperor will probably end by getting himself crowned King of Bohemia, although it will be difficult for him to lend himself to a proscription of the German language by the Tsechs, as he has been forced by the Magyars to lend himself to the proscription in parts of Hungary of Rouman and of various Slavonic languages. But how far is this process to continue? The German Austrians are as unpopular in Istria and Dalmatia as in Bohemia; and Dalmatia is also an ancient kingdom. These territories were originally obtained by the election of the King of Hungary to the crown of the tripartite Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia, and Dalmatia. Is Ferencz Jozsef to be crowned King of Dalmatia? And is Dalmatia to have its separate Ministry and its separate official language, and its completely separate laws? And what then of Fiume, the so-called Hungarian port? Then, again, Galicia is also an ancient kingdom, although it has at other times formed part of Poland; and the Emperor is King of Galicia, as he is King of Bohemia and Dalmatia. Is he to be crowned King of Galicia? And if so, is the separate existence of Galicia to be a Polish or a Ruthenian existence, or, indeed, a Jewish? for the Jews

are not only extraordinarily powerful and numerous there, but are gaining ground day by day. The Ruthenians complain as bitterly of being bullied by the Poles in Galicia as the Croats complain of the Magyars. Even here the difficulties are not ended. The Margravate of Moravia contains a large Tsech population, and will have to be added to the Bohemian kingdom. Bukowina may go with Galicia or Transylvania, Austrian Silesia may be divided between the Tsechs of Bohemia and Moravia on the one part, and the Poles or Ruthenians or Jews of Galicia on the other. But what is to become of that which, with the most obstinate disregard of pedants, I intend to continue to call the Tyrol? Trieste must go with Austria and Salzburg, and the Northern Tyrol and Styria and Carinthia no doubt; but it is not difficult to show that Austria would actually be strengthened by giving up the Southern Tyrol, where the Italian people, or at least the Italian language, is gaining ground day by day. There really seems very little left of the integrity of the Austrian Empire at the conclusion of our survey of its constituent parts. Matters do not look much better if we turn to Trans-Leithania. Hungary has its Reichstag (which is also known by some terrible Magyar name), its House of Representatives, and its House of Magnates, and, although there are not so many Provincial Diets as in Austria, Slavonia and the Banat of Croatia possess a Common Diet with which the Magyars are far from popular; and the Principality of Transylvania also possessed separate local rights, for trying completely to suppress which the Magyars are at present highly unpopular. The Principality, although under Magyar rule, is divided between 'Saxons' and Roumans, who equally detest the Magyars, and the Croats and Slovenes who people the Banat are Slavs who also execrate their Ugrin rulers, inscriptions in whose language are defaced whenever seen. Croatia is under-represented at Pest, and says that she goes unheard, and the Croats, who have partial Home Rule without an executive, ask for a local executive as well, and demand Fiume and Dalmatia. If we look to the numbers of the various races, there are in Austria of Germans and Jews about 9,000,000 to about 13,000,000 Slavs and a few Italians and Roumans. There are in the lands of the Crown of Hungary 2,000,000 of Germans and Jews, of Roumans nearly 3,000,000, although the Magyars only acknowledge 2,500,000, and of Magyars and Slavs between five and six millions apiece. In the whole of the territories of the Dual Monarchy it will be seen that there are 18,000,000 of Slavs and only 17,000,000 of the ruling races—Germans, Jews, and Magyars—while between three and four millions of Roumans and Italians count along with the Slav majority, as being hostile to the dominant nationalities. It is difficult to exaggerate the gravity for Austria of the state of things which these figures reveal."—*The Present Position of European Politics (Fortnightly Review, April, 1887)*.—"In past times, when Austria had held France tight bound between Spain, Germany, and the Netherlands, she had aspired to a dominant position in Western Europe; and, so long as her eyes were turned in that direction, she naturally had every interest in preserving the Ottoman Empire intact, for she was thus

guaranteed against all attacks from the south. But, after the loss of her Italian possessions in 1805, and of part of Croatia in 1809, after the disasters of 1849, 1859 and 1866, she thought more and more seriously of indemnifying herself at the expense of Turkey. It was moreover evident that, in order to paralyse the damaging power of Hungary, it was essential for her to assimilate the primitive and scattered peoples of Turkey, accustomed to centuries of complete submission and obedience, and form thus a kind of iron band which should encircle Hungary and effectually prevent her from rising. If, in fact, we glance back at the position of Austria in 1860, and take the trouble carefully to study the change of ideas and interests which had then taken place in the policy of France and of Russia, the tendencies of the strongly constituted nations who were repugnant to the authority and influence of Austria, the basis of the power of that empire, and, finally, the internal ruin with which she was then threatened, we cannot but arrive at the conclusion that Austria, by the very instinct of self-preservation, was forced to turn eastwards and to consider how best she might devour some, at least, of the European provinces of Turkey. Austrian statesmen have been thoroughly convinced of this fact, and, impelled by the instinct above-mentioned, have not ceased carefully and consistently to prepare and follow out the policy here indicated. Their objects have already been partially attained by the practical annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1878 [see **TURKS**: A. D. 1878]; and it was striking to observe with what bitter feeling and resentment this measure was looked upon at the time by the Hungarian section of the empire. . . . Russia has never made any secret of her designs upon Turkey; she has, indeed, more than once openly made war in order to carry them out. But Austria

remains a fatal obstacle in her path. Even as things at present stand, Austria, by her geographical position, so commands and dominates the Russian line of operations that, once the Danube passed, the Russians are constantly menaced by Austria on the flank and rear. . . . And if this be true now, how much more true would it be were Austria to continue her march eastwards towards Salonica. That necessarily, at some time or other, that march must be continued may be taken for almost certain; but that Austria has it in her power to commence it for the present, cannot, I think, be admitted. She must further consolidate and make certain of what she has. Movement now would bring upon her a struggle for life or death—a struggle whose issue may fairly be said in no unfriendly spirit to Austria, to be doubtful. With at home a bitterly discontented Croatia, strong Pan-slavistic tendencies in Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Dalmatia, a Greek population thoroughly disaffected, and a Hungary whose loyalty is doubtful, she would have to deal beyond her frontiers with the not contemptible armies, when combined, of Servia, Bulgaria, and Greece, whose aspirations she would be asphyxiating for ever, with a bitterly hostile population in Macedonia, with the whole armed force of Turkey, and with the gigantic military power of Russia; whilst it is not fantastic to suppose that Germany would be hovering near, ready to pounce on her German provinces when the 'moment psychologique' should occur. With such a prospect before her, it would be worse than madness for Austria to move until the cards fell more favourably for her.—V. Caillard, *The Bulgarian Imbrolio* (*Fortnightly Review*, December, 1885).

**A. D. 1878.—The Treaty of Berlin.—Acquisition of Bosnia and Herzegovina.** See **TURKS**: A. D. 1878.

**AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN EMPIRE.** See **AUSTRIA**: A. D. 1866-1867.

**AUTERI, The.** See **IRELAND, TRIBES OF EARLY CELTIC INHABITANTS**.

**AUTUN**: Origin. See **GAULS**.

**A. D. 287.—Sacked by the Bagauds.** See **BAGAUDS**.

**AUVERGNE, Ancient.** The country of the Arverni. See **ÆDUI**; also **GAULS**.

**AUVERGNE, The Great Days of.** See **FRANCE**: A. D. 1665.

**AUXILIUM.** See **TALLAGE**.

**AVA.** See **INDIA**: A. D. 1823-1833.

**AVALON.** See **NEWFOUNDLAND**: A. D. 1610-1655; and **MARYLAND**: A. D. 1632.

**AVARICUM.** See **BOUAGES, ORIGIN OF**.

**AVARS, The.**—The true AVARS are represented to have been a powerful Turanian people who exercised in the sixth century a wide dominion in Central Asia. Among the tribes subject to them was one called the Ogors, or Ougours, or Ouiars, or Ouar Khouni, or Varchonites (these diverse names have been given to the nation) which is supposed to have belonged to the national family of the Huns. Some time in the early half of the sixth century, the Turks, then a people who dwelt in the very center of Asia, at the foot of the Altai mountains, making their first appearance in history as conquerors, crushed and almost annihilated the Avars, there-

by becoming the lords of the Ougours, or Ouar Khouni. But the latter found an opportunity to escape from the Turkish yoke. "Gathering together their wives and their children, their flocks and their herds, they turned their waggons towards the Setting Sun. This immense exodus comprised upwards of 200,000 persons. The terror which inspired their flight rendered them resistless in the onset; for the avenging Turk was behind their track. They overturned everything before them, even the Hunnic tribes of kindred origin, who had long hovered on the north-east frontiers of the Empire, and, driving out or enslaving the inhabitants, established themselves in the wide plains which stretch between the Volga and the Don. In that age of imperfect information they were naturally enough confounded with the greatest and most formidable tribe of the Turanian stock known to the nations of the West. The report that the Avars had broken loose from Asia, and were coming in irresistible force to overrun Europe, spread itself all along both banks of the Danube and penetrated to the Byzantine court. With true barbaric cunning, the Ouar Khouni, misled themselves of the mistake, and by calling themselves Avars largely increased the terrors of their name and their chances of conquest." The pretended Avars were taken into the pay of the Empire by Justinian and employed against the Hun tribes north and east of the Black Sea. They presently

acquired a firm footing on both banks of the Danube, and turned their arms against the Empire. The important city of Sirmium was taken by them after an obstinate siege and its inhabitants put to the sword. Their ravages extended over central Europe to the Elbe, where they were beaten back by the warlike Franks, and, southwards, through Moesia, Illyria, Thrace, Macedonia and Greece, even to the Peloponnesus. Constantinople itself was threatened more than once, and in the summer of 626, it was desperately attacked by Avars and Persians in conjunction (see *ROME*; A. D. 595-628), with disastrous results to the assailants. But the seat of their Empire was the Dacian country—modern Roumania, Transylvania and part of Hungary—in which the Avars had helped the Lombards to crush and extinguish the Gepidae. The Slavic tribes which, by this time, had moved in great numbers into central and south-eastern Europe, were largely in subjection to the Avars and did their bidding in war and peace. "These unfortunate creatures, of apparently an imperfect, or, at any rate, imperfectly cultivated intelligence, endured such frightful tyranny from their Avar conquerors, that their very name has passed into a synonyme for the most degraded servitude."—J. G. Sheppard, *Fall of Rome*, lect. 4.

ALSO IN: E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 42.

**7th Century.—The Slavic Revolt.**—The Empire of the Avars was shaken and much diminished in the Seventh Century by an extensive rising of their oppressed Slavic subjects, roused and led, it is said, by a Frank merchant, or adventurer, named Samo, who became their king. The first to throw off the yoke were a tribe called the Vendes, or Wendes, or Venedi, in Bohemia, who were reputed to be half-castes, resulting from intercourse between the Avar warriors and the women of their Slavic vassals. Under the lead of Samo, the Wendes and Slovenes or Slavonians drove the Avars to the east and north; and it seems to have been in connection with this revolution that the Emperor Heraclius induced the Serbs or Servians and Croats—Slavic tribes of the same race and region—to settle in depopulated Dalmatia. "From the year 630 A. D." writes M. Thierry, "the Avar people are no longer mentioned in the annals of the East; the successors of Attila no longer figure beside the successors of Constantine. It required new wars in the West to bring upon the stage of history the Khan and his people." In these wars [of Pepin and Charlemagne] they were finally swept off from the roll of European nations."—J. G. Sheppard, *Fall of Rome*, lect. 4.

**A. D. 791-805.—Conquest by Charlemagne.**—"Hungary, now so called, was possessed by the Avars, who, joining with themselves a multitude of Hunnish tribes, accumulated the immense spoils which both they themselves and their equally barbarous predecessors had torn from the other nations of Europe. . . . They extended their limits towards Lombardy, and touched upon the very verge of Bavaria. . . . Much of their eastern frontier was now lost, almost without a struggle on their part, by the rise of other barbarous nations, especially the various tribes of Bulgarians." This was the position of the Avars at the time of Charlemagne, whom they provoked by forming an al-

liance with the ambitious Duke of Bavaria, Tassilo,—most obstinate of all who resisted the Frank king's imperious and imperial rule. In a series of vigorous campaigns, between 791 and 797 Charlemagne crushed the power of the Avars and took possession of their country. The royal "ring" or stronghold—believed to have been situated in the neighborhood of Tatar, between the Danube and the Theiss—was penetrated, and the vast treasure stored there was seized. Charlemagne distributed it with a generous hand to churches, to monasteries and to the poor, as well as to his own nobles, servants and soldiers, who are said to have been made rich. There were subsequent risings of the Avars and wars, until 805, when the remnant of that almost annihilated people obtained permission to settle on a tract of land between Sarwar and Hainburg, on the right bank of the Danube, where they would be protected from their Slavonian enemies. This was the end of the Avar nation.—G. P. R. James, *Hist. of Charlemagne*, bks. 9 and 11.

ALSO IN: J. I. Mombert, *Hist. of Charles the Great*, bk. 2, ch. 7.

**AVARS, The Rings of the.**—The fortifications of the Avars were of a peculiar and effective construction and were called Rings, or Rings. "They seem to have been a series of eight or nine gigantic ramparts, constructed in concentric circles, the inner one of all being called the royal circle or camp, where was deposited all the valuable plunder which the warriors had collected in their expeditions. The method of constructing these ramparts was somewhat singular. Two parallel rows of gigantic piles were driven into the ground, some twenty feet apart. The intervening space was filled with stones, or a species of chalk, so compacted as to become a solid mass. The sides and summit were covered with soil, upon which were planted trees and shrubs, whose interlacing branches formed an impenetrable hedge."—J. G. Sheppard, *Fall of Rome*, lect. 9.

**AVEBURY.** See *ABURY*.

**AVEIN, Battle of (1635).** See *NETHERLANDS*: A. D. 1635-1638.

**AVENTINE, The.** See *SEVEN HILLS OF ROME*.

**AVERNUS, Lake and Cavern.**—A gloomy lake called Avernus, which filled the crater of an extinct volcano, situated a little to the north of the Bay of Naples, was the object of many superstitious imaginations among the ancients. "There was a place near Lake Avernus called the prophetic cavern. Persons were in attendance there who called up ghosts. Any one desiring it came thither, and, having killed a victim and poured out libations, summoned whatever ghost he wanted. The ghost came, very faint and doubtful to the sight, but vocal and prophetic; and, having answered the questions, went off."—Maximus Tyrius, quoted by C. C. Felton, in *Greece, Ancient and Modern*, c. 2, lect. 9.—See, also, *CUMÆ* and *BALÆ*.

**AVERYSBORO, Battle of.** See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1865 (FEBRUARY—MARCH: *THE CAROLINAS*).

**AVIGNON: 10th Century.**—In the Kingdom of Arles. See *BURGUNDY*: A. D. 843-933.

**A. D. 1226.—Siege by Louis VIII.** See *ALMOENES*: A. D. 1217-1229.

**A. D. 1309-1348.**—Made the seat of the Papacy.—Purchase of the city by Clement V. See PAPACY: A. D. 1294-1348.

**A. D. 1367-1369.**—Temporary return of Urban V. to Rome. See PAPACY: A. D. 1352-1378.

**A. D. 1377-1417.**—Return of Pope Gregory XI. to Rome.—Residence of the anti-popes of the great Schism. See PAPACY: A. D. 1377-1417.

**A. D. 1790-1791.**—Revolution and Anarchy.—Atrocities committed.—Reunion with France decreed. See FRANCE: A. D. 1790-1791.

**A. D. 1797.**—Surrendered to France by the Pope. See FRANCE: A. D. 1790-1797 (OCTOBER—APRIL).

**A. D. 1815.**—Possession by France confirmed. See VIENNA, THE CONGRESS OF.

**AVIONES, The.**—"The Aviones were a Suevic clan. They are mentioned by Tacitus in connexion with the Reudigni, Angli, Varini, Eudoses, Suardones and Nuthones, all Suevic clans. These tribes must have occupied Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Mecklenburg-Strelitz and Sleswick-Holstein, the Elbe being their Eastern boundary. It is, however, impossible to define their precise localities."—A. J. Church and W. J. Brodrick, *Minor Works of Tacitus, Geog. Notes to the Germany.*

**AVIS, The House of.** See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1383-1385.

**AVIS, Knights of.**—This is a Portuguese military-religious order which originated about 1147 during the wars with the Moors, and which formerly observed the monastic rule of St. Benedict. It became connected with the order of Calatrava in Spain and received from the latter its property in Portugal. Pope Paul III. united the Grand Mastership to the Crown of Portugal.—F. C. Woodhouse, *Military Religious Orders, pt. 4.*—See, also, PORTUGAL: A. D. 1095-1325.

**AVITUS, Roman Emperor (Western), A. D. 455-456.**

**AVVIM, The.**—The original inhabitants of the south-west corner of Canaan, from which they were driven by the Philistines.—II. Ewald, *Hist. of Israel, bk. 1, sect. 4.*

**AYACUCHO, Battle of (1824).** See PERU: A. D. 1820-1826.

**AYLESBURY ELECTION CASE.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1793.

**AYLESFORD, Battle of (A. D. 455).**—The first battle fought and won by the invading Jutes after their landing in Britain under Hengest and Horsa. It was fought at the lowest ford of the river Medway. See ENGLAND: A. D. 449-473.

**AYMARAS, The.** See PERU: THE ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

**AYOUBITE OR AIYUBITE DYNASTY.** See SALADIN, THE EMPIRE OF.

**AZINCOUR (AGINCOURT), Battle of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1415.

**AZOF OR AZOV: A. D. 1696.**—Taken by the Russians. See TURKS: A. D. 1684-1696.

**A. D. 1711.**—Restoration to the Turks. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1707-1718.

**A. D. 1736-1739.**—Captured by the Russians.—Secured to them by the Treaty of Belgrade. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1725-1739.

**AZTEC.** See MEXICO, ANCIENT; and A. D. 1825-1502; also, AMERICAN ABORIGINES: MAYAS.

**AZTEC AND MAYA PICTURE-WRITING.**—"No nation ever reduced it [pictography] more to a system. It was in constant use in the daily transactions of life. They [the Aztecs] manufactured for writing purposes a thick coarse paper from the leaves of the agave plant by a process of maceration and pressure. An Aztec book closely resembles one of our quarto volumes. It is made of a single sheet, 12 to 15 inches wide, and often 60 or 70 feet long, and is not rolled, but folded either in squares or zigzags in such a manner that on opening there are two pages exposed to view. Thin wooden boards are fastened to each of the outer leaves, so that the whole presents as neat an appearance, remarks Peter Martyr, as if it had come from the shop of a skillful book binder. They also covered buildings, tapestries and scrolls of parchment with these devices. . . . What is still more astonishing, there is reason to believe, in some instances, their figures were not painted, but actually printed with movable blocks of wood on which the symbols were carved in relief, though this was probably confined to those intended for ornament only. In these records we discern something higher than a mere symbolic notation. They contain the germ of a phonetic alphabet, and represent sounds of spoken language. The symbol is often not connected with the idea, but with the word. The mode in which this is done corresponds precisely to that of the rebus. It is a simple method, readily suggesting itself. In the middle ages it was much in vogue in Europe for the same purpose for which it was chiefly employed in Mexico at the same time—the writing of proper names. For example, the English family Bolton was known in heraldry by a 'tun' transfixed by a 'bolt.' Precisely so the Mexican Emperor Ixcóatl is mentioned in the Aztec manuscripts under the figure of a serpent, 'coatl,' pierced by obsidian knives, 'ixtli.' . . . As a syllable could be expressed by any object whose name commenced with it, as few words can be given the form of a rebus without some change, as the figures sometimes represent their full phonetic value, sometimes only that of their initial sound, and as universally the attention of the artist was directed less to the sound than to the idea, the didactic painting of the Mexicans, whatever it might have been to them, is a sealed book to us, and must remain so in great part. . . . Immense masses of such documents were stored in the imperial archives of ancient Mexico. Torquemada asserts that five cities alone yielded to the Spanish governor on one requisition no less than 16,000 volumes or scrolls! Every leaf was destroyed. Indeed, so thorough and wholesale was the destruction of these memorials, now so precious in our eyes, that hardly enough remain to whet the wits of antiquaries. In the libraries of Paris, Dresden, Pesth, and the Vatican are, however, a sufficient number to make us despair of deciphering them, had we for comparison all which the Spaniards destroyed. Beyond all others the Mayas, resident on the peninsula of Yucatan, would seem to have approached nearest a true phonetic system. They had a regular and well understood alphabet of 27 elementary sounds, the letters of which are totally different from those of any other nation, and evidently originated with themselves. But besides these they used a large number of purely conventional symbols, and moreover

were accustomed constantly to employ the ancient pictographic method in addition as a sort of commentary on the sound represented. . . . With the aid of this alphabet, which has fortunately been preserved, we are enabled to spell out a few words on the Yucatecan manuscripts and façades, but thus far with no positive

results. The loss of the ancient pronunciation is especially in the way of such studies. In South America, also, there is said to have been a nation who cultivated the art of picture-writing, the Panos, on the river Ucayali."—D. G. Brinton, *The Myths of the New World*, ch. 1.

## B.

**BABAR**, King of Ferghana, A. D. 1494—; King of Kabul, A. D. 1504—; **Moghul Emperor or Padschah of India**, A. D. 1526-1530. **BABENBERGS**, The. See **AUSTRIA**: A. D. 805-1246.

**BABYLON**; **The City**.—"The city stands on a broad plain, and is an exact square, a hundred and twenty furlongs in length each way, so that the entire circuit is four hundred and eighty furlongs. While such is its size, in magnitude there is no other city that approaches it. It is surrounded, in the first place, by a broad and deep moat, full of water, behind which rises a wall fifty royal cubits in width and two hundred in height. . . . And here I may not omit to tell the use to which the mould dug out of the great moat was turned, nor the manner wherein the wall was wrought. As fast as they dug the moat the soil which they got from the cutting was made into bricks, and when a sufficient number were completed they baked the bricks in kilns. Then they set to building, and began with bricking the borders of the moat, after which they proceeded to construct the wall itself, using throughout for their cement hot bitumen, and interposing a layer of wattled reeds at every thirtieth course of the brick. On the top, along the edges of the wall, they constructed buildings of a single chamber facing one another, leaving between them room for a four-horse chariot to turn. In the circuit of the wall are a hundred gates, all of brass, with brazen lintels and side posts. The bitumen used in the work was brought to Babylon from the Is, a small stream which flows into the Euphrates at the point where the city of the same name stands, eight days' journey from Babylon. Lumps of bitumen are found in great abundance in this river. The city is divided into two portions by the river which runs through the midst of it. This river is the Euphrates. . . . The city wall is brought down on both sides to the edge of the stream; thence, from the corners of the wall, there is carried along each bank of the river a fence of burnt bricks. The houses are mostly three and four stories high; the streets all run in straight lines; not only those parallel to the river, but also the cross streets which lead down to the water side. At the river end of these cross streets are low gates in the fence that skirts the stream, which are, like the great gates in the outer wall, of brass, and open on the water. The outer wall is the main defence of the city. There is, however, a second inner wall, of less thickness than the first, but very little inferior to it in strength. The centre of each division of the town was occupied by a fortress. In the one stood the palace of the kings, surrounded by a wall of great strength and size; in the other was the sacred precinct of Jupiter Belus, a square enclosure, two furlongs each way, with gates of solid brass; which was

also remaining in my time. In the middle of the precinct there was a tower of solid masonry, a furlong in length and breadth, upon which was raised a second tower, and on that a third, and so on up to eight. The ascent to the top is on the outside, by a path which winds round all the towers. . . . On the topmost tower there is a spacious temple."—Herodotus, *Hist.*, trans. by G. Baeleynson, bk. 1, ch. 178-181.—According to Ctesias, the circuit of the walls of Babylon was but 360 furlongs. The historians of Alexander agreed nearly with this. As regards the height of the walls, "Strabo and the historians of Alexander substitute 50 for the 200 cubits of Herodotus, and it may therefore be suspected that the latter author referred to hands, four of which were equal to the cubit. The measure, indeed, of 50 fathoms or 200 royal cubits for the walls of a city in a plain is quite preposterous. . . . My own belief is that the height of the walls of Babylon did not exceed 60 or 70 English feet."—H. C. Rawlinson, *note to above*.—See, also, **BABYLONIA**: B. C. 625-539.

**BABYLON OF THE CRUSADERS**, The. See **CRUSADES**: A. D. 1248-1254.

**BABYLONIA**, **Primitive**.—(So much new knowledge of the ancient peoples in the East has been and is being brought to light by recent search and study, and the account of it in English historical literature is so meagre as yet, that there seems to be good reason for deferring the treatment of these subjects, for the most part, to a later volume of this work. The reader is referred, therefore, to the article "Semites," in the hope that, before its publication is reached, in the fourth or fifth volume, there will be later and better works to quote from on all the subjects embraced. Terrien de Lacouperie's interesting theory, which is introduced below, in this place, is questioned by many scholars; and Professor Sayce, whose writings have done much to popularize the new oriental studies, seems to go sometimes in advance of the sure ground.)—The Sumirians, inhabitants of the Shinar of the Old Testament narrative, and Accadians, who divided primitive Babylonia between them, "were overrun and conquered by the Semitic Babylonians of later history, Accad being apparently the first half of the country to fall under the sway of the new comers. It is possible that Casdim, the Hebrew word translated Chaldees or Chaldeans in the authorized version, is the Babylonian 'casidi' or conquerors, a title which continued to cling to them in consequence of their conquest. The Accadians had been the inventors of the pictorial hieroglyphics which afterwards developed into the cuneiform or wedge-shaped writing; they had founded the great cities of Chaldea, and had attained to a high degree of culture and civilization. Their cities possessed libraries, stocked with books, written partly on papyrus, partly on clay, which was, while still

soft, impressed with characters by means of a metal stylus. The books were numerous, and related to a variety of subjects. . . . In course of time, however, the two dialects of Sumir and Accad ceased to be spoken; but the necessity for learning them still remained, and we find, accordingly, that down to the latest days of both Assyria and Babylonia, the educated classes were taught the old extinct Accadian, just as in modern Europe they are taught Latin."—A. H. Sayce, *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments*, ch. 2. —"Since Sumir, the Shinar of the Bible, was the first part of the country occupied by the invading Semites, while Accad long continued to be regarded as the seat of an alien race, the language and population of primitive Chaldaea have been named Accadian by the majority of Assyrian scholars. The part played by these Accadians in the intellectual history of mankind is highly important. They were the earliest civilizers of Western Asia, and it is to them that we have to trace the arts and sciences, the religious traditions and the philosophy not only of the Assyrians, but also of the Phœnicians, the Arameans, and even the Hebrews themselves. It was, too, from Chaldea that the germs of Greek art and of much of the Greek pantheon and mythology originally came. Columnar architecture reached its first and highest development in Babylonia; the lions that still guard the main entrance of Mykene are distinctly Assyrian in character; and the Greek Herakles with his twelve labours finds his prototype in the hero of the great Chaldean epic. It is difficult to say how much of our present culture is not owed to the stunted, oblique-eyed people of ancient Babylonia; Jerusalem and Athens are the sacred cities of our modern life; and both Jerusalem and Athens were profoundly influenced by the ideas which had their first starting-point in primeval Accad. The Semite has ever been a trader and an inter-nedary, and his earliest work was the precious trade in spiritual and mental wares. Babylonia was the home and mother of Semitic culture and Semitic inspiration; the Phœnicians never forgot that they were a colony from the Persian Gulf, while the Israelite recounted that his father Abraham had been born in Ur of the Chaldees. Almost the whole of the Assyrian literature was derived from Accad, and translated from the dead language of primitive Chaldea."—A. H. Sayce, *Babylonian Literature*, pp. 6-7.—The same, *Ancient Empires of the East*, app. 2.—"The place of China in the past and future is not that which it was long supposed to be. Recent researches have disclosed that its civilization, like ours, was variously derived from the same old focus of culture of south-western Asia. . . . It was my good fortune to be able to show, in an uninterrupted series of a score or so of papers in periodicals, of communications to the Royal Asiatic Society and elsewhere, published and unpublished, and of contributions to several works since April 1880, downwards, that the writing and some knowledge of arts, science and government of the early Chinese, more or less enumerated below, were derived from the old civilization of Babylonia, through the secondary focus of Susiana, and that this derivation was a social fact, resulting not from scientific teaching but from practical intercourse of some length between the Susian confederation and the future civilizers of the Chinese, the Bak tribes, who, from their neighbouring

settlements in the N., moved eastwards at the time of the great rising of the XXIII. century B. C. Coming again in the field, Dr. J. Edkins has joined me on the same line."—Terrien de Lacouperie, *Babylonia and China* (Academy, Aug. 7, 1880).—"We could enumerate a long series of affinities between Chaldean culture and Chinese civilization, although the last was not borrowed directly. From what evidence we have, it seems highly probable that a certain number of families or of tribes, without any apparent generic name, but among which the Kutta filled an important position, came to China about the year 2500 B. C. These tribes, which came from the West, were obliged to quit the neighbourhood, probably north of the Susiana, and were comprised in the feudal agglomeration of that region, where they must have been influenced by the Akkado-Chaldean culture."—Terrien de Lacouperie, *Early Hist. of Chinese Civilization*, p. 32. —See, also, CHINA: THE ORIGIN OF THE PEOPLE.

**The early (Chaldean) monarchy.**—"Our earliest glimpse of the political condition of Chaldea shows us the country divided into numerous small states, each headed by a great city, made famous and powerful by the sanctuary or temple of some particular deity, and ruled by a patesi, a title which is now thought to mean priest-king, i. e., priest and king in one. There can be little doubt that the beginning of the city was every where the temple, with its college of ministering priests, and that the surrounding settlement was gradually formed by pilgrims and worshippers. That royalty developed out of the priesthood is also more than probable. . . . There comes a time when for the title of patesi is substituted that of king. . . . It is noticeable that the distinction between the Semite newcomers and the indigenous Shumiro-Accadians continues long to be traceable in the names of the royal temple-builders, even after the new Semitic idiom, which we call the Assyrian, had entirely ousted the old language. . . . Furthermore, even superficial observation shows that the old language and the old names survive longest in Shumir,—the South. From this fact it is to be inferred with little chance of mistake that the North,—the land of Accad,—was earlier Semitized, that the Semitic immigrants established their first headquarters in that part of the country, that their power and influence thence spread to the South. Fully in accordance with these indications, the first grand historical figure that meets us at the threshold of Chaldean history, dim with the mists of ages and fabulous traditions, yet unmistakably real, is that of the Semite Sharrukin, king of Accad, or Agade, as the great Northern city came to be called—more generally known in history under the corrupt modern reading of Sargon, and called Sargon I., 'the First,' to distinguish him from a very famous Assyrian monarch of the same name who reigned many centuries later. As to the city of Agade, it is no other than the city of Accad mentioned in Genesis x, 10. It was situated close to the Euphrates on a wide canal just opposite Sippar, so that in time the two cities came to be considered as one double city, and the Hebrews always called it 'the two Sippars'—Sepharvaim, which is often spoken of in the Bible. . . . The tremendously ancient date of 3800 B. C. is now generally accepted for Sargon of Agade—perhaps the remotest

authentic date yet arrived at in history."—Z. A. Ragozin, *Story of Chaldea*, ch. 4.—"A horde of Cassites or Kossseans swept down from the mountains of Northern Elam under their leader, Khammuragas; Accad was conquered, a foreign dynasty established in the land, and the capital transferred from Agade to Babylon. Babylon now became a city of importance for the first time; the rank assigned to it in the mythical age was but a reflection of the position it held after the Cassite conquest. The Cassite dynasty is probably the Arabian dynasty of Berossos. . . . A newly-found inscription of Nabonides makes the date [of its advent] B. C. 3750 [*foot-note*]. . . . The first care of Khammuragas, after establishing himself in Accad, was to extend his sway over the southern kingdom of Sumer as well. . . . Khammuragas became king of the whole of Babylonia. From this time onward the country remained a united monarchy. The Cassite dynasty must have lasted for several centuries, and probably included more than one line of kings. . . . It was under the Cassite dynasty that the kingdom of Assyria first took its rise,—partly, perhaps, in consequence of the Asiatic conquests of the Egyptian monarchs of the eighteenth dynasty. . . . In B. C. 1400 the Cassite king married an Assyrian princess. Her son, Kara-Murdas, was murdered by the party opposed to Assyrian influence, but the usurper, Nazi-bugas, was quickly overthrown by the Assyrians, who placed a vassal-prince on the throne. This event may be considered the turning-point in the history of the kingdoms of the Tigris and Euphrates; Assyria henceforth takes the place of the worn-out monarchy of Babylonia, and plays the chief part in the affairs of Western Asia until the day of its final fall. In little more than a hundred years later the Assyrians were again in Babylonia, but this time as avowed enemies to all parties alike; Babylon was captured by the Assyrian monarch Tiglath-Adar in B. C. 1270, and the rule of the Cassite dynasty came to an end."—A. H. Sayce, *Ancient Empires of the East*, app. 2.

ALSO IN: G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: Chaldea*, ch. 8.—See, also, ASSYRIA.

**B. C. 625-539.**—**The later Empire.**—For more than six centuries after the conquest of B. C. 1270, Babylonia was obscured by Assyria. During most of that long period, the Chaldean kingdom was subject to its northern neighbor and governed by Assyrian viceroys. There were frequent revolts and some intervals of independence; but they were brief, and the political life of Babylonia as a distinct power may be said to have been suspended from 1270 until 625 B. C., when Nabopolassar, who ruled first as the viceroy of the Assyrian monarch, threw off his yoke, took the attributes of sovereignty to himself, and joined the Medes in extinguishing the glory of Nineveh. "The Assyrian Empire was now shared between Media and Babylon. Nabucudur-utser, or Nebuchadrezzar, Nabopolassar's eldest son, was the real founder of the Babylonian empire. The attempt of Pharaoh Neco to win for Egypt the inheritance of Assyria was overthrown at the battle of Carchemish, and when Nebuchadrezzar succeeded his father in B. C. 604, he found himself the undisputed lord of Western Asia. Palestine was conquered in 602, and the destruction of Jerusalem in 587 laid a way open for the invasion of Egypt, which took

place twenty years later. Tyre also underwent a long siege of thirteen years, but it is doubtful whether it was taken after all. Babylon was now enriched with the spoils of foreign conquest. It owed as much to Nebuchadrezzar as Rome owed to Augustus. The buildings and walls with which it was adorned were worthy of the metropolis of the world. The palace, now represented by the Kasr mound, was built in fifteen days, and the outermost of its three walls was seven miles in circuit. Hanging gardens were constructed for Queen Amytis, the daughter of the Median prince, and the great temple of Bel was roofed with cedar and overlaid with gold. The temple of the Seven Lights, dedicated to Nebo at Borsippa by an early king, who had raised it to a height of forty-two cubits, was completed, and various other temples were erected on a sumptuous scale, both in Babylon and in the neighbouring cities, while new libraries were established there. After a reign of forty-two years, six months and twenty-one days, Nebuchadrezzar died (B. C. 562), and left the crown to his son Evil-Merodach, who reigned a short and inactive reign of three years, and thirty-four days, when he was murdered by his brother-in-law, Nergal-sharezer, the Neriglissar of the Greeks. . . . The chief event of his reign of four years and four months was the construction of a new palace. His son, who succeeded him, was a mere boy, and was murdered after a brief reign of four months. The power now passed from the house of Nabopolassar,—Nabu-nahid or Nabonides, who was raised to the throne, being of another family. His reign lasted seventeen years and five months, and witnessed the end of the Babylonian empire,"—which was overthrown by Cyrus the Great (or Kyros), B. C. 539 [see PERSIA: B. C. 549-521], and swallowed up in the Persian empire which he founded.—A. H. Sayce, *Ancient Empires of the East*, app. 2.

ALSO IN: M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, bk. 4, ch. 15.—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: The Fourth Monarchy*, ch. 8.

**BABYLONIAN JEWS.** See JEWS: B. C. 536—A. D. 50, and A. D. 200—100.

**BABYLONIAN TALENT.** See TALENT.  
**BABYLONIAN TALMUD,** *Thc.* See TALMUD.

"**BABYLONISH CAPTIVITY**" OF THE POPES. See PAPACY: A. D. 1294-1348.

**BACCALAO, OR BACALHAS, OR BACALHAO COUNTRY.** See NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1501-1578.

**BACCHIADÆ.** See CORINTH.

**BACCIC FESTIVALS.** See DIONYSIA.

**BACENIS, Forest of.** See HERCYNIAN FOREST.

**BACON'S REBELLION.** See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1660-1677.

**BACTRIA.**—"Where the edge [of the table-land of Iran] rises to the lofty Hindu Kush, there lies on its northern slope a favored district in the region of the Upper Oxus. . . . On the banks of the river, which flows in a north-westerly direction, extend broad mountain pastures, where support is found in the fresh mountain air for numerous herds of horses and sheep, and beneath the wooded hills are blooming valleys. On these slopes of the Hindu Kush, the middle stage between the table-land and the

deep plain of the Caspian Sea, lay the Bactrians—the Bakhtri of the Achaemenids, the Bakhdl of the Avesta. . . . In ancient times the Bactrians were hardly distinguished from nomads; but their land was extensive and produced fruits of all kinds, with the exception of the vine. The fertility of the land enabled the Hellenic princes to make great conquests.”—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, bk. 6, ch. 2.—The Bactrians were among the people subjugated by Cyrus the Great and their country formed part of the Persian Empire until the latter was overthrown by Alexander (see MACEDONIA, &c.; B. C. 330–323). In the division of the Macedonian conquests, after Alexander's death, Bactria, with all the farther east, fell to the share of Seleucus Nicator and formed part of what came to be called the kingdom of Syria. About 256 B. C. the Bactrian province, being then governed by an ambitious Greek satrap named Diodotus, was led by him into revolt against the Syrian monarchy, and easily gained its independence, with Diodotus for its king (see SELEUCIDÆ; B. C. 281–224). “The authority of Diodotus was confirmed and riveted on his subjects by an undisturbed reign of eighteen years before a Syrian army even showed itself in his neighbourhood. . . . The Bactrian Kingdom was, at any rate at its commencement, as thoroughly Greek as that of the Seleucidæ.” “From B. C. 206 to about B. C. 185 was the most flourishing period of the Bactrian monarchy, which expanded during that space from a small kingdom to a considerable empire”—extending over the greater part of modern Afghanistan, and across the Indus into the Punjab. But meantime the neighboring Parthians, who threw off the Seleucid yoke soon after the Bactrians had done so, were growing in power and they soon passed from rivalry to enmity. The Bactrian kingdom was practically extinguished about 150 B. C. by the conquests of the Parthian Mithridates I., “although Greek monarchs of the Bactrian series continued masters of Cabul and Western India till about B. C. 126.”—G. Rawlinson, *Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy*, ch. 3–5.

**BADAJOS:** The Geographical Congress (1524). See AMERICA: A. D. 1519–1524.

**BADEN:** Early Suevic population. See SUEVI.

**A. D. 1801–1803.**—Acquisition of territory under the Treaty of Lunenburg. See GERMANY: A. D. 1801–1803.

**A. D. 1805–1806.**—Aggrandized by Napoleon.—Created a Grand Duchy.—Joined to the Confederation of the Rhine. See GERMANY: A. D. 1805–1806, and 1806 (JANUARY–AUGUST).

**A. D. 1813.**—Abandonment of the Rhenish Confederacy and the French Alliance. See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (JANUARY–MARCH).

**A. D. 1849.**—Revolution suppressed by Prussian troops. See GERMANY: A. D. 1848–1850.

**A. D. 1866.**—The Seven Weeks War.—Indemnity and territorial cession to Prussia. See GERMANY: A. D. 1866.

**A. D. 1870–1871.**—Treaty of Union with the Germanic Confederation, soon transformed into the German Empire. See GERMANY: A. D. 1870 (SEPTEMBER–DECEMBER), and 1871.

**BADEN, OR RASTADT, Treaty of (1714).** See UTRICHT: A. D. 1712–1714.

**BADR, OR BEDR, Battle of.** See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 600–632.

**BÆCULA, Battle of.** See PUNIC WAR, THE SECOND.

**BÆRSERK.** See BERSERKER.

**BÆTICA.**—The ancient name of the province in Spain which afterwards took from the Vandals the name of Andalusia. See SPAIN: B. C. 218–25, and A. D. 428; also TURDETANI, and VANDALS: A. D. 428.

**BÆTIS, The.**—The ancient name of the Guadalquivir river in Spain.

**BAGACUM.** See NEUVIL.

**BAGAUDS, Insurrection of the (A. D. 287).**

—The peasants of Gaul, whose condition had become very wretched during the distractions and misgovernment of the third century, were provoked to an insurrection, A. D. 287, which was general and alarming. It was a rising which seems to have been much like those that occurred in France and England eleven centuries later. The rebel peasants were called Bagauds, —a name which some writers derive from the Celtic word “bagad” or “bagat,” signifying “tumultuous assemblage.” They sacked and ruined several cities,—taking Autun after a siege of seven months,—and committed many terrible atrocities. The Emperor Maximian—colleague of Diocletian,—succeeded, at last, in suppressing the general outbreak, but not in extinguishing it every where. There were traces of it surviving long afterwards.—P. Codwin, *Hist. of France*, v. 1: *Ancient Gaul*, bk. 2, ch. 6.

ALSO IN: W. T. Arnold, *The Roman System of Provincial Administration*, ch. 4.—See, also, DEBITTUS.

**BAGDAD, A. D. 763.**—The founding of the new capital of the Caliphs. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST AND EMPIRE: A. D. 763.

**A. D. 815–945.**—Decline of the Caliphate. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST AND EMPIRE: A. D. 815–945.

**A. D. 1050.**—In the hands of the Seldjuk Turks. See TURKS: A. D. 1004–1063.

**A. D. 1258.**—The Fall of the Caliphate.—Destruction of the city by the Mongols.—In 1252, on the accession of Mangu Khan, grandson of Jingsis Khan, to the sovereignty of the Mongol Empire [see MONGOLS], a great Kuriltai or council was held, at which it was decided to send an expedition into the West, for two purposes: (1), to exterminate the Ismailians or Assassins, who still maintained their power in northern Persia; (2), to reduce the Caliph of Bagdad to submission to the Mongol supremacy. The command of the expedition was given to Mangu's brother, Khulagu, or Houlagou, who performed his appointed tasks with thoroughness and unmerciful resolution. In 1257 he made an end of the Assassins, to the great relief of the whole eastern world, Mahometan and Christian. In 1258 he passed on to Bagdad, preceded by an embassy which summoned the Caliph to submit, to raze the walls of Bagdad, to give up his vain pretensions to the sovereignty of the Moslem world, and to acknowledge the Great Khan for his lord. The feeble caliph and his treacherous and incapable ministers neither submitted nor made vigorous preparations for defence. As a consequence, Bagdad was taken after a siege which only excited the ferocity of the Mongols. They fired the city and slaughtered its people, excepting some Christians, who are



said to have been spared through the influence of one of Khulagu's wives, who was a Nestorian. The sack of Bagdad lasted seven days. The number of the dead, we are told by Rasehid, was 800,000. The caliph, Mostassem, with all his family, was put to death.—II. II. Ho-worth, *List. of the Mongols*, v. 1, pp. 193-201.—For a considerable period before this final catastrophe, in the decline of the Seljuk Empire, the Caliphate at Bagdad had become once more "an independent temporal state, though, instead of ruling in the three quarters of the globe, the caliphs ruled only over the province of Irak Arabi. Their position was not unlike that of the Popes in recent times, whom they also resembled in assuming a new name, of a pious character, at their inauguration. Both the Christian and the Moslem pontiff was the real temporal sovereign of a small state; each claimed to be spiritual sovereign over the whole of the Faithful; each was recognized as such by a large body, but rejected by others. But in truth the spiritual recognition of the Abbasside caliphs was more nearly universal in their last age than it had ever been before." With the fall of Bagdad fell the caliphate as a temporal sovereignty; but it survived, or was resurrected, in its spiritual functions, to become merged, a little later, in the supremacy of the sultan of the Ottoman Turks. "A certain Ahmed, a real or pretended Abbasside, fled [from Bagdad] to Egypt, where he was proclaimed caliph by the title of Al Mostanser Billah, under the protection of the then Sultan Bibars. He and his successors were deened, in spiritual things, Commanders of the Faithful, and they were found to be a convenient instrument both by the Mameluke sultans and by other Mahometan princes. From one of them, Bajazet the Thunderbolt received the title of Sultan; from another, Selim the Inflexible procured the cession of his claims, and obtained the right to deem himself the shadow of God upon earth. Since then, the Ottoman Padishah has been held to inherit the rights of Omar and of Haroun, rights which if strictly pressed, might be terrible alike to enemies, neutrals, and allies."—E. A. Freeman, *List. and Cong. of the Saracens*, lect. 4.

A. D. 1393.—Timour's pyramid of heads. See TIMOUR.

A. D. 1623-1638.—Taken by the Persians and retaken by the Turks.—Fearful slaughter of the inhabitants. See TURKS: A. D. 1623-1640.

**BAGISTANA.** See BEHISTUN, ROCK OF.  
**BAGLIONI, The.**—"The Baglioni first came into notice during the wars they carried on with the Oddi of Perugia in the 14th and 15th centuries. This was one of those duels to the death, like that of the Visconti with the Torrensi of Milan, on which the fate of so many Italian cities of the middle ages hung. The nobles fought; the townsfolk assisted like a Greek chorus, sharing the passions of the actors, but contributing little to the catastrophe. The piazza was the theatre on which the tragedy was played. In this contest the Baglioni proved the stronger, and began to sway the state of Perugia after the irregular fashion of Italian despots. They had no legal right over the city, no hereditary magistracy, no title of princely authority. The Church was reckoned the supreme administrator of the Perugian common-

wealth. But in reality no man could set foot on the Umbrian plain without permission from the Baglioni. They elected the officers of state. The lives and goods of the citizens were at their discretion. When a Papal legate showed his face, they made the town too hot to hold him. . . . It was in vain that from time to time the people rose against them, massacring Pandolfo Baglioni on the public square in 1393, and joining with Ridolfo and Braecio of the dominant house to assassinate another Pandolfo with his son Niccolo in 1460. The more they were cut down, the more they flourished. The wealth they derived from their lordships in the duchy of Spoleto and the Umbrian hill-cities, and the treasures they accumulated in the service of the Italian republics, made them omnipotent in their native town. . . . From father to son they were warriors, and we have records of few Italian houses, except perhaps the Malatesti of Rimini, who equalled them in hardihood and fierceness. Especially were they noted for the remorseless vendette which they carried on among themselves, cousin tracking cousin to death with the ferocity and craft of sleuth-hounds. Had they restrained these fratricidal passions, they might, perhaps, by following some common policy, like that of the Medici in Florence or the Bentivogli in Bologna, have successfully resisted the Papal authority, and secured dynastic sovereignty. It is not until 1495 that the history of the Baglioni becomes dramatic, possibly because till then they lacked the pen of Matarazzo. But from this year forward to their final extinction, every detail of their doings has a picturesque and awful interest. Domestic furies, like the revel described by Cassandra above the palace of Mycenae, seem to take possession of the fated house; and the doom which has fallen on them is worked out with pitiless exactitude to the last generation."—J. A. Symonds, *Sketches in Italy and Greece*, pp. 70-72.

**BAGRATIDAE, The.** See ARMENIA: 12th-14th CENTURIES.


**BAHAMA ISLANDS: A. D. 1492.**—Discovery by Columbus. See AMERICA: A. D. 1492.



**BAHRITE SULTANS.** See EGYPT: A. D. 1250-1517.

**BAIÆ.**—Baiæ, in Campania, opposite Puteoli on a small bay near Naples, was the favorite watering place of the ancient Romans. "As soon as the reviving heats of April gave token of advancing summer, the noble and the rich hurried from Rome to this choice retreat; and here, till the raging dogstar forbade the tolls even of amusement, they disported themselves on shore or on sea, in the thick groves or on the placid lakes, in litters and chariots, in gilded boats with painted sails, lulled by day and night with the sweetest symphonies of song and music, or gazing indolently on the wanton measures of male and female dancers. The bath, elsewhere their relaxation, was here the business of the day; . . . they turned the pools of Avernus and Lucrinus into tanks for swimming; and in these pleasant waters both sexes met familiarly together, and conversed amidst the roses sprinkled lavishly on their surface."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 40.

**BAINBRIDGE, Commodore William,** in the War of 1812. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812-1813.









**BAIREUTH, Creation of the Principality of.** See GERMANY: THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

**Separation from the Electorate of Brandenburg.** See BRANDENBURG: A. D. 1417-1640.

**BAJAZET I.**—Turkish Sultan, A. D. 1389-1402. . . . **Bajazet II.**, A. D. 1481-1512.

**BAKAIRI, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: CAHIES.

**BAKER, Colonel Edward D.**, Killed at Ball's Bluff. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (OCTOBER: VIRGINIA).

**BAKSAR, OR BAXAR, OR BUXAR, Battle of (1764).** See INDIA: A. D. 1757-1772.

**BALACLAVA, Battle of.** See RUSSIA: A. D. 1854 (OCTOBER—NOVEMBER).

**BALBINUS, Roman Emperor,** A. D. 238.

**BALBOA'S DISCOVERY OF THE PACIFIC.** See AMERICA: A. D. 1513-1517.

**BALCHITAS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PAMPAS TRIBES.

**BALDWIN OF FLANDERS, The Crusade of.** See CRUSADES: A. D. 1201-1203. . . .

**Baldwin I., Latin Emperor at Constantinople (Romania),** A. D. 1204-1205. . . . **Baldwin II.,** A. D. 1237-1261.

**BALEARIC ISLANDS: Origin of the Name, &c.**—"The inhabitants were celebrated for the skill and force with which they managed their slings of leather, hemp or rushes; in the wars of the Carthaginians with the Romans

they were a most formidable description of light troops. The name 'Balcares' was derived by the Greeks from 'ballein', to throw; but the art was taught them by the Phœnicians, and the name is no doubt Phœnician."—J. Kenrick, *Phœnicia*, ch. 4.—For the chief incidents in the history of these islands, see MINORCA and MAJORCA.

**BALIA OF FLORENCE, The.**—"The chief instrument employed by the Medici to establish their power in Florence was "the pernicious system of the Parlamento and Balìa, by means of which the people, assembled from time to time in the public square, and intimidated by the reigning faction, entrusted full powers to a select committee nominated in private by the chiefs of the great house. . . . Segni says: 'The Parlamento is a meeting of the Florentine people on the Piazza of the Signory. When the Signory has taken its place to address the meeting, the piazza is guarded by armed men, and then the people are asked whether they wish to give absolute power (Balìa) and authority to the citizens named, for their good. When the answer, yes, prompted partly by inclination and partly by compulsion, is returned, the Signory immediately retires into the palace. This is all that is meant by this parlamento, which thus gives away the full power of effecting a change in the state.'—J. A. Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy: Age of the Despots*, p. 164, and foot-note.—See, also, FLORENCE: A. D. 1378-1427, and 1458-1469.

## BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES.

**Ancient History.**—The States of south-eastern Europe, lately emancipated, for the most part, from the rule of the Turks, are so associated by a common history, although remarkably diverse in race, that it seems expedient to bring them for discussion together. They occupy mainly the regions known in Roman times as MOESIA, DACIA and ILLYRICUM, to which names the reader is referred for some account of the scanty incidents of their early history.—See, also, AVARS.

**Races existing.**—"In no part of Western Europe do we find districts inhabited by men differing in speech and national feeling, lying in distinct patches here and there over a large country. A district like one of our larger counties in which one parish, perhaps one hundred, spoke Welsh, another Latin, another English, another Danish, another Old French, another the tongue of more modern settlers, Flemings, Huguenots or Palatines, is something which we find hard to conceive, and which, as applied to our own land or to any other Western land, sounds absurd on the face of it. When we pass into South-eastern Europe, this state of things, the very idea of which seems absurd in the West, is found to be perfectly real. All the races which we find dwelling there at the beginning of recorded history, together with several races which have come in since, all remain, not as mere fragments or survivals, but as nations, each with its national language and national feelings, and each having its greater or less share of practical importance in the politics of the present moment. Setting aside races which have simply passed through the country without occupying it, we may say that all the races

which have ever settled in the country are there still as distinct races. And, though each race has its own particular region where it forms the whole people or the great majority of the people, still there are large districts where different races really live side by side in the very way which seems so absurd when we try to conceive it in any Western country. We cannot conceive a Welsh, an English, and a Norman village side by side; but a Greek, a Bulgarian, and a Turkish village side by side is a thing which may be seen in many parts of Thrace. The oldest races in those lands, those which answer to Basques and Bretons in Western Europe, hold quite another position from that of Basques and Bretons in Western Europe. They form three living and vigorous nations, Greek, Albanian, and Rouman. They stand as nations alongside of the Slaves who came in later, and who answer roughly to the Teutons in the West, while all alike are under the rule of the Turk, who has nothing answering to him in the West. . . . When the Romans conquered the South-eastern lands, they found there three great races, the Greek, the Illyrian, and the Thracian. Those three races are all there still. The Greeks speak for themselves. The Illyrians are represented by the modern Albanians. The Thracians are represented, there seems every reason to believe, by the modern Roumans. Now had the whole of the South-eastern lands been inhabited by Illyrians and Thracians, those lands would doubtless have become as thoroughly Roman as the Western lands became. . . . But the position of the Greek nation, its long history and its high civilization, hindered this. The Greeks could not become Romans in any but the most



**DANUBIAN  
AND  
BALKAN STATES**  
SHOWING CHANGES DURING  
THE PRESENT CENTURY

The political condition in 1815 is shown by **ROMAN LETTERS** and this style of boundary: ————  
 All subsequent changes are shown by **ITALIC LETTERS** and this style of boundary: - - - - -  
 The Bulgarian boundary according to the Treaty of San Stefano 1878 is shown thus: + + + + +

SCALE OF MILES.  
 0 50 100 150 200 250

The M. N. Co., Buffalo, N. Y.

18°                      20°                      22° Longitude East 24° from Greenwich                      26°                      28°

purely political sense. Like other subjects of the Roman Empire, they gradually took the Roman name; but they kept their own language, literature, and civilization. In short we may say that the Roman Empire in the East became Greek, and that the Greek nation became Roman. The Eastern Empire and the Greek-speaking lands became nearly coextensive. Greek became the one language of the Eastern Roman Empire, while those that spoke it still called themselves Romans. Till quite lately, that is till the modern ideas of nationality began to spread, the Greek-speaking subjects of the Turk called themselves by no name but that of Romans. . . . While the Greeks thus took the Roman name without adopting the Latin language, another people in the Eastern peninsula adopted both name and language, exactly as the nations of the West did. If, as there is good reason to believe, the modern Roumans represent the old Thracians, that nation came under the general law, exactly like the Western nations. The Thracians became thoroughly Roman in speech, as they have ever since kept the Roman name. They form in fact one of the Romance nations, just as much as the people of Gaul or Spain. . . . In short, the existence of a highly civilized people like the Greeks hindered in every way the influence of Rome from being so thorough in the East as it was in the West. The Greek nation lived on, and alongside of itself, it preserved the other two ancient nations of the peninsula. Thus all three have lived on to the present as distinct nations. Two of them, the Greeks and the Illyrians, still keep their own languages, while the third, the old Thracians, speak a Romance language and call themselves Roumans. . . . The Slavonic nations hold in the East a place answering to that which is held by the Teutonic nations in the West. . . . But though the Slaves in the East thus answer in many ways to the Teutons in the West, their position with regard to the Eastern Empire was not quite the same as that of the Teutons towards the Western Empire. . . . They learned much from the half Roman, half Greek power with which they had to do; but they did not themselves become either Greek or Roman, in the way in which the Teutonic conquerors in the Western Empire became Roman. . . . Thus, while in the West everything except a few survivals of earlier nations, is either Roman or Teutonic, in the East, Greeks, Illyrians, Thracians or Roumans, and Slaves, all stood side by side as distinct nations when the next set of invaders came, and they remain as distinct nations still. . . . There came among them, in the form of the Ottoman Turk, a people with whom union was not only hard but impossible, a people who were kept distinct, not by special circumstances, but by the inherent nature of the case. Had the Turk been other than what he really was, he might simply have become a new nation alongside of the other South-eastern nations. Being what he was the Turk could not do this. . . . The original Turks did not belong to the Aryan branch of mankind, and their original speech is not an Aryan speech. The Turks and their speech belong to altogether another class of nations and languages. . . . Long before the Turks came into Europe, the Magyars or Hungarians had come; and, before the Magyars came, the Bulgarians had come. Both the Magyars

and the Bulgarians were in their origin Turanian nations, nations as foreign to the Aryan people of Europe as the Ottoman Turks themselves. But their history shows that a Turanian nation settling in Europe may either be assimilated with an existing European nation or may sit down as an European nation alongside of others. The Bulgarians have done one of these things; the Magyars have done the other; the Ottoman Turks have done neither. So much has been heard lately of the Bulgarians as being in our times the special victims of the Turk that some people may find it strange to hear who the original Bulgarians were. They were a people more or less nearly akin to the Turks, and they came into Europe as barbarian conquerors who were as much dreaded by the nations of South-eastern Europe as the Turks themselves were afterwards. The old Bulgarians were a Turanian people, who settled in a large part of the South-eastern peninsula, in lands which had been already occupied by Slaves. They came in as barbarian conquerors; but, exactly as happened to so many conquerors in Western Europe, they were presently assimilated by their Slavonic subjects and neighbours. They learned the Slavonic speech; they gradually lost all traces of their foreign origin. Those whom we now call Bulgarians are a Slavonic people speaking a Slavonic tongue, and they have nothing Turanian about them except the name which they borrowed from their Turanian masters. . . . The Bulgarians entered the Empire in the seventh century, and embraced Christianity in the ninth. They rose to great power in the South-eastern lands, and played a great part in their history. But all their later history, from a comparatively short time after the first Bulgarian conquest, has been that of a Slavonic and not that of a Turanian people. The history of the Bulgarians therefore shows that it is quite possible, if circumstances are favourable, for a Turanian people to settle among the Aryans of Europe and to be thoroughly assimilated by the Aryan nation among whom they settled.—E. A. Freeman, *The Ottoman Power in Europe*, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: R. G. Latham, *The Nationalities of Europe*.

7th Century.—(Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia, Dalmatia and Montenegro).—The Slavonic settlement.—'No country on the face of our unfortunate planet has been oftener ravaged, no land so often soaked with the blood of its inhabitants. At the dawn of history Bosnia formed part of Illyria. It was said to have been already peopled by Slav tribes. Rome conquered all this region as far as the Danube, and annexed it to Dalmatia. Two provinces were formed, 'Dalmatia maritima,' and 'Dalmatia interior,' or 'Illyris barbara.' Order reigned, and as the interior communicated with the coast, the whole country flourished. Important ports grew upon the littoral. . . . At the fall of the Empire came the Goths, then the Avars, who, for two centuries, burned and massacred, and turned the whole country into a desert. . . . In 630 the Croats began to occupy the present Croatia, Slavonia, and the north of Bosnia, and in 640 the Servians, of the same race and language, exterminated the Avars and peopled Serbia, Southern Bosnia, Montenegro and Dalmatia. The ethnic situation which exists to-day dates



from this epoch."—E. de Laveleye, *The Balkan Peninsula*, ch. 3.—Heraclius [who occupied the throne of the Eastern Empire at Constantinople from 610 to 642] appears to have formed the plan of establishing a permanent barrier in Europe against the encroachments of the Avars and Slavonians. . . . To accomplish this object, Heraclius induced the Serbs, or Western Slavonians, who occupied the country about the Carpathian mountains, and who had successfully opposed the extension of the Avar empire in that direction, to abandon their ancient seats, and move down to the South into the provinces between the Adriatic and the Danube. The Roman and Greek population of these provinces had been driven towards the seacoast by the continual incursions of the northern tribes, and the desolate plains of the interior had been occupied by a few Slavonian subjects and vassals of the Avars. The most important of the western Slavonian tribes who moved southward at the invitation of Heraclius were the Servians and Croats, who settled in the countries still peopled by their descendants. Their original settlements were formed in consequence of friendly arrangements, and, doubtless, under the sanction of an express treaty; for the Slavonian people of Illyria and Dalmatia long regarded themselves as bound to pay a certain degree of territorial allegiance to the Eastern Empire. . . . These colonies, unlike the earlier invaders of the Empire, were composed of agricultural communities. . . . Unlike the military races of Goths, Huns, and Avars, who had preceded them, the Servian nations increased and flourished in the lands which they had colonized; and by the absorption of every relic of the ancient population, they formed political communities and independent states, which offered a firm barrier to the Avars and other hostile nations. . . . The states which they constituted were of considerable weight in the history of Europe; and the kingdoms or bannats of Croatia, Servia, Bosnia, Rascia and Dalmatia, occupied for some centuries a political position very similar to that now held by the secondary monarchical states of the present day."—G. Finlay, *Greece under the Romans*, ch. 4, sect. 6.—See, also, AVARS; THE BREAKING OF THEIR DOMINION; and SLAVONIC NATIONS: 6TH AND 7TH CENTURIES.

**7th-8th Centuries (Bulgaria).—Vassalage to the Khazars.** See KHAZARS.

**9th Century (Servia).—Rise of the Kingdom.**—"At the period alluded to [the latter part of the ninth century] the Servians did not, like the rest of the Slavonians, constitute a distinct state, but acknowledged the supremacy of the Eastern Roman Emperor: in fact the country they inhabited had, from ancient times, formed part of the Roman territory; and it still remained part of the Eastern Empire when the Western Empire was re-established, at the time of Charlemagne. The Servians, at the same period, embraced the Christian faith; but in doing so they did not subject themselves entirely, either to the empire or church of the Greeks. . . . The Emperor . . . permitted the Servians to be ruled by native chiefs, solely of their own election, who preserved a patriarchal form of government. . . . In the eleventh century, the Greeks, despite of the stipulations they had entered into, attempted to take Servia under their immediate control, and to subject it to their financial sys-

tem." The attempt met with a defeat which was decisive. "Not only did it put a speedy termination to the encroachment of the Court of Constantinople in imposing a direct government, but it also firmly established the princely power of the Grand Shupanes; whose existence depended on the preservation of the national independence. . . . Pope Gregory VII. was the first who saluted a Grand Shupane as King."—L. Von Ranke, *Hist. of Servia*, ch. 1.

**9th-16th Centuries (Bosnia, Servia, Croatia, Dalmatia).—Conversion to Christianity.—The Bogomiles.—Hungarian crusades.—Turkish conquest.**—After the Slavonic settlement of Servia, Bosnia, Croatia and Dalmatia, for a time "the sovereignty of Byzantium was acknowledged. But the conversion of these tribes, of identical race, to two different Christian rites, created an antagonism which still exists. The Croats were converted first by missionaries from Rome; they thus adopted Latin letters and Latin ritual; the Servians, on the contrary, and consequently part of the inhabitants of Bosnia, were brought to Christianity by Cyril and Methodius, who, coming from Thessalonica, brought the characters and rites of the Eastern Church. About 860 Cyril translated the Bible into Slav, inventing an alphabet which bears his name, and which is still in use. . . . In 874 Budimir, the first Christian King of Bosnia, Croatia and Dalmatia, called a diet upon the plain of Dalminium, where he tried to establish a regular organization. It was about this time that the name Bosnia appeared for the first time. It is said to be derived from a Slav tribe coming originally from Thrace. In 905 Branimir, King of Servia, annexed Croatia and Bosnia; but this union did not last long. The sovereignty of Byzantium ceased in these parts after the year 1000. It was gained by Ladislaus, King of Hungary, about 1091. In 1103 Coloman, King of Hungary, added the titles of 'Rex Ramae' (Herzegovina), then of 'Rex Bosniae.' Since then Bosnia has always been a dependence of the crown of Saint Stephen. . . . About this time some Albigenses came to Bosnia, who converted to their beliefs a large number of the people who were called Cathare, in German Patrener. In Bosnia they received and adopted the name of Bogomile, which means 'loving God.' Nothing is more tragic than the history of this heresy. . . . They [the Bogomiles] became in Bosnia a chief factor, both of its history and its present situation. . . . The Hungarian Kings, in obedience to the Pope, ceaselessly endeavoured to extirpate them, and their frequent wars of extermination provoked the hatred of the Bosnians. . . . In 1238 the first great crusade was organized by Bela IV. of Hungary, in obedience to Pope Gregory VII. The whole country was devastated, and the Bogomiles nearly all massacred, except a number who escaped to the forests and mountains. In 1245 the Hungarian Bishop of Kalocsa himself led a second crusade. In 1280 a third crusade was undertaken by Ladislaus IV., King of Hungary, in order to regain the Pope's favour. . . . About the year 1300 Paul' of Brebir, 'Banu Croatorum et Bosniae dominus,' finally added Herzegovina to Bosnia. Under the Ban Stephen IV., the Emperor of Servia, the great Dushan, occupied Bosnia, but it soon regained its independence (1355), and under Stephen Tvartko, who took

the title of king, the country enjoyed a last period of peace and prosperity. . . . Before his death the Turks appeared on the frontiers. At the memorable and decisive battle of Kossovo [see **TURKS**: A. D. 1380-1389], which gave them Servia, 30,000 Bosnians were engaged, and, though retreating stopped the conqueror. Under Tvartko II., the second king, who was a Bogomile, Bosnia enjoyed some years' peace (1326-1443). "Then followed [see **TURKS**: A. D. 1402-1451] a bloody interlude of civil war," which invited the Turks and prepared the way for them. "Mohammed II., who had just taken Constantinople (1453), advanced with a formidable army of 150,000 men, which nothing could resist. The country was laid waste; 30,000 young men were circumcised and enrolled amongst the janissaries; 200,000 prisoners were made slaves; the towns which resisted were burned; the churches turned into mosques, and the land confiscated by the conquerors (1463). . . . A period of struggle lasted from 1463 till the definite conquest in 1527 [see **TURKS**: A. D. 1451-1481]. . . . When the battle of Mohacz (August 20, 1526) gave Hungary to the Ottomans [see **HUNGARY**: A. D. 1487-1526] Jaitche, the last rampart of Bosnia, whose defence had inspired acts of legendary courage, fell in his turn in 1527. A strange circumstance facilitated the Mussulman conquest. To save their wealth, the greater number of magnates, and almost all the Bogomiles, who were exasperated by the cruel persecutions directed against them, went over to Islamism. From that time they became the most ardent followers of Mohammedanism, whilst keeping the language and names of their ancestors. They fought everywhere in the forefront of the battles which gained Hungary for the Turks." Within the present century the Bosnian Mussulmans have risen in arms "against all the reforms that Europe, in the name of modern principles, wrested from the Porte."—E. de Laveleye, *The Balkan Peninsula*, ch. 3.

**ALSO** **IX**: L. von Ranke, *Hist. of Servia*, &c.  
**10th-11th Centuries (Bulgaria).—The First Bulgarian Kingdom and its overthrow by Basil II.**—"The glory of the Bulgarians was confined to a narrow scope both of time and place. In the 9th and 10th centuries they reigned to the south of the Danube, but the more powerful nations that had followed their emigration repelled all return to the north and all progress to the west. . . . In the beginning of the 11th century, the Second Basil [Byzantine or Greek Emperor, A. D. 976-1025] who was born in the purple, deserved the appellation of conqueror of the Bulgarians [subdued by his predecessor, John Zimisce, but still rebellious]. His avarice was in some measure gratified by a treasure of 400,000 pounds sterling (10,000 pounds' weight of gold) which he found in the palace of Lychnidus. His cruelty inflicted a cool and exquisite vengeance on 15,000 captives who had been guilty of the defence of their country. They were deprived of sight, but to one of each hundred a single eye was left, that he might conduct his blind country to the presence of their king. Their king is said to have expired of grief and horror; the nation was awed by this terrible example, the Bulgarians were swept away from their settlements, and circumscribed within a narrow province; the surviving chiefs bequeathed to their children the advice of patience

and the duty of revenge."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 55.

**ALSO** **IX**: G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine Empire*, from 716 to 1067, bk. 2, ch. 2.—See, also, **CONSTANTINOPLE**: A. D. 907-1043, and **ACHAÏDA, THE KINGDOM OF**.

**A. D. 1096 (Bulgaria).—Hostilities with the First Crusaders.** See **CRUSADES**: A. D. 1090-1090.

**12th Century (Bulgaria).—The Second Bulgarian or Wallachian Kingdom.**—"The reign of Isaac II. [Byzantine or Greek Emperor, A. D. 1185-1195] is filled with a series of revolts, caused by his incapable administration and financial rapacity. The most important of these was the great rebellion of the Vallachian and Bulgarian population which occupied the country between Mount Hæmus and the Danube. The immense population of this extensive country now separated itself finally from the government of the Eastern Empire, and its political destinies ceased to be united with those of the Greeks. A new European monarchy, called the Vallachian, or Second Bulgarian kingdom, was formed, which for some time acted an important part in the affairs of the Byzantine Empire, and contributed powerfully to the depression of the Greek race. The sudden importance assumed by the Vallachian population in this revolution, and the great extent of country then occupied by a people who had previously acted no prominent part in the political events of the East, render it necessary to give some account of their previous history. Four different countries are spoken of under the name of Vallachia by the Byzantine writers: Great Vallachia, which was the country round the plain of Thessaly, particularly the southern and south-western part. White Vallachia, or the modern Bulgaria, which formed the Vallachio-Bulgarian kingdom that revolted from Isaac II.; Black Vallachia, Mavro-Vallachia, or Karabogdon, which is Moldavia; and Hungarovallachia, or the Vallachia of the present day, comprising a part of Transylvania. . . . The question remains undecided whether these Vallachians are the lineal descendants of the Thracian race, who, Strabo tells us, extended as far south as Thessaly, and as far north as to the borders of Pannonia; for of the Thracian language we know nothing."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine and Greek Empires*, from 716 to 1453, bk. 3, ch. 3, sect. 1.—  
 "Whether they were of Slavic origin or of Gaelic or Welsh origin, whether they were the aboriginal inhabitants of the country who had come under the influence of the elder Rome, and had acquired so many Latin words as to overlay their language and to retain little more than the grammatical forms and mould of their own language, or whether they were the descendants of the Latin colonists of Dacia [see **DACIA: TRAJAN'S CONQUEST**] with a large mixture of other peoples, are all questions which have been much controverted. It is remarkable that while no people living on the south of the Balkans appear to be mentioned as Wallachs until the tenth century, when Anna Comæna mentions a village called Ezeban, near Mount Kissavo, occupied by them, almost suddenly we hear of them as a great nation to the south of the Balkans. They spoke a language which differed little from Latin. Thessaly, during the twelfth century is usually called Great Wallachia. . . . Besides the Wallachs in Thessaly, whose descendants are now

called Kutzo-Wallachs, there were the Wallachs in Dacia, the ancestors of the present Roumanians, and Mavro-Wallachs in Dalmatia. Indeed, according to the Hungarian and Byzantine writers, there were during the twelfth century a series of Wallachian peoples, extending from the Theiss to the Dniester. . . . The word Wallach is used by the Byzantine writers as equivalent to shepherd, and it may be that the common use of a dialect of Latin by all the Wallachs is the only bond of union among the peoples bearing that name. They were all occasionally spoken of by the Byzantine writers as descendants of the Romans."—E. Pears, *The Fall of Constantinople*, ch. 3.—"The classical type of feature, so often met with among Roumanian peasants, pleads strongly for the theory of Roman extraction, and if just now I compared the Saxon peasants to Noah's ark figures rudely carved out of the coarsest wood, the Roumanians as often remind me of a type of face chiefly to be seen on cameo ornaments, or ancient signet rings. Take at random a score of individuals from any Roumanian village, and, like a handful of antique gems which have been strewn broadcast over the land, you will there surely find a good choice of classical profiles worthy to be immortalized on agate, onyx, or jasper. An air of plaintive melancholy generally characterizes the Roumanian peasant; it is the melancholy of a long-subjected and oppressed race. . . . Perhaps no other race possesses in such marked degree the blind and immovable sense of nationality which characterizes the Roumanians. They hardly ever mingle with the surrounding races, far less adopt manners and customs foreign to their own. This singular tenacity of the Roumanians to their own dress, manners and customs is probably due to the influence of their religion [the Greek church], which teaches that any divergence from their own established rules is sinful."—E. Gérard, *Transylvanian Peoples* (*Contemp. Rev.*, March, 1887).

**A. D. 1341-1356 (Serbia).—The Empire of Stephan Dushan.**—"In 1341, when John Cantacuzenus assumed the purple [at Constantinople], important prospects were opened to the Servians. Cantacuzenus . . . went up the mountains and prevailed upon Stephan Dushan, the powerful king of the Servians, whom he found in a country palace at Pristina, to join his cause." As the result of this connection, and by favor of the opportunities which the civil war and general decline in the Greek Empire afforded him, Stephan Dushan extended his dominions over Epirus, Thessaly, Macedonia, and a part of Thrace. "The Shkypetures in Albania followed his standard; Arta and Joannina were in his possession. From these points his Voivodes [Palatines], whose districts may easily be traced, spread themselves over the whole of the Roumelian territory on the Vardar and the Marizza, as far as Bulgaria, which he also regarded as a province of his kingdom. Being in the possession of so extensive a dominion, he now ventured to assume a title which was still in dispute between the Eastern and Western Empires, and could not rightly be claimed by either. As a Servian Krale, he could neither ask nor expect the obedience of the Greeks; therefore he called himself Emperor of the Roumelians—the Macedonian Christ-loving Czar—and began to wear the tiara. . . . Stephan Dushan died [Dec. 2, 1356] before he had completed the Empire of

which he had laid the foundation, and ere he had strengthened his power by the bulwark of national institutions."—L. Von Ranke, *Hist. of Serbia*, ch. 1-2.

ALSO IN: Mme E. L. Mijatovich, *Kosovo, Int. A. D. 1389 (Bulgaria).—Conquest by the Turks.* See **TURKS (THE OTTOMANS): A. D. 1360-1389.**

**14th Century (Bulgaria).—Subjection to Hungary.** See **HUNGARY: A. D. 1301-1442.**

**14th-18th Centuries (Roumania, or Wallachia, and Moldavia).—Four Centuries of Conflict with Hungarians and Turks.**—"The Wallacho-Bulgarian monarchy, whatever may have been its limits, was annihilated by a horde of Tartars about A. D. 1250. The same race committed great havoc in Hungary, conquered the Kumaní, overran Moldavia, Transylvania, &c., and held their ground there until about the middle of the 14th century, when they were driven northward by the Hungarian, Saxon, and other settlers in Transylvania; and with their exit we have done with the barbarians. . . . Until recently the historians of Roumania have had little to guide them concerning the events of the period beyond traditions which, though very interesting, are now gradually giving place to recorded and authenticated facts. . . . It is admitted that the plains and slopes of the Carpathians were inhabited by communities ruled over by chieftains of varying power and influence. Some were banates, as that of Craiova, which long remained a semi-independent State; then there were petty voivodes or princes . . . ; and besides these there were Khanates, . . . some of which were petty principalities, whilst others were merely the governorships of villages or groups of them. . . . Mircea, one of the heroes of Roumanian history, not only secured the independent sovereignty, and called himself Voivode of Wallachia 'by the grace of God,' but in 1389 he formed an alliance with Poland, and assumed other titles by the right of conquest. This alliance . . . had for its objects the extension of his dominions, as well as protection against Hungary on the one hand, and the Ottoman power on the other; for the . . . Turkish armies had overrun Bulgaria, and about the year 1391 they first made their appearance north of the Danube. At first the bravery of Mircea was successful in stemming the tide of invasion;" but after a year or two, "finding himself between two powerful enemies, the King of Hungary and the Sultan, Mircea elected to form an alliance with the latter, and concluded a treaty with him at Nicopolis (1393), known as the First Capitulation, by which Wallachia retained its autonomy; but agreed to pay an annual tribute and to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Sultan. . . . According to several historians Mircea did not adhere to it long, for he is said to have been in command of a contingent in the army of the crusaders, and to have been present at the battle of Nicopolis (1396), in which the flower of the French nobility fell, and, when he found their cause to be hopeless, once more to have deserted them and joined the victorious arms of Bajazet. Of the continued wars and dissensions in Wallachia during the reign of Mircea it is unnecessary to speak. He ruled with varying fortunes until 1418 A. D." A Second Capitulation was concluded, at Adrianople, with the Turks, in

1460, by a later Wallachian voivode, named Vlad. It increased the tribute to the Porte, but made no other important change in the terms of suzerainty. Meantime, in the neighbouring Moldavian principality, events were beginning to shape themselves into some historical distinctness. "For a century after the foundation of Moldavia, or, as it was at first called, Bogdania, by Bogdan Dragosch [a legendary hero], the history of the country is shrouded in darkness. Kings or princes are named, one or more of whom were Lithuanians. . . . At length a prince more powerful than the rest ascended the throne. . . . This was Stephen, sometimes called the 'Great' or 'Good.' . . . He came to the throne about 1456 or 1458, and reigned until 1504, and his whole life was spent in wars against Transylvania, Wallachia, . . . the Turks, and Tartars. . . . In 1475 he was at war with the Turks, whom he defeated on the river Birlad. . . . In that year also Stephen . . . completely overran Wallachia. Having reduced it to submission, he placed a native boyard on the throne as his viceroy, who showed his gratitude to Stephen by rebelling and liberating the country from his rule; but he was in his turn murdered by his Wallachian subjects. In 1476 Stephen sustained a terrible defeat at the hands of the Ottomans at Valca Alba (the White Valley), but eight years afterwards, allied with the Poles, he again encountered [and defeated] this terrible enemy. . . . After the battle of Mohacs [see HUNGARY: A. D. 1487-1526] the Turks began to encroach more openly upon Roumanian (Moldo-Wallachian) territory. They occupied and fortified Braila, Giurgevo, and Galatz; interfered in the election of the princes . . . adding to their own influence, and rendering the princes more and more subservient to their will. This state of things lasted until the end of the 16th century, when another hero, Michael the Brave of Wallachia, restored tranquility and independence to the Principalities, and raised them for a season in the esteem of surrounding nations." Michael, who mounted the throne in 1593, formed an alliance with the Prince of Siebenbürgen (Transylvania) and the voivode of Moldavia, against the Turks. He began his warfare, November, 1594, by a wholesale massacre of the Turks in Bucharest and Jassy. He then took Giurgevo by storm and defeated the Ottoman forces in a battle at Rustchuk. In 1595, Giurgevo was the scene of two bloody battles, in both of which Michael came off victor, with famous laurels. The Turks were effectually driven from the country. The ambition of the victorious Michael was now excited, and he invaded Transylvania (1599) desiring to add it to his dominions. In a battle "which is called by some the battle of Schellenberg, and by others of Hermanstadt," he defeated the reigning prince, Cardinal Andreas, and Transylvania was at his feet. He subdued Moldavia with equal ease, and the whole of ancient Dacia became subject to his rule. The Emperor Rudolph, as suzerain of Transylvania, recognized his authority. But his reign was brief. Before the close of the year 1600 a rising occurred in Transylvania, and Michael was defeated in a battle fought at Miriszlo. He escaped to the mountains and became a fugitive for some months, while even his Wallachian throne was occupied by a brother of the Moldavian voivode. At length he made

terms with the Emperor Rudolph, whose authority had been slighted by the Transylvanian insurgents, and procured men and money with which he returned in force, crushed his opponents at Goroszlo, and reigned again as viceroy. But he quarrelled soon with the commander of the imperial troops, General Basta, and the latter caused him to be assassinated, some time in August, 1601. . . . The history of Moldo-Wallachia during the 17th century . . . possesses little interest for English readers." At the end of the 17th century "another great Power [Russia] was drawing nearer and nearer to Roumania, which was eventually to exercise a grave influence upon her destiny. . . . In the beginning of the 18th century there ruled two voivodes, Constantine Brancovano, in Wallachia, and Demetrius Cantemir in Moldavia, both of whom had been appointed in the usual manner under the suzerainty of the Porte; but these princes, independently of each other, had entered into negotiations with Peter the Great after the defeat of Charles XII. at Pultawa (1706), to assist them against the Sultan, their suzerain, stipulating for their own independence under the protection of the Czar." Peter was induced to enter the country with a considerable army [1711], but soon found himself in a position from which there appeared little chance of escape. He was extricated only by the cleverness of the Czarina, who bribed the Turkish commander with her jewels—see SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1707-1718. The Moldavian Voivode escaped with the Russians. The Wallachian, Brancovano, was seized, taken to Constantinople, and put to death, along with his four sons. "Stephen Cantacuzene, the son of his accusers, was made Voivode of Wallachia, but like his predecessors he only enjoyed the honour for a brief term, and two years afterwards he was deposed, ordered to Constantinople, imprisoned, and decapitated; and with him terminated the rule of the native princes, who were followed, both in Wallachia and Moldavia, by the so-called Phanariote governors [see PHANARIOTES] or farmers-general of the Porte."—J. Samuelson, *Roumania, Past and Present*, pt. 2, ch. 11-13.

**14th-19th Centuries: (Montenegro) The new Servia.**—"The people that inhabit the two territories known on the map as Servia and Montenegro are one and the same. If you ask a Montenegrin what language he speaks, he replies 'Serb.' The last of the Serb Czars fell gloriously fighting at Kossovo in 1389 [see TURKS: A. D. 1360-1389]. To this day the Montenegrin wears a strip of black silk upon his headgear in memory of that fatal day. . . . The brave Serbs who escaped from Kossovo found a sanctuary in the mountains that overlook the Bay of Cattaro. Their leader, Ivo, surnamed Tsernoi (Black), gave the name of Tzrnogora (Montenegro) to these desert rocks. . . . Servia having become a Turkish province, her colonists created in Montenegro a new and independent Servia [see TURKS: A. D. 1451-1481]. The memory of Ivo the Black is still green in the country. Springs, ruins, and caverns are called after him, and the people look forward to the day when he will reappear as a political Messiah. But Ivo's descendants proved unworthy of him; they committed the unpardonable sin of marrying aliens, and early

in the 16th century the last descendant of Ivo the Black retired to Venice. From 1516 to 1697 Montenegro was ruled by elective Vladikas or Bishops; from 1697 to 1851 by hereditary Vladikas. For the Montenegrins the 10th, 17th and 18th centuries formed a period of incessant warfare. . . . Up till 1708 the Serbs of the mountain were no more absolutely independent of the Sultan than their enslaved kinsmen of the plain. The Havatch or Sultan's slipper tax was levied on the mountaineers. In 1703 Danilo Petrovitch celebrated his consecration as a Christian Bishop by ordering the slaughter of every Mussulman who refused to be baptised. This massacre took place on Christmas Eve 1703. . . . The 17th and 18th centuries were for Montenegro a struggle for existence. In the 19th century began their struggle for an outlet to the sea. The fall of Venice would naturally have given the mountaineers the bay of Cattaro, had not the French stepped in and annexed Dalmatia." In 1813, the Vladika, Peter I., "with the aid of the British fleet . . . took Cattaro from the French, but (pursuant to an arrangement between Russia and Austria) was compelled subsequently to relinquish it to the latter power. . . . Peter I. of Montenegro . . . died in 1830, at the age of 80. . . . His nephew Peter II. was a wise ruler. . . . On the death of Peter II., Prince Danilo, the uncle of the present Prince, went to Russia to be consecrated Bishop of Montenegro. The czar seems to have laughed him out of this ancient practice; and the late Prince instead of converting himself into monk and bishop returned to his own country and married [1851]. . . . Prince Danilo was assassinated at Cattaro (1860). . . . He was succeeded by his nephew Nicholas."—J. G. C. Minchin, *Serbia and Montenegro (National Life and Thought, lect. 19)*.—"The present form of government in Montenegro is at once the most despotic and the most popular in Europe—despotic, because the will of the Prince is the law of the land; and popular, because the personal rule of the Prince meets all the wants and wishes of the people. No Sovereign in Europe sits so firmly on his throne as the Prince of this little State, and no Sovereign is so absolute. The Montenegrins have no army; they are themselves a standing army."—J. G. C. Minchin, *The Growth of Freedom in the Balkan Peninsula, ch. 1*.—A. A. Paton, *Researches on the Danube and the Adriatic, bk. 2, ch. 7 (n. 1)*.—L. Von Ranke, *Hist. of Serbia, &c.: Slave Provinces of Turkey, ch. 2-6*.—"Montenegro is an extremely curious instance of the way in which favourable geographical conditions may aid a small people to achieve a fame and a place in the world quite out of proportion to their numbers. The Black Mountain is the one place where a South Slavonic community maintained themselves in independence, sometimes seeing their territory overrun by the Turks, but never acknowledging Turkish authority de jure from the time of the Turkish Conquest of the 15th century down to the Treaty of Berlin. Montenegro could not have done that but for her geographical structure. She is a high mass of limestone; you cannot call it a plateau, because it is seamed by many valleys, and rises into many sharp mountain-peaks. Still, it is a mountain mass, the average height of which is rather more than 2,000 feet above the sea, with summits reaching 5,000. It is bare

limestone, so that there is hardly anything grown on it, only grass—and very good grass—in spots, with little patches of corn and potatoes, and it has scarcely any water. Its upland is covered with snow in winter, while in summer the invaders have to carry their water with them, a serious difficulty when there were no roads, and active mountaineers fired from behind every rock, a difficulty which becomes more serious the larger the invading force. Consequently it is one of the most impracticable regions imaginable for an invading army. It is owing to those circumstances that this handful of people—because the Montenegrins of the 17th century did not number more than 40,000 or 50,000—have maintained their independence. That they did maintain it is a fact most important in the history of the Balkan Peninsula, and may have great consequences yet to come."—J. Bryce, *Relations of History and Geography (Contemp. Rev., Mar., 1880)*.

**14th-19th Centuries.—(Serbia): The long oppression of the Turk.—Struggle for freedom under Kara Georg and Milosch.—Independence achieved.—The Obrenovitch dynasty.**—"The brilliant victories of Stephan Dushan were a misfortune to Christendom. They shattered the Greek empire, the last feeble bulwark of Europe, and paved the way for those ultimate successes of the Asiatic conquerors which a timely union of strength might have prevented. Stephan Dushan conquered, but did not consolidate; and his scourging wars were insufficiently balanced by the advantage of the code of laws to which he gave his name. His son Urosh, being a weak and incapable prince, was murdered by one of the generals of the army, and thus ended the Neman dynasty, after having subsisted 212 years, and produced eight kings and two emperors. The crown now devolved on Knes, or Prince Lasar, a connexion of the house of Neman. . . . Of all the ancient rulers of the country, his memory is held the dearest by the Servians of the present day." Knes Lasar perished in the fatal battle of Kosovo, and with him fell the Servian monarchy (see **TURKS: A. D. 1360-1389, 1402-1451, and 1450; also MONTENEGRO**). "The Turkish conquest was followed by the gradual dispersion or disappearance of the native nobility of Serbia, the last of whom, the Brankovitch, lived as 'despots' in the castle of Semendria up to the beginning of the 18th century. . . . The period preceding the second siege of Vienna was the spring-tide of Islam conquest. After this event, in 1684, began the ebb. Hungary was lost to the Porte, and six years afterwards 37,000 Servian families emigrated into that kingdom; this first led the way to contact with the civilization of Germany. . . . Serbia Proper, for a short time wrested from the Porte by the victories of Prince Eugene, again became a part of the dominions of the Sultan [see **RUSSIA: A. D. 1739**]. But a turbulent militia overawed the government and tyrannized over the Rayahs. Pasvan Oglou and his bands at Widdin were, at the end of the last century, in open revolt against the Porte. Other chiefs had followed his example; and for the first time the Divan thought of associating Christian Rayahs with the spahis, to put down these rebels. The Dahis, as these brigand-chiefs were called, resolved to anticipate the approaching struggle by a massacre of the

most influential Christians. This atrocious massacre was carried out with indescribable horrors. . . . Kara Georg [Black George], a peasant, born at Topola about the year 1767, getting timely information that his name was in the list of the doomed, fled into the woods, and gradually organized a formidable force. In the name of the Porte he combated the Dalis, who had usurped local authority in defiance of the Pasha of Belgrade. The Divan, little anticipating the ultimate issue of the struggle in Servia, was at first delighted at the success of Kara Georg; but soon saw with consternation that the rising of the Servian peasants grew into a formidable rebellion, and ordered the Pashas of Bosnia and Scodra to assemble all their disposable forces and invade Servia. Between 40,000 and 50,000 Bosnia-caburs into Servia on the west, in the spring of 1806, cutting to pieces all who refused to receive Turkish authority. Kara Georg undauntedly met the storm," defeating the Turkish forces near Tchouprin, September, 1804, and more severely two years later (August, 1806) at Shabatz. In December of the same year he surprised and took Belgrade. "The succeeding years were passed in the vicissitudes of a guerilla warfare, neither party obtaining any marked success; and an auxiliary corps of Russians assisted in preventing the Turks from making the re-conquest of Servia. . . . Kara Georg was now a Russian lieutenant-general, and exercised an almost unlimited power in Servia; the revolution, after a struggle of eight years, appeared to be successful, but the momentous events then passing in Europe completely altered the aspect of affairs. Russia, in 1812, on the approach of the countless legions of Napoleon, precipitately concluded the treaty of Bucharest, the eighth article of which formally assured a separate administration to the Servians. Next year, however, was fatal to Kara Georg. In 1813, the vigour of the Ottoman empire . . . was now concentrated on the resubjugation of Servia. A general panic seemed to seize the nation; and Kara Georg and his companions in arms sought a retreat on the Austrian territory, and thence passed into Wallachia. In 1814, 300 Christians were impaled at Belgrade by the Pasha, and every valley in Servia presented the spectacle of infuriated Turkish spahis avenging on the Servians the blood, exile and confiscation of the ten preceding years. At this period, Milosh Obrenovitch appears prominently on the political tapis. He spent his youth in herding the famed swine of Servia; and during the revolution was employed by Kara Georg to watch the passes of the Balkans. . . . He now saw that a favourable conjuncture had come for his advancement from the position of chieftain to that of chief; he therefore lost no time in making terms with the Turks, offering to collect the tribute, to serve them faithfully, and to aid them in the resubjugation of the people. . . . He now displayed singular activity in the extirpation of all the other popular chiefs," until he found reason to suspect that the Turks were only using him to destroy him in the end. Then, in 1815, he turned upon them and raised the standard of revolt. The movement which he headed was so formidable that the Porte made haste to treat, and Milosh made favourable terms for himself, being reinstated as tribute-collector. "Many of the chiefs, impatient at the speedy submission of Milosh, wished to fight

the matter out, and Kara Georg, in order to give effect to their plans, landed in Servia. Milosh pretended to be friendly to his designs, but secretly betrayed his place of concealment to the governor, whose men broke into the cottage where he slept, and put him to death."—A. A. Paton, *Researches on the Danube and the Adriatic*, bk. 1, ch. 3.—"In 1817 Milosh was proclaimed hereditary Prince of Servia by the National Assembly. . . . In 1830 the autonomy of Servia was at length solemnly recognized by the Porte, and Milosh proclaimed 'the father of the Fatherland.' . . . If asked why the descendants of Milosh still rule over Servia, and not the descendants of Kara George, my answer is that every step in Servian progress is connected with the Obrenovitch dynasty. The liberation of the country, the creation of a peasant proprietary, the final withdrawal of the Turkish troops from Belgrade in 1862, the independence of the country, the extension of its territory, and the making of its railways,—all of these are among the results of Obrenovitch rule. The founder of the dynasty had in 1830 a great opportunity of making his people free as well as independent. But Milosh had lived too long with Turks to be a lover of freedom. . . . In 1839 Milosh abdicated. The reason for this step was that he refused to accept a constitution which Russia and Turkey concocted for him. This charter vested the actual government of the country in a Senate composed of Milosh's rivals, and entirely independent of that Prince. . . . It was anti-democratic, no less than anti-dynastic. Milosh was succeeded first by his son Milan, and on Milan's death by Michael. Michael was too gentle for the troubled times in which he lived, and after a two years' reign he too started upon his travels. . . . When Michael crossed the Save, Alexander Kara Georgevitch was elected Prince of Servia. From 1842 to 1858 the son of Black George lived—he can scarcely be said to have reigned—in Belgrade. During these 17 years this feeble son of a strong man did absolutely nothing for his country. . . . Late in 1858 he fled from Servia, and Milosh ruled in his stead. Milosh is the Grand Old Man of Serb history. His mere presence in Servia checked the intrigues of foreign powers. He died peacefully in his bed. . . . Michael succeeded his father. . . . Prince Michael was murdered by convicts in the park at Topsisidera near Belgrade." He "was succeeded (1868) by Milan, the grandson of Zepherm, the brother of Milosh. As Milan was barely fourteen years of age, a Regency of three was appointed."—J. G. C. Minchin, *Servia and Montenegro (National Life and Thought, lect. 19)*.

ALSO IN: E. de Laveleye, *The Balkan Peninsula*, ch. 6.

A. D. 1718 (Bosnia).—A part ceded to Austria by the Turks. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1699-1718.

A. D. 1739 (Bosnia and Roumania).—Entire restoration of Bosnia to the Turks, and Cession of Austrian Wallachia. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1725-1739.

19th Century (Roumania and Servia).—Awakening of a National Spirit.—The effect of historical teaching.—"No political fact is of more importance and interest in modern continental history than the tenacity with which the smaller nations of Europe preserve their pride of nationality in the face of the growing tendency

towards the formation of large, strongly concentrated empires, supported by powerful armies. Why should Portugal utterly refuse to unite with Spain? Why do Holland and Belgium cling to their existence as separate States, in spite of all the efforts of statesmen to join them? Why do the people of Bohemia and Croatia, of Finland, and of Poland, refuse to coalesce with the rest of the population of the empires of which they form but small sections? Why, finally, do the new kingdoms of Roumania and Servia show such astonishing vitality? The arguments as to distinctive race or distinctive language fail to answer all these questions. . . . This rekindling of the national spirit is the result chiefly of the development of the new historical school all over the Continent. Instead of remaining in ignorance of their past history, or, at best, regarding a mass of legends as containing the true tale of their countries' achievements, these small nations have now learnt from the works of their great historians what the story of their fatherlands really is, and what title they have to be proud of their ancestors. These great historians—Herulano, Pnlucky, Széchenyi, and the rest—who made it their aim to tell the truth and not to show off the beauties of a fine literary style, all belonged to the generation which had its interest aroused in the history of the past by the novels of Sir Walter Scott and the productions of the Romantic School, and they all learnt how history was to be studied, and then written, from Niebuhr, Von Ranke and their disciples and followers. From these masters they learnt that their histories were not to be made interesting at the expense of truth. . . . The vitality of the new historical school in Roumania is particularly remarkable, for in the Danubian provinces, which form that kingdom, even more strenuous efforts had been made to stemp out the national spirit than in Bohemia. The extraordinary rapidity with which the Roumanian people has reasserted itself in recent years, is one of the most remarkable facts in modern European history, and it is largely due to the labours of its historians. Up till 1822 the Roumanian language was vigorously proscribed; the rulers of the Danubian provinces permitted instruction to the upper classes in the language of the rulers only, and while Slavonic, and in the days of the Phanariots Greek, was the official and fashionable language, used in educating the nobility and bourgeois, the peasants were left in ignorance. Four men, whose names deserve record, first endeavoured to raise the Roumanian language to a literary level, and not only studied Roumanian history, but tried to teach the Roumanian people something of their own early history. Of these four, George Schinkaf was by far the most remarkable. He was an inhabitant of Transylvania, a Roumanian province which still remains subject to Hungary, and he first thought of trying to revive the Roumanian nationality by teaching the people their history. He arranged the annals of his country from A. D. 86 to A. D. 1739 with indefatigable labour, during the last half of the 18th century, and, according to Edgar Quinet, in such a truly modern manner, after such careful weighing of original authorities, and with such critical power, that he deserves to be ranked with the creators of the modern historical school. It need hardly be said that Schinkaf's History was not allowed to be printed by the Hungarian

authorities, who had no desire to see the Roumanian nationality re-assert itself, and the censor marked on it 'opis igne, auctor putibulo dignus.' It was not published until 1853, more than forty years after its completion, and then only at Jassy, for the Hungarians still proscribed it in Transylvania. Schinkaf's friend, Peter Major, was more fortunate in his work, a 'History of the Origin of the Roumanians in Dacia,' which, as it did not touch on modern society, was passed by the Hungarian censorship, and printed at Buda Pesth in 1813. The two men who first taught Roumanian history in the provinces which now form the kingdom of Roumania were not such learned men as Schinkaf and Peter Major, but their work was of more practical importance. In 1813 George Asaky got leave to open a Roumanian class at the Greek Academy of Jassy, under the pretext that it was necessary to teach surveying in the Roumanian tongue, because of the questions which constantly arose in that profession, in which it would be necessary to speak to the peasants in their own language, and in his lectures he carefully inserted lessons in Roumanian history, and tried to arouse the spirit of the people. George Lazarus imitated him at Bucharest in 1816, and the fruit of this instruction was seen when the Roumanians partially regained their freedom. The Moldo-Wallachian princes encouraged the teaching of Roumanian history, as they encouraged the growth of the spirit of Roumanian independence, and when the Roumanian Academy was founded, an historical section was formed with the special mission of studying and publishing documents connected with Roumanian history. The modern scientific spirit has spread widely throughout the kingdom."—H. Morse Stephens, *Modern History us and Small Nationalities* (*Cont. ap. Rev.*, July, 1887).

**A. D. 1829 (Roumania, or Wallachia and Moldavia).—Important provisions of the Treaty of Adrianople.—Life Election of the Hospodars.—Substantial independence of the Turk.** See **TURKS:** A. D. 1826-1829.

**A. D. 1856 (Roumania, or Wallachia and Moldavia).—Privileges guaranteed by the Treaty of Paris.** See **RUSSIA:** A. D. 1854-1856.

**A. D. 1858-1866.—(Roumania or Wallachia and Moldavia).—Union of the two provinces under one Crown.—Accession of Prince Charles of Hohenzollern.** See **TURKS:** A. D. 1861-1877.

**A. D. 1875-1878.—The Breaking of the Turkish yoke.—Bulgarian atrocities.—Russo-Turkish War.**—In 1875, a revolt broke out in Herzegovina. "The efforts made to suppress the growing revolt strained the already weakened resources of the Porte, until they could bear up against it no longer, and the Herzegovinese rebellion proved the last straw which broke the back of Turkish solvency. . . . The hopes of the insurgents were of course quickened by this catastrophe, which, as they saw, would alienate much sympathy from the Turks. The advisers of the Sultan, therefore, thought it necessary to be conciliatory, and . . . they induced him to issue an Iradé, or circular note, promising the remission of taxes, and economical and social reforms. . . . Europe, however, had grown tired of the Porte's promises of amendment, and for some time the Imperial Powers had been laying their hands together, and the result of their cou-

sultations was the Andrassy Note. The date of this document was December 30th, 1875, and it was sent to those of the Western Powers who had signed the treaties of 1856. It declared that although the spirit of the suggested reforms was good, there was some doubt whether the Porte had the strength to carry them out; Count Andrassy, therefore, proposed that the execution of the necessary measures should be placed under the care of a special commission, half the members of which should be Mussulmans and half Christians. . . . It concluded with a serious warning, that if the war was not gone with the snow, 'the Governments of Servia and Montenegro, which have had great dilliculty in keeping aloof from the movement, will be unable to resist the current.' . . . It was evident, however, that this note would have but little or no effect; it contained no coercive precautions, and accordingly the Porte quietly allowed the question to drop, and contented himself with profuse promises. . . . So affairs drifted on; the little war continued to sputter on the frontier; reinforced by Servians and Montenegrins, the Herzegovinese succeeded in keeping their enemy at bay, and, instigated, it is said, by Russian emissaries, put forward demands which the Porte was unable to accept. . . . The Powers, in no wise disconcerted by the failure of their first attempt to settle the difficulties between the Sultan and his rebellious subjects, had published a sequel to the Andrassy Note. There was an informal conference of the three Imperial Chancellors, Prince Bismarck, Prince Gortschakoff, and Count Andrassy, at Berlin, in May. . . . Then on May 18th the Ambassadors of England, France, and Italy were invited to Prince Bismarck's house, and the text of the famous Berlin Memorandum was laid before them. . . . While the three Chancellors were forging their diplomatic thunderbolt, a catastrophe of such a terrible nature had occurred in the interior of Turkey that all talk of armistices and mixed commissions had become stale and unprofitable. The Berlin Memorandum was not even presented to the Porte; for a rumour, though carefully suppressed by Turkish officials, was beginning to leak out that there had been an insurrection of the Christian population of Bulgaria, and that the most horrible atrocities had been committed by the Turkish irregular troops in its suppression. It was communicated to Lord Derby by Sir Henry Elliot on the 4th of May. . . . On June 16th a letter was received from him at the Foreign Office, saying, 'The Bulgarian insurrection appears to be unquestionably put down, although I regret to say, with cruelty, and, in some places, with brutality.' . . . A week afterwards the Constantinople correspondent of the Daily News . . . gave the estimates of Bulgarians slain as varying from 18,000 to 30,000, and the number of villages destroyed at about a hundred. . . . That there was much truth in the statements of the newspaper correspondents was . . . demonstrated beyond possibility of denial as soon as Sir Henry Elliot's despatches were made public. . . . 'I am satisfied,' wrote Sir Henry Elliot, 'that, while great atrocities have been committed, both by Turks upon Christians and Christians upon Turks, the former have been by far the greatest, although the Christians were undoubtedly the first to commence them.' . . . Meanwhile, the Daily News had resolved on sending out a special commissioner to make an investi-

gation independent of official reports. Mr. J. A. MacGahan, an American, who had been one of that journal's correspondents during the Franco-German War, was the person selected. He started in company with Mr. Eugene Schuyler, the great authority on the Central Asian question, who, in the capacity of Consul-General, was about to prepare a similar statement for the Hon. Horace Maynard, the United States Minister at Constantinople. They arrived at Philippopolis on the 25th of July, where Mr. Walter Baring, one of the Secretaries of the British Legation at Constantinople, was already engaged in collecting information. The first of Mr. MacGahan's letters was dated July the 28th, and its publication in this country revived in a moment the half-extinct excitement of the populace. . . . Perhaps the passage which was most frequently in men's mouths at the time was that in which he described the appearance of the mountain village of Batak. 'We entered the town. On 'ever' side were skulls and skeletons charred among the ruins, or lying entire where they fell in their clothing. There were skeletons of girls and women, with long brown hair hanging to their skulls. We approached the church. There these remains were more frequent, until the ground was literally covered by skeletons, skulls, and putrefying bodies in clothing. Between the church and school there were heaps. The stench was fearful. We entered the churehyard. The sight was more dreadful. The whole churchyard, for three feet deep, was festering with dead bodies, partly covered; hands, legs, arms, and heads projecting in ghastly confusion. I saw many little hands, heads, and feet of children three years of age, and girls with heads covered with beautiful hair. The church was still worse. The floor was covered with rotting bodies quite uncovered. I never imagined anything so fearful. . . . The town had 9,000 inhabitants. There now remain 1,200. Many who had escaped had returned recently, weeping and moaning over their ruined homes. Their sorrowful wailing could be heard half a mile off. Some were digging out the skeletons of loved ones. A woman was sitting moaning over three small skulls, with hair clinging to them, which she had in her lap. The man who did this, Achmed Agra, has been promoted, and is still governor of the district.' An exceeding bitter cry of horror and disgust arose throughout the country on the receipt of this terrible news. Mr. Anderson at once asked for information on the subject, and Mr. Bourke was entrusted with the difficult duty of replying. He could only read a letter from Mr. Baring, in which he said that, as far as he had been able to discover, the proportion of the numbers of the slain was about 12,000 Bulgarians to 500 Turks, and that 60 villages had been wholly or partially burnt. . . . Mr Schuyler's opinions were, as might be expected from the circumstance that his investigations had been shorter than those of Mr. Baring, and that he was ignorant of the Turkish language—which is that chiefly spoken in Bulgaria—and was therefore at the mercy of his interpreter, the more highly coloured. He totally rejected Lord Beaconsfield's idea that there had been a civil war, and that cruelties had been committed on both sides. On the contrary he asserted that 'the insurgent villages made little or no resistance. In many



cases they surrendered their arms on the first demand. . . . No Turkish women or children were killed in cold blood. No Mussulman women were violated. No Mussulmans were tortured. No purely Turkish village was attacked or burnt. No Mosque was desecrated or destroyed. The Bashi-Bazouks, on the other hand, had burnt about 65 villages, and killed at least 15,000 Bulgarians.' The terrible story of the destruction of Batak was told in language of precisely similar import to that of Mr. MacGahan, whose narrative the American Consul had never seen, though there was a slight difference in the numbers of the massacred. 'Of the 8,000 inhabitants,' he said, 'not 2,000 are known to survive'. . . . Abdul Aziz had let loose the hordes of Bashi-Bazouks on defenceless Bulgaria, but Murad seemed utterly unable to rectify the fatal error; the province fell into a state of complete anarchy. . . . As Lord Derby remarked, it was impossible to effect much with an imbecile monarch and bankrupt treasury. One thing, at any rate, the Turks were strong enough to do, and that was to defeat the Servians, who declared war on Turkey on July 1st. . . . Up to the last Prince Milan declared that his intentions were purely pacific; but the increasing troubles of the Porte enabled him, with some small chance of success, to avail himself of the anti-Turkish spirit of his people and to declare war. His example was followed by Prince Nikita of Montenegro, who set out with his brave little army from Cetigne on July 2nd. At first it appeared as if the principalities would have the better of the struggle. The Turkish generals showed their usual dilatoriness in attacking Servia, and Tchernaeff, who was a man of considerable military talent, gave them the good-bye, and cut them off from their base of operations. This success was, however, transitory; Abdul Kerim, the Turkish Commander-in-Chief, drove back the enemy by mere force of numbers, and by the end of the month he was over the border. Meanwhile, the hardy Montenegrins had been considerably more fortunate; but their victories over Mukhtar Pasha were not sufficiently important to effect a diversion. The Servians fell back from all their positions of defence, and on September 1st received a most disastrous beating before the walls of Alexinatz. . . . On September 16th the Porte agreed to a suspension of hostilities until the 25th. It must be acknowledged that the Servians used this period of grace exceedingly ill. Prince Milan was proclaimed by General Tchernaeff, in his absence and against his will, King of Servia and Bosnia; and though, on the remonstrance of the Powers, he readily consented to waive the obnoxious title, the evil effect of the declaration remained. Lord Derby's proposals for peace, which were made on September 21st, were nevertheless accepted by the Sultan when he saw that unanimity prevailed among the Powers, and he offered in addition to prolong the formal suspension of hostilities to October 2nd. This offer the Servians, relying on the Russian volunteers who were flocking to join Tchernaeff, rejected with some contempt, and hostilities were resumed. They paid dearly for their temerity. Tchernaeff's position before Alexinatz was forced by the Turks after three days' severe fighting; position after position yielded to them; on October 31st Alexinatz was taken,

and Deligrad was occupied on November 1st. Nothing remained between the outpost of the crescent and Belgrade, and it seemed as if the new Kingdom of Servia must perish in the throes of its birth." Russia now invoked the intervention of the powers, and brought about a conference at Constantinople, which effected nothing, the Porte rejecting all the proposals submitted. On the 24th of April, 1877, Russia declared war and entered upon a conflict with the Turks, which had for its result the readjustment of affairs in South-eastern Europe by the Congress and Treaty of Berlin.—*Cassell's Illustrated History of England*, v. 10, ch. 22-23.—See **TURKS: A. D. 1877-1878**, and 1878.

**A. D. 1878.—Treaty of Berlin.—Transfer of Bosnia to Austria.—Independence of Servia, Montenegro and Roumania.—Division and semi-independence of Bulgaria.**—“(1) Bosnia, including Herzegovina, was assigned to Austria for permanent occupation. Thus Turkey lost a great province of nearly 1,250,000 inhabitants. Of these about 500,000 were Christians of the Greek Church, 450,000 were Mohammedans, mainly in the towns, who offered a stout resistance to the Austrian troops, and 200,000 Roman Catholics. By the occupation of the Novi-Bazar district Austria wedged in her forces between Montenegro and Servia, and was also able to keep watch over the turbulent province of Macedonia. (2) Montenegro received less than the San Stefano terms had promised her, but secured the seaports of Antivari and Duleigno. It needed a demonstration of the European fleets off the latter port, and a threat to seize Smyrna, to make the Turks yield Duleigno to the Montenegrins (who alone of all the Christian races of the peninsula had never been conquered by the Turks). (3) Servia was proclaimed an independent Principality, and received the district of Old Servia on the upper valley of the Morava. (4) Roumania also gained her independence and ceased to pay any tribute to the Porte, but had to give up to her Russian benefactors the slice acquired from Russia in 1856 between the Pruth and the northern mouth of the Danube. In return for this sacrifice she gained the large but marshy Dobruzscha district from Bulgaria, and so acquired the port of Kustendje on the Black Sea. (5) Bulgaria, which, according to the San Stefano terms, would have been an independent State as large as Roumania, was by the Berlin Treaty subjected to the suzerainty of the sultan, divided into two parts, and confined within much narrower limits. Besides the Dobruzscha, it lost the northern or Bulgarian part of Macedonia, and the Bulgarians who dwelt between the Balkans and Adrianople were separated from their kinsfolk on the north of the Balkans, in a province called Eastern Roumelia, with Philippopolis as capital. The latter province was to remain Turkish, under a Christian governor nominated by the Porte with the consent of the Powers. Turkey was allowed to occupy the passes of the Balkans in time of war.”—J. H. Rose, *A Century of Continental History*, ch. 42.—See **TURKS: A. D. 1878**.

ALSO IN: E. Hertslet, *The Map of Europe by Treaty*, v. 4, nos. 518, 524-532.

**A. D. 1878-1891.—Proposed Balkan Confederation and its aims.**—“During the reaction against Russia which followed the great war of 1878, negotiations were actually set on foot with a view to forming a combination of the Balkan

States for the purpose of resisting Russian aggression. . . . Prince Alexander always favoured the idea of a Balkan Confederation which was to include Turkey; and even listened to proposals on the part of Greece, defining the Bulgarian and Greek spheres of influence in Macedonia. But the revolt of Eastern Roumelia, followed by the Servo-Bulgarian war and the chastisement of Greece by the Powers, provoked so much bitterness of feeling among the rival races that for many years nothing more was heard of a Balkan Confederation. The idea has lately been revived under different auspices and with somewhat different aims. During the past six years the Triple Alliance, with England, has, despite the indifference of Prince Bismarck, protected the Balkan States in general, and Bulgaria in particular from the armed intervention of Russia. It has also acted the part of policeman in preserving the peace throughout the Peninsula, and in deterring the young nations from any dangerous indulgence in their angry passions. The most remarkable feature in the history of this period has been the extraordinary progress made by Bulgaria. Since the revolt of Eastern Roumelia, Bulgaria has been treated by Dame Europa as a naughty child. But the Bulgarians have been shrewd enough to see that the Central Powers and England have an interest in their national independence and consolidation; they have recognised the truth that fortune favours those who help themselves, and they have boldly taken their own course, while carefully avoiding any breach of the proprieties such as might again bring them under the censure of the European Aroopagus. They ventured, indeed, to elect a Prince of their own choosing without the sanction of that august conclave; the wisacres shook their heads, and prophesied that Prince Ferdinand's days in Bulgaria might, perhaps, be as many as Prince Alexander's years. Yet Prince Ferdinand remains on the throne, and is now engaged in celebrating the fourth anniversary of his accession; the internal development of the country proceeds apace, and the progress of the Bulgarian sentiment outside the country—in other words, the Macedonian propaganda—is not a whit behind. The Bulgarians have made their greatest strides in Macedonia since the fall of Prince Bismarck, who was always ready to humour Russia at the expense of Bulgaria. . . . What happened after the great war of 1878? A portion of the Bulgarian race was given a nominal freedom which was never expected to be a reality; Russia pounced on Bessarabia, England on Cyprus, Austria on Bosnia and Herzegovina, France got something elsewhere, but that is another matter. The Bulgarians have never forgiven Lord Beaconsfield for the division of their race, and I have seen some bitter poems upon the great Israelite in the Bulgarian tongue which many Englishmen would not care to hear translated. The Greeks have hated us since our occupation of Cyprus, and firmly believe that we mean to take Crete as well. The Servians have not forgotten how Russia, after instigating them to two disastrous wars, dealt with their claims at San Stefano; they cannot forgive Austria for her occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and every Servian peasant, as he pays his heavy taxes, or reluctantly gives a big price for some worthless imported article, feels the galling yoke of her fiscal and commercial tyranny. Need it be

said how outraged Bulgaria scowls at Russia, or how Roumania, who won Plevna for her heartless ally, weeps for her Bessarabian children, and will not be comforted? It is evident that the Balkan peoples have no reason to expect much benefit from the next great war, from the European Conference which will follow it, or from the sympathy of the Christian Powers. . . . What, then, do the authors of the proposed Confederation suggest as its ultimate aim and object? The Balkan States are to act independently of the foreign Powers, and in concert with one another. The Sick Man's inheritance lies before them, and they are to take it when an opportunity presents itself. They must not wait for the great Armageddon, for then all may be lost. If the Central Powers come victorious out of the conflict, Austria, it is believed, will go to Salonika; if Russia conquers, she will plant her standard at Stamboul, and practically annex the Peninsula. In either case the hopes of the young nations will be destroyed forever. It is, therefore, sought to extricate a portion at least of the Eastern Question from the tangled web of European politics, to isolate it, to deal with it as a matter which solely concerns the Sick Man and his immediate successors. It is hoped that the Sick Man may be induced by the determined attitude of his expectant heirs to make over to them their several portions in his lifetime; should he refuse, they must act in concert, and provide euthanasia for the moribund owner of Macedonia, Crete, and Thrace. In other words, it is believed that the Balkan States, if once they could come to an understanding as regards their claims to what is left of the Ottoman Empire in Europe, might conjointly, and without the aid of any foreign Power, bring such pressure to bear upon Turkey as to induce her to surrender peacefully her European possessions, and to content herself henceforth with the position of an Asiatic Power." —J. D. Bouchier, *A Balkan Confederation* (*Fortnightly Review*, Sept., 1891).

**A. D. 1878-1886 (Bulgaria):** Rennon of the two Bulgarians.—Hostility of Russia.—Victorious war with Servia.—Abduction and abdication of Prince Alexander.—“The Berlin Treaty, by cutting Bulgaria into three pieces, contrary to the desire of her inhabitants, and with utter disregard of both geographical and ethnical fitness, had prepared the ground from which a crop of never-ending agitation was inevitably bound to spring—a crop which the Treaty of San Stefano would have ended in preventing. On either side of the Balkans, both in Bulgaria and in Roumelia, the same desire for union existed. Both parties were agreed as to this, and only differed as to the means by which the end should be attained. The Liberals were of opinion that the course of events ought to be awaited; the unionists, on the other hand, maintained that they could be challenged. It was a few individuals belonging to the latter party and acting with M. Karaveloff, the head of the Bulgarian Cabinet, who prepared and successfully carried out the revolution of September 18, 1885. So unanimously was this movement supported by the whole population, including even the Mussulmans, that it was accomplished and the union proclaimed without the least resistance being encountered, and without the shedding of one drop of blood! Prince Alexander was in no way made aware of what was in preparation;

but he knew very well that it would be his duty to place himself at the head of any national movement, and in a proclamation dated the 19th of September, and addressed from Tirnova, the ancient capital, he recommended union and assumed the title of Prince of North and South Bulgaria. The Porte protested in a circular, dated the 23rd of September, and called upon the Powers who had signed the Treaty of Berlin, to enforce the observance of its stipulations. On the 13th of October, the Powers collectively declare 'that they condemn this violation of the Treaty, and are sure that the Sultan will do all that he can, consistently with his sovereign rights, before resorting to the force which he has at his disposal.' From the moment when there was opposition to the use of force, which even the Porte did not seem in a hurry to employ, the union of the two Bulgarias necessarily became an accomplished fact. . . . Whilst England and Austria both accepted the union of the two Bulgarias as being rendered necessary by the position of affairs, whilst even the Porte (although protesting) was resigned, the Emperor of Russia displayed a passionate hostility to it, not at all in accord with the feelings of the Russian nation. . . . In Russia they had reckoned upon all the liberties guaranteed by the Constitution of Tirnova becoming so many causes of disorder and anarchy, instead of which the Bulgarians were growing accustomed to freedom. Schools were being endowed, the country was progressing in every way, and thus the Bulgarians were becoming less and less fitted for transformation into Russian subjects. Their lot was a preferable one, by far, to that of the people of Russia—henceforth they would refuse to accept the Russian yoke! . . . If, then, Russia wanted to maintain her high-handed policy in Bulgaria, she must oppose the union and hinder the consolidation of Bulgarian nationality by every means in her power; this she has done without scruple of any sort or kind, as will be shown by a brief epitome of what has happened recently. Servia, hoping to extend her territory in the direction of Tru and Widdin, and, pleading regard for the Treaty of Berlin and the theory of the balance of power, attacks Bulgaria. On November 14th [17th to 19th?] 1885, Prince Alexander defends the Sliwnitza positions [in a three days' battle] with admirable courage and strategic skill. The Roumelian militia, coming in by forced marches of unheard-of length, perform prodigies of valour in the field. Within eight days, i. e., from the 20th to the 28th of November, the Servian army, far greater in numbers, is driven back into its own territory; the Dragoman Pass is crossed; Plrot is taken by assault; and Prince Alexander is marching on Nishe, when his victorious progress is arrested by the Austrian Minister, under threats of an armed intervention on the part of that country! On December 21st, an armistice is concluded, afterwards made into a treaty of peace, and signed at Bucharest on March 3rd by M. Miyatovitch on behalf of Servia, by M. Gucehoff on behalf of Bulgaria, and by Madjid Pascha for the Sultan. Prince Alexander did all he could to bring about a reconciliation with the Czar and even went so far as to attribute to Russian instructors all the merit of the victories he had just won. The Czar would not yield. Then the Prince turned to the Sultan, and with

him succeeded in coming to a direct understanding. The Prince was to be nominated Governor-General of Roumelia; a mixed Commission was to meet and modify the Roumelian statutes; more than this, the Porte was bound to place troops at his disposal, in the event of his being attacked. . . . From that date the Czar swore that he would cause Prince Alexander's downfall. It was said that Prince Alexander of Battenberg had changed into a sword the sceptre which Russia had given him and was going to turn it against his benefactor. Nothing could be more untrue. Up to the very last moment, he did everything he could to disarm the anger of the Czar, but what was wanted from him was this—that he should make Bulgaria an obedient satellite of Russia, and rather than consent to do so he left Sofia. The story of the Prince's dethronement by Russian influence, or, as Lord Salisbury said, by Russian gold, is well known. A handful of malcontent officers, a few cadets of the École Militaire, and some of Zankoff's adherents, banding themselves together, broke into the palace during the night of the 21st of August, seized the Prince, and had him carried off, without escort, to Rahova on the Danube, from thence to Renl in Bessarabia, where he was handed over to the Russians! The conspirators endeavoured to form a government, but the whole country rose against them, in spite of the support openly given them by M. Bogdanoff the Russian diplomatic agent. On the 3rd of September, a few days after these occurrences, Prince Alexander returned to his capital, welcomed home by the acclamations of the whole people; but in answer to a respectful, not to say too humble, telegram in which he offered to replace his Crown in the hands of the Czar, that potentate replied that he ceased to have any relations with Bulgaria as long as Prince Alexander remained there. Owing to advice which came, no doubt, from Berlin, Prince Alexander decided to abdicate; he did so because of the demands of the Czar and in the interests of Bulgaria."—E. de Laveleye, *The Balkan Peninsula, Intro.*

ALSO IN: A. Von Huhn, *The Struggle of the Bulgarians*.—J. G. C. Minehin, *Growth of Freedom in the Balkan Peninsula*.—A. Koch, *Prince Alexander of Battenberg*.

A. D. 1879-1889 (Servia).—Quarrels and divorce of King Milan and Queen Natalia.—Abdication of the King.—"In October, 1875. . . . Milan, then but twenty-one years old, married Natalia Keckko, herself but sixteen. The present Queen was the daughter of a Russian officer and of the Princess Pulckerle Stourza. She, as little as her husband, had been born with a likelihood to sit upon the throne, and a quiet burgher education had been hers at Odessa. But even here her great beauty attracted notice, as also her abilities, her ambition and her wealth. . . . At first all went well, to outward appearance at least, for Milan was deeply enamoured of his beautiful wife, who soon became the idol of the Servians, on account of her beauty and her amiability. This affection was but increased when, a year after her marriage, she presented her subjects with an heir. But from that hour the domestic discord began. The Queen had been ill long and seriously after her boy's birth; Milan had sought distractions elsewhere. Scenes of jealousy and recrimination

grew frequent. Further, Servia was then passing through a difficult political crisis: the Turkish war was in full swing. Milan, little beloved ever since he began to reign, brought home no wreaths from this conflict, although his subjects distinguished themselves by their valour. Then followed in 1882 the raising of the principality into a kingdom—a fact which left the Servians very indifferent, and in which they merely beheld the prospect of increased taxes, a provision that was realized. As time went on, and troubles increased, King Milan became somewhat of a despot, who was sustained solely by the army, itself undermined by factious intrigues. Meantime the Queen, now grown somewhat callous to her husband's infidelities, aspired to comfort herself by assuming a political rôle, for which she believed herself to have great aptitude. . . . As she could not influence the decisions of the Prince, she entered into opposition to him, and made it her aim to oppose all his projects. The quarrel spread throughout the entire Palace, and two inimical factions were formed, that of the King and that of the Queen. . . . Meantime Milan got deeper and deeper into debt, so that after a time he had almost mortgaged his territory. . . . While the husband and wife were thus quarrelling and going their own ways, grave events were maturing in neighbouring Bulgaria. The coup d'état of Fillippopolis, which annexed Eastern Roumelia to the principality, enlarged it in such wise that Servia henceforth had to cut a sorry figure in the Balkans. Milan roused himself, or pretended to rouse himself, and war was declared against Bulgaria. . . . There followed the crushing defeat of Silvitza, in which Prince Alexander of Battenberg carried off such laurels, and the Servians had to beat a disgraceful and precipitate retreat. Far from proving himself the hero Nathalie had dreamed, Milan . . . telegraphed to the Queen, busied with tending the wounded, that he intended to abdicate forthwith. This cowardly conduct gave the death blow to any

feeling the Queen might have retained for the King. Henceforth she despised him, and took no pains to hide the fact. . . . In 1887 the pair parted without outward scandals, the Queen taking with her the Crown Prince. . . . Florence was the goal of the Queen's wanderings, and here she spent a quiet winter. . . . The winter ended, Nathalie desired to return to Belgrade. Milan would not hear of it. . . . The Queen went to Westhaden in consequence. While residing there Milan professed to be suddenly taken with a paternal craving to see his son. . . . And to the shame of the German Government, he it said, they lent their hand to abducting an only child from his mother. . . . Before ever the excitement about this act could subside in Europe, Milan . . . petitioned the Servian Synod for a divorce, on the ground of 'irreconcilable mutual antipathy.' Neither by canonical or civil law was this possible, and the Queen refused her consent. . . . Nor could the divorce have been obtained but for the servile complaisance of the Servian Metropolitan Theodore. . . . Quick vengeance, however, was in store for Milan. The international affairs of Servia had grown more and more disturbed. . . . The King, perplexed and afraid, storm-tossed between divided counsels, highly irritable, and deeply impressed by Rudolph of Hapsburg's recent suicide, suddenly announced his intention to abdicate in favour of his son. . . . Without regret his people saw depart from among them a man who at thirty-five years of age was already decrepit, and who had not the pluck or ambition to try and overcome a difficult political crisis. . . . After kneeling down before his son and swearing fidelity to him as a subject (March, 1889), Milan betook himself off to tour through Europe . . . leaving the little boy and his guardians to extricate themselves. . . . 'Now I can see mamma again,' were the first words of the boy King on hearing of his elevation. . . . Three Regents are appointed to aid the King during his minority." — "Politkos," *The Sovereigns*, pp. 353-363.

**BALKH.**—Destruction by Jingsis Khan (A. D. 1221).—From his conquest of the region beyond the Oxus, Jingsis Khan moved southward with his vast horde of Mongols, in pursuit of the fugitive Khahrezmian prince, in 1220 or 1221, and invested the great city of Balkh,—which is thought in the east to be the oldest city of the world, and which may not impossibly have been one of the capitals of the primitive Aryan race. "Some idea of its extent and riches [at that time] may possibly be formed from the statement that it contained 1,200 large mosques, without including chapels, and 200 public baths for the use of foreign merchants and travellers,—though it has been suggested that the more correct reading would be 200 mosques and 1,200 baths. Anxious to avert the horrors of storm and pillage, the citizens at once offered to capitulate; but Chinghiz, distrusting the sincerity of their submission so long as Sultan Mohammed Shah was yet alive, preferred to carry the place by force of arms—an achievement of no great difficulty. A horrible butchery ensued, and the 'Tabernacle of Islam'—as the pious town was called—was razed to the ground. In the words of the Persian poet, quoted by Major Price, 'The noble city he laid as smooth as the palm of his hand—its spacious and lofty structures he

levelled in the dust.'"—J. Hutton, *Central Asia*, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: H. H. Howorth, *Hist. of the Mongols*, v. 1, ch. 3.

**BALL'S BLUFF, The Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (OCTOBER: VIRGINIA).

**BALMACEDA'S DICTATORSHIP.** See CHILE: A. D. 1885-1891.

**BALNEÆ.** See THERMÆ.

**BALTHI, OR BALTHINGS.**—"The rulers of the Visigoths, though they, like the Amlal kings of the Ostrogoths, had a great house, the Balthi, sprung from the seed of gods, did not at this time [when driven across the Danube by the Huns] bear the title of King, but contented themselves with some humbler designation, which the Latin historians translated into Judex (Judge)."—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, int., ch. 3.—See BAUX, LORDS OF.

**BALTIMORE, Lord, and the Colonization of Maryland.** See MARYLAND: A. D. 1632, to 1688-1757.

**BALTIMORE, A. D. 1729-1730.**—Founding of the city. See MARYLAND: A. D. 1729-1730.

**A. D. 1812.**—Rioting of the War Party.—The mob and the Federalists. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812 (JUNE—OCTOBER).

**A. D. 1814.**—British attempt against the city. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1814 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER).

**A. D. 1860.**—The Douglas Democratic and Constitutional Union Conventions. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1860 (APRIL—NOVEMBER).

**A. D. 1861 (April).**—The city controlled by the Secessionists.—The Attack on the Sixth Massachusetts Regiment. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (APRIL).

**A. D. 1861 (May).**—Disloyalty put down. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (APRIL—MAY; MARYLAND).

**BALUCHISTAN.** See Supplement in v. 5.

**BAN.—BANAT.**—"Ban is Duke (DUX), and Banat is Duchy. The territory [Hungarian] east of the Carpathians is the Banat of Severin and that of the west the Banat of Temes." The Banat is the cornucopia, not only of Hungary, but of the whole Austrian Empire."—A. A. Paton, *Researches on the Danube and the Adriatic*, v. 2, p. 28.—Among the Croats, "after the king, the most important officers of the state were the bans. At first there was but one ban, who was a kind of lieutenant-general; but later on there were seven of them, each known by the name of the province he governed, as the ban of Sirmia, ban of Dalmatia, etc. To this day the royal lieutenant of Croatia (or 'governor-general,' if that title be preferred) is called the ban."—L. Leger, *Hist. of Austro-Hungary*, p. 55.

**BAN, The Imperial.** See SAXONY: A. D. 1178-1183.

**BANBURY, Battle of.**—Sometimes called the "Battle of Edgecote"; fought July 20, 1469, and with success, by a body of Lancastrian insurgents, in the English "Wars of the Roses," against the forces of the Yorkist King, Edward IV. The latter were routed and most of their leaders taken and beheaded.—Mrs. Hookham, *Life and Times of Margaret of Anjou*, v. 2, ch. 5.

**BANDA ORIENTAL, The.**—Signifying the "Eastern Border"; a name applied originally by the Spaniards to the country on the eastern side of Rio de La Plata which afterwards took the name of Uruguay. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1580-1777.

**BANGALORE, Capture of (1790).** See INDIA: A. D. 1785-1793.

**BANK OF ST. GEORGE.** See GENOA: A. D. 1407-1448.

**BANK OF THE UNITED STATES.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1833-1836.

**BANKS, General Nathaniel P.**—Command in the Shenandoah. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (MAY—JUNE; VIRGINIA). . . . **Siege and Capture of Port Hudson.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (MAY—JULY; ON THE MISSISSIPPI). . . . **Red River Expedition.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MARCH—MAY; LOUISIANA).

**BANKS OF AMSTERDAM, ENGLAND AND FRANCE.**—The Bank of Amsterdam was founded in 1609, and replaced, after 1814, by the Netherland Bank. The Bank of England was founded in 1694 by William Patterson, a Scotchman; and that of France by John Law, in 1716. The latter collapsed with the Mississippi scheme and was revived in 1776.—J. J. Lalor, *ed. Cyclopædia of Pol. Science*.

ALSO IN: J. W. Gilbart, *Hist. and Principles of Banking*, sect. 1 and 3.

**BANKS, Wildcat.** See WILDCAT BANKS.

**BANNACKS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SHOSHONEAN FAMILY.

**BANNERETS, Knights.** See KNIGHTS BANNERETS.

**BANNOCKPURN, Battle of (A. D. 1314).** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1314; and 1314-1328.

**BANT, The.** See GAU.

**BANTU TRIBES, The.** See SOUTH AFRICA: THE ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS; and AFRICA: THE INHABITING RACES.

**BAPTISTS.** See article in the Supplement, v. 5.

**BAR, A. D. 1659-1735.**—The Duchy ceded to France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1659-1661, and 1733-1735.

**BAR, The Confederation of.** See POLAND: A. D. 1793-1773.

**BARATHRUM, The.**—"The barathrum, or 'pit of punishment' at Athens, was a deep hole like a well into which criminals were precipitated. Iron hooks were inserted in the sides, which tore the body in pieces as it fell. It corresponds to the Ceadas of the Lacedæmonians."—G. Rawlinson, *Hist. of Herodotus*, bk. 7, sect. 133, *note*.

**BARBALDOES: A. D. 1649-1660.**—Royalist attitude towards the English Commonwealth. See NAVIGATION LAWS: A. D. 1651.

**A. D. 1656.**—Cromwell's colony of disorderly women. See JAMAICA: A. D. 1655.

**BARBARIANS.** See ARYANS.

**BARBAROSSAS, Piracies and dominion of.** See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1516-1535.

## BARBARY STATES.

**A. D. 647-709.**—Mahometan conquest of North Africa. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 647-709.

**A. D. 908-1171.**—The Fatimite Caliphs. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST AND EMPIRE: A. D. 908-1171.

**A. D. 1415.**—Siege and capture of Ceuta by the Portuguese. See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1415-1460.

**A. D. 1505-1510.**—Spanish conquests on the coast.—Oran.—Bugia.—Algiers.—Tripoli.—In 1505, a Spanish expedition planned and urged by Cardinal Ximenes, captured Mazarquivel, an

"important port, and formidable nest of pirates, on the Barbary coast, nearly opposite Carthage." In 1509, the same energetic prelate led personally an expedition of 4,000 horse and 10,000 foot, with a fleet of 10 galleys and 80 smaller vessels, for the conquest of Oran. "This place, situated about a league from the former, was one of the most considerable of the Moslem possessions in the Mediterranean, being a principal mart for the trade of the Levant," and maintained a swarm of cruisers, which swept the Mediterranean "and made fearful depredations on its populous borders." Oran was taken by

storm. "No mercy was shown; no respect for age or sex; and the soldiery abandoned themselves to all the brutal license and ferocity which seem to stain religious wars above every other. . . . No less than 4,000 Moors were said to have fallen in the battle, and from 5,000 to 8,000 were made prisoners. The loss of the Christians was inconsiderable." Recalled to Spain by King Ferdinand, Ximenes left the army in Africa under the command of Count Pedro Navarro. Navarro's "first enterprise was against Bugha (Jan. 13th, 1510), whose king, at the head of a powerful army, he routed in two pitched battles, and got possession of his flourishing capital (Jan. 31st). Algiers, Tunis, Tremeen, and other cities on the Barbary coast, submitted one after another to the Spanish arms. The inhabitants were received as vassals of the Catholic king. . . . They guaranteed, moreover, the liberation of all Christian captives in their dominions; for which the Algerines, however, took care to indemnify themselves, by extorting the full ransom from their Jewish residents. . . . On the 26th of July, 1510, the ancient city of Tripoli, after a most bloody and desperate defence, surrendered to the arms of the victorious general, whose name had now become terrible along the whole northern borders of Africa. In the following month, however (Aug. 28th), he met with a serious discomfiture in the island of Gelves, where 4,000 of his men were slain or made prisoners. This check in the brilliant career of Count Navarro put a final stop to the progress of the Castilian arms in Africa under Ferdinand. The results obtained, however, were of great importance. . . . Most of the new conquests escaped from the Spanish crown in later times, through the imbecility or indolence of Ferdinand's successors. The conquests of Ximenes, however, were placed in so strong a posture of defence as to resist every attempt for their recovery by the enemy, and to remain permanently incorporated with the Spanish empire."—W. H. Prescott, *Hist. of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella*, ch. 21 (v. 3).

**A. D. 1516-1535.—Piratical dominion of the Barbarossas in Algiers.—Establishment of Turkish sovereignty.—Seizure of Tunis by the Corsairs and its conquest by Charles V.**—"About the beginning of the 16th century, a sudden revolution happened, which, by rendering the states of Barbary formidable to the Europeans, hath made their history worthy of more attention. This revolution was brought about by persons born in a rank of life which entitled them to act no such illustrious part. Horuc and Hayradin, the sons of a potter in the isle of Lisbon, prompted by a restless and enterprising spirit, forsook their father's trade, ran to sea, and joined a crew of pirates. They soon distinguished themselves by their valor and activity, and becoming masters of a small brigantine, carried on their infamous trade with such conduct and success that they assembled a fleet of 12 galleys, besides many vessels of smaller force. Of this fleet Horuc, the elder brother, called Barbarossa from the red color of his beard, was admiral, and Hayradin second in command, but with almost equal authority. They called themselves the friends of the sea, and the enemies of all who sail upon it; and their names soon became terrible from the Straits of the Dardanelles to those of Gibraltar. . . . They often

carried the prizes which they took on the coasts of Spain and Italy into the ports of Barbary, and, enriching the inhabitants by the sale of their booty, and the thoughtless prodigality of their crews, were welcome guests in every place at which they touched. The convenient situation of these harbours, lying so near the greatest commercial states at that time in Christendom, made the brothers wish for an establishment in that country. An opportunity of accomplishing this quickly presented itself [1516], which they did not suffer to pass unimproved." Invited by Enteml, king of Algiers, to assist him in taking a Spanish fort which had been built in his neighbourhood, Barbarossa was able to murder his too confiding employer, master the Algerine kingdom and usurp its crown. "Not satisfied with the throne which he had acquired, he attacked the neighbouring king of Tremeen, and, having vanquished him in battle, added his dominions to those of Algiers. At the same time, he continued to infest the coasts of Spain and Italy with fleets which resembled the armaments of a great monarch, rather than the light squadrons of a corsair. Their frequent cruel devastations obliged Charles [the Fifth—the great Emperor and King of Spain: 1519-1555], about the beginning of his reign, to furnish the Marquis de Comares, governor of Oran, with troops sufficient to attack him." Barbarossa was defeated in the ensuing war, driven from Tremeen, and slain [1518]. "His brother Hayradin, known likewise by the name of Barbarossa, assumed the sceptre of Algiers with the same ambition and abilities, but with better fortune. His reign being undisturbed by the arms of the Spaniards, which had full occupation in the wars among the European powers, he regulated with admirable prudence the interior police of his kingdom, carried on his naval operations with great vigour, and extended his conquests on the continent of Africa. But perceiving that the Moors and Arabs submitted to his government with reluctance, and being afraid that his continual depredations would one day draw upon him the arms of the Christians, he put his dominions under the protection of the Grand Seigneur [1519], and received from him [with the title of Bey, or Beylerbey] a body of Turkish soldiers sufficient for his domestic as well as foreign enemies. At last, the fame of his exploits daily increasing, Solymann offered him the command of the Turkish fleet. . . . Barbarossa repaired to Constantinople, and . . . gained the entire confidence both of the sultan and his vizier. To them he communicated a scheme which he had formed of making himself master of Tunis, the most flourishing kingdom at that time on the coast of Africa; and this being approved of by them, he obtained whatever he demanded for carrying it into execution. His hopes of success in this undertaking were founded on the intestine divisions in the kingdom of Tunis." The last king of that country, having 34 sons by different wives, had established one of the younger sons on the throne as his successor. This young king attempted to put all of his brothers to death; but Alraschid, who was one of the eldest, escaped and fled to Algiers. Barbarossa now proposed to the Turkish sultan to attack Tunis on the pretence of vindicating the rights of Alraschid. His proposal was adopted and carried out; but even

before the Turkish expedition sailed, Alraschid himself disappeared—a prisoner, shut up in the Seraglio—and was never heard of again. The use of his name, however, enabled Barbarossa to enter Tunis in triumph, and the betrayed inhabitants discovered too late that he came as a viceroy, to make them the subjects of the sultan. "Being now possessed of such extensive territories, he carried on his depredations against the Christian states to a greater extent and with more destructive violence than ever. Daily complaints of the outrages committed by his cruisers were brought to the emperor by his subjects, both in Spain and Italy. All Christendom seemed to expect from him, as its greatest and most fortunate prince, that he would put an end to this new and odious species of oppression. At the same time Muley-Hascen, the exiled king of Tunis, . . . applied to Charles as the only person who could assert his rights in opposition to such a formidable usurper." The Emperor, accordingly, in 1535, prepared a great expedition against Tunis, drawing men and ships from every part of his wide dominions—from Spain, Italy, Germany and the Netherlands. "On the 16th of July the fleet, consisting of near 500 vessels, having on board above 30,000 regular troops, set sail from Cagliari, and, after a prosperous navigation, landed within sight of Tunis." The fort of Goletta, commanding the bay, was invested and taken; the corsair's fleet surrendered, and Barbarossa, advancing boldly from Tunis to attack the invaders, was overwhelmingly beaten, and fled, abandoning his capital. Charles's soldiers rushed into the unfortunate town, escaping all restraint, and making it a scene of indescribable horrors. "Above 30,000 of the innocent inhabitants perished on that unhappy day, and 10,000 were carried away as slaves. Muley-Hascen took possession of a throne surrounded with carnage, abhorred by his subjects, on whom he had brought such calamities." Before quitting the country, Charles concluded a treaty with Muley-Hascen, under which the latter acknowledged that he held his kingdom in fee of the crown of Spain, doing homage to the Emperor as his liege, and maintaining a Spanish garrison in the Goletta. He also released, without ransom, all the Christian slaves in his dominions, 20,000 in number, and promised to detain in servitude no subject of the Emperor thereafter. He opened his kingdom to the Christian religion, and to free trade, and pledged himself to exclude Turkish corsairs from his ports.—W. Robertson, *Hist. of the Reign of Charles V.*, bk. 5 (c. 2).

**A. D. 1541.**—The disastrous expedition of Charles V. against Algiers.—Encouraged, and deceived, by his easy success at Tunis, the emperor, Charles V., determined, in 1541, to undertake the reduction of Algiers, and to wholly exterminate the freebooters of the north African coast. Before his preparations were completed, "the season unfortunately was far advanced, on which account the Pope entreated, and Doria conjured him not to expose his whole armament to a destruction almost unavoidable on a wild shore during the violence of the autumnal gales. Adhering, however, to his plan with determined obstinacy, he embarked at Porto Venere. . . . The force . . . which he had collected . . . consisted of 20,000 foot and 2,000 horse, mostly veterans, together with 3,300 volunteers, . . .

Besides these there had joined his standard 1,000 soldiers sent by the Order of St. John, and led by 100 of its most valiant knights. Landing near Algiers without opposition, Charles immediately advanced towards the town. To oppose the invaders, Hassan had only 800 Turks, and 5,000 Moors, partly natives of Africa, and partly refugees from Spain. When summoned to surrender he, nevertheless, returned a fierce and haughty answer. But with such a handful of troops, neither his desperate courage nor consummate skill in war could have long resisted forces superior to those which had formerly defeated Barbarossa at the head of 60,000 men." He was speedily relieved from danger, however, by an opportune storm, which burst upon the region during the second day after Charles's debarkation. The Spanish camp was flooded; the soldiers drenched, chilled, sleepless and dispersed. In this condition they were attacked by the Moors at dawn, and narrowly escaped a rout. "But all feeling of this disaster was soon obliterated by a more affecting spectacle. As the tempest continued with unabated violence, the full light of day showed the ships, on which alone their safety depended, driving from their anchors, dashing against one another, and many of them forced on the rocks, or sinking in the waters. In less than an hour, 15 ships of war and 140 transports, with 8,000 men, perished before their eyes; and such of the unhappy sailors as escaped the fury of the sea, were murdered by the Arabs as soon as they reached land." With such ships as he could save, Doria sought shelter behind Cape Matafuz, sending a message to the emperor, advising that he follow with the army to that point. Charles could not do otherwise than act according to the suggestion; but his army suffered horribly in the retreat, which occupied three days. "Many perished by famine, as the whole army subsisted chiefly on roots and berries, or on the flesh of horses, killed for that purpose by the emperor's orders; numbers were drowned in the swollen brooks; and not a few were slain by the enemy." Even after the army had regained the fleet, and was reembarked, it was scattered by a second storm, and several weeks passed before the emperor reached his Spanish dominions, a wiser and a sadder man.—M. Russell, *Hist. of the Barbary States*, ch. 8.

ALSO IN: W. Robertson, *Hist. of the Reign of Charles V.*, bk. 6 (c. 2.)

**A. D. 1543-1560.**—The pirate Dragut and his exploits.—Turkish capture of Tripoli.—Disastrous Christian attempt to recover the place.—Dragut, or Torghtid, a native of the Carmanian coast, opposite the island of Rhodes, began his career as a Mediterranean corsair some time before the last of the Barbarossas quitted the scene and was advanced by the favor of the Algerine. In 1540 he fell into the hands of one of the Dorias and was bound to the oar as a galley-slave for three years,—which did not sweeten his temper toward the Christian world. In 1543 he was ransomed, and resumed his piracies, with more energy than before. "Dragut's lair was at the island of Jerba [called Gelves, by the Spaniards]. . . . Not content with the rich spoils of Europe, Dragut took the Spanish outposts in Africa, one by one—Susa, Sfax, Monastir; and finally set forth to conquer 'Africa.' It is not uncommon in Arabic to call

a country and its capital by the same name. . . . 'Africa' meant to the Arabs the province of Carthage or Tunis and its capital, which was not at first Tunis but successively Kayrawan and Mahdiya. Throughout the later middle ages the name 'Africa' is applied by Christian writers to the latter city. . . . This was the city which Dragut took without a blow in the spring of 1550. Mahdiya was then in an anarchic state ruled by a council of chiefs, each ready to betray the other, and none owing the smallest allegiance to any king, least of all the despised king of Tunis, Hamid, who had deposed and blinded his father, Hasan, Charles V.'s protégé. One of these chiefs let Dragut and his merry men into the city by night. . . . So easy a triumph roused the emulation of Christendom. . . . Don Garcia de Toledo dreamed of outshining the Corsair's glory. His father, the Viceroy of Naples, the Pope, and others, promised their aid, and old Andrea Doria took the command. After much delay and consultation a large body of troops was conveyed to Mahdiya and disembarked on June 28, 1550. Dragut, though aware of the project, was at sea, devastating the Gulf of Genoa, and paying himself in advance for any loss the Christians might inflict in Africa: his nephew Hissar Reis commanded in the city. When Dragut returned, the siege had gone on for a month," but he failed in attempting to raise it and retired to Jerba. Mahdiya was carried by assault on the 8th of September. "Next year, 1551, Dragut's place was with the Ottoman navy, then commanded by Sinan Pasha. . . . With nearly 150 galleys or galleots, 10,000 soldiers, and numerous siege-guns, Sinan and Dragut sailed out of the Dardanelles—whither bound no Christian could tell. They ravaged, as usual, the Straits of Messina, and then revealed the point of attack by making direct for Malta." But the demonstration made against the strong fortifications of the Knights of St. John was ill-planned and feebly executed; it was easily repelled. To wipe out his defeat, Sinan "sailed straight for Tripoli, some 64 leagues away. Tripoli was the natural antidote to Malta: for Tripoli, too, belonged to the Knights of St. John—much against their will—inasmuch as the Emperor had made their defence of this easternmost Barbary state a condition of their tenure of Malta." But the fortifications of Tripoli were not strong enough to resist the Turkish bombardment, and Gaspard de Villiers, the commandant, was forced to surrender (August 15th), "on terms, as he believed, identical with those which Suleyman granted to the Knights of Rhodes. But Sinan was no Suleyman; moreover, he was in a furious rage with the whole Order. He put the garrison—all save a few—in chains and carried them off to grace his triumph at Stambol. Thus did Tripoli fall once more into the hands of the Moslems. . . . The misfortunes of the Christians did not end here. Year after year the Ottoman fleet appeared in Italian waters. . . . Unable as they felt themselves to cope with the Turks at sea, the powers of Southern Europe resolved to strike one more blow on land, and recover Tripoli. A fleet of nearly 100 galleys and ships, gathered from Spain, Genoa, 'the Religion,' the Pope, from all quarters, with the Duke de Medina-Celi at their head, assembled at Messina. . . . Five times the expedition got to sea; five times was it driven

back by contrary winds. At last, on February 10, 1560, it was fairly away for the African coast. Here fresh troubles awaited it. Long delays in crowded vessels had produced their disastrous effects: fevers and scurvy and dysentery were working their terrible ravages among the crews, and 2,000 corpses were flung into the sea. It was impossible to lay siege to Tripoli with a diseased army, and when actually in sight of their object the admirals gave orders to return to Jerba. A sudden descent quickly gave them the command of the beautiful island. . . . In two months a strong castle was built, with all scientific earthworks, and the admiral prepared to carry home such troops as were not needed for its defence. Unhappily for him, he had lingered too long. . . . He was about to prepare for departure when news came that the Turkish fleet had been seen at Goza. Instantly all was panic. Valiant gentlemen forgot their valour, forgot their coolness. . . . Before they could make out of the strait . . . the dread Corsair [Dragut] himself, and Ochliali, and Piali Pasha were upon them. Then ensued a scene of confusion that baffles description. Despairing of weathering the north side of Jerba the panic-stricken Christians ran their ships ashore and deserted them, never stopping even to set them on fire. . . . On rowed the Turks; galleys and galleots to the number of 56 fell into their hands; 18,000 Christians bowed down before their semitars; the beach on that memorable 11th of May, 1560, was a confused medley of stranded ships, helpless prisoners, Turks busy in looting men and galleys—and a hideous heap of mangled bodies. The fleet and the army which had sailed from Messina . . . were absolutely lost."—S. Lane-Poole, *Story of the Barbary Corsairs*.

ALSO IN: W. H. Prescott, *Hist. of the Reign of Philip II.*, bk. 4, ch. 1.

A. D. 1563-1565.—**Repulse of the Moors from Oran and Mazarquivier.—Capture of Penou de Velez.**—In the spring of 1563 a most determined and formidable attempt was made by Hassem, the dey of Algiers, to drive the Spaniards from Oran and Mazarquivier, which they had held since the African conquests of Cardinal Ximenes. The siege was fierce and desperate; the defence most heroic. The beleaguered garrisons held their ground until a relieving expedition from Spain came in sight, on the 8th of June, when the Moors retreated hastily. In the summer of the next year the Spaniards took the strong island fortress of Penou de Velez, breaking up one more nest of piracy and strengthening their footing on the Barbary coast. In the course of the year following they blocked the mouth of the river Tetuan, which was a place of refuge for the marauders.—W. H. Prescott, *Hist. of the Reign of Philip II.*, bk. 4, ch. 1 (p. 2).

A. D. 1565.—**Participation in the Turkish Siege of Malta.—Death of Dragut.** See HOSPITALIERS OF ST. JOHN: A. D. 1530-1565.

A. D. 1570-1571.—**War with the Holy League of Spain, Venice and the Pope.—The Battle of Lepanto.** See TUNKS: A. D. 1560-1571.

A. D. 1572-1573.—**Capture of Tunis by Don John of Austria.—Its recovery, with Goletta, by the Turks.** See TUNKS: A. D. 1572-1573.



A. D. 1579.—Invasion of Morocco by Sebastian of Portugal.—His defeat and death. See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1579-1580.

A. D. 1664-1684.—Wars of France against the piratical powers.—Destructive bombardments of Algiers.—“The ancient alliance of the crown of France with the Ottoman Porte, always unpopular, and less necessary since France had become so strong, was at this moment [early in the reign of Louis XIV.] well-nigh broken, to the great satisfaction both of the Christian nations of the South and of the Austrian empire. . . . Divers plans were proposed in the King's council for attacking the Ottoman power on the Moorish coasts, and for repressing the pirates, who were the terror of the merchant-shipping and maritime provinces. Colbert induced the king to attempt a military settlement among the Moors as the best means of holding them in check. A squadron commanded by the Duke de Beaufort . . . landed 5,000 picked soldiers before Jijeli (or Djigelli), a small Algerine port between Boughiah and Bona. They took possession of Jijeli without difficulty (July 22, 1664); but discord arose between Beaufort and his officers; they did not work actively enough to fortify themselves,” and before the end of September they were obliged to evacuate the place precipitately. “The success of Beaufort's squadron, commanded under the duke by the celebrated Chevalier Paul, ere long effaced the impression of this reverse: two Algerine flotillas were destroyed in the course of 1665.” The Dey of Algiers sent one of his French captives, an officer named Du Babinais, to France with proposals of peace, making him swear to return if his mission failed. The proposals were rejected; Du Babinais was loyal to his oath and returned — to suffer death, as he expected, at the hands of the furious barbarian. “The devotion of this Breton Regulus was not lost: despondency soon took the place of anger in the heart of the Moorish chiefs. Tunis yielded first to the guns of the French squadron, brought to bear on it from the Bay of Goletta. The Pacha and the Divan of Tunis obligated themselves to restore all the French slaves they possessed, to respect French ships, and thenceforth to release all Frenchmen whom they should capture on foreign ships. . . . Rights of ubaine, and of admiralty and shipwreck, were suppressed as regarded Frenchmen (November 25, 1665). The station at Cape Negro was restored to France. . . . Algiers submitted, six months after, to nearly the same conditions imposed on it by Louis XIV.: one of the articles stipulated that French merchants should be treated as favorably as any foreign nation, and even more so (May 17, 1666). More than 3,000 French slaves were set at liberty.” Between 1669 and 1672, Louis XIV. was seriously meditating a great v. r. of conquest with the Turks and their dependencies, but preferred, finally, to enter upon his war with Holland, which brought the other project to naught. France and the Ottoman empire then remained on tolerably good terms until 1681, when a “squadron of Tripolitan corsairs having carried off a French ship on the coast of Provence, Duquesne, at the head of seven vessels, pursued the pirates into the waters of Greece. They took refuge in the harbor of Scio. Duquesne summoned the Pacha of Scio to expel them. The Pacha refused, and fired on the French

squadron, when Duquesne cannonaded both the pirates and the town with such violence that the Pacha, terrified, asked for a truce, in order to refer the matter to the Sultan (July 23, 1681). Duquesne converted the attack into a blockade. At the news of this violation of the Ottoman territory, the Sultan, Mahomet IV., fell into a rage . . . and dispatched the Captain-Pacha to Scio with 32 galleys. Duquesne allowed the Turkish galleys to enter the harbor, then blockaded them with the pirates, and declared that he would burn the whole if satisfaction were not had of the Tripolitans. The Divan hesitated. War was about to recommence with the Emperor; it was not the moment to kindle it against France.” In the end there was a compromise, and the Tripolitans gave up the French vessel and the slaves they had captured, promising, also, to receive a French consul at Tripoli. “During this time another squadron, commanded by Château-Renaud, blockaded the coasts of Morocco, the men of Maghreb having rivalled in depredations the vassals of Turkey. The powerful Emperor of Morocco, Muley Ismael, sent the governor of Tetuan to France to solicit peace of Louis XIV. The treaty was signed at Saint-Germain, January 29, 1682, on advantageous conditions,” including restitution of French slaves. “Affairs did not terminate so amicably with Algiers. From this piratical centre had proceeded the gravest offenses. A captain of the royal navy was held in slavery there, with many other Frenchmen. It was resolved to inflict a terrible punishment on the Algerines. The thought of conquering Algeria had more than once presented itself to the king and Colbert, and they appreciated the value of this conquest; the Jijeli expedition had been formerly a first attempt. They did not, however, deem it incumbent on them to embark in such an enterprise; a descent, a siege, would have required too great preparations; they had recourse to another means of attack. The regenerator of the art of naval construction, Petit-Renaud, invented bomb-ketches expressly for the purpose. . . . July 23, 1682, Duquesne anchored before Algiers, with 11 ships, 15 galleys, 5 bomb-ketches, and Petit-Renaud to guide them. After five weeks' delay caused by bad weather, then by a fire on one of the bomb-ketches, the thorough trial took place during the night of August 30. The effect was terrible: a part of the great mosque fell on the crowd that had taken refuge there. During the night of September 3-4, the Algerines attempted to capture the bomb-ketches moored at the entrance of their harbor; they were repulsed, and the bombardment continued. The Dey wished to negotiate; the people, exasperated, prevented him. The wind shifting to the north-west presaged the equinoctial storm; Duquesne set sail again, September 12. The expedition had not been decisive. It was begun anew. June 18, 1683, Duquesne reappeared in the road of Algiers; he had, this time, seven bomb-ketches instead of five. These instruments of extermination had been perfected in the interval. The nights of June 26-27 witnessed the overthrow of a great number of houses, several mosques, and the palace of the Dey. A thousand men perished in the harbor and the town.” The Dey opened negotiations, giving up 700 French slaves, but was killed by his Janizaries, and one Hadgi-Hussein

proclaimed in his stead. "The bombardment was resumed with increasing violence. . . . The Algerines avenged themselves by binding to the muzzles of their guns a number of Frenchmen who remained in their hands. . . . The fury of the Algerines drew upon them redoubled calamities. . . . The bombs rained almost without intermission. The harbor was strewn with the wrecks of vessels. The city was . . . a heap of bloody ruins." But "the bomb-ketches had exhausted their ammunition. September was approaching. Duquesne again departed; but a strong blockading force was kept up, during the whole winter, as a standing threat of the return of the 'infernal vessels.' The Algerines finally bowed their head, and, April 25, 1684, peace was accorded by Tourville, the commander of the blockade, to the Pacha, Dey, Divan, and troops of Algiers. The Algerines restored 320 French slaves remaining in their power, and 180 other Christians claimed by the King; the janizaries only which had been taken from them were restored; they engaged to make no prizes within ten leagues of the coast of France, nor to assist the other Moorish corsairs at war with France; to recognize the precedence of the flag of France over all other flags, &c., &c.; lastly, they sent an embassy to carry their submission to Louis XIV.; they did not, however, pay the damages which Duquesne had wished to exact of them."—H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV.*, v. 1, ch. 4 and 7.

**A. D. 1785-1801.—Piratical depredations upon American commerce.—Humiliating treaties and tribute.—The example of resistance given by the United States.**—"It is difficult for us to realize that only 70 years ago the Mediterranean was so unsafe that the merchant ships of every nation stood in danger of being captured by pirates, unless they were protected either by an armed convoy or by tribute paid to the petty Barbary powers. Yet we can scarcely open a book of travels during the last century without mention being made of the immense risks to which every one was exposed who ventured by sea from Marseilles to Naples. . . . The European states, in order to protect their commerce, had the choice either of paying certain sums per head for each captive, which in reality was a premium on capture, or of buying entire freedom for their commerce by the expenditure of large sums yearly. The treaty renewed by France, in 1788, with Algiers, was for fifty years, and it was agreed to pay \$200,000 annually, besides large presents distributed according to custom every ten years, and a great sum given down. The peace of Spain with Algiers is said to have cost from three to five millions of dollars. There is reason to believe that at the same time England was paying an annual tribute of about \$280,000. England was the only power sufficiently strong on the sea to put down these pirates; but in order to keep her own position as mistress of the seas she preferred to leave them in existence in order to be a scourge to the commerce of other European powers, and even to support them by paying a sum so great that other states might find it difficult to make peace with them. When the Revolution broke out, we [of the United States of America] no longer had the safeguards for our commerce that had been given to us by England, and it was therefore that in our very first negotiations for a treaty with France we

desired to have an article inserted into the treaty, that the king of France should secure the inhabitants of the United States, and their vessels and effects, against all attacks or depredations from any of the Barbary powers. It was found impossible to insert this article in the treaty of 1778, and instead of that the king agreed to employ his good offices and interposition in order to provide as fully and efficaciously as possible for the benefit, conveniency and safety of the United States against the princes and the states of Barbary or their subjects."—Direct negotiations between the United States and the piratical powers were opened in 1785, by a call which Mr. Adams made upon the Tripolitan ambassador. The latter announced to Mr. Adams that "Turkey, Tripoli, Tunis, Algiers, and Morocco were the sovereigns of the Mediterranean; and that no nation could navigate that sea without a treaty of peace with them." . . . The ambassador demanded as the lowest price for a perpetual peace 30,000 guineas for his employers and £3,000 for himself; that Tunis would probably treat on the same terms; but he could not answer for Algiers or Morocco. Peace with all four powers would cost at least \$1,000,000, and Congress had appropriated only \$80,000. . . . Mr. Adams was strongly opposed to war, on account of the expense, and preferred the payment of tribute. . . . Mr. Jefferson quite as decidedly preferred war." The opinion in favor of a trial of pacific negotiations prevailed, and a treaty with the Emperor of Morocco was concluded in 1787. An attempt at the same time to make terms with the Dey of Algiers and to redeem a number of American captives in his hands, came to nothing. "For the sake of saving a few thousand dollars, fourteen men were allowed to remain in imprisonment for ten years. . . . In November, 1793, the number of [American] prisoners at Algiers amounted to 115 men, among whom there remained only ten of the original captives of 1785." At last, the nation began to realize the intolerable shame of the matter, and, "on January 2, 1794, the House of Representatives resolved that a 'naval force adequate for the protection of the commerce of the United States against the Algerine forces ought to be provided.' In the same year authority was given to build six frigates, and to procure ten smaller vessels to be equipped as galleys. Negotiations, however, continued to go on," and in September, 1795, a treaty with the Dey was concluded. "In making this treaty, however, we had been obliged to follow the usage of European powers—not only pay a large sum for the purpose of obtaining peace, but an annual tribute, in order to keep our vessels from being captured in the future. The total cost of fulfilling the treaty was estimated at \$992,463.25."—E. Schuyler, *American Diplomacy*, pt. 4.—"The first treaty of 1795, with Algiers, which was negotiated during Washington's administration, cost the United States, for the ransom of American captives, and the Dey's forbearance, a round \$1,000,000, in addition to which an annuity was promised. Treaties with other Barbary States followed, one of which purchased peace from Tripoli by the payment of a gross sum. Nearly \$2,000,000 had been squandered thus far in bribing these powers to respect our flag, and President Adams complained in 1800 that the United States had to pay three times the tribute imposed upon Sweden and Denmark.

But this temporizing policy only made matters worse. Captain Bainbridge arrived at Algiers in 1800, bearing the annual tribute money for the Dey in a national frigate, and the Dey ordered him to proceed to Constantinople to deliver Algerine dispatches. 'English, French, and Spanish ships of war have done the same,' said the Dey, insolently, when Bainbridge and the American consul remonstrated. 'You pay me tribute because you are my slaves.' Bainbridge had to obey. . . . The lesser Barbary States were still more exasperating. The Bashaw of Tripoli had threatened to seize American vessels unless President Adams sent him a present like that bestowed upon Algiers. The Bashaw of Tunis made a similar demand upon the new President [Jefferson]. . . . Jefferson had, while in Washington's cabinet, expressed his detestation of the method hitherto favored for pacifying these pests of commerce; and, availing himself of the present favorable opportunity, he sent out Commodore Dale with a squadron of three frigates and a sloop of war, to make a naval demonstration on the coast of Barbary. . . . Commodore Dale, upon arriving at Gibraltar [July, 1801], found two Tripolitan cruisers watching for American vessels; for, as had been suspected, Tripoli already meditated war. The frigate Philadelphia blockaded these vessels, while Bainbridge, with the frigate Essex, convoyed American vessels in the Mediterranean. Dale, in the frigate President, proceeded to cruise off Tripoli, followed by the schooner Experiment, which presently captured a Tripolitan cruiser of 14 guns after a spirited action. The Barbary powers were for a time overawed, and the United States thus set the first example among Christian nations of making reprisals instead of ransom the rule of security against these commercial marauders. In this respect Jefferson's conduct was applauded at home by men of all parties."—J. Schouler, *Hist. of the U. S.*, ch. 5, sect. 1 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: R. L. Playfair, *The Scourge of Christendom*, ch. 16.

A. D. 1803-1805.—American War with the pirates of Tripoli.—"The war with Tripoli dragged tediously along, and seemed no nearer its end at the close of 1803 than 18 months before. Commodore Morris, whom the President sent to command the Mediterranean squadron, cruised from port to port between May, 1802, and August, 1803, convoying merchant vessels from Gibraltar to Leghorn and Malta, or lay in harbor and repaired his ships, but neither blockaded nor molested Tripoli; until at length, June 21, 1803, the President called him home and dismissed him from the service. His successor was Commodore Preble, who Sept. 12, 1803, reached Gibraltar with the relief-squadron which Secretary Gallatin thought unnecessarily strong. . . . He found Morocco taking part with Tripoli. Captain Bainbridge, who reached Gibraltar in the 'Philadelphia' August 24, some three weeks before Preble arrived, caught in the neighborhood a Moorish cruiser of 23 guns with an American brig in its clutches. Another American brig had just been seized at Mogador. Determined to stop this peril at the outset, Preble united to his own squadron the ships which he had come to relieve, and with this combined force, . . . sending the 'Philadelphia' to blockade Tripoli, he crossed to Tangiers October 6, and brought the Emperor of Morocco

to reason. On both sides prizes and prisoners were restored, and the old treaty was renewed. This affair consumed time; and when at length Preble got the 'Constitution' under way for the Tripolitan coast, he spoke a British frigate off the Island of Sarinlia, which reported that the 'Philadelphia' had been captured October 21, more than three weeks before. Bainbridge, cruising off Tripoli, had chased a Tripolitan cruiser into shoal water, and was hauling off, when the frigate struck on a reef at the mouth of the harbor. Every effort was made without success to float her; but at last she was surrounded by Tripolitan gunboats, and Bainbridge struck his flag. The Tripolitans, after a few days work, floated the frigate, and brought her under the guns of the castle. The officers became prisoners of war, and the crew, in number 300 or more, were put to hard labor. The affair was in no way discreditably to the squadron. . . . The Tripolitans gained nothing except the prisoners; for at Bainbridge's suggestion Preble, some time afterward, ordered Stephen Decatur, a young lieutenant in command of the 'Enterprise,' to take a captured Tripolitan craft renamed the 'Intrepid,' and with a crew of 75 men to sail from Syracuse, enter the harbor of Tripoli by night, board the 'Philadelphia,' and burn her under the castle guns. The order was literally obeyed. Decatur ran into the harbor at ten o'clock in the night of Feb. 16, 1804, boarded the frigate within half gun-shot of the Pacha's castle, drove the Tripolitan crew overboard, set the ship on fire, remained alongside until the flames were beyond control, and then withdrew without losing a man."—H. Adams, *Hist. of the U. S.: Administration of Jefferson*, v. 2, ch. 7.—"Commodore Preble, in the meantime, hurried his preparations for more serious work, and on July 25th arrived off Tripoli with a squadron, consisting of the frigate Constitution, three brigs, three schooners, six gunboats, and two bomb vessels. Opposed to him were arrayed over a hundred guns mounted on shore batteries, nineteen gunboats, one ten-gun brig, two schooners mounting eight guns each, and twelve galleys. Between August 3rd and September 3rd five attacks were made, and though the town was never reduced, substantial damage was inflicted, and the subsequent satisfactory peace rendered possible. Preble was relieved by Barron in September, not because of any loss of confidence in his ability, but from exigencies of the service, which forbade the Government sending out an officer junior to him in the relief squadron which reinforced his own. Upon his return to the United States he was presented with a gold medal, and the thanks of Congress were tendered him, his officers, and men, for gallant and faithful services. The blockade was maintained vigorously, and in 1805 an attack was made upon the Tripolitan town of Derna, by a combined land and naval force; the former being under command of Consul-General Eaton, who had been a captain in the American army, and of Lieutenant O'Bannon of the Marines. The enemy made a spirited though disorganized defence, but the shells of the war-ships drove them from point to point, and finally their principal work was carried by the force under O'Bannon and Midshipman Mann. Eaton was eager to press forward, but he was denied reinforcements and military stores, and much of his

advantage was lost. All further operations were, however, discontinued in June, 1805, when, after the usual intrigues, delays, and provarications, a treaty was signed by the Pasha, which provided that no further tribute should be exacted, and that American vessels should be forever free of his rovers. Satisfactory as was this conclusion, the uncomfortable fact remains that tribute entered into the settlement. After all the prisoners had been exchanged man for man, the Tripolitan Government demanded, and the United States paid, the handsome sum of sixty thousand dollars to close the contract. This treaty, however, awakened the conscience of Europe, and from the day it was signed the power of the Barbary Corsairs began to wane. The older countries saw their duty more clearly, and ceased to legalize robbery on the high seas."—S. Lane-Poole, *Story of the Barbary Corsairs*, ch. 20.

ALSO IN: J. F. Cooper, *Hist. of the U. S. Navy*, v. 1, ch. 18 and v. 2, ch. 1-7.—The same, *Life of Preble*.—A. S. Mackenzie, *Life of Decatur*, ch. 3-7.

**A. D. 1815.—Final War of Algiers with the United States.—Death-blow to Algerine piracy.**—"Just as the late war with Great Britain broke out, the Dey of Algiers, taking offense at not having received from America the precise articles in the way of tribute demanded, had unceremoniously dismissed Lear, the consul, had declared war, and had since captured an American vessel, and reduced her crew to slavery. Immediately after the ratification of the treaty with England, this declaration had been reciprocated. Efforts had been at once made to fit out ships, new and old, including several small ones lately purchased for the proposed squadrons of Porter and Perry, and before many weeks Decatur sailed from New York with the *Guerrière*, *Macedonian*, and *Constellation* frigates, now released from blockade; the *Ontario*, new sloop of war, four brigs, and two schooners. Two days after passing Gibraltar, he fell in with and captured an Algerine frigate of 44 guns, the largest ship in the Algerine navy, which struck to the *Guerrière* after a running fight of twenty-five minutes. A day or two after, an Algerine brig was chased into shoal water on the Spanish coast, and captured by the smaller vessels. Decatur having appeared off Algiers, the terrified Dey at once consented to a treaty, which he submitted to sign on Decatur's quarter deck, surrendering all prisoners on hand, making certain pecuniary indemnities, renouncing all future claim to any American tribute or presents, and the practice, also, of reducing prisoners of war to slavery. Decatur then proceeded to Tunis and Tripoli, and obtained from both indemnity for certain American vessels captured under the guns of their forts by British cruisers during the late war. The Bey of Tripoli being short of cash, Decatur agreed to accept in part payment the restoration of liberty to eight Danes and two Neapolitans held as slaves."—R. Hildreth, *Hist. of the U. S.*, *Second Series*, ch. 30 (v. 3).

ALSO IN: A. S. Mackenzie, *Life of Decatur*, ch. 13-14.

**A. D. 1816.—Bombardment of Algiers by Lord Exmouth.—Relinquishment of Christian slavery in Algiers, Tripolis and Tunis.**—"The corsairs of Barbary still scoured the Mediter-

anean; the captives, whom they had taken from Christian vessels, still languished in captivity in Algiers; and, to the disgrace of the civilized world, a piratical state was suffered to exist in its very centre. . . . The conclusion of the war [of the Coalition against Napoleon and France] made the continuance of these ravages utterly intolerable. In the interests of civilization it was essential that piracy should be put down; Britain was mistress of the seas, and it therefore devolved upon her to do the work. . . . Happily for this country the Mediterranean command was held by an officer [Lord Exmouth] whose bravery and skill were fully equal to the dangers before him. . . . Early in 1816 Exmouth was instructed to proceed to the several states of Barbary; to require them to recognize the cession of the Ionian Islands to Britain; to conclude peace with the kingdoms of Sardinia and Naples; and to abolish Christian slavery. The Dey of Algiers readily assented to the two first of these conditions; the Beys of Tripolis and Tunis followed the example of the Dey of Algiers, and in addition consented to refrain in future from treating prisoners of war as slaves. Exmouth thereupon returned to Algiers, and endeavoured to obtain a similar concession from the Dey. The Dey pleaded that Algiers was subject to the Ottoman Porte, and obtained a truce of three months in order to confer with the Sultan. But meantime the Algerines made an unprovoked attack upon a neighbouring coral fishery, which was protected by the British flag, massacring the fishermen and destroying the flag. This brought Exmouth back to Algiers in great haste, with an ultimatum which he delivered on the 27th of August. No answer to it was returned, and the fleet (which had been joined by some vessels of the Dutch navy) sailed into battle range that same afternoon. "The Algerines permitted the ships to move into their stations. The British reserved their fire till they could deliver it with good effect. A crowd of spectators watched the ships from the shore; and Exmouth waved his hat to them to move and save themselves from the fire. They had not the prudence to avail themselves of his timely warning. A signal shot was fired by the Algerines from the mole. The 'Queen Charlotte' replied by delivering her entire broadside. Five hundred men were struck down by the first discharge. . . . The battle, which had thus begun at two o'clock in the afternoon, continued till ten o'clock in the evening. By that time half Algiers had been destroyed; the whole of the Algerine navy had been burned; and, though a few of the enemy's batteries still maintained a casual fire, their principal fortifications were crumbling ruins; the majority of their guns were dismounted." The Dey humbled himself to the terms proposed by the British commander. "On the first day of September Exmouth had the satisfaction of acquainting his government with the liberation of all the slaves in the city of Algiers, and the restitution of the money paid since the commencement of the year by the Neapolitan and Sardinian Governments for the redemption of slaves." He had also extorted from the piratical Dey a solemn declaration that he would, in future wars, treat all prisoners according to the usages of European nations. In the battle which won these important results, "128 men were killed and 690 wounded on

board the British fleet; the Dutch lost 13 killed and 52 wounded."—S. Walpole, *Hist. of Eng. from 1815*, ch. 2 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: H. Martineau, *Hist. of the Thirty Years Peace*, bk. 1, ch. 6 (v. 1).—L. Hertslet, *Collection of Treaties and Conventions*, v. 1.

**A. D. 1830.—French conquest of Algiers.**—"During the Napoleonic wars, the Dey of Algiers supplied grain for the use of the French armies; it was bought by merchants of Marseilles, and there was a dispute about the matter which was unsettled as late as 1829. Several instalments had been paid; the dey demanded payment in full according to his own figures, while the French government, believing the demand excessive, required an investigation. In one of the numerous debates on the subject, Hussein Pasha, the reigning dey, became very angry, struck the consul with a fan, and ordered him out of the house. He refused all reparation for the insult, even on the formal demand of the French government, and consequently there was no alternative but war." The expedition launched from the port of Toulon, for the chastisement of the insolent Algerine, "comprised 37,500 men, 3,000 horses, and 180 pieces of artillery. . . . The sea-forces included 11 ships of the line, 23 frigates, 70 smaller vessels, 377 transports, and 230 boats for landing troops. General Bourmont, Minister of War, commanded the expedition, which appeared in front of Algiers on the 13th of June, 1830." Hussein Pasha "had previously asked for aid from the Sultan of Turkey, but that wily ruler had blankly refused. The beys of Tunis and Tripoli had also declined to meddle with the affair." The landing of the French was effected safely and without serious opposition, at Sidi-Ferruch, about 16 miles west of Algiers. The Algerine army, 40,000 to 50,000 strong, commanded by Aga Ibrahim, son-in-law of the dey, took its position on the table-land of Staoueli, overlooking the French, where it waited while their landing was made. On the 19th General Bourmont was ready to advance. His antagonist, instead of adhering to the waiting attitude, and forcing the French to attack him, on his own ground, now went out to meet them, and flung his disorderly mob against their disciplined battalions, with the result that seldom fails. "The Arab loss in killed and wounded was about 3,000. . . . while the French loss was less than 500. In little more than an hour the battle was over, and the Osmanlis were in full and disorderly retreat." General Bourmont took possession of the Algerine camp at Staoueli, where he was again attacked on the 24th of June, with a similar disastrous result to the Arabs. He then advanced upon the city of Algiers, established his army in position behind the city, constructed batteries, and opened, on the 4th of July, a bombardment so terrific that the dey hoisted the white flag in a few hours. "Hussein Pasha hoped to the last moment to retain his country and its independence by making liberal concessions in the way of indemnity for the expenses of the war, and offered to liberate all Christian slaves in addition to paying them for their services and sufferings. The English consul tried to mediate on this basis, but his offers of mediation were politely declined. . . . It was finally agreed that the dey should surrender Algiers with all its forts and military stores, and be permitted to retire wherever he chose with

his wives, children, and personal belongings, but he was not to remain in the country under any circumstances. On the 5th of July the French entered Algiers in great pomp and took possession of the city. . . . The spoils of war were such as rarely fall to the lot of a conquering army, when its numbers and the circumstances of the campaign are considered. In the treasury was found a large room filled with gold and silver coins heaped together indiscriminately, the fruits of three centuries of piracy; they were the coins of all the nations that had suffered from the depredations of the Algerines, and the variety in the dates showed very clearly that the accumulation had been the work of two or three hundred years. How much money was contained in this vast pile is not known; certain it is that nearly 50,000,000 francs, or £2,000,000 sterling, actually reached the French treasury. . . . The cost of the war was much more than covered by the captured property. . . . Many slaves were liberated. . . . The Algerine power was forever broken, and from that day Algeria has been a prosperous colony of France. Hussein Pasha embarked on the 10th of July with a suite of 110 persons, of whom 55 were women. He proceeded to Naples, where he remained for a time, went afterwards to Leghorn, and finally to Egypt." In Egypt he died, under circumstances which indicated poison.—T. W. Knox, *Decisive Battles Since Waterloo*, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: R. L. Playfair, *The Scourge of Christendom*, ch. 19.—E. E. Crowe, *Hist. of the Reigns of Louis XVIII. and Charles X.*, v. 2, ch. 13.

**A. D. 1830-1846.—The French war of Subjugation in Algeria with Abd-el-Kader.**—"When Louis Philippe ascended the throne [of France, A. D. 1830] the generals of his predecessor had overrun the country [of Algiers]—though they did not effectually subdue it; their absolute dominion not extending far round Algiers—from Bona, on the east, in lat. 36° 53' N., long. 7° 46' W., to Oran, on the west—nearly the entire extent of the ancient Libya. . . . There was always a party in the chamber of deputies opposed to the conquest who deprecated the colonisation of Algeria, and who steadily opposed any grants of either men or money to be devoted to the African enterprise. The natural result followed. Ten thousand men could not effect the work for which 40,000 were required; and, whilst the young colony languished, the natives became emboldened, and encouraged to make that resistance which cost the French so dear. Marshal Clausel, when entrusted with the government of the colony, and the supreme command of the troops. . . . established a series of fortified posts, which were adequately garrisoned; and roads were opened to enable the garrisons promptly to communicate with each other. These positions, rapidly acquired, he was unable to maintain, in consequence of the home government recalling the greater part of his force. To recruit his army he resolved to enlist some corps of the natives; and, in October, 1830, the first regiment of zouaves was raised." . . . In 1833 we "first hear of Abd-el-Kader. This chief was the son of a marabout, or priest, in the province of Oran. He united consummate ability with great valour; was a devout Mohammedan; and when he raised the standard of the prophet, he called the Arabs around him, with the fullest confidence of success. His countrymen obeyed his

call in great numbers; and, encouraged by the enthusiasm they displayed, he first, at the close of 1833, proclaimed himself emir of Tlemcen (the former name of Oran), and then seized on the port of Arzew, on the west side of the gulf of that name; and the port of Mostaganem, on the opposite coast. The province of Mascara, lying at the foot of the Atlas, was also under his rule. At that time general Desmichels commanded at Oran. He had not a very large force, but he acted promptly. Marching against Abd-el-Kader, he defeated him in two pitched battles; retook Arzew and Mostaganem; and, on the 26th of February, 1834, entered into a treaty with the emir, by which both parties were bound to keep the peace towards each other. During that year the terms were observed; but, in 1835, the Arab chief again commenced hostilities. He marched to the east, entered the French territories, and took possession of Medeah, being received with the utmost joy by the inhabitants. On the 26th of June, general Trezel, with only 2,300 men, marched against him. Abd-el-Kader had 8,000 Arabs under his command; and a sanguinary combat took place in the defiles of Mouley-Ismael. After a severe combat, the French forced the passage, but with considerable loss. . . . The French general, finding his position untenable, commenced a retrograde movement on the 28th of June. In his retreat he was pursued by the Arabs; and before he reached Oran, on the 4th of July, he lost all his waggons, train, and baggage; besides having ten officers, and 252 sous-officers and rank-and-file killed, and 308 wounded. The heads of many of the killed were displayed in triumph by the victors. This was a severe blow to the French, and the cause of great rejoicing to the Arabs. The former called for marshal Clausel to be restored to his command, and the government at home complied; at the same time issuing a proclamation, declaring that Algeria should not be abandoned, but that the honour of the French arms should be maintained. The marshal left France on the 28th of July; and as soon as he landed, he organised an expedition against Mascara, which was Abd-el-Kader's capital. . . . The Arab chieftain advanced to meet the enemy; but, being twice defeated, he resolved to abandon his capital, which the French entered on the 6th of December, and found completely deserted. The streets and houses were alike empty and desolate; and the only living creature they encountered was an old woman, lying on some mats, who could not move of herself, and had been either forgotten or abandoned. The French set fire to the deserted houses; and having effected the destruction of Mascara, they marched to Mostaganem, which Clausel determined to make the centre of French power in that district."—Thos. Wright, *History of France*, v. 3, pp. 633-635.—"A camp was established on the Taafna in April 1836, and an action took place there on the 25th, when the Tableau states that 3,000 French engaged 10,000 natives; and some of the enemies being troops of Morocco, an explanation was required of Muley-Abd-er-Rachman, the emperor, who said that the assistance was given to the Algerines without his knowledge. On July 6th, 1836, Abd-el-Kader suffered a disastrous defeat on the river Sikkak, near Tlemcen, at the hands of Marshal Bugeaud. November 1836, the first expedition was formed against Constantina. . . . After the failure of Clausel,

General Damrémont was appointed governor, Feb. 12th, 1837; and on the 30th of May the treaty of the Taafna between General Bugeaud and Abd-el-Kader left the French government at liberty to direct all their attention against Constantina, a camp being formed at Medjey-el-Almar in that direction. An army of 10,000 men set out thence on the 1st of October, 1837, for Constantina. On the 6th it arrived before Constantina; and on the 13th the town was taken with a severe loss, including Damrémont. Marshal Vallée succeeded Damrémont as governor. The fall of Constantina destroyed the last relic of the old Turkish government. . . . By the 27th January, 1838, 100 tribes had submitted to the French. A road was cleared in April by General Negrier from Constantina to Stora on the sea. This road, passing by the camps of Saucelou and the Arrouch, was 22 leagues in length. The coast of the Bay of Stora, on the site of the ancient Rusicaada, became covered with French settlers; and Philippeville was founded Oct. 1838, threatening to supplant Bona. Abd-el-Kader advancing in December 1837 to the province of Constantina, the French advanced also to observe him; then both retired, without coming to blows. A misunderstanding which arose respecting the second article of the treaty of Taafna was settled in the beginning of 1838. . . . When Abd-el-Kader assumed the royal title of Sultan and the command of a numerous army, the French, with republican charity and fraternal sympathy, sought to infringe the Taafna treaty, and embroil the Arab hero, in order to ruin his rising empire, and found their own on his ashes. The Emir had been recognised by the whole country, from the gates of Ouchda to the river Mijerla. . . . The war was resumed, and many French razzias took place. They once marched a large force from Algiers on Milianah to surprise the sultan's camp. They failed in their chief object, but nearly captured the sultan himself. He was surrounded in the middle of a French square, which thought itself sure of the reward of 100,000 francs (£4,000) offered for him; but uttering his favourite 'en-shallah' (with the will of God), he gave his white horse the spur, and came over their bayonets un wounded. He lost, however, thirty of his body-guard and friends, but killed six Frenchmen with his own hand. Still, notwithstanding his successes, Abd-el-Kader had been losing all his former power, as his Arabs, though brave, could not match 8,000 French troops, with artillery and all the other ornaments of civilised warfare. Seven actions were fought at the Col de Mouzaia, where the Arabs were overthrown by the royal dukes, in 1841; and at the Oued Fodhdha, where Changarnier, with a handful of troops, defeated a whole population in a frightful gorge. It was on this occasion that, having no guns, he launched his Chasseurs d'Afrique against the fort, saying, 'Voilà mon artillerie!' Abd-el-Kader had then only two chances,—the support of Muley-Abd-er-Rahman, Emperor of Morocco; or the peace that the latter might conclude with France for him. General Bugeaud, who had replaced Marshal Vallée, organised a plan of campaign by movable columns radiating from Algiers, Oran, and Constantina; and having 100,000 excellent soldiers at his disposal, the results as against the Emir were slowly but surely effective. General Negrier at Constantina, Changarnier amongst the Hadjouts about Medeah and Milianah, Cavaignac

and Lamoriclere in Oran,—carried out the commander-in-chief's instructions with untrifling energy and perseverance; and in the spring of 1843 the Duc d'Anmale, in company with General Changarnier, surprised the Emir's camp in the absence of the greatest part of his force, and it was with difficulty that he himself escaped. Not long afterwards he took refuge in Morocco, excited the fanatical passions of the populace of that empire, and thereby forced its ruler, Muley-Abd-el-Rahman, much against his own inclination, into a war with France; a war very speedily terminated by General Bugeaud's victory of Isly, with some slight assistance from the bombardment of Tangier and Mogador by the Prince de Joinville. In 1845 the struggle was maintained amidst the hills by the partisans of Abd-el-Kader; but our limits prevent us from dwelling on its particulars, save in one instance. . . . On the night of the 12th of June, 1845, about three months before Marshal Bugeaud left Algeria, Colonels Pelissier and St. Arnaud, at the head of a considerable force, attempted a razzia upon the tribe of the Beul-Ouled-Riah, numbering, in men, women, and children, about 700 persons. This was in the Dahra. The Arabs escaped the first clutch of their pursuers; and when hard pressed, as they soon were, took refuge in the cave of Khartani, which had some odour of sanctity about it: some holy man or marabout had lived and died there, we believe. The French troops came up quickly to the entrance, and the Arabs were summoned to surrender. They made no reply. Possibly they did not hear the summons. . . . As there was no other outlet from the cave than that by which the Arabs entered, a few hours' patience must have been rewarded by the unconditional surrender of the imprisoned tribe. Colonels Pelissier and St. Arnaud were desirous of a speedier result; and by their order an immense fire was kindled at the mouth of the cave, and fed sedulously during the summer night with wood, grass, reeds, anything that would help to keep up the volume of smoke and

flame which the wind drove, in roaring, whirling eddies, into the mouth of the cavern. It was too late now for the unfortunate Arabs to offer to surrender; the discharge of a cannon would not have been heard in the roar of that huge blast-furnace, much less smoke-strangled cries of human agony. The fire was kept up throughout the night; and when the day had fully dawned, the then expiring embers were kicked aside, and as soon as a sufficient time had elapsed to render the air of the silent cave breathable, some soldiers were directed to ascertain how matters were within. They were gone but a few minutes; and they came back, we are told, pale, trembling, terrified, hardly daring, it seemed, to confront the light of day. No wonder they trembled and looked pale. They had found all the Arabs dead—men, women, children. . . . St. Arnaud and Pelissier were rewarded by the French minister; and Marshal Soult observed, that 'what would be a crime against civilisation in Europe might be a justifiable necessity in Africa.' . . . A taste of French bayonets at Isly, and the booming of French guns at Mogador, had brought Morocco to reason. . . . Morocco sided with France, and threatened Abd-el-Kader, who cut one of their corps to pieces, and was in June on the point of coming to blows with Muley-Abd-el-Rahman, the emperor. But the Emperor of Morocco took vigorous measures to oppose him, nearly exterminating the tribes friendly to him; which drew off many partisans from the Emir, who tried to pacify the emperor, but unsuccessfully." In December, 1846, "he asked to negotiate, offered to surrender; and after 24 hours' discussion he came to Sidl Ibrahim, the scene of his last exploits against the French, where he was received with military honours, and conducted to the Duke of Aumale at Nemours. France has been severely abused for the detention of Abd-el-Kader in Ham."—J. R. Morel, *Algeria*, ch. 23.

**A. D. 1881.**—Tunis brought under the protectorate of France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1875-1889.

**BARBES.—BARBETS.**—The elders among the early Waldenses were called barbes, which signified "Uncle." Whence came the nickname Barbets, applied to the Waldensian people generally.—E. Comba, *Hist. of the Waldenses of Italy*, p. 147.

**BARCEL.** See CYRENE.

**BARCELONA:** A. D. 713.—Surrender to the Arab-Moors. See SPAIN: A. D. 711-713.

**A. D. 1151.**—The County joined to Aragon. See SPAIN: A. D. 1035-1258.

**12th-16th Centuries.**—Commercial prosperity and municipal freedom.—"The city of Barcelona, which originally gave its name to the county of which it was the capital, was distinguished from a very early period by ample municipal privileges. After the union with Aragon in the 12th century, the monarchs of the latter kingdom extended towards it the same liberal legislation; so that, by the 13th, Barcelona had reached a degree of commercial prosperity rivaling that of any of the Italian republics. She divided with them the lucrative commerce with Alexandria; and her port, thronged with foreigners from every nation, became a principal emporium in the Mediterranean for the spices, drugs, perfumes, and other rich commodities of the East, whence they were diffused over the in-

terior of Spain and the European continent. Her consuls, and her commercial factories, were established in every considerable port in the Mediterranean and in the north of Europe. The natural products of her soil, and her various domestic fabrics, supplied her with abundant articles of export. Fine wool was imported by her in considerable quantities from England in the 14th and 15th centuries, and returned there manufactured into cloth; an exchange of commodities the reverse of that existing between the two nations at the present day. Barcelona claims the merit of having established the first bank of exchange and deposit in Europe, in 1401; it was devoted to the accommodation of foreigners as well as of her own citizens. She claims the glory, too, of having compiled the most ancient written code, among the moderns, of maritime law now extant, digested from the usages of commercial nations, and which formed the basis of the mercantile jurisprudence of Europe during the Middle Ages. The wealth which flowed in upon Barcelona, as the result of her activity and enterprise, was evinced by her numerous public works, her docks, arsenals, warehouses, exchange, hospitals, and other constructions of general utility. Strangers, who visited Spain in the 14th and 15th centuries, expatiate on the magnificence of this

city, its commodious private edifices, the cleanliness of its streets and public squares (a virtue by no means usual in that day), and on the amenity of its gardens and cultivated environs. But the peculiar glory of Barcelona was the freedom of her municipal institutions. Her government consisted of a senate or council of one hundred, and a body of regidores or counsellors, as they were styled, varying at times from four to six in number; the former intrusted with the legislative, the latter with the executive functions of administration. A large proportion of these bodies were selected from the merchants, tradesmen, and mechanics of the city. They were invested not merely with municipal authority, but with many of the rights of sovereignty. They entered into commercial treaties with foreign powers; superintended the defence of the city in time of war; provided for the security of trade; granted letters of reprisal against any nation who might violate it; and raised and appropriated the public moneys for the construction of useful works, or the encouragement of such commercial adventures as were too hazardous or expensive for individual enterprise. The counsellors, who presided over the municipality, were complimented with certain honorary privileges, not even accorded to the nobility. They were addressed by the title of magnificos; were seated, with their heads covered, in the presence of royalty; were preceded by mace-bearers, or lettors, in their progress through the country; and deputies from their body to the court were admitted on the footing and received the honors of foreign ambassadors. These, it will be recollected, were plebeians,—merchants and mechanics. Trade never was esteemed a degradation in Catalonia, as it came to be in Castile.—W. H. Prescott, *Hist. of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, introd., sect. 2.*

A. D. 1640.—Insurrection. See SPAIN: A. D. 1640-1642.

A. D. 1651-1652.—Siege and capture by the Spaniards. See SPAIN: A. D. 1648-1652.

A. D. 1705.—Capture by the Earl of Peterborough. See SPAIN: A. D. 1705.

A. D. 1706.—Unsuccessful siege by the French and Spaniards. See SPAIN: A. D. 1706.

A. D. 1713-1714.—Betrayal and desertion by the Allies.—Siege, capture and massacre by French and Spaniards. See SPAIN: A. D. 1713-1714.

A. D. 1842.—Rebellion and bombardment. See SPAIN: A. D. 1833-1846.

BARCELONA, Treaty of. See ITALY: A. D. 1527-1529.

BARCIDES, OR BARCINE FAMILY, The.—The family of the great Carthaginian, Hamilcar Barca, father of the more famous Hannibal. The surname Barca, or Barcas, given to Hamilcar, is equivalent to the Hebrew Barak and signified lightning.—R. B. Smith, *Carthage and the Carthaginians, ch. 7.*

BARDS. See FILL.

BARDULIA, Ancient Cantabria. See SPAIN: A. D. 1026-1230.

BARÉ, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: GUCK ON COCO GROUP.

BAREBONES PARLIAMENT, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1633 (JUNE—DECEMBER).

BARÈRE AND THE COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC SAFETY. See FRANCE: A. D.

1793 (MARCH—JUNE); (SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER); TO 1794-1795 (JULY—APRIL).

BARKIAROK, Seljouk Turkish Sultan, A. D. 1092-1104.

BARMECIDES, OR BARMEKIDES, The.—The Barmecides, or Barmekides, famous in the history of the Caliphate at Bagdad, and made familiar to all the world by the stories of the "Arabian Nights," were a family which rose to great power and wealth under the Caliph Haroun Alraschid. It took its name from one Khaled Ibn Barmek, a Persian, whose father had been the "Barmek" or custodian of one of the most celebrated temples of the Zoroastrian faith. Khaled accepted Mahometanism and became one of the ablest agents of the conspiracy which overthrew the Ommlad Caliphs and raised the Abbasides to the throne. The first of the Abbassid Caliphs recognized his ability and made him vizier. His son Yahya succeeded to his power and was the first vizier of the famous Haroun Alraschid. But it was Jaufar, one of the sons of Yahya, who became the prime favorite of Haroun and who raised the family of the Barmecides to its acme of splendor. So much greatness in a Persian house excited wide jealousy, however, among the Arabs, and, in the end, the capricious lord and master of the all powerful vizier Jaufar turned his heart against him, and against all his house. The fall of the Barmecides was made as cruel as their advancement had been unscrupulous. Jaufar was beheaded without a moment's warning; his father and brother were imprisoned, and a thousand members of the family are said to have been slain.—R. D. Osborn, *Islam under the Khalifs of Baghad, pt. 2, ch. 2.*

ALSO IN: E. H. Palmer, *Haroun Alraschid, ch. 3.*

BARNABITES. — PAULINES. — "The clerks-regular of St. Paul (Paulines), whose congregation was founded by Antonio Maria Zaccaria of Cremona and two Milanese associates in 1532, approved by Clement VII. in 1533, and confirmed as independent by Paul III. in 1534, in 1545 took the name of Barnabites, from the church of St. Barnabas, which was given up to them at Milan. The Barnabites, who have been described as the democratic wing of the Theatines, actively engaged in the conversion of heretics, both in Italy and in France and in that home of heresy, Bohemia."—A. W. Ward, *The Counter Reformation, p. 29.*

BARNBURNERS. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1845-1846.

BARNET, Battle of (A. D. 1471).—The decisive battle, and the last but one fought, in the "Wars of the Roses." Edward IV., having been driven out of England and Henry VI. reinstated by Warwick, "the King-maker," the former returned before six months had passed and made his way to London. Warwick hastened to meet him with an army of Lancastrians and the two forces came together on Easter Sunday, April 14, 1471, near Barnet, only ten miles from London. The victory, long doubtful, was won for the white rose of York and it was very bloodily achieved. The Earl of Warwick was among the slain. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1455-1471.

BARNEVELDT, John of, The religious persecution and death of. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1603-1619.



**BARON.**—"The title of baron, unlike that of Earl, is a creation of the [Norman] Conquest. The word, in its origin equivalent to 'homo,' receives under feudal institutions, like 'homo' itself, the meaning of vassal. Homage (hominium) is the ceremony by which the vassal becomes the man of his lord; and the homines of the king are barons. Possibly the king's liege of Anglo-Saxon times may answer to the Norman baron."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 11, sect. 124.

**BARON, Court.** See MANORS.

**BARONET.**—"One approaches with reluctance the modern title of baronet. . . . Grammatically, the term is clear enough; it is the diminutive of baron; but baron is emphatically a man, the liege vassal of the king; and baronet, therefore, etymologically would seem to imply a doubt. Degrees of honor admit of no diminution; a 'damoiseil' and a 'donzello' are grammatical diminutives, but they do not lessen the rank of the bearer; for, on the contrary, they denote the heir to the larger honor, being attributed to none but the sons of the prince or nobleman, who bore the paramount title. They did not degrade, even in their etymological signification, which baronet appears to do, and no act of parliament can remove this radical defect. . . . Independently of these considerations, the title arose from the expedient of a needy monarch [James I.] to raise money, and was offered for sale. Any man, provided he were of good birth, might, 'for a consideration,' canton his family shield with the red haud of Ulster."—R. T. Hampson, *Origines Patriæ*, pp. 368-369.

**BARONS' WAR, The.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1216-1274.

**BARONY OF LAND.**—"Fifteen acres, but in some places twenty acres."—N. H. Nicolas, *Notitia Historica*, p. 134.

**BARRIER FORTRESSES, The razing of the.** See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1746-1787.

**BARRIER TREATIES, The.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1709, and NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1713-1715.

**BARROW.**—A mound raised over the buried dead. "This form of memorial, . . . as ancient as it has been lasting, is found in almost all parts of the globe. Barrows, under diverse names, line the coasts of the Mediterranean, the seats of ancient empires and civilisations. . . . They abound in Great Britain and Ireland, differing in shape and size and made of various materials; and are known as barrows (mounds of earth) and cairns (mounds of stone) and popularly in some parts of England as lous, houses, and tumps."—W. Greenwell, *British Barrows*, pp. 1-2.

Also in: Sir J. Lubbock, *Prehistoric Times*, ch. 5.

**BARTENSTEIN, Treaty of.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1807 (FEBRUARY-JUNE).

**BARWALDE, Treaty of.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1831 (JANUARY).

**BASHAN.** See JEWS: ISRAEL UNDER THE JUDGES.

**BASHI BOZOUKS, OR BAZOUKS.**—For the suppression of the revolt of 1875-77 in the Christian provinces of the Turkish dominions (see TURKS: 1861-1876), "besides the regular forces engaged against the Bulgarians, great

numbers of the Moslem part of the local population had been armed by the Government and turned loose to fight the insurgents in their own way. These irregular warriors are called Bashi Bozouks, or Rottenheads. The term alludes to their being sent out without regular organization and without officers at their head."—H. O. Dwight, *Turkish Life in War Time*, p. 15.

**BASIL I.** (called the Macedonian), Emperor in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), A. D. 867-866. . . . Basil, or Vassili, I., Grand Duke of Volodimir, A. D. 1272-1276. . . . Basil II., Emperor in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), A. D. 963-1025. . . . Basil, or Vassili, II., Grand Prince of Moscow, A. D. 1389-1425. . . . Basil III. (The Blind), Grand Prince of Moscow, A. D. 1425-1492. . . . Basil IV., Czar of Russia, A. D. 1505-1533.

**BASILEUS.**—"From the earliest period of history, the sovereigns of Asia had been celebrated in the Greek language by the title of Basileus, or King; and since it was considered as the first distinction among men, it was soon employed by the servile provincials of the east in their humble address to the Roman throne."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 13.

**BASILIAN DYNASTY, The.** See BYZANTINE EMPIRE: A. D. 820-1057.

**BASILICÆ.**—"Among the buildings appropriated to the public service at Rome, none were more important than the Basilicæ. Although their name is Greek, yet they were essentially a Roman creation, and were used for practical purposes peculiarly Roman,—the administration of law and the transaction of merchants' business. Historically, considerable interest attaches to them from their connection with the first Christian churches. The name of Basilicæ was applied by the Romans equally to all large buildings intended for the special needs of public business. . . . Generally, however, they took the form most adapted to their purposes—a semi-circular apse or tribunal for legal trials and a central nave, with arcades and galleries on each side for the transaction of business. They existed not only as separate buildings, but also as reception rooms attached to the great mansions of Rome. . . . It is the opinion of some writers that these private basilicæ, and not the public edifices, served as the model for the Christian Basilica."—R. Burn, *Rome and the Campagna*, introd.

Also in: A. P. Stanley, *Christian Institutions*, ch. 9.

**BASILIKA, The.**—A compilation or codification of the imperial laws of the Byzantine Empire promulgated A. D. 884, in the reign of Basil I. and afterwards revised and amplified by his son, Leo VI.—G. Milnes, *Hist. of the Byzantine Empire*, from 716 to 1057, bk. 2, ch. 1, sect. 1.

**BASING HOUSE, The Storming and Destruction of.**—"Basing House [mansion of the Marquis of Winchester, near Basingstoke, in Hampshire], an immense fortress, with a feudal castle and a Tudor palace within its ramparts, had long been a thorn in the side of the Parliament. Four years it had held out, with an army within, well provisioned for years, and blocked the road to the west. At last it was resolved to take it; and Cromwell was directly commissioned by Parliament to the work. Its capture is one of the most terrible and stirring incidents of the

war. After six days' constant cannonade, the storm began at six o'clock in the morning of the 14th of October [A. D. 1645]. After some hours of desperate fighting, one after another its defences were taken and its garrison put to the sword or taken. The plunder was prodigious; the destruction of property unsparing. It was gutted, burnt, and the very ruins carted away."

—F. Harrison, *Oliver Cromwell*, ch. 5.  
 ALSO IN: S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. of the Civil War*, ch. 37 (v. 2).—Mrs. Thompson, *Recollections of Literary Characters and Celebrated Places*, v. 2, ch. 1.  
**BASLE, Council of.** See PAPACY; A. D. 1431-1448.  
**BASLE, Treaties of (1795).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1794-1795 (OCTOBER—MAY), and 1795 (JUNE—DECEMBER).

**BASOCHÉ.—BASOCHIENS.**—"The Basoché was an association of the 'clerics du Parlement' [Parliament of Paris]. The etymology of the name is uncertain. . . . The Basoché is supposed to have been instituted in 1302, by Philippe-le-Bel, who gave it the title of 'Royaume de la Basoché,' and ordered that it should form a tribunal for judging, without appeal, all civil and criminal matters that might arise among the clerks and all actions brought against them. He likewise ordered that the president should be called 'Roi de la Basoché,' and that the king and his subjects should have an annual 'montre' or review. . . . Under the reign of Henry III. the number of subjects of the roi de la Basoché amounted to nearly 10,000. . . . The members of the Basoché took upon themselves to exhibit plays in the 'Palais,' in which they censured the public manners; indeed they may be said to have been the first comic authors and actors that appeared in Paris. . . . At the commencement of the Revolution, the Basochiens formed a troop, the uniform of which was red, with epaulettes and silver buttons; but they were afterwards disbanded by a decree of the National Assembly."  
 —*Hist. of Paris* (London: G. B. Whittaker, 1827), v. 2, p. 106.

**BASQUES, The.**—"The western extremity of the Pyrenees, where France and Spain join, gives us a locality . . . where, although the towns, like Bayonne, Pampeluna, and Bilbao, are French or Spanish, the country people are Basques or Biscayans—Basques or Biscayans not only in the provinces of Biscny, but in Alava, Upper Navarre, and the French districts of Labourd and Soule. Their name is Spanish (the word having originated in that of the ancient Vascones), and it is not the one by which they designate themselves; though possibly it is indirectly connected with it. The native name is derived from the root Eusk-, which becomes Euskara when the language, Euskkerra when the country, and Euskaldunac when the people are spoken of."—R. G. Latham, *Ethnology of Europe*, ch. 2.  
 ALSO IN: I. Taylor, *Origin of the Aryans*, ch. 4, sect. 4.—See, also, IBERIANS, THE WESTERN, and APPENDIX A. v. 1.

**BASSANO, Battle of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1796 (APRIL—OCTOBER).

**BASSEIN, Treaty of (1802).** See INDIA: A. D. 1798-1805.

**BASSORAH.** See BUSSORAH.

**BASTARNÆ, The.** See PEUCINI.

**BASTILLE, The.**—"The name of Bastille or Bastel was, in ancient times, given to any

kind of erection calculated to withstand a military force; and thus, formerly in England and on the borders of Scotland, the term Bastel-house was usually applied to places of strength and fancied security. Of the many Bastilles in France that of Paris, . . . which at first was called the Bastille St-Antoine, from being erected near the suburb of St-Antoine, retained the name longest. This fortress, of melancholy celebrity, was erected under the following circumstances: In the year 1356, when the English, then at war with France, . . . in the neighbourhood of Paris, it was considered necessary by the inhabitants of the French capital to repair the bulwarks of their city. Stephen Marcel, provost of the merchants, undertook this task, and, amongst other defences, added to the fortifications at the eastern entrance of the town a gate flanked with a tower on each side." This was the beginning of the constructions of the Bastille. They were enlarged in 1369 by Hugh Aubriot, provost of Paris under Charles V. He "added two towers, which, being placed opposite to those already existing on each side of the gate, made of the Bastille a square fort, with a tower at each of the four angles." After the death of Charles V., Aubriot, who had many enemies, was prosecuted for alleged crimes, "was condemned to perpetual confinement, and placed in the Bastille, of which, according to some historians, he was the first prisoner. After some time, he was removed thence to Fort l'Évêque, another prison," from which he was liberated in 1381, by the insurrection of the Maillotins (see PARIS: A. D. 1381). "After the insurrection of the Maillotins, in 1382, the young king, Charles VI., still further enlarged the Bastille by adding four towers to it, thus giving it, instead of the square form it formerly possessed, the shape of an oblong or parallelogram. The fortress now consisted of eight towers, each 100 feet high, and, like the wall which united them, nine feet thick. Four of these towers looked on the city, and four on the suburb of St-Antoine. To increase its strength, the Bastille was surrounded by a ditch 25 feet deep and 120 feet wide. The road which formerly passed through it was turned on one side. . . . The Bastille was now completed (1383), and though additions were subsequently made to it, the body of the fortress underwent no important change. . . . Both as a place of military defence, and as a state prison of great strength, the Bastille was, even at an early period, very formidable."—*Hist. of the Bastille* (Chambers's Miscellany, no. 132, v. 17).—For an account of the taking and destruction of the Bastille by the people, in 1789, see FRANCE: A. D. 1789 (JULY).

ALSO IN: D. Bingham, *The Bastille*.—R. A. Davenport, *Hist. of the Bastille*.

**BASTITANI, The.** See TURDETANI.

**BASUTOS, The.** See SOUTH AFRICA: A. D. 1811-1868.

**BATAVIA (Java), Origin of.** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1594-1620.

**BATAVIAN REPUBLIC, The.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1794-1795 (OCTOBER—MAY).

**BATAVIANS, OR BATAVI, The.**—"The Germanic Batavi had been peacefully united with the [Roman] Empire, not by Cæsar, but not long afterwards, perhaps by Drusus. They were settled in the Rhine delta, that is on the left bank of the Rhine and on the islands formed

by its arms, upwards as far as at least as the Old Rhine, and so nearly from Antwerp to Utrecht and Leyden in Zealand and southern Holland, on territory originally Celtic—at least the local names are predominantly Celtic; their name is still borne by the Betuwe, the lowland between the Waal and the Lek with the capital Noviomagus, now Nimeguen. They were, especially compared with the restless and refractory Celts, obedient and useful subjects, and hence occupied a distinctive position in the aggregate, and particularly in the military system of the Roman Empire. They remained quite free from taxation, but were on the other hand drawn upon more largely than any other canton in the recruiting; this one canton furnished to the army 1,000 horsemen and 9,000 foot soldiers; besides, the men of the imperial body-guard were taken especially from them. The command of these Batavian divisions was conferred exclusively on native Batavi. The Batavi were accounted indisputably not merely as the best riders and swimmers of the army, but also as the model of true soldiers.—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 8, ch. 4.—“When the Cimbr and their associates, about a century before our era, made their memorable onslaught upon Rome, the early inhabitants of the Rhine island of Batavia, who were probably Celts, joined in the expedition. A recent and tremendous inundation had swept away their miserable homes. . . . The island was deserted of its population. At about the same period a civil dissension among the Chatti—a powerful German race within the Hercynian forest—resulted in the expatriation of a portion of the people. The exiles sought a new home in the empty Rhine island, called it ‘Bet-auw,’ or ‘good meadow,’ and were themselves called, thenceforward, Batavi, or Batavians.”—J. L. Motley, *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, *introd.*, sect. 2.

**A. D. 69.—Revolt of Civilis.**—“Galba [Roman Emperor], succeeding to the purple upon the suicide of Nero, dismissed the Batavian life-guards to whom he owed his elevation. He is murdered, Otho and Vitellius contend for the succession, while all eyes are turned upon the eight Batavian regiments. In their hands the scales of Empire seem to rest. They declare for Vitellius and the civil war begins. Otho is defeated; Vitellius acknowledged by Senate and people. Fearing, like his predecessors, the imperious turbulence of the Batavian legions, he, too, sends them into Germany. It was the signal for a long and extensive revolt, which had well-nigh overturned the Roman power in Gaul and Lower Germany. Claudius Civilis was a Batavian of noble race, who had served twenty-five years in the Roman armies. His Teutonic name has perished. . . . After a quarter of a century’s service he was sent in chains to Rome and his brother executed, both falsely charged with conspiracy. . . . Desire to avenge his own wrongs was mingled with loftier motives in his breast. He knew that the sceptre was in the gift of the Batavian soldiery. . . . By his courage, eloquence and talent for political combinations, Civilis effected a general confederation of all the Netherland tribes, both Celtic and German. For a brief moment there was a united people, a Batavian commonwealth. . . . The details of the revolt [A. D. 69] have been carefully preserved by Tacitus, and form

one of his grandest and most elaborate pictures. . . . The battles, the sieges, the defeats, the indomitable spirit of Civilis, still flaming most brightly when the clouds were darkest around him, have been described by the great historian in his most powerful manner. . . . The struggle was an unsuccessful one. After many victories and many overthrows, Civilis was left alone. . . . He accepted the offer of negotiation from Cerialis [the Roman commander]. . . . A colloquy was agreed upon. The bridge across the Nabalia was broken asunder in the middle and Cerialis and Civilis met upon the severed sides. . . . Here the story abruptly terminates. The remainder of the Roman’s narrative is lost, and upon that broken bridge the form of the Batavian hero disappears forever.”—J. L. Motley, *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, *introd.*, sects. 3-4.

ALSO IN: Tacitus, *History*, bks. 4-5.

**BATH, The Order of the.**—“The present Military Order of the Bath, founded by King George I. in the year 1725, differs so essentially from the Knighthood of the Bath, or the custom of making Knights with various rites and ceremonies, of which one was Bathing, that it may almost be considered a distinct and new fraternity of chivalry. The last Knights of the Bath, made according to the ancient forms, were at the coronation of King Charles II.; and from that period until the reign of the first George, the old institution fell into total oblivion. At the latter epoch, however, it was determined to revive, as it was termed, The Order of the Bath, by erecting it ‘into a regular Military Order’; and on the 25th May, 1725, Letters Patent were issued for that purpose. By the Statutes then promulgated, the number of Knights, independent of the Sovereign, a Prince of the Blood Royal, and a Great Master, was restricted to 35.” It has since been greatly increased, and the Order divided into three classes: First Class, consisting of “Knights Grand Cross,” not to exceed 50 for military and 25 for civil service; Second Class, consisting of “Knights Commanders,” not to exceed 102 for military and 50 for civil service; Third Class, “Companions,” not to exceed 525 for military and 200 for civil service.—Sir B. Burke, *Book of Orders of Knighthood*, p. 104.

**BATH, in Roman times.** See AQUÆ SOLIÆ.  
**BATHS OF CARACALLA, Nero, etc.** See THERMÆ.

**BATONIAN WAR, The.**—A formidable revolt of the Dalmatians and Pannonians, A. D. 6, involved the Roman Empire, under Augustus, in a serious war of three years duration, which was called the Batonian War, from the names of two leaders of the insurgents.—Bato the Dalmatian, and Bato the Pannonian.—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 8, ch. 1.

**BATOUÏ: Ceded to Russia.**—Declared a free port. See TUNKS: A. D. 1878.

**BATTIADÆ, The.** See CYRENE.

**BATTLE ABBEY.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1066 (OCTOBER).

**BATTLE ABOVE THE CLOUDS, The.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (OCTOBER—NOVEMBER; TENNESSEE).

**BATTLE OF THE CAMEL.** See MACHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 661.

**BATTLE OF THE KEGS, The.** See PHILADELPHIA: A. D. 1777-1778.

**BATTLE OF THE NATIONS (Leipsic).** See GERMANY: A. D. 1813 (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER), and (OCTOBER).

**BATTLE OF THE THREE EMPERORS.**—The battle of Austerlitz—see FRANCE: A. D. 1805 (MARCH—DECEMBER)—was so called by Napoleon.

**BATTLES.**—The battles of which account is given in this work are so numerous that no convenience would be served by collecting references to them under this general heading. They are severally indexed under the names by which they are historically known.

**BAURE, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINALS: ANDESIANS.

**BAUTZEN, Battle of.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1813 (MAY—AUGUST).

**BAUX, Lords of; Gothic Origin of.**—The illustrious Visigothic race of the "Balthi" or "Balthia" ("the bold"), from which sprang Alaric, "continued to flourish in France in the Gothic province of Septimania, or Langue-doc, under the corrupted appellation of <sup>301</sup>BAUX, and a branch of that family afterwards settled in the kingdom of Naples."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 30, note.

**BAVARIA: The name.**—Bavaria derived its name from the Boli.—R. G. Latham, *The Germania of Tacitus; Epitomea*, sect. 20.—See, also, BOIANS.

**The Ethnology of.**—"Bavaria . . . falls into two divisions; the Bavaria of the Rhine, and the Bavaria of the Danube. In Rhenish Bavaria the descent is from the ancient Vangiones and Nemetes, either Germanized Gauls or Gallicized Germans, with Roman superadditions. Afterwards, an extension of the Alemannic and Suevic populations from the right bank of the Upper Rhine completes the evolution of their present Germanic character. Danubian Bavaria falls into two subdivisions. North of the Danube the valley of the Naab, at least, was originally Slavonic, containing an extension of the Slavonic population of Bohemia. But disturbance and displacement began early. . . . In the third and fourth centuries, the Suevi and Alemanni extended themselves from the Upper Rhine. . . . The northwestern parts of Bavaria were probably German from the beginning. South of the Danube the ethnology changes. In the first place the Roman elements increase; since Vindelicia was a Roman province. . . . Its present character has arisen from an extension of the Germans of the Upper Rhine."—R. G. Latham, *Ethnology of Europe*, ch. 8.

**A. D. 547.—Subjection of the Bavarians to the Franks.**—"It is about this period [A. D. 547] that the Bavarians first become known in history as tributaries of the Franks; but at what time they became so is matter of dispute. From the previous silence of the annalists respecting this people, we may perhaps infer that both they and the Stabians remained independent until the fall of the Ostrogothic Empire in Italy. The Gothic dominions were bounded on the north by Rætia and Noricum; and between these countries and the Thuringians, who lived still further to the north, was the country of the Bavarians and Stabians. Thuringia had long been possessed by the Franks. Rætia was ceded by Vitiges, king of Italy, and Venetia was conquered by Theudebert [the Austrasian Frank King]. The Bavarians were therefore, at this

period, almost surrounded by the Frankish territories. . . . Whenever they may have first submitted to the yoke, it is certain that at the time of Theudebert's death [A. D. 547], or shortly after that event, both Havarians and Stabians (or Alemannians), had become subjects of the Merovingian kings."—W. C. Perry, *The Franks*, ch. 3.

**A. D. 843-962.—The ancient Duchy.** See GERMANY: A. D. 843-962.

**A. D. 876.—Added to the Austrian March.** See AUSTRIA: A. D. 805-1246.

**A. D. 1071-1178.—The Dukes of the House of Gueif.** See GUEIFES AND GIBELLINES; and SAXONY: A. D. 1178-1183.

**A. D. 1101.—Disastrous Crusade of Duke Welf.** See CRUSADES: A. D. 1101-1102.

**A. D. 1125-1152.—The origin of the Electorate.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1125-1152.

**A. D. 1138-1183.—Involved in the beginnings of the Gueif and Ghibelline Conflicts.—The struggles of Henry the Proud and Henry the Lion.** See GUEIFES AND GIBELLINES, and SAXONY: A. D. 1178-1183.

**A. D. 1156.—Separation of the Austrian March, which becomes a distinct Duchy.** See AUSTRIA: A. D. 805-1246.

**A. D. 1180-1356.—The House of Wittelsbach.—Its acquisition of Bavaria and the Palatinate of the Rhine.—Loss of the Electoral Vote by Bavaria.**—When, in 1180, the dominions of Henry the Lion, under the ban of the Empire, were stripped from him (see SAXONY: A. D. 1178-1183), by the imperial sentence of forfeiture, and were divided and conferred upon others by Frederick Barbarossa, the Duchy of Bavaria was given to Otto, Count Palatine of Wittelsbach. "As he claimed a descent from an ancient royal family of Bavaria, it was alleged that, in obtaining the sovereignty of that state, he had only in some measure regained those rights which in former times belonged to his ancestors."

—Sir A. Halliday, *Annals of the House of Hanover*, v. 1, p. 276.—"Otto . . . was a descendant of that Duke Luitpold who fell in combat with the Hungarians, and whose sons and grandsons had already worn the ducal cap of Bavaria. No princely race in Europe is of such ancient extraction. . . . Bavaria was as yet destitute of towns; Landshutt and Munich first rose into consideration in the course of the 13th century; Ratisbon, already a flourishing town, was regenerated as the capital and residence of the Dukes of Bavaria. . . . A further accession of dignity and power awaited the family in 1214 in the acquisition of the Palatinate of the Rhine. Duke Ludwig was now the most powerful prince of Southern Germany. . . . His son Otto the Illustrious, remaining . . . true to the imperial house, died excommunicate, and his dominions were placed for several years under an interdict. . . . Upon the death of Otto a partition of the inheritance took place. This partition became to the family an hereditary evil, a fatal source of quarrel and of secret or open enmity. . . . In [the] dark and dreadful period of interregnum [see GERMANY: A. D. 1250-1272], when all men waited for the final dissolution of the empire, nothing appears concerning the Wittelsbach family. . . . Finally in 1273 Rudolf, the first of the Habsburgs, ascended the long-unoccupied throne. . . . He won over the Bavarian princes by bestowing his daughters upon them in

me rlage. Louis remained faithful and rendered him good service; but the turbulent Henry, who had already made war upon his brother for the possession of the electoral vote, deserted him, and for this Bavaria was punished by the loss of the vote, and of the territory above the Enns." Afterwards, for a time, the Duke of Bavaria and the Count Palatine exercised the right of the electoral vote alternately; but in 1356 by the Golden Bull of Charles IV. [see GERMANY: A. D. 1347-1438], the vote was given wholly to the Count Palatine, and lost to Bavaria for nearly 300 years.—J. I. von Dollinger, *The House of Wittelsbach* (Studies in European History, ch. 2).

A. D. 1314.—Election of Louis to the imperial throne. See GERMANY: A. D. 1314-1347.

A. D. 1500.—Formation of the Circle. See GERMANY: A. D. 1493-1519.

A. D. 1610.—The Duke at the head of the Catholic League. See GERMANY: A. D. 1608-1618.

A. D. 1616.—The Duke in command of the forces of the Catholic League. See GERMANY: A. D. 1618-1620.

A. D. 1623.—Transfer to the Duke of the Electoral dignity of the Elector Palatine. See GERMANY: A. D. 1621-1623.

A. D. 1632.—Occupation by Gustavus Adolphus. See GERMANY: A. D. 1631-1632.

A. D. 1646-1648.—Ravaged by the Swedes and French.—Truce made and renounced by the Elector.—The last campaigns of the war. See GERMANY: A. D. 1646-1648.

A. D. 1648.—Acquisition of the Upper Palatinate in the Peace of Westphalia. See GERMANY: A. D. 1648.

A. D. 1686.—The League of Augsburg. See GERMANY: A. D. 1686.

A. D. 1689-1696.—The war of the Grand Alliance against Louis XIV. See FRANCE: A. D. 1689-1690; 1689-1691; 1692; 1693 (JULY-1694); 1695-1696.

A. D. 1700.—Claims of the Electoral Prince on the Spanish Crown. See SPAIN: A. D. 1698-1700.

A. D. 1702.—The Elector joins France against the Allies. See GERMANY: A. D. 1702.

A. D. 1703.—Successes of the French and Bavarians. See GERMANY: A. D. 1703.

A. D. 1704.—Ravaged, crushed and surrendered by the Elector. See GERMANY: A. D. 1704.

A. D. 1705.—Dissolution of the Electorate. See GERMANY: A. D. 1705.

A. D. 1714.—The Elector restored to his Dominions. See UTRECHT: A. D. 1712-1714.

A. D. 1740.—Claims of the Elector to the Austrian succession. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1740 (OCTOBER).

A. D. 1742.—The Elector crowned Emperor. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1741 (OCTOBER).

A. D. 1743 (April).—The Emperor-Elector recovers his Electoral territory. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1742 (JUNE-DECEMBER), and 1743.

A. D. 1743 (June).—The Emperor-Elector again a fugitive.—The Austrians in Possession. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1743.

A. D. 1745.—Death of the Emperor-Elector.—Peace with Austria. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1744-1745.

A. D. 1748.—Termination and results of the war of the Austrian Succession. See AIX-LA-CHAPELLE, THE CONGRESS.

A. D. 1767.—Expulsion of the Jesuits. See JESUITS: A. D. 1761-1769.

A. D. 1777-1779.—The Succession question.—"With the death of Maximilian Joseph, of Bavaria (30 December, 1777), the younger branch of the house of Wittelsbach became extinct, and the electorate of Bavaria . . . came to an end. By virtue of the original partition in 1310, the duchy of Bavaria ought to pass to the elder branch of the family, represented by Charles Theodore, the Elector Palatine. But Joseph [the Second, the Emperor], saw the possibility of securing valuable additions to Austria which would round off the frontier on the west. The Austrian claims were legally worthless. They were based chiefly upon a gift of the Straubingen territory which Sigismund was said to have made in 1426 to his son-in-law, Albert of Austria, but which had never taken effect and had since been utterly forgotten. It would be impossible to induce the diet to recognise such claims, but it might be possible to come to an understanding with the aged Charles Theodore, who had no legitimate children and was not likely to feel any very keen interest in his new inheritance. Without much difficulty the elector was half frightened, half induced to sign a treaty (3 January, 1778), by which he recognised the claims put forward by Austria, while the rest of Bavaria was guaranteed to him and his successors. Austrian troops were at once despatched to occupy the ceded districts. The condition of Europe seemed to assure the success of Joseph's bold venture. . . . There was only one quarter from which opposition was to be expected, Prussia. Frederick promptly appealed to the fundamental laws of the Empire, and declared his intention of upholding them with arms. But he could find no supporters except those who were immediately interested, the elector of Saxony, whose mother, as a sister of the late elector of Bavaria, had a legal claim to his allodial property, and Charles of Zweibrücken, the heir apparent of the childless Charles Theodore. . . . Frederick, left to himself, despatched an army into Bohemia, where the Austrian troops had been joined by the emperor in person. But nothing came of the threatened hostilities. Frederick was unable to force on a battle, and the so-called war was little more than an armed negotiation. . . . France and Russia undertook to mediate, and negotiations were opened in 1779 at Teschen, where peace was signed on the 13th of May. Austria withdrew the claims which had been recognised in the treaty with the Elector Palatine, and received the 'quarter of the Inn,' i. e., the district from Passau to Wildshut. Frederick's eventual claims to the succession in the Franconian principalities of Ansbach and Baireuth, which Austria had every interest in opposing, were recognised by the treaty. The claims of Saxony were bought off by a payment of 4,000,000 thalers. The most unsatisfactory part of the treaty was that it was guaranteed by France and Russia. . . . On the whole, it was a great triumph for Frederick and an equal humiliation for Joseph II. His schemes of aggrandisement had been foiled."—R. Lodge, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, ch. 20, sect. 3.

ALSO IN: T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 6, ch. 8 (p. 3).

A. D. 1801-1803.—Acquisition of territory under the Treaty of Luneville. See GERMANY: A. D. 1801-1803.

**A. D. 1805-1806.**—Aggrandized by Napoleon.—Created a Kingdom.—Joined to the Confederation of the Rhine. See GERMANY: A. D. 1805-1806, and 1806 (JANUARY—AUGUST).

**A. D. 1809.**—The revolt in the Tyrol.—Heroic struggle of Hofer and his countrymen. See GERMANY: A. D. 1809-1810 (APRIL—FEBRUARY).

**A. D. 1813.**—Abandonment of Napoleon and the Rhenish Confederation.—Union with the Allies. See GERMANY: A. D. 1813 (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER), and (OCTOBER—DECEMBER).

**A. D. 1814-1815.**—Restoration of the Tyrol to Austria.—Territorial compensations. See VIENNA, THE CONGRESS OF, and FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (APRIL—JUNE).

**A. D. 1848 (March).**—Revolutionary outbreak.—Expulsion of Lola Montez.—Abdication of the King. See GERMANY: A. D. 1848 (MARCH).

**A. D. 1866.**—The Seven Weeks War.—Indemnity and territorial cession to Prussia. See GERMANY: A. D. 1866.

**A. D. 1870-1871.**—Treaty of Union with the Germanic Confederation, soon transformed into the German Empire. See GERMANY: A. D. 1870 (SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER), and 1871.

**BAVAY**, Origin of. See NERVIL.

**BAXAR, OR BAKSAR, OR BUXAR**, Battle of (1764). See INDIA: A. D. 1757-1773.

**BAYARD**, The Chevalier: His knightly deeds and his death. See ITALY: A. D. 1501-1504, and FRANCE: A. D. 1523-1525.

**BAYEUX TAPESTRY.**—A remarkable roll of mediæval tapestry, 214 feet long and 20 inches wide, preserved for centuries in the cathedral at Bayeux, Normandy, on which a pictorial history of the Norman invasion and conquest of England is represented, with more or less of names and explanatory inscriptions. Mr. E. A. Freeman (*Norman Conquest*, v. 3, note A) says: "It will be seen that, throughout this volume, I accept the witness of the Bayeux Tapestry as one of my highest authorities. I do not hesitate to say that I look on it as holding the first place among the authorities on the Norman side. That it is a contemporary work I entertain no doubt whatever, and I entertain just as little doubt as to its being a work fully entitled to our general confidence. I believe the tapestry to have been made for Bishop Odo, and to have been most probably designed by him as an ornament for his newly rebuilt cathedral church of Bayeux." The precious tapestry is now preserved in the public library at Bayeux, carefully stretched round the room under glass.

**BAYEUX**, The Saxons of. See SAXONS OF BAYEUX.

**BAYLEN**, Battle of (1808). See SPAIN: A. D. 1808 (MAY—SEPTEMBER).

**BAYOGULAS**, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: MUSKHOGEAN FAMILY.

**BAYONNE**: Conference of Catharine de' Medici and the Duke of Alva (1565). See FRANCE: A. D. 1563-1570.

**BAZAINE'S SURRENDER AT METZ**. See FRANCE: A. D. 1870 (JULY—AUGUST), (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER), and (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER).

**BEACONSFIELD (Disraeli) Ministries**. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1851-1852; 1858-1859; 1868-1870, and 1873-1880.

**BEAR FLAG**, The. See CALIFORNIA: A. D. 1846-1847.

**BÉARN**: The rise of the Counts. See BURGUNDY: A. D. 1032.

**A. D. 1620.**—Absorbed and incorporated in the Kingdom of France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1620-1622.

**A. D. 1685.**—The Dragonnade.—Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. See FRANCE: A. D. 1681-1698.

**BEATOUN**, Cardinal, The assassination of. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1546.

**BEAUFORT**, N. C., Capture of, by the National forces (1862). See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JANUARY—APRIL: NORTH CAROLINA).

**BEAUGÉ**, Battle of.—The English commanded by the Duke of Clarence, defeated in Anjou by an army of French and Scots, under the Dauphin of France; the Duke of Clarence slain.

**BEAUMARCHAIS'S TRANSACTIONS** WITH THE UNITED STATES. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776-1778.

**BEAUMONT**, Battle of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1870 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER).

**BEAUREGARD**, General G. T.—Bombardment of Fort Sumter. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (MARCH—APRIL). . . . At the first Battle of Bull Run. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (JULY: VIRGINIA). . . . Command in the Potomac district. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861-1862 (DECEMBER—APRIL: VIRGINIA). . . . Command in the West. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (FEBRUARY—APRIL: TENNESSEE), and (APRIL—MAY: TENNESSEE—MISSISSIPPI). . . . The Defence of Charleston. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (AUGUST—DECEMBER: SOUTH CAROLINA).

**BEAUVAIS**, Origin of. See BELGÆ.

**BEBRYKIANS**, The. See BITHYNIANS.

**BEC**, Abbey of.—One of the most famous abbeys and ecclesiastical schools of the middle ages. Its name was derived from the little beck or rivulet of a valley in Normandy, on the banks of which a pious knight, Herlouin, retiring from the world, had fixed his hermitage. The renown of the piety of Herlouin drew others around him and resulted in the formation of a religious community with himself at its head. Among those attracted to Herlouin's retreat were a noble Lombard scholar, Lanfranc of Pavia, who afterwards became the great Norman archbishop of Canterbury, and Anselm of Aosta, another Italian, who succeeded Lanfranc at Canterbury with still more fame. The teaching of Lanfranc at Bec raised it, says Mr. Green in his *Short History of the English People*, into the most famous school of Christendom; it was, in fact, the first wave of the intellectual movement which was spreading from Italy to the ruder countries of the West. The fabric of the canon law and of mediæval scholasticism, with the philosophical scepticism which first awoke under its influence, all trace their origin to Bec. "The glory of Bec would have been as transitory as that of other monastic houses, but for the appearance of one illustrious man [Lanfranc] who came to be enrolled as a private member of the brotherhood, and who gave Bec for a while a special and honorable character with which hardly any other monastery in Christendom could

compare."—E. A. Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, ch. 8.

**BECHUANAS**, The. See SOUTH AFRICA: THE ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS; and AFRICA: THE INHABITING RACES.

**BECCKET**, Thomas, and King Henry II. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1162-1170.

**BED-CHAMBER QUESTION**, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1837-1839.

**BED OF JUSTICE**.—"The ceremony by which the French kings compelled the registration of their edicts by the Parliament was called a 'lit de justice' [bed of justice]. The monarch proceeded in state to the Grand Chambre, and the chancellor, having taken his pleasure, announced that the king required such and such a decree to be entered on their records in his presence. It was held that this personal interference of the sovereign suspended for the time being the functions of all inferior magistrates, and the edict was accordingly registered without a word of objection. The form of registration was as follows: 'Le roi séant en son lit de justice a ordonné et ordonne que les présents édicts seront enregistrés;' and at the end of the decree, 'Fait en Parlement, le roi y séant en son lit de justice.'"—*Students' Hist. of France*, note to ch. 19.

—See, also, PARLIAMENT OF PARIS.—"The origin of this term ['bed of justice'] has been much discussed. The wits complained it was so styled because there justice was put to sleep. The term was probably derived from the arrangement of the throne on which the king sat. The back and sides were made of bolsters and it was called a bed."—J. B. Perkins, *France under Mazarin*, v. 1, p. 388, foot-note.—An elaborate and entertaining account of a notable Bed of Justice held under the Regency, in the early part of the reign of Louis XV., will be found in the Memoirs of the Duke de Saint Simon, abridged translation of St. John, v. 4, ch. 5-7.

**BEDR**, Battle of. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 609-632.

**BEDRIACUM**, Battles of. See ROME: A. D. 69.

**BEECHY HEAD**, Battle of (A. D. 1690). See ENGLAND: A. D. 1690 (JUNE).

**BEEF-EATERS**, The. See YEOMEN OF THE GUARD.

**BEEF STEAK CLUB**, The. See CLUBS: THE BEEF STEAK.

**BEER-ZATH**, Battle of.—The field on which the great Jewish soldier and patriot, Judas Maccabæus, having but 800 men with him, was beset by an army of the Syrians and slain, B. C. 161.—Josephus, *Antiq. of the Jews*, bk. 12, ch. 11.

ALSO IX: H. Ewald, *Hist. of Israel*, bk. 5, sect. 2.

**BEG**.—A Turkish title, signifying prince or lord; whence, also, Bey. See BEY.

**BEGGARS** (Gueux) of the Netherland Revolt. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1562-1566.

**BEGGARS OF THE SEA**. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1572.

**BEGUINES**, OR **BEGHINES**.—**BEGHARDS**.—Weaving Brothers.—Lollards.—Brethren of the Free Spirit.—Fratricelli.—Bizochi.—Turlupins.—"In the year 1180 there lived in Liege a certain kindly, stammering priest, known from his infirmity as Lambert le Bègue. This man took pity on the destitute widows of the town. Despite the impediment in his speech, he was, as often happens, a man of a certain power and eloquence in preaching. . .

This Lambert so moved the hearts of his hearers that gold and silver poured in on him, given to relieve such of the destitute women of Liege as were still of good and pious life. With the moneys thus collected, Lambert built a little square of cottages, with a church in the middle and a hospital, and at the side a cemetery. Here he housed these homeless widows, one or two in each little house, and then he drew up a half monastic rule which was to guide their lives. The rule was very simple, quite informal: no vows, no great renunciation bound the 'Swestrones Brod durch Got.' A certain time of the day was set apart for prayer and pious meditation; the other hours they spent in spinning or sewing, in keeping their houses clean, or they went as nurses in time of sickness into the homes of the townspeople. . . . Thus these women, though pious and sequestered, were still in the world and of the world. . . . Soon we find the name 'Swestrones Brod durch Got' set aside for the more usual title of Beguines or Beghines. Different authorities give different origins of this word. . . . Some have thought it was taken in memory of the founder, the charitable Lambert le Bègut. Others think that, even as the Mystics or Mutterers, the Lollards or Hummers, the Popelhards or Babbler, so the Beguines or Stammerers were thus nicknamed from their continual murmuring in prayer. This is plausible; but not so plausible as the suggestion of Dr. Mosheim and M. Auguste Jundt, who derive the word Beguine from the Flemish word 'beggen,' to beg. For we know that these pious women had been veritable beggars; and beggars should they again become. With surprising swiftness the new order spread through the Netherlands and into France and Germany. . . . Lambert may have lived to see a beguineage in every great town within his ken; but we hear no more of him. The Beguines are no longer for Liege, but for all the world. Each city possessed its quiet congregation; and at any sick-bed you might meet a woman clad in a simple smock and a great veil-like mantle, who lived only to pray and do deeds of mercy. . . . The success of the Beguines had made them an example. . . . Before St. Francis and St. Dominic instituted the mendicant orders, there had silently grown up in every town of the Netherlands a spirit of fraternity, not imposed by any rule, but the natural impulse of a people. The weavers seated all day long alone at their rattling looms, the armourers beating out their thoughts in iron, the cross-legged tailors and busy cobblers thinking and stitching together—these men silent, pious, thoughtful, joined themselves in a fraternity modelled on that of the Beguines. They were called the Weaving Brothers. Bound by no vows and fettered by no rule, they still lived the worldly life and pled their trade for hire. Only in their leisure they met together and prayed and dreamed and thought. . . . Such were the founders of the great fraternity of 'Fratres Textores,' or Beghards as in later years the people more generally called them."—A. M. F. Robinson, *The End of the Middle Ages*, 1.—"The Lollards differed from the Beghards less in reality than in name. We are informed respecting them that, at their origin in Antwerp, shortly after 1300, they associated together for the purpose of waiting upon patients dangerously sick, and burying the dead. . . . Very

ear, y, however, an element of a different kind began to work in those fellowships. Even about the close of the 13th century irregularities and extravagances are laid to their charge. . . . The charges brought against the later Beghards and Lollards, in connection, on the one hand, with the fanatical Franciscans, who were violently contending with the Church, and on the other, with the Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit, relate to three particulars, viz., an aversion to all useful industry, conjoined with a propensity to mendicancy and idleness, an intemperate spirit of opposition to the Church, and a skeptical and more or less pantheistical mysticism. . . . They . . . declared that the time of Antichrist was come, and on all hands endeavoured to embroil the people with their spiritual guides. Their own professed object was to restore the pure primeval state, the divine life of freedom, innocence, and nature. The idea they formed of that state was, that man, being in and of himself one with God, requires only to act in the consciousness of this unity, and to follow unrestrained the divinely implanted impulses and inclinations of his nature, in order to be good and godly."—C. Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, v. 2, pp. 14-16.—"The names of beghards and beguines came not unnaturally to be used for devotees who, without being members of any regular monastic society, made a profession of religious strictness; and thus the applications of the names to some kinds of sectaries was easy—more especially as many of these found it convenient to assume the outward appearance of beghards, in the hope of disguising their differences from the church. But on the other hand, this drew on the orthodox beghards frequent persecutions, and many of them, for the sake of safety, were glad to connect themselves as tertiary with the great mendicant orders. . . . In the 14th century, the popes dealt hardly with the beghards; yet orthodox societies under this name still remained in Germany; and in Belgium, the country of their origin, sisterhoods of beguines flourish to the present day. . . . Matthias of Janow, the Bohemian reformer, in the end of the 14th century, says that all who act differently from the profane vulgar are called beghardi or turlupini, or by other blasphemous names. . . . Among those who were confounded with the beghards—partly because, like them, they abounded along the Rhine—were the brethren and sisters of the Free Spirit. These appear in various places under various names. They wore a peculiarly simple dress, professed to give themselves to contemplation, and, holding that labour is a hindrance to contemplation and to the elevation of the soul to God, they lived by beggary. Their doctrines were mystical and almost pantheistic. . . . The brethren and sisters of the Free Spirit were much persecuted, and probably formed a large proportion of those who were burnt under the name of beghards."—J. C. Robertson, *Hist. of Christian Church*, bk. 7, ch. 7 (v. 6).—"Near the close of this century [the 13th] originated in Italy the Fraticelli and Bizoeli, parties that in Germany and France were denominated Beguards; and which, first Boniface VIII., and afterwards other pontiffs condemned, and wished to see persecuted by the Inquisition and exterminated in every possible way. The Fraticelli, who also called themselves in Latin 'Frates parvi'

(Little Brethren), or 'Fraterculi de paupere vita' (Little Brothers of the Poor Life), were Franciscan monks, but detached from the great family of Franciscans; who wished to observe the regulations prescribed by their founder St. Francis more perfectly than the others, and therefore possessed no property, either individually or collectively, but obtained their necessary food from day to day by begging. . . . They predicted a reformation and purification of the church. . . . They extolled Celestine V. as the legal founder of their sect; but Boniface and the succeeding pontiffs, who opposed the Fraticelli, they denied to be true pontiffs. As the great Franciscan family had its associates and dependents, who observed the third rule prescribed by St. Francis [which required only certain pious observances, such as fasts, prayers, continence, a coarse, cheap dress, gravity of manners, &c., but did not prohibit private property, marriage, public offices, and worldly occupations], and who were usually called Tertiarii, so also the sect of the Fraticelli . . . had numerous Tertiarii of its own. These were called, in Italy, Bizoeli and Bocasoti; in France Beguini; and in Germany Beghardi, by which name all the Tertiarii were commonly designated. These differed from the Fraticelli . . . only in their mode of life. The Fraticelli were real monks, living under the rule of St. Francis; but the Bizoeli or Beguini lived in the manner of other people. . . . Totally different from these austere Beguini and Beguine, were the German and Belgic Beguine, who did not indeed originate in this century, but now first came into notice. . . . Concerning the Turlupins, many have written; but none accurately. . . . The origin of the name, I know not; but I am able to prove from substantial documents, that the Turlupins who were burned at Paris, and in other parts of France were no other than the Brethren of the Free Spirit whom the pontiffs and councils condemned."—J. L. Von Mosheim, *Inst's of Ecclesiastical Hist.*, bk. 3, century 13, pt. 2, ch. 2, sect. 29-41, and ch. 5, sect. 9, foot-note.

ALSO IN: L. Mariotti (A. Gallenga), *Fra Dolcino and his Times*.—See, also, PICARDS.

**BEGUMS OF OUDE, Warren Hastings and the.** See INDIA: A. D. 1773-1785.

**BEHISTUN, Rock of.**—"This remarkable spot, lying on the direct route between Babylon and Ecbatana, and presenting the unusual combination of a copious fountain, a rich plain and a rock suitable for sculpture, must have early attracted the attention of the great monarchs who marched their armies through the Zagros range, as a place where they might conveniently set up memorials of their exploits. . . . The tablet and inscriptions of Darius, which have made Behistun famous in modern times, are in a recess to the right of the scarped face of the rock, and at a considerable elevation."—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: Media*, ch. 1.—"The mountain or rock of Behistun fixes the location of the district known to the Greeks as Bagistana. "It lies southwest of Elvend, between that mountain and the Zagrus in the valley of the Choaspes, and is the district now known as Kirmensah."—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, bk. 8, ch. 1.

**BEHRING SEA CONTROVERSY, and Arbitration.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1886-1893.



**BEIRUT**, Origin of. See **BEIRYTUS**.

**BELA I.**, King of Hungary, A. D. 1060-1063. . . . **Bela II.**, A. D. 1131-1141. . . . **Bela III.**, A. D. 1173-1196. . . . **Bela IV.**, A. D. 1235-1270.

**BELCHITE**, Battle of. See **SPAIN**: A. D. 1809 (FEBRUARY—JUNE).

**BELERION**, OR **BOLERIUM**.—The Roman name of Land's End, England. See **BRITAIN**: **CELTIC TRIBES**.

**BELFORT**.—Siege by the Germans (1870-1871). See **FRANCE**: A. D. 1870-1871.

**BELGÆ**, The.—“This Belgian confederation included the people of all the country north of the Seine and Marne, bounded by the Atlantic on the west and the Rhine on the north and east, except the *Mediomatrici* and *Treviri*. . . . The old divisions of France before the great revolution of 1789 corresponded in some degree to the divisions of the country in the time of Cæsar, and the names of the people are still retained with little alteration in the names of the chief towns or the names of the ante-revolutionary divisions of France. In the country of the Remi between the Marne and the Aisne there is the town of Reims. In the territory of the *Suessiones* between the Marne and the Aisne there is Soissons on the Aisne. The *Bellovaci* were west of the Oise (*Isara*) a branch of the Seine: their chief town, which at some time received the name of *Cæsaromagus*, is now Beauvais. The *Nervii* were between and on the *Sambre* and the *Schelde*. The *Atrebatæ* were north of the *Bellovaci* between the *Somme* and the upper *Schelde*: their chief place was *Nemetacum* or *Nemetocenna*, now Arras in the old division of *Artois*. The *Ambiani* were on the *Somme* (*Samara*): their name is represented by *Amiens* (*Samarobriua*). The *Morini*, or sea-coast men extended from *Boulogne* towards *Dunkerque*. The *Menapii* bordered on the northern *Remii* and were on both sides of the lower *Rhine* (B. G. iv., 4). The *Caleti* were north of the lower *Seine* along the coast in the *Pays de Caux*. The *Velocasses* were east of the *Caleti* on the north side of the *Seine* as far as the *Oise*: their chief town was *Rotomagus* (*Rouen*) and their country was afterwards *Vexin Normand* and *Vexin Français*. The *Veromandui* were north of the *Suessiones*: their chief town under the Roman dominion, *Augusta Veromanduorum*, is now *St. Quentin*. The *Aduatuci* were on the lower *Maas*. The *Condrusi* and the others included under the name of *Germani* were on the *Maas*, or between the *Maas* and the *Rhine*. The *Eburones* had the country about *Tongern* and *Spa*, and were the immediate neighbours of the *Menapii* on the *Rhine*.”—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, v. 4, ch. 3.—“Cæsar . . . informs us that, in their own estimation, they [the Belgæ] were principally descended from a German stock, the offspring of some early migration across the *Rhine*. . . . Strabo . . . by no means concurred in Cæsar's view of the origin of this . . . race, which he believed to be Gaulish and not German, though differing widely from the *Galli*, or *Gauls* of the central region.”—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: E. Guest, *Origines Celticæ*, v. 1, ch. 12.

**B. C. 57**.—Cæsar's campaign against the confederacy.—In the second year of Cæsar's command in Gaul, B. C. 57, he led his legions against the Belgæ, whom he characterized in his

Commentaries as the bravest of all the people of Gaul. The many tribes of the Belgian country had joined themselves in a great league to oppose the advancing Roman power, and were able to bring into the field no less than 200,000 men. The tribe of the Remi alone refused to join the confederacy and placed themselves on the Roman side. Cæsar who had quartered his army during the winter in the country of the *Sequali*, marched boldly, with eight legions, into the midst of these swarming enemies. In his first encounter with them on the banks of the *Aisne*, the Belgic barbarians were terribly cut to pieces and were so disheartened that tribe after tribe made submission to the proconsul as he advanced. But the *Nervii*, who boasted a Germanic descent, together with the *Aduatuci*, the *Atrebatæ* and the *Veromandui*, rallied their forces for a struggle to the death. The *Nervii* succeeded in surprising the Romans, while the latter were preparing their camp on the banks of the *Sambre*, and very nearly swept Cæsar and his veterans off the field, by their furious and tremendous charge. But the energy and personal influence of the one, with the steady discipline of the other, prevailed in the end over the untrained valour of the *Nervii*, and the proud nation was not only defeated but annihilated. “Their eulogy is preserved in the written testimony of their conqueror; and the Romans long remembered, and never failed to signalize their formidable valour. But this recollection of their ancient prowess became from that day the principal monument of their name and history, for the defeat they now sustained well nigh annihilated the nation. Their combatants were cut off almost to a man. The elders and the women, who had been left in secure retreats, came forth of their own accord to solicit the conqueror's clemency. . . . ‘Of 600 senators,’ they said, ‘we have lost all but three; of 60,000 fighting men 500 only remain.’ Cæsar treated the survivors with compassion.”—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 7.

ALSO IN: Julius Cæsar, *Gallie Wars*, bk. 2.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, v. 4, ch. 3.—Napoleon III., *Hist. of Cæsar*, bk. 3, ch. 5.

**BELGÆ OF BRITAIN**, The.—Supposed to be a colony from the Belgæ of the continent. The territory which they occupied is now embraced in the counties of *Wiltshire* and *Somerset*. See **BRITAIN**: **CELTIC TRIBES**.

**BELGIUM: Ancient and Mediaeval History**. See **BELGÆ**, **NERVII**, **FRANKS**, **LORRAINE**, **FLANDERS**, **LIÈGE**, **NETHERLANDS**.

**Modern History**. See **NETHERLANDS**.

**BELGRADE: Origin**.—During the attacks of the *Avars* upon the territory of the Eastern Empire, in the last years of the 6th century, the city of *Singidunum*, at the junction of the *Sava* with the *Danube*, was taken and totally destroyed. The advantageous site of the extinct town soon attracted a colony of *Slavonians*, who raised out of the ruins a new and strongly fortified city—the *Belgrade*, or the *White City* of later times. “The *Slavonic* name of *Belgrade* is mentioned in the 10th century by *Constantine Porphyrogenitus*: the Latin appellation of *Alba Græca* is used by the *Franks* in the beginning of the 9th.”—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 46, note.

**A. D. 1425**.—Acquired by Hungary and fortified against the *Turks*. See **HUNGARY**: A. D. 1301-1442.

**A. D. 1442.**—First repulse of the Turks. See **TURKS (THE OTTOMANS)**: A. D. 1402-1451.

**A. D. 1456.**—Second repulse of the Turks. See **HUNGARY**: A. D. 1442-1458; and **TURKS (THE OTTOMANS)**: A. D. 1451-1481.

**A. D. 1521.**—Siege and capture by Solymán the Magnificent. See **HUNGARY**: A. D. 1487-1520.

**A. D. 1688-1690.**—Taken by the Austrians and recovered by the Turks. See **HUNGARY**: A. D. 1683-1690.

**A. D. 1717.**—Recovery from the Turks. See **HUNGARY**: A. D. 1699-1718.

**A. D. 1739.**—Restored to the Turks. See **RUSSIA**: A. D. 1725-1739.

**A. D. 1789-1791.**—Taken by the Austrians and restored to the Turks. See **TURKS**: A. D. 1770-1792.

**A. D. 1806.**—Surprised and taken by the Servians. See **BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES: 14TH-19TH CENTURIES (SERVIA)**.

**A. D. 1862.**—Withdrawal of Turkish troops. See **BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES: 14TH-19TH CENTURIES (SERVIA)**.

**BELGRADE, The Peace of.** See **RUSSIA**: A. D. 1725-1739.

**BELIK, Battle on the (Carrhæ—B. C. 53).** See **ROME**: B. C. 57-52.

**BELISARIUS, Campaigns of.** See **VANDALS**: A. D. 533-534, and **ROME**: A. D. 535-533.

**BELIZE, or British Honduras.** See **NICARAGUA**: A. D. 1830.

**BELL ROLAND, The great.** See **GHEENT**: A. D. 1539-1540.

**BELLE ALLIANCE, Battle of La.**—The battle of Waterloo—see **FRANCE**: A. D. 1815 (JUNE)—is so called by the Prussians.

**BELLE ISLE PRISON-PEN, The.** See **PRISONS AND PRISON-PENS, CONFEDERATE**.

**BELLOVACI, The.** See **BELGÆ**.

**BELLVILLE, Battle of.** See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1863 (JULY; KENTUCKY).

**BELMONT, Battle of.** See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1861 (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER: ON THE MISSISSIPPI).

**BEMA, The.** See **PNYX**.

**BEMIS HEIGHTS, Battle of.** See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1777 (JULY—OCTOBER).

**BENARES.**—"The early history of Benares is involved in much obscurity. It is, indisputably, a place of great antiquity, and may even date from the time when the Aryan race first spread itself over Northern India. . . . It is certain that the city is regarded by all Hindus as coeval with the birth of Hinduism, a notion derived both from tradition and from their own writings. Allusions to Benares are exceedingly abundant in ancient Sanskrit literature; and perhaps there is no city in all Hindustan more frequently referred to. By reason of some subtle and mysterious charm, it has linked itself with the religious sympathies of the Hindus through every century of its existence. For the sanctity of its inhabitants—of its temples and reservoirs—of its wells and streams—of the very soil that is trodden—of the very air that is breathed—and of everything in and around it, Benares has been famed for thousands of years. . . . Previously to the introduction of the Buddhist faith into India, she was already the sacred city of the land,—the centre of Hinduism, and chief seat of its authority. Judging from the strong feelings

of veneration and affection with which the native community regard her in the present day, and bearing in mind that the founder of Buddhism commenced his ministry at this spot, it seems indisputable that, in those early times preceding the Buddhist reformation, the city must have exerted a powerful and wide-spread religious influence over the land. Throughout the Buddhist period in India—a period extending from 700 to 1,000 years—she gave the same support to Buddhism which she had previously given to the Hindu faith. Buddhist works of that era . . . clearly establish the fact that the Buddhists of those days regarded the city with much the same kind of veneration as the Hindu does now."—M. A. Sherring, *The Sacred City of the Hindus*, ch. 1.—For an account of the English annexation of Benares, see **INDIA**: A. D. 1773-1785.

**BENEDICT II., Pope, A. D. 684-685. . . . Benedict III., Pope, A. D. 855-858. . . . Benedict IV., Pope, A. D. 900-903. . . . Benedict V., Pope, A. D. 964-965. . . . Benedict VI., Pope, A. D. 972-974. . . . Benedict VII., Pope, A. D. 975-984. . . . Benedict VIII., Pope, A. D. 1012-1024. . . . Benedict IX., Pope, A. D. 1033-1044, 1047-1048. . . . Benedict X., Antipope, A. D. 1058-1059. . . . Benedict XI., Pope, A. D. 1303-1304. . . . Benedict XII., Pope, A. D. 1334-1342. . . . Benedict XIII., Pope, A. D. 1394-1423 (at Avignon). . . . Benedict XIII., Pope, A. D. 1724-1730. . . . Benedict XIV., Pope, A. D. 1740-1758.**

**BENEDICTINE ORDERS.**—The rule of **St. Benedict.**—"There were many monasteries in the West before the time of St. Benedict of Nursia (A. D. 480); but he has been rightly considered the father of Western monasticism; for he not only founded an order to which many religious houses became attached, but he established a rule for their government which, in its main features, was adopted as the rule of monastic life by all the orders for more than five centuries, or until the time of St. Dominic and St. Francis of Assisi. Benedict was first a hermit, living in the mountains of Southern Italy, and in that region he afterwards established in succession twelve monasteries, each with twelve monks and a superior. In the year 520 he founded the great monastery of Monte Casino as the mother-house of his order, a house which became the most celebrated and powerful monastery, according to Montalembert, in the Catholic universe, celebrated especially because there Benedict prepared his rule and formed the type which was to serve as a model to the innumerable communities submitting to that sovereign code. . . . Neither in the East nor in the West were the monks originally ecclesiastics; and it was not until the eighth century that they became priests, called regulars, in contrast with the ordinary parish clergy, who were called seculars. . . . As missionaries, they proved the most powerful instruments in extending the authority and the boundaries of the church. The monk had no individual property: even his dress belonged to the monastery. . . . To enable him to work efficiently, it was necessary to feed him well; and such was the injunction of Benedict, as opposed to the former practice of strict asceticism."—C. J. Stillé, *Studies in Mediæval Hist.*, ch. 12.—"Benedict would not have the monks limit themselves to spiritual

labour, to the action of the soul upon itself; he made external labour, manual or literary, a strict obligation of his rule. . . . In order to banish idleness, which he called the enemy of the soul, he regulated minutely the employment of every hour of the day according to the seasons, and ordained that, after having celebrated the praises of God seven times a-day, seven hours a-day should be given to manual labour, and two hours to reading. . . . Those who are skilled in the practice of an art or trade, could only exercise it by the permission of the abbot, in all humility; and if any one prided himself on his talent, or the profit which resulted from it to the house, he was to leave his occupation changed until he had humbled himself. . . . Obedience is also to his eyes a work, *obedientiae laborem*, the most meritorious and essential of all. A monk entered into monastic life only to make the sacrifice of self. This sacrifice implied especially that of the will. . . . Thus the rule pursued pride into its most secret hiding-place. Submission had to be prompt, perfect, and absolute. The monk must obey always, without reserve, and without murmur, even in those things which seemed impossible and above his strength, trusting in the succour of God, if a humble and reasonable remonstrance, the only thing permitted to him, was not accepted by his superiors."—The Count de Montalembert, *The Monks of the West*, bk. 4, sect. 2 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: E. L. Cutts, *Scenes and Characters of the Middle Ages*, ch. 2.—S. R. Maitland, *The Dark Ages*, No. 10.—J. H. Newman, *Mission of St. Benedict* (*Hist. Sketches*, v. 2).—P. Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, v. 2, ch. 4, sect. 43-45.—E. F. Henderson, *Select Hist. Docs. of the Middle Ages*, bk. 3, no. 1.—See, also, CAPUCHINS.

**BENEFICIUM.—COMMENDATION.**—Feudalism "had grown up from two great sources—the beneficum, and the practice of commendation, and had been specially fostered on Gallie soil by the existence of a subject population which admitted of any amount of extension in the methods of dependence. The beneficiary system originated partly in gifts of land made by the kings out of their own estates to their kinsmen and servants, with a special undertaking to be faithful; partly in the surrender by landowners of their estates to churches or powerful men, to be received back again and held by them as tenants for rent or service. By the latter arrangement the weaker man obtained the protection of the stronger, and he who felt himself insecure placed his title under the defence of the Church. By the practice of commendation, on the other hand, the inferior put himself under the personal care of a lord, but without altering his title or divesting himself of his right to his estate; he became a vassal and did homage. The placing of his hands between those of his lord was the typical act by which the connexion was formed."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 9, sect. 93.

ALSO IN: H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 2, pt. 1.—See, also, SCOTLAND: 10TH-11TH CENTURIES.

**BENEFIT OF CLERGY.**—"Among the most important and dearly-prized privileges of the church was that which conferred on its members immunity from the operation of secular law, and relieved them from the jurisdiction of secular tribunals. . . . So priceless a

prerogative was not obtained without a long and resolute struggle. . . . To ask that a monk or priest guilty of crime should not be subject to the ordinary tribunals, and that civil suits between laymen and ecclesiastics should be referred exclusively to courts composed of the latter, was a claim too repugnant to the common sense of mankind to be lightly accorded. . . . The persistence of the church, backed up by the unflinching resource of excommunication, finally triumphed, and the sacred immunity of the priesthood was acknowledged, sooner or later, in the laws of every nation of Europe." In England, when Henry II. in 1164, "endeavored, in the Constitutions of Clarendon, to set bounds to the privileges of the church, he therefore especially attacked the benefit of clergy. . . . The disastrous result of the quarrel between the King and the archbishop [Becket] rendered it necessary to abandon all such schemes of reform. . . . As time passed on, the benefit of clergy gradually extended itself. That the laity were illiterate and the clergy educated was taken for granted, and the test of churchmanship came to be the ability to read, so that the privilege became in fact a free pardon on a first offence for all who knew their letters. . . . Under Elizabeth, certain heinous offences were declared felonies without benefit of clergy. . . . Much legislation ensued from time to time, effecting the limitation of the privilege in various offences. . . . Early in the reign of Anne the benefit of clergy was extended to all malefactors by abrogating the reading test, thus placing the unlettered felon on a par with his better educated fellows, and it was not until the present century was well advanced that this remnant of mediæval ecclesiastical prerogative was abolished by 7 and 8 Geo. iv. c. 28."—H. C. Lea, *Studies in Church Hist.*, pt. 2.

ALSO IN: W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, sect. 722-725 (ch. 19, v. 3).—See, also, ENGLAND: A. D. 1162-1170.

**BENEVENTO, OR GRANDELLA, Battle of (1266).** See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1250-1268.

**BENEVENTUM: The Lombard Duchy.**—The Duchy of Beneventum was a Lombard fief of the 8th and 9th centuries, in southern Italy, which survived the fall of the Lombard kingdom in northern Italy. It covered nearly the territory of the modern kingdom of Naples. Charlemagne reduced the Duchy to submission with considerable difficulty, after he had extinguished the Lombard kingdom. It was afterwards divided into the minor principalities of Benevento, Salerno and Capua, and became part of the Norman conquest.—See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 800-1016; and 1000-1090; also, LOMBARDS: A. D. 573-774, and AMALFI.

**BENEVENTUM, Battle of (B. C. 275).** See ROME: B. C. 282-275.

**BENEVOLENCES.**—"The collection of benevolences, regarded even at the time [England, reign of Edward IV.] as an innovation, was perhaps a resuscitated form of some of the worst measures of Edward II. and Richard II., but the attention which it aroused under Edward IV. shows how strange it had become under the intervening kings. . . . Such evidence as exists shows us Edward IV. canvassing by word of mouth or by letter for direct gifts of money from his subjects. Henry III. had thus

begged for new year's gifts. Edward IV. requested and extorted 'free-will offerings' from every one who could not say no to the pleadings of such a king. He had a wonderful memory, too, and knew the name and the particular property of every man in the country who was worth taxing in this way. He had no excuse for such meanness; for the estates had shown themselves liberal."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 18, sect. 696.—See, also, ENGLAND: A. D. 1471-1485.

**BENGAL, The English acquisition of.** See INDIA: A. D. 1755-1757; 1757; and 1757-1772.

**BENGAL: "Permanent Settlement."** See INDIA: A. D. 1785-1793.

**BENNINGTON, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777 (JULY—OCTOBER).

**BENTINCK, Lord William, The Indian Administration of.** See INDIA: A. D. 1823-1833.

**BENTONSVILLE, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (FEBRUARY—MARCH; THE CAROLINAS).

**BEOTHUK, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: BEOTHUKAN FAMILY.

**BERBERS, The.** See LIBYANS; NUMIDIANS; EGYPT, ORIGIN OF THE ANCIENT PEOPLE; and MAROCCO.

**BERENICE, Cities of.**—Ptolemy Philadelphus, the second of the Ptolemies, founded a city on the Egyptian shore of the Red Sea, to which he gave the name of his mother, Berenice. It became an important port of trade. Subsequently two other cities of the same name were founded at points further south on the same coast, while a fourth Berenice came into existence on the border of the Great Syrtis, in Cyrenaica.—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 15, sect. 1.

**BERESINA, Passage of the.** See RUSSIA: A. D. 1812 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER).

**BERESTECZKO, Battle of (1651).** See POLAND: A. D. 1648-1654.

**BERGEN, Battles of (1759 and 1799).** See GERMANY: A. D. 1759 (APRIL—AUGUST); and FRANCE: A. D. 1799 (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER).

**BERGEN-OP-ZOOM, A. D. 1588.**—The siege raised. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1588-1593.

**A. D. 1622.**—Unsuccessful siege by the Spaniards. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1621-1633.

**A. D. 1747-1748.**—Taken by the French and restored to Holland. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1746-1747, and AIX-LA-CHAPELLE, THE CONGRESS.

**BERGER.** See BIRGER.

**BERGERAC, Peace of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1577-1578.

**BERING SEA CONTROVERSY AND ARBITRATION.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1886-1893.

**BERKELEY, Lord, The Jersey Grant to.** See NEW JERSEY: A. D. 1664-1667, to 1688-1738.

**BERKELEY, Sir William, Government of Virginia.** See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1642-1649, to 1660-1677.

**BERLIN: A. D. 1631.**—Forcible entry of Gustavus Adolphus. See GERMANY: A. D. 1631.

**A. D. 1675.**—Threatened by the Swedes. See BRANDENBURG: A. D. 1640-1688.

**A. D. 1757.**—Dashing Austrian attack. See GERMANY: A. D. 1757 (JULY—DECEMBER).

**A. D. 1760.**—Taken and plundered by the Austrians and Russians. See GERMANY: A. D. 1760.

**A. D. 1806.**—Napoleon in possession. See GERMANY: A. D. 1806 (OCTOBER).

**A. D. 1848.**—Mistaken battle of soldiers and citizens.—Continued disorder.—State of siege. See GERMANY: A. D. 1848 (MARCH), and 1848-1850.

**BERLIN CONFERENCE (1884-5), The.** See AFRICA: A. D. 1884-1889; and CONGO FREE STATE.

**BERLIN, Congress and Treaty of.** See TURKS: A. D. 1878.

**BERLIN DECREE, The.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1806-1810; and UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1804-1809.

**BERMUDA HUNDRED.** See HUNDRED, THE.

**BERMUDA HUNDRED, Butler's Army at.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MAY; VIRGINIA), THE ARMY OF THE JAMES.

**BERMUDAS, The.—English Discovery of the islands (1609).** See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1609-1616.

**BERMUDO, King of Leon and the Asturias, or Oviedo, A. D. 788-791.... Bermudo II., A. D. 982-999.... Bermudo III., A. D. 1037-1037.**

**BERN, Dietrich of.** See VERONA: A. D. 493-525.

**BERNADOTTE, Career of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1798-1799 (AUGUST—APRIL); 1799 (NOVEMBER); 1806 (JANUARY—OCTOBER); 1814 (JANUARY—MARCH); 1806-1807; SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1810; GERMANY: A. D. 1812-1813; 1813 (AUGUST), (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER), (OCTOBER—DECEMBER).

**BERNARD, St., and the Second Crusade.** See CRUSADES: A. D. 1147-1149.

**BERNE, A. D. 1353.**—Joined to the original Swiss Confederation, or Old League of High Germany. See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1332-1460.

**A. D. 1798.**—Occupation by the French.—The plundering of the Treasury. See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1792-1798.

**BERNICIA, The Kingdom of.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 547-633; and SCOTLAND: 7th CENTURY.

**BERSERKER. — BÆRSÆRK. —** The word Berserker is variously spelt, and stated to be derived from 'bar' and 'særk,' or 'bareshirt.' The men to whom the title was applied [among the Northmen] . . . were stated to be in the habit of fighting without armour, and wearing only a shirt of skins, or at times naked. In Iceland they were sometimes called Ulfhedin, i. e., wolfskin. The derivation of Bærsærk has been questioned, as in philology is not uncommon. The habit of their wearing bear (björn) skins, is said to afford the meaning of the word. In philology, to agree to differ is best. The Bersærks, according to the sagas, appear to have been men of unusual physical development and savagery. They were, moreover, liable to what was called Berserkegang, or a state of excitement in which they exhibited superhuman strength, and then spared neither friend nor foe. . . . After an attack of Bærsærk frenzy, it was

believed that the superhuman influence or spirit left the Berserk's body as a 'ham,' or cast-off shape or form, with the result that the Berserk suffered great exhaustion, his natural forces being used up."—J. F. Vicary, *Saga Time*, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: P. B. Du Challu, *The Viking Age*, v. 2, ch. 26.

**BERWICK-UPON-TWEED: A. D. 1293-1333.—Conquest by the English.**—At the beginning, in 1293, of the struggle of the Scottish nation to cast off the feudal yoke which Edward I. had laid upon it, the English king, marching angrily northwards, made his first assault upon Berwick. The citizens, whose only rampart was a wooden stockade, foolishly aggravated his wrath by gibes and taunts. "The stockade was stormed with the loss of a single knight, and nearly 8,000 of the citizens were mown down in a ruthless carnage, while a handful of Flemish traders who held the town-hall stoutly against all assailants were burned alive in it. . . . The town was ruined forever, and the great merchant city of the North sank from that time into a petty seaport." Subsequently recovered by the Scotch, Berwick was held by them in 1393 when Edward III. attempted to seat Edward Bulliol, as his vassal, on the Scottish throne. The English laid siege to the place, and an army under the regent Douglas came to its relief. The battle of Halidon Hill, in which the Scotch were utterly routed, decided the fate of Berwick. "From that time the town remained the one part of Edward's conquests which was preserved by the English crown. Fragment as it was, it was viewed as legally representing the realm of which it had once formed a part. As Scotland, it had its chancellor, chamberlain, and other officers of state; and the peculiar heading of acts of Parliament enacted for England 'and the town of Berwick-upon-Tweed' still preserves the memory of its peculiar position."—J. R. Green, *Short Hist. of the English People*, ch. 4, sect. 3 and 6.

ALSO IN: J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland*, ch. 17.—See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1290-1305.

**BERWICK, Pacification of.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1638-1640.

**BERWICK, Treaty of.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1558-1560.

**BERYTUS.**—The colony of Berytus (modern Beirut) was founded by Agrippa, B. C. 15, and made a station for two legions.

**A. D. 551.—The Schools.—Its Destruction by Earthquake.**—The city of Berytus, modern Beirut, was destroyed by earthquake on the 9th of July, A. D. 551. "That city, on the coast of Phœnicia, was illustrated by the study of the civil law, which opened the surest road to wealth and dignity: the schools of Berytus were filled with the rising spirits of the age, and many a youth was lost in the earthquake who might have lived to be the scourge and the guardian of his country."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 43.

**A. D. 1111.—Taken by the Crusaders.** See CRUSADES: A. D. 1104-1111.

**BESANCON: Origin.** See VESONTIO.  
**A. D. 1152-1648.—A Free City of the Empire.** See FRANCIE COMTE.

**A. D. 1674.—Siege and capture by Vauban.** See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1674-1678.

**BESSI, The.**—The Bessi were an ancient Thracian tribe who occupied the mountain range of Hæmus (the Balkan) and the upper valley of the Hebrus. They were subdued by Lucullus, brother of the conqueror of Mithridates.—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 18, sect. 6.

**BESSIN, The.**—The district of Bayeux. See SAXONS OF BAYEUX.

**BETH-HORON, Battles of.**—The victory of Joshua over "the five kings of the Amorites" who laid siege to Gibeon; the decisive battle of the Jewish conquest of Canaan. "The battle of Beth-horon or Gibeon is one of the most important in the history of the world; and yet so profound has been the indifference, first of the religious world, and then (through their example or influence) of the common world, to the historical study of the Hebrew annals, that the very name of this great battle is far less known to most of us than that of Marathon or Cannæ."—Dean Stanley, *Lects. on the Hist. of the Jewish Church*, lect. 11.—In the Maccabean war, Beth-horon was the scene of two of the brilliant victories of Judas Maccabeus, in B. C. 167 and 162.—Josephus, *Antiq. of the Jews*, bk. 12.—Later, at the time of the Jewish revolt against the Romans, it witnessed the disastrous retreat of the Roman general Cestius.

**BETHSHEMESH, Battle of.**—Fought by Joash, king of Israel, with Amaziah, king of Judah, defeating the latter and causing part of the walls of Jerusalem to be thrown down.—2 *Chronicles*, xzv.

**BETH-ZACHARIAH, Battle of.**—A defeat suffered (B. C. 163) by the Jewish patriot, Judas Maccabeus, at the hands of the Syrian monarch Antiochus Eupator; the youngest of the Maccabees being slain.—Josephus, *Antiq. of the Jews*, bk. 12, ch. 9.

**BETHZUR, Battle of.**—Defeat of an army sent by Antiochus, against Judas Maccabeus, the Jewish patriot, B. C. 165, Josephus, *Antiq. of the Jews*, bk. 12, ch. 7.

**BEVERHOLT, Battle of (1381).** See FLANDERS: A. D. 1379-1381.

**BEY.—BEYLERBEY.—PACHA.—PAD-ISCHAH.**—"The administration of the [Turkish] provinces was in the time of Mahomet II. [the Sultan, A. D. 1451-1481, whose legislation organized the Ottoman government] principally intrusted to the Beys and Beylerbeys. These were the natural chiefs of the class of feudatories [Spahis], whom their tenure of office obliged to serve on horseback in time of war. They mustered under the Sanjak, the banner of the chief of their district, and the districts themselves were thence called Sanjaks, and their rulers Sanjak-beys. The title of Pacha, so familiar to us when speaking of a Turkish provincial ruler, is not strictly a term implying territorial jurisdiction, or even military authority. It is a title of honour, meaning literally the Shah's or sovereign's foot, and implying that the person to whom that title was given was one whom the sovereign employed. . . . The title of Pacha was not at first applied among the Ottomans exclusively to those officers who commanded armies or ruled provinces or cities. Of the five first Pachas, that are mentioned by Ottoman writers, three were literary men. By degrees this honorary title was appropriated to those whom the Sultan employed in war and set over districts and important

towns; so that the word *Pacha* became almost synonymous with the word governor. The title *Padschah*, which the Sultan himself bears, and which the Turkish diplomatists have been very jealous in allowing to Christian Sovereigns, is an entirely different word, and means the great, the imperial *Schah* or Sovereign. In the time of Mahomet II. the Ottoman Empire contained in Europe alone thirty-six Sanjaks, or banners, around each of which assembled about 400 cavaliers."—Sir E. S. Creasy, *Hist. of the Ottoman Turks*, ch. 0.

**BEYLAN**, Battle of (183). See **TURKS**: A. D. 1831-1840.

**BEYROUT**, Origin of. See **BERYTUS**.

**BEZANT**, The.—The bezant was a Byzantine gold coin (whence its name), worth a little less than ten English shillings—\$2.50.

**BEZIERES**, The Massacre at. See **ALBIGENES**: A. D. 1209.

**BHARADARS**. See **INDIA**: A. D. 1805-1816.

**BHONSLA RAJA**, The. See **INDIA**: A. D. 1798-1805.

**BHURTPORE**, Siege of (1805). See **INDIA**: A. D. 1798-1805.

**BIANCHI AND NERI** (The Whites and Blacks). See **FLORENCE**: A. D. 1295-1300, and 1301-1313.

**BIANCHI**, or White Penitents. See **WHITE PENITENTS**.

**BIBERACH**, Battles of (1796 and 1800). See **FRANCE**: A. D. 1796 (APRIL—OCTOBER); and A. D. 1800-1801 (MAY—FEBRUARY).

**BIBRACTE**. See **GAULS**.

**BIBROCI**, The.—A tribe of ancient Britons who dwelt near the Thames. It is suspected, but not known, that they gave their name to Berks County.

**BICAMERAL SYSTEM**, The.—This term was applied by Jeremy Bentham to the division of a legislative body into two chambers—such as the House of Lords and House of Commons in England, and the Senate and House of Representatives in the United States of America.

**BICOQUE OR BICOCCA**, La, Battle of (1522). See **FRANCE**: A. D. 1520-1523.

**BIG BETHEL**, Battle of. See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1861 (JUNE—VIRGINIA).

**BIG BLACK**, Battle of the. See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1863 (APRIL—JULY: ON THE MISSISSIPPI).

**BIGERRIONES**, The. See **AQUITAINE**, THE ANCIENT THINES.

**BIGI, OR GREYS**, The.—One of the three factions which divided Florence in the time of Savonarola, and after. The Bigi, or Greys, were the partisans of the Medici; their opponents were the Piagnoni, or Weepers, and the Arrabiati, or Madmen. See **FLORENCE**: A. D. 1490-1498.

**BILL OF RIGHTS**. See **ENGLAND**: A. D. 1689 (OCTOBER).

**BILLAUD-VARENNE**s and the French Revolutionary Committee of Public Safety. See **FRANCE**: A. D. 1793 (JUNE—OCTOBER), (SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER), to 1794-1795 (JULY—APRIL).

**BILOXIS**, The. See **AMERICAN ABORIGINES**: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**BIMINI**, The island of. See **AMERICA**: A. D. 1512.

**BIRAPARACH**, Fortress of. See **JURO-PACH**.

**BIRGER**, King of Sweden, A. D. 1200-1319. . . . Birger, or Berger Jarl, Regent of Sweden, A. D. 1250-1266.

**BISHOPS' WAR**, The First and Second. See **SCOTLAND**: A. D. 1638-1640; and **ENGLAND**: A. D. 1640.

**BISMARCK'S MINISTRY**. See **GERMANY**: A. D. 1861-1866, to 1888; and **FRANCE**: A. D. 1870 (JUNE—JULY); 1870-1871; and 1871 (JANUARY—MAY).

**BISSEXTILE YEAR**. See **CALENDAR**, JULIAN.

**BITHYNIANS, THYNIANS**.—"Along the coast of the Euxine, from the Thracian Bosphorus eastward to the river Halys, dwelt Bithynians or Thynians, Mariandynians and Paphlagonians,—all recognized branches of the widely extended Thracian race. The Bithynians especially, in the northwestern portion of this territory, and reaching from the Euxine to the Propontis, are often spoken of as Asiatic Thracians,—while on the other hand various tribes among the Thracians of Europe are denominated Thyni or Thynians,—so little difference was there in the population on the two sides of the Bosphorus, alike brave, predatory, and sanguinary. The Bithynians of Asia are also sometimes called Berykians, under which denomination they extend as far southward as the gulf of Kios in the Propontis."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 16.—The Bithynians were among the people in Asia Minor subjugated by Cræsus, king of Lydia, and fell, with his fall, under the Persian rule. But, in some way not clearly understood, an independent kingdom of Bithynia was formed, about the middle of the 5th century B. C. which resisted the Persians, successfully resisted Alexander the Great and his successors in Asia Minor, resisted Mithridates of Pontus, and existed until B. C. 74, when its last king Nicomedes III. bequeathed his kingdom to Rome and it was made a Roman province.

**BITONTO**, Battle of (1734). See **FRANCE**: A. D. 1733-1735.

**BITURIGES**, The. See **ÆDUI**; also **BOURGES**, ORIGIN OF.

**BIZOCHI**, The. See **BEQUINES**, ETC.

**BIZYE**. See **THRACIANS**.

**BLACK ACTS**, The. See **SCOTLAND**: A. D. 1584.

**BLACK DEATH**, The.—"The Black Death appears to have had its origin in the centre of China, in or about the year 1333. It is said that it was accompanied at its outbreak by various terrestrial and atmospheric phenomena of a novel and most destructive character, phenomena similar to those which characterized the first appearance of the Asiatic Cholera, of the Influenza, and even in more remote times of the Athenian Plague. It is a singular fact that all epidemics of an unusually destructive character have had their homes in the farthest East, and have travelled slowly from those regions towards Europe. It appears, too, that the disease exhausted itself in the place of its origin at about the same time in which it made its appearance in Europe. . . . The disease still exists under the name of the Levant or Oriental Plague, and is endemic in Asia Minor, in parts of Turkey, and in Egypt. It is specifically a disease in which the blood is poisoned, in which the system seeks to relieve itself by suppuration of the glands, and in which, the tissues becoming dis-

organized, and the blood thereupon being infiltrated into them, dark blotches appear on the skin. Hence the earliest name by which the Plague was described. The storm burst on the Island of Cyprus at the end of the year 1347, and was accompanied, we are told, by remarkable physical phenomena, as convulsions of the earth, and a total change in the atmosphere. Many persons affected died instantly. The Black Death seemed, not only to the frightened imagination of the people, but even to the more sober observation of the few men of science of the time, to move forward with measured steps from the desolated East, under the form of a dark and fetid mist. It is very likely that consequent upon the great physical convulsions which had rent the earth and preceded the disease, foreign substances of a deleterious character had been projected into the atmosphere. . . . The Black Death appeared at Avignon in January 1348, visited Florence by the middle of April, and had thoroughly penetrated France and Germany by August. It entered Poland in 1349, reached Sweden in the winter of that year, and Norway by infection from England at about the same time. It spread even to Iceland and Greenland. . . . It made its appearance in Russia in 1351, after it had well-nigh exhausted itself in Europe. It thus took the circuit of the Mediterranean, and unlike most plagues which have penetrated from the Eastern to the Western world, was checked, it would seem, by the barrier of the Caucasus. . . . Hecker calculates the loss to Europe as amounting to 25,000,000."—J. E. T. Rogers, *Hist. of Agriculture and Prices*, v. 1, ch. 15.

ALSO IN: J. F. C. Hecker, *Epidemics of the Middle Ages*.—See, also, ENGLAND: A. D. 1348-1349; FRANCE: A. D. 1347-1348; FLORENCE: A. D. 1348; JEWS: A. D. 1348-1349.

**BLACK EAGLE, Order of the.**—A Prussian order of knighthood instituted by Frederick III., elector of Brandenburg, in 1701.

**BLACK FLAGS, The.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1875-1889.

**BLACK FRIARS.** See MENDICANT ORDERS.  
**BLACK GUELF(S) (NERI).** See FLORENCE: A. D. 1295-1300, and 1301-1313.

**BLACK HAWK WAR, The.** See ILLINOIS: A. D. 1832.

**BLACK HOLE OF CALCUTTA, The.** See INDIA: A. D. 1755-1757.

**BLACK PRINCE, The wars of the.** See POITIERS; FRANCE: A. D. 1360-1380; and SPAIN (CASTILE): A. D. 1366-1369.

**BLACK ROBE, Counsellors of the.** See VENICE: A. D. 1632-1319.

**BLACK ROD.**—"The gentleman whose duty it is to preserve decorum in the House of Lords, just as it is the duty of the Sergeant-at-Arms to maintain order in the House of Commons. These officials are bound to execute the commands of their respective chambers, even though the task involves the forcible ejection of an obstreperous member. . . . His [Black Rod's] most disturbing occupation, now-a-days, is when he conveys a message from the Lords to the Commons. . . . No sooner do the policemen herald his approach from the lobbies than the doors of the Lower Chamber are closed against him, and he is compelled to ask for admission with becoming humility and humbleness. After this has been granted, he advances to the bar,

bows to the chair, and then—with repeated acts of obeisance—walks slowly to the table, where his request is made for the Speaker's attendance in the Upper House. The object may be to listen to the Queen's speech, or it may simply be to hear the Royal assent given to various bills. . . . The consequence is nearly always the same. The Sergeant-at-Arms should the mace, the Speaker joins Black Rod, the members fall in behind, and a more or less orderly procession then starts on its way to the Peer's Chamber. . . . No matter what the subject under consideration, Black Rod's appearance necessitates a check . . . till the journey to the Lords has been completed, The annoyance thus caused has often found expression during recent sessions. So great was the grumbling last year [1890], indeed, that the Speaker undertook to devise a better system."—*Popular Acc't of Parliamentary Procedure*, p. 11.

**BLACK ROOD, of Scotland.** See HOLY ROOD OF SCOTLAND.

**BLACKBURN'S FORD, Engagement at.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (JULY: VIRGINIA).

**BLACKFEET.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: BLACKFEET.

**BLADENSBURG, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1814 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER).

**BLAIR, Francis P., Sr., in the "Kitchen Cabinet" of President Jackson.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1829.

**BLAIR, General Francis P., Jr.—Difficulties with General Fremont.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (AUGUST—OCTOBER: MISSOURI).

**BLANCHE, Queen of Aragon,** A. D. 1425-1441.

**BLANCO, General Guzman, The dictatorship of.** See VENEZUELA: A. D. 1869-1892.

**BLAND SILVER BILL, The.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1878.

**BLANII, The.** See IRELAND, THIRDS OF EARLY CELTIC INHABITANTS.

**BLANKETEERS, The.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1816-1820.

**BLENEAU, Battle of (1652).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1651-1653.

**BLENHEIM, Battle of.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1704.

**BLENNERHASSET, Harman, and Aaron Burr.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1806-1807.

**BLENNERHASSETT'S ISLAND.**—An island in the Ohio, near Marietta, on which Harman Blennerhassett, a gentleman from Ireland, had created a charming home, at the beginning of the present century. He was drawn into Aaron Burr's mysterious scheme (see UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1806-1807); his island became the rendezvous of the expedition, and he was involved in the ruin of the treasonable project.

**BLOCK BOOKS.** See PRINTING: A. D. 1430-1450.

**BLOCK ISLAND, The name.** See NEW YORK: A. D. 1610-1614.

**BLOCKADE, Paper.**—This term has been applied to the assumption by a belligerent power, in war, of the right to declare a given coast or certain enumerated ports, to be in the state of blockade, without actual presence of blockading squadrons to enforce the declaration; as by the

British "Orders in Council," and the "Berlin" and "Milan Decrees" of Napoleon, in 1806-1807. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1804-1809.

**BLOIS, Treaties of.** See ITALY: A. D. 1504-1506.

**BLOOD COUNCIL, The.** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1507.

**BLOOD, or Kenai Indians.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: BLACKFEET.

**BLOODY ANGLE, The.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MAY: VIRGINIA).

**BLOODY ASSIZE, The.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1685 (SEPTEMBER).

**BLOODY BRIDGE, Ambuscade at (A. D. 1763).** See PONTIAC'S WAR.

**BLOODY BROOK, Battle of.** See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1675.

**BLOODY MARSH, The Battle of the.** See GEORGIA: A. D. 1738-1743.

**BLOREHEATH, Battle of (A. D. 1459).**—Fought on a plain called Bloreheath, near Drayton, in Staffordshire, England, Sept. 23, 1459, between 10,000 Lancastrians, commanded by Lord Audley, and about half that number of Yorkists under the Earl of Salisbury. The latter won a victory by superior strategy. The battle was the second that occurred in the Wars of the Roses. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1455-1471.

**BLÜCHER'S CAMPAIGNS.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1806 (OCTOBER); 1812-1813; 1813 (APRIL—MAY) to (OCTOBER—DECEMBER); FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (JANUARY—MARCH), and 1815.

**BLUE, Boys in.** See BOYS IN BLUE.  
**BLUE LICKS, Battle of (A. D. 1782).** See KENTUCKY: A. D. 1775-1784.

**BLUE-LIGHT FEDERALISTS.**—"An incident, real or imaginary, which had lately [in 1813] occurred at New London [Connecticut] was seized upon as additional proof of collusion between the Federalists and the enemy. [See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812.] As the winter approached, Decatur had expected to get to sea with his two frigates. Vexed to find himself thwarted in every attempt by the watchfulness of the enemy, he wrote to the Navy Department in a fit of disgust, that, beyond all doubt, the British had, by signals or otherwise, instantaneous information of all his movements; and as proof of it, he stated that, after several nights of favorable weather, the report circulating in the town that an attempt was to be made to get out, 'in the course of the evening two blue lights were burned on both points of the harbor's mouth.' These 'signals to the enemy,' for such he unhesitatingly pronounced them, had been repeated, so he wrote, and had been seen by twenty persons at least of the squadron, though it does not appear that Decatur himself was one of the number. . . . Such a clamor was raised about it, that one of the Connecticut members of Congress moved for a committee of investigation. . . . The inquiry was . . . quashed; but the story spread and grew, and the more vehement opponents of the war began to be stigmatized as 'blue-light Federalists.'"—R. Hildreth, *Hist. of the U. S.*, v. 6, p. 467.

**BLUE PARTY (of Venezuela), The.** See VENEZUELA: A. D. 1829-1886.

**BLUE RIBBON, The Order of the.** See SERAPHIM.

**BLUES, Roman Faction of the.** See CRUCIUS, FACTIONS OF THE ROMAN.

**BOABDIL, The last Moorish King in Spain.** See SPAIN: A. D. 1476-1492.

**BOADICEA, Revolt of.** See BRITAIN: A. D. 61.

**BOAIRE, The.**—A "Cow-lord," having certain wealth in cattle, among the ancient Irish.

**BOARIAN TRIBUTE, The.**—Also called the Boruwa, or Cow-tribute. An humiliating exaction said to have been levied on the province of Leinster by a King Tuathal of Erin, in the second century, and which was maintained for five hundred years.

**BOCAGE, The.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (MARCH—APRIL).

**BOCASOTTI, The.** See BEGUINES, &C.

**BOCLAND.—BOOKLAND.** See ALON.

**BŒOTARCHS.** See BŒOTIAN LEAGUE.

**BŒOTIA.—BŒOTIANS.**—"Between Phokis and Lokris on one side, and Attika (from which it is divided by the mountains Kithaeron and Parnes) on the other, we find the important territory called Bœotia, with its ten or twelve autonomous cities, forming a sort of confederacy under the presidency of Thebes, the most powerful among them. Even of this territory, destined during the second period of this history to play a part so conspicuous and effective, we know nothing during the first two centuries after 776 B. C. We first acquire some insight into it on occasion of the disputes between Thebes and Plataea, about the year 520 B. C."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 3.—In the Greek legendary period one part of this territory, subsequently Bœotian—the Copaic valley in the north—was occupied by the enterprising people called the Minyi, whose chief city was Orchomenus. Their neighbors were the Cadmeians of Thebes, who are "rich," as Grote expresses it, "in legendary antiquities." The reputed founder of Thebes was Cadmus, bringer of letters to Hellas, from Phenicia or from Egypt, according to different representations. Dionysus (Bacchus) and Hēraklēs were both supposed to recognize the Cadmeian city as their birth-place. The terrible legends of Œdipus and his unhappy family connect themselves with the same place, and the incident wars between Thebes and Argos—the assaults of the seven Argive chiefs and of their sons, the Epigoni—were, perhaps, real causes of a real destruction of the power of some race for whom the Cadmeians stand. They and their neighbors, the Minyi of Orchomenus, appear to have given way before another people, from Thessaly, who gave the name Bœotia to the country of both and who were the inhabitants of the Thebes of historic times.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 1, ch. 14.—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 1, ch. 4.—"That the Bœotia of history should never have attained to a significance corresponding to the natural advantages of the locality, and to the prosperity of the district in the pre-Homeric age, is due above all to one principal cause. The immigration of the Thessalian Bœotians, from which the country derived its name and the beginnings of its connected history, destroyed the earlier civilization of the land, without succeeding in establishing a new civilization capable of conducting the entire district to a prosperous and harmonious development. It cannot be said that the ancient germs of culture were suppressed, or that barbarous times supervened. The ancient seats of the gods and oracles continued to be



honoured and the ancient festivals of the Muses on Mount Helicon, and of the Charites at Orchomenus, to be celebrated. In Beotia too the beneficent influence of Delphi was at work, and the poetic school of Hesiod, connected as it was with Delphi, long maintained itself here. And a yet stronger inclination was displayed by the Æolian immigrants towards music and lyric poetry. The cultivation of the music of the lute was encouraged by the excellent reeds of the Copaic morasses. This was the genuinely national species of music in Beotia. . . . And yet the Beotians lacked the capacity for attracting to themselves the earlier elements of population in such a way as to bring about a happy amalgamation. . . . The Beotian lords were not much preferable to the Thessalians; nor was there any region far or near, inhabited by Greek tribes, which presented a harsher contrast in culture or manners, than the district where the road led from the Attic side of Mount Parnes across to the Beotian."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 6, ch. 1.—See, also, GREECE: THE MIGRATIONS.

**BEOTIAN LEAGUE.**—"The old Beotian League, as far as its outward forms went, seems to have been fairly entitled to the name of a Federal Government, but in its whole history we trace little more than the gradual advance of Thebes to a practical supremacy over the other cities. . . . The common government was carried on in the name of the whole Beotian nation. Its most important magistrates bore the title of Bœotarchs; their exact number, whether eleven or thirteen, is a disputed point of Greek archeology, or rather of Beotian geography. . . . Thebes chose two Bœotarchs and each of the other cities one."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of Federal Govt.*, ch. 4, sect. 2.

**BOERS, Boer War.** See SOUTH AFRICA: A. D. 1806-1881.

**BOGDANIA.** See BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES, 14TH-15TH CENTURIES (ROUMANIA, ETC.)

**BOGESUND, Battle of (1520).** See SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1397-1527.

**BOGOMILIANS, The.**—A religious sect which arose among the Slavonians of Thrace and Bulgaria, in the eleventh century, and suffered persecution from the orthodox of the Greek church. They sympathized with the Iconoclasts of former times, were hostile to the adoration of the Virgin and saints, and took more or less from the heretical doctrines of the Paulicians. Their name is derived by some from the two Slavonian words, "Bog," signifying God, and "milul," "have mercy." Others say that "Bogumil," meaning "one beloved by God," was the correct designation. Basilios, the leader of the Bogomilians, was burned by the Emperor Alexis Comnenos, in the hippodrome, at Constantinople, A. D. 1118.—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine and Greek Empires*, 716-1453, bk. 3, ch. 2, sect. 1.—See BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES: 9TH-16TH CENTURIES (BOSNIA, ETC.)

**BOGOTA, The founding of the city (1538).** See COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1536-1731.

**BOHEMIA, Derivation of the name.** See BOIANS.

**Its people and their early history.**—"Whatever may be the inferences from the fact of Bohemia having been politically connected with the empire of the Germanic Marcomanni, whatever may be those from the element Bolo-

as connecting its population with the Boii of Gaul and Bavaria (Balovirri), the doctrine that the present Slavonic population of that kingdom—Tshekhs [or Czekhs] as they call themselves—is either recent in origin or secondary to any German or Celtic aborigines, is wholly unsupported by history. In other words, at the beginning of the historical period Bohemia was as Slavonic as it is now. From A. D. 526 to A. D. 550, Bohemia belonged to the great Thuringian Empire. The notion that it was then Germanic (except in its political relations) is gratuitous. Nevertheless, Schaffarik's account is, that the ancestors of the present Tshekhs came, probably, from White Croatia: which was either north of the Carpathians, or each side of them. According to other writers, however, the parts above the river Kulpa in Croatia sent them forth. In Bohemian the verb 'cceti'='to begin,' from which Dobrowsky derives the name Czekhs=the beginners, the foremost, i. e., the first Slavonians who passed westwards. The powerful Samo, the just Krok, and his daughter, the wise Libussa, the founder of Prague, begin the uncertain list of Bohemian kings, A. D. 624-700. About A. D. 723, a number of petty chiefs become united under Premysl the husband of Libussa. Under his son Nezamysl occurs the first Constitutional Assembly at Wysehrad; and in A. D. 845, Christianity was introduced. But it took no sure footing till about A. D. 966. Till A. D. 1471 the names of the Bohemian kings and heroes are Tshekh—Wenceslaus, Ottokar, Ziska, Podiebrad. In A. D. 1564, the Austrian connexion and the process of Germanizing began. . . . The history and ethnology of Moravia is nearly that of Bohemia, except that the Marcomannic Germans, the Turks, Huns, Avars, and other less important populations may have effected a greater amount of intermixture. Both populations are Tshekh, speaking the Tshekh language—the language, probably, of the ancient Quadi."—R. G. Latham, *Ethnology of Europe*, ch. 11.

**7th Century.**—The Yoke of the Avars broken.—The Kingdom of Samo. See AVARS: 7TH CENTURY.

**9th Century.**—Subject to the Moravian Kingdom of Svatopluk. See MORAVIA: 9TH CENTURY.

**13th Century.**—The King made a Germanic Elector. See GERMANY: A. D. 1125-1152.

**A. D. 1276.**—War of King Ottocar with the Emperor Rodolph of Hapsburg.—His defeat and death. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1246-1283.

**A. D. 1310.**—Acquisition of the crown by John of Luxembourg. See GERMANY: A. D. 1308-1313.

**A. D. 1347.**—Charles IV. elected to the imperial throne. See GERMANY: A. D. 1347-1403.

**A. D. 1355.**—The succession fixed in the Luxembourg dynasty.—Incorporation of Moravia, Silesia, &c.—The diet of the nobles, in 1355, joined Charles IV. in fixing the order of succession in the dynasty of Luxemburg, and in definitely establishing that principle of primogeniture which had already been the custom in the Premyslide dynasty. Moravia, Silesia, Upper Lusatia, Brandenburg, which had been acquired from the margrave Otto, and the county of Glatz (Kladsko), with the consent of

the diets of these provinces, were declared integral and inalienable portions of the kingdom of Bohemia."—L. Leger, *Hist. of Austro-Hungary*, ch. 11.

A. D. 1364.—Reversion of the crown guaranteed to the House of Austria. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1330-1364.

A. D. 1378-1400.—Imperial election and deposition of Wenceslaus. See GERMANY: A. D. 1347-1493.

A. D. 1405-1415.—John Hus, and the movement of Religious Reformation.—"Some sparks of the fire which Wiclif had lighted [see ENGLAND: A. D. 1360-1414], blown over half Europe, as far as remote Bohemia, quickened into stronger activity a flame which for long years burned and scorched and consumed, defying all efforts to extinguish it. But for all this, it was not Wiclif who kindled the Bohemian fires. His writing did much to fan and feed them; while the assumed and in part erroneously assumed, identity of his teaching with that of Hus contributed not a little to shape the tragic issue of the Bohemian reformer's life. But the Bohemian movement was an independent and eminently a national one. If we look for the proper forerunners of Hus, his true spiritual ancestors, we shall find them in his own land, in a succession of earnest and faithful preachers. . . . John Hus (b. 1369, d. 1415), the central figure of the Bohemian Reformation, took in the year 1394 his degree as Bachelor of Theology in that University of Prague, upon the fortunes of which he was destined to exercise so lasting an influence; and four years later, in 1398, he began to deliver lectures there. . . . He soon signalized himself by his diligence in breaking the bread of life to hungry souls, and his boldness in rebuking vice in high places as in low. So long as he confined himself to reproving the sins of the laity, leaving those of the Clergy and monks unassailed, he found little opposition, nay, rather support and applause from these. But when [1405] he brought them also within the circle of his condemnation, and began to upbraid them for their covetousness, their ambition, their luxury, their sloth, and for other vices, they turned angrily upon him, and sought to undermine his authority, everywhere spreading reports of the unsoundness of his teaching. . . . While matters were in this strained condition, events took place at Prague which are too closely connected with the story that we are telling, exercised too great an influence in bringing about the issues that lie before us, to allow us to pass them by. . . . The University of Prague, though recently founded—it only dated back to the year 1348—was now, next after those of Paris and Oxford, the most illustrious in Europe. . . . This University, like that of Paris, on the pattern of which it had been modelled, was divided into four 'nations'—four groups, that is, or families of scholars—each of these having in academical affairs a single collective vote. These nations were the Bavarian, the Saxon, the Polish, and the Bohemian. This does not appear at first an unfair division—two German and two Slavonic; but in practical working the Polish was so largely recruited from Silesia, and other German or half-German lands, that its vote was in fact German also. The Teutonic votes were thus as three to one, and the Bohemians in their own land and their own University on every

important matter hopelessly outvoted. When, by aid of this preponderance, the University was made to condemn the teaching of Wiclif . . . matters came to a crisis. Urged by Hus, who as a stout patriot, and an earnest lover of the Bohemian language and literature, had more than a theological interest in the matter,—by Jerome [of Prague],—by a large number of the Bohemian nobility,—King Wenzel published an edict whereby the relations of natives and foreigners were completely reversed. There should be henceforth three votes for the Bohemian nation, and only one for the three others. Such a shifting of the weights certainly appears as a redressing of one inequality by creating another. At all events it was so earnestly resented by the Germans, by professors and students alike, that they quitted the University in a body, some say of five, and some of thirty thousand, and founded the rival University of Lelpsic, leaving no more than two thousand students at Prague. Full of indignation against Hus, whom they regarded as the prime author of this affront and wrong, they spread throughout all Germany the most unfavourable reports of him and of his teaching. This exodus of the foreigners had left Hus, who was now Rector of the University, with a freer field than before. But Church matters at Prague did not mend; they became more confused and threatening every day; until presently the shameful outrage against all Christian morality which a century later did a still more effectual work, served to put Hus into open opposition to the corrupt hierarchy of his time. Pope John XXIII., having a quarrel with the King of Naples, proclaimed a crusade against him, with what had become a constant accompaniment of this,—Indulgences to match. But to denounce Indulgences, as Hus with fierce and righteous indignation did now, was to wound Rome in her most sensitive part. He was excommunicated at once, and every place which should harbour him stricken with an interdict. While matters were in this frame the Council of Constance [see PAPACY: A. D. 1414-1418] was opened, which should appease all the troubles of Christendom, and correct whatever was amiss. The Bohemian difficulty could not be omitted, and Hus was summoned to make answer at Constance for himself. He had not been there four weeks when he was required to appear before the Pope and Cardinals (Nov. 18, 1414). After a brief informal hearing he was committed to harsh durance from which he never issued as a free man again. Sigismund, the German King and Emperor Elect, who had furnished Hus with a safe-conduct which should protect him, 'going to the Council, tarrying at the Council, returning from the Council,' was absent from Constance at the time, and heard with real displeasure how lightly regarded this promise and pledge of his had been. Some big words too he spoke, threatening to come himself and release the prisoner by force; but, being waited on by a deputation from the Council, who represented to him that he, as a layman, in giving such a safe-conduct had exceeded his powers, and intruded into a region which was not his, Sigismund was convinced, or affected to be convinced. . . . More than seven months elapsed before Hus could obtain a hearing before the Council. This was granted to him at last. Thrice heard (June 5, 7, 8, 1415),—if indeed such tumultuary sittings,

where the man speaking for his life, and for much more than his life, was continually interrupted and overborne by hostile voices, by loud cries of 'Recant,' 'Recant,' may be reckoned as hearings at all,—he bore himself, by the confession of all, with courage, meekness and dignity." He refused to recant. Some of the articles brought against him, he said, "charged him with teaching things which he had never taught, and he could not, by this formal act of retraction, admit that he had taught them." He was condemned, sentenced to the stake, and burned, on the 6th of July, 1415. His friend, Jerome, of Prague, suffered the same fate in the following May.—R. C. Trench, *Lects. on Mediaeval Church History*, lect. 22.

ALSO IN: E. H. Gillett, *Life and times of John Hus*.—A. H. Wratislav, *John Hus*.—A. Neander, *General Hist. of Christian Religion*, v. 9, pt. 2.

A. D. 1410.—Election of King Sigismund to the imperial throne. See GERMANY: A. D. 1347-1493.

A. D. 1419-1434.—The Hussite Wars.—The Reformation checked.—"The fate of Huss and Jerome created an instant and fierce excitement among the Bohemians. An address, defending them against the charge of heresy and protesting against the injustice and barbarity of the Council, was signed by 400 or 500 nobles and forwarded to Constance. The only result was that the Council decreed that no safe-conduct could be allowed to protect a heretic, that the University of Prague must be reorganized, and the strongest measures applied to suppress the Hussite doctrines in Bohemia. This was a defiance which the Bohemians courageously accepted. Men of all classes united in proclaiming that the doctrines of Huss should be freely taught, and that no Interdict of the Church should be enforced; the University, and even Wenzel's queen, Sophia, favored this movement, which soon became so powerful that all priests who refused to administer the sacrament 'in both forms' were driven from the churches. . . . When the Council of Constance was dissolved [1418], Sigismund [the Emperor] hastened to Hungary to carry on a new war with the Turks, who were already extending their conquests along the Danube. The Hussites in Bohemia employed this opportunity to organize themselves for resistance; 40,000 of them, in July, 1419, assembled on a mountain to which they gave the name of Tabor, and chose as their leader a nobleman who was surnamed Ziska, 'the one-eyed.' The excitement soon rose to such a pitch that several monasteries were stormed and plundered. King Wenzel arrested some of the ringleaders, but this only inflamed the spirit of the people. They formed a procession in Prague, marched through the city, carrying the sacramental cup at their head, and took forcible possession of several churches. When they halted before the city-hall, to demand the release of their imprisoned brethren, stones were thrown at them from the windows, whereupon they broke into the building and hurled the Burgomaster and six other officials upon the upheld spears of those below. . . . The Hussites were already divided into two parties, one moderate in its demands, called the Calixtines, from the Latin 'calix,' a chalice, which was their symbol [referring to their demand for the administration of the eucharistic cup to the laity,

or communion 'sub utraque specie'—whence they were also called 'Utraquists']; the other radical and fanatic, called the 'Taborites,' who proclaimed their separation from the Church of Rome and a new system of brotherly equality through which they expected to establish the Millennium upon earth. The exigencies of their situation obliged these two parties to unite in common defence against the forces of the Church and the Empire, during the sixteen years of war which followed; but they always remained separated in their religious views, and mutually intolerant. Ziska, who called himself 'John Ziska of the Chalice, commander in the hope of God of the Taborites,' had been a friend and was an ardent follower of Huss. He was an old man, bald-headed, short, broad-shouldered, with a deep furrow across his brow, an enormous aquiline nose, and a short red moustache. In his genius for military operations, he ranks among the great commanders of the world; his quickness, energy and inventive talent were marvellous, but at the same time he knew neither tolerance nor mercy. . . . Sigismund does not seem to have been aware of the formidable character of the movement, until the end of his war with the Turks, some months afterwards, and he then persuaded the Pope to summon all Christendom to a crusade against Bohemia. During the year 1420 a force of 100,000 soldiers was collected, and Sigismund marched at their head to Prague. The Hussites met him with the demand for the acceptance of the following articles: 1.—The word of God to be freely preached; 2.—The sacrament to be administered in both forms; 3.—The clergy to possess no property or temporal authority; 4.—All sins to be punished by the proper authorities. Sigismund was ready to accept these articles as the price of their submission, but the Papal Legate forbade the agreement, and war followed. On the 1st of November, 1420, the Crusaders were totally defeated by Ziska, and all Bohemia was soon relieved of their presence. The dispute between the moderates and the radicals broke out again; the idea of a community of property began to prevail among the Taborites, and most of the Bohemian nobles refused to act with them. Ziska left Prague with his troops and for a time devoted himself to the task of suppressing all opposition through the country, with fire and sword. He burned no less than 550 convents and monasteries, slaying the priests and monks who refused to accept the new doctrines. . . . While besieging the town of Raby, an arrow destroyed his remaining eye, yet he continued to plan battles and sieges as before. The very name of the blind warrior became a terror throughout Germany. In September, 1421, a second Crusade of 200,000 men, commanded by five German Electors, entered Bohemia from the west. . . . But the blind Ziska, nothing daunted, led his wagons, his fall-men, and mace-wielders against the Electors, whose troops began to fly before them. No battle was fought; the 200,000 Crusaders were scattered in all directions, and lost heavily during their retreat. Then Ziska wheeled about and marched against Sigismund, who was late in making his appearance. The two armies met on the 8th of January, 1422 [at Deutschbrod], and the Hussite victory was so complete that the Emperor narrowly escaped falling into their hands. . . . A third Crusade

was arranged and Frederick of Brandenburg (the Hohenzollern) selected to command it, but the plan failed from lack of support. The dissensions among the Hussites became fiercer than ever; Ziska was at one time on the point of attacking Prague, but the leaders of the moderate party succeeded in coming to an understanding with him, and he entered the city in triumph. In October, 1424, while marching against Duke Albert of Austria, who had invaded Moravia, he fell a victim to the plague. Even after death he continued to terrify the German soldiers, who believed that his skin had been made into a drum, and still called the Hussites to battle. A majority of the Taborites elected a priest, called Procopius the Great, as their commander in Ziska's stead; the others who thenceforth styled themselves 'Orphans,' united under another priest, Procopius the Little. The approach of another Imperial army, in 1426, compelled them to forget their differences, and the result was a splendid victory over their enemies. Procopius the Great then invaded Austria and Silesia, which he laid waste without mercy. The Pope called a fourth Crusade, which met the same fate as the former ones: the united armies of the Archbishop of Treves, the Elector Frederick of Brandenburg and the Duke of Saxony, 200,000 strong, were utterly defeated, and fled in disorder, leaving an enormous quantity of stores and munitions of war in the hands of the Bohemians. Procopius, who was almost the equal of Ziska as a military leader, made several unsuccessful attempts to unite the Hussites in one religious body. In order to prevent their dissensions from becoming dangerous to the common cause, he kept the soldiers of all sects under his command, and undertook fierce invasions into Bavaria, Saxony and Brandenburg, which made the Hussite name a terror to all Germany. During these expeditions one hundred towns were destroyed, more than 1,500 villages burned, tens of thousands of the inhabitants slain, and such quantities of plunder collected that it was impossible to transport the whole of it to Bohemia. Frederick of Brandenburg and several other princes were compelled to pay heavy tributes to the Hussites: the Empire was thoroughly humiliated, the people weary of slaughter, yet the Pope refused even to call a Council for the discussion of the difficulty. . . . The German princes made a last and desperate effort: an army of 130,000 men, 40,000 of whom were cavalry, was brought together, under the command of Frederick of Brandenburg, while Albert of Austria was to support it by invading Bohemia from the south. Procopius and his dauntless Hussites met the Crusaders on the 14th of August, 1431, at a place called Thaus, and won another of their marvellous victories. The Imperial army was literally cut to pieces, 8,000 wagons, filled with provisions and munitions of war, and 150 cannons, were left upon the field. The Hussites marched northward to the Baltic, and eastward into Hungary, burning, slaying, and plundering as they went. Even the Pope now yielded, and the Hussites were invited to attend the Council at Basel, with the most solemn stipulations in regard to personal safety and a fair discussion of their demands. . . . In 1433, finally 300 Hussites, headed by Procopius, appeared in Basel. They demanded nothing more than the acceptance of

the four articles upon which they had united in 1420; but after seven weeks of talk, during which the Council agreed upon nothing and promised nothing, they marched away, after stating that any further negotiation must be carried on in Prague. This course compelled the Council to act; an embassy was appointed, which proceeded to Prague, and on the 30th of November, the same year, concluded a treaty with the Hussites. The four demands were granted, but each with a condition attached which gave the Church a chance to regain its lost power. For this reason, the Taborites and 'Orphans' refused to accept the compact; the moderate party united with the nobles and undertook to suppress the former by force. A fierce internal war followed, but it was of short duration. In 1434, the Taborites were defeated [at Lipan, May 30], their fortified mountain taken, Procopius the Great and the Little were both slain, and the members of the sect dispersed. The Bohemian Reformation was never again dangerous to the Church of Rome.—B. Taylor, *Hist. of Germany*, ch. 22.

ALSO IN: C. A. Peschek, *Reformation and Anti-Reformation in Bohemia*, introductory ch.—E. H. Gillett, *Life and Times of John Hus*, v. 2, ch. 13-18.—E. de Schweinitz, *Hist. of the Ch. known as the Unitas Fratrum*, ch. 9.

A. D. 1434-1457.—Organization of the Ultraquist National Church.—Minority of Ladislaus Posthumus.—Regency of George Podiebrad.—Origin of the Unitas Fratrum.—"The battle of Lipan was a turning point in the history of the Hussites. It put Bohemia and Moravia into the hands of the Ultraquists, and enabled them to carry out their plans unhindered. The man who was foremost in shaping events and who became more and more prominent, until he exercised a commanding influence, was John of Rokycana. . . . At the diet of 1435 he was unanimously elected archbishop. . . . Meantime Sigismund endeavored to regain his kingdom. The Diet made demands which were stringent and humiliating; but he pledged himself to fulfill them, and on the 5th of July, 1436, at a meeting held with great pomp and solemnity, in the market-place of Iglau, was formally acknowledged as King of Bohemia. On the same occasion, the Compactata were anew ratified and the Bohemians readmitted to the fellowship of the mother church. But scarcely had Sigismund reached his capital when he began so serious a reaction in favor of Rome that Rokycana secretly left the city and retired to a castle near Pardubie (1437). The king's treachery was, however, cut short by the hand of death, on the 9th of December, of the same year, at Znaim, while on his way to Hungary; and his successor and son-in-law, Albert of Austria, followed him to the grave in 1439, in the midst of a campaign against the Turks. Bohemia was left without a ruler, for Albert had no children except a posthumous son [Ladislaus Posthumus].—See HUNGARY: A. D. 1301-1449, and 1442-1458]. A time of anarchy began and various leagues arose, the most powerful of which stood under Baron Ptacek. . . . He . . . called an ecclesiastical convention at Kuttenberg (October 4th). This convention brought about far-reaching results. . . . Rokycana was acknowledged as Archbishop elect, the supreme direction of ecclesiastical affairs was committed into his hands,

the priests promised him obedience, and 24 doctrinal and constitutional articles were adopted which laid the foundation of the Utraquist Church as the National Church of Bohemia. But the Taborites stood aloof. . . . At last a disputation was agreed upon," as the result of which the Taborites were condemned by the Diet. "They lost all prestige; their towns, with the exception of Tabor, passed out of their hands; their membership was scattered and a large part of it joined the National Church. In the following summer Ptacek died and George Podiebrad succeeded him as the head of the league. Although a young man of only 24 years, he displayed the sagacity of an experienced statesman and was distinguished by the virtues of a patriot. In 1448 a bold stroke made him master of Prague and constituted him practically Regent of all Bohemia; four years later his regency was formally acknowledged. He was a warm friend of Rokycana, whose consecration he endeavored to bring about." When it was found that Rome could not be reconciled, there were thoughts of cutting loose altogether from the Roman Catholic and uniting with the Greek Church. "Negotiations were actually begun in 1453, but came to an abrupt close in the following year, in consequence of the fall of Constantinople. About the same time Ladislaus Posthumus, Albert's son, assumed the crown, Podiebrad remaining Regent. The latter continued the friend of Rokycana; the former, who was a Catholic, conceived a strong dislike to him. As soon as Rokycana had given up the hope of conciliating Rome, he began to preach, with great power and eloquence, against its corruptions." It was at this time that a movement arose among certain of his followers which resulted in the formation of the remarkable religious body which called itself *Unitas Fratrum*. The leading spirit in this movement was Rokycana's nephew, commonly called Gregory the Patriarch. The teaching and influence which shaped it was that of Peter Chelcicky. Gregory and his companions, wishing to dwell together, in the Christian unity of which they had formed an ideal in their minds, found a retreat at the secluded village of Kunwald, on the estate of George Podiebrad. "The name which they chose was 'Brethren of the Law of Christ'—'Fratres Legis Christi'; inasmuch, however, as this name gave rise to the idea that they were a new order of Monks, they changed it simply into 'Brethren.' When the organization of their Church had been completed, they assumed the additional title of 'Jednota Bratska,' or *Unitas Fratrum*, that is, the Unity of the Brethren, which has remained the official and significant appellation of the Church to the present day. . . . It was often abbreviated into 'The Unity.' Another name by which the Church called itself was 'The Bohemian Brethren.' It related to all the Brethren, whether they belonged to Bohemia, Moravia, Prussia or Poland. To call them The Bohemian-Moravian Brethren, or the Moravian Brethren, is historically incorrect. The name Moravian arose in the time of the Renewed Brethren's Church, because the men by whom it was renewed came from Moravia. . . . The organization of the *Unitas Fratrum* took place in the year 1457."—E. De Schweinitz, *Hist. of the Church known as Unitas Fratrum*, ch. 10-12.

**A. D. 1458.—Election of George Podiebrad to the throne.** See HUNGARY: A. D. 1442-1458.

**A. D. 1458-1471.—Papal excommunication and deposition of the king, George Podiebrad.—A crusade.—War with the Emperor and Matthias of Hungary.—Death of Podiebrad and election of Ladislaus of Poland.**—George Podiebrad had scarcely ascended the throne before the Catholics, at the instigation of the pope, required him to fulfil his coronation oath, by expelling all heretics from the kingdom. He complied with their request, banished the Taborites, Picards, Adamites, and all other religious sects who did not profess the Catholic doctrines, and issued a decree that all his subjects should become members of the Catholic church, as communicants under one or both kinds. The Catholics, however, were not satisfied; considering the Calixtins as heretics, they entreated him to annul the compacts, or to obtain a new ratification of them from the new pope. To gratify their wishes he sent an embassy to Rome, requesting a confirmation of the compacts; but Pius, under the pretence that the compacts gave occasion to heresy, refused his ratification, and sent Fantino della Valle, as legate, to Prague, for the purpose of persuading the king to prohibit the administration of the communion under both kinds. In consequence of this legation the king called a diet, at which the legate and the bishops of Olmutz and Breslau were present. The ill success of the embassy to Rome having been announced, he said, 'I am astonished, and cannot divine the intentions of the pope. The compacts were the only means of terminating the dreadful commotions in Bohemia, and if they are annulled, the kingdom will again relapse into the former disorders. The council of Basle, which was composed of the most learned men in Europe, approved and granted them to the Bohemians, and pope Eugenius confirmed them. They contain no heresy, and are in all respects conformable to the doctrines of the holy church. I and my wife have followed them from our childhood, and I am determined to maintain them till my death.' . . . Fantino replying in a long and virulent invective, the king ordered him to quit the assembly, and imprisoned him in the castle of Podiebrad, allowing him no other sustenance except bread and water. The pope, irritated by this insult, annulled the compacts, in 1463, and fulminated a sentence of excommunication against the king, unless he appeared at Rome within a certain time to justify his conduct. This bull occasioned a great ferment among the Catholics; Podiebrad was induced to liberate the legate, and made an apology to the offended pontiff; while Frederic, grateful for the assistance which he had recently received from the king of Bohemia, when besieged by his brother Albert, interposed his mediation with the pope, and procured the suspension of the sentence of excommunication. Pius dying on the 14th of August, 1464, the new pope, Paul II., persecuted the king of Bohemia with increasing serimony. He sent his legate to Breslau to excite commotions among the Catholics, endeavoured without effect to gain Casimir, king of Poland, by the offer of the Bohemian crown, and applied with the same ill success to the states of Germany. He at length overcame the gratitude of the emperor by threats and promises, and at the diet of Nuremberg in 1467, the proposal of his legate Fantino, to form a crusade against the

heretic king of Bohemia, was supported by the imperial ambassadors. Although this proposal was rejected by the diet, the pope published a sentence of deposition against Podiebrad, and his emissaries were allowed to preach the crusade throughout Germany, and in every part of the Austrian territories. The conduct of Frederic drew from the king of Bohemia, in 1468, a violent invective against his ingratitude, and a formal declamation of war; he followed this declaration by an irruption into Austria, spreading devastation as far as the Danube. Frederic in vain applied to the princes of the empire for assistance: and at length excited Matthias king of Hungary against his father-in-law, by offering to invest him with the kingdom of Bohemia. Matthias, forgetting his obligations to Podiebrad, to whom he owed his life and crown, was dazzled by the offer, and being assisted by bodies of German marauders, who had assumed the cross, invaded Bohemia. At the same time the intrigues of the pope exciting the Catholics to insurrection, the country again became a prey to the dreadful evils of a civil and religious war. The vigour and activity of George Podiebrad suppressed the internal commotions, and repelled the invasion of the Hungarians; an armistice was concluded, and the two kings, on the 4th of April, 1469, held an amicable conference at Sternberg, in Moravia, where they entered into a treaty of peace. But Matthias, influenced by the perfidious maxim, that no compact should be kept with heretics, was persuaded by the papal legate to resume hostilities. After overrunning Moravia and Silesia, he held a mock diet at Olmutz with some of the Catholic party, where he was chosen king of Bohemia, and solemnly crowned by the legate. . . . Podiebrad, in order to baffle the designs both of the emperor and Matthias, summoned a diet at Prague, and proposed to the states as his successor, Ladislaus, eldest son of Casimir, king of Poland, by Elizabeth, second daughter of the emperor Albert. The proposal was warmly approved by the nation, . . . as the Catholics were desirous of living under a prince of their own communion, and the Calixtines anxious to prevent the accession of Frederic or Matthias, both of whom were hostile to their doctrines. The states accordingly assented without hesitation, and Ladislaus was unanimously nominated successor to the throne. The indignation of Matthias was inflamed by his disappointment, and hostilities were continued with increasing fury. The two armies, conducted by their respective sovereigns, the ablest generals of the age, for some time kept each other in check; till at length both parties, wearied by the devastation of their respective countries, concluded a kind of armistice, on the 22nd of July, 1470, which put a period to hostilities. On the death of Podiebrad, in the ensuing year, Frederic again presenting himself as a candidate, was supported by still fewer adherents than on the former occasion; a more numerous party espoused the interests of Matthias; but the majority declaring for Ladislaus, he was re-elected, and proclaimed king. Frederic supported Ladislaus in preference to Matthias, and by fomenting the troubles in Hungary, as well as by his intrigues with the King of Poland, endeavoured not only to dispossess Matthias of the throne of Bohemia, but even to drive him from that of Hungary."—W.

Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 18 (v. 1).

**A. D. 1471-1479.—War with Matthias of Hungary.—Surrender of Moravia and Silesia.** See HUNGARY: A. D. 1471-1487.

**A. D. 1490.—King Ladislaus elected to the throne of Hungary.** See HUNGARY: A. D. 1487-1526.

**A. D. 1516-1576.—Accession of the House of Austria.—The Reformation and its strength.—Alternating toleration and persecution.**—In 1489 Vhldislav "was elected to the throne of Hungary after the death of Mathias Corvius. He died in 1516, and was succeeded on the throne of Bohemia and Hungary by his minor son, Louis, who perished in 1526 at the battle of Mohacz against the Turks [see HUNGARY: A. D. 1487-1526]. An equality of rights was maintained between the Hussites and the Roman Catholics during these two reigns. Louis left no children, and was succeeded on the throne of Hungary and Bohemia by Ferdinand of Austria [see, also, AUSTRIA: A. D. 1496-1526], brother of the Emperor Charles V., and married to the sister of Louis, a prince of a bigoted and despotic character. The doctrines of Luther had already found a speedy echo amongst the Calixtines under the preceding reign; and Protestantism gained so much ground under that of Ferdinand, that the Bohemians refused to take part in the war against the Protestant league of Smalkalden, and formed a union for the defence of the national and religious liberties, which were menaced by Ferdinand. The defeat of the Protestants at the battle of Muhlbberg, in 1547, by Charles V., which laid prostrate their cause in Germany, produced a severe reaction in Bohemia. Several leaders of the union were executed, others imprisoned or banished; the property of many nobles was confiscated, the towns were heavily fined, deprived of several privileges, and subjected to new taxes. These measures were carried into execution with the assistance of German, Spanish, and Hungarian soldiers, and legalized by an assembly known under the name of the Bloody Diet. . . . The Jesuits were also introduced during that reign into Bohemia. The privileges of the Calixtine, or, as it was officially called, the Utraquist Church, were not abolished; and Ferdinand, who had succeeded to the imperial crown after the abdication of his brother Charles V., softened, during the latter years of his reign, his harsh and despotic character. . . . He died in 1564, sincerely regretting, it is said, the acts of oppression which he had committed against his Bohemian subjects. He was succeeded by his son, the Emperor Maximilian II., a man of noble character and tolerant disposition, which led to the belief that he himself inclined towards the doctrines of the Reformation. He died in 1576, leaving a name venerated by all parties. . . . Maximilian's son, the Emperor Rudolph, was educated at the court of his cousin, Philip II. of Spain, and could not be but adverse to Protestantism, which had, however, become too strong, not only in Bohemia, but also in Austria proper, to be easily suppressed; but several indirect means were adopted, in order gradually to effect this object."—V. Krasinski, *Lects. on the Religious Hist. of the Slavonic Nations*, lect. 2.

**A. D. 1576-1604.—Persecution of Protestants by Rudolph.** See HUNGARY: A. D. 1567-1604.

A. D. 1611-1618.—The Letter of Majesty, or Royal Charter, and Matthias's violation of it.—Ferdinand of Styria forced upon the nation as king by hereditary right.—The throwing of the Royal Counsellors from the window.—Beginning of the Thirty Years War.—In 1611, the Emperor Rodolph was forced to surrender the crown of Bohemia to his brother Matthias. The next year he died, and Matthias succeeded him as Emperor also. "The tranquillity which Rodolph II.'s Letter of Majesty [see GERMANY: A. D. 1608-1618] had established in Bohemia lasted for some time, under the administration of Matthias, till the nomination of a new heir to this kingdom in the person of Ferdinand of Gratz [Styria]. This prince, whom we shall afterwards become better acquainted with under the title of Ferdinand II., Emperor of Germany, had, by the violent extirpation of the Protestant religion within his hereditary dominions, announced himself as an inexorable zealot for popery, and was consequently looked upon by the Roman Catholic part of Bohemia as the future pillar of their church. The declining health of the Emperor brought on this hour rapidly; and, relying on so powerful a supporter, the Bohemian Papists began to treat the Protestants with little moderation. The Protestant vassals of Roman Catholic nobles, in particular, experienced the harshest treatment. At length several of the former were incautious enough to speak somewhat loudly of their hopes, and by threatening hints to awaken among the Protestants a suspicion of their future sovereign. But this mistrust would never have broken out into actual violence, had the Roman Catholics confined themselves to general expressions, and not by attacks on individuals furnished the discontent of the people with enterprising leaders. Henry Matthias, Count Thurn, not a native of Bohemia, but proprietor of some estates in that kingdom, had, by his zeal for the Protestant cause, and an enthusiastic attachment to his newly adopted country, gained the entire confidence of the Utraquists, which opened him the way to the most important posts. . . . Of a hot and impetuous disposition, which loved tumult because his talents shone in it—rash and thoughtless enough to undertake things which cold prudence and a calmer temper would not have ventured upon—unscrupulous enough, where the gratification of his passions was concerned, to sport with the fate of thousands, and at the same time politic enough to hold in leading-strings such a people as the Bohemians then were. He had already taken an active part in the troubles under Rodolph's administration; and the Letter of Majesty which the States had extorted from that Emperor, was chiefly to be laid to his merit. The court had intrusted to him, as burgrave or castellan of Calstein, the custody of the Bohemian crown, and of the national charter. But the nation had placed in his hands something far more important—*itself*—with the office of defender or protector of the faith. The aristocracy by which the Emperor was ruled, imprudently deprived him of this harmless guardianship of the dead, to leave him his full influence over the living. They took from him his office of burgrave, or constable of the castle, which had rendered him dependent on the court, thereby opening his eyes to the importance of the other which remained, and

wounded his vanity, which yet was the thing that made his ambition harmless. From this moment he was actuated solely by a desire of revenge; and the opportunity of gratifying it was not long wanting. In the Royal Letter which the Bohemians had extorted from Rodolph II., as well as in the German religious treaty, one material article remained undetermined. All the privileges granted by the latter to the Protestants, were conceived in favour of the Estates or governing bodies, not of the subjects; for only to those of ecclesiastical states had a toleration, and that precarious, been conceded. The Bohemian Letter of Majesty, in the same manner, spoke only of the Estates and the imperial towns, the magistrates of which had contrived to obtain equal privileges with the former. These alone were free to erect churches and schools, and openly to celebrate their Protestant worship: in all other towns, it was left entirely to the government to which they belonged, to determine the religion of the inhabitants. The Estates of the Empire had availed themselves of this privilege in its fullest extent; the secular indeed without opposition; while the ecclesiastical, in whose case the declaration of Ferdinand had limited this privilege, disputed, not without reason, the validity of that limitation. What was a disputed point in the religious treaty, was left still more doubtful in the Letter of Majesty. . . . In the little town of Klostergrab, subject to the Archbishop of Prague; and in Braunau, which belonged to the abbot of that monastery, churches were founded by the Protestants, and completed notwithstanding the opposition of their superiors, and the disapprobation of the Emperor. . . . By the Emperor's orders, the church at Klostergrab was pulled down; that at Braunau forcibly shut up, and the most turbulent of the citizens thrown into prison. A general commotion among the Protestants was the consequence of this measure; a loud outcry was everywhere raised at its violation of the Letter of Majesty; and Count Thurn, animated by revenge, and particularly called upon by his office of defender, showed himself not a little busy in inflaming the minds of the people. At his instigation deputies were summoned to Prague from every circle in the empire, to concert the necessary measures against the common danger. It was resolved to petition the Emperor to press for the liberation of the prisoners. The answer of the Emperor, already offensive to the states, from its being addressed, not to them, but to his viceroy, denounced their conduct as illegal and rebellious, justified what had been done at Klostergrab and Braunau as the result of an imperial mandate, and contained some passages that might be construed into threats. Count Thurn did not fail to augment the unfavourable impression which this imperial edict made upon the assembled Estates. . . . He held it . . . advisable first to direct their indignation against the Emperor's counsellors; and for that purpose circulated a report, that the imperial proclamation had been drawn up by the government at Prague and only signed in Vienna. Among the imperial delegates, the chief objects of the popular hatred, were the President of the Chamber, Slavata, and Baron Martin, who had been elected in place of Count Thurn, Burgrave of Calstein. . . . Against two characters so unpopular the public indignation was easily ex-



cited, and they were marked out for a sacrifice to the general indignation. On the 23rd of May, 1618, the deputies appeared armed, and in great numbers, at the royal palace, and forced their way into the hall where the Commissioners Sternberg, Martinitz, Lobkowitz, and Slawata were assembled. In a threatening tone they demanded to know from each of them, whether he had taken any part, or had consented to, the imperial proclamation. Sternberg received them with composure, Martinitz and Slawata with defiance. This decided their fate; Sternberg and Lobkowitz, less hated, and more feared, were led by the arm out of the room; Martinitz and Slawata were seized, dragged to a window, and precipitated from a height of 80 feet, into the castle trench. Their creature, the secretary Fabricius, was thrown after them. This singular mode of execution naturally excited the surprise of civilized nations. The Bohemians justified it as a national custom, and saw nothing remarkable in the whole affair, excepting that any one should have got up again safe and sound after such a fall. A dunghill, on which the imperial commissioners chanced to be deposited, had saved them from injury. [The incident of the flinging of the obnoxious ministers from the window is often referred to us 'the defenestration at Prague.']. . . . By this brutal act of self-redress, no room was left for irresolution or repentance, and it seemed as if a single crime could be absolved only by a series of violences. As the deed itself could not be undone, nothing was left but to disarm the hand of punishment. Thirty directors were appointed to organize a regular insurrection. They seized upon all the offices of state, and all the Imperial revenues, took into their own service the royal functionaries and the soldiers, and summoned the whole Bohemian nation to avenge the common cause."—F. Schiller, *Hist. of the Thirty Years' War*, bk. 1, pp. 51-55.

ALSO IN: S. R. Gardiner, *The Thirty Years' War*, ch. 2.—A. Gludely, *Hist. of the Thirty Years' War*, ch. 1.—F. Kohlrausch, *Hist. of Germany*, ch. 22.

**A. D. 1618-1620.**—Conciliatory measures defeated by Ferdinand.—His election to the Imperial throne, and his deposition in Bohemia.—Acceptance of the crown by Frederick the Palatine Elector.—His unsupported situation. See GERMANY: A. D. 1618-1620.

**A. D. 1620.**—Disappointment in the newly elected King.—His aggressive Calvinism.—Battle of the White Mountain before Prague.—Frederick's flight.—Annulment of the Royal charter.—Loss of Bohemian Liberties. See GERMANY: A. D. 1620, and HUNGARY: A. D. 1606-1660.

**A. D. 1621-1648.**—The Reign of Terror.—Death, banishment, confiscation, dragoonades.—The country a desert.—Protestantism crushed, but not slain.—'In June, 1621, a fearful reign of terror began in Bohemia, with the execution of 27 of the most distinguished heretics. For years the unhappy people bled under it; thousands were banished, and yet Protestantism was not fully exterminated. The charter was cut into shreds by the Emperor himself; there could be no forbearance towards 'such acknowledged rebels.' As a matter of course, the Lutheran preaching was forbidden under the heaviest penalties; heretical works, Bibles especially, were taken away in heaps. Jesuit

colleges, churches, and schools came into power; but this was not all. A large number of distinguished Protestant families were deprived of their property, and, as if that were not enough, it was decreed that no non-Catholic could be a citizen, nor carry on a trade, enter into a marriage, nor make a will; any one who harboured a Protestant preacher forfeited his property; whoever permitted Protestant instruction to be given was to be fined, and whipped out of town; the Protestant poor who were not converted were to be driven out of the hospitals, and to be replaced by Catholic poor; he who gave free expression to his opinions about religion was to be executed. In 1621 an order was issued to all preachers and teachers to leave the country within eight days under pain of death; and finally, it was ordained that whoever had not become Catholic by Easter, 1626, must emigrate. . . . But the real conversions were few; thousands quietly remained true to the faith; other thousands wandered as beggars into foreign lands, more than 30,000 Bohemian families, and among them 500 belonging to the aristocracy, went into banishment. Exiled Bohemians were to be found in every country of Europe, and were not wanting in any of the armies that fought against Austria. Those who could not or would not emigrate, held to their faith in secret. Against them dragoonades were employed. Detachments of soldiers were sent into the various districts to torment the heretics till they were converted. The 'Converters' (Seligmacher) went thus throughout all Bohemia, plundering and murdering. . . . No succour reached the unfortunate people; but neither did the victors attain their end. Protestantism and the Hussite memories could not be slain, and only outward submission was extorted. . . . A respectable Protestant party exists to this day in Bohemia and Moravia. But a desert was created; the land was crushed for a generation. Before the war Bohemia had 4,000,000 inhabitants, and in 1648 there were but 700,000 or 800,000. These figures appear preposterous, but they are certified by Bohemian historians. In some parts of the country the population has not attained the standard of 1620 to this day."—L. Hutcher, *The Period of the Reformation*, ch. 32.

ALSO IN: C. A. Peschek, *Reformation and Anti-Reformation in Bohemia*, v. 2.—E. de Schweinitz, *Hist. of the Church known as the Unitas Fratrum*, ch. 47-51.

**A. D. 1631-1632.**—Temporary occupation by the Saxons.—Their expulsion by Wallenstein. See GERMANY: A. D. 1631-1632.

**A. D. 1640-1645.**—Campaigns of Baner and Torstenson. See GERMANY: A. D. 1640-1645.

**A. D. 1646-1648.**—Last campaigns of the Thirty Years War.—Surprise and capture of part of Prague by the Swedes.—Siege of the old city.—Peace. See GERMANY: A. D. 1646-1648.

**A. D. 1740.**—The question of the Austrian Succession.—The Pragmatic Sanction. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1718-1738, and 1740.

**A. D. 1741.**—Brief conquest by the French, Bavarians and Saxons. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1741 (AUGUST—NOVEMBER), and (OCTOBER).

**A. D. 1742 (January—May).**—Prussian invasion.—Battle of Chotusitz. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1742 (JANUARY—MAY).



**A. D. 1742 (June—December).—Expulsion of the French.—Belleisle's retreat.—Maria Theresa crowned at Prague.** See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1742 (JUNE—DECEMBER).

**A. D. 1757.—The Seven Years War.—Frederick's invasion and defeat.—Battles of Prague and Kolin.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1757 (APRIL—JUNE).

**BOHEMIAN BRETHREN, The.** See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1434-1457, and GERMANY: A. D. 1630.

**BOHEMIANS (Gypsies).** See GYPSIES.

**BOIANS, OR BOII.**—Some passages in the earlier history and movements of the powerful Gallie tribe known as the Boii will be found touched upon under ROME: B. C. 390-347, and B. C. 295-191, in accounts given of the destruction of Rome by the Gauls, and of the subsequent wars of the Romans with the Cisalpine Gauls. After the final conquest of the Boians in Gallia Cisalpina, early in the second century, B. C., the Romans seem to have expelled them, wholly or partly, from that country, forcing them to cross the Alps. They afterwards occupied a region embraced in modern Bavaria and Bohemia, both of which countries are thought to have derived their names from these Boian people. Some part of the nation, however, associated itself with the Helvetii and joined in the migration which Cæsar arrested. He settled these Boians in Gaul, within the Eduan territory, between the Loire and the Allier. Their capital city was Gergovia, which was also the name of a city of the Arverni. The Gergovia of the Boians is conjectured to have been modern Moulins. Their territory was the modern Bourbonnais, which probably derived its name from them. Three important names, therefore, in European geography and history, viz.—Bourbon, Bavaria and Bohemia, are traced to the Gallie nation of the Boii.—Tacitus, *Germany*, trans. by Church and Brodribb, notes.

ALSO IN: C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 12, note.

**BOIS-LE-DUC.**—Siege and capture by the Dutch (1629). See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1631-1633.

**BOKHARA (Ancient Transoxania).**—“Taken literally, the name [Transoxania] is a translation of the Arabic *Mavera-un-nahr* (that which lies beyond or across the river), and it might therefore be supposed that Transoxania meant the country lying beyond or on the right shore of the Oxus. But this is not strictly speaking the case. . . . From the period of the Samanides down to modern times, the districts of Talkan, Tokharistan and Zem, although lying partly or entirely on the left bank of the Oxus, have been looked on as integral portions of Bokhara. Our historical researches seem to prove that this arrangement dates from the Samanides, who were themselves originally natives of that part of Khorassan. . . . It is almost impossible in dealing geographically with Transoxania to assign definitely an accurate frontier. We can and will therefore comprehend in our definition of Transoxania solely Bokhara, or the khanate of Bokhara; for although it has only been known by the latter name since the time of Sheibani and of the Ozbegs [A. D. 1500], the shores of the Zereshan and the tract of country stretching southwards to the Oxus

and northwards to the desert of Kizil Kum, represent the only parts of the territory which have remained uninterruptedly portions of the original undivided state of Transoxania from the earliest historical times. . . . Bokhara, the capital from the time of the Samanides, and at the date of the very earliest geographical reports concerning Transoxania, is said, during its prosperity, to have been the largest city of the Islamite world. . . . Bokhara was not, however, merely a luxurious city, distinguished by great natural advantages; it was also the principal emporium for the trade between China and Western Asia; in addition to the vast warehouses for silks, brocades, and cotton stuffs, for the finest carpets, and all kinds of gold and silversmiths' work, it boasted of a great money-market, being in fact the Exchange of all the population of Eastern and Western Asia. . . . Sogd . . . comprised the mountainous part of Transoxania (which may be described as the extreme western spurs of the Thien-Shan). . . . The capital was Samarkand, undoubtedly the Maracanda of the Greeks, which they specify as the capital of Sogdia. The city has, throughout the history of Transoxania been the rival of Bokhara. Before the time of the Samanides, Samarkand was the largest city beyond the Oxus, and only began to decline from its former importance when Ismail chose Bokhara for his own residence. Under the Khahrezmians it is said to have raised itself again, and become much larger than its rival, and under Timour to have reached the culminating point of its prosperity.”—A. Vambery, *Hist. of Bokhara*, introd.

ALSO IN: J. Hutton, *Central Asia*, ch. 2-3.

**B. C. 329-327.—Conquest by Alexander the Great.** See MACEDONIA: B. C. 330-323.

**6th Century.—Conquest from the White Huns by the Turks.** See TURKS: 6TH CENTURY.

**A. D. 710.—The Moslem Conquest.** See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 710.

**A. D. 991-998.—Under the Samanides.** See SAMANIDES.

**A. D. 1004-1193.—The Seldjuk Turks.** See TURKS (THE SELDJUKS): A. D. 1004-1063, and after.

**A. D. 1209-1220.—Under the Khwarezmians.** See KHWAREZM: 12TH CENTURY.

**A. D. 1219.—Destruction of the city by Jings Khan.**—Bokhara was taken by Jings Khan in the summer of 1219. “It was then a very large and magnificent city. Its name, according to the historian Alai-ud-din, is derived from Bokhar, which in the Magian language means the Centre of Science.” The city surrendered after a siege of a few days. Jings Khan, on entering the town, saw the great mosque and asked if it was the Sultan's palace. “Being told it was the house of God, he dismounted, climbed the steps, and said in a loud voice to his followers, ‘The hay is cut, give your horses fodder.’ They easily understood this cynical invitation to plunder. . . . The inhabitants were ordered to leave the town in a body, with only their clothes, so that it might be more easily pillaged, after which the spoil was divided among the victors. ‘It was a fearful day,’ says Ibn al Ithir; ‘one only heard the sobs and weeping of men, women and children, who were separated forever; women were ravished, while men died rather than survive the dishonour of

their wives and daughters.' The Mongols ended by setting fire to all the wooden portion of the town, and only the great mosque and certain palaces which were built of brick remained standing."—H. H. Howorth, *Hist. of the Mongols*, v. 1, ch. 3.—"The flourishing city on the Zerfshan had become a heap of rubbish, but the garrison in the citadel, commanded by Kok Khau, continued to hold out with a bravery which deserves our admiration. The Mongols used every imaginable effort to reduce this last refuge of the enemy; the Bokhariots themselves were forced on to the scaling-ladders: but all in vain, and it was not until the moat had been literally clogged with corpses of men and animals that the stronghold was taken and its brave defenders put to death. The peaceable portion of the population was also made to suffer for this heroic resistance. More than 30,000 men were executed, and the remainder were, with the exception of the very old people among them, reduced to slavery, without any distinction of rank whatever; and thus the inhabitants of Bokhara, lately so celebrated for their learning, their love of art, and their general refinement, were brought down to a dead level of misery and degradation and scattered to all quarters."—A. Vambéry, *Hist. of Bokhara*, ch. 8.—See **MONGOLS**: A. D. 1153-1227.

**A. D. 1868.**—**Subjection to Russia.** See **RUSSIA**: A. D. 1859-1876.

**BOLERIUM.** See **BELENERON**.

**BOLESLAUS I.**, King of Poland, A. D. 1000-1025....**Boleslaus II.**, King of Poland, A. D. 1058-1083....**Boleslaus III.**, Duke of Poland, A. D. 1102-1138....**Boleslaus IV.**, Duke of Poland, A. D. 1140-1173....**Boleslaus V.**, King of Poland, A. D. 1227-1279.

**BOLEYN, Anne.**—**Marriage, trial and execution.** See **ENGLAND**: A. D. 1527-1534; and, 1536-1543.

**BOLGARI.** See **BULGARIA**: **ORIGIN OF.**

**BOLIVAR'S LIBERATION OF THE SOUTH AMERICAN STATES.** See **COLOMBIAN STATES**: A. D. 1810-1819, 1819-1830; and **PERU**: A. D. 1820-1826, 1825-1826, and 1826-1876.

**BOLIVIA:** The aboriginal inhabitants.—"With the Toromonos tribe, who occupied, as Orbigny tells us, a district of from 11° to 13° of South latitude, it was an established rule for every man to build his house, with his own hands alone, and if he did otherwise he lost the title of man, as well as became the laughing-stock of his fellow citizens. The only clothing worn by these people was a turban on the head, composed of feathers, the rest of the body being perfectly naked; whilst the women used a garment, manufactured out of cotton, that only partially covered their persons. . . . The ornament in which the soft sex took most pride was a necklace made of the teeth of enemies, killed by their husbands in battle. Amongst the Moxos polygamy was tolerated, and woman's infidelity severely punished. . . . The Moxos cultivated the land with ploughs, and other implements of agriculture, made of wood. They fabricated canoes, fought and fished with bows and arrows. In the province of the Moxos lived also a tribe called Itonomos, who, besides these last named instruments of war, used two-edged wooden scimitars. The immorality of these Itonomos

was something like that of the Mormons of our time. . . . The Canchans, who lived near Machupo, between 13° and 14° S. lat. and 67° to 68° W. long., are reputed by M. d'Orbigny as the bravest of the Bolivian Indians. They are accredited to have been cannibals. . . . Where Jujuy—the most northern province of the Argentine Republic—joins Bolivia, we have in the present day the Mataguaya and Cambas Indians. The latter are represented to me by Dr. Matienzo, of Rosario, as intelligent and devoted to agricultural labor. They have fixed tolderias [villages], the houses of which are clean and neat. Each town is commanded by a capitán, whose sovereignty is hereditary to his male descendants only."—T. J. Hutchinson, *The Parana*, ch. 4.—See, also, **AMERICAN ABORIGINALS**: **ANDESANS**, and **TUPI**.

**In the Empire of the Incas.** See **PERU: THE EMPIRE OF THE INCAS**.

**A. D. 1559.**—**Establishment of the Audiencia of Charcas.** See **AUDIENCIAS**.

**A. D. 1825-1826.**—**The independent Republic founded and named in Upper Peru.**—**The Bolivian Constitution.**—"Upper Peru [or Las Charcas, as it was more specifically known] . . . had been detached [in 1776—see **ARGENTINE REPUBLIC**: A. D. 1580-1777] from the government of Lima . . . to form part of the newly constituted Viceroyalty of Buenos Ayres. The fifteen years' struggle for independence was here a sanguinary one indeed. There is scarcely a town, village, or noticeable place in this vast region where blood is not recorded to have been shed in this terrible struggle. . . . The Spanish army afterwards succumbed to that of the independents of Peru; and thus Upper Peru gained, not indeed liberty, but independence under the rule of a republican army. This vast province was incapable of governing itself. The Argentines laid claim to it as a province of the confederation; but they already exercised too great a preponderance in the South American system, and the Colombian generals obtained the relinquishment of these pretensions. Sucre [Bolivar's Chief of Staff] assumed the government until a congress could be assembled; and under the influence of the Colombian soldiery Upper Peru was erected into an independent state by the name of the Republic of Bolivar, or Bolivia."—E. J. Payne, *Hist. of European Colonies*, p. 200.—For an account of the Peruvian war of liberation—the results of which embraced Upper Peru—and the adoption of the Bolivian constitution by the latter, see **PERU**: A. D. 1820-1826, and 1825-1826.

**A. D. 1834-1839.**—**Confederation with Peru.**—**War with Chile.** See **PERU**: A. D. 1820-1876.

**A. D. 1879-1884.**—**The war with Chile.** See **CHILE**: A. D. 1833-1884.

**BOLIVIAN CONSTITUTION, or Code Bolivar.** See **PERU**: A. D. 1825-1826, and 1826-1876.

**BOLOGNA:** Origin of the city.—On the final conquest of the Boian Gauls in North Italy, a new Roman colony and frontier fortress were established, B. C. 189, called first Felsina and then Bononia, which is the Bologna of modern Italy.—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 5, ch. 41.

**Origin of the name.** See **BOIANS**.

**B. C. 43.**—Conference of the Triumvirs. See **ROME**: **B. C. 44-43**.

**11th Century.**—**School of Law.**—**The Glossators.**—"Just at this time [end of the 11th century] we find a famous school of law established in Bologna, and frequented by multitudes of pupils, not only from all parts of Italy, but from Germany, France, and other countries. The basis of all its instructions was the *Corpus Juris Civilis*. Its teachers, who constitute a series of distinguished jurists extending over a century and a half, devoted themselves to the work of expounding the text and elucidating the principles of the *Corpus Juris*, and especially the *Digest*. From the form in which they recorded and handed down the results of their studies, they have obtained the name of glossators. On their copies of the *Corpus Juris* they were accustomed to write glosses, i. e., brief marginal explanations and remarks. These glosses came at length to be an immense literature."—**J. Hadley, *Introductio ad Roman Law, lect. 2.***

**11th-12th Centuries.**—**Rise and Acquisition of Republican Independence.** See **ITALY**: **A. D. 1050-1152**.

**A. D. 1275.**—**Sovereignty of the Pope confirmed by Rodolph of Hapsburg.** See **GERMANY**: **A. D. 1273-1308**.

**A. D. 1350-1447.**—**Under the tyranny of the Visconti.** See **MILAN**: **A. D. 1277-1447**; and **FLORENCE**: **A. D. 1390-1402**.

**A. D. 1512.**—**Acquisition by Pope Julius II.** See **ITALY**: **A. D. 1510-1513**.

**A. D. 1796-1797.**—**Joined to the Cispadane Republic.** See **FRANCE**: **A. D. 1796 (APRIL-OCTOBER)**; **1796-1797 (OCTOBER-APRIL)**.

**A. D. 1831.**—**Revolt suppressed by Austrian troops.** See **ITALY**: **A. D. 1830-1832**.

**BOMBAY.**—**Cession to England (1661).** See **INDIA**: **A. D. 1600-1792**.

**BON HOMME RICHARD AND THE SERAPIS.**—**Sea-fight.** See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: **A. D. 1779 (SEPTEMBER)**.

**BONAPARTE, Jerome, and his Kingdom of Westphalia.** See **GERMANY**: **A. D. 1807 (JUNE-JULY)**; **1813 (SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER)**, and **(OCTOBER-DECEMBER)**.

**BONAPARTE, Joseph, King of Naples and King of Spain.** See **FRANCE**: **A. D. 1805-1806 (DECEMBER-SEPTEMBER)**; **SPAIN**: **A. D. 1808 (MAY-SEPTEMBER)**, to **1812-1814**.

**BONAPARTE, Louis, and the Kingdom of Holland.** See **NETHERLANDS**: **A. D. 1806-1810**.

**BONAPARTE, Louis Napoleon.** See **NAPOLÉON III**.

**BONAPARTE, NAPOLEON, The career of.** See **FRANCE**: **A. D. 1793 (JULY-DECEMBER)**, and **1795 (OCTOBER-DECEMBER)**, to **1815**.

**BONAPARTE FAMILY, The origin of the.**—"About four miles to the south of Florence, on an eminence overlooking the valley of the little river Greve, and the then bridle-path leading towards Siena and Rome, there was a very strong castle, called Monte Boni, Mons Boni, as it is styled in sundry deeds of gift executed within its walls in the years 1041, 1085, and 1100, by which its lords made their peace with the Church, in the usual way, by sharing with churchmen the proceeds of a course of life such as needed a whitewashing stroke of the Church's office. A strong castle on the road to Florence, and just at a point where the path ascended a steep hill, offered

advantages and temptations not to be resisted; and the lords of Monte Boni 'took toll' of passengers. But, as Villani very naively says, 'the Florentines could not endure that another should do what they abstained from doing.' So as usual they sallied forth from their gates one fine morning, attacked the strong fortress, and razed it to the ground. All this was, as we have seen, an ordinary occurrence enough in the history of young Florence. This was a way the burghers had. They were clearing their land of these vestiges of feudalism, much as an American settler clears his ground of the stumps remaining from the primeval forest. But a special interest will be admitted to belong to this instance of the clearing process, when we discover who those noble old freebooters of Monte Boni were. The lords of Monte Boni were called, by an easy, but it might be fancied ironical, derivation from the name of their entle 'Buoni del Monte,'—the Good Men of the Mountain;—and by abbreviation, Buondelmonte, a name which we shall hear more of anon in the pages of this history. But when, after the destruction of their fortress, these Good Men of the Mountain became Florentine citizens, they increased and multiplied; and in the next generation, dividing off into two branches, they assumed, as was the frequent practice, two distinctive appellations; the one branch remaining Buondelmonti, and the other calling themselves Buonaparte. This latter branch shortly afterwards again divided itself into two, of which one settled at San Miniato al Tedesco, and became extinct there in the person of an aged canon of the name within this century; while the other first established itself at Sarzana, a little town on the coast about half-way between Florence and Genoa, and from thence at a later period transplanted itself to Corsica; and has since been heard of."—**T. A. Trollope, *Hist. of the Commonwealth of Florence, v. 1, pp. 50-51.***

**BONIFACE, ST., The Mission of.** See **CHRISTIANITY**: **A. D. 496-800**.

**BONIFACE, COUNT, and the Vandals.** See **VANDALS**: **A. D. 429-439**.

**BONIFACE III, Pope, A. D. 607, FEBRUARY TO NOVEMBER.** . . . **Boniface IV., Pope, A. D. 608-615.** . . . **Boniface V., Pope, A. D. 619-625.**

. . . **Boniface VI., Pope, A. D. 896.** . . . **Boniface VII., Pope, A. D. 974, 984-985.** . . . **Boniface VIII., Pope, A. D. 1204-1303.** . . . **Boniface IX., Pope, A. D. 1389-1404.**

**BONN, Siege and Capture by Marlborough (1703).** See **NETHERLANDS**: **A. D. 1702-1704**.

**BONNET ROUGE, The.** See **LIBERTY CAP**.

**BONONIA IN GAUL.** See **GESORIACUM**.

**BONONIA IN ITALY.** See **BOLOGNA**.

**BOOK OF THE DEAD.**—"A collection (ancient Egyptian) of prayers and exorcisms composed at various periods for the benefit of the pilgrim soul in his journey through Amenti (the Egyptian Hades); and it was in order to provide him with a safe conduct through the perils of that terrible valley that copies of this work, or portions of it, were buried with the mummy in his tomb. Of the many thousands of papyri which have been preserved to this day, it is perhaps scarcely too much to say that one half, if not two thirds, are copies more or less complete of the Book of the Dead."—**A. B. Edwards, *Academy, Sept. 10, 1887.*** **M. Naville** published in 1887 a collation of the numerous differing

texts of the Book of the Dead, on the preparation of which he had been engaged for ten years.

**BOCNE, Daniel, and the settlement of Kentucky.** See KENTUCKY: A. D. 1765-1778, and 1775-1784.

**BOONVILLE, Battle of.** See MISSOURI: A. D. 1861 (FEBRUARY—JULY).

**BOONSBORO, or South Mountain, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (SEPTEMBER; MARYLAND).

**BOOTH, John Wilkes.—Assassination of President Lincoln.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (APRIL 14TH).

**BOR-RUSSIA.** See PRUSSIA: THE ORIGINAL COUNTRY AND ITS NAME.

**BORDARIL.** See SLAVERY, MÆDÆVAL: ENGLAND; also MANORS.

**BORDEAUX: Origin.** See BURDIGALA.

**A. D. 732.—Stormed and sacked by the Moslems.** See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 715-732.

**A. D. 1650.—Revolt of the Frondeurs.—Siege of the city.—Treaty of Peace.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1650-1651.

**A. D. 1652-1653.—The last phase of the Fronde.—Rebellion of the Society of the Ormée.—Cromwell's help invoked.—Siege and submission of the city.**—"The peace of Bordeaux in October, 1650, had left the city tranquil, but not intimidated, and its citizens were neither attached to the government nor afraid of it. . . . There, as at Paris, a violent element obtained control, ready for disturbance, and not alarmed by the possibility of radical changes in the government. . . . During the popular emotion against Épernon, meetings, mostly of the lower classes, had been held under some great clms near the city, and from this circumstance a party had taken the name of the Ormée. It now assumed a more definite form, and began to protest against the slackness of the officers and magistrates, who it was charged, were ready to abandon the popular cause. The Parliament was itself divided into two factions," known as the Little Fronde and the Great Fronde—the latter of which was devoted to the Prince of Condé. "The Ormée was a society composed originally of a small number of active and violent men, and in its organization not wholly unlike the society of the Jacobins. . . . Troubles increased between this society and the parliament, and on June 3d [1652] it held a meeting attended by 3,000 armed men, and decided on the exile of fourteen of the judges who were regarded as traitors to the cause. . . . The offending judges were obliged to leave the city, but in a few days the Parliament again obtained control, and the exiles were recalled and received with great solemnity. But the Ormée was not thus to be overcome. On June 25th these contests resulted in a battle in the streets, in which the society had the advantage. Many of the judges abandoned the conflict and left the city. The Ormée established itself at the Hotel de Ville, and succeeded in controlling for the most part the affairs of the city. . . . Condé decided that he would recognize the Ormée as a political organization, and strengthen it by his approval. . . . The restoration of the King's authority at Paris [see FRANCE: A. D. 1651-1653] strengthened the party at Bordeaux that desired peace, and increased the violence of the party that was opposed to it. Plots were laid for the over-

throw of the local authorities, but they were wholly unsuccessful. . . . The desire of the people, the nobility, and the clergy was for peace. Only by speedy aid from Spain could the city be kept in hostility to its King and in allegiance to Condé. Spain was asked to send assistance and prevent this important loss, but the Spanish delayed any vigorous action, partly from remissness and partly from lack of troops and money. The most of the province of Guienne was gradually lost to the insurgents. . . . Condé seems to have left Guienne to itself. . . . In this condition, the people of Bordeaux turned to Cromwell as the only person who had the power to help them. . . . The envoys were received by Cromwell, but he took no steps to send aid to Bordeaux. Hopes were held out which encouraged the city and alarmed the French minister, but no ships were sent." Meantime, the King's forces in Guienne advanced with steady success, and early in the summer of 1653 they began the siege of the city. The peace party within, thus encouraged, soon overthrew the Ormée, and arranged terms for the submission of the town. "The government proceeded at once to erect the castles of Trompette and Hô, and they were made powerful enough to check any future turbulence."—J. B. Perkins, *France under Mazarin*, ch. 15 (p. 2).

**A. D. 1791.—The Girondists in the National Legislative Assembly.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1791 (OCTOBER).

**A. D. 1793.—Revolt against the Revolutionary Government of Paris.—Fearful vengeance of the Terrorists.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (JUNE); (JULY—DECEMBER); and 1793-1794 (OCTOBER—APRIL).

**A. D. 1814.—Occupied by the English.** See SPAIN: A. D. 1812-1814.

**BORDER-RUFFIANS.** See KANSAS: A. D. 1854-1859.

**BORGHETTO, Battle of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1796 (APRIL—OCTOBER).

**BORGIAS, The.** See PAPACY: A. D. 1471-1513.

**BORIS, Czar of Russia.** A. D. 1508-1605.

**BORLA, The.** See PERU: A. D. 1533-1548.

**BORNHOVED, Battle of (1227).** See SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1018-1397.

**BORNY, OR COLOMBEY-NOUILLY, Battle of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1870 (JULY—AUGUST).

**BORODINO, OR THE MOSKOWA, Battle of.** See RUSSIA: A. D. 1812 (JUNE—SEPTEMBER).

**BOROUGH.—CITY.—TOWN.—VILLE.**

—"The burh of the Anglo-Saxon period was simply a more strictly organized form of the township. It was probably in a more defensible position; had a ditch and mound instead of the quickset hedge or 'tun' from which the township took its name; and as the 'tun' originally was the fenced homestead of the cultivator, the burh was the fortified house and court-yard of the mighty man—the king, the magistrate, or the noble."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 5.—"I must freely confess that I do not know what difference, except a difference in rank, there is in England between a city and a borough. . . . A city does not seem to have any rights or powers as a city which are not equally shared by every other corporate town. The only

corporate towns which have any special powers above others are those which are counties of themselves; and all cities are not counties of themselves, while some towns which are not cities are. The city in England is not so easily defined as the city in the United States. There, every corporate town is a city. This makes a great many cities, and it leads to an use of the word city in common talk which seems a little strange in British ears. In England, even in speaking of a real city, the word city is seldom used, except in language a little formal or rhetorical; in America it is used whenever a city is mentioned. But the American rule has the advantage of being perfectly clear and avoiding all doubt. And it agrees very well with the origin of the word: a corporate town is a 'civitas,' a commonwealth; any lesser collection of men hardly is a commonwealth, or is such only in a much less perfect degree. This brings us to the historical use of the word. It is clear at starting that the word is not English. It has no Old-English equivalent; burh, burgh, borough, in its various spellings and various shades of meaning, is our native word for urbes of every kind from Rome downward. It is curious that this word should in ordinary speech have been so largely displaced by the vaguer word *town*, *town*, which means an enclosure of any kind, and in some English dialects is still applied to a single house and its surroundings. . . . In common talk we use the word *borough* hardly oftener than the word *city*; when the word is used, it has commonly some direct reference to the parliamentary or municipal characters of the town. Many people, I suspect, would define a borough as a town which sends members to Parliament, and such a definition, though still not accurate, has, by late changes, been brought nearer to accuracy than it used to be. *City* and *borough*, then, are both rather formal words; *town* is the word which comes most naturally to the lips when there is no special reason for using one of the others. Of the two formal words, *borough* is English; *city* is Latin; it comes to us from Gaul and Italy by some road or other. It is in Domesday that we find, by no means its first use in England, but its first clearly formal use, the first use of it to distinguish a certain class of towns, to mark those towns which are 'civitates' as well as *burgi* from those which are *burgi* only. Now in Gaul the 'civitas' in formal Roman language was the tribe and its territory, the whole land of the Arverni, Parisii, or any other tribe. In a secondary sense it meant the head town of the tribe. . . . When Christianity was established, the 'civitas' in the wider sense marked the extent of the bishop's diocese; the 'civitas' in the narrower sense became the immediate seat of his bishopstool. Thus we cannot say that in Gaul a town became a city because it was a bishop's see; but we may say that a certain class of towns became bishops' sees because they were already cities. But in modern French use no distinction is made between these ancient capitals which became bishoprics and other towns of less temporal and spiritual honour. The seat of the bishopric, the head of the ancient province, the head of the modern department, the smaller town which has never risen to any of those dignities, are all alike *ville*. Lyons, Rheims, Paris, are in no way

distinguished from meaner places. The word *cité* is common enough, but it has a purely local meaning. It often distinguishes the old part of a town, the ancient 'civitas,' from later additions. In Italy on the other hand, *città* is both the familiar and the formal name for towns great and small. It is used just like *ville* in French.—E. A. Freeman, *City and Borough* (*Macmillan's Mag.*, May, 1880).

**BOROUGH-ENGLISH.** See FEUDAL TENURES.

**BOROUGHBRIDGE, Battle of.**—Fought March 16, 1322, in the civil war which arose in England during the reign of Edward II on account of the King's favorites, the Despencers. Thomas, Earl of Lancaster, the leader of opposition, was defeated, captured, summarily tried and beheaded.

**BOROUGHES, Rotten and Pocket.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1830, and 1830-1832.

**BORROMEAN, OR GOLDEN LEAGUE, The.** See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1579-1630.

**BORYSTHENES, The.**—The name which the Greeks gave anciently to the river now known as the Dnieper. It also became the name of a town near the mouth of the river, which was originally called *Olbia*,—a very early trading settlement of the Milesians.

**BOSCOBEL, The Royal Oak of.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1651.

**BOSNIA.** See BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES.

**BOSPHORUS, OR BOSPORUS, The.**—The word means literally an 'ox-ford,' and the Greeks derived it as a name from the legend of Io, who, driven by a gad-fly, swam across the straits from Europe into Asia. They gave the name particularly to that channel, on which Constantinople lies, but applied it also to other similar straits, such as the Cimmerian Bosphorus, opening the Sea of Azov.

**The city and kingdom.**—"Respecting Bosphorus, or *Pantikapeum* (for both names denote the same city, though the former name often comprehends the whole annexed dominion) founded by Milesian settlers on the European side of the Kimmerian Bosphorus (near Kertsch) we first hear, about the period when Xerxes was repulsed from Greece (480-479 B. C.) It was the centre of a dominion including Phana-goria, Kepl, Hermonassa, and other Greek cities on the Asiatic side of the strait; and it is said to have been governed by what seems to have been an oligarchy—called the *Archeanaktide*—for forty-two years (480-438 B. C.) After them we have a series of princes standing out individually by name, and succeeding each other in the same family, [438-284 B. C.] . . . During the reigns of these princes, a connexion of some intimacy subsisted between Athens and Bosphorus; a connexion not political, since the Bosphoran princes had little interest in the contentions about Hellenic hegemony—but of private intercourse, commercial exchange and reciprocal good offices. The eastern corner of the Thauric Chersonesus, between *Pantikapeum* and Theodosia, was well suited for the production of corn; while plenty of fish, as well as salt, was to be had in or near the *Palus Maeotis*. Corn, salted fish and meat, hides and barbaric slaves in considerable numbers, were in demand among all Greeks round the Ægean, and not least at Athens, where Scythian slaves were numerous; while oil and

wine, and other products of more southern regions, were acceptable in Bosphorus and the other Pontic ports. This important traffic seems to have been mainly carried on in ships and by capital belonging Athens and other Ægean maritime towns and must have been greatly under the protection and regulation of the Athenians, so long as their maritime empire subsisted. Enterprising citizens of Athens went to Bosphorus (as to Thrace and the Thracian Chersonesus), to push their fortunes. . . . We have no means of following [the fortunes of the Bosphoric princes] in detail; but we know that, about a century B. C., the then reigning prince, Parisades IV. found himself so pressed and squeezed by the Scythians, that he was forced (like Olbia and the Pentapolis) to forego his independence, and to call in, as auxiliary or master, the formidable Mithridates Eupator of Pontus; from whom a new dynasty of Bosphoric kings began—subject, however, after no long interval, to the dominion and interference of Rome.”—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 98.

ALSO IN: T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 8, ch. 7.—See MITHRIDATIC WARS, and ROME: B. C. 47-46.

**Acquisition by the Goths.** See GOTHs, ACQUISITION OF BOSPHORUS.

**A. D. 565-574.—Capture by the Turks.**—“During the reign of Justin [A. D. 565-574] the city of Bosphorus, in Tauris, had been captured by the Turks, who then occupied a considerable portion of the Tauric Chersonesus. The city of Cherson alone continued to maintain its independence in the northern regions of the Black Sea.”—G. Finlay, *Greece under the Romans*, ch. 4, sect. 8.—See TURKS: SIXTH CENTURY.

**BOSSISM.**—The “Spoils System” in American politics [see SPOILS SYSTEM] developed enormously the influence and power of certain leaders and managers of party organizations, in the great cities and some of the states, who acquired the names of “Bosses,” while the system of politics which they represented was called “Bossism.” The notorious William M. Tweed, of the New York “Tammany Ring” [see NEW YORK: A. D. 1863-1871] seems to have been the first of the species to be dubbed “Boss Tweed” by his “heelers,” or followers, and the title passed from him to others of like kind.

**BOSTON: A. D. 1628-1630.**—The first white inhabitant.—The founding and naming of the city. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1622-1628, and 1630.

**A. D. 1631-1651.—The Puritan Theocracy.**—Troubles with Roger Williams, Anne Hutchinson and the Presbyterians. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1631-1636, to 1646-1651.

**A. D. 1656-1661.—The persecution of Quakers.** See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1656-1661.

**A. D. 1657-1669.—The Halfway Covenant and the founding of the Old South Church.**—“In Massachusetts after 1650 the opinion rapidly gained ground that all baptised persons of upright and decorous lives ought to be considered, for practical purposes, as members of the church, and therefore entitled to the exercise of political rights, even though unqualified for participation in the Lord’s Supper. This theory of church-membership, based on what was at that time stigmatized as the Halfway Covenant, aroused

intense opposition. It was the great question of the day. In 1657 a council was held in Boston, which approved the principle of the Halfway Covenant; and as this decision was far from satisfying the churches, a synod of all the clergymen in Massachusetts was held five years later, to reconsider the great question. The decision of the synod substantially confirmed the decision of the council, but there were some dissenting voices. Foremost among the dissenters, who wished to retain the old theocratic régime in all its strictness, was Charles Chauncy, the president of Harvard College, and Increase Mather agreed with him at the time, though he afterward saw reason to change his opinion and published two tracts in favour of the Halfway Covenant. Most bitter of all toward the new theory of church-membership was, naturally enough, Mr. Davenport of New Haven. This burning question was the source of angry contentions in the First Church of Boston. Its teacher, the learned and melancholy Norton, died in 1663, and four years later the aged pastor, John Wilson, followed him. In choosing a successor to Wilson the church decided to declare itself in opposition to the liberal decision of the synod, and in token thereof invited Davenport to come from New Haven to take charge of it. Davenport, who was then seventy years old, was disgusted at the recent annexation of his colony to Connecticut. He accepted the invitation and came to Boston, against the wishes of nearly half of the Boston congregation, who did not like the liberal principle which he represented. In little more than a year his ministry at Boston was ended by death; but the opposition to his call had already proceeded so far that a secession from the old church had become inevitable. In 1660 the advocates of the Halfway Covenant organized themselves into a new society under the title of the ‘Third Church in Boston.’ A wooden meeting-house was built on a lot which had once belonged to the late governor Winthrop, in what was then the south part of the town, so that the society and its meeting-house became known as the South Church; and after a new church founded in Summer Street in 1717 took the name of the New South, the church of 1660 came to be further distinguished as the Old South. As this church represented a liberal idea which was growing in favour with the people, it soon became the most flourishing church in America. After sixty years its numbers had increased so that the old meeting-house could not contain them; and in 1729 the famous building which still stands was erected on the same spot,—a building with a grander history than any other on the American continent, unless it be that other plain brick building in Philadelphia where the Declaration of Independence was adopted and the Federal Constitution framed.”—J. Fiske, *The Beginnings of New Eng.*, ch. 6.

ALSO IN: H. M. Dexter, *The Congregationalist of the last 300 years*, lect. 9.—B. B. Wisner, *Hist. of the Old South Church*, sermon 1.—W. Emerson, *Hist. Sketch of the First Ch. in Boston*, sect. 4-7.

**A. D. 1674-1678.—King Philip’s War.** See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1674-1675; 1675; 1676-1678.

**A. D. 1689.—The rising for William and Mary and the downfall of Andros.** See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1686-1689.

**A. D. 1697.—Threatened attack by the French.** See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1692-1697.

**A. D. 1704.—The first newspaper.** See PRINTING, &c.: A. D. 1704-1729.

**A. D. 1740-1742.—The origin of Faneuil Hall.** See FANEUIL HALL.

**A. D. 1761.—The question of the Writs of assistance and James Otis's speech.** See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1761.

**A. D. 1764-1767.—Patriotic self-denials.—Non-importation agreements.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1764-1767.

**A. D. 1765-1767.—The doings under the Liberty Tree.** See LIBERTY TREE.

**A. D. 1768.—The seizure of the sloop "Liberty."—Riotous patriotism.**—"For some years these officers [of the customs] had been resisted in making seizures of uncustomed goods, which were frequently rescued from their possession by interested parties, and the determination of the commissioners of customs to break up this practice frequently led to collisions; but no flagrant outbreak occurred until the seizure of John Hancock's sloop 'Liberty' (June 10, 1768), laden with a cargo of Madeira wine. The officer in charge, refusing a bribe, was forcibly locked up in the cabin, the greater part of the cargo was removed, and the remainder entered at the custom-house as the whole cargo. This led to seizure of the vessel, said to have been the first made by the commissioners, and for security she was placed under the guns of the 'Romney,' a man-of-war in the harbor. For this the revenue officers were roughly handled by the mob. Their boat was burned, their houses threatened, and they, with their alarmed families, took refuge on board the 'Romney,' and finally in the Castle. These proceedings undoubtedly led to the sending additional military forces to Boston in September. The General Court was in session at the time, but no effectual proceedings were taken against the rioters. Public sympathy was with them in their purposes if not in their measures."

—M. Chamberlain, *The Revolution Impending (Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v. 6, ch. 1)*.

**A. D. 1768.—The quartering of British troops.**—"Before news had reached England of the late riot in Boston, two regiments from Halifax had been ordered thither. When news of that riot arrived, two additional regiments were ordered from Ireland. The arrival of an officer, sent by Gage from New York, to provide quarters for these troops, occasioned a town meeting in Boston, by which the governor was requested to summon a new General Court, which he peremptorily refused to do. The meeting then recommended a convention of delegates from all the towns in the province to assemble at Boston in ten days; 'in consequence of prevailing apprehensions of a war with France'—such was the pretence—they advised all persons not already provided with fire-arms to procure them at once; they also appointed a day of fasting and prayer, to be observed by all the Congregational societies. Delegates from more than a hundred towns met accordingly at the day appointed [Sept. 22], chose Cushing, speaker of the late House, as their chairman, and petitioned Bernard to summon a General Court. The governor not only refused to receive their petition, but denounced the meeting as treasonable. In view of this charge, the proceedings were exceedingly

cautious and moderate. All pretensions to political authority were expressly disclaimed. In the course of a four days' session a petition to the King was agreed to, and a letter to the agent, De Herdt, of which the chief burden was to defend the province against the charge of a rebellious spirit. Such was the first of those popular conventions, destined within a few years to assume the whole political authority of the colonies. The day after the adjournment the troops from Halifax arrived. There was room in the barracks at the castle, but Gage, alarmed at the accounts from Massachusetts, had sent orders from New York to have the two regiments quartered in the town. The council were called upon to find quarters, but, by the very terms of the Quartering Act, as they alleged, till the barracks were full there was no necessity to provide quarters elsewhere. Bernard insisted that the barracks had been reserved for the two regiments expected from Ireland, and must, therefore, be considered as already full. The council replied, that, even allowing that to be the case, by the terms of the act, the provision of quarters belonged not to them, but to the local magistrates. There was a large building in Boston belonging to the province, known as the 'Manufactory House,' and occupied by a number of poor families. Bernard pressed the council to advise that this building be cleared and prepared for the reception of the troops; but they utterly refused. The governor then undertook to do it on his own authority. The troops had already landed, under cover of the ships of war, to the number of a thousand men. Some of them appeared to demand an entrance into the Manufactory House; but the tenants were encouraged to keep possession; nor did the governor venture to use force. One of the regiments encamped on the common; for a part of the other regiment, which had no tents, the temporary use of Faneuil Hall was reluctantly yielded; to the rest of it, the Town House, used also as a State House, all except the council chamber, was thrown open by the governor's order. It was Sunday. The Town House was directly opposite the meeting-house of the First Church. Cannon were planted in front of it; sentinels were stationed in the streets; the inhabitants were challenged as they passed. The devout were greatly aggravated and annoyed by the beating of drums and the marching of the troops. Presently Gage came to Boston to urge the provision of quarters. The council directed his attention to the terms of the act, and referred him to the selectmen. As the act spoke only of justices of the peace, the selectmen declined to take any steps in the matter. Bernard then constituted what he called a Board of Justices, and required them to find quarters; but they did not choose to exercise a doubtful and unpopular authority. Gage was finally obliged to quarter the troops in houses which he hired for the purpose, and to procure out of his own military chest the firing, bedding, and other articles mentioned in the Quartering Act, the council having declined to order any expenditure for those purposes, on the ground that the appropriation of money belonged exclusively to the General Court."—R. Hildreth, *Hist. of the U. S., ch. 20 (v. 2)*.

ALSO IN: R. Frothingham, *Life and Times of Joseph Warren, ch. 6*.—T. Hutchinson, *Hist. of the Province of Mass. Bay, 1749-1774, pp. 202-217*.

**A. D. 1769.**—The patriots threatened and Virginia speaking out. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1769.

**A. D. 1770.**—Soldiers and citizens in collision.—The "Massacre."—Removal of the troops.—"As the spring of the year 1770 appeared, the 14th and 29th regiments had been in Boston about seventeen months. The 14th was in barracks near the Hittale Street Church; the 29th was quartered just south of King Street; about midway between them, in King Street, and close at hand to the town-house, was the main guard, whose nearness to the public buildings had been a subject of great annoyance to the people. . . . One is forced to admit . . . 'hat a good degree of discipline was maintained; no blood had as yet been shed by the soldiers, although provocations were constant, the rude element in the town growing gradually more aggressive as the soldiers were never allowed to use their arms. Insults and blows with fists were frequently taken and given, and cudgels also came into fashion in the brawls. Whatever awe the regiments had inspired at their first coming had long worn off. In particular the workmen of the rope-walks and slip-yards allowed their tongues the largest license and were foremost in the encounters. About the 1st of March fights of unusual bitterness had occurred near Grey's rope-walk, not far from the quarters of the 29th, between the hands of the rope-walk and soldiers of that regiment, which had a particularly bad reputation. The soldiers had got the worst of it, and were much irritated. Threats of revenge had been made, which had called out arrogant replies, and signs abounded that serious trouble was not far off. From an early hour on the evening of the 5th of March the symptoms were very ominous. . . . At length an altercation began in King Street between a company of lawless boys and a few older brawlers on the one side, and the sentinel, who paced his beat before the custom-house, on the other. . . . The soldier retreated up the steps of the custom-house and called out for help. A file of soldiers was at once despatched from the main guard, across the street, by Captain Preston, officer of the guard, who himself soon followed to the scene of trouble. A coating of ice covered the ground, upon which shortly before had fallen a light snow. A young moon was shining; the whole transaction, therefore, was plainly visible. The soldiers, with the sentinel, nine in number, drew up in line before the people, who greatly outnumbered them. The pieces were loaded and held ready, but the mob, believing that the troops would not use their arms except upon requisition of a civil magistrate, shouted coarse insults, pressed upon the very muzzles of the pieces, struck them with sticks, and assaulted the soldiers with balls of ice. In the tumult precisely what was said and done cannot be known. Many affidavits were taken in the investigation that followed, and, as always at such times, the testimony was most contradictory. Henry Knox, afterwards the artillery general, at this time a bookseller, was on the spot and used his influence with Preston to prevent a command to fire. Preston declared that he never gave the command. The air, however, was full of shouts, daring the soldiers to fire, some of which may have been easily understood as commands, and at last the discharge came. If it had failed to come, indeed, the forbearance

would have been quite miraculous. Three were killed outright, and eight were wounded, only one of whom, Crispus Attucks, a tall mulatto who faced the soldiers, leaning on a stick of coriander, had really taken any part in the disturbance. The rest were bystanders or were hurrying into the street, not knowing the cause of the tumult. . . . A wild confusion . . . took possession of the town. The alarm-bells rang frantically; on the other hand the drums of the regiments thundered to arms. . . . What averted a fearful battle in the streets was the excellent conduct of Hutchinson"—the lieutenant-governor, who made his way promptly to the scene, caused the troops to be sent back to their barracks, ordered the arrest of Captain Preston and the nine soldiers who had done the firing, and began an investigation of the affair the same night. The next day a great town meeting was held, and, as crowds from the surrounding towns pressed in, it was adjourned from Faneuil Hall to the Old South Church, and overflowed in the neighboring streets. A formal demand for the removal of the troops was sent to the governor and council by a committee which had Samuel Adams at its head. Governor Hutchinson disclaimed authority over the troops; but their commanding officer, Colonel Dalrymple, proposed to compromise by sending away the 29th regiment and retaining the 14th. As the committee returned to the meeting with this proposal, through the crowd, Adams dropped right and left the words, "Both regiments or none."—"Both regiments or none." So he put into the mouths of the people their reply, which they shouted as with one voice when the report of the committee was made to them. There was a determination in the cry which overcame even the obstinacy of Governor Hutchinson, and the departure of both regiments was ordered that same day. "In England the affair was regarded as a 'successful bully' of the whole power of the government by the little town, and when Lord North received details of these events he always referred to the 14th and 29th as the 'Sam Adams regiments.'"—J. K. Hosmer, *Samuel Adams*, ch. 11.

ALSO IN: R. Frothingham, *Life and Times of Joseph Warren*, ch. 6.—The same, *The Sam. Adams Regiments* (*Atlantic Monthly*, v. 9, 10, and 12; 1862-63).—J. Q. Adams, *Life of John Adams*, ch. 3 (v. 1).—T. Hutchinson, *Hist. of the Province of Mass. Bay, 1740-1774*, pp. 270-280.—H. Niles, *Principles and Acts of the Revolution* (*Centennial edition*), pp. 15-79.—F. Kedder, *Hist. of the Boston Massacre*.

**A. D. 1770.**—The fair trial of the soldiers.—"The episode [of the affray of March 5th] had . . . a sequel which is extremely creditable to the American people. It was determined to try the soldiers for their lives, and public feeling ran so fiercely against them that it seemed as if their fate was sealed. The trial, however, was delayed for seven months, till the excitement had in some degree subsided. Captain Preston very judiciously appealed to John Adams, who was rapidly rising to the first place both among the lawyers and the popular patriots of Boston, to undertake his defence. Adams knew well how much he was risking by espousing so unpopular a cause, but he knew also his professional duty, and, though violently opposed to the British government, he was an eminently honest, brave, and humane man. In conjunc-



tion with Josiah Quincy, a young lawyer who was also of the patriotic party, he undertook the invidious task, and he discharged it with consummate ability. . . . There was abundant evidence that the soldiers had endured gross provocation and some violence. If the trial had been the prosecution of a smuggler or a seditious writer, the jury would probably have decided against evidence, but they had no disposition to shed innocent blood. Judges, counsel, and jurymen acted bravely and honourably. All the soldiers were acquitted, except two, who were found guilty of manslaughter, and who escaped with very slight punishment. It is very remarkable that after Adams had accepted the task of defending the incriminated soldiers, he was elected by the people of Boston as their representative in the Assembly, and the public opinion of the province appears to have fully acquiesced in the verdict. In truth, although no people have indulged more largely than the Americans in violent, reckless, and unscrupulous language, no people have at every period of their history been more signally free from the thirst for blood, which in moments of great political excitement has been often shown both in England and France."—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng. in the 18th Century*, ch. 12 (v. 3).

ALSO IN: J. Adams, *Autobiography* (*Works*, v. 2, p. 230).—Lord Mahon (*Earl Stanhope*), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713-1783, v. 5, p. 269.

**A. D. 1773.—The Tea Party.**—"News reached Boston in the spring of this year [1773] that the East India Company, which was embarrassed by the accumulation of tea in England, owing to the refusal of the Americans to buy it, had induced parliament to permit its exportation to America without the payment of the usual duty [see UNITED STATES OF AM: A. D. 1772-1773]. This was intended to bribe the colonists to buy; for there had been a duty both in England and in America. That in England was six pence a pound, that in America three pence. Ships were laden and sent to Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Charleston, and they were now expected to arrive in a short time. . . . On the 28th of November, 1773, which was Sunday, the first tea-ship (the 'Dartmouth') entered the harbor [of Boston]. The following morning the citizens were informed by placard that the 'worst o'ragues, the detested tea,' had actually arrived, and that a meeting was to be held at nine in the morning, at Faneuil Hall, for the purpose of making 'a united and successful resistance to this last, worst, and most destructive measure of administration.' The Cradle of Liberty was not large enough to contain the crowd that was called together. Adams rose and made a stirring motion expressing determination that the tea should not be landed, and it was unanimously agreed to. The meeting then adjourned to the Old South meeting-house, where the motion was repeated, and again adopted without an opposing voice. The owner of the ship protested in vain that the proceedings were illegal; a watch of twenty-five persons was set, to see that the intentions of the citizens were not evaded, and the meeting adjourned to the following morning. The throng at that time was as great as usual, and while the deliberations were going on, a message was received from the governor, through the sheriff, ordering them to cease their proceedings. It was voted

not to follow the advice, and the sheriff was hissed and obliged to retreat discomfited. It was formally resolved that any person importing tea from England should be deemed an enemy to his country, and it was declared that at the risk of their lives and properties the landing of the tea should be prevented, and its return effected. It was necessary that some positive action should be taken in regard to the tea within twenty days from its arrival, or the collector of customs would confiscate ships and cargoes. . . . The twenty days would expire on the 16th of December. On the fourteenth a crowded meeting was held at the Old South, and the importer was enjoined to apply for a clearance to allow his vessel to return with its cargo. He applied, but the collector refused to give an answer until the following day. The meeting therefore adjourned to the 16th, the last day before confiscation would be legal, and before the tea would be placed under protection of the ships of war in the harbor. There was another early morning meeting, and 7,000 people thronged about the meeting-house, all filled with a sense of the fact that something notable was to occur. The importer appeared and reported that the collector refused a clearance. He was then directed to ask the governor for a pass to enable him to sail by the Castle. Hutchinson had retreated to his mansion at Milton, and it would take some time to make the demand. The importer started out in the cold of a New England winter, apologized to his Excellency for his visit, but assured him that it was involuntary. He received a reply that no pass could be given him. . . . It was six o'clock before the importer returned, and a few candles were brought in to relieve the fast-increasing darkness. He reported the governor's reply, and Samuel Adams rose and exclaimed: 'This meeting can do nothing more to save the country!' In an instant there was a shout on the porch; there was a war-whoop in response, and forty or fifty of the men disguised as Indians rushed out of the doors, down Milk Street towards Griffin's (afterwards Liverpool) Wharf, where the vessels lay. The meeting was declared dissolved, and the throng followed their leaders, forming a determined guard about the wharf. The 'Mohawks' entered the vessel; there was tugging at the ropes; there was breaking of light boxes; there was pouring of precious tea into the waters of the harbor. For two or three hours the work went on, and three hundred and forty-two chests were emptied. Then, under the light of the moon, the Indians marched to the sound of fife and drum to their homes, and the vast throng melted away, until not a man remained to tell of the deed. The committee of correspondence held a meeting next day, and Samuel Adams and four others were appointed to prepare an account of the affair to be posted to other places. Paul Revere, who is said to have been one of the 'Mohawks,' was sent express to Philadelphia with the news, which was received at that place on the 26th. It was announced by ringing of bells, and there was every sign of joy. . . . The continent was universally stirred at last."—A. Gilman, *The Story of Boston*, ch. 23.

ALSO IN: E. G. Porter, *The Beginning of the Revolution* (*Memorial Hist. of Boston*, v. 3, ch. 1).—B. J. Lossing, *Field Book of the Revolution*, v. 1, ch. 21.—T. Hutchinson, *Hist. of the Province of*

*Mass. Bay, 1749-1774, pp. 429-440.*—Same, *Diary and Letters*, p. 138.—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S. (Author's last revision)*, v. 3, ch. 34.—J. Kimball, *The 100th Anniversary of the Destruction of Tea (Essex Inst. Hist. Coll., v. 12, no. 3).*

**A. D. 1774.—The Port Bill and the Massachusetts Act.—Commerce interdicted.—Town Meetings forbidden.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1774 (MARCH—APRIL).

**A. D. 1774.—The enforcement of the Port Bill and its effects.—Military occupation of the city by General Gage.**—"The execution of this measure [the Port Bill] devolved on Thomas Gage, who arrived at Boston May 13, 1774, as Captain General and Governor of Massachusetts. He was not a stranger in the colonies. He had exhibited gallantry in Braddock's defeat. . . . He had married in one of the most respectable families in New York, and had partaken of the hospitalities of the people of Boston. His manners were pleasing. Hence he entered upon his public duties with a large measure of popularity. But he took a narrow view of men and things about him. . . . General Gage, on the 17th of May, landed at the Long Wharf and was received with much parade. . . . On the first day of June the act went into effect. It met with no opposition from the people, and hence, there was no difficulty in carrying it into rigorous execution. 'I hear from many,' the governor writes, 'that the act has staggered the most presumptuous; the violent party men seem to break, and people to fall off from them.' Hence he looked for submission; but Boston asked assistance from other colonies, and the General Court requested him to appoint a day of fasting and prayer. The loyalists felt uneasy at the absence of the army. . . . Hence a respectable force was soon concentrated in Boston. On the 4th of June, the 4th or king's own regiment, and on the 15th the 43d regiment, landed at the Long Wharf and encamped on the common." The 5th and 38th regiments arrived on the 4th and 5th of July; the 59th regiment was landed at Salem August 6, and additional troops were ordered from New York, the Jerseys and Quebec. "The Boston Port Bill went into operation amid the tolling of bells, fasting and prayer. . . . It bore severely upon two towns, Boston and Charlestown, which had been long connected by a common patriotism. Their laborers were thrown out of employment, their poor were deprived of bread, and gloom pervaded their streets. But they were cheered and sustained by the large contributions sent from every quarter for their relief, and by the noble words that accompanied them. . . . The excitement of the public mind was intense; and the months of June, July, and August, were characterized by varied political activity. Multitudes signed a solemn league and covenant against the use of British goods. The breach between the whigs and loyalists daily became wider. Patriotic donations from every colony were on their way to the suffering towns. Supplies for the British troops were refused. . . . It was while the public mind was in this state of excitement that other acts arrived which General Gage was instructed to carry into effect." These were the acts which virtually annulled the Massachusetts charter, which forbade town meetings, and which provided for the sending of accused persons to England or to other colonies for trial. "Should Massachusetts submit to the

new acts? Would the other colonies see, without increased alarm, the humiliation of Massachusetts? This was the turning-point of the Revolution. It did not find the patriots unprepared. They had an organization beyond the reach alike of proclamations from the governors, or of circulars from the ministry. This was the Committees of Correspondence, chosen in most of the towns in legal town-meetings, or by the various colonial assemblies, and extending throughout the colonies. . . . The crisis called for the wisdom of these committees. A remarkable circular from Boston addressed to the towns (July, 1774), dwelt upon the duty of opposing the new laws; the towns, in their answers, were bold, spirited, and firm and echoed the necessity of resistance. Nor was this all. The people promptly thwarted the first attempts to exercise authority under them. Such councillors as accepted their appointments were compelled to resign, or, to avoid compulsion, retired into Boston." General Gage now began (in September) movements to secure the cannon and powder in the neighborhood. Some 250 barrels of powder belonging to the province were stealthily removed by his orders from a magazine at Charlestown and two field-pieces were carried away from Cambridge. "The report of this affair, spreading rapidly, excited great indignation. The people collected in large numbers, and many were in favor of attempting to recapture the powder and cannon. Influential patriots, however, succeeded in turning their attention in another direction. . . . Meantime the fact of the removal of the powder became magnified into a report that the British had cannonaded Boston, when the bells rang, beacon-fires blazed on the hills, the neighbor colonies were alarmed, and the roads were filled with armed men hastening to the point of supposed danger. These demonstrations opened the eyes of the governor to the extent of the popular movement. . . . General Gage saw no hope of procuring obedience but by the power of arms; and the patriot party saw no safety in anything short of military preparation. Resistance to the acts continued to be manifested in every form. On the 9th of September the memorable Suffolk resolves [drawn by Joseph Warren] were adopted [by a convention of Suffolk county, which embraced Boston] . . . and these were succeeded by others in other counties equally bold and spirited. These resolves were approved by the Continental Congress, then in session. Everywhere the people either compelled the unconstitutional officers to resign, or opposed every attempt to exercise authority, whether by the governor or constable. They also made every effort to transport ammunition and stores to places of security. Cannon and muskets were carried secretly out of Boston. The guns were taken from an old battery at Charlestown, where the navy yard is, . . . silently, at night. . . . General Gage immediately began to fortify Boston Neck. This added intensity to the excitement. The inhabitants became alarmed at so ominous a movement; and, on the 5th of September, the selectmen waited on the general, represented the public feeling, and requested him to explain his object. The governor stated in reply that his object was to protect his majesty's troops and his majesty's subjects; and that he had no intention to stop up the avenue, or to obstruct the free passage over it, or to do anything hostile

against the inhabitants. He went on with the works and soon mounted on them two twenty-four pounders and eight nine pounders."—R. Frothingham, *Hist. of the Siege of Boston*, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: The same, *Life and Times of Joseph Warren*, ch. 11, and app. 1 (giving text of the *Suffolk Resolves*).—W. V. Wells, *Life of Samuel Adams*, v. 2, pp. 164-232.—W. Tudor, *Life of James Otis*, ch. 27-29.

A. D. 1775.—The beginning of war.—Lexington.—Concord.—The British troops beleaguered in the city.—Battle of Bunker Hill. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775.

A. D. 1775-1776.—The siege directed by Washington.—Evacuation of the city by the British. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775-1776.

**BOSWORTH, Battle of (A. D. 1485).** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1483-1485.

**BOLANY BAY.** See AUSTRALIA: A. D. 1601-1800.

**BOTHWELL BRIDGE, Battle of.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1679 (JUNE).

**BOTOCUDOS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: TUPÍ.

**BOUCHAIN, Marlborough's capture of (1711).** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1710-1712.

**BOUIDES, The.** See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST AND EMPIRE: A. D. 815-945; also, TURKS (THE SELJUKS): A. D. 1004-1063; also, SAMANIDES.

**BOULANGER, General, The intrigues of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1875-1889.

**BOULE, The.**—The Council of Chiefs in Homeric Greece.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 20.—See, also, AREEPOAGUS.

**BOULOGNE, Origin.** See GESORIACUM.

A. D. 1801.—Bonaparte's preparations for the invasion of England.—Nelson's attack. See FRANCE: A. D. 1801-1802.

**BOULON, Battle of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (JULY)—DECEMBER.

**BOUQUET'S EXPEDITION.** See PONTIAC'S WAR.

**BOURBON, The Constable: His treason and his attack on Rome.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1520-1523, 1523-1525, 1525-1526; and ITALY: A. D. 1523-1527, 1527.

**BOURBON: Origin of the name.** See BOIANS; also ROME: B. C. 390-347.

**BOURBON, The House of: Its origin.**—From King Louis IX. (St. Louis), of France, "through his last male child, Robert de France, Comte de Clermont, sprang the House of Bourbon. An ancient barony, the inheritance of Béatrix, wife of this prince, was erected into a dukedom in favour of Louis, his son, and gave to his descendants the name which they have retained, that of France being reserved for the Royal branch. . . . The House which had the honour of supplying sovereigns to our country was called 'France.' But our kings, jealous of that great name, reserved it for their own sons and grandsons. Hence the designation 'fils' and 'petit-fils de France.' The posterity of each 'fils de France' formed a cadet branch which took its name from the title borne by its head, Valois, Artois, Bourbon, &c. At the time of the accession of Henry IV. the name of Bourbon remained with those younger branches of Condé and Montpensier, which had sprung from the main branch before the death of Henry III. But Henry IV.'s

children, those of Louis XIII., and those of their successors in the throne, were surnamed 'de France'; whilst in conformity with the law the descendants of Louis XIII.'s second son received the surname d'Orléans, from the title borne by their grandfather. . . . Possessors of vast territories which they [the Bourbons] owed more to family alliances than to the generosity of kings, they had known how to win the affection of their vassals. Their magnificent hospitality drew around them a numerous and brilliant nobility. 'Thus the 'hôtel' of those brave and august princes, the 'gracieux ducs de Bourbon,' as our ancient poet called them, was considered the best school in which a young nobleman could learn the profession of arms. The order of the Écu, instituted by one of them, had been coveted and worn by the bravest warriors of France. Sufficiently powerful to outshine the rank and file of the nobility, they had at the same time neither the large estates nor the immense power which enabled the Dukes of Bourgogne, of Bretagne, and other great vassals, to become the rivals or the enemies of the royal authority." The example of the treason of the Constable Bourbon [see FRANCE: A. D. 1520-1523] "was not followed by any of the princes of his House. . . . The property of the Connétable was definitely alienated from his House, and Vendôme [his brother] did not receive the hereditary possessions of the Dukes d'Alençon, to which his wife was entitled. He died on the 25th of March, 1538, leaving but a scanty patrimony to his numerous descendants. . . . Five only of his sons obtained their majority. . . . Two of these princes founded families: Antoine [Duc de Vendôme and afterwards King of Navarre through his marriage with Jeanne d'Albret, see NAVARRE: A. D. 1528-1563], father of Henry IV., who was the ancestor of all the Bourbons now living, and Louis [Prince de Condé, born 1530], who was the root of the House of Condé and all its branches."—Duc d'Aumale, *Hist. of the Princes of the House of Condé*, bk. 1, ch. 1, and foot-note.—See, also, FRANCE: A. D. 1327.

**BOURBON: The Spanish House.** See SPAIN: A. D. 1608-1700, and 1701-1702.

**BOURBON FAMILY COMPACT, The First.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1733. . . . **The Second.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1743 (OCTOBER). . . . **The Third.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1761 (AUGUST).

**BOURGEOIS.—BOURG.**—In France, "the word Bourg originally meant any aggregation of houses, from the greatest city to the smallest hamlet. But . . . the word shifted its meaning, and came to signify an assemblage of houses surrounded with walls. Secondly, the word Bourgeois also was at first used as synonymous with the inhabitant of a bourg. Afterward, when corporate franchises were bestowed on particular bourgs, the word acquired a sense corresponding with that of the English designation Burgess; that is a person entitled to the privileges of a municipal corporation. Finally, the word Bourgeois, in its primitive sense, was the description of the burgesses when spoken of collectively. But, in its later use, the word would be best rendered into English by our term citizenship; that is, the privilege or franchise of being a burgess."—Sir J. Stephen, *Lects. on the Hist. of France*, lect. 5.

**BOURGES, Origin of.**—The city of Bourges, France, was originally the capital city of the

Gaulic tribe of the Bituriges, and was called Avaricum. "As with many other Gaulish towns, the original name became exchanged for that of the people, i. e., Bituriges, and thence the modern Bourges and the name of the province, Berl."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 12.—See, also, *Edut*, and *GAUL*: B. C. 58-51.

**BOUVINES, Battle of (A. D. 1214).**—The battle of Bouvines, fought at Bouvines, in Flanders, not far from Tournay, on the 27th of August, A. D. 1214, was one of the important battles of European history. On one side were the French, led by their king Philip Augustus, and fighting ostensibly as the champions of the Pope and the church. On the other side was an allied army of English, under king John, of Germans, under Otho, the Guelph—one of two rival claimants of the imperial crown—and of Flemings and Lotharingians, led by their several lords. Philip Augustus had expelled the English king from his Norman dukedom and caused a court of the peers of France to declare the title forfeit. From that success his ambition rose so high that he had aspired to the conquest of the English crown. A terrible pope—Innocent III.—had approved his ambition and encouraged it; for John, the miserable English king, had given provocations to the church which had brought the thunders of the Vatican upon his head. Excommunicated, himself, his kingdom under interdict, —the latter offered itself a tempting prey to the vigorous French king, who posed as the champion of the pope. He had prepared a strong army and a fleet for the invasion of England; but fate and papal diplomacy had baffled his schemes. At the last moment, John had made a base submission, had meekly surrendered his kingdom to the pope and had received it back as a papal fief. Whereupon the victorious pope commanded his French champion to forego his intended attack. Philip, under these circumstances, determined to use the army he had assembled against a troublesome and contumacious vassal, the count of Flanders. The pope approved, and Flanders was overrun. King John led an English force across the channel to the help of the Flemish count, and Otho, the German king or emperor, who was king John's nephew, joined the coalition, to antagonize France and the pope. The battle of Bouvines was the decisive conflict of the war. It humbled, for the time, the independent spirit of Flanders, and several remoter consequences can be traced to it. It was "the first real French victory. It roused the national spirit as nothing else could have roused it; it was the nation's first taste of glory, dear above all things to the French heart. . . . The battle somewhat broke the high spirit of the barons; the lesser barons and churches grouped themselves round the king; the greater lords came to feel their weakness in the presence of royalty. Among the incidental consequences of the day of Bouvines was the ruin of Otho's ambition. He fled from the field into utter obscurity. He retired to the Hartz mountains, and there spent the remaining years of his life in private. King John, too, was utterly discredited by his share in the year's campaign. To it may partly be traced his humiliation before his barons, and the signing of the Great Charter in the following year at Runnymede."—G. W. Kitchin, *Hist. of France*, bk. 3, ch. 7, sect. 4.—"The battle of Bouvines was not the victory of Philip Augustus alone, over a

coalition of foreign princes; the victory was the work of king and people, barons, burghers, and peasants, of Ile de France, of Orleanness, of Picardy, of Normandy, of Champagne, and of Burgundy. . . . The victory of Bouvines marked the commencement of the time at which men might speak, and indeed did speak, by one single name, of 'the French.' The nation in France and the kingship in France on that day rose out of and above the feudal system."—F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 18.—See, also, *ITALY*: A. D. 1183-1250, and *ENGLAND*: A. D. 1205-1213, and 1215.

**BOVATE, OR OXGANG.**—"Originally as much as an ox-team could plough in a year. Eight Bovates are usually said to have made a Carucate, but the number of acres which made a Bovate are variously stated in different records from 8 to 24."—N. H. Nicolas, *Notitia Historica*, p. 134.

**BOVIANUM, Battle of (B. C. 88).** See *ROME*: B. C. 90-88.

**BOWIDES, The.** See *MAHOMETAN CONQUEST AND EMPIRE*: A. D. 815-945; also, *SAMANIDES*; also, *TURKS (SELJUKS)*: A. D. 1004-1063.

**BOYACA, Battle of (1819).** See *COLOMBIAN STATES*: A. D. 1810-1819.

**BOYARS.**—"In the old times, when Russia was merely a collection of independent principalities, each reigning prince was surrounded by a group of armed men, composed partly of Boyars, or large landed proprietors, and partly of knights, or soldiers of fortune. These men, who formed the Noblesse of the time, were to a certain extent under the authority of the Prince, but they were by no means mere obedient, silent executors of his will. The Boyars might refuse to take part in his military expeditions. . . . Under the Tartar domination this political equilibrium was destroyed. When the country had been conquered, the princes became servile vassals of the Khan, and arbitrary rulers towards their own subjects. The political significance of the nobles was thereby greatly diminished."—D. M. Wallace, *Russia*, ch. 17.

**BOYNE, Battle of the (1690).** See *IRELAND*: A. D. 1689-1691.

**BOYS IN BLUE.—BOYS IN GRAY.—Soldier nicknames of the American Civil War.**—"During the first year of the war [of the Rebellion, in the United States] the Union soldiers commonly called their opponents 'Rebs' and 'Secesh'; in 1862, 'Confeds'; in 1863, 'Gray-backs' and 'Butternuts'; and in 1864, 'Johnnies.' The nickname 'Butternuts' was given the Confederates on account of their homespun clothes, dyed reddish-brown with a dye made of butternut bark. The last name, 'Johnnies,' is said to have originated in a quarrel between two pickets, which began by the Union man's saying that the Confederates depended on England to get them out of their scrape. . . . The Union man . . . said that a 'Reb' was no better than a Johnny Bull, anyhow. . . . The name stuck, and in the last part of the war the Confederate soldiers were almost universally called 'Johnnies.' Throughout the war the Confederates dubbed all the Union soldiers 'Yankees' and 'Yanks,' without any reference to the part of the country they came from. . . . Other nicknames for Union soldiers, occasionally used, were 'Feds,' 'Blue Birds' and 'Blue Bellies.' Since the war

the opponents have been commonly called 'Boys in Blue' and 'Boys in Gray.'—J. D. Champlin, Jr., *Young Folks' History of the War for the Union*, p. 137.

**BOZRA.** See **CARTHAGE: DIVISIONS, &c.**

**BOZZARIS, Marco,** The death of. See **GREECE: A. D. 1821-1829.**

**BRABANT: Mythical Explanation of the name.** See **ANTWERP.**

**4th century.**—First settlement of the Franks. See **TOXANDRIA.**

**9th century.**—Known as **Basse Lorraine.** See **LORRAINE: A. D. 843-870.**

**A. D. 1096-1099.**—**Duke Godfrey de Bouillon** in the **First Crusade**, and his kingdom of **Jerusalem.** See **CRUSADES: A. D. 1096-1099;** and **JERUSALEM: A. D. 1099-1144.**

**12th to 15th centuries.**—The county and duchy.—From the beginning of the 12th century, the county, afterwards the duchy, of **Brabant**, existed under its own counts and dukes, until the beginning of the 15th century, when it drifted under the influences which at that time were drawing all the **Netherland States** within the sphere of the sovereignty of the **Burgundian dukes.**

**A. D. 1430.**—Acquisition by the **House of Burgundy.** See **NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1428-1430.**

**BRACCATI, The.** See **ROME: B. C. 275.**

**BRACHYCEPHALIC MEN.** See **DOLICHOCEPHALIC.**

**BRADDOCK'S DEFEAT.** See **OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1755.**

**BRADFORD, Governor, and the Plymouth Colony.** See **MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1621,** and after.

**BRADFORD'S PRESS.** See **PRINTING, &c.: A. D. 1535-1700, 1704-1729,** and **PENNSYLVANIA: A. D. 1693-1696.**

**BRAGANZA, The House of: A. D. 1640.**—Accession to the throne of **Portugal.** See **PORTUGAL: A. D. 1637-1668.**

**BRAGG, General Braxton.**—**Invasion of Kentucky.** See **UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (JUNE—OCTOBER: TENNESSEE—KENTUCKY).** . . . **The Battle of Stone River.** See **UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863-1863 (DECEMBER—JANUARY: TENNESSEE).** . . . **The Tullahoma Campaign.** See **UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (JUNE—JULY: TENNESSEE).** . . . **Chickamanga.**—**The Chattanooga Campaign.** See **UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER, and OCTOBER—NOVEMBER: TENNESSEE).**

**BRAHMANISM.** See **INDIA: THE IMMIGRATION and CONQUESTS OF THE ARYAS.**

**BRAHMANS.** See **CASTE SYSTEM OF INDIA.**—**ALSO, INDIA: THE ADORIGINAL INHABITANTS.**

**BRANCHIDÆ, The.** See **ORACLES OF THE GREEKS.**

**BRANDENBURG: A. D. 928-1142.**—**Beginnings of the Margrave.**—"A. D. 928, Henry the Fowler, marching across the frozen bogs, took **Brannibor**, a chief fortress of the **Wends**; first mention in human speech of the place now called **Brandenburg: Bor** or '**Burg of the Brenns**' (if there ever was any **Tribe of Brenns**,—**Brennus**, there as elsewhere, being name for **King** or **Leader**); '**Burg of the Woods**,' say others,—who as little know. Probably, at that time, a town of clay huts, with ditch and palisaded

sod-wall round it; certainly 'a chief fortress of the **Wends**,'—who must have been a good deal surprised at sight of **Henry** on the rimy winter morning near a thousand years ago. . . . That **Henry** appointed **duc Wardenship** in **Brannibor** was in the common course. Sure enough, some **Markgraf** must take charge of **Brannibor**,—he of the **Lausitz** eastward, for example, or he of **Salzwedel** westward;—that **Brannibor**, in time, will itself be found the fit place, and have its own **Markgraf** of **Brandenburg**; this, and what in 'the next nine centuries **Brandenburg** will grow to, **Henry** is far from surmising. . . . In old books are lists of the primitive **Markgraves** of **Brandenburg**, from **Henry's** time downward; two sets, '**Markgraves of the Wittekind race**,' and of another; but they are altogether uncertain, a shadowy intermittent set of **Markgraves**, both the **Wittekind** set and the **Non-Wittekind**; and truly, for a couple of centuries, seem none of them to have been other than subaltern **Deputies**, belonging mostly to **Lausitz** or **Salzwedel**; of whom therefore we can say nothing here, but must leave the first two hundred years in their natural gray state,—perhaps sufficiently conceivable by the reader. . . . The **Ditmarsch-Stade** kindred, much slain in battle with the **Heathen**, and otherwise beaten upon, died out, about the year 1130 (earlier perhaps, perhaps later, for all is shadowy still); and were succeeded in the **Salzwedel** part of their function by a kindred called '**of Ascanien** and **Ballenstädt**'; the **Ascaner** or **Anhalt Margraves**; whose **History**, and that of **Brandenburg**, becomes henceforth articulate to us. . . . This **Ascanien**, happily, has nothing to do with **Brute** of **Troy** or the pious **Æneas's** son; it is simply the name of a most ancient **Castle** (etymology unknown to me, ruins still dimly traceable) on the north slope of the **Hartz Mountains**; short way from **Aschersleben**,—the **Castle** and **Town** of **Aschersleben** are, so to speak, a second edition of **Ascanien**. . . . The kindred, called **Grafs** and ultimately **Herzogs** (**Dukes**) of '**Ascanien** and **Ballenstädt**,' are very famous in old **German History**, especially down from this date. Some reckon that they had intermittently been **Markgrafs**, in their region, long before this; which is conceivable enough; at all events it is very plain they did now attain the **Office** in **Salzwedel** (straightway shifting it to **Brandenburg**); and held it continuously, it and much else that lay adjacent, for centuries, in a highly conspicuous manner. In **Brandenburg** they lasted for about two hundred years."—**T. Carlyle, Frederick the Great, bk. 2, ch. 3-4.**

**A. D. 1142-1152.**—**The Electorate.**—"Ife they call '**Albert** the **Bear** (**Albrecht der Bär**),' first of the **Ascanien Markgraves** of **Brandenburg**;—first wholly definite **Markgrave** of **Brandenburg** that there is; once a very shining figure in the world, though now fallen dim enough again, . . . got the **Northern** part of what is still called **Saxony**, and kept it in his family; got the **Brandenburg Countries** wital, got the **Lausitz**; was the shining figure and great man of the **North** in his day. The **Markgrafsdom** of **Salzwedel** (which soon became of **Brandenburg**) he very naturally acquired (**A. D. 1142** or earlier); very naturally, considering what **Saxon** and other honours and possessions he had already got hold of. We can only say, it was the luckiest of events for **Brandenburg**, and the beginning of all

the better destinies it has had. A conspicuous Country ever since in the world, and which grows ever more so in our late times. . . . He transferred the Markgrafdom to Brandenburg, probably as more central in his wide lands; Salzwedel is henceforth the led Markgrafdom or Marek, and soon falls out of notice in the world. Salzwedel is called henceforth ever since the 'Old Marek (Alte Marek, Altmarek)'; the Brandenburg countries getting the name of 'New Marek.' . . . Under Albert the Markgrafdom had risen to be an Electorate withal. The Markgraf of Brandenburg was now furthermore the Kurfürst of Brandenburg; officially 'Arch-treasurer of the Holy Roman Empire'; and one of the Seven who have a right (which became about this time an exclusive one for those Seven) to choose, to 'kieren' the Romish Kaiser; and who are therefore called 'Kur-Princes,' Kurfürste or Electors, as the highest dignity except the Kaiser's own. —T. Carlyle, *Frederick the Great*, bk. 2, ch. 4.—See, also, GERMANY: A. D. 1125-1132.

**A. D. 1168-1417.**—Under the Ascanian, the Bavarian and the Luxemburg lines, to the first of the Hohenzollern.—Albert the Bear was succeeded in 1168 by his son Otho. "In 1170, as it would appear, the name of Brandenburg was substituted for that of North Mark, which had ceased to describe more than the original nucleus of the colony, now one of the several districts into which it was divided. The city and territory of Brandenburg were not probably included in the imperial grant, but were inherited from the Wendish prince, Pribislaw, whom Albert had converted to Christianity. . . . Under Otho II., brother of the preceding, the family inheritance was sorely mismanaged. The Margrave becoming involved in some quarrel with the Sec of Magdeburg, the Archbishop placed him under the ban; and as the price of release Otho was required to accept the Suzerainty of the prelate for the older and better part of his dominions. His brother and successor, Albert II., was also unfortunate in the beginning of his career; but recovered the favor of the Emperor, and restored the prestige of his house before his death. . . . Very important acquisitions were made during the reign of these two princes. The preoccupations of the King of Denmark gave them a secure foothold in Pomerania, which the native nobility acknowledged; the frontiers were pushed eastward to the Oder, where the New Mark was organized, and the town of Frankfort was laid out; purchase put them in possession of the district of Lebus; and the bride of Otho III., a Bohemian princess, brought him as her dowry an extensive region on the Upper Spree with several thriving villages—all this in spite of the division of power and authority. . . . Otho III. died in 1267, John one year later; and a new partition of the estate was made between their several sons, the oldest, Otho IV., receiving, however, the title and prerogatives of head of the house." The last margrave of the Ascanian line, Walde-mar, died in 1319. "His cousin and only heir, Henry, was a minor, and survived him but a year." Then "a host of claimants arose for the whole or parts of the Mark. The estates showed at first a gallant devotion to the widow, and intrusted the reins of authority to her; but she repaid this fidelity by hastily espousing the Duke of Brunswick, and transferring her rights

to him. The transaction was not, however, rattled by the estates, and the Duke failed to enforce it by arms. Pomerania threw off the yoke which it had once unwillingly accepted; Bohemia reclaimed the wedding portion of Otho's bride; the Duke of Liegnitz sought to recover Lebus, although it had once been regularly sold; and in the general scramble the Church, through its local representatives, fought with all the energy of mere worldly robbers. But in this crisis the Emperor forgot neither the duties of his station nor the interests of his house. Louis II. of Bavaria then wore the purple. By feudal law a vacant fief reverted to its suzerain. . . . It was not therefore contrary to law, nor did it shock the moral sense of the age, when Louis drew the Mark practically into his own possession by conferring it nominally upon his minor son. . . . During the minority of Louis the Margrave, the province was administered by Louis the Emperor, and with some show of vigor." But troubles so thickened about the Emperor, in his conflict with the House of Austria, on the one hand, and with the Pope on the other [see GERMANY: A. D. 1314-1347], that he could not continue the protection of his son. The Mark of Brandenburg was invaded by the King of Poland, and its Margrave "watched the devastation in helpless dismay." The people defended themselves. "The young city of Frankfort was the leader in the tardy but successful uprising. The Poles were expelled; the citizens had for the time saved the Mark. . . . The Margrave finally wearied even of the forms of authority, and sold his unhappy dominions to his two brothers, another Louis and Otho. In the meantime his father had died. The Electors—or five of them—had already deposed him and chosen in his place Charles of Moravia, a prince of the house of Luxemburg, as his successor. He became respectably and even creditably known in history as Charles IV. . . . Although he failed in the attempt to subdue by arms the Margrave of Brandenburg, who had naturally espoused his father's cause, he was persistent and ingenious in diplomatic schemes for overthrowing the House of Bavaria and bringing the Mark under his own sceptre. . . . From Louis he procured . . . a treaty of succession, by which he should acquire Brandenburg in case of the death of that Margrave and his brother Otho without heirs. His intrigues were finally crowned with complete success. Louis died suddenly in 1365. Otho, thenceforth alone in the charge, vacillated between weak submission to the Emperor's will, and spurts of petulant but feeble resistance; until Charles put an end to the farce by invading the Mark, crushing the army of the Margrave, and forcing him to an abject capitulation. In 1371, after a nominal rule of half a century, and for the price of a meagre annuity, the Bavarian line transferred all its rights to the family of Charles IV." Charles died in 1378. His son Wenzel, "for whom the Mark had been destined in the plans of Charles, acquired, meanwhile, the crown of Bohemia a richer prize, and Brandenburg passed to the next son, Sigismund. The change was a disastrous one." Sigismund pawned the Mark to his kinsman, Jobst, of Moravia, and it fell into great disorder. "Imperial affairs during this period were in scarcely less confusion. Wenzel of Bohemia had been chosen emperor, and then deposed for obvious

unfitness. Rupert, Count Palatine, had next been elected, and had died. Again the post was vacant, and Sigismund, still the real Elector of Brandenburg, . . . issued successfully from the contest. His good fortune was due in a conspicuous degree to the influence and the money of Frederic, Burggrave of Nuremberg [see Hohenzollern, Rise of the House of]; and it is to the credit of Sigismund that he did not add ingratitude to his other vices, but on his election as emperor hastened [1411] to make his patron statthalter, or viceroy of the Mark." Six years later, in 1417, Frederic was formally invested with the sovereignty of the Mark, as Margrave and Elector.—H. T. T. *Hist. of Prussia to the Accession of Frederic the Great*, ch. 1 and 3.

**A. D. 1355.**—Declared an integral part of the Kingdom of Bohemia. See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1555.

**A. D. 1417-1640.**—Rising importance of the Hohenzollern family.—Acquisition of the Duchy of Prussia.—On being invested with the Electorate of Brandenburg, Frederick of Nuremberg sold the office of Burggrave to the Nurembergers and devoted himself to his new province. "Temperate, just, and firm in his dealings, he succeeded in reducing Brandenburg from anarchy to order. Already as deputy for Sigismund he had begun the task. . . . During the reign of his son and successor, characteristically known as Frederick Iron-tooth [1440-1472], the strong hand was not relaxed; and Brandenburg became thenceforward tamed to law and order. The Electorate, which during the preceding century had been curtailed by losses in war and by sales, began again to enlarge its borders. The New March, which had been sold in the days of Sigismund to the Teutonic Knights, was now [1455] bought back from them in their need. . . . Albert Achilles, the brother and successor of Frederick II., was a man as powerful and as able as his predecessor. By his accession the principalities of Baireuth and Anspach, which had been separated from the Electorate for the younger sons of Frederick I., were reunited to it; and by a scheme of cross-remainders new plans were laid for the acquisition of territory. . . . It was already understood that the Electorate was to descend according to the law of primogeniture; but Anspach and Baireuth were still reserved as appanages for younger sons; and upon the death of Albert Achilles, in 1484, his territories were again divided, and remained so for more than a hundred years. The result of the division, however, was to multiply and not to weaken the strength of the House. The earlier years of the 16th century saw the Hohenzollerns rising everywhere to power. Albert Achilles had been succeeded [1486] by John, of whom little is known except his eloquence, and by Joachim [1499], who was preparing to bear his part against the Reformation. A brother of Joachim had become, in 1514, Elector of Mentz; and the double vote of the family at the election of Charles V. had increased their importance. The younger branch was rising also to eminence. George of Brandenburg, Margrave of Anspach, and grandson of Albert Achilles, was able in 1524 to purchase the Duchy of Jagerndorf in Silesia, and with it the reversions to the principalities of Oppeln and Ratibor, which eventually fell to him. His younger brother, Albert, had

been chosen in 1511 Grand Master of the Teutonic Order, and was already converting his office into the hereditary Dukedom of Prussia," which it became in 1525 (see POLAND: A. D. 1333-1572). "The Elector Joachim I. of Brandenburg is perhaps the least prominent, but was not the least prudent, of his family. Throughout his life he adhered to the old faith, and preserved his dominions in tranquility. His son and successor, Joachim II., to the joy of his people, adopted the new religion [1539]; and found in the secularized bishoprics of Brandenburg, Havelburg, and Lebus, some compensation for the ecclesiastical Electorate which was about to pass, upon the death of Albert of Mentz, from his family. But he also was able to secure the continuance of peace. Distrustful of the success of the League of Smalkald he refused to join in it, and became chiefly known as a mediator in the struggles of the time. The Electors John George [1571-1598] and Joachim Frederick [1598-1608] followed the same policy of peace. . . . Peace and internal progress had characterized the 16th century; war and external acquisitions were to mark the 17th. The failure of the younger line in 1603 caused Bayreuth, Anspach, and Jagerndorf to fall to the Elector Joachim Frederick; but as they were re-granted almost at once to younger sons, and never again reverted to the Electorate, their acquisition became of little importance. The Margrave, George Frederick, however, had held, in addition to his own territories, the office of administrator for Albert Frederick, second Duke of Prussia, who had become imbecile; and, by his death, the Elector of Brandenburg became next of kin, and claimed to succeed to the office. The admission of this claim placed the Electors in virtual possession of the Duchy. By a deed of co-ineffortment, which Joachim II. had obtained in 1568 from his father-in-law the King of Poland, they were heirs to the Duchy upon failure of the younger line. . . . Duke Albert died in 1618; and Brandenburg and Prussia were then united under the Elector John Sigismund. It was well that the Duchy had been secured before the storm which was already gathering over the Empire had burst. . . . During the long struggle of the Thirty Years' War, the history of Brandenburg is that of a sufferer rather than an actor. . . . George William, who died in 1640, bequeathed a desert to his successor. That successor was Frederick William, to be known in history as the Great Elector."—C. F. Johnstone, *Historical Abstracts*, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: T. Carlyle, *Hist. of Frederick the Great*, bk. 3 (p. 1).

**A. D. 1609.**—The Jülich-Cleve contest. See GERMANY: A. D. 1608-1618.

**A. D. 1627.**—Occupied by Wallenstein and the Imperial army. See GERMANY: 1627-1629.

**A. D. 1630-1631.**—Compulsory alliance of the Elector with Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden. See GERMANY: A. D. 1630-1631, and 1631.

**A. D. 1632.**—Refusal to enter the Union of Heilbronn. See GERMANY: A. D. 1632-1634.

**A. D. 1634.**—Desertion of the Protestant cause.—Alliance with the Emperor. See GERMANY: A. D. 1634-1639.

**A. D. 1640-1688.**—The Great Elector.—His development of the strength of the Electorate.—His successful wars.—His acquisition of the

**complete sovereignty of Prussia.**—Fehrbellin. —Frederic William, known in history as the Great Elector, was only twenty years old when he succeeded his father. He found everything in disorder: his country desolate, his fortresses garrisoned by troops under a solemn order to obey only the mandates of the Emperor, his army to be counted almost on the fingers. His first care was to conclude a truce with the Swedes; his second to secure his western borders by an alliance with Holland; his third—not in order of action, for in that respect it took first place—to raise the nucleus of an army; his fourth, to cause the evacuation of his fortresses. . . . To allay the wrath of the Emperor, he temporised until his armed force had attained the number of 8,000. That force once under arms, he boldly asserted his position, and with so much effect that in the discussions preceding the Peace of Westphalia he could exercise a considerable influence. By the terms of that treaty, the part of Pomerania known as Hinter Pommern, the principalities of Magdeburg and Halberstadt, and the bishoprics of Minden and Kammin were ceded to Brandenburg. . . . The Peace once signed, Frederic William set diligently to work to heal the disorders and to repair the mischief which the long war had caused in his dominions. . . . He specially cherished his army. We have seen its small beginning in 1640-42. Fifteen years later, in 1655, or seven years after the conclusion of the Peace of Westphalia, it amounted to 25,000 men, well drilled and well disciplined, disposing of seventy-two pieces of cannon. In the times in which he lived he had need of such an army. In 1654, Christina, the wayward and gifted daughter of Gustavus Adolphus, had abdicated. Her successor on the throne of Sweden was her cousin, Charles Gustavus, Duke of Zweibrücken. . . . The right of Charles Gustavus to the succession was, however, contested by John Casimir, King of Poland. . . . War ensued. In that war the star of Charles Gustavus was in the ascendant, and the unfortunate John Casimir was forced to abandon his own dominions and to flee into Silesia. The vicinity of the two rivals to his own outlying territories was, however, too near not to render anxious Frederic William of Brandenburg. To protect Prussia, then held in fief from the King of Poland, he marched with 8,000 men to its borders. But even with such a force he was unable, or perhaps, more correctly, he was prudently unwilling, to resist the insistence put upon him at Königsberg by the victorious King of Sweden (1656) to transfer to him the feudal overlordship of that province. Great results followed from this compliance. Hardly had the treaty been signed, when John Casimir, returning from Silesia with an Imperial army at his back, drove the Swedes from Poland, and recovered his dominions. He did not evidently intend to stop there. Then it was that the opportunity arrived to the Great Elector. Earnestly solicited by the King of Sweden to aid him in a contest which had assumed dimensions so formidable, Frederic William consented, but only on the condition that he should receive the Polish palatinates (Woiwodschaften) of Posen and Kalisch as the price of a victorious campaign. He then joined the King with his army, met the enemy at Warsaw, fought with him close to that city a great battle, which lasted three days (28th to 30th July 1656), and which terminated then, thanks mainly to the

pertinacity of the Brandenburgers—in the complete defeat of the Poles. The victory gained, Frederic William withdrew his troops. . . . Again did John Casimir recover from his defeat: again, aided by the Imperialists, did he march to the front, reoccupy Warsaw, and take up a threatening position opposite to the Swedish camp. The King of Sweden beheld in this action on the part of his enemy the prelude to his own certain destruction, unless by any means he could induce the Elector of Brandenburg once more to save him. He sent, then, urgent messengers after him to beg him to return. The messengers found Frederic William at Labiau. There the Elector halted and there, joined the next day, 20th November 1656, by King Charles Gustavus, he signed a treaty, by which, on condition of his material aid in the war, the latter renounced his feudal overlordship over Prussia, and agreed to acknowledge the Elector and his male descendants as sovereign dukes of that province. In the war which followed, the enemies of Sweden and Brandenburg multiplied on every side. The Danes and Lithuanians espoused the cause of John Casimir. Its issue seemed to Frederic William more than doubtful. He asked himself, then, whether—the new enemies who had arisen being the enemies of Sweden and not of himself—he had not more to gain by sharing in the victories of the Poles than in the defeats of the Swedes. Replying to himself affirmatively, he concluded, 29th September 1657, through the intermediation of the Emperor, with the Poles, at Wehlau, a treaty whereby the dukedom of Prussia was ceded in absolute sovereignty to the Elector of Brandenburg and his male issue, with reversion to Poland in case of the extinction of the family of the Franconian Hohenzollerns; in return, Frederic William engaged himself to support the Poles in their war against Sweden with a corps of 4,000 men. But before this convention could be acted upon, fortune had again smiled upon Charles Gustavus. Turning in the height of winter against the Danes, the King of Sweden had defeated them in the open field, pursued them across the frozen waters of the Belt to Fünen and Seeland, and had imposed upon their king the humiliating peace of Roeskilde (1658). He seemed inclined to proceed still further in the destruction of the ancient rival of his country, when a combined army of Poles and Brandenburgers suddenly poured through Mecklenburg into Holstein, drove thence the Swedes, and gave them no rest till they had evacuated likewise Schleswig and Jütland (1659). In a battle which took place shortly afterwards on the island of Fünen, at Nyborg, the Swedes suffered a defeat. This defeat made Charles Gustavus despair of success, and he had already begun to treat for peace, when death snatched him from the scene (January 1660). The negotiations which had begun, however, continued, and finally peace was signed on the 1st May 1660, in the monastery of Oliva, close to Danzig. This peace confirmed to the Elector of Brandenburg his sovereign rights over the duchy of Prussia. From this epoch dates the complete union of Brandenburg and Prussia—a union upon which a great man was able to lay the foundation of a powerful North German Kingdom! During the next dozen years, the Great Elector was chiefly busied in establishing his authority in his dominions and curbing the power of the nobles, particularly in



Prussia. In 1674, when Louis XIV. of France provoked war with the German princes by his attack on the Dutch, Frederic William led 20,000 men into Alsace to join the Imperial forces. Louis then called upon his allies, the Swedes, to invade Brandenburg, which they did, under General Wrangel, in January, 1675. "Plundering and burning as they advanced, they entered Haveland, the granary of Berlin, and carried their devastations up to the very gates of that capital." The Elector was retreating from Alsace before Turenne when he heard of the invasion. He paused for some weeks, to put his army in good condition, and then he hurried northwards, by forced marches. The enemy was taken by surprise, and attacked while attempting to retreat, near Fehrbellin, on the 18th of June. After two hours of a tremendous hand-to-hand conflict, "the right wing of the Swedes was crushed and broken; the centre, and left wing were in full retreat towards Fehrbellin. The victors, utterly exhausted — they had scarcely quitted their saddles for eleven days — were too worn out to pursue. It was not till the following morning that, refreshed and recovered, they followed the retreating foe to the borders of Mecklenburg. . . . The Great Elector promptly followed up his victory till he had compelled the Swedes to evacuate all Pomerania. Three years later, when they once more crossed the border from Livonia, he forced them again to retreat; and although in the treaty signed at St. Germain in 1679 he was forced to renounce his Pomeranian conquests, he did not the less establish the ultimate right of the State of which he was the real founder to those lands on the Baltic for which he had so hardly struggled at the negotiations which preceded the Peace of Westphalia. When he died (9th May 1688) he left the Kingdom already made in a position of prosperity sufficient to justify his sor. and successor in assuming, thirteen years later, on the anniversary of the victory of Fehrbellin, the title of King."—G. B. Mallison, *The Battle Fields of Germany*, ch. 8.—See, also, SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1644-1697.

A. D. 1648.—The Peace of Westphalia.—Loss of part of Pomerania.—Compensating acquisitions. See GERMANY: A. D. 1648.

A. D. 1672-1679.—In the Coalition against Louis XIV. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1672-1674, and 1674-1678; also NIMEGUEN, PEACE OF.

A. D. 1689-1696.—The war of the Grand Alliance against Louis XIV. See FRANCE: A. D. 1689-1690, to 1695-1696.

A. D. 1697.—The Treaty of Ryswick.—Restitutions by France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1697.

A. D. 1700.—The Elector made King of Prussia. See PRUSSIA: A. D. 1700.

BRANDY STATION, OR FLEET-WOOD, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (JUNE; VIRGINIA).

BRANDYWINE, Battle of the (A. D. 1777). See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777 (JANUARY—DECEMBER).

BRANKIRKA, Battle of (1518). See SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1397-1527.

BRANT, CHEF, and the Indian warfare of the American Revolution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778 (JUNE—NOVEMBER), and (JULY).

BRASIDAS IN 'CHALKIDIKE. See GREECE: B. C. 424-421.

BRAZIL: Origin of the name.—"As the most valuable part of the cargo which Americus Vesputius carried back to Europe was the well-known dye-wood, 'Caesalpinia Braziliensis,'—called in the Portuguese language 'pau brazil,' on account of its resemblance to 'brazas,' 'coals of fire,'—the land whence it came was termed the 'land of the brazil-wood'; and finally this appellation was shortened to Brazil, and completely usurped the names Vera Cruz, or Santa Cruz."—J. C. Fletcher and D. P. Kidder, *Brazil and the Brazilians*, ch. 3.—See, also, AMERICA: A. D. 1500-1514.

The aboriginal inhabitants. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: TUPI.—GUARAANI.—TUPUYAS; also GUCK OR COCO GROUP.

A. D. 1500-1504.—Discovery, exploration of the coast and first settlement. See AMERICA: A. D. 1499-1500, 1500-1514, and 1503-1504.

A. D. 1510-1661.—Portuguese colonization and agriculture.—Introduction of Slavery.—The coming of the Jesuits.—Conquests of the Dutch, and the Portuguese recovery of them.—"Brazil, on which the Portuguese ships had been cast by accident, had been found to unite in itself the capabilities of every part of the world in which Europeans have settled, though happily gold and silver had not yet been discovered, and the colonists betook themselves from the first to agriculture. The first permanent settlements on this coast were made by Jews, exiled by the persecution of the Inquisition; and the government supplemented these by sending out criminals of all kinds. But gradually the consequence of Brazil became recognized, and, as afterwards happened in New England, the nobility at home asked to share the land among themselves. Emmanuel would not countenance such a claim, but this great prince died in 1521, and his successor, John III., extended to Brazil the same system which had been adopted in Madeira and the Azores. The whole sea-coast of Brazil was parcelled out by feudal grants. It was divided into captaincies, each 50 leagues in length, with no limits in the interior; and these were granted out as male fiefs, with absolute power over the natives, such as at that time existed over the serfs who tilled the soil in Europe. But the native Brazilians were neither so easy a conquest as the Peruvians, nor so easily induced to labour; and the Portuguese now began to bring negroes from the Guinea coast. This traffic in human flesh had long been vigorously pursued in various parts of Europe; the Portuguese now introduced it to America. The settlers of Brazil were, properly speaking, the first European colonists. For they sold their own possessions at home, and brought their households with them to the new country. Thus they gradually formed the heart of a new nation, whereas the chief Spaniards always returned home after a certain tenure of their offices, and those who remained in the colony descended to the rank of the conquered natives. Many of those who came to Brazil had already served in the expeditions to the East; and they naturally perceived that the coast of America might raise the productions of India. Hence Brazil early became a plantation colony, and its prosperity is very much due to the culture of the sugar cane. The Portuguese were greatly assisted, both in

the East and the West, by the efforts of the newly founded order of the Jesuits. . . . John III. in [1549] sent out six of the order with the first governor of Brazil. . . . The Dutch, made bold by their great successes in the East, now sought to win the trade of Brazil by force of arms, and the success of the East India Company encouraged the adventurers who subscribed the funds for that of the West Indies, incorporated in 1621. The Dutch Admiral, Jacob Willekens, successfully assaulted San Salvador [Bahia] in 1624, and though the capital was afterwards retaken by the intrepid Archbishop Teixeira, one half of the coast of Brazil submitted to the Dutch. Here, as in the East, the profit of the company was the whole aim of the Dutch, and the spirit in which they executed their design was a main cause of its failure. . . . But . . . the profits of the company . . . rose at one time to cent per cent. The visions of the speculators of Amsterdam became greater; and they resolved to become masters of all Brazil. . . . The man whom they despatched [1637] to execute this design was Prince John Maurice of Nassau. . . . In a short time he had greatly extended the Dutch possessions. But the Stad-houder was subject, not to the wise and learned men who sat in the States-General, but to the merchants who composed the courts of the company. They thought of nothing but their dividends; they considered that Maurice kept up more troops and built more fortresses than were necessary for a mercantile community, and that he lived in too princely a fashion for one in their service. Perhaps they suspected him of an intention of slipping into that royal dignity which the feudal frame of Brazilian society seemed to offer him. At any rate, in 1643, they forced him to resign. A recent revolution had terminated the subjection of Portugal to Spain, and the new king of Portugal concluded a truce for ten years with Holland. War was therefore supposed to be out of the question. . . . But the recall of Maurice was the signal for an independent revolt in Brazil. Though the mother countries were at peace, war broke out between the Dutch and the Portuguese of Brazil in 1645. The Jesuits had long preached a crusade against the heretic Dutch. . . . John Ferdinand de Vieyra, a wealthy merchant of Pernambuco, led a general uprising of the Brazilians, and although the Dutch made a stubborn resistance, they received no assistance from home; they were driven from one post after another, until, in 1654, the last of the company's servants quitted Brazil. The Dutch declared war against Portugal; but in 1661 peace was made, and the Dutch sold their claims for 8000,000 florins, the right of trading being secured to them. But after the expulsion of the Dutch, the trade of Brazil came more and more into the hands of the English."—E. J. Payne, *Hist. of European Colonies*, ch. 2-3.

ALSO IN: R. G. Watson, *Spanish and Portuguese South America*, v. 1, ch. 9 and 15; v. 2, ch. 1-4.—R. Soutbey, *Hist. of Brazil*, v. 1-2.

A. D. 1524.—*Conceded to Portugal.* See AMERICA: A. D. 1519-1524.

A. D. 1531-1641.—*The Republic of St. Paul.*—*The Paulistas or Mamelukes.*—"The celebrated republic of St. Paul, as it is usually denominated, had its rise about the year 1531, from a very inconsiderable beginning. A mariner of the name of Ramalho, having been shipwrecked on this part of the coast, was received

among a small Indian tribe called the Piratininga, after the name of their chief. Here he was found by De Sousa some years afterwards, and, contrary to the established policy of permitting no settlement excepting immediately on the seacoast, he allowed this man to remain, on account of his having intermarried and having a family. The advantages of this establishment were such, that permission was soon after given to others to settle here, and as the adventurers intermarried with the natives, their numbers increased rapidly. . . . A mixed race was formed, possessing a compound of civilized and uncivilized manners and customs. The Jesuits soon after established themselves with a number of Indians they had reclaimed, and exerted a salutary influence in softening and harmonizing the growing colony. In 1581, the seat of government was removed from St. Vincent on the coast to St. Pauls; but its subjection to Portugal was little more than nominal. . . . The mixture produced an improved race, 'the European spirit of enterprise,' says Southey, 'developed itself in constitutions adapted to the country.' But it is much more likely that the free and popular government which they enjoyed produced the same fruits here as in every other country. . . . They soon quarreled with the Jesuits [1581], on account of the Indians whom they had reduced to slavery. The Jesuits declaimed against the practice; but as there were now many wealthy families among the Paulistas, the greater part of whose fortunes consisted in their Indians, it was not heard with patience. The Paulistas first engaged in war against the enemies of their allies, and afterwards on their own account, on finding it advantageous. They established a regular trade with the other provinces whom they supplied with Indian slaves. They by this time acquired the name of Mamelukes, from the peculiar military discipline they adopted, bearing some resemblance to the Mamelukes of Egypt. The revolution in Portugal, when Philip II. of Spain placed himself on its throne, cast the Paulistas in a state of independence, as they were the only settlers in Brazil which did not acknowledge the new dynasty. From the year 1580 until the middle of the following century, they may be regarded as a republic, and it was during this period they displayed that active and enterprising character for which they were so much celebrated. . . . While a Spanish king occupied the throne of Portugal, they attacked the Spanish settlements on the Paraguay, alleging that the Spaniards were encroaching on their territory. . . . They attacked the Jesuit missions [1629]. . . . As they had fixed themselves east of the Parana, the Paulistas laid hold of this as a pretext. They carried away upwards of 2,000 of their Indians into captivity, the greater part of whom were sold and distributed as slaves. The Jesuits complained to the king of Spain and to the pope; the latter fulminated his excommunication. The Paulistas attacked the Jesuits in their college, and put their principal to death, expelled the remainder, and set up a religion of their own; at least no longer acknowledged the supremacy of the pope. In consequence of the interruption of the African trade during the Dutch war, the demand for Indian slaves was very much increased. The Paulistas redoubled their exertions, and traversed every part of the Brazils in armed troops. . . . The foundation was laid of enmity to the Portu-

guese, which continues to this day, although a complete stop was put to the infamous practice in the year 1756. . . . When the house of Braganza, in 1640, ascended the throne, the Paulistas, instead of acknowledging him, conceived the idea of electing a king for themselves. They actually elected a distinguished citizen of the name of Bueno, who persisted in refusing to accept, upon which they were induced to acknowledge Joam IV. [1641]. It was not until long afterwards that they came under the Portuguese government."—H. M. Brackenridge, *Voyage to South America*, v. 1, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: R. Southey, *Hist. of Brazil*, ch. 23 (p. 2).

A. D. 1540-1541.—Orellana's voyage down the Amazons. See AMAZONS RIVER.

A. D. 1555-1560.—Attempted Huguenot colony on the Bay of Rio Janeiro. See FLORIDA: A. D. 1562-1563.

A. D. 1654-1777.—The Portuguese policy of exclusion and restriction.—Boundary disputes with Spain.—“The period of peace which followed these victories [over the Dutch] . . . was used by the Portuguese government only to get up a kind of old Japanese system of isolation, by which it was intended to keep the colony in perpetual tutelage. In consequence of this even now, after the lapse of half a century since it violently separated itself, Brazilians generally entertain a bitter grudge against the mother country. All the trade to and from Brazil was engrossed by Portugal; every functionary, down to the last clerk, was Portuguese. Any other European of scientific education was looked at with suspicion; and particularly they sought to prevent by all means the exploration of the interior, as they feared not only that the eyes of the natives might be opened to their mode of administration, but also that such travellers might side with the Spaniards in their long dispute regarding the boundaries of the two nations, as the French astronomer, La Condamine, had done. This question, which arose shortly after the discovery, and was hushed up only during the short union of both crowns (from 1581-1640), broke out with renewed vigor now and then, mauge the Treaty of Tordesilhas in 1494 [see AMERICA: A. D. 1494]. . . . By the Treaty of São Ildefonso, in 1777, both parties having long felt how impracticable the old arrangements were—at least, for their American colonies—the boundaries were fixed upon the principle of the ‘uti possidetis,’ at any rate so far as the imperfect knowledge of the interior allowed; but this effort also proved to be vain. . . . The unsolved question descended as an evil heritage to their respective heirs, Brazil and the South American Republics. A few years ago it gave rise to the terrible war with Paraguay; and it will lead to fresh conflicts between Brazil and the Argentine Republic.”—F. Keller, *The Amazon and Muleiro Rivers*, pp. 23-24.

ALSO IN: R. Southey, *History of Brazil*, v. 3.

A. D. 1713.—The Portuguese title confirmed. See UTRECHT: A. D. 1712-1714.

A. D. 1759.—Expulsion of the Jesuits. See JESUITS: A. D. 1757-1773.

A. D. 1808-1822.—Becomes the asylum of Portuguese royalty.—The founding of the independent Empire.—“While anarchy and ruin . . . overspread the greater part of the beautiful continent of South America, the Empire of Bra-

zil won an independent existence without bloodshed, and kept it with credit. The Dutch conquest of Brazil, and its reconquest by the Portuguese, has been mentioned in a former chapter. The country long remained under the close and oppressive monopoly imposed upon it by the Portuguese; but in 1808 [1807] when Napoleon invaded Portugal, the regent embarked [see PORTUGAL: A. D. 1807], with the royal insignia, for Brazil, which at once assumed the dignity of an integral part of the kingdom. The ports were opened to the commerce of the world; the printing-press was introduced; learning was encouraged; the enormous resources of the country were explored; foreign settlers were invited to establish themselves; embassies were sent to European powers of the first rank, and diplomatic agents received. New towns and harbours were planned; new life was breathed into every department of the state. After a few years, the state of affairs in Europe compelled King John VI. to return to Europe, as the only chance of preserving the integrity of the monarchy. The Cortes of Lisbon invited their sovereign to revisit his ancient capital, and deputies from Brazil were summoned to attend the sittings of the National Assembly. But before the deputies could arrive, the Cortes had resolved that Brazil should be again reduced to absolute dependence on Portugal. A resolution more senseless or more impracticable can hardly be imagined. The territory of Brazil was as large as all Europe put together; Portugal was a little kingdom, isolated and without influence among the monarchies of the Old World; yet it was deliberately decreed that all the monopolies of the exploded colonial system should be revived, and that England should be deprived of her free trade to Brazil. The king appointed his eldest son, Dom Pedro, Regent of the new kingdom, and soon after took his departure for Lisbon, with many of the emigrant nobility. Dom Pedro assumed the government under the perplexing circumstances of an empty treasury, a heavy public debt, and the provinces almost in revolt. Bahia disavowed his authority, and the Cortes withheld their support from him. The regent reduced his expenditure to the monthly sum allowed to his princess for pin money; he retired to a country house, and observed the most rigid economy. By great exertions he reduced the public expenditure from \$50,000,000 to \$15,000,000; but the northern and internal provinces still withheld their taxes; the army became mutinous, and the ministers of his father, who still remained in power, were unpopular; the regent in despair demanded his recall. But the Brazilians were at length disarmed by his noble conduct; they recognized his activity, his beneficence, his assiduity in the affairs of government, and the habitual feelings of affection and respect for the House of Braganza, which had for a moment been laid asleep by distrust, were reawakened with renewed strength. It was fortunate that the quarrels which disturbed Brazil were accommodated before the arrival of intelligence from Portugal. Hardly had the king arrived in Lisbon when he found himself obliged to assent to a constitution which treated his Brazilian subjects as mere colonists; succeeding mails brought orders more and more humiliating to the Brazilians. The design of declaring Brazil an independent kingdom, grew

more and more in public favour; but the prince was unwilling to place himself in direct rebellion to the crown of Portugal, and steadily adhered to his determination to leave America. At length, it is related, a despatch was delivered to the regent, which he declined to show to any of his ministers, but which evidently excited in his mind no ordinary emotions of anger: he crushed the paper in his hand, and moved away to a window, where he stood for a few moments in thought; at length he turned to his council with the words 'Independencia ou morte':—the exclamation was received with tumultuous cheers, and was adopted as the watchword of the Revolution. The Portuguese troops were sent back to Europe. The Cortes of Lisbon were now anxious to recall their obnoxious decrees; to admit the deputies from Brazil; to make any concession that might be demanded. But it was too late: the independence of Brazil was formally proclaimed in August, 1822, and in December of the same year, Dom Pedro was crowned Emperor of Brazil. This is the first, and as yet the only instance of a modern colony relieving its independence, and separating itself completely from its metropolis without bloodshed."—Viscount Bury, *Exodus of the Western Nations*, v. 2, ch. 11.

ALSO IN: J. Armitage, *Hist. of Brazil*, ch. 1-7. —See, also, PORTUGAL: A. D. 1820-1824.

**A. D. 1825-1865.—Wars with the Argentines.—Abdication of Dom Pedro I.—The Guerra dos Cabanos.**—"In 1825, chiefly through the mediation of England, Brazil was acknowledged as an independent empire. But the inner commotions continued, and were not even soothed by a new Constitution, drawn up in 1823, and sworn to by the Emperor in 1824. New revolts in Pernambuco, and some of the other Northern provinces, and a war of three years with the Argentine Republic, which ended in 1828 by Brazil giving up Banda Oriental, annexed only eleven years before, disturbed and weakened the land. The foreign soldiers, enlisted for this war, and retained after its conclusion to keep down the Opposition, and the extravagant private life of the Emperor, who recklessly trampled down the honour of respectable families, provoked dissatisfaction and murmurs, which rose to the highest pitch when he insisted upon carrying on a most unpopular war in Portugal to defend the rights of his daughter, Dona Maria da Gloria (in whose favour he had abdicated the Portuguese Crown), against his brother, Don Miguel [see PORTUGAL: A. D. 1824-1889]. In April, 1831, Dom Pedro I., so enthusiastically raised to the Brazilian throne only nine years before, was forced to abdicate it, deserted and betrayed by every one, in behalf of his younger son, Pedro. The next period was the most disturbed one that the young Empire had yet witnessed. Slave revolts at Bahia, a civil war in the South, which almost cost it the province of Rio Grande do Sul, and the bloody rebellion known as the Guerra dos Cabanos, in Pará and Amazon, from 1835 to 1837, followed each other quickly. In this last revolt, the Brazilians had stirred up the Indians and mestizos against the abhorred Portuguese, without considering that they should not be able to quench the fire they had themselves kindled. In a short time, the fury of the whole colored population turned against all whites, Brazilians and Portuguese alike, without any

distinction. More than 10,000 persons are said to have perished in this Guerra dos Cabanos; and, to the present day, those terrible times and the barbarous cruelties committed by the Indians, half-castes, and mulattoes, continue to be talked of with awe in the two provinces. A revolution in Minas, got up by the personal ambitions of a few political leaders, rather than emanating from the spirit of the people, and the war against Rosas, the Dictator of the Argentine Republic, passed over Brazil without leaving deep traces, at least when compared with the last war against Paraguay; which, besides the stimulus of the old differences about boundaries, was occasioned by the endless vexations and restrictions with which the Dictator Lopez strove to ruin the Brazilian trade on the Paraguay, and to prejudice the province of Mato Grosso."—F. Keller, *The Amazon and Madeira Rivers*, pp. 25-26.

ALSO IN: J. Armitage, *Hist. of Brazil*, 1808-1831.—See, also, ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1819-1874.

**A. D. 1865-1870.—The war with Paraguay.** See PARAGUAY: A. D. 1608-1873.

**A. D. 1871-1888.—Emancipation of Slaves.**—"The Brazilian act of emancipation, known as the Law of Rio Branco (taking that name from the Minister who carried it through) was passed on the 28th of September, 1871, "and from that date it was enacted 'that children henceforth born of slave women shall be considered of free condition.' . . . Such children are not to be actually free, but are bound to serve the owners of their mothers for a term of 21 years, under the name of 'apprentices.' These must work, under severe penalties, for their hereditary masters; but if the latter inflict on them excessive bodily punishment, they are allowed to bring suit in a criminal court, which may declare their freedom. A provision was also made for the emancipation of government slaves; and there was a clause which insured a certain sum, to be annually set aside from fines, which was to aid each province in emancipating by purchase a certain number of slaves. . . . The passage of this law did not prove merely prospective in its effects. In a very short time the sums placed aside for emancipating slaves by purchase resulted in the freedom of many bondmen. And more than this, there seemed to be a generous private rivalry in the good work, from motives of benevolence and from religious influence. Many persons in various parts of Brazil liberated their slaves without compensation. . . . I am happy to say that the number liberated, either by the provisions of the State or by private individuals, is always in an increasing ratio. When the writer first went to Brazil [1852] . . . it was estimated that there were 2,000,000 in slavery. . . . There were at the beginning of 1875, when the law of emancipation had been but a little more than three years in operation, 1,476,567 slaves."—J. C. Fletcher and D. P. Kidder, *Brazil and the Brazilians*, ch. 28.—"On the 25th of March, 1884, slavery was abolished in the province of Ceará. The Rio News says, 'The movement began only 15 months ago, the first municipality liberating its slaves on the 1st of January, 1883. The new tax law of last November greatly accelerated this progress, because it made slave-holding impossible, the value of the slave being less than the tax.'" On the 28th of September, 1885, the

impatience of the Brazilians to rid themselves of slavery expressed itself in a new Emancipation Act, known as the Saraiva law. It provided for facilitating and hastening the extension of freedom, by increasing the public fund appropriated to it, by defining the valuation of slaves, and by other effective provisions, so that "within ten years [from its date] it is supposed that slavery will have ceased to exist in Brazil."—H. C. Dent, *A Year in Brazil*, pp. 281-296.—"On March 30, 1887, the official return gave the number of slaves in Brazil as 723,419, of the legal value of \$485,225,212. On May 13, 1888, the Crown Princess, as regent, gave the royal assent to a short measure of two clauses, the first declaring that slavery was abolished in Brazil from the day of the promulgation of the law, and the second repealing all former Acts on the subject. Both Chambers refused to consider the claim for compensation made by the slave owners."—*Statesman's Year-Book*, 1890, p. 391.

**A. D. 1889-1891.—Revolution.—Overthrow of the Empire.—Establishment of the Republic of the United States of Brazil.—Religious freedom declared.**—"The sudden collapse of the Imperial Government in November [1889], resulting in the downfall of Dom Pedro and his banishment, caused universal surprise. For some time the Government had been credited by the Republican journals with the wish and intention to disperse the army throughout the provinces and along the frontier, so that, with the assistance of the newly-organised National Guard, the succession of the Princess Imperial to the throne might be secured in the event of the death or incapacity through old age of the Emperor Dom Pedro. An infantry battalion, ordered to embark for a distant province, mutinied and refused to go. The War Department resolved to compel them by force to depart." The result was a general mutiny (November 15, 1889), which soon became a revolution. "The organiser of the mutiny was Colonel Benjamin Constant Botelho de Magalhães, an officer of exceptional ability and Professor in the Military Academy. The movement seemed directed at first only against the obnoxious Ouro Preto Ministry; but the enthusiasm of the Republicans, under the leadership of a popular agitator, José de Patrocínio, was so very pronounced, that at a meeting held in the city hall, in the afternoon of Nov. 15, a resolution proclaiming the Republic was passed by acclamation. About the same hour, a self-constituted committee, consisting of General Deodoro [da Fonseca], Benjamin Constant, and Quintino Bocayuva, met and organised a Provisional Government," with Marshal Deodoro da Fonseca for its Chief, Colonel Botelho de Magalhães for Minister of War. "A formal decree was issued declaring a federal Republic, the several provinces of the late Empire constituting the States and each State arranging its own constitution and electing its deliberative bodies and local governments. On the morning of the 16th the deposed Emperor received intimation that he and his family must leave the country within twenty-four hours:—Between 2 and 3 o'clock on the morning of the 17th an officer appeared at the palace and informed the Emperor that he must at once embark, with all the members of his family. The wretched old man protested that he was not a fugitive, and that he preferred

to embark by day; but after listening to the officer's explanation that a conflict might occur and blood might be shed, he finally yielded, protesting that in such a crisis his old grey head was the only one that was cool. And so at the dead hour of night, with no one to say a farewell and bid him God-speed, the aged Emperor, with his devoted wife and children, went down to the Caes Pharonx, where a launch was waiting to convey them out to the small gunboat Parnahyba. About 10 o'clock the gunboat steamed out of the harbour and went down to Ilha Grande to wait for the merchant steamer Alagoas, which had been chartered to convey the exiles to Europe. . . . It was said that the Imperial Ministry, principally through the instrumentality of Ouro Preto, had arranged with Dom Pedro to abdicate at the end of January, 1890, in favour of his daughter, the Countess d'Eu. But the Countess, with her husband, was extremely unpopular with the army and navy, and from these the feeling of disloyalty spread rapidly among the people. By decree of the Provisional Government, the provinces of Brazil, united by the tie of federation, were to be styled the 'United States of Brazil,' and general elections were to take place in August, 1890, to confirm the establishment of the Republic. A counter-revolution broke out in Rio on Dec. 18. A number of soldiers, sailors, and civilians took part in it, and troops had to be ordered out to disperse them. It was not until the 20th that the disturbance was finally quelled."—*Annual Register*, 1889, pt. 1, pp. 444-448.—"The revolution was the work of leaders who were not only conscious of their power, but also confident that the nation would inevitably condone their temporary acts of usurpation. There were no signs of weakness, vacillation or uncertainty in their action. . . . A coalition of the army officers and the constitution-makers and political dreamers of the League would have been impracticable if the leaders had not known that the 20 provinces of the Empire were profoundly disaffected and would readily acquiesce in a radical change of government. . . . The Emperor of Brazil has enjoyed the reputation of being one of the most enlightened and progressive sovereigns of his time. . . . He was a ruler with many fascinating and estimable traits, who endeared himself to his people. This and much more may be said in praise of the deposed and banished Emperor; but when the record of his public services and of his private virtues is complete, the fact remains that he stood for a system of centralization that practically deprived the great series of federated provinces of their autonomy and his subjects of the privileges of self-government. Dom Pedro II. was not a constitutional reformer. The charter which he had received from his father was not modified in any essential respect during his long reign."—*N. Y. Tribune Extra*, v. 1, no. 12 (1889).—"A new Constitution . . . was ratified by the first National Congress, convened on Nov. 15, 1890. By this instrument the Brazilian nation constituted itself into a federal republic, under the name of the United States of Brazil. Each of the old provinces was declared a self-governing state, to be administered under a republican form of government, with power to impose taxes, and subject to no interference from the Central Government, except for purposes of national

defense or the preservation of internal order or for the execution of Federal laws. Legislation relating to customs, paper currency, and postal communications is reserved to the Federal Government. The right of suffrage is secured to all male citizens over 21 years old, with the exception of beggars, persons ignorant of the alphabet, soldiers in actual service, and persons under monastic vows, registration being the only prerequisite. The executive authority is vested in the President . . . elected by the people directly for the term of six years, and . . . not eligible for the succeeding term. . . . Senators are elected by the Legislatures of the States for nine years, three from each State, one retiring and his successor being chosen every three years. . . . The Chamber of Deputies has the initiative in all laws relating to taxation. Deputies are elected for three years by direct popular vote in the proportion of one to every 70,000 inhabitants. . . . It is declared that no sect or church shall receive aid from the National or State governments." In 1891, differences arose between the President and Congress, at first over financial measures passed by the Chambers and vetoed by the President and schemes recommended by the President that were voted down by Congress. In November the President published a decree dissolving Congress, closed the Chambers by force, proclaimed himself Dictator on the invitation of officers of the army, and convoked a new Congress, to be charged with the revision of the constitution. The State of Rio Grande do Sul led off in a revolt against this usurpation, and on the 23d of November, after some shots had been fired into the city of Rio de Janeiro by a naval squadron acting against him, President Fonseca resigned. "Floriano Peixoto was immediately installed by the revolutionary committee as President in his stead . . . and the country soon settled down under the new government."—*Appleton's Annual Cyclopaedia* 1891, pp. 91-96.—"When Deodoro, after struggling for twelve months with the factions in Congress, closed the doors of São Christovão Palace and proclaimed a dictatorship, he had recourse to a familiar expedient of Latin-American civilization. The speedy collapse of his administration, when it was wholly dependent upon military force, was a good augury for the future of Brazil. . . . In the early days of the Republic, the Provisional Ministry were unable to agree upon the radical policy of disestablishing the Church. . . . Fortunately for Brazil there was no compromise of the disestablishment question. . . . Under the Constitution no religious denomination was permitted to hold relations of dependence upon, or alliance with, the federal or State governments. . . . Every church was made free in the free State. Civil marriage was recognized as essential. . . . Perhaps the most hopeful sign for the cause of progress and religion is the adoption of educational suffrage."—I. N. Forl, *Tropical America*, ch. 4.—See CONSTITUTION OF BRAZIL.

**BREAD AND CHEESE WAR.** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1482-1493.

**BRECKINRIDGE, John C.—Defeat in Presidential election.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1860 (APRIL—NOVEMBER).

**BREDA: A. D. 1575.—Spanish-Dutch Congress.** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1575-1577.

**A. D. 1590.—Capture by Prince Maurice of Nassau-Orange.** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1588-1593.

**A. D. 1624-1625.—Siege and capture by the Spaniards.** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1621-1633.

**A. D. 1637.—Taken by the Prince of Orange.** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1635-1638.

**A. D. 1793.—Taken and lost by the French.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (FEBRUARY—APRIL).

**BREDA, Declaration from.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1658-1660.

**BREDA, Treaty of (1666).** See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1665-1666.

**BREED'S HILL (Bunker Hill), Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775 (JUNE).

**BREHON LAWS.**—"The portion of the Irish tribe system which has attracted most attention is the mode in which the judicial authority was withdrawn from the chief and appropriated by the hereditary caste of the Brehons, and also the supposed anomalous principles which they applied to the decision of the cases which came before them. The earlier English writers found no terms too strong to express their abhorrence and contempt of these native judges, and their contempt for the principles upon which they proceeded. On the other hand, Irish writers attributed to these professional arbitrators advanced principles of equity wholly foreign to an early community. . . . The translation of the existing vast mass of Brehon law books, and the translation [publication?] of the most important of them by the order of the government, have disposed of the arguments and assertions on both sides. It is now admitted, that the system and principles of the Brehon jurisprudence present no characteristics of any special character, although in them primitive ideas of law were elaborated in a manner not found elsewhere; . . . the laws which existed among the native Irish were in substance those which are found to have prevailed among other Aryan tribes in a similar stage of social progress; as the social development of the nation was prematurely arrested, so also were the legal ideas of the same stage of existence retained after they had disappeared in all other nations of Europe. This legal survival continued for centuries the property of an hereditary caste, who had acquired the knowledge of writing, and some tincture of scholastic philosophy and civil law. . . . The learning of the Brehons consisted (1) in an acquaintance with the minute ceremonies, intelligible now only to an archaeologist, and not always to him, by which the action could be instituted, and without which no Brehon could assume the role of arbitrator; and (2) in a knowledge of the traditions, customs and precedents of the tribe, in accordance with which the dispute should be decided."—A. G. Richey, *Short Hist. of the Irish People*, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: Sir H. Maine, *Early Hist. of Institutions*, lect. 2.

**BREISACH: A. D. 1638.—Siege and capture by Duke Bernhard.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1634-1639.

**A. D. 1648.—Cession to France.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1648.

**BREITENFELD, Battle of (or first battle of Leipsic).** See GERMANY: A. D. 1631. . . .

The second battle of (1642). See GERMANY: A. D. 1640-1645.

**BREMEN: 13th-15th Centuries.**—In the Hansatic League. See HANSA TOWNS.

**A. D. 1525.**—Formal establishment of the Reformed Religion. See PAPACY: A. D. 1523-1525.

**A. D. 1648.**—Cession of the Bishoprick to Sweden. See GERMANY: A. D. 1648.

**A. D. 1720.**—The Duchy ceded to the Elector of Hanover. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1719-1721.

**A. D. 1801-1803.**—One of six free cities which survive the Peace of Luneville. See GERMANY: A. D. 1801-1803.

**A. D. 1810.**—Annexed to France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1810 (FEBRUARY—DECEMBER).

**A. D. 1810-1815.**—Loss and recovery of autonomy as a "free city." See CITIES, IMPERIAL AND FREE, OF GERMANY.

**A. D. 1817.**—Once more a Free City and a member of the Germanic Confederation. See VIENNA, THE CONGRESS OF.

**A. D. 1888.**—Surrender of free privileges.—Absorption in the Zollverein and Empire. See GERMANY: A. D. 1888.

**BREMI: A. D. 1635-1638.**—Taken by the French.—Recovered by the Spaniards. See ITALY: A. D. 1635-1659.

**BREMULE, Battle of (1119).** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1087-1135.

**BREHIN, The Cymric title.** See ROME: B. C. 390-347.

**BRENNI, The.** See RILÆTIANS.

**BRENTFORD, Battle of.**—Fought and won by Edmund Ironsides in his contest with Cnut, or Canute, for the English throne A. D. 1016.

**BRESCIA: A. D. 1512.**—Capture and pillage by the French. See ITALY: A. D. 1510-1513.

**A. D. 1849.**—Bombardment, capture and brutal treatment by the Austrian Haynau. See ITALY: A. D. 1848-1849.

**BRESLAU: A. D. 1741-1760.**—In the wars of Frederick the Great. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1741 (MAY—JUNE); 1742 (JANUARY—MAY); 1742 (JUNE); GERMANY: A. D. 1757 (JULY—DECEMBER), and 1760.

**BREST: A. D. 1694.**—Rise of the English fleet. See FRANCE: A. D. 1694.

**BRETAGNE.** See BRITANNY.

**BRETHREN OF THE COMMON LOT OR COMMON LIFE.**—"The Societies of the Beguines, Beghards, and Lollards [see BEGUINES], which from the first laboured under various defects and imperfections, had in course of time degenerated, and by their own fault, either fallen to pieces of themselves, or been suppressed. The two things, however, still existed, viz., the propensity to religious association, . . . and, likewise, the outward condition, which required and rendered practicable the efforts of benevolence and charity, strengthened by cooperation. The case was particularly the case in the Netherlands, and most in the northern provinces. . . . Here, then, the Institute of the Common Lot takes its rise. . . . The first author of this new series of evolutions was Gerhard Groot (Geert Groete or de Groot, Gerhardus Magnus), a man of glowing piety, and great zeal in doing good, a

powerful popular orator and an affectionate friend of youth [1340-1384]. . . . His affection for Holy Scripture and the ancient Fathers kindled in Gerhard's bosom the liveliest zeal for collecting the records of Christian antiquity. . . . Hence, he had long before employed young men, under his oversight, as copyists, thereby accomplishing the threefold end of multiplying these good theological works, giving profitable employment to the youths, and obtaining an opportunity of influencing their minds. This he continued more and more to do. The circle of his youthful friends, scholars, and transcribers, became from day to day larger, and grew at length into a regular society. Having thus in part owed its origin to the copying of the Scriptures and devotional books, the Society from the outset, and through its whole continuance, made the Holy Scripture and its propagation, the copying, collecting, preserving, and utilizing of good theological and ascetical books, one of its main objects. . . . The members were called 'Brethren of the Common Lot,' [or of the Common Life] or 'Brethren of God Will,' 'Frates Collationarii,' 'Jeronymians,' and 'Gregorians,' . . . Imitating the Church at Jerusalem, and prompted by brotherly affection, they mutually shared with each other their earnings and property, or consecrated also their fortune, if they possessed any, to the service of the community. From this source, and from donations and legacies made to them, arose the 'Brother-houses,' in each of which a certain number of members lived together, subjected, it is true, in dress, diet, and general way of life, to an appointed rule, but yet not conventually sequestered from the world, with which they maintained constant intercourse, and in such a way as, in opposition to Monachism, to preserve the principle of individual liberty."—C. Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, v. 2, pt. 2, ch. 1.—"Through the wonderful activity of that fraternity of teachers, begun about 1360, called the Brethren of the Common Life, the Netherlands had the first system of common schools in Europe. These schools flourished in every large town and almost in every village, so that popular education was the rule."—W. E. Griffis, *The Influence of the Netherlands*, p. 3.

Also in: S. Kettlewell, *Thomas à Kempis and the Brothers of Common Life*, ch. 5-6 (v. 1).

**BRETHREN OF THE FREE SPIRIT.** See BEGUINES.

**BRETIGNY, Treaty of.**—The treaty, called at the time "the great peace," concluded May 8, 1360, between Edward III. of England and John II. of France, in which Edward renounced his pretensions to the French crown, released for a ransom King John, then a prisoner in his hands, and received the full sovereignty of Guienne, Poitou and Ponthieu in France, besides retaining Calais and Guisnes.—See FRANCE: A. D. 1337-1360.

**BRETWALDA.**—A title given to some of the early English kings. "Opinions differ as to the meaning of the word Bretwalda. Palgrave and Lappenberg take it as equivalent to 'ruler of Britain'; Kemble construes it 'broad-ruling,' and sees in it a dignity without duty, hardly more than an 'accidental predominance.' (Saxons in England, ii., 18.) The list of those who obtained this 'catus' includes Ethelbert of Kent, who broke the power of the petty kings

as far as the Humber, Redbald of East Anglia, who obtained it by some means even in the lifetime of Ethelbert, and the three great Northumbrian kings, Edwin, Oswald and Oswy, whose supremacy however did not extend to Kent."—C. Elton, *Origins of English Hist.*, p. 392, note.

ALSO IN: E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of the Norman Conq. of Eng.*, v. 1, app. B.—See, also, ENGLAND: A. D. 477-527, and ENGLAND: 7TH CENTURY.

**BREWSTER, William, and the Plymouth Pilgrims.** See INDEPENDENTS: A. D. 1604-1617, and MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1620, and after.

**BREYZAD.**—The people and the language of Brittany, or Bretagne. See BRITTANY: A. D. 818-912.

**BRIAN BORU, The reign in Ireland of.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1014.

**BRIDGE, Battle of the.**—A serious reverse suffered by the Arab followers of Mahomet in their early movements against the Persians, A. D. 634. A force of 9,000 or 10,000 having crossed the Euphrates by a bridge of boats were beaten back, their bridge destroyed and half of them slain or drowned.—G. Rawlinson, *Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy*, ch. 26.—See MAROMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 632-651.

**BRIDGEWATER, OR LUNDY'S LANE, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1814 (JULY—SEPTEMBER).

**BRIDGEWATER, Storming of.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1645 (JULY—SEPTEMBER).

**BRIENNE, Battle of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (JANUARY—MARCH).

**BRIGANTES, The.**—One of the strongest and fiercest of the tribes of ancient Britain, believed by some historians to have been the original pre-Celtic inhabitants of the island. At the time of the Roman conquest they held the whole interior northward from the Humber and Mersey to the Forth and Clyde. They were subdued by Agricola.—E. Guist, *Origines Celticae*, v. 1, ch. 1.—See, also, BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES, and A. D. 43-53; also, IRELAND, TRIBES OF EARLY CELTIC INHABITANTS.

**BRIGANTINE.**—BERGANTIN. See CARAVELS.

**BRIHUEGA, Battle of (A. D. 1710).** See SPAIN: A. D. 1707-1710.

**BRILL, The capture of.** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1572.

**BRISBANE.** See AUSTRALIA: A. D. 1800-1840, and 1859.

**BRISSOT DE WARVILLE AND THE GIRONDISTS.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1791 (OCTOBER), to 1793 (SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER).

**BRISSOTINS.**—The party of the Girondists, in the French Revolution, was sometimes so called, after Brissot de Warville, one of its leaders.

**BRISTOE STATION, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (JULY—NOVEMBER: VIRGINIA).

**BRISTOL: 12th Century.—Its slave trade and other commerce.**—"Within its comparatively narrow limits Bristol must have been in general character and aspect not unlike what it is to-day—a busy, bustling, closely-packed city, full of the eager, active, surging life of commercial enterprise. Ostmen from Waterford and Dublin, Northmen from the Western Isles and the more distant Orkneys, and even from Norway itself, had long ago learnt to avoid the shock of the 'Higra,' the mighty current which

still kept its heathen name derived from the sea-god of their forefathers, and make it serve to float them into the safe and commodious harbour of Bristol, where a thousand ships could ride at anchor. As the great trading centre of the west Bristol ranked as the third city in the kingdom, surpassed in importance only by Winchester and London. The most lucrative branch of its trade, however, reflects no credit on its burghers. All the eloquence of S. Wulfstan and all the sternness of the Conqueror had barely availed to check for a while their practice of kidnapping men for the Irish slave-market; and that the traffic was in full career in the latter years of Henry I, we learn from the experiences of the canons of Laon."—K. Norgate, *England under the Angevin Kings*, v. 1, ch. 1.

**A. D. 1497.—Cabot's voyage of discovery.** See AMERICA: A. D. 1497.

**A. D. 1645.—The storming of the city by Fairfax.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1645 (JULY—SEPTEMBER).

**A. D. 1685.—The commerce and wealth of the city.**—"Next to the capital, but next at an immense distance, stood Bristol, then the first English seaport. . . . Pepys, who visited Bristol eight years after the Restoration, was struck by the splendour of the city. But his standard was not high; for he noted down as a wonder the circumstance that, in Bristol, a man might look round him and see nothing but houses. . . . A few churches of eminent beauty rose out of a labyrinth of narrow lanes built upon vaults of no great solidity. If a coach or cart entered those alleys, there was danger that it would be wedged between the houses, and danger also that it would break in the cellars. Goods were therefore conveyed about the town almost exclusively in trucks drawn by dogs; and the richest inhabitants exhibited their wealth, not by riding in carriages, but by walking the streets with trains of servants in rich liveries and by keeping tables loaded with good cheer. The hospitality of the city was widely renowned, and especially the collations with which the sugar refiners regaled their visitors. . . . This luxury was supported by a thriving trade with the North American Plantations and with the West Indies. The passion for colonial traffic was so strong that there was scarcely a small shopkeeper in Bristol who had not a venture on board of some ship bound for Virginia or the Antilles. Some of these venturers indeed were not of the most honourable kind. There was, in the Transatlantic possessions of the crown, a great demand for labour; and this demand was partly supplied by a system of crimping and kidnapping at the principal English seaports. Nowhere was this system in such active and extensive operation as at Bristol. . . . The number of houses appears, from the returns of the hearth-money, to have been, in the year 1685, just 5,300. . . . The population of Bristol must therefore have been about 29,000."—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 3 (v. 1).

**A. D. 1831.—The Reform Bill Riots.**—The popular excitement produced in England in 1831 by the action of the House of Lords in rejecting the Reform Bill, led to riots in several places, but most seriously at Bristol. "The Bristol mobs have always been noted for their brutality; and the outbreak now was such as to amaze and confound the the whole kingdom. . . . The lower parts of the city were the harbourage of probably



a worse seaport populace than any other place in England, while the police was ineffective and demoralised. There was no city in which a greater amount of savagery lay beneath a society proud, exclusive, and mutually repellent, rather than enlightened and accustomed to social co-operation. These are circumstances which go far to account for the Bristol riots being so fearfully bad as they were. Of this city, Sir Charles Wetherell—then at the height of his unpopularity as a vigorous opponent of the Reform Bill—was recorder; and there he had to go, in the last days of October, in his judicial capacity. . . . The symptoms of discontent were such as to induce the mayor, Mr. Pinney, to apply to the home-office for military aid. Lord Melbourne sent down some troops of horse, which were quartered within reach, in the neighbourhood of the city. . . . Sir Charles Wetherell could not be induced to relinquish his public entry, though warned of the danger by the magistrates themselves. . . . On Saturday, October 29, Sir Charles Wetherell entered Bristol in pomp; and before he reached the Mansion House at noon, he must have been pretty well convinced, by the hootings and throwing of stones, that he had better have foregone the procession. For some hours the special constables and the noisy mob in front of the Mansion House exchanged discourtesies of an emphatic character, but there was no actual violence till night. At night, the Mansion House was attacked, and the Riot Act was read; but the military were not brought down, as they ought to have been, to clear the streets. The mayor had 'religious scruples,' and was 'humane'; and his indecision was not overborne by any aid from his brother-magistrates. When the military were brought in, it was after violence had been committed, and when the passions of the mob were much excited. Sir Charles Wetherell escaped from the city that night. During the dark hours, sounds were heard provocative of further riot; shouts in the streets, and the hammering of workmen who were boarding up the lower windows of the Mansion House and the neighbouring dwellings. On the Sunday morning, the rioters broke into the Mansion House without opposition; and from the time they got into the cellars, all went wrong. Hungry wretches and boys broke the necks of the bottles, and Queen Square was strewn with the bodies of the dead-drunk. The soldiers were left without orders, and their officers without that sanction of the magistracy in the absence of which they could not act, but only parade; and in this parading, some of the soldiers naturally lost their tempers, and spoke and made gestures on their own account, which did not tend to the soothing of the mob. This mob never consisted of more than five or six hundred. . . . The mob declared openly what they were going to do; and they went to work unchecked—armed with staves and bludgeons from the quays, and with iron palisades from the Mansion House—to break open and burn the bridewell, the jail, the bishop's palace, the custom-house, and Queen Square. They gave half an hour's notice to the inhabitants of each house in the square, which they then set fire to in regular succession, till two sides, each measuring 550 feet, lay in smoking ruins. The bodies of the drunken were seen roasting in the fire. The greater number of the rioters were believed to be under twenty years of age, and some

were mere children; some Sunday scholars, hitherto well conducted, and it may be questioned whether one in ten knew anything of the Reform Bill, or the offences of Sir Charles Wetherell. On the Monday morning, after all actual riot seemed to be over, the soldiery at last made two slaughterous charges. More horse arrived, and a considerable body of foot soldiers; and the constabulary became active; and from that time the city was in a more orderly state than the residents were accustomed to see it. . . . The magistrates were brought to trial, and so was Colonel Brereton, who was understood to be in command of the whole of the military. The result of that court-martial caused more emotion throughout the kingdom than all the slaughtering and burning, and the subsequent executions which marked that fearful season. It was a year before the trial of the magistrates was entered upon. The result was the acquittal of the mayor, and the consequent relinquishment of the prosecution of his brother-magistrates."—H. Martineau, *A History of the Thirty Years' Peace*, bk. 4, ch. 4 (p. 2).

**BRITAIN, Count and Duke of.**—The military commanders of Roman Britain. See BRITAIN: A. D. 323-337, also ARTHUR, KING.

**BRITAIN, The name.** See BRITANNIA.

**Celtic Tribes.**—"It appears that the south-eastern part of the island, or the district now occupied by the county of Kent, was occupied by the Cantii, a large and influential tribe, which in Cæsar's time, was divided among four chiefs or kings. To the west, the Regni held the modern counties of Sussex and Surrey, from the sea-coast to the Thames. Still farther west, the Belgæ occupied the country from the southern coast to the Bristol Channel, including nearly the whole of Hampshire, Wiltshire and Somersetshire. The whole of the extensive district extending from the Belgæ to the extreme western point of the island, then called Antivestæum or Bolorium (now the Land's End) including Devonshire and Cornwall, was occupied by the Dumnonii, or Dannonii. On the coast between the Dumnonii and the Belgæ the smaller tribe of the Durotriges held the modern county of Dorset. On the other side of the Thames, extending northwards to the Stour, and including the greater part of Middlesex as well as Essex, lay the Trinobantes. To the north of the Stour dwelt the Icenii, extending over the counties of Suffolk, Norfolk, Cambridge and Huntingden. The Coritavi possessed the present counties of Northampton, Leicester, Rutland, Derby, Nottingham and Lincoln; and the south-eastern part of Yorkshire was held by the Parisi. Between the tribes last enumerated, in the counties of Buckingham, Bedford and Hertford, lay the tribe called by Ptolemy the Catyuchlani, and by others Catuvellani. Another name, apparently, for this tribe, or for a division of it, was the Cassii. West of these were the Atrebatæ, in Berkshire; and still farther west were the Dobuni, in the counties of Oxford and Gloucester. . . . The interior of the island northward was occupied by the Brigantes, who held the extensive districts, difficult of approach on account of their mountains and woods, extending from the Humber and the Mersey to the present borders of Scotland. This extensive tribe appears to have included several smaller ones [the Voluntii, the Sestuntii, the Jugantes and the Cangi]. The Brigantes are believed to

have been the original inhabitants of the island, who had been driven northward by successive invasions. . . . Wales, also, was inhabited by a primitive population. The northern counties . . . was the territory of the Ordovices. The south-eastern counties . . . were held by the Demetæ. The still more celebrated tribe of the Silures inhabited the modern counties of Hereford, Radnor, Brecknock, Monmouth and Glamorgan. Between these and the Brigantes lay the Cornabii or Carnabil. The wilder parts of the island of Britain, to the north of the Brigantes, were inhabited by a great number of smaller tribes, some of whom seem to have been raised in the scale of civilization little above savages. Of these we have the names of no less than twenty-one. Bordering on the Brigantes were the Otadeni, inhabiting the coast from the Tyne to the Firth of Forth.

. . . Next to them were the Gadeni. . . . The Selgovæ inhabited Annandale, Nithsdale and Eskdale, in Dumfriesshire, with the East of Galloway. The Novantes inhabited the remainder of Galloway. The Damnii, a larger tribe, held the country from the chain of hills separating Galloway from Carrick, northward to the river Ern. These tribes lay to the south of the Forth and Clyde. Beyond the narrow boundary formed by these rivers lay [the Horestii, the Venricones or Veruicomes, the Taixali or Tuxali, the Vacomagi, the M'ani, the Cantæ, the Logi, the Carnabil, the Catini, the Mertæ, the Carnonnce, the Creones, the Cerones, and the Epidii]. The ferocious tribe of the Atacotti inhabited part of Argyleshire, and the greater part of Dumbartonshire. The wild forest country of the interior, known as the Caledonia Sylva (or Forest of Celdvdon), extended from the ridge of mountains between Inverness and Perth, northward to the forest of Balmagowan, including the middle parts of Inverness and Ross, was held by the Caledonii, which appears to have been at this time [of the conquests of Agricola] the most important and powerful of all the tribes north of the Brigantes."

—T. Wright, *The Celt, the Roman and the Saxon*, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: J. Rhys, *Celtic Britain*.—J. F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, bk. 1, ch. 2.

**B. C. 55-54.—Cæsar's invasions.**—Having extended his conquests in Gaul to the British Channel and the Strait of Dover (see GAUL: B. C. 58-51), Cæsar crossed the latter, in August, B. C. 55, and made his first landing in Britain, with two legions, numbering 8,000 to 10,000 men. Portus Itius, from which he sailed, was probably either Wissant or Boulogne, and his landing place on the British coast is believed to have been near Deal. The Britons disputed his landing with great obstinacy, but were driven back, and offered to submit; but when a few days afterwards, Cæsar's fleet suffered greatly from a storm, they reconsidered their submission and opened hostilities again. Routed in a second battle, they once more sued for peace, and gave hostages; whereupon Cæsar reembarked his troops and returned to the continent, having remained in Britain not more than three weeks and penetrated the island a short distance only. The following summer he crossed to Britain again, determined on making a thorough conquest of the country. This time he had five legions at his back, with two thousand horse, and the expedition was embarked on more than eight hundred ships. He sailed from and landed

at the same points as before. Having established and garrisoned a fortified camp, he advanced into the country, encountering and defeating the Britons, first, at a river, supposed to be the Stour which flows past Canterbury. A storm which damaged his fleet then interrupted his advance, compelling him to return to the coast. When the disaster had been repaired he marched again, and again found the enemy on the Stour, assembled under the command of Cassivelaunus, whose kingdom was north of the Thames. He dispersed them, after much fighting, with great slaughter, and crossed the Thames, at a point, it is supposed, near the junction of the Wey. Thence he pushed on until he reached the "oppidum" or stronghold of Cassivelaunus, which is believed by some to have been on the site of the modern town of St. Albans,—but the point is a disputed one. On receiving the submission of Cassivelaunus, and of other chiefs, or kings, fixing the tribute they should pay and taking hostages, Cæsar returned to the coast, reembarked his army and withdrew. His stay in Britain on this occasion was about sixty days.—Cæsar, *Gallie War*, bk. 4, ch. 20-36, and bk. 7, ch. 7-33.

ALSO IN: H. M. Scarth, *Roman Britain*, ch. 2.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, s. 4, ch. 9 and 11-12.—T. Lewin, *Invasion of Britain by Cæsar*.—F. T. Vine, *Cæsar in Kent*.—E. Guest, *Origines Celtice*, v. 2.

**A. D. 43-53.—Conquests of Claudius.**—Nearly a hundred years passed after Cæsar's hasty invasion of Britain before the Romans reappeared on the island, to enforce their claim of tribute. It was under the fourth of the imperial successors of Julius Cæsar, the feeble Claudius, that the work of Roman conquest in Britain was really begun. Aulus Plautius, who commanded in Gaul, was sent over with four legions, A. D. 43, to obtain a footing and to smooth the way for the Emperor's personal campaign. With him went one, Vespasian, who began in Britain to win the fame which pushed him into the imperial seat and to a great place in Roman history. Plautius and Vespasian made good their occupation of the country as far as the Thames, and planted their forces strongly on the northern bank of that river, before they summoned the Emperor to their aid. Claudius came before the close of the military season, and his vanity was gratified by the nominal leading of an advance on the chief oppidum, or stronghold of the Britons, called Camulodunum, which occupied the site of the modern city of Colchester. The Trinobantes, whose capital it was, were beaten, and the place surrendered. Satisfied with this easy victory, the Emperor returned to Rome, to enjoy the honors of a triumph; while Vespasian, in command of the second legion, fought his way, foot by foot, into the southwest of the island, and subjugated the obstinate tribes of that region. During the next ten years, under the command of Ostorius Scapula, who succeeded Plautius, and Avitus Didius Gallus, who succeeded Ostorius, the Roman power was firmly settled in southern Britain, from the Stour, at the East, to the Exe and the Severn at the West. The Silures, of South Wales, who had resisted most stubbornly, under Caractacus, the fugitive Trinobantine prince, were subdued and Caractacus made captive. The Iceni (in Suffolk, Norfolk and Cambridge-

shire) were reduced from allies to sullen dependents. The Brigantes, most powerful of all the tribes, and who held the greater part of the whole north of modern England, were still independent, but distracted by internal dissensions which Roman influence was active in keeping alive. This, stated briefly, was the extent to which the conquest of Britain was carried during the reign of Claudius,—between A. D. 43 and 54.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 51.

ALSO IN: E. Guest, *Origines Celticae*, v. 2, pt. 2, ch. 13.—H. M. Searth, *Roman Britain*, ch. 4.—See, also, COLCHESTER, ORIGIN OF.

**A. D. 61.—Campaigns of Suetonius Paulinus.**—From A. D. 50 to 61, while Didius Gallus and his successor Veranus commanded in Britain, nothing was done to extend the Roman acquisitions. In the latter year, Suetonius Paulinus came to the command, and a stormy period of war ensued. His first movement was to attack the Druids in the isle of Mona, or Anglesey, into which they had retreated from Gaul and Britain, in successive flights, before the implacable hostility of Rome. "In this gloomy hair, secure apparently, though shorn of might and dignity, they still persisted in the practice of their unholy superstition. . . . Here they retained their assemblies, their schools, and their oracles; here was the asylum of the fugitives; here was the sacred grove, the abode of the awful deity, which in the stillest noon of night or day the priest himself scarce ventured to enter lest he should rush unwittingly into the presence of its lord." From Segontium (modern Caernarvon) Suetonius crossed the Menai Strait on rafts and boats with one of his legions, the Batavian cavalry swimming their horses. The landing was fiercely disputed by women and men, priests and worshippers; but Roman valor bore down all resistance. "From this moment the Druids disappear from the page of history; they were exterminated, we may believe, upon their own altars; for Suetonius took no half measures." This accomplished, the Roman commander was quickly called upon to meet a terrific outburst of patriotic rage on the part of the powerful nation of the Iceni, who occupied the region now forming the counties of Suffolk, Norfolk, Cambridge, and Huntingdon. They had been allies of the Romans, first; then tributaries, under their own king, and finally subjects, much oppressed. Their last king, Prasutagus, had vainly hoped to win favor for his wife and children, when he died, by bequeathing his kingdom to the Roman State. But the widowed queen, Bonduca, or Boadicea, and her daughters, were only exposed with more helplessness to the insolence and the outrages of a brutal Roman officer. They appealed to their people and maddened them by the exposure of indescribable wrongs. The rising which ensued was fierce and general beyond precedent. "The Roman officials fled, or, if arrested, were slaughtered; and a vast multitude, armed and unarmed, rolled southward to overwhelm and extirpate the intruders. To the Colne, to the Thames, to the sea, the country lay entirely open." The colony at Camulodunum (Colchester), was destroyed; Verulamium (St. Albans), and Londinium (London), were sacked and burned; not less than 70,000 of the Romans in Britain were slaughtered without mercy. Suetonius made

haste to quit Anglesey when the dreadful news reached him, and pressed, with all speed, along the great highway of Watling Street—gathering up his forces in hand as he went—to reach the awful scene of rage and terror. He had collected but 10,000 men when he confronted, at last, the vast swarm of the insurgents, on a favorable piece of ground that he had secured, in the neighborhood of Camulodunum. But, once more, the valor of undisciplined semi-barbarism wrecked itself on the firm shields of the Roman cohorts, and 80,000 Britons are said to have fallen in the merciless fight. The insurrection was crushed and Roman authority in Britain re-affirmed. But the grim Suetonius dealt so harshly with the broken people that even Rome remonstrated, and he was, presently, recalled, to give place to a more pacific commander.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 51.

ALSO IN: H. M. Searth, *Roman Britain*, ch. 5.—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 8, ch. 5.

**A. D. 78-84.—Campaigns of Agricola.**—For seventeen years after the recall of Suetonius Paulinus (A. D. 61) there was a suspension of Roman conquest in Britain. The military power in the island suffered great demoralization, resulting naturally from the chaos of affairs at Rome, between Nero and Vespasian. These conditions ceased soon after the accession of the Flavian Emperor, and he, who had attained first in Britain the footing from which he climbed to the throne, interested himself in the spreading of his sovereignty over the whole of the British island. C. Julius Agricola was the soldier and statesman—a great man in each character—whom he selected for the work. Agricola was made prefect or Governor of Britain, A. D. 78. "Even in his first summer, when he had been but a few months in the island, and when none even of his own officers expected active service, Agricola led his forces into the country of the Ordovices, in whose mountain passes the war of independence still lingered, drove the Britons across the Menai Straits and pursued them into Anglesey, as Suetonius had done before him, by boldly crossing the boiling current in the face of the enemy. Another summer saw him advance northward into the territory of the Brigantes, and complete the organization of the district, lately reduced, between the Humber and Tyne. Struck perhaps with the natural defences of the line from the Tyne to the Solway, where the island seems to have broken, as it were, in the middle and soldered unevenly together, he drew a chain of forts from sea to sea. . . . In the third year of his command, Agricola pushed forward along the eastern coast, and, making good with roads and fortresses every inch of his progress, reached, as I imagine, the Firth of Forth. . . . Here he repeated the operations of the preceding winter, planting his camps and stations from hill to hill, and securing a new belt of territory, ninety miles across, for Roman occupation." The next two years were spent in strengthening his position and organizing his conquest. In A. D. 83 and 84 he advanced beyond the Forth, in two campaigns of hard fighting, the latter of which was made memorable by the famous battle of the Grampians, or Graupius, fought with the Caledonian hero Galgacus. At the close of this campaign he sent his fleet northward to explore the unknown coast and to awe the remoter tribes, and it is

claimed that the vessels of Agricola circumnavigated the island of Britain, for the first time, and saw the Orkneys and Shetlands. The further plans of the successful prefect were interrupted by his sudden recall. Vespasian, first, then Titus, had died while he pursued his victorious course in Caledonia, and the mean Domitian was envious and afraid of his renown.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 61.

ALSO IN: Tacitus, *Agricola*.—Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 8, ch. 5.

**2d-3d Centuries.**—Introduction of Christianity. See CHRISTIANITY: A. D. 100-312.

**A. D. 208-211.**—Campaigns of Severus.—A fresh inroad of the wild Caledonians of the north upon Roman Britain, in the year 208, caused the Emperor Severus to visit the distant island in person, with his two worthless sons, Caracalla and Geta. He desired, it is said, to remove these troublesome youths from Rome and to subject them to the wholesome discipline of military life. The only result, so far as they were concerned, was to give Caracalla opportunities for exciting mutiny among the troops and for making several attempts against his father's life. But Severus persisted in his residence in Britain during more than two years, and till his death, which occurred at Eboracum (York) on the 4th of February, A. D. 211. During that time he prosecuted the war against the Caledonians with great vigor, penetrating to the northern extremity of the island, and losing, it is said, above 50,000 men, more by the hardships of the climate and the march than by the attacks of the skulking enemy. The Caledonians made a pretence of submission, at last, but were soon in arms again. Severus was then preparing to pursue them to extermination, when he died.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 6.

ALSO IN: T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 8, ch. 5.

**A. D. 288-297.**—Rebellion of Carausius.—“During the reign of Gallienus [A. D. 260-268] . . . the pirate fleets of the Franks infested the British seas, and it became needful to have a fleet to protect the coast. The command of this fleet had been conferred on Carausius, a Menapian by birth; but he was suspected of conniving at piracy, in order that he might enrich himself by becoming a sharer in their booty, when they returned laden with plunder. To save himself, therefore, from punishment, he usurped the imperial power, A. D. 288, and reigned over Britain for seven years. A vast number of his coins struck in Britain have been preserved, so many that the history of Carausius has been written from his medals. He was slain at length by his minister Allectus, who usurped his power. The Franks [as allies of Allectus] had well-nigh established their power over the south portion of Britain when it was broken by Constantius, the father of Constantine the Great, who defeated Allectus in a decisive battle, in which that usurper was slain. . . . Allectus held the government of Britain for three years. Many of his coins are found.”—H. M. Search, *Ro. in Britain*, ch. 10.

ALSO IN: T. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon*, ch. 4.

**A. D. 323-337.**—Constantine's Organization.—Under the scheme of government designed by Diocletian and amended by Constantine, “Britain

formed part of a vast pro-consulate, extending from Mount Atlas to the Caledonian deserts, and was governed by the Gallic prefect, through a ‘vicar’ or deputy at York. The island was divided into five new provinces. . . . Britain was under the orders of the Count of Britain, assisted by the subordinate officers. The Duke of Britain commanded in the north. The Count of the Saxon Shore, governed the ‘Maritime Tract’ and provided for the defence of the south-eastern coast. The Saxon Shore on the coast of Britain must not be mistaken for the Saxon Shore on the opposite coast of France, the headquarters of which were the harbour of Boulogne. The names of the several provinces into which Britain was divided are given in the ‘Notitia,’ viz:—1. Britannia Prima, which included all the south and west of England, from the estuary of the Thames to that of the Severn. 2. Britannia Secunda, which included the Principality of Wales, bounded by the Severn on the east and the Irish Channel on the west. 3. Flavia Cesariensis,—all the middle portion of Britain, from the Thames to the Humber and the estuary of the Dee. 4. Maxima Cesariensis,—the Brigantian territory, lying between the estuaries of the Humber and Dee, the Barrier of the Lower Isthmus. 5. Valentia,—the most northern portion, lying between the barrier of Hadrian and that of Antoninus.”—H. M. Search, *Roman Britain*, ch. 10.

**A. D. 367-370.**—Deliverance by Theodosius.—The distracted condition of affairs in the Roman Empire that soon followed the death of Constantine, which was relieved by Julian for a brief term, and which became worse at his death, proved especially ruinous to Roman Britain. The savage tribes of Caledonia—the Picts, now beginning to be associated with the Scots from Ireland—became bolder from year to year in their incursions, until they marched across the whole extent of Britain. “Their path was marked by cruelties so atrocious, that it was believed at the time and recorded by St. Jerome that they lived on human flesh. London, even, was threatened by them, and the whole island, which, like all the other provinces of the Empire, had lost every spark of military virtue, was incapable of opposing any resistance to them. Theodosius, a Spanish officer, and father of the great man of the same name who was afterwards associated in the Empire, was charged by Valentinian with the defence of Britain. He forced the Scots to fall back (A. D. 367-370), but without having been able to bring them to an engagement.”—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 5.—“The splendour of the cities and the security of the fortifications were diligently restored by the paternal care of Theodosius, who with a strong hand confined the trembling Caledonians to the northern angle of the island, and perpetuated, by the name and settlement of the new province of Valentia, the glories of the reign of Valentinian.”—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 25.

**A. D. 383-388.**—Revolt of Maximus.—In 383, four years after Theodosius the Great had been associated in the Roman sovereignty by the young Emperor Gratian, and placed on the throne of the East, the generous Gratian lost his own throne, and his life, through a revolt that was organized in Britain. “One Maximus, a Spaniard by birth, occupying a high official position

in that province, forced on step by step into insurrection, by a soldiery and a people of whom he appears to have been the idol, raised the standard of revolt in the island, and passed over into Gaul, attended by a large multitude, — 130,000 men and 70,000 women, says Zosimus, the Byzantine historian. This colony, settling in the Armorican peninsula, gave it the name of Brittany, which it has since retained. The rebel forces were soon victorious over the two Emperors who had agreed to share the Roman throne [Gratian and his boy-brother Valentinian who divided the sovereignty of the West between them, while Theodosius ruled the East]. Gratian they slew at Lyons; Valentinian they speedily expelled from Italy. . . . Theodosius adopted the cause of his brother Emperor" and overthrew Maximus (see *ROME: A. D. 379-395*).

—J. G. Sheppard, *Fall of Rome, lect. 5*.  
 ALSO IN: E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch. 27*.

**A. D. 407.—The Usurpation of Constantine.**  
 —"The Roman soldiers in Britain, seeing that the Empire was falling to pieces under the feeble sway of Honorius, and fearing lest they, too, should soon be ousted from their dominion in the island (part of which was already known as the Saxon Shore) clothed three usurpers successively with the imperial purple [A. D. 407], falling, as far as social position was concerned, lower and lower in their choice each time. The last and least ephemeral of these rulers was a private soldier named Constantine, and chosen for no other reason but his name, which was accounted lucky, as having been already borne by a general who had been carried by a British army to supreme dominion."—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders, bk. 1, ch. 5*.—The usurper Constantine soon led his legions across the channel into Gaul, then ravaged by the Vandals, Sueves, Alans and Burgundians who passed the Rhine in 406. He was welcomed with joy by the unhappy people who found themselves abandoned to the barbarians. Some successes which the new Constantine had, in prudent encounters with detached parties of the German invaders, were greatly magnified, and gave prestige to his cause. He was still more successful, for a time, in buying the precarious friendship of some tribes of the enemy, and made, on the whole, a considerable show of dominion in Gaul during two or three years. The seat of his government was established at Arles, to which city the offices and court of the Roman Prefect of Gaul had retreated from Trèves in 402. With the help of a considerable army of barbarian auxiliaries (a curious mixture of Scots, Moors and Marcomanni) he extended his sovereignty over Spain. He even extorted from the pusillanimous court at Ravenna a recognition of his usurped royalty, and promised assistance to Honorius against the Goths. But the tide of fortune presently turned. The lieutenant of Constantine in Spain, Count Gerontius, became for some reason disaffected and crowned a new usurper, named Maximus. In support of the latter he attacked Constantine and shut him up in Arles. At the same time, the Emperor Honorius, at Ravenna, having made peace with the Goths, sent his general Constantius against the Gallo-British usurper. Constantius, approaching Arles, found it already besieged by Gerontius. The latter was abandoned by his troops, and fled, to be slain soon afterwards.

Arles capitulated to the representative of the great name which Honorius still bore, as titular Emperor of Rome. Constantine was sent to Ravenna, and put to death on the way (A. D. 411).—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch. 31*.

ALSO IN: P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul, bk. 3, ch. 10*.

**A. D. 410.—Abandoned by the Romans.**  
 —"Up to the moment . . . when the Imperial troops quitted Britain, we see them able easily to repel the attacks of its barbarous assailants. When a renewal of their inroads left Britain weak and exhausted at the accession of the Emperor Honorius, the Roman general Stilicho renewed the triumphs which Theodosius had won. The Pict was driven back afresh, the Saxon boats chased by his galleys as far as the Orkneys, and the Saxon Shore probably strengthened with fresh fortresses. But the campaign of Stilicho was the last triumph of the Empire in its western waters. The struggle Rome had waged so long drew in fact to its end; at the opening of the fifth century her resistance suddenly broke down; and the savage mass of barbarism with which she had battled broke in upon the Empire. . . . The strength of the Empire, broken everywhere by military revolts, was nowhere more broken than in Britain, where the two legions which remained quartered at Richborough and York set up more than once their chiefs as Emperors and followed them across the channel in a march upon Rome. The last of these pretenders, Constantine, crossed over to Gaul in 407 with the bulk of the soldiers quartered in Britain, and the province seems to have been left to its own defence; for it was no longer the legionaries, but 'the people of Britain' who, 'taking up arms,' repulsed a new onset of the barbarians. . . . They appealed to Honorius to accept their obedience, and replace the troops. But the legions of the Empire were needed to guard Rome itself; and in 410 a letter of the Emperor bade Britain provide for its own government and its own defence. Few statements are more false than those which picture the British provincials as cowards, or their struggle against the barbarian as a weak and unworthy one. Nowhere, in fact, through the whole circuit of the Roman world, was so long and so desperate a resistance offered to the assaults of the Empire. . . . For some thirty years after the withdrawal of the legions the free province maintained an equal struggle against her foes. Of these she probably counted the Saxons as still the least formidable. . . . It was with this view that Britain turned to what seemed the weakest of her assailants, and strove to find . . . troops whom she could use as mercenaries against the Pict."—J. R. Green, *The Making of England, int.*

ALSO IN: J. M. Lappenberg, *Hist. of Eng. under the Anglo-Saxon Kings, v. 1, pp. 57-66*.

**A. D. 446.—The last appeal to Rome.**  
 —"Yet once again a supplicating embassy was sent to the Roman general Ætius, during his third consulship, in the year 446. . . . Ætius was unable to help them."—J. M. Lappenberg, *Hist. of Eng. under the Anglo-Saxon Kings, p. 63*.—"The date of the letters of appeal is fixed by the form of their address: 'The groans of the Britons to Ætius for the third time Consul. The savages drive us to the sea and the sea casts us back upon the savages: so arise two kinds of

death, and we are either drowned or slaughtered.' The third Consulate of Aetius fell in A. D. 446, a year memorable in the West as the beginning of a profound calm which preceded the onslaught of Attila. The complaint of Britain was left no trace in the poems which celebrated the year of repose; and our Chronicles are at any rate wrong when they attribute its rejection to the stress of a war with the Huns. It is possible, indeed, that the appeal was never made, and that the whole story represents nothing but a rumour current in the days of Gildas among the British exiles in Armorica."—C. Elton, *Origins of English Hist.*, ch. 12.

**A. D. 449-633.—The Anglo-Saxon Conquest.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 449-473, to 547-633.

**6th Century.—The unsubdued Britons.**—"The Britons were soon restricted to the western parts of the island, where they maintained themselves in several small states, of which those lying to the east yielded more and more to Germanic influence; the others protected by their mountains, preserved for a considerable time a gradually decreasing independence. . . . In the south-west we meet with the powerful territory of Damnonia, the kingdom of Arthur, which bore also the name of West Wales. Damnonia, at a later period, was limited to Dyvnaint, or Devonshire, by the separation of Cernau, or Cornwall. The districts called by the Saxons those of the Sumorsetas, of the Thornsetas (Dorsetshire), and the Wiltsetas were lost to the kings of Dyvnaint at an early period; though for centuries afterwards a large British population maintained itself in those parts among the Saxon settlers, as well as among the Defnsetas, long after the Saxon conquest of Dyvnaint, who for a considerable time preserved to the natives of that shire the appellation of the 'Welsh kind.' Cambria (Cymru), the country which at the present day we call Wales, was divided into several states." The chief of these early states was Venedotia (Gwynedd), the king of which was supreme over the other states. Among these latter were Dimetia (Dyfed), or West Wales; Powys, which was east of Gwynedd and Snowdon mountain; Gwent (Monmouthshire) or South-east Wales, the country of the Silures. "The usages and laws of the Cambrians were in all these states essentially the same. An invaluable and venerable monument of them, although of an age in which the Welsh had long been subject to the Anglo-Saxons, and had adopted many of their institutions and customs, are the laws of the king Howel Dda, who reigned in the early part of the 10th century. . . . The partition of Cambria into several small states is not, as has often been supposed, the consequence of a division made by king Rodri Mawr, or Roderic the Great, among his sons. . . . Of Dyfed, during the first centuries after the coming of the Saxons, we know very little; but with regard to Gwynedd, which was in constant warfare with Northumbria and Mercia, our information is less scanty: of Gwent, also, as the bulwark of Dimetia, frequent mention occurs. On the whole we are less in want of a mass of information respecting the Welsh, than of accuracy and precision in that which we possess. . . . An obscurity still more dense than that over Wales involves the district lying to the north of that country, comprised under the name of Cumbria [see CUMERIA AND STRATH-

CLYDE]."—I. M. Lappenberg, *Hist. of Eng. under the Anglo-Saxon Kings*, v. 1, p. 119-122.

**A. D. 635.—Defeat of the Welsh by the English of Bernicia.** See HEVENFIELD, BATTLE OF THE.

**BRITAIN, Great: Adoption of the name for the United Kingdoms of England and Scotland.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1707.

**BRITAIN, Roman Walls in.** See ROMAN WALLS IN BRITAIN.

**BRITANNIA, The Origin of the name.**—"Many are the speculations which have been started as to the etymology of the word Britannia, and among the later ones have been some of the most extraordinary. Yet surely it is not one of those philological difficulties which we need despair of solving. Few persons will question that the name Britannia is connected with the name B-ritanni, in the same way as Germania, Gallia, Græcia, &c., with Germani, Galli, Græci, &c., and it is not unreasonable to assume that Britanni was originally nothing more than the Latinized form of the Welsh word Brython, a name which we find given in the Triads to one of the three tribes who first colonized Britain. . . . From the Welsh 'brith' and Irish 'brit,' parti-coloured, may have come Brython, which on this hypothesis would signify the painted men. . . . As far then as philology is concerned, there seems to be no objection to our assuming Brython, and therefore also Britanni, to signify the painted men. How this Celtic name first came to denote the inhabitants of these islands is a question, the proper answer to which lies deeper than is generally supposed. . . . The 'Britannic Isles' is the oldest name we find given to these islands in the classical writers. Under this title Polybius (3. 57) refers to them in connection with the tin-trade, and the well-known work on the Kosmos (c. 3) mentions 'The Britannic Isles, Albion and Ierne.' . . . But in truth neither the authorship nor the age of this last-named work has been satisfactorily settled, and therefore we cannot assert that the phrase 'The Britannic Isles' came into use before the second century B. C. The name Britannia first occurs in the works of Cæsar and was not improbably invented by him."—E. Guest, *Origines Celticae*, v. 2, ch. 1.—The etymology contended for by Dr. Gnest is scouted by Mr. Rhys, on principles of Celtic phonology. He, on the contrary, traces relations between the name Brython and "the Welsh vocables 'brethyn,' cloth, and its congeners," and concludes that it signified "a clothed or cloth-clad people."—J. Rhys, *Celtic Britain*, ch. 6.

**BRITANNIA PRIMA AND SECUNDA.** See BRITAIN: A. D. 323-337.

**BRITISH COLUMBIA: Aboriginal inhabitants.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ATHAPASCAN FAMILY.

**A. C. 1858-1871.—Establishment of provincial government.—Union with the Dominion of Canada.**—"British Columbia, the largest of the Canadian provinces, cannot be said to have had any existence as a colony until 1858. Previous to that year provision had been made by a series of Acts for extending the Civil and Criminal Laws of the Courts of Lower and Upper Canada over territories not within any province, but otherwise the territory was used as a hunting ground of the Hudson's Bay Company. The

disputes and difficulties that arose from the influx of miners owing to the gold discoveries in 1856, resulted in the revocation of the licence of the Hudson's Bay Company, and the passing of the Imperial Act 21 & 23 Vic., c. 99, to provide for the government of British Columbia. . . . Sir James Douglas was appointed Governor and by his commission he was authorised to make laws, institutions and ordinances for the peace, order and good government of British Columbia, by proclamation issued under the public seal of the colony. . . . The Governor continued to legislate by proclamation until 1864, when his proclamations gave way to Ordinances passed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Legislative Council. . . . Up to this time the Governor of British Columbia was also Governor of the neighbouring island of Vancouver. Vancouver's Island is historically an older colony than British Columbia. Though discovered in 1592 it remained practically unknown to Europeans for two centuries, and it was not until 1849, when the island was granted to the Hudson's Bay Company, that a Governor was appointed. . . . In 1865 the legislature of the island adopted a series of resolutions in favour of union with British Columbia, and by the Imperial Act 29 & 30 Vic. (I), c. 67, the two colonies were united. . . . By an Order in Council dated the 16th day of May, 1871, British Columbia was declared to be a province of the Dominion [see CANADA: A. D. 1867, and 1869-1873] from the 20th of July, 1871."—J. E. C. Munro, *The Constitution of Canada*, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, v. 27: *British Columbia*.

A. D. 1872.—Settlement of the San Juan Water Boundary Dispute. See SAN JUAN or NORTHWESTERN WATER BOUNDARY QUESTION.

BRITISH EAST AFRICA AND SOUTH AFRICA COMPANIES. See AFRICA: A. D. 1884-1889.

BRITISH HONDURAS. See CENTRAL AMERICA: A. D. 1821-1871.

BRITONS, OR BRITHONS. See CELTS; also, BRITANNIA; and BRITAIN: 6TH CENTURY.

BRITONS OF CUMBRIA AND STRATHCLYDE. See CUMBRIA.

BRITANNY, OR BRITANNY: In the Roman period. See ARMORICA; also, VENETI of WESTERN GAUL.

A. D. 383.—Alleged origin of the British settlement and name. See BRITAIN: A. D. 383-388.

A. D. 409.—Independence asserted.—At the time that the British island practically severed its connection with the expiring Roman Empire (about 409) the Britons of the continent,—of the Armorican province, or modern Brittany,—followed the example. "They expelled the Roman magistrates, who acted under the authority of the usurper Constantine; and a free government was established among a people who had so long been subject to the arbitrary will of a master."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 31.—"From this time, perhaps, we ought to date that isolation of Brittany from the politics of the rest of France which has not entirely disappeared even at the present day."—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders*, bk. 2, ch. 3.—The Armoricians, however, were found fighting by the side of the Romans

and the Goths, against the Huns, on the great day at Chalons. See HUNS: A. D. 451.

A. D. 818-912.—The Breyzad Kingdom.—Subjection to the Norman Dukes.—"Charlemagne's supremacy over the Armoricians may be compared to the dominion exercised by Imperial Russia amongst the Caucasian tribes—periods during which the vassals dare not claim the rights of independence, intercalated amongst the converse periods when the Emperor cannot assert the rights of authority; yet the Frank would not abandon the prerogative of the Caesars, whilst the mutual antipathy between the races inflamed the desire of dominion on the one part, and the determination of resistance on the other. Brittany is divided into Bretagne Bretonnante and Bretagne Gallieante, according to the predominance of the Breyzad and the Romane languages respectively. The latter constituted the march-lands, and here the Counts-marchers were placed by Charlemagne and his successors, Franks mostly by lineage; yet one Breyzad, Nominot, was trusted by Louis-le-débonnaire [A. D. 818] with a delegated authority. Nominot deserved his power; he was one of the new men of the era, literally taken from the plough. . . . The dissensions among the Franks enabled Nominot to increase his authority. Could there be any adversary of the Empire so stupid as not to profit by the battle of Fontenay. . . . Nominot assumed the royal title, vindicated the independence of his ancient people, and enabled them, in the time of Rollo, to assert with incorrect grandiloquence, pardonable in political argument, that the Frank had never reigned within the proper Armorican boundaries." Nominot transmitted his crown to his son Herispot; but the latter reigned briefly, succumbing to a conspiracy which raised his nephew, Solomon, to the throne. Solomon was a vigorous warrior, sometimes fighting the Franks, and sometimes struggling with the Normans, who pressed hard upon his small kingdom. He extended his dominions considerably, in Maine, Anjou, and the future Normandy, and his royal title was sanctioned by Charles the Bald. But he, too, was conspired against, blinded and dethroned, dying in prison; and, about 912, the second duke of Normandy established his lordship over the distracted country. "Historical Brittany settled into four great counties, which also absorbed the Carolingian march-lands, Rennes, Nantes, Vannes and Cornouailles, rivalling and jealous, snarling and warring against each other for the royal or ducal dignity, until the supremacy was permanently established in Alan Fergant's line, the ally, the opponent, the son-in-law of William the Bastard. But the suzerainty or superiority of 211 Brittany was vested in the Conqueror's and the Plantagenet's lineage, till the forfeiture incurred by King John—an unjust exercise of justice."—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and England*, bk. 1, ch. 3.

A. D. 992-1237.—The First Dukes.—"After the death of Solomon . . . all these districts or territories merged in the three dominations of Nantes, Rennes, and Cornouaille. Amongst the Celts concord was impossible. In early times Noracnoe, the Ruler of Cornouaille, had assumed, by Papal authority, the royal style, but the Counts of Rennes acquired the pre-eminence over the other chief-tains. Regality vanished. Geoffrey, son of Conan [A. D. 992-1008] . . . must

be distinguished as the first Duke of Brittany. He constituted himself Duke simply by taking the title. This assumption may possibly have been sanctioned by the successor of Saint Peter; and, by degrees, his rank in the civil hierarchy became ultimately recognized. . . . The Counts of Brittany, and the Dukes in like manner, in later times, rendered homage 'en parage' to Normandy in the first instance, and that same homage was afterwards demanded by the crown of France. But the Capetian monarchs refused to acknowledge the 'Duke,' until the time of Peter Mauclerc, son of Robert, Count of Dreux, Earl of Richmond [A. D. 1213-1237].—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and Eng.*, v. 3, p. 165.

**A. D. 1341-1365.**—The long Civil War.—Montfort against Blois.—Almost simultaneously with the beginning of the Hundred Years War of the English kings in France, there broke out a malignant and destructive civil war in Brittany, which French and English took part in, on the opposing sides. "John III. duke of that province, had died without issue, and two rivals disputed his inheritance. The one was Charles de Blois, husband of one of his nieces and nephew of the King of France; the other, Montfort, . . . younger brother of the last duke and . . . disinherited by him. The Court of Peers, devoted to the king, adjudged the duchy to Charles de Blois, his nephew. Montfort immediately made himself master of the strongest places, and rendered homage for Brittany to king Edward [III. of England], whose assistance he implored. This war, in which Charles de Blois was supported by France and Montfort by England, lasted twenty-four years without interruption, and presented, in the midst of heroic actions, a long course of treacheries and atrocious robberies." The war was ended in 1365 by the battle of Auray, in which Charles de Blois was slain, and Bertrand Du Guesclin, the famous Breton warrior, was taken prisoner. This was soon followed by the treaty of Guérande, which established Montfort in the duchy.—E. De Bonnehose, *Hist. of France*, v. 1, bk. 2, ch. 2 and 4.

ALSO IN: Froissart (Johnes), *Chronicles*, bk. 1, ch. 64-227.

**A. D. 1491.**—Joined by marriage to the French crown.—The family of Montfort, having been established in the duchy of Brittany by the arms of the English, were naturally inclined to English connections; "but the Bretons would seldom permit them to be effectual. Two cardinal feelings guided the conduct of this brave and faithful people; the one an attachment to the French nation and monarchy in opposition to foreign enemies; the other, a zeal for their own privileges, and the family of Montfort, in opposition to the encroachments of the crown. In Francis II., the present duke [at the time of the accession of Charles VIII. of France, A. D. 1483], the male line of that family was about to be extinguished. His daughter Anne was naturally the object of many suitors, among whom were particularly distinguished the duke of Orleans, who seems to have been preferred by herself; the lord of Albret, a member of the Gascon family of Foix, favoured by the Breton nobility, as most likely to preserve the peace and liberties of their country, but whose age rendered him not very acceptable to a youthful princess; and Maximilian, king of the Romans [whose first wife, Mary of Burgundy, died in 1482]. Britany

was rent by factions and overrun by the armies of the regent of France, who did not lose this opportunity of interfering with its domestic troubles, and of persecuting her private enemy, the duke of Orleans. Anne of Britany, upon her father's death, finding no other means of escaping the addresses of Albret, was married by proxy to Maximilian. This, however, aggravated the evils of the country, since France was resolved at all events to break off so dangerous a connexion. And as Maximilian himself was unable, or took not sufficient pains to relieve his betrothed wife from her embarrassments, she was ultimately compelled to accept the hand of Charles VIII. He had long been engaged by the treaty of Arras to marry the daughter of Maximilian, and that princess was educated at the French court. But this engagement had not prevented several years of hostilities, and continual intrigues with the towns of Flanders against Maximilian. The double injury which the latter sustained in the marriage of Charles with the heiress of Britany seemed likely to excite a protracted contest; but the king of France, who had other objects in view, and perhaps was conscious that he had not acted a fair part, soon came to an accommodation, by which he restored Artois and Franche-comté. . . . France was now consolidated into a great kingdom: the feudal system was at an end."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 1, pt. 2.—In the contract of marriage between Charles VIII. and Anne of Britany, "each party surrendered all separate pretensions upon the Duchy, and one stipulation alone was considered requisite to secure the perpetual union of Britany with France, namely, that in case the queen should survive her consort, she should not remarry unless either with the future king, or, if that were not possible, with the presumptive heir of the crown."—E. Smedley, *Hist. of France*, pt. 1, ch. 18.

ALSO IN: F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 26.

**A. D. 1532.**—Final reunion with the crown of France.—"Duprat [chancellor of Francis I. of France], whose administration was . . . shameful, promoted one measure of high utility. Francis I. until then had governed Britany only in the quality of duke of that province; Duprat counselled him to unite this duchy in an indissoluble manner with the crown, and he prevailed upon the States of Britany themselves to request this reunion, which alone was capable of preventing the breaking out of civil wars at the death of the king. It was irrevocably voted by the States assembled at Vannes in 1532. The king swore to respect the rights of Britany, and not to raise any subsidy therein without the consent of the States Provincial."—E. de Bonnehose, *Hist. of France*, bk. 1, ch. 2.

**A. D. 1793.**—Resistance to the French Revolution.—The Vendean War. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (MARCH—APRIL); (JUNE); (JULY—DECEMBER).

**A. D. 1794-1796.**—The Chouans. See FRANCE: A. D. 1794-1796.

**BRIGHAM CAVE.**—A cavern near Brigham, Devonshire, England, in which noted evidences of a very early race of men, contemporaneous with certain extinct animals, have been found.—J. Geikie, *Prehistoric Europe*.

ALSO IN: W. B. Dawkins, *Cave Hunting*.



**BROAD-BOTTOMED ADMINISTRATION**, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1742-1745.  
**BROAD CHURCH**, The. See OXFORD OR TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT.

**BROCK, General Isaac, and the War of 1812**. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812 (JUNE—OCTOBER), (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER).

**BROMSEBRO, Peace of (1645)**. See GERMANY: A. D. 1640-1645.

**BRONKHORST SPRUIT, Battle of (1880)**. See SOUTH AFRICA: A. D. 1806-1880.

**BRONZE AGE**. See STONE AGE.

**BROOKLYN, N. Y.: A. D. 1624**.—The first settlers.—“A few families of Walloons, in 1624, built their cottages on Long Island, and began the cultivation of the lands they had secured, the women working in the fields, while the men were engaged in the service of the company [the Dutch West India Company, controlling the colony of New Netherland]. These were the first settlers of Brooklyn. They were joined in time by a few others, until there were enough to be incorporated as a village. The numbers were not large, for Brooklyn, nearly forty years afterward, contained only ‘31 households and 134 souls.’”—G. W. Schuyler, *Colonial New York*, v. 1, p. 27.

**A. D. 1646**.—The town named and organized.—“The occupation of land within the limits of the present city of Brooklyn . . . had steadily progressed, until now (1646) nearly the whole water-front, from Newtown Creek to the southerly side of Gowanus Bay, was in the possession of individuals who were engaged in its actual cultivation. . . . The village . . . which was located on the present Fulton Avenue, in the vicinity of the junction of Hoyt and Smith streets with said avenue, and southeast of the present City Hall, was called Breuckelen, after the ancient village of the same name in Holland, some 18 miles from Amsterdam.” The town of Breuckelen was organized under a commission from the Colonial Council in 1646, and two schepens appointed. The following winter Jan Tenmissen was commissioned as schout.—H. R. Stiles, *Hist. of Brooklyn*, ch. 1.

**A. D. 1776**.—The Battle of Long Island and defeat of the Americans. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776 (AUGUST).

**BROTHERS**.—**BROTHERHOODS**. See BRETHREN.

**BROTHERS' CLUB**, The. See CLUBS.

**BROWN, George, and the Canadian “Clear Grits.”** See CANADA: A. D. 1840-1867.

**BROWN, General Jacob, and the War of 1812**. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812 (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER); 1813 (OCTOBER—NOVEMBER); 1814 (JULY—SEPTEMBER).

**BROWN, John**.—Attack on Harper's Ferry.—Trial and execution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1850.

**BROWNISTS**. See INDEPENDENTS.

**BROWNLOW, Parson, and the reconstruction of Tennessee**. See TENNESSEE: A. D. 1865-1860.

**BRUCE, Robert, King of Scotland**, A. D. 1306-1329.

**BRUCHIUM**, The. See ALEXANDRIA: B. C. 282-246, and A. D. 273.

**BRUCTERI**, The.—“After the Teneteri [on the Rhine] came, in former days, the Bructeri; but the general account now is, that the Cham-

avi and Angrivaril entered their settlements, drove them out and utterly exterminated them with the common help of the neighbouring tribes, either from hatred of their tyranny, or from the attractions of plunder, or from heaven's favourable regard for us. It did not even grieve us the spectacle of the conflict. More than 60,000 fell, not beneath the Roman arms and weapons, but, grander far, before our delighted eyes.”—“The original settlements of the Bructeri, from which they were driven by the Chamavi and Angrivaril, seem to have been between the Rhine and the Ems, on either side of the Lippe. Their destruction could hardly have been so complete as Tacitus represents, as they are subsequently mentioned by Claudian.”—Tacitus, *Minor works*, trans. by Church and Brodrick: *The Germany*, with geog. notes.—See, also, FRANKS.

**BRUGES: 13th Century**.—The Great Fair. See FLANDERS: 13TH CENTURY.

**A. D. 13th-15th Centuries**.—Commercial importance in the Hanseatic League. See HANSA TOWNS.

**A. D. 1302**.—Massacre of the French.—“The Bruges Matins.” See FLANDERS: A. D. 1299-1304.

**A. D. 1341**.—Made the Staple for English trade. See STAPLE.

**A. D. 1379-1381**.—Hostilities with Ghent. See FLANDERS: A. D. 1379-1381.

**A. D. 1382**.—Taken and plundered by the people of Ghent. See FLANDERS: A. D. 1382.

**A. D. 1482-1488**.—At war with Maximilian. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1482-1493.

**A. D. 1584**.—Submission to Philip of Spain. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1584-1585.

**A. D. 1745-1748**.—Taken by the French, and restored. See NETHERLANDS (AUSTRIAN PROVINCES): A. D. 1745; and AIX-LA-CHAPELLE: THE CONGRESS, &c.

**BRULÉ**, The. See AMERICAN ABOIGINOISES: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**BRUMAIRE**, The month. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (OCTOBER).

**BRUMAIRE**, The Eighteenth of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1799 (NOVEMBER).

**BRUNDISIUM: Origin**. See ROME: B. C. 292-275.

**B. C. 49**.—Flight of Pompeius before Cæsar. See ROME: B. C. 50-49.

**B. C. 40**.—The peace of Antony and Octavius.—The peace which Antony and Octavius were forced by their own soldiers to make at Brundisium, B. C. 40, postponed for ten years the final struggle between the two chief Triumvirs. For a much longer time it “did at least secure the repose of Italy. For a period of three hundred and fifty years, except one day's fighting in the streets of Rome, from Rhetium to the Rubicon no swords were again crossed in war.”—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 27.—See, also, ROME: B. C. 31.

**BRUNKEBURG, Battle of the (1471)**. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1397-1527.

**BRUNNABURGH, OR BRUNANBURH, Battle of**. See ENGLAND: A. D. 938.

**BRUNSWICK**, The city of.—Origin and name.—In the tenth century, a prince named Bruno, younger son of the reigning duke of Bavaria, and grandson of the Emperor Henry the

Fowler, received as his patrimony the country about the Ocker. "Having fixed his residence at a village established by Charlemagne on the banks of that river, it became known as the 'Vicus Brunonis,' and, when enlarged and formed into a city, afterwards gave its name to the principality of which it formed the capital."—Sir A. Halliday, *Annals of the House of Hanover*, v. 1, bk. 4.

In the Hanseatic League. See HANSA TOWNS.

**BRUNSWICK-LÜNEBURG, OR HANOVER.** See HANOVER.

**BRUNSWICK-WOLFENBÜTTEL, OR BRUNSWICK:** Origin of the house and dukedom. See SAXONY: THE OLD DUCHY, and A. D. 1178-1183.

The Guelph connection. See GUELF AND GIBELINE, and ESTE, HOUSE OF.

A. D. 1543.—Expulsion of Duke Henry by the League of Smalcald. See GERMANY: A. D. 1533-1546.

A. D. 1546.—Final separation from the Lüneburg or Hanoverian branch of the house. See HANOVER: A. D. 1546.

A. D. 1806.—The Duke's dominions confiscated by Napoleon. See GERMANY: A. D. 1806 (OCTOBER-DECEMBER).

A. D. 1807.—Absorbed in the kingdom of Westphalia. See GERMANY: A. D. 1807 (JUNE-JULY).

A. D. 1830.—Deposition of the Duke. See GERMANY: A. D. 1819-1847.

**BRUSSELS:** A. D. 1577.—The Union of the patriots. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1573-1577.

A. D. 1585.—Surrender to the Spaniards. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1584-1585.

A. D. 1695.—Bombardment by the French. See FRANCE: A. D. 1695-1696.

A. D. 1706.—Taken by Marlborough and the Allies. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1706-1707.

A. D. 1746-1748.—Taken by the French and restored to Austria. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1746-1747, and AIX-LA-CHAPELLE: THE CONGRESS, &c.

A. D. 1815.—The Battle of Waterloo. See FRANCE: A. D. 1815 (JUNE).

A. D. 1830.—Riot and Revolution.—Dutch attack on the city repelled. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1830-1832.

**BRUTII, The.** See SAMNITES.

**BRUTUM FULMEN.**—A phrase, signifying a blind thrust, or a stupid and ineffectual blow, which was specially applied in a contemporary pamphlet by Francis Hotman to the Bull of excommunication issued by Pope Sixtus V. against Henry of Navarre, in 1585.—H. M. Baird, *The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre*, v. 1, p. 369. See FRANCE: A. D. 1584-1589.

**BRUTUS, Lucius Junius, and the expulsion of the Tarquins.** See ROME: B. C. 510.

**BRUTUS, Marcus Junius, and the assassination of Caesar.** See ROME: B. C. 44 to 44-42.

**BRYTHONS, The.** See CELTS, THE.

**BUBASTIS.**—"On the eastern side of the Delta [of the Nile], more than half-way from Memphis to Zoan, lay the great city of Pi-beseth, or Bubastis. Vast mounds now mark the site and preserve the name; deep in their midst lie the shattered fragments of the beautiful temple

which Herodotus saw, and to which in his days the Egyptians came annually in vast numbers to keep the greatest festival of the year, the Assembly of Bast, the goddess of the place. Here, after the Empire had fallen, Shishak [Sheshonk] set up his throne, and for a short space revived the imperial magnificence of Thebes."—R. S. Poole, *Cities of Egypt*, ch. 10.

**BUCCANEERS, The.** See AMERICA: A. D. 1639-1700.

**BUCENTAUR, The.** See VENICE: 14TH CENTURY.

**BUCHANAN, JAMES.**—Presidential election and administration. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1856 to 1861.

**BUCHAREST, Treaty of (1812).** See TURKS: A. D. 1789-1812; also BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES: 14TH-19TH CENTURIES (SERVIA).

**BUCKINGHAM, Assassination of.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1028.

**BUCKINGHAM PALACE.** See ST. JAMES, THE PALACE AND COURT OF.

**BUCKTAILS.** See NEW YORK: A. D. 1817-1819.

**BUDA:** A. D. 1526.—Taken and plundered by the Turks. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1487-1526.

A. D. 1529-1567.—Taken by the Turks.—Besieged by the Austrians.—Occupied by the Sultan.—Becomes the seat of a Pasha. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1520-1567.

A. D. 1686.—Recovery from the Turks. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1683-1687.

A. D. 1849.—Siege and capture by the Hungarians. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1848-1849.

**BUDA-PESTH:** A. D. 1872.—Union of the cities.—Buda, on the right bank of the Danube, and Pesth, on the left, were incorporated in 1873 into one city—Buda-Pesth.

**BUDDHISM.** See INDIA: B. C. 312—; also LAMAS, —LAMAISM; and CHINA: THE RELIGIONS.

**BUDGET, The.**—"The annual financial statement which the Chancellor of the Exchequer makes in the House of Commons in a Committee of ways and means. In making this statement the minister gives a view of the general financial policy of the government, and at the same time presents an estimate of the probable income and expenditure for the following twelve months, and a statement of what taxes it is intended to reduce or abolish, or what new ones it may be necessary to impose.—To open the budget, to lay before the legislative body the financial estimates and plans of the executive gov't."—*Imp. Dict.*—Mr. Dowell in his *History of Taxation* (v. 1, ch. 5) states that the phrase 'opening the Budget' came into use in England during the reign of George III., and that it bore a reference to the bougette, or little bag, in which the chancellor of the exchequer kept his papers. The French, he adds, adopted the term in the present century, about 1814. The following, however, is in disagreement with Mr. Dowell's explanation: "In the reign of George II. the word was used with conscious allusion to the celebrated pamphlet which ridiculed Sir R. Walpole as a conjuror opening his budget or 'bag of tricks.' Afterwards, it must, for a time, have been current as slang; but, as it supplied a want, it was soon taken up into the ordinary vocabulary."—*Athenaeum*, Feb. 14, 1891, p. 213.

**BUDINI, The.**—A nomadic tribe which Herodotus describes as incidentally inhabiting a region between the Ural Mountains and the Caspian Sea.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 17.

**BUELL, General Don Carlos, Campaigns of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (JULY—NOVEMBER); 1862 (JANUARY—FEBRUARY); KENTUCKY—TENNESSEE; (FEBRUARY—APRIL: TENNESSEE); (JUNE—OCTOBER: TENNESSEE—KENTUCKY).

**BUENA VISTA, Battle of.** See MEXICO: A. D. 1840-1847.

**BUENOS AYRES, Viceroyalty and Republic of.** See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC.

**BUENOS AYRES, The City of:** A. D. 1534.—First and unsuccessful founding of the city. See PARAGUAY: A. D. 1515-1557.

**BUFFALO, N. Y.: The aboriginal occupants of the site.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: IROQUOIS, &c.

A. D. 1764.—Cession of the Four Mile Strip by the Senecas. See PONTIAC'S WAR.

A. D. 1779.—The site occupied by the Senecas after Sullivan's Expedition. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1779 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1799.—The founding and naming of the city. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1786-1799.

A. D. 1812.—At the opening of the war. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812 (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER).

A. D. 1813.—Destruction by British and Indians. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1813 (DECEMBER).

A. D. 1825.—Opening of the Erie Canal. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1817-1825.

A. D. 1848.—The National Free-Soil Convention. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1848.

A. D. 1866.—The Fenian invasion of Canada. See CANADA: A. D. 1866-1871.

**BUFFALO HILL, Battles of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (AUGUST—DECEMBER: WEST VIRGINIA).

**BUFFINGTON FORD, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (JULY: KENTUCKY).

**BUGIA, Conquest by the Spaniards (1510).** See BAHARIY STATES: A. D. 1505-1510.

**BULGARIA.** See BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES.

**BULGARIANS, The religious Sectaries so called.** See PAULICIANS.

**BULL "Apostolicum," The.** See JESUITS: A. D. 1761-1769.

**BULL "Ausculta filii," The.** See PAPACY: A. D. 1294-1348.

**BULL "Clericis Laicos."**—Published by Pope Boniface VIII. Feb. 24, 1296, forbidding "the clergy to pay and the secular powers to exact, under penalty of excommunication, contributions or taxes, tenths, twentieths, hundredths, or the like, from the revenues or the goods of the churches or their ministers."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 14.

ALSO IN: E. F. Henderson, *Select Hist. Doc's of the Middle Ages*, bk. 4, no. 6.—See, also, PAPACY: A. D. 1294-1348.

**BULL "Dominus Redemptor noster."** See JESUITS: A. D. 1769-1871.

**BULL "Exurge Domine."** See PAPACY: A. D. 1517-1521.

**BULL, Golden.** See GOLDEN BULL, BYZANTINE; also GERMANY: A. D. 1317-1493, and HUNGARY: A. D. 1114-1301.

**BULL, "Laudabiliter," The.**—A papal bull promulgated in 1155 by Pope Adrian IV. (the one Englishman who ever attained to St. Peter's seat) assuming to bestow the kingdom of Ireland on the English King Henry II. See IRELAND: A. D. 1169-1175.

**BULL, "Salvator mundi," The.** See PAPACY: A. D. 1204-1348.

**BULL "Unigenitus," The.** See PORT ROYAL AND THE JANSENISTS: A. D. 1702-1715.

**BULL RUN, OR MANASSAS, First Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (JULY: VIRGINIA). . . . **Second Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER: VIRGINIA).

**BULLA, The.** See TOGA.

**BUMMERS, Sherman's.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (NOVEMBER—DECEMBER: GEORGIA).

**BUND, BUNDESRAH, BUNDESPRE-  
SIDENT, BUNDESGERICHT, The Swiss.** See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1848-1890.

**BUNDE-STAAT.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1814-1820.

**BUNDSCHUH INSURRECTIONS.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1492-1514.

**BUNKER HILL, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775 (JUNE).

**BURDIGALA.**—The original name of the modern city of Bordeaux, which was a town of the Gallie tribe called the Bituriges-Vivisci.—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 5, ch. 7.

**BURGAGE TENURE.** See FEUDAL TENURES.

**BURGESS.** See BOURGEOIS.

**BURGH, OR BURGI, OR BURH.** See BOROUGH.

**BURGOS, Battle of.** See SPAIN: A. D. 1808 (SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER).

**BURGOYNE, General John, and the War of the American Revolution.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775 (APRIL—MAY); 1777 (JULY—OCTOBER).

**BURGRAVES.** See PALATINE, COUNTS.

**BURGUNDIANS: Origin and early history.**—"About the middle of the fourth century, the countries, perhaps of Lusatia and Thuringia, on either side of the Elbe, were occupied by the vague dominion of the Burgundians—a warlike and numerous people of the Vandal race, whose obscure name insensibly swelled into a powerful kingdom, and has finally settled on a flourishing province. . . . The disputed possession of some salt-pits engaged the Alemanni and the Burgundians in frequent contests. The latter were easily tempted by the secret solicitations and liberal offers of the emperor [Valentinian, A. D. 371]; and their fabulous descent from the Roman soldiers who had formerly been left to garrison the fortresses of Drusus was admitted with mutual credulity, as it was conducive to mutual interest. An army of fourscore thousand Burgundians soon appeared on the banks of the Rhine, and impatiently required the support and subsidies which Valentinian had promised; but they were amused with excuses and delays, till at length, after a fruitless expectation, they were compelled to retire. The arms and fortifications of the Gallie frontier checked the fury of their just resentment."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*

of the Roman Empire, ch. 25.—“We first hear of them [the Burgundians] as a tribe of Teutonic stock, located between the Oder and the Vistula, on either bank of the river Warta. When the Gepidae descended southward with the Goths, the Burgundians were compelled to recoil before the advance of the former tribe: one portion of them took refuge in Bornholm, an island of the Baltic; the remainder turned westward, and made an attempt to enter Gaul. They were repulsed by Probus, but permitted to settle near the sources of the Main. Jovian showed them favour, and gave them lands in the Germania Secunda. This was in the latter part of the fourth century. Just at its close, they adopted Christianity, but under an Arian form. Ammianus tells us that they were a most warlike race.”—J. G. Sheppard, *The Fall of Rome*, lect. 8.—“The other Teutonic people had very little regard for the Burgundians; they accused them of having degenerated from the valor of their ancestors, by taking in petty towns (bourgades), whence their name Burgundii sprang; and they looked upon them as being more suitable for the professions of mechanics, smiths, and carpenters, than for a military life.”—J. C. L. de Sismond, *The French under the Merovingians*, ch. 8.—“A document of A. D. 786, in noticing the high tract of lands between Ellwangen and Anspach, has the following expression,—‘in Waldo, qui vocatur Virginnia.’ Grimm looks for the derivation of this word in the Mæso-Gothic word ‘fatrgund.’ Old High German ‘fergund’ = woody hill-range. . . . I have little doubt but that this is the name of the tract of land from which the name Burgundi arose; and that it is the one which fixes their locality. If so, between the Burgundian and Sævic Germans, the difference, such as it was, was probably almost wholly political.”—R. G. Latham, *The Germania of Tacitus; Epitomena*, sect. 12.

A. D. 406-409.—Invasion of Gaul. See GAUL: A. D. 406-409.

A. D. 443-451.—Their Savoyan kingdom.—“In the south-east of Gaul, the Burgundians had, after many wars and some reverses, established themselves (443) with the consent of the Romans in the district then called Sapaudia and now Savoy. Their territory was somewhat more extensive than the province which was the cradle of the present royal house of Italy, since it stretched northwards beyond the lake of Neufchatel and southwards as far as Grenoble. Here the Burgundian immigrants under their king Gundioch, were busy settling themselves in their new possession, cultivating the lands which they had divided by lot, each one receiving half the estate of a Roman host or ‘hospes’ (for under such gentle names the spoliation was veiled), when the news came that the terrible Hun had crossed the Rhine [A. D. 451], and that all hosts and guests in Gaul must unite for its defence.”—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders*, bk. 2, ch. 3.

A. D. 451.—At the battle of Chalons. See HUNS: A. D. 451.

A. D. 500.—Extension of their kingdom.—“Their [the Burgundians] domain, considerably more extensive than when we last viewed it on the eve of Attila’s invasion, now included the later provinces of Burgundy, Franche-Comté and Dauphiné, besides Savoy and the greater

part of Switzerland.—In fact the whole of the valleys of the Saône and the Rhone, save that for the last hundred miles of its course the Visigoths barred them from the right bank and from the mouths of the latter river.”—At the time now spoken of (A. D. 500), the Burgundian kingdom was divided between two brother-kings, Gundobad, reigning at Lyons and Vienne, and Godegisel at Geneva. Godegisel, the younger, had conspired with Clovis, the king of the Franks, against Gundobad, and in this year 500 the two confederates defeated the latter, at Dijon, driving him from the most part of his kingdom. But Gundobad presently recovered his footing, besieged and captured his treacherous brother at Vienne and promptly put him to death—thereby reuniting the kingdom.—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders*, bk. 4, ch. 9.

A. D. 534.—Final conquest by the Franks.—“I am impatient to pursue the final rubric of that kingdom [the Burgundian] which was accomplished under the reign of Sigismund, the son of Gundobad [or Gundobad]. The Catholic Sigismund has acquired the honours of a saint and martyr; but the hands of the royal saint were stained with the blood of his innocent son. . . . It was his humble prayer that Heaven would inflict in this world the punishment of his sins. His prayer was heard; the avengers were at hand; and the provinces of Burgundy were overwhelmed by an army of victorious Franks. After the event of an unsuccessful battle, Sigismund . . . with his wife and two children, was transported to Orleans and buried alive in a deep well by the stern command of the sons of Clovis, whose cruelty might derive some excuse from the maxims and examples of their barbarous age. . . . The rebellious Burgundians, for they attempted to break their chains, were still permitted to enjoy their national laws under the obligation of tribute and military service; and the Merovingian princes peaceably reigned over a kingdom whose glory and greatness had been first overthrown by the arms of Clovis.”—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 38.

ALSO IN: W. C. Perry, *The Franks*, ch. 3.

BURGUNDY: A. D. 534-752.—The Merovingian kingdom.—After the overthrow of the Burgundian monarchy by the sons of Clovis, the territory of the Burgundians, with part of the neighboring Frank territory added to it, became, under the name of Burgundia or Burgundy, one of the three Frank kingdoms (Austria and Neustria being the other two), into which the Merovingian princes divided their dominion. It occupied “the east of the country, between the Loire and the Alps, from Provence on the south to the hill-ranges of the Vosges on the north.”—P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul*, ch. 13.

A. D. 843-933.—Divisions of the early kingdom.—The later kingdoms of the south and the French dukedom of the northwest.—By the treaty of Verdun, A. D. 843, which formally divided the empire of Charlemagne between his three grandsons, a part of Burgundy was taken to form, with Italy and Lorraine, the kingdom of the Emperor Lothar, or Lothaire. In the further dissolutions which followed, a kingdom of Burgundy or Provence was founded in 877 by one Boso, a prince who had married Irmingard, daughter of the Emperor Louis II., son of

Lothaire. It "included Provence, Dauphiné, the southern part of Savoy, and the country between the Saone and the Jura," and is sometimes called the kingdom of Cis-Jurane Burgundy. "The kingdom of Trans-Jurane Burgundy, . . . founded by Rudolf in A. D. 888, recognized in the same year by the Emperor Arnulf, included the northern part of Savoy, and all Switzerland between the Reuss and the Jura."—J. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, ch. 6, and *app.*, note A.—"The kingdoms of Provence and Transjuran Burgundy were united, in 933, by Raoul II., King of Transjuran Burgundy, and formed the kingdom of Arles, governed, from 937 to 993, by Conrad le Pacifique."—F. Guizot, *Hist. of Civilization*, lect. 24.—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and England*, bk. 1, ch. 4.—"Several of the greater and more commercial towns of France, such as Lyons, Vienne, Geneva, Besançon, Avignon, Arles, Marseille and Grenoble were situated within the bounds of his [Conrad the Pacific's] states."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *France under the Feudal System*, ch. 2.—"Of the older Burgundian kingdom, the northwestern part, forming the land best known as the Duchy of Burgundy, was, in the divisions of the ninth century, a fief of Karolingia or the Western Kingdom. This is the Burgundy which has Dijon for its capital, and which was held by more than one dynasty of dukes as vassals of the Western kings, first at Laon, and then at Paris. This Burgundy, which, as the name of France came to bear its modern sense may be distinguished as the French Duchy, must be carefully distinguished from the Royal Burgundy of the Cis-Jurane and Trans-Jurane kingdoms mentioned above.—E. A. Freeman, *Historical Geog. of Europe*, ch. 6, sect. 1.

**A. D. 888-1032.—The French Dukedom.—The founding of the First Capetian House.**—Of the earliest princes of this northwestern fragment of the old kingdom of Burgundy little seems to have been discoverable. The fief and its title do not seem to have become hereditary until they fell into the grasping hands of the Capetian family, which happened just at the time when the aspiring counts of Paris were rising to royal rank. In the early years of the tenth century the reigning count or duke was Richard-le-Justicier, whose distinguishing princely virtue is recorded in his name. This Richard-le-Justicier was a brother of that Boso, or Boson, son-in-law of the Emperor Louis II., who took advantage of the confusions of the time to fashion for himself a kingdom of Burgundy in the South. (Cis-Jurane Burgundy, or Provence,—see above). Richard's son Raoul, or Rudolph, married Emma, the daughter of Robert, Count of Paris and Duke of France, who was soon afterwards chosen king, by the nobles who tired of Carolingian misrule. King Robert's reign was short; he fell in battle with the Carolingians, at Soissons, the next year (A. D. 923). His son Hugh, called Le Grand, or The Great, found it more to his taste to be king-maker than to be king. He declined the proffered crown, and brought about the coronation of his brother-in-law, the Burgundian Rudolph, who reigned for eleven years. When he died, in 934, Hugh the Great still held the crown at his disposal and still refused to wear it himself. It now pleased this king-maker to set a Carolingian prince on the throne, in the person of Louis d'Outre Mer, a young son of Charles

the Simple, who had been reared in England by his English mother. But, if Duke Hugh cared nothing for the name, he cared much for the substance, of power. He grasped dominion wherever it fell within his reach, and the Burgundian duchy was among the states which he clutched. King Rudolph left no son to inherit either his dukedom or his kingdom. He had a brother, Hugh, who claimed the Duchy; but the greater Hugh was too strong for him and secured, with the authority of the young king, his protégé, the title of Duke of Burgundy and the larger part of the domain. "In the Duchy of France or the County of Paris Hugh-le-Grand had nothing beyond the regalities to desire, and both in Burgundy and the Duchy he now became an irremovable Viceroy. But the privileges obtained by Hugh-le-Grand produced very important political results both present and future. Hugh assumed even a loftier bearing than before; Burgundy was annexed to the Duchy of France, and passed with the Duchy; and the grant thereof made by Hugh Capet to his son [brother?] Henri-le-Grand, severing the same from the crown, created the premier Duchy of Christendom, the most splendid appanage which a prince of the third race [the Capetians] could enjoy—the rival of the throne."—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and Eng.*, bk. 1, pt. 2, ch. 1-4.—Hugh-le-Grand died in 956. "His power, which, more than his talents or exploits, had given him the name of Great, was divided between his children, who were yet very young. . . . There is some doubt as to their number and the order of their birth. It appears, however, that Otho was the eldest of his three sons. He had given him his part of the duchy of Burgundy, and had made him marry the daughter and heir of Gislebert, duke of another part of Burgundy, to which Otho succeeded the same year. The latter dying in 963 or 965, the duchy of Burgundy passed to his third brother, sometimes named Henry, sometimes Eudes. Hugues [Hugh], surnamed Capet, who succeeded to the county of Paris and the duchy of France, was but the second son."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *The French under the Carolingians*, ch. 15.—In 987 Hugh Capet became king of France and founded the lasting dynasty which bears his name. His elder brother Henry remained Duke of Burgundy until his death, in 1002, when his royal nephew, Robert, son and successor of Hugh, annexed the Duchy to the Crown. It so remained until 1032. Then King Henry I., son of Robert, granted it as an appanage to his brother Robert, who founded the first Capetian House of Burgundy.—E. de Bonnaventure, *Hist. of France*, bk. 1, ch. 2.

**A. D. 1032.—The last kingdom.—Its union with Germany, and its dissolution.**—The last kingdom which bore the name of Burgundy—though more often called the kingdom of Arles—formed, as stated above, by the union of the short-lived kingdoms of Provence and Trans-Jurane Burgundy, became in 1052 nominally united to the dominions of the Emperor-King of Germany. Its last independent king was Rudolf III., son of Conrad the Pacific, who was uncle to the Emperor Henry II. Being childless, he named Henry his heir. The latter, however, died first, in 1024, and Rudolf attempted to cancel his bequest, claiming that it was made to Henry personally, not as King of the Germans. When, however, the Burgundian king died, in

1032, the then reigning Emperor, Conrad the Salic, or the Franconian, formally proclaimed the union of Burgundy with Germany. "But since Burgundy was ruled almost exclusively by the great nobility, the sovereignty of the German Emperors there was never much more than nominal. Besides, the country, from the Bernese Oberland to the Mediterranean, except that part of Allemannia which is now German Switzerland, was inhabited by a Romance people, too distinct in language, customs and laws from the German empire ever really to form a part of it. . . . Yet Switzerland was thenceforth connected forever with the development of Germany, and for 500 years remained a part of the empire."—C. T. Lewis, *Hist. of Germany*, bk. 2, ch. 6-7.—"The weakness of Rodolph-le-Faincant [Rodolph III., who made Henry II. of Germany his heir, as stated above], gave the great lords of the kingdom of Arles an opportunity of consolidating their independence. Among these one begins to remark Berchtold and his son, Humbert-aux-Blanches-Mains (the White-handed), Counts of Maurienne, and founders of the House of Savoy; Otto William, who it is pretended was the son of Adalbert, King of Italy, and heir by right of his mother to the county of Burgundy, was the founder of the sovereign house of Franche-Comté [County Palatine of Burgundy]; Guigne, Count of Albon, founder of the sovereign house of the dauphins of Viennois; and William, who it is pretended was the issue of a brother of Rodolph of Burgundy, King of France, and who was sovereign count of Provence. These four lords had, throughout the reign of Rodolph, much more power than he in the kingdom of Arles; and when at his death his crown was united to that of the Empire, the feudatories who had grown great at his expense became almost absolutely independent. On the other hand, their vassals began on their side to acquire importance under them; and in Provence can be traced at this period the succession of the counts of Forelquier and of Venaisin, of the princes of Orange, of the viscounts of Marsaille, of the barons of Baux, of Sault, of Grignau, and of Castellane. We can still follow the formation of a great number of other feudatory or rather sovereign houses. Thus the counts of Toulouse, those of Rouergue, the dukes of Gascony, the counts of Foix, of Béarn, and of Carcassone, date at least from this epoch; but their existence is announced to us only by their diplomas and their wills."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *France under the Feudal System*, ch. 2.—See, also, PROVENCE: A. D. 943-1092, and FRANÇHE-COMTÉ.

A. D. 1127-1378.—The Franco-Germanic contest for the valley of the Rhone.—End of the kingdom of Arles.—"As soon as the Capetian monarchs had acquired enough strength at home to be able to look with safety abroad, they began to make aggressions on the tempting and wealthy dependencies of the distant emperors. But the Rhone valley was too important in itself and of too great strategical value as securing an easy road to Italy, to make it possible for the emperors to acquiesce easily in its loss. Hence a long conflict, which soon became a national conflict of French and Germans, to maintain the Imperial position in the 'middle kingdom' of the Rhone valley. M. Fournier's book [*Le Royaume d'Arles et de Vienne* (1138-1178)]; par Paul Fournier] aims at giving an

adequate account of this struggle. . . . From the times of the mighty Barbarossa to the times of the pretentious and cunning Charles of Luxemburg [see GERMANY: A. D. 1138-1268, and A. D. 1347-1493], nearly every emperor sought by constant acts of sovereignty to uphold his precarious powers in the Arleate. Unable to effect much with their own resources, the emperors exhausted their ingenuity in finding allies and inventing brilliant schemes for reviving the Arleate, which invariably came to nothing. Barbarossa won the hand of the heiress of the county of Burgundy, and sought to put in place of the local dynasties princes or whom he could rely, like Berthold of Züringen, whose father had received in 1127 from Conrad III. the high-sounding but meaningless title of Rector of the Burgundies. But his quarrel with the church soon set the clergy against Frederick, and, led by the Carthusian and Cistercian orders, the Churchmen of the Arleate began to look upon the orthodox king of the French as their truest protector from a schismatic emperor. But the French kings of the period saw in the power of Henry of Anjou [Henry II., of England—see ENGLAND: A. D. 1154-1189] a more real and pressing danger than the Empire of the Hohenstaufen. The result was an alliance between Philipp Augustus and his successors and the Swabian emperors, which gave Frederick and his successors a new term in which they could strive to win back a real hold over Burgundy. Frederick II. never lost sight of this object. His investiture of the great feudal lord William of Baux with the kingdom of Arles in 1215; his long struggle with the wealthy merchant city of Marseilles; his alliance with Raymond of Toulouse and the heretical elements in Provence against the Pope and the French; his efforts to lead an army against Innocent IV. at Lyons, were among the chief phases of his constant efforts to make the Imperial influence really felt in the valley of the Rhone. But he had so little success that the French crusaders against the Albigenses waged open war within its limits, and destroyed the heretic city of Avignon [see ALBIGENSES: A. D. 1217-1229], while Innocent in his exile could find no surer protection against the emperor than in the Imperial city of Lyons. After Frederick's death the policy of St. Louis of France was a complete triumph. His brother, Charles of Anjou, established himself in Provence, though in later times the Angevin lords of Provence and Naples became so strong that their local interests made them enemies rather than friends of the extension of French power on their borders. The subsequent efforts of the emperors were the merest shams and unrealities. Rudolf of Hapsburg acquiesced without a murmur in the progress of Philip the Fair, who made himself master of Lyons, and secured the Free County of Burgundy for his son [see FRANÇHE-COMTÉ]. . . . The residence of the Popes at Avignon was a further help to the French advance. . . . Weak as were the early Valois kings, they were strong enough to push still further the advantage won by their greater predecessors. The rivalry of the leading states of the Rhone valley, Savoy and Dauphiny, facilitated their task. Philip VI. aspired to take Vienne as Philip IV. had obtained Lyons. The Dauphin, Humbert II., struggled in vain against him, and at last accepted the inevitable by

ceding to the French king the succession to all his rights in Dauphiny, henceforth to become the appanage of the eldest sons of the French kings. At last, Charles of Luxemburg, in 1378, gave the French aggressions a legal basis by conferring the Vicariat of Arles on the Dauphin Charles, subsequently the mad Charles VI. of France. From this grant Savoy only was excepted. Henceforth the power of France in the Rhone valley became so great that it soon became the fashion to despise and ignore the theoretical claims of the Empire.—*The Athenæum*, Oct. 3, 1891 (reviewing "*Le Royaume d'Arles et de Viennois*," par Paul Fournier).

**A. D. 1207-1401.**—**Advance of the dominions of the house of Savoy beyond Lake Geneva.** See SAVOY: 11TH-15TH CENTURIES.

**A. D. 1364.**—**The French Dukedom.**—**The Planting of the Burgundian branch of the house of Valois.**—The last Duke of Burgundy of the Capetian house which descended from Robert, son of King Robert, died in December, 1361. He was called Philip de Rouvre, because the Château de Rouvre, near Dijon, had been his birth-place, and his residence. He was still in his youth when he died, although he had borne the ducal title for twelve years. It fell to him at the age of four, when his father died. From his mother and his grandmother he inherited, additionally, the county of Burgundy (Franche Comté) and the counties of Boulogne, Auvergne and Artois. His tender years had not prevented the marriage of the young duke to Margaret, daughter and heiress of the Count of Flanders. John II. King of France, whose mother was a Burgundian princess, claimed to be the nearest relative of the young duke, when the latter died, in 1361, and, although his claim was disputed by the King of Navarre, Charles the Bad, King John took possession of the dukedom. He took it by right of succession, and not as a fief which had lapsed, the original grant of King Robert having contained no reversionary provision. Franche Comté, or the county of Burgundy, together with Artois, remained to the young widow, Margaret of Flanders, while the counties of Boulogne and Auvergne passed to John of Boulogne, Count de Montfort. A great opportunity for strengthening the crown of France, by annexing to it the powerful Burgundian dukedom, was now offered to King John; but he lacked the wisdom to improve it. He preferred to grant it away as a splendid appanage for his favorite son—the fourth—the spirited lad Philip, called the Fearless, who had stood by his father's side in the disastrous battle of Poitiers, and who had shared his captivity in England. By a deed which took effect on King John's death, in 1364, the great duchy of Burgundy was conferred on Philip the Fearless and on his heirs. Soon afterwards, Philip's marriage with the young widow of his predecessor, Philip de Rouvre, was brought about, which restored to their former union with the dukedom the Burgundian County (Franche Comté) and the county of Artois, while it gave to the new duke prospectively the rich county of Flanders, to which Margaret was the heiress. Thus was raised up anew the most formidable rival which the royal power in France had ever to contend with, and the magnitude of the blunder of King John was revealed before half a century had passed.—*Froissart* (Johnes) *Chronicles*, bk. I, ch. 216.

ALSO IN: F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 22.

**A. D. 1383.**—**Flanders added to the ducal dominions.** See FLANDERS: A. D. 1383.

**A. D. 1405-1453.**—**Civil war with the Armagnacs.**—**Alliance with the English.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1380-1415; 1415-1419; 1417-1422; 1429-1431; 1431-1453.

**A. D. 1430.**—**Holland, Hainault and Friesland absorbed by the dukes.** See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND AND HAINAULT): A. D. 1417-1430.

**A. D. 1467.**—**Charles the Bold.**—**His position, between Germany and France.**—**His antagonism to Louis XI.**—**The "Middle Kingdom" of his aims.**—Charles, known commonly in history as Charles the Bold, became Duke of Burgundy in 1467, succeeding his father Philip, misnamed "The Good." His position was a very peculiar one; it requires a successful shaking-off of modern notions fully to take in what it was. Charles held the rank of one of the first princes in Europe without being a King, and without possessing an inch of ground for which he did not owe service to some superior lord. And, more than this, he did not owe service to one lord only. The phrase of 'Great Powers' had not been invented in the 15th century; but there can be no doubt that, if it had been, the Duke of Burgundy would have ranked among the foremost of them. He was, in actual strength, the equal of his royal neighbour to the west, and far more than the equal of his Imperial neighbour to the east. Yet for every inch of his territories he owed a vassal's duty to one or other of them. Placed on the borders of France and the Empire, some of his territories were held of the Empire and some of the French Crown. Charles, Duke of Burgundy, Count of Flanders and Artois, was a vassal of France; but Charles, Duke of Brabant, Count of Burgundy, Holland, and a dozen other duchies and counties, held his dominions as a vassal of Cesar. His dominions were large in positive extent, and they were valuable out of all proportion to their extent. No other prince in Europe was the direct sovereign of so many rich and flourishing cities, rendered still more rich and flourishing through the long and, in the main, peaceful administration of his father. The cities of the Netherlands were incomparably greater and more prosperous than those of France or England; and, though they enjoyed large municipal privileges, they were not, like those of Germany, independent commonwealths, acknowledging only an external suzerain in their nominal lord. Other parts of his dominions, the Duchy of Burgundy especially, were as rich in men as Flanders was rich in money. So far the Duke of Burgundy had some great advantages over every other prince of his time. But, on the other hand, his dominions were further removed than those of any prince in Europe from forming a compact whole. He was not King of one kingdom, but Duke, Count, and Lord of innumerable duchies, counties, and lordships, acquired by different means, held by different titles and of different overlords, speaking different languages, subject to different laws, transmitted according to different rules of succession. . . . They lay in two large masses, the two Burgundies forming one and the Low Countries forming the other, so that their common master could not go from one capital to another







without passing through a foreign territory. And, even within these two great masses, there were portions of territory intersecting the ducal dominions which, there was no hope of annexing by fair means. . . . The career of Charles the Bold . . . divides itself into a French and a German portion. In both alike he is exposed to the restless rivalry of Lewis of France; but in the one period that rivalry is carried on openly within the French territory, while in the second period the crafty king finds the means to deal far more effectual blows through the agency of Teutonic hands. . . . As a French prince, he joined with other French princes to put limits on the power of the Crown, and to divide the kingdom into great feudal holdings, as nearly independent as might be of the common overlord. As a French prince, he played his part in the War of the Public Weal [see FRANCE: A. D. 1461-1468], and insisted, as a main object of his policy, on the establishment of the King's brother as an all but independent Duke of Normandy. The object of Lewis was to make France a compact monarchy; the object of Charles and his fellows was to keep France as nearly as might be in the same state as Germany. But, when the other French princes had been gradually conquered, won over, or got rid of in some way or other by the crafty policy of Lewis, Charles remained no longer the chief of a coalition of French princes, but the personal rival, the deadly enemy, of the French King. . . . Chronologically and geographically alike, Charles and his Duchy form the great barrier, or the great connecting link, whichever we choose to call it, between the main divisions of European history and European geography. The Dukes of Burgundy of the House of Valois form a sort of bridge between the later Middle Age and the period of the Renaissance and the Reformation. They connect those two periods by forming the kernel of the vast dominion of that Austrian House which became their heir, and which, mainly by virtue of that heirship fills such a space in the history of the 16th and 17th centuries. But the dominions of the Burgundian Dukes hold a still higher historical position. They may be said to bind together the whole of European history for the last thousand years. From the 9th century to the 19th, the politics of Europe have largely gathered round the rivalry between the Eastern and the Western Kingdoms—in modern language, between Germany and France. From the 9th century to the 19th, a succession of efforts have been made to establish, in one shape or another, a middle state between the two. Over and over again during that long period have men striven to make the whole or some portion of the frontier lands stretching from the mouth of the Rhine to the mouth of the Rhone into an independent barrier state. . . . That object was never more distinctly aimed at, and it never seemed nearer to its accomplishment, than when Charles the Bold actually reigned from the Zuyder Zee to the Lake of Neuchâtel, and was not without hopes of extending his frontier to the Gulf of Lyons. . . . Holding, as he did, parts of old Lotharingia and parts of old Burgundy, there can be no doubt that he aimed at the re-establishment of a great Middle Kingdom, which should take in all that had ever been Burgundian or Lotharingian ground. He aimed, in short, as others have aimed before and since, at

the formation of a state which should hold a central position between France, Germany and Italy—a state which should discharge, with infinitely greater strength, all the duties which our own age has endeavoured to throw on Switzerland, Belgium and Savoy. . . . Undoubtedly it would have been for the permanent interest of Europe if he had succeeded in his attempt."—E. A. Freeman, *Charles the Bold (Historical Essays, 1st series, no. 11)*.

**A. D. 1467-1468.**—The war of Charles the Bold with the Liegeois and his troubles with Louis XI.—“Soon after the pacification of the troubles of France [see FRANCE: A. D. 1461-1468], the Duke of Burgundy began a war against the Liegeois, which lasted for several years; and whenever the king of France [Louis XI.] had a mind to interrupt him, he attempted some new action against the Bretons, and, in the meantime, supported the Liegeois underhand; upon which the Duke of Burgundy turned against him to succour his allies, or else they came to some treaty or truce among themselves. . . . During these wars, and ever since, secret and fresh intrigues were carried on by the princes. The king was so exceedingly exasperated against the Dukes of Bretagne and Burgundy that it was wonderful. . . . The king of France's aim, in the meantime, was chiefly to carry his design against the province of Bretagne, and he looked upon it as a more feasible attempt, and likelier to give him less resistance than the house of Burgundy. Besides, the Bretons were the people who protected and entertained all his malcontents; as his brother, and others, whose interest and intelligence were great in his kingdom; for this cause he endeavoured very earnestly with Charles, Duke of Burgundy, by several advantageous offers and proposals, to prevail with him to desert them, promising that upon those terms he also would abandon the Liegeois, and give no further protection to his malcontents. The Duke of Burgundy would by no means consent to it, but again made preparations for war against the Liegeois, who had broken the peace.” This was in October, 1467. The Duke (Charles the Bold) attacked St. Tron, which was held by a garrison of 3,000 of the men of Liège. The Liegeois, 30,000 strong, came to the relief of the besieged town, and were routed, leaving 6,000 slain on the field. St. Tron and Tongres were both surrendered, and Liège, itself, after considerable strife among its citizens, opened its gates to the Duke, who entered in triumph (Nov. 17, 1467) and hanged half-a-dozen for his moderate satisfaction. In the course of the next summer the French king opened war afresh upon the Duke of Bretagne and forced him into a treaty, before the Duke of Burgundy, his ally, could take the field. The king, then being extremely anxious to pacify the Duke of Burgundy, took the extraordinary step of visiting the latter at Peronne, without any guard, trusting himself wholly to the honor of his enemy. But it happened unfortunately, during the king's stay at Peronne, that a ferocious revolt occurred at Liège, which was traced beyond denial to the intrigues of two agents whom king Louis had sent thither not long before, for mischief-making purposes. The Duke, in his wrath, was not easily restrained from doing some violence to the king; but the royal trickster escaped from his grave predicament by giving up the unhappy

Liegeois to the vengeance of Duke Charles and personally assisting the latter to inflict it. "After the conclusion of the peace [dictated by Charles at Peronne and signed submissively by Louis] the King and the Duke of Burgundy set out the next morning [Oct. 15, 1468] for Cambrai, and from thence towards the country of Liège: it was the beginning of winter and the weather was very bad. The king had with him only his Scotch guards and a small body of his standing forces; but he ordered 300 of his men-at-arms to join him." Liège was invested, and, notwithstanding its walls had been thrown down the previous year, it made a stubborn defense. During a siege of a fortnight, several desperate sallies were made, by the last one of which both the Duke and the King were brought into great personal peril. Exhausted by this final effort, the Liegeois were unprepared to repel a grand assault which the besieging forces made upon the town the next morning—Sunday, Oct. 30. Liège was taken that day almost without resistance, the miserable inhabitants flying across the Mees into the forest of Ardennes, abandoning their homes to pillage. The Duke of Burgundy now permitted King Louis to return home, while he remained a few days longer in desolate Liège, which his fierce hatred had doomed. "Before the Duke left the city, a great number of those poor creatures who had hid themselves in the houses when the town was taken, and were afterwards made prisoners, were drowned. He also resolved to burn the city, which had always been very populous; and orders were given for firing it in three different places, and 3,000 or 4,000 foot of the country of Limbourg (who were their neighbours, and used the same habit and language), were commanded to effect this desolation, but to secure the churches. . . . All things being thus ordered, the Duke began his march into the country of Franchemont: he was no sooner out of town, but immediately we saw a great number of houses on fire beyond the river; the duke lay that night four leagues from the city, yet we could hear the noise as distinctly as if we had been upon the spot; but whether it was the wind which lay that way, or our quartering upon the river, that was the cause of it, I know not. The next day the Duke marched on, and those who were left in the town continued the conflagration according to his orders; but all the churches (except some few) were preserved, and above 300 houses belonging to the priests and officers of the churches, which was the reason it was so soon reinhabited, for many flocked thither to live with the priests."—Philip de Commines, *Memoirs*, bk. 2.

ALSO IN: J. F. Kirk, *Hist. of Charles the Bold*, bk. 1, ch. 7-9; bk. 2.—P. F. Willert, *The Reign of Louis XI.*—Sir. W. Scott, *Quentin Durward*.—See, also, DINANT.

**A. D. 1476-1477.—Charles the Bold and the Swiss.—His defeats and his death.—The effects of his fall.**—"Sovereign of the duchy of Burgundy, of the Free County, of Hainaut, of Flanders, of Holland, and of Gueldre, Charles wished, by joining to Lorraine, a portion of Switzerland, and the inheritance of old King René, Count of Provence, to recompose the ancient kingdom of Lorraine, such as it had existed under the Carlovingian dynasty; and flattered himself that by offering his daughter to Maximilian, son of Frederick III., he would obtain the title of king. Deceived in his hopes, the Duke

of Burgundy tried means to take away Lorraine from the young René. That province was necessary to him, in order to join his northern states with those in the south. The conquest was rapid, and Nancy opened its gates to Charles the Rash; but it was reserved for a small people, already celebrated for their heroic valour and by their love of liberty, to beat this powerful man. Irritated against the Swiss, who had braved him, Charles crossed over the Jura, besieged the little town of Granson, and, in despite of a capitulation, caused all the defenders to be hanged or drowned. At this news the eight cantons which then composed the Helvetic republic arose, and under the very walls of the town which had been the theatre of his cruelty they attacked the Duke and dispersed his troops [March 3, 1476]. Some months later [June 21], supported by young René of Lorraine, despoiled of his inheritance, they exterminated a second Burgundian army before Morat. Charles, vanquished, reassembled a third army, and marched in the midst of winter against Nancy, which had fallen into the hands of the Swiss and Lorrainers. It was there that he perished [Jan. 5, 1477] betrayed by his mercenary soldiers, and overpowered by numbers."—E. de Bonnechose, *Hist. of France*, v. 1, bk. 3, ch. 2.—"And what was the cause of this war? A miserable cart-load of sheep skins that the Count of Romont had taken from the Swiss, in his passage through his estates. If God Almighty had not forsaken the Duke of Burgundy it is scarce conceivable he would have exposed himself to such great dangers upon so small and trivial an occasion; especially considering the offers the Swiss had made him, and that his conquest of such enemies would yield him neither profit nor honour; for at that time the Swiss were not in such esteem as now, and no people in the world could be poorer." At Granson, "the poor Swiss were mightily enriched by the plunder of his [the Duke of Burgundy's] camp. At first they did not understand the value of the treasure they were masters of, especially the common soldiers. One of the richest and most magnificent tents in the world was cut into pieces. There were some of them that sold quantities of dishes and plates of silver for about two sous of our money, supposing they had been pewter. His great diamond, . . . with a large pearl fixed to it, was taken up by a Swiss, put up again into the case, thrown under a wagon, taken up again by the same soldier, and after all offered to a priest for a florin, who bought it, and sent it to the magistrates of that country, who returned him three francs as a sufficient reward. [This was long supposed to be the famous Swiss diamond; but Mr. Streeter thinks that the tradition which so connects it is totally disproved.] They also took three very rich jewels called the Three Brothers, another large ruby called La Hätte, and another called the Ball of Flanders, which were the fairest and richest in the world; besides a prodigious quantity of other goods." In his last battle, near Nancy, the Duke had less than 4,000 men, "and of that number not above 1,200 were in a condition to fight." He encountered on this occasion a powerful army of Swiss and Germans, which the Duke of Lorraine had been able to collect, with the help of the king of France and others. It was against the advice of all his counsellors that the headstrong, half-mad Duke Charles dashed his little army upon this

greater one, and he paid the penalty. It was broken at the first shock, and the Duke was killed in the confused rout without being known. His body, stripped naked by the pillagers and mangled by wolves or dogs, was found frozen fast in a ditch. "I cannot easily determine towards whom God Almighty showed his anger most, whether towards him who died suddenly, without pain or sickness in the field of battle, or towards his subjects, who never enjoyed peace after his death, but were continually involved in wars against which they were not able to maintain themselves, upon account of the civil dissensions and cruel animosities that arose among them. . . . As I had seen these princes puissant, rich and honourable, so it fared with their subjects: for I think I have seen and known the greatest part of Europe, yet I never knew any province or country, though of a larger extent, so abounding in money, so extravagantly fine in their furniture, so sumptuous in their buildings, so profuse in their expenses, so luxurious in their feasts and entertainments, and so prodigal in all respects, as the subjects of these princes in my time; and if any think I have exaggerated, others who lived in my time will be of opinion that I have rather said too little. . . . In short, I have seen this family in all respects the most flourishing and celebrated of any in Christendom: and then, in a short space of time, it was quite ruined and turned upside down, and left the most desolate and miserable of any house in Europe, as regards both prince and subjects."—Phillip de Commines, *Memoirs*, bk. 5, ch. 1-9.—"The popular conception of this war [between Charles the Bold and the Swiss] is simply that Charles, a powerful and encroaching prince, was overthrown in three great battles by the petty commonwealths which he had expected easily to attach to his dominion. Grandson and Morat are placed side by side with Morgarten and Sempach. Such a view as this implies complete ignorance of the history; it implies ignorance of the fact that it was the Swiss who made war upon Charles, and not Charles who made war upon the Swiss; it implies ignorance of the fact that Charles's army never set foot on proper Swiss territory at all, that Grandson and Morat were at the beginning of the war no part of 'the possessions of the Confederation. . . . The mere political accident that the country which formed the chief seat of war now forms part of the Swiss Confederation has been with many people enough to determine their estimate of the quarrel. Grandson and Morat are in Switzerland; Burgundian troops appeared and were defeated at Grandson and Morat; therefore Charles must have been an invader of Switzerland, and the warfare on the Swiss side must have been a warfare of purely defensive heroism. The simple fact that it was only through the result of the Burgundian war that Grandson and Morat ever became Swiss territory at once disposes of this line of argument. . . . The plain facts of the case are that the Burgundian war was a war declared by Switzerland against Burgundy. . . . and that in the campaigns of Grandson and Morat the Duke of Burgundy was simply repelling and avenging Swiss invasions of his own territory and the territory of his allies."—E. A. Freeman, *Historical Essays*, v. 1, no. 11.

ALSO IN: J. F. Kirk, *Hist. of Charles the Bold*, bk. 5.—L. S. Costello, *Memoirs of Mary of Burgundy*, ch. 14-27.

**A. D. 1477.**—Permanently restored to the French crown.—Louis XI. of France, who had been eagerly watching while Charles the Bold shattered his armies and exhausted his strength in Switzerland, received early news of the death of the self-willed Duke. While the panic and confusion which it caused still prevailed, the king lost no time in taking possession of the duchy of Burgundy, as an appanage which had reverted to the crown, through default of male heirs. The legality of his claim has been much in dispute. "Charles left an only daughter, undoubted heiress of Flanders and Artois, as well as of his dominions out of France, but whose right of succession to the duchy of Burgundy was more questionable. Originally the great fiefs of the crown descended to females, and this was the case with respect to the two first mentioned. But John had granted Burgundy to his son Philip by way of appanage; and it was contended that the appanages reverted to the crown in default of male heirs. In the form of Philip's investiture, the duchy was granted to him and his lawful heirs, without designation of sex. The construction, therefore, must be left to the established course of law. This, however, was by no means acknowledged by Mary, Charles's daughter, who maintained both that no general law restricted appanages to male heirs, and that Burgundy had always been considered as a feminine fief, John himself having possessed it, not by reversion as king (for descendants of the first dukes were then living), but by inheritance derived through females. Such was this question of succession between Louis XI. and Mary of Burgundy, upon the merits of whose pretensions I will not pretend altogether to decide, but shall only observe that, if Charles had conceived his daughter to be excluded from this part of his inheritance, he would probably, at Compiègne or Peronne, where he treated upon the vantage ground, have attempted at least to obtain a renunciation of Louis's claim. There was one obvious mode of preventing all further contest, and of aggrandizing the French monarchy far more than by the reunion of Burgundy. This was the marriage of Mary with the dauphin, which was ardently wished in France." The dauphin was a child of seven years; Mary of Burgundy a masculine-minded young woman of twenty. Probably Louis despaired of reconciling the latter to such a marriage. At all events, while he talked of it occasionally, he proceeded actively in despoiling the young duchess, seizing Artois and Franche Comté, and laying hands upon the frontier towns which were exposed to his arms. He embittered her natural enmity to him by various acts of meanness and treachery. "Thus the French alliance becoming odious in Flanders, this princess married Maximilian of Austria, son of the Emperor Frederic—a connexion which Louis strove to prevent, though it was impossible then to foresee that it was ordained to retard the growth and to bias the fate of Europe during three hundred years. This war lasted till after the death of Mary, who left one son Philip and one daughter Margaret."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 1, pt. 2.—"The king [Louis XI.] had reason to be more than ordinarily pleased at the death of that duke [of Burgundy], and he triumphed more in his ruin than in that of all the rest of his enemies, as he thought that nobody, for the future, either of

his own subjects, or his neighbours, would be able to oppose him, or disturb the tranquillity of his reign. . . . Although God Almighty has shown, and does still show, that his determination is to punish the family of Burgundy severely, not only in the person of the duke, but in their subjects and estates; yet I think the king our master did not take right measures to that end. For, if he had acted prudently, instead of pretending to conquer them, he should rather have endeavoured to annex all those large territories, to which he had no just title, to the crown of France by some treaty of marriage; or to have gained the hearts and affections of the people, and so have brought them over to his interest, which he might, without any great difficulty, have effected, considering how their late afflictions had impoverished and dejected them. If he had acted after that manner, he would not only have prevented their ruin and destruction, but extended and strengthened his own kingdom, and established them all in a firm and lasting peace."—Philip de Commines. *Memoirs*, bk. 5, ch. 12.—"He [Louis XI.] reassured, caressed, comforted the duchy of Burgundy, gave it a parliament, visited his good city of Dijon, swore in St. Benignus' church to respect all the old privileges and customs that could be sworn to, and bound his successors to do the same on their accession. Burgundy was a land of nobles; and the king raised a bridge of gold for all the great lords to come over to him."—J. Michelet, *Hist. of France*, bk. 17, ch. 3-4.

**A. D. 1477-1482.**—Reign of the Burgundian heiress in the Netherlands.—Her marriage with Maximilian of Austria. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1477.

**A. D. 1512.**—Formation of the Circle. See GERMANY: A. D. 1493-1519.

**A. D. 1544.**—Renunciation of the Claims of Charles V. See FRANCE: A. D. 1532-1547.

**BURH, The.** See BOROUGH.

**BURI, The.**—A Suevic clan of Germans whose settlements were anciently in the neighborhood of modern Cracow.—Tacitus, *Germany*, trans. by Church and Brodrick. *Geog. notes.*

**BURKE, Edmund, and the American Revolution.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775 (JANUARY—MARCH). . . . And the French Revolution. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1793-1796.

**BURLEIGH, Lord, and the reign of Queen Elizabeth.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1558-1598.

**BURLINGAME CHINESE EMBASSY AND TREATIES.** See CHINA: A. D. 1857-1868.

**BURMA: Rise of the kingdom.**—First war with the English (1824-1826).—Cession of Assam and Aracan. See INDIA: A. D. 1823-1833.

**A. D. 1852.**—Second war with the English.—Loss of Pegu. See INDIA: A. D. 1852.

**BURNED CANDLEMAS.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1333-1370.

**BURNSIDE, General Ambrose E.**—Expedition to Roanoke. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JANUARY—APRIL; NORTH CAROLINA). . . . Command of the Army of the Potomac. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (OCTOBER—NOVEMBER; VIRGINIA). . . . Retirement from command of the Army of the Potomac. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (JANUARY—APRIL; VIRGINIA). . . . Deliverance of East Tennessee. See UNITED STATES

OF AM.: A. D. 1863 AUGUST—SEPTEMBER: TENNESSEE). . . . Defense of Knoxville. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER: TENNESSEE). . . . At the siege of Petersburg. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (JUNE: VIRGINIA), (JULY: VIRGINIA).

**BURR, Aaron.**—Duel with Hamilton.—Conspiracy.—Arrest.—Trial. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1806-1807.

**BURSCHENSCHAFT, The.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1817-1820.

**BUSACO, Battle of (1810).** See SPAIN: A. D. 1810-1812.

**BUSHMEN, The.** See AFRICA: THE INHABITING RACES.

**BUSHY RUN, Battle of (A. D. 1763).** See POSTIAC'S WAR.

**BUSHWHACKERS.**—A name commonly given to the rebel guerrillas or half-bandits of the southwest in the American Civil War.—J. G. Nicolay and J. Hay, *Abraham Lincoln*, v. 6, p. 371.

**BUSIRIS.**—Destroyed by Diocletian. See ALEXANDRIA: A. D. 296.

**BUSSORAH AND KUFA, The rise and importance of.**—In the first years of their conquest and occupation of Mesopotamia and the Delta of the Euphrates and Tigris—as early as A. D. 638—the Moslems founded two cities which acquired importance in Mahometan history. In both cases, these cities appear to have arisen out of the need felt by the Arabs for more salubrious sites of residence than their predecessors in the ancient country had been contented with. Of Bussorah, or Bassorah, the city founded in the Delta, the site is said to have been changed three times. Kufa was built on a plain very near to the neglected city of Hira, on the Euphrates. "Kufa and Bussorah . . . had a singular influence on the destinies of the Caliphate and of Islam itself. The vast majority of the population came from the Peninsula and were of pure Arabian blood. The tribes which, with their families, scenting from afar the prey of Persia, kept streaming into Chaldea from every corner of Arabia, settled chiefly in these two cities. At Kufa, the races from Yemen and the south predominated; at Bussorah, from the north. Rapidly they grew into two great and luxurious capitals, with an Arab population each of from 150,000 to 200,000 souls. On the literature, theology, and politics of Islam, these cities had a greater influence than the whole Moslem world besides. . . . The people became petulant and factious, and both cities grew into hotbeds of turbulence and sedition. The Bedouin element, conscious of its strength, was jealous of the Coreish, and impatient of whatever checked its capricious humour. Thus factions sprang up which, controlled by the strong and wise arm of Omar, broke loose under the weaker Caliphs, eventually rent the unity of Islam, and brought on disastrous days."—Sir W. Muir, *Annals of the Early Caliphate*, ch. 18.—See, also, MANOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 632-651.

**PUTAÐÆ, The.** See PHYLÆ.

**BUTE'S ADMINISTRATION.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1760-1763.

**BUTLER, General Benjamin F.**—In command at Baltimore. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (APRIL—MAY; MARYLAND). . . . In command at Fortress Mouroe. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (MAY). . . . The Hat-

**teras Expedition.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (AUGUST: NORTH CAROLINA). . . . **Command at New Orleans.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (MAY—DECEMBER: LOUISIANA). . . . **Command of the Army of the James.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MAY: VIRGINIA).

**BUTLER, Walter, and the Tory and Indian partisans of the American Revolution.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778 (JUNE—NOVEMBER), and (JULY).

**BUTTERNUTS.** See BOYS IN BLUE; also UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (OCTOBER).

**BUXAR, OR BAKAR, OR BAKSAR, Battle of (1764).** See INDIA: A. D. 1757—1772.

**BYRON, Lord, in Greece.** See GREECE: A. D. 1821—1829.

**BYRSA.—The citadel of Carthage.** See CARTHAGE, THE DOMINION OF.

**BYTOWN.**—The original name of Ottawa, the capital of the Dominion of Canada. See OTTAWA.

**BYZACIUM.** See CARTHAGE, THE DOMINION OF.

**BYZANTINE EMPIRE.**—The Eastern Roman Empire, having its capital at Byzantium (modern Constantinople), the earlier history of which will be found sketched under the caption **ROME: A. D. 394—395, to 717—800**, has been given, in its later years, the name of the Byzantine Empire. The propriety of this designation is questioned by some historians, and the time when it begins to be appropriate is likewise a subject of debate. For some discussion of these questions, see **ROME: A. D. 717—800**.

**Its part in history.—Its defence of Europe.—Its civilizing influence.**—"The later Roman Empire was the bulwark of Europe against the oriental danger; Maurice and Heraclius, Constantine IV. and Leo the Isaurian were the successors of Themistocles and Africanus. . . . Until the days of the crusades, the German nations did not combine with the Empire against the common foe. Nor did the Teutons, by themselves, achieve any success of ecumenical importance against non-Aryan races. I may be reminded that Charles the Great exterminated the Avars; but that was after they had ceased to be really dangerous. When there existed a truly formidable Avar monarchy it was the Roman Empire that bore the brunt; and yet while most people who read history know of the Avar war of Charles, how few there are who have ever heard of Priscus, the general who so bravely waged against the Avars in the reign of Maurice. I may be reminded that Charles Martel won a great name by victories in southern Gaul over the Saracens; yet those successes sink into insignificance by the side of the achievement of his contemporary, the third Leo, who held the gate of eastern Europe against all the forces which the Saracen power, then at its height, could muster. Every one knows about the exploits of the Frank; it is almost incredible how little is known of the Roman Emperor's defence of the greatest city of Christian Europe, in the quarter where the real danger lay. . . . The Empire was much more than the military guard of the Asiatic frontier; it not only defended but also kept alive the traditions of Greek and Roman culture. We cannot over-estimate the importance of the presence of a highly civilised state for a system of nations which were as yet

only beginning to be civilised. The constant intercourse of the Empire with Italy, which until the eleventh century was partly imperial, and with southern Gaul and Spain, had an incalculable influence on the development of the West. Venice, which contributed so much to the growth of western culture, was for a long time actually, and for a much longer time nominally, a city of the Roman Empire, and learned what it taught from Byzantium. The Byzantine was the mother of the Italian school of painting, as Greece in the old days had been the mistress of Rome in the fine arts; and the Byzantine style of architecture has had perhaps a wider influence than any other. It was to New Rome that the Teutonic kings applied when they needed men of learning, and thither students from western countries, who desired a university education, repaired. . . . It was, moreover, in the lands ruled by New Rome that old Hellenic culture and the monuments of Hellenic literature were preserved, as in a secure storehouse, to be given at length to the 'wild nations' when they had been sufficiently tamed. And in their taming New Rome played an indispensable part. The Justinian law, which still interpenetrates European civilisation, was a product of New Rome. In the third place the Roman Empire for many centuries entirely maintained European commerce. This was a circumstance of the greatest importance; but unfortunately it is one of those facts concerning which contemporary historians did not think of leaving records to posterity. The fact that the coins of the Roman Emperors were used throughout Europe in the Middle Ages speaks for itself. . . . In the fourth place, the Roman Empire preserved a great idea which influenced the whole course of western European history down to the present day—the idea of the Roman Empire itself. If we look at the ecumenical event of 800 A. D. from a wide point of view, it really resolves itself into this: New Rome bestowed upon the western nations a great idea, which moulded and ordered their future history; she gave back to Old Rome the idea which Old Rome bestowed upon her five centuries before. . . . If Constantinople and the Empire had fallen, the imperial idea would have been lost in the whirl of the 'wild nations.' It is to New Rome that Europeans really owe thanks for the establishment of the principle and the system which brought law and order into the political relations of the West."—J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, bk. 6, ch. 14 (v. 2).

**A. D. 717.—Its organization by Leo the Isaurian.**—"The accession of Leo the Isaurian to the throne of Constantinople suddenly opened a new era in the history of the Eastern Empire. . . . When Leo III. was proclaimed emperor [A. D. 717], it seemed as if no human power could save Constantinople from falling as Rome had fallen. The Saracens considered the sovereignty of every land, in which any remains of Roman civilization survived, as within their grasp. Leo, an Isaurian, and an Iconoclast, consequently a foreigner and a heretic, ascended the throne of Constantine and arrested the victorious career of the Mohammedans. He then reorganized the whole administration so completely in accordance with the new exigencies of Eastern society that the reformed empire outlived for many centuries every government contemporary

with its establishment. The Eastern Roman Empire, thus reformed, is called by modern historians the Byzantine Empire; and the term is well devised to mark the changes effected in the government, after the extinction of the last traces of the military monarchy of ancient Rome. . . . The provincial divisions of the Roman Empire had fallen into oblivion. A new geographical arrangement into Themes appears to have been established by Heraclius, when he recovered the Asiatic provinces from the Persians; it was reorganized by Leo, and endured as long as the Byzantine government. The number of themes varied at different periods. The Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus, writing about the middle of the tenth century, counts sixteen in the Asiatic portion of the Empire and twelve in the European. . . . The European provinces were divided into eight continental and five insular or transmarine themes, until the loss of the exarchate of Ravenna reduced the number to twelve. Venice and Naples, though they acknowledged the suzerainty of the Eastern Empire, acted generally as independent cities. . . . When Leo was raised to the throne the Empire was threatened with immediate ruin. . . . Every army assembled to encounter the Saracens broke out into rebellion. The Bulgarians and Schavonians wasted Europe up to the walls of Constantinople; the Saracens ravaged the whole of Asia Minor to the shores of the Bosphorus."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine Empire*, bk. 1, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: E. W. Brooks, *The Emperor Zenon and the Isaurians* (*English Hist. Rev.*, April, 1893).

**A. D. 717-797.**—The Isaurian dynasty.—The dynasty founded by Leo the Isaurian held the throne until the dethronement of Constantine VI. by his mother, Irene, A. D. 797, and her dethronement, in turn by Nicephorus I., A. D. 802. It embraced the following reigns: Constantine V., called Copronymus, A. D. 741-775; Leo IV., 775-780; Constantine VI., 780-797; Irene, 797-802.

**A. D. 726-751.**—The Iconoclastic Controversy.—Rupture with the West.—Fall of the Exarchate of Ravenna.—End of authority in Italy. See ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY, and PAPACY. A. D. 728-774.

**A. D. 802-820.**—Emperors: Nicephorus I., A. D. 802-811; Stauracius, A. D. 811; Michael I., A. D. 811-813; Leo V., A. D. 813-820.

**A. D. 803.**—Treaty with Charlemagne, fixing boundaries. See VENICE; A. D. 697-810.

**A. D. 820-1057.**—The Amorion and Basilian or Macedonian dynasties.—Michael, the Amorion (820-829) so named from his birth-place, Amorion, in Phrygia, was a soldier, raised to the throne by a revolution which deposed and assassinated his friend and patron, the Emperor Leo V. Michael transmitted the crown to his son (Theophilus, 829-842) and grandson. The latter, called Michael the Drunkard, was conspired against and killed by one of the companions of his drunken orgies (867), Basil the Macedonian, who had been in early life a groom. Basil founded a dynasty which reigned, with several interruptions, from A. D. 867 to 1057—a period covering the following reigns: Basil I., A. D. 867-886; Leo VI., A. D. 886-911; Constantine VII. (Porphyrogenitus), A. D. 911-959; Romanus I. (Collegue), A. D. 919-944; Constantine VIII. (Collegue), A. D. 944; Romanus II., A. D.

959-963; Nicephorus II., A. D. 963-969; John Zimisces, A. D. 969-976; Basil II., A. D. 963-1025; Constantine IX., A. D. 963-1028; Romanus III., A. D. 1028-1034; Michael IV., A. D. 1034-1041; Michael V., A. D. 1041-1042; Zoe and Theodora, A. D. 1042-1056; Constantine X., A. D. 1042-1054; Michael VI., A. D. 1056-1057.

**A. D. 865-1043.**—Wars, commerce and Church Connection with the Russians. See RUSSIANS; A. D. 865-900; also CONSTANTINOPLE; A. D. 865 and 907-1043.

**A. D. 870-1016.**—Fresh acquisitions in Southern Italy. See ITALY (SOUTHERN); A. D. 800-1016.

**A. D. 963-1025.**—Recovery of prestige and territory.—"Amidst all the crimes and revolutions of the Byzantine government—and its history is but a series of crimes and revolutions—it was never dismembered by intestine war. A sedition in the army, a tumult in the theatre, a conspiracy in the palace, precipitated a monarch from the throne; but the allegiance of Constantinople was instantly transferred to his successor, and the provinces implicitly obeyed the voice of the capital. The custom, too, of partition, so baneful to the Latin kingdoms, and which was not altogether unknown to the Saracens, never prevailed in the Greek Empire. It stood in the middle of the tenth century, as vicious indeed and cowardly, but more wealthy, more enlightened, and far more secure from its enemies than under the first successors of Heraclius. For about one hundred years preceding there had been only partial wars with the Mohammedan potentates; and in these the emperors seem gradually to have gained the advantage, and to have become more frequently the aggressors. But the increasing distractions of the East encouraged two brave usurpers, Nicephorus Phocas and John Zimisces, to attempt the actual recovery of the lost provinces. They carried the Roman arms (one may use the term with less reluctance than usual) over Syria; Antioch and Aleppo were taken by storm; Damascus submitted; even the cities of Mesopotamia, beyond the ancient boundary of the Euphrates, were added to the trophies of Zimisces, who unwillingly spared the capital of the Khalifah. From such distant conquests it was expedient, and indeed necessary to withdraw; but Cilicia and Antioch were permanently restored to the Empire. At the close of the tenth century the emperors of Constantinople possessed the best and greatest portion of the modern kingdom of Naples, a part of Sicily, the whole [present] European dominions of the Ottomans, the province of Anatolia or Asia Minor, with some part of Syria and Armenia."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 6.

**A. D. 970-1014.**—Recovery of Bulgaria. See CONSTANTINOPLE A. D. 907-1043; also BULGARIA, and ACHUIDA.

**A. D. 1054.**—Ecclesiastical division of the Eastern from the Roman Church. See FLOUQUE CONTROVERSY, and ORTHODOX CHURCH.

**A. D. 1057-1081.**—between the Basilian and the Comnenian dynasties.—A dark period.—"The moment that the last of the Macedonian dynasty was gone, the elements of discord seemed unchained, and the double scourge of civil war and foreign invasion began to afflict the empire. In the twenty-four years between 1057 and 1081 were pressed more disasters than

had been seen in any other period of East Roman history, save perhaps the reign of Heraclius. . . . The aged Theophano had named as her successor on the throne Michael Stratolocus, a contemporary of her own who had been an able soldier 25 years back. But Michael VI. was grown aged and incompetent, and the empire was full of ambitious generals, who would not tolerate a dotard on the throne. Before a year had passed a band of great Asiatic nobles entered into a conspiracy to overturn Michael, and replace him by Isaac Comnenus, the chief of one of the ancient Cappadocian houses, and the most popular general of the East. Isaac Comnenus and his friends took arms, and dispossessed the aged Michael of his throne with little difficulty. But a curse seemed to rest upon the usurpation; Isaac was stricken down by disease when he had been little more than a year on the throne, and retired to a monastery to die. His crown was transferred to Constantine Ducaes, another Cappadocian noble, "who reigned for seven troubled years. His three immediate successors were Romanus IV., A. D. 1067-1071; Michael VII., A. D. 1071-1078; Nicephorus III., A. D. 1078-1081.—C. W. C. Oman, *The Story of the Byzantine Empire*, ch. 20.

**A. D. 1063-1092.—Disasters in Asia Minor.** See **TURKS (SELJUKS)**: A. D. 1063-1073; and A. D. 1073-1092.

**A. D. 1064.—Great revival of pilgrimages from Western Europe to the Holy Land.** See **CRUSADES; CAUSES, ETC.**

**A. D. 1081.—The enthronement of the Comnenian Dynasty.** See **CONSTANTINOPLE**: A. D. 1081.

**A. D. 1081-1085.—Attempted Norman conquest from Southern Italy.**—Robert Guiscard, the Norman adventurer who had carved for himself a principality in Southern Italy and acquired the title of Duke of Apulia,—his duchy coinciding with the subsequent Norman kingdom of Naples—conceived the ambitious design of adding the Byzantine Empire to his estate. His conquests in Italy had been mostly at the expense of the Byzantine dominions, and he believed that he had measured the strength of the degenerate Roman-Greeks. He was encouraged, moreover, by the successive revolutions which tossed the imperial crown from hand to hand, and which had just given it to the Comnenian, Alexius I. Beyond all, he had a claim of right to interfere in the affairs of the Empire; for his young daughter was betrothed to the heir-expectant whose expectations were now vanishing, and had actually been sent to Constantinople to receive her education for the throne. To promote his bold undertaking, Robert obtained the approval of the pope, and an absolution for all who would join his ranks. Thus spiritually equipped, the Norman duke invaded Greece, in the summer of 1081, with 150 ships and 30,000 men. Making himself master, on the way, of the island of Coreyra (Corfu), and taking several ports on the mainland, he laid siege to Dyrrachium, and found it a most obstinate fortification to reduce. Its massive ancient walls defied the Norman enginery, and it was not until February, 1082, that Robert Guiscard gained possession of the town, by the treachery of one of its defenders. Meantime the Normans had routed and scattered one large army, which the Emperor Alexius led in person to the relief of Dyrrachium: but

the fortified towns in Illyria and Epirus delayed their advance toward Constantinople. Robert was called home to Italy by important affairs and left his son Bohemund (the subsequent Crusader and Prince of Antioch), in command. Bohemund defeated Alexius again in the spring of 1083, and still a third time the following autumn. All Epirus was overrun and Macedonia and Thessaly invaded; but the Normans, while besieging Larissa, were undone by a stratagem, lost their camp and found it necessary to retreat. Robert was then just reentering the field, in person, and had won an important naval battle at Corfu, over the combined Greeks and Venetians, when he died (July, 1085), and his project of conquest in Greece ended with him. Twenty years afterwards, his son Bohemund, when Prince of Antioch, and quarrelling with the Byzantines, gathered a crusading army in France and Italy to lead it against Constantinople; but it was stopped by stubborn Dyrrachium, and never got beyond. Alexius had recovered that strong coast defence shortly after Robert Guiscard's death, with the help of the Venetians and Amalfitans. By way of reward, those merchant allies received important commercial privileges, and the title of Venice to the sovereignty of Dalmatia and Croatia was recognized. "From this time the doge appears to have styled himself lord of the kingdoms of Dalmatia and Croatia."—G. Flinlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine and Greek Empires*, bk. 3, ch. 2, sect. 1.

**A. D. 1081-1185.—The Comnenian emperors.**—Alexius I., A. D. 1081-1118; John II., A. D. 1118-1143; Manuel I., A. D. 1143-1181; Alexius II., A. D. 1181-1183; Andronicus I., A. D. 1183-1185.

**A. D. 1096-1097.—The passage of the first Crusaders.** See **CRUSADES**: A. D. 1096-1099.

**A. D. 1146.—Destructive invasion of Roger, king of Sicily.—Sack of Thebes and Corinth.**—When Roger, king of Sicily, united the Norman possessions in Southern Italy to his Sicilian realm he became ambitious, in his turn, to acquire some part of the Byzantine possessions. His single attack, however, made simultaneously with the second crusading movement (A. D. 1146), amounted to no more than a great and destructive plundering raid in Greece. An insurrection in Corfu gave that island to him, after which his fleet ravaged the coasts of Euboea and Attica, Acarnania and Etolia. "It then entered the gulf of Corinth, and debarked a body of troops at Crissa. This force marched through the country to Thebes, plundering every town and village on the way. Thebes offered no resistance, and was plundered in the most deliberate and barbarous manner. The inhabitants were numerous and wealthy. The soil of Bœotia is extremely productive, and numerous manufactures established in the city of Thebes gave additional value to the abundant produce of agricultural industry. . . . All military spirit was now dead, and the Thebans had so long lived without any fear of invasion that they had not even adopted any effectual measures to secure or conceal their movable property. The conquerors, secure against all danger of interruption, plundered Thebes at their leisure. . . . When all ordinary means of collecting booty were exhausted, the citizens were compelled to take an oath on the Holy Scriptures that they had not concealed any portion of their property'



yet many of the wealthiest were dragged away captive, in order to profit by their ransom; and many of the most skilful workmen in the silk-manufactories, for which Thebes had long been famous, were pressed on board the fleet to labour at the oar. . . . Benjamin of Tudela, who visited Thebes about twenty years later, or perhaps in 1161, speaks of it as then a large city, with two thousand Jewish inhabitants, who were the most eminent manufacturers of silk and purple cloth in all Greece. The silks of Thebes continued to be celebrated as of superior quality after this invasion. . . . From Bœotia the army passed to Corinth. . . . Corinth was sacked as cruelly as Thebes; men of rank, beautiful women, and skilful artisans, with their wives and families, were carried away into captivity. . . . This invasion of Greece was conducted entirely as a plundering expedition. . . . Corfu was the only conquest of which Roger retained possession; yet this passing invasion is the period from which the decline of Byzantine Greece is to be dated. The century-and-a-half which preceded this disaster had passed in uninterrupted tranquillity, and the Greek people had increased rapidly in numbers and wealth. The power of the Slavonian population sank with the ruin of the kingdom of Achrida; and the Slavonians who now dwell in Greece were peaceable cultivators of the soil, or graziers. The Greek population, on the other hand, was in possession of an extensive commerce and many flourishing manufactures. The ruin of this commerce and of these manufactures has been ascribed to the transference of the silk trade from Thebes and Corinth to Palermo, under the judicious protection it received from Roger; but it would be more correct to say that the injudicious and oppressive financial administration of the Byzantine Emperors destroyed the commercial prosperity and manufacturing industry of the Greeks; while the wise liberality and intelligent protection of the Norman kings extended the commerce and increased the industry of the Sicilians. When the Sicilian fleet returned to Palermo, Roger determined to employ all the silk-manufacturers in their original occupations. He consequently collected all their families together, and settled them at Palermo, supplying them with the means of exercising their industry with profit to themselves, and inducing them to teach his own subjects to manufacture the richest brocades, and to rival the rarest productions of the East. . . . It is not remarkable that the commerce and manufactures of Greece were transferred in the course of another century to Sicily and Italy."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of Byzantine and Greek Empires*, from 716 to 1453, bk. 3, ch. 2, sect. 3.

**A. D. 1147-1148.—Trouble with the German and French Crusaders.** See CRUSADES: A. D. 1147-1149.

**A. D. 1185-1204.—The Angeli.—Isaac II., A. D. 1185-1195; Alexius III., A. D. 1195-1203; Alexius IV., A. D. 1203-1204.**

**A. D. 1203-1204.—Its overthrow by the Venetians and Crusaders.—Sack of Constantinople.**—The last of the Comnenian Emperors in the male line—the brutal Andronicus I.—perished horribly in a wild insurrection at Constantinople which his tyranny provoked, A. D. 1185. His successor, Isaac Angelus, collaterally related to the imperial house, had been a

contemptible creature before his coronation, and received no tincture of manliness or virtue from that ceremony. In the second year of his reign, the Empire was shorn of its Bulgarian and Wallachian provinces by a successful revolt. In the tenth year (A. D. 1195), Isaac was pushed from his throne, deprived of sight and shut up in a dungeon, by a brother of equal worthlessness, who styled himself Alexius III. The latter neglected, however, to secure the person of Isaac's son, Alexius, who escaped from Constantinople and made his way to his sister, wife of Phillip, the German King and claimant of the western imperial crown. Phillip thereupon plotted with the Venetians to divert the great crusading expedition, then assembling to take ship at Venice, and to employ it for the restoration of young Alexius and his father Isaac to the Byzantine throne. The cunning and perfidious means by which that diversion was brought about are related in another place (see CRUSADES: A. D. 1201-1203). The great fleet of the crusading filibusters arrived in the Bosphorus near the end of June, 1203. The army which it bore was landed first on the Asiatic side of the strait, opposite the imperial city. After ten days of parley and preparation it was conveyed across the water and began its attack. The towers guarding the entrance to the Golden Horn—the harbor of Constantinople—were captured, the chain removed, the harbor occupied, and the imperial fleet seized or destroyed. On the 17th of July a combined assault by land and water was made on the walls of the city, at their northwest corner, near the Blachern palace, where they presented one face to the Horn and another to the land. The land-attack failed. The Venetians, from their ships, stormed twenty-five towers, gained possession of a long stretch of the wall, and pushed into the city far enough to start a conflagration which spread ruin over an extensive district. They could not hold their ground, and withdrew; but the result was a victory. The cowardly Emperor, Alexius III., fled from the city that night, and blind old Isaac Angelus was restored to the throne. He was ready to associate his son in the sovereignty, and to fulfill, if he could, the contracts which the latter had made with Venetians and Crusaders. These invaders had now no present excuse for making war on Constantinople any further. But the excuse was soon found. Money to pay their heavy claims could not be raised, and their hatefulness to the Greeks was increased by the insolence of their demeanor. A serious collision occurred at length, provoked by the plundering of a Mahometan mosque which the Byzantines had tolerated in their capital. Once more, on this occasion, the splendid city was fired by the ruthless invaders, and an immense district in the richest and most populous part was destroyed, while many of the inhabitants perished. The fire lasted two days and nights, sweeping a wide belt from the harbor to the Marmoræ. The suburbs of Constantinople were pillaged and ruined by the Latin soldiery, and more and more it became impossible for the two restored emperors to raise money for paying the claims of the Crusaders who had champed them. Their subjects hated them and were desperate. At last, in January, 1204, the public feeling of Constantinople flamed out in a revolution which crowned a new emperor,—one Alexis Ducas,

nicknamed Mourtzophlos, on account of his eyebrows, which met. A few days afterwards, with suspicious opportuneness, Isaac and Alexius died. Then both sides entered upon active preparations for serious war; but it was not until April 9th that the Crusaders and Venetians were ready to assail the walls once more. The first assault was repelled, with heavy loss to the besiegers. They rested two days and repeated the attack on the 12th with irresistible resolution and fury. The towers were taken, the gates were broken down, knights and soldiers poured into the fated city, killing without mercy, burning without scruple—starting a third appalling conflagration which laid another wide district in ruins. The new emperor fled, the troops laid down their arms,—Constantinople was conquered and prostrate. "Then began the plunder of the city. The imperial treasury and the arsenal were placed under guard; but with these exceptions the right to plunder was given indiscriminately to the troops and sailors. Never in Europe was a work of pillage more systematically and shamelessly carried out. Never by the army of a Christian state was there a more barbarous sack of a city than that perpetrated by these soldiers of Christ, sworn to chastity, pledged before God not to shed Christian blood, and bearing upon them the emblem of the Prince of Peace. . . . 'Never since the world was created,' says the Marshal [Villehardouin] 'was there so much booty gained in one city. Each man took the house which pleased him, and there were enough for all. Those who were poor found themselves suddenly rich. There was captured an immense supply of gold and silver, of plate and of precious stones, of satins and of silk, of furs and of every kind of wealth ever found upon the earth.' . . . The Greek eye-witness [Nicetas] gives the complement of the picture of Villehardouin. The lust of the army spared neither maiden nor the virgin dedicated to God. Violence and debauchery were everywhere present; cries and lamentations and the groans of the victims were heard throughout the city; for everywhere pillage was unrestrained and lust unbridled. . . . A large part of the booty had been collected in the three churches designated for that purpose. . . . The distribution was made during the latter end of April. Many works of art in bronze were sent to the melting-pot to be coined. Many statues were broken up in order to obtain the metals with which they were adorned. The conquerors knew nothing and cared nothing for the art which had added value to the metal."—E. Pears, *The Fall of Constantinople*, ch. 14-15.

ALSO IN: G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine and Greek Empires*, from 716 to 1453, bk. 3, ch. 3, sect. 3.

#### A. D. 1204.—Reign of Alexius V.

A. D. 1204-1205.—The partitioning of the Empire by the Crusaders and the Venetians.—"Before the crusaders made their last successful attack on Constantinople, they concluded a treaty partitioning the Byzantine empire and dividing the plunder of the capital. . . . This treaty was entered into by the Frank crusaders on the one part, and the citizens of the Venetian republic on the other, for the purpose of preventing disputes and preserving unity in the expedition." The treaty further provided for the creation of an Empire of Romania, to take the place of the Byzantine Empire, and for the election of an

Emperor to reign over it. The arrangements of the treaty in this latter respect were carried out, not long after the taking of the city by the election of Baldwin, count of Flanders, the most esteemed and the most popular among the princes of the crusade, and he received the imperial crown of the new Empire of Romania at the hands of the legate of the pope. "Measures were immediately taken after the coronation of Baldwin to carry into execution the act of partition as arranged by the joint consent of the Frank and Venetian commissioners. But their ignorance of geography, and the resistance offered by the Greeks in Asia Minor, and by the Vlachians and Albanians in Europe, threw innumerable difficulties in the way of the proposed distribution of fiefs. The quarter of the Empire that formed the portion of Baldwin consisted of the city of Constantinople, with the country in its immediate vicinity, as far as Blyza and Tzouroulos in Europe and Nicomedia in Asia. Beyond the territory around Constantinople, Baldwin possessed districts extending as far as the Strymon in Europe and the Sangarius in Asia; but his possessions were intermingled with those of the Venetians and the vassals of the Empire. Prokonnesos, Lesbos, Chios, Lemnos, Skyros, and several smaller islands, also fell to his share."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of Greece from its Conquest by the Crusaders*, ch. 4, sect. 1-2.—"In the division of the Greek provinces the share of the Venetians was more ample than that of the Latin emperor. No more than one fourth was appropriated to his domain; a clear moiety of the remainder was reserved for Venice and the other moiety was distributed among the adventurers of France and Lombardy. The venerable Dandolo was proclaimed Despot of Romania, and was invested, after the Greek fashion, with the purple buskins. He ended at Constantinople his long and glorious life; and if the prerogative was personal, the title was used by his successors till the middle of the fourteenth century, with the singular, though true, addition of 'Lords of one fourth and a half of the Roman Empire.' . . . They possessed three of the eight quarters of the city. . . . They had rashly accepted the dominion and defence of Adrianople; but it was the more reasonable aim of their policy to form a chain of factories and cities and islands along the maritime coast, from the neighbourhood of Ragusa to the Hellespont and the Bosphorus. . . . For the price of 10,000 marks the republic purchased of the marquis of Montferat the fertile island of Crete or Candia with the ruins of a hundred cities. . . . In the moiety of the adventurers the Marquis Boniface [of Montferat] might claim the most liberal reward; and, besides the isle of Crete, his exclusion from the throne [for which he had been a candidate against Baldwin of Flanders] was compensated by the royal title and the provinces beyond the Hellespont. But he prudently exchanged that distant and difficult conquest for the kingdom of Thessalonica or Macedonia, twelve days' journey from the capital, where he might be supported by the neighbouring powers of his brother-in-law, the king of Hungary. . . . The lots of the Latin pilgrims were regulated by chance or choice or subsequent exchange. . . . At the head of his knights and archers each baron mounted on horseback to secure the possession of his share, and their first efforts were

generally successful. But the public force was weakened by their dispersion; and a thousand quarrels must arise under a law and among men whose sole umpire was the sword."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 61.

**A. D. 1204-1205.**—The political shaping of the fragments. See ROMANIA, THE EMPIRE; GREEK EMPIRE OF NICÆA; THEBIZOND; EPIRUS; NAXOS, THE MEDIEVAL DUKEDOM; ACHAIA; A. D. 1205-1387; ATHENS; A. D. 1205-1456; SALONIKI.

**A. D. 1261-1453.**—The Greek restoration.—Last struggle with the Turks and final overthrow.—The story of the shadowy restoration of a Greek Empire at Constantinople, its last struggle with the Turks, and its fall is told elsewhere.—See CONSTANTINOPLE; A. D. 1261-1453, to 1453.—“From the hour of her foundation to that in which her sun finally sank in blood, Christian Constantinople was engaged in constant struggles against successive hordes of barbarians. She did not always triumph in the strife, but, even when she was beaten she did not succumb, but carried on the contest still; and the fact that she was able to do so is alone a sufficing proof of the strength and vitality of her organization. . . . Of the seventy-six emperors and five empresses who occupied the Byzantine throne, 15 were put to death, 7 were blinded or otherwise mutilated, 4 were deposed and imprisoned in monasteries, and 10 were compelled to abdicate. This list, comprising nearly half of the whole number, is sufficient indication of the horrors by which the history of the empire is only too often marked, and it may be frankly admitted that these dark stains, disfiguring pages which but for them would be bright with the things which were beautiful and glorious, go some way to excuse, if not to justify, the obloquy which Western writers have been so prone to cast upon the East. But it is not by considering the evil only, any more than the good only, that it is possible to form a just judgment upon an historic epoch. To judge the Byzantine Empire only by the crimes which defiled the palace would be as unjust as if the French people were to be estimated by nothing but the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, the Reign of Terror, and the Commune of 1871. The dynastic crimes and revolutions of New Rome were not a constant feature in her history. On the contrary, the times of trouble and anarchy were episodes between long periods of peace. They arose either from quarrels in the imperial family itself, which degraded the dignity of the crown, or from the contentions of pretenders struggling among themselves till one or other had worsted his rivals and was able to become the founder of a long dynasty. . . . The most deplorable epoch in the history of the Byzantine Empire, the period in which assassination and mutilation most abounded, was that in which it was exposed to the influence of the Crusaders, and thus brought into contact with Western Europe. . . . The Byzantine people, although in every respect the superiors of their contemporaries, were unable entirely to escape the influence of their neighborhood. As the guardians of classical civilization, they strove to keep above the deluge of barbarism by which the rest of the world was then inundated. But it was a flood whose waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth, and sometimes all the high hills were

covered, even where might have rested the ark in which the traditions of ancient culture were being preserved. . . . The Byzantine Empire was predestinated to perform in especial one great work in human history. That work was to preserve civilization during the period of barbarism which we call the Middle Ages. . . . Constantinople fell, and the whole Hellenic world passed into Turkish slavery. Western Europe looked on with unconcern at the appalling catastrophe. It was in vain that the last of the Palaiologoi cried to them for help. ‘Christendom,’ says Gibbon, ‘beheld with indifference the fall of Constantinople.’ . . . Up to her last hour she had never ceased, for more than a thousand years, to fight. In the fourth century she fought the Goths; in the fifth, the Huns and Vandals; in the sixth, the Slavs; in the seventh, the Persians, the Avars, and the Arabs; in the eighth, ninth, and tenth, the Bulgars, the Magyars, and the Russians; in the eleventh, the Koumanoi, the Petchenegoi, and the Seljoukian Turks; in the twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth, the Ottomans, the Normans, the Crusaders, the Venetians, and the Genoese. No wonder that at last she fell exhausted. The wonder is, how she could keep herself alive so long. But it was by this long battle that she succeeded in saving from destruction, amid the universal cataclysm which overwhelmed the classical world, the civilization of the ancients, modified by the Christian religion. The moral and intellectual development of modern Europe are owing to the Byzantine Empire, if it be true that this development is the common offspring of antiquity upon the one hand and of Christianity upon the other.”—Demetrios Bikelas, *The Byzantine Empire* (*Scottish Rev.*, v. 8, 1886).

**BYZANTIUM, Beginnings of.**—The ancient Greek city of Byzantium, which occupied part of the site of the modern city of Constantinople, was founded, according to tradition, by Megarians, in the seventh century B. C. Its situation on the Bosphorus enabled the possessors of the city to control the important corn supply which came from the Euxine, while its tunny fisheries were renowned sources of wealth. It was to the latter that the bay called the Golden Horn was said to owe its name. The Persians, the Lacedæmonians, the Athenians and the Macedonians were successive masters of Byzantium, before the Roman day, Athens and Sparta having taken and retaken the city from one another many times during their wars.

**B. C. 478.**—Taken by the Greeks from the Persians. See GREECE; B. C. 478-477.

**B. C. 440.**—Unsuccessful revolt against Athens. See ATHENS; B. C. 440-437.

**B. C. 408.**—Revolt and reduction by the Athenians. See GREECE; B. C. 411-407.

**B. C. 340.**—Unsuccessful siege by Philip of Macedon. See GREECE; B. C. 340.

**B. C. 336.**—Alliance with Alexander the Great. See GREECE; B. C. 336-335.

**A. D. 194.**—Siege by Severus. See ROME; A. D. 192-284.

**A. D. 267.**—Capture by the Goths. See GOTHIS; A. D. 258-267.

**A. P. 323.**—Siege by Constantine. See ROME; A. D. 305-323.

**A. D. 330.**—Transformed into Constantinople. See CONSTANTINOPLE.

## C.

**ÇA IRA: The origin of the cry and the song.**—"When the news of the disastrous retreat [of Washington, in 1776] through the Jerseys and the miseries of Valley Forge reached France, many good friends to America began to think that now indeed all was lost. But the stout heart of Franklin never flinched. 'This is indeed bad news,' said he, 'but ça ira, ça ira [literally, 'this will go, this will go'], it will all come right in the end.' Old diplomats and courtiers, amazed at his confidence, passed about his cheering words. They were taken up by the newspapers; they were remembered by the people, and, in the dark days of the French Revolution, were repeated over and over again on every side, and made the subject of a stirring song which, till the Marseillaise Hymn appeared, had no equal in France."—J. B. McMaster, *Hist. of the People of the U. S.*, v. 2, p. 89.—L. Rosenthal, *America and France*, p. 203.—"The original words (afterward much changed) were by Ladré, a street singer; and the music was a popular dance tune of the time composed by Béconrt, a drummer of the Grand Opera."—*Century Dictionary*.—"The original name of the tune to which the words were written is 'Le Carillon National,' and it is a remarkable circumstance that it was a great favourite with the unfortunate Marie Antoinette, who used to play it on the harpsichord."—J. Oxenford, *Book of French Songs* (note to "Ça ira").

**CAABA AT MECCA, The.**—"An Arab legend asserts that this famous temple was erected by Abraham and his son Ishmael with the aid of the angel Gabriel. Mahomet lent his authority to the legend and devoted to it several chapters in the Koran, and thus it became one of the Mussulman articles of faith. Even before the introduction of Islamism this story was current through a great part of Arabia and spread abroad in proportion as the Ishmaelitic tribes gained ground. . . . This temple, whose name 'square house' indicates its form, is still preserved. It was very small and of very rude construction. It was not till comparatively recent times that it had a door with a lock. . . . For a long time the sole sacred object it contained was the celebrated black stone hadjarel-aswad, an aerolite, which is still the object of Mussulman veneration. . . . We have already mentioned Hoba, the first anthropomorphic idol, placed in the Caaba. This example was soon copied. . . . The Caaba thus became a sort of Arabian Pantheon, and even the Virgin Mary, with her child on her knees, eventually found a place there."—F. Lenormant, *Manual of Ancient Hist. of the East*, bk. 7, ch. 3.

**ALSO IN:** Sir W. Muir, *Life of Mahomet*, ch. 2.

**CABAL, The.** See CABINET, THE ENGLISH; also, ENGLAND: A. D. 1671.

**CABALA, The.**—"The term Cabala is usually applied to that wild system of Oriental philosophy which was introduced, it is uncertain at what period, into the Jewish schools; in a wider sense it comprehended all the decisions of the Rabbinical courts or schools, whether on religious or civil points."—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, v. 2, bk. 18.—"The philosophic Cabala aspired to be a more sublime and transcendental Rabbinism. It was a mystery not exclusive of, but above their more common mysteries; a secret

more profound than their profoundest secrets. It claimed the same guaranty of antiquity, of revelation, of tradition; it was the true, occult, to few intelligible sense of the sacred writings and of the sayings of the most renowned Wise Men; the inward interpretation of the genuine interpretation of the Law and the Prophets. . . . Then went on; they advanced, they rose from the most full and perfect study of the Talmuds to the higher doctrines, to the more divine contemplations of the Cabala. And the Zohar was the Book of the Cabala which soared almost above the comprehension of the wisest. . . . In its traditional, no doubt unwritten form, the Cabala, at least a Cabala, ascends to a very early date, the Captivity; in its proper and more mature form, it belongs to the first century, and reaches down to the end of the seventh century of our era. The Sepher Yetzirah, the Book of Creation, which boasts itself to be derived from Moses, from Abraham, if not from Adam, or even aspires higher, belongs to the earlier period; the Zohar, the Light, to the later. The remote origin of the Cabala belongs to that period when the Jewish mind, during the Captivity, became so deeply impregnated with Oriental notions, those of the Persian or Zoroastrian religion. Some of the first principles of the Cabala, as well as many of the tenets, still more of the superstitions, of the Talmud, coincide so exactly with the Zendavesta . . . as to leave no doubt of their kindred and affiliation."—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, bk. 30.

**CABILDO, The.** See LOUISIANA: A. D. 1769.

**CABINET, The American.**—"There is in the government of the United States no such thing as a Cabinet in the English sense of the term. But I use the term, not only because it is current in America to describe the chief ministers of the President, but also because it calls attention to the remarkable difference which exists between the great officers of State in America and the similar officers in the free countries of Europe. Almost the only reference in the Constitution to the ministers of the President is that contained in the power given him to 'require the opinion in writing of the principal officer in each of the executive departments upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices.' All these departments have been created by Acts of Congress. Washington began in 1789 with four only, at the head of whom were the following four officials: Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of War, Attorney General. In 1798 there was added a Secretary of the Navy, in 1829 a Postmaster General, and in 1849 a Secretary of the Interior. . . . Each receives a salary of \$8,000 (£1,600). All are appointed by the President, subject to the consent of the Senate (which is practically never refused), and may be removed by the President alone. Nothing marks them off from any other officials who might be placed in charge of a department, except that they are summoned by the President to his private council. None of them can vote in Congress, Art. XI, § 6 of the Constitution providing that 'no person holding any office under the United States shall be a member of either House during his continuance in office.'"—J. Bryce, *The Am. Commonwealth*, ch.

9.—“In 1862 a separate Department of Agriculture was established. . . . In 1889 the head of the Department became Secretary of the Department of Agriculture and a Cabinet officer. A Bureau of Labor under the Interior Department was created in 1881. In 1888 Congress constituted it a separate department, but did not make its head a Secretary, and therefore not a Cabinet officer.” There are now (1891) eight heads of departments who constitute the President's Cabinet.—W. W. and W. F. Willoughby, *Govt. and Administration of the U. S. (Johns Hopkins Univ. Studies, series IX., nos. 1-2), ch. 10.*

**CABINET, The English.**—“Few things in our history are more curious than the origin and growth of the power now possessed by the Cabinet. From an early period the Kings of England had been assisted by a Privy Council to which the law assigned many important functions and duties [see PRIVY COUNCIL]. During several centuries this body deliberated on the gravest and most delicate affairs. But by degrees its character changed. It became too large for despatch and secrecy. The rank of Privy Councillor was often bestowed as an honorary distinction on persons to whom nothing was confided, and whose opinion was never asked. The sovereign, on the most important occasions, resorted for advice to a small knot of leading ministers. The advantages and disadvantages of this course were early pointed out by Bacon, with his usual judgment and sagacity; but it was not till after the Restoration that the interior council began to attract general notice. During many years old fashioned politicians continued to regard the Cabinet as an unconstitutional and dangerous board. Nevertheless, it constantly became more and more important. It at length drew to itself the chief executive power, and has now been regarded, during several generations, as an essential part of our polity. Yet, strange to say, it still continues to be altogether unknown to the law. The names of the noblemen and gentlemen who compose it are never officially announced to the public. No record is kept of its meetings and resolutions; nor has its existence ever been recognized by any Act of Parliament. During some years the word Cabal was popularly used as synonymous with Cabinet. But it happened by a whimsical coincidence that, in 1671, the Cabinet consisted of five persons the initial letters of whose names made up the word Cabal, Clifford, Arlington, Buckingham, Ashley, and Lauderdale. These ministers were therefore emphatically called the Cabal; and they soon made that appellation so infamous that it has never since their time been used except as a term of reproach.”—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng., ch. 2.*—“Walpole's work, . . . the effect of his policy, when it was finally carried through, was to establish the Cabinet on a definite footing, as the seat and centre of the executive government, to maintain the executive in the closest relation with the legislature, to govern through the legislature, and to transfer the power and authority of the Crown to the House of Commons. Some writers have held that the first Ministry in the modern sense was that combination of Whigs whom William called to aid him in government in 1695. Others contend that the second administration of Lord Rockingham, which came into power in 1782, after the triumph of the American colonists, the fall of Lord North, and the defeat of

George III., was the earliest Ministry of the type of to-day. At whatever date we choose first to see all the decisive marks of that remarkable system which combines unity, steadfastness, and initiative in the executive, with the possession of supreme authority alike over men and measures by the House of Commons, it is certain that it was under Walpole that its ruling principles were first fixed in parliamentary government, and that the Cabinet system received the impression that it bears in our own time. . . . Perhaps the most important of all the distinctions between the Cabinet in its rudimentary stage at the beginning of the century and its later practice, remains to be noticed. Queen Anne held a Cabinet every Sunday, at which she was herself present, just as we have seen that she was present at debates in the House of Lords. With a doubtful exception in the time of George III., no sovereign has been present at a meeting of the Cabinet since Anne. . . . This vital change was probably due to the accident that Anne's successor did not understand the language in which its deliberations were carried on. The withdrawal of the sovereign from Cabinet Councils was essential to the momentous change which has transferred the whole substance of authority and power from the Crown, to a committee chosen by one member of the two Houses of Parliament, from among other members. . . . The Prime Minister is the keystone of the Cabinet arch. Although in Cabinet all its members stand on an equal footing, speak with equal voice, and, on the rare occasions when a division is taken, are counted on the fraternal principle of one man, one vote, yet the head of the Cabinet is ‘primus inter pares,’ and occupies a position which, so long as it lasts, is one of exceptional and peculiar authority. It is true that he is in form chosen by the Crown, but in practice the choice of the Crown is pretty strictly confined to the man who is designated by the acclamation of a party majority. . . . The Prime Minister, once appointed, chooses his own colleagues, and assigns them to their respective offices. . . . The flexibility of the Cabinet system allows the Prime Minister in an emergency to take upon himself a power not inferior to that of a dictator, provided always that the House of Commons will stand by him. In ordinary circumstances, he leaves the heads of departments to do their own work in their own way. . . . Just as the Cabinet has been described as being the regulator of relations between Queen, Lords and Commons, so is the Prime Minister the regulator of relations between the Queen and her servants. . . . Walpole was in practice able to invest himself with more of the functions and powers of a Prime Minister than any of his successors, and yet was compelled by the feeling of the time earnestly and profusely to repudiate both the name and title, and every one of the pretensions that it involves. The earliest instance in which I have found the head of the government designated as the Premier is in a letter to the Duke of Newcastle from the Duke of Cumberland in 1746.”—J. Morley, *Walpole, ch. 7.*—“In theory the Cabinet is nothing but a committee of the Privy Council, yet with the Council it has in reality no dealings; and thus the extraordinary result has taken place, that the Government of England is in the hands of men whose position is legally undefined: that while the Cabinet is a word of every-day use, no

lawyer can say what a Cabinet is: that while no ordinary Englishman knows who the Lords of the Council are, the Church of England prays, Sunday by Sunday, that these Lords may be 'endued with wisdom and understanding' that while the collective responsibility of Ministers is a doctrine appealed to by members of the Government, no less than by their opponents, it is more than doubtful whether such responsibility could be enforced by any legal penalties: that, to sum up this catalogue of contradictions, the Privy Council has the same political powers which it had when Henry VIII. ascended the throne, whilst it is in reality composed of persons many of whom never have taken part or wished to take part in the contests of political life."—A. V. Dicey, *The Privy Council*, p. 143.

**CABINET, The Kitchen.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1829.

**CABOCHIENS, The.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1380-1415.

**CABOT, John and Sebastian.**—American Discoveries. See AMERICA: A. D. 1497, and 1498.

**CABUL: A. D. 1840-1841.**—Occupation by the British.—Successful native rising.—Retreat and destruction of the British army. See AFGHANISTAN: A. D. 1838-1842.

**A. D. 1878-1880.**—Murder of Major Cavagnari, the British Resident.—Second occupation by the English. See AFGHANISTAN: A. D. 1869-1881.

**CACIQUE.**—"Cacique, lord of vassals, was the name by which the natives of Cuba, designated their chiefs. Learning this, the conquerors applied the name generally to the rulers of wild tribes, a though in none of the dialects of the continent is the word found."—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, v. 1, p. 210, *foot-note*.

**CADDOAN FAMILY, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PAWNEE (CADDOAN) FAMILY; also, TEXAS: THE ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

**CADE'S REBELLION.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1450.

**CADESIA (KADISIYEH), Battle of.**—This was the first of the decisive series of battles in which the Arab followers of Mohammed effected the overthrow of the Persian Empire (the Sassanian) and the conquest of its dominions. It was desperately fought, A. D. 636, under the walls of the fortified town of Cadesia (Kadisyeh in the Arabic) situated near the Sea of Nedjef, between the Euphrates and the Arabian desert. The Persians numbered 120,000 men, under Rostam, their best general. The Arabs were but 30,000 strong at first, but were reinforced the second day. They were commanded by Sa'ad and led by the redoubtable Kaled. The battle was obstinately prolonged through four days, but ended in the complete rout of the Persians and the death of Rostam, with 40,000 of his men.—G. Rawlinson, *Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy*, ch. 26.—See, also, MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 632-651.

**CADIZ: Origin.** See UTICA, and GADES. A. D. 1596.—Taken and sacked by the English and Dutch. See SPAIN: A. D. 1596.

A. D. 1702.—Abortive English and Dutch expedition against. See SPAIN: A. D. 1702.

A. D. 1810-1811.—Siege by the French. See SPAIN: A. D. 1810-1812.

A. D. 1823.—Siege, bombardment and capture by the French. See SPAIN: A. D. 1814-1827.

**CADMEA (KADMEIA), The.** See GREECE: B. C. 383.

**CADMEANS, OR KADMEIANS.** See BEOTIA.

**CADURCI, The.**—The Cadurei were one of the tribes of ancient Gaul whose chief place was Divona, now Cahors on the Lot.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, v. 4, ch. 17.

**CADUSIANS, The.**—An ancient people so-called by the Greeks, whose territory was on the south-western border of the Caspian Sea,—the district of modern Persians called Ghilan or Ghulan. Their native name was "Gæls."—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, bk. 8, ch. 1.

**CADWALLON, Death of.** See HEVENFIELD, BATTLE OF THE.

**CÆLIAN HILL, The.** See SEVEN HILLS OF ROME.

**CAERLAVEROCK, Siege of.**—A famous siege and reduction of the Scottish castle of Caerlaverock, in Dumfriesshire, by Edward I. A. D. 1300.

**CAERLEON.**—"Caer," like the "Ceaster" of the Saxons, is a corruption by Celtic tongues of the Roman "Castrum." "In memory of the second legion, which had been so long established at the Silurian Isca, they [the Welsh] gave to the ruins of that city the name of Caer-Legion, the city of the legion, now softened to Caerleon."—T. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon*, ch. 5.

**CÆSAR, JULIUS, Career and death of.** See ROME: B. C. 69-63, to 44; GAUL: B. C. 58-51; and BRITAIN: B. C. 55-54.

**CÆSAR, The title.**—"Octavius was the adopted heir of Julius Cæsar; from the moment of his adoption the surname Cæsar became appropriated to him, and it was by this name accordingly that he was most familiarly known to his own contemporaries. Modern writers for the sake of distinction have agreed for the most part to confine this illustrious title to the first of the Cæsarian dynasty; but we should doubtless gain a clearer conception of the gradual process by which the idea of a dynastic succession fixed itself in the minds of the Romans, if we followed their own practice in this particular, and applied the name of Cæsar, not to Augustus only, but also to his adopted son Tiberius, to the sons of the same lineage who succeeded him, and even to those of later and independent dynasties. As late indeed as the reign of Diocletian, the Roman monarch was still eminently the Cæsar. It was not till the close of the third century of our era that that illustrious title was deposed from its preeminence, and restricted to a secondary and deputed authority. Its older use was however revived and perpetuated, though less exclusively, through the declining ages of the empire, and has survived with perhaps unbroken continuity even to our own days. The Austrian Kaiser still retains the name, though he has renounced the succession, of the Cæsars of Rome, while the Czar of Muscovy pretends to derive his national designation by direct inheritance from the Cæsars of Byzantium."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 31.—See, also, ROME: B. C. 31—A. D. 14.

**CÆSAR-AUGUSTA.**—One of the fortified posts established in Spain by the Emperor Augustus, B. C. 27, and in which the veterans of the legions were settled. The place and its name (corrupted) survive in modern Saragossa.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 34.

**CÆSAREA IN CAPPADOCIA:** Origin. See *MIZACA*.

A. D. 260.—Capture, massacre and pillage by Sapor, king of Persia. See *PERSIA*: A. D. 226-437.

**CÆSAREA IN PALESTINE:** Massacre of Jews. See *Jews*: A. D. 66-70.

The Church in. See *CHRISTIANITY*: A. D. 100-312.

**CÆSAROMAGUS IN BRITAIN.**—A Roman town identified, generally, with modern Chelmsford.—T. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon*, ch. 5.

**CÆSAROMAGUS IN GAUL.**—Modern Bervaux. See *BELGIÆ*.

**CÆSARS, The Twelve.** See *ROME*: A. D. 68-90.

**CÆSAR'S TOWER.** See *TOWER OF LONDON*.

**CAFFA.** See *GENOA*: A. D. 1261-1299.

**CAHORS:** Origin. See *CADURCI*. . . . A. D. 1580.—Siege and capture by Henry of Navarre. See *FRANCE*: A. D. 1578-1580.

**CAIRN.** See *BARROW*.

**CAIRO:** A. D. 641.—Origin. See *MAHOMETAN CONQUEST*: A. D. 640-646.

A. D. 967-1171.—Capital of the Fatimite Caliphs. See *MAHOMETAN CONQUEST AND EMPIRE*: A. D. 908-1171.

A. D. 1517.—Capture, sack and massacre by the Ottoman Turks. See *TURKS*: A. D. 1481-1520.

A. D. 1798.—Occupied by the French under Bonaparte. See *FRANCE*: A. D. 1798 (MAY-AUGUST).

A. D. 1800.—Revoit suppressed by the French. See *FRANCE*: A. D. 1800 (JANUARY-JUNE).

A. D. 1801-1802.—Surrender to the English.—Restoration to Turkey. See *FRANCE*: A. D. 1801-1802.

A. D. 1805-1811.—Massacres of the Mamelukes. See *EGYPT*: A. D. 1803-1811.

A. D. 1879-1883.—Revoit against the Khedive and the foreign control.—Occupation by the British. See *EGYPT*: A. D. 1875-1882, and 1882-1883.

**CAIROAN.** See *KAIRWAN*.

**CAIUS, called Caligula, Roman Emperor,** A. D. 37-41.

**CAKCHIQUELS, The.** See *AMERICAN ABOIGINES: QUICHES, and MAYAS*.

**CALABRIA:** Transfer of the name.—“After the loss of the true Calabria [to the Lombards] the vanity of the Greeks substituted that name instead of the more ignoble appellation of Brutium; and the change appears to have taken place before the time of Charlemagne.”—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 45, note.

A. D. 1080.—Norman duchy. See *ITALY (SOUTHERN)*: A. D. 1000-1090.

**CALAIS:** A. D. 1346-1347.—Siege and capture by Edward III.—Immediately after his great victory won at Creci, the English king, Edward III. laid siege to the strong city of Calais. He built a town of huts round the city, “which he called ‘Newtown the Bold,’ and laid it out with a market, regular streets and shops, and all the necessary accommodation for an army, and hither were carried in vast stores of

victuals and other necessaries, obtained by ravaging the country round and by shipment from England.” Calais held out for a year, and angered the king so by its obstinacy that when, in August, 1347, starvation forced its people to surrender, he required that six of the chief burgesses should be given up to him, with halters round their necks, for execution. Eustache St. Pierre and five others nobly offered themselves for the sacrifice, and it was only by the weeping intercession of Queen Philippa that Edward was induced to spare their lives. He expelled all the inhabitants who refused to take an oath of fealty to him and re-peopled the town with Englishmen.—W. Warburton, *Edward III., Second Decade*, ch. 3.—See, also, *FRANCE*: A. D. 1337-1360.

A. D. 1348.—The Staple for English trade. See *STAPLE*.

A. D. 1558.—Recovery from the English by France. See *FRANCE*: A. D. 1547-1559.

A. D. 1564.—Final surrender of English claims. See *FRANCE*: A. D. 1563-1564.

A. D. 1596-1598.—Surprise and capture by the Spaniards.—Restoration to France. See *FRANCE*: A. D. 1593-1598.

**CALATRAVA AND SANTIAGO, Knights of.**—“It was to repress the never-ceasing incursions of the Mohammedans, as well as to return these incursions with interest, that, in the time of Fernando [Fernando II. of the early Spanish kingdom of Leon], two military orders, those of Calatrava and Santiago [or St. Jago—or St. James of Compostella], were instituted. The origin of the former order was owing to the devotion of two Cistercian monks; St. Raymond, abbot of Fitero, and his companion, the friar Diego Velasquez. These intrepid men, who had both borne arms previous to their monastic profession, indignant at the cowardice of the Templars, who resigned into the king of Castile's hands the fortress of Calatrava, which had been confided to their defense by the emperor Alfonso, proposed, in 1158, to the regency of that kingdom, to preserve that position against the assailants. The proposal was readily accepted. The preaching of the warlike abbot was so efficacious, that in a short time he assembled 20,000 men, whom he conducted to Calatrava, and among whom were not a few of his own monks. There he drew up the institutions of the order, which took its name from the place, and which in its religious government long followed the Cistercian rule, and wore the same monastic habit,—a white robe and scapulary. [By pope Benedict XIII. the habit was dispensed with, and the knights allowed to marry ‘once.’—*Foot-note*.] The other order commenced in 1161. Some robbers of Leon, touched with their past enormities, resolved to make reparation for them, by defending the frontiers against the incursions of the Mohammedans. Don Pedro Fernandez—if the ‘don’ has not been added to give something like respectability to the origin—was the chief founder of the order. He engaged the brethren to assume the rule of St. Augustine, in addition to the ordinary obligations of knighthood. His military and monastic fraternity was approved by king Fernando; at whose suggestion the knights chose Santiago as their patron, whose bloody sword, in form of a cross, became their professional symbol. These two orders were richly endowed by successive kings of Leon and

Castile, until their possessions became immense."—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of Spain and Portugal*, bk. 3, sect. 2, ch. 1, div. 2.—In 1396 the knights of the order of St. James of Compostella "received permission to marry. In 1491, the Grand Mastership was united to the crown of Spain." In 1523 the right of nomination to the Grand Mastership of the Order of Calatrava was transferred from the Pope to the crown of Spain, "and since that time the order has gradually merged into a court institution. The state dress is a white robe, with a red cross on the left breast. The permission to marry has been enjoyed since 1540."—F. C. Woodhouse, *Military Religious Orders*, pt. 4.

**CALAURIA, Confederation of.**—A naval confederation, formed at a very early period of Greek history, by the seven maritime cities of Orchomenus, Athens, Ægina, Epidaurus, Hermione, Prasie and Nauplia against the kings of Argos. The island of Calauria, off the eastern point of Argolis, was the center of the confederacy.—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, v. 1, bk. 1, ch. 3.

**CALCINATO, Battle of (1706).** See ITALY (SAVOY AND PIEDMONT): A. D. 1701-1713.

**CALCUTTA: A. D. 1698.**—The founding of the city. See INDIA: A. D. 1600-1702.

**A. D. 1756.**—Capture by Surajah Dowlah.—The tragedy of the Black Hole. See INDIA: A. D. 1755-1757.

**CALDERON, Battle of.** See MEXICO: A. D. 1810-1810.

**CALEDONIA, The name.** See SCOTLAND, THE NAME.

**Ancient Tribes.** See BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.  
**Wars of the Romans.** See BRITAIN: A. D. 78-84.

**CALEDONIA SYLVA.** See BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.

**CALEDONII, The.**—One of the wild tribes which occupied the Highlands of Scotland when the Romans held Britain, and whose name they gave thence to all the Highland tribes and to that part of the island.—W. F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, v. 1.—See BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.

**CALENDAR, The French Republican.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (OCTOBER).

**CALENDAR, Gregorian.**—**Gregorian Era.**—"This was a correction and improvement of the Julian [see CALENDAR, JULIAN]. It was discovered at length, by more accurate astronomical observations, that the true solar or tropical year was 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, and 57 seconds; whence it fell short of the Julian or Egyptian computation of 365 days and 6 hours by an interval of 11 minutes, 3 seconds, . . . which, in the course of 130 years, amounted to a whole day. At the end of 130 years, therefore, the tropical year began a day earlier than the civil, or fell back a day behind it. . . . In the time of Pope Gregory XIII., A. D. 1582, . . . the [vernal] equinox was found to be on the 11th of March, having fallen back ten days. In order, therefore, to bring it forward to its former place of the 21st, he left out ten days in October, calling the 5th the 15th day of that month. Whence in that year of confusion, the 23d day of December became the first of January, A. D. 1583, which was the first year of the Gregorian Era.

In making this correction, he was principally assisted by the celebrated mathematician Clavius. But to prevent the repetition of this error in future, a further reformation of the Julian Calendar was wanting. Because the vernal equinox fell backwards three days in the course of 390 years, Gregory, chiefly by the assistance of Aloysius Lilius, decreed that three days should be omitted in every four centuries; namely, that every first, second and third centennial year, which would otherwise be bissextile, should be a common year; but that every fourth centennial year should remain bissextile. Thus, the years A. D. 1700, 1800, 1900, and 2100, 2200, 2300, were to be common years; but A. D. 1600, 2000, 2400, to remain leap years. By this ingenious reform, the Julian Calendar is rendered sufficiently accurate for all the purposes of chronology, and even of astronomy, for 6000 years to come. . . . The Gregorian or reformed Julian year was not adopted in England until A. D. 1751, when, the deficiency from the time of the Council of Nice then amounting to eleven days, this number was struck out of the month of September, by Act of Parliament; and the 3d day was counted the 14th, in that year of confusion. The next year A. D. 1752, was the first of the new style, beginning January 1, instead of March 25."—W. Hales, *New Analysis of Chronology*, v. 1, bk. 1.—The change from Old Style, as the Julian Calendar, and dates according with it, now came to be called to New Style, or the reformed, Gregorian Calendar, was made in Spain, Portugal, part of Italy, part of the Netherlands, France, Denmark, and Lorraine, in A. D. 1582; in Poland in 1586; in Hungary in 1587; in Catholic Switzerland in 1583; in Catholic Germany in 1584; in most parts of Protestant Germany and Switzerland in 1700 and 1701, and, lastly, in England, in 1751. In Russia, Greece, and the East generally, the Old Style is still retained.—Sir H. Nicolas, *Chronology of History*.

**CALENDAR, Julian.**—**Julian Era.**—"The epoch of the Julian Era, which precedes the common or Christian Era by forty-five years, is the reformation of the Roman calendar by Julius Cæsar, who ordained that the year of Rome 707 should consist of 15 months, forming altogether 445 days; that the ensuing year, 708, should be composed of 365 days; and that every fourth year should contain 366 days, the additional day being introduced after the 6th of the calends of March, i. e., the 24th of February, which year he called Bissextile, because the 6th of the calends of March were then doubled. Julius Cæsar also divided the months into the number of days which they at present contain. The Roman calendar, which was divided into calends, nones and ides, was used in most public instruments throughout Europe for many centuries. . . . The calend is the 1st day of each month. The ides were eight days in each month: in March, May, July and October the ides commence on the 15th, and in all other months on the 13th day. The nones are the 5th day of each month, excepting in March, May, July and October, when the nones fall on the 7th day. The days of the month were reckoned backwards instead of forwards; thus, the 3d calends of February is the 30th of January; the 4th calends of February the 29th January. . . . Excepting July and August, which were named after Julius and Augustus Cæsar, having been called Quintilis and Sextilis, the



Roman months bore their present names. An error prevailed for 37 years after the death of Julius Cæsar, from reckoning every third instead of every fourth year a bissextile, or leap year, as if the year contained 365 days, 8 hours. When this mistake was detected, thirteen intercalations had occurred instead of ten, and the year consequently began three days too late: the calendar was, therefore, again corrected, and it was ordered that each of the ensuing twelve years should contain 365 days only, and that there should not be any leap year until A. U. C. 760 or A. D. 7. From that time the years have been calculated without mistakes, and the Roman year has been adopted by all Christian nations, though about the sixth century they began to date from the birth of our Saviour."—Sir H. Nicolas, *Chronology of History*, p. 4.—"It might naturally have been expected that Julius Cæsar would have so ordered his reformed solar year, as to begin on the day of the winter solstice, which, in the 'Year of Confusion' [i. e., the year in which the error of the calendar was corrected] was supposed to fall on Dec. 25. But he chose to begin his new year on the first of January following, because on that day the moon was new, or in conjunction with the sun, at 7 hours, 6 minutes and 35 seconds after noon. By this means he began his year on a most high or holy day among the ancient Druids, with whose usages he was well acquainted, and also made his new year the first of a lunar cycle."—W. Hales, *New Analysis of Chronology*, v. 1, bk. 1.

ALSO IN: C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 20.—For an account of the subsequent correction of the Julian calendar, see CALENDAR, GREGORIAN.

**CALENDS.** See CALENDAR, JULIAN.

**CALETI,** The. See BELGE.

**CALHOUN, John C., and the War of 1812.**

See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1810-1812.

...And the Nullification Movement. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1828-1833.

**CALIFORNIA: The aboriginal inhabitants.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SHOSHONEAN FAMILY, and MODOCs AND THEIR CALIFORNIA NEIGHBORS.

**A. D. 1543-1781.—Origin of the name.—Early Spanish exploration and settlement.—The founding of the Franciscan missions.—**"The settlements of the Spanish missionaries within the present limits of the State of California date from the first foundation of San Diego in 1769. The missions that were later founded north of San Diego were, with the original establishment itself, for a time known merely by some collective name, such as the Northern Missions. But later the name California, already long since applied to the country of the peninsular missions to the Southward, was extended to the new land, with various prefixes or qualifying phrases; and out of these the definitive name Alta [or Upper] California at last came, being applied to our present country during the whole period of the Mexican Republican ownership. As to the origin of the name California, no serious question remains that this name, as first applied, between 1535 and 1539 to a portion of Lower California, was derived from an old printed romance, the one which Mr. Edward Everett Hale rediscovered in 1862, and from which he drew this now accepted conclusion. For, in this romance, the name California was

already before 1520 applied to a fabulous island, described as near the Indies and also 'very near the Terrestrial Paradise.' Colonists whom Cortes brought to the newly discovered peninsula in 1535, and who returned the next year, may have been the first to apply the name to this supposed island, on which they had been for a time resident. The coast of Upper California was first visited during the voyage of the explorer Juan Cabrillo in 1542-43. Several landings were then made on the coast and on the islands, in the Santa Barbara region. . . . In 1579 Drake's famous visit took place [see AMERICA: A. D. 1572-1580]. . . . It is . . . almost perfectly sure that he did not enter or observe the Golden Gate, and that he got no sort of idea of the existence of the Great Bay. . . . This result of the examination of the evidence about Drake's voyage is now fairly well accepted, although some people will always try to insist that Drake discovered our Bay of San Francisco. The name San Francisco was probably applied to a port on this coast for the first time by Cermeñon, who, in a voyage from the Philippines in 1595 ran ashore, while exploring the coast near Point Reyes. It is now, however, perfectly sure that neither he nor any other Spanish navigator before 1769 applied this name to our present bay, which remained utterly unknown to Europeans during all this period. . . . In 1602-3, Sebastian Vizcaino conducted a Spanish exploring expedition along the California coast. . . . From this voyage a little more knowledge of the character of the coast was gained; and thenceforth geographical researches in the region of California ceased for over a century and a half. With only this meagre result we reach the era of the first settlement of Upper California. The missions of the peninsula of Lower California passed, in 1767, by the expulsion of the Jesuits, into the hands of the Franciscans; and the Spanish government, whose attention was attracted in this direction by the changed conditions, ordered the immediate prosecution of a long-cherished plan to provide the Manila ships, on their return voyage, with good ports of supply and repairs, and to occupy the north-west land as a safeguard against Russian or other aggressions. . . . Thus began the career of Spanish discovery and settlement in California. The early years show a generally rapid progress, only one great disaster occurring,—the destruction of San Diego Mission in 1775, by assailing Indians. But this loss was quickly repaired. In 1770 the Mission of San Carlos was founded at Monterey. In 1772, a land expedition, under Fages and Crespi, first explored the eastern shore of our San Francisco Bay, in an effort to reach by land the old Port of San Francisco. . . . After 1775, the old name began to be generally applied to the new Bay, and so, thenceforth, the name Port of San Francisco means what we now mean thereby. In 1775, Lieutenant Aynla entered the new harbor by water. In the following year the Mission at San Francisco was founded, and in October its church was dedicated. Not only missions, however, but pueblos, inhabited by Spanish colonists, lay in the official plan of the new undertakings. The first of these to be established was San José, founded in November, 1777. The next was Los Angeles, founded in September, 1781."—J. Royce, *California*, ch. 1, sect. 2.

ALSO IN: H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, v. 13 (*California*, v. 1).—F. W. Blackmar, *Spanish Institutions of the Southwest*, ch. 5-15.

**A. D. 1846-1847.—The American conquest and its unexplained preludes.**—“Early in 1846, the Americans in California numbered about 300, mostly able-bodied men, and who in their activity, enterprise, and audacity, constituted quite a formidable element in this sparsely inhabited region. The population of California at this time was 6,000 Mexicans and 200,000 Indians. We now come to a period in the history of California that has never been made clear, and respecting which there are conflicting statements and opinions. The following facts were obtained by careful inquiry of intelligent parties who lived in California during the period mentioned, and who participated in the scenes narrated. The native Californians appear to have entertained no very strong affection for their own government, or, rather, they felt that under the influences at work they would inevitably, and at no very distant period, become a dismembered branch of the Mexican nation; and the matter was finally narrowed down to this contested point, namely, whether this state surgery should be performed by Americans or English, the real struggle being between these two nationalities. In the northern part of the territory, such native Californians as the Vallejos, Castros, etc., with the old American settlers, Leese, Larkin, and others, sympathized with the United States, and desired annexation to the American republic. In the south, Pio Pico, then governor of the territory, and other prominent native Californians, with James Alexander Forbes, the English consul, who settled in Santa Clara in 1828, were exerting themselves to bring the country under English domination. . . . This was the state of affairs for two or three years previous to the Mexican War. For some months before the news that hostilities between the United States and Mexico had commenced [see MEXICO: A. D. 1846-1847] reached California, the belief that such an event would certainly occur was universal throughout the territory. This quickened the impulses of all parties, and stimulated the two rivals—the American and English—in their efforts to be the first to obtain a permanent hold of the country. The United States government had sent Colonel Fremont to the Pacific on an exploring expedition. Colonel Fremont had passed through California, and was on his way to Oregon, when, in March, 1846, Lieutenant Gillespie, of the United States marine service, was sent from Washington with dispatches to Colonel Fremont. Lieutenant Gillespie went across Mexico to Mazatlan, and from thence by sea to California. He finally overtook Fremont early in June, 1846, a short distance on the road to Oregon, and communicated to him the purport of his dispatches, they having been committed to memory and the papers destroyed before he entered Mexico. What these instructions authorized Colonel Fremont to do has never been promulgated, but it is said they directed him to remain in California, and hold himself in readiness to cooperate with the United States fleet, in case war with Mexico should occur. Fremont immediately returned to California, and camped a short time on Feather River, and then took up his headquarters at Sutter's Fort. A few days after, on Sunday, June 14th, 1846, a party of

fourteen Americans, under no apparent command, appeared in Sonoma, captured the place, raised the Bear flag, proclaimed the independence of California, and carried off to Fremont's headquarters four prominent citizens, namely, the two Vallejos, J. P. Leese, and Colonel Prudhon. On the consummation of these achievements, one Merritt was elected captain. This was a rough party of revolutionists, and the manner in which they improvised the famous Bear flag shows upon what slender means nations and kingdoms are sometimes started. From an estimable old lady they obtained a fragmentary portion of her white skirt, on which they painted what was intended to represent a grizzly bear, but not being artistic in their work . . . the Mexicans, with their usual happy faculty on such occasions, called it the ‘Bandera Colchis,’ or ‘Hog Flag.’ This flag now ornaments the rooms of the Pioneer Society in San Francisco. On the 18th of June, 1846, William B. Ide, a native of New England, who had emigrated to California the year previous, issued a proclamation as commander-in-chief of the fortress of Sonoma. This proclamation declared the purpose to overthrow the existing government, and establish in its place the republican form. . . . General Castro now proposed to attack the feebly manned post at Sonoma, but he was frustrated by a rapid movement of Fremont, who, on the 4th of July, 1846, called a meeting of Americans at Sonoma; and this assembly, acting under his advice, proclaimed the independence of the country, appointed Fremont Governor, and declared war against Mexico. During these proceedings at Sonoma, a flag with one star floated over the headquarters of Fremont at Sutter's Fort. The meaning of this lone-star flag no one seems to have understood. . . . Just as Fremont, with his company, had started for the coast to confront Castro, and act on the aggressive generally, he was suddenly brought to a stand by the astounding intelligence that Commodore Sloat had arrived at Monterey, and that, on the 7th of July, 1846, he had raised the American flag and taken possession of the place; also, that, by command of Commodore Sloat, Commander Montgomery, of the United States sloop-of-war Portsmouth, then lying in San Francisco Bay, had, on the 8th of July, taken possession of Yerba Buena and raised the American flag on the plaza. This of course settled the business for all parties. The Mexican flag and the Bear flag were lowered, and in due time, volens volens, all acquiesced in the flying of the Stars and Stripes. . . . Commodore Sloat . . . had heard of the commencement of hostilities on the Rio Grande, . . . sailed from Mazatlan for California, took possession of the country and raised the American flag on his own responsibility. These decisive steps on the part of Commodore Sloat were not taken a moment too soon, as on the 14th of July the British man-of-war Collingwood, Sir George Seymour commanding, arrived at Monterey,” intending, as Sir George acknowledged, “to take possession of that portion of the country.” In August, Commodore Sloat relinquished the command of the Pacific squadron to Commodore Stockton, who “immediately instituted bold and vigorous measures for the subjugation of the territory. All his available force for land operations was 350 men—sailors and marines. But so rapid and skillful were Stockton's move-

ments, and so efficient was the coöperation of Fremont with his small troop, that California was effectually conquered in January, 1847. During all this period the people of the United States were ignorant of what was transpiring in California and vice versa. But the action of Commodore Sloat . . . and . . . Commodore Stockton . . . did not anticipate the wishes of the United States Government, which had, in June, 1846, dispatched General Kearney across the country from Fort Leavenworth [see NEW MEXICO: A. D. 1846], at the head of 1,000 men, with orders to conquer California, and when conquered to assume the governorship of the territory. General Kearney arrived in California via San Pasqual with greatly diminished forces, December, 1846, a few weeks before active military operations in that region ceased."—E. E. Dunbar, *The Romance of the Age*, pp. 20-42.

ALSO IN: H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, v. 17 (*California*, v. 5), ch. 1-16.—J. C. Fremont, *Memoirs of my Life*, v. 1, ch. 14-15.

A. D. 1848.—Cession to the United States. See MEXICO: A. D. 1848.

A. D. 1848-1849.—The discovery of Gold and the immigration of the Gold-hunters.—"In the summer of 1847 the American residents of California, numbering perhaps 2,000, and mostly established near San Francisco Bay, looked forward with hope and confidence to the future. Their government held secure possession of the whole territory, and had announced its purpose to hold it permanently. . . . It so happened that at this time one of the leading representatives of American interests in California was John A. Sutter, a Swiss by his parentage; a German by the place of his birth in Baden; an American by residence and naturalization in Missouri; and a Mexican by subsequent residence and naturalization in California. In 1839 he had settled at the junction of the Sacramento and American rivers, near the site of the present city of Sacramento." His rancho became known as Sutter's Fort. In the summer of 1847 he planned the building of a flour-mill, and "partly to get lumber for it, he determined to build a saw-mill also. Since there was no good timber in the valley, the saw-mill must be in the mountains. The site for it was selected by James W. Marshall, a native of New Jersey, a skilful wheelwright by occupation, industrious, honest, generous, but 'cranky,' full of wild fancies, and defective in some kinds of business sense. . . . The place for his mill was in the small valley of Coloma, 1,500 feet above the level of the sea, and 45 miles from Sutter's Fort, from which it was accessible by wagon without expense for road-making." Early in 1848 the saw-mill was nearly completed; "the water had been turned into the race to carry away some of the loose dirt and gravel, and then had been turned off again. On the afternoon of Monday, the 24th of January, Marshall was walking in the tail-race, when on its rotten granite bed-rock he saw some yellow particles and picked up several of them. The largest were about the size of grains of wheat. . . . He thought they were gold, and went to the mill, where he told the men that he had found a gold mine. At the time, little importance was attached to his statement. It was regarded as a proper subject for ridicule. Marshall hammered his new metal and found it

malleable; he put it into the kitchen fire, and observed that it did not readily melt or become discolored; he compared its color with gold coin; and the more he examined it the more he was convinced that it was gold." He soon found an opportunity to show his discovery to Sutter, who tested the metal with acid and by careful weighing, and satisfied himself that Marshall's conclusion was correct. In the spring of 1848 San Francisco, a village of about 700 inhabitants, had two newspapers, the 'California' and the 'California Star,' both weeklies. The first printed mention of the gold discovery was a short paragraph in the former, under date of the 15th of March, stating that a gold mine had been found at Sutter's Mill, and that a package of the metal worth \$30 had been received at New Helvetia. . . . Before the middle of June the whole territory resounded with the cry of 'gold'! . . . Nearly all the men hurried off to the mines. Workshops, stores, dwellings, wives, and even ripe fields of grain, were left for a time to take care of themselves. . . . The reports of the discovery, which began to reach the Atlantic States in September, 1849, commanded little credence there before January; but the news of the arrival of large amounts of gold at Mazatlan, Valparaiso, Panama, and New York, in the latter part of the winter, put an end to all doubt, and in the spring there was such a rush of peaceful migration as the world had never seen. In 1840, 25,000—according to one authority 50,000—immigrants went by land, and 23,000 by sea from the region east of the Rocky Mountains, and by sea perhaps 40,000 from other parts of the world. . . . The gold yield of 1848 was estimated at \$5,000,000; that of 1849 at \$23,000,000; that of 1850 at \$50,000,000; that of 1853 at \$65,000,000; and then came the decline which has continued until the present time [1890] when the yield is about \$12,000,000."—J. S. Hittell, *The Discovery of Gold in California* (*Century Magazine*, February, 1891).

ALSO IN: E. E. Dunbar, *The Romance of the Age, or the Discovery of Gold in Cal.*—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, v. 18 (*California*, v. 6) ch. 2-4.

A. D. 1850.—Admission to the Union as a free state.—The Compromise. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1850.

A. D. 1856.—The San Francisco Vigilance Committee.—"The association of citizens known as the vigilance committee, which was organized in San Francisco on the 15th of May, 1856, has had such an influence on the growth and prosperity of that city that now [1877], at the end of 21 years, a true account of the origin and subsequent action of that association will be read with interest. For some time the corruption in the courts of law, the insecurity of the ballot-box at elections, and the infamous character of many of the public officials, had been the subject of complaint, not only in San Francisco, but throughout the State of California. It was evident to the honest and respectable citizens of San Francisco that . . . it would become the duty of the people to protect themselves by reforming the courts of law, and by taking the ballot-box from the hands of greedy and unprincipled politicians." The latter were represented by a newspaper called the Sunday Times, edited by one James P. Casey. The opinion of

the better classes of citizens was voiced by the Evening Bulletin, whose editor was James King. On the 14th of May, 1850, King was shot by Casey, in the public street, receiving a wound from which he died six days later, and intense excitement of feeling in the city was produced. Casey surrendered himself and was lodged in jail. During the evening of the 14th some of the members of a vigilance committee which had been formed in 1851, and which had then checked a free riot of crime in the suddenly populated and unorganized city, by trying and executing a few desperadoes, came together and determined the organization of another committee for the same purpose. "The next day (the 15th) a set of rules and regulations were drawn up which each member was obliged to sign. The committee took spacious rooms, and all citizens of San Francisco having the welfare of the city at heart were invited to join the association. Several thousands enrolled themselves in a few days. . . . The members of the vigilance committee were divided into companies of 100, each company having a captain. Early on Sunday (the 18th) orders were sent to the different captains to appear with their companies ready for duty at the headquarters of the committee, in Sacramento Street, at nine o'clock. When all the companies had arrived, they were formed into one body, in all about 2,000 men. Sixty picked men were selected as a guard for the executive committee. At half-past eleven the whole force moved in the direction of the jail. A large number of spectators had collected, but there was no confusion, no noise. They marched through the city to Broadway, and there formed in the open space before the jail. . . . The houses opposite the jail were searched for men and arms secreted there, the committee wishing to prevent any chance of a collision which might lead to bloodshed. A cannon was then brought forward and placed in front of the jail, the muzzle pointed at the door." The jailer was now called upon to deliver Casey to the committee, and complied, being unable to resist. One Charles Cora, who had killed a United States marshal the November previous, was taken from the jail at the same time. The two prisoners were escorted to the quarters of the vigilance committee and there confined under guard. Two days afterwards (May 20th) Mr. King died. Casey and Cora were put on trial before a tribunal which the committee had organized, were condemned to death, and were hanged, with solemnity, on the 22d, from a platform erected in front of the building on Sacramento Street. "The executive committee, finding that the power they held was perfectly under control, and that there was no danger of any popular excesses, determined to continue their work and rid the country of the gang of ruffians which had for so long a time managed elections in San Francisco and its vicinity. These men were all well known, and were ordered to leave San Francisco. Many went away. Those who refused to go were arrested and taken to the rooms of the committee, where they were confined until opportunities offered for shipping them out of the country. . . . The governor of California at this time was Mr. J. Neely Johnson. . . . The major-general of the second division of state militia (which included the city and county of San Francisco) was Mr. William T. Sherman

[afterwards well known in the world as General Sherman] who had resigned his commission in the United States army and had become a partner in the banking house of Lucas, Turner & Co., in San Francisco. . . . Toward the end of May, Governor Johnson . . . appealed to General Sherman for advice and assistance in putting a stop to the vigilance committee. At this time General Wool was in command of the United States troops, and Commodore Farragut had charge of the navy yard." General Wool was applied to for arms, and Commodore Farragut was asked to station a vessel of war at anchor off San Francisco. Both officers declined to act as requested, having no authority to do so. "When Governor Johnson returned to Sacramento, a writ was issued, at his request, by Judge Terry of the supreme court, commanding the sheriff of San Francisco to bring before him one William Mulligan, who was then in the hands of the vigilance committee." The vigilance committee refused to surrender their prisoner to the sheriff, and General Sherman was ordered to call out the militia of his division to support that officer. At the same time the governor issued a proclamation declaring the city of San Francisco in a state of insurrection. General Sherman found it impossible to arm his militia for service, and resigned the command. The governor sought and obtained arms elsewhere; but the schooner which brought them was seized and the arms possessed by the committee. On attempting to arrest the person who had charge of the schooner, one of the vigilance committee's policemen, named Hopkins, was stabbed by the afterwards notorious Judge Terry, who, with some others, had undertaken to protect the man. "The signal for a general meeting under arms was sounded, and in a short time 1,500 men were reported ready for duty. In an hour 4,000 men were under arms and prepared to act against the so-called law-and-order party, who were collected in force at the different armories. These armories were surrounded." Judge Terry was demanded and delivered up, and all the arms and ammunition in the armories were removed. "In this way was settled the question of power between the vigilance committee, who wished to restore order and were working to establish an honest judiciary and a pure ballot, and their opponents, the law-and-order party, who wished to uphold the dignity of the law by means of a butcher's knife in the hands of a judge of the supreme court. Although the committee were masters in San Francisco, their position was made more precarious by the very fact of their having disarmed their opponents. The attention of the whole Union was attracted to the state of things in California, and it was rumored that instructions had been sent from Washington to all the United States vessels in the Pacific to proceed at once to San Francisco; and that orders were on the way, placing the United States military force in California at the disposal of Governor Johnson. The committee went on steadily with their work. . . . All the important changes which they had undertaken had been carried out successfully, and they would gladly have given up the responsibility they had assumed had it not been for the case of Judge Terry. . . . At last the physicians announced that Hopkins was out of danger, and on the 7th of August Judge Terry was released. . . . Having got rid of

Judge Terry the committee prepared to bring their labours to a close, and on the 18th of August the whole association, numbering over 5,000 men, after marching through the principal streets of San Francisco, returned to their headquarters in Sacramento Street, where after delivering up their arms they were relieved from duty. . . . In the following November there was an election of city and county officers. Every thing went off very quietly. A 'people's ticket', bearing the names of thoroughly trustworthy citizens, irrespective of party, was elected by a large majority, and for the last 20 years San Francisco has had the reputation of being one of the best governed cities in the United States."—T. G. Cary, *The San Francisco Vigilance Committee* (*Atlantic Monthly*, Dec. 1877).

ALSO IN: H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, v. 18 (*California*, v. 6), ch. 25.—Gen. W. T. Sherman, *Memoirs*, ch. 4 (c. 1).

**A. D. 1877-1880.—Denis Kearney and the Sand Lot Party.—The new state constitution.**—"Late in 1877 a meeting was called in San Francisco to express sympathy with the men then on strike at Pittsburg in Pennsylvania. . . . Some strong language used at this meeting, and exaggerated by the newspapers, frightened the business men into forming a sort of committee of public safety. . . . The chief result of the incident was further irritation of the poorer classes, who perceived that the rich were afraid of them, and therefore disposed to deal harshly with them. Shortly after came an election of municipal officers and members of the State legislature. The contest, as is the custom in America, brought into life a number of clubs and other organizations, purporting to represent various parties or sections of a party, and among others a body calling itself 'The Working men's Trade and Labor Union,' the Secretary of which was a certain Denis Kearney. When the election was over, Kearney declared that he would keep his union going, and form a working man's party. He was a drayman by trade, Irish by birth, brought up a Roman Catholic, but accustomed to include his religion among the established institutions he reviled. He had borne a good character for industry and steadiness till some friend 'put him into stocks,' and the loss of what he hoped to gain is said to have first turned him to agitation. He had gained some faculty in speaking by practice at a Sunday debating club called the Lyceum of Self Culture. . . . Kearney's tongue, loud and abusive, soon gathered an audience. On the west side of San Francisco, as you cross the peninsula from the harbor towards the ocean, there is (or then was) a large open space, laid out for building, but not yet built on, covered with sand, and hence called the Sand Lot. Here the mob had been wont to gather for meetings; here Kearney formed his party. At first he had merely vagabonds to listen, but one of the two great newspapers took him up. These two, the *Chronicle* and the *Morning Call*, were in keen rivalry, and the former seeing in this new movement a chance of going ahead, filling its columns with sensational matter and increasing its sale among working men, went in hot and strong for the Sand Lot party. . . . The advertisement which the *Chronicle* gave him by its reports and articles, and which he repaid by advising working men to take it, soon made him a personage; and his

position was finally assured by his being, along with several other speakers, arrested and prosecuted on a charge of riot, in respect of inflammatory speeches delivered at a meeting on the top of Nob Hill, one of the steep heights which make San Francisco the most picturesque of American cities. The prosecution failed, and Kearney was a popular hero. Clerks and the better class of citizens now began to attend his meetings, though many went from mere curiosity, as they would have gone to a circus; the W. P. C. (Working man's Party of California) was organized as a regular party, embracing the whole State of California, with Kearney for its President. . . . The Sand Lot party drew its support chiefly from the Democrats, who here, as in the East, have the larger share of the rabble; hence its rise was not unwelcome to the Republicans, because it promised to divide and weaken their old opponents; while the Democrats, hoping ultimately to capture it, gave a feeble resistance. Thus it grew the faster, and soon began to run a ticket of its own at city and State elections. It carried most of the city offices, and when the question was submitted to the people whether a new Constitution should be framed for California, it threw its vote in favor of having one and prevailed. . . . Next came, in the summer of 1878, the choice of delegates to the convention which was to frame the new Constitution. The Working man's Party obtained a substantial representation in the convention, but its nominees were ignorant men, without experience or constructive ideas. . . . However the working men's delegates, together with the more numerous and less corruptible delegates of the farmers, got their way in many things and produced that surprising instrument by which California is now governed. . . . 1. It restricts and limits in every possible way the powers of the State legislature, leaving it little authority except to carry out by statutes the provisions of the Constitution. It makes 'lobbying,' i. e., the attempt to corrupt a legislator, and the corrupt action of a legislator, felony. 2. It forbids the State legislature or local authorities to incur debts beyond a certain limit, taxes uncultivated land equally with cultivated, makes sums due on mortgage taxable in the district where the mortgaged property lies, authorizes an income tax, and directs a highly inquisitorial scrutiny of everybody's property for the purposes of taxation. 3. It forbids the 'watering of stock,' declares that the State has power to prevent corporations from conducting their business so as to 'infringe the general well-being of the State'; directs the charges of telegraph and gas companies, and of water-supplying bodies, to be regulated and limited by law; institutes a railroad commission with power to fix the transportation rates on all railroads and examine the books and accounts of all transportation companies. 4. It forbids all corporations to employ any Chinese, debars them from the suffrage, forbids their employment on any public works, annuls all contracts for 'coolie labour,' directs the legislature to provide for the punishment of any company which shall import Chinese, and to cause their removal if they fail to observe these conditions. It also declares that eight hours shall constitute a legal day's work on all public works. When the Constitution came to

be submitted to the vote of the people, in May 1879, it was vehemently opposed by the moulded men. . . . The struggle was severe, but the Granger party commanded so many rural votes, and the Sand Lot party so many in San Francisco (whose population is nearly a third of that of the entire State) that the Constitution was carried, though by a small majority, only 11,000 out of a total of 145,000 citizens voting. . . . The next thing was to choose a legislature to carry out the Constitution. Had the same influences prevailed in this election as prevailed in that of the Constitutional Convention, the results might have been serious. But fortunately there was a slight reaction. . . . A series of statutes was passed which gave effect to the provisions of the Constitution in a form perhaps as little harmful as could be contrived, and certainly less harmful than had been feared when the Constitution was put to the vote. Many bad bills, particularly those aimed at the Chinese, were defeated, and one may say generally that the expectations of the Sand Lot men were grievously disappointed. While all this was passing, Keane had more and more declined in fame and power. He did not sit either in the Constitutional Convention or in the legislature of 1880. The mob had tired of his harangues, especially as little seemed to come of them, and as the candidates of the W. P. C. had behaved no better in office than those of the old parties. He had quarreled with the Chronicle. He was, moreover, quite unfitted by knowledge or training to argue the legal, economical, and political questions involved in the new Constitution so that the prominence of these questions threw him into the background. . . . Since 1880 he has played no part in Californian politics, and is indeed so insignificant that no one cares to know where he goes or what he does."—J. Bryce, *The American Commonwealth*, ch. 90 (v. 2), and app. to v. 1 (containing the text of the Const. of Cal).

—♦—

**CALIGULA.** See CAIUS.

**CALIPH, The Title.**—The title Caliph, or Khalifa, simply signifies in the Arabic language "Successor." The Caliphs were the successors of Mahomet.

**CALIPHATE, The.** See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST.

**CALIPHS, The Turkish Sultan becomes successor to the.** See BAGDAD: A. D. 1258.

**CALISCH, OR KALISCH, Treaty of.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1812-1813.

**CALIXTINES, The.** See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1419-1434.

**CALLAO: Siege, 1825-1826.** See PERU: A. D. 1820-1826.

**A. D. 1866.—Reprise of the Spanish fleet.** See PERU: A. D. 1864-1876.

**CALLEVA.**—One of the greater towns of Roman Britain, the walls of which, found at Silchester enclose an area of three miles in circuit.—T. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon*, ch. 5.

**CALLIAS, Peace of.** See ATHENS: B. C. 400-449.

**CALLINICUS, Battle of.**—Fought in the wars of the Romans with the Persians, on the banks of the Euphrates, Easter Eve, A. D. 531. The Romans, commanded by Belisarius, suffered an apparent defeat, but they checked an intended advance of the Persians on Antioch.—G. Rawlinson, *Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy*, ch. 19.

**CALLISTUS II., Pope, A. D. 1110-1124.**

... **Callistus III., Pope, A. D. 1455-1458.**

**CALMAR, The Union of.** See SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1018-1397, and 1397-1527.

**CALPULALPAM, Battle of (1860).** See MEXICO: A. D. 1848-1861.

**CALPURNIAN LAW, The.**—"In this year, B. C. 149, the tribune L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi, who was one of the Roman writers of annals, proposed and carried a Lex Calpurnia, which made a great change in the Roman criminal procedure. Before this time and to the third Punic war, when a magistratus had misconducted himself in his foreign administration by oppressive acts and spoliation, there were several ways of inquiring into his offence. . . . But these modes of procedure were insufficient to protect the subjects of Rome against bad magistratus. . . . The remedy for these evils was the establishment of a court under the name of *Quaestio Perpetua de pecuniis repetundis*, the first regular criminal court that existed at Rome. Courts similarly constituted were afterwards established for the trial of persons charged with other offences. The Lex Calpurnia defined the offence of *Repetundae*, as it was briefly named, to be the taking of money by irregular means for the use of a governor. The name *Repetundae* was given to this offence, because the object of the procedure was to compel the governor to make restitution. . . . The court consisted of a presiding judge . . . and of a body of judges or jurymen annually appointed. The number of this body of judges is not known, but they were all senators. The judge and a jury taken from the body of the judges tried all the cases which came before them during one year; and hence came the name *Quaestio Perpetua* or standing court, in opposition to the extraordinary commissions which had hitherto been appointed as the occasion arose. We do not know that the Lex Calpurnia contained any penalties. As far as the evidence shows, it simply enabled the complainants to obtain satisfaction."—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, ch. 2.

**CALUSA, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: TIMUCUANAN FAMILY.

**CALVEN, Battle of (1499).** See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1390-1499.

**CALVIN AND THE REFORMATION.** See PAPACY: A. D. 1521-1535; and GENEVA: A. D. 1536-1564.

**CAMARCUM.**—The ancient name of the town of Cambrai.

**CAMARILLA.**—A circle of irresponsible chamber counsellors—courtiers—surrounding a sovereign with influences superior to those of his responsible ministers.

**CAMBALU, OR CAMBALEC.** See CHINA: A. D. 1259-1294.

**CAMBAS, OR CAMPA, OR CAMPO, The.** See BOLIVIA: ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS; and AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ANDESANS.

**CAMBORICUM.**—A Roman town in Britain.—"Camboricum was without doubt a very important town, which commanded the southern fens. It had three forts or citadels, the principal of which occupied the district called the Castle-end, in the modern town of Cambridge, and appears to have had a bridge over the Cam, or Granta; of the others, one stood below the town, at Chesterton, and the other above it, at Granchester. Numerous roads branched off from this town.

. . . Bede calls the representative of Camboricum, in his time, a 'little deserted city,' and tells us how, when the nuns of Ely wanted a coffin for their saintly abbess, Etheldreda, they found a beautiful sculptured sarcophagus of white marble outside the city walls of the Roman town.—T. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon*, ch. 5.

**CAMBRAI: A. D. 1581.**—Unsuccessful siege by the Prince of Parma. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1581-1584.

**A. D. 1595-1598.**—End of the Principality of governor Balagni.—Siege and capture by the Spaniards.—Retention under the treaty of Ver-  
vins. See FRANCE: A. D. 1593-1598.

**A. D. 1677.**—Taken by Louis XIV. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1674-1678.

**A. D. 1679.**—Ceded to France. See NIMEGUEN, THE PEACE OF.

**CAMBRAI, The League of.** See VENICE: A. D. 1508-1509.

**CAMBRAL, Peace of.** See ITALY: A. D. 1527-1529.

**CAMBRIA.**—The early name of Wales. See KYMRY, and CUMBRIA; also, BRITAIN: 6TH CENTURY.

**CAMBRIDGE, England, Origin of.** See CAMBORICUM.

**CAMBRIDGE, Mass.**—The first settlement. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1629-1630.

**CAMBRIDGE, Platform, The.** See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1646-1651.

**CAMBYSES, OR KAMBYSES, King of Persia.** B. C. 529-522.

**CAMDEN, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1780 (FEBRUARY—AUGUST).

**CAMERONIAN REGIMENT, The.**—In 1689, when Claverhouse was raising the Highland clans in favor of James II., "William Cleland, who had fought with distinguished bravery at Bothwell, and was one of the few men whom Claverhouse feared, made an offer to the [Scottish] Estates to raise a regiment among the Cameronians, under the colonelcy of the Earl of Angus, and the offer was accepted. Such was the origin of the Cameronian regiment. Its first lieutenant-colonel was Cleland; its first chaplain was Shields. Its courage was first tried at Dunkeld, where these 800 Covenanted warriors rolled back the tide of Celtic invasion; and since that, undegenerate though changed, it has won trophies in every quarter of the world."—J. Cunningham, *Church Hist. of Scotland*, v. 2, ch. 7.

ALSO IN: J. Browne, *Hist. of the Highlands*, v. 2, ch. 8.

**CAMERONIANS, The.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1681-1689.

**CAMISARDS, The revolt of the.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1702-1710.

**CAMORRA, OR CAMORRISTI, The.**—“Besides the regular authorities known to and avowed by the law . . . there existed under the Bourbon rule at Naples [overthrown by Garibaldi in 1860] a self-constituted authority more terrible than either. It was not easy to obtain exact proof of the operation of this authority, for it was impatient of question, its vengeance was prompt, and the instrument of that vengeance was the knife. In speaking of it as one authority it is possible to err, for different forms or branches of this secret institution at times

revealed their existence by the orders which they issued. This secret influence was that of the Camorra, or Camorristi, a sort of combination of the violence of the middle ages, of the trades union tyranny of Sheffield, and of the blackmail levy of the borders. The Camorristi were a body of unknown individuals who subsisted on the public, especially on the smaller tradespeople. A man effected a sale of his ware; as the customer left his shop a man of the people would enter and demand the tax on the sale for the Camorra. None could escape from the odious tyranny. It was impalpable to the police. It did not confine itself to the industry of illicit taxation. It issued its orders. When the Italian Parliament imposed stamp duties, that sensibly increased the cost of litigation, that indispensable luxury of the Neapolitans, the advocates received letters warning them to cease all practice in the courts so long as these stamp duties were enforced. ‘Otherwise,’ continued the mandate, ‘we shall take an early opportunity of arranging your affairs.’ Signed by ‘the Camorra of the avvocati.’ The arrangement hinted at was to be made by the knife. . . . The Italian government, much to its credit, made a great onslaught on the Camorristi. Many were arrested, imprisoned or exiled, some even killed one another in prison. But the total eradication of so terrible a social vice must be [published in 1867] a work of great difficulty, perseverance and time.”—*The Trinity of Italy; by an English Civilian*, p. 70.

**CAMP OF REFUGE AT ELY.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1069-1071.

**CAMPAGNA, OR CAMPANIA.**—“The name of Campania,” says Pelligrini, ‘which was first applied to the territory of Capua alone, extended itself by successive re-arrangements of the Italian provinces over a great part of Central Italy, and then gradually shrank back again into its birth-place, and at last became restricted to the limits of one city only, Naples, and that one of the least importance in Italy. What naturally followed was the total disuse of the name.’ . . . The term Campania, therefore, became obsolete except in the writings of a few mediæval authors, whose statements created some confusion by their ignorance of the different senses in which it had at different times been used. An impression seems, however, to have prevailed that the district of Capua had been so named on account of its flat and fertile nature, and hence every similar tract of plain country came to be called a campagna in the Italian language. The exact time when the name, which had thus become a mere appellative, was applied to the Roman Campagna is not accurately ascertained. . . . It will be seen that the term Roman Campagna is not a geographical definition of any district or province with clearly fixed limits, but that it is a name loosely employed in speaking of the tract which lies round the city of Rome.”—R. Burn, *Rome and the Campagna*, ch. 14, note at end.

ALSO IN: Sir W. Gell, *Topog. of Rome*, v. 1.

**CAMPALDINO, Battle of.** See FLORENCE: A. D. 1289.

**CAMPANIANS, The.** See SABINES; also, SAMNITES.

**CAMPBELL, Sir Colin (Lord Clyde), The Indian Campaign of.** See INDIA: A. D. 1857-1858.

**CAMPBELL'S STATION, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER: TENNESSEE).

**CAMPERDOWN, Naval battle of.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1797.

**CAMPO-FORMIO, Peace of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1797 (MAY—OCTOBER).

**CAMPO SANTO, Battle of (1743).** See ITALY: A. D. 1741—1743.

**CAMPO-TENESE, Battle of (1806).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1805—1806 (DECEMBER—SEPTEMBER).

**CAMPUS MARTIUS AT ROME, The.**—"The history of the Campus Martius presents us with a series of striking contrasts. It has been covered in successive ages, first by the cornfields of the Tarquinian dynasty, then by the parade ground of the great military republic, next by a forest of marble colonnades and porticoes, and, lastly, by a confused mass of mean and filthy streets, clustering round vast mausoleums, and innumerable churches of every size and description. . . . During the time of the Republic, the whole Campus seems to have been considered state property and was used as a military and athletic exercise ground and a place of meeting for the comitia centuriata."—R. Burn, *Rome and the Campagna*, ch. 13, pt. 1.—"We have hitherto employed this name to designate the whole of the meadow land bounded by the Tiber on one side, and on the other by the Collis Hortulorum, the Quirinal and the Capitoline. . . . But the Campus Martius, strictly speaking, was that portion only of the flat ground

which lies in the angle formed by the bend of the stream. According to the narrative of Livy, it was the property of the Tarquins, and upon their expulsion was confiscated, and then consecrated to Mars; but Dionysius asserts that it had been previously set apart to the god and sacrilegiously appropriated by the tyrant. . . . During the republic the Campus Martius was employed specially for two purposes. (1.) As a place for holding the constitutional assemblies (comitia) especially the Comitia Centuriata, and also for ordinary public meetings (conclones). (2.) For gymnastic and warlike sports. For seven centuries it remained almost entirely open. . . . In the Comitia, the citizens, when their votes were taken, passed into enclosures termed septa, or ovilia, which were, for a long period, temporary wooden erections."—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq.*, ch. 1.

**CAMULODUNUM.** See COLCHESTER, ORIGIN OF.

**CAMUNI, The.** See RILÆTIANS.

**CANAAN. — CANAANITES.**—"Canaan signifies 'the lowlands,' and was primarily the name of the coast on which the great cities of Phœnicia were built. As, however, the inland parts of the country were inhabited by a kindred population, the name came to be extended to designate the whole of Palestine, just as Palestine itself meant originally only the small territory of the Philistines."—A. H. Sayce, *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments*, ch. 2.—See PHENICIANS: ORIGIN AND EARLY HISTORY; also, JEWS: THE EARLY HEBREW HISTORY, and HAMITES.

## CANADA.

(NEW FRANCE.)

**Names.**—"The year after the failure of Verazano's last enterprise, 1525, Stefano Gomez sailed from Spain for Cuba and Florida; thence he steered northward in search of the long hoped-for passage to India, till he reached Cape Race, on the southeastern extremity of Newfoundland. The further details of his voyage remain unknown, but there is reason to suppose that he entered the Gulf of St. Lawrence and traded upon its shores. An ancient Castilian tradition existed that the Spaniards visited these coasts before the French, and having perceived no appearance of mines or riches, they exclaimed frequently 'Aca nada' [signifying 'here is nothing']; the natives caught up the sound, and when other Europeans arrived, repeated it to them. The strangers concluded that these words were a designation, and from that time this magnificent country bore the name of Canada. . . . Father Hennepin asserts that the Spaniards were the first discoverers of Canada, and that, finding nothing there to gratify their extensive desires for gold, they bestowed upon it the appellation of Capo di Nada, 'Cape Nothing,' whence by corruption its present name. . . . La Potherie gives the same derivation. . . . This derivation would reconcile the different assertions of the early discoverers, some of whom give the name of Canada to the whole valley of the St. Lawrence; others, equally worthy of credit, confine it to a small district in the neighbourhood of Stadacona (now Quebec). . . . Duponceau, in

the Transactions of the [American] Philosophical Society, of Philadelphia, founds his conjecture of the Indian origin of the name of Canada upon the fact that, in the translation of the Gospel of St. Matthew into the Mohawk tongue, made by Brandt, the Indian chief, the word Canada is always used to signify a village. The mistake of the early discoverers, in taking the name of a part for that of the whole, is very pardonable in persons ignorant of the Indian language. . . . The natural conclusion . . . is, that the word Canada was a mere local appellation, without reference to the country; that each tribe had their own Canada, or collection of huts, which shifted its position according to their migrations."—E. Warburton, *The Conquest of Canada*, v. 1, ch. 1, and Foot-note.—"Canada was the name which Cartier found attached to the land and there is no evidence that he attempted to displace it. . . . Nor did Roberval attempt to name the country, while the commission given him by the king does not associate the name of Francis or any new name therewith. . . . There seems to have been a belief in New England, at a later day, that Canada was derived from William and Emery de Caen (Caen, as the English spelled it), who were in New France in 1621, and later. Cf. Morton's 'New English Cannaan,' Adam's edition, p. 235, and Josselyn's 'Rarities,' p. 5; also, J. Reade, in his history of geographical names in Canada, printed in New Dominion Monthly, xi. 344."—B. F. De Costa, *Jacques Cartier and*



his *Successors* (Narrative and Crit. Hist. of Am., v. 4, ch. 2), and *Editor's foot-note*.—"Cartier calls the St. Lawrence the 'River of Hochelaga,' or 'the great river of Canada.' He confines the name of Canada to a district extending from the Isle aux Coudres in the St. Lawrence to a point at some distance above the site of Quebec. The country below, he adds, was called by the *Indians* Saguenay, and that above, Hochelaga. In the map of Gerard Mercator (1569) the name Canada is given to a town, with an adjacent district, on the river Stadin (St. Charles). Lescarbot, a later writer, insists that the country on both sides of the St. Lawrence, from Hochelaga to its mouth, bore the name of Canada. In the second map of Ortelius, published about the year 1572, New France, Nova Francia is thus divided:—"Canada," a district on the St. Lawrence above the River Saguenay; 'Chilaga' (Hochelaga), the angle between the Ottawa and the St. Lawrence; 'Saguenai,' a district below the river of that name; 'Moscosa,' south of the St. Lawrence and east of the River Richelieu; 'Avalal,' west and south of Moscosa; 'Norumbega,' Maine and New Brunswick; 'Apalachen,' Virginia, Pennsylvania, etc.; 'Terra Corterealis,' Labrador; 'Florida,' Mississippi, Alabama, Florida. Mercator confines the name of New France to districts bordering on the St. Lawrence. Others give it a much broader application. The use of this name, or the nearly allied names of Francisca and La Franciscane, dates back, to say the least, as far as 1525, and the Dutch geographers are especially free in their use of it, out of spite to the Spaniards. The derivation of the name of Canada has been a point of discussion. It is, without doubt, not Spanish, but Indian. . . . Lescarbot admits that Canada is simply an Indian proper name, of which it is vain to seek a meaning. Belleforest also calls it an Indian word, but translates it 'Terre,' as does also Thevet."—F. Parkin, *Pioneers of France in the New World: Champlain, ch. 1, foot-note*.

**The Aboriginal inhabitants.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES; ALGONQUIAN FAMILY; ILLINOIS; OJIBWAYS; SIOUAN FAMILY; ATHAPASCAN FAMILY, AND ESKIMAUAN FAMILY.

**A. D. 1497-1498.—Coast discoveries of the Cabots.** See AMERICA: A. D. 1497 and 1498.

**A. D. 1500.—Cortereal on the coast.** See AMERICA: A. D. 1500.

**A. D. 1501-1504.—Portuguese, Norman and Breton fishermen on the Newfoundland banks.** See NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1501-1578.

**A. D. 1524.—The coasting voyage of Verazano.** See AMERICA: A. D. 1523-1524.

**A. D. 1534-1535.—Possession taken by Jacques Cartier for the King of France.** See AMERICA: A. D. 1534-1535.

**A. D. 1541-1603.—Jacques Cartier's last undertaking.—Unsuccessful French attempts at Colonization.** See AMERICA: A. D. 1541-1603.

**A. D. 1603-1605.—The Beginning of Champlain's Career in the New World.—Colonization at Port Royal.—Exploration of the New England coast.**—In Pontgrève's expedition of 1603 to New France (See AMERICA: A. D. 1541-1603), "Samuel de Champlain, a captain in the navy, accepted a command . . . at the request of De Chaste [or De Chastes]; he was a native of Saintonge, and had lately returned to France from the West Indies, where he had gained a

high name for boldness and skill. Under the direction of this wise and energetic man the first successful efforts were made to found a permanent settlement in the magnificent province of Canada, and the stain of the errors and disasters of more than seventy years was at length wiped away. Pontgrève and Champlain sailed for the St. Lawrence in 1603," explored it as far as the rapids of St. Louis, and then returned to France. They found that the patron of their undertaking, De Chastes, was dead. "Pierre du Guast, Sieur de Monts, had succeeded to the powers and privileges of the deceased, with even a more extensive commission. De Monts was a Calvinist, and had obtained from the king the freedom of religious faith for himself and his followers in America, but under the engagement that the Roman Catholic worship should be established among the natives. . . . The trading company established by De Chaste was continued and increased by his successor. With this additional aid De Monts was enabled to fit out a more complete armament than had ever hitherto been engaged in Canadian commerce. He sailed from Havre on the 7th of March, 1604, with four vessels. Of these, two under his immediate command were destined for Acadia. Champlain, Poutrincourt, and many other volunteers, embarked their fortunes with him, purposing to cast their future lot in the New World. A third vessel was dispatched under Pontgrève to the Strait of Canso, to protect the exclusive trading privileges of the company. The fourth steered for Tadoussac, to barter for the rich furs brought by the Indian hunters from the dreary wilds of the Saguenay. On the 6th of May De Monts reached a harbor on the coast of Acadia;" but, for some reason not to be understood, his projected colony was quartered on the little islet of St. Croix, near the mouth of the river of that name, which became subsequently the boundary between Maine and New Brunswick. Meantime, the fine harbor, now Annapolis, then named Port Royal, had been discovered, and was granted, with a large surrounding territory, by De Monts to De Poutrincourt, who proposed to settle upon it as his feudal proprietor and lord. The colony at St. Croix having been housed and put in order, De Poutrincourt sailed for France, intending to bring his family and establish himself at Port Royal. De Monts, Champlain, and those who remained, suffered a winter of terrible hardships, and thirty-five died before spring. De Monts now resolved to seek a better site for his infant settlement, and, finding no other situation so good he resumed possession of that most desirable Port Royal which he had granted away to Poutrincourt and removed his colony thither. Champlain, meanwhile, in the summer of 1605, had explored the coast southward far down the future home of the English Puritans, looking into Massachusetts Bay, taking shelter in Plymouth harbor and naming it Port St. Louis, doubling Cape Cod (which he called Cap Blanc), turning back at Nausett Harbor, and gaining on the whole a remarkable knowledge of the country and its coast. Soon after Champlain's return from this coasting voyage, De Monts was called home to France, by news of machinations that were threatening to extinguish his patent, and Pontgrève was left in command of the colony at Port Royal.—E. Warburton, *The Conquest of Canada, v. 1, ch. 3.*—In

Do Monts' petition to the king for leave to colonize Acadia that region was defined "as extending from the 40th to the 46th degree of north latitude, or from Philadelphia to beyond Montreal."—F. Parkman, *Pioneers of France in the New World: Champlain*, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: E. F. Slafter, *Memoir pref. to "Voyages of Samuel de Champlain"* (Prince Soc., 1880), ch. 1-5.

A. D. 1606-1608.—The fortunes of the Acadian colony.—"De Monts found his pathway in France surrounded with difficulties. The Rochelle merchants who were partners in the enterprise desired a return for their investments. The Baron de Poutrincourt, who was still possessed with the desire to make the New World his home, proved of assistance to De Monts. De Poutrincourt returned to Acadia and encouraged the colonists, who were on the verge of deserting Port Royal. With De Poutrincourt emigrated at this time a Parisian advocate, named Mark Lescarbot, who was of great service to the colony. During the absence of De Poutrincourt on an exploring expedition down the coast, Lescarbot drained and repaired the colonists' fort, and made a number of administrative changes, much improving the condition of the settlers. The following winter was one of comfort, indeed of enjoyment. . . . In May, however, the sad news reached the colony that the company of the merchants on whom it depended had been broken up. Their dependence being gone, on the 30th of July most of the colonists left Acadia for France in vessels sent out for them. For two years the empty buildings of Port Royal stood, a melancholy sight, with not a white person in them, but under the safe protection of Memberton, the Micmak chief, who proved a trusty friend to the French. The opposition to the company of Rochelle arose from various causes. In addition to its financial difficulties the fact of De Monts being a Protestant was seized on as the reason why nothing was being done in the colony to christianize the Indians. Accordingly when De Monts, fired with a new scheme for exploring the northwest passage, turned over the management of Acadian affairs to De Poutrincourt, who was a sincere Catholic, some of the difficulties disappeared. It was not, however, till two years later that arrangements were made for a new Acadian expedition."—G. Bryce, *Short Hist. of the Canadian People*, ch. 4, sect. 1.

ALSO IN: J. Hannay, *Hist. of Acadia*, ch. 4.

A. D. 1608-1611.—Champlain's third and fourth expeditions.—His settlement at Quebec, discovery of Lake Champlain, and first wars with the Iroquois.—"De Monts in no way lost heart, and he resolved to continue in the career of exploration for settlement. A new expedition was determined on, and De Monts selected the Saint Lawrence as the spot where the effort should be made. Champlain counselled the change. In Nova Scotia and on the coast of New Brunswick and Maine he had been struck by the number of ports affording protection to vessels from sea, and by the small number of Indians whom he had met. In Nova Scotia he would be exposed to rival attempts at settlement, and at the same time he could not see the possibility of obtaining Indian allies. In Canada the full control would remain with those who first made a settlement on the Saint Lawrence,

and Champlain counted the native tribes as powerful instruments in carrying out his policy. We have the key here to his conduct in assisting the Hurons in their wars. . . . In 1608 Champlain started for the St. Lawrence. Pontgravé was with the expedition. A settlement was made at Quebec, as the most suitable place. Some ground was cleared, buildings were commenced, when a conspiracy was discovered. The ringleader was hanged and three of those actively implicated were sent back to France with Pontgravé on his return in the autumn. Matters now went peaceably on. The summer was passed in completing the 'Abitation de Quebec,' of which Champlain has left us a sketch. It was situated in the present Lower Town on the river bank, in the corner where Notre Dame Street meets Sous le Fort Street. It was here Champlain laid the foundation for the future city. Winter came, the scurvy carrying off twenty of their number. . . . In June, Des Marais, Pontgravé's son-in-law, arrived, telling him that Pontgravé was at Tadoussac. Champlain proceeded thither. The question had then to be discussed, what policy should be followed with the Indians? Should they be aided by what force Champlain could command, in the expedition which they had resolved to make against the Iroquois? It is plain that no advance in discovery could have been made without their assistance, and that this assistance could only have been obtained by rendering them service. . . . With the view of making explorations beyond the points then known by Europeans, Champlain in the middle of June ascended the St. Lawrence. About a league and a half west of the river Saint Anne, they were joined by a party of Algonquins who were to form a part of the expedition. Champlain tells us of their mortal feud with the Iroquois, a proof that in no way he created it. They all returned to Quebec, where there was festivity for some days. It was brought to a close and the war parties started; Champlain with nine men, Des Marais and a pilot, joined it [them?]. With his Indian allies he ascended the Richelieu and reached Lake Champlain, the first white man who saw its waters; subsequently for 165 years to be the scene of contest between the Indian and white man, the French and English, the revolted Colonies and the Mother Country. . . . The advance up Lake Champlain was made only by night. They reached Crown Point. They were then in the Iroquois domain; very shortly they knew of the presence of the enemy." On the 30th of July the invaders fought a battle with the Iroquois, who fled in terror before the arguable of Champlain, which killed two of their chiefs and wounded a third. Soon after his return to Quebec from this expedition—the beginning of the long war of the French with the Iroquois—Champlain was summoned to France. The patent of De Monts had been revoked and he could not obtain its renewal. "Nevertheless, De Monts, with his associates decided to continue their efforts, and, in March, 1610, Champlain again started for Canada." After reaching Quebec his stay this time was short. He joined his Indian allies in another expedition of war, and helped them to win another victory over the Iroquois, at a place on the Richelieu, one league above Sorel. On returning he got news of the assassination of

Henry IV and started at once for France. "The death of Henry IV exercised great influence on the fortunes of Canada. He had personally taken interest in Champlain's voyages, and his energetic mind was well qualified to direct the fortunes of a growing colony. Louis XIII. was not then ten years old. Mary of Medecis was under the control of her favourites, Leonora Galligai, and her husband, Concino Concini. Richelieu had not then appeared on the scene. . . . The Jesuits were becoming all-powerful at Court. . . . France was unsettled and disordered. The Protestants, not without provocation, were acting with passion and without judgment. The assassination of the King had alarmed them. The whole kingdom was threatened with convulsion and anarchy, and Canada was to pass out of the notice of those in power: and, in the sense of giving aid, half a century was to elapse before the French Government could comprehend the duty of taking part in the defence of the country, and of protecting the persons of those living in New France. The ground was to be regarded simply as a field for the active trader, side by side with the devoted missionary. Thus the Government fell virtually under the control of the Jesuits, who, impatient of contradiction, aimed only at the establishment of their authority, which was to bring the colony to the verge of destruction." Champlain returned to his colony in the spring of 1611, facing its prospects with such courage as he found in his own stout heart.—W. Kingsford, *Hist. of Canada*, bk. 1, ch. 3-4 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., *Doc. Hist. of N. Y.*, v. 3, pp. 1-9.

**A. D. 1610-1613.**—The Acadian colony revived, but destroyed by the English of Virginia.—Port Royal was left uninhabited till 1610, when Poutrincourt returned at the instance of the king to make the new settlement a central station for the conversion of the Indians,—a work which made some Jesuit missionaries prominent in the history of the New World. His son followed in 1611, with fathers Pierre Biard, and Enemond Masse. Madame la Marquise de Guercheville, a pious Catholic, to whom De Monts had ceded his title to Acadia, and to whom afterwards the French king granted the whole territory now covered by the United States, was the chief patroness of these voyages. Desiring to make another settlement, she despatched a vessel in 1613 with two more Jesuits, father Quentin and Gilbert Du Thet, and forty-eight men under La Saussaye. "When they arrived at Port Royal, they only found five persons—fathers Biard and Masse, their servant, the apothecary Hébert, and another. All the rest were absent, either hunting or trading. They showed the Queen's letter to Hébert, who represented Biencourt in his absence, and taking the two Jesuits, with their servant and luggage aboard, again set sail. It was their intention to establish the colony at Pentagoet, which father Biard had visited the year previous, but when off Grand Manan a thick fog came on, which lasted for two days, and when it became clear, they put into a harbor on the eastern side of Mount Desert Island, in Maine. The harbor was deep, secure and commodious, and they judged this would be a favorable site for the colony, and named the place St. Sauveur. . . . La Saussaye was advised by the principal colon-

ists to erect a sufficient fortification before commencing to cultivate the soil, but he disregarded this advice, and nothing was completed in the way of defence, except the raising of a small palisaded structure, when a storm burst upon the colony, which was little expected by its founders. In 1607 a company of London merchants had founded a colony on the James River, in Virginia, where, after suffering greatly from the insalubrity of the climate and want of provisions, they had attained a considerable degree of property. In 1613 they sent a fleet of eleven vessels to fish on the coast of Acadia, convoyed by an armed vessel under the command of Captain Samuel Argal, who had been connected with the colony since 1609. Argal was one of those adventurers formed in the school of Drake, who made a trade of piracy, but confined themselves to the robbery of those who were so unfortunate as not to be their own countrymen. . . . When Argal arrived at Mount Desert, he was told by the Indians that the French were there in the harbor with a vessel. Learning that they were not very numerous, he at once resolved to attack them. All the French were ashore when Argal approached, except ten men, most of whom were unacquainted with the working of a ship. Argal attacked the French with musketry, and at the second discharge Gilbert Du Thet fell back, mortally wounded; four others were severely injured, and two young men, named Lemoine and Neveau, jumped overboard and were drowned. Having taken possession of the vessel, Argal went ashore and informed La Saussaye that the place where they were was English territory, and included in the charter of Virginia, and that they must remove; but, if they could prove to him that they were there under a commission from the crown of France, he would treat them tenderly. He then asked La Saussaye to show him his commission; but, as Argal, with unparalleled indecency, had abstracted it from his chest while the vessel was being plundered by his men, the unhappy governor was of course unable to produce it. Argal then assumed a very lofty tone. . . . When Argal arrived in Virginia, he found that his perfidious theft of the French governor's commission was likely to cause his prisoners to be treated as pirates. They were put into prison and in a fair way of being executed, in spite of Argal's remonstrances, until struck with shame and remorse, he produced the commission which he had so dishonestly filched from them, and the prisoners were set free. But the production of this document, while it saved the lives of one set of Frenchmen, brought ruin upon all the others who remained in Acadia. The Virginia colonists . . . resolved to send Argal to destroy all the French settlements in Acadia, and erase all traces of their power. . . . The only excuse offered for this piratical outrage of Argal—which was committed during a period of profound peace—was the claim which was made by England to the whole continent of North America, founded on the discoveries of the Cabots more than a century before. That claim might, perhaps, have been of some value if followed by immediate occupancy, as was the case with the Spaniards in the South, but that not having been done, and the French colony being the oldest, it was entitled to, at least, as much consideration as that of Virginia. Singularly enough, this act

produced no remonstrance from France." J. Hannay, *Hist. of Acadia*, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: W. C. Bryant and S. H. Gay, *Popular Hist. of the U. S.*, v. 1, ch. 12.

**A. D. 1611-1616.—The founding of Montreal.**—Champlain's invasion of the Iroquois in New York.—"In 1611 Champlain again returned to America . . . and on the 28th of May proceeded in search of his allies, whom he was to meet by appointment. Not finding them he employed his time in choosing a site for a new settlement, higher up the river than Quebec. After a careful survey, he fixed upon an eligible spot in the vicinity of Mont Royal. His choice has been amply justified by the great prosperity to which this place, under the name of Montreal, has subsequently risen. Having cleared a considerable space of ground, he fenced it in by an earthen ditch and planted grain in the enclosure. At length, on the 13th of June, three weeks after the time appointed, a party of his Indian friends appeared. . . . As an evidence of their good will they imparted much valuable information respecting the geography of this continent, with which they seemed to be tolerably well acquainted as far south as the Gulf of Mexico. They readily agreed to his proposal to return shortly with 40 or 50 of his people to prosecute discoveries and form settlements in their country if he thought proper. They even made a request that a French youth should accompany them, and make observations upon their territory and tribe. Champlain again returned to France, with a view of making arrangements for more extensive operations; but this object was now of very difficult accomplishment. De Monts, who had been appointed governor of Salntonge, was no longer inclined to take the lead in measures of this kind, and excused himself from going to court by stating the urgency of his own affairs. He therefore committed the whole conduct of the settlement to Champlain, advising him, at the same time, to seek some powerful protector, whose influence would overcome any opposition which might be made to his plans. The latter was so fortunate as to win over, almost immediately, the Count de Soissons to aid him in his designs. This nobleman obtained the title of lieutenant-general of New France; and, by a formal agreement, transferred to Champlain all the functions of that high office. The Count died soon after, but Champlain found a still more influential friend in the Prince of Conde, who succeeded to all the privileges of the deceased, and transferred them to him in a manner equally ample. These privileges, including a monopoly of the fur trade, gave great dissatisfaction to the merchants; but Champlain endeavored to remove their principal objection, by permitting as many of them as chose to accompany him to the New World, and to engage in this traffic. In consequence of this permission, three merchants from Normandy, one from Rochelle, and one from St. Malo, accompanied him. They were allowed the privileges of a free trade on contributing six men each to assist in projects of discovery, and giving one-twentieth of their profits towards defraying the expenses of the settlement. In the beginning of March [1613] the expedition sailed from Harfleur, and on the 7th of May arrived at Quebec. Champlain now engaged in a new project." His new project was a voyage of exploration up the Ottawa river, which he accomplished with great

difficulty, through the aid of his Indian allies, but from which he returned disappointed in the hope he had entertained of discovering the northern sea and a way to India thereby. The next summer found Champlain again in France, where "matters still continued favorable for the colony. The Prince of Conde retained his influence at Court, and no difficulty was consequently found in equipping a small fleet, to carry out settlers and supplies from Rouen and St. Malo. On board of this fleet came four fathers of the order of the Recollets, whose benevolence induced them to desire the conversion of the Indians to Christianity. These were the first priests who settled in Canada. Champlain arrived safely, on the 25th of May, at Tadoussac, whence he immediately pushed forward to Quebec, and subsequently to the usual place of Indian rendezvous, at the Lachine Rapids. Here he found his Algonquin and Huron allies full of projects of war against the Iroquois, whom they now proposed to assail among the lakes to the westward, with a force of 2,000 fighting men."—J. MacMullen, *Hist. of Canada*, ch. 1.—"Champlain found the Hurons and their allies preparing for an expedition against their ancient enemies, the Iroquois. Anxious to reconnoitre the hostile territory, and also to secure the friendship of the Canadian savages, the gallant Frenchman resolved to accompany their warriors. After visiting the tribes at the head waters of the Ottawa, and discovering Lake Huron [at Georgian Bay], which, because of its 'great extent,' he named 'a Mer Douce,' Champlain, attended by an armed party of ten Frenchmen, accordingly set out toward the south, with his Indian allies. Enraptured with the 'very beautiful and pleasant country' through which they passed, and amusing themselves with fishing and hunting, as they descended the chain of 'Shallow Lakes,' which discharge their waters through the River Trent, the expedition reached the banks of Lake Ontario. Crossing the end of the lake, 'at the outlet of the great River of Saint Lawrence,' and passing by many beautiful islands on the way, the invaders followed the eastern shore of Ontario for fourteen leagues, toward their enemy's country. . . . Leaving the shores of the lake, the invaders continued their route inland to the southward, for 25 or 30 leagues." After a journey of five days, "the expedition arrived before the fortified village of the Iroquois, on the northern bank of the Onondaga Lake, near the site of the present town of Liverpool. The village was inclosed by four rows of palisades, made of large pieces of timber closely interlaced. The stockade was 30 feet high, with galleries running around like a parapet." In the siege which followed the Iroquois were dismayed by the firearms of Champlain and his men, and by the operation of a moveable tower with which he advanced to their stockade and set fire to it. But his Indian allies proved incapable of acting in any rational or efficient way, or to submit to the least direction, and the attack was abortive. After a few days the invading force retreated, carrying Champlain with them and forcing him to remain in the Huron country until the following spring (1616), when he made his way back to Montreal.—J. R. Brodhead, *Hist. of the State of New York*, v. 1, ch. 3.—The above account, which fixes on Onondaga Lake the site of the Iroquois port to which Champlain penetrated, does not

agree with the views of Parkman, O'Callaghan, and some other historians, who trace Champlain's route farther westward in New York; but it accepts the conclusions reached by O. H. Marshall, J. V. H. Clark, and other careful students of the question. Mr. MacMullen, in the "History of Canada" quoted above, finds an extraordinary route for the expedition via Lakes Huron and St. Clair, to the vicinity of Detroit.—J. V. H. Clark, *Hist. of Onondaga*.

ALSO IN: O. H. Marshall, *Champlain's Exp. ag't the Onondagas.—Champlain's Voyages (Prince Soc.)*, 1880.—E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., *Doc. Hist. of N. Y.*, v. 3, pp. 10-24.

**A. D. 1616-1628.—Champlain and the fur traders.—The first Jesuit mission.—Creation of the Company of the Hundred Associates.**—"The exploration in the distant Indian territories which we have just described in the preceding pages was the last made by Champlain. He had plans for the survey of other regions yet unexplored, but the favorable opportunity did not occur. Henceforth he directed his attention more exclusively than he had hitherto done to the enlargement and strengthening of his colonial plantation, without such success, we regret to say, as his zeal, devotion and labors fitly deserved. The obstacles that lay in his way were insurmountable. The establishment of a factory, we can hardly call it a plantation, at Quebec, was the creature of a company of merchants. They had invested considerable sums in shipping, buildings, and in the employment of men, in order to carry on a trade in furs and peltry with the Indians, and they naturally desired remunerative returns. This was the limit of their purpose in making the investment. . . . Under these circumstances, Champlain struggled on for years against a current which he could barely direct, but by no means control. . . . He succeeded at length in extorting from the company a promise to enlarge the establishment to 80 persons, with suitable equipments, farming implements, all kinds of seeds, and domestic animals, including cattle and sheep. But when the time came, this promise was not fulfilled. Differences, bickerings and feuds sprang up in the company. Some wanted one thing, and some wanted another. The Catholics wished to extend the faith of their church into the wilds of Canada, while the Huguenots desired to prevent it, or at least not to promote it by their own contributions. The company, inspired by avarice and a desire to restrict the establishment to a mere trading post, raised an issue to discredit Champlain. It was gravely proposed that he should devote himself exclusively to exploration, and that the government and trade should henceforth be under the direction and control of Pont Gravé. But Champlain . . . obtained a decree ordering that he should have the command at Quebec, and at all other settlements in New France, and that the company should abstain from any interference with him in the discharge of the duties of his office." In 1620 the Prince de Condé sold his viceroyalty to the Duke de Montmorency, then high-admiral of France, who commissioned Champlain anew, as his lieutenant, and supported him vigorously. Champlain had made voyages to Canada in 1617 and 1618, and now, in 1620, he proceeded to his post again. At Quebec he began immediately the building of a fort, which he called fort St. Louis.

The company of associates opposed this work, and so provoked the Duke of Montmorency by their conduct that "in the spring of 1621, he summarily dissolved the association of merchants, which he denominated the 'Company of Rouen and St. Malo,' and established another in its place. He continued Champlain in the office of lieutenant, but committed all matters relating to trade to William de Caen, a merchant of high standing, and to Émeric de Caen, the nephew of the former, a good naval captain." In the course of the following year, however, the new and the old trading companies were consolidated in one. "Champlain remained at Quebec four years before again returning to France. His time was divided between many local enterprises of great importance. His special attention was given to advancing the work on the unfinished fort, in order to provide against incursions of the hostile Iroquois, who at one time approached the very walls of Quebec, and attacked unsuccessfully the guarded house of the Recollets on the St. Charles." In the summer of 1624 Champlain returned again to France, where the Duke de Montmorency was just selling, or had sold, his viceroyalty to the Duke de Ventadour. "This nobleman, of a deeply religious cast of mind, had taken holy orders, and his chief purpose in obtaining the viceroyalty was to encourage the planting of Catholic missions in New France. As his spiritual directors were Jesuits, he naturally committed the work to them. Three fathers and two lay brothers of this order were sent to Canada in 1625, and others subsequently joined them. . . . Champlain was reappointed lieutenant, but remained in France two years." Returning to Quebec in July, 1626, he found, as usual, that everything but trade had suffered neglect in his absence. Nor was he able, during the following year, to improve much the prospects of the colony. As a colony, "it had never prospered. The average number composing it had not exceeded about 50 persons. At this time it may have been somewhat more, but did not reach a hundred. A single family only appears to have subsisted by the cultivation of the soil. The rest were sustained by supplies sent from France. . . . The company as a mere trading association, was doubtless successful. . . . The large dividends that they were able to make, intimated by Champlain to be not far from forty per centum yearly, were, of course, highly satisfactory to the company. . . . Nearly twenty years had elapsed since the founding of Quebec, and it still possessed only the character of a trading post, and not that of a colonial plantation. This progress was satisfactory neither to Champlain, to the Viceroy, nor to the Council of State. In the view of these several interested parties, the time had come for a radical change in the organization of the company. Cardinal de Richelieu had risen by his extraordinary ability as a statesman, a short time anterior to this, into supreme authority. . . . He lost no time in organizing measures. . . . The company of merchants whose finances had been so skillfully managed by the Caens was by him at once dissolved. A new one was formed, denominated 'La Compagnie de la Nouvelle-France,' consisting of a hundred or more members, and commonly known as the Company of the Hundred Associates. It was under the control and management of Richelieu himself.

Its members were largely gentlemen in official positions. . . . Its authority extended over the whole domain of New France and Florida. . . . It entered into an obligation . . . within the space of 15 years to transport 4,000 colonists to New France. . . . The organization of the company . . . was ratified by the Council of State on the 6th of May, 1628."—E. F. Slafter, *Memoir of Champlain (Voyages: Prince Soc., 1880, v. 1), ch. 9.*

ALSO IN: Père Charlevoix, *Hist. of New France, trans. by J. G. Shea, bk. 4 (v. 2).*

**A. D. 1628-1635.—Conquest and brief occupation by the English.—Restoration to France.**

—"The first care of the new Company was to succor Quebec, whose inmates were on the verge of starvation. Four armed vessels, with a fleet of transports commanded by Roquemont, one of the associates, sailed from Dieppe with colonists and supplies in April, 1628; but nearly at the same time another squadron, destined also for Quebec, was sailing from an English port. War had at length broken out in France. The Huguenot revolt had come to a head. Rochelle was in arms against the king; and Richelieu, with his royal ward, was beleaguering it with the whole strength of the kingdom. Charles I. of England, urged by the heated passions of Buckingham, had declared himself for the rebels, and sent a fleet to their aid. . . . The attempts of Sir William Alexander to colonize Acadia had of late turned attention in England towards the New World; and, on the breaking out of the war, an expedition was set on foot, under the auspices of that singular personage, to seize on the French possessions in North America. It was a private enterprise, undertaken by London merchants, prominent among whom was Gervase Kirke, an Englishman of Derbyshire, who had long lived at Dieppe, and had there married a Frenchwoman. Gervase Kirke and his associates fitted out three small armed ships, commanded respectively by his sons David, Lewis and Thomas. Letters of marque were obtained from the king, and the adventurers were authorized to drive out the French from Acadia and Canada. Many Huguenot refugees were among the crews. Having been expelled from New France as settlers, the persecuted sect were returning as enemies." The Kirkes reached the St. Lawrence in advance of Roquemont's supply ships, intercepted the latter and captured or sank the whole. They then sailed back to England with their spoils, and it was not until the following summer that they returned to complete their conquest. Meantime, the small garrison and population at Quebec were reduced to starvation, and were subsisting on acorns and roots when, in July 1629, Admiral David Kirke, with his three ships, appeared before the place. Champlain could do nothing but arrange a dignified surrender. For three years following, Quebec and New France remained under the control of the English. They were then restored, under a treaty stipulation to France. "It long remained a mystery why Charles consented to a stipulation which pledged him to resign so important a conquest. The mystery is explained by the recent discovery of a letter from the king to Sir Isaac Wake, his ambassador at Paris. The promised dowry of Queen Henrietta Maria, amounting to 800,000 crowns, had been but half paid by the French government, and Charles, then at issue with his

Parliament and in desperate need of money, instructs his ambassador that, when he receives the balance due, and not before, he is to give up to the French both Quebec and Port Royal, which had also been captured by Kirke. The letter was accompanied by 'solemn instruments under our hand and seal' to make good the transfer on fulfilment of the condition. It was for a sum equal to about \$240,000 that Charles entailed on Great Britain and her colonies a century of bloody wars. The Kirkes and their associates, who had made the conquest at their own cost, under the royal authority, were never reimbursed, though David Kirke received the honor of knighthood, which cost the king nothing,"—and also the grant of Newfoundland. On the 5th of July, 1632, Quebec was delivered up by Thomas Kirke to Emery de Cneu, commissioned by the French king to reclaim the place. The latter held command for one year, with a monopoly of the fur trade; then Champlain resumed the government, on behalf of the Hundred Associates, continuing in it until his death, which occurred on Christmas Day, 1635.—F. Parkman, *Pioneers of France in the New World: Champlain, ch. 16-17.*

ALSO IN: *Calendar of State Papers: Colonial Series, 1574-1660, pp. 96-143.*—D. Brymner, *Rept. on Canadian Archives, pp. xi-xiv, and note D.*—H. Kirke, *First English Conquest of Canada.*—See, also, **NEWFOUNDLAND, A. D. 1610-1655.**

**A. D. 1634-1652.—The Jesuit missions and their fate.**—The first of the Jesuit missionaries came to Quebec in 1625, as stated above, but it was not until nearly seven years later that they made their way into the heart of the Indian country and began there their devoted work. "The Father Superior of the Mission was Paul le Jeune, a man devoted in every fibre of mind and heart to the work on which he had come. He utterly scorned difficulty and pain. He had received the order to depart for Canada 'with inexpressible joy at the prospect of a living or dying martyrdom.' Among his companions was Jean de Brébœuf, a man noble in birth and aspect, of strong intellect and will, of zeal which knew no limit, and recognized no obstacle in the path of duty. . . . Far in the west, beside a great lake of which the Jesuits had vaguely heard, dwelt the Hurons, a powerful nation with many kindred tribes over which they exercised influence. The Jesuits resolved to found a mission among the Hurons. Once in every year a fleet of canoes came down the great river, bearing six or seven hundred Huron warriors, who visited Quebec to dispose of their furs, to gamble and to steal. Brébœuf and two companions took passage [1634] with the returning fleet, and set out for the dreary scene of their new apostolate. . . . The Hurons received with hospitable welcome the black-robed strangers. The priests were able to repay the kindness with services of high value. They taught more effective methods of fortifying the town in which they lived. They promised the help of a few French musketeers against an impending attack by the Iroquois. They cured diseases; they bound up wounds. They gave simple instruction to the young, and gained the hearts of their pupils by gifts of beads and raisins. The elders of the people came to have the faith explained to them: they readily owned that it was a good faith for the French, but they could

not be persuaded that it was suitable for the red man. The fathers laboured in hope and the savages learned to love them. . . . Some of their methods of conversion were exceedingly rude. A letter from Father Garnier has been preserved in which pictures are ordered from France for the spiritual improvement of the Indians. Many representations of souls in perdition are required, with appropriate accompaniment of flames, and triumphant demons tearing them with pincers. One picture of saved souls would suffice, and 'a picture of Christ without a beard.' They were consumed by a zeal for the baptism of little children. At the outset the Indians welcomed this ceremonial, believing that it was a charm to avert sickness and death. But when epidemics wasted them they charged the calamity against the mysterious operations of the fathers, and refused now to permit baptism. The fathers recognized the hand of Satan in this prohibition, and refused to submit to it. They baptized by stealth. . . . In time, the patient, self-denying labour of the fathers might have won those discouraging savages to the cross; but a fatal interruption was at hand. A powerful and relentless enemy, bent on extermination, was about to sweep over the Huron territory, involving the savages and their teachers in one common ruin. Thirty-two years had passed since those ill-judged expeditions in which Champlain had given help to the Hurons against the Iroquois. The unforgiving savages had never forgotten the wrong. . . . The Iroquois [1648-1649] attacked in overwhelming force the towns of their Huron enemies; forced the inadequate defences; burned the palisades and wooden huts; slaughtered with indescribable tortures the wretched inhabitants. In one of these towns they found Brébœuf and one of his companions. They bound the ill-fated missionaries to stakes; they hung around their necks collars of red-hot iron; they poured boiling water on their heads; they cut stripes of flesh from their quivering limbs and ate them in their sight. To the last Brébœuf cheered with hopes of heaven the native converts who shared his agony. And thus was gained the crown of martyrdom for which in the fervour of their enthusiasm, these good men had long yearned. In a few years the Huron nation was extinct; famine and small-pox swept off those whom the Iroquois spared. The Huron mission was closed by the extirpation of the race for whom it was founded. Many of the missionaries perished; some returned to France. Their labour seemed to have been in vain; their years of toil and suffering left no trace."—R. Mackenzie, *America: A History*, pp. 326-332.—

"With the fall of the Hurons, fell the best hope of the Canadian mission. They, and the stable and populous communities around them, had been the rude material from which the Jesuit would have formed his Christian empire in the wilderness; but, one by one, these kindred peoples were uprooted and swept away, while the neighboring Algonquins, to whom they had been a bulwark, were involved with them in a common ruin. . . . In a measure, the occupation of the Jesuits was gone. Some of them went home, 'well resolved,' writes the Father Superior, 'to return to the combat at the first sound of the trumpet'; while of those who remained, about twenty in number, several soon fell victims to famine, hardship and the Iroquois. A few

years more, and Canada ceased to be a mission political and commercial interests gradually became ascendant, and the story of Jesuit propaganda was interwoven with her civil and 'liturgical annals.'—F. Parkman, *The Jesuits in N. Am.*, ch. 34.

Also in: Father Charlevoix, *Hist. of New France*, tr. by Shea, bk. 5-7 (v. 2).—J. G. Shea, *The Jesuits, Recollects, and the Indians* (Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v. 4, ch. 6).

A. D. 1634-1673.—Nicolet.—Marquette.—Joliet.—Pioneer exploration in the West and discovery of the Mississippi.—When Champlain gave up his work, the map of New France was blank beyond Lake Ontario and Georgian Bay. The first of the French explorers who widened it far westward was a Norman named Jean Nicolet, who came to America in 1618, and who was trained for many years in Champlain's service. "After dwelling some time among the Nipissings, he visited the Far West; seemingly between the years 1634 and 1640. In a birch-bark canoe, the brave Norman voyageur crossed or coasted Lake Huron, entered the St. Mary's River, and, first of white men, stood at the strait now called Sault Ste Marie. He does not seem to have known of Lake Superior, but returned down the St. Mary's River, passed from Lake Huron through the western detour to Michilimackinac, and entered another fresh-water sea, Michiliganon or Michigan, also afterwards known as the Lake of the Illinois, Lake St. Joseph, Lake Dauphin, or even Algonquin Lake. Here he visited the Menomonee tribe of Indians, and after them the Winnibagoes. . . . The fierce wrath of the Iroquois had driven numbers of the Hurons, Ottawas, and several minor Algonquin tribes westward. The Iroquois, like a wedge, had split the northern tribes into east and west. Sault Ste Marie became a central point for the refugees. . . . Another gathering place for the fugitives had been found very near the south-west corner of this great lake. This was La Pointe, one of the Apostle Islands, near the present town of Ashland in Wisconsin. The Jesuits took up these two points as mission centres. . . . In 1669 the Fathers Dablon and Marquette, with their men, had erected a palisaded fort, enclosing a chapel and house, at Sault Ste Marie. In the same year Father Allouez had begun a mission at Green Bay. In 1670 an intrepid explorer, St. Luson, under orders from Intendant Talon, came west searching for copper-mines. He was accompanied by the afterwards well-known Joliet. When this party arrived at Sault Ste Marie, the Indians were gathered together in great numbers, and with imposing ceremonies St. Luson took possession of 'Sainte Marie du Saut, as also of Lakes Huron and Superior, the island of Manetoulin, and all countries, rivers, lakes, and streams contiguous and adjacent thereunto.' . . . It was undoubtedly the pressing desire of the Jesuit fathers to visit the country of the Illinois and their great river that led to the discovery of the 'Father of Waters.' Father Allouez indeed had already ascended the Fox River from Lake Michigan, and seen the marshy lake which is the head of a tributary of the Mississippi. At last on June 4th, 1673, the French minister, Colbert, wrote to Talon: 'As after the increase of the colony there is nothing more important for the colony than the discovery



of a passage to the South Sea, his Majesty wishes you to give it your attention.' This message to the Intendant came as he was leaving for France, and he recommended the scheme and the explorer he had in view for carrying it out to the notice of the Governor, Frontenac, who had just arrived. Governor Frontenac approved and the explorer started. The man chosen for the enterprise was Louis Joliet, who had already been at Sault Ste Marie. He was of humble birth, and was a native of New France. . . . The French Canadian explorer was acceptable to the missionaries, and immediately journeyed west to meet Marquette, who was to accompany him. . . . M. Joliet met the priest Marquette at St. Ignace Mission, Michilimackinac. Jacques Marquette, of whom we have already heard, was born in 1637 at Laon, Champagne, in France. He sprang of an ancient and distinguished family. . . . On May 17th, 1673, with deepest religious emotion, the trader and missionary launched forth on Lake Michigan their two canoes, containing seven Frenchmen in all, to make the greatest discovery of the time. They hastened to Green Bay, followed the course of Father Alouez up the Fox River, and reached the tribe of the Mascoutins or Fire Nation on his river. These were new Indians to the explorers. They were peaceful, and helped the voyagers on their way. With guides furnished, the two canoes were transported for 2,700 paces, and the head waters of the Wisconsin were reached. After an easy descent of 30 or 40 leagues, on June 17th, 1673, the feat was accomplished, the Mississippi was discovered by white men, and the canoes shot out upon its surface in latitude 43°. Sailing down the great river for a month, the party reached the village of Akansoa, on the Arkansas River, in latitude 34°, and on July 17th began their return journey. It is but just to say that some of the Recollet fathers, between whom and the Jesuits jealousy existed, had disputed the fact of Joliet and Marquette ever reaching this point. The evidence here seems entirely in favour of the explorers. On their return journey the party turned from the Mississippi into a tributary river in latitude 38°. This was the Illinois. Ascending this, the Indian town of Kaskaskia was reached, and here for a time Father Marquette remained. Joliet and his party passed on," arriving at Montreal in due time, but losing all their papers in the rapids of the St. Lawrence. Father Marquette established a mission among the Illinois Indians, but his labors were cut short. He died while on a journey to Green Bay, May 18, 1675. "High encomiums of Father Marquette fill—and deservedly so—the 'Jesuit Relations.' We have his autograph map of the Mississippi. This great stream he desired to call 'Conception River,' but the name, like those of 'Colbert' and 'Buade' [the family name of Count Frontenac], which were both bestowed upon it, have failed to take the place of the musical Indian name."—G. Bryce, *Short Hist. of the Canadian People*, ch. 5, sect. 3.

ALSO IN: F. Parkman, *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West*, ch. 2-5.—C. W. Butterfield, *Hist. of the Discovery of the N. W. by Nicolet*.—J. W. Monette, *Hist. of the Discovery and Settlement of the Valley of the Miss.*, bk. 2, ch. 1 (v. 1).—S. S. Hebbard, *Hist. of Wis. under the dominion of France*, ch. 1-2.

### A. D. 1637-1657.—The Sulpician settlement of Montreal and religious activity at Quebec.

—Champlain was succeeded as governor of New France by M. de Châteaufort, of whose brief administration little is known, and the latter was followed by M. de Montmagny, out of the translation of whose name the Indians formed the title Ontario, signifying "Great Mountain," which they afterwards applied to all the French governors. Montmagny entered with zeal into the plans of Champlain, "but difficulties accumulated on all sides. Men and money were wanting, trade languished, and the Associated Company in France were daily becoming indifferent to the success of the colony. Some few merchants and inhabitants of the outposts, indeed, were enriched by the profitable dealings of the fur-trade, but their suddenly-acquired wealth excited the jealousy rather than increased the general prosperity of the settlers. The work of religious institutions was alone pursued with vigor and success in those times of failure and discouragement. At Sillery, one league from Quebec, an establishment was founded for the instruction of the savages and the diffusion of Christian light [1651]. The Hotel Dieu owed its existence to the Duchesse d'Aiguillon two years afterward, and the convent of the Ursulines was founded by the pious and high-born Madame de la Peltrie. The partial success and subsequent failure of Champlain and his Indian allies in their encounters with the Iroquois had emboldened these brave and polite savages. They now captured several canoes belonging to the Hurons, laden with furs, which that friendly people were conveying to Quebec. Montmagny's military force was too small to allow of his avenging this insult; he, however, zealously promoted an enterprise to build a fort and effect a settlement on the island of Montreal, which he fondly hoped would curb the audacity of his savage foes. The Associated Company would render no aid whatever to this important plan, but the religious zeal of the Abbé Olivier overcame all difficulties. He obtained a grant of Montreal from the king, and dispatched the Sieur de Maisonneuve and others to take possession. On the 17th of May, 1641, the place destined for the settlement was consecrated by the superior of the Jesuits. At the same time the governor erected a fort at the entrance of the River Richelieu," which so far checked the Iroquois that they entered into a treaty of peace and respected it for a brief period.—E. Warburton, *The Conquest of Canada*, v. 1, ch. 12.—The settlement of Montreal was undertaken by an association of thirty-five rich and influential persons in France, among whom was the Duke de Liancourt de la Roche Guyon. "This company obtained a concession of the island in 1640, and a member of the association arrived at Quebec from France with several immigrating families, some soldiers, and an armament valued at 25,000 piastres." In 1642 "a reinforcement of colonists arrived, led by M. d'Ailleboust de Musseau. During the following year, a second party came. At this time the European population resident in Canada did not exceed 200 souls. The immigrants who now entered it had been selected with the utmost care."—A. Bell, *Hist. of Canada*, bk. 3, ch. 1 (v. 1).—In 1657 the seigniority of Montreal was ceded to the Seminary of St. Sulpice in Paris, where the reins of its government



were held until 1692.—Father Charlevoix, *Hist. of New France, trans. by Shea*, v. 3, p. 23.

ALSO IN: F. Parkman, *The Jesuits in North Am.*, ch. 13-15.

**A. D. 1640-1700.—The wars with the Iroquois.**—From about the year 1640 to the year 1700, a constant warfare was maintained between the Iroquois and the French, interrupted occasionally by negotiations and brief intervals of peace. As the former possessed both banks of the St. Lawrence, and the circuits of lakes Erie and Ontario, they intercepted the fur trade, which the French were anxious to maintain with the western nations. . . . The war parties of the League ranged through these territories so constantly that it was impossible for the French to pass in safety through the lakes, or even up the St. Lawrence above Montreal. . . . So great was the fear of these sudden attacks, that both the traders and the missionaries were obliged to ascend the Ottawa river to near its source, and from thence to cross over to the Sault St. Marie, and the shores of Lake Superior. . . . To retaliate for these frequent inroads, and to prevent their recurrence, the country of the Iroquois was often invaded by the French. . . . In 1665, M. Courcelles, governor of Canada, led a strong party into the country of the Mohawks; but the hardships they encountered rendered it necessary for them to return without accomplishing their purpose. The next year, M. de Tracy, Viceroy of New France, with 1,200 French and 600 Indians, renewed the invasion with better success. He captured Te-a-ton-ta-lé-ga, one of the principal villages of the Mohawks, situated at the mouth of the Scholarie Creek; but after destroying the town, and the stores of corn, which they found in caches, they were obliged to retire without meeting an opposing force. Again, in 1684, M. De La Barre, then governor of Canada, entered the country of the Onondagas, with about 1,800 men. Having reached Hungry Bay, on the east shore of lake Ontario, a conference was had with a delegation of Iroquois chiefs. . . . A species of armistice was finally agreed upon, and thus the expedition ended. A more successful enterprise was projected and carried into execution in 1687 by M. de Nonville, then governor of Canada. Having raised a force of 2,000 French and 600 Indians, he embarked them in a fleet of 200 bateau, and as many birch bark canoes. After coasting lake Ontario from Kingston to Irondequoit bay, in the territory of the Senecas, he landed at the head of this bay, and found himself within a few miles of the principal villages of the Senecas, which were then in the counties of Ontario and Monroe." After one battle with about 500 of the Senecas, the latter retreated into the interior, and the French destroyed four of their villages, together with the surrounding fields of growing corn. "To retaliate for this invasion, a formidable party of the Iroquois, in the fall of the same year, made a sudden descent upon Fort Chambly, on the Sorel River, near Montreal. Unable to capture the fort, which was resolutely defended by the garrison, they ravaged the settlements adjacent, and returned with a number of captives. About the same time, a party of 800 attacked Frontenac, on the site of Kingston, and destroyed and laid waste the plantations and establishments of the French without the fortification. In July of the ensuing year the French were made to feel

still more sensibly the power of their revenge. A band of 1,100 warriors, animated with the fiercest resentment, made a descent upon the island of Montreal. . . . All that were without the fortifications fell under the rifle or the relentless tomahawk. Their houses were burned, their plantations ravaged, and the whole island covered with desolation. About 1,000 of the French, according to some writers, perished in this invasion, or were carried into captivity. . . . Overwhelmed by this sudden disaster, the French destroyed their forts at Niagara and Frontenac, and thus yielded the whole country west of Montreal to the possession of the Iroquois. At this critical period Count Frontenac again became governor of Canada, and during the short residue of his life devoted himself, with untiring energy, to restore its declining prosperity."—L. H. Morgan, *League of the Iroquois*, bk. 1, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: W. Kingsford, *Hist. of Canada*, bk. 2-4 (p. 1-2).—E. H. O'Callaghan, ed., *Doc. Hist. of N. Y.*, v. 1, pp. 57-278.—J. R. Brodhead, *Hist. of the State of N. Y.*, v. 2, ch. 3 and 8.—O. H. Marshall, *Expedit. of the Marquis de Nonville ag't the Senecas* (*Hist. Writings*, pp. 123-180).

**A. D. 1660-1688.—French encroachments and English concessions in Newfoundland.** See NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1660-1688.

**A. D. 1663-1674.—Erected by Colbert into a Royal Province.—Brief career of the French West India Company.**—"In 1663 the proceedings of the company [of the hundred associates] became so obnoxious that the king of France decided upon the immediate resumption of his rights, and the erecting of Canada into a royal government; Monsieur de Mézy was appointed governor, and proceeded from France to Quebec with 400 regular troops, and 100 families as settlers, with cattle, horses and implements of agriculture. Under the royal jurisdiction, the governor, a king's commissioner, an apostolical vicar, and four other gentlemen, were formed into a sovereign council, to whom were confided the powers of cognizance in all causes, civil and criminal, to judge in the last resort according to the laws and ordinances of France, and the practice of the Parliament of Paris, reserving the general legislative powers of the Crown, to be applied according to circumstances. This Council was further invested with the regulation of commerce, the expenditure of the public monies, and the establishment of inferior courts at Three Rivers and Montreal. This change of Canada from an ecclesiastical mission to a secular government was owing to the great Colbert, who was animated by the example of Great Britain, to improve the navigation and commerce of his country by colonial establishments. The enlightened policy of this renowned financial minister of Louis XIV. was followed by the success which it deserved. To a regulated civil government was added increased military protection against the Iroquois Indians; the emigration of French settlers to New France was promoted by every possible means, and a martial spirit was imparted to the population, by the location in the colony of the disbanded soldiers of the Carignan regiment . . . and other troops, whose officers became the principal Seigneurs of the colony, on condition of making cessions of land under the feudal tenure, as it still exists, to the soldiers and other inhabitants." The ambitious projects of Louis XIV. soon led, however, to a new measure

which proved less satisfactory in its working. "The French West India Company was remodelled [1664], and Canada added to their possessions, subordinate to the crown of France, with powers controlled by his Majesty's governors and Intendants in the different colonies." The domain of the company embraced all the possessions of France in the New World and its islands and on the African coast. "The company was to enjoy a monopoly of the territories and the trade of the colonies thus conceded for 40 years; it was not only to enjoy the exclusive navigation, but his Majesty conferred a bounty of 30 livres on every ton of goods exported to France. . . . The company was not only endowed as Selsneur with all unconceded lands, but invested with the right of extinguishing the titles of seignories granted or sold by previous companies, on condition of reimbursing the grantees and purchasers for their costs and improvements." The West India Company's management soon showed evil effects, and came to an end after ten years of unsatisfactory trial. "Monsieur De Talon, the Intendant, a man of profound views, . . . perceived that it was the natural interest of the Company to discourage colonization. He represented to the minister Colbert the absolute necessity of the total resumption of the rights of the crown; drew his attention to the means of obtaining abundance of warlike instruments and naval stores within the colony . . . and, in fact, at last prevailed; so that, in 1674, the king of France resumed his rights to all the territories conceded to the West India Company, assumed their debts and the current value of their stock, and appointed a governor, council and judges for the direction of the Canadian colonies. . . . From this period (1674), when the population, embracing converted Indians, did not exceed 8,000, the French settlement in Canada rapidly progressed, and as it rose in power, and assumed offensive operations on the New England frontier, the jealousy of the British colonies became roused, and both parties, aided alternately by the Indians, carried on a destructive and harassing border warfare."—R. M. Martin, *Hist. of Upper and Lower Canada*, ch. I.

ALSO IN: A. Bell, *Hist. of Canada*, bk. 3, ch. 3 (p. 1).—F. Parkman, *The Old Regime in Canada*, ch. 10-17.

**A. D. 1669-1687.—La Salle and the acquisition of Louisiana.**—"Second only to Champlain among the heroes of Canadian history stands Robert Caveller de la Salle—a man of iron if ever there was one—a man austere and cold in manner, and endowed with such indomitable pluck and perseverance as have never been surpassed in this world. He did more than any other man to extend the dominion of France in the New World. As Champlain had founded the colony of Canada and opened the way to the great lakes, so La Salle completed the discovery of the Mississippi, and added to the French possessions the vast province of Louisiana. . . . In 1669 La Salle made his first journey to the west, hoping to find a northwest passage to China, but very little is known about this expedition . . . except that the Ohio River was discovered, and perhaps also the Illinois. La Salle's feudal domain of St. Sulpice, some eight miles from Montreal, bears to-day the name of La Chine, or China, which is said to have been applied to it in derision of this fruitless expedition. In 1673 the priest

Marquette and the fur-trader Joliet actually reached the Mississippi by way of the Wisconsin, and sailed down the great river as far as the mouth of the Arkansas; and now the life-work of La Salle began in earnest. He formed a grand project for exploring the Mississippi to its mouth, and determining whether it flowed into the Gulf of California or the Gulf of Mexico. The advance of Spain on the side of Mexico was to be checked forever, the English were to be confined to the east of the Alleghanies, and such military posts were to be established as would effectually confirm the authority of Louis XIV. throughout the centre of this continent. La Salle had but little ready money, and was surrounded by rivals and enemies; but he had a powerful friend in Count Frontenac, the Viceroy of Canada. . . . At length, after surmounting innumerable difficulties, a vessel [the Griffon or Grillon] was built and launched on the Niagara River (1679), a small party of 30 or 40 men were gathered together, and La Salle, having just recovered from a treacherous dose of poison, embarked on his great enterprise. His departure was clouded by the news that his impatient creditors had laid hands upon his Canadian estates; but, nothing daunted, he pushed on through Lakes Erie and Huron, and after many disasters reached the southern extremity of Lake Michigan. The vessel was now sent back, with half the party, to Niagara, carrying furs to appease the creditors and purchase additional supplies for the remainder of the journey, while La Salle with his diminished company pushed on to the Illinois, where a fort was built, and appropriately named Fort Crèvecoeur, or, as we might translate it, the 'fort of the breaking heart.' Here, amid perils of famine, mutiny, and Indian attack, and exposed to death from the wintry cold, they waited until it became evident to all that their vessel must have perished. She never was heard from again, and most likely had foundered on her perilous voyage. To add to the trouble, La Salle was again poisoned; but his iron constitution, aided by some lucky antidote, again carried him safely through the ordeal, and about the 1st of March, 1680, he started on foot for Montreal. Leaving Fort Crèvecoeur and its tiny garrison under command of his faithful lieutenant, Tonty, he set out with four Frenchmen and one Mohegan guide. . . . They made their way for a thousand miles across Michigan and Western Canada to Niagara, and so on to Montreal. . . . At Niagara La Salle learned that a ship from France, freighted for him with a cargo worth more than 20,000 livres, had been wrecked in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and nothing had been saved. In spite of this dreadful blow, he contrived to get together supplies and reinforcements at Montreal, and had returned to Fort Frontenac, at the lower end of Lake Ontario, when still more woful tidings were received. Here, toward the end of July, a message came from the fortress so well named Crèvecoeur. The garrison had mutinied and destroyed the fort, and made their way back through Michigan." The indomitable La Salle promptly hunted down the deserters, and sent them in chains to Quebec. He then "proceeded again to the Illinois to reconstruct his fort, and rescue, if possible, his lieutenant Tonty and the few faithful followers who had survived the mutiny. This little party, abandoned in the wilderness had found shelter among the Illinois Indians; but during the sum-

mer of 1680 the great village or town of the Illinois was destroyed by the Iroquois, and the hard-pressed Frenchmen retreated up the western shore of Lake Michigan to Green Bay. On arriving at the Illinois, therefore, La Salle found nothing but the terrible traces of fire and massacre and cannibal orgies; but he spent the following winter to good purpose in securing the friendship of the western Indians, and in making an alliance with them against the Iroquois. Then, in May, 1681, he set out again for Canada, to look after his creditors and obtain new resources. On the way home, at the outlet of Lake Michigan, he met his friend Tonty, and together they paddled their canoes a thousand miles and came to Fort Frontenac. So, after all this hardship and disaster, the work was to be begun anew; and the enemies of the great explorer were exulting in what they imagined must be his despair. But that was a word of which La Salle knew not the meaning, and now his fortunes began to change. In Mr. Parkman's words, 'Fate at length seemed tired of the conflict with so stubborn an adversary.' At this third venture everything went smoothly. The little fleet passed up the great lakes, from the outlet of Ontario to the head of Michigan, and gained the Chicago River. Crossing the narrow portage, they descended the Illinois and the Mississippi, till they came out upon the Gulf of Mexico; and on the 9th of April, 1682, the fleurs-de-lis were planted at the mouth of the great river, and all the country drained by its tributaries, from the Alleghanies to the Rocky Mountains, was formally declared to be the property of the king of France, and named after him Louisiana. Returning up the river after his triumph, La Salle founded a station or small colony on the Illinois, which he called St. Louis, and leaving Tonty in command, kept on to Canada, and crossed to France for means to circumvent his enemies and complete his far-reaching schemes. A colony was to be founded at the mouth of the Mississippi, and military stations were to connect this with the French settlements in Canada. At the French court La Salle was treated like a hero, and a fine expedition was soon fitted out, but everything was ruined by jealousy and ill-will between La Salle and the naval commander, Beaujeu. The fleet sailed beyond the mouth of the Mississippi, the colony was thrown upon the coast of Texas, some of the vessels were wrecked, and Beaujeu—though apparently without sinister design—sailed away with the rest, and two years of terrible suffering followed. At last, in March, 1687, La Salle started to find the Mississippi, hoping to ascend it to Tonty's fort on the Illinois, and obtain relief for his followers. But he had scarcely set out on this desperate enterprise when two or three mutinous wretches of his party laid an ambush for him in the forest, and shot him dead. Thus, at the early age of forty-three, perished this extraordinary man, with his life-work but half accomplished. Yet his labors had done much towards building up the imposing dominion with which New France confronted New England in the following century."

—J. Fiske, *The Romance of the Spanish and French Explorers* (*Harper's Mag.*, v. 64, pp. 446-448).

ALSO IN: F. Parkman, *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West*.—Chevalier Tonty, *Account of M. de la Salle's last Exp.* (*N. Y. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, v. 2).—J. G. Shea, *Discovery and Expl. of the Mis-*

*issippi Valley*.—C. Le Clercq, *First Establishment of the Faith in N. France*, tr. by Shea, ch. 21-25 (v. 2).

A. D. 1689-1690.—The first Inter-Colonial War (King William's War): The Schenectady Massacre.—Montreal threatened, Quebec attacked, and Port Royal taken by the English.

—The Revolution of 1688, in England, which drove James II. from the throne, and called to it his daughter Mary with her able husband, William of Orange, produced war between England and France (see FRANCE: A. D. 1689-1690). The French and English colonies in America were soon involved in the contest, and so far as it troubled American history, it bears in New England annals the name of King William's War. "If the issue had depended on the condition of the colonies, it could hardly have seemed doubtful. The French census for the North American continent, in 1688, showed but 11,249 persons, scarcely a tenth part of the English population on its frontiers; about a twentieth part of English North America. West of Montreal, the principal French posts, and those but inconsiderable ones, were at Frontenac, at Mackinaw, and on the Illinois. At Niagara, there was a wavering purpose of maintaining a post, but no permanent occupation. So weak were the garrisons that English traders, with an escort of Indians, had ventured even to Mackinaw.

France, bounding its territory next New England by the Kennebec, claimed the whole eastern coast, Nova Scotia, Cape Breton, Newfoundland, Labrador, and Hudson's Bay; and to assert and defend this boundless region, Acadia and its dependencies counted but 900 French inhabitants. The missionaries, swaying the minds of the Abenakis, were the sole source of hope. On the declaration of war by France against England, Count Frontenac, once more governor of Canada, was charged to recover Hudson's Bay; to protect Acadia; and, by a descent from Canada, to assist a fleet from France in making conquest of New York. Of that province De Callieres was, in advance, appointed governor; the English Catholics were to be permitted to remain,—other inhabitants to be sent into Pennsylvania or New England. . . .

In the east, blood was first shed at Cocheo, where, thirteen years before, an unsuspecting party of 350 Indians had been taken prisoners and shipped for Boston, to be sold into foreign slavery. The memory of the treachery was indelible, and the Indian emissaries of Castin easily excited the tribe of Penacook to revenge. On the evening of the 27th of June [1689] two squaws repaired to the house of Richard Waldron, and the octogenarian magistrate bade them lodge on the floor. At night, they rise, unbar the gates, and summon their companions," who tortured the aged Waldron until he died. "The Indians, burning his house and others that stood near it, having killed three-and-twenty, returned to the wilderness with 29 captives." In August, the stockade at Pemaquid was taken by 100 Indians from the French mission on the Penobscot. "Other inroads were made by the Penobscot and St. John Indians, so that the settlements east of Falmouth were deserted. In September, commissioners from New England held a conference with the Mohawks at Albany, soliciting an alliance. 'We have burned Montreal,' said they; 'we are the allies of the English; we will

keep the chain unbroken.' But they refused to invade the Abenakis. . . . Frontenac . . . now used every effort to win the Five Nations [the Iroquois] to neutrality or to friendship. To recover esteem in their eyes; to secure to Durantaye, the commander at Mackinaw, the means of treating with the Hurons and the Ottawas; it was resolved by Frontenac to make a triple descent into the English provinces. From Montreal, a party of 110, composed of French and of the Christian Iroquois,—having De Mantet and Sainte Helene as leaders . . . —for two and twenty days waded through snows and morasses, through forests and across rivers, to Schenectady. The village had given itself calmly to slumber: through open and unguarded gates the invaders entered silently [Feb. 8, 1690], and having, just before midnight, reached its heart, the war-whoop was raised (dreadful sound to the mothers of that place and their children!), and the dwellings set on fire. Of the inhabitants, some, half clad, fled through the snows to Albany; 60 were massacred, of whom 17 were children and 10 were Africans. . . . The party from Three Rivers, led by Hertel, and consisting of but 52 persons . . . surprised the settlement at Salmon Falls, on the Piscataqua, and, after a bloody engagement, burned houses, barns, and cattle in the stalls, and took 54 prisoners, chiefly women and children. . . . Returning from this expedition, Hertel met the war party, under Portneuf, from Quebec, and, with them and a reinforcement from Castin, made a successful attack on the fort and settlement in Casco Bay. Meantime, danger taught the colonies the necessity of union, and, on the 1st day of May, 1690, New York beheld the momentous example of an American congress [see UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1690]. . . . At that congress it was resolved to attempt the conquest of Canada by marching an army, by way of Lake Champlain, against Montreal, while Massachusetts should, with a fleet, attack Quebec."—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S.*, ch. 21 (v. 3), (pt. 3, ch. 11, v. 2, in the "Author's last Revision").—Before the end of the month in which the congress was held, Port Royal and the whole of Acadia had already been conquered, having surrendered to an expedition sent out by Massachusetts, in eight small vessels, under Sir William Phips. The larger fleet (consisting of 32 ships and carrying 2,000 men) directed against Quebec, sailed in August from Nastasket, and was, likewise, commanded by Phips. "The plan of the campaign contemplated a diversion to be made by an assault on Montreal, by a force composed of English from Connecticut and New York, and of Iroquois Indians, at the same time with the attack on Quebec by the fleet. And a second expedition into Maine under Captain Church was to threaten the Eastern tribes whose incursions had, during the last summer, been so disastrous. . . . As is so apt to happen when a plan involves the simultaneous action of distant parties, the condition of success failed. The movement of Church, who had with him but 300 men, proved ineffective as to any contribution to the descent upon Canada. . . . It was not till after a voyage of more than six weeks that the fleet from Boston cast anchor within the mouth of the river St. Lawrence, and meanwhile the overland expedition against Montreal had miscarried. The commanders respectively of the Connecticut and the New York troops

had disagreed, and could not act effectively together. . . . The supply, both of boats and of provisions, was found to be insufficient. The disastrous result was that a retreat was ordered, without so much as an embarkation of the troops on Lake Champlain. Frontenac was at Montreal, whither he had gone to superintend the defence, when the intelligence, so unexpected, reached him from Quebec; and presently after came the tidings of Phips's fleet being in the St. Lawrence. Nothing could have been more opportune than this coincidence, which gave the Governor liberty to hasten down to direct his little force of 200 soldiers at the capital. The French historian says that, if he had been three days later, or if the English fleet had not been delayed by contrary winds, or had had better pilots in the river, where it was nearly a fortnight more in making its slow way, Frontenac would have come down from the upper country only to find the English commander in his citadel. As it was, there ensued a crushing mortification and sorrow to Massachusetts. New France was made much more formidable than ever." The fleet arrived before Quebec Oct. 6, and retreated on the 11th, after considerable cannonading and an assault which the French repelled. It suffered storms and disasters on the return voyage, and lost altogether some 200 men.—J. G. Palfrey, *Hist. of New Eng.*, bk. 4, ch. 2 (v. 4).

ALSO IN: F. Parkman, *Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV.*, ch. 10-13.—*Dec. Hist. of N. Y.*, v. 1-2.—F. Bowen, *Life of Sir W. Phips (Library of Am. Biog.*, v. 7), ch. 2-3.—J. R. Brodhead, *Hist. of the State of N. Y.*, v. 2, ch. 12.—J. Pearson, et al, *Hist. of the Schenectady Patent*, ch. 8-10.

A. D. 1692-1697.—The first Inter-Colonial War (King William's War): Abortive plans of invasion on both sides.—French recovery of Acadia.—"The defeat of the expedition of 1690 was probably attributable to the want of concert on the part of the troops from Connecticut and New York and those from Massachusetts, and the failure of the supplies which were sought from England. . . . But there was mismanagement on all hands in the conduct of the expedition; and it seems to have been predestinated that New England should not be delivered from the presence of the French at the north, until time had wrought the necessary changes which were to render the conquest of that country available for the promotion of still more important ends. Hence a new expedition, projected two years later, and resolved to be prosecuted in the following year [1693], was attended with the like circumstances of mortification and defeat. England herself participated in this enterprise, and . . . the government was informed that it had 'pleased the king, out of his great goodness and disposition for the welfare of all his subjects, to send a considerable strength of ships and men into the West Indies, and to direct Sir Francis Wheeler, the admiral, to sail to New England from the Caribbee Islands, sons to be there by the last of May or the middle of June at furthest, with a strength sufficient to overcome the enemy, if joined and seconded by the forces of New England.' . . . Unfortunately for the success of these plans, the letter, which should have reached Boston by the first of April, did not arrive until July; and the mortality which prevailed in the

fleet during its stay in the West Indies was so great that, when the commander-in-chief, Sir Francis Wheeler, anchored off Nantasket,—bringing himself the news of the projected invasion,—he had lost 1,300 out of 2,100 sailors, and 1,800 out of 2,400 soldiers. All thoughts of reducing Canada were therefore abandoned; but a plan for another year was settled with the governor, the details of which were that 2,000 land forces should be sent from England to Canseau by the first of June, to be joined by 2,000 from the colonies, and that the whole force should go up the St. Lawrence, divide and simultaneously attack Montreal and Quebec. Changes in the government of the province, however, and other causes, prevented the execution of this plan, whose success was problematical even if it had been attempted. But if the plans of the English for the reduction of Canada were doomed to disappointment, the plans of the French for the recovery of Acadia were more successful. For the first year after the conquest of that country, indeed, the French were as little concerned to regain, as the English were to retain, the possession of its territory; nor was Massachusetts able to bear the charge of a sufficient military force to keep its inhabitants in subjection, though she issued commissions to judges and other officers, and required the administration of the oath of fidelity. In the course of that year [1691], authority was given to Mr. John Neeson, of Boston, who had taken an active part in the overthrow of Andros, and who was bound thither on a trading voyage, to be commander-in-chief of Acadia; but as he neared the mouth of the St. John's, he was taken by Monsieur Villebon, who, under a commission from the French king, had touched at Port Royal, and ordered the English flag to be struck, and the French flag to be raised in its place. The next year an attempt was made to dislodge Villebon, but without success. . . . In the summer of 1696, Pemaquid was taken by the French, under D'Iberville and Castine, and the frontier of the dominion of France was extended into Maine; and by the treaty of the following year Acadia was receded to France, and the English relinquished their claims to the country. The last year of King William's War, as it was long termed in New England, was a year of especial alarm to the province [Massachusetts] and rumors were rife that the French were on the eve of fitting out a formidable fleet for the invasion of the colonies and the conquest of New York." According to the plan of the French undertaking, a powerful fleet from France was to be joined by a force of 1,500 men, raised by Count Frontenac, in Canada, and make, first, a conquest of Boston. "When that town was taken, they were to range the coast to Piscataqua, destroying the settlements as far back into the country as possible. Should there be time for further acquisitions, they were next to go to New York, and upon its reduction the Canadian troops were to march overland to Quebec, laying waste the country as they proceeded." This project was frustrated by happenings much the same in kind as those which thwarted the designs of the English against Quebec. The fleet was delayed by contrary winds, and by certain bootless undertakings in Newfoundland, until the season was too far advanced for the enterprise contemplated. "The peace of Ryswick, which

soon followed, led to a temporary suspension of hostilities. France, anxious to secure as large a share of territory in America as possible, retained the whole coast and adjacent islands from Maine to Labrador and Hudson's Bay, with Canada, and the Valley of the Mississippi. The possessions of England were southward from the St. Croix. But the bounds between the nations were imperfectly defined, and were, for a long time, a subject of dispute and negotiation."—J. S. Barry, *Hist. of Mass.*, v. 2, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: F. Parkman, *Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV.*, ch. 16-19.—J. Hannay, *Hist. of Acadia*, ch. 14.—See, also, NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1694-1697.

A. D. 1696.—Frontenac's expedition against the Iroquois.—The war with the "Bastonnais" or "Bostonnais," as he called the New Englanders, did not divert Frontenac's attention from "the grand castigation which at last he was planning for the Iroquois. He had succeeded, in 1694, in inducing them to meet him in general council at Quebec, and had framed the conditions of a truce; but the English at Albany intrigued to prevent the fulfilment, and war was again imminent. Both sides were endeavoring to secure the alliance of the tribes of the upper lakes. These wavered, and Frontenac saw the peril and the remedy. His recourse was to attack the Iroquois in their villages at once, and conquer on the Mohawk the peace he needed at Michillimackinac. It was Frontenac's last campaign. Early in July [1696] he left Montreal with 2,200 men. He went by way of Fort Frontenac, crossed Lake Ontario, landed at Oswego, and struggled up its stream, and at last set sails to his canoes on Lake Onondaga. Then his force marched again, and Frontenac, enfeebled by his years, was borne along in an arm-chair. Eight or nine miles and a day's work brought them to the Onondaga village; but its inhabitants had burned it and fled. Vaudreuil was sent with a detachment which destroyed the town of the Oneidas. After committing all the devastation of crops that he could, in hopes that famine would help him, Frontenac began his homeward march before the English at Albany were aroused at all. The effect was what Frontenac wished. The Iroquois ceased their negotiations with the western tribes, and sued for peace."—G. Stewart, Jr., *Frontenac and his Times (Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am.*, v. 4, ch. 7).

ALSO IN: F. Parkman, *Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV.*, ch. 18-19.

A. D. 1698-1710.—Colonization of Louisiana and the organization of its separate government. See LOUISIANA: A. D. 1698-1712.

A. D. 1700-1735.—The spread of French occupation in the Mississippi Valley and on the Lakes.—"From the time of La Salle's visit in 1679, we can trace a continuous French occupation of Illinois. . . . He planted his citadel of St. Louis on the summit of 'Starved Rock,' proposing to make that the centre of his colony. . . . At first his colony was exceedingly feeble, but it was never discontinued. Joutel found a garrison at Fort St. Louis . . . in 1687, and in 1689 La Hontan bears testimony that it still continued. In 1696 a public document proves its existence; and when Tonty, in 1700, again descended the Mississippi, he was attended by twenty Canadians, residents on the Illinois."

Even while the wars named after King William and Queen Anne were going on, the French settlements were growing in numbers and increasing in size; those wars over, they made still more rapid progress. Missions grew into settlements and parishes. Old Kaskaskia was begun in what La Salle called the 'terrestrial paradise' before the close of the seventeenth century. The Wabash Valley was occupied about 1700, the first settlers entering it by the portage leading from the Kankakee. Later the voyageurs found a shorter route to the fertile valley. . . . The French located their principal missions and posts with admirable judgment. There is not one of them in which we cannot see the wisdom of the priest, of the soldier, and the trader combined. The triple alliance worked for an immediate end, but the sites that they chose are as important to-day as they were when they chose them. . . . La Salle's colony of St. Louis was planted in one of the gardens of the world, in the midst of a numerous Indian population, on the great line of travel between Lake Michigan and the Mississippi River. Kaskaskia and the neighboring settlements held the centre of the long line extending from Canada to Louisiana. The Wabash colony commanded that valley and the Lower Ohio. Detroit was a position so important that, securely held by the French, it practically banished from the English mind for fifty years the thought of acquiring the Northwest. . . . Then how unerringly were the French guided to the carrying places between the Northern and the Southern waters, viz., Green Bay, Fox River, and the Wisconsin; the Chicago River and the Illinois; the St. Joseph and the Kankakee; the St. Joseph and the Wabash; the Maumee and the Wabash; and, later, on the eve of the war that gave New France to England, the Chautauqua and French Creek routes from Lake Erie to the Ohio. . . . In due time the French began to establish themselves on the Northern frontier of the British colonies. They built Fort Niagara in 1726, four years after the English built Fort Oswego. Following the early footsteps of Champlain, they ascended to the head of the lake that bears his name, where they fortified Crown Point in 1727, and Ticonderoga in 1731. Presque Isle, the present site of the city of Erie, was occupied about the time that Vincennes was founded in the Wabash Valley [1735]. Finally, just on the eve of the last struggle between England and France, the French pressed into the valleys of the Allegheny and the Ohio, at the same time that the English also began to enter them."—B. A. Hinsdale, *The Old Northwest*, ch. 4.

A. D. 1702-1710.—The Second Inter-Colonial War (Queen Anne's War): Border ravages in New England and Acadia.—English Conquest of Acadia. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1702-1710.

A. D. 1711-1713.—The Second Inter-Colonial War.—Walker's Expedition against Quebec.—Massacre of Fox Indians.—The Peace of Utrecht.—After the reduction of Port Royal, which was practically the conquest of Acadia, Colonel Nicholson, who bore the honors of that achievement, repaired to England and prevailed with the government to fit out an adequate expedition for the Conquest of Canada. "The fleet, consisting of 15 ships of war and 40 transports, was placed under the command of

Sir Hovenden Walker; seven veteran regiments from Marlborough's army, with a battalion of marines, were intrusted to Mrs. Masham's second brother, whom the queen had pensioned and made a brigadier-general, whom his bottle companions called honest Jack Hill. . . . From June 25th to the 30th day of July 1711, the fleet lay at Boston, taking in supplies and the colonial forces. At the same time, an army of men from Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York, Palatine emigrants, and about 600 Iroquois, assembling at Albany, prepared to burst upon Montreal; while in Wisconsin the English had allies in the Foxes, who were always wishing to expel the French from Michigan. In Quebec, measures of defence began by a renewal of friendship with the Indians. To deputies from the Onondagas and Senecas, the governor spoke of the fidelity with which the French had kept their treaty; and he reminded them of their promise to remain quiet upon their mats. A war festival was next held, at which were present all the savages domiciliated near the French settlements, and all the delegates of their allies who had come down to Montreal. In the presence of 700 or 800 warriors, the war song was sung and the hatchet uplifted. The savages of the remote west were wavering, till twenty Hurons from Detroit took up the hatchet, and swayed all the rest by their example. By the influence of the Jesuits over the natives, an alliance extending to the Ojibways constituted the defence of Montreal. Descending to Quebec, Vaudreuil found Abenaki volunteers assembling for his protection. Measures for resistance had been adopted with heartiness; the fortifications were strengthened; Beaufort was garrisoned; and the people were resolute and confiding; even women were ready to labor for the common defence. Toward the last of August, it was said that peasants at Matanes had descried 90 or 96 vessels with the English flag. Yet September came, and still from the heights of Cape Diamond no eye caught one sail of the expected enemy. The English squadron, leaving Boston on the 30th of July [1711], after loitering near the bay of Gaspé, at last began to ascend the St. Lawrence, while Sir Hovenden Walker puzzled himself with contriving how he would secure his vessels during the winter at Quebec." At the same time, the present and actual difficulties of the expedition were so heedlessly and ignorantly dealt with that eight ships of the fleet were wrecked among the rocks and shoals near the Egg Islands, and 884 men were drowned. The enterprise was then abandoned. "'Had we arrived safe at Quebec,' wrote the admiral, 'ten or twelve thousand men must have been left to perish of cold and hunger: by the loss of a part, Providence saved all the rest.' Such was the issue of hostilities in the north. Their total failure left the expedition from Albany no option but to return, and Montreal was unmolested. Detroit, in 1712, almost fell before the valor of a party of the Ottogamies, or Foxes. . . . Resolving to burn Detroit, they pitched their lodgings near the fort, which Du Buisson, with but twenty Frenchmen, defended. Aware of their intention, he summoned his Indian allies from the chase; and, about the middle of May, Ottawas and Hurons and Pottawottamies, with one branch of the Sacs, Illinois, Menomonies, and even Osages and Missouris, each nation with its own ensign, came to his re-

lied. So wide was the influence of the missionaries in the West. . . . The warriors of the Fox nation, far from destroying Detroit, were themselves besieged, and at last were compelled to surrender at discretion. Those who bore arms were ruthlessly murdered; the rest distributed among the confederates, to be enslaved or massacred at the will of their masters. Cherished as the loveliest spot in Canada, the possession of Detroit secured for Quebec a great highway to the upper Indian tribes and to the Mississippi. . . . In the meantime, the preliminaries of a treaty had been signed between France and England; and the war . . . was suspended by negotiations that were soon followed by the uncertain peace of Utrecht [April 11, 1713]. . . . England, by the peace of Utrecht, obtained from France large concessions of territory in America. The assembly of New York had addressed the queen against French settlements in the West; William Penn advised to establish the St. Lawrence as the boundary on the north, and to include in our colonies the valley of the Mississippi. 'It will make a glorious country'; such were his prophetic words. . . . The colony of Louisiana excited in Saint-John 'apprehensions of the future undertakings of the French in North America.' The occupation of the Mississippi valley had been proposed to Queen Anne; yet, at the peace, that immense region remained to France. But England obtained the bay of Hudson and its borders; Newfoundland, subject to the rights of France in its fisheries; and all Nova Scotia, or Acadia, according to its ancient boundaries. It was agreed that 'France should never molest the Five Nations subject to the dominion of Great Britain.' But Louisiana, according to French ideas, included both banks of the Mississippi. Did the treaty of Utrecht assent to such an extension of French territory? And what were the ancient limits of Acadia? Did it include all that is now New Brunswick? or had France still a large territory on the Atlantic between Acadia and Maine? And what were the bounds of the territory of the Five Nations, which the treaty appeared to recognize as a part of the English dominions? These were questions which were never to be adjusted amicably."—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S. (Author's Last Revision)*, pt. 3, ch. 12 (e. 2).—With reference to the destruction of the Fox Indians at Detroit, a recent writer says: "The French official reports pretend that the Wisconsin Indians, being in secret alliance with the Iroquois and the English, had come to Detroit with the express purpose of besieging the fort and reducing it to ruins; and their statement has heretofore been unsuspectingly accepted by all historians. But there is little doubt that the charge is a shameful falsehood. The Fox Indians had rendered themselves very obnoxious to the French. Firmly lodged on the Fox River, they controlled the chief highway to the West; a haughty, independent and intractable people, they could not be cajoled into vassalage. It was necessary for the success of the French policy to get them out of the way. They were enticed to Detroit in order that they might be slaughtered."—S. S. Heberd, *Hist. of Wis. under the dominion of France*, ch. 5-6.

ALSO IN: *Wis. Hist. Soc. Colls.*, v. 5.—W. Klugford, *Hist. of Canada*, bk. 6, ch. 5-8 (v. 2).—R. Brown, *Hist. of the Island of Cape Breton*, letters

8-9.—See, also, **UTRECHT**: A. D. 1712-1714, and **NEWFOUNDLAND**: A. D. 1713.

**A. D. 1720.**—The fortifying of Louisbourg. See **CAPE BRETON**: A. D. 1720-1745.

**A. D. 1744-1748.**—The Third Inter-Colonial War (King George's War).—Loss and recovery of Louisbourg and Cape Breton. See **NEW ENGLAND**: A. D. 1744; 1745; and 1745-1748.

**A. D. 1748-1754.**—Active measures to fortify possession of the Ohio Valley and the West. See **OHIO (VALLEY)**: A. D. 1748-1754.

**A. D. 1750-1753.**—Boundaries disputes with England.—Futile negotiations at Paris.—"For the past three years [1750-1753] the commissioners appointed under the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle to settle the question of boundaries between France and England in America had been in session at Paris, waging interminable war on paper; La Gallissonière and Silhouette for France, Shirley and Mildmay for England. By the treaty of Utrecht, Acadia belonged to England; but what was Acadia? According to the English commissioners, it comprised not only the peninsula called Nova Scotia, but all the immense tract of land between the River St. Lawrence on the north, the Gulf of the same name on the east, the Atlantic on the south, and New England on the west. The French commissioners, on their part, maintained that the name Acadia belonged of right only to about a twentieth part of this territory, and that it did not even cover the whole of the Acadian peninsula, but only its southern coast, with an adjoining belt of barren wilderness. When the French owned Acadia, they gave it boundaries as comprehensive as those claimed for it by the English commissioners; now that it belonged to a rival, they cut it down to a paring of its former self. . . . Four censuses of Acadia while it belonged to the French had recognized the mainland as included in it; and so do also the early French maps. Its prodigious shrinkage was simply the consequence of its possession by an alien. Other questions of limits, more important and equally perilous, called loudly for solution. What line should separate Canada and her western dependencies from the British colonies? Various principles of demarcation were suggested, of which the most prominent was a geographical one. All countries watered by streams falling into the St. Lawrence, the Great Lakes, and the Mississippi were to belong to her. This would have planted her in the heart of New York and along the crests of the Alleghanies, giving her all the interior of the continent, and leaving nothing to England but a strip of sea-coast. Yet in view of what France had achieved; of the patient gallantry of her explorers, the zeal of her missionaries, the adventurous hardihood of her bushrangers, revealing to civilized mankind the existence of this wilderness world, while her rivals plodded at their workshops, their farms, or their fisheries,—in view of all this, her pretensions were moderate and reasonable compared with those of England. The treaty of Utrecht had declared the Iroquois, or Five Nations, to be British subjects; therefore it was insisted that all countries conquered by them belonged to the British Crown. But what was an Iroquois conquest? The Iroquois rarely occupied the countries they overran. . . . But the range of their war-parties was prodigious; and the English laid claim to every mountain, forest or prairie where



an Iroquois had taken a scalp. This would give them not only the country between the Alleghenies and the Mississippi, but also that between Lake Huron and the Ottawa, thus reducing Canada to the patch on the American map now represented by the province of Quebec,—or rather by a part of it, since the extension of Acadia to the St. Lawrence would cut off the present counties of Gaspé, Rimouski and Bonaventure. Indeed, among the advocates of British claims there were those who denied that France had any rights whatever on the south side of the St. Lawrence. Such being the attitude of the two contestants, it was plain there was no resort but the last argument of kings. Peace must be won with the sword.”—F. Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe*, ch. 5 (p. 1).

ALSO IN: T. C. Halliburton, *Account of Nova Scotia*, v. 1, pp. 143-149.—See, also, NOVA SCOTIA: A. D. 1749-1755.—Relative to the very dubious English claim based on treaties with the Iroquois, see NEW YORK: A. D. 1684, and 1726.

**A. D. 1755 (April).—Plans of the English against the French.**—“While the negotiations [between England and France, at Paris] were pending, Braddock arrived in the Chesapeake. In March [1755] he reached Williamsburgh, and visited Annapolis; on the 14th of April, he, with Commodore Keppel, held a congress at Alexandria. There were present, of the American governors, Shirley, next to Braddock in military rank; Delancey, of New York; Morris, of Pennsylvania; Sharpe, of Maryland; and Dinwiddie, of Virginia. . . . Between England and France peace existed under ratified treaties; it was proposed not to invade Canada, but to repel encroachments on the frontier. For this end, four expeditions were concerted by Braddock at Alexandria. Lawrence, the lieutenant-governor of Nova Scotia, was to reduce that province according to the English interpretation of its boundaries; Johnson [afterwards Sir William Johnson, of New York] from his long acquaintance with the Six Nations, was selected to enroll Mohawk warriors in British pay and lend them with provincial militia against Crown Point; Shirley proposed to drive the French from Niagara; the commander-in-chief was to recover the Ohio valley.”—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S. (Author's last revision)*, v. 2, pp. 416-419.

**A. D. 1755 (June).—French disaster at Sea.—Frustrated attempt against Nova Scotia.—The arrival of Dieskau at Quebec.**—“In 1754, France fully awakened to the fact that England not only intended to maintain her position in the wilds of America, but likewise by sea. She equipped an armament under the command of admirals Macnamara and Bois de la Mothe, of 18 ships of the line and 9 frigates, having on board, ostensibly for Canada, eleven battalions of troops under General Dieskau, an ‘*étève*’ of Marshal Saxe. England, apprised of this force being sent, despatched Vice-Admiral Boscawen with 11 ships of the line and one frigate to intercept it en route. Both sailed about the same time, the 22d of April, 1755. The French ambassador at London being duly notified, replied: ‘That his royal master would consider the first gun fired at sea in a hostile manner to be a declaration of war.’ The esoteric instructions of the French fleet were to rendezvous at Chebuctou Harbour, destroy Halifax, and then proceed to Annapolis for the same purpose. While the instructions

were of necessity secret, it was well known in Acadia that an attempt would be made by France to recover possession of the province. It was this fleet, so eagerly expected by the Acadians, that gave rise to the insolent manner in which they addressed the Council at Halifax, and which led to an immediate removal of their arms and subsequent dispersal. Owing to misadventure, some of the French fleet under Macnamara had to put back to Brest; the remainder met the English off the coast of Newfoundland [June 8] in a dense fog; avoiding an engagement, several of them escaped by taking the northern route via Belleisle . . . successfully reaching the ‘harbour of refuge,’ Louisbourg. The ‘Lys’ and the ‘Aleyde’ were sufficiently unfortunate to be compelled to face the guns of the English frigates ‘Dunkirk’ and ‘Defiance,’ and after five hours close engagement the ‘Lys’ struck its colors . . . followed by the ‘Aleyde,’ when Hocquart in command became Boscawen’s prisoner by sea for the third time, together with £78,000 sterling in money, eight companies of soldiers and several officers and engineers. The unexpected rencontre with Boscawen’s fleet, the loss of two of their vessels, and the knowledge that the garrison at Halifax was considerably reinforced by the forces brought out by Boscawen, caused the abandonment of all attempts to recover Acadia. Dieskau, after landing a few regiments at Louisbourg, proceeded to Quebec.”—G. E. Hart, *The Fall of New France*, pp. 51-54.

ALSO IN: J. Campbell, *Naval Hist. of Great Britain*, v. 5, pp. 104-106.

**A. D. 1755 (July).—Defeat of Braddock's Expedition against Fort Duquesne.** See OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1755.

**A. D. 1755 (August—October): The abortive expedition against Niagara.**—According to the English plan of campaign, concerted with Braddock at Alexandria, Governor Shirley was to lead an army for the conquest of Niagara; but his march westward ended at Oswego. “Colonel Philip Schuyler led the first regiment of the expedition. Boats were built at Oswego to convey 600 men by lake. Shirley followed by way of the Mohawk, and reached Oswego August 21. He was delayed from various causes, and in October a council of war decided that the attack on Niagara should be postponed for a year. Shirley was to have met Braddock in victory at Niagara. Both branches of the plan had been shattered. The great western scheme sank to a mere strengthening of the defences of Oswego. Colonel Mercer was left in command of a garrison of 700 men, with instructions to build two new forts, and General Shirley took the remainder of his force back to Albany. The pitiful failure led to recriminations relative to the causes of the fatal delays.”—E. H. Roberts, *New York*, v. 1, ch. 20.

ALSO IN: R. Hildreth, *Hist. of the U. S.*, ch. 26 (v. 2).

**A. D. 1755 (September).—The Battle of Lake George and defeat of Dieskau.**—“The expedition against Crown Point on Lake Champlain, had been entrusted to General William Johnson. His troops were drawn principally from Massachusetts and Connecticut; a regiment from New Hampshire joined them at Albany. At the head of boat navigation on the Hudson, a fort was built which, in honor of their com-



mander, whom they revered as 'a brave and virtuous man,' the soldiers named Fort Lyman. But when Johnson assumed the command he ungenerously changed the name to Fort Edward. Leaving a garrison in this fort, Johnson moved with about 5,000 men to the head of Lake George, and there formed a camp, intending to descend into Lake Champlain. Hendrick, the celebrated Mohawk chief, with his warriors, were among these troops. Israel Putnam, too, was there, as a captain, and John Stark as a lieutenant, each taking lessons in warfare. The French were not idle; the district of Montreal made the most strenuous exertions to meet the invading foe. All the men who were able to bear arms were called into active service; so that, to gather in the harvest, their places were supplied by men from other districts. The energetic Baron Dieskau resolved, by a bold attack, to terrify the invaders. Taking with him 200 regulars, and about 1,200 Canadians and Indians, he set out to capture Fort Edward; but, as he drew near, the Indians heard that it was defended by cannon, which they greatly dreaded, and they refused to advance. He now changed his plan, and resolved to attack Johnson's camp, which was supposed to be without cannon. Meantime scouts had reported to Johnson that they had seen roads made through the woods in the direction of Fort Edward. Not knowing the movements of Dieskau, a detachment of 1,000 men, under Colonel Ephraim Williams, of Massachusetts, and 200 Mohawks, under Hendrick, marched to relieve that post. The French had information of their approach and placed themselves in ambush. They were concealed among the thick bushes of a swamp, on the one side, and rocks and trees on the other. The English recklessly marched into the defile. They were vigorously attacked [Sept. 5] and thrown into confusion. Hendrick was almost instantly killed, and in a short time Williams fell also. The detachment commenced to retreat, occasionally halting to check their pursuers. The firing was heard in the camp; as the sound drew nearer and nearer, it was evident the detachment was retreating. The drums beat to arms, trees were hastily felled and thrown together to form a breastwork, upon which were placed a few cannon, just arrived from the Hudson. Scarcely were these preparations made when the panting fugitives appeared in sight, hotly pursued by the French and Indians. Intending to enter the camp with the fugitives, Dieskau urged forward his men with the greatest impetuosity. The moment the fugitives were past the muzzles of the cannon they opened with a tremendous shower of grape, which scattered the terrified Indians and checked the Canadians, but the regulars pushed on. A determined contest ensued, which lasted five hours, until the regulars were nearly all slain, while the Indians and Canadians did but little execution; they remained at a respectful distance among the trees. At length the enemy began to retreat, and the Americans leaped over the breastworks and pursued them with great vigor. That same evening, after the pursuit had ceased, as the French were retreating, they were suddenly attacked with great spirit by the New Hampshire regiment, which was on its way from Fort Edward. They were so panic stricken by this new assault that they abandoned everything and fled for their lives. Dieskau had been wounded

once or twice at the commencement of the battle, but he never left his post. . . . He was taken prisoner, kindly treated, and sent to England, where he died. Johnson was slightly wounded at the commencement of the battle, and prudently retired from danger. To General Lyman belongs the honor of the victory, yet Johnson, in his report of the battle, did not even mention his name. Johnson, for his exertions on that day, was made a baronet, and received from royal favor a gift of \$25,000. He had friends at court, but Lyman was unknown. Col. Ephraim Williams, who fell in this battle, while passing through Albany, had taken the precaution to make his will, in which he bequeathed property to found a free school in western Massachusetts. That school has since grown into Williams College."—J. H. Patton, *Concise Hist. of the Am. People*, v. 1, ch. 22.

ALSO IN: W. L. Stone, *Life and Times of Sir W. Johnson*, v. 1, ch. 16.—F. Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe*, v. 1, ch. 9.

**A. D. 1755 (October—November).—Removal and dispersion in exile of the French Acadians.** See NOVA SCOTIA: A. D. 1755.

**A. D. 1756.—Formal declarations of war—the "Seven Years War" of Europe, called the "French and Indian War" in British America.—Montcalm sent from France.**—"On the 18th of May, 1756, England, after a year of open hostility, at length declared war. She had attacked France by land and sea, turned loose her ships to prey on French commerce, and brought some 300 prizes into her ports. It was the act of a weak government, supplying by spasms of violence what it lacked in considerate resolution. France, no match for her amphibious enemy in the game of marine depredation, cried out in horror; and to emphasize her complaints and signalize a pretended good faith which her acts had belied, ostensibly released a British frigate captured by her cruisers. She in her turn declared war on the 9th of June; and now began the most terrible conflict of the 18th century; one that convulsed Europe and shook America, India, the coasts of Africa, and the islands of the sea [see ENGLAND: A. D. 1754-1755, and after; also GERMANY: A. D. 1755-1756, and after]. . . . Henceforth France was to turn her strength against her European foes; and the American war, the occasion of the universal outbreak, was to hold in her eyes a second place. . . . Still, something must be done for the American war; at least there must be a new general to replace Dieskau. None of the court favorites wanted a command in the backwoods, and the minister of war was free to choose whom he would. His choice fell on Louis Joseph, Marquis de Montcalm-Gozon de Saint V6ran. . . . The Chevalier de L6vis, afterwards Marshal of France, was named as his second in command. . . . The troops destined for Canada were only two battalions, one belonging to the regiment of La Sarre, and the other to that of Royal Roussillon. Louis XV. and Pompadour sent 100,000 men to fight the battles of Austria, and could spare but 1,200 to reinforce New France." Montcalm, who reached Quebec in May, was placed in difficult relations with the governor-general, Vaudreuil, by the fact that the latter held command of the colonial troops. The forces in New France, were of three kinds,—"the 'troupes de terre,' troops of the line, or regulars from France; the 'troupes

de la marine,' or colony regulars; and lastly the militia. The first consisted of the four battalions that had come over with Dieskau and the two that had come with Montcalm, comprising in all a little less than 3,000 men. Besides these, the battalions of Artois and Bourgoigne, to the number of 1,100 men, were in garrison at Louisbourg." This constituted Montcalm's command. The colony regulars and the militia remained subject to the orders of the governor, who manifested an early jealousy of Montcalm. The former troops numbered less than 2,000 men. "All the effective male population of Canada, from 15 years to 60, was enrolled in the militia. . . . In 1750 the militia of all ranks counted about 13,000; and eight years later the number had increased to about 15,000. Until the last two years of the war, those employed in actual warfare were but few. . . . To the white fighting force of the colony are to be added the red men. . . . The military situation was somewhat perplexing. Iroquois spies had brought reports of great preparations on the part of the English. As neither party dared offend these wavering tribes, their warriors could pass with impunity from one to the other, and were paid by each for bringing information, not always trustworthy. They declared that the English were gathering in force to renew the attempt made by Johnson the year before against Crown Point and Ticonderoga, as well as that made by Shirley against Forts Frontenac and Niagara. Vaudreuil had spared no effort to meet the double danger. Lotbinière, a Canadian engineer, had been busied during the winter in fortifying Ticonderoga, while Pouchot, a captain in the battalion of Béarn, had rebuilt Niagara, and two French engineers were at work in strengthening the defences of Frontenac. . . . Indians presently brought word that 10,000 English were coming to attack Ticonderoga." Both Montcalm and Lévis, with troops, "hastened to the supposed scene of danger . . . and reached Ticonderoga at the end of June. They found the fort . . . advanced towards completion. It stood on the crown of the promontory. . . . The rampart consisted of two parallel walls ten feet apart, built of the trunks of trees, and held together by transverse logs dovetailed at both ends, the space between being filled with earth and gravel well packed. Such was the first Fort Ticonderoga, or Carillon,—a structure quite distinct from the later fort of which the ruins still stand on the same spot. . . . Ticonderoga was now the most advanced position of the French, and Crown Point, which had before held that perilous honor, was in the second line. . . . The danger from the English proved to be still remote. . . . Meanwhile, at the head of Lake George, the raw bands of ever-active New England, were mustering for the fray."—F. Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe*, v. 1, ch. 11.

ALSO IN: W. Kingsford, *Hist. of Canada*, bk. 11, ch. 9 (v. 3).

**A. D. 1756-1757.—French successes.—Capture of Oswego and Fort William Henry.—Bloody work of the savage allies.**—On the death of Braddock, Gov. Shirley became commander-in-chief of the British forces in America, "a position for which he was not adapted by military knowledge. . . . His military schemes for the season of 1756 were grand in conception and theory, but disastrous failures in practice.

Ten thousand men were to advance against Crown Point—6,000 for service on Lake Ontario, 3,000 for an attack on Fort Duquesne, and 2,000 to advance up the river Kennebec, destroy the settlement adjoining the Chaudière and descending the mouth of that river within three miles of Quebec, keep all that part of Canada in alarm. While each of these armies was being put into motion, the season had become too far advanced for action at any one point. Moreover, the British Government, dissatisfied with a Provincial officer being at the head of its army in America, determined upon sending out General Lord Loudoun. While Shirley was preparing, Montcalm advanced against the three forts at Oswego, the terror of the French in the Iroquois country and which it had been their desire to destroy for many years back; they likewise commanded the entrance to Lake Ontario. The English had a garrison of 1,800 men in these divided between Fort Ontario . . . Fort Oswego . . . and Fort George, or Rascal . . . about a mile distant from each other." Montcalm took all three of the forts without much difficulty, and demolished them. "Shirley was much blamed for this defeat and the failure of his projects, and lost both his government and command, being succeeded by John Campbell, fourth Earl of Loudoun, Baron Mauchlax, one of the sixteen peers of Scotland, with General Abercromby as second in command—both notorious for previous incompetency. . . . They were sent out with considerable reinforcements, and had transferred to them by Shirley 18,000 men in the field, of whom 6,000 were regulars; but, with that masterly inactivity and indecision for which Loudoun was most renowned, no further movement was made this year. The year 1757 was not distinguished by any military movements of much moment." An intended attack on Louisbourg was postponed because of news that a powerful French fleet held possession of its harbor and that the garrison was very strong. "Montcalm, finding himself free from attack, penetrated with his army of 7,000 men to Fort William Henry, at the head of Lake George. Included were 2,000 Indians. The fort was garrisoned by 2,204 regulars under Colonel Munroe of the 85th Regiment, and in the neighborhood there was an additional force of 4,000 men under General Webb. On the 3d of August the fort was invested and, after a summons to surrender was rejected, the attack was begun and continued with undiminished fervor until the 9th at noon, when a capitulation was signed. General Webb did not join Munroe, as he was instructed to do by Abercromby's plans, some cowardice being attributed to him by contemporary writers. An incident of the war which has given rise to a great deal of controversy and ill-feeling up to the present moment, was the so-called massacre at Fort William Henry, the outcome of the numerous horde of savages the French allies had in the engagement. . . . On the morning following the surrender, the garrison was to march out under a proper escort to protect them from injury at the hands of the Indians. The evacuation had barely commenced, when a repetition of the looting of the day previous, which ensued immediately after the capitulation had been signed, was attempted. An effort being made by the escort to stop it, some drunken Indians

attacked the defile, which resulted in the murdering and scalping of some 60 or 70 of the prisoners; maltreating and robbing a large number of others. Upon a careful investigation of the contemporary authorities, no blame whatever can be attached to the good fame of the brave and humane Montcalm or De Lévis. . . . Fort George, or William Henry, as it was indifferently called, like its compeer Fort Oswego, was razed to the ground and the army retreated into their winter quarters at Montreal. The termination of the year left the French masters of Lakes Champlain and George, together with the chain of great lakes connecting the St. Lawrence with the Mississippi; also the undisturbed possession of all the country in dispute west of the Allegheny Mountains."—G. E. Hart, *The Fall of New France*, pp. 70-70.

ALSO IN: E. Warburton, *Conquest of Canada*, v. 2, ch. 2-3.

**A. D. 1758.—The loss of Louisbourg and Fort Du Quéne.—Bloody defeat of the English at Ticonderoga.**—"The affairs of Great Britain in North America were a more gloomy aspect, at the close of the campaign of 1757, than at any former period. By the acquisition of fort William Henry, the French had obtained complete possession of the lakes Champlain, and George. By the destruction of Oswego, they had acquired the dominion of those lakes which connect the St. Lawrence with the waters of the Mississippi, and unto Canada to Louisiana. By means of fort Du Quéne, they maintained their ascendancy over the Indians, and held undisturbed possession of the country west of the Allegheny mountains; while the English settlers were driven to the blue ridge. The great object of the war in that quarter was gained, and France held the country for which hostilities had been commenced. . . . But this inglorious scene was about to be succeeded by one of unrivalled brilliancy. . . . The brightest era of British history was to commence. . . . The public voice had, at length, made its way to the throne, and had forced, on the unwilling monarch, a minister who has been justly deemed one of the greatest men of the age in which he lived. . . . In the summer of 1757, an administration was formed, which conciliated the great contending interests in parliament; and Mr. Pitt was placed at its head. . . . Possessing the public confidence without limitation, he commanded all the resources of the nation, and drew liberally from the public purse. . . . In no part of his majesty's dominions was the new administration more popular than in his American colonies. . . . The circular letter of Mr. Pitt assured the several governors that, to repair the losses and disappointments of the last inactive campaign, the cabinet was determined to send a formidable force, to operate by sea and land, against the French in America; and he called upon them to raise as large bodies of men, within their respective governments, as the number of inhabitants might allow. . . . The legislature of Massachusetts agreed to furnish 7,000 men; Connecticut 5,000; and New Hampshire 3,000. . . . Three expeditions were proposed. The first was against Louisbourg; the second against Ticonderoga and Crown Point; and the third against fort Du Quéne. The army destined against Louisbourg, consisting of 14,000 men, was commanded by major general Amherst. [The expe-

dition was successful and Louisbourg fell, July 26, 1758.—See CAPE BRETON ISLAND: A. D. 1758-1760.] . . . The expedition against Ticonderoga and Crown Point was conducted by general Abercrombie in person. His army, consisting of near 10,000 effectives, of whom 9,000 were provincials, was attended by a formidable train of artillery, and possessed every requisite to ensure success. On the 5th of July he embarked on lake George, and reached the landing place early the next morning. A disembarkation being effected without opposition, the troops were immediately formed in four columns, the British in the centre, and the provincials on the flanks; in which order they marched towards the advanced guard of the French, composed of one battalion posted in a log camp, which, on the approach of the English, made a precipitate retreat. Abercrombie continued his march towards Ticonderoga, with the intention of investing that place; but, the woods being thick, and the guides unskilful, his columns were thrown into confusion, and, in some measure, entangled with each other. In this situation lord Howe, at the head of the right centre column, fell in with a part of the advanced guard of the French; which, in retreating from lake George, was likewise lost in the wood. He immediately attacked and dispersed them; killing several, and taking 148 prisoners, among whom were five officers. This small advantage was purchased at a dear rate. Though only two officers, on the side of the British, were killed, one of these was lord Howe himself, who fell on the first fire. This gallant young nobleman had endeared himself to the whole army. . . . Without farther opposition, the English army took possession of the post at the Saw Mills, within two miles of Ticonderoga. This fortress [called Carillon by the French], which commands the communication between the two lakes, is encompassed on three sides by water, and secured in front by a morass. The ordinary garrison amounting to 4,000 men, was stationed under the cannon of the place, and covered by a breast-work, the approach to which had been rendered extremely difficult by trees felled in front, with their branches outward, many of which were sharpened so as to answer the purpose of chevaux-de-frize. This body of troops was rendered still more formidable by its general than by its position. It was commanded by the marquis de Montcalm. Having learned from his prisoners the strength of the army under the walls of Ticonderoga, and that a reinforcement of 3,000 men was daily expected, general Abercrombie thought it advisable to storm the place before this reinforcement should arrive. The troops marched to the assault with great intrepidity; but their utmost efforts could make no impression on the works. . . . After a contest of near four hours, and several repeated attacks, general Abercrombie ordered a retreat. The army retired to the camp from which it had marched in the morning; and, the next day, resumed its former position on the south side of lake George. In this rash attempt, the killed and wounded of the English amounted to near 2,000 men, of whom not quite 400 were provincials. The French were covered during the whole action, and their loss was inconsiderable. Entirely disconcerted by this unexpected and bloody repulse, general Abercrombie relinquished his designs against Ticonderoga

and Crown Point. Searching however for the means of repairing the misfortune, if not the disgrace, sustained by his arms, he readily acceded to a proposition made by colonel Bradstreet, for an expedition against fort Frontignac. This fort stands on the north side of Ontario. . . . Colonel Bradstreet embarked on the Ontario at Oswego, and on the 25th of August, landed within one mile of the fort. In two days, his batteries were opened at so short a distance that almost every shell took effect; and the governor, finding the place absolutely untenable, surrendered at discretion. . . . After destroying the fort and vessels, and such stores as could not be brought off, colonel Bradstreet returned to the army which undertook nothing farther during the campaign. The demolition of fort Frontignac and of the stores which had been collected there, contributed materially to the success of the expedition against fort Du Québec. The conduct of this enterprise had been entrusted to general Forbes, who marched from Philadelphia, about the beginning of July, at the head of the main body of the army, destined for this service, in order to join colonel Bouquet at Raystown. So much time was employed in preparing to move from this place, that the Virginia regulars, commanded by colonel Washington, were not ordered to join the British troops until the month of September. . . . Early in October general Forbes moved from Raystown; but the obstructions to his march were so great that he did not reach fort Du Québec until late in November. The garrison, being deserted by the Indians, and too weak to maintain the place against the formidable army which was approaching, abandoned the fort the evening before the arrival of the British, and escaped down the Ohio in boats. The English placed a garrison in it, and changed its name to Pittsburg, in compliment to their popular minister. The acquisition of this post was of great importance to Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia."—J. Marshall, *Life of Washington*, v. 1, ch. 13.

ALSO IN: W. C. Bryant and S. H. Gay, *Pop. Hist. of the U. S.*, v. 3, ch. 11.—B. Fernow, *The Ohio Valley in Colonial Days*, ch. 7.—Major R. Rogers, *Journals*, ed. by Hough, pp. 115-123.—W. Irving, *Life of Washington*, v. 1, ch. 24.—N. B. Craig, *The Olden Time*, v. 1, pp. 177-200.

A. D. 1759 (June—September).—**The Fall of Quebec.**—Wolfe's name stood high in the esteem of all who were qualified to judge, but, at the same time, it stood low in the column of colonels in the Army List. The great minister [Pitt] thought that the former counterbalanced the latter. . . . One of the last gazettes in the year 1758 announced the promotion of Colonel James Wolfe to the rank of major-general, and his appointment to the chief command of the expedition against Quebec. About the middle of February, 1759, the squadron sailed from England to Louisbourg, where the whole of the British force destined for the River St. Lawrence was ordered to assemble. . . . Twenty-two ships of the line, five frigates, and nineteen smaller vessels of war, with a crowd of transports, were mustered under the orders of the admiral [Saunders], and a detachment of artillery and engineers, and ten battalions of infantry, with six companies of Rangers, formed Wolfe's command; the right flank companies of the three regiments which still garrisoned Louisbourg soon after joined the

army, and were formed into a corps called the Louisbourg Grenadiers. The total of the land forces embarked were somewhat under 8,000.—E. Warburton, *Conquest of Canada*, v. 2, ch. 9.—"Wolfe, with his 8,000 men, ascended the St. Lawrence in the fleet in the month of June. With him came Brigadiers Monckton, Townshend and Murray, youthful and brave like himself, and, like himself, already schooled to arms. . . . The Grenadiers of the army were commanded by Colonel Guy Carleton, and part of the light infantry by Lieutenant-Colonel William Howe, both destined to celebrity in after years, in the annals of the American revolution. Colonel Howe was brother of the gallant Lord Howe, whose fall in the preceding year was so generally lamented. Among the officers of the fleet was Jervis, the future admiral, and ultimately Earl St. Vincent; and the master of one of the ships was James Cook, afterwards renowned as a discoverer. About the end of June, the troops embarked on the large, populous, and well-cultivated Isle of Orleans, a little below Quebec, and encamped in its fertile fields. Quebec, the citadel of Canada, was strong by nature. It was built round the point of a rocky promontory, and flanked by precipices. . . . The place was tolerably fortified, but art had not yet rendered it, as at the present day, impregnable. Montcalm commanded the post. His troops were more numerous than the assailants; but the greater part of them were Canadians, many of them inhabitants of Quebec; and he had a host of savages. His forces were drawn out along the northern shore below the city, from the River St. Charles to the Falls of Montmorency, and their position was secured by deep intrenchments. . . . After much resistance, Wolfe established batteries at the west point of the Isle of Orleans, and at Point Levis, on the right (or south) bank of the St. Lawrence, within cannon range of the city. . . . Many houses were set on fire in the upper town, the lower town was reduced to rubbish; the main fort, however, remained unharmed. Anxious for a decisive action, Wolfe, on the 9th of July, crossed over in boats from the Isle of Orleans to the north bank of the St. Lawrence, and encamped below the Montmorency. It was an ill-judged position. . . . On the 18th of July, Wolfe made a reconnoitering expedition up the river, with two armed sloops, and two transports with troops. He passed Quebec unharmed and carefully noted the shores above it. Rugged cliffs rose almost from the water's edge. . . . He returned to Montmorency disappointed, and resolved to attack Montcalm in his camp, however difficult to be approached, and however strongly posted. Townshend and Murray, with their brigades, were to cross the Montmorency at low tide, below the falls, and storm the redoubt thrown up in front of the ford. Monckton, at the same time, was to cross, with part of his brigade in boats from Point Levis. . . . As usual in complicated orders, part were misunderstood, or neglected, and confusion was the consequence." The assault was repelled and Wolfe fell back across the river, having lost four hundred men, with two vessels, which ran aground and were burned. He felt the failure deeply, and his chagrin was increased by news of the successes of his coadjutors at Ticonderoga and Niagara. "The difficulties multiplying around him, and the delay of

General Amherst in hastening to his aid, preyed incessantly on his spirits. . . . The agitation of his mind, and his acute sensibility, brought on a fever, which for some time incapacitated him from taking the field. In the midst of his illness he called a council of war, in which the whole plan of operations was altered. It was determined to convey troops above the town, and endeavor to make a diversion in that direction, or draw Montcalm into the open field. . . . The brief Canadian summer was over; they were in the month of September. The camp at Montmorency was broken up. The troops were transported to Point Levi, leaving a sufficient number to man the batteries on the Isle of Orleans. On the 5th and 6th of September the embarkation took place above Point Levi, in transports which had been sent for the purpose. Montcalm detached De Bougainville with 1,500 men to keep along the north shore above the town, watch the movements of the squadron, and prevent a landing. To deceive him, Admiral Holmes moved with the ships of war three leagues beyond the place where the landing was to be attempted. He was to drop down, however, in the night, and protect the landing. . . . The descent was made in flat-bottomed boats, past midnight, on the 13th of September. They dropped down silently, with the swift current. 'Qui va là?' (who goes there?) cried a sentinel from the shore. 'La France,' replied a captain in the first boat, who understood the French language. 'A quel regiment?' was the demand. 'De la Reine' (the queen's) replied the captain, knowing that regiment was in De Bougainville's detachment. Fortunately, a convoy of provisions was expected down from De Bougainville's, which the sentinel supposed this to be. 'Passe,' cried he, and the boats glided on without further challenge. The landing took place in a cove near Cape Diamond, which still bears Wolfe's name. He had marked it in reconnoitering, and saw that a craggy path straggled up from it to the Heights of Abraham, which might be climbed, though with difficulty, and that it appeared to be slightly guarded at top. Wolfe was among the first that landed and ascended up the steep and narrow path, where not more than two could go abreast, and which had been broken up by cross ditches. Colonel Howe, at the same time, with the light infantry and Highlanders, scrambled up the woody precipices, helping themselves by the roots and branches, and putting to flight a sergeant's guard posted at the summit. Wolfe drew up the men in order as they mounted; and by the break of day found himself in possession of the fateful Plains of Abraham. Montcalm was thunderstruck when word was brought to him in his camp that the English were on the heights threatening the weakest part of the town. Abandoning his intrenchments, he hastened across the river St. Charles and ascended the heights, which slope up gradually from its banks. His force was equal in number to that of the English, but a great part was made up of colony troops and savages. When he saw the formidable host of regulars he had to contend with, he sent off swift messengers to summon De Bougainville with his detachment to his aid; and De Vaudreuil to reinforce him with 1,500 men from the camp. In the meantime he prepared to flank the left of the English line and force them to the opposite precipices." In the

memorable battle which ensued, Wolfe, who led the English line, received, first, a musket ball in his wrist, and soon afterward was struck by a second in the breast. He was borne mortally wounded to the rear, and lived just long enough to hear a cry from those around him that the enemy ran. Giving a quick order for Webb's regiment to be hurried down to the Charles River bridge and there obstruct the French retreat, he turned upon his side, saying, "Now, God be praised, I will die in peace," and expired. In the meantime the French commander, Montcalm, had received his death-wound, while striving to rally his flying troops. The victory of the English was complete, and they hastened to fortify their position on the Plains of Abraham, preparing to attack the citadel. But, Montcalm dying of his wound the following morning, no further defence of the place was undertaken. It was surrendered on the 17th of September to General Townshend, who had succeeded to the command.—W. Irving, *Life of Washington*, v. 1, ch. 25.

ALSO IN: F. Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe*, ch. 27-28 (v. 2).—R. Wright, *Life of Wolfe*, ch. 21-23.—Lord Mahon (*Earl Stanhope*), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713-1783, ch. 35 (v. 4).—W. Smith, *Hist. of Canada*, v. 1, ch. 6.—J. Knox, *Historical Journal*, v. 1, pp. 255-360; v. 2, pp. 1-132.

A. D. 1759 (July-August).—The fall of Niagara, Ticonderoga and Crown Point.—"For the campaign of 1759 the British Parliament voted liberal supplies of men and money, and the American colonies, encouraged by the successes of the preceding year, raised large numbers of troops. Amherst superseded Abercrombie as commander-in-chief. The plan for the year embraced three expeditions: Fort Niagara was to be attacked by Prideaux, assisted by Sir William Johnson; Amherst was to march his force against Ticonderoga and Crown Point; and Quebec was to be assailed by an army under Wolfe and a fleet under Saunders. Prideaux and Amherst, after the capture of the forts, were to descend the St. Lawrence, take Montreal, and join the army before Quebec. . . . Vaudreuil, the Governor, having received warning from France of the intentions of the English, sent a small force to Niagara under the engineer Pouchot, not expecting to be able to hold the post, and not wishing to sacrifice many men, or to spare the troops from the more important points. Pouchot repaired the defences, and when the alarm was given that the English were near, sent for men from Presqu' Isle, Venango, and Detroit. Prideaux, in command of two British regiments, a battalion of Royal Americans, two battalions from New York, and a train of artillery, was joined by Johnson with a detachment of Indians. They began their march from Schenectady on the 20th of May, and, after a difficult journey, reached Oswego, where a detachment under Colonel Haldimand was left to take possession and form a post, and the remainder of the forces embarked on Lake Ontario, and on the 1st of July landed without opposition about six miles east of the mouth of the Niagara. . . . Prideaux began his trenches on the 10th, and on the 11th a sally was made from the fort; but the English placed themselves in line of battle, and the French were obliged to retire. Prideaux was steadily advancing the work . . . when, on the 19th, he was killed by the bursting of a shell from a Coehorn mortar in one of the trenches, where he had gone to issue

orders. Amherst appointed General Gage to succeed him, but before the arrival of Gage the command devolved upon General Johnson, who carried on the siege according to the plans of Prideaux." On the 24th a considerable force of French and Indians, about 1,600 strong, sent to the relief of the beleaguered fort, was intercepted and routed, most of the French officers and men being slain or captured. This took from Pouchot his last hope, and he surrendered the following day. "As the stations beyond Niagara were now completely cut off from communication with the east, and had given up a large part of their men to join D'Aubry [in the attempt to relieve Niagara], they were no longer capable of resistance. Presqu' Isle, Venango, and Le Renf were easily taken by Colonel Bouquet, who had been sent to summon them to surrender." The detachment left at Oswego, in charge of stores, was attacked by a body of French and Indians from La Presentation (Ogdensburg), but the attack failed. "For the reduction of the forts at Ticonderoga and Crown Point, Amherst had somewhat more than 11,000 men. He began preparations early in May at Albany, preparing boats, gathering stores, and disciplining the new recruits." In June he reached Lake George with his army, but it was not until late in July that "the army moved down the lake in four columns, in a fleet of whale-boats, bateaux, and artillery rafts, very much as Abercromby's men had gone to their defeat the year before, and left the boats nearly opposite the former landing-place. The vanguard, pushing on rapidly over the road to the falls, met a detachment of French and Indians, whom they overpowered and scattered after a slight skirmish, and the main body pressed on and took a position at the saw mills. From prisoners it was learned that Bourlamaque commanded at Ticonderoga with 3,400 men. Montcalm was at Quebec." The French withdrew from their outer lines into the fort, and made a show of resistance for several days while they evacuated the place. An explosion, during the night of the 25th of July, "and the light of the burning works, assured the English of the retreat of the French, of which they had already heard from a deserter, and Colonel Frawland pursued them down the lake with a few troops, and took sixteen prisoners and some boats laden with powder. . . . After the flames were extinguished, Amherst, who had lost about 75 men, went to work to repair the fortifications and complete the road from the lake. Some sunken French boats were raised, and a brig was built. Amherst was slowly preparing to attack Crown Point, and sent Rogers with his rangers to reconnoitre. But on the first of August they learned that the French had abandoned that fort also; and on the 16th that Bourlamaque's men were encamped on the Isle aux Noix, at the northern extremity of Lake Champlain, commanding the entrance to the Richelieu. They had been joined by some small detachments, and numbered about 3,500 men. Amherst spent his time in fortifying Crown Point, and building boats and rafts," until "it was too late to descend to Montreal and go to the help of Wolfe; the time for that had been passed in elaborate and useless preparations."—R. Johnson, *Hist. of the French War*, ch. 18.

ALSO IN: E. Warburton, *Conquest of Canada*, v. 2, ch. 9.—W. L. Stone, *Life and Times of Sir W. Johnson*, v. 2, ch. 4.

A. D. 1760.—The completion of the English conquest.—The end of "New France."—"Notwithstanding the successes of 1759, Canada was not yet completely conquered. If Amherst had moved on faster and taken Montreal, the work would have been finished; but his failure to do so gave the French forces an opportunity to rally, and the indefatigable De Levis, who had succeeded Montcalm, gathered what remained of the army at Montreal, and made preparations for attempting the recovery of Quebec. . . . After several fruitless attacks had been made on the British outposts during the winter, De Levis refitted all the vessels yet remaining early in the spring and gathered the stores still left at the forts on the Richelieu. On the 17th of April, he left Montreal with all his force and descended the river, gathering up the detached troops on the way; the whole amounting to more than 10,000 men. Quebec had been left in charge of Murray, with 7,000 men, a supply of heavy artillery, and stores of ammunition and provisions; but the number of men had been much reduced by sickness and by hardship encountered in bringing fuel to the city from forests, some as far as ten miles away. Their position, however, had been very much strengthened. . . . De Levis encamped at St. Foy, and on the 27th advanced to within three miles of the city."—R. Johnson, *Hist. of the French War*, ch. 21.—"On the 28th of April, Murray, marching out from the city, left the advantageous ground which he first occupied, and hazarded an attack near Sillery Wood. The advance-guard, under Bourlamaque, returned it with ardor. In danger of being surrounded, Murray was obliged to fly, leaving 'his very fine train of artillery,' and losing 1,000 men. The French appear to have lost about 300, though Murray's report increased it more than eightfold. During the next two days, Levis [Levis] opened trenches against the town; but the frost delayed the works. The English garrison, reduced to 2,200 effective men, labored with alacrity; women, and even cripples were set to light work. In the French army, not a word would be listened to of the possibility of failure. But Pitt had foreseen and prepared for all. A fleet at his bidding went to relieve the city; and to his wife he was able to write in June: 'Join, my love, with me, in most humble and grateful thanks to the Almighty. Swanton arrived at Quebec in the Vanguard on the 15th of May, and destroyed all the French shipping, six or seven in number. The siege was raised on the 17th, with every happy circumstance. The enemy left their camp standing; abandoned 40 pieces of cannon. Happy, happy day! My joy and hurry are inexpressible.' When the spring opened, Amherst had no difficulties to encounter in taking possession of Canada but such as he himself should create. A country suffering from a four years' scarcity, a disheartened peasantry, five or six battalions, wasted by incredible services and not recruited from France, offered no opposition. Amherst led the main army of 10,000 men by way of Oswego; though the labor of getting there was greater than that of proceeding directly upon Montreal. He descended the St. Lawrence cautiously, taking possession of the feeble works at Ogdensburg. Treating the helpless Canadians with humanity, and with no loss of lives except in passing the rapids, on the 7th of September, 1760,

he met before Montreal the army of Murray. The next day Haviland arrived with forces from Crown Point; and, in the view of the three armies, the flag of St. George was raised in triumph over the gate of Montreal. . . . The capitulation [signed by the Marquis de Vaudreuil, governor, against the protest of Lévis] included all Canada, which was said to extend to the crest of land dividing branches of Lakes Erie and Michigan from those of the Miami, the Wabash, and the Illinois rivers. Property and religion were cared for in the terms of surrender; but for civil liberty no stipulation was thought of. . . . On the fifth day after the capitulation, Rogers departed with 200 rangers to carry English banners to the upper posts. . . . The Indians on the lakes were at peace, united under Pontiac, the great chief of the Ottawas, happy in a country fruitful of corn and abounding in game. The Americans were met at the mouth of a river by a deputation of Ottawas. 'Pontiac,' said they, 'is the chief and lord of the country you are in; wait till he can see you.' When Pontiac and Rogers met, the savage chieftain asked: 'How have you dared to enter my country without my leave?' 'I come,' replied the English agent, 'with no design against the Indians, but to remove the French.'" Pontiac, after some delay, smoked the calumet with Rogers and consented to his mission. The latter then proceeded to take possession of Detroit. In the following spring he went on to the French posts in the northwest.—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S. (Author's last revision)*, v. 2, pp. 523-524.

ALSO IN: W. Smith, *Hist. of Canada*, v. 1, ch. 7 (giving the Articles of Capitulation in full).—F. Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe*, ch. 29-30 (p. 2).

A. D. 1763.—Ceded to England by the Treaty of Paris. See SEVEN YEARS WAR.

A. D. 1763-1774.—The Province of Quebec created.—Eleven years of military rule.—The Quebec Act of 1774.—Extension of Quebec Province to the Ohio and the Mississippi.—“For three years after the conquest, the government of Canada was entrusted to military chiefs, stationed at Quebec, Montreal and Three Rivers, the headquarters of the three departments into which General Amherst divided the country. Military councils were established to administer law, though, as a rule, the people did not resort to such tribunals, but settled their difficulties among themselves. In 1763, the king, George III., issued a proclamation establishing four new governments, of which Quebec was one. Labrador, from St. John's River to Hudson's Bay, Anticosti, and the Magdalen Islands, were placed under the jurisdiction of Newfoundland, and the islands of St. John (or Prince Edward Island, as it was afterwards called), and Cape Breton (Île Royale) with the smaller islands adjacent thereto, were added to the government of Nova Scotia. Express power was given to the governors, in the letters-patent by which these governments were constituted, to summon general assemblies, with the advice and consent of His Majesty's Council, 'in such manner and form as was usual in those colonies and provinces which were under the King's immediate government'. . . . No assembly, however, ever met, as the French-Canadian population were unwilling to take the test oath, and the government of the province was carried on solely by the governor general, with the assistance of an executive council, composed

in the first instance of the two lieutenant-governors of Montreal and Three Rivers, the chief justice, the surveyor general of customs, and eight others chosen from the leading residents in the colony. From 1763 to 1774 the province remained in a very unsettled state, chiefly on account of the uncertainty that prevailed as to the laws actually in force. . . . The province of Quebec remained for eleven years under the system of government established by the proclamation of 1763. In 1774, Parliament intervened for the first time in Canadian affairs and made important constitutional changes. The previous constitution had been created by letters-patent under the great seal of Great Britain, in the exercise of an unquestionable and undisputed prerogative of the Crown. The colonial institutions of the old possessions of Great Britain, now known as the United States of America, had their origin in the same way. But in 1774, a system of government was granted to Canada by the express authority of Parliament. This constitution was known as the Quebec Act, and greatly extended the boundaries of the province of Quebec, as defined in the proclamation of 1763. On one side, the province extended to the frontiers of New England, Pennsylvania, New York province, the Ohio, and the left bank of the Mississippi; on the other, to the Hudson's Bay Territory, Labrador, and the islands annexed to Newfoundland by the proclamation of 1763, were made part of the province of Quebec. . . . The Act of 1774 was exceedingly unpopular in England and in the English-speaking colonies, then at the commencement of the Revolution. Parliament, however, appears to have been influenced by a desire to adjust the government of the province so as to conciliate the majority of the people. . . . The new constitution came into force in October, 1774. The Act sets forth among the reasons for legislation that the provisions made by the proclamation of 1763 were 'inapplicable to the state and circumstances of the said province, the inhabitants whereof amounted at the conquest, to above 65,000 persons professing the religion of the Church of Rome, and enjoying an established form of constitution and system of laws, by which their persons and property had been protected, governed, and ordered for a long series of years, from the first establishment of the province.' Consequently, it is provided that Roman Catholics should be no longer obliged to take the test oath, but only the oath of allegiance. The government of the province was entrusted to a governor and a legislative council, appointed by the Crown, inasmuch as it was 'inexpedient to call an assembly.' This council was to comprise not more than twenty-three, and not less than seventeen members, and had the power, with the consent of the governor or commander-in-chief for the time being, to make ordinances for the peace, welfare, and good government of the province. They had no authority, however, to lay on any taxes or duties except such as the inhabitants of any town or district might be authorized to assess or levy within its precincts for roads and ordinary local services. No ordinance could be passed, except by a majority of the council, and every one had to be transmitted within six months after its enactment to His Majesty for approval or disallowance. It was also enacted that in all matters of controversy, relative to property and civil rights,



recourse should be had to the French civil procedure, whilst the criminal law of England should obtain to the exclusion of every other criminal code which might have prevailed before 1764.

... Roman Catholics were permitted to observe their religion with perfect freedom, and their clergy were to enjoy their 'accustomed dues and rights' with respect to such persons as professed that creed. Consequently, the Roman Catholic population of Canada were relieved of their disabilities many years before people of the same belief in Great Britain and Ireland received similar privileges. The new constitution was inaugurated by Major General Carleton, afterwards Lord Dorchester, who nominated a legislative council of twenty-three members, of whom eight were Roman Catholics."—J. G. Bourinot, *Manual of Const. Hist. of Canada*, ch. 2-3.

ALSO IN: W. Houston, *Documents Illustrative of the Canadian Constitution*, pp. 90-96.—See, also, UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1774 (MARCH-APRIL).

**A. D. 1775-1776.—Invasion by the revolting American colonists.—Loss and recovery of Montreal.—Successful defence of Quebec.**—At the beginning of the revolt of the thirteen colonies which subsequently formed, by their separation from Great Britain, the United States of America, it was believed among them that Canada would join their movement if the British troops which occupied the country were driven out. Acting on this belief, the Continental Congress at Philadelphia, in June, 1775, adopted a resolution instructing General Schuyler to repair without delay to Ticonderoga (which had been surprised and taken a few weeks before by Ethan Allen and his "Green Mountain Boys"), and "If he found it practicable, and it would not be disagreeable to the Canadians, immediately to take possession of St. John's and Montreal, and pursue any other measures in Canada which might have a tendency to promote the peace and security of these colonies." General Schuyler found it difficult to gather troops and supplies for the projected expedition, and it was the middle of August before he was prepared to move. His chief subordinate officer was Gen. Richard Montgomery, an Irishman, formerly in the British service, but settled latterly in New York; and he was to be supported by a cooperative movement planned and led by Benedict Arnold. "General Montgomery, with 3,000 men, would go down Lake Champlain and attack Montreal; while General Arnold, with 1,200, was to seek the headwaters of Kennebec River, cross the height of land, and descend the Chaudiere to the very gates of Quebec. The brave General Carleton, who had been with Wolfe at Quebec, was now in command of the forces of Canada—If 500 British regulars and a few hundred militia might be so denominated. No doubt Governor Carleton with his small army undertook too much. He sought to defend the way to Montreal by holding Fort St. John, and that to Quebec by defending Chambly. Both these places fell before the Americans. General Montgomery pushed on down the River Richelieu and occupied Sorel, throwing forces across the St. Lawrence, and erected batteries on both sides to prevent intercourse between Montreal and Quebec. Montreal, now defenceless, was compelled to surrender on the 13th of November, and 11 British vessels were given up to the enemy.

It was really a dark hour for Canada. General Carleton has been severely criticized for dividing his forces. The truth is, the attack was so unexpected, and so soon after the outbreak of the rebellion, that no plan of defence for Canada had been laid. . . . General Carleton escaped from Montreal, and, in a boat, passed the Sorel batteries with muffled oars under cover of night. The general had but reached Quebec in time. The expedition of Arnold had already gained the St. Lawrence on the side opposite the 'Ancient Capital.' The energy displayed by Arnold's men was remarkable. The Kennebec is a series of rapids. Its swift current hurries over dangerous rocks at every turn. The highlands when reached consist of swamps and rocky ridges covered with forest. The Chaudiere proved worse than the Kennebec, and the current being with the boats, dashed them to pieces on the rocks. Arnold's men, on their six weeks' march, had run short of food, and were compelled to eat the dogs which had accompanied them. Not much more than half of Arnold's army reached the St. Lawrence. Arnold's force crossed the St. Lawrence, landed at Wolfe's Cove, and built huts for themselves on the Plains of Abraham. On the 6th of December Montgomery joined the Kennebec men before Quebec. The united force was of some 3,000 men, supported by about a dozen light guns. Carleton had, for the defence of Quebec, only one company of regulars and a few seamen and marines of a sloop of war at Quebec. The popularity of the governor was such that he easily prevailed upon the citizens, both French and English, to enroll themselves in companies for the defence of their homes. He was able to count upon about 1,600 bayonets. The defences of Quebec were, however, too strong for the Americans. On the night of December 31st, a desperate effort was made to take the city by escalade. Four attacks were made simultaneously. Arnold sought to enter by the St. Charles, on the north side of Quebec, and Montgomery by the south, between Cape Diamond and the St. Lawrence. Two feints were to be made on the side towards the Plains of Abraham. The hope of the commanders was to have forced the gates from the lower to the upper town in both cases. Arnold failed to reach the lower town, and in a scuffle the defenders cut off nearly the whole of his column. He escaped wounded. Montgomery was killed at the second entrenchment of the lower town, and his troops retired in confusion. The American generals have been criticized by experts for not making their chief attack on the wall facing on the Plains of Abraham. . . . General Arnold remained before Quebec, though his troops had become reduced to 800 men. General Carleton pursued a policy of acting strictly on the defensive. If he retained Quebec it would be his greatest success. General Arnold sought to gain the sympathy of the French Canadian seigniors and people, but without any success. Three thousand troops, however, came to reinforce Arnold early in the year, and 4,000 occupied Montreal, St. John's, and Chambly. But on the 6th of May relief came from England; men of war and transports, with three brigades of infantry besides artillery, stores, and ammunition. The Americans withdrew to Sorel. The British troops followed them, and a brigade encamped at Three Rivers. The Americans at-



tempted to surprise the force at Three Rivers, but were repulsed with heavy loss. The Americans now fell back from Montreal, deserted all the posts down to Lake Champlain, and Governor Carleton had the pleasure of occupying Isle-aux-Noix as the outpost, leaving Canada as it had been before the first attack in the year before."—G. Bryce, *Short Hist. of the Canadian People*, ch. 6, sect. 3.

ALSO IN: B. J. Lossing, *Life and Times of Philip Schuyler*, v. 1, ch. 19-20, and v. 2, ch. 1-4.—J. Sparks, *Life and Treason of Benedict Arnold*, ch. 3-5 (*Library of Am. Biog.*, v. 3).—J. Armstrong, *Life of Richard Montgomery* (*Lib. of Am. Biog.*, v. 1).—C. H. Jones, *Hist. of the Campaign for the Conquest of Canada in 1776*.—J. J. Henry, *Arnold's Campaign against Quebec*.

A. D. 1776.—General Carleton's unsuccessful advance against Ticonderoga. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776-1777.

A. D. 1777.—Burgoyne's disastrous invasion of New York. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777 (JULY—OCTOBER).

A. D. 1783.—Settlement of boundaries in the Treaty of Peace between Great Britain and the United States. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1783 (SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1783-1784.—Influx of the "United Empire Loyalists" from the United States. See TORIES OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

A. D. 1791.—The Constitutional Act.—Division of the province into Upper and Lower Canada.—"In 1791 a bill was introduced by Pitt dividing the Province into Upper and Lower Canada, the line of division being so drawn as to give a great majority to the British element in Upper Canada and a great majority to the French settlers in Lower Canada. The measure was strongly opposed by Fox, who urged that the separation of the English and French inhabitants was most undesirable. . . . The act was passed, and is known as the Constitutional Act of 1791.

. . . In each province the legislature was to consist of the Governor, a Legislative Council and a Legislative Assembly. The Governor had power to give or withhold the royal assent to bills, or to reserve them for consideration by the Crown. He could summon, prorogue, or dissolve the legislature, but was required to convene the legislature at least once a year. The Legislative Council in Upper Canada consisted of not less than 7, and in Lower Canada of not less than 15 members, chosen by the King for life, the Speaker being appointed by the Governor-General. The Legislative Assembly was in counties elected by 40s. freeholders, and in towns by owners of houses of £5 yearly value and by resident inhabitants paying £10 yearly rent. The number and limits of electoral districts were fixed by the Governor-General. Lower Canada had 50 members, Upper Canada 16 members, assigned to their respective legislatures. The new Constitution did not prove a success. Serious differences arose between the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly in regard to the control of the revenue and supplies, differences which were aggravated by the conflict that still went on between the French and English races. . . . The discontent resulted in the rebellion of 1837-8."—J. E. C. Munro, *The Constitution of Canada*, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: W. Houston, *Docs. Illustrative of the Canadian Const.*, pp. 112-133.—D. Brymner, *Rept. on Canadian Archives*, 1890, app. B.

A. D. 1812-1815.—The War of Great Britain with the United States. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812 (JUNE—OCTOBER), to 1815 (JANUARY).

A. D. 1818.—Convention between Great Britain and the United States relating to Fisheries, etc. See FISHERIES, NORTH AMERICAN: A. D. 1814-1818.

A. D. 1820-1837.—The Family Compact.—"The Family Compact manifestly grew out of the principles of the U. E. Loyalists. It was the union of the leaders of the loyalists with others of kindred spirit, to rule Upper Canada, heedless of the rights or wishes of its people. We have admired the patriotic, heroic and sentimental side of U. E. loyalism; but plainly, as related to civil government, its political doctrines and practices were tyrannical. Its prominent members belonged to the class which in the American colonies, in the persons of Governors Bernard and Hutchinson, and many others of high office and standing, had plotted to destroy the liberties of the people and had hastened the American revolution. . . . By the years 1818 or 1820 a junto or cabal had been formed, definite in its aims and firmly combined together, known as the Family Compact, not to its best leaders seeing an embodiment of selfishness, but rather set for patriotic defence and hallowed with the name of religion."—G. Bryce, *Short Hist. of the Canadian People*, ch. 10, sect. 2.—"Upper Canada . . . has long been entirely governed by a party commonly designated throughout the Province as the 'Family Compact,' a name not much more appropriate than party designations usually are, inasmuch as there is, in truth, very little of family connection among the persons thus united. For a long time this body of men, receiving at times accessions to its members, possessed almost all the highest public offices, by means of which, and of its influence in the Executive Council, it wielded all the powers of government; it maintained influence in the legislature by means of its predominance in the Legislative Council; and it disposed of a large number of petty posts which are in the patronage of the Government all over the Province. Successive Governors, as they came in their turn, are said to have either submitted quietly to its influence, or, after a short and unavailing struggle, to have yielded to this well-organized party the real conduct of affairs. The bench, the magistracy, the high offices of the Episcopal Church, and a great part of the legal profession, are filled by the adherents of this party: by grant or purchase, they have acquired nearly the whole of the waste lands of the Province; they are all powerful in the chartered banks, and, till lately, shared among themselves almost exclusively all offices of trust and profit. The bulk of this party consists, for the most part, of native-born inhabitants of the colony, or of emigrants who settled in it before the last war with the United States; the principal members of it belong to the church of England, and the maintenance of the claims of that church has always been one of its distinguishing characteristics."—Earl of Durham, *Rept. on the Affairs of British N. Am.*, p. 105.—"The influences which produced the Family Compact were not confined to Upper Canada. In the Lower Province, as well as in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, similar causes led to similar results, and the term Family Compact has at one

time or another been a familiar one in all the British North American colonies. . . . The designation Family Compact, however, did not owe its origin to any combination of North American colonists, but was borrowed from the diplomatic history of Europe."—J. C. Dent, *The Story of the Upper Canadian Rebellion*, ch. 3.

—A. D. 1837.—The Causes of discontent which produced rebellion.—“It was in Lower Canada that the greatest difficulties arose. A constant antagonism grew up between the majority of the legislative council, who were nominees of the Crown, and the majority of the representative assembly, who were elected by the population of the province [see above: A. D. 1791]. The home Government encouraged and indeed kept up that most odious and dangerous of all instruments for the supposed management of a colony—a ‘British party’ devoted to the so-called interests of the mother country, and obedient to the word of command from their masters and patrons at home. The majority in the legislative council constantly thwarted the resolutions of the vast majority of the popular assembly. Disputes arose as to the voting of supplies. The Government retained in their service officials whom the representative assembly had condemned, and insisted on the right to pay them their salaries out of certain funds of the colony. The representative assembly took to stopping the supplies, and the Government claimed the right to counteract this measure by appropriating to the purpose such public moneys as happened to be within their reach at the time. The colony—for indeed on these subjects the population of Lower Canada, right or wrong, was so near to being of one mind that we may take the declarations of public meetings as representing the colony—demanded that the legislative council should be made elective, and that the colonial government should not be allowed to dispose of the moneys of the colony at their pleasure. The House of Commons and the Government here replied by refusing to listen to the proposal. . . . It is not necessary to suppose that in all these disputes the popular majority were in the right and the officials in the wrong. No one can doubt that there was much bitterness of feeling arising out of the mere differences of race. . . . At last the representative assembly refused to vote any further supplies or to carry on any further business. They formulated their grievances against the home Government. Their complaints were of arbitrary conduct on the part of the governors; intolerable composition of the legislative council, which they insisted ought to be elective; illegal appropriation of the public money, and violent prorogation of the provincial parliament. One of the leading men in the movement which afterwards became rebellion in Lower Canada was Mr. Louis Joseph Papineau. This man had risen to high position by his talents, his energy, and his undoubtedly honourable character. He had represented Montreal in the representative Assembly of Lower Canada, and he afterwards became Speaker of the House. He made himself leader of the movement to protest against the policy of the governors, and that of the Government by whom they were sustained. He held a series of meetings, at some of which undoubtedly rather strong language was used. . . . Lord Gosford, the governor, began by dismissing several militia officers who had taken part in some of these

demonstrations; Mr. Papineau himself was an officer of this force. Then the governor issued warrants for the apprehension of many members of the popular Assembly on the charge of high treason. Some of these at once left the country; others against whom warrants were issued were arrested, and a sudden resistance was made by their friends and supporters. Then, in a manner familiar to all who have read anything of the history of revolutionary movements, the resistance to a capture of prisoners suddenly transformed itself into open rebellion.”—J. McCarthy, *Hist. of our own Times*, v. 1, ch. 3.—Among the grievances which gave rise to discontent in both Upper and Lower Canada, “first of all there was the chronic grievance of the Clergy Reserves [which were public lands set apart by the Act of 1791 for the support of the Protestant Clergy], common both to British and French, to Upper and to Lower Canada. In Upper Canada these reserves amounted to 2,500,000 acres, being one-seventh of the lands in the Province. Three objections were made against continuing these Reserves for the purpose for which they had been set apart. The first objection arose from the way in which the Executive Council wished to apply the revenues accruing from these lands. According to the Act they were to be applied for ‘maintaining the Protestant religion in Canada’; and the Executive Council interpreted this as meaning to exclusively the Church of England, which was established by law in the mother-country. But the objectors claimed a right for all Protestant denominations to share in the Reserves. The second objection was that the amount of these lands was too large for the purpose in view: and the third referred to the way in which the Reserves were selected. These 2,500,000 acres did not lie in a block, but, when the early surveys were made, every seventh lot was reserved; and as these lots were not cleared for years the people complained that they were not utilized, and so became inconvenient barriers to uniform civilization. With the Roman Catholics, both priests and people, the Clergy Reserves were naturally unpopular. . . . An additional source of complaint was found in the fact that the government of Upper and Lower Canada had found its way into the hands of a few powerful families banded together by a Family Compact [see above: A. D. 1820-1837]. . . . But the Constitutional difficulty was, after all, the great one, and it lay at the bottom of the whole dispute. . . . Altogether the issues were very complicated in the St. Lawrence Valley Provinces and the Maritime Provinces . . . and so it is not to be wondered at that some should interpret the rebellion as a class, and perhaps semi-religious, contest rather than a race-conflict. The constitutional dead-lock, however, was tolerably clear to those who looked beneath the surface. . . . The main desire of all was to be freed of the burden of Executive Councils, nominated at home and kept in office with or without the wish of the people. In Upper Canada, William Lyon Mackenzie, and in Lower Canada, Louis Papineau and Dr. Wolfred Nelson, agitated for independence.”—W. P. Greswell, *Hist. of the Dominion of Canada*, ch. 16.

ALSO IN: J. McMullen, *Hist. of Canada*, ch. 19-20.—Earl of Durham, *Rept. and Dispatches*.—Sir F. B. Head, *Narrative*.—*Rept. of Comrs. appointed to inquire into the grievances complained of in Lower Canada (House of Commons, Feb. 20, 1837)*.

**A. D. 1837-1838.—The rebellion under Papineau and Mackenzie, and its suppression.—The Burning of the Caroline.**—"Immediately on the breaking out of the rebellion, the constitution of Lower Canada was suspended; the revolt was put down at once, and with little difficulty. Though the outbreak in Upper Canada showed that a comparatively small portion of the population was disaffected to the government, there were some sharp skirmishes before the smouldering fire was completely trodden out. . . . On the night of the 4th of December, 1837, when all Toronto was asleep, except the policemen who stood sentries over the arms in the city hall, and a few gentlemen who sat up to watch out the night with the Adjutant-General of Militia in the Parliament House, the alarm came that the rebels were upon the city. They were under the command of a newspaper editor named Mackenzie, whose grotesque figure was until lately [this was published in 1865] familiar to the frequenters of the Canadian House of Assembly. Rumours had been rife for some days past of arming and drilling among the disaffected in the Home and London districts. . . . The alarm threw Toronto into commotion. . . . The volunteers were formed in the market square during the night and well armed. In point of discipline, even in the last instance, they were not wholly deficient, many of them being retired officers and discharged men from both the naval and military services. . . . Towards morning news came of a smart skirmish which had occurred during the night, in which a party of the rebels were driven back and their leader killed. During the succeeding day and night, loyal yeomen kept pouring in to act in defence of the crown. Sir Allan, then Colonel Macnab, the Speaker of the House of Assembly . . . raised a body of his friends and adherents in the course of the night and following day, and, seizing a vessel in the harbour at Hamilton, hurried to Toronto. . . . The rebels were defeated and dispersed next day, at a place some two miles from Toronto. In this action, the Speaker took the command of the Volunteers, which he kept during the subsequent campaign on the Niagara frontier, and till all danger was over. . . . Mackenzie soon rallied his scattered adherents, and seized Navy Island, just above Niagara Falls, where he was joined by large numbers of American 'sympathizers,' who came to the spot on the chance of a quarrel with the English. On receipt of this intelligence, the Speaker hastened from the neighbourhood of Brantford (where he had just dispersed a band of insurgents under the command of a doctor named Duncombe) to reinforce Colonel Cameron, formerly of the 79th, who had taken up a position at Chippewa. Navy Island, an eyot some quarter of a mile in length, lies in the Niagara River within musket-shot of the Canadian bank. The current runs past the island on both sides with great velocity, and, immediately below it, hurries over the two miles of rocks and rapids that precede its tremendous leap. The rebels threw up works on the side facing the Canadians. They drew their supplies from Fort Schlosser, an American work nearly opposite the village of Chippewa." A small steambot, named the Caroline, had been secured by the insurgents and was plying between Fort Schlosser and Navy Island. She "had brought over several

field-pieces and other military stores; it therefore became necessary to decide whether it was not expedient for the safety of Canada to destroy her. Great Britain was not at war with the United States, and to cut out an American steamer from an American port was to incur a heavy responsibility. Nevertheless Colonel Macnab determined to assume it." A party set over in boats at night to Fort Schlosser surprised the Caroline at her wharf, fired her and sent her adrift in the river, to be carried over the Falls. —Viscount Bury, *Exodus of the Western Nations*, v. 2, ch. 12.—"On all sides the insurgents were crushed, jails were filled with their leaders, and 180 were sentenced to be hanged. Some of them were executed and some were banished to Van Dieman's Land, while others were pardoned on account of their youth. But there was a great revulsion of feeling in England, and after a few years, pardons were extended to almost all. Even Papineau and Mackenzie, the leaders of the rebellion, were allowed to come back, and, strange to say, both were elected to seats in the Canadian Assembly."—W. P. Greswell, *Hist. of the Dominion of Canada*, ch. 16, sect. 15.—On the American border the Canadian rebellion of 1837-38 was very commonly called "the Patriot War."

ALSO IN: C. Lindsey, *Life and Times of Wm. Lyon Mackenzie*, v. 2.—J. C. Dent, *Story of the U. Canada Rebellion*.

**A. D. 1840-1841.—International Imbroglío consequent on the burning of the Caroline.—The McLeod Case.**—The burning of the steamer Caroline (see above, A. D. 1837-1838) gave rise to a serious question between Great Britain and the United States. "In the fray which occurred, an American named Duffree was killed. The British government avowed this invasion to be a public act and a necessary measure of self-defence; but it was a question when Mr. Van Buren [President of the United States] went out of office whether this avowal had been made in an authentic manner. . . . In November, 1840, one Alexander McLeod came from Canada to New York, where he boasted that he was the slayer of Duffree, and thereupon was at once arrested on a charge of murder and thrown into prison. This aroused great anger in England, and the conviction of McLeod was all that was needed to cause immediate war. . . . Our [the American] government was, of course, greatly hampered in action . . . by the fact that McLeod was within the jurisdiction and in the power of the New York courts, and wholly out of reach of those of the United States. . . . Mr. Webster [who became Secretary of State under President Taylor] . . . was hardly in office before he received a demand from Mr. Fox for the release of McLeod, in which full avowal was made that the burning of the Caroline was a public act. Mr. Webster determined that . . . the only way to dispose of McLeod was to get him out of prison, separate him, diplomatically speaking, from the affair of the Caroline, and then take that up as a distinct matter for negotiation with the British government. . . . His first step was to instruct the Attorney-General to proceed to Lockport, where McLeod was imprisoned, and communicate with the counsel for the defence, furnishing them with authentic information that the destruction of the Caroline was a public act, and that therefore McLeod could not be held responsible. . . . This threw

the responsibility for McLeod, and for consequent peace or war, where it belonged, on the New York authorities, who seemed, however, but little inclined to assist the general government. McLeod came before the Supreme Court of New York in July, on a writ of habeas corpus, but they refused to release him on the grounds set forth in Mr. Webster's instructions to the Attorney-General, and he was remanded for trial in October, which was highly embarrassing to our government, as it kept this dangerous affair open." But when McLeod came to trial in October, 1841, it appeared that he was a mere braggart who had not even been present when Durfree was killed. His acquittal happily ended the case, and smoothed the way to the negotiation of the Ashburton treaty, which opened at Washington soon afterwards and which settled all questions between England and the United States.—H. C. Lodge, *Daniel Webster*, ch. 8.

ALSO IN: W. H. Seward, *Works*, v. 2, pp. 547-588.—D. Webster, *Works*, v. 6, pp. 247-269.

**A. D. 1840-1867.—Reunion of the provinces.—The opposition of races.—Clear Grits and Conservatives.**—"The reunion of the two Provinces had been projected before: it was greatly desired by the British of the Lower Province; and in 1822 a bill for the purpose had actually been brought into the Imperial Parliament, but the French being bitterly opposed to it, the Bill had been dropped. The French were as much opposed to reunion as ever, clearly seeing, what the author of the policy [Lord Durham] had avowed, that the measure was directed against their nationality. But since the Rebellion they were prostrate. Their Constitution had been superseded by a Provisional Council sitting under the protection of Imperial bayonets, and this Council consented to the union. The two Provinces were now [July, 1840] placed under a Governor-General with a single legislature, consisting, like the legislatures of the two Provinces before, of an Upper House nominated by the Crown and a Lower House elected by the people. Each province was to have the same number of representatives, although the population of the French Province was at that time much larger than that of the British Province. The French language was proscribed in official proceedings. French nationality was thus sent, constitutionally, under the yoke. But to leave it its votes, necessary and right as that might be, was to leave it the only weapon which puts the weak on a level with the strong, and even gives them the advantage, since the weak are the most likely to hold together and to submit to the discipline of organised party. . . . The French . . . 'had the wisdom,' as their manual of history . . . complacently observes, 'to remain united among themselves, and by that union were able to exercise a happy influence on the Legislature and the Government.' Instead of being politically suppressed, they soon, thanks to their compactness as an interest and their docile obedience to their leaders, became politically dominant. The British factions began to bid against each other for their support, and were presently it their feet. . . . The statute proscribing the use of the French language in official proceedings was repealed, and the Canadian Legislature was made bi-lingual. The Premiership was divided between the English and the French leader, and the Ministries were designated by the double

name—'the Lafontaine-Baldwin,' or 'the Macdonald-Taché.' The French got their full share of seats in the Cabinet and of patronage; of public funds they got more than their full share, especially as being small consumers of imported goods they contributed far less than their quota to the public revenue. By their aid the Roman Catholics of the Upper Province obtained the privilege of Separate Schools in contravention of the principle of religious equality and severance of the Church from the State. In time it was recognized as a rule that a Ministry to retain power must have a majority from each section of the Province. This practically almost reduced the Union to a federation, under which French nationality was more securely entrenched than ever. Gradually the French and their clergy became, as they have ever since been, the basis of what styles itself a Conservative party, playing for French support, by defending clerical privilege, by protecting French nationality, and, not least, by allowing the French Province to dip her hand deep in the common treasury. On the other hand, a secession of thorough-going Reformers from the Moderates . . . gave birth to the party of the 'Clear Grits,' the leader of which was Mr. George Brown, a Scotch Presbyterian, and which having first insisted on the secularization of the Clergy Reserves, became, when that question was out of the way, a party of general opposition to French and Roman Catholic influence. . . . A change had thus come over the character and relations of parties. French Canada, so lately the seat of disaffection, became the basis of the Conservative party. British Canada became the stronghold of the Liberals. . . . A period of tricky combinations, perfidious alliances, and selfish intrigues now commenced, and a series of weak and ephemeral governments was its fruit."—Goldwin Smith, *Canada and the Canadian Question*, ch. 7.

ALSO IN: W. Houston, *Does Illustrative of the Canadian Const.*, pp. 149-185.—J. G. Bourinot, *Manual of the Const. Hist. of Canada*, ch. 5.

**A. D. 1842.—Settlement of boundary disputes with the United States by the Ashburton Treaty.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1842.

**A. D. 1854-1866.—The Reciprocity Treaty with the United States and its abrogation.** See TARIFF LEGISLATION (UNITED STATES AND CANADA): A. D. 1854-1866.

**A. D. 1864.—The St. Albans Raid.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (OCTOBER).

**A. D. 1866-1871.—Fenian invasions.**—The Fenian movement (see IRELAND: A. D. 1858-1867) had its most serious outcome in an attempted invasion of Canada from the United States, which took place in 1866. "Canadian volunteers were under arms all day on the 7th of March, 1866, expecting a Fenian invasion, but it was not made: in April an insignificant attack was made upon New Brunswick. About 900 men, under Col. O'Neil, crossed from Buffalo to Fort Erie on the night of May 31st. Moving westward, this body aimed at destroying the Welland Canal, when they were met by the Queen's Own Volunteer Regiment of Toronto, and the 18th battalion of Hamilton Militia, near the village of Ridgeway. Here, after a conflict of two hours, in which for a time the Volunteers drove the enemy before them, the Canadian

forces retired to Ridgeway, and thence to Port Colborne, with a loss of nine killed and 30 wounded. Col. Peacock, in charge of a body of regulars, was marching to meet the volunteers, so that O'Neil was compelled to flee to Fort Erie, and, crossing to the United States with his men, was arrested, but afterwards liberated. The day after the skirmish the regulars and volunteers encamped at Fort Erie, and the danger on the Niagara Frontier was past. A Fenian expedition threatened Prescott, aiming at reaching the capital at Ottawa, and another band of marauders crossed the border from St. Albans, Vermont, but both were easily driven back. The Fenian troubles roused strong feeling in Canada against the American authorities. . . . A Fenian attack was led by Col. O'Neil on the Lower Canadian frontier, in 1870, but it was easily met, and the United States authorities were moved to arrest the repulsed fugitives. A foolish movement was again made in 1871 by the same leader, through Minnesota, against Manitoba. Through the prompt action of the friendly American commander at Fort Pembina, the United States troops followed the Fenians across the border, arrested their leader, and, though he was liberated after a trial at St. Paul, Minnesota, the expedition ended as a miserable and laughable failure. These movements of the Fenian Society, though trifling in effect, yet involved Canada in a considerable expense from the maintenance of bodies of the Active Militia at different points along the frontier. The training of a useful force of citizen soldiery however resulted."—G. Bryce, *Short Hist. of the Canadian People*, pp. 468-470.

ALSO IN: G. T. Denison, Jr., *The Fenian Raid on Fort Erie.—Corr. relating to the Fenian Invasion.—Official Report of Gen. John O'Neill.*

A. D. 1867.—Federation of the provinces of British North America in the Dominion of Canada.—The constitution of the Dominion.—"The Union between Upper and Lower Canada lasted until 1867, when the provinces of British North America were brought more closely together in a federation and entered on a new era in their constitutional history. For many years, previous to 1865, the administration of government in Canada had become surrounded with political difficulties of a very perplexing character. . . . Parties at last were so equally balanced on account of the antagonism between the two sections, that the vote of one member might decide the fate of an administration, and the course of legislation for a year or a series of years. From the 21st of May, 1863, to the end of June, 1864, there were no less than five different ministries in charge of the public business. Legislation, in fact, was at last practically at a dead-lock. . . . It was at this critical juncture of affairs that the leaders of the government and opposition, in the session of 1864, came to a mutual understanding, after the most mature consideration of the whole question. A coalition government was formed on the basis of a federal union of all the British American provinces, or of the two Canadas, in case of the failure of the larger scheme. . . . It was a happy coincidence that the legislatures of the lower provinces were about considering a maritime union at the time the leading statesmen of Canada had combined to mature a plan of settling their political difficulties. The Canadian

ministry at once availed themselves of this fact to meet the maritime delegates at their convention in Charlottetown, and the result was the decision to consider the question of the larger union at Quebec. Accordingly, on the 10th of October, 1864, delegates from all the British North American provinces assembled in conference, in 'the ancient capital,' and after very ample deliberations during eighteen days, agreed to 72 resolutions, which form the basis of the Act of Union. These resolutions were formally submitted to the legislature of Canada in January, 1865, and after an elaborate debate, which extended from the 3d of February to the 14th of March, both houses agreed by very large majorities to an address to her Majesty praying her to submit a measure to the Imperial Parliament 'for the purpose of uniting the provinces in accordance with the provisions of the Quebec resolutions.' Some time, however, had to elapse before the Union could be consummated, in consequence of the strong opposition that very soon exhibited itself: in the maritime provinces, more especially to the financial terms of the scheme." Certain modifications of the terms of the Quebec resolutions were accordingly made, and "the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, being at last in full accord, through the action of their respective legislatures, the plan of union was submitted on the 12th of February, 1867, to the Imperial Parliament, where it met with the warm support of the statesmen of all parties, and passed without amendment in the course of a few weeks, the royal assent being given on the 29th of March. The new constitution came into force on the First of July [annually celebrated since, as 'Dominion Day'] 1867, and the first parliament of the united provinces met on November of the same year. . . . The confederation, as inaugurated in 1867, consisted only of the four provinces of Ontario [Upper Canada], Quebec [Lower Canada], Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick. By the 146th section of the Act of Union, provision was made for the admission of other colonies on addresses from the parliament of Canada, and from the respective legislatures of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, and British Columbia. Rupert's Land and the North-west Territory might also at any time be admitted into the Union on the address of the Canadian Parliament. . . . The title of Dominion did not appear in the Quebec resolutions. The 71st Res. is to the effect that 'Her Majesty be solicited to determine the rank and name of the federated Provinces.' The name ['The Dominion of Canada'] was arranged at the conference held in London in 1866, when the union bill was finally drafted."—J. G. Bourne, *Manual of Const. Hist. of Canada*, ch. 6-7 (with foot-note).—"The Federal Constitution of the Dominion of Canada is contained in the British North America Act, 1867, a statute of the British Parliament (30 Vict., c. 3). I note a few of the many points in which it deserves to be compared with that of the United States. The Federal or Dominion Government is conducted on the so-called 'Cabinet system' of England, i. e., the Ministry sit in Parliament, and hold office at the pleasure of the House of Commons. The Governor-General [appointed by the Crown] is in the position of an irresponsible and permanent executive similar to that of the Crown of Great Britain, acting on the advice

of responsible ministers. He can dissolve Parliament. The Upper House or Senate, is composed of 78 persons, nominated for life by the Governor-General, i. e., the Ministry. The House of Commons has at present 210 members, who are elected for five years. Both senators and members receive salaries. The Senate has very little power or influence. The Governor-General has a veto but rarely exercises it, and may reserve a bill for the Queen's pleasure. The judges, not only of the Federal or Dominion Courts, but also of the provinces, are appointed by the Crown, i. e., by the Dominion Ministry, and hold for good behaviour. Each of the Provinces, at present [1888] seven in number, has a legislature of its own, which, however, consists in Ontario, British Columbia, and Manitoba, of one House only, and a Lieutenant-Governor, with a right of veto on the acts of the legislature, which he seldom exercises. Members of the Dominion Parliament cannot sit in a Provincial legislature. The Governor-General has a right of disallowing acts of a Provincial legislature, and sometimes exerts it, especially when a legislature is deemed to have exceeded its constitutional competence. In each of the Provinces there is a responsible Ministry, working on the Cabinet system of England. The distribution of matters within the competence of the Dominion Parliament and of the Provincial legislatures respectively, bears a general resemblance to that existing in the United States; but there is this remarkable distinction, that whereas in the United States, Congress has only the powers actually granted to it, the State legislatures retaining all such powers as have not been taken from them, the Dominion Parliament has a general power of legislation, restricted only by the grant of certain specific and exclusive powers to the Provincial legislatures. Criminal law is reserved for the Dominion Parliament; and no Province has the right to maintain a military force. Questions as to the constitutionality of a statute, whether of the Dominion Parliament or of a Provincial legislature, come before the courts in the ordinary way, and if appealed, before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England. The Constitution of the Dominion was never submitted to a popular vote, and can be altered only by the British Parliament, except as regards certain points left to its own legislature. . . . There exists no power of amending the Provincial constitutions by popular vote similar to that which the peoples of the several States exercise in the United States."—J. Bryce, *The American Commonwealth*, v. 1, app., note (B) to ch. 30.—See CONSTITUTION OF CANADA.

ALSO IN: J. E. C. Munro, *The Const. of Canada (with text of Act in app.)—Parl. Debate on Confederation*, 3d Sess., 8th Prov. Parl. of Canada.—W. Houston, *Docs. Illustrative of the Canadian Const.*, pp. 186-224.

A. D. 1869-1873.—Acquisition of the Hudson's Bay Territory.—Admission of Manitoba, British Columbia and Prince Edward's Island to the Dominion.—"In 1869 . . . the Dominion was enlarged by the acquisition of the famous Hudson's Bay Territory. When the charter of the Hudson's Bay Company expired in 1869, Lord Granville, then Colonial Secretary, proposed that the chief part of the Company's territories should be transferred to the Dominion for £300,000; and the proposition was agreed to

on both sides. The Hudson's Bay Charter dated from the reign of Charles II. The region to which it referred carries some of its history imprinted in its names. Prince Rupert was at the head of the association incorporated by the Charter into the Hudson's Bay Company. The name of Rupert's Land perpetuates his memory. . . . The Hudson's Bay Company obtained from King Charles, by virtue of the Charter in 1670, the sole and absolute government of the vast watershed of Hudson's Bay, the Rupert's Land of the Charter, on condition of paying yearly to the King and his successors 'two elks and two black beavers,' 'whosoever and as often as we, our heirs and successors, shall happen to enter into the said countries, territories and regions.' The Hudson's Bay Company was opposed by the North West Fur Company in 1783, which fought them for a long time with Indians and law, with the tomahawk of the red man and the legal judgment of a Romilly or a Keating. In 1813 Lord Selkirk founded the Red River Company. This interloper on the battle field was harassed by the North West Company, and it was not until 1821, when the Hudson's Bay and North West Companies—impoverished by their long warfare—amalgamated their interests, that the Red River settlers were able to reap their harvests in peace, disturbed only by occasional plagues of locusts and blackbirds. In 1835, on Lord Selkirk's death, the Hudson's Bay Company bought the settlement from his executors. It had been under their sway before that, having been committed to their care by Lord Selkirk during his lifetime. The privilege of exclusive trading east of the Rocky Mountains was conferred by Royal license for twenty-one years in May 1838, and some ten years later the Company received a grant of Vancouver's Island for the term of ten years from 1849 to 1859. The Hudson's Bay Company were always careful to foster the idea that their territory was chiefly wilderness, and discountenanced the reports of its fertility and fitness for colonisation which were from time to time brought to the ears of the English Government. In 1857, at the instance of Mr. Labouchere, a Select Committee of the House of Commons was appointed to enquire into the state of the British possessions under the Company's administration. Various Government expeditions, and the publication of many Blue Books, enlightened the public mind as to the real nature of those tracts of land which the council from the Fenchurch Street house declared to be so desolate. . . . During the sittings of the Committee there was cited in evidence a petition from 575 Red River settlers to the Legislative Assembly of Canada demanding British protection. This appeal was a proceeding curiously at variance with the later action of the settlement. When in 1869 the chief part of the territories was transferred to Canada, on the proposition of Earl Granville, the Red River country rose in rebellion, and refused to receive the new Governor. Louis Riel, the insurgent chief, seized on Fort Garry and the Company's treasury, and proclaimed the independence of the settlement. Sir Garnet, then Colonel, Wolseley, was sent in command of an expedition which reached Fort Garry on August 23, when the insurgents submitted without resistance, and the district received the name of Manitoba."—J. McCarthy, *Hist. of our own Times*, ch. 55 (v. 4).—Manitoba

and the Northwest Territories were admitted to the Dominion Confederation May 12, 1870; British Columbia, July 20, 1871; Prince Edward Island, July 1, 1873.—J. McCoun, *Manitoba and the Great North West*.

Also in: G. M. Adam, *The Canadian Northwest*, ch. 1-13.—G. L. Huyshe, *The Red River Expedition*.—W. P. Greswell, *Hist. of the Dominion of Canada*, p. 313.—J. E. C. Munro, *The Constitution of Canada*, ch. 2.—G. E. Ellis, *The Hudson Bay Company (Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v. 8)*.—See, also, BRITISH

**CANAI, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**CANARES, The.** See ECADOR: THE ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

**CANARY ISLANDS, Discovery of the.**—The first great step in African exploration "was the discovery of the Canary Islands. These were the 'Elysian fields' and 'Fortunate islands' of antiquity. Perhaps there is no country in the world that has been so many times discovered, conquered, and invaded, or so much fabled about, as these islands. There is scarcely a nation upon earth of any maritime repute that has not had to do with them. Phœnicians, Carthaginians, Romans, Moors, Genoese, Normans, Portuguese, and Spaniards of every province (Aragonese, Castilians, Gallicians, Biscayans, Andalucians) have all made their appearance in these islands. The Carthaginians are said to have discovered them, and to have reserved them as an asylum in case of extreme danger to the state. Sertorius, the Roman general who par took the fallen fortunes of Marius is said to have meditated retreat to these 'islands of the blessed,' and by some writers is supposed to have gone there. Juba, the Mauritanian prince, son of the Juba celebrated by Sallust, sent ships to examine them, and has left a description of them. Then came the death of empires, and darkness fell upon the human race, at least upon the records of their history. When the world revived, and especially when the use of the loadstone began to be known among mariners, the Canary Islands were again discovered. Petrarch is referred to by Viera to prove that the Genoese sent out an expedition to these islands. Las Casas mentions that an English or French vessel bound from France or England to Spain was driven by contrary winds to the Canary Islands, and on its return spread abroad in France an account of the voyage."—A. Helps, *Spanish Conquest*, bk. 1, ch. 1.

Also in: E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 20, note E.

**CANAS, The.** See PERU: THE ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

**CANCELLARIUS.** See CHANCELLOR.

**CANDAHAR.**—Siege and relief of English forces (1880). See AFGHANISTAN: A. D. 1869-1881.

**CANDIA.**—This is the name of the principal town in the island of Crete, but has been often applied to Crete itself. See TURKS: A. D. 1645-1669, where an account is given of the so-called "War of Candia"; also CRETE: A. D. 823.

**CANDRAGUPTA, OR CHANDRAGUPTA, The empire of.** See INDIA: B. C. 327-312, and 312.—

**CANGI, The.**—A tribe in early Britain which occupied the westerly part of Modern Carnarvonshire. See BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.

COLUMBIA: A. D. 1858-1871, and NORTHWEST TERRITORIES OF CANADA.

A. D. 1871.—The Treaty of Washington. See ALABAMA CLAIMS: A. D. 1871.

A. D. 1877.—The Halifax Fishery Award. See FISHERIES, NORTH AMERICAN: A. D. 1877-1888.

A. D. 1885-1888.—Termination of the Fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington.—Renewed controversies.—The rejected Treaty. See FISHERIES, NORTH AMERICAN: A. D. 1877-1888.

**CANICHANAS, The.** See BOLIVIA: ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

**CANIENGAS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: IHOQUOIS CONFEDERACY.

**CANNÆ, Battles of (B. C. 216).** See PUNIC WAR: THE SECOND. . . . (B. C. 88). See ROME: B. C. 90-88.

**CANNENEFATES, The.**—"On the other bank of the Rhine [on the right bank] next to the Batavi, in the modern Kennemer district (north Holland, beyond Amsterdam) dwelt the Cannenefates, closely related to them but less numerous; they are not merely named among the tribes subjugated by Tiberius, but were also treated like the Batavi in the furnishing of soldiers."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 8, ch. 4.

**CANNING, Lord, The Indian administration of, A. D. 1856-1862.**

**CANNING MINISTRY, The.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1820-1827.

**CANOPUS, Decree of.**—An important inscribed stone found in 1865 at San, or Tanis, in Egypt, which is a monument of the reign of Ptolemy Euergetes, who ascended the throne in 246 B. C. It gives "in hieroglyphics and Greek (the demotic version is on the edge) a decree of the priests assembled at Canopus for their yearly salutation of the king. When they were so assembled, in his ninth year, his infant daughter Berenice, fell sick and died, and there was great lamentation over her. The decree first recounts the generous conduct and prowess of the king, who had conquered all his enemies abroad, and had brought back from Persia all the statues of the gods carried off in old time from Egypt by foreign kings. He had also, in a great threatening of famine, when the Nile had failed to rise to its full amount, imported vast quantities of corn from Cyprus, Phœnicia, &c., and fed his people. Consequently divine honours are to be paid to him and his queen as 'Benefactor-Gods' in all the temples of Egypt, and feasts are to be held in their honour. . . . This great inscription, far more perfect and considerably older than the Rosetta Stone, can now be cited as the clearest proof of Champollion's reading of the hieroglyphics."—J. P. Mahaffy, *Story of Alexander's Empire*, ch. 15, note.

**CANOSSA, Henry IV. at.**—In the conflict which arose between the German Emperor, Henry IV. (then crowned only as King of the Romans) and Pope Gregory VII. (the inflexible Hildebrand), the former was placed at a great disadvantage by revolts and discontents in his own Germanic dominions. When, therefore, on the 22d of February, A. D. 1076, the audacious pontiff pronounced against the king his tremendous sentence, not only of excommunication, but of deposition, releasing all Christians from



allegiance to him, he addressed a large party, both in Germany and Italy, who were more than willing to accept an excuse for depriving Henry of his crown. This party controlled a diet held at Tribur, in October, which declared that his forfeiture of the throne would be made irrevocable if he did not procure from the pope a release from his excommunication before the coming anniversary of its pronouncement, in February. A diet to be held then at Augsburg, under the presidency of the pope, would determine the affairs of the Empire. With characteristic energy, Henry resolved to make his way to the pope, in person, and to become reconciled with him, before the Augsburg meeting. Accompanied by the queen, her child, and a few attendants, he crossed the Alps, with great hardship and danger, in the midst of an uncommonly cold and snowy winter. Meantime, the pope had started upon his journey to Augsburg. Hearing on the way of Henry's movement to meet him, not desiring the encounter, and distrusting, moreover, the intentions of his enemy, he took refuge in the strong fortress of Canossa, high up in the rocky recesses of the Apennines. To that mountain retreat the desperate king pressed his way. "It was January 21, 1077, when Henry arrived at Canossa; the cold was severe and the snow lay deep. He was lodged at the foot of the castle-steep, and had an interview with the countess Matilda [mistress of the castle, and devoted friend of the pope], Hugh, abbot of Clugny, and others, in the Chapel of St. Nicolas, of which no traces now remain. Three days were spent in debating terms of reconciliation; Matilda and Hugh interceded with the pope on the king's behalf, but Gregory was inexorable; unless Henry surrendered the crown into the pope's hands the ban should not be taken off. Henry could not stoop so low as this, but he made up his mind to play the part of a penitent suppliant. Early on the morning of January 25 he mounted the winding, rocky path, until he reached the uppermost of the three walls, the one which enclosed the castle yard. And here, before the gateway which still exists, and perpetuates in its name, 'Porta di penitenza,' the memory of this strange event, the king, barefoot, and clad in a coarse woolen shirt, stood knocking for admittance. But he knocked in vain: from morning till evening the heir of the Roman Empire stood shivering outside the fast-closed door. Two more days he climbed the rugged path and stood weeping and imploring to be admitted." At last, the iron-willed pontiff consented to a parley, and an agreement was brought about by which Henry was released from excommunication, but the question of his crown was left for future settlement. In the end he gained nothing by his extraordinary abasement of himself. Many of his supporters were alienated by it; a rival king was elected. Gathering all his energies, Henry then stood his ground and made a fight in which even Gregory fled before him; but it was all to no avail. The triumph remained with the priests.—W. R. W. Stephens, *Hildebrand and His Times*, ch. 11-15.

ALSO IN: A. F. Vilemain, *Life of Gregory VII.*, bk. 5.—See, also, PAPACY: A. D. 1056-1122; also ROME: 1081-1084.

**CANTABRIA, Becomes Bardenia and Castile.** See SPAIN: A. D. 1026-1230.

**CANTABRIANS AND ASTURIANS, The.**—The Cantabrians were an ancient people in the north of Spain, inhabiting a region to the west of the Asturians. They were not conquered by the Romans until the reign of Augustus, who led an expedition against them in person, B. C. 27, but was forced by illness to commit the campaign to his lieutenants. The Cantabrians submitted soon after being defeated in a great battle at Vellia, near the sources of the Ebro; but in 22 B. C. they joined the Asturians in a desperate revolt, which was not subdued until three years later.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 34.

ALSO IN: T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 8, ch. 2.—See APPENDIX A, v. 1.

**CANTÆ, The.**—A tribe in ancient Caledonia. See BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.

**CANTERBURY.**—The murder of Becket (1170). See ENGLAND: A. D. 1162-1170.

**CANTERBURY PRIMACY, Origin of the.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 597-685.

**CANTII, The.**—The tribe of ancient Britons which occupied the region of Kent. See BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.

**CANTON; A. D. 1839-1842.**—The Opium War.—Ransom of the city from English assault.—Its port opened to British trade. See CHINA: A. D. 1839-1842.

**A. D. 1856-1857.**—Bombardment by the English.—Capture by the English and French. See CHINA: A. D. 1856-1860.

**CANTONS, Latin.** See GENS, ROMAN; also ALBA.

**CANTONS, Swiss.** See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1848-1890.

**CANULEIAN LAW, The.** See ROME: B. C. 445.

**CANUTE, OR CNUT, King of England, A. D. 1017-1035, and King of Denmark, A. D. 1018-1035.... Canute II., King of Denmark, A. D. 1080-1086.... Canute III., King of Denmark, A. D. 1147-1156.... Canute IV., King of Denmark, A. D. 1182-1202.**

**CANZACA.** See ECHIATANA.

**CANZACA, OR SHIZ, Battle of.**—A battle fought A. D. 591, by the Romans, under Narses, supporting the cause of Chosroës II. king of Persia, against a usurper Bahram, who had driven him from his throne. Bahram was defeated and Chosroës restored.—G. Rawlinson, *Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy*, ch. 23.

**CAP OF LIBERTY, The.** See LIBERTY CAP.

**CAPE BRETON ISLAND: A. D. 1497.**—Discovery by John Cabot. See AMERICA: A. D. 1497.

**A. D. 1504.**—Named by the fishermen from Brittsy. See NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1501-1578.

**A. D. 1713.**—Possession confirmed to France. See NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1713.

**A. D. 1720-1745.**—The fortification of Louisbourg.—After the surrender of Placentia or Plaisance, in Newfoundland, to England, under the treaty of Utrecht (see NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1713), the French government determined to fortify strongly some suitable harbor on the island of Cape Breton for a naval station, and especially for the protection of the fisheries of France on the neighboring coasts. The harbor known previously as Havre à l'Anglois was chosen for the purpose. "When the French



government decided in favour of Havre à l'Anglois its name was changed to Louisbourg, in honour of the king; and, to mark the value set upon Cape Breton it was called Isle Royale, which it retained until its final conquest in 1758, when its ancient name was resumed." In 1720 the fortifications were commenced, and the work of their construction was prosecuted with energy and with unstinted liberality for more than twenty years. "Even the English colonies contributed a great proportion of the materials used in their construction. When Messrs. Newton and Bradstreet, who were sent to confer with M. de St. Ovide [to remonstrate against the supplying of arms to the Indians in Nova Scotia] . . . returned to Annapolis, they reported that during their short stay at Louisbourg, in 1725, fourteen colonial vessels, belonging chiefly to New England, arrived there with cargoes of boards, timber and bricks. . . . Louisbourg [described, with a plan, in the work here quoted] . . . had, between the years 1720 and 1745, cost the French nation the enormous sum of 30,000,000 livres, or £1,200,000 sterling; nevertheless, as Dussieux informs us, the fortifications were still unfinished, and likely to remain so, because the cost had far exceeded the estimates; and it was found such a large garrison would be required for their defence that the government had abandoned the idea of completing them according to the original design."—R. Brown, *Hist. of the Island of Cape Breton, letters 9-11*.—"The fort was built of stone, with walls more than 30 feet high, and a ditch 80 feet wide, over which was a communication with the town by a drawbridge. It had six bastions and three batteries, with platforms for 148 cannon and six mortars. On an islet, which was flanked on one side by a shoal, a battery of 30 guns, 28 pounders, defended the entrance of the harbor, which was about 400 yards wide, and was also commanded from within by the Grand or Royal Battery, mounting as many guns, of the calibre of 42 pounds. The fort . . . was a safe rendezvous and refuge for French fleets and privateers, sailing in the Western Hemisphere. It commanded the maritime way into Canada, and it watched the English settlements all along the coast. It was a standing threat to the great business of New England seamen, which was the fishery on the banks."—J. G. Palfrey, *Hist. of N. Eng., bk. 5, ch. 9 (v. 5)*.—"So great was its strength that it was called the Dunkirk of America. It had nunneries and palaces, terraces and gardens. That such a city rose upon a low and desolate island in the infancy of American colonization appears incredible; explanation is alone found in the fishing enthusiasm of the period."—C. B. Elliott, *The U. S. and the N. E. Fisheries, p. 18*.

**A. D. 1744.**—Outbreak of the Third Inter-Colonial War. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1744.

**A. D. 1745.**—Conquest by the New Englanders.—Fall of Louisbourg. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1745; and ENGLAND: A. D. 1745-1747.

**A. D. 1748.**—Restored to France. See AIX-LA-CHAPELLE, THE CONGRESS; and NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1745-1748.

**A. D. 1758-1760.**—The final capture and destruction of Louisbourg, by the English.—"In May, 1758 [during the Seven Years War.—see CANADA: A. D. 1750-1753 and after, a

powerful fleet, under command of Admiral Boscawen, arrived at Halifax for the purpose of recapturing a place [Louisbourg] which ought never to have been given up. The fleet consisted of 23 ships of the line and 18 frigates, besides transports, and when it left Halifax it numbered 157 vessels. With it was a land force, under Jeffery Amherst, of upward of 12,000 men. The French forces at Louisbourg were much inferior, and consisted of only 8 ships of the line and 8 frigates, and of about 4,000 soldiers. The English fleet set sail from Halifax on the 28th of May, and on the 8th of June a landing was effected in Gabarus Bay. The next day the attack began, and after a sharp conflict the French abandoned and destroyed two important batteries. The siege was then pushed by regular approaches; but it was not until the 26th of July that the garrison capitulated. By the terms of surrender the whole garrison were to become prisoners of war and to be sent to England, and the English acquired 218 cannon and 18 mortars, beside great quantities of ammunition and military stores. All the vessels of war had been captured or destroyed; but their crews, to the number of upward of 2,600 men, were included in the capitulation. Two years later, at the beginning of 1760, orders were sent from England to demolish the fortress, render the harbor impracticable, and transport the garrison and stores to Halifax. These orders were carried out so effectually that few traces of its fortifications remain, and the place is inhabited only by fishermen."—C. C. Smith, *The Wars on the Seaboard (Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v. 5, ch. 7)*.

ALSO IN: F. Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe, ch. 19 (v. 2)*.—See, also, CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1758.

**A. D. 1763.**—Ceded to England by the Treaty of Paris. See SEVEN YEARS WAR.

**A. D. 1763.**—Added to the government of Nova Scotia. See CANADA: A. D. 1763-1774.

CAPE COLONY. See SOUTH AFRICA.

CAPE ST. VINCENT, Naval battle of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1797.

CAPETIANS, Origin and crowning of the. See FRANCE: A. D. 861, and 877-987.

CAPHARSALAMA, Battle of.—One of the victories of the Jewish patriot, Judas Maccabæus over the Syrian general Nicanor, B. C. 162.—Josephus, *Antiq. of the Jews, bk. 12, ch. 10*.

CAPHTOR.—An ancient Phœnician settlement on the coast of the Nile Delta. "From an early period the whole of this district had been colonised by the Phœnicians, and as Phœnicia itself was called Keft by the Egyptians, the part of Egypt in which they had settled went by the name of Keft-ur, or 'Greater Phœnicia.'"—A. H. Sayce, *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments, ch. 2*.—On the other hand, Ewald and other writers say that "the Philistines came from Caphtor," and that "this now obsolete name probably designated either the whole or a part of Crete."

CAPHYÆ, Battle of.—Fought B. C. 220 in the Social War of the Achaean and Ætolian Leagues. The forces of the former were totally routed.—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece, ch. 63*.

CAPITOLINE HILL AT ROME.—The Capitol.—"In prehistoric times this hill was called the Mons Saturnius, see Varro, *Lin. Lat.*,

v. 41; its name being connected with that legendary 'golden age' when Saturn himself reigned in Italy. . . . This hill, which, like the other hills of Rome, has had its contour much altered by cutting away and levelling, consists of a mass of tufa rock harder in structure than that of the Palatine hill. It appears once to have been surrounded by cliffs, very steep at most places, and had only approaches on one side—that towards the Forum. . . . The top of the hill is shaped into two peaks of about equal height, one of which was known as the Capitolium, and the other as the Arx, or Citadel. . . . The Capitolium was also in early time known as the 'Mons Tarpeius,' so called from the familiar legend of the treachery of Tarpeia. . . . In later times the name 'rupes Tarpeia' was applied, not to the whole peak, but to a part of its cliff which faced towards the 'Vicus Jugarius' and the 'Forum Magnum.' The identification of that part of the Tarpeian rock, which was used for the execution of criminals, according to a very primitive custom, is now almost impossible. At one place the cliff of the Capitolium is quite perpendicular, and has been cut very carefully into an upright even surface; a deep groove, about a foot wide, runs up the face of this cutting, and there are many rock-cut chambers excavated in this part of the cliff, some openings into which appear in the face of the rock. This is popularly though erroneously known as the Tarpeian rock. . . . The perpendicular cliff was once very much higher than it is at present, as there is a great accumulation of rubbish at its foot. . . . That this cliff cannot be the Tarpeian rock where criminals were executed is shown by Dionysius (viii. 78, and vii. 35), who expressly says that this took place in the sight of people in the Forum Magnum, so that the popular Rupes Tarpeia is on the wrong side of the hill."—J. H. Middleton, *Ancient Rome in 1885*, ch. 7.—See, also, SEVEN HILLS OF ROME, and GENS, ROMAN.

**CAPITULARIES.**—"It is commonly supposed that the term capitularies applies only to the laws of Charlemagne; this is a mistake. The word 'capitula,' 'little chapters,' equally applies to all the laws of the Frank kings. . . . Charlemagne, in his capitularies, did anything but legislate. Capitularies are, properly speaking, the whole acts of his government, public acts of all kinds by which he manifested his authority."—F. Guizot, *Hist. of Civilization*, lect. 21.

ALSO IN: E. F. Henderson, *Select Hist. Docs. of the Middle Ages*, bk. 2.

**CAPITULATION OF CHARLES V.** See GERMAN: A. D. 1520-1521.

**CAPO D'ISTRIA, Count, The Assassination of.** See GREECE: A. D. 1830-1832.

**CAPPADOCIA.** See MITHRIDATIC WARS.

**CAPS, Party of the.** See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1720-1792.

**CAPTAL.**—A title, derived from "capitalis," originally equivalent to count, and anciently borne by several lords in Aquitaine. "Towards the 14th century there were no more than two captals acknowledged, that of Buch and that of Franc."—I roissart (Johnes), *Chronicles*, bk. 1, ch. 158, note.

**CAPTIVITY, Prince of the.** See JEWS: A. D. 200-400.

**CAPTIVITY OF THE JEWS, The.** See JEWS: B. C. 604-536.

**CAPUA.**—Capua, originally an Etruscan city, called Vulturum, was taken by the Samnites, B. C. 424, and was afterwards a city in which Etruscan and neighboring Greek influences were mixed in their effect on a barbarous new population. "Capua became by its commerce and agriculture the second city in Italy in point of size—the first in point of wealth and luxury. The deep demoralization in which, according to the accounts of the ancients, that city surpassed all others in Italy, is especially reflected in the mercenary recruiting and in the gladiatorial sports, both of which pre-eminently flourished in Capua. Nowhere did recruiting officers find so numerous a concourse as in this metropolis of demoralized civilization. . . . The gladiatorial sports . . . if they did not originate, were at any rate carried to perfection in Capua. There, sets of gladiators made their appearance even during banquets."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 2, ch. 5.

**B. C. 343.—Surrender to the Romans.** See ROME: B. C. 343-290.

**B. C. 216-211.—Welcome to Hannibal.—Siege and capture by the Romans.—The city re-peopled.** See PUNIC WAR, THE SECOND.

**A. D. 800-1016.—The Lombard principality.** See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 800-1016.

**A. D. 1501.—Capture, sack and massacre by the French.** See ITALY: A. D. 1501-1504.

**CAPUCHINS, The.**—"The Capuchins were only a branch of the great Franciscan order, and their mode of life a modification of its Rule. Among the Franciscans the severity of their Rule had early become a subject of discussion, which finally led to a secession of some of the members, of whom Matteo de' Bassi, of the convent of Montefalco was the leading spirit. These were the rigorists who desired to restore the primitive austerities of the Order. They began by a change of dress, adding to the usual monastic habit a 'cappuccio,' or pointed hood, which Matteo claimed was of the same pattern as that worn by St. Francis. By the bull 'Religionis zelus' (1528), Matteo obtained from Pope Clement VII. leave for himself and his companions to wear this peculiar dress; to allow their beards to grow; to live in hermitages, according to the rule of St. Francis, and to devote themselves chiefly to the reclaiming of great sinners. Paul III. afterwards gave them permission to settle whosoever they liked. Consistently with the austerity of their professions, their churches were unadorned, and their convents built in the simplest style. They became very serviceable to the Church, and their fearlessness and assiduity in waiting upon the sick during the plague, which ravaged the whole of Italy, made them extremely popular."—J. Alzog, *Manual of Universal Church Hist.*, v. 3, p. 455.

**CAPUCHONS, OR CAPUTIATI.** See WHITE HOODS OF FRANCE.

**CARABOBO, Battles of (1821-1822).** See COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1819-1830.

**CARACALLA, Roman Emperor,** A. D. 211-217.

**CARACCAS: A. D. 1812.—Destruction by earthquake.** See COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1810-1819.

**CARAFFA, Cardinal (Pope Paul IV.) and the Counter Reformation.** See PAPACY: A. D. 1537-1563, and 1555-1603.

**CARAS, OR CARANS, OR CARANQUIS,** The. See **ECUADOR**.

**CARAUZIUS, Revolt of.** See **BRITAIN:** A. D. 288-297.

**CARAVELS.—GALEONS, Etc.**—"The term caravel was originally given to ships navigated wholly by sails as distinguished from the galley propelled by oars. It has been applied to a great variety of vessels of different size and construction. The caravels of the New World discoverers may be generally described as long narrow boats of from 20 to 100 tons burden, with three or four masts of about equal height carrying sometimes square and sometimes lateen sails, the fourth mast set at the heel of the bowsprit carrying square sails. They were usually half-decked, and adorned with the lofty forecabin and loftier poop of the day. The latter constituted over that part of the vessel a double or treble deck, which was pierced for cannon. . . . The galera was a vessel of low bulwarks, navigated by sails and oars, usually twenty or thirty oars on either side, four or five oarsmen to a bench. . . . The galeaza was the largest class of galera, or craft propelled wholly or in part by oars. . . . A galeota was a small galera, having only 16 or 20 oarsmen on a side, and two masts. The galeon was a large armed merchant vessel with high bulwarks, three or four decks, with two or three masts, square rigged, spreading courses and top-sails, and sometimes top-gallant sails. . . . Those which plied between Acapulco and Manila were from 1,200 to 2,000 tons burden. A galeoncello was a small galeon. The carac was a large carrying vessel, the one intended for Columbus' second voyage being 1,250 toneles or 1,500 tons. A nao, or navio, was a large ship with high bulwarks and three masts. A nave was a vessel with deck and sails, the former distinguishing it from the barca, and the absence of oars from a galera. The bergantín, or brig, had low bulwarks. . . . The name brigantine was applied in America also to an open flat-bottomed boat, which usually carried one sail and from 8 to 16 men."—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, v. 1, p. 187, foot-note.—See, also, **AMERICA:** A. D. 1492.

**CARBERRY, Mary Stuart's surrender at.** See **SCOTLAND:** A. D. 1561-1568.

**CARBONARI, Origin and character of the.** See **ITALY (SOUTHERN):** A. D. 1808-1809.

**CARCHEMISH.** See **HITTITES, THE.**

**CARCHEMISH, Battle of.**—Fought, B. C. 604, between the armies of Necho, the Egyptian Pharaoh, and Nebuchadnezzar, then crown prince of Babylon. Necho, being defeated, was driven back to Egypt and stripped of all his Syrian conquests.—F. Lenormant, *Manual of Ancient Hist. of the East*, bk. 2, ch. 4.

**CARDADEN, Battle of (1808).** See **SPAIN:** A. D. 1808-1809 (DECEMBER—MARCH).

**CARDINAL INFANT, The.** See **NETHERLANDS:** A. D. 1635-1638.

**CARDINALS, College of.** See **CURIA, THE ROMAN (PAPAL),** and **PAPACY:** A. D. 1059.

**CARDUCHI, The.**—"South of the lake [Lake of Van, in Asia Minor] lay the Carduchi, whom the later Greeks call the Gordyæans and Gordyenes; but among the Armenians they were known as Kordu, among the Syrians as Kardu. These are the ancestors of the modern Kurds, a nation also of the Aryan stock."—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, bk. 2, ch. 12.—See, also,

**GORDYENE.**—Under Saladin and the Ayoûbide dynasty the Kurds played an important part in mediæval history. See **SALADIN, EMPIRE OF.**

**CARGILLITES, The.** See **SCOTLAND:** A. D. 1681-1689.

**CARHAM, Battle of.**—Fought and won by an army of Scots, under King Malcolm, invading the then English earldom of Bernicia, A. D. 1018, and securing the annexation of Lothian to the Scottish kingdom. The battlefield was near that on which Flodden was afterwards fought.—E. A. Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, ch. 6, sect. 2.

**CARIANS, The.**—"The Carians may be called the doubles of the Leleges. They are termed the 'speakers of a barbarous tongue,' and yet, on the other hand, Apollo is said to have spoken Carian. As a people of pirates clad in bronze they once upon a time had their day in the Archipelago, and, like the Normans of the Middle Ages, swooped down from the sea to desolate the coasts; but their real home was in Asia Minor, where their settlements lay between those of Phrygians and Pisidians, and community of religion united them with the Lydians and Mysians."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 1, ch. 2.—The country of the Carians was the mountainous district in the southwestern angle of Asia Minor, the coast of which is indented with gulfs and frayed with long-projecting rocky promontories. The island of Rhodes lies close to it on the south. The Carians were subjugated by the Lydian King Croesus, and afterwards passed under the Persian yoke. The Persians permitted the establishment of a vassal kingdom, under a dynasty which fixed its capital at Halicarnassus, and made that city one of the splendid Asiatic outposts of Greek art and civilization, though always faithfully Persian in its politics. 'It was to the memory of one of the Carian kings at Halicarnassus, Mausolus, that the famous sepulchral monument, which gave its name to all similar edifices, and which the ancients counted among the seven wonders of the world, was erected by his widow. Halicarnassus offered an obstinate resistance to Alexander the Great and was destroyed by that ruthless conqueror after it had succumbed to his siege. Subsequently rebuilt, it never gained importance again. The Turkish town of Budrum now occupies the site.—C. T. Newton, *Travels and Discoveries in the Levant*, v. 2.—See, also, **HAMITES** and **DORIANS** and **IONIANS.**

**CARIAY, The.** See **AMERICAN ABORIGINES:** GUCK OR COCO GROUP.

**CARIBBEAN ISLANDS, The.** See **AMERICA:** A. D. 1493-1496, and **WEST INDIES.**

**CARIBS, The.** See **AMERICAN ABORIGINES:** CARIBS.

**CARILLON.**—The French name of Fort Ticonderoga. See **CANADA (NEW FRANCE):** A. D. 1758.

**CARINTHIA, Early mediæval history.** See **SLAVONIC PEOPLES:** 6TH-7TH CENTURIES, and **GERMANY:** A. D. 843-962.

**CARINUS, Roman Emperor.** A. D. 283-284.

**CARIPUNA, The.** See **AMERICAN ABORIGINES:** GUCK OR COCO GROUP.

**CARISBROOK CASTLE, The flight of King Charles to.** See **ENGLAND:** A. D. 1647 (AUGUST—DECEMBER).

**CARIZMIANS.** See **KHUAAREZM.**

**CARL, OR KARL.** See **ETHEL.**—**ETHELING.**

**CARLINGS.** See FRANKS (CARLOVINGIAN EMPIRE): A. D. 768-814.

**CARLISLE,** Origin of. See LUGUVALLIUM. **CARLISTS AND CHRISTINOS.** See SPAIN: A. D. 1833-1846, and 1873-1887.

**CARLOMAN, King of the Franks (East Franks—Germany—in association with Louis III.),** A. D. 876-881; (Burgundy and Aquitaine), A. D. 879-894. . . . **Carloman, Duke and Prince of the Franks,** A. D. 741-747.

**CARLOS.** See CHARLES.

**CARLOVINGIANS.** See FRANKS (CARLOVINGIAN EMPIRE): A. D. 768-814.

**CARLOWITZ, Peace of.** See HUNGARY: A. D. 1683-1690.

**CARLSBAD, Congress of.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1814-1820.

**CARMAGNOLE.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (FEBRUARY—APRIL).

**CARMANIANS, The.**—"The Germanians of Herodotus are the Carmanians of the later Greeks, who also passed with them as a separate nation, though closely allied to the Persians and Medes. They wandered to and fro to the east of Persia in the district now called Kirman."—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, v. 5, bk. 8, ch. 3.

**CARMATHIANS, The.**—"In the 277th year of the Hegira [A. D. 890], and in the neighbourhood of Cufa, an Arabian preacher of the name of Carmath assumed the lofty and incomprehensible style of the Guide, the Director, the Demonstration, the Word, the Holy Ghost, the Camel, the Herald of the Messiah, who had conversed with him in a human shape, and the representative of Mohammed the son of All, of St. John the Baptist, and of the Angel Gabriel." Carmath was one of the eastern proselytes of the sect of the Ismailians or Ismailites—the same from which sprang the terrible secret order of the Assassins. He founded another branch of the Ismailians, which, taking his name, were called the Carmathians. The sect made rapid gains among the Bedouins and were soon a formidable and uncontrollable body. "After a bloody conflict they prevailed in the province of Bahrein, along the Persian Gulf. Far and wide the tribes of the desert were subject to the sceptre, or rather to the sword, of Abu Sald and his son Abu Taher; and these rebellious Imams could muster in the field 107,000 fanatics. . . .

The cities of Racea and Baulbec, of Cufa and Bassorah, were taken and pillaged; Bagdad was filled with consternation; and the caliph trembled behind the veils of his palace. . . . The rapine of the Carmathians was sanctified by their aversion to the worship of Mecca. They robbed a caravan of pilgrims, and 20,000 devout Moslems were abandoned on the burning sands to a death of hunger and thirst. Another year [A. D. 929] they suffered the pilgrims to proceed without interruption; but, in the festival of devotion, Abu Taher stormed the holy city and trampled on the most venerable relics of the Mahometan faith. Thirty thousand citizens and strangers were put to the sword; the sacred precincts were polluted by the burial of 3,000 dead bodies; the well of Zenizen overflowed with blood; the golden spout was forced from its place; the veil of the Caaba was divided among these impious sectaries; and the black stone, the first monument of the nation, was borne away in triumph to their capital. After this deed of sacrilege and cruelty they continued to infest the

conflues of Irak, Syria and Egypt; but the vital principle of enthusiasm had withered at the root.

. . . It is needless to enquire into what factions they were broken, or by whose swords they were finally extirpated. The sect of the Carmathians may be considered as the second visible cause of the decline and fall of the empire of the caliphs."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 52, and note by Dr. Smith.—See, also, ASSASSINS.

**CARMELITE FRIARS.**—"About the middle of the [12th] century, one Berthold, a Calabrian, with a few companions, migrated to Mount Carmel [Palestine], and in the place where the prophet Elias of old is said to have hid himself, built a humble cottage with a chapel, in which he and his associates led a laborious and solitary life. As others continued to unite themselves with these residents on Mount Carmel, Albert the patriarch of Jerusalem, near the commencement of the next century prescribed for them a rule of life; which the pontiffs afterwards sanctioned by their authority, and also changed in various respects, and when it was found too rigorous and burdensome, mitigated considerably. Such was the origin of the celebrated order of Carmelites, or as it is commonly called the order of St. Mary of Mount Carmel [and known in England as the White Friars]; which subsequently passed from Syria into Europe, and became one of the principal mendicant orders. The Carmelites themselves reject with disdain this account of their origin, and most strenuously contend that the holy prophet Elias of the Old Testament, was the parent and founder of their society. But they were able to persuade very few, (or rather none out of their society), that their origin was so ancient and illustrious."—J. L. von Mosheim, *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 3, cent'y 12, pt. 2, ch. 2, sect. 21.

ALSO IN: G. Waddington, *Hist. of the Church*, ch. 19, sect. 5.—J. Alzog, *Manual of Universal Church Hist.*, sect. 244 (p. 2).—E. L. Cutts, *Scenes and Characters of the Middle Ages*, ch. 5.

**CARMIGNANO, Battle of (1796).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1796-1797 (OCTOBER—APRIL).

**CARNABII, OR CORNABII, The.** See BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.

**CARNAC.** See ANCHY.

**CARNATES, The.** See THURANIAN RACES.

**CARNEIAN FESTIVAL, The.**—A Spartan festival, said to have been instituted B. C. 676. "The Carneian festival fell in the Spartan month Carneus, the Athenian Metageitnon, corresponding nearly to our August. It was held in honour of Apollo Carneus, a deity worshipped from very ancient times in the Peloponnese, especially at Amyclæ. . . . It was of a warlike character, like the Athenian Boedrömia."—G. Rawlinson, *Note to Herodotus*, bk. 7.

ALSO IN: E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 2, ch. 1.

**CARNIANS, The.** See RHETIANS.

**CARNIFEX FERRY, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (AUGUST—DECEMBER: WEST VIRGINIA).

**CARNONACÆ, The.** See BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.

**CARNOT, Lazare N. M., and the French Revolution.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (JUNE—OCTOBER), to 1797 (SEPTEMBER), and 1800-1801 (MAY—FEBRUARY).

**CARNOT, Sadi, President of the French Republic, 1887—**

**CARNUTES, The.**—The Carnutes were a tribe who occupied a region supposed to be the center of Gaul. The modern city of Chartres stands in the midst of it. The sacred general meeting place of the Druids was in the country of the Carnutes.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, v. 3, ch. 22.—See, also, VENETI OF WESTERN GAUL.

**CAROLINAS, The.** See NORTH CAROLINA, and SOUTH CAROLINA.

**CAROLINE, Queen, Trial of.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1820-1827.

**CAROLINE, The Burning of.** See CANADA: A. D. 1857-1859, and 1840-1841.

**CAROLINE BOOKS, The.**—A work put forth by Charlemagne against image-worship, in considerable sympathy with the views of the Eastern Iconoclasts and against the decrees of the Second Council of Nicea (A. D. 787), is known as the Caroline Books. It is supposed to have been chiefly the composition of the king's learned friend and counsellor, Alcuin, the Englishman.—J. I. Mombert, *Hist. of Charles the Great*, bk. 2, ch. 12.

**CAROLINGIA.**—On the division of the empire of Charlemagne between his three grandsons, A. D. 843, the western kingdom, which fell to Charles, took for a time the name of Carolingia, as part of Lothar's middle kingdom took the name of Lotharingia, or Lorraine. But the name died out, or was slowly superseded by that of France.—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. Geog. of Europe*, ch. 6, sect. 1.

**CAROLINGIANS.** See FRANKS (CAROLINGIAN EMPIRE): A. D. 768-814.

**CARPET-BAGGE, S.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1866-1871.

**CARR DIKE.**—A Roman work in Britain, formed for the draining of the Lincolnshire Fens, and used, also, as a road.—H. M. Scarth, *Roman Britain*, ch. 16.

**CARRACKS, OR CARACS.**—"A large species of merchant vessel, principally used in coasting trade," among the Spaniards of the 15th and 16th centuries.—W. Irving, *Life and Voyages of Columbus*, bk. 6, ch. 1 (v. 1), foot-note.—See, also, CARAVELS.

**CARRARA FAMILY, The: Its rise to sovereignty at Padua and its struggle with the Visconti of Milan.** See VERONA: A. D. 1260-1338, and MILAN: A. D. 1277-1447.

**CARRHÆ, Battles of (B. C. 53).** See ROME: B. C. 57-52. . . . (A. D. 297). See PERSIA: A. D. 226-627.

**CARRICK'S FORD, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (JUNE—JULY: WEST VIRGINIA).

**CARROCCIO, The.**—"The militia of every city [in Lombardy, or northern Italy, eleventh and twelfth centuries] was divided into separate bodies, according to local partitions, each led by a Gonfaloniere, or standard-bearer. They fought on foot, and assembled round the carroccio, a heavy car drawn by oxen, and covered with the flags and armorial bearings of the city. A high pole rose in the middle of this car, bearing the colours and a Christ, which seemed to bless the army, with both arms extended. A priest said daily mass at an altar placed in the front of the car. The trumpeters of the community, seated on the back part, sounded the charge and the retreat. It was Heribert, archbishop of Milan, contemporary of Conrad the Salic, who invented

this car in imitation of the ark of alliance, and caused it to be adopted at Milan. All the free cities of Italy followed the example; this sacred car, intrusted to the guardianship of the militia, gave them weight and confidence."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Hist. of the Italian Republics*, ch. 1.

**CARTERET, Sir George, The Jersey Grant to.** See NEW JERSEY: A. D. 1664-1667, to 1688-1738.

**CARTERET'S MINISTRY.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1742-1745.

**CARTHAGE, The founding of.**—Ethbaal, or Ithobaal, a priest of Astarte, acquired possession of the throne of Tyre B. C. 917, deposing and putting to death the legitimate prince, a descendant of Ilimar, Solomon's ally and friend. The Jezebel of Jewish history, who married Ahab, king of Israel, was the daughter of this king Ethbaal. "Ethbaal was succeeded by his son Balezor (885-877 B. C.). After eight years Balezor left two sons, Mutton and Sichebaal, both under age. . . . Mutton died in the year 853 B. C. and again left a son nine years old, Pygmalion, and a daughter, Ellssa, a few years older, whom he had married to his brother Sichebaal, the priest of the temple of Melkarth. Mutton had intended that Ellssa and Pygmalion should reign together, and thus the power really passed into the hands of Sichebaal, the husband of Ellssa. When Pygmalion reached his sixteenth year the people transferred to him the sovereignty of Tyre, and he put Sichebaal, his uncle, to death. . . . (846 B. C.). Ellssa [or Dido, as she was also called] fled from Tyre before her brother, as we are told, with others who would not submit to the tyranny of Pygmalion. The exiles . . . are said . . . to have landed on the coast of Africa, in the neighbourhood of Ityke, the old colony of the Phenicians, and there to have bought as much land of the Libyans as could be covered by the skin of an ox. By dividing this into very thin strips they obtained a piece of land sufficient to enable them to build a fortress. This new dwelling-place, or the city which grew up round this fortress, the wanderers called, in reference to their old home, Kartthada (Karta hadasha), i. e., 'the new city,' the Karchedon of the Greeks, the Carthage of the Romans. The legend of the purchase of the soil may have arisen from the fact that the settlers for a long time paid tribute to the ancient population, the Maxyans, for their soil."—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, bk. 3, ch. 11.

Also in: J. Kenrick, *Phoenicia: Hist.*, ch. 1. **Divisions, Size and Population.**—"The city proper, at the time at which it is best known to us, the period of the Punic wars, consisted of the Byrsa or Citadel quarter, a Greek word corrupted from the Canaanitish Bozra, or Bostra, that is, a fort, and of the Cothon or harbour quarter, so important in the history of the final siege. To the north and west of these, and occupying all the vast space between them and the isthmus behind, were the Megara (Hebrew, tagurim), that is, the suburbs and gardens of Carthage, which, with the city proper, covered an area of 23 miles in circumference. Its population must have been fully proportioned to its size. Just before the third Punic war, when its strength had been drained. . . . it contained 700,000 inhabitants."—R. B. Smith, *Carthage and the Carthaginians*, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: E. A. Freeman, *Carthage (Hist. Essay, 4th series)*.

**The Dominion of.**—"All our positive information, scanty as it is, about Carthage and her institutions, relates to the fourth, third, or second centuries B. C.; yet it may be held to justify presumptive conclusions as to the fifth century B. C., especially in reference to the general system pursued. The maximum of her power was attained before her first war with Rome, which began in 264 B. C.; the first and second Punic wars both of them greatly reduced her strength and dominion. Yet in spite of such reduction we learn that about 150 B. C. shortly before the third Punic war, which ended in the capture and depopulation of the city, not less than 700,000 souls were computed in it, as occupants of a fortified circumference of above twenty miles, covering a peninsula with its isthmus. Upon this isthmus its citadel Byrsa was situated, surrounded by a triple wall of its own, and crowned at its summit by a magnificent temple of Æsculapius. The numerous population is the more remarkable, since Utica (a considerable city, colonized from Phœnicia more anciently than even Carthage itself, and always independent of the Carthaginians, though in the condition of an inferior and discontented ally) was within the distance of seven miles from Carthage on the one side, and Tunis seemingly not much further off on the other. Even at that time, too, the Carthaginians are said to have possessed 300 tributary cities in Libya. Yet this was but a small fraction of the prodigious empire which had belonged to them certainly in the fourth century B. C. and in all probability also between 480-410 B. C. That empire extended eastward as far as the Altars of the Phileni, near the Great Syrtis,—westward, all along the coast to the Pillars of Heracles and the western coast of Morocco. The line of coast southeast of Carthage, as far as the bay called the Lesser Syrtis, was proverbial (under the name of Byzacium and the Emporia) for its fertility. Along this extensive line were distributed indigenous Libyan tribes, living by agriculture; and a mixed population called Liby-Phœnician. . . . Of the Liby-Phœnician towns the number is not known to us, but it must have been prodigiously great. . . . A few of the towns along the coast,—Hippo, Utica, Adrumetum, Thapsus, Lepcis, &c.—were colonies from Tyre, like Carthage itself. . . . Yet the Carthaginians contrived in time to render every town tributary, with the exception of Utica. . . . At one time, immediately after the first Punic war, they took from the rural cultivators as much as one-half of their produce, and doubled at one stroke the tribute levied upon the towns. . . . The native Carthaginians, though encouraged by honorary marks to undertake . . . military service were generally averse to it, and sparingly employed. . . . A chosen division of 2,500 citizens, men of wealth and family, formed what was called the Sacred Band of Carthage distinguished for their bravery in the field as well as for the splendour of their arms, and the gold and silver plate which formed part of their baggage. We shall find these citizen troops occasionally employed on service in Sicily; but most part of the Carthaginian army consists of Gauls, Iberians, Libyans, &c., a mingled host got together for the occasion, discordant in language as well as in

customs."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 81.

**B. C. 480.**—Invasion of Sicily.—Great defeat at Himera. See SICILY; B. C. 480.

**B. C. 409-405.**—Invasions of Sicily.—Destruction of Selinus, Himera and Agrigentum. See SICILY; B. C. 409-405.

**B. C. 396.**—Siege of Syracuse. See SYRACUSE; B. C. 397-396.

**B. C. 383.**—War with Syracuse. See SICILY; B. C. 383.

**B. C. 310-306.**—Invasion by Agathokles. See SYRACUSE; B. C. 317-280.

**B. C. 264-241.**—The first war with Rome.—Expulsion from Sicily.—Loss of maritime supremacy. See PUNIC WAR, THE FIRST.

**B. C. 241-238.**—Revolt of the mercenaries.—At the close of the First Punic War, the veteran army of mercenaries with which Hamilcar Barca had maintained himself so long in Sicily—a motley gathering of Greeks, Ligurians, Gauls, Iberians, Libyans and others—was sent over to Carthage for the long arrears of pay due them and for their discharge. The party in power in Carthage, being both incapable and mean, and being also embarrassed by an empty treasury, exasperated this dangerous body of men by delays and by attempts at bargaining with them for a reduction of their claims, until a general mutiny was provoked. The mercenaries, 20,000 strong, with Spendius, a runaway Campanian slave, Matho, an African, and Autaritus, a Gaul, for their leaders, marched from the town of Sica, where they were quartered, and camped near Tunis, threatening Carthage. The government became panic-stricken and took no measures which did not embolden the mutineers and increase their demands. All the oppressed African peoples in the Carthaginian domain rose to join the revolt, and poured into the hands of the mercenaries the tribute money which Carthage would have wrung from them. The latter was soon brought to a state of sore distress, without an army, without ships, and with its supplies of food mostly cut off. The neighboring cities of Utica and Hippo Zarytus were besieged. At length the Carthaginian government, controlled by a party hostile to Hamilcar, was obliged to call him to the command, but associated with him Hanno, his bitterest personal enemy and the most incompetent leader of the ruling faction. Hamilcar succeeded, after a desperate and long struggle, in destroying the mutineers to almost the last man, and in saving Carthage. But the war, which lasted more than three years (B. C. 241-238), was mercenary and horrible beyond description. It was known to the ancients as the "Truceless War" and the "Inexpiable War." The scenes and circumstances of it have been extraordinarily pictured in Flaubert's "Salamambo," which is one of the most revolting but most powerful of historical romances.—R. B. Smith, *Carthage and the Carthaginians*, ch. 8.

ALSO IN: W. Iluc, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 4, ch. 4.

**B. C. 237-202.**—Hamilcar in Spain.—The second war with Rome.—Hannibal in Italy and Sicily.—Scipio in Africa.—The great defeat at Zama.—Loss of naval dominion and of Spain. See PUNIC WAR, THE SECOND.

**B. C. 146.**—Destruction by Scipio.—Carthage existed by Roman sufferance for fifty years after the ending of the Second Punic War, and even recovered some considerable prosperity

In trade, though Rome took care that her chances for recovery should be slight. When Hannibal gave signs of being able to reform the government of the city and to distinguish himself in statesmanship as he had immortalized himself in war, Rome demanded him, and he escaped her chains only by flight. When, even without Hannibal, Carthage slowly repaired the broken fortunes of her merchants, there was an enemy at her door always ready, at the bidding of Rome, to plunder them afresh. This was Masinissa, the Numidian prince, client and obedient servant of the Roman state. Again and again the helpless Carthaginians appealed to Rome to protect them from his deprecations, and finally they ventured to attempt the protection of themselves. Then the patient perfidy of Roman statecraft grasped its reward. It had waited many years for the provocations of Masinissa to work their effect; the maddened Carthaginians had broken, at last, the hard letter of the treaty of 201 by assailing the friend and ally of Rome. The pretext sufficed for a new declaration of war, with the fixed purpose of pressing it to the last extreme. Old Cato, who had been crying in the ears of the Senate, "Carthago delenda est," should have his will. The doomed Carthaginians were kept in ignorance of the fate decreed, until they had been foully tricked into the surrender of their arms and the whole armament of their city. But when they knew the dreadful truth, they threw off all cowardice and rose to such a majesty of spirit as had never been exhibited in their history before. Without weapons, or engines or ships, until they made them anew, they shut their gates and kept the Roman armies out for more than two years. It was another Scipio, adopted grandson and namesake of the conqueror of Hannibal, who finally entered Carthage (B. C. 146), fought his way to its citadel, street by street, and, against his own wish, by command of the implacable senate at Rome, levelled its last building to the earth, after sending the inhabitants who survived to be sold as slaves.—R. B. Smith, *Carthage and the Carthaginians*, ch. 20.

ALSO IN: H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome*, ch. 46.

**B. C. 44.—Restoration by Cæsar.**—"A settlement named Junonia, had been made at Carthage by C. Gracchus [which furnished his enemies one of their weapons against him, because, they said, he had drawn on himself the curse of Scipio] and it appears that the city of Gracchus still existed. Cæsar restored the old name, and, as Strabo says, rebuilt the place; many Romans who preferred Carthage to Rome were sent there, and some soldiers; and it is now, adds Strabo [reign of Augustus] more populous than any town in Libya."—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, v. 5, ch. 32.

**2d-4th Centuries.—The Christian Church.** See CHRISTIANITY: A. D. 100-312.

**A. D. 439.—Taken by the Vandals.**—Carthage was surprised and captured by the Vandals on the 9th of Oct., A. D. 439,—nine years after the conquest and destruction of the African provinces by Genseric began;—585 years after the ancient Carthage was destroyed by Scipio. "A new city had risen from its ruins, with the title of a colony; and though Carthage might yield to the royal prerogatives of Constantinople, and perhaps to the trade of Alexandria or the splendour of Antioch, she still

maintained the second rank in the West—as the Rome (if we may use the style of contemporaries) of the African world. . . . The buildings of Carthage were uniform and magnificent. A shady grove was planted in the midst of the capital; the new port, a secure and capacious harbour, was subservient to the commercial industry of citizens and strangers; and the splendid games of the circus and theatre were exhibited almost in the presence of the barbarians. The reputation of the Carthaginians was not equal to that of their country, and the reproach of Punic faith still adhered to their subtle and faithless character. The habits of trade and the abuse of luxury had corrupted their manners. . . . The King of the Vandals severely reformed the vices of a voluptuous people. . . . The lands of the proconsular province, which formed the immediate district of Carthage, were accurately measured and divided among the barbarians."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 33.—See, also, VANDALS: A. D. 429-430.

**A. D. 533.—Taken by Belisarius.** See VANDALS: A. D. 533-534.

**A. D. 534-558.—The Province of Africa after Justinian's conquest.**—"Successive inroads [of the Moorish tribes] had reduced the province of Africa to one-third of the measure of Italy; yet the Roman emperors continued to reign above a century over Carthage and the fruitful coast of the Mediterranean. But the victories and the losses of Justinian were alike pernicious to mankind; and such was the desolation of Africa that a stranger might wander whole days without meeting the face either of a friend or an enemy. The nation of the Vandals had disappeared. . . . Their numbers were infinitely surpassed by the number of the Moorish families extirpated in a relentless war; and the same destruction was retaliated on the Romans and their allies, who perished by the climate, their mutual quarrels, and the rage of the barbarians. When Procopius first landed [with Belisarius, A. D. 533] he admired the populousness of the cities and country, strenuously exercised in the labours of commerce and agriculture. In less than twenty years that busy scene was converted into a silent solitude; the wealthy citizens escaped to Sicily and Constantinople; and the secret historian has confidently affirmed that five millions of Africans were consumed by the wars and government of the Emperor Justinian."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 43.

**A. D. 698.—Destruction by the Arabs.**—"In the 77th year of the Hégira [A. D. 698] . . . Abd'almalek [the Caliph] sent Hossan Ibn Anno'man, at the head of 40,000 choice troops, to carry out the scheme of African conquest [which had languished for some years, during the civil wars among the Moslems]. That general pressed forward at once with his troops against the city of Carthage, which, though declined from its ancient might and glory, was still an important seaport, fortified with lofty walls, haughty towers and powerful bulwarks, and had a numerous garrison of Greeks and other Christians. Hossan proceeded according to the old Arab mode; beleaguering and reducing it by a long siege; he then assailed it by storm, scaled its lofty walls with ladders, and made himself master of the place. Many of the inhabitants fell by the edge



of the sword; many escaped by sea to Sicily and Spain. The walls were then demolished; the city was given up to be plundered by the soldiery, the meanest of whom was enriched by booty. . . . The triumph of the Moslem host was suddenly interrupted. While they were revelling in the ravaged palaces of Carthage, a fleet appeared before the port; snapped the strong chain which guarded the entrance, and sailed into the harbor. It was a combined force of ships and troops from Constantinople and Sicily; reinforced by Goths from Spain; all under the command of the prefect John, a patrician general of great valor and experience. Hossun felt himself unable to cope with such a force; he withdrew, however in good order, and conducted his troops laden with spoils to Tripoli and Caerwan, and, having strongly posted them, he awaited reinforcements from the Caliph. These arrived in course of time by sea and land. Hossun again took the field; encountered the prefect John, not far from Utica, defeated him in a pitched battle and drove him to embark the wrecks of his army and make all sail for Constantinople. Carthage was again assailed by the victors, and now its desolation was complete, for the vengeance of the Moslems gave that majestic city to the flames. A heap of ruins and the remains of a noble aqueduct are all the relics of a metropolis that once valiantly contended for dominion with Rome."—W. Irving, *Mahomet and his Successors*, v. 2, ch. 5k.

ALSO IN: N. Davis, *Carthage and Her Remains*.—See, also, MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 647-709.

**CARTHAGE, Mo., Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (JULY—SEPTEMBER: MISSOURI).

**CARTHAGENA (NEW CARTHAGE).**—The founding of the city.—Hasdrubal, son-in-law and successor of Hamilcar Barca in Spain, founded New Carthage—modern Carthagena—some time between 229 and 221 B. C. to be the capital of the Carthaginian dominion in the Spanish peninsula.—R. B. Smith, *Carthage and the Carthaginians*, ch. 9.

**Capture by Scipio.** See PUNIC WAR. THE SECOND.

**Settlement of the Alans in.** See SPAIN: A. D. 400-414.

**CARTHAGENA (S. Am.): A. D. 1697.**—Taken and sacked by the French.—One of the last enterprises of the French in the war which was closed by the Peace of Ryswick—undertaken, in fact, while the negotiations at Ryswick were in progress—was the storming and sacking of Carthagena by a privateer squadron, from Brest, commanded by rear-admiral Pointis, April, 1697. "The inhabitants were allowed to carry away their effects; but all the gold, silver, and precious stones were the prey of the conqueror. Pointis . . . reëntered Brest safe and sound, bringing back to his ship-owners more than ten millions. The officers of the squadron and the privateers had well provided for themselves besides, and the Spaniards had probably lost more than twenty millions."—H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV.* (tr. by M. L. Booth), v. 2, ch. 2.

**A. D. 1741.**—Attack and repulse of the English. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1739-1741.

**A. D. 1815.**—Siege and capture by the Spaniards. See COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1810-1819.

**CARTHUSIAN ORDER.**—La Grande Chartreuse.—"St. Bruno, once a canon of St. Cunibert's, at Cologne, and afterward chancellor of the metropolitan church of Rheims, followed by six companions, founded a monastery near Grenoble, amid the bleak and rugged mountains of the desert of Chartreuse (A. D. 1084). The rule given by St. Bruno to his disciples was founded upon that of St. Benedict, but with such modifications as almost to make of it a new and particular one. The Carthusians were very nearly akin to the monks of Vallis-Umbrosa and Camaldoli; they led the same kind of life—the eremitical joined to the cenobitic. Each religious had his own cell, where he spent the week in solitude, and met the community only on Sunday. . . . Never, perhaps, had the monastic life surrounded itself with such rigors and holy austerities. . . . The religious were bound to a life-long silence, having renounced the world to hold converse with Heaven alone. Like the solitaries of Thebais they never eat meat, and their dress, as an additional penance, consisted only of a sack-cloth garment. Manual labors, broken only by the exercise of common prayer; a board on the bare earth for a couch; a narrow cell, where the religious twice a day receives his slight allowance of boiled herbs;—such is the life of pious austerities of which the world knows not the heavenly sweetness. For 800 years has this order continued to edify and to serve the Church by the practice of the most sublime virtue; and its very rigor seems to hold out a mysterious attraction to pious souls. A congregation of women has embraced the primitive rule."—J. E. Darras, *Hist. of the Catholic Church*, v. 3, ch. 4, par. 26, and ch. 10, par. 11.—From the account of a visit to the Grande Chartreuse, the parent monastery, near Grenoble, made in 1667, by Dom Claude Lancelot, of Port Royal, the following is taken: "All I had heard of this astonishing seclusion falls infinitely short of the reality. No adequate description can be given of the awful magnificence of this dreary solitude. . . . The desert of the Chartreuse is wholly inaccessible but by one exceedingly narrow defile. This pass, which is only a few feet wide, is indeed truly tremendous. It winds between stupendous granite rocks, which overhang above. . . . The monastery itself is as striking as the approach. . . . On the west . . . there is a little space which . . . is occupied by a dark grove of pine trees; on every other side the rocks, which are as steep as so many walls, are not more than ten yards from the convent. By this means a dim and gloomy twilight perpetually reigns within."—M. A. Schimmelpenninck, *A tour to Alet and La Grande Chartreuse*, v. 1, pp. 6-13.

**CARTIER, Jacques, Exploration of the Lawrence by.**—See AMERICA: A. D. 1534-1535, and 1541-1603.

**CARTOUCHE.**—"It is impossible to travel in Upper Egypt without knowing what is meant by a cartouche. A cartouche is that elongated oval terminated by a straight line which is to be seen on every wall of the Egyptian temples, and of which other monuments also afford us numerous examples. The cartouche always contains the name of a king or of a queen, or in



some cases the names of royal princesses. To designate a king there are most frequently two cartouches side by side. The first is called the prenomen, the second the nomen."—A. Mariette, *Monuments of Upper Egypt*, p. 43.

**CARTWRIGHT'S POWER LOOM**, The invention of. See **COTTON MANUFACTURE**.

**CARUCATE**. See **HIDE OF LAND**.

**CARUS**, Roman Emperor, A. D. 282-283.

**CASA MATA**, Battle of. See **MEXICO**: A. D. 1847 (MARCH—SEPTEMBER).

**CASALE**: A. D. 1628-1631.—Siege by the Imperialists.—Final acquisition by France. See **ITALY**: A. D. 1627-1631.

A. D. 1640.—Unsuccessful siege by the Spaniards. See **ITALY**: A. D. 1635-1639.

A. D. 1697.—Ceded to the Duke of Savoy. See **SAVOY AND PIEDMONT**: A. D. 1580-1713.

**CASALSECCO**, Battle of (1427). See **ITALY**: A. D. 1412-1447.

**CASAS**, Bartolomé de las, The humane labors of. See **SLAVERY: MODERN—OF THE INDIANS**.

**CASDIM**. See **BABELONIA, PRIMITIVE**.

**CASENA**, Massacre at. See **ITALY**: A. D. 1343-1393.

**CASHEL**, Psalter of. See **TARA, THE HILL AND THE FEIS OF**.

**CASHEL**, Synod of. See **IRELAND**: A. D. 1169-1175.

**CASHMERE**: A. D. 1819-1820.—Conquest by Runjet Singh. See **SIKHS**.

A. D. 1846.—Taken from the Sikhs by the English and given as a kingdom to Gholab Singh. See **INDIA**: A. D. 1845-1849.

**CASIMIR I.**, King of Poland, A. D. 1037-1058. . . . **Casimir II.**, Duke of Poland, A. D. 1177-1194. . . . **Casimir III.** (called *The Great*), King of Poland, A. D. 1333-1370. . . . **Casimir IV.**, King of Poland, A. D. 1445-1492. . . . **Casimir**, John, King of Poland, A. D. 1648-1668.

**CASKET GIRLS**, The. See **LOUISIANA**: A. D. 1728.

**CASKET LETTERS**, The. See **SCOTLAND**: A. D. 1561-1568.

**CASPIAN GATES (PYLÆ CASPIÆ)**.—An important pass in the Elburz Mountains, so called by the Greeks. It is identified with the pass known to the modern Persians as the Girduni Surdurrah, some fifty miles or more eastward, or northeastward, from Teheran. "Through this pass alone can armies proceed from Armenia, Media, or Persia eastward, or from Turkestan, Khorasan and Afghanistan into the more western parts of Asia. The position is therefore one of primary importance. It was to guard it that Rhages was built so near to the eastern end of its territory."—G. Rawlinson, *Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy*, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: Same, *Five Great Monarchies: Media*, ch. 1.

**CASSANDER**, and the wars of the Diadochi. See **MACEDONIA**: B. C. 323-316 to 297-280; also Greece: B. C. 321-312.

**CASSANO**, Battles of (1705 and 1799). See **ITALY**: A. D. 1701-1713, and France: A. D. 1799 (APRIL—SEPTEMBER).

**CASSEL**: A. D. 1383.—Burned by the French. See **FLANDERS**: A. D. 1383.

**CASSEL**, Battles of (1328 and 1677). See **FLANDERS**: A. D. 1328, and **NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND)**: A. D. 1674-1678.

**CASSIAN ROAD**.—One of the great Roman roads of antiquity, which ran from Rome, by way of Sutrium and Clusium to Arretium and Florentia.—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 4, ch. 11.

**CASSII**, The.—A tribe of ancient Britons whose territory was near the Thames. See **BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES**.

**CASSITERIDES**, The.—The "tin islands," from which the Phœnicians and Carthaginians obtained their supply of tin. Some archaeologists identify them with the British islands, some with the Scilly islands, and some with the island's in Vigo Bay, on the coast of Spain.—Charles Elton, *Origins of Eng. Hist.*

ALSO IN: J. Rhys, *Celtic Britain*.

**CASSOPIANS**. See **EPIRUS**.

**CASTALIAN SPRING**.—A spring which issued from between two peaks or cliffs of Mount Parnassus and flowed downward in a cool stream past the temple of Apollo at Delphi.

**CASTE SYSTEM OF INDIA**, The.—"The caste system of India is not based upon an exclusive descent as involving a difference of rank and culture, but upon an exclusive descent as involving purity of blood. In the old materialistic religion which prevailed so largely in the ancient world, and was closely associated with sexual ideas, the maintenance of purity of blood was regarded as a sacred duty. The individual had no existence independent of the family. Male or female, the individual was but a link in the life of the family; and any intermixture would be followed by the separation of the impure branch from the parent stem. In a word, caste was the religion of the sexes, and as such exists in India to this day. . . . The Hindus are divided into an infinite number of castes, according to their hereditary trades and professions; but in the present day they are nearly all comprehended in four great castes, namely, the Brahmans, or priests; the Kshatriyas, or soldiers; the Vaisyas, or merchants; and the Sudras, or servile class. The Brahmans are the mouth of Brahma; the Kshatriyas are his arms; the Vaisyas are his thighs; and the Sudras are his feet. The three first castes of priests, soldiers, and merchants, are distinguished from the fourth caste of Sudras by the thread, or paita, which is worn depending from the left shoulder and resting on the right side below the loins. The investiture usually takes place between the eighth and twelfth year, and is known as the second birth, and those who are invested are termed the 'twice born.' It is difficult to say whether the thread indicates a separation between the conquerors and the conquered; or whether it originated in a religious investiture from which the Sudras were excluded."—J. T. Wheeler, *Hist. of India*, v. 3, pp. 114 and 64.—"Among the delusions about modern India which it seems impossible to kill, the belief still survives that, although there have been many changes in the system of caste, it remains true that the Hindu population is divided into the four great classes described by Manu: Brahmans, Kshatriyas, Vaisyas, and Sudras. In India itself this notion is fostered by the more learned among the Brahmans, who love to make themselves and others believe in the continuous existence of a divinely constituted organization.

To what extent the religious and social systems shadowed forth in the ancient Brahmanical literature had an actual existence it is difficult to say, but it is certain that little remains of them now. The Brahmans maintain their exceptional position; but no one can discern the other great castes which Manu described. Excluding the Brahmans, caste means for the most part hereditary occupation, but it also often signifies a common origin of tribe or race. India, in the words of Sir Henry Maine, is divided into a vast number of independent, self-acting, organised social groups—trading, manufacturing, cultivating.

In the enormous majority of instances, caste is only the name for a number of practices which are followed by each one of a multitude of groups of men, whether such a group be ancient and natural or modern and artificial. As a rule, every trade, every profession, every guild, every tribe, every class, is also a caste; and the members of a caste not only have their special objects of worship, selected from the Hindu Pantheon, or adopted into it, but they exclusively eat together, and exclusively intermarry. Mr. Kitts, in his interesting 'Compendium of the Castes and Tribes of India,' compiled from the Indian Census reports of 1881, enumerates 1929 different castes. Forty-seven of these have each more than 1,000,000 members; twenty-one have 2,000,000 and upwards. The Brahmans, Kumbis (agriculturists), and Chumars (workers in leather), are the only three castes each of which has more than 10,000,000; nearly 15 per cent. of the inhabitants of India are included in these three castes. The distinctions and subdivisions of caste are innumerable, and even the Brahmans, who have this in common, that they are revered by the members of all other castes, are as much divided among themselves as the rest. There are nearly 14,000,000 Brahmans; according to Mr. Sherring, in his work on 'Hindu Tribes and Castes,' there are more than 1,800 Brahmanical subdivisions; and it constantly happens that to a Brahman of some particular class or district the pollution of eating with other Brahmans would be ruinous. . . . The Brahmans have become so numerous that only a small proportion can be employed in sacerdotal functions, and the charity which it is a duty to bestow upon them could not, however profuse, be sufficient for their support. They are found in almost every occupation. They are soldiers, cultivators, traders, and servants; they were very numerous in the old Sepoy army, and the name of one of their subdivisions, 'Pande,' became the generic term by which the mutineers of 1857 were commonly known by the English in India. . . . Mr. Ibbetson, in his report on the census in the Punjab, shows how completely it is true that caste is a social and not a religious institution. Conversion to Mohammedanism, for instance, does not necessarily affect the caste of the convert.—Sir J. Strachey, *India*, lect. 8.

ALSO IN: M. Williams, *Religious Thought and Life in India*, ch. 18.—Sir A. C. Lyall, *Asiatic Studies*, ch. 7.—Sir H. S. Maine, *Village Communities*, ch. 2.

**CASTEL.** See MONTIACUM.  
**CASTELAR AND REPUBLICANISM IN SPAIN.** See SPAIN: A. D. 1806-1873, and 1873-1885.

**CASTELFIDARDO, Battle of (1860).** See ITALY: A. D. 1859-1861.

**CASTELLANO.** See SPANISH COINS.

**CASTIGLIONE, Battle of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1796 (APRIL—OCTOBER).

**CASTILE, Early inhabitants of.** See CELTIBERIANS.

A. D. 713-1230.—Origin and rise of the kingdom. See SPAIN: A. D. 713-737, and 1026-1230.

A. D. 1140.—Separation of Portugal as an independent kingdom. See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1095-1325.

A. D. 1169.—The first Cortes.—The old monarchical constitution. See CORTES.

A. D. 1212-1238.—Progress of arms.—Permanent union of the crown with that of Leon.—Conquest of Cordova.—Vassalage imposed on Granada and Marcia. See SPAIN: A. D. 1212-1238.

A. D. 1248-1350.—Reigns of St. Ferdinand, Alfonso the Learned, and their three successors. See SPAIN: A. D. 1248-1350.

A. D. 1366-1369.—Pedro the Cruel and the invasion of the English Black Prince. See SPAIN (CASTILE): A. D. 1366-1369.

A. D. 1368-1476.—Under the house of Trastamare.—Discord and civil war.—The triumph of Queen Isabella and her marriage to Ferdinand of Aragon. See SPAIN: A. D. 1368-1476.

A. D. 1515.—Incorporation of Navarre with the kingdom. See NAVARRE: A. D. 1442-1521.

A. D. 1516.—The crown united with that of Aragon, by Joanna, mother of Charles V. See SPAIN: A. D. 1496-1517.

**CASTILLA DEL ORO.** See AMERICA: A. D. 1509-1511.

**CASTILLON, Battle of (1450).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1431-1453.

**CASTLE ST. ANGELO.**—The Mausoleum of Hadrian, begun by the emperor Hadrian, A. D. 135, and probably completed by Antoninus Pius, "owes its preservation entirely to the peculiar fitness of its site and shape for the purposes of a fortress, which it has served since the time of Belisarius. . . . After the burial of Marcus Aurelius, the tomb was closed until the sack of Rome by Alaric in 410 A. D., when his barbarian soldiers probably broke it open in search of treasure, and scattered the ashes of the Antonines to the winds. From this time, for a hundred years, the tomb was turned into a fortress, the possession of which became the object of many struggles in the wars of the Goths under Vitiges (537 A. D.) and Totilas (killed 552). From the end of the sixth century, when Gregory the Great saw in its summit a vision of St. Michael sheathing his sword, in token that the prayers of the Romans for preservation from the plague were heard, the Mausoleum of Hadrian was considered as a consecrated building, under the name of 'S. Angelus inter Nubes,' 'Usque ad Caelos,' or 'Inter Caelos,' until it was seized in 923 A. D. by Alberic, Count of Tusculum, and the infamous Marozia, and again became the scene of the fierce struggles between Popes, Emperors, and reckless adventurers which marked those miserable times. The last injuries appear to have been inflicted upon the building in the contest between the French Pope Clemens VII. and the Italian Pope Urban VIII. [see PAPACY: A. D. 1377-1417]. The exterior was then finally dismantled and stripped. Partial additions and restorations soon began to take place. Boniface IX., in the beginning of the fifteenth century, erected

new battlements and fortifications on and around the building; and since his time it has remained in the possession of the Papal government. The strange medley of Papal reception rooms, dungeons and military magazines which now encombres the top, was chiefly built by Paul III. The corridor connecting it with the Vatican dates from the time of Alexander Borghia (1494 A. D.), and the bronze statue of St. Michael on the summit, which replaced an older marble statue, from the reign of Benedict XIV."—R. Burn, *Rome and the Campagna*, ch. 11.

ALSO IN: W. W. Story, *Castle St. Angelo*.

**CASTLENAUDARI, Battle of (1632).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1630-1632.

**CASTLEREAGH, Lord, and the union of Ireland with Great Britain.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1798-1800.

**CASTOR WARE.**—"Durobrivian or Castor ware, as it is variously called, is the production of the extensive Romano-British potteries on the River Nen in Northamptonshire and Huntingdonshire, which, with settlements, are computed to have covered a district of some twenty square miles in extent. . . . There are several varieties . . . and two especially have been remarked; the first, blue, or slate-coloured, the other reddish-brown, or of a dark copper colour."—L. Jewett, *Grave Mounds*, p. 152.

**CASTRA, Roman.**—"When a Roman army was in the field it never halted, even for a single night, without throwing up an entrenchment capable of containing the whole of the troops and their baggage. This field-work was termed *Castra*. . . . The form of the camp was a square, each side of which was 2,017 Roman feet in length. The defences consisted of a ditch, (*fossa*), the earth dug out, being thrown inwards so as to form a rampart, (*agger*), upon the summit of which a palisade (*vallum*) was erected of wooden stakes, (*valli*—*sudes*), a certain number of which were carried by each soldier, along with his entrenching tools."—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq.*, ch. 12.

**CASTRICUM, Battle of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1799 (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER).

**CASTRIOTS, The.** See ALBANIANS: A. D. 1443-1467.

**CASTRUCCIO CASTRACANI, The despotism of.** See ITALY: A. D. 1313-1330.

**CAT NATION, The.** See AMERICAN INDIANS: HURONS, &c., and INDIANS CONFEDERACY: THEIR CONQUESTS, &c.

**CATACOMBS OF ROME, The.**—"The Roman Catacombs—a name consecrated by long usage, but having no etymological meaning, and not a very determinate geographical one—are a vast labyrinth of galleries excavated in the bowels of the earth in the hills around the Eternal City; not in the hills on which the city itself was built, but in those beyond the walls. Their extent is enormous, not as to the amount of superficial soil which they underlie, for they rarely, if ever, pass beyond the third milestone from the city, but in the actual length of their galleries; for these are often excavated on various levels, or *plani*, three, four, or even five, one above the other, and they cross and recross one another, some times at short intervals, on each of these levels; so that, on the whole, there are certainly not less than 850 miles of them; that is to say, if stretched out in one continuous line, they would extend the whole length of Italy

itself. The galleries are from two to four feet in width, and vary in height according to the nature of the rock in which they are dug. The walls on both sides are pierced with horizontal niches, like shelves in a book-case, or berths in a steamer, and every niche once contained one or more dead bodies. At various intervals this succession of shelves is interrupted for a moment, that room may be made for a doorway opening into a small chamber; and the walls of these chambers are generally pierced with graves in the same way as the galleries. These vast excavations once formed the ancient Christian cemeteries of Rome; they were begun in apostolic times, and continued to be used as burial-places of the faithful until the capture of the city by Alaric in the year 410. In the third century, the Roman Church numbered twenty-five or twenty-six of them, corresponding to the number of her titles or parishes within the city; and besides these, there are about twenty others, of smaller dimensions, isolated monuments of special martyrs, or belonging to this or that private family. Originally they all belonged to private families or individuals, the villas or gardens in which they were dug being the property of wealthy citizens who had embraced the faith of Christ, and devoted of their substance to His service. Hence their most ancient titles were taken merely from the names of their lawful owners, many of which still survive. . . . It has always been agreed among men of learning who have had an opportunity of examining these excavations, that they were used exclusively by the Christians as places of burial and of holding religious assemblies. Modern research has placed it beyond a doubt, that they were also originally designed for this purpose and for no other."—J. S. Northcote and W. R. Brownlow, *Roma Sotterranea*, bk. 1, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: A. P. Stanley, *Christian Institutions*, ch. 13.

**CATALAN GRAND COMPANY, The.**—The Catalan Grand Company was a formidable body of military adventurers—mercenary soldiers—formed in Sicily during the twenty years of war that followed the Sicilian Vespers. "Ill-gain and great license drew the best swards in Catalonia and Aragon into the mercenary battalions of Sicily and induced them to submit to the severest discipline." The conclusion of peace in 1302 threw this trained army out of employment, and the greater part of its members were enlisted in the service of Andronicus II., of the restored Greek empire at Constantinople. They were under the command of one Roger de Flor, who had been a Templar, degraded from his knighthood for desertion, and afterwards a pirate; but whose military talents were undoubted. The Grand Company soon quarrelled with the Greek emperor; its leader was assassinated, and open war declared. The Greek army was terribly defeated in a battle at Apros, A. D. 1307, and the Catalans plundered Thrace for two years without resistance. Gallipoli, their headquarters, to which they brought their captives, became one of the great slave marts of Europe. In 1310 they marched into the heart of Greece, and were engaged in the service of Walter de Brienne, Duke of Athens. He, too, found them dangerous servants. Quarrels were followed by war; the Duke perished in a battle (A. D. 1311) with his Catalan

mercenaries on the banks of the Cephissus; his dukedom, embracing Attica and Bœotia, was the prize of their victory. The widows and daughters of the Greek nobles who had fallen were forced to marry the officers of the Catalans, who thus settled themselves in family as well as estate. They elected a Duke of Athens; but proceeded afterwards to make the duchy an appanage of the House of Aragon. The title was held by sons of the Aragonese kings of Sicily until 1377, when it passed to Alphonso V., king of Aragon, and was retained by the kings of Spain after the union of the crowns of Aragon and Castile. The titular dukes were represented at Athens by regents. "During the period the duchy of Athens was possessed by the Sicilian branch of the house of Aragon, the Catalans were incessantly engaged in wars with all their neighbours." But, gradually, their military vigor and discipline were lost, and their name and power in Greece disappeared about 1386, when Athens and most of the territory of its duchy was conquered by Nero Acciainoli, a rich and powerful Florentine, who had become governor of Corinth, but acted as an independent prince, and who founded a new ducal family.—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine and Greek Empires*, bk. 4, ch. 2, sect. 2.

ALSO IN: Same, *Hist. of Greece from its Conq. by the Crusaders*, ch. 7, sec. 3.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 62.

**CATALANS: A. D. 1151.**—The County of Barcelona united by marriage to Aragon. See SPAIN: A. D. 1035-1258.

**A. D. 12th-15th Centuries.**—Commercial importance and municipal freedom of Barcelona. See BARCELONA: 12th-16th CENTURIES.

**A. D. 1461-1472.**—Long but unsuccessful revolt against John II. of Aragon. See SPAIN: A. D. 1368-1479.

**A. D. 1639-1640.**—Causes of disaffection and revolt. See SPAIN: A. D. 1637-1640.

**A. D. 1640-1652.**—Revolt.—Renunciation of allegiance to the Spanish crown.—Annexation to France offered and accepted.—Re-subjection to Spain. See SPAIN: A. D. 1640-1642; 1644-1646; 1648-1652.

**A. D. 1705.**—Adhesion to the Allies in the War of the Spanish Succession. See SPAIN: A. D. 1705.

**A. D. 1713-1714.**—Betrayed and deserted by the Allies. See SPAIN: A. D. 1713-1714.

**CATALAUNIAN PLAINS.** See HUNS: A. D. 451.

**CATALONIA.** See CATALANS.

**CATANA, OR KATANA, Battle of.** See SYRACUSE: B. C. 307-306.

**CATANIA.**—Storming and capture by King Ferdinand (1849). See ITALY: A. D. 1848-1840.

**CATAPAN.** See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 800-1016.

**CATAWBAS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: STOUAN FAMILY.

**CATEAU-CAMBRESIS, Treaty of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1547-1559.

**CATERANS.**—"In 1384 an act was passed [by the Scotch parliament] for the suppression of masterful plunderers, who get in the statute their Highland name of 'cateran.' . . . This is the first of a long succession of penal and denuncia-

tory laws against the Highlanders."—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland*, v. 3, ch. 27.

**CATHARISTS, OR PATARENES.**—"Among all the sects of the Middle Ages, very far the most important in numbers and in radical antagonism to the Church, were the Cathari, or the Pure, as with characteristic sectarian assumption they styled themselves. Albigenses they were called in Languedoc; Patarenes in North Italy; Good Men by themselves. Stretching through central Europe to Thrace and Bulgaria, they joined hands with the Paulicians of the East and shared their errors. Whether these Cathari stood in lineal historical descent from the old Manicheans, or had generated a dualistic scheme of their own, is a question hard to answer, and which has been answered in very different ways. This much, however, is certain, that in all essentials they agreed with them."—R. C. Trench, *Lects. on Medieval Church Hist.*, lect. 15.—"In Italy, men supposed to hold the same belief [as that of the Paulicians, Albigenses, etc.] went by the name of the Paterini, a word of uncertain derivation, perhaps arising from their willingness meekly to submit to all sufferings for Christ's sake (pati), perhaps from a quarter in the city of Milan named 'Pataria'; and more lately by that of Cathari (the Pure, Puritans), which was soon corrupted into Gazari, whence the German 'Ketzer,' the general word for a heretic."—L. Mariotti, *Frà Dolcino and his Times*, ch. 1.—See, also, PAULICIANS, and ALBIGENSES.

**CATHAY.** See CHINA: THE NAMES OF THE COUNTRY.

**CATHELINEAU AND, THE INSURRECTION IN LA VENDEE.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (MARCH—APRIL); (JUNE); and (JULY—DECEMBER).

**CATHERINE I., Czarina of Russia, A. D. 1725-1727.** . . . Catherine II., Czarina of Russia, A. D. 1762-1796. . . . Catherine and Jean d'Albret, Queen and King of Navarre, A. D. 1503-1512. . . . Catherine de Medici: her part in French history. See FRANCE: A. D. 1532-1547, to 1584-1589.

**CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION AND THE CATHOLIC RENT IN IRELAND.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1811-1829.

**CATHOLIC DEFENDERS.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1760-1798.

**CATHOLIC LEAGUE, The.** See PAPACY: A. D. 1530-1531.

**CATHOLIC LEAGUE IN FRANCE, The.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1570-1585 and after.

**CATHOLICS (England): A. D. 1572-1679.**—Persecutions. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1572-1603; 1585-1587; 1587-1588; 1678-1679.

(Ireland): A. D. 1691-1782.—Oppression of the Penal Laws. See IRELAND: A. D. 1691-1782.

(England): A. D. 1778-1780.—Repeal of Penal laws.—No-Popery Riots. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1778-1780.

(Ireland): A. D. 1795-1796.—Persecution by Protestant mobs.—Formation of the Orange Society. See IRELAND: A. D. 1795-1796.

(Ireland): A. D. 1801.—Pitt's promises broken by the King. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1801-1806.

(England and Ireland): A. D. 1829.—Emanicipation from civil disabilities. See IRELAND: A. D. 1811-1829.

**CATHOLICS, Old.** See PAPACY: A. D. 1869-1870.

**CATILINE, The Conspiracy of.** See ROME: B. C. 63.

**CATINI, The.** See BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.

**CATO THE YOUNGER, and the last years of the Roman Republic.** See ROME: B. C. 63-58, to 47-46.

**CATO STREET CONSPIRACY, The.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1820-1827.

**CATRIL, The.**—An ancient rampart, the remains of which are found in southern Scotland, running from the south-east corner of Peeblesshire to the south side of Liddesdale. It is supposed to have marked the boundary between the old Anglian kingdom of Bernicia and the territory of the British kings of Alclufth (Dumbarton).—W. F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, v. 1.

**CATTANI.—VASSALI.—MASNADA.—SERVI.**—The feudal barons of northern Italy were called Cattani. In the Florentine territory, "many of these Cattani, after having been subdued and made citizens of Florence, still maintained their feudal following, and were usually attended by troops of retainers, half slaves, half freedmen, called 'Uomini di Masnada,' who held certain possessions of their by the tenure of military service, took oaths of fidelity, and appear to have included every rank of person in the different Italian states according to the quality of the chief; but without any degradation of character being attached to such employment. This kind of servitude, which could not be thrown off without a formal act of manumission, was common in the north of Italy, and began in the 11th century, when innumerable chieftains started up owning no superior but the emperor. Being at constant war with each other they sought every means of creating a military following by granting lands to all ranks of people, and it is probable that many slaves were then partly emancipated for the purpose: such a condition, though not considered dishonourable, was thus essentially tinged with the colours of slavery, and so far differed from the 'Vassi' and 'Vassalli,' as well as from the 'Vavasours' . . . Some slight, perhaps unnecessary distinction is made between the 'Vassi,' who are supposed to have been vassals of the crown, and the 'Vassalli,' who were the vassals of great lords. The 'Vavasours' were the vassals of great vassals. . . . This union [as described above] of 'Servi,' slaves, or vassals of one chief, was called 'Masnada,' and hence the name 'Masnadieri,' so often recurring in early Italian history; for the commanders of these irregular bands were often retained in the pay of the republic and frequently kept the field when the civic troops had returned to their homes, or when the war was not sufficiently important to bring the latter out with the Carroccio. . . . Besides these military Villains, who were also called 'Fedelli,' there were two other kinds of slaves amongst the early Italians, namely prisoners of war and the labourers attached to the soil, who were considered as cattle in every respect except that of their superior utility and value; the former species of slavery was probably soon dissolved by the union of self-interest and humanity: the latter began to decline in the 12th century, partly continued through the 13th, and vanished entirely in the 14th century."—H. E. Napier, *Florentine History*, v. 1, p. 624.

**CATTI, The.** See CHIATTI.  
**CATUVELLANI, The.** See BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.

**CAUCASUS AND THE CIRCASSIANS.**—**The Russian conquest.**—"The Caucasus has always possessed a certain fascination not for the Russians only, but also for western nations, and is peculiarly rich in historical traditions, and in memories of ancient times and ancient nations. Here to the rocks of Elbruz, Prometheus lay chained; and to Coichis, where the Phasis flowed towards the sea, through ever green woods, came the Argonauts. The present Kutais is the old capital of King Æetes, near which, in the sacred grove of Ares, hung the golden fleece. The gold mines which the Russians discovered in 1864 were apparently known to the Greeks, whose colony, Dioscurias, was an assemblage of 300 diverse nationalities. . . . Here on the coasts of the stormy and dangerous Black Sea arose the famous Pontine kingdom [see MITHRIDATIC WARS] which in spite of its valiant resistance under Mithridates, fell a victim to Roman aggression. Along the rivers Kura and Rion ran the old commercial road from Europe to Asia, which enriched the Venetians and the Genoese in the middle ages. Up to recent times this trade consisted not only of all sorts of other merchandise, but of slaves; numberless girls and women were conveyed to Turkish harems and there exercised an important influence on the character of the Tartar and Mongol races. In the middle ages the Caucasus was the route by which the wild Asiatic hordes, the Goths, Khusars, Huns, Avars, Mongols, Tartars, and Arabs crossed from Asia into Europe; and consequently its secluded valleys contain a population composed of more different and distinct races than any other district in the world. . . . It was in the 16th century, under Ivan the Terrible, that Russia first turned her attention to the conquest of the Caucasus; but it was not till 1859 that the defeat and capture of the famous Schamyl brought about the final subjugation of the country. . . . In 1785 [after the partial conquest of 1784—see TURKS: A. D. 1776-1792] the mountaineers had been incited to take arms by a so-called prophet Scheick Mansur, but he was seized and banished to Solovetsk, on the White Sea. In 1820 a Mollah, Kasi by name, made his appearance in Daghestan, and began to preach the 'Kasawat,' that is, holy war against the Russians. To him succeeded another equally fanatical adventurer, Hamset Beg. The work which they had begun was carried on by Schamyl, who far surpassed his predecessors in all the qualities which make up a successful guerilla chief, and who maintained the unequal conflict against the enemies of his country for 25 years with singular good fortune, undaunted courage, untrifling energy, and conspicuous ability. He was of the tribe of the Lesghians in Daghestan, and was born in 1790, in the village of Glimri, of poor shepherd parents. In spite of his humble origin he raised himself to the rank of an Imaum, surrounded himself with a strong body-guard of devoted adherents, whom he named Murides, and succeeded in fanning to a flame the patriotic ardour of his fellow-countrymen. The capture of the mountain fastness of Achulgo in 1839 seemed to be the death-blow of Schamyl's cause, for it brought about the loss of the whole of Daghestan, the very focus of the

Murides' activity. Schamyl barely escaped being made a prisoner, and was forced to yield up his son, Djammel-Edden, only nine years of age as a hostage. The boy was sent to St. Petersburg and placed in a cadet corps, which he left at the conclusion of his military education somewhere about 1850 and returned to his native country in 1854 where he died a few years later. In 1840 the Tchetchens, who had previously been pacified, rose in arms once more, and Daghestan and other parts of the country followed their example. The country of the Tchetchens was a specially favourable theatre for the conflict with the Russians; its long mountain chains, rocky fastnesses, impenetrable forests, and wild precipices and gorges rendered ambushes and surprises of constant and, to the Russians, fatal occurrence. During the earlier stages of the war, Russia had ransomed the officers taken prisoners by the mountaineers, but, subsequently, no quarter was given on either side. At last, by means of a great concentration of troops on all the threatened points, by fortifying the chief central stations, and by forming broad military roads throughout the district, the Russians succeeded in breaking down Schamyl's resistance. He now suffered one reverse after another. His chief fastnesses, Dargo, Weden, and Guin, were successively stormed and destroyed; and, finally, he himself and his family were taken prisoners. He was astonished and, it is said, not altogether gratified to find that a violent death was not to close his romantic career. He and his family were at first interned at Kaluga in Russia, both a house and a considerable sum of money for his maintenance being assigned to him. But after a few years he was allowed to remove to Mecca, where he died. His sons and grandsons, who have entirely adopted the manners of the Russians, are officers in the Circassian guard. In 1864 the pacification of the whole country was accomplished, and a few years later the abolition of serfdom was proclaimed at Tiflis. After the subjugation of the various mountain tribes, the Circassians had the choice given them by the Government of settling on the low country along the Kuban, or of emigrating to Turkey. The latter course was chosen by the bulk of the nation, urged, thereto, in great measure, by envoys from Turkey. As many as 400,000 are said to have come to the ports, where the Sultan had promised to send vessels to receive them; but delays took place, and a large number died of want and disease. Those who reached Turkey were settled on the west coasts of the Black Sea, in Bulgaria and near Varna, and proved themselves most troublesome and unruly subjects. Most of those who at first remained in Circassia followed their fellow-countrymen in 1874.—H. M. Chester, *Russia*, ch. 18.

ALSO IN: F. Mayne, *Life of Nicholas I.*, pt. 1, ch. 11 and 14.—S. M. Schmucker, *Life and Reign of Nicholas I.*, ch. 21.

**CAUCASUS, The Indian.**—"The real Caucasus was the most lofty range of mountains known to the Greeks before [Alexander's conquests], and they were generally regarded as the highest mountains in the world. Hence when the army of Alexander came in sight of the vast mountain barrier [of the Hindoo Koosh] that rose before them as they advanced northward from Arachosia, they seem to have at once concluded that

this could be no other than the Caucasus." Hence the name Caucasus given by the Greeks to those mountains; "for the name of Hindoo Koosh, by which they are still known, is nothing more than a corruption of the Indian Caucasus."—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 12, note Q.

**CAUCI, The.** See IRELAND, TRIBES OF EARLY CELTIC INHABITANTS.

**CAUCUS.**—In 1634—the fourth year of the colony of Massachusetts Bay—the freemen of the colony chose Dudley instead of Winthrop for governor. The next year they "followed up the doctrine of rotation in office by choosing Haynes as governor, a choice agreed upon by deputies from the towns, who came together for that purpose previously to the meeting of the court—the first instance of 'the caucus system' on record."—R. Hildreth, *Hist. of the U. S.*, c. 1, p. 224.—See, also, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

**CAUDINE FORKS, The Romans at the.** See ROME: B. C. 343-290.

**CAUSENNÆ, OR ISINÆ.**—A town of some importance in Roman Britain. "There can be no doubt that this town occupied the site of the modern Ancaster, which has been celebrated for its Roman antiquities since the time of Leland."—T. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon*, ch. 5.

**CAVALIERS, The party of the.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1641 (OCTOBER); also, ROUNDHEADS.

**CAVE DWELLERS.**—"We find a hunting and fishing race of cave-dwellers, in the remote pleistocene age, in possession of France, Belgium, Germany, and Britain, probably of the same stock as the Eskimos, living and forming part of a fauna in which northern and southern, living and extinct, species are strangely mingled with those now living in Europe. In the neolithic age caves were inhabited, and used for tombs, by men of the Iberian or Basque race, which is still represented by the small dark-haired peoples of Europe."—W. B. Dawkins, *Cave Hunting*, p. 430.

**CAVE OF ADULLAM.** See ADULLAM, CAVE OF.

**CAVOUR, Count, and the unification of Italy.** See ITALY: A. D. 1856-1859, and 1859-1861.

**CAVOUR, Treaty of (1561).** See SAVOY: A. D. 1559-1580.

**CAWNPUR, OR CAWNPORE; A. D. 1857.**—Siege by the Sepoy mutineers.—Surrender and massacre of the English. See INDIA: A. D. 1857 (MAY—AUGUST), and 1857-1858 (JULY—JUNE).

**CAXTON PRESS, The.** See PRINTING AND THE PRESS: A. D. 1476-1491.

**CAYENNE, Colonization of.** See GUIANA: A. D. 1580-1814.

**CAYUGAS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY.

**CEADAS, The.** See BARATHRUM.

**CEBRENES, The.** See TROJA.

**CECIL, Sir William (Lord Burleigh), and the reign of Elizabeth.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1558-1598.

**CECORA, Battle of (1621).** See POLAND: A. D. 1590-1648.

**CECROPIA.—CECROPIAN HILL.**—The Acropolis of Athens. See ATTICA.

**CEDAR CREEK, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (AUGUST—OCTOBER: VIRGINIA).

**CEDAR MOUNTAIN OR CEDAR RUN, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JULY—AUGUST: VIRGINIA).

**CELESTINE II., Pope, A. D. 1143-1144.**

**... Celestine III., Pope, A. D. 1191-1198.**

**Celestine IV., Pope, A. D. 1241.**

**... Celestine V., Pope, A. D. 1294, July to December.**

**CELTIBERIANS, The.**—"The Celtiberi occupied the centre of Spain, and a large part of the two Castiles, an elevated table land bordered and intersected by mountains. They were the most warlike race in the Spanish peninsula."—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, ch. 1.*—"The appellation Celtiberians indicates that in the north-eastern part of the peninsula [Spain] there was a mixture of Celts and Iberians. Nevertheless the Iberians must have been the prevailing race, for we find no indications of Celtic characteristics in the people."—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome, bk. 5, ch. 6, note.*—See, also, NUMANTIAN WAR.

**CELTS, The.**—"The Celts form a branch of the great family of nations which has been variously called Aryan, Indo-European, Indo-Germanic, Indo-Celtic and Japhetic, its other branches being represented by the Italians, the Greeks, the Litu-Slaves, the Armenians, the Persians and the chief peoples of Hindustan. . . . The Celts of antiquity who appeared first and oftenest in history were those of Gallia, which, having been made by the French into Gaule, we term Gaul. It included the France and Switzerland of the present day, and much territory besides. This people had various names. One of them was Gall, which in their language meant warriors or brave men; . . . but the Gauls themselves in Cæsar's time appear to have preferred the name which he wrote *Celta*. This was synonymous with the other and appears to have meant warriors. . . . The Celtic family, so far back as we can trace it into the darkness of antiquity consisted of two groups or branches, with linguistic features of their own which marked them off from one another. To the one belonged the ancestors of the people who speak Gaelic in Ireland, the Isle of Man and the Highlands of the North. . . . The national name which the members of this group have always given themselves, so far as one knows, is that of *Gaidhel*, pronounced and spelt in English Gael, but formerly written by themselves *Goidel*. . . . The other group is represented in point of speech by the people of Wales and the Bretons. . . . The national name of those speaking these dialects was that of *Briton*; but, since that word has now no precise meaning, we take the Welsh form of it, which is *Brython*, and call this group *Brythons* and *Brythonic*, whenever it is needful to be exact. The ancient Gauls must also be classified with them, since the *Brythons* may be regarded as Gauls who came over to settle in Britain."—J. Rhys, *Celtic Britain, ch. 1.*—See, also, *ARYANS*, and APPENDIX A, v. 1.

**Origin and first meaning of the name.**—"Who were the *Celtae* of Spain? the population whose name occurs in the word *Celtici* and *Celtiberi*, Celtic Iberians or Iberian Celts? . . . I think, that though used to denominate the tribe and nations allied to the Gauls, it [the word *Celt* or *Kelt*] was, originally, no Gallic word—

as little native as Welsh is British. I also think that even the first populations to which it was applied were other than Celtic in the modern sense of the term. I think, in short, that it was a word belonging to the Iberian language, applied, until the time of Cæsar at least, to Iberic populations. . . . By the time of Cæsar, however, a great number of undoubted Gauls were included under the name *Celtae*: in other words, the Iberian name for an Iberian population was first adopted by the Greeks as the name for all the inhabitants of south-western Gaul, and it was then extended by the Romans so as to include all the populations of Gallia except the *Belgæ* and *Aquitaniæ*."—R. G. Latham, *Etymology of Europe, ch. 2.*

**CELTS.**—A name given among archæologists to certain prehistoric implements, both stone and bronze, of the wedge, chisel and axe kind. Mr. Thomas Wright contends that the term is properly applied only to the bronze chisels, which the old antiquary Hearn identified with the Roman *celtis*, or chisel—whence the name. It has evidently no connection with the word *Celt* used ethnologically.

**CELYDDON, Forest of (or Coed Celydon).** See BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.

**CENABUM.** See GENABUM.

**CENOMANIANS, The.** See INSUBRIANS.

**CENSORS, The Roman.**—"The censorship was an office so remarkable that, however familiar the subject may be to many readers, it is necessary here to bestow some notice on it. Its original business was to take a register of the citizens and of their property; but this, which seems at first sight to be no more than the drawing up of a mere statistical report, became in fact, from the large discretion allowed to every Roman officer, a political power of the highest importance. The censors made out the returns of the free population; but they did more; they divided it according to its civil distinctions, and drew up a list of the senators, a list of the equites, a list of the members of the several tribes, or of those citizens who enjoyed the right of voting, and a list of the *æriarii*, consisting of those freedmen, naturalized strangers, and others, who, being enrolled in no tribe, possessed no vote in the *comitia*, but still enjoyed all the private rights of Roman citizens. Now the lists thus drawn up by the censors were regarded as legal evidence of a man's condition. . . . From thence the transition was easy, according to Roman notions, to the decision of questions of right; such as whether a citizen was really worthy of retaining his rank. . . . If a man behaved tyrannically to his wife or children, if he was guilty of excessive cruelty even to his slaves, if he neglected his land, if he indulged in habits of extravagant expense, or followed any calling which was regarded as degrading, the offence was justly noted by the censors, and the offender was struck off from the list of senators, if his rank was so high; or, if he were an ordinary citizen, he was expelled from his tribe, and reduced to the class of the *æriarii*. . . . The censors had the entire management of the regular revenues of the state, or of its *vectigalia*. They were the commonwealth's stewards, and to their hands all its property was entrusted. . . . With these almost kingly powers, and arrayed in kingly state, for the censor's robe was all scarlet

. . . the censors might well seem too great for a free commonwealth."—T. Arnold, *Hist. of Rome*, ch. 17. —See, also, LUSTRUM.

**CENTRAL AMERICA: Ruins of ancient civilization.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINALS: MAYAS, and QUICHES; also, MEXICO, ANCIENT.

**Discovery and early settlement.** See AMERICA. A. D. 1498-1505; 1500-1511; 1513-1517.

**A. D. 1821-1871.—Separation from Spain, and Independence.—Attempted federation and its failures.—Wars and revolutions of the five Republics.**—"The central part of the American continent, extending from the southern boundary of Mexico to the Isthmus of Panama, consisted in the old colonial times of several Intendencies, all of which were united in the Captaincy-General of Guatemala. Like the West Indian Islands, it was a neglected part of the Spanish Empire. . . . Central America has no history up to the epoch of independence. . . . It was not until the success of the Revolution had become certain on both sides of them, both in Mexico and New Granada, that the Intendencies which made up the Captaincy-General of Guatemala declared themselves also independent of Spain. The cry of liberty had indeed been raised in Costa Rica in 1813, and in Nicaragua in 1815; but the Revolution was postponed for six years longer. Guatemala, the seat of government, published its declaration in September, 1821, and its example was speedily followed by San Salvador and Honduras. Nicaragua, on proclaiming its independence, together with one of the departments of Guatemala, declared its adhesion to what was known in Mexico as the plan of Iguala [see MEXICO: A. D. 1820-1826]. As there were no Spanish troops in Central America, the recalcitrant Spanish official party could make no resistance to the popular movement; and many of them crossed the sea to Cuba or returned to Spain. . . . The Revolution of Central America thus stands alone in the history of independence, as having been accomplished without the shedding of blood." During the brief empire of Iturbide in Mexico [see as above] the Central American states were annexed to it, though with strong resistance on the part of all except Guatemala. "On the proclamation of the Federal Republic in Mexico [1824], the whole of Central America, except the district of Chiapas, withdrew from the alliance, and drove out the Mexican officials as only a year before they had driven out the Spanish officials. The people now had to face the task of forming a government for themselves; and . . . they now resolved on combining in a federation, in imitation of the great United States of North America. Perhaps no states were ever less suited to form a federal union. The petty territories of Central America lie on two oceans, are divided by lofty mountains, and have scarcely any communication with each other; and the citizens of each have scarcely any common interest. A Central American federation, however, was an imposing idea, and the people clung to it with great pertinacity. The first effort for federation was made under the direction of General Filisola. All the Intendencies combined in one sovereign state; first under the name of the 'United Provinces,' afterwards (November 22, 1823) under that of the 'Federal Republic' of Central America. . . . A constitution of the most liberal kind was voted. This constitution is remarkable for having been the

first which abolished slavery at once and absolutely and declared the slave trade to be piracy. . . . The clerical and oligarchic party set their faces stubbornly against the execution of the constitution, and began the revolt at Leon in Nicaragua. The union broke down in 1826, and though Morazan [of Honduras] reconstituted it in 1829, its history is a record of continual rebellion and reaction on the part of the Guatemalteco oligarchy. Of all South American conservative parties this oligarchy was perhaps the most despicable. They sank to their lowest when they raised the Spanish flag in 1832. But in doing this they went too far. Morazan's successes date from this time, and having beaten the Guatemaltecos, he transferred the Federal government in 1834 to San Salvador. But the Federal Republic of Central America dragged on a precarious existence until 1838, when it was overthrown by the revolt of Carrera in Guatemala. From the first the influence of the Federalists in the capital began to decay, and it was soon apparent that they had little power except in Honduras, San Salvador and Nicaragua. The Costa Ricans, a thriving commercial community, but of no great political importance, and separated by mountainous wastes from all the rest, soon ceased to take any part in public business. A second Federal Republic, excluding Costa Rica, was agreed to in 1842; but it fared no better than the first. The chief representative of the Federalist principle in Central America was Morazan, of Honduras, from whose government Carrera had revolted in 1838. On the failure of the Federation Morazan had fled to Chile, and on his return to Costa Rica he was shot at San José by the Carrerists. This was a great blow to the Liberals, and it was not until 1847 that a third Federation, consisting of Honduras, San Salvador, and Nicaragua, was organized. For some years Honduras, at the head of these states, carried on a war against Guatemala to compel it to join the union. Guatemala was far more than their match: San Salvador and Nicaragua soon failed in the struggle, and left Honduras to carry on the war alone. Under General Carrera Guatemala completely defeated its rival; and to his successes are due the revival of the Conservative or Clerical party all over Central America. . . . The government of each state became weaker and weaker; revolutions were everywhere frequent; and ultimately . . . the whole country was near falling into the hands of a North American adventurer [see NICARAGUA: A. D. 1855-1890]. In former times the English government had maintained some connection with the country [originating with the buccannery and made important by the mahogany-cutting] through the independent Indians of the Mosquito coast, over whom, for the purposes of their trade with Jamaica, it had maintained a protectorate; and even a small English commercial colony, called Greytown, had been founded on this coast at the mouth of the river San Juan. Towards the close of Carrera's ascendancy this coast was resigned to Nicaragua, and the Bay Islands, which lie off the coast, to Honduras; and England thus retained nothing in the country but the old settlement of British Honduras, with its capital, Belize. After Carrera's death in 1865, the Liberal party began to reassert itself: and in 1871 there was a Liberal revolution in Guatemala itself."—E. J. Payne, *Hist. of Europ'n Colon's*, ch. 21.



ALSO IN: H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*.

**CENTRAL ASIA.** See ASIA, CENTRAL.

**CENTRE, The.** See RIGHT, &c.

**CENTREVILLE, Evacuation of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861-1863 (DECEMBER—MARCH; VIRGINIA).

**CENTURIES, Roman.** See COMITIA CENTURIATA.

**CENTURION.**—The officer commanding one of the fifty-five centuries or companies in a Roman legion of the empire. See LEGION, ROMAN.

**CENWULF, King of Mercia,** A. D. 704-819.

**CEORL.** See EORL, and ETHEL.

**CEPEDA, Battle of (1859).** See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1819-1874.

**CEPHISSUS, Battle of the (A. D. 1311).** See CATALAN GRAND COMPANY.

**CERAMICUS OF ATHENS.**—The Ceramicus was originally the most important of the suburban districts of Athens and derived its name from the potters. "It is probable that about the time of Pisistratus the market of the ancient suburb called the Ceramicus (for every Attic district possessed its own market) was constituted the central market of the city. . . . They [the Pisistratidæ] connected Athens in all directions by roadways with the country districts: these roads were accurately measured, and all met on the Ceramicus, in the centre of which an altar was erected to the Twelve Gods. From this centre of town and country were calculated the distances to the different country districts, to the ports, and to the most important sanctuaries of the common fatherland. . . . [In the next century—in the age of Pericles—the population had extended to the north and west and] part of the ancient potters' district or Ceramicus had long become a quarter of the city [the Inner Ceramicus]; the other part remained suburb [the Outer Ceramicus]. Between the two lay the double gate or Dipylon, the broadest and most splendid gate of the city. . . . Here the broad carriage-road which, avoiding all heights, ascended from the market-place of Hippodamus directly to the city-market of the Ceramicus, entered the city; from here straight to the west led the road to Eleusis, the sacred course of the festive processions. . . . From this road again, immediately outside the gate, branched off that which led to the Academy. . . . The high roads in the vicinity of the city gates were everywhere bordered with numerous and handsome sepulchral monuments, in particular the road leading through the outer Ceramicus. Here lay the public burial-ground for the citizens who had fallen in war; the vast space was divided into fields, corresponding to the different battle-fields at home and abroad."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 2, ch. 2, and bk. 3, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: W. M. Leake, *Topography of Athens*, sect. 3.

**CERESTES, OR KERESTES, Battle of (1596).** See HUNGARY: A. D. 1595-1806.

**CERIGNOLA, Battle of (1503).** See ITALY: A. D. 1501-1504.

**CERISOLES, Battle of (1544).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1532-1547.

**CERONES, The.** See BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.

**CERRO GORDO, Battle of.** See MEXICO: A. D. 1847 (MARCH—SEPTEMBER).

**CESS.**—A word, corrupted from "assess," signifying a rate, or tax; used especially in Scotland, and applied more particularly to a tax imposed in 1078, for the maintenance of troops, during the persecution of the Covenanters.—*A Cloud of Witnesses*, ed. by J. H. Thompson, p. 67.—*The Imp. Dict.*

**CEUTA, A. D. 1415.**—Siege and capture by the Portuguese. See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1415-1460.

**A. D. 1668.**—Ceded to Spain. See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1637-1668.

**CEVENNES, The prophets of the (or the Cévenol prophets).**—The Camisards. See FRANCE: A. D. 1702-1710.

**CEYLON, 3d Century B. C.**—Conversion to Buddhism. See INDIA: B. C. 312—

**A. D. 1802.**—Permanent acquisition by England. See FRANCE: A. D. 1801-1802.

**CHACABUCO, Battle of (1817).** See CHILE: A. D. 1810-1818.

**CHACO, The Gran.** See GRAN CHACO.

**CHÆRONEA, Battles of (B. C. 338).** See GREECE: B. C. 357-336. . . . (B. C. 86). See MITHRIDATIC WARS.

**CHAGAN.** See KHAN.

**CHA'HTAS, OR CHOCTAWS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINALS: MUSKHOGEAN FAMILY.

**CHALCEDON.**—An ancient Greek city, founded by the Megarians on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus, nearly opposite to Byzantium, like which city it suffered in early times many changes of masters. It was bequeathed to the Romans by the last king of Bithynia.

**A. D. 258.**—Capture by the Goths. See GOTHS: A. D. 258-267.

**A. D. 616-625.**—The Persians in possession. See PERSIA: A. D. 226-627.

**CHALCEDON, The Council of (A. D. 451).** See NESTORIAN AND MONOPHYSITE CONTROVERSY.

**CHALCIS AND ERETRIA.**—"The most dangerous rivals of Ionia were the towns of Eubœa, among which, in the first instance, Cyme, situated in an excellent bay of the east coast, in a district abounding in wine, and afterwards the two sister-towns on the Euripus, Chalcis and Eretria, distinguished themselves by larger measures of colonization. While Eretria, the 'city of rowers,' rose to prosperity especially by means of purple-fisheries and a ferry-navigation conducted on a constantly increasing scale, Chalcis, the 'bronze city,' on the double sea of the Boeotian sound, contrived to raise and employ for herself the most important of the many treasures of the island—its copper. . . . Chalcis became the Greek centre of this branch of industry; it became the Greek Sldon. Next to Cyprus there were no richer stores of copper in the Greek world than on Eubœa, and in Chalcis were the first copper-works and smithies known in European Greece."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 2, ch. 8.—The Chalcidians were enterprising colonists, particularly in Thrace, in the Macedonian peninsula, where they are said to have founded thirty-two towns, which were collectively called the Chalcidice, and in southern Italy and Sicily. It was the abundant wealth of

Thrace in metallic ores which drew the Chalcidians to it. About 700 B. C. a border feud between Chalcis and Eretria, concerning certain "Lelantian fields" which lay between them, grew to such proportions and so many other states came to take part in it, that, "according to Thucydides no war of more universal importance for the whole nation was fought between the fall of Troya and the Persian war."—The same, *v. 1, bk. 2, ch. 1.*—Chalcis was subdued by the Athenians in B. C. 506. See ATHENS: B. C. 509-506; also KLERUCHS, and EURGEA.

**CHALCUS.** See TALENT.

**CHALDEA.—CHALDEES.** See BABYLONIA.

**CHALDEAN CHURCH.** See NESTORIANS.

**CHALDIRAN, Battle of (1514).** See TURKS: A. D. 1481-1520.

**CHALGROVE FIELD, Fall of Hampden at.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1643 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER).

**CHALONS, Battles at (A. D. 271).**—Among the many pretenders to the Roman imperial throne—"the thirty tyrants," as they were called—of the distracted reign of Gallienus, was Tetricus, who had been governor of Aquitaine. The dangerous honor was forced upon him, by a demoralized army, and he reigned against his will for several years over Gaul, Spain and Britain. At length, when the iron-handed Aurelian had taken the reins of government at Rome, Tetricus secretly plotted with him for deliverance from his own uncoveted greatness. Aurelian invaded Gaul and Tetricus led an army against him, only to betray it, in a great battle at Chalons (271), where the rebels were cut to pieces.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 11.

**A. D. 366.** See ALEMANNI, INVASION OF GAUL BY THE.

**A. D. 451.** See HUNS: A. D. 451, ATTLA'S INVASION OF GAUL.

**CHALYBES, The.**—The Chalybes, or Chalybians, were an ancient people in Asia Minor, on the coast of the Euxine, probably east of the Halys, who were noted as workers of iron.—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 22, note A.

**CHAMAVI, The.** See BRUCTERI; also, FRANKS; also, GAUL: A. D. 355-361.

**CHAMBERS OF REANNEKATON, French.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1679-1681.

**CHAMBERSBURG, Burning of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (JULY: VIRGINIA—MARYLAND).

**CHAMPAGNE: Origin of the county.**—In the middle years of the revolt that dethroned the Carolingians and raised the Capetians to a throne which they made the throne of a kingdom of France, Count Herbert of Vermandois allied himself with the party of the latter, and began operations for the expanding of his domain. "The Campaign of Rheims, the 'Campania Remensis'—a most appropriate descriptive denomination of the region—an extension of the plains of Flanders—but not yet employed politically as designating a province—was protected against Count Herbert on the Vermandois border by the Castrum Theodorici—Château Thierry. . . . Herbert's profuse promises induced the commander to betray his duty. . . . Herbert, through this occupation of Château Thierry,

obtained the city of Troyes and all the 'Campania Remensis,' which, under his potent sway, was speedily developed into the magnificent County of Champagne. Herbert and his lineage held Champagne during three generations, until some time after the accession of the Capets, when the Grand Fief passed from the House of Vermandois to the House of Blois."—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and Eng.*, v. 2, p. 192.

**CHAMPEAUBERT, Battle of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (JANUARY—MARCH).

**CHAMPIGNY, Sortie of (1870).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1870-1871.

**CHAMPION'S HILL, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (APRIL—JULY: ON THE MISSISSIPPI).

**CHAMPLAIN, Samuel.—Explorations and Colonizations.** See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1603-1605; 1608-1611; and 1611-1616.

**CHAMPLAIN, Lake: A. D. 1776.**—Arnold's naval battle with Carleton. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776-1777.

**A. D. 1814.—Macdonough's naval victory.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1814 (SEPTEMBER).

**CHAMPS DE MARS.—CHAMPS DE MAI.**—When the Merovingian kings of the Franks summoned their captives to gather for the planning and preparing of campaigns, the assemblies were called at first the Champs de Mars, because the meeting was in earliest spring—in March. "But as the Franks, from serving on foot, became cavaliers under the second [the Carolingian] race, the time was changed to May, for the sake of forage, and the assemblies were called Champs de Mai."—E. E. Crowe, *Hist. of France*, ch. 1.—See, also, MALLUM, and PARLIAMENT OF PARIS.

**CHANCAS, The.** See PERU: THE ANTIQUARIAL INHABITANTS.

**CHANCELLOR, The.**—"The name [of the Chancellor], derived probably from the cancell or screen behind which the secretarial work of the royal household was carried on, claims a considerable antiquity; and the offices which it denotes are various in proportion. The chancellor of the Karolingian sovereigns, succeeding to the place of the more ancient referendarius, is simply the royal notary; the archi-cancellarius is the chief of a large body of such officers associated under the name of the chancery, and is the keeper of the royal seal. It is from this minister that the English chancellor derives his name and function. Edward the Confessor, the first of our sovereigns who had a seal, is also the first who had a chancellor; from the reign of the Conqueror the office has descended in regular succession. It seems to have been to a comparatively late period, generally if not always, at least in England, held by an ecclesiastic who was a member of the royal household and on a footing with the great dignitaries. The chancellor was the most dignified of the royal chaplains, if not the head of that body. The whole secretarial work of the household and court fell on the chancellor and the chaplains. . . . The chancellor was, in a manner, the secretary of state for all departments."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 11, sect. 121.—"In the reign of Edward I. we begin to perceive signs of the rise of the extraordinary or equitable jurisdiction of the Chancellor. The numerous petitions addressed to the King and

his Council, seeking the interposition of the royal grace and favour either to mitigate the harshness of the Common Law or supply its deficiencies, had been in the special care of the Chancellor, who examined and reported upon them to the King. . . . At length, in 1348, by a writ or ordinance of the 23d year of Edward III. all such matters as were 'of Grace' were directed to be dispatched by the Chancellor or by the Keeper of the Privy Seal. This was a great step in the recognition of the equitable jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery, as distinct from the legal jurisdiction of the Chancellor and of the Courts of Common Law; although it was not until the following reign that it can be said to have been permanently established.—"T. P. Taswell-Langmead, *Eng. Const. Hist.*, pp. 173-174.—"The Lord Chancellor is a Privy Councillor by his office; a Cabinet Minister; and, according to Lord Chancellor Ellesmere, prolocutor [chairman, or Speaker] of the House of Lords by prescription."—A. C. Ewald, *The Crown and its Adversers*, lect. 2.

ALSO IN: E. Fischel, *The English Constitution*, bk. 5, ch. 7.

**CHANCELLOR'S ROLLS.** See EXCHEQUER.—EXCHEQUER ROLLS.

**CHANCELLORSVILLE, Battles of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (APRIL—MAY); VIRGINIA).

**CHANCERY.** See CHANCELLOR.

**CHANDRAGUPTA, OR CANDRAGUPTA, The empire of.** See INDIA: B. C. 327-312, and 312—

**CHANEERS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**CHANTILLY, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER); VIRGINIA).

**CHANTRY PRIESTS.**—"With the more wealthy and devout [in the 14th, 15th and 16th centuries] it was the practice to erect little chapels, which were either added to churches or enclosed by screens within them, where chantry priests might celebrate mass for the good of their souls in perpetuity. . . . Large sums of money were . . . devoted to the maintenance of chantry priests, whose duty it was to say mass for the repose of the testator's soul. . . . The character and conduct of the chantry priests must have become somewhat of a lax order in the 16th century."—R. R. Sharpe, *Int. to "Calendar of Wills in the Court of Husting, London,"* v. 2, p. ciii.

**CHAOUANONS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SHAWANESE.

**CHAPAS, OR CHAPANECES, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ZAPOTEC, &C.

**CHAPULTEPEC, Battle of.** See MEXICO: A. D. 1847 (MARCH—SEPTEMBER).

**CHARCAS, Las.**—The Spanish province which now forms the Republic of Bolivia. Also called, formerly, Upper Peru, and sometimes the province of Potosí.—See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1580-1777; and BOLIVIA: A. D. 1825-1826.

**CHARIBERT I., King of Aquitaine.** A. D. 501-567. . . . Charibert II., King of Aquitaine, A. D. 628-631.

**CHARITON RIVER, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JULY—SEPTEMBER); MISSOURI—ARKANSAS).

**CHARLEMAGNE'S EMPIRE.** See FRANKS (CARLOVINGIAN EMPIRE): A. D. 768-814; ROMAN EMPIRE: A. D. 800; LOMBARDS: A. D.

754-774; SAXONS: A. D. 772-804; AVARS: 791-805; and SPAIN: A. D. 778.

**CHARLEMAGNE'S SCHOOL OF THE PALACE.** See SCHOOL OF THE PALACE.

**CHARLEROI: A. D. 1667.**—Taken by the French. See NETHERLANDS (THE SPANISH PROVINCES): A. D. 1667.

**A. D. 1668.**—Ceded to France. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1668.

**A. D. 1679.**—Restored to Spain. See NIMEGUEN, THE PEACE OF.

**A. D. 1693.**—Siege and capture by the French. See FRANCE: A. D. 1693 (JULY).

**A. D. 1697.**—Restored to Spain. See FRANCE: A. D. 1697.

**A. D. 1713.**—Ceded to Holland. See UTRECHT: A. D. 1713-1714.

**A. D. 1746-1748.**—Taken by French and ceded to Austria. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1746-1747, and AIX-LA-CHAPELLE, THE CONGRESS.

**CHARLES (called The Great—Charlemagne), King of Neustria, A. D. 768; of all the Franks, A. D. 771; of Franks and Lombardy, 774; Emperor of the West, 800-814. . . . Charles of Austria, Archduke, Campaigns of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1796 (APRIL—OCTOBER); 1796-1797 (OCTOBER—APRIL); 1797 (APRIL—MAY); 1798-1799 (AUGUST—APRIL); 1799 (AUGUST—DECEMBER); also GERMANY: 1800 (JANUARY—JUNE), (JULY—SEPTEMBER). . . . Charles of Bourbon, King of Naples or the Two Sicilies, 1734-1759. . . . Charles (called The Bold), Duke of Burgundy, 1467-1477. . . . Charles I., King of England, 1025-1049.—Trial and execution. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1049 (JANUARY). . . . Charles I. (of Anjou), King of Naples and Sicily, 1266-1282; King of Naples, 1282-1285. . . . Charles I., King of Portugal, 1869. . . . Charles II. (called The Bald), Emperor, and King of Italy, A. D. 875-877; King of Neustria and Burgundy, 840-877. . . . Charles II., King of England, 1660-1685. (By a loyal fiction, supposed to have reigned from 1649, when his father was beheaded; though the throne was in Cromwell's possession). . . . Charles II., King of Naples, 1285-1309. . . . Charles II., King of Navarre, 1349-1387. . . . Charles II., King of Spain, 1665-1700. . . . Charles III. (called The Fat), Emperor, King of the East Franks (Germany), and King of Italy, A. D. 881-888; King of the West Franks (France), 884-888. . . . Charles III. (called The Simple), King of France, A. D. 892-929. . . . Charles III., King of Naples, 1381-1386. . . . Charles III., King of Navarre, 1387-1425. . . . Charles III., King of Spain, 1759-1788. . . . Charles IV., Emperor, and King of Italy, 1355-1378; King of Bohemia, 1346-1378; King of Germany, 1347-1378; King of Burgundy, 1365-1378. . . . Charles IV., King of France, and of Navarre (Charles I.), 1322-1328. . . . Charles IV., King of Spain, 1788-1808. . . . Charles V., Emperor, 1519-1558; Duke of Burgundy, 1506-1555; King of Spain (as Charles I.) and of Naples, or the Two Sicilies, 1516-1556. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1496-1526. . . . Charles V. (called The Wise), King of France, 1364-1380. . . . Charles VI., Germanic Emperor, and King of Hungary and Bohemia, 1711-1740. . . . Charles VI. (called The Well-loved), King of France, 1380-1422. . . . Charles VII. (of Bavaria), Germanic Emperor, 1742-1745. . . . Charles VII., King of France, 1422-1461. . . .

Charles VIII., King of France, 1483-1498. ....  
 Charles IX., King of France, 1560-1574. ....  
 Charles IX., King of Sweden, 1604-1611. ....  
 Charles X., King of France (the last of the House of Bourbon), 1824-1830. ....  
 Charles X., King of Sweden, 1654-1660. ....  
 Charles XI., King of Sweden, 1660-1697. ....  
 Charles XII., King of Sweden, 1697-1718. ....  
 Charles XIII., King of Sweden, 1809-1818. ....  
 Charles XIV. (Bernadotte), King of Sweden, 1818-1844. ....  
 Charles XV., King of Sweden, 1859-1872. ....  
 Charles Albert, Duke of Savoy and King of Sardinia, 1831-1849. ....  
 Charles Emanuel, Duke of Savoy, 1580-1630. ....  
 Charles Emanuel II., Duke of Savoy, 1638-1675. ....  
 Charles Emanuel III., Duke of Savoy and King of Sardinia, 1730-1773. ....  
 Charles Emanuel IV., Duke of Savoy and King of Sardinia, 1790-1802. ....  
 Charles Felix, Duke of Savoy and King of Sardinia, 1821-1831. ....  
 Charles Martel, Duke of Austrasia and Mayor of the Palace (of the King of the Franks), A. D. 715-741. ....  
 Charles Robert, or Charobert, or Caribert, King of Hungary, 1308-1342. ....  
 Charles Swerkeron, King of Sweden, 1161-1167.

**CHARLESTON, S. C.:** A. D. 1680.—The founding of the city. See SOUTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1670-1696.

A. D. 1706.—Unsuccessful attack by the French. See SOUTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1701-1706.

A. D. 1775-1776.—Revolutionary proceedings. See SOUTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1775 and 1776.

A. D. 1776.—Sir Henry Clinton's attack and repulse. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776 (JUNE).

A. D. 1780.—Siege by the British.—Surrender of the city. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1780 (FEBRUARY—AUGUST).

A. D. 1860.—The splitting of the National Democratic Convention. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1860 (APRIL—NOVEMBER).

A. D. 1860.—The adoption of the Ordinance of Secession. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1860 (NOVEMBER—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1860.—Major Anderson at Fort Sumter. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1860 (DECEMBER).

A. D. 1861 (April).—The Beginning of war.—Bombardment of Fort Sumter. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (MARCH—APRIL).

A. D. 1863 (April).—The attack and repulse of the Monitor fleet. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (APRIL; SOUTH CAROLINA).

A. D. 1863 (July).—The Union troops on Morris Island.—Assault on Fort Wagner. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (JULY; SOUTH CAROLINA).

A. D. 1863 (August—December).—Siege of Fort Wagner.—Bombardment of the city. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (AUGUST—DECEMBER; SOUTH CAROLINA).

A. D. 1865 (February).—Evacuation by the Confederates.—Occupation by Federal troops. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (FEBRUARY; SOUTH CAROLINA).

**CHARLESTOWN, Mass.:** A. D. 1623.—The first settlement. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1629-1630.

**CHARTER OAK, The.** See CONNECTICUT: A. D. 1685-1687.

**CHARTER OF FORESTS.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1216-1274.

**CHARTERHOUSE, OR CHARTREUSE.** See CARTHUSIAN ORDER.

**CHARTISTS.—CHARTISM.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1838-1842, and 1848.

**CHARTRES, Defeat of the Normans at.**—The Norman, Rollo, investing the city of Chartres, sustained there, on the 20th of July, A. D. 911, the most serious defeat which he and his pirates ever suffered.—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and Eng.*, bk. 1, ch. 5.

**CHARTREUSE, La Grande.** See CARTHUSIAN ORDER.

**CHASIDIM, OR CHASIDEES, OR ASSIDEANS, The.**—A name, signifying the godly or pious, assumed by a party among the Jews, in the second century B. C., who resisted the Grecianizing tendencies of the time under the influence of the Greco-Syrian domination, and who were the nucleus of the Maccabean revolt. The later school of the Pharisees is represented by Ewald (*Hist. of Israel*, bk. 5, sect. 2) to have been the product of a narrowing transformation of the school of the Chasidim; while the Essenes, in his view, were a purer residue of the Chasidim "who strove after piety, yet would not join the Pharisees"; who abandoned "society as worldly and incurably corrupt," and in whom "the conscience of the nation, as it were, withdrew into the wilderness."—H. Ewald, *Hist. of Israel*, bk. 5, sect. 2.—A modern sect, borrowing the name, founded by one Israel Baal Sehem, who first appeared in Podolia, in 1740, is said to embrace most of the Jews in Galicia, Hungary, Southern Russia, and Wallachia.—H. C. Adams, *Hist. of the Jews*, p. 338.

ALSO IN: H. Grätz, *Hist. of the Jews*, v. 5, ch. 9.

**CHASARII, The.** See FRANKS: ORIGIN, ETC.

**CHÂTEAU CAMBRESIS, Treaty of (1550).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1547-1559.

**CHÂTEAU GALLAIRD.**—This was the name given to a famous castle, built by Richard Cœur de Lion in Normandy, and designed to be the key to the defences of that important duchy. "As a monument of warlike skill, his 'Saucy Castle,' Château Galliard, stands first among the fortresses of the Middle Ages. Richard fixed its site where the Seine bends suddenly at Gailion in a great semicircle to the north, and where the Valley of Les Andély's breaks the line of the chalk cliffs along its bank. The castle formed part of an entrenched camp which Richard designed to cover his Norman capital. . . . The easy reduction of Normandy on the fall of Château Galliard at a later time [when it was taken by Phillip Augustus, of France] proved Richard's foresight."—J. R. Green, *Short Hist. of the English People*, ch. 2, sect. 9.

**CHÂTEAU THIERRY, Battle of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (JANUARY—MARCH).

**CHÂTEAUVIEUX, Fête to the soldiers of.** See LIBERTY CAP.

**CHATHAM, Lord; Administration of.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1757-1760; 1760-1763, and 1765-1768. . . . And the American Revolution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775 (JANUARY—MARCH).

**CHÂTILLON, Battles of (1793).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (JULY—DECEMBER).

**CHÂTILLON-SUR-SEINE, Congress of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (JANUARY—MARCH).

**CHATTANOOGA: The name.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER: TENNESSEE).

**A. D. 1862.—Secured by the Confederates.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (JUNE—OCTOBER: TENNESSEE—KENTUCKY).

**A. D. 1863 (August).—Evacuation by the Confederates.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER: TENNESSEE).

**A. D. 1863 (October—November).—The siege.—The battle on Lookout Mountain.—The assault of Missionary Ridge.—The Routing of Bragg's army.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (OCTOBER—NOVEMBER: TENNESSEE).

**CHATTI, OR CATTI, The.**—"Beyond [the Mattiac] are the Chatti, whose settlements begin at the Hercynian forest, where the country is not so open and marshy as in the other cantons into which Germany stretches. They are found where there are hills, and with them grow less frequent, for the Hercynian forest keeps close till it has seen the last of its native Chatti. Hardy frames, close-knit limbs, fierce countenances, and a peculiarly vigorous courage, mark the tribe. For Germans, they have much intelligence and sagacity. . . . Other tribes you see going to battle, the Chatti to a campaign."—"The settlements of the Chatti, one of the chief German tribes, apparently coincide with portions of Westphalia, Nassau, Hesse-Darmstadt and Hesse-Cassel. Dr. Latham assumes the Chatti of Tacitus to be the Suevi of Cæsar. The fact that the name Chatti does not occur in Cæsar renders this hypothesis by no means improbable."—Tacitus, *Germany, trans. by Church and Brodrick, and note.*—See, also, SUEVI.

**CHAUCER, and his times.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1350-1400.

**CHAUCI AND CHERUSCI, The.**—"The tribe of the Chauci . . . beginning at the Frisian settlements and occupying a part of the coast, stretches along the frontier of all the tribes which I have enumerated, till it reaches with a bend as far as the Chatti. This vast extent of country is not merely possessed but densely peopled by the Chauci, the noblest of the German races, a nation who would maintain their greatness by righteous dealing. Without ambition, without lawless violence, . . . the crowning proof of their valour and their strength is, that they keep up their superiority without harm to others. . . . Dwelling on one side of the Chauci and Chatti, the Cherusci long cherished, unassailed, an excessive and enervating love of peace. This was more pleasant than safe, . . . and so the Cherusci, ever reputed good and just, are now called cowards and fools, while in the case of the victorious Chatti success has been identified with prudence. The downfall of the Cherusci brought with it also that of the Fosi, a neighbouring tribe."—"The settlements of the Chauci . . . must have included almost the entire country between the Rhine and the Weser—that is, Oldenburg and a portion of Hanover—and have taken in portions of Westphalia about Munster and Paderborn. The Cherusci . . . appear to have occupied Brunswick and the south part of Hanover. Arminius who destroyed the Roman army under Varus, was a Cheruscan chief. . . . The Fosi . . . must have occupied part of Hanover."—Tacitus, *Minor Works, trans.*

*by Church and Brodrick: The Germany, with Geog. notes.*—Bishop Stubbs conjectures that the Chauci, Cherusci, and some other tribes may have been afterwards comprehended under the general name "Saxon." See SAXONS.

**CHAZARS, The.** See KHAZARS.

**CHEAT SUMMIT, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (AUGUST—DECEMBER: WEST VIRGINIA).

**CHEBUCTO.**—The original name of the harbor chosen for the site of the city of Halifax. See NOVA SCOTIA: A. D. 1749-1755, and HALIFAX: A. D. 1749.

**CHEIROTANIA.**—A vote by show of hands, among the ancient Greeks.—G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State, pt. 3, ch. 3.*

**CHEMI.** See EGYPT: ITS NAMES.

**CHEMNITZ, Battle of (1639).** See GERMANY: A. D. 1634-1639.

**CHERBOURG.**—Destroyed by the English. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1758 (JULY—AUGUST).

**CHEROKEE WAR, The.** See SOUTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1759-1761.

**CHEROKEES, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: CHEROKEES.

**CHERONESUS, The proposed State of.** See NORTHWEST TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1784.

**CHERRY VALLEY, The massacre at.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778 (JUNE—NOVEMBER).

**CHERSON.** See BOSPORUS: A. D. 565-574.

**A. D. 988.—Taken by the Russians.**—"A thousand years after the rest of the Greek nation was sunk in irremediable slavery, Cherson remained free. Such a phenomenon as the existence of manly feeling in one city, when mankind everywhere else slept contented in a state of political degradation, deserved attentive consideration. . . . Cherson retained its position as an independent State until the reign of Theophilus [Byzantine emperor A. D. 829-842], who compelled it to receive a governor from Constantinople; but, even under the Byzantine government, it continued to defend its municipal institutions, and, instead of slavishly soliciting the imperial favour, and adopting Byzantine manners, it boasted of its constitution and self government. But it gradually lost its former wealth and extensive trade, and when Vladimir, the sovereign of Russia, attacked it in 988, it was betrayed into his hands by a priest, who informed him how to cut off the water. . . . Vladimir obtained the hand of Anne, the sister of the emperors Basil II. and Constantine VIII., and was baptised and married in the church of the Panaghia at Cherson. To soothe the vanity of the Empire, he pretended to retain possession of his conquest as the dowry of his wife. Many of the priests who converted the Russians to Christianity, and many of the artists who adorned the earliest Russian churches with paintings and mosaics, were natives of Cherson."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine Empire from 716 to 1057.*

**CHERONESE, The Golden.** See CHRYSE.

**CHERONESUS.**—The Greek name for a peninsula, or "land-island," applied most especially to the long tongue of land between the Hellespont and the Gulf of Melas.

**CHERUSCI, The.** See CHAUCI.

**CHESAPEAKE AND SHANNON, The fight of the.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812-1813.

**CHESS, Origin of the game of.**—"If we wished to know, for instance, who has taught us the game of chess, the name of chess would tell us better than anything else that it came to the West from Persia. In spite of all that has been written to the contrary, chess was originally the game of Kings, the game of Shahs. This word Shah became in Old French eschac, It. scacco, Germ. Schach; while the Old French eschecs was further corrupted into chess. The more original form chee has likewise been preserved, though we little think of it when we draw a cheque, or when we suffer a check, or when we speak of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The great object of the chess-player is to protect the king, and when the king is in danger, the opponent is obliged to say 'check,' i. e., Shah, the king. . . . After this the various meanings of check, cheque, or exchequer become easily intelligible, though it is quite true that if similar changes of meaning, which in our case we can watch by the light of history, had taken place in the dimness of prehistoric ages, it would be difficult to convince the sceptic that exchequer, or scaccarium, the name of the chess-board was afterwards used for the checkered cloth on which accounts were calculated by means of counters, and that a checkered career was a life with many cross-lines."—F. Max Müller, *Bioq. of Words*, ch. 4.

**CHESTER, Origin of.** See DEVA.

**CHESTER, The Palatine Earldom.** See PALATINE, THE ENGLISH COUNTIES; also WALES, PRINCE OF.

**CHESTER, Battle of.**—One of the fiercest of the battles fought between the Welsh and the Angles. A. D. 613. The latter were the victors.

**CHEVY CHASE.** See OTTERBURN, BATTLE OF.

**CHEYENNES, OR SHEYENNES, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUAN FAMILY.

**CHIAPAS: Ruins of ancient civilization in.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: MAYAS; and MEXICO, ANCIENT.

**CHIARI, Battle of (1701).** See ITALY (SAVOY AND PIEDMONT): A. D. 1701-1713.

**CHIBCHAS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: CHIBCHAS.

**CHICAGO: A. D. 1812.—Evacuation of the Fort Dearborn Post, and massacre of most of the retreating garrison.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812 (JUNE—OCTOBER).

**A. D. 1860.—The Republican National Convention.—Nomination of Lincoln.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1860 (APRIL—NOVEMBER).

**A. D. 1871.—The great Fire.**—"The greatest event in the history of Chicago was the Great Fire, as it is termed, which broke out on the evening of Oct. 8, 1871. Chicago was at that time [except in the business centre] a city of wood. For a long time prior to the evening referred to there had been blowing a hot wind from the southwest, which had dried everything to the inflammability of tinder, and it was upon a mass of sun and wind-dried wooden structures that the fire began its work. It is supposed to have originated from the accidental upsetting of a kerosene lamp in a cow barn [Mrs. O'Leary's]

on De Koven Street, near the corner of Jefferson, on the west side of the river. This region was composed largely of shanties, and the fire spread rapidly, very early crossing the river to the South Side, and fastening on that portion of the city which contained nearly all the leading business houses, and which was built up very largely with stone and brick. But it seemed to enkindle as if it were tinder. Some buildings were blown up with gunpowder, which, in connection with the strong southwest gale, prevented the extension of the flames to the south. The fire swept on Monday steadily to the north including everything from the lake to the South Branch, and then crossed to the North Side, and, taking in everything from the lake to the North Branch, it burned northward for a distance of three miles, where it died out at the city limits, when there was nothing more to burn. In the midst of this broad area of devastation, on the north side of Washington Square, between Clark Street and Dearborn Avenue, the well-known Ogden house stands amid trees of the ancient forest and surrounded by extensive grounds, the solitary relic of that section of the city before the fiery flood. The total area of the land burned over was 2,100 acres. Nearly 20,000 buildings were consumed; 100,000 people were rendered homeless; 200 lives were lost, and the grand total of values destroyed is estimated at \$200,000,000. Of this vast sum, nearly one-half was covered by insurance, but under the tremendous losses many of the insurance companies were forced to the wall, and went into liquidation, and the victims of the conflagration recovered only about one-fifth of their aggregate losses. Among the buildings which were burned were the court-house, custom-house and post office, chamber of commerce, three railway depots, nine daily newspaper offices, thirty-two hotels, ten theatres and halls, eight public schools and some branch school buildings, forty-one churches, five elevators, and all the national banks. If the Great Fire was an event without parallel in its dimensions and the magnitude of its dire results, the charity which followed it was equally unrivalled in its extent. . . . All the civilized world appeared to instantly appreciate the calamity. Food, clothing, supplies of every kind, money, messages of affection, sympathy, etc., began pouring in apace in a stream that appeared endless and bottomless. In all, the amount contributed reached over \$7,000,000. . . . It was believed by many that the fire had forever blotted out Chicago from the list of great American cities, but the spirit of her people was undaunted by calamity, and, encouraged by the generous sympathy and help from all quarters, they set to work at once to repair their almost ruined fortunes. . . . Rebuilding was at once commenced, and, within a year after the fire, more than \$40,000,000 were expended in improvements. The city came up from its ruins far more palatial, splendid, strong and imperishable than before. In one sense the fire was a benefit. Its consequence was a class of structures far better, in every essential respect, than before the conflagration. Fire-proof buildings became the rule, the limits of wood were carefully restricted, and the value of the reconstructed portion immeasurably exceeded that of the city which had been destroyed."—*Marquis' Handbook of Chicago*, p. 22.—"Thousands of people on the North Side fled far out on the prairie, but other thousands, less fortunate, were

hemmed in before they could reach the country, and were driven to the Sands, a group of beach-hillocks fronting on Lake Michigan. These had been covered with rescued merchandise and furniture. The flames fell fiercely upon the heaps of goods, and the miserable refugees were driven into the black waves, where they stood neck-deep in chilling water, scorched by sheets of sparks and blowing sand. A great number of horses had been collected here, and they too dashed into the sea, where scores of them were drowned. Toward evening the Mayor sent a fleet of tow-boats which took off the fugitives at the Sands. When the next day [Tuesday, October 10] dawned, the prairie was covered with the calcined ruins of more than 17,000 buildings. . . . This was the greatest and most disastrous conflagration on record. The burning of Moscow, in 1812, caused a loss amounting to £30,000,000; but the loss at Chicago was in excess of this amount. The Great Fire of London, in 1666, devastated a tract of 436 acres, and destroyed 13,000 buildings; but that of Chicago swept over 1,000 acres, and burned more than 17,000 buildings."—M. F. Sweetser, *Chicago* ("Cities of the World," v. 1). — The following is the statement of area burned over, and of property destroyed, made by the Chicago Relief and Aid Society, and which is probably authoritative: "The total area burned over in the city, including streets, was 2,124 acres, or nearly three and one-third square miles. This area contained about 73 miles of streets, 18,000 buildings, and the homes of 100,000 people."—A. T. Andreas, *Hist. of Chicago*, v. 2, p. 760.

ALSO IN: E. Colbert and E. Chamberlain, *Chicago and the Great Conflagration*.

**A. D. 1886-1887.—The Haymarket Conspiracy.—Crime of the Anarchists.—Their trial and execution.**—"In February, 1886, Messrs. McCormick, large agricultural-machine makers of Chicago, refusing to yield to the dictation of their workmen, who required them to discharge some non-Union hands they had taken on, announced a 'lock-out,' and prepared to resume business as soon as possible with a new staff. Spies, Lingg, and other German Anarchists saw their opportunity. They persuaded the ousted workmen to prevent the 'scabs,'—anglicé, 'blacklegs,'—from entering the works on the day of their reopening. Revolvers, rifles, and bombs were readily found, the latter being entrusted principally to the hands of professional 'Reds.' The most violent appeals were made to the members of Unions and the populace generally; but though a succession of riots were got up, they were easily quelled by the resolute action of the police, backed by the approval of the immense majority of the people of Chicago. Finally, a mass meeting in arms was called to take place on May 4th, 1886, at 7.30 p.m., in the Haymarket, a long and recently widened street of the town, for the express purpose of denouncing the police. But the intention of the Anarchists was not merely to denounce the police: this was the pretext only. The prisons were to be forced, the police-stations blown up, the public buildings attacked, and the onslaught on property and capital to be inaugurated by the devastation of one of the fairest cities of the Union. By 8 p. m. a mob of some three or four thousand persons had been collected, and were regaled by speeches that became more violent as the night wore on. At 10 p. m. the police

appeared in force. The crowd were commanded to disperse peaceably. A voice shouted: 'We are peaceable.' Captain Schanck says this was a signal. The words were hardly uttered when 'a spark flashed through the air. It looked like the lighted remnant of a cigar, but hissed like a miniature sky-rocket.' It was a bomb, and fell amid the ranks of the police. A terrific explosion followed, and immediately afterwards the mob opened fire upon the police. The latter, stunned for a moment, soon recovered themselves, returned the fire, charged the mob, and in a couple of minutes dispersed it in every direction. But eight of their comrades lay dead upon the pavement, and scores of others were weltering in their blood around the spot. Such was the Chicago outrage of May 4th, 1886."—*The Spectator*, Apr. 19, 1890 (reviewing Schanck's "*Anarchy and Anarchists*").—The Anarchists who were arrested and brought to trial for this crime were eight in number,—August Spies, Michael Schwab, Samuel Fielden, Albert R. Parsons, Adolph Fischer, George Engel, Louis Lingg, and Osenar W. Neebe. The trial began July 14, 1886. The evidence closed on the 10th of August; the argument of counsel consumed more than a week, and on the 20th of August the jury brought in a verdict which condemned Neebe to imprisonment for fifteen years, and all the other prisoners to death. Lingg committed suicide in prison; the sentences of Schwab and Fielding were commuted by the Governor to imprisonment for life; the remaining four were hanged on the 11th of November, 1887.—Judge Gary, *The Chicago Anarchists of 1886* (*Century Mag.*, April, 1893).

ALSO IN: M. J. Schanck, *Anarchy and Anarchists*.

**A. D. 1892-1893.—The World's Columbian Exposition.**—"As a fitting mode of celebrating the four hundredth anniversary of the landing of Columbus on Oct. 12, 1492, it was proposed to have a universal exhibition in the United States. The idea was first taken up by citizens of New York, where subscriptions to the amount of \$5,000,000 were obtained from merchants and capitalists before application was made for the sanction and support of the Federal Government. When the matter came up in Congress the claims of Chicago were considered superior, and a bill was passed and approved on April 25, 1890, entitled 'An Act to provide for celebrating the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus, by holding an international exhibition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the soil, mine, and sea in the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois.' The act provided for the appointment of commissioners who should organize the exposition. . . . When the organization was completed and the stipulated financial support from the citizens and municipality of Chicago assured, President Harrison, on Dec. 24, 1890, issued a proclamation inviting all the nations of the earth to participate in the World's Columbian Exposition. Since the time was too short to have the grounds and buildings completed for the summer of 1892, as was originally intended, the opening of the exposition was announced for May, 1893. When the work was fairly begun it was accelerated, as many as 10,000 workmen being employed at one time, in order to have the buildings ready to be dedi-

cated with imposing ceremonies on Oct. 12, 1802, in commemoration of the exact date of the discovery of America."—*Appleton's Annual Cyclopaedia*, 1891, p. 837.—On May 1, 1893, the Fair was opened with appropriate ceremonies by President Cleveland.

**CHICASAS, The.** See AMERICAN INDIANS; MUSKHOGEAN FAMILY; also, LOUISIANA: A. D. 1719-1750.

**CHICHIMECS, The.** See MEXICO: A. D. 1325-1502.

**CHICKAHOMINY, Battles on the (Gaines' Mill, 1862; Cold Harbor, 1864).** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JUNE—JULY: VIRGINIA); and 1864 (MAY—JUNE: VIRGINIA).

**CHICKAMAUGA, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER: TENNESSEE).

**CHICORA.**—The name given to the region of South Carolina by its Spanish discoverers. See AMERICA: A. D. 1519-1525.

**CHILDEBERT I., King of the Franks, at Paris, A. D. 511-558.** . . . **Childebert II., King of the Franks (Austrasia), A. D. 575-596;** (Burgundy), 593-596. . . . **Childebert III., King of the Franks (Neustria and Burgundy), A. D. 695-711.**

**CHILDERIC II., King of the Franks (Austrasia), A. D. 600-673.** . . . **Childeric III., King of the Franks (Neustria), A. D. 742-752.**

**CHILDREN OF REBECCA.** See REBECCAITES.

**CHILDREN'S CRUSADE, The.** See CRUSADES: A. D. 1212.

**CHILE: The Araucanians.**—"The land of Chili, from 30° south latitude, was and is still in part occupied by several tribes who speak the same language. They form the fourth and most southern group of the Andes people, and are called Araucanians. Like almost all American tribal names, the term Araucanians is indefinite; sometimes it is restricted to a single band, and sometimes so extended as to embrace a group of tribes. Some regard them as a separate family, calling them Chilians, while others, whom we follow, regard them as the southern members of the Andes group, and still others class them with the Pampas Indians. The name Araucanian is an improper one, introduced by the Spaniards, but it is so firmly fixed that it cannot be changed. The native names are *Moluche* (warriors) and *Akapuche* (natives). Originally they extended from Coquimbo to the Chonos Archipelago and from ocean to ocean, and even now they extend, though not very far, to the east of the Cordilleras. They are divided into four (or, if we include the *Picunche*, five) tribes, the names of which all end in 'tche' or 'che,' the word for man. Other minor divisions exist. The entire number of the Araucanians is computed at about 30,000 souls, but it is decreasing by sickness as well as by vice. They are owners of their land and have cattle in abundance, pay no taxes, and even their labor in the construction of highways is only light. They are warlike, brave, and still enjoy some of the blessings of the Inca civilization; only the real, western Araucanians in Chili have attained to a sedentary life. Long before the arrival of the Spaniards the government of the Araucanians offered a striking resemblance to the military aristocracy of the old world. All the rest that has been written of their high stage of

culture has proved to be an empty picture of fancy. They followed agriculture, built fixed houses, and made at least an attempt at a form of government, but they still remain, as a whole, cruel, plundering savages."—*The Standard Natural Hist. (J. S. Kingsley, ed.), v. 6, pp. 232-234.*—"The Araucanians inhabit the delightful region between the Andes and the sea, and between the rivers Bio-bio and Valdivia. They derive the appellation of Araucanians from the province of Arauco. . . . The political division of the Araucanian state is regulated with much intelligence. It is divided from north to south into four governments. . . . Each government is divided into five provinces, and each province into nine counties. The state consists of three orders of nobility, each being subordinate to the other, and all having their respective vassals. They are the Toquis, the Apo-Ulmenes, and the Ulmenes. The Toquis, or governors, are four in number. They are independent of each other, but confederated for the public welfare. The Arch-Ulmenes govern the provinces under their respective Toquis. The Ulmenes govern the counties. The upper ranks, generally, are likewise comprehended under the term Ulmenes."—R. G. Watson, *Spanish and Portuguese S. Am., v. 1, ch. 12.*

ALSO IN: J. I. Molina, *Geog., Natural and Civil Hist. of Chili, v. 2, bk. 2.*

**A. D. 1450-1724.—The Spanish conquest.—The Araucanian War of Independence.**—"In the year 1450 the Peruvian Inca, Yupanqui, desirous of extending his dominions towards the south, stationed himself with a powerful army at Atacama. Thence he dispatched a force of 10,000 men to Chili, under the command of Chinchiruca, who, overcoming almost incredible obstacles, marched through a sandy desert as far as Copiapo, a distance of 80 leagues. The Copiapinos flew to arms, and prepared to resist this invasion. But Chinchiruca, true to the policy which the Incas always observed, stood upon the defensive, trusting to persuasion rather than to force for the accomplishment of his designs. . . . While he proffered peace, he watched them of the consequences of resisting the 'Children of the Sun.'" After wavering for a time, the Copiapinos submitted themselves to the rule of the Incas. "The adjoining province of Coquimbo was easily subdued, and steadily advancing, the Peruvians, some six years after their first entering the country, firmly established themselves in the valley of Chili, at a distance of more than 200 leagues from the frontier of Atacama. The 'Children of the Sun' had met thus far with little resistance, and, encouraged by success, they marched their victorious armies against the Purumancians, a warlike people living beyond the river Rapel." Here they were desperately resisted, in a battle which lasted three days, and from which both armies withdrew, undefeated and unvictorious. On learning this result, the Inca Yupanqui ordered his generals to relinquish all attempts at further conquest, and to "seek, by the introduction of wise laws, and by instructing the people in agriculture and the arts, to establish themselves more firmly in the territory already acquired. To what extent the Peruvians were successful in the endeavor to ingraft their civilization, religion, and customs upon the Chilians, it is at this distant day impossible to determine, since the earliest



historians differ widely on the subject. Certain it is, that on the arrival of the Spaniards the Incas, at least nominally, ruled the country, and received an annual tribute of gold from the people. In the year 1535, after the death of the unfortunate Inca Atahualpa, Diego Almagro, fired by the love of glory and the thirst for gold, yielded to the solicitations of Francisco Pizarro, the conqueror of Peru, and set out for the subjection of Chili, which, as yet, had not been visited by any European. His army consisted of 570 Spaniards, well equipped, and 15,000 Peruvian auxiliaries. Regardless of difficulties and dangers this impetuous soldier selected the near route that lay along the summits of the Andes, in preference to the more circuitous road passing through the desert of Atacama. Upon the horrors of this march, of which so thrilling an account is given by Prescott in the 'Conquest of Peru,' it is unnecessary for us to dwell; suffice it to state that, on reaching Copiapo no less than one-fourth of his Spanish troops, and two-thirds of his Indian auxiliaries, had perished from the effects of cold, fatigue and starvation. . . . Everywhere the Spaniards met with a friendly reception from the natives, who regarded them as a superior race of beings, and the after conquest of the country would probably have been attended with no difficulty had a conciliatory policy been adopted; but this naturally inoffensive people, aroused by acts of the most barbarous cruelty, soon flew to arms. Despite the opposition of the natives, who were now rising in every direction to oppose his march, Almagro kept on, overcoming every obstacle, until he reached the river Cachapoal, the northern boundary of the Purumancian territory." Here he met with so stubborn and effective a resistance that he abandoned his expedition and returned to Peru, where, soon after, he lost his life [see PERU: A. D. 1533-1548] in a contest with the Pizarros. "Pizarro, ever desirous of conquering Chili, in 1540 dispatched Pedro Valdivia for that purpose, with some 200 Spanish soldiers and a large body of Peruvians." The invasion of Valdivia was opposed from the moment he entered the country; but he pushed on until he reached the river Mapocho, and "encamped upon the site of the present capital of Chili. Valdivia, finding the location pleasant, and the surrounding plain fertile, here founded a city on the 24th of February, 1541. To this first European settlement in Chili he gave the name of Santiago, in honor of the patron saint of Spain. He laid out the town in Spanish style; and as a place of refuge in case of attack, erected a fort upon a steep rocky hill, rising some 200 feet above the plain." The Mapochins soon attacked the infant town, drove its people to the fort and burned their settlement; but were finally repulsed with dreadful slaughter. "On the arrival of a second army from Peru, Valdivia, whose ambition had always been to conquer the southern provinces of Chili, advanced into the country of the Purumancians. Here history is probably defective, as we have no account of any battles fought with these brave people. . . . We simply learn that the Spanish leader eventually gained their good-will, and established with them an alliance both offensive and defensive. . . . In the following year (1546) the Spanish forces crossed the river Maulé, the southern boundary of the Purumancians, and advanced

toward the Itata. While encamped near the latter river, they were attacked at dead of night by a body of Araucanians. So unexpected was the approach of this new enemy, that many of the horses were captured, and the army with difficulty escaped total destruction. After this terrible defeat, Valdivia finding himself unable to proceed, returned to Santiago." Soon afterwards he went to Peru for reinforcements and was absent two years; but came back, at the end of that time, with a large band of followers, and marched to the South. "Reaching the bay of Talcahuano without having met with any opposition, on the 5th of October, 1550, he founded the city of Concepcion on a site at present known as Penco." The Araucanians, advancing boldly upon the Spaniards at Concepcion, were defeated in a furious battle which cost the invaders many lives. Three years later, in December, 1553, the Araucanians had their revenge, routing the Spaniards utterly and pursuing them so furiously that only two of their whole army escaped. Valdivia was among the prisoners taken and was slain. Again and again, under the lead of a youthful hero, Lautaro, and a vigorous toqui, or chief, named Caupolican, the Araucanians assailed the invaders of their country with success; but the latter increased in numbers and gained ground, at last, for a time, building towns and extending settlements in the Araucanian territory. The indomitable people were not broken in spirit, however; and in 1598, by an universal and simultaneous rising, they expelled the Spaniards from almost every settlement they had made. "In 1602 . . . of the numerous Spanish forts and settlements south of the Bio-Bio, Nacimiento and Arauco only had not fallen. Valdivia and Osorno were afterward rebuilt. About the same time a fort was erected at Boron. This fort was soon after abandoned. Valdivia, Osorno, Nacimiento, and Arauco still remain. But of all the 'cities of the plain' lying within the boundaries of the haughty Araucanians, not one ever rose from its ashes; their names exist only in history; and the sites where they once flourished are now marked by ill-defined and grass-grown ruins. From the period of their fall dates the independence of the Araucanian nation; for though a hundred years more were wasted in the vain attempt to reconquer the heroic people . . . the Spaniards, weary of constant war, and disheartened by the loss of so much blood and treasure, were finally compelled to sue for peace; and in 1724 a treaty was ratified, acknowledging their freedom, and establishing the limits of their territory."—E. R. Smith, *The Araucanians*, ch. 11-14.

ALSO IN: R. G. Watson, *Spanish and Portuguese S. Am.*, v. 1, ch. 12-14.—J. I. Molina, *Geog., Natural and Civil Hist. of Chili*, v. 2, bk. 1, 3-4.

A. D. 1568.—The Audiencia established. See AUDIENCIAS.

A. D. 1810-1818.—The achievement of independence.—San Martin, the Liberator.—"Chili first threw off the Spanish yoke in September, 1810 [on the pretext of fidelity to the Bourbon king dethroned by Napoleon], but the national independence was not fully established till April 1818. During the intermediate period, the dissensions of the different parties; their disputes as to the form of government and the law of election; with other distracting causes, arising out of the ambition of turbulent individuals, and the inexperience of the whole nation in political

affairs; so materially retarded the union of the country, that the Spaniards, by sending expeditions from Peru, were enabled, in 1814, to regain their lost authority in Chili. Meanwhile the Government of Buenos Ayres, the independence of which had been established in 1810 [see ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1806-1820], naturally dreaded that the Spaniards would not long be confined to the western side of the Andes; but would speedily make a descent upon the provinces of the River Plate, of which Buenos Ayres is the capital. In order to guard against this formidable danger, they bravely resolved themselves to become the invaders, and by great exertions equipped an army of 4,000 men. The command of this force was given to General Don José de San Martín, a native of the town of Yapeyu in Paraguay; a man greatly beloved by all ranks, and held in such high estimation by the people, that to his personal exertions the formation of this army is chiefly due. With these troops San Martín entered Chili by a pass over the Andes heretofore deemed inaccessible, and on the 12th of February, 1817, attacked and completely defeated the royal army at Chacabuco. The Chilians, thus freed from the immediate presence of the enemy, elected General O'Higgins [see PERU: A. D. 1820-1826] as Director; and he, in 1818, offered the Chilians a constitution, and nominated five senators to administer the affairs of the country. This meritorious officer, an Irishman by descent, though born in Chili, has since [1825] remained at the head of the government. It was originally proposed to elect General San Martín as Director; but this he steadily refused, proposing his companion in arms, O'Higgins, in his stead. The remnant of the Spanish army took refuge in Talcuhuana, a fortified sea-port near Concepcion, on the southern frontier of Chili. Vigorous measures were taken to reduce this place, but, in the beginning of 1818, the Viceroy of Peru, by draining that province of its best troops, sent off a body of 5,000 men under General Osorio, who succeeded in joining the Spaniards shut up in Talcuhuana. Thus reinforced, the Royal army, amounting in all to 8,000, drove back the Chilians, marched on the capital, and gained other considerable advantages; particularly in a night attack at Talca, on the 10th of March 1818, where the Royalists almost entirely dispersed the Patriot forces. San Martín, however, who, after the battle of Chacabuco, had been named Commander-in-chief of the united armies of Chili and Buenos Ayres, rallied his army and equipped it anew so quickly that, "on the 5th of April, only 17 days after his defeat, he engaged, and, after an obstinate and sanguinary conflict, completely routed the Spanish army on the plains of Maypo. From that day Chili may date her complete independence; for although a small portion of the Spanish troops endeavoured to make a stand at Concepcion, they were soon driven out and the country left in the free possession of the Patriots. Having now time to breathe, the Chilean Government, aided by that of Buenos Ayres, determined to attack the Royalists in their turn, by sending an armament against Peru [see PERU: A. D. 1820-1826]—a great and bold measure, originating with San Martín."—Capt. B. Hall, *Extracts from a Journal*, v. 1, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: J. Miller, *Memoirs of General Miller*, ch. 4-7 (v. 1).—T. Sutcliffe, *Sixteen Years in Chili*

and Peru, ch. 2-4.—Gen. B. Mitre, *The Emancipation of S. America: Hist. of San Martín*.

A. D. 1820-1826.—Operations in Peru. See PERU: A. D. 1820-1826.

A. D. 1833-1884.—A successful oligarchy and its constitution.—The war with Peru and Bolivia.—"After the perfection of its national independence, the Chilean government soon passed into the permanent control of civilians, 'while the other governments of the west coast remained prizes for military chieftains.' Its present constitution was framed in 1833, and though it is only half a century old 'it is the oldest written national constitution in force in all the world except our own, unless the Magna Charta of England be included in the category.' The political history of Chile during the fifty years of its life has been that of a well ordered commonwealth, but one of a most unusual and interesting sort. Its government has never been forcibly overthrown, and only one serious attempt at revolution has been made. Chile is in name and in an important sense a republic, and yet its government is an oligarchy. Suffrage is restricted to those male citizens who are registered, who are twenty-five years old if unmarried and twenty-one if married, and who can read and write; and there is also a stringent property qualification. The consequence is that the privilege of voting is confined to an aristocracy: in 1876, the total number of ballots thrown for president was only 46,114 in a population of about two and a quarter millions. The president of Chile has immense powers of nomination and appointment, and when he is a man of vigorous will he tyrannically sways public policy, and can almost always dictate the name of his successor. The government has thus become practically vested in a comparatively small number of leading Chilean families. There is no such thing as 'public opinion' in the sense in which we use the phrase, and the newspapers, though ably conducted, do not attempt, as they do not desire, to change the existing order of things. 'History,' says Mr. Browne, 'does not furnish an example of a more powerful political "machine" under the title of republic; nor, I am bound to say, one which has been more ably directed so far as concerns the aggrandizement of the country, or more honestly administered so far as concerns pecuniary corruption.' The population of Chile doubled between 1843 and 1875; the quantity of land brought under tillage was quadrupled; . . . more than 1,000 miles of railroad were built; a foreign export trade of \$31,695,039 was reported in 1878; and two powerful iron-clads, which were destined to play a most important part in Chilean affairs, were built in England. Meanwhile, the constitution was officially interpreted so as to guarantee religious toleration, and the political power of the Roman Catholic priesthood diminished. Almost everything good, except home manufactures and popular education, flourished. The development of the nation in these years was on a wonderful scale for a South American state, and the contrast between Chile and Peru was peculiarly striking. . . . Early in 1879 began the great series of events which were to make the fortune of Chile. We use the word 'great,' in its low, superficial sense, and without the attribution of any moral significance to the adjective. The aggressor in

the war between Chile and Peru was inspired by the most purely selfish motives, and it remains to be seen whether the just gods will not win in the long run, even though the game of their antagonists be played with heavily plated iron-clads. . . . At the date last mentioned Chile was suffering, like many other nations, from a general depression in business pursuits. Its people were in no serious trouble, but as a government it was in a bad way. . . . The means to keep up a sinking fund for the foreign debt had failed, and the Chilean five per cents were quoted in London at sixty-four. 'A political cloud also was darkening again in the north, in the renewal of something like a confederation between Peru and Bolivia.' In this state of things the governing oligarchy of Chile decided, rather suddenly, Mr. Browne thinks, upon a scheme which was sure to result either in splendid prosperity or absolute ruin, and which contemplated nothing less than a war of conquest against Peru and Bolivia, with a view to seizing the most valuable territory of the former country. There is a certain strip of land bordering upon the Pacific and about 400 miles long, of which the northern three quarters belonged to Peru and Bolivia, the remaining one quarter to Chile. Upon this land a heavy rain never falls, and often years pass in which the soil does not feel a shower. . . . Its money value is immense. 'From this region the world derives almost its whole supply of nitrates—chiefly saltpetre—and of iodine;' its mountains, also, are rich in metals, and great deposits of guano are found in the highlands bordering the sea. The nitrate-bearing country is a plain, from fifty to eighty miles wide, the nitrate lying in layers just below a thin sheet of impacted stones, gravel, and sand. The export of saltpetre from this region was valued in 1882 at nearly \$30,000,000, and the worth of the Peruvian section, which is much the largest and most productive, is estimated, for government purposes, at a capital of \$600,000,000. Chile was, naturally, well aware of the wealth which lay so close to her own doors, and to possess herself thereof, and thus to rehabilitate her national fortunes, she addressed herself to war. The occasion for war was easily found. Bolivia was first attacked, a difficulty which arose at her port of Antofagasta, with respect to her enforcement of a tax upon some nitrate works carried on by a Chilean company, affording a good pretext; and when Peru attempted intervention her envoy was confronted with Chile's knowledge of a secret treaty between Peru and Bolivia, and war was formally declared by Chile upon Peru, April 5, 1879. This war lasted, with some breathing spaces, for almost exactly five years. At the outset the two belligerent powers—Bolivia being soon practically out of the contest—seemed to be about equal in ships, soldiers, and resources; but the supremacy which Chile soon gained upon the seas substantially determined the war in her favor. Each nation owned two powerful iron-clads, and six months were employed in settling the question of naval superiority. . . . On the 21st of May, 1879, the Peruvian fleet attacked and almost destroyed the Chilean wooden frigates which were blockading Iquique; but in chasing a Chilean corvette the larger Peruvian iron-clad—the *Independencia*—ran too near the shore, and was fatally wrecked.

'So Peru lost one of her knights. The game she played with the other—the *Huascar*—was admirable, but a losing one;' and on the 8th of October of the same year the *Huascar* was attacked by the Chilean fleet, which included two iron-clads, and was finally captured 'after a desperate resistance.' . . . From this moment the Peruvian coast was at Chile's mercy: the Chilean arms prevailed in every pitched battle, at San Francisco [November 16, 1879], at Tacna [May 26, 1880], at Arica [June 7, 1880]; and finally, on the 17th of January, 1881, after a series of actions which resembled in some of their details the engagements that preceded our capture of the city of Mexico [ending in what is known as the Battle of Miraflores], the victorious army of Chile took possession of Lima, the capital of Peru. . . . The results of the war have thus far exceeded the wildest hopes of Chile. She has taken absolute possession of the whole nitrate region, has cut Bolivia off from the sea, and achieved the permanent dissolution of the Peru-Bolivian confederation. As a consequence, her foreign trade has doubled, the revenue of her government has been trebled, and the public debt greatly reduced. The Chilean bonds, which were sold at 64 in London in January, 1879, and fell to 60 in March of that year, at the announcement of the war, were quoted at 95 in January, 1881.'—*The Growing Power of the Republic of Chile* (*Atlantic Monthly*, July, 1884).

ALSO IN: H. Birkedal, *The late War in S. Am.* (*Overland Monthly*, Jan., Feb., and March, 1884).—C. R. Markham, *The War bet. Peru and Chile*.—R. N. Boyd, *Chile*, ch. 16-17.—*Message of the Pres't of the U. S., transmitting Papers relating to the War in S. Am., Jan. 26, 1882*.—T. W. Knox, *Decisive Battles since Waterloo*, ch. 23.—See, also, PERU: A. D. 1826-1876.

A. D. 1885-1891.—The presidency and dictatorship of Balmaceda.—His conflict with the Congress.—Civil war.—'Save in the one struggle in which the parties resorted to arms, the political development of Chili was free from civil disturbances, and the ruling class was distinguished among the Spanish-American nations not only for wealth and education, but for its talent for government and love of constitutional liberty. The republic was called 'the England of South America,' and it was a common boast that in Chili a pronunciamiento or a revolution was impossible. The spirit of modern Liberalism became more prevalent. . . . As the Liberal party became all-powerful it split into factions, divided by questions of principle and by struggles for leadership and office. . . . The patronage of the Chilean President is enormous, embracing not only the general civil service, but local officials, except in the municipalities, and all appointments in the army and navy and in the telegraph and railroad services and the giving out of contracts. The President has always been able to select his successor, and has exercised this power, usually in harmony with the wishes of influential statesmen, sometimes calling a conference of party chiefs to decide on a candidate. In the course of time the more advanced wing of the Liberals grew more numerous than the Moderates. The most radical section had its nucleus in a Reform Club in Santiago, composed of young university men, of whom Balmaceda was the finest orator. Entering Congress in 1868, he took a leading part in

debates. . . . In 1885 he was the most popular man in the country; but his claim to the presidential succession was contested by various other aspirants—older politicians and leaders of factions striving for supremacy in Congress. He was elected by an overwhelming majority, and as President enjoyed an unexampled degree of popularity. For two or three years the politicians who had been his party associates worked in harmony with his ideas. . . . At the flood of the democratic tide he was the most popular man in South America. But when the old territorial families saw the seats in Congress and the posts in the civil service that had been their prerogative filled by new men, and fortunes made by upstarts where all chances had been at their disposal, then a reaction set in, corruption was scented, and Moderate Liberals, joining hands with the Nationalists and the reviving Conservative party, formed an opposition of respectable strength. In the earlier part of his administration Balmaceda had the co-operation of the Nationalists, who were represented in the Cabinet. In the last two years of his term, when the time drew near for selecting his successor, defection and revolt and the rivalries of aspirants for the succession threw the party into disorder and angered its hitherto unquestioned leader. . . . In January, 1890, the Opposition were strong enough to place their candidate in the chair when the House of Representatives organized. The ministry resigned, and a conflict between the Executive and legislative branches of the Government was openly begun when the President appointed a Cabinet of his own selection. . . . This ministry had to face an overwhelming majority against the President, which treated him as a dictator and began to pass hostile laws and resolutions that were vetoed, and refused to consider the measures that he recommended. The ministers were cited before the Chambers and questioned about the manner of their appointment. They either declined to answer, or answered in a way that increased the animosity of Congress, which finally passed a vote of censure, in obedience to which, as was usual, the Cabinet resigned. Then Balmaceda appointed a ministry in open defiance of Congress, with Sanfuentes at its head, the man who was already spoken of as his selected candidate for the presidency. He prepared for the struggle that he invited by removing the chiefs of the administration of the departments and replacing them with men devoted to himself and his policy, and making changes in the police, the militia, and, to some extent, in the army and navy commands. The press denounced him as a dictator, and indignation meetings were held in every town. Balmaceda and his supporters pretended to be not only the champions of the people against the aristocracy, but of the principle of Chile for the Chilians."—*Appleton's Annual Cyclop.*, 1891, pp. 123-124.—"The conflict between President Balmaceda and Congress ripened into revolution. On January 1, 1891, the Opposition members of the Senate and House of Deputies met, and signed an Act declaring that the President was unworthy of his post, and that he was no longer head of the State nor President of the Republic, as he had violated the Constitution. On January 7 the navy declared in favour of the Legislature, and against Balmaceda. The President denounced the navy as traitors, abolished all

the laws of the country, declared himself Dictator, and proclaimed martial law. It was a reign of terror. The Opposition recruited an army in the Island of Santa Maria under General Urrutia and Commander Canto. On February 14 a severe fight took place with the Government troops in Iquique, and the Congressional army took possession of Pisagua. In April, President Balmaceda . . . delivered a long message, denouncing the navy. . . . The contest continued, and April 7, Arica, in the province of Tarapaca, was taken by the revolutionists. Some naval fights occurred later, and the iron-clad Blanco Encalada was blown up by the Dictator's torpedo cruisers. Finally, on August 21, General Canto landed at Concon, ten miles north of Valparaiso. Balmaceda's forces attacked immediately and were routed, losing 3,500 killed and wounded. The Congress army lost 600. On the 25th a decisive battle was fought at Placilla, near Valparaiso. The Dictator had 12,000 troops, and the opposing army 10,000. Balmaceda's forces were completely routed after five hours' hard fighting, with a loss of 1,500 men. Santiago formally surrendered, and the triumph of the Congress party was complete. A Junta, headed by Señor Jorge Montt, took charge of affairs at Valparaiso August 30. Balmaceda, who had taken refuge at the Argentine Legation in Santiago, was not able to make his escape, and to avoid capture, trial, and punishment, committed suicide, September 20, by shooting himself. On the 19th November Admiral Jorge Montt was chosen by the Electoral College, at Santiago, President of Chile, and on December 20 he was installed with great ceremony and general rejoicings."—*Annual Register*, 1891, p. 420.

**CHILIARCHS.**—Captains of thousands, in the army of the Vandals.—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, bk. 3, ch. 2.

**CHILLIANWALLAH, Battle of (1849).** See INDIA: A. D. 1845-1849.

**CHILPERIC I., King of the Franks (Neustria), A. D. 561-584. . . . Chilperic II., King of the Franks, A. D. 715-720.**

**CHILTERN HUNDREDS, Applying for the Stewardship of the.**—A seat in the British House of Commons "cannot be resigned, nor can a man who has once formally taken his seat for one constituency throw it up and contest another. Either a disqualification must be incurred, or the House must declare the seat vacant." The necessary disqualification can be incurred by accepting an office of profit under the Crown,—within certain official categories. "Certain old offices of nominal value in the gift of the Treasury are now granted, as of course, to members who wish to resign their seats in order to be quit of Parliamentary duties or to contest another constituency. These offices are the Stewardship of the Chiltern Hundreds [Crown property in Buckinghamshire], of the manors of East Hendred, Northstead, or Hempsholme, and the escheatorship of Munster. The office is resigned as soon as it has operated to vacate the seat and sever the tie between the member and his constituents."—Sir W. R. Anson, *Law and Custom of the Const.*, v. 1, p. 84.

**CHIMAKUAN FAMILY, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: CHIMAKUAN FAMILY.

**CHIMARIKAN FAMILY, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: CHIMARIKAN FAMILY.

## CHINA.

**The names of the Country.**—"That spacious seat of ancient civilization which we call China has loomed always so large to western eyes, . . . that, at eras far apart, we find it to have been distinguished by different appellations according as it was regarded as the terminus of a southern sea-route coasting the great peninsula and islands of Asia, or as that of a northern land route traversing the longitude of that continent. In the former aspect the name applied has nearly always been some form of the name Sín, Chín, Sínæ, China. In the latter point of view the region in question was known to the ancients as the land of the Seres; the middle ages as the Empire of Cathay. The name of China has been supposed, like many another word and name connected with trade and geography of the far east, to have come to us through the Malays, and to have been applied by them to the great eastern monarchy from the style of the dynasty of Tsin, which a little more than two centuries before our era enjoyed a brief but very vigorous existence. . . . There are reasons however for believing that the name of China must have been bestowed at a much earlier date, for it occurs in the laws of Manu, which assert the Chínas to have been degenerate Kshatriyas, and in the Mahabharat, compositions many centuries older than the imperial dynasty of Tsin. . . . This name may have yet possibly been connected with the Tsin, or some monarchy of like dynastic title; for that dynasty had reigned locally in Shensi from the 9th century before our era; and when, at a still earlier date, the empire was partitioned into many small kingdoms, we find among them the dynasties of the Tchin and the Ching. . . . Some at least of the circumstances which have been collected . . . render it the less improbable that the Sínim of the prophet Isalah . . . should be truly interpreted as indicating the Chinese. The name of China in this form was late in reaching the Greeks and Romans, and to them it probably came through people of Arabian speech, as the Arabs, being without the sound of 'ch,' made the Chir'a of the Hindus and Malays into Sín, and perhaps sometimes into Thín. Hence the Thín of the author of the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea, who appears to be the first extant author to employ the name in this form; hence also the Sínæ and Thínæ of Ptolemy. . . . If we now turn to the Seres we find this name mentioned by classic authors much more frequently and at an earlier date by at least a century. The name is familiar enough to the Latin poets of the Augustan age, but always in a vague way. . . . The name of Seres is probably from its earliest use in the west identified with the name of the silkworm and its produce, and this association continued until the name ceased entirely to be used as a geographical expression. . . . It was in the days of the Mongols . . . that China first became really known to Europe, and that by a name which, though especially applied to the northern provinces, also came to bear a more general application, Cathay. This name, Khitai, is that by which Chín'a is styled to this day by all, or nearly all, the nations which know it from an inland point of view, including the Russians, the Persians, and the nations of Turkestan; and yet it originally belonged to a people who were not Chinese at

all. The Khitans were a people of Manchu race, who inhabited for centuries a country to the north-east of China." During a period between the 10th and 12th centuries, the Khitans acquired supremacy over their neighbours and established an empire which embraced Northern China and the adjoining regions of Tartary. "It must have been during this period, ending with the overthrow of the dynasty [called the Leao or Iron Dynasty] in 1123, and whilst this northern monarchy was the face which the Celestial Empire turned to Inner Asia, that the name of Khitan, Khitai, or Khital, became indissolubly associated with China."—H. Yule, *Cathay and the Way Thither: Preliminary Essay*.

**The Origin of the People and their early History.**—"The origin of the Chinese race is shrouded in some obscurity. The first records we have of them represent them as a band of immigrants settling in the north-eastern provinces of the modern empire of China, and fighting their way amongst the aborigines, much as the Jews of old forced their way into Canaan against the various tribes which they found in possession of the land. It is probable that though they all entered China by the same route, they separated into bands almost on the threshold of the empire, one body, those who have left us the records of their history in the ancient Chinese books, apparently followed the course of the Yellow River, and, turning southward with it from its northernmost bend, settled themselves in the fertile districts of the modern provinces of Shansi and Honan. But as we find also that at about the same period a large settlement was made as far south as Annam, of which there is no mention in the books of the northern Chinese, we must assume that another body struck directly southward through the southern provinces of China to that country. The question then arises, where did these people come from? and the answer which recent research [see *BABYLONIA PRIMITIVE*] gives to this question is, from the south of the Caspian Sea. . . . In all probability, the outbreak in Susiana of, possibly, some political disturbance, in about the 24th or 23rd century B. C., drove the Chinese from the land of their adoption, and that they wandered eastward until they finally settled in China and the countries south of it. . . . It would appear also that the Chinese came into China possessed of the resources of Western Asian culture. They brought with them a knowledge of writing and astronomy, as well as of the arts which primarily minister to the wants and comfort of mankind. The invention of these civilising influences is traditionally attributed to the Emperor Hwang-te, who is said to have reigned from B. C. 2697-2597. But the name of this sovereign leads us to suppose that he never sat on the throne in China. One of his names, we are told, was Nai, anciently Nak, and in the Chinese paleographical collection he is described by a character composed of a group of phonetics which read Nak-kon-ti. The resemblance between this name and that of Nakhunte, who, according to the Sísian texts, was the chief of the gods, is sufficiently striking, and many of the attributes belonging to him are such as to place him on an equality with the Sísian deity. In exact accordance also with the system

of Babylonian chronology he established a cycle of twelve years, and fixed the length of the year at 360 days composed of twelve months, with an intercalary month to balance the surplus time. He further, we are told, built a Ling tai, or observatory, reminding us of the Babylonian Zigguratu, or house of observation, 'from which to watch the movements of the heavenly bodies.' The primitive Chinese, like the Babylonians, recognised five planets besides the sun and moon, and, with one exception, knew them by the same names. . . . The various phases of these planets were carefully watched, and portents were derived from every real and imaginary change in their relative positions and colours. A comparison between the astrological tablets translated by Professor Sayce and the astrological chapter (27th) in the She ke, the earliest of the Dynastic Histories, shows a remarkable parallelism, not only in the general style of the forecasts, but in particular portents which are so contrary to Chinese prejudices, as a nation, and the train of thought of the people that they would be at once put down as of foreign origin, even if they were not found in the Babylonian records. . . . In the reign of Chwan Hu (2513-2435 B. C.), we find according to the Chinese records, that the year, as among the Chaldeans, began with the third month of the solar year, and a comparison between the ancient names of the months given in the Uih ya, the oldest Chinese dictionary, with the Accadian equivalents, shows, in some instances, an exact identity. . . . These parallelisms, together with a host of others which might be produced, all point to the existence of an early relationship between Chinese and Mesopotamian culture; and, armed with the advantages thus possessed, the Chinese entered into the empire over which they were ultimately to over-spread themselves. But they came among tribes who, though somewhat inferior to them in general civilisation, were by no means destitute of culture. . . . Among such people, and others of a lower civilisation, such as the Jungs of the west and the Tekks, the ancestors of the Tekke Turcomans, in the north, the Chinese succeeded in establishing themselves. The Emperor Ynou (2356-2255 B. C.) divided his kingdom into twelve portions, presided over by as many Pastors, in exact imitation of the duodenary feudal system of Susa with their twelve Pastor Princes. To Ynou succeeded Shun, who carried on the work of his predecessor of consolidating the Chinese power with energy and success. In his reign the first mention is made of religious worship. . . . In Shun's reign occurred the great flood which inundated most of the provinces of the existing empire. The waters, we are told, rose to so great a height, that the people had to betake themselves to the mountains to escape death. The disaster arose, as many similar disasters, though of a less magnitude, have since arisen, in consequence of the Yellow River bursting its bounds, and the 'Great Yu' was appointed to lead the waters back to their channel. With unremitting energy he set about his task, and in nine years succeeded in bringing the river under control. . . . As a reward for the services he had rendered to the empire, he was invested with the principality of Hea, and after having occupied the throne conjointly with Shun for some years, he succeeded that sovereign on his death, in 2208 B. C. With Yu began the dynasty

of Hea, which gave place, in 1766 B. C., to the Shang Dynasty. The last sovereign of the Hea line, Kieh kwei, is said to have been a monster of iniquity, and to have suffered the just punishment for his crimes at the hands of T'ang, the prince of the State of Shang, who took his throne from him. In like manner, 640 years later, Woo Wang, the prince of Chow, overthrew Chou Sin, the last of the Shang Dynasty, and established himself as the chief of the sovereign state of the empire. By empire it must not be supposed that the empire, as it exists at present, is meant. The China of the Chow Dynasty lay between the 33rd and 38th parallels of latitude, and the 106th and 119th of longitude only, and extended over no more than portions of the provinces of Pih chih-li, Shansé, Shense, Honan, Keang-se, and Shan-tung. This territory was re-arranged by Woo Wang into the nine principalities established by Yu. . . . Woo is held up in Chinese history as one of the model monarchs of antiquity. . . . Under the next ruler, K'ang (B. C. 1078-1053), the empire was consolidated, and the feudal princes one and all acknowledged their allegiance to the ruling house of Chow. . . . From all accounts there speedily occurred a marked degeneracy in the characters of the Chow kings. . . . Already a spirit of lawlessness was spreading far and wide among the princes and nobles, and wars and rumours of wars were creating misery and unrest throughout the country. . . . The hand of every man was against his neighbour, and a constant state of internecine war succeeded the peace and prosperity which had existed under the rule of 'Woo-wang. . . . As time went on and the disorder increased, supernatural signs added their testimony to the impending crisis. The brazen vessels upon which Yu had engraved the nine divisions of the empire were observed to shake and totter as though foreshadowing the approaching change in the political position. Meanwhile Ts'in on the northwest, Ts'oo on the south, and Tsin on the north, having vanquished all the other states, engaged in the final struggle for the mastery over the confederate principalities. The ultimate victory rested with the state of Ts'in, and in 255 B. C., Chaou-seang Wang became the acknowledged ruler over the 'black-haired' people. Only four years were given him to reign supreme, and at the end of that time he was succeeded by his son Heaou-wan Wang, who died almost immediately on ascending the throne. To him succeeded Chwang-seang Wang, who was followed in 246 B. C. by Che Hwang-te, the first Emperor of China. The abolition of feudalism, which was the first act of Che Hwang-te raised much discontent among those to whom the feudal system had brought power and emoluments, and the countenance which had been given to the system by Confucius and Mencius made it desirable—so thought the emperor—to demolish once for all their testimony in favour of that condition of affairs, which he had decreed should be among the things of the past. With this object he ordered that the whole existing literature, with the exception of books on medicine, agriculture, and divination should be burned. The decree was obeyed as faithfully as was possible in the case of so sweeping an ordinance, and for many years a night of ignorance rested on the country. The construction of one gigantic work—the Great Wall of China—has made

the name of this monarch as famous as the destruction of the books has made it infamous. Finding the Hsiung-nu Tartars were making dangerous inroads into the empire, he determined with characteristic thoroughness to build a huge barrier which should protect the northern frontier of the empire through all time. In 214 B. C. the work was begun under his personal supervision, and though every endeavor was made to hasten its completion he died (209) leaving it unfinished. His death was the signal for an outbreak among the dispossessed feudal princes, who, however, after some years of disorder, were again reduced to the rank of citizens by a successful leader, who adopted the title of Kaou-te, and named his dynasty that of Han (206). From that day to this, with occasional interregnums, the empire has been ruled on the lines laid down by Che Hwang-te. Dynasty has succeeded dynasty, but the political tradition has remained unchanged, and though Mongols and Manchoos have at different times wrested the throne from its legitimate heirs, they have been engulfed in the homogeneous mass inhabiting the empire, and instead of impressing their seal on the country have become but the reflection of the vanquished. The dynasties from the beginning of the earlier Han, founded, as stated above, by Kaou-te, are as follows:—The earlier Han Dynasty B. C. 206—A. D. 25; the late Han A. D. 25—220; the Wei 220—280; the western Tsin 265—317; the eastern Tsin 317—420; the Sung 420—479; the Ts'e 479—502; the Leang 502—557; the Ch'iu 557—589. Simultaneously with these—the northern Wei A. D. 386—534; the western Wei 535—557; the eastern Wei 534—550; the northern Ts'e 550—577; the northern Chow 557—589. The Suy 589—618; the Tang 618—907; the later Leang 907—923; the later Tang 923—936; the later Tsin 936—947; the later Han 947—951; the later Chow 951—960; the Sung 960—1127; the southern Sung 1127—1280; the Yuen 1280—1368; the Ming 1368—1644; the Ts'ing 1644. Simultaneously with some of these—the Leau 907—1125; the western Leau 1125—1168; the Kin 1115—1280.”—R. K. Douglas, *China*, ch. 1.

Also in D. C. Boulger, *Hist of China*, v. 1—2.

**The Religions of the People.—Confucianism.—Taouism.—Buddhism.**—“The Chinese describe themselves as possessing three religions, or more accurately, three sects, namely Joo keou, the sect of Scholars; Fah keou, the sect of Buddha; and Taou keou, the sect of Taou. Both as regards age and origin, the sect of Scholars, or, as it is generally called, Confucianism, represents pre-eminently the religion of China. It has its root in the worship of Shang-te, a deity which is associated with the earliest traditions of the Chinese race. Hwang-te (2697 B. C.) erected a temple to his honour, and succeeding emperors worshipped before his shrine. . . . During the troublous times which followed after the reign of the few first sovereigns of the Chow Dynasty, the belief in a personal deity grew indistinct and dim, until, when Confucius [born B. C. 551] began his career, there appeared nothing strange in his atheistic doctrines. He never in any way denied the existence of Shang-te, but he ignored him. His concern was with man as a member of society, and the object of his teaching was to lead him into those paths of rectitude which might best contribute to his own happiness, and to the well-

being of that community of which he formed part. Man, he held, was born good, and was endowed with qualities which, when cultivated and improved by watchfulness and self-restraint, might enable him to acquire godlike wisdom and to become ‘the equal of Heaven.’ He divided mankind into four classes, viz., those who are born with the possession of knowledge; those who learn, and so readily get possession of knowledge; those who are dull and stupid, and yet succeed in learning; and, lastly, those who are dull and stupid, and yet do not learn. To all these, except those of the last class, the path to the climax reached by the ‘Sage’ is open. Man has only to watch, listen to, understand, and obey the moral sense implanted in him by Heaven, and the highest perfection is within his reach. . . . In this system there is no place for a personal God. The Impersonal Heaven, according to Confucius, implants a pure nature in every being at his birth, but, having done this, there is no further supernatural interference with the thoughts and deeds of men. It is in the power of each one to perfect his nature, and there is no divine influence to restrain those who take the downward course. Man has his destiny in his own hands, to make or to mar. Neither had Confucius any inducement to offer to encourage men in the practice of virtue, except virtue’s self. He was a matter-of-fact, unimaginative man, who was quite content to occupy himself with the study of his fellow-men, and was disinclined to grope into the future or to peer upwards. No wonder that his system, as he enunciated it, proved a failure. Eagerly he sought in the execution of his official duties to effect the regeneration of the empire, but beyond the circle of his personal disciples he found few followers, and as soon as princes and statesmen had satisfied their curiosity about him they turned their backs on his precepts and would none of his reproofs. Succeeding ages, recognising the loftiness of his aims, eliminated all that was impracticable and unreal in his system, and held fast to that part of it that was true and good. They were content to accept the logic of events, and to throw overboard the ideal ‘sage,’ and to ignore the supposed potency of his influence; but they clung to the doctrines of filial piety, brotherly love, and virtuous living. It was admiration for the emphasis which he laid on these and other virtues which has drawn so many millions of men unto him; which has made his tomb at Keo-foo been to be the Mecca of Confucianism, and has adorned every city of the empire with temples built in his honour. . . . Concurrently with the lapse of pure Confucianism, and the adoption of those principles which find their earliest expression in the pre-Confucian classics of China, there is observable a return to the worship of Shang-te. The most magnificent temple in the empire is the Temple of Heaven at Peking, where the highest object of Chinese worship is adored with the purest rites. . . . What is popularly known in Europe as Confucianism is, therefore, Confucianism with the distinctive opinions of Confucius omitted. . . . But this worship of Shang-te is confined only to the emperor. The people have no lot or heritage in the sacred acts of worship at the Altar of Heaven. . . . Side by side with the revival of the Joo keou, under the influence of Confucius, grew up a system of a totally different nature,

and which, when divested of its esoteric doctrines, and reduced by the practically-minded Chinamen to a code of morals, was destined in future ages to become affiliated with the teachings of the Sage. This was Taoism, which was founded by Laou-tsze, who was a contemporary of Confucius. An air of mystery hangs over the history of Laou-tsze. Of his parentage we know nothing, and the historians, in their anxiety to conceal their ignorance of his earlier years, shelter themselves behind the legend that he was born an old man. . . . The primary meaning of Taou is 'The way,' 'The path,' but in Laou-tsze's philosophy it was more than the way, it was the way-goer as well. It was an eternal road; along it all beings and things walked; it was everything and nothing, and the cause and effect of all. All things originated from Taou, conformed to Taou, and to Taou at last returned. . . . 'If, then, we had to express the meaning of Taou, we should describe it as the Absolute; the totality of Being and Things; the phenomenal world and its order; and the ethical nature of the good man, and the principle of his action.' It was absorption into this 'Mother of all things' that Laou-tsze aimed at. And this end was to be attained to by self-emptiness, and by giving free scope to the uncontaminated nature which, like Confucius, he taught was given by Heaven to all men. . . . But these subtleties, like the more abstruse speculations of Confucius, were suited only to the taste of the schools. To the common people they were foolishness, and, before long, the philosophical doctrine of Laou-tsze of the identity of existence and non-existence, assumed in their eyes a warrant for the old Epicurean motto, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' The pleasures of sense were substituted for the delights of virtue, and the next step was to desire prolongation of the time when those pleasures could be enjoyed. Legend said that Laou-tsze had secured to himself immunity from death by drinking the elixir of immortality, and to enjoy the same privilege became the all-absorbing object of his followers. The demand for elixirs and charms produced a supply, and Taoism quickly degenerated into a system of magic. . . . The teachings of Laou-tsze having familiarised the Chinese mind with philosophical doctrines, which, whatever were their direct source, bore a marked resemblance to the musings of Indian sages, served to prepare the way for the introduction of Buddhism. The exact date at which the Chinese first became acquainted with the doctrines of Buddha was, according to an author quoted in K'ang-he's Imperial Encyclopædia, the thirtieth year of the reign of She Hwang-te, i. e., B. C. 216. The story this writer tells of the difficulties which the first missionaries encountered is curious, and singularly suggestive of the narrative of St. Peter's imprisonment."—P. K. Douglas, *China*, ch. 17.—ALSO in The same, *Confucianism and Taoism*.—"Buddhism . . . penetrated to China along the fixed route from India to that country, round the north-west corner of the Himalayas and across Eastern Turkestan. Already in the 2nd year B. C., an embassy, perhaps sent by Huvishka [who reigned in Kabul and Kashmir] took Buddhist books to the then Emperor of China, A-ill; and the Emperor Ming-ti, 62 A. D., guided by a dream, is said to have sent to Tartary and

Central India and brought Buddhist books to China. From this time Buddhism rapidly spread there. . . . In the fourth century Buddhism became the state religion."—T. W. Rhys Davids, *Buddhism*, ch. 9.

ALSO in J. Legge, *The Religions of China*.—J. Edkins, *Religion in China*.—The same, *Chinese Buddhism*.—S. Beals, *Buddhism in China*.—S. Johnson, *Oriental Religions: China*.

**A. D. 1205-1234.—Conquest by Jingis Khan and his son.**—"The conquest of China was commenced by Chinghiz [or Jingis Khan], although it was not completed for several generations. Already in 1205 he had invaded Tangut, a kingdom occupying the extreme north-west of China, and extending beyond Chinese limits in the same direction, held by a dynasty of Tibetan race, which was or had been a vassal to the Kin. This invasion was repeated in succeeding years; and in 1211 his attacks extended to the Empire of the Kin itself. In 1214 he ravaged their provinces to the Yellow River, and in the following year took Chungtu or Peking. In 1219 he turned his arms against Western Asia; . . . but a lieutenant whom he had left behind him in the East continued to prosecute the subjection of Northern China. Chinghiz himself on his return from his western conquests renewed his attack on Tangut, and died on that enterprise, 18th August. Ökkodai, the son and successor of Chinghiz, followed up the subjugation of China, extinguished the Kin finally in 1234 and consolidated with his Empire all the provinces north of the Great Klang. The Southern provinces remained for the present subject to the Chinese dynasty of the Sung, reigning now at Kingssé or Hangcheu. This kingdom was known to the Tartars as Nangkiass, and also by the quasi-Chinese title of Mangi or Manzi, made so famous by Marco Polo and the travellers of the following age."—H. Yule, *Cathay and the Way Thither. Preliminary Essay*, sect. 91-92.—See, also, *MOXOLS: A. D. 1153-1227*.

**A. D. 1259-1294.—The Empire of Kublai Khan.**—Kublai, or Khubilai Khan, one of the grandsons of Jingis Khan, who reigned as the Great Khan or Supreme lord of the Mongols from 1259 until 1294, "was the sovereign of the largest empire that was ever controlled by one man. China, Corea, Tibet, Tung-King, Cochin China, a great portion of India beyond the Ganges, the Turkish and Siberian realms from the Eastern Sea to the Dnieper, obeyed his commands; and although the chief of the Hordes of Jugatai and Ogatai refused to acknowledge him, the Ilkhans of Persia . . . were his feudatories. . . . The Supreme Khan had immediate authority only in Mongolia and China. . . . The capital of the Khakan, after the accession of Khubilai, was a new city he built close to the ancient metropolis of the Liao and Kin dynasties."—H. H. Howorth, *Hist. of the Mongols*, v. 1, pp. 216-283.—"Khan-Bálig (Mong., 'The Khan's city'), the Cambalu of Marco, Peking . . . was captured by Chinghiz in 1215, and in 1264 Kublai made it his chief residence. In 1267 he built a new city, three 'li' to the north-east of the old one, to which was given the name of Ta-tu or 'Great Court,' called by the Mongols Daifu, the Taydo of Odoric and Taidu of Polo, who gives a description of its dimensions, the number of its gates, etc., similar to that in the text. The



Chinese accounts give only eleven gates. This city was abandoned as a royal residence on the expulsion of the Mongol dynasty in 1368, but re-occupied in 1421 by the third Ming Emperor, who built the walls as they now exist, reducing their extent and the number of the gates to nine. This is what is commonly called the 'Tartar city' of the present day (called also by the Chinese Lau-Chhing or 'Old Town'), which therefore represents the Taydo of Odoric.—H. Yule, *Cathay and the Way Thither*, v. 1, p. 127, footnote.

ALSO IN Marco Polo, *Travels, with Notes by Sir H. Yule*, bk. 2.—See, also, **MONGOLS**: A. D. 1229-1294, and **POLO, MARCO**.

**A. D. 1294-1882.—Dissolution of the Empire of Kublai Khan.—The Ming dynasty and its fall.—The enthronement of the present Manchu Tartar Dynasty, of the Tsings or Ch'ings.—The appearance of the Portuguese and the Jesuit Missionaries.**—"The immediate successors of Kublai, brought up in the luxuries of the imperial palace, the most gorgeous at that time in the world, relied upon the prestige with which the glory of the late emperor invested them, and never dreamed that change could touch a dominion so vast and so solid. Some devoted themselves to elegant literature and the improvement of the people; later princes to the mysteries of Buddhism, which became, in some degree, the state religion; and as the cycle went round, the dregs of the dynasty abandoned themselves, as usual, to priests, women, and eunuchs. . . . The distant provinces threw off their subjection; robbers ravaged the land, and pirates the sea; a minority and a famine came at the same moment; and in less than ninety years after its commencement, the fall of the dynasty was only illumined by some few flashes of dying heroism, and every armed Tartar, who could obtain a horse to aid his flight, spurred back to his native deserts. Some of them, of the royal race, turning to the west, took refuge with the Manchows, and in process of time, marrying with the families of the chiefs, intermingled the blood of the two great tribes. The proximate cause of this catastrophe was a Chinese of low birth, who, in the midst of the troubles of the time, found means to raise himself by his genius from a servile station to the leadership of a body of the malcontents, and thence to step into the imperial throne. The new dynasty [the Ming] began their reign with great brilliance. The emperor carried the Tartar war into their own country, and at home made unrelenting war upon the abuses of his palace. He committed the mistake, however, of granting separate principalities to the members of his house, which in the next reign caused a civil war, and the usurpation of the throne by an uncle of the then emperor. The usurper found it necessary to transfer the capital to Peking, as a post of defence against the eastern Tartars, who now made their appearance again on this eventful stage. He was successful, however, in his wars in the desert, and he added Tonquin and Cochin China to the Chinese dominions. After him the fortunes of the dynasty began to wane. The government became weaker, the Tartars stronger, some princes attached themselves to literature, some to Buddhism or Taoism; Cochin China revolted, and was lost to the empire, Japan ravaged the coasts with her priva-

teers; famine came to add to the horrors of misrule."—Leitch Ritchie, *Hist. of the Oriental Nations*, bk. 7, ch. 1 (v. 2).—"From without, the Mings were constantly harassed by the encroachments of the Tartars; from within, the senseless intriguing of the eunuchs (resulting in one case in the temporary deposition of an Emperor) was a fertile cause of trouble. Towards the close of the 16th century the Portuguese appeared upon the scene, and from their 'concession' at Macao, some time the residence of Camoens, opened commercial relations between China and the West. They brought the Chinese, among other things, opium, which had previously been imported overland from India. They possibly taught them how to make gunpowder, to the invention of which the Chinese do not seem, upon striking a balance of evidence, to possess an independent claim. About the same time [1580] Rome contributed the first instalment of those wonderful Jesuit fathers, whose names may truly be said to have filled the empire 'with sounds that echo still,' the memory of their scientific labours and the benefits they thus conferred upon China having long survived the wreck and discredit of the faith to which they devoted their lives. And at this distance of time it does not appear to be a wild statement to assert that had the Jesuits, the Franciscans, and the Dominicans, been able to resist quarrelling among themselves, and had they rather united to persuade Papal infallibility to permit the incorporation of ancestor worship with the rites and ceremonies of the Romish church—China would at this moment be a Catholic country, and Buddhism, Taoism, and Confucianism would long since have receded into the past. Of all these Jesuit missionaries, the name of Matteo Ricci [who died in 1610] stands by common consent first upon the long list. . . . The overthrow of the Mings [A. D. 1644] was brought about by a combination of events, of the utmost importance to those who would understand the present position of the Tartars as rulers of China. A sudden rebellion had resulted in the capture of Peking by the insurgents, and in the suicide of the Emperor who was fated to be the last of his line. The Imperial Commander-in-chief, Wu San-kuei, at that time away on the frontiers of Manchuria, engaged in resisting the incursions of the Manchu Tartars, now for a long time in a state of ferment, immediately hurried back to the capital, but was totally defeated by the insurgent leader, and once more made his way, this time as a fugitive and a suppliant, towards the Tartar camp. Here he obtained promises of assistance, chiefly on condition that he would shave his head and grow a tail in accordance with Manchu custom, and again set off with his new auxiliaries towards Peking, being reinforced on the way by a body of Mongol volunteers. As things turned out Wu San-kuei arrived at Peking in advance of these allies, and actually succeeded, with the remnant of his own scattered forces, in routing the troops of the rebel leader before the Tartars and the Mongols came up. He then started in pursuit of the flying foe. Meanwhile the Tartar contingent arrived; and on entering the capital, the young Manchu prince in command was invited by the people of Peking to ascend the vacant throne. So that by the time Wu San-kuei re-appeared he found a new dynasty [the Ch'ing or Tsing dynasty of the present day] already

established, and his late Manchu ally at the head of affairs. His first intention had doubtless been to continue the Ming line of emperors; but he seems to have readily fallen in with the arrangement already made, and to have tendered his formal allegiance on the four following conditions:—(1.) That no Chinese woman should be taken into the Imperial seraglio. (2.) That the first place at the great triennial examination for the highest literary degrees should never be given to a Tartar. (3.) That the people should adopt the national costume of the Tartars in their everyday life; but that they should be allowed to bury their corpses in the dress of the late dynasty. (4.) That this condition of costume should not apply to the women of China, who were not to be compelled either to wear the hair in a tail before marriage (as the Tartar girls do) or to abandon the custom of compressing their feet. The great Ming dynasty was now at an end, though not destined wholly to pass away. A large part of it may be said to remain in the literary monuments which were executed during its three centuries of existence. The dress of the period survives upon the monuments: Chinese stage; and when occasionally the present alien yoke is found to gail, seditious whispers of 'restoration' are not altogether unheard. . . . The age of the Ch'ings is the age in which we live; but it is not so familiar to some persons as it ought to be, that a Tartar, and not a Chinese sovereign, is now seated upon the throne of China. For some time after the accession of the first Manchu Emperor there was considerable friction between the two races, due, among other natural causes, to the enforced adoption of the peculiar coiffure in vogue among the Manchus—i. e., the tail, or plaited queue of hair, which now hangs down every Chinaman's back. This fashion was for a long time vigorously resisted by the inhabitants of southern China, though now regarded by all alike as one of the most sacred characteristics of the 'black-haired people'. . . . The subjugation of the empire by the Manchus was followed by a military occupation of the country, which has survived the original necessity, and is part of the system of government at the present day. Garrisons of Tartar troops were stationed at various important centres of population. . . . Those Tartar garrisons still occupy the same positions; and the descendants of the first battalions, with occasional reinforcements from Peking, live side by side and in perfect harmony with the strictly Chinese populations. These Banner-men, as they are called, may be known by their square, heavy faces, which contrast strongly with the sharper and more astute physiognomies of the Chinese. They speak the dialect of Peking, now recognised as the official language par excellence. They do not use their family or surnames—which belong rather to the clan than to the individual—but in order to conform to the requirements of Chinese life, the personal name is substituted. Their women do not compress their feet, and the female coiffure and dress are wholly Tartar in character. Intermarriage between the two races is not considered desirable, though instances are not unknown. In other respects, it is the old story of 'victa victrix'; the conquering Tartars have been themselves conquered by the people over whom they set themselves to rule. They have adopted the language, written and colloquial, of China. . . . Manchu, the language of

the conquerors, is still kept alive at the Court of Peking. By a State fiction, it is supposed to be the language of the sovereign. . . . Eight emperors of this line have already occupied the throne, and 'become guests on high'; the ninth is yet (in 1882) a boy less than ten years of age. Of these eight, the second in every way fills the largest space in Chinese history. Kang Hsi (or Kang Hi) reigned for sixty-one years. . . . Under the third Manchu Emperor, Yung Cheng [A. D. 1723-1736], began that violent persecution of the Catholics which has continued almost to the present day. The various sects—Jesuits, Dominicans, Franciscans—had been unable to agree about the Chinese equivalent for God, and the matter had been finally referred to the Pope. Another difficulty had arisen as to the toleration of ancestral worship by Chinese converts professing the Catholic faith. . . . As the Pope refused to permit the embodiment of this ancient custom with the ceremonies of the Catholic church, the new religion ceased to advance, and by-and-by fell into disrepute."—H. A. Giles, *Historic China*, ch. 5-6.

ATLANTIC S. W. Williams, *The Middle Kingdom*, ch. 17, and 19-20 (v. 2).—C. Gutzlaff, *Sketch of Chinese Hist.*, v. 1, ch. 16, v. 2.—J. Ross, *The Manchus*.—Abbé Hue, *Christianity in China*, v. 2-3.

A. D. 1839-1842.—The Opium War with England.—Treaty of Nanking.—Opening of the Five Ports.—"The first Chinese war [of England] was in one sense directly attributable to the altered position of the East India Company after 1833. [See INDIA: A. D. 1823-1833.] Up to that year trade between England and China had been conducted in both countries on principles of strict monopoly. The Chinese trade was secured to the East India Company, and the English trade was confined to a company of merchants specially nominated for the purpose by the Emperor. The change of thought which produced the destruction of monopolies in England did not penetrate to the conservative atmosphere of the Celestial Empire, and while the trade in one country was thrown open to everyone, trade in the other was still exclusively confined to the merchants nominated by the Chinese Government. These merchants, Hong merchants as they were called, traded separately, but were mutually liable for the dues to the Chinese Government and for their debts to the foreigners. Such conditions neither promoted the growth of trade nor the solvency of the traders; and, out of the thirteen Hong merchants in 1837, three or four were avowedly insolvent. (State Papers, v. 27, p. 1310.) Such were the general conditions on which the trade was conducted. The most important article of trade was opium. The importation of opium into China had, indeed, been illegal since 1796. But the Chinese Government had made no stringent efforts to prohibit the trade, and a Select Committee of the House of Commons had declared that it was inadvisable to abandon an important source of revenue to the East India Company. (State Papers, v. 29, p. 1020.) The opium trade consequently thrived, and grew from 4,100 chests in 1796 to 39,000 chests in 1837, and the Chinese connived at or ignored the growing trade. (Ibid., p. 1019.) . . . In 1837 the Chinese Government adopted a fresh policy. It decided on rigorously stopping the trade at which it had

previously tacitly connived. . . . Whether the Chinese Government was really shocked at the growing use of the drug and the consequences of its use, or whether it was alarmed at a drain of silver from China which disturbed what the political arithmeticians of England a hundred years before would have called the balance of trade, it undoubtedly determined to check the traffic by every means at its disposal. With this object it strengthened its force on the coast and sent Lin, a man of great energy, to Canton [March, 1839] with supreme authority. (State Papers, v. 29, p. 934, and Autobiography of Sir H. Taylor, v. 1, appx., p. 343.) Before Lin's arrival cargoes of opium had been seized by the Custom House authorities. On his arrival Lin required both the Hong merchants and the Chinese merchants to deliver up all the opium in their possession in order that it might be destroyed. (State Papers, v. 29, p. 936.) The interests of England in China were at that time entrusted to Charles Elliot. . . . But Elliot occupied a very difficult position in China. The Chinese placed on their communications to him the Chinese word 'Yu,' and wished him to place on his despatches to them the Chinese word 'Pin.' But Yu signifies a command, and Pin a humble address, and a British Plenipotentiary could not receive commands from, or humble himself before, Chinese officials. (State Papers, v. 29, pp. 881, 886, 888.) And hence the communications between him and the Chinese Government were unable to follow a direct course, but were frequently or usually sent through the Hong merchants. Such was the state of things in China when Lin, arriving in Canton, insisted on the surrender and destruction of all the opium there. Elliot was at Macao. He at once decided on returning to the post of difficulty and danger; and, though Canton was blockaded by Chinese forces and its river guarded by Chinese batteries, he made his way up in a boat of H. M. S. 'Larne,' and threw himself among his imprisoned countrymen. After his arrival he took the responsibility of demanding the surrender into his own hands, for the service of his Government, of all the British opium in China, and he surrendered the opium which he thus obtained, amounting to 20,283 chests, to the Chinese authorities, by whom it was destroyed. (Ibid., pp. 945, 967.) The imminent danger to the lives and properties of a large number of British subjects was undoubtedly removed by Elliot's action. Though some difficulty arose in connection with the surrender, Lin undertook gradually to relax the stringency of the measures which he had adopted (ibid., p. 977), and Elliot hoped that his own zealous efforts to carry out the arrangement which he had made would lead to the raising of the blockade. He was, however, soon undeceived. On the 4th of April Lin required him, in conjunction with the merchants, to enter into a bond under which all vessels hereafter engaged in the opium traffic would have been confiscated to the Chinese Government, and all persons connected with the trade would 'suffer death at the hands of the Celestial Court.' (Ibid., p. 989.) This bond Elliot steadily refused to sign (ibid., p. 992); and feeling that 'all sense of security was broken to pieces' (ibid., p. 978), he ordered all British subjects to leave Canton (ibid., p. 1004), he himself withdrew to the Portuguese settlement at Macao

(ibid., p. 1007), and he wrote to Auckland, the Governor-General of India, for armed assistance. (Ibid., p. 1009.) These grave events naturally created profound anxiety. A Select Committee of the House of Commons had formerly declined to interfere with the trade. The opium monopoly at that time was worth some £1,000,000 or £1,500,000 a year to British India (ibid., p. 1020); and India, engaged in war with Afghanistan and already involved in a serious deficit, could not afford to part with so large an amount of its revenue (ibid., p. 1020). Nine-tenths of the British merchants in China were engaged in the illegal trade (ibid., p. 1030), while Elliot, in enforcing the surrender of the opium, had given the merchants bonds on the British Government for its value, and the 20,000 chests surrendered were supposed to be worth from 600 to 1,200 dollars a chest (ibid., p. 987), or say from £2,400,000 to £4,800,000. . . . As the summer advanced, moreover, a fresh outrage increased the intensity of the crisis. On the 7th July some British seamen landed near Hong Kong, and engaged in a serious riot. A native was unfortunately killed on the occasion, and though Elliot, at his own risk, gave the relations of the victim a large pecuniary compensation, and placed the men engaged in the riot on their trial, Lin was not satisfied. He moved down to the coast, cut off the supplies of British subjects, and threatened to stop the supplies to Macao if the Portuguese continued to assist the British. (Ibid., pp. 1037-1039.) The British were in consequence forced to leave Macao; and about the same time a small schooner, the 'Black Joke,' was attacked by the Chinese, and a British subject on board of her seriously wounded. Soon afterwards, however, the arrival of a ship of war, the 'Volage,' in Chinese waters enabled Elliot to assume a bolder front. He returned to Macao; he even attempted to procure supplies from the mainland. But, though he succeeded in purchasing food, 'the Mandarin runners approached and obliged the natives to take back their provisions,' and Elliot, exasperated at their conduct, fired on some war junks of the Chinese, which returned the fire. A week afterwards Elliot declared the port and river of Canton to be in a state of blockade. (Ibid., p. 1060.) The commencement of the blockade, however, did not lead to immediate war. On the contrary, the Chinese showed considerable desire to avoid hostilities. They insisted, indeed, that some British sailor must be surrendered to them to suffer for the death of the Chinaman who had fallen in the riot of Hong Kong. But they showed so much anxiety to conclude an arrangement on this point that they endeavoured to induce Elliot to declare that a sailor who was accidentally drowned in Chinese waters, and whose body they had found, was the actual murderer. (State Papers, v. 30, p. 27.) And in the meanwhile the trade which Lin had intended to destroy went on at least as actively as ever. Lin's proceedings had, indeed, the effect of stimulating it to an unprecedented degree. The destruction of vast stores of opium led to a rise in the price of opium in China. The rise in price produced the natural consequence of an increased speculation; and, though British shipping was excluded from Chinese waters, and the contents of British vessels had to be transferred to American bottoms for conveyance into Chinese ports,

British trade had never been so large or so advantageous as in the period which succeeded Lin's arbitrary proceedings. Elliot was, of course, unable to prevent war either by the surrender of a British sailor to the Chinese, or by even assuming that a drowned man was the murderer; and war in consequence became daily more probable. In January, 1840, operations actually commenced. Elliot was instructed to make an armed demonstration on the northern coasts of China, to take possession of some island on the coast, and to obtain reparation and indemnity, if possible by a mere display of force, but otherwise to proceed with the squadron and thence send an ultimatum to Peking. In accordance with these orders the Island of Chusan was occupied in July, and the fleet was sent to the mouth of the Peiho with orders to transmit a letter to Peking. But the sea off the Peiho is shallow, the ships could not approach the coasts, and the Chinese naturally refused to yield to an empty demonstration. The expedition was forced to return to Chusan, where it found that the troops whom they had left behind were smitten by disease, that one out of every four men were dead, and that more than one-half of the survivors were invalided. Thus, throughout 1840, the Chinese war was only attended with disaster and distress. Things commenced a little more prosperously in 1841 by the capture of the Chinese position at the mouth of the Canton river. Elliot, after this success, was even able to conclude a preliminary treaty with the Chinese authorities. But this treaty did not prove satisfactory either to the British Government or to the Chinese. The British saw with dismay that the treaty made no mention of the trade in opium which had been the ostensible cause of the war. The Whig Government accordingly decided on superseding Elliot. He was recalled and replaced by Henry Pottinger. Before news of his recall reached him, however, the treaty which had led to his supersession had been disavowed by the Chinese authorities, and Elliot had commenced a fresh attack on the Chinese force which guarded the road to Canton. British sailors and British troops, under the command of Bremer and Gough, won a victory which placed Canton at their mercy. But Elliot, shrinking from exposing a great town to the horrors of an assault, stopped the advance of the troops and admitted the city to a ransom of £1,250,000. (Sir H. Taylor's Autobiography, v. 1, appx., pp. 353-363.) His moderation was naturally unacceptable to the troops and not entirely approved by the British Government. It constituted, however, Elliot's last action as agent in China. The subsequent operations were conducted under Pottinger's advice.—S. Walpole, *Hist. of Eng. from 1815*, Note, v. 5, pp. 287-291.—“Sir Henry Pottinger, who arrived as Plenipotentiary on the 10th of August, took the chief direction of the affairs. . . . To the end of 1841 there were various successes achieved by the land and naval forces, which gave the British possession of many large fortified towns, amongst which were Amoy, Ting-hai, Chia-hai, Ning-po, and Shang-hai. The Chinese were nevertheless persevering in their resistance, and in most cases evinced a bravery which showed how mistaken were the views which regarded the subjection of this extraordinary people as an easy task. . . . The British fleet on the 13th of

June [1842] entered the great river Kiang, and on the 6th of July advanced up the river, and cut off its communication with the Grand Canal, by which Nanking, the ancient capital of China, was supplied with grain. The point where the river intersects the canal is the city of Chin-Kiang-oo. . . . On the morning of the 21st the city was stormed by the British, in three brigades. The resistance of the Tartar troops was most desperate. Our troops fought under a burning sun, whose overpowering heat caused some to fall dead. The obstinate defence of the place prevented its being taken till six o'clock in the evening. When the streets were entered, the houses were found almost deserted. They were filled with ghastly corpses, many of the Tartar soldiers having destroyed their families and then committed suicide. The city, from the number of the dead, had become uninhabitable.”—C. Knight, *Popular Hist. of Eng.*, v. 8, ch. 25.—“The destruction of life was appalling. . . . Every Manchu preferred resistance, death, suicide, or flight, to surrender. Out of a Manchu population of 4,000, it was estimated that not more than 500 survived, the greater part having perished by their own hands. . . . Within twenty-four hours after the troops landed, the city and suburbs of Chinking were a mass of ruin and destruction. . . . The total loss of the English was 37 killed and 131 wounded. . . . Some of the large ships were towed up to Nanking, and the whole fleet reached it August 9th, at which time preparations had been made for the assault. . . . Everything was ready for the assault by daylight of August 15th;” but on the night of the 14th the Chinese made overtures for the negotiation of peace, and the important Treaty of Nanking was soon afterwards concluded. Its terms were as follows: “1. Lasting peace between the two nations. 2. The ports of Canton, Amoy, Fuchau, Ningpo, and Shanghai [known afterwards as the Treaty Ports] to be opened to British trade and residence, and trade conducted according to a well-understood tariff. 3. ‘It being obviously necessary and desirable that British subjects should have some port whereto they may careen and refit their ships when required,’ the island of Hongkong ‘to be ceded to her Majesty.’ 4. Six millions of dollars to be paid as the value of the opium which was delivered up ‘as a ransom for the lives of H. B. M. Superintendent and subjects,’ in March, 1839. 5. Three millions of dollars to be paid for the debts due to British merchants. 6. Twelve millions to be paid for the expenses incurred in the expedition sent out ‘to obtain redress for the violent and unjust proceedings of the Chinese high authorities.’ 7. The entire amount of \$21,000,000 to be paid before December 31, 1845. 8. All prisoners of war to be immediately released by the Chinese. 9. The Emperor to grant full and entire amnesty to those of his subjects who had aided the British.” Articles 10 to 13 related to the tariff of export and import dues that should be levied at the open ports; to future terms of official correspondence, etc. The Treaty was signed by the Commissioners on the 29th of August, 1842, and the Emperor's ratification was received September 15th.—S. W. Williams, *The Middle Kingdom*, ch. 23-25.

ALSO IN D. C. Boulger, *Hist. of China*, v. 3, ch. 5-7.—E. H. Parker, *Chinese Acc't of the Opium War*.

**A. D. 1850-1864.—The Taiping Rebellion.**—"The phrase 'Taiping Rebellion' is wholly of foreign manufacture; at Peking and everywhere among those loyal to the government the insurgents were styled 'Chang-mao tseh,' or 'Long-haired rebels,' while on their side, by a whimsical resemblance to English slang, the imperialists were dubbed 'Inps.' When the chiefs assumed to be aiming at independence in 1850, in order to identify their followers with their cause they took the term 'Ping Chao,' or 'Peace Dynasty,' as the style of their sway, to distinguish it from the 'Tsing Chao,' or 'Pure Dynasty' of the Manchus. Each of them prefixed the adjective 'Ta' (or 'Tai,' in Cantonese), 'Great,' as is the Chinese custom with regard to dynasties and nations; thus the name Tai-ping became known to foreigners."—S. W. Williams, *The Middle Kingdom*, ch. 24 (v. 2).—"This remarkable movement, which at one time excited much interest in Western lands, originated with a man named Hung Sew-tseuen [or Hung Siu-tseuen], son of a humble peasant residing in a village near Canton. On the occasion of one of his visits to the provincial city, probably in the year 1833, he appears to have seen a foreign Protestant missionary addressing the populace in the streets, assisted by a native interpreter. Either then or on the following day he received from some tract-distributor a book entitled 'Good Words for Exhorting the Age,' which consisted of essays and sermons by Leang A-fah, a well-known convert and evangelist. Taking the volume home with him, he looked it over with some interest, but carelessly laid it aside in his book-case. A few years afterward he attended for the second time the competitive literary examination with high hopes of honor and distinction, having already passed with much credit the lower examination in the district city. His ambitious venture, however, met with severe disappointment, and he returned to his friends sick in mind and body. During this state of mental depression and physical infirmity, which continued for some forty days, he had certain strange visions, in which he received commands from heaven to destroy the idols. These fancied revelations seem to have produced a deep impression on his mind, and led to a certain gravity of demeanor after his recovery and return to his quiet occupation as a student and village schoolmaster. When the English war broke out, and foreigners swept up Canton River with their wonderful fire-ships, . . . it is not surprising that Hung should have had his attention again attracted to the Christian publication which had lain so long neglected in his library. . . . The writings of Leang A-fah contained chapters from the Old and New Testament Scriptures, which he found to correspond in a striking manner with the preternatural sights and voices of that memorable period in his history [during his sickness, six years before]; and this strange coincidence convinced him of their truth, and of his being divinely appointed to restore the world, that is China, to the worship of the true God. Hung Sew-tseuen accepted his mission and began the work of propagating the faith he had espoused. Among his first converts was one Fung Yun-sun, who became a most ardent missionary and disinterested preacher. These two leaders of the movement traveled far and near through the country, teaching the

people of all classes and forming a society of God-worshippers. All the converts renounced idleness and gave up the worship of Confucius. Hung, at this time apparently a sincere and earnest teacher after truth, went to Canton and placed himself under the instructions of the Rev. Mr. Roberts, an American missionary, who for some cause fearing that his novitiate might be inspired by mercenary motives, denied him the rite of baptism. But, without being offended at this cold and suspicious treatment, he went home and taught his converts how to baptize themselves. The God-worshippers rapidly increased in numbers, and were known and feared as zealous iconoclasts. . . . For a year after Hung Sew-tseuen had rejoined the God-worshippers that society retained its exclusively religious nature, but in the autumn of 1850 it was brought into direct collision with the civil magistrates, when the movement assumed a political character of the highest aims." It was soon a movement of declared rebellion, and allied with a rebel army of bandits and pirates which had taken arms against the government in south-eastern China.—L. N. Wheeler, *The Foreigner in China*, ch. 13.—"The Hukka schoolmaster proclaimed his 'mission' in 1850. A vast horde gathered to him. He nominated five 'Wangs' or soldier sub-kings from out of his clan, and commenced his northward movement from Woosewen in January, 1851. Through the rich prosperous provinces his desultory march, interspersed with frequent halts, spread destruction and desolation. The peaceful fled shudderingly before this wave of fierce, stalwart ruffianhood, with its tatteredmailian tawdriness, its flaunting banners, its rusty naked weapons. Everywhere it gathered in the local scoundrelism. The pirates came from the coast; the robbers from the interior mountains rallied to an enterprise that promised so well for their trade. In the perturbed state of the Chinese population the horde grew like an avalanche as it rolled along. The Heavenly King [as Hung now styled himself] met with no opposition to speak of, and in 1853 his promenade ended under the shadow of the Porcelain Tower, in the city of Nanking, the second metropolis of the Chinese Empire, where, till the rebellion and his life ended simultaneously, he lived a life of licentiousness, darkened further by the grossest cruelties. The rebellion had lasted nearly ten years when the fates brought it into collision with the armed civilization of the West. The Imperialist forces had made sluggishly some head against it. Nanking had been invested after a fashion for years on end. 'The prospects of the Tai-pings,' says Commander Brine, 'in the early spring of 1860, had become very gloomy.' The Imperialist generals had hemmed Tai-pingdom within certain limits in the lower valley of the Yantze, and the movement languished further 'from its destructive and exhausting nature, which for continued vitality constantly required new districts of country to exhaust and destroy.' But in 1859 China and the West came into collision. . . . The rebellion had opportunity to recover lost ground. For the sixth time the 'Faithful King' relieved Nanking. The Imperialist generals fell back, and then the Tai-pings took the offensive, and as the result of sundry victories, the rebellion regained an active and flourishing condition. . . . Shanghai, one of

the treaty ports, was threatened."—A. Forbes, *Chinese Gordon*, ch. 2.—"Europe . . . has known ev.'s days under the hauds of three conquerors, plundering and destroying in religion's name; but its annals may be ransacked in vain, without find'g any parallel to the miseries endured in those provinces of China over which 'The Heavenly King,' the Tai-ping prophet, extended his fell sway for ten sad years. Hung Sew-tsuen (better known in China by his assumed title, Tien Wang) . . . had read Christian tracts, had learnt from a Christian missionary; and when he announced publicly three years afterwards that part of his mission was to destroy the temples and images, and showed in the jargon of his pretended visions some traces of his New Testament study, the conclusion was instantly seized by the sanguine minds of a section set upon evangelizing the East, that their efforts had produced a true prophet, fit for the work. Wedded to this fancy, they rejected as the inventions of the enemies of missions the tales of Tai-ping cruelty which soon reached Europe: and long after the details of the impostor's life at Nankin, with its medley of visions, executions, edicts, and harem indulgence, became notorious to the world, prayers were offered for his success by devotees in Great Britain as bigoted to his cause as the bloodiest commander, or 'Wang,' whom he had raised from the ranks of his followers to carry out his 'exterminating decrees.' The Tai-ping cause was lost in China before it was wholly abandoned by these fanatics in England, and their belief in its excellence so powerfully reacted on our policy, that it might have preserved us from active intervention down to the present time, had not certain Imperialist successes elsewhere, the diminishing means of their wasted possessions, and the rashness of their own chiefs, brought the Tai-ping arms into direct collision with us. And with the occasion there was happily raised up the man whose prowess was to scatter their blood-cemented empire to pieces far more speedily than it had been built up."—C. C. Chesney, *Essays in Military Et'g.*, ch. 10.—"The Tai-ping rebellion was of so barbarous a nature that its suppression had become necessary in the interests of civilization. A force raised at the expense of the Shanghai merchants, and supported by the Chinese government, had been for some years struggling against its progress. This force, known as the 'Ever Victorious Army,' was commanded at first by Ward, an American, and, on his death, by Burgevine, also an American, who was summarily dismissed; for a short time the command was held by Holland, an English marine officer, but he was defeated at Taitsan 2<sup>o</sup> Feb., 1863. Li Hung Chang, governor-general of the Kiang provinces, then applied to the British commander-in-chief for the services of an English officer, and Gordon [Charles George, subsequently known as 'Chinese Gordon'] was authorised to accept the command. He arrived at Sung-Kiong and entered on his new duties as a mandarin and lieutenant-colonel in the Chinese service on 24 March 1863. His force was composed of some three to four thousand Chinese, officered by 150 Europeans of almost every nationality and often of doubtful character. By the indomitable will of its commander this heterogeneous body was moulded into a little army whose high-sounding title of

'ever-victorious' became a reality, and in less than two years, after 33 engagements, the power of the Taipings was completely broken and the rebellion stamped out. The theatre of operations was the district of Kiangsoo, lying between the Yang-tze-Kiang river in the north and the bay of Hang-chow in the south." Before the summer of 1863 was over, Gordon had raised the rebel siege of Chanzi, and taken from the Taipings the towns of Fushan, Taitsan, Quinsan, Kahpoo, Wokong, Patachiaow, Leeku, Wanti, and Fusaikwan. Finally, in December, the great city of Soo-chow was surrendered to him. Gordon was always in front of all his storming parties, "carrying no other weapon than a little cane. His men called it his 'magic wand,' regarding it as a charm that protected his life and led them on to victory. When Soo-chow fell Gordon had stipulated with the Governor-general Li for the lives of the Wangs (rebel leaders). They were treacherously murdered by Li's orders. Indignant at this perfidy, Gordon refused to serve any longer with Governor Li, and when on 1 Jan. 1864 money and rewards were heaped upon him by the Emperor, declined them all. . . . After some [two] months of inaction it became evident that if Gordon did not again take the field the Taipings would regain the rescued country," and he was prevailed upon to resume his campaign, which, although badly wounded in one of the battles, he brought to an end in the following April (1864), by the capture of Chan-chu-fu. "This victory not only ended the campaign but completely destroyed the rebellion, and the Chinese regular forces were enabled to occupy Nankin in the July following. The large money present offered to Gordon by the emperor was again declined, although he had spent his pay in promoting the efficiency of his force, so that he wrote home: 'I shall leave China as poor as when I entered it.'"—Col. R. H. Vetch, *Charles George Gordon (Dict. of Nat. Biog.)*

ALSO IN: A. E. Hake, *The Story of Chinese Gordon*, ch. 3-8.—W. F. Butler, *Chas. George Gordon*, ch. 2.—S. Mossman, *General Gordon in China*.—*Private Diary of Gen. Gordon in China*.—Mm. Callery and Yvan, *Hist. of the Insurrection in China*.

A. D. 1856-1860.—War with England and France.—Bombardment and capture of Canton.—The Allies in Pekin.—Their destruction of the Summer Palace.—Terms of peace.—The speech from the throne at the opening of the English Parliament, on February 3, 1857, "stated that acts of violence, insults to the British flag, and infractions of treaty rights, committed by the local authorities at Canton, and a pertinacious refusal of redress, had rendered it necessary for her Majesty's officers in China to have recourse to measures of force to obtain satisfaction. The alleged offences of the Chinese authorities at Canton had for their single victim the lorcha 'Arrow.' The lorcha 'Arrow' was a small boat built on the European model. The word 'Lorcha' is taken from the Portuguese settlement at Macao, at the mouth of the Canton river. It often occurs in treaties with the Chinese authorities. On October 8, 1856, a party of Chinese in charge of an officer boarded the 'Arrow,' in the Canton river. They took off twelve men on a charge of piracy, leaving two men in charge of the lorcha. The 'Arrow' was

declared by its owners to be a British vessel. Our consul at Canton, Mr. Parkes, demanded from Yeh, the Chinese Governor of Canton, the return of the men, basing his demand upon the Treaty of 1843, supplemental to the Treaty of 1842. This treaty did not give the Chinese authorities any right to seize Chinese offenders, or supposed offenders, on board an English vessel. It merely gave them a right to require the surrender of the offenders at the hands of the English. The Chinese Governor, Yeh, contended, however, that the *lorcha* was a Chinese pirate vessel, which had no right whatever to hoist the flag of England. It may be plainly stated at once that the 'Arrow' was not an English vessel, but only a Chinese vessel which had obtained by false pretences the temporary possession of a British flag. Mr. Consul Parkes, however, was fussy, and he demanded the instant restoration of the captured men, and he sent off to our Plenipotentiary at Hong Kong, Sir John Bowring, for authority and assistance in the business. Sir John Bowring . . . ordered the Chinese authorities to surrender all the men taken from the 'Arrow,' and he insisted that an apology should be offered for their arrest, and a formal pledge given that no such act should ever be committed again. If this were not done within forty-eight hours, naval operations were to be begun against the Chinese. The Chinese Governor, Yeh, sent back all the men, and undertook to promise that for the future great care should be taken that no British ships should be visited improperly by Chinese officers. But he could not offer an apology for the particular case of the 'Arrow,' for he still maintained, as was indeed the fact, that the 'Arrow' was a Chinese vessel, and that the English had nothing to do with her. Accordingly Sir John Bowring carried out his threat, and had Canton bombarded by the fleet which Admiral Sir Michael Seymour commanded. From October 23 to November 13 naval and military operations were kept up continuously. Commissioner Yeh retaliated by foolishly offering a reward for the head of every Englishman. This news from China created a considerable sensation in England. On February 24, 1857, Lord Derby brought forward in the House of Lords a motion, comprehensively condemning the whole of the proceedings of the British authorities in China. The debate would have been memorable if only for the powerful speech in which the venerable Lord Lyndhurst supported the motion, and exposed the utter illegality of the course pursued by Sir John Bowring. The House of Lords rejected the motion of Lord Derby by a majority of 146 to 110. On February 26 Mr. Cobden brought forward a similar motion in the House of Commons. . . . Mr. Cobden had probably never dreamed of the amount or the nature of the support his motion was destined to receive. The vote of censure was carried by 263 votes against 247—a majority of 16. Lord Palmerston announced two or three days after that the Government had resolved on a dissolution and an appeal to the country. Lord Palmerston understood his countrymen. In the ensuing elections his victory was complete. "Cobden, Bright, Milner Gibson, W. J. Fox, Layard, and many other leading opponents of the Chinese policy, were left without seats. Lord Palmerston came back to power with renewed and redoubled strength." He "had the satisfaction before he left office [in

1858] of being able to announce the capture of Canton. The operations against China had been virtually suspended . . . when the Indian Mutiny broke out. England had now got the co-operation of France. France had a complaint of long standing against China on account of the murder of some missionaries, for which redress had been asked in vain. There was, therefore, an allied attack made upon Canton [December, 1857], and of course the city was easily captured. Commissioner Yeh himself was taken prisoner, not until he had been sought for and hunted out in most ignominious fashion. He was found at last hidden away in some obscure part of a house. He was known by his enormous fatness. . . . He was put on board an English man-of-war, and afterwards sent to Calcutta, where he died early in the following year. Unless report greatly belied him he had been exceptionally cruel, even for a Chinese official. The English and French Envoys, Lord Elgin and Baron Gros, succeeded in making a treaty with China. By the conditions of the treaty, England and France were to have ministers at the Chinese Court, on certain special occasions at least, and China was to be represented in London and Paris; there was to be toleration of Christianity in China, and a certain freedom of access to Chinese rivers for English and French mercantile vessels, and to the interior of China for English and French subjects. China was to pay the expenses of the war. It was further agreed that the term 'barbarian' was no longer to be applied to Europeans in China. There was great congratulation in England over this treaty, and the prospect it afforded of a lasting peace with China. The peace thus procured lasted in fact exactly a year. . . . The treaty of Tien-tsin, which had been arranged by Lord Elgin and Baron Gros, contained a clause providing for the exchange of the ratifications at Peking within a year from the date of the signature, which took place in June 1858. Lord Elgin returned to England, and his brother, Mr. Frederick Bruce, was appointed in March 1859 Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to China. Mr. Bruce was directed to proceed by way of the Peiho to Tien-tsin, and thence to Peking to exchange the ratifications of the treaty. Lord Malmesbury, who was then Foreign Secretary . . . impressed upon Mr. Bruce that he was not to be put off from going to the capital. Instructions were sent out from England at the same time to Admiral Hope, the Naval Commander-in-Chief in China, to provide a sufficient force to accompany Mr. Bruce to the mouth of the Peiho. The Peiho river flows from the highlands on the west into the Gulf of Pecheli, at the north-east corner of the Chinese dominions. The capital of the Empire is about 100 miles inland from the mouth of the Peiho. It does not stand on that river, which flows past it at some distance westward, but it is connected with the river by means of a canal. The town of Tien-tsin stands on the Peiho near its junction with one of the many rivers that flow into it, and about forty miles from the mouth. The entrance to the Peiho was defended by the Taku forts. On June 20, 1859, Mr. Bruce and the French Envoy reached the mouth of the Peiho with Admiral Hope's fleet, some nineteen vessels in all, to escort them. They found the forts defended; some negotiations and inter-communications took place, and a Chinese official from Tien-tsin came

to Mr. Bruce and endeavoured to obtain some delay or compromise. Mr. Bruce became convinced that the condition of things predicted by Lord Malmesbury was coming about, and that the Chinese authorities were only trying to defeat his purpose. He called on Admiral Hope to clear a passage for the vessels. When the Admiral brought up his gunboats the forts opened fire. The Chinese artillerymen showed unexpected skill and precision. Four of the gunboats were almost immediately disabled. All the attacking vessels got aground. Admiral Hope attempted to storm the forts. The attempt was a complete failure. Admiral Hope himself was wounded; so was the commander of the French vessel which had contributed a contingent to the sterning party. The attempt to force a passage of the river was given up and the mission to Peking was over for the present. It seems only fair to say that the Chinese at the mouth of the Peiho cannot be accused of perfidy. They had mounted the forts and barricaded the river openly and even ostentatiously. . . . It will be easily imagined that the news created a deep sensation in England. People in general made up their minds at once that the matter could not be allowed to rest there, and that the mission to Peking must be enforced. . . . Before the whole question came to be discussed in Parliament the Conservatives had gone out and the Liberals had come in. The English and French Governments determined that the men who had made the treaty of Tien-tsin — Lord Elgin and Baron Gros — should be sent back to insist on its reinforcement. Sir Hope Grant was appointed to the military command of our land forces, and General Cousin de Montauban, afterwards Count Palikao, commanded the soldiers of France. The Chinese, to do them justice, fought very bravely, but of course they had no chance whatever against such forces as those commanded by the English and French generals. The allies captured the Taku forts [August, 1860], occupied Tien-tsin, and marched on Peking. The Chinese Government endeavoured to negotiate for peace, and to interpose any manner of delay, diplomatic or otherwise, between the allies and their progress to the capital. Lord Elgin consented at last to enter into negotiations at Tungechow, a walled town ten or twelve miles nearer than Peking. Before the negotiations took place, Lord Elgin's secretaries, Mr. Parkes and Mr. Loch, some English officers, Mr. Bowly, the correspondent of the 'Times,' and some members of the staff of Baron Gros, were treacherously seized by the Chinese while under a flag of truce and dragged off to various prisons. Mr. Parkes and Mr. Loch, with eleven of their companions, were afterwards released, after having been treated with much cruelty and indignity, but thirteen of the prisoners died of the horrible ill-treatment they received. Lord Elgin refused to negotiate until the prisoners had been returned, and the allied armies were actually at one of the great gates of Peking, and had their guns in position to blow the gate in, when the Chinese acceded to their terms. The gate was surrendered, the allies entered the city, and the English and French flags were hoisted side by side on the walls of Peking. It was only after entering the city that Lord Elgin learned of the murder of the captives. He then determined that the Summer Palace should be burnt down as a means of impressing the

mind of the Chinese authorities generally with some sense of the danger of treachery and foul play. Two days were occupied in the destruction of the palace. It covered an area of many miles. Gardens, temples, small lodges, and pagodas, groves, grottoes, lakes, bridges, terraces, artificial hills, diversified the vast space. All the artistic treasures, all the curiosities, archaeological and other, that Chinese wealth and Chinese taste, such as it was, could bring together, had been accumulated in this magnificent pleasure. The surrounding scenery was beautiful. The high mountains of Tartary ramparted one side of the enclosure. The buildings were set on fire; the whole place was given over to destruction. A monument was raised with an inscription in Chinese, setting forth that such was the reward of perfidy and cruelty. Very different opinions were held in England as to the destruction of the Imperial palace. To many it seemed an act of unintelligible and unpardonable vandalism. Lord Elgin explained, that if he did not demand the surrender of the actual perpetrators, it was because he knew full well that no difficulty would have been made about giving him a seeming satisfaction. The Chinese Government would have selected for vicarious punishment, in all probability, a crowd of mean and unfortunate wretches who had nothing to do with the murders. . . . It is somewhat singular that so many persons should have been roused to indignation by the destruction of a building who took with perfect composure the unjust invasion of a country. The allied powers now of course had it all their own way. England established her right to have an envoy in Peking, whether the Chinese liked it or not. China had to pay a war indemnity, and a large sum of money as compensation to the families of the murdered prisoners and to those who had suffered injuries, and to make an apology for the attack by the garrison of the Taku forts. Perhaps the most important gain to Europe from the war was the knowledge that Peking was not by any means so large a city as we had all imagined it to be, and that it was on the whole rather a crumbling and tumble-down sort of place."—J. McCarthy, *Short Hist. of our own Time*, ch. 12, 15, 17 (ch. 30 and 42, v. 3, of larger work).

ALSO IN: L. Oliphant, *Narrative of the Earl of Elgin's Mission*, v. 1.—H. B. Loch, *Personal Narrative*.—S. W. Williams, *The Middle Kingdom*, ch. 25 (p. 2).—Col. Sir W. F. Butler, *Chas. Geo. Gordon*, ch. 3.

**A. D. 1857-1868.—Treaty with the United States.—The Burlingame Embassy and the Burlingame Treaties.**—"The government of the United States viewed with anxiety the new breaking out of hostilities between Great Britain, supported by France as an ally, and China, in the year 1856. President Buchanan sent thither the Hon. William B. Reed to watch the course of events, and to act the part of a mediator and peacemaker when opportunity should offer. In this he was sustained by the influence of Russia. Mr. Reed arrived in Hong-Kong, on the fine war steamer *Minnesota*, November 7, 1857. He at once set himself to remove the difficulties between the English and Chinese, and save if possible the future effusion of blood. He endeavored in vain to persuade the proud and obstinate governor Yeh to yield, and save Canton from bombardment. He proceeded to the north,



and made on behalf of his government a treaty of peace with China which was signed June 18. The first article of the treaty contains a significant reference to the posture of the United States in relation to the war then in progress, as well as to any which might thereafter arise. The article says: 'There shall be, as there have always been, peace and friendship between the United States of America and the Ta-Tsing Empire, and between their people respectively. They shall not insult or oppress each other for any trifling cause, so as to produce an estrangement between them; and if any other nation should act unjustly or oppressively, the United States will exert their good offices, on being informed of the case, to bring about an amicable arrangement of the question, thus showing their friendly feelings.' A subsequent article of this treaty is to be interpreted by keeping in view the bitter root of the difficulties between Great Britain and China which led to the previous war of 1839 to '42, and to this war. After stating the ports where Americans shall be permitted to reside and their vessels to trade, it continues in the following language: 'But said vessels shall not carry on a clandestine and fraudulent trade at other ports of China not declared, to be legal, or along the coasts thereof; and any vessel under the American flag violating this provision shall, with her cargo, be subject to confiscation to the Chinese government; and any citizen of the United States who shall trade in any contraband article of merchandise shall be subject to be dealt with by the Chinese government, without being entitled to any countenance or protection from that of the United States; and the United States will take measures to prevent their flag from being abused by the subjects of other nations as a cover for the violation of the laws of the empire.' . . . The development of the foreign trade with China during the brief time which has passed [1870] since the last war has been very great. . . . The American government has been represented most of the time by the Hon. Anson Burlingame, who has taken the lead, with remarkable ability and success, in establishing the policy of peaceful co-operation between the chief treaty-powers, in encouraging the Chinese to adopt a more wise and progressive policy in their intercourse with foreign nations and in the introduction of the improvements of the age. . . . Mr. Burlingame, who had been in China six years, determined [in 1867] to resign his post and return to America. The news of it excited much regret among both Chinese and foreign diplomats. The former endeavored in vain to dissuade him from his purpose. Failing to accomplish this, he was invited by Prince Kung to a farewell entertainment, at which were present many of the leading officers of the government. During it they expressed to him their gratitude for his offices to them as an intelligent and disinterested counselor and friend. And they seem to have conceived at this time the thought of putting the relations of the empire with foreign countries upon a more just and equal basis, by sending to them an imperial embassy of which he should be the head. They promptly consulted some of their more reliable friends among the foreign gentlemen at the capital, and in two days after they tendered to Mr. Burlingame, much to his surprise, the appointment of minister plenipotentiary of China to the Western powers. . . . Mr. Burlingame left the

Chinese capital on the 25th of November, 1867. The embassy consisted, besides the principal, of Chih-k'ang and Sun Chia-ku, a Manchu and a Chinese officer, each wearing the red ball on his cap which indicates an official of a rank next to the highest in the empire; J. McLeary Brown formerly of the British Legation, and M. De champs, as secretaries; Teh Ming and Fung I as Chinese attachés, and several other persons in subordinate positions. . . . It went to Shanghai, thence to San Francisco, where it was most cordially welcomed by both the American and Chinese mercantile communities. It reached Washington in May, 1868. The embassy was treated with much distinction at the American capital. No American statesman was so capable and disposed to enter cordially into its objects as the Secretary of State at that time, the Hon. William H. Seward, whose mind had long apprehended the great features of the policy which American and foreign nations should pursue in relation to the Chinese empire. On the 16th of July the Senate of the United States ratified a treaty which he had made in behalf of this country with the representative of the Chinese government. The treaty defines and fixes the principles of the intercourse of Western nations with China, of the importance of which I have already spoken. It secures the territorial integrity of the empire, and concedes to China the rights which the civilized nations of the world accord to each other as to eminent domain over land and waters, and jurisdiction over persons and property therein. It takes the first step toward the appointment of Chinese consuls in our seaports—a measure promotive of both Chinese and American interests. It secures exemption from all disability or persecution on account of religious faith in either country. It recognizes the right of voluntary emigration and makes penal the wrongs of the coolie traffic. It pledges privileges as to travel or residence in either country such as are enjoyed by the most favored nation. It grants to the Chinese permission to attend our schools and colleges, and allows us to freely establish and maintain schools in China. And while it acknowledges the right of the Chinese government to control its own whole interior arrangements, as to railroads, telegraphs and other internal improvements, it suggests the willingness of our government to afford aid toward their construction by designating and authorizing suitable engineers to perform the work, at the expense of the Chinese government. The treaty expressly leaves the question of naturalization in either country an open one. . . . It is not necessary to follow in detail the progress of this first imperial Chinese embassy. In England it was received at first very coldly, and it was some months before proper attention could be secured from the government to its objects. At length, however, on November 20, it was presented to the queen at Windsor Castle. . . . What heart is there that will not join in the cordial wish that the treaties made by the embassy with Great Britain, France, Prussia and other European powers may be the commencement of a new era in the diplomatic and national intercourse of China with those and all other lands of the West!—W. Speer, *The Oldest and the Newest Empire*, ch. 14.

ALSO IN: *Treaties and Conventions bet. the U. S. and other Powers* (1889), p. 159 and 179.

**A. D. 1884-1885.—War with France.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1875-1889.

**A. D. 1892.—Exclusion of Chinese from the United States.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1892.

**A. D. 1893.—The future of the Chinese.—A speculation.**—"China is generally regarded as a stationary power which can fairly hold its own, though it has lost Annam to France, and the suzerainty of Upper Burmah to England, and the Amoor Valley to Russia, but which is not a serious competitor in the race for empire. There is a certain plausibility in this view. On the other hand, China has recovered Eastern Turkestan from Mahomedan rule and from a Russian protectorate, is dominating the Corea, and has stamped out a dangerous rebellion in Yunnan. No one can doubt that if China were to get for sovereign a man with the organising and aggressive genius of Peter the Great or Frederick the Second, it would be a very formidable neighbour to either British India or Russia. Neither is it easy to suppose that the improvements, now tentatively introduced into China, will not soon be taken up and pushed on a large scale, so that railways will be carried into the heart of Asia, and large armies drilled and furnished with arms of precision on the European model. In any such case the rights which China has reluctantly conceded or still claims over Annam and Tonquin, over Siam, over Upper Burmah, and over Nepal, may become matters of very serious discussion. At present the French settlements arrest the expansion of China in the direction most dangerous to the world. Unfortunately, the climate of Saigon is such as no European cares to settle in, and the war to secure Tonquin was so unpopular that it cost a French premier his tenure of office. . . . Whatever, however, be the fortune of China in this direction, it is scarcely doubtful that she will not only people up to the furthest boundary of her recognised territory, but gradually acquire new dominions. The history of our Straits Settlements will afford a familiar instance how the Chinese are spreading. They already form half the population predominating in Singapore and Penak, and the best observers are agreed that the Malay cannot hold his own against them. They are beginning to settle in Borneo and Sumatra, and they are supplanting the natives in some of the small islands of the Pacific, such as Hawaii. The climate of all these countries suits them, and they commend themselves to governments and em-

ployers by their power of steady industry; and they intermarry freely up to a safe point with the women of the country, getting all the advantages of alliance, yet not sacrificing their nationality. Several causes have retarded their spread hitherto: the regions enumerated have mostly been too insecure for an industrial people to flourish in, until the British or the Dutch established order; the government of China has hitherto discouraged emigration; English administrations have been obliged to be rather wary in their dealings with a people who showed at Sarawak and Penang that they were capable of combining for purposes of massacre; and the Chinese superstition about burial in the sacred soil of the Celestial Empire made the great majority of the emigrants birds of passage. All these causes are disappearing. . . . Europeans cannot flourish under the tropics, and will not work with the hand where an inferior race works. What we have to consider, therefore, is the probability that the natives who are giving way to the Chinese in the Malay Peninsula will be able to make head against them in Borneo or Sumatra. Borneo is nearly six times as big as Java, and if it were peopled like Java would support a population of nearly 100,000,000. . . . In the long run the Chinese, who out-number the Malays as sixteen to one, who are more decidedly industrial, and who organise where they can in a way that precludes competition, are tolerably certain to gain the upper hand. They may not destroy the early settlers, but they will reduce them to the position of the Hill tribes in India, or of the Ainos in Japan. Assume fifty years hence that China has taken its inevitable position as one of the great powers of the world, and that Borneo has a population of 10,000,000, predominantly Chinese, is it easy to suppose in such a case that the larger part of Borneo would still be a dependency of the Netherlands? or that the whole island would not have passed, by arms or diplomacy, into the possession of China? . . . There are those who believe that the Chinaman is likely to supercede the Spaniard and Indian alike in parts of South America. Without assuming that all of these possibilities are likely to be realised, there is surely a strong presumption that so great a people as the Chinese, and possessed of such enormous natural resources, will sooner or later overflow their borders and spread over new territory, and submerge weaker races."—C. H. Pearson, *National Life and Character*, pp. 45-51.

**CHIINANTECS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ZAPOTECAS, ETC.

**CH'ING OR T'ING DYNASTY, The.** See CHINA: A. D. 1294-1882.

**CHINGIS KHAN, Conquests of.** See MONGOLS: A. D. 1153-1227; and INDIA: A. D. 977-1290.

**CHINOOK, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: CHINOOKAN FAMILY.

**CHIOGGIA, The War of.** See VENICE: A. D. 1379-1381.

**CHIOS.**—The rocky island known anciently as Chios, called Scio in modern times, was one of the places which claimed Homer's birth. It is situated in the Ægean Sea, separated by a strait only five miles wide from the Asiatic coast. The wines of Chios were famous in antiquity and have a good reputation at the present day. The

island was an important member of the Ionian confederation, and afterwards subject to Athens, from which it revolted twice, suffering terrible barbarities in consequence. See ASIA MINOR: THE GREEK COLONIES.

**B. C. 413.—Revolt from Athens.** See GREECE: B. C. 413-412.

**A. D. 1346.—Taken by the Genoese.** See CONSTANTINOPLE: A. D. 1348-1355.

**A. D. 1681.—Blockade and attack by the French.** See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1664-1684.

**A. D. 1770.—Temporary possession by the Russians.** See TURKS: A. D. 1768-1774.

**A. D. 1822.—Turkish massacre of Christians.** See GREECE: A. D. 1821-1829.

**CHIPPEWA, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1814 (JULY—SEPTEMBER).

**CHIPPEWAS, OR OJIBWAS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINALS: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY, AND OJIBWAS.

**CHIPPEWYANS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINALS: ATHAPASCAN FAMILY.

**CHITON, The.**—"The chiton [of the ancient Greeks] was an oblong piece of cloth arranged round the body so that the arm was put through a hole in the closed side, the two ends of the open side being fastened over the opposite shoulder by means of a button or clasp. On this latter side, therefore, the chiton was completely open, at least as far as the thigh, underneath of which the two ends might be either pinned or stitched together. Round the hips the chiton was fastened with a ribbon or girdle, and the lower part could be shortened as much as required by pulling it through this girdle. . . . Frequently sleeves, either shorter and covering only the upper arm, or continued to the wrist were added to the chiton. . . . The short-sleeved chiton is frequently worn by women and children on monuments. Of the sleeveless chiton, worn by men over both shoulders, it is stated that it was the sign of a free citizen. Slaves and artisans are said to have worn a chiton with one hole for the left arm, the right arm and half the chest remaining quite uncovered. . . . It appears clearly that the whole chiton consists of one piece. Together with the open and half-open kinds of the chiton we also find the closed double chiton flowing down to the feet. It was a piece of cloth considerably longer than the human body, and closed on both sides, inside of which the person putting it on stood as in a cylinder."—E. Guhl and W. Koner, *Life of the Greeks and Romans*, pt. 1, sect. 41.—"The principal, or rather, the sole garment, of the Dorian maidens was the chiton, or himation made of woolen stuff, and without sleeves, but fastened on either shoulder by a large clasp, and gathered on the breast by a kind of brooch. This sleeveless robe, which seldom reached more than half way to the knee, was moreover left open up to a certain point on both sides, so that the skirts or wings, flying open as they walked, entirely exposed their limbs. . . . The married women, however, did not make their appearance in public 'en chemise,' but when going abroad donned a second garment which seems to have resembled pretty closely their husbands' himatia."—J. A. St. John, *The Hellenes*, bk. 3, ch. 6.

**CHITTIM.** See KITTIM.

**CHIVALRY.**—"The primitive sense of this well-known word, derived from the French Chevalier, signifies merely cavalry, or a body of soldiers serving on horseback; and has been used in that general acceptation by the best of our poets, ancient and modern, from Milton to Thomas Campbell. But the present article respects the peculiar meaning given to the word in modern Europe, as applied to the order of knighthood, established in almost all her kingdoms during the middle ages, and the laws, rules, and customs, by which it was governed. Those laws and customs have long been antiquated, but their effects may still be traced in European manners; and, excepting only the change which flowed from the introduction of the Christian religion, we know no cause which has produced such general and permanent difference betwixt the ancients and moderns, as that which has arisen out of the institution of chivalry.

. . . From the time that cavalry becomes used in war, the horseman who furnishes and supports a charger arises, in all countries, into a person of superior importance to the mere foot-soldier. . . . In various military nations, therefore, we find that horsemen are distinguished as an order in the state. . . . But, in the middle ages, the distinction ascribed to soldiers serving on horseback assumed a very peculiar and imposing character. They were not merely respected on account of their wealth or military skill, but were bound together by a union of a very peculiar character, which monarchs were ambitious to share with the poorest of their subjects, and governed by laws directed to enhance, into enthusiasm, the military spirit and the sense of personal honour associated with it. The aspirants to this dignity were not permitted to assume the sacred character of knighthood until after a long and severe probation, during which they practised, as acolytes, the virtues necessary to the order of Chivalry. Knighthood was the goal to which the ambition of every noble youth turned; and to support its honours, which (in theory at least) could only be conferred on the gallant, the modest, and the virtuous, it was necessary he should spend a certain time in a subordinate situation, attendant upon some knight of eminence, observing the conduct of his master, as what must in future be the model of his own, and practising the virtues of humility, modesty, and temperance, until called upon to display those of a higher order. . . . In the general and abstract definition of Chivalry, whether as comprising a body of men whose military service was on horseback, and who were invested with peculiar honours and privileges, or with reference to the mode and period in which these distinctions and privileges were conferred, there is nothing either original or exclusively proper to our Gothic ancestors. It was in the singular tenets of Chivalry,—in the exalted, enthusiastic, and almost sanctimonious, ideas connected with its duties,—in the singular balance which its institutions offered against the evils of the rude ages in which it arose, that we are to seek those peculiarities which render it so worthy of our attention. . . . The education of the future knight began at an early period. The care of the mother, after the first years of early youth were passed, was deemed too tender, and the indulgences of the paternal roof too effeminate, for the future aspirant to the honours of chivalry. . . . To counteract these habits of indulgence, the first step to the order of knighthood was the degree of Page. The young and noble stripling, generally about his twelfth year, was transferred from his father's house to that of some baron or gallant knight, sedulously chosen by the anxious parent as that which had the best reputation for good order and discipline. . . . When advancing age and experience in the use of arms had qualified the page for the hardships and dangers of actual war, he was removed, from the lowest to the second gradation of chivalry, and became an Escuyer, Esquire, or Squire. The derivation of this phrase has been much contested. It has been generally supposed to be derived from it; becoming the official duty of the esquire to carry the shield (Escu) of the knight his master, until he was about to engage the enemy. Others have fetched the epithet (more remotely certainly) from Scuria, a stable,

the charger of the knight being under the especial care of the squire. Others, again, ascribe the derivation of the word to the right which the squire himself had to carry a shield, and to blazon it with armorial bearings. This, in later times, became almost the exclusive meaning attached to the appellative esquire; and, accordingly, if the phrase now means anything, it means a gentleman having a right to carry arms. There is reason, however, to think this is a secondary meaning of the word, for we do not find the word Escuyer, applied as a title of rank, until so late as the Ordinance of Blois, in 1579. . . . In actual war the page was not expected to render much service, but that of the squire was important and indispensable. Upon a march he bore the helmet and shield of the knight and led his horse of battle, a tall heavy animal fit to bear the weight of a man in armour, but which was led in hand in marching, while the knight rode an ambling hackney. The squire was also qualified to perform the part of an armourer, not only lacing his master's helmet and buckling his cuirass, but also closing with a hammer the rivets by which the various pieces were united to each other. . . . In the actual shock of battle, the esquire attended closely on the banner of his master, or on his person if he were only a knight bachelor, kept pace with him during the melee, and was at hand to remount him when his steed was slain, or relieve him when oppressed by numbers. If the knight made prisoners they were the charge of the esquire; if the esquire himself fortuneed to make one, the ransom belonged to his master. . . . A youth usually ceased to be a page at 14, or a little earlier, and could not regularly receive the honour of knighthood until he was one-and-twenty. . . . Knighthood was, in its origin, an order of a republican, or at least an oligarchic nature; arising . . . from the customs of the free tribes of Germany [see COMITATUS], and, in its essence, not requiring the sanction of a monarch. On the contrary, each knight could confer the order of knighthood upon whomsoever preparatory noviciate and probation had fitted to receive it. The highest potentates sought the accolade, or stroke which conferred the honour, at the hands of the worthiest knight whose achievements had dignified the period. . . . Though no positive regulation took place on the subject, ambition on the part of the aspirant, and pride and policy on that of the sovereign princes and nobles of high rank, gradually limited to the latter the power of conferring knighthood. . . . Knights were usually made either on the eve of battle, or when the victory had been obtained; or they were created during the pomp of some solemn warning or grand festival. . . . The spirit of chivalry sunk gradually under a combination of physical and moral causes; the first arising from the change gradually introduced into the art of war, and the last from the equally great alteration produced by time in the habits and modes of thinking in modern Europe. Chivalry began to dawn in the end of the 10th, and beginning of the 11th century. It blazed forth with high vigour during the crusades, which indeed may be considered as exploits of national knight-errantry, or general wars, undertaken on the very same principles which actuated the conduct of individual knights adventurers. But its most brilliant period was during the wars

between France and England, and it was unquestionably in those kingdoms that the habit of constant and honourable opposition, unembittered by rancour or personal hatred, gave the fairest opportunity for the exercise of the virtues required from him whom Chaucer terms 'a very perfect gentle knight.' Froissart frequently makes allusions to the generosity exercised by the French and English to their prisoners, and contrasts it with the dungeons to which captives taken in war were consigned both in Spain and Germany. Yet both these countries, and indeed every kingdom in Europe, partook of the spirit of chivalry in a greater or less degree; and even the Moors of Spain caught the emulation, and had their orders of Knighthood as well as the Christians. But even during this splendid period, various causes were silently operating the future extinction of the flame, which blazed thus wide and brightly. An important discovery, the invention of gunpowder, had taken place, and was beginning to be used in war, even when chivalry was in its highest glory. . . . Another change, of vital importance, arose from the institution of the bands of gens-d'armes, or mer at arms in France, constituted . . . expressly as a sort of standing army. . . . A more fatal cause had, however, been for some time operating in England, as well as France, for the destruction of the system we are treating of. The wars of York and Lancaster in England, and those of the Huguenots and of the League, were of a nature so bitter and rancorous, as was utterly inconsistent with the courtesy, fair play, and gentleness, proper to chivalry. . . . The civil wars not only operated in debasing the spirit of chivalry, but in exhausting and destroying the particular class of society from which its votaries were drawn."—Sir W. Scott, *Essay on Chivalry*.

ALSO IN: G. P. R. James, *Hist. of Chivalry*.—H. Hallam, *State of Europe during the Middle Ages*, ch. 9, pt. 2 (v. 3).—F. P. Guizot, *Hist. of Civilization in France*, 6th lect., 2d course (v. 4).—C. Mills, *Hist. of Chivalry*.—H. Stebbing, *Hist. of Chivalry and the Crusades*.—L. Gautier, *Chivalry*.—K. H. Digby, *The Broadstone of Honour*.—Dr. Dorn, *Knights and their Days*.—See, also, KNIGHTHOOD, ORDERS OF.

**CHLAMYS, The.**—"The chlamys [worn by the ancient Greeks] . . . was an oblong piece of cloth thrown over the left shoulder, the open ends being fastened across the right shoulder by means of a clasp; the corners hanging down were, as in the himation, kept straight by means of weights sewed into them. The chlamys was principally used by travellers and soldiers."—E. Guhl and W. Koner, *Life of the Greeks and Romans*, pt. 1, sect. 42.

**CHOCIM.** See CHOCZIM.

**CHOCTAWS, OR CHA'HTAS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: MUSKOGEOAN FAMILY.

**CHOCZIM (KHOTZIM, CHOTYN, KHOTIN, CHOCIM, KOTZIM):** A. D. 1622.—Defeat of the Turks by the Poles. See POLAND: A. D. 1590-1648.

A. D. 1672.—Taken by Sobieska and the Poles.—Great defeat of the Turks. See POLAND: A. D. 1668-1696.

A. D. 1739.—Captured by the Russians and restored to the Turks. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1725-1739.

A. D. 1719.—Taken by the Russians.—Defeat of the Turks. See TURKS: A. D. 1768-1774.

**A. D. 1790.**—Defeat of the Turks by the Russians. See TURKS: A. D. 1776-1792.

**CHOLEI, Battles of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (JULY—DECEMBER).

**CHOLULA, Pyramids at.** See MEXICO, ANCIENT: THE TOLTEC EMPIRE.

**A. D. 1519.**—The Massacre at. See MEXICO: A. D. 1519 (OCTOBER).

**CHONTALS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: CHONTALS.

**CHONTAQUIROS, OR PIRU, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ANDESIAÑE.

**CHORASMIA.** See KHUAHEZM.

**CHOREGIA.** See LITURGIES.

**CHOTOSITZ, OR CZASLAU, Battle of.** See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1742 (JANUARY—MAY).

**CHOTYN.** See CHOCZIM.

**CHOUANS.—CHOUANNERIE.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1794-1793.

**CHOUT.**—The blacknail levied by the Mahattas. See INDIA: A. D. 1805-1816.

**CHOWANS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: IROQUOIS TRIBES OF THE SOUTH.

**CHREMONIDEAN WAR, The.** See ATHENS: B. C. 288-263.

**CHRIST, Knights of the Order of.** See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1415-1460.

**CHRISTIAN I., King of Denmark, Norway and Sweden,** A. D. 1448-1481....**Christian II.,** A. D. 1513-1523....**Christian III., King of Denmark and Norway,** A. D. 1534-1558....**Christian IV.,** A. D. 1588-1648....**Christian V.,** A. D. 1670-1699....**Christian VI.,** A. D. 1730-1746....**Christian VII.,** A. D. 1766-1808....**Christian VIII., King of Denmark,** A. D. 1820-1848....**Christian IX.,** A. D. 1863-.

**CHRISTIAN COMMISSION, The United States.** See SANITARY COMMISSION.

**CHRISTIAN ERA.** See ERA, CHRISTIAN.

## CHRISTIANITY.

"Historical geography has of late years become an integral part of the historical science. Recent investigations have opened up the subject and a solid beginning has been made—but it is only a beginning. It is clearly recognized that the land itself as it appears at different periods is one of those invaluable original documents upon which history is built, and no stone is being left unturned to clear away mysteries and to bring to our aid a realism hitherto unknown to the science. . . . But the special branch of this vast and complicated theme of historical geography which interests us most and which I desire briefly to bring to your attention is that which deals with the Christian Church. . . . Our eyes first rest upon that little group at Jerusalem that made up the Pentecostal Church. Its spread was conditioned by the extent and character of the Roman Empire, by the municipal genius of that empire, its great highways by land and sea; conditioned by the commercial routes and the track of armies outside the bounds of civilization; conditioned by the spread of languages—Aramaic, Greek, and Latin,—and, most important of all, conditioned by the whereabouts of the seven million Jews massed in Syria, Babylonia, and Egypt, and scattered every where throughout the Empire and far beyond its boundaries."—H. W. Hulbert, *The Historical Geography of the Christian Church* (Am. Soc. Church Hist., v. 3).—"When we turn from the Jewish 'dispersion' in the East to that in the West, we seem in quite a different atmosphere. Despite their intense nationalism, all unconsciously to themselves, their mental characteristics and tendencies were in the opposite direction from those of their brethren. With those of the East rested the future of Judaism; with them of the West, in a sense, that of the world. The one represented old Israel groping back into the darkness of the past; the other young Israel, stretching forth its hands to where the dawn of a new day was about to break. These Jews of the West are known by the term Hellenists. . . . The translation of the Old Testament into Greek may be regarded as the starting point of Hellenism. It rendered possible the hope that what in its original form

had been confined to the few, might become accessible to the world at large. . . . In the account of the truly representative gathering in Jerusalem on that ever-memorable Feast of Weeks, the division of the 'dispersion' into two grand sections—the Eastern or Trans-Euphratic, and the Western or Hellenist—seems clearly marked. In this arrangement the former would include 'the Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and dwellers in Mesopotamia,' Judæa standing, so to speak, in the middle, while 'the Cretes and Arabians' would typically represent the farthest outrunners respectively of the Western and Eastern Diaspora. The former, as we know from the New Testament, commonly bore in Palestine the name of the 'dispersion of the Greeks,' and of 'Hellenists' or 'Grecians.' On the other hand, the Trans-Euphratic Jews, who 'inhabited Babylon and many of the other satrapies,' were included with the Palestinian and the Syrians under the term 'Hebrews,' from the common language which they spoke. But the difference between the 'Grecians' and the 'Hebrews' was far deeper than merely of language, and extended to the whole direction of thought."—A. Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, v. 1, bk. 1, ch. 2-3, and 1.—"Before Pentecost an assembly of the believers took place, at which the post vacated in the number of the apostles by the suicide of the traitor Judas of Kerioth, was filled up by the election of Matthias by lot. On this occasion the number of the assembled brethren amounted to about 120 men. . . . At the feast of Pentecost . . . a very considerable accession was made to the formerly moderate band of believers in Jerusalem . . . ; about 3,000 souls received the word and were joined to the Church by baptism (Acts ii. 41). We must not, however, at once credit the Church in Jerusalem with this increase. For among the listeners to the apostolic discourse there were Israelitish guests and proselytes from near and distant countries (ii. 5, 9-11, 14), whence we may infer that of those newly converted many were not living in Jerusalem itself, but partly in Judæa and Galilee, partly in countries beyond Palestine, who therefore returned home after the feast days were



# DEVELOPMENT MAP OF CHRISTIANITY

EXTENT OF CHRISTIANITY AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE SEVENTH CENTURY

TERRITORY CHRISTIANIZED IN THE SEVENTH AND EIGHTH CENTURIES

TERRITORY CHRISTIANIZED IN THE NINTH, TENTH AND ELEVENTH CENTURIES

THE TERRITORY STILL HEATHEN AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY REMAINS UNCOLORED.

THE CHURCHES OF THE APOSTOLIC PERIOD (33-100) ARE UNDERLINED THIS - Thyatira.

THE MORE PROMINENT CHURCHES OF THE POST-APOSTOLIC PERIOD (100-300) ARE UNDERLINED THIS - Nicomedia.

CHURCHES WHICH FORM AS CENTRES OF DIFFUSION BOTH IN THE APOSTOLIC AND POST-APOSTOLIC PERIODS ARE INDICATED BY THE DOUBLE UNDERLINE THIS - Antioch and Alexandria.

THE JOURNEYS OF THE APOSTLE PAUL ARE INDICATED THIS

CITIES OF THE ROMAN PERIOD ARE INDICATED IN THIS TYPE Mediolanum. CITIES OF THE MEDIAEVAL PERIOD ARE INDICATED IN THIS TYPE Fulda.

THE DATES ON THE MAP ARE INTENDED TO INDICATE THE APPROXIMATE PERIODS OF CONVERSION.









ended. Some of these might, under certain circumstances, form the centre of a small Church in the dispersion, so that gradually Churches may have arisen to which also James may possibly have addressed his Epistle. . . . So abundantly did God bless with success the activity of the early apostles though limited to the nation of Israel and the land of Canaan, and their fidelity within a circumscribed sphere. Hence there existed at the end of the period of which we treat numerous Christian Churches in Jerusalem and the whole country of Judea (comp. Gal. i. 22, etc.; Acts xi. 1), also on the coast (Acts ix. 32-35, etc.) in Samaria and Galilee, and finally in Syria, Phœnicia, and Cyprus, (Acts ix. 2, 10, 25, xi. 19), some of which were directly, some indirectly, founded by the Twelve, and were, in any case, governed and guided by them. In the above named districts outside Palestine, it might not, indeed, have been easy to find a Christian Church consisting exclusively of believing Jews, for as a rule they consisted of believing Jews and individual Gentiles. On the other hand, we shall scarcely be wrong in regarding the Christian Churches within Palestine itself as composed entirely of believing Israelites. But even among these there were many distinctions, e. g., between Palestinians and Hellenists."—G. V. Lechler, *The Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times*, v. 1, p. 30-35.—"We find the early [Jewish] Christians observing the national feasts and holidays (Acts ii. 1; xviii. 21; xx. 6, 16; Rom. xiv. 5). They take part in the worship of the temple and the synagogue; they pray at the customary hours (chaps. ii. 46; iii. 1; v. 42; x. 9). They observe the fasts, and undergo voluntary abstinence, binding themselves by special vows like all pious Jews (xiii. 2; xvii. 18; xxi. 23). They scrupulously avoid unlawful food, and all legal defilement (x. 14). They have their children circumcised (xv. 5; xvi. 3; Gal. v. 2). . . . This scrupulous piety won for them the esteem and admiration of the people (chap. v. 13)." At first their creed was "comprised in a single dogma: 'Jesus is the Messiah.' . . . Their preaching of the Gospel strictly followed the lines of Messianic tradition (i. 7; ii. 36; iii. 20). . . . But in reality all this formed only the outside of their life and creed. . . . Herein lies the profound significance of the miracle of Pentecost. That day was the birthday of the Church, not because of the marvelous success of Peter's preaching, but because the Christian principle, hitherto existing only objectively and externally in the person of Jesus, passed from that moment into the souls of His disciples. . . . And thus in the very midst of Judaism we see created and unfolded a form of religious life essentially different from it—the Christian life."—A. Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*, pp. 35-36.—"By the two parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven, Christ marked out the two sides or aspects of His truth—its external growth from the least to the greatest, and its internal action on society at large—as setting up a ferment, and making a new lump out of the unknéaded mass of the old humanity. With these two symbols in view we may gauge what the gospel was designed to be and to do. It was to grow into a great outward society—the tree of the Church; but it was also to do a work on secular society as such, corresponding to the action of leaven on flour. The history of Christianity has been the carrying out

of these two distinct and contrasted conceptions; but how imperfectly, and under what drawbacks."—Rev. J. B. Heard, *Alexandrian and Carthaginian Theology Contrasted*, p. 186.—"The organic connection of Jewish Christians with the synagogue, which must, in accordance with the facts before us, be regarded as a rule, is certainly not to be taken as a mere incidental phenomenon, a customary habit or arbitrary accommodation, but as a moral fact resting upon an internal necessity, having its foundation in the love of Jewish Christians to their nation, and in the adhesion of their religious consciousness to the old covenant. To mistake this would be to underestimate the wide bearing of the fact. But lest we should over-estimate its importance, we must at once proceed to another consideration. Within Judaism we must distinguish not only the Rabbinical or Pharisaic tradition of the original canonical revelation, but also within the canon itself we have to distinguish the Levitical element from the prophetic, . . . taking the latter not in a close but a wide sense as the living spiritual development of the theocracy."—G. V. Lechler, *The Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times*, v. 1, p. 54.—"Moreover the law had claims on a Hebrew of Palestine wholly independent of his religious obligations. To him it was a national institution, as well as a divine covenant. Under the Gospel he might consider his relations to it in this latter character altered, but as embodying the decrees and usages of his country it still demanded his allegiance. To be a good Christian he was not required to be a bad citizen. On these grounds the more enlightened members of the mother-church would justify their continued adhesion to the law. Nor is there any reason to suppose that St. Paul himself took a different view of their obligations."—J. B. Lightfoot, *Dissertations on the Apostolic Age*, p. 67.—"The term 'Jewish-Christianity' is applicable exclusively to those Christians who really retained, entirely or in the smallest part, the national and political forms of Judaism and insisted upon the observance of the Mosaic Law without modification as essential to Christianity, at least to the Christianity of the Jewish-born converts, or who indeed rejected these forms, but acknowledged the prerogative of the Jewish people also in Christianity."—A. Harnack, *Outlines of the History of Dogma*, p. 75.

A. D. 33-100.—**The Rise of the Churches. —Jerusalem.**—"After the miraculous healing of the cripple and the discourse of the Apostle Peter on that occasion, the historian goes on to say, 'Many of them which heard the word believed, and the number of the men was about 5,000' (iv. 4). It seems as if in consequence of this event, which made no little stir, a larger number joined themselves to the Church. Nor is it probable that this healing took place until a long time after the beginning of the Church. The miracle, with the effect which it had, serves as a resting place at which the result of the previous growth of the Church may be ascertained. And here the number again incidentally mentioned refers without doubt to the Church at Jerusalem."—G. V. Lechler, *The Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times*, v. 1, p. 32.—The early history of the Churches "falls into three periods which mark three distinct stages in its progress: (1) The Extension of the Church to the Gentiles; (2) The Recognition of Gentle

Liberty; (3) The Emancipation of the Jewish Churches. . . . And soon enough the pressure of events began to be felt. The dispersion was the link which connected the Hebrews of Palestine with the outer world. Led captive by the power of Greek philosophy at Athens and Tarsus and Alexandria, attracted by the fascinations of Oriental mysticism in Asia, swept along with the busy whirl of social life in the city and court of the Cæsars, these outlying members of the chosen race had inhaled a freer spirit and contracted wider interests than their fellow-countrymen at home. By a series of insensible gradations — proselytes of the covenant — proselytes of the gate — superstitious devotees who observed the rites without accepting the faith of the Mosaic dispensation — curious lookers-on who interested themselves in the Jewish ritual as they would in the worship of Isis or of Astarte — the most stubborn zealot of the law was linked to the idolatrous heathen whom he abhorred and who despised him in turn. Thus the train was unconsciously laid, when the spark fell from heaven and fired it. . . . Meanwhile at Jerusalem some years passed away before the barrier of Judaism was assailed. The Apostles still observed the Mosaic ritual; they still confined their preaching to Jews by birth, or Jews by adoption, the proselytes of the covenant. At length a breach was made, and the assailants as might be expected were Hellenists. The first step towards the creation of an organized ministry was also the first step towards the emancipation of the Church. The Jews of Judæa, 'Hebrews of the Hebrews' had ever regarded their Hellenist brethren with suspicion and distrust; and this estrangement reproduced itself in the Christian Church. The interests of the Hellenist widows had been neglected in the daily distribution of alms. Hence 'arose a murmuring of the Hellenists against the Hebrews' (Acts vi. 1), which was met by the appointment of seven persons specially charged with providing for the wants of these neglected poor. If the selection was made, as St. Luke's language seems to imply, not by the Hellenists themselves but by the Church at large (vi. 2), the concession when granted was carried out in a liberal spirit. All the names of the seven are Greek, pointing to a Hellenist rather than a Hebrew extraction, and one is especially described as a proselyte, being doubtless chosen to represent a hitherto small but growing section of the community. By this appointment the Hellenist members obtained a status in the Church; and the effects of this measure soon became visible. Two out of the seven stand prominently forward as the champions of emancipation, Stephen the preacher and martyr of liberty, and Philip the practical worker."—J. B. Lightfoot, *Dissertations on the Apostolic Age*, pp. 50-52.—"The Hellenist Stephen roused deep-stirring movements chiefly in Hellenist circles. . . . The persecution of the Jerusalem community — perhaps specially of its Hellenist part — which followed the coming of Stephen, became a means of promoting the spread of the Christian faith to . . . Cyprus, at last to so important a centre as Antioch, the imperial capital of the East. To the winning of the Jews to faith in Jesus there is already added the reception into the Christian community of the pious Gentile Cornelius, a proselyte of the gate. . . . Though this appears in tradition as an

individual case sanctioned by special Divine guidance, in the meantime Hellenist Christians had already begun to preach the Gospel to born Greeks, also at Antioch in Syria, and successfully (Acts xi. 19-26), Barnabas is sent thither from Jerusalem."—W. Moeller, *History of the Christian Church*, p. 53-54.—"Philip, driven from Jerusalem by the persecution, preached Christ to the Samaritans. . . . The Apostles who had remained at Jerusalem, hearing of the success of Philip's preaching, sent two of their number into this new and fruitful field of labor. . . . Peter and John return to Jerusalem while the Deacon Philip is called, by a new manifestation of the will of God, yet further to extend the field of Christian missions. It is not a Samaritan but a pagan, whom he next instructs in the truth. . . . He was an Ethiopian eunuch, a great dignitary of the court of Meroë, treasurer of the Queen. . . . This man, a pagan by birth, had taken a long journey to worship the true God in the temple of Jerusalem."—E. De Pressensé, *The Early Years of Christianity*, pp. 71-74.—"For the sake of the popular feeling Herod Agrippa laid hands on members of the community, and caused James the brother of John (the sons of Zebedee) to be put to death by the sword, in the year 44, for soon thereafter Herod Agrippa died. Peter also was taken prisoner, but miraculously escaped and provisionally left Jerusalem. From this time on James the brother of the Lord appears ever more and more as really bearing rank as head of the Jerusalem community, while Peter more and more devotes himself to the apostolic mission abroad, and indeed, more accurately, to the mission in Israel."—W. Moeller, *History of the Christian Church*, p. 55.—"The accounts which we have regarding the apostle Peter, represent him as preaching the gospel from the far east to distant parts of the west. . . . According to his own words, he founded churches in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, and according to the testimony of ancient historians of the Church in the east also; in Syria, Babylon, Mesopotamia, Chaldaea, Arabia, Phœnicia and Egypt; and in the west, at Rome, in Britain, Ireland, Helvetia and Spain."—J. E. T. Wiltseh, *Hand Book of the Geography and Statistics of The Church*, v. 1, pp. 19-20.—"Three and three only of the personal disciples and immediate followers of our Lord hold any prominent place in the Apostolic records—James, Peter, and John; the first the Lord's brother, the two latter the foremost members of the Twelve. Apart from an incidental reference to the death of James the son of Zebedee, which is dismissed in a single sentence, the rest of the Twelve are mentioned by name for the last time on the day of the Lord's Ascension. Thenceforward they disappear wholly from the canonical writings. And this silence also extends to the traditions of succeeding ages. We read indeed of St. Thomas in India, of St. Andrew in Scythia; but such scanty notices, even if we accept them as trustworthy, show only the more plainly how little the Church could tell of her earliest teachers. Doubtless they laboured zealously and effectively in the spread of the Gospel; but, so far as we know, they have left no impress of their individual mind and character on the Church at large. Occupying the foreground, and indeed covering the whole canvas of early ecclesiastical history,

appear four figures alone, St. Paul, and the three Apostles of the Circumcision."—J. B. Lightfoot, *Dissertations on the Apostolic Age*, p. 46.—"While Peter (as it appears) is occupied with the work of preaching to the Jews outside of Palestine, the community at Jerusalem, and indeed the Palestinian communities in general, stand under the leadership of the brother of the Lord, James, as their recognised head. They remain strictly in the life of the law, and still hold securely to the hope of the conversion of the whole of God's people (which Paul had for the present given up). The mission to the Gentiles is indeed recognised, but the manner of its conduct by Paul and the powerful increase of Pauline communities excite misgivings and dissensions. For in these mixed communities, in the presence of what is often a preponderating Gentile element, it becomes ever clearer in what direction the development is pressing; that, in fact, for the sake of the higher Christian communion the legalists even of the Jewish Christians in these communities must inevitably be broken down, and general Christian freedom, on principle, from the commands of the law, gain recognition."—Dr. Wilhelm Moeller, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, p. 73.—"The fall of Jerusalem occurred in the Autumn of the year 70 [see JEWS: A. D. 66-70]. And soon the catastrophe came which solved the difficult problem. . . . Jerusalem was razed to the ground, and the Temple-worship ceased, never again to be revived. The Christians foreseeing the calamity had fled before the tempest. . . . Before the crisis came, they had been deprived of the counsel and guidance of the leading apostles. Peter had fallen a martyr at Rome; John had retired to Asia Minor; James, the Lord's brother, was slain not long before the great catastrophe. . . . He was succeeded by his cousin Symeon, the son of Clopas and nephew of Joseph. Under these circumstances the Church was reformed at Pella. Its history in the ages following is a hopeless blank."—J. B. Lightfoot, *Dissertations on the Apostolic Age*, p. 68.—"While Cæsarea succeeded Jerusalem as the political capital of Palestine, Antioch succeeded it as the centre of Christendom."—A. Plummer, *Church of the Early Fathers*, ch. 3.

**Antioch.**—"Under Macedonian rule the Greek intellect had become the leading intellectual power of the world. The great Greek-speaking towns of the East were alike the strongholds of intellectual power, the battlefields of opinion and systems, and the laboratories of scientific research, where discoveries were made and literary undertakings requiring the combination of forces were carried out. Such was Antioch on the Orontes, the meeting point of Syrian and Greek intellect; such, above all, was Alexandria."—J. J. von Döllinger, *Studies in European History*, p. 165.—"The chief line along which the new religion developed was that which led from Syrian Antioch through the Cilician Gates, across Lycæonia to Ephesus, Corinth, and Rome. One subsidiary line followed the land route by Philadelphia, Troas, Philipp, and the Egnatian Way to Brindisi and Rome; and another went north from the Gates by Tyana and Cæsarea of Cappadocia to Amisos in Pontus, the great harbour of the Black Sea, by which the trade of Central Asia was carried to Rome. The maintenance of close and constant communication between the scattered congregations must be

presupposed, as necessary to explain the growth of the Church and the attitude which the State assumed towards it. Such communication was, on the view advocated in the present work, maintained along the same lines on which the general development of the Empire took place; and politics, education and religion grew side by side."—W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 10.—"The incitement to the wider preaching of the Gospel in the Greek world starts from the Christian community at Antioch. For this purpose Barnabas receives Paul as a companion (Acts xiii., and xiv.). Saul, by birth a Jew of the tribe of Benjamin, born at Tarsus in Cilicia, educated as a Pharisee, and although indeed as a Hellenist, he had command of Greek and had come into contact with Greek culture and Greek life, yet had not actually passed through the discipline of Greek culture, was introduced by Gamaliel to the learned study of the law, and his whole soul was seized with fiery zeal for the Statutes of the fathers. . . . After [his conversion and] his stay in Damascus and in Arabia and the visit to Peter (and James) at Jerusalem, having gone to Syria and Cilicia, he was taken to Antioch by Barnabas."—W. Moeller, *History of the Christian Church*, p. 57.—"The strength and zeal of the Antioch Christian society are shown in the sending forth of Paul and Barnabas, with Mark, a cousin of Barnabas, for their companion for a part of the way, on a preaching tour in the eastern districts of Asia Minor. First they visited Cyprus, where Sergius Paulus, the proconsul, was converted. Thence they sailed to Attalia, on the southern coast of Pamphylia, and near Perga; from Perga they proceeded to Antioch in Pisidia, and from there eastward to Iconium, and as far as Lystra and Derbe in Lycæonia. Retracing their steps, they came back to Attalia, and sailed directly to Antioch. . . . This was the first incursion of Paul into the domain of heathenism."—G. P. Fisher, *History of the Christian Church*, p. 22.—"How then should Paul and Barnabas proceed? To leave Syria they must go first to Seleucia, the harbour of Antioch, where they would find ships going south to the Syrian coast and Egypt, and west either by way of Cyprus or along the coast of Asia Minor. The western route led toward the Roman world, to which all Paul's subsequent history proves that he considered himself called by the Spirit. The Apostles embarked in a ship for Cyprus, which was very closely connected by commerce and general intercourse with the Syrian coast. After traversing the island from east to west, they must go onward. Ships going westward naturally went across the coast of Pamphylia, and the Apostles, after reaching Paphos, near the west end of Cyprus, sailed in one of these ships, and landed at Attalia in Pamphylia."—W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 60.—"The work starting from Antioch, by which access to the faith is opened to the Gentiles, the formation of (preponderatingly) Gentile Christian communities, now introduces into the original Christian development an important problem, which (about the year 52, probably not later), (Gal. ii.; Acts xv.) leads to discussions and explanations of the so-called Apostolic Council [at Jerusalem]. . . . For Paul, who has risen to perfect independence by the energy of his own peculiar stamp of gospel, there now begin the years of his powerful

activity, in which he not only again visits and extends his former missionary field in Asia Minor, but gains a firm footing in Macedonia (Philippi), Athens, and Achaia (Corinth); then on the so-called third missionary journey he exercises a comprehensive influence during a stay of nearly three years at Ephesus, and finally looks from Achaia towards the metropolis of the world."—W. Moeller, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, pp. 57-59.—"If the heathen whom he (Paul) had won to the faith and received into the Church were to be persuaded to adopt circumcision and the law before they could attain to full participation in the Christian salvation, his preaching had fallen short of his aim, it had been in vain, since it was very doubtful whether the Gentiles gained over to believe in the Messiah would submit to the condition. Paul could only look on those who made such a demand as false brethren, who having no claim to Christian brotherhood had forced themselves into the Church at Antioch in an unauthorized way (Gal. ii. 4), and was persuaded that neither the primitive Church as such, nor its rulers, shared this view. In order therefore to prevent the Gentile Christians from being disturbed on this point, he determined to go to Jerusalem and there to challenge a decision in the matter that should put an end to the strife (ii. 2). The Church at Antioch also recognized this necessity; hence followed the proceedings in Jerusalem [about A. D. 52], whither Paul and Barnabas repaired with other associates (Gal. ii. 1, Acts xv. 2 ff.). . . . It is certain that when Paul laid his (free) gospel before the authorities in Jerusalem, they added nothing to it (Gal. ii. 2-6), i. e., they did not require that the gospel he preached to the Gentiles should, besides the sole condition of faith which he laid down, impose Judaism upon them as a condition of participation in salvation. . . . Paul's stipulations with the authorities in Jerusalem respecting their future work were just as important for him as the recognition of his free gospel (Gal. ii. 7-10). They had for their basis a recognition on the part of the primitive apostles that he was entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision, to which they could add nothing (ii. 6), just as Peter (as admittedly the most prominent among the primitive apostles) was entrusted with that of the circumcision."—Bernhard Weiss, *A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*, v. 1, pp. 172-175, 178.—"It seems clear that the first meetings of the Christians as a community apart — meetings that is of a private rather than a proselytising character — took place, as we see from Acts i. 13-15, in private apartments, the upper rooms or large guest-chambers in the houses of individual members. Such a room was doubtless provided by the liberality of Titus Justus (Acts xviii. 7), such a room again was the upper chamber in which St. Paul preached at Troas (Acts xx. 7, 8); in such assembled the converts saluted by the Apostle as the church which is in the house of Aquila and Prisca, of Nymphas and of Philemon. . . . The primitive Roman house had only one story, but as the cities grew to be more densely populated upper stories came into use, and it was the custom to place in these dining apartments, which were called cenacula. Such apartments would answer to the 'upper rooms' . . . associated with the early days of Christianity. . . . The Christian communities contained from an early period members of

wealth and social position, who could accommodate in their houses large gatherings of the faithful; and it is interesting to reflect that while some of the mansions of an ancient city might be witnessing in suppers of a Trimalchio or a Virro, scenes more revolting to modern taste than almost anything presented by the pagan world, others, perhaps in the same street, might be the seat of Christian worship or of the simple Christian meal."—G. B. Brown, *From School to Cathedral*, pp. 38-43.

**Asia Minor and Greece.**—"Our knowledge of the Apostle Paul's life is far from being complete. We have only a brief sketch of journeys and toils that extended over a period of thirty years. Large spaces are passed over in silence. For example, in the catalogue of his sufferings, incidentally given, he refers to the fact that he had been shipwrecked three times, and these disasters were all prior to the shipwreck on the Island of Malta described by Luke. Shortly after the conference at Jerusalem he started on his second missionary tour. He was accompanied by Silas, and was joined by Timothy at Lystra. He revisited his converts in Eastern Asia Minor, founded churches in Galatia and Phrygia, and from Troas, obedient to a heavenly summons, crossed over to Europe. Having planted at Philippi a church that remained remarkably devoted and loyal to him, he followed the great Roman road to Thessalonica, the most important city in Macedonia. Driven from there and from Berea, he proceeded to Athens [see ATHENS: A. D. 54 (?)]. In that renowned and cultivated city he discoursed on Mars Hill to auditors eager for new ideas in philosophy and religion, and in private debated with Stoics and Epicureans. At Corinth, which had risen from its ruins and was once more rich and prosperous, he remained for a year and a half. It was there, probably, that he wrote his two Epistles to the Thessalonian Christians. After a short stay at Ephesus he returned to Antioch by way of Cesarea and Jerusalem. It was not long before Paul—a second Alexander, but on a peaceful expedition—began his third great missionary journey. Taking the land route from Antioch, he traversed Asia Minor to Ephesus, a flourishing commercial mart, the capital of the Roman province of Asia. There, with occasional absences, he made his abode for upwards of two years. From Ephesus, probably, he wrote the Epistle to the Galatians. . . . From Ephesus Paul also wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians. The Second Epistle to the Corinthians he probably wrote from Philippi. . . . Coming down through Greece, he remained there three months. There he composed his Epistle to the Romans. . . . The untravelling Apostle now turned his face towards Jerusalem. He desired to be present at the festival of the Pentecost. In order to save time, he sailed past Ephesus, and at Miletus bade a tender farewell to the Ephesian elders. He had fulfilled his pledge given at the conference, and he now carried contributions from the Christians of Macedonia and Achaia for the poor at Jerusalem."—G. P. Fisher, *History of the Christian Church*, pp. 27-28.—"We may safely say that if Saul had been less of a Jew, Paul the Apostle would have been less bold and independent. His work would have been more superficial, and his mind less unfettered. God did not choose a heathen to be the apostle for the

heathen; for he might have been ensnared by the traditions of Judaism, by its priestly hierarchy and the splendours of its worship, as indeed it happened with the church of the second century. On the contrary God chose a Pharisee. But this Pharisee had the most complete experience of the emptiness of external ceremonies and the crushing yoke of the law. There was no fear that he would ever look back, that he would be tempted to set up again what the grace of God had justly overthrown (Gal. ii. 18). Judaism was wholly vanquished in his soul, for it was wholly displaced."—A. Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*, p. 69.—"Notwithstanding the opposition he met from his countrymen, in spite of all the liberal and the awakened sympathies which he derived from his work, despite the necessity of contending daily and hourly for the freedom of the Gospel among the Gentiles, he never ceased to be a Jew. . . . The most ardent patriot could not enlarge with greater pride on the glories of the chosen race than he does in the Epistle to the Romans. His care for the poor in Judæa is a touching proof of the strength of this national feeling. His attendance at the great annual festivals in Jerusalem is still more significant. 'I must spend the coming feast at Jerusalem.' This language becomes the more striking when we remember that he was then intending to open out a new field of missionary labour in the far West, and was bidding perhaps his last farewell to the Holy City, the joy of the whole earth."—J. B. Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, pp. 209-210.—"The Macedonian Churches are honorably distinguished above all others by their fidelity to the Gospel and their affectionate regard for St. Paul himself. While the Church of Corinth disgraced herself by gross moral delinquencies, while the Galatians bartered the liberty of the Gospel for a narrow formalism, while the believers of Ephesus drifted into the wildest speculative errors, no such stain attaches to the brethren of Philippi and Thessalonica. It is to the Macedonian congregations that the Apostle ever turns for solace in the midst of his severest trials and sufferings. Time seems not to have chilled these feelings of mutual affection. The Epistle to the Philippians was written about ten years after the Thessalonian letters. It is the more surprising therefore that they should resemble each other so strongly in tone. In both alike St. Paul drops his official title at the outset, . . . and in both he adopts throughout the same tone of confidence and affection. In this interval of ten years we meet with one notice of the Macedonian Churches. It is conceived in terms of unmeasured praise. The Macedonians had been called upon to contribute to the wants of their poorer brethren in Judæa, who were suffering from famine. They had responded nobly to the call. Deep-sunk in poverty and sorely tried by persecution, they came forward with eager joy and poured out the riches of their liberality, straining their means to the utmost in order to relieve the sufferers. . . . We may imagine that the people still retained something of those simpler habits and that sturdier character, which triumphed over Greeks and Orientals in the days of Philip and Alexander, and thus in the early warfare of the Christian Church the Macedonian phalanx offered a successful resistance to the assaults of an enemy, before which the lax and enervated ranks of Asia and Achaia had yielded

ignominiously."—J. B. Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, pp. 249-250.—"At Jerusalem, 'the Apostle was rescued by a detachment of the Roman garrison from a mob of Jewish malignants, was held in custody for two years at Cæsarea, and was finally enabled to accomplish a long-cherished intention to go to Rome, by being conveyed there as a prisoner, he having made an appeal to Cæsar. After being wrecked on the Mediterranean and east ashore on the Island of Malta, under the circumstances related in Luke's graphic and accurate description of the voyage, he went on his way in safety to the capital.'"—G. P. Fisher, *History of the Christian Church*, p. 29.—"Paul's apostolic career, as known to us, lasted . . . twenty-nine or thirty years; and it falls into three distinct periods which are summarized in the following chronological table: First Period—Essentially Missionary: 35 A. D. Conversion of Paul.—Journey to Arabia; 38, First visit to Jerusalem; 38-40, Mission in Syria and Cilicia—Tarsus and Antioch; 50-51, First missionary journey—Cyprus, Pamphylia and Galatia (Acts xiii., xiv.); 52, Conference at Jerusalem (Acts xv.; Gal. ii.); 52-55, Second missionary journey—Epistles to the Thessalonians (from Corinth). Second Period—The Great Conflicts, and the Great Epistles: 54, Return to Antioch—Controversy with Peter (Gal. ii. 12-22); 55-57, Mission to Ephesus and Asia; 56, Epistle to the Galatians; 57 or 58 (Passover), First Epistle to the Corinthians (Ephesus); 57 or 58 (Autumn), Second Epistle to the Corinthians (Macedonia); 58 (Winter), Epistle to the Romans. Third Period—The Captivity: 58 or 59 (Pentecost), Paul is arrested at Jerusalem; 58-60, or 59-61, Captivity at Cæsarea—Epistles to Philemon, Colossians and Ephesians; 60 or 61 (Autumn), Departure for Rome; 61 or 62 (Spring), Arrival of Paul in Rome; 62-63, Epistle to the Philippians; 63 or 64, End of the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles."—A. Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*, pp. 21-22.—"The impression that we get from Acts is, that the evangelisation of Asia Minor originated from St. Paul; and that from his initiative the new religion gradually spread over the country through the action of many other missionaries (Acts xix. 10). Moreover, missionaries not trained by him, were at work in South Galatia and in Ephesus as early as 54-56 A. D. (Gal. v. 7-10; Acts xviii. 25). . . . The Christian Church in Asia Minor was always opposed to the primitive native character. It was Christianity, and not the Imperial government, which finally destroyed the native languages, and made Greek the universal language of Asia Minor. The new religion was strong in the towns before it had any hold of the country parts. The ruder and the less civilised any district was, the slower was Christianity in permeating it. Christianity in the early centuries was the religion of the more advanced, not of the 'barbarian' peoples; and in fact it seems to be nearly confined within the limits of the Roman world, and practically to take little thought of any people beyond, though in theory, 'Barbarian and Scythian' are included in it. . . . The First Epistle of John was in all probability 'addressed primarily to the circle of Asiatic Churches, of which Ephesus was the centre.'"—W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 284, 44, 303.—"Unless we are prepared to reject without a hearing all the traditions of Christianity, we cannot refuse to believe that the latest years

of the Apostle St. John were spent in the Roman province of Asia and chiefly in Ephesus its capital. This tradition is singularly full, consistent and well-authenticated. Here he gathered disciples about him, organized churches, appointed bishops and presbyters. A whole chorus of voices unite in bearing testimony to its truth. One who passed his earlier life in these parts and had heard his aged master, a disciple of St. John himself, recount his personal reminiscences of the great Apostle; another, who held this very see of Ephesus, and writing less than a century after the Apostle's death was linked with the past by a chain of relatives all bishops in the Christian Church; a third who also flourished about the close of the century and numbered among his teachers an old man from this very district—are the principal, because the most distinct, witnesses to a fact which is implied in several other notices of earlier or contemporary writers. As to the time at which St. John left his original home and settled in this new abode no direct account is preserved; but a very probable conjecture may be hazarded. The impending fall of the Holy City was the signal for the dispersion of the followers of Christ. About this same time the three other great Apostles, St. Peter, St. Paul and St. James, died a martyr's death; and on St. John, the last surviving of the four great pillars of the Church, devolved the work of developing the theology of the Gospel and completing the organization of the Church. It was not unnatural that at such a crisis he should fix his residence in the centre of a large and growing Christian community, which had been planted by the Apostle of the Gentiles, and watered by the Apostle of the Circumcision. The missionary labours of St. Paul and St. Peter in Asia Minor were confirmed and extended by the prolonged residence of their younger contemporary. At all events such evidence as we possess is favourable to this view of the date of St. John's settlement at Ephesus. Assuming that the Apocalypse is the work of the beloved Apostle, and accepting the view which assigns it to the close of Nero's reign or thereabouts, we find him now for the first time in the immediate neighbourhood of Asia Minor and in direct communication with Ephesus and the neighbouring Churches. St. John however was not alone. Whether drawn thither by the attraction of his presence or acting in pursuance of some common agreement, the few surviving personal disciples of the Lord would seem to have chosen Asia Minor as their permanent abode, or at all events as their recognised headquarters. Here at least we meet with the friend of St. John's youth and perhaps his fellow-townsmen, Andrew of Bethsaida, who with him had first listened to John the Baptist, and with him also had been the earliest to recognise Jesus as the Christ. Here too we encounter Philip the Evangelist with his daughters, and perhaps also Philip of Bethsaida, the Apostle. Here also was settled the Apostle's namesake, John the Presbyter, also a personal disciple of Jesus, and one Aristion, not otherwise known to us, who likewise had heard the Lord. And possibly also other Apostles whose traditions Papias recorded (see J. B. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, p. 527), Matthew and Thomas and James, may have had some connexion, temporary or permanent, with this district. Thus surrounded by the surviving disciples of the Lord, by bishops and presbyters of his own ap-

pointment, and by the pupils who gathered about him and looked to him for instruction, St. John was the focus of a large and active society of believers. In this respect he holds a unique position among the great teachers of the new faith. St. Peter and St. Paul converted disciples and organized congregations; St. John alone was the centre of a school. His life prolonged till the close of the century, when the Church was firmly rooted and widely extended, combined with his fixed abode in the centre of an established community to give a certain definiteness to his personal influence which would be wanting to the wider labours of these strictly missionary preachers. Hence the notices of St. John have a more solid basis and claim greater attention than stories relating to the other Apostles.—J. B. Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, pp. 51-53.—“In the parable of Jesus, of which we are speaking, it is said that ‘the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself;’—that is, to transfer the Greek term into English, ‘automatically.’ That epithet is chosen which denotes most precisely a self-acting, spontaneous energy, inherent in the seed which Jesus, through his discourses, his acts of mercy and power, and his patience unto death, was sowing in the world. This grand prophetic declaration, uttered in a figure so simple and beautiful, in the ears of a little company of Galileans was to be wonderfully verified in the coming ages of Christian history.”—G. P. Fisher, *The Nature and Method of Revelation*, p. 47.

**Alexandria.**—“Plutarch looked upon it as the great mission of Alexander to transplant Grecian culture into distant countries, and to conciliate Greeks and barbarians, and to fuse them into one. He says of him, not without reason, that he was sent of God for this purpose; though the historian did not divine that this end itself was only subsidiary to, and the means of, one still higher—the making, viz., the united peoples of the East and West more accessible to the new creation which was to proceed from Christianity, and by the combination of the elements of Oriental and Hellenic culture the preparing for Christianity a material in which it might develop itself. If we overlook this ulterior end, and do not fix our regards on the higher quickening spirit destined to reanimate, for some new end, that combination which already bore within itself a germ of corruption, we might well doubt whether that union was really a gain to either party; whether, at least, it was not everywhere attended with a correspondent loss. For the fresh vigour which it infused into the old national spirit must have been constantly repressed by the violence which the foreign element did to it. To introduce into that combination a new living principle of development, and, without prejudice to their original essence, to unite peculiarities the most diverse into a whole in which each part should be a complement to the other, required something higher than any element of human culture. The true living communion between the East and the West, which should combine together the two peculiar principles that were equally necessary for a complete exhibition of the type of humanity, could first come only from Christianity. But still, as preparatory thereto, the influence which, for three centuries, went forth from Alexandria, that centre of the intercourse of the world, was of great importance.”—A. Neander, *General Hist. of the*

*Christian Religion and Church, v. 1, introd.*—"The Greek version [of the Old Testament, the Septuagint], like the Targum of the Palestinians, originated, no doubt, in the first place, in a felt national want on the part of the Hellenists, who as a body were ignorant of Hebrew. Hence we find notices of very early Greek versions of at least parts of the Pentateuch. But this, of course, could not suffice. On the other hand, there existed, as we may suppose, a natural curiosity on the part of the students, specially in Alexandria, which had so large a Jewish population, to know the sacred books on which the religion and history of Israel were founded. Even more than this, we must take into account the literary tastes of the first three Ptolemies (successors in Egypt of Alexander the Great), and the exceptional favour which the Jews for a time enjoyed."—A. Eidersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, v. 1, p. 24.*

**Rome.**—"Alongside of the province of Asia Minor, Rome very early attains to an outstanding importance for young Christianity. If, as we have supposed, the community here which emancipated itself from the synagogue was mainly recruited from among the proselyte circles which had formed themselves around the Jewish synagogue, if Paul during the years of his captivity, and Peter also, influenced this preponderatingly Gentile-Christian community, we must, however, by no means undervalue for the Christian community the continuous influence of Judaism on the Roman world, an influence which was not lessened but rather increased by the destruction of Jerusalem. Many thousands of Jewish captives had arrived here and been sold as slaves—Rome was the greatest Jewish city in the Empire. . . . and in part it was an enlightened and liberal Judaism. Jewish Hellenism had already long availed itself of the weapons of Hellenic philosophy and science . . . in order to exalt the Jewish faith. . . . Under this stimulus there was . . . developed a proselytism which was indeed attracted by that monotheism and the belief in providence and prophecy and the moral ideas allied therewith, and which also had a strong tendency to Jewish customs and festivals—especially the keeping of the Sabbath—-but which remained far from binding itself to a strictly legal way of life in circumcision, etc. We may suppose that Roman Christianity not only appeared in the character of such a proselytism, but also retained from it a certain Jewish colouring."—W. Moeller, *History of the Christian Church: A. D. 1-600, pp. 83-84.*—"The last notice of the Roman Church in the Apostolic writings seems to point to two separate communities, a Judaizing Church and a Pauline Church. The arrival of the Gentile Apostle in the metropolis, it would appear, was the signal for the separation of the Judaizers, who had hitherto associated with their Gentile brethren coldly and distrustfully. The presence of St. Paul must have vastly strengthened the numbers and influence of the more liberal and Catholic party; while the Judaizers provoked by rivalry redoubled their efforts, that in making converts to the Gospel they might also gain proselytes to the law."—J. B. Lightfoot, *Dissertations on the Apostolic Age, p. 94.*—"Historical information of any certainty on the latter period of Paul's life is entirely wanting. While the epistles require this unknown period, and a second captivity, as a basis for their apostolic

origin, on the other hand, the hypothesis of a second captivity scarcely finds any real foundations except in the three Pastoral letters."—A. Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul, p. 209.*—"It only remains for us, returning to the close of the apostle's life, to put together the slender indications that we have of its date. He embarked for Rome in the autumn of 60 (or 61) A. D.; but was compelled by shipwreck to winter in the island of Malta, and only reached the Eternal City in the spring of 61 (62). Luke adds that he remained there as a prisoner for two years, living in a private house under the guard of a soldier; then his narrative breaks off abruptly, and we are confronted with the unknown (Acts, xxviii, 30). Paul is supposed to have perished in the frightful persecution caused by the fire of Rome in July 64 A. D. All that is certain is that he died a martyr at Rome under Nero (Sabatier).

[The purpose of what follows in this article is to give a brief history of Christianity in some of its relations to general history by the method of this work, and in the light of some of the best thought of our time. The article as a combination of quotations from many authors attempts a presentation of historic facts, and also a positive and representative view, so far as this may be obtained under the guidance of ideas common to many of the books used. Some of these books have had more influence on the development of the article than others: entire harmony and a full presentation of any author's view would manifestly be impossible. Nevertheless, the reader may discover in the article principles and elements of unity derived from the literature and representing it. Unfortunately, one of the essential parts of such a history must be omitted—biography.]

**A. D. 100-312.—The Period of Growth and Struggle.**—"Christian belief, Christian morality, the Christian view of the world, of which the church as a religious society and institution is the focus, as fluid spiritual elements permeate humanity as it becomes Christian, far beyond the sphere of the church proper; while conversely the church is not assured against the possibility that spiritual elements originally alien to her may dominate and influence her in their turn. . . . In this living interaction the peculiar life of the church is unfolded, in accordance with its internal principles of formation, into an extraordinarily manifold and complicated object of historical examination. . . . For this purpose it is necessary to elucidate the general historical movement of the church by the relative separation of certain of its aspects, without loosening the bond of unity."—W. Moeller, *Hist. of the Christian Church: A. D. 1-600, pp. 1-3.*—"Such, in fact, has been the history of the Faith: a sad and yet a glorious succession of battles, often hardly fought, and sometimes indecisive, between the new life and the old life. . . . The Christian victory of common life was wrought out in silence and patience and nameless agonies. It was the victory of the soldiers and not of the captains of Christ's army. But in due time another conflict had to be sustained, not by the masses, but by great men, the consequence and the completion of that which had gone before. . . . The discipline of action precedes the effort of reason. . . . So it came to pass that the period during which this second conflict of the Faith was waged was, roughly speaking, from the middle of the second



to the middle of the third century."—B. F. Westcott, *Essays in the History of Religious Thought in the West*, pp. 194-197.—"Philosophy went on its way among the higher classes, but laid absolutely no hold on men at large. The reformation which it wrought in a few elect spirits failed utterly to spread downward to the mass of mankind. The poor were not touched by it; society was not helped by it; its noblest men, and they grow fewer and fewer, generation by generation, bewailed bitterly the universal indifference. The schools dwindled into a mere university system of culture; Christianity developed into a religion for the civilised world. . . . New ideas it had in abundance, but new ideas were not the secret of its power. The essential matter in the Gospel was that it was the history of a life. It was a tale of fact that all could understand, that all could believe, that all could love. It differed fundamentally from Philosophy, because it appealed not to culture, but to life. . . . It was the spell of substantial facts, living facts, . . . the spell of a loyalty to a personal Lord; and those who have not mastered the difference between a philosopher's speculations about life, and the actual record of a life which, in all that makes life holy and beautiful, transcended the philosopher's most pure and lofty dreams, have not understood yet the rudiments of the reason why the Stoic could not, while Christianity could and did, regenerate society."—J. B. Brown, *Stoics and Saints*, pp. 85-86.—The "period, from the accession of Marcus Aurelius (A. D. 161) to the accession of Valerian (A. D. 253) was for the Gentile world a period of unrest and exhaustion, of ferment and of indecision. The time of great hopes and creative minds was gone. The most conspicuous men were, with few exceptions, busied with the past. . . . Local beliefs had lost their power. Even old Rome ceased to exercise an unquestioned moral supremacy. Men strove to be cosmopolitan. They strove vaguely after a unity in which the scattered elements of ancient experience should be harmonized. The effect can be seen both in the policy of statesmen and in the speculations of philosophers, in Marcus Aurelius, or Alexander Severus, or Decius, no less than in Plotinus or Porphyry. As a necessary consequence, the teaching of the Bible accessible in Greek began to attract serious attention among the heathen. The assailants of Christianity, even if they affected contempt, shewed that they were deeply moved by its doctrines. The memorable saying of Numenius, 'What is Plato but Moses speaking in the language of Athens?' shews at once the feeling after spiritual sympathy which began to be entertained, and the want of spiritual insight in the representatives of Gentile thought."—B. F. Westcott, *Essays in the History of Religious Thought in the West*, pp. 196-197.—"To our minds it appears that the preparation of philosophy for Christianity was complete. . . . The time was ripe for that movement of which Justin is the earliest [complete] representative."—G. T. Purves, *The Testimony of Justin Martyr*, p. 135.—"The writing in defense of Christianity is called the apology, and the writer an apologist. . . . There were two classes of apologists, the Greek and the Latin, according to the territory which they occupied, and the language in which they wrote. But there were further differences. The Greeks belonged mostly to the second century, and their writings exhibited a

profound intimacy with the Greek philosophy. Some of them had studied in the Greek schools, and entered the church only in mature life. They endeavored to prove that Christianity was the blossom of all that was valuable in every system. They stood largely on the defensive. The Latins, on the other hand, were aggressive. They lived mostly in the third century. . . . The principal Greek apologists [were] Aristo, Quadratus, Aristides [A. D. 131], Justin [A. D. 160], Melito [A. D. 170], Miltiades, Irenæus, Athenagoras [A. D. 178], Tatian, Clement of Alexandria [A. D. 200], Hippolytus, and Origen [A. D. 225]."—J. F. Hurst, *Short History of the Christian Church*, p. 33. Lightfoot assigns to about A. D. 150 (?) the author of the Epistle to Diognetus: "Times without number the defenders of Christianity appeal to the great and advantageous change wrought by the Gospel in all who embraced it. . . . 'We who hated and destroyed one another, and on account of their different manners would not receive into our houses men of a different tribe, now, since the coming of Christ, live familiarly with them. We pray for our enemies, we endeavor to persuade those who hate us unjustly to live conformably to the beautiful precepts of Christ, to the end that they may become partakers with us of the same joyful hope of a reward from God, the Ruler of all.' This distinction between Christians and heathen, this consciousness of a complete change in character and life, is nowhere more beautifully described than in the noble epistle . . . to Diognetus."—Gerhard Uhlhorn, *The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism*, p. 166.—"For Christians are not distinguished from the rest of mankind either in locality or in speech or in customs. For they dwell not somewhere in cities of their own, neither do they use some different language, nor practise an extraordinary kind of life. . . . But while they dwell in cities of Greeks and barbarians as the lot of each is cast, and follow the native customs in dress and food and the other arrangements of life, yet the constitution of their own citizenship, which they set forth, is marvelous, and confessedly contradicts expectation. They dwell in their own countries, but only as sojourners; they bear their share in all things as citizens, and they endure all hardships as strangers. Every foreign country is a fatherland to them, and every fatherland is foreign. . . . Their existence is on earth, but their citizenship is in heaven. They obey the established laws, and they surpass the laws in their own lives. They love all men and they are persecuted by all. . . . War is urged against them as aliens by the Jews, and persecution is carried on against them by the Greeks, and yet those that hate them cannot tell the reason of their hostility."—J. B. Lightfoot, *Trans. of the Epistle to Diognetus (The Apostolic Fathers, pp. 505-506)*.—"These apologists rise against philosophy also, out of which they themselves had arisen, in the full consciousness of their faith open to all and not only to the cultured few, the certainty of which, based upon revelation, cannot be replaced by uncertain human wisdom, which, moreover, is self-contradictory in its most important representatives. On the other hand, they willingly recognise in the philosophy by means of which they had themselves been educated, certain elements of truth, which they partly derive from the seed-corns of truth, which the divine Logos had scattered among the heathen

also, partly externally from a dependence of Greek wisdom on the much older wisdom of the East, and therefore from the use of the Scriptures of the Old Testament. To the reproach that they had deserted the religion which had been handed down from their ancestors and thereby made sacred, they oppose the right of recognised truth, the right of freedom of conscience; religion becomes the peculiar affair of personal conviction, against which methods of force do not suffice: God is to be obeyed rather than man."—W. Moeller, *List. of the Christian Church*: A. D. 1-600, p. 179.—"Such a morality, as Roman greatness was passing away, took possession of the ground. Its beginnings were scarcely felt, scarcely known of, in the vast movement of affairs in the greatest of empires. By and by its presence, strangely austere, strangely gentle, strangely tender, strangely inflexible, began to be noticed. But its work was long only a work of indirect preparation. Those whom it charmed, those whom it opposed, those whom it tamed, know not what was being done for the generations which were to follow."—R. W. Church, *The Gifts of Civilization*, p. 159.—"The more spiritual and profound historians of the Church recognize it as a manifestation of this divine life flowing into human history. But this is true of the organized church only with important qualifications. The life must manifest itself in an organization; but the organization is neither the only nor the complete expression of the life. . . . The life which creates the organization penetrates and purifies also the family and the state, renovates individuals, and blooms and fructifies in Christian civilizations; and these are also historical manifestations."—S. Harris, *The Kingdom of Christ on Earth*, p. 87.—"It was the great formative period of the world's new life, and all streams tended to flow together. The influence of Greek thought on Roman law had led, under the circumstances of Roman commercial life, to the development of an ideal "jus gentium," a kind of natural law discovered by the reason. This conception transformed the Roman law and brought it into touch with the new sense of human relations. "It was by means of this higher conception of equity which resulted from the identification of the jus gentium with the jus naturale—that the alliance between law and philosophy was really made efficient."—W. C. Morey, *Outlines from Roman Law*, p. 114.—"There were three agencies whose influence in working simultaneously and successively at this identical task, the developing and importing of the jus gentium, was decisive of the ultimate result. These were the praetorian edict [which reached its climax under the Republic and was completed under Hadrian], Roman scientific jurisprudence [which developed its greatest ability about A. D. 200] and imperial legislation."—R. Sohm, *Institutes of Roman Law*, p. 46.—"The liberal policy of Rome gradually extended the privileges of her citizenship till it included all her subjects; and along with the 'Jus suffragii,' went of course the 'Jus honorum.' Even under Augustus we find a Spanish consul at Rome; and under Galba an Egyptian is governor of Egypt. It is not long before even the emperor himself is supplied by the provinces. It is easy to comprehend therefore how the provincials forgot the fatherland of their birth for the fatherland of their citizenship. Once win the fran-

chise, and to great capacity was opened a great career. The Roman Empire came to be a homogeneous mass of privileged persons, largely using the same language, aiming at the same type of civilisation, equal among themselves, but all alike conscious of their superiority to the surrounding barbarians."—W. T. Arnold, *The Roman System of Provincial Administration*, p. 37.—"As far as she could, Rome destroyed the individual genius of nations; she seems to have rendered them unqualified for a national existence. When the public life of the Empire ceased, Italy, Gaul, and Spain were thus unable to become nations. Their great historical existence did not commence until after the arrival of the barbarians, and after several centuries of experiments amid violence and calamity. But how does it happen that the countries which Rome did not conquer, or did not long have under her sway, now hold such a prominent place in the world—that they exhibit so much originality and such complete confidence in their future? Is it only because, having existed a shorter time, they are entitled to a longer future? Or, perchance, did Rome leave behind her certain habits of mind, intellectual and moral qualities, which impede and limit activity?"—E. Lavisse, *Political Hist. of Europe*, p. 6.—Patriotism was a considerable part of both the ancient religion and the old morality. The empire weakened the former and deeply injured the latter by conquest of the individual states. It had little to offer in place of these except that anomaly, the worship of the emperor; and a law and justice administered by rulers who, to say the least, grew very rich. "The feeling of pride in Roman citizenship . . . became much weaker as the citizenship was widened. . . . Roman citizenship included an ever growing proportion of the population in every land round the Mediterranean, till at last it embraced the whole Roman world. . . . Christianity also created a religion for the Empire, transcending all distinctions of nationality. . . . The path of development for the Empire lay in accepting the religion offered it to complete its organisation. Down to the time of Hadrian there was a certain progress on the part of the Empire towards a recognition of this necessity."—W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 373, 191-192.—The relations of the laws of the Empire to Christianity may be briefly stated, but there are differences of opinion which cannot be noted here: "A. D. 30 to 100, Christians treated as a sect of the Jews and sharing in the general toleration accorded to them. A. D. 100 to 250, Christians recognized, . . . and rendered liable to persecution: (1st) For treason and impiety. (2nd) As belonging to illegal associations, but at the same time protected in their capacity of members of Friendly or Burial Societies of a kind allowed by the law. A. D. 250 to 300, Christianity recognized as a formidable power by the State. Commencement of an open struggle between Christianity and the secular authority. . . . The cemeteries of the Christians now for the first time interfered with and became places of hiding and secret assembly. A. D. 260 to 300, Persecutions cease for a time, 40 years Peace for the Church. Time of much prosperity when, as Eusebius writes, 'great multitudes flocked to the religion of Christ.' A. D. 300 to 313, Last decisive struggle under Diocletian."—G. B. Brown, *From School to Cathedral*.—"The judges decided

simply in accordance with the laws, and, in the great majority of cases, did so coolly, calmly, without passion, as men who were simply discharging their duty. . . . Not the priests, but the Emperors led the attack. . . . It is true the Christians never rebelled against the State. They cannot be reproached with even the appearance of a revolutionary spirit. Despised, persecuted, abused, they still never revolted, but showed themselves everywhere obedient to the laws, and ready to pay to the Emperors the honor which was their due. Yet in one particular they could not obey, the worship of idols, the strewing of incense to the Cæsar-god. And in this one thing it was made evident that in Christianity lay the germ of a wholly new political and social order. This is the character of the conflict which we are now to review. It is a contest of the spirit of Antiquity against that of Christianity, of the ancient heathen order of the world against the new Christian order. Ten persecutions are commonly enumerated, viz., under Nero, Domitian, Trajan, Hadrian, Marcus Aurelius, Septimius Severus, Maximinus the Thracian, Decius, Valerian, and Diocletian. This traditional enumeration is, however, very superficial, and leaves entirely unrecognized the real course of the struggle. . . . Though times of relative tranquillity occurred, Christianity remained, notwithstanding, a prohibited religion. This being the case, the simple arrangement of the persecutions in a series makes the impression that they were all of the same character, while in fact the persecution under Nero was wholly different from that under Trajan and his successors, and this again varied essentially from those under Decius and Diocletian. The first persecution which was really general and systematically aimed at the suppression of the Church, was the Decian [see *ROME: A. D. 192-284*]. That under Trajan and his successors [see *ROME: A. D. 96-138, 138-180, and 303-305*] consisted merely of more or less frequent processes against individual Christians, in which the established methods of trial were employed, and the existing laws were more or less sharply used against them. Finally, the persecutions under Nero and Domitian [see *ROME: A. D. 64-68, and 70-96*] were mere outbreaks of personal cruelty and tyrannical caprice. . . . Christianity is the growing might; with the energy of youth it looks the future in the face, and there sees victory beckoning onward. And how changed are now its ideas of that triumph! The earlier period had no thought of any victory but that which Christ was to bring at his coming. . . . But in the time of Cyprian the hopes of the Christians are directed towards another victory: they begin to grasp the idea that Christianity will vanquish heathenism from within, and become the dominant religion in the Roman Empire. . . . It is true that the Christians were still greatly in the minority. It is generally assumed that they formed about one-twelfth of the whole population in the East, and in the West about one-fifteenth. Even this is perhaps too high an estimate. But there were two things which gave a great importance to this minority. First, that no single religion of the much divided Heathenism had so many adherents as the Christian. Over against the scattered forces of Heathenism, the Christians formed a close phalanx; the Church was a compact and strongly framed organization. Second, the Christians were massed in the towns,

while the rural population was almost exclusively devoted to Heathenism. There existed in Antioch, for instance, a Christian Church of fifty thousand souls."—G. Uhlhorn, *The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism*, bk. 2.—"The Encyclopedia of Missions" on the authority of the late Prof. R. D. Ilitchcock states that there are on record "the names of churches existing at this period [at the close of the persecutions] in 525 cities: cities of Europe 188, of Asia 214, of Africa 123." (See Appendix D.) There were tendencies at work in many of these against that toward general catholic (universal) organization, but in suffering and sympathy the Christian Churches formed a vast body of believers. "Such a vast organisation of a perfectly new kind, with no analogy in previously existing institutions, was naturally slow in development. . . . The critical stage was passed when the destruction of Jerusalem annihilated all possibility of a localised centre for Christianity, and made it clear that the centralisation of the Church could reside only in an idea—viz., a process of intercommunication, union and brotherhood. It would be hardly possible to exaggerate the share which frequent intercourse from a very early stage between the separate congregations had in moulding the development of the Church. Most of the documents in the New Testament are products and monuments of this intercourse; all attest in numberless details the vivid interest which the scattered communities took in one another. From the first the Christian idea was to annihilate the separation due to space, and hold the most distant brother as near as the nearest. A clear consciousness of the importance of this idea first appears in the Pastoral Epistles, and is still stronger in writings of A. D. 80-100. . . . The close relations between different congregations is brought into strong relief by the circumstances disclosed in the letters of Ignatius: the welcome extended everywhere to him; the loving messages sent when he was writing to other churches; the deputations sent from churches off his road to meet him and convoy him; the rapidity with which news of his progress was sent round, so that deputations from Ephesus, Magnesia, and Tralles were ready to visit him in Smyrna; the news from Antioch which reached him in Troas, but which was unknown to him in Smyrna; the directions which he gave to call a council of the church in Smyrna, and send a messenger to congratulate the church in Antioch; the knowledge that his fate is known to and is engaging the efforts of the church in Rome."—W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 364-366.—"The fellowship . . . thus strongly impressed by apostolic hands on the infant Church, is never wholly lost sight of throughout all the ages, and its permanent expression is found in the synod, whether ecumenic, provincial, or diocesan. This becomes fainter as we reach the age in which a presbyter, told off from the body to a distinct parish, attains gradual isolation from his brethren. But this comes some centuries later. . . . Everywhere, till that decline, the idea is that of a brotherhood or corporate office, a unity of function pervaded by an energy of brotherly love. . . . It is no mere confluence of units before distinct."—H. Hayman, *Diocesan Synods* (*Contemp. Rev.*, Oct., 1882).—"It is the age when the New Testament writings begin to come together to form a generally recognized canon.

The opposition too to the sovereign spirit of Montanist prophecy undoubtedly increased the need for it. . . . After the example of the Gnostics, a beginning is also made with exegetical explanation of New Testament writings; Melito with one on the Revelation of John, a certain Heraclitus with one on the Apostles. . . . Finally, in this same opposition to the heretics, it is sought to secure the agreement of the different churches with one another, and in this relation importance is gained by the idea of a universal (Catholic) Church. So-called catholic Epistles of men of repute in the church to different communities are highly regarded. As illustrations take those of Bishop Dionysius of Corinth to Lacedæmon, Athens, Crete, Paphlagonia, Pontus, Rome (Euseb. 4, 23).—W. Moeller, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, pp. 183-184.—“This period [100-312] may be divided into the Post-Apostolic Age which reaches down to the middle of the second century, and the Age of the Old Catholic Church which ends with the establishment of the Church under Constantine. . . . The point of transition from one Age to the other may be unhesitatingly set down at A. D. 170. The following are the most important data in regard thereto. The death about A. D. 165 of Justin Martyr, who marks the highest point reached in the Post-Apostolic Age and forms also the transition to the Old Catholic Age; and Irenæus, flourishing somewhere about A. D. 170, who was the real inaugurator of this latter age. Besides these we come upon the beginnings of the Trinitarian controversies about the year 170. Finally, the rejection of Montanism from the universal Catholic Church was effected about the year 170 by means of the synodal institution called into existence for that purpose.”—J. H. Kurtz, *Church History*, v. 1, p. 70.—“If every church must so live in the world as to be a part of its collective being, then it must always be construed in and through the place and time in which it lives.”—A. M. Fairbairn, *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*.—“The Church of the first three centuries was never, except perhaps on the day of Pentecost, in an absolutely ideal condition. But yet during the ages of persecution, the Church as a whole was visibly an unworldly institution. It was a spiritual empire in recognized antagonism with the world-empire.”—F. W. Fuller, *The Primitive Saints and The See of Rome*, p. 153.—“All the greater forces of the ætæc, political and legal, and commercial, aided those working within the church to create an organic unity. “Speaking with some qualifications, the patristic church was Greek, as the primitive church had been Jewish, and the mediæval church was to be Latin. Its unity, like that of the Greek nation, was federative; each church, like each of the Grecian states, was a little commonwealth. As the Greece which resisted the Persians was one, not by any imperial organization, but by common ideas and a common love of liberty, so the church of the fathers was one, not by any organic connection, but by common thoughts and sympathies, above all by a common loyalty to Christ. Naturally the questions which agitated such a church were those which concern the individual soul rather than society. Its members made much of personal beliefs and speculative opinions; and so long as the old free spirit lasted they allowed one another large freedom of thought, only requiring that common instinct of loyalty to

Christ. Happily for the world, that free spirit did not die out from the East for at least two centuries after Paul had proclaimed the individual relationship of the soul to God. . . . The genius of the Greek expressing itself in thought, of the Latin in ruling power, the Christianity which was to the former a body of truth, became to the latter a system of government.”—G. A. Jackson, *The Fathers of the Third Century*, pp. 154-56.—“The Apostolic ideal was set forth, and within a few generations forgotten. The vision was only for a time and then vanished. “The kingdom of Christ, not being a kingdom of this world, is not limited by the restrictions which fetter other societies, political or religious. It is in the fullest sense free, comprehensive, universal. . . . It is most important that we should keep this ideal definitely in view, and I have therefore stated it as broadly as possible. Yet the broad statement, if allowed to stand alone, would suggest a false impression, or at least would convey only a half truth. It must be evident that no society of men could hold together without officers, without rules, without institutions of any kind; and the Church of Christ is not exempt from this universal law. The conception in short is strictly an ideal, which we must ever hold before our eyes. . . . Every member of the human family was potentially a member of the Church, and, as such, a priest of God. . . . It will hardly be denied, I think, by those who have studied the history of modern civilization with attention, that this conception of the Christian Church has been mainly instrumental in the emancipation of the degraded and oppressed, in the removal of artificial barriers between class and class, and in the diffusion of a general philanthropy untrammelled by the fetters of party or race; in short, that to it mainly must be attributed the most important advantages which constitute the superiority of modern societies over ancient. Consciously or unconsciously, the idea of an universal priesthood, of the religious equality of all men, which, though not untaught before, was first embodied in the Church of Christ, has worked and is working untold blessings in political institutions and in social life. But the careful student will also observe that this idea has hitherto been very imperfectly apprehended; that throughout the history of the Church it has been struggling for recognition, at most times discerned in some of its aspects but at all times wholly ignored in others; and that therefore the actual results are a very inadequate measure of its efficacy, if only it could assume due prominence and were allowed free scope in action. . . . It may be a general rule, it may be under ordinary circumstances a practically universal law, that the highest acts of congregational worship shall be performed through the principal officers of the congregation. But an emergency may arise when the spirit and not the letter must decide. The Christian ideal will then . . . interpret our duty. The higher ordinance of the universal priesthood will overrule all special limitations. The layman will assume functions which are otherwise restricted to the ordained minister.”—J. B. Lightfoot, *Dissertations on the Apostolic Age*, pp. 137-140, 237.—“No Church now existing is an exact counterpart of the Apostolic Church. . . . Allusions bear out the idea that the Church at Corinth was as yet almost structureless—little more than

an aggregate of individuals—with no bishop, presbyter or deacon.”—J. W. Cunningham, *The Growth of the Church in its Organization and Institutions*, pp. 73, 18.—“Some time before the middle of the second century heresy began sadly to distract the Christian community; and to avoid imminent danger of schism, it was deemed expedient. In a few great towns to arm the chairman of the eldership with additional power. A modified form of prelacy was thus introduced.”—W. D. Killen, *The Old Catholic Church*, p. 51.—Respecting the rise of the Episcopate as a distinct office there is a difference of opinion among scholars,—some holding that it was expressly ordained by the Apostles, others that it arose quite independently of them; a third class think that it was developed gradually out of the eldership, but not without the sanction of one or more of the Apostles. “For the Church is a catholic society, that is, a society belonging to all nations and ages. As a catholic society it lacks the bonds of the life of a city or a nation—local contiguity, common language, common customs. We cannot then very well conceive how its corporate continuity could have been maintained otherwise than through some succession of persons such as, bearing the apostolic commission for ministry, should be in each generation the necessary centres of the Church’s life.”—C. Gore, *The Mission of the Church*, pp. 10, 11.—“Jewish presbyteries existed already in all the principal cities of the dispersion, and Christian presbyteries would early occupy a no less wide area. . . . The name of the presbyter then presents no difficulty. But what must be said of the term bishop? . . . But these notices, besides establishing the general prevalence of episcopacy, also throw considerable light on its origin. They indicate that the relation suggested by the history of the word ‘bishop’ and its transference from the lower to the higher office is the true solution, and that the episcopate was created out of the presbytery. . . . They seem to hint also that, so far as this development was affected at all by national temper and characteristics, it was slower where the prevailing influences were more purely Greek, as at Corinth and Philippi and Rome, and more rapid where an Oriental spirit predominated, as at Jerusalem and Antioch and Ephesus. Above all, they establish this result clearly, that its maturer forms are seen first in those regions where the latest surviving Apostles (more especially St. John) fixed their abode, and at a time when its prevalence cannot be dissociated from their influence or their sanction.”—J. B. Lightfoot, *Dissertations on the Apostolic Age*, pp. 151, 190, 191.—“Since then in the constitution of the church two elements met together—the aristocratic and the monarchical—it could not fail to be the case that a conflict would ensue between them. . . . These struggles between the presbyterial and episcopal systems belong among the most important phenomena connected with the process of the development of church life in the third century. Many presbyters made a capricious use of their power, hurtful to good discipline and order in the communities.”—A. Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, v. 1, sect. 2.—“As a rule Christianity would get a footing first in the metropolis of its region. The lesser cities would be evangelized by missions sent from thence; and so the suffragan sees would look on themselves as daughters of the metropolitan see.

The metropolitan bishop is the natural center of unity for the bishops of the province. . . . The bishops of the metropolitan sees acquired certain rights which were delegated to them by their brother bishops. Moreover, among the most important churches a certain order of precedence grew up which corresponded with the civil dignity of the cities in which those churches existed; and finally the churches which were founded by the apostles were treated with peculiar reverence.”—F. W. Puller, *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, pp. 11 and 18.—“The triumph of the episcopal system undoubtedly promoted unity, order, and tranquillity. But, on the other hand, it was unfavourable to the free development of the life of the church; and while the latter promoted the formation of a priesthood foreign to the essence of that development of the kingdom of God which the New Testament sets forth, on the other hand a revolution of sentiment which had already been prepared—an altered view of the idea of the priesthood—had no small influence on the development of the episcopal system. Thus does this change of the original constitution of the Christian communities stand intimately connected with another and still more radical change,—the formation of a sacerdotal caste in the Christian church. . . . Out of the husk of Judaism Christianity had evolved itself to freedom and independence,—had stripped off the forms in which it first sprang up, and within which the new spirit lay at first concealed, until by its own inherent power it broke through them. This development belonged more particularly to the Pauline position, from which proceeded the form of the church in the Gentile world. In the struggle with the Jewish elements which opposed the free development of Christianity, this principle had triumphantly made its way. In the churches of pagan Christians the new creation stood forth completely unfolded; but the Jewish principle, which had been vanquished, pressed in once more from another quarter. Humanity was as yet incapable of maintaining itself at the lofty position of pure spiritual religion. The Jewish position was better adapted to the mass, which needed first to be trained before it could apprehend Christianity in its purity,—needed to be disabused from paganism. Out of Christianity, now become independent, a principle once more sprang forth akin to the principles of the Old Testament,—a new outward shaping of the kingdom of God, a new discipline of the law which one day was to serve for the training of rude nations, a new tutelage for the spirit of humanity, until it should arrive at the maturity of the perfect manhood in Christ. This investiture of the Christian spirit in a form nearly akin to the position arrived at in the Old Testament, could not fail, after the fruitful principle had once made its appearance, to unfold itself more and more, and to bring to light one after another all the consequences which it involved; but there also began with it a reaction of the Christian consciousness as it yearned after freedom, which was continually bursting forth anew in an endless variety of appearances, until it attained its triumph at the Reformation.”—A. Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, v. 1, sect. 2, B.—“Though the forms of [pagan] religion had broken away, the spirit of religion was still quick; it and even developed: the sense of sin, an almost new

phenomenon, began to invade Society and Philosophy; and along with this, an almost importunate craving after a revelation. The changed tone of philosophy, the spread of mysticism, the rapid growth of mystery-worship, the revived Platonism, are all articulate expressions of this need. The old Philosophy begins not only to preach but to pray: the new strives to catch the revealed voice of God in the oracles of less unfaithful days. . . . In the teeth of an organised and concentrated despotism a new society had grown up, self-supporting, self-regulated, self-governed, a State within the State. Calm and assured amid a world that hid its fears only in blind excitement, free amid the servile, sanguine amid the despairing, Christians lived with an object. United in loyal fellowship by sacred pledges more binding than the sacramentum of the soldier, welded together by a stringent discipline, led by trained and tried commanders, the Church had succeeded in attaining unity. It had proved itself able to command self-devotion even to the death. It had not feared to assimilate the choicest fruits of the choicest intellects of East and West. . . . Yet the centripetal forces were stronger; Tertullian had died an heresiarch, and Origen but narrowly and somewhat of grace escaped a like fate. If rent with schisms and threatened with disintegration, the Church was still an undivided whole."—G. H. Rendall, *The Emperor Julian, Paganism and Christianity*, pp. 21-22.—"The designation of the Universal Christian Church as Catholic dates from the time of Irenaeus. . . . At the beginning of this age, the heretical as well as the non-heretical Ebionism may be regarded as virtually suppressed, although some scanty remnants of it might yet be found. The most brilliant period of Gnosticism, too, . . . was already passed. But in Manicheism there appeared, during the second half of the third century, a new peril of a no less threatening kind inspired by Parseism and Buddhism. . . . With Marcus Aurelius, Paganism outside of Christianity as embodied in the Roman State, begins the war of extermination against the Church that was ever more and more extending her boundaries. Such manifestation of hostility, however, was not able to subdue the Church. . . . During the same time the episcopal and synodal-hierarchical organization of the church was more fully developed by the introduction of an order of Metropolitans, and then in the following period it reached its climax in the oligarchical Pentarchy of Patriarchs, and in the institution of oecumenical Synods."—J. H. Kurtz, *Church History*, v. 1, pp. 72-73, to which the reader is also referred for all periods of church history. See, also, P. Schaaf, *History of the Christian Church*; and, for biography, W. Smith and H. Wace, *A Dictionary of Christian Biography*.—"Missionary effort in this period was mainly directed to the conversion of the heathen. On the ruins of Jerusalem, Hadrian's colony of Ælia Capitolina was planted; so that even there the Church, in its character and modes of worship, was a Gentile community. Christianity was early carried to Edessa, the capital of the small state of Osrhene, in Mesopotamia. After the middle of the second century, the Church at Edessa was sufficiently flourishing to count among its members the king, Abgar Bar Manu. At about this time the gospel was preached in Persia, Media, Parthia, and Bactria. We have notices of churches in Arabia in the

early part of the third century. They were visited several times by Origen, the celebrated Alexandrian Church teacher (185-254). In the middle of the fourth century a missionary, Theophilus, of Diu, found churches in India. In Egypt, Christianity made great progress, especially at Alexandria, whence it spread to Cyrene and other neighboring places. In upper Egypt, where the Coptic language and the superstition of the people were obstacles in its path, Christianity had, nevertheless, gained a foothold as early as towards the close of the second century. At this time the gospel had been planted in proconsular Africa, being conveyed thither from Rome, and there was a flourishing church at Carthage. In Gaul, where the Druidical system, with its priesthood and sacrificial worship, was the religion of the Celtic population, several churches were founded from Asia Minor. At Lyons and Vienne there were strong churches in the last quarter of the second century. At this time Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, speaks of the establishment of Christianity in Germany, west of the Rhine, and Tertullian, the North African presbyter, speaks of Christianity in Britain. The fathers in the second century describe in glowing terms, and not without rhetorical exaggeration, the rapid conquests of the Gospel. The number of converts in the reign of Hadrian must have been very large. Otherwise we cannot account for the enthusiastic language of Justin Martyr respecting the multitude of professing Christians. Tertullian writes in a similar strain. Irenaeus refers to Barbarians who have believed without having a knowledge of letters, through oral teaching merely."—G. P. Fisher, *History of the Christian Church*, pp. 45-46.

**Alexandria.**—"Christianity first began its activity in the country among the Jewish and Greek population of the Delta, but gradually also among the Egyptians proper (the Copts) as may be inferred from the Coptic (Memphytic) translation of the New Testament (third century). In the second century, Gnosticism [see Gnostics], which had its chief seat here as well as in Syria, and, secondly, towards the close of the century, the Alexandrian Catechetical School, show the importance of this centre of religious movement and Christian education."—W. Moeller, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, p. 105.—"Never perhaps has the free statement of the Christian idea had less prejudice to encounter than at Alexandria at the close of the second century. Never has it more successfully vindicated by argument its right to be the great interpreter of the human spirit. The institutions of the great metropolis were highly favourable to this result. The Museum, built by the Ptolemies, was intended to be, and speedily became, the centre of an intense intellectual life. The Serapeum, at the other end of the town, rivalled it in beauty of architecture and wealth of rare MSS. The Sebastian, reared in honour of Augustus, was no unworthy companion to these two noble establishments. In all three, splendid endowments and a rich professoriate attracted the talent of the world. If the ambition of a secured reputation drew many eminent men away to Rome, the means of securing such eminence were mainly procured at Alexandria. . . . The Christian Church in this city rose to the height of its grand opportunity. It entered the lists without fear and without favour, and boldly proclaimed its competence to

satisfy the intellectual cravings of man. Numbers of restless and inquiring spirits came from all parts of the world, hoping to find a solution of the doubts that perplexed them. And the Church, which had already brought peace to the souls of the woman and the slave, now girded herself to the harder task of convincing the trained intelligence of the man of letters and the philosopher."—C. T. Cruttwell, *A Literary History of Early Christianity*, bk. 4, ch. 1 (c. 2).—"The question . . . came up for decision towards the close of the sub-apostolic age, as to what shape the Church was finally to take. Two types were set before her to choose from—one the Hebrew-Latin type, as we may call it, into which . . . she finally settled down; the other the Hellenist type of a Demos, or commonwealth of free citizens, all equal, all alike kings and priests unto God, and whose moral and spiritual growth was left very much to the initiative of each member of the community. In Alexandria, as the meeting-point of all nationalities, and where Judaism itself had tried to set up a new type of thought, eclectic between Hebraism and Hellenism, and comprehending what was best in both, naturally enough there grew up a Christian type of eclecticism corresponding to that of Philo. . . . Into this seething of rival sects and races the Alexandrian school of catechists threw themselves, and made a noble attempt to rescue the Church, the synagogue, and the Stoics alike from the one ban common to all—the dangerous delusion that the truth was for them, not they for the truth. Setting out on the assumption that God's purpose was the education of the whole human family, they saw in the Logos doctrine of St. John the key to harmonise all truth, whether of Christian sect, Hebrew synagogue, or Stoic philosophy. . . . To educate all men up to this standard seemed to them the true ideal of the Church. True Gnosis was their keynote; and the Gnostic, as Clemens loves to describe himself, was to them the pattern philosopher and Christian in one. They regarded, moreover, a discipline of at least three years as imperative; it was the preliminary condition of entrance into the Christian Church."—J. B. Heard, *Alexandrian and Carthaginian Theology Contrasted*, pp. 37–38.—The two great Christian writers of Alexandria were Clement and Origen. "The universal influence of Origen made itself felt in the third century over the whole field of Greek theology. In him, as it were, everything which had hitherto been striven after in the Greek field of theology, had been gathered together, so as, being collected here in a centre, to give an impulse in the most various directions; hence also the further development of theology in subsequent times is always accustomed to link itself on to one side or the other of his rich spiritual heritage. . . . And while this involves that Christianity is placed on friendly relations with the previous philosophical development of the highest conceptions of God and the world, yet on the other hand Christian truth also appears conversely as the universal truth which gathers together in itself all the hitherto isolated rays of divine truth. . . . In the great religious ferment of the time there was further contained the tendency to seek similar religious ideas amid the different mythological religious forms and to mingle them syncretistically. This religious ferment was still further increased by the original

content of Christianity, that mighty leaven, which announced a religion destined to the redemption and perfecting of the world, and by this means a like direction and tendency was imparted to various other religious views likewise. The exciting and moving effect of Gnosticism on the Church depended at the same time on the fact, that its representatives practically apprehended Christianity in the manner of the antique religious mysteries, and in so doing sought to lean upon the Christian communities and make themselves at home in them, according as their religious life and usages seemed to invite them, and to establish in them a community of the initiated and perfect; an endeavour which the powerful ascetic tendency in the church exploited and augmented in its own sense, and for which the institution of prophecy, which was so highly respected and powerful in the communities, afforded a handle. In this way the initiated were able to make for themselves a basis in the community on which they could depend, while the religio-philosophical speculations, which are always intelligible only to a few, at the same time propagated themselves and branched out scholastically."—W. Moeller, *History of the Christian Church*, pp. 215, 213, 130–131.—"At Alexandria, Basilides (A. D. 125) and Valentinus exerted in turn an extraordinary influence; the latter endeavored to establish his school at Rome about the year 140. The Gnostics of Syria professed a more open dualism than those of Egypt. The Church of Antioch had to resist Saurin, that of Edessa to oppose Boredanes and Tatian."—E. De Pressensé, *The Early Years of Christianity; The Martyrs and Apologists*, p. 135.—"There was something very imposing in those mighty systems, which embraced heaven and earth. How plain and meagre in comparison seemed simple Christianity! There was something remarkably attractive in the breadth and liberality of Gnosticism. It seemed completely to have reconciled Christianity with culture. How narrow the Christian Church appeared! Even noble souls might be captivated by the hope of winning the world over to Christianity in this way. . . . Over against the mighty systems of the Gnostics, the Church stood, in sober earnestness and child-like faith, on the simple Christian doctrine of the Apostles. This was to be sought in the churches founded by the apostles themselves, where they had defined the faith in their preaching."—G. Uhlhorn, *The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism*, bk. 2, ch. 3.—"Greek philosophy had joined hands with Jewish theosophy, and the Church knew not where to look for help. So serious did the danger seem, when it was assailed at once and from opposite sides by Jewish and Greek types of Gnosticism, the one from the monotheistic point of view impugning the Godhead, the other for the Docetic side explaining away [as a spiritual illusion] the manhood of Christ, that the Church, in despair of beating error by mere apology, fell back on the method of authority. The Church was the only safe keeper of the deposit of sacred tradition; whoever impugned that tradition, let him be put out of the communion of saints."—Rev. J. B. Heard, *Alexandrian and Carthaginian Theology Contrasted*, p. 41.—"The interest, the meaning, of Gnosticism rest entirely upon its ethical motive. It was an attempt, a serious attempt, to fathom the dread mystery of sorrow and pain, to answer that spectral doubt, which is mostly crushed



down by force—Can the world as we know it have been made by God? 'Cease,' says Basilides, 'from idle and curious variety, and let us rather discuss the opinions, which even barbarians have held, on the subject of good and evil.' 'I will say anything rather than admit that Providence is wicked.' Valentinus describes in the strain of an ancient prophet the woes that afflict mankind. 'I durst not affirm,' he concludes, 'that God is the author of all this.' So Tertullian says of Marcion, 'like many men of our time, and especially the heretics, he is bewildered by the question of evil.' They approach the problem from a non-Christian point of view, and arrive therefore at a non-Christian solution. . . . Many of them, especially the later sectaries, accepted the whole Christian Creed, but always with reserve. The teaching of the Church thus became in their eyes a popular exoteric confession, beneath their own Gnosis, or Knowledge, which was a Mystery, jealously guarded from all but the chosen few.—C. Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, pp. 28-29.

**Cæsarea.**—"The chief points of interest in the history of the Church of Cæsarea during this period are the residence of Origen there (first between A. D. 215 and 219 and again after his final departure from Alexandria in 231), the education of Eusebius, the foundation of the great library by Pamphilus, and the martyrdoms during the Diocletian persecution. Most of these will come before us again in other connexions, but they require mention here. It would be difficult to over-estimate the effect of what they imply on the Church at large. Had the work of Origen, Pamphilus, and Eusebius at Cæsarea remained unrecorded, there would be a huge blank in ecclesiastical history, rendering much that is otherwise known scarcely intelligible. Had that work never been done, the course of ecclesiastical history would have been very different. In the whole of the second and third centuries it would be difficult to name two more influential Christians than Origen and Eusebius; and Pamphilus laboured earnestly to preserve and circulate the writings of the one and to facilitate those of the other. It was from the libraries of Pamphilus at Cæsarea and of Alexander at Jerusalem that Eusebius obtained most of his material" for his "Ecclesiastical History," which has preserved titles and quotations from many lost books of exceeding value.—A. Plummer, *The Church of the Early Fathers*, ch. 3.

**Edessa.**—"Edessa (the modern Urfa) was from the beginning of the third century one of the chief centres of Syrian Christian life and theological study. For many years, amid the vicissitudes of theological persecution, a series of flourishing theological schools were maintained there, one of which (the 'Persian school') is of great importance as the nursery of Nestorianism in the extreme East. It was as bishop of Edessa, also, that Jacob Baradaeus organized the monophysite churches into that Jacobite church of which he is the hero. From the scholars of Edessa came many of the translations which carried Greek thought to the East, and in the periods of exciting controversy Edessa was within the range of the theological movements that stirred Alexandria and Constantinople. The 'Chronicle of Edessa,' as it is called because the greater number of its notices relate to Edessene affairs, is a brief document in Syriac contained

in a manuscript of six leaves in the Vatican library. It is one of the most important fundamental sources for the history of Edessa, contains a long official narrative of the flood of A. D. 201, which is perhaps the only existing monument of heathen Syriac literature, and includes an excellent and very carefully dated list of the bishops of Edessa from A. D. 313 to 543.—*Anderson Review*, v. 19, p. 374.—The Syriac Versions (of the Gospel) form a group of which mention should undoubtedly be made. The Syriac versions of the Bible (Old Testament) are among the most ancient remains of the language, the Syriac and the Chaldee being the two dialects of the Aramaean spoken in the North. Of versions of the New Testament, the 'Peshito' or the 'Simple,' though not the oldest text, has been the longest known. . . . The 'Curetonian' . . . was discovered after its existence had been for a long time suspected by sagacious scholars [but is not much more than a series of fragments]. . . . Cureton, Tregelles, Alford, Ewald, Bleek, and others, believe this text to be older than the Peshito [which speaks for the Greek text of the second century, though its own date is doubtful]. . . . Other valuable Syriac versions are 'Philo-xenian' . . . and the 'Jerusalem Syriac Lectionary' . . . a service-book with lessons from the Gospels for Sundays and feast days throughout the year . . . written at Antioch in 1030 in a dialect similar to that in use in Jerusalem and from a Greek text of great antiquity." A recent discovery renders these facts and statements of peculiar interests.—G. E. Merrill, *The Story of the Manuscripts*, ch. 10.

**Rural Palestine.**—"If Ebionism [see ENRONISM] was not primitive Christianity, neither was it a creation of the second century. As an organization, a distinct sect, it first made itself known, we may suppose, in the reign of Trajan: but as a sentiment, it had been harboured within the Church from the very earliest days. Moderated by the personal influence of the Apostles, soothed by the general practice of their church, not yet forced into declaring themselves by the turn of events, though scarcely tolerant of others, these Judaizers were tolerated for a time themselves. The beginning of the second century was a winnowing season in the Church of the Circumcision. . . . It is a probable conjecture, that after the destruction of Jerusalem the fugitive Christians, living in their retirement in the neighbourhood of the Essene settlements, received large accessions to their numbers from this sect, which thus inoculated the Church with its peculiar views. It is at least worthy of notice, that in a religious work emanating from this school of Ebionites the 'true Gospel' is reported to have been first propagated 'after the destruction of the holy place.'—J. B. Lightfoot, *Dissertations on the Apostolic Age*, pp. 78-80.

**Carthage.**—"If the world is indebted to Rome for the organisation of the Church, Rome is indebted to Carthage for the theory on which that organisation is built. The career of Carthage as a Christian centre exemplifies the strange vicissitudes of history. The city which Rome in her jealousy had crushed, which, not content with crushing, she had obliterated from the face of the earth, had at the bidding of Rome's greatest son risen from her ashes, and by her career almost verified the poet's taunt that the greatness of Carthage was reared on the



ruin of Italy. For in truth the African capital was in all but political power no unworthy rival of Rome. It had steadily grown in commercial prosperity. Its site was so advantageous as to invite, almost to compel, the influx of trade, which ever spontaneously moves along the line of least resistance. And the people were well able to turn this natural advantage to account. A mixed nationality, in which the original Italian immigration lent a steadying force to the native Punic and kindred African elements that formed its basis, with its intelligence enriched by large accessions of Greek settlers from Cyrene and Alexandria—Carthage had developed in the second century of our era into a community at once wealthy, enterprising and ambitious. . . . It was no longer in the sphere of profane literature, but in her contributions to the cause of Christianity and the spiritual armoury of the Church, that the proud Queen of Africa was to win her second crown of fame. . . . The names of Tertullian, Cyprian and Augustine, at once suggest the source from which Papal Rome drew the principles of Church controversy, Church organisation, and Church doctrine, which have consolidated her authority, and to some extent justified her pretensions to rule the conscience of Christendom.”—C. T. Crutwell, *A Literary History of Early Christianity*, bk. 5, ch. 2 (e. 2).—“At the end of the second century the African Tertullian first began to wrestle with the difficulties of the Latin language in the endeavour to make it a vehicle for the expression of Christian ideas. In reading his dogmatic writings the struggle is so apparent that it seems as though we beheld a rider endeavouring to discipline an unbroken steed. Tertullian’s doctrine is, however, still wholly Greek in substance, and this continued to be the case in the church of the Latin tongue until the end of the fourth century. Hilary, Ambrose, even Jerome, are essentially interpreters of Greek philosophy and theology to the Latin West. With Augustine learning begins to assume a Latin form, partly original and independent—partly, I say, for even later compositions are abundantly interwoven with Greek elements and materials. Very gradually from the writings of the African fathers of the church does the specific Latin element come to occupy that dominant position in Western Christendom, which soon, partly from self-sufficient indifference, partly from ignorance, so completely severed itself from Greek influences that the old unity and harmony could never be restored. Still the Biblical study of the Latins is, as a whole, a mere echo and copy of Greek predecessors.”—J. I. von Döllinger, *Studies in European History*, pp. 170–171.

—From Carthage which was afterward the residence of “the primate of all Africa . . . the Christian faith soon disseminated throughout Numidia, Mauritania and Getulia, which is proved by the great number of bishops at two councils held at Carthage in 256 and 308. At the latter there were 270 bishops, whose names are not given, but at the former were bishops from (87) . . . cities.”—J. E. T. Witsch, *Handbook of the Geography and Statistics of the Church*.

Rome.—“In the West, Rome remains and indeed becomes ever more and more the ‘sedes Apostolica,’ by far the most important centre where, alongside of the Roman element, there are to be found elements streaming together from

all points of the Empire. Greek names, and the long lasting (still dominant in the second century) maintenance of Greek as the written language of Roman Christianity are here noteworthy. . . . Rome was the point of departure not only for Italy and the Western Provinces, but without doubt also for Proconsular Africa, where in turn Carthage becomes the centre of diffusion. . . . The diffusion in the Greco-Roman world as a whole goes first to the more important towns and from these gradually over the country. . . . The instruments however of this mission are by no means exclusively apostolic men, who pursue missions as their calling . . . ; every Christian becomes a witness in his own circle, and intercourse and trade bring Christians hither and thither, and along with them their Christian faith.”—W. Moeller, *History of the Christian Church*, pp. 105–107.—“It has been contended, and many still believe, that in ancient Rome the doctrines of Christ found no proselytes, except among the lower and poorer classes of citizens. . . . The gospel found its way also to the mansions of the masters, nay, even to the palace of the Cæsars. The discoveries lately made on this subject are startling, and constitute a new chapter in the history of imperial Rome. . . . A difficulty may arise in the mind of the reader: how was it possible for these magistrates, generals, consuls, officers, senators, and governors of provinces, to attend to their duties without performing acts of idolatry? . . . The Roman emperors gave plenty of liberty to the new religion from time to time; and some of them, moved by a sort of religious syncretism, even tried to ally it with the official worship of the empire, and to place Christ and Jupiter on the steps of the same ‘lararium.’ . . . We must not believe that the transformation of Rome from a pagan into a Christian city was a sudden and unexpected event, which took the world by surprise. It was the natural result of the work of three centuries, brought to maturity under Constantine by an inevitable reaction against the violence of Diocletian’s rule. It was not a revolution or a conversion in the true sense of these words; it was the official recognition of a state of things which had long ceased to be a secret. The moral superiority of the new doctrines over the old religions was so evident, so overpowering, that the result of the struggle had been a foregone conclusion since the age of the first apologists. The revolution was an exceedingly mild one, the transformation almost imperceptible. . . . The transformation may be followed stage by stage in both its moral and material aspect. There is not a ruin of ancient Rome that does not bear evidence of the great change. . . . Rome possesses authentic remains of the ‘houses of prayer’ in which the gospel was first announced in apostolic times. . . . A very old tradition, confirmed by the ‘Liber Pontificalis,’ describes the modern church of S. Pudenciana as having been once the private house of the same Pudens who was baptized by the apostles, and who is mentioned in the epistles of S. Paul. . . . The connection of the house with the apostolate of SS. Peter and Paul made it very popular from the beginning. . . . Remains of the house of Pudens were found in 1870. They occupy a considerable area under the neighboring houses. . . . Among the Roman churches whose origin can be traced to the hall of meeting, besides those of Pudens and Prisca

already mentioned, the best preserved seems to be that built by Demetrias at the third mile-stone of the Via Latina, near the 'painted tombs.' . . . The Christians took advantage of the freedom accorded to funeral colleges, and associated themselves for the same purpose, following as closely as possible their rules concerning contributions, the erection of lodges, the meetings, and the . . . love feasts; and it was largely through the adoption of these well-understood and respected customs that they were enabled to hold their meetings and keep together as a corporate body through the stormy times of the second and third centuries. Two excellent specimens of schools connected with Christian cemeteries and with meetings of the faithful have come down to us, one above the Catacombs of Callixtus, the other above those of Soter." This formation of Christian communities into colleges is an important fact, and connects these Christian societies with one of the social institutions of the Empire which may have influenced the church as an organization. "The experience gained in twenty-five years of active exploration in ancient Rome, both above and below ground, enables me to state that every pagan building which was capable of giving shelter to a congregation was transformed, at one time or another, into a church or a chapel. . . . From apostolic times to the persecution of Domitian, the faithful were buried, separately or collectively, in private tombs which did not have the character of a Church institution. These early tombs, whether above or below ground, display a sense of perfect security, and an absence of all fear or solitude. This feeling arose from two facts; the small extent of the cemeteries, which secured to them the rights of private property, and the protection and freedom which the Jewish colony in Rome enjoyed from time immemorial. . . . From the time of the apostles to the first persecution of Domitian, Christian tombs, whether above or below ground, were built with perfect impunity and in defiance of public opinion. We have been accustomed to consider the catacombs of Rome as crypts plunged in total darkness, and penetrating the bowels of the earth at unfathomable depths. This is, in a certain measure, the case with those catacombs, or sections of catacombs, which were excavated in times of persecution; but not with those belonging to the first century. The cemetery of these members of Domitian's family who had embraced the gospel—such as Flavius Clemens, Flavia Domitilla, Plautilla, Petronilla, and others—reveals a bold example of publicity. . . . How is it possible to imagine that the primitive Church did not know the place of the death of its two leading apostles? In default of written testimony let us consult monumental evidence. There is no event of the imperial age and of imperial Rome which is attested by so many noble structures, all of which point to the same conclusion,—the presence and execution of the apostles in the capital of the empire."—R. Lanciani, *Pagan and Christian Rome*, ch. 1, 3 and 7.—The Church at Rome "gave no illustrious teachers to ancient Christianity. . . . All the greatest questions were debated elsewhere. . . . By a sort of instinct of race, [it] occupied itself far more with points of government and organization than with speculation. Its central position, in the capital of the empire, and its glorious memories, guar-

anteed to it a growing authority."—E. De Pressensé, *The Early Years of Christianity: The Martyrs and Apologists*, p. 41.

**Gaul.**—"Of the history of the Gallican Churches before the middle of the second century we have no certain information. It seems fairly probable indeed that, when we read in the Apostolic age of a mission of Crescens to 'Galatia' or 'Gaul,' the western country is meant rather than the Asiatic settlement which bore the same name; and, if so, this points to some relations with St. Paul himself. But, even though this explanation should be accepted, the notice stands quite alone. Later tradition indeed supplements it with legendary matter, but it is impossible to say what substratum of fact, if any underlies these comparatively recent stories. The connection between the southern parts of Gaul and the western districts of Asia Minor had been intimate from very remote times. Gaul was indebted for her earliest civilization to her Greek settlements like Marseilles, which had been colonized from Asia Minor some six centuries before the Christian era; and close relations appear to have been maintained even to the latest times. During the Roman period the people of Marseilles still spoke the Greek language familiarly along with the vernacular Celtic of the native population and the official Latin of the dominant power. When therefore Christianity had established her headquarters in Asia Minor, it was not unnatural that the Gospel should flow in the same channels which already conducted the civilization and the commerce of the Asiatic Greeks westward. At all events, whatever we may think of the antecedent probabilities, the fact itself can hardly be disputed. In the year A. D. 177, under Marcus Aurelius, a severe persecution broke out on the banks of the Rhone in the cities of Vienna and Lyons—a persecution which by its extent and character bears a noble testimony to the vitality of the Churches in these places. To this incident we owe the earliest extant historical notice of Christianity in Gaul."—J. B. Lightfoot, *Essays on the work entitled Supernatural Religion*, pp. 251–252.—"The Churches of proconsular Africa, of Spain, of Italy, and of Southern Gaul constitute, at this period, the Western Church, so different in its general type from the Eastern. With the exception of Irenaeus [bishop of Lyons] and Hippolytus [the first celebrated preacher of the West, of Italy and, for a period, Lyons] who represent the oriental element in Gaul and at Rome, the Western Fathers are broadly distinguished from those of the East. . . . They affirm rather than demonstrate; . . . they prefer practical to speculative questions. The system of episcopal authority is gradually developed with a larger amount of passion at Carthage, with greater prudence and patience in Italy."—E. De Pressensé, *The Early Years of Christianity: the Martyrs and Apologists*.

**Spain.**—"Christians are generally mentioned as having existed in all parts of Spain at the close of the second century; before the middle of the third century there is a letter of the Roman bishop Anterus (in 237) to the bishops of the provinces of Bœtica and Toletana . . . ; and after the middle of the same century a letter of Cyprian's was addressed to . . . people . . . in the north . . . as well as . . . in the south of that country."—J. E. T. Wiltch, *Handbook of*

the *Geography and Statistics of the Church*, pp. 40-41.

**Britain.**—"All that we can safely assert is that there is some reason for believing that there were Christians in Britain before A. D. 200. Certainly there was a British Church with bishops of its own soon after A. D. 300, and possibly some time before that. Very little can be known about this Celtic Church; but the scanty evidence tends to establish three points, (1) It had its origin from, and remained largely dependent upon, the Gallic Church. (2) It was confined almost exclusively to Roman settlements. (3) Its numbers were small and its members were poor. . . . That Britain may have derived its Christianity from Asia Minor cannot be denied; but the peculiar British custom respecting Easter must not be quoted in evidence of it. It seems to have been a mere blunder, and not a continuation of the old Quarta-deciman practice. Gaul is the more probable parent of the British Church. . . . At the Council of Rimini in 359 Constantius offered to pay out of the treasury the travelling expenses of all the bishops who attended. Out of more than four hundred bishops, three from Britain were the only clergy who availed themselves of this offer. Neither at Rimini, any more than at Arles, do the British representatives make any show; they appear to be quite without influence."—A. Plummer, *The Church of the Early Fathers*, ch. 8.

**Goths.**—"It has been observed that the first indisputable appearance of the Goths in European history must be dated in A. D. 238, when they had waste the South-Danubian province of Moesia as far as the Black Sea. In the thirty years (238-269) that followed, there took place no fewer than ten such incursions. . . . From these expeditions they returned with immense booty, — corn and cattle, silks and fine linen, silver and gold, and captives of all ranks and ages. It is to these captives, many of whom were Christians, and not a few clergy, that the introduction of Christianity among the Goths is primarily due. . . . The period of the incursions, which so strangely formed a sowing-time for Christianity, was followed by a long period of tranquillity, during which the new faith took root and spread. . . . It is to the faithful work and pure lives of [Christian] men . . . who had fled from Roman civilisation for conscience sake, to the example of patience in misfortune and high Christian character displayed by the captives, and to the instruction of the presbyters sprinkled among them, that we must look, as the source of Christianity among the Goths. . . . The fact (to which we shall have to refer later), that, of all the sea raids undertaken by the Goths between the years 238 and 269, the Visigoths took part in only two, while the Ostrogoths, who were settled in Southern Russia along the coast of the Euxine from the Crimea to the Dnieper, were engaged probably in all of them, makes it very unlikely that the captives mentioned by Philostorgius were carried anywhere else than the eastern settlements. To the influence of these Asian Christians, exerted mainly, if not entirely upon the Ostrogoths, must be added the ever-increasing intercourse carried on by sea between the Crimea and both the southern shore of the Euxine and Constantinople. To these probabilities has now to be added the fact that the only

traces of an organised Gothic Church existing before the year 341 are clearly to be referred to a community in this neighbourhood. Among the bishops who were present at the Council of Nicaea (A. D. 325), and who signed the symbol which was then approved, we find a certain Theophilus, before whose name stand the words, 'de Gothis,' and after it the word 'Bosphoritanus.' There can be little doubt that this was a bishop representing a Gothic Church on the Cimmerian Bosphorus; and if, following the Paris MSS., we read further down the list the name Domnus Bosphorensis or Bosphoranus, we may find here another bishop from this diocese, and regard Theophilus as chief or arch-bishop of the Crimean churches. The undoubted presence at this council of at least one bishop of the Goths, and the conclusion drawn therefrom in favour of the orthodoxy of the Gothic Church in general, led afterwards to the greatest confusion. Failing to distinguish between the Crimean and Danubian communities, the historians often found their information contradictory, and altered it in the readiest way to suit the condition of the Church which they had specially in view. . . . The conversion of that section of the nation, which became the Gothic Church, was due to the apostolic labours of one of their own race, — the great missionary bishop Ulfilas [see *Goths*: A. D. 341-381]. But to him too was to be traced the heresy in which they stopped short on the way from heathenism to a complete Christian faith."—C. A. A. Scott, *Ulfilas, Apostle of the Goths*, pp. 19-30.—"The superstitions of the barbarians, who had found homes in the empire, had been exchanged for a more wholesome belief. But Christianity had done more than this. It had extended its influence to the distant East and South, to Abyssinia, and the tribes of the Syrian and Lybian deserts, to Armenia, Persia, and India."—G. P. Fisher, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, p. 98.—"We have before us many significant examples of the facility with which the most intelligent of the Pagans accepted the outward rite of Christian baptism, and made a nominal profession of the Faith, while they retained and openly practiced, without rebuke, without remark, with the indulgence even of genuine believers, the rites and usages of the Paganism they pretended to have abjured. We find abundant records of the fact that personages high in office, such as consuls and other magistrates, while administering the laws by which the old idolatries were proscribed, actually performed Pagan rites and even erected public statues to Pagan divinities. Still more did men, high in the respect of their fellow-Christians, allow themselves to cherish sentiments utterly at variance with the definitions of the Church."—C. Merivale, *Four lectures on some Epochs of Early Church History*, p. 150.—"We look back to the early acts and policy of the Church towards the new nations, their kings and their people; the ways and works of her missionaries and lawgivers, Ulfilas among the Goths, Augustine in Kent, Remigius in France, Boniface in Germany, Anskar in the North, the Irish Columban in Burgundy and Switzerland, Benedict at Monte Cassino; or the reforming kings, the Arian Theodoric, the great German Charles, the great English Alfred. Measured by the light and the standards they have helped us to attain to, their methods no doubt surprise,

disappoint—it may be, revolt us; and all that we dwell upon is the childishness, or the imperfect morality, of their attempts. But if there is anything certain in history, it is that in these rough communications of the deepest truths, in these [for us] often questionable modes of ruling minds and souls, the seeds were sown of all that was to make the hope and the glory of the foremost nations. . . . I have spoken of three other groups of virtues which are held in special regard and respect among us—those connected with manliness and hard work, with reverence for law and liberty, and with pure family life. The rudiments and tendencies out of which these have grown appear to have been early marked in the German races; but they were only rudiments, existing in company with much wilder and stronger elements, and liable, amid the changes and chances of barbarian existence, to be paralysed or trampled out. No mere barbarian virtues could by themselves have stood the trial of having won by conquest the wealth, the lands, the power of Rome. But their guardian was there. What Christianity did for these natural tendencies to good was to adopt them, to watch over them, to discipline, to consolidate them. The energy which warriors were accustomed to put forth in their efforts to conquer, the missionaries and ministers of Christianity exhibited in their enterprises of conversion and teaching. The crowd of unknown saints whose names fill the calendars, and live, some of them, only in the tithe. Our churches, mainly represent the age of heroic spiritual ventures, of which we see glimpses in the story of St. Boniface, the apostle of Germany; of St. Columban and St. Gall, wandering from Ireland to reclaim the barbarians of the Burgundian deserts and of the shores of the Swiss lakes. It was among men like these—men who were then termed emphatically ‘men of religion’—that the new races saw the example of life ruled by a great and serious purpose, which yet was not one of ambition or the excitement of war; a life of deliberate and steady industry, of hard and uncomplaining labour; a life as full of activity in peace, of stout and brave work, as a warrior’s was wont to be in the camp, on the march, in the battle. It was in these men and in the Christianity which they taught, and which inspired and governed them, that the fathers of our modern nations first saw exemplified the sense of human responsibility, first learned the nobleness of a ruled and disciplined life, first enlarged their thoughts of the uses of existence, first were taught the dignity and sacredness of honest toil. These great axioms of modern life passed silently from the special homes of religious employment to those of civil; from the cloisters and cells of men who, when they were not engaged in worship, were engaged in field-work or book-work,—clearing the forest, extending cultivation, multiplying manuscripts—to the guild of the craftsman, the shop of the trader, the study of the scholar. Religion generated and fed these ideas of what was manly and worthy in man.”—R. W. Church, *The Gifts of Civilization*, pp. 279-283.

**A. D. 312-337.—The Church and the Empire.**—“Shortly after the beginning of the fourth century there occurred an event which, had it been predicted in the days of Nero or even of Decius, would have been deemed a wild fancy.

It was nothing less than the conversion of the Roman Emperor to the Christian faith. It was an event of momentous importance in the history of the Christian religion. The Roman empire, from being the enemy and persecutor of the Church, thenceforward became its protector and patron. The Church entered into an alliance with the State, which was to prove fruitful of consequences, both good and evil, in the subsequent history of Europe. Christianity was now to reap the advantages and incur the dangers arising from the friendship of earthly rulers and from a close connection with the civil authority. Constantine was born in 274. He was the son of Constantius Chlorus. His mother, Helena, was of obscure birth. She became a Christian—whether before or after his conversion, is doubtful. . . . After the death of Constantine’s father, a revolt against Galerius augmented the number of emperors, so that, in 308, not less than six claimed to exercise rule. The contest of Constantine was at first in the West, against the tyrannical and dissolute Maxentius. It was just before his victory over this rival at the Milvian Bridge, near Rome, that he adopted the Christian faith. That there mingled in this decision, as in most of the steps of his career, political ambition, is highly probable. The strength of the Christian community made it politic for him to win its united support. But he sincerely believed in the God whom the Christians worshipped, and in the help which, through his providence, he could lend to his servants. . . . Shortly before his victory over Maxentius there occurred what he asserted to be the vision of a flaming cross in the sky, seen by him at noonday, on which was the inscription, in Greek, ‘By this conquer.’ It was, perhaps, an optical illusion, the effect of a parhelion beheld in a moment when the imagination . . . was strongly excited. He adopted the labarum, or the standard of the cross, which was afterwards carried in his armies. [See *ROME: A. D. 323.*] In later contests with Licinius, the ruler in the East, who was a defender of paganism, Constantine became more distinctly the champion of the Christian cause. The final defeat of Licinius, in 323, left him the master of the whole Roman world. An edict signed by Galerius, Constantine, and Licinius, in 311, had proclaimed freedom and toleration in matters of religion. The edict of Milan, in 312, emanating from the two latter, established unrestricted liberty on this subject. If we consider the time when it was issued, we shall be surprised to find that it alleges as a motive for the edict the sacred rights of conscience.”—G. P. Fisher, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, pp. 87-88.—“Towards the end of the year Constantine left Rome for Milan, where he met Licinius. This meeting resulted in the issue of the famous edict of Milan. Up to that hour Christianity had been an ‘*illicita religio*,’ and it was a crime to be a Christian. Even in Trajan’s answer to Pliny this position is assumed, though it forms the basis of humane regulations. The edict of Milan is the charter of Christianity; it proclaims absolute freedom in the matter of religion. Both Christians and all others were to be freely permitted to follow whatsoever religion each might choose. Moreover, restitution was to be made to the Christian body of all churches and other buildings which had been alienated from them during the persecution. This was in

313 A. D. . . . But the causes of dissension remained behind. Once more (323) the question between paganism and Christianity was to be tried on the field of battle, and their armies confronted one another on the plains of Nicæna. Again the skill of Constantine and the trained valour of his troops proved superior to the undisciplined levies of Licinius; while at sea Crispus, the eldest and ill-fated son of Constantine, destroyed the enemy's fleet in the crowded waters of the Hellespont, sowing thereby the seeds of his father's jealousy. Byzantium fell, but not without a vigorous resistance; and, after one more crushing defeat on the site of the modern Scutari, Licinius submitted himself to the mercy of Constantine. . . . What we notice in the whole of these events is the enormous power which still belonged to paganism. The balance still wavered between paganism and Christianity. . . . Constantine had now, by a marvellous succession of victories, placed himself in a position of supreme and undisputed power. At this juncture it is of interest to observe that . . . the divided empire, which followed the reign of Constantine, served to sustain Catholicity at least in one half of the world. . . . The foundation of Constantinople was the outward symbol of the new monarchy and of the triumph of Christianity. . . . The choice of this incomparable position for the new capital of the world remains the lasting proof of Constantine's genius. . . . The magnificence of its public buildings, its treasures of art, its vast endowments, the beauty of its situation, the rapid growth of its commerce, made it worthy to be 'as it were a daughter of Rome herself.' But the most important thought for us is the relation of Constantinople to the advance of Christianity. That the city which had sprung into supremacy from its birth and had become the capital of the conquered world, should have excluded from the circuit of its walls all public recognition of polytheism, and made the Cross its most conspicuous ornament, and the token of its greatness, gave a reality to the religious revolution. . . . The imperial centre of the world had been visibly displaced."—A. Carr, *The Church and the Roman Empire*, ch. 4.—With the first General Council of the Church, held at Nicæna, A. D. 325 (see ΝΙΣΑΕΝΑ), "the decisions . . . of which received the force of law from the confirmation of the Emperor, a tendency was entered upon which was decisive for the further development; decisive also by the fact that the Emperor held it to be his duty to compel subordination to the decisions of the council on penalty of banishment, and actually carried out this banishment in the case of Arius and several of his adherents. The Emperor summoned general synods, the fiscus provided the cost of travel and subsistence (also at other great synods), an imperial commissioner opened them by reading the imperial edict, and watched over the course of business. Only the bishops and their appointed representatives had votes. Dogmatic points fixed . . . were to be the outcome of unanimous agreement, the rest of the ordinances (on the constitution, discipline and worship) of a majority of votes."—W. Moeller, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, p. 337.—"The direct influence of the emperor, however, does not appear until the Emperor Marcian procured from the Council of Chalcedon the completion of

the Patriarchal system. Assuming that Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch were Patriarchates by the recognition of their privileges at the Council of Nicæna (though the canon of that council does not really admit that inference), the Council of Chalcedon, by its ninth, seventeenth and twenty-eighth canons, enlarged and fixed the patriarchal jurisdiction and privileges of the Church of Constantinople, giving it authority over the Dioceses of Thrace, Asia and Pontus, with the power of ordaining and requiring canonical obedience from the metropolitans of those Dioceses, and also the right to adjudicate appeals in causes ecclesiastical from the whole Eastern Church. The Bishop of Jerusalem also obtained in this council patriarchal authority over Palestine. The organization of the Church was thus conformed to that of the empire, the patriarchs corresponding to the Pretorian Prefects, the exarchs, to the governors of the Dioceses, and the metropolitans to the governors of the provinces—the Bishop of Rome being given by an edict of Valentinian III., of the year 445, supreme appellate jurisdiction in the West, and the Bishop of Constantinople, by these canons of Chalcedon, supreme appellate jurisdiction in the East. . . . Dean Milman remarks that the Episcopate of St. John Chrysostom was the last attempt of a bishop of Constantinople to be independent of the political power, and that his fate involved the freedom of the Church of that city."

—J. H. Egar, *Christendom: Ecclesiastical and Political, from Constantine to the Reformation*, pp. 25-27.—"The name of patriarch, probably borrowed from Judaism, was from this period the appellation of the highest dignitaries of the church, and by it were more immediately, but not exclusively, designated the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. One patriarch accordingly presided over several provinces, and was distinguished from the metropolitan in this, that the latter was subordinate to him, and had only the superintendence of one province or a small district. However the designation applied only to the highest rulers of the church in the east, and not to those in the west, for here the title of patriarch was not unfrequently given, even in later times, to the metropolitan. The first mention of this title occurs in the second letter of the Roman bishop, Anacletus at the beginning of the second century, and it is next spoken of by Socrates; and after the Council of Chalcedon, in 451, it came into general use. The bishop of Constantinople bore the special title of œcumenical bishop or patriarch; there were also other titles in use among the Nestorians and Jacobites. The Primates and Metropolitans or Archbishops arose contemporaneously. The title of Eparch is also said to have been given to primates about the middle of the fifth century. The metropolitan of Ephesus subscribed himself thus in the year 680, therefore in the succeeding period. There was no particular title of long continuance for the Roman bishop until the sixth century; but from the year 536 he was usually called Papa, and from the time of Gregory the Great he styled himself *Servus Servorum Dei*."—J. E. T. Wiltch, *Handbook of the Geography and Statistics of the Church*, pp. 70, 71 and 72.—"Christianity may now be said to have ascended the imperial throne; with the single exception of Julian, from this period the monarchs of the Roman empire professed

the religion of the Gospel. This important crisis in the history of Christianity almost forcibly arrests the attention to contemplate the change wrought in Christianity by its advancement into a dominant power in the state; and the change in the condition of mankind up to this period, attributable to the direct authority or indirect influence of the new religion. By ceasing to exist as a separate community, and by advancing its pretensions to influence the general government of mankind, Christianity to a certain extent, forfeited its independence. It could not but submit to these laws, framed, as it might seem, with its own concurrent voice. It was no longer a republic, governed exclusively—as far, at least, as its religious concerns—by its own internal polity. The interference of the civil power in some of its most private affairs, the promulgation of its canons, and even, in some cases, the election of its bishops by the state, was the price which it must inevitably pay for its association with the ruling power. . . . During the reign of Constantine Christianity had made a rapid advance, no doubt, in the number of its proselytes as well as in its external position. It was not yet the established religion of the empire. It did not as yet stand forward as the new religion adapted to the new order of things, as a part of the great simultaneous change which gave to the Roman world a new capital, a new system of government, and, in some important instances, a new jurisprudence. . . . The religion of the emperor would soon become that of the court, and, by somewhat slower degrees, that of the empire. At present, however, as we have seen, little open aggression took place upon paganism. The few temples which were closed were insulated cases, and condemned as offensive to public morality. In general the temples stood in all their former majesty, for as yet the ordinary process of decay from neglect or supineness could have produced little effect. The difference was, that the Christian churches began to assume a more stately and imposing form. In the new capital they surpassed in grandeur, and probably in decoration, the pagan temples, which belonged to old Byzantium. The immunities granted to the Christian clergy only placed them on the same level with the pagan priesthood. The pontifical offices were still held by the distinguished men of the state; the emperor himself was long the chief pontiff; but the religious office had become a kind of appendage to the temporal dignity. The Christian prelates were constantly admitted, in virtue of their office, to the imperial presence."—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, bk. 3, ch. 4.—"As early as Constantine's time the punishment of crucifixion was abolished; immoral practices, like infanticide, and the exhibition of gladiatorial shows, were discouraged, the latter of these being forbidden in Constantinople; and in order to improve the relation of the sexes, severe laws were passed against adultery, and restrictions were placed on the facility of divorce. Further, the bishops were empowered, in the name of religion, to intercede with governors, and even with the emperor, in behalf of the unfortunate and oppressed. And gradually they obtained the right of exercising a sort of moral superintendence over the discharge of their official duties by the judges, and others, who belonged to their communities. The supervision of the

prisons, in particular, was entrusted to them; and, whereas in the first instance their power of interference was limited to exhortations addressed to the judges who superintended them, in Justinian's reign the bishops were commissioned by law to visit the prisons on two days of each week in order to inquire into, and, if necessary, report upon, the treatment of the prisoners. In all these and many other ways, the influence of the State in controlling and improving society was advanced by its alliance with the Church."  
—H. F. Tozer, *The Church and the Eastern Empire*, pp. 56-57.—"The Christians were still a separate people. . . . It can scarcely be doubted that the stricter moral tone of Constantine's legislation more or less remotely emanated from Christianity. . . . During the reign of Constantine Christianity continued to advance beyond the borders of the Roman empire, and in some degree to indemnify herself for the losses which she sustained in the kingdom of Persia. The Ethiopians appear to have attained some degree of civilization; a considerable part of the Arabian commerce was kept up with the other side of the Red Sea through the port of Adulis; and Greek letters appear, from inscriptions recently discovered, to have made considerable progress among this barbarous people. . . . The theological opinions of Christianity naturally made more rapid progress than its moral influence. The former had only to overpower the resistance of a religion which had already lost its hold upon the mind, or a philosophy too speculative for ordinary understandings and too unsatisfactory for the more curious and inquiring; it had only to enter, as it were, into a vacant place in the mind of man. But the moral influence had to contest, not only with the natural dispositions of man, but with the barbarism and depraved manners of ages. While, then, the religion of the world underwent a total change, the Church rose on the ruins of the temple, and the pontifical establishment of paganism became gradually extinct or suffered violent suppression; the moral revolution was far more slow and far less complete. . . . Everywhere there was exaggeration of one of the constituent elements of Christianity; that exaggeration which is the inevitable consequence of a strong impulse upon the human mind. Wherever men feel strongly, they act violently. The more speculative Christians, therefore, who were more inclined, in the deep and somewhat selfish solitude for their own salvation, to isolate themselves from the infected class of mankind, pressed into the extreme of asceticism; the more practical, who were in earnest in the desire of disseminating the blessings of religion throughout society, scrupled little to press into their service whatever might advance their cause. With both extremes the dogmatical part of the religion predominated. . . . In proportion to the admitted importance of the creed, men became more sternly and exclusively wedded to their opinions. . . . While they swept in converts indiscriminately from the palace and the public street, while the emperor and the lowest of the populace were alike admitted on little more than the open profession of allegiance, they were satisfied if their allegiance in this respect was blind and complete. Hence a far larger admixture of human passions, and the common vulgar incentives of action, were infused into the expanding Christian body.

Men became Christians, orthodox Christians, with little sacrifice of that which Christianity aimed chiefly to extirpate. Yet, after all, this imperfect view of Christianity had probably some effect in concentrating the Christian community, and holding it together by a new and more indissoluble bond. The world divided into two parties. . . . All, however, were enrolled under one or the other standard, and the party which triumphed eventually would rule the whole Christian world."—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, bk. 3, ch. 4-5.—"Of this deterioration of morals we have abundant evidence. Read the Canons of the various Councils and you will learn that the Church found it necessary to prohibit the commission of the most heinous and abominable crimes not only by the laity, but even by the clergy. Read the homilies of such preachers as Chrysostom, Basil, and Gregory, and you may infer what the moral tone of a Christian congregation must have been to which such reproofs could be addressed. Read, above all, the treatise on Providence, or De Gubernatione Dei, written at the close of our period by Salvian, a presbyter of Marseilles. The barbarians had over-spread the West, and Christians had suffered so many hardships that they began to doubt whether there was any Divine government of human affairs. Salvian retorted that the fact of their suffering was the best evidence of the doctrine of Providence, for the miseries they endured were the effects of the Divine displeasure provoked by the debauchery of the Church. And then he proceeds to draw up an indictment and to lead proof which I prefer not to give in detail. After making every allowance for rhetorical exaggeration, enough remains to show that the morality of the Church had grievously declined, and that the declension was due to the inroads of Pagan vice. . . . Under this head, had space permitted, some account would have been given of the growth of the Christian literature of this period, of the great writers and preachers, and of the opposing schools of interpretation which divided Christendom. In the Eastern Church we should have had to notice [at greater length the work of] Eusebius of Cæsarea, the father of Church History and the friend of Constantine; Ephrem the Syrian, the poet-preacher; the three Cappadocians, Basil of Cæsarea, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory of Nazianzus, each great in his own way, the first as a preacher and administrator, the second as a thinker, the third as a poet and panegyrist; Chrysostom, the orator and exegete; Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret of Kyros, along with Chrysostom the most influential representatives of the School of Antioch. In the Western Church we should have had to speak of Ambrose, the eloquent preacher and voluminous writer; of Jerome, the biblical critic; and of Augustine, the philosopher and controversialist, whose thoughts live among us even at the present day."—W. Stewart, *The Church of the 4th and 5th Centuries* (*St. Giles' Lectures, 4th series*).—See ROME: A. D. 323, to 391-395.—"Hitherto Christian asceticism had been individualistic in its character. . . . In the third century hermits began to form a class by themselves in the East and in Africa; in the fourth they began to be organized into communities. After the institution of monastic societies, this development of Christian asceticism spread

far and wide from the deserts of the Thebaid and Lower Egypt; Basil, Jerome, Athanasius, Augustine, Ambrose, were foremost among its earliest advocates and propagators; Cassian, Columbanus, Benedict, and others, crowned the labours of their predecessors by a more elaborate organization."—I. Gregory Smith, *Christian Monasticism*, pp. 23-25.

A. D. 318-325.—**The Arian Controversy and the Council of Nicæa.** See ARIANISM, and NICÆA, THE FIRST COUNCIL OF.

A. D. 330-1054.—**The Eastern (Greek, or Orthodox) Church.**—"The Eastern Church," says a well-known writer, 'was like the East, stationary and immutable; the Western, like the West, progressive and flexible. This distinction is the more remarkable, because at certain periods of their course, there can be no doubt that the civilization of the Eastern Church was far higher than that of the Western.'"—G. F. Maclear, *The Slaves*, p. 25.—It is the more remarkable because this long-continuing uniformity, while peculiarly adapted to a people and a church which should retain and transmit an inheritance of faith and culture, stands in singular contrast to the reputed character of the Greek-speaking peoples of the East. The word Greek, however, has, as an adjective, many meanings, and there is danger of wrong inference through inattention to these; some of its distinctive characters are therefore indicated in brackets in various places in the following matter. "The New Rome at the time of its foundation was Roman.

. . . But from the first it was destined to become Greek; for the Greeks, who now began to call themselves Romans—an appellation which they have ever since retained—held fast to their language, manners, and prejudices, while they availed themselves to the full of their rights as Roman citizens. The turning-point in this respect was the separation of the empires of the East and the West in the time of Arcadius and Honorius; and in Justinian's time we find all the highest offices in the hands of the Greeks, and Greek was the prevailing language. But the people whom we call by this name were not the Hellenes of Greece proper, but the Macedonian Greeks. This distinction arose with the establishment of Greek colonies with municipal government throughout Asia by Alexander the Great and his successors. The type of character which was developed in them and among those who were Hellenized by their influence, differed in many respects from that of the old Greeks. The resemblance between them was indeed maintained by similarity of education and social feelings, by the possession of a common language and literature, and by their exclusiveness, which caused them to look down on less favoured races; but while the inhabitants of Greece retained more of the independent spirit and of the moral character and patriotism of their forefathers, the Macedonian Greeks were more cosmopolitan, more subservient, and more ready to take the impress of those among whom they were thrown; and the astuteness and versatility which at all times had formed one element in the Hellenic character, in them became the leading characteristic. The influence of this type is traceable in the policy of the Eastern Empire, varying in intensity in different ages in proportion to the power exercised by the Greeks: until, during the later period of the history—in

the time of the Comneni, and still more in that of the Paleologi—it is the predominant feature."—H. F. Tozer, *The Church and the Eastern Empire*, pp. 9-10.—"What have been the effects of Christianity on what we call national character in Eastern Christendom? . . . The Greeks of the Lower Empire are taken as the typical example of these races, and the Greeks of the Lower Empire have become a byword for everything that is false and base. The Byzantine was profoundly theological, we are told, and profoundly vile. . . . Those who wish to be just to [it] . . . will pass . . . to the . . . equitable and conscientious, but by no means indulgent, judgments of Mr. Finlay, Mr. Freeman, and Dean Stanley. One fact alone is sufficient to engage our deep interest in this race. It was Greeks [Hellenist Jews] and people imbued with Greek ideas who first welcomed Christianity. It was in their language that it first spoke to the world, and its first home was in Greek households and in Greek cities. It was in Greek [Hellenist] atmosphere that the Divine Stranger from the East, in many respects so widely different from all that Greeks were accustomed to, first grew up to strength and shape; first showed its power of assimilating and reconciling; first showed what it was to be in human society. Its earliest nurslings were Greeks; Greeks [Hellenist Jews] first took in the meaning and measure of its amazing and eventful announcements; Greek sympathies first awoke and vibrated to its appeals; Greek obedience, Greek courage, Greek suffering first illustrated its new lessons. Had it not first gained over Greek mind and Greek belief, it is hard to see how it would have made its further way. . . . The Roman conquest of the world found the Greek race, and the Eastern nations which it had influenced, in a low and declining state—morally, socially, politically. The Roman Empire, when it fell, left them in the same discouraging condition, and suffering besides from the degradation and mischief wrought on all its subjects by its chronic and relentless fiscal oppression. . . . These were the men in whose childish conceit, childish frivolity, childish self-assertion, St. Paul saw such dangers to the growth of Christian manliness and to the unity of the Christian body—the idly curious and gossiping men of Athens; the vain and shamelessly ostentatious Corinthians, men in intellect, but in moral seriousness babes; the Ephesians, 'like children carried away with every blast of vain teaching,' the victims of every impostor, and sport of every deceiver; the Cretans, proverbially, 'ever liars, evil beasts, slow bellies,' the passionate, volatile, Greek-speaking, Celts of Asia, the 'foolish' Galatians. . . . The Greek of the Roman times is portrayed in the special warnings of the Apostolic Epistles. After Apostolic times he is portrayed in the same way by the heathen satirist Lucian, and by the Christian preacher Chrysostom; and such, with all his bad tendencies, aggravated by almost uninterrupted misrule and oppression, the Empire, when it broke up, left him. The prospects of such a people, amid the coming storms, were dark. Everything, their gifts and versatility, as well as their faults, threatened national decay and disintegration. . . . These races whom the Empire of the Cæsars left like scattered sheep to the mercy of the barbarians, lived through a succession of the most appalling storms, and

kept themselves together, holding fast, resolute and unwavering, amid all their miseries and all their debasement, to the faith of their national brotherhood. . . . This, it seems to me, Christianity did for a race which had apparently lived its time, and had no future before it—the Greek race in the days of the Cæsars. It created in them, in a new and characteristic degree, national endurance, national fellowship and sympathy, national hope. . . . It gave them an Empire of their own, which, undervalued as it is by those familiar with the ultimate results of Western history, yet withstood the assaults before which, for the moment, Western civilisation sank, and which had the strength to last a life—a stirring and eventful life—of ten centuries. The Greek Empire, with all its evils and weaknesses, was yet in its time the only existing image in the world of a civilised state. . . . The lives of great men profoundly and permanently influence national character; and the great men of later Greek memory are saints. They belong to the people more than emperors and warriors; for the Church is of the people. . . . The mark which such men left on Greek society and Greek character has not been effaced to this day, even by the melancholy examples of many degenerate successors. . . . Why, if Christianity affected Greek character so profoundly, did it not do more? Why, if it cured it of much of its instability and trifling, did it not also cure it of its falsehood and dissimulation? Why, if it impressed the Greek mind so deeply with the reality of the objects of faith, did it not also check the vain inquisitiveness and spirit of disputatiousness and sophistry, which filled Greek Church history with furious wranglings about the most hopeless problems? Why, if it could raise such admiration for unselfishness and heroic nobleness, has not this admiration borne more congenial fruit? Why, if heaven was felt to be so great and so near, was there in real life such coarse and mean worldliness? Why, indeed? . . . Profoundly, permanently, as Christianity affected Greek character, there was much in that character which Christianity failed to reach, much that it failed to correct, much that was obstinately refractory to influences which, elsewhere, were so fruitful of goodness and greatness. The East, as well as the West, has learned much to learn from that religion, which each too exclusively claims to understand, to appreciate, and to defend."—R. V. Church, *The Gifts of Civilization*, pp. 188-216.—"The types of character that were developed in the Eastern Church, as might be expected, were not of the very highest. There was among them no St. Francis, no St. Louis. The uniformity which pervades everything Byzantine prevented the development of such salient characters as are found in the West. It is difficult, no doubt, to form a true estimate of the influence of religion on men's lives in Eastern countries, just as it is of their domestic relations, and even of the condition of the lower classes, because such matters are steadily ignored by the contemporary historians. But all the evidence tends to show that individual rather than heroic piety was fostered by the system which prevailed there. That at certain periods a high tone of spirituality prevailed among certain classes is sufficiently proved by the beautiful hymns of the Eastern Church, many of which,



thanks to Dr. Neale's singular felicity in translation, are in use among ourselves. But the loftier development of their spirit took the form of asceticism, and the scene of this was rather the secluded monastery, or the pillar of the Stylite, than human society at large. But if the Eastern Church did not rise as high as her sister of the West, she never sank as low."—H. F. Tozer, *The Church and the Eastern Empire*, pp. 45-46.—"The Greek Church, or, as it calls itself, the Holy Orthodox, Catholic, Apostolic, Oriental Church, has a venerable if not an eventful history. Unlike the Church of the West, it has not been moulded by great political movements, the rise and fall of kingdoms, and the convulsions which have passed over the face of modern society. Its course has been out of the sight of European civilisation, it has grown up among peoples who have been but slightly affected, if they have been affected at all, by the progressive movements of mankind. It has no middle ages. It has no renaissance. It has no Reformation. It has given birth to no great universities and schools of learning. It has no Protestantism. It remains very much as the fourth and fifth centuries left it. . . . When the royal throne in the days of the first Christian Emperor was removed from Rome to Constantinople, there arose at once a cause of strife between the bishops of old and new Rome, as Byzantium or Constantinople was named. Each claimed pre-eminence, and each alternately received it from the governing powers in Church and State. One Council decreed (A. D. 381) that the Bishop of the new Rome should be inferior only to that of the old; another declared (A. D. 451) the equality of both prelates. The Patriarch of Constantinople at the close of the sixth century claimed superiority over all Christian Churches,—a claim which might have developed, had circumstances favoured it, into an Eastern Papacy. The assumption was, however, but short-lived, and the Bishop of Rome Boniface, obtained from the Emperor Phocas in 606 the much-coveted position. The Eastern Church submitted, but from this time looked with a jealous eye on her Western sister. She noted and magnified every point of divergence between them. Differences or apparent differences in doctrine and ritual were denounced as heresies. Excommunications fulminated between the Eastern and Western city, and ecclesiastical bitterness was intensified by political intrigue. . . . In the ninth century the contest grew very fierce. The holder of the Eastern see, Photius, formulated and denounced the terrible doctrinal and other defections of the Western prelate and his followers. The list is very formidable. They, the followers of Rome, deemed it proper to fast on the seventh day of the week—that is on the Jewish Sabbath; in the first week of Lent they permitted the use of milk and cheese; they disapproved wholly of the marriage of priests; they thought none but bishops could anoint with the holy oil or confirm the baptized, and that they therefore anointed a second time those who had been anointed by presbyters; and fifthly, they had adulterated the Constantinopolitan Creed by adding to it the words Filioque, thus teaching that the Holy Spirit did not proceed only from the Father, but also from the Son. This last was deemed, and has always been deemed by the Greek Church the great

heresy of the Roman Church. . . . The Greek Church to-day in all its branches—in Turkey, Greece, and Russia—professes to hold firmly by the formulas and decisions of the seven Ecumenical or General Councils, regarding with special honour that of Nice. The Nicene and Athanasian Creeds are the symbols of its faith, the Filioque clause being omitted from the former, and the eighth article reading thus: 'And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, and with the Father and Son together is worshipped and glorified.' . . . The Greek Church, unlike the Latin, denounces the use of images as objects of devotion, and holds in abhorrence every form of what it terms 'image worship.' Its position in this manner is very curious. It is true, no figures of our Lord, of the Virgin, or saints, such as one sees in churches, wayside chapels, and in the open fields in countries where the Roman Church is powerful, are to be seen in Russia, Greece, or any of those lands where the Eastern Church is supreme. On the other hand, pictures of the plainest kind everywhere take their place, and are regarded with the deepest veneration."—J. C. Lees, *The Greek Church (in the Churches of Christendom)*, lect. 4.—See, also, **FILIOQUE CONTROVERSY.**

**A. D. 337-476.—The fall of Imperial Rome.—The rise of Ecclesiastical Rome.**—The political and religious history of the Empire from the death of Constantine is so fully narrated under Rome that mere mention here of a few events will suffice, viz.: the revival of Paganism under the Emperor Julian; the reascendency of Christianity; the formal establishment of Christianity as the religion of the Romans, by the suffrages of the senate; the final division of the Empire into East and West between the sons of Theodosius; the three sieges and the sacking of Rome by Alaric; the legal separation of the Eastern and Western Empires; the pillage of Rome by the Vandals and its final submission to the barbarians. See **ROME: A. D. 337-361, to 445-476.** For an account of the early bishops of Rome, see **PAPACY.** "A heathen historian traces the origin of the calamities which he records to the abolition of sacrifice by Theodosius, and the sack of Rome to the laws against the ancient faith passed by his son. This objection of the heathens that the overthrow of idolatry and the ascendancy of Christianity were the cause of the misfortunes of the empire was so wide spread, and had such force with those, both Pagans and Christians, who conceived history to be the outcome of magical or demonic powers, that Augustine devoted twelve years of his life to its refutation. His treatise, 'De Civitate Dei,' was begun in 413, and was not finished till 426, within four years of his death. Rome had once been taken; society, consumed by inward corruption, was shaken to its foundations by the violent onset of the Teutonic tribes; men's hearts were failing them for fear; the voice of calumny cried aloud, and laid these woes to the charge of the Christian faith. Augustine undertook to refute the calumny, and to restore the courage of his fellow-Christians. Taking a rapid survey of history, he asks what the gods had ever done for the well-being of the state or for public morality. He maintains that the greatness of Rome in the past was due to the virtues of her sons, and not to the protection of the gods. He shows that,

long before the rise of Christianity, her ruin had begun with the introduction of foreign vices after the destruction of Carthage, and declares that much in the ancient worship, instead of preventing, had hastened that ruin. He rises above the troubles of the present, and amid the vanishing glories of the city of men he proclaims the stability of the city of God. At a time when the downfall of Rome was thought to presage approaching doom, Augustine regarded the disasters around him as the birth-throes of a new world, as a necessary moment in the onward movement of Christianity."—W. Stewart, *The Church of the 4th and 5th Centuries (St. Giles' Lectures, 4th series)*.—"There is as little ground for discovering a miraculous, as there is for discerning a providential element in the course of events. The institutions of Roman authority and law had been planted regularly over all the territory which the conquering hordes coveted and seized; alongside of every magistrate was now placed a minister of Christ, and by every Hall of Justice stood a House of Prayer. The Representative of Cæsar lost all his power and dignity when the armies of Cæsar were scattered in flight; the minister of Christ felt that believing him was an invisible force which the hosts of the alien could not cope, and his behaviour impressed the barbarian with the conviction that there was reality here. That beneficent mission of Leo, A. D. 452, of which Gibbon says: 'The pressing eloquence of Leo, his majestic aspect and sacerdotal robes, excited the veneration of Attila for the spiritual father of the Christians'—would be but an instance of what many nameless priests from provincial towns did, 'not counting their lives dear to them.' The organisation of the Latin state vitalised by a new spiritual force vanquished the victors. It was the method and the discipline of this organisation, not the subtlety of its doctrine, nor the fervour of its officials, that beat in detail one chief with his motley following after another. Hence too it came about that the Christianity which was adopted as the religion of Europe was not modified to suit the tastes of the various tribes that embraced it, but was delivered to each as from a common fountain-head. . . . It was a social triumph, proceeding from religious motives which we may regard with unstinted admiration and gratitude."—J. Watt, *The Latin Church (St. Giles' Lectures, 4th series)*.—"The temporal fall of the Imperial metropolis tended to throw a brighter light upon her ecclesiastical claims. The separation of the East and the West had already enhanced the religious dignity of the ancient capital. The great Eastern patriarchates of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem had up to that time all held themselves equal, if not superior to Rome. Constantinople had even assumed certain airs of supremacy over all. The General Councils which had defined the Faith at Niceæ and Constantinople had been composed almost wholly of Orientals. The great Doctors of the Church, the men who had defended or diffused the common Faith, had been mostly Greeks by origin and language. None had been Romans, and it was rarely, till the fourth century, that any of them had written in the Latin tongue. When Athanasius, exiled from Alexandria, came to Italy and Gaul, it was three years before he could learn enough of the language of the West to address its congregations in public. But this

curious fact shows that the Western Christians were now no longer the little Greek colony of the first and second centuries. Christianity had become the national religion of the native races. The Romans might now feel that they were becoming again a people; that their glorious career was assuming, as it were, a new point of departure. . . . For at this moment the popular instinct could not fail to perceive how strongly the conscience of the barbarians had been affected by the spiritual majesty of Christian Rome. The Northern hordes had beaten down all armed resistance. They had made a deep impression upon the strength of the Eastern Empire; they had, for a moment at least, actually overcome the Western; they had overrun many of the fairest provinces, and had effected a permanent lodgement in Gaul and Spain, and still more recently in Africa. Yet in all these countries, rude as they still were, they had submitted to accept the creed of the Gospel. There was no such thing as a barbarian Paganism established within the limits of the Empire anywhere, except perhaps in furthest Britain."—C. Merivale, *Four lectures on some Epochs of Early Church History*, pp. 130–136.—"When the surging tides of barbarian invasion swept over Europe, the Christian organization was almost the only institution of the past which survived the flood. It remained as a visible monument of what had been, and, by so remaining, was of itself an antithesis to the present. The chief town of the Roman province, whatever its status under barbarian rule, was still the bishop's see. The limits of the old 'province,' though the boundary of a new kingdom might bisect them, were still the limits of his diocese. The bishop's tribunal was the only tribunal in which the laws of the Empire could be pleaded in their integrity. The bishop's dress was the ancient robe of a Roman magistrate. The ancient Roman language which was used in the Church services was a standing protest against the growing degeneracy of the 'vulgar tongue.' . . . As the forces of the Empire became less and less, the forces of the Church became more and more. The Churches preserved that which had been from the first the secret of Imperial strength. For underneath the Empire which changed and passed, beneath the shifting pageantry of Emperors who moved across the stage and were seen no more, was the abiding empire of law and administration,—which changed only as the deep sea changes beneath the windswept waves. That inner empire was continued in the Christian Churches. In the years of transition from the ancient to the modern world, when all civilized society seemed to be disintegrated, the confederation of the Christian Churches, by the very fact of its existence upon the old imperial lines, was not only the most powerful, but the only powerful organization in the civilized world. It was so vast, and so powerful, that it seemed to be, and there were few to question its being, the visible realization of that Kingdom of God which our Lord Himself had preached."—E. Hatch, *The Organization of the Christian Churches*, pp. 160–178.

A. D. 347-412.—The Syrian Churches.—"St. Chrysostom was born there A. D. 347; and it was in his time that Antioch, with its hundred thousand Christians, became the leading Church in Asia, especially in the Arian controversy [see ARIANISM], for Arianism was very prevalent

there. But all this lies outside our period. The so-called 'School of Antioch' has its origin just before . . . our period [311, Wiltseh]. Dorotheus, . . . and the martyr Lucian may be regarded as its founders. In contrast to the allegorising mysticism of the School of Alexandria, it was distinguished by a more sober and critical interpretation of Scripture. It looked to grammar and history for its principles of exegesis. But we must not suppose that there was at Antioch an educational establishment like the Catechetical School at Alexandria, which, by a succession of great teachers, kept up a traditional mode of exegesis and instruction. It was rather an intellectual tendency which, beginning with Lucian and Dorotheus, developed in a definite direction in Antioch and other Syrian Churches. . . . These notices of the Churches of Jerusalem, Casarea in Palestine, and Antioch must suffice as representative of the Syrian Churches. The number of these Churches was considerable even in the second century, and by the beginning of the fourth was very large indeed, as is seen by the number of bishops who attend local Councils."—A. Plummer, *The Church of the Early Fathers*, ch. 3.—"It has often astonished me that no one has ever translated the letters of St. Jerome. The letters of St. Augustine have been translated, and are in many parts very entertaining reading, but they are nothing in point of living interest when compared with St. Jerome's. These letters illustrate life about the year 400 as nothing else can. They show us, for instance, what education then was, what clerical life consisted in; they tell us of modes and fashions, and they teach us how vigorous and constant was the communication at that same period between the most distant parts of the Roman empire. We are apt to think of the fifth century as a time when there was very little travel, and when most certainly the East and West—Ireland, England, Gaul and Palestine—were much more widely and completely separated than now, when steam has practically annihilated time and space. And yet such an idea is very mistaken. There was a most lively intercourse existing between these regions, a constant Church correspondence kept up between them, and the most intense and vivid interest maintained by the Gallic and Syrian churches in the minutest details of their respective histories. Mark now how this happened. St. Jerome at Bethlehem was the centre of this intercourse. His position in the Christian world in the beginning of the fifth century can only be compared to, but was not at all equalled by, that of John Calvin at the time of the Reformation. Men from the most distant parts consulted him. Bishops of highest renown for sanctity and learning, like St. Augustine, and Exuperius of Toulouse in southern France, deferred to his authority. The keen interest he took in the churches of Gaul, and the intimate knowledge he possessed of the most petty local details and religious gossip therein, can only be understood by one who has studied his very abusive treatise against Vigilantius or his correspondence with Exuperius. . . . But how, it may be asked, was this correspondence carried on when there was no postal system? Here it was that the organization of monasticism supplied a . . . Jerome's letters tell us the very name of his postman. He was a monk named Syinnius. He was perpetually on the road between Mar-

selles and Bethlehem. Again and again does Jerome mention his coming and his going. His appearance must indeed have been the great excitement of life at Bethlehem. Travelling probably via Sarinina, Rome, Greece, and the islands of the Adriatic, he gathered up all kinds of clerical news on the way—a piece of conduct on his part which seems to have had its usual results. As a tale-bearer, he not only revealed secrets, but also separated chief friends, and this monk Syinnius with his gossips seems to have been the original cause of the celebrated quarrel between Augustine and Jerome."—G. T. Stokes, *Ireland and the Celtic Church*, pp. 170-172.

A. D. 496-800.—The Frankish Church to the Empire of Charlemagne.—"The baptism of Chlodovech [Clovis—see FRANKS: A. D. 481-511] was followed by the wholesale conversion of the Franks. No compulsion was used to bring the heathen into the Church. As a heathen, Chlodovech had treated the Church with forbearance; he was equally tolerant to heathenism when he was a Christian. But his example worked, and thousands of noble Franks crowded to the water of regeneration. Gregory of Tours reckons the Franks as Christians after the baptism of their king, which took place at Christmas, A. D. 496. His conversion made no alteration in the policy and conduct of Chlodovech; he remained the same mixture of cunning and audacity, of cruelty and sensuality, that he was before. . . . But, though his baptism was to him of no moral import, its consequences were wide spreading. When Gregory of Tours compares the conversion of Chlodovech with that of Constantine the Great, he was fully in the right. . . . And the baptism of Chlodovech declared to the world that the new blood being poured into the veins of the old and expiring civilization, had been quickened by the same elements, and would unite with the old in the new development. . . . That many of those who were baptized carried with them into their new Christianity their old heathen superstitions as well as their barbarism is certain; and the times were not those in which the growth of the great Christian graces was encouraged; the germs, however, of a new life were laid."—S. Baring-Gould, *The Church in Germany*, ch. 3.—"The details of the history of the Merovingian period of Frankish history are extraordinarily complicated; happily, it is not at all necessary for our purpose to follow them. . . . In the earlier years after the conquest, all ranks of the clergy were filled by Gallo-Romans. The Franks were the dominant race, and were Christian, but they were new converts from a rude heathenism, and it would take some generations to raise up a 'native ministry' among them. Not only the literature of the (Western) Church, but all its services, and, still more, the conversational intercourse of all civilized and Christian people, was in Latin. Besides, the Franks were warriors, a conquering caste, a separate nation; and to lay down the battle-axe and spear, and enter into the peaceful ranks of the Romano-Gallic Church, would have seemed to them like changing their nationality for that of the more highly cultured, perhaps, but, in their eyes, subject race. The Frank kings did not ignore the value of education. Clovis is said to have established a Palatine school, and encouraged his young men to qualify themselves for the positions which his conquests had opened out

to them. His grandsons, we have seen, prided themselves on their Latin culture. After a while, Franks aspired to the magnificent positions which the great sees of the Church offered to their ambition; and we find men with Teutonic names, and no doubt of Teutonic race, among the bishops. . . . For a still longer period, few Franks entered into the lower ranks of the Church. Not only did the priesthood offer little temptation to them, but also the policy of the kings and nobles opposed the diminution of their military strength, by refusing leave to their Franks to enter into holy orders or into the monasteries. The cultured families of the cities would afford an ample supply of men for the clergy, and promising youths of a lower class seem already not infrequently to have been educated for the service of the Church. It was only in the later period, when some approach had been made to a fusion of the races, that we find Franks entering into the lower ranks of the Church, and simultaneously we find Gallo-Romans in the ranks of the armies. . . . Monks wielded a powerful spiritual influence. But the name of not a single priest appears in the history of the times as exercising any influence or authority. . . . Under the gradual secularization of the Church in the Merovingian period, the monasteries and the greatest share in keeping alive a remnant of vital religion among the people; and in the gradual decay of learning and art, the monastic institution was the ark in which the ancient civilization survived the deluge of barbarism, and emerged at length to spread itself over the modern world."—E. L. Cutts, *Charlemagne*, ch. 5 and 7.—"Two Anglo-Saxon monks, St. Wilfrid, bishop of York, and St. Willibrord undertook the conversion of the savage fishermen of Friesland and Holland at the end of the seventh and beginning of the eighth century; they were followed by another Englishman, the most renowned of all these missionaries, Winfrith, whose name was changed to Boniface, perhaps by the Pope, in recognition of his active and beneficent apostleship. When Gregory II. appointed him bishop of Germany (723), he went through Bavaria and established there the dioceses of Frisingen, Passau, and Ratisbon. When Pope Zacharias bestowed the rank of metropolitan upon the Church of Mainz in 748, he entrusted its direction to St. Boniface, who from that time was primate, as it were, of all Germany, under the authority of the Holy See. St. Boniface was assassinated by the Pagans of Friesland in 755."—V. Duruy, *Hist. of the Middle Ages*, bk. 3, ch. 8.—"Boniface, whose original name was Winfrid, was of a noble Devonshire family (A. D. 680), educated at the monastery of Nuttelle, in Hampshire, and at the age of thirty-five years had obtained a high reputation for learning and ability, when (in A. D. 716), seized with the prevalent missionary enthusiasm, he abandoned his prospects at home, and set out with two companions to labour among the Frisians. . . . Winfrid was refused permission by the Duke to preach in his dominions, and he returned home to England. In the following spring he went to Rome, where he remained for some months, and then, with a general authorization from the pope to preach the gospel in Central Europe, he crossed the Alps, passed through Bavaria into Thuringia, where he began his work. While here the death of Radbod,

A. D. 719, and the conquest of Frisia by Charles Martel, opened up new prospects for the evangelization of that country, and Boniface went thither and laboured for three years among the missionaries, under Willibrord of Utrecht. Then, following in the track of the victorious forces of Charles Martel, he plunged into the wilds of Hessa, converted two of its chiefs whose example was followed by multitudes of the Hessians and Saxons, and a monastery arose at Amöneburg as the headquarters of the mission. The Bishop of Rome being informed of this success, summoned Boniface to Rome, A. D. 723, and consecrated him a regency bishop, with a general jurisdiction over all whom he should win from paganism into the Christian fold, requiring from him at the same time the oath which was usually required of bishops within the patriarchate of Rome, of obedience to the see. . . . Boniface was not only a zealous missionary, an earnest preacher, a learned scholar, but he was a statesman and an able administrator. He not only spread the Gospel among the heathen, but he organized the Church among the newly converted nations of Germany; he regulated the disorder which existed in the Frankish Church, and established the relations between Church and State on a settled basis. The mediæval analysts tell us that Boniface crowned Pepin king, and modern writers have usually reproduced the statement. 'Rettberg, and the able writer of the biography of Boniface in Herzog (Renl Ecyk, s. v.), argue satisfactorily from Boniface's letters that he took no part in Pepin's coronation.' When Boniface withdrew from the active supervision of the Frankish Churches, it is probable that his place was to some extent supplied in the councils of the mayor and in the synods of the Church by Chrodegang, Bishop of Metz, a man whose character and influence in the history of the Frank Church have hardly hitherto been appreciated."—E. L. Cutts, *Charlemagne*, ch. 12.—"Both Karlmann and Pippin tried to reform certain abuses that had crept into the Church. Two councils, convoked by Karlmann, the one in Germany (742), the other in the following year at Lestines (near Charleroi, in Belgium), drew up decrees which abolished superstitious rites and certain Pagan ceremonies, still remaining in force; they also authorized grants of Church lands by the 'Prince' for military purposes on condition of a payment of an annual rent to the Church; they reformed the ecclesiastical life, forbade the priests to hunt or to ride through the woods with dogs, falcons, or sparrow-hawks; and, finally, made all priests subordinate to their diocesan bishops, to whom they were obliged to give account each year of their faith and their ministry—all of which were necessary provisions for the organization of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and for the regulation of church government. Similar measures were taken by the Council of Soissons, convoked by Pippin in 744. In 747, Karlmann renounced the world and retired to the celebrated Italian monastery of Monte Cassino. As he left he entrusted his children to the care of their uncle, Pippin, who robbed them of their inheritance and ruled alone over the whole Frankish Empire. . . . Charlemagne enlarged and completed the work which had only been begun by Charles Martel and Pippin. . . . The Middle Ages acknowledged two Masters, the Pope and the Emperor, and these

two powers came, the one from Rome, and the other from Austrasia France. . . . The mayors of Austrasia, Pippin of Herstal, and Charles Martel, rebuilt the Frankish monarchy and prepared the way for the empire of Charlemagne; . . . the Roman pontiffs . . . gathered around them all the churches of the West, and placed themselves at the head of the great Catholic society, over which one day Gregory VII. and Innocent I. should claim to have sole dominion."—V. Duruy, *Hist. of the Middle Ages*, pp. 119–168.—See MAYORS OF THE PALACE; FRANKS: A. D. 768–814; and PAPACY: A. D. 755–774, and 774.—The coronation of Charlemagne at Rome by Pope Leo III. (see ROMAN EMPIRE, A. D. 800) gave the Western Church the place in the state it had held under the earlier Roman emperors. The character of so great a man, the very books he read and all that fed the vigorous ideal element in so powerful a spirit are worthy of interest; for this at least he sought to accomplish—to give order to a tumultuous and barbarian world, and to establish learning, and purify the church: "While at table, he liked to hear a recital or a reading, and it was histories and the great deeds of past times which were usually read to him. He took great pleasure, also, in the works of St. Augustine, and especially in that whose title is *De Civitate Dei*. . . . He practiced the Christian religion in all its purity and with great fervour, whose principles had been taught him from his infancy. . . . He diligently attended . . . church in the evening and morning, and even at night, to assist at the offices and at the holy sacrifice, as much as his health permitted him. He watched with care that nothing should be done but with the greatest propriety, constantly ordering the guardians of the church not to allow anything to be brought there or left there inconsistent with or unworthy of the sanctity of the place. . . . He was always ready to help the poor, and it was not only in his own country, or within his own dominions that he dispensed those gratuitous liberalities which the Greeks call 'alms,' but beyond the seas—in Syria, in Egypt, in Africa, at Jerusalem, at Alexandria, at Carthage, everywhere where he learned that Christians were living in poverty—he pitied their misery and loved to send them money. If he sought with so much care the friendship of foreign sovereigns, it was, above all, to procure for the Christians living under their rule help and relief. Of all the holy places, he had, above all, a great veneration for the Church of the Apostle St. Peter at Rome."—Eginhard, *Life of Charlemagne*.—"The religious side of Charles' character is of the greatest interest in the study of his remarkable character as a whole and his religious policy led to the most important and durable results of his reign. He inherited an ecclesiastical policy from his father; the policy of regulating and strengthening the influence of the Church in his dominions as the chief agent of civilization, and a great means of binding the various elements of the empire into one; the policy of accepting the Bishop of Rome as the head of Western Christianity, with patriarchal authority over all its Churches."—E. L. Cutts, *Charlemagne*, ch. 23.—The following is a noteworthy passage from Charlemagne's Capitulary of 787: "It is our wish that you may be what it behoves the soldiers of the church to be,—religious in heart, learned in discourse, pure in

act, eloquent in speech; so that all who approach your house in order to invoke the Divine Majesty, or to behold the excellence of the religious life, may be edified in beholding you, and instructed in hearing you discourse or chant, and may return home rendering thanks to God most High. Fail not, as thou regardest our favour, to send a copy of this letter to all thy suffragans and to all the monasteries; and let no monk go beyond his monastery to administer justice or to enter the assemblies and the voting-places. Adieu."—J. B. Mullinger, *The Schools of Charles the Great*.

**5th-7th Centuries.**—**The Nestorian, Monophysite and Monothelite Controversies.** See NESTORIAN AND MONOPHYSITE, and MONOTHELITE.

**5th-9th Centuries.**—**The Irish Church and its missions.**—The story of the conversion of Ireland by St. Patrick, and of the missionary labors of the Church which he founded, is briefly told elsewhere—see IRELAND: 5th-8th CENTURIES. "The early Church worked her way, in the literal sense of the word, 'underground,' under camp and palace, under senate and forum. Put turn where we will in these Celtic missions, we notice how different were the features that marked them now. In Dalaradia St. Patrick obtains the site of his earliest church from the chieftain of the country, Dichu. At Tara, he obtains from King Laoghaire a reluctant toleration of his ministry. In Connaught he addresses himself first to the chieftains of Tirawley, and in Munster baptizes Angus, the king, at Cashel, the seat of the kings. What he did in Ireland reproduces itself in the Celtic missions of Wales and Scotland, and we cannot but take note of the important influence of Welsh and Pictish chiefs. . . . 'The people may not have adopted the actual profession of Christianity, which was all perhaps that in the first instance they adopted from any clear or intelligent appreciation of its superiority to their former religion. But to obtain from the people even an actual profession of Christianity was an important step to ultimate success. It secured toleration at least for Christian institutions. It enabled the missionaries to plant in every tribe their churches, schools, and monasteries, and to establish among the half pagan inhabitants of the country societies of holy men, whose devotion, usefulness, and piety soon produced an effect on the most barbarous and savage hearts.'"—G. F. Maclean, *Conversion of the West: The Celts*, ch. 11.—"The Medieval Church of the West found in the seventh century an immense task before it to fulfil. . . . The missionaries who addressed themselves to the enormous task of the conversion of Germany may be conveniently divided into three groups—the British, the Frankish, and, entering somewhat later into an honourable rivalry with these, the Anglo-Saxon. A word or two upon each of these groups. The British—they include Irish and Scotch—could no longer find a field for the exercise of their ministry in England, now that there the Roman rule and discipline, to which they were so little disposed to submit, had everywhere won the day. Their own religious houses were full to overflowing. At home there was little for them to do, while yet that divine hunger and thirst for the winning of souls, which had so possessed the heart of St. Patrick, lived on in theirs. To these so minded, pagan Germany offered a welcome field of

labour, and one in which there was ample room for all. Then there were the Frankish missionaries, who enjoyed the support of the Frankish kings, which sometimes served them in good stead; while at other times this protection was very far from a recommendation in their eyes who were easily persuaded to see in these missionaries the emissaries of a foe. Add to these the Anglo-Saxons; these last, mindful of the source from which they had received their own Christianity, making it a point to attach their converts to Rome, even as they were themselves bound to her by the closest ties. The language which these spoke—a language which as yet can have diverged very little from the Low German of Frisia, must have given to them many facilities which the Frankish missionaries possessed in a far slighter degree, the British not at all; and this may help to account for a success on their parts far greater than attended the labours of the others. To them too it was mainly due that the battle of the Creeds, which had been fought and lost by the Celtic missionaries in England, and was presently renewed in Germany, had finally the same issues there as in England. . . . At the same time, there were differences in the intensity and obstinacy of resistance to the message of truth, which would be offered by different tribes. There was ground, which at an early day had been won for the Gospel, but which in the storms and confusion of the two preceding centuries had been lost again; the whole line, that is, of the Danube and the Rhine, regions fair and prosperous once, but in every sense wildernesses now. In these we may note a readier acceptance of the message than found place in lands which in earlier times that message had never reached; as though obscure reminiscences and traditions of the past, not wholly extinct, had helped to set forward the present work.”—R. C. Trench, *Lectures on Medieval Church History*, lect. 5.—“From Ireland came Gallus, Fridolin, Kilian, Trutbert and Levin. . . . The order in which these men succeeded one another cannot always be established, from the uncertainty of the accounts. We know thus much, that of all those above-mentioned, Gallus was the first, for his labours in Helvetia (Switzerland) were continued from the preceding into the period of which we are now treating. On the other hand, it is uncertain as to Fridolin whether he had not completed his work before Gallus, in the sixth century, for in the opinion of some he closed his career in the time of Clodoveus I., but, according to others, he is said to have lived under Clodoveus II., or at another period. His labours extended over the lands on the Moselle, in the Vosges Mountains, over Helvetia, Rhetia and Nigra Silva (the Black Forest). He built the monastery of Sekkinga on the Rhine. Trutbert was a contemporary and at the same time a countryman of Gallus. His sphere of action is said to have been Brigovia (Breisgau) and the Black Forest. Almost half a century later Kilian proclaimed the gospel in Franconia and Wirtzburg, with two assistants, Colonus and Totnaus. In the latter place they converted duke Gozbert, and were put to death there in 388. After the above mentioned missionaries from Ireland, in the seventh century, had built churches and monasteries in the southern Germany, the missionaries from Britain repaired with a similar purpose, to the northern countries.

. . . Men from other nations, as Willericus, bishop of Bremen, preached in Transalbingia at the beginning of the ninth century. Almost all the missionaries from the kingdom of the Franks selected southern Germany as their sphere of action: Emmeran, about 649, Ratisbona, Rudbert, about 696, Bajoria (Bavaria), Corbinian the country around Frisinga, Othert the Breisgau and Black Forest, and Pirminius the Breisgau, Bajoria, Franconia, Helvetia, and Alsatis.”—J. E. T. Wittsch, *Handbook of the Geography and Statistics of the Church*, v. 1, pp. 365-367.

**A. D. 553-800.—The Western Church.—Rise of the Papacy.**—“Though kindly treated, the Church of Rome did not make any progress under the Ostrogoths. But when their power had been broken (553), and Rome had been placed again under the authority of the Emperor of Constantinople [see **ROME**: A. D. 535-553], the very remoteness of her new master insured to the Church a more prosperous future. The invasion of the Lombards drove a great many refugees into her territory, and the Roman population showed a slight return of its old energy in its double hatred toward them, as barbarians and as Arians. . . . It was at this favorable point in the state of affairs, though critical in some respects, that Gregory the Great made his appearance (590-604). He was a descendant of the noble Anicia family, and added to his advantages of birth and position the advantages of a well-endowed body and mind. He was prefect of Rome when less than thirty years old, but after holding this office a few months he abandoned the honors and cares of worldly things for the retirement of the cloister. His reputation did not allow him to remain in the obscurity of that life. Toward 579 he was sent to Constantinople by Pope Pelagius II. as secretary or papal nuncio, and he rendered distinguished services to the Holy See in its relations with the Empire and in its struggles against the Lombards. In 590 the clergy, the senate, and the people raised him with one accord to the sovereign pontificate, to succeed Pelagius. As it was still necessary for every election to be confirmed by the Emperor at Constantinople, Gregory wrote to him to beg him not to sanction this one; but the letter was intercepted and soon orders arrived from Maurice ratifying the election. Gregory hid himself, but he was discovered and led back to Rome. When once Pope, though against his will, he used his power to strengthen the papacy, to propagate Christianity, and to improve the discipline and organization of the Church. . . . Strengthened thus by his own efforts, he undertook the propagation of Christianity and orthodoxy both within and without the limits of the old Roman Empire. Within those limits there were still some who clung to paganism, in Sicily, Sardinia, and even at the very gates of Rome, at Terracina, and doubtless also in Gaul, as there is a constitution of Childebert still extant dated 554, and entitled: ‘For the abolition of the remains of idolatry.’ There were Arians very near to Rome—namely, the Lombards; but through the intervention of Theudalinda, their queen, Gregory succeeded in having Adewald, the heir to the throne, brought up in the Catholic faith; as early as 587 the Visigoths in Spain, under Recared, were converted. . . . The Roman Empire had perished, and the barbarians had built upon its ruins many slight structures that

were soon overthrown. Not even had the Franks, who were destined to be perpetuated as a nation, as yet succeeded in founding a social state of any strength; their lack of experience led them from one attempt to another, all equally vain; even the attempt of Charlemagne met with no more permanent success. In the midst of these successive failures one institution alone, developing slowly and steadily through the centuries, following out the spirit of its principles, continued to grow and gain in power, in extent and in unity. . . . The Pope had now become, in truth, the ruler of Christendom. He was, however, still a subject of the Greek Emperor; but a rupture was inevitable, as his authority, on the one hand, was growing day by day, and the emperor's was on the contrary, was declining."—V. Duruy, *Hist. of the Middle Ages*, pp. 114-115, 108-109, 117.—"The real power which advanced the credit of the Roman see during these ages was the reaction against the Byzantine despotism over the Eastern Church; and this is the explanation of the fact that although the new map of Europe had been marked out, in outline at least, by the year 500, the Roman see, clung to the eastern connection until the first half of the eighth century. . . . In the political or diplomatic struggle between the Church and the Emperors, in which the Emperors endeavored to make the Church subservient to the imperial policy, or to adjust the situation to the necessities of the empire, and the Church strove to retain its autonomy as a witness to the faith and a legislator in the affairs of religion, the Bishop of Rome became, so to speak, the constitutional head of the opposition; and the East was willing to exalt his authority, as a counterpoise to that of the Emperor, to any extent short of acknowledging that the primacy implied a supremacy."—J. H. Egar, *Christendom: Ecclesiastical and Political, from Constantine to the Reformation*, p. 99.—"The election system was only used for one degree of the ecclesiastical dignitaries, for the bishopric. The lower dignitaries were chosen by the bishop. They were divided into two categories of orders—the higher and the lower orders. There were three higher orders, namely, the priests, the deacons, and the sub-deacons, and four lower orders, the acolytes, the doorkeepers, the exorcists, and the readers. The latter orders were not regarded as an integral part of the clergy, as their members were the servants of the others. As regards the territorial divisions, the bishop governed the diocese, which at a much later date was divided into parishes, whose spiritual welfare was in the hands of the parish priest or curate (curio). The parishes, taken together, constituted the diocese; the united dioceses, or suffragan bishoprics, constituted the ecclesiastical province, at whose head stood the metropolitan or archbishop. When a provincial council was held, it met in the metropolis and was presided over by the metropolitan. Above the metropolitans were the Patriarchs, in the East, and the Primates in the West, bishops who held the great capitals or the apostolic sees, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Rome, Jerusalem, Cesarea in Cappadocia, Carthage in Africa, and Heraclius in Thrace; among them Rome ranked higher by one degree, and from this supreme position exercised a supreme authority acknowledged by all the Church."—V. Duruy, *Hist. of the Middle Ages*, pp. 109-110.—

"The divergence of the two Churches, Eastern and Western, was greater in reality than it appears to be from a superficial view. It was based on essential variations in the character and disposition of the people in the East and in the West, on the nature of their civilization, and on the different, almost antagonistic, development of the Christian idea in one Church and in the other. . . . The Eastern Church rejoiced in its direct affiliation with apostolic times, in its careful preservation of traditions, and was convinced of its especial right to be considered the true heir and successor of Christ. . . . The letter of the law superseded the spirit; religion stiffened into formalism; piety consisted in strict observance of ceremonial rites; external holiness replaced sincere and heartfelt devotion. . . . Throughout the West the tendency was in a contrary direction—towards the practical application of the religious idea. The effete, worn-out civilization of the past was there renovated by contact and admixture with young and vigorous races, and gained new strength and vitality in the struggle for existence. The Church, freed from control, became independent and self-asserting; the responsibility of government, the preservation of social order, devolved upon it, and it rose proudly to the task."—A. F. Heard, *The Russian Church and Russian Dissent*, pp. 6-10.—"On the overthrow of the Western Empire, and the demonstration, rendered manifest to all, that with the complete triumph of the new world of secular politics a new spiritual development, a new phase of Divine guidance, was opening, the conscience of the believers was aroused to a sense of the sinfulness of their cowardly inactivity. 'Go ye into all nations, and baptize them,' had been the last words of their blessed Master. . . . It is to this new or revived missionary spirit which distinguished the sixth century, of which I would place Pope Gregory the First, or the Great, as the central figure, that I desire now to introduce you. Remember that the Empire, which had represented the unity of mankind, had become disintegrated and broken into fragments. Men were no longer Romans, but Goths and Sueves, Burgundians and Vandals, and beyond them Huns, Avars, Franks, and Lombards, some with a slight tincture of Christian teaching, but most with none. . . . Let but the Gospel be proclaimed to all, and leave the issue in God's hands! Such was the contrast between the age of Leo and the age of Gregory! . . . The conversion of Clovis and the Franks is, I suppose, the earliest instance of a Christian mission carried out on a national scale by the common action of the Church represented by the Pope and See of Rome. It becomes accordingly a great historical event, deserving the earnest consideration not of Churchmen only, but of all political enquirers."—C. Merivale, *Four Lectures on some Epochs of Early Church Hist.*, pp. 172-177.—"Christianity thus renewed its ardor for proselytism, and Gregory contributed to its success most wisely by enjoining precepts of moderation upon his missionaries, and by the skillful manner in which he made the transition to Catholicism easy to the pagans; he wrote to Augustine: 'Be careful not to destroy the pagan temples; it is only necessary to destroy the idols, then to sprinkle the edifice with holy water, and to build altars and place relics there. If the temples are well built, it is a wise and useful

thing for them to pass from the worship of demons to the worship of the true God; for while the nation sees its old places of worship still standing, it will be the more ready to go there, by force of habit, to worship the true God.' In the interior Gregory succeeded in arranging the different degrees of power in the Church, and in forcing the recognition of the supreme power of the Holy See. We find him granting the title of Vicar of Gaul to the bishop of Arles, and corresponding with Augustine, archbishop of Canterbury, in regard to Great Britain, with the archbishop of Seville in regard to Spain, with the archbishop of Thessalonica in regard to Greece, and, finally, sending legates 'a latere' to Constantinople. In his Pastoral, which he wrote on the occasion of his election, and which became an established precedent in the West, he prescribed to the bishops their several duties, following the decisions of many councils. He strengthened the hierarchy by preventing the encroachments of the bishops upon one another: 'I have given to you the spiritual direction of Britain,' he wrote to the ambitious Augustine, 'and not that of the Gauls.' He rearranged the monasteries, made discipline the object of his vigilant care, reformed Church music, and substituted the chant that bears his name for the Ambrosian chant, 'which resembled,' according to a contemporary, 'the far-off noise of a chariot rumbling over pebbles.' Rome, victorious again with the help of Gregory the Great, continued to push her conquests to distant countries after his death.—V. Duruy, *Hist. of the Middle Ages*, p. 116.—See, above: A. D. 496-800, and ROME: A. D. 590-640.

**A. D. 597-800.—The English Church.**—"It seems right to add a word of caution against the common confusion between the British Church and the English Church. They were quite distinct, and had very little to do with one another. To cite the British bishops at the Councils of Arles and Rimini as evidence of the antiquity of the English Church is preposterous. There was then no England; and the ancestors of English Churchmen were heathen tribes on the continent. The history of the Church of England begins with the episcopate of Archbishop Theodore (A. D. 668), or at the very earliest with the landing of Augustine (A. D. 597). By that time the British Church had been almost destroyed by the heathen English. . . . Bede tells us that down to his day the Britons still treated English Christians as pagans."—A. Plummer, *The Church of the Early Fathers*, ch. 8.—"About the year 580, in the pontificate of Pelagius, Gregory occupied the rank of a deacon among the Roman clergy. He was early noted for his zeal and piety; coming into large possessions, as an offshoot of an ancient and noble family, he had expended his wealth in the foundation of no less than seven monasteries, and had become himself the abbot of one of them, St. Andrew's, at Rome. Devoted as he was from the first to all the good works to which the religious profession might best apply itself, his attention was more particularly turned to the cause of Christian missions by casually remarking a troop of young slaves exhibited for sale in the Roman market. Struck with the beauty or fresh complexion of these strangers, he asked whether they were Christians or Pagans. They were Pagans, it was replied. How sad, he exclaimed, that such

fair countenances should lie under the power of demons. 'Whence came they?'—'From Anglia.'—'Truly they are Angels. What is the name of their country?'—'Deira.'—'Truly they are subject to the wrath of God; ira Dei. And their king?'—'Is named Ælla.'—'Let them learn to sing Allelujah.' Britain had lately fallen under the sway of the heathen Angles. Throughout the eastern section of the island, the faith of Christ, which had been established there from early times, had been, it seems, utterly extirpated. The British church of Lucius and Albanus still lingered, but was chiefly confined within the ruder districts of Cornwall, Wales, and Cumbria. The reported destruction of the people with all their churches, and all their culture, begun by the Picts and Scots, and carried on by the Angles and their kindred Saxons, had made a profound impression upon Christendom. The 'Groans of the Britons' had terrified all mankind, and discouraged even the brave missionaries of Italy and Gaul. . . . Gregory determined to make the sacrifice himself. He prevailed on the Pope to sanction his enterprise; but the people of Rome, with whom he was a favourite, interposed, and he was constrained reluctantly to forego the peril and the blessing. But the sight he had witnessed in the marketplace still retained its impression upon him. He kept the fair-haired Angles ever in view; and when, in the year 592, he was himself elevated to the popedom, he resolved to send a mission, and fling upon the obscure shores of Britain the full beams of the sun of Christendom, as they then seemed to shine so conspicuously at Rome. Augustine was the preacher chosen from among the inmates of one of Gregory's monasteries, for the arduous task thus imposed upon him. He was to be accompanied by a select band of twelve monks, together with a certain number of attendants. . . . There is something very remarkable in the facility with which the fierce idolaters, whose name had struck such terror into the Christian nations far and near, yielded to the persuasions of this band of peaceful evangelists."—C. Merivale, *Four lectures on some Epochs of Early Church History*, pp. 192-198.—See ENGLAND: A. D. 597-685.—The Roman missionaries in England landed in Kent and appear to have had more influence with the petty courts of the little kingdoms than with the people. The conversion of the North of England must be credited to the Irish monastery on the island of Iona. "At the beginning of the sixth century these Irish Christians were seized with an unconquerable impulse to wander afar and preach Christianity to the heathen. In 563 Columba, with twelve confederates, left Ireland and founded a monastery on a small island off the coast of Scotland (Iona or Hy), through the influence of which the Scots and Picts of Britain became converted to Christianity, twenty-three missions among the Scots and eighteen in the country of the Picts having been established at the death of Columba (597). Under his third successor the heathen Saxons were converted; Aedan, summoned by Oswald of Northumbria, having labored among them from 635 to 651 as missionary, abbot, and bishop. His successors, Finnan and Colman, worthily carried on his work, and introduced Christianity into other Anglo-Saxon kingdoms near East Anglia, Mercia, and Essex."—H. Zimmer, *The Irish*



*Element in Medieval Culture*, pp. 19-21.—“Two bands of devoted men had hitherto been employed in the conversion of England, the Roman, assisted by their converts and some teachers from France, and the Irish, who were plainly the larger body. Between the two there were the old differences as to the time of keeping Easter and the form of the clerical tonsure. . . . Thus, while Oswy [King of Mercia] was celebrating Easter according to the custom he had learnt at Iona, his queen Earleda observed it according to the rule which she had learnt in Kent, and was still practising the austerities of Lent. These differences were tolerated during the Episcopate of Aidan and Finan, but when Finan died and was succeeded by Colman, the controversy” was terminated by Oswy, after much debate, with the words—“I will hold to St. Peter, lest, when I present myself at the gates of Heaven, he should close them against me.” . . . Colman, with all his Irish brethren, and thirty Northumbrians who had joined the monastery, quitted Lindisfarne and sailed to Iona.”—G. F. Maclear, *Conversion of the West: The English*, pp. 81-85.—The impartial historian to whom we owe all the early history of the English Church, thus records the memory of these devoted men as it remained in the minds of Englishmen long after their departure. It is a brief passage, one like those in the greater Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, which must stand for much we do not know. Referring to their devoted lives—“For this reason the religious habit was at that time in great veneration; so that whosoever any clergyman or monk happened to come, he was joyfully received by all persons, as God’s servant; and if they chanced to meet him upon the way, they ran to him, and bowing, were glad to be signed with his hand, or blessed with his mouth. Great attention was also paid to their exhortations; and on Sundays they flocked eagerly to the church, or the monasteries, not to feed their bodies, but to hear the word of God; and if any priest happened to come into a village, the inhabitants flocked together to hear from him the word of life; for the priests and clergymen went into the village on no other account than to preach, baptize, visit the sick, and, in few words, to take care of souls; and they were so free from worldly avarice, that none of them received lands and possessions for building monasteries, unless they were compelled to do so by the temporal authorities; which custom was for some time after observed in all the churches of the Northumbrians. But enough has now been said on this subject.”—*The Venerable Bede’s Ecclesiastical History of England*; ed. by J. A. Giles, bk. 3, ch. 26.—The English Church passed through several stages during this period. A notable one was the rise and fall of a loose monastic system which attracted men and women of the better classes, but for lack of a strict rule brought itself into disrepute. Another was the development of classical learning and the foundation of the school at Jarrow in Northumberland resulting in making England the intellectual centre of the world. Venerable Bede, who wrote the Ecclesiastical History of the English Church, was the greatest teacher of this epoch; and Alcuin, a Northumbrian by birth, and of the school at York, of the next. Invited by Charlemagne to the Frankish Court, he carried English learning to the Continent, and although

he died at the time of the foundation of the Empire, left his influence in many ways on the development of European culture. A single fact of interest will suffice, to show the close connection of this early history with that of Rome and the continent—viz., to Alcuin we are largely indebted for the parent script which formed our Roman letters. (I. Taylor, *The Alphabet*, v. 2, p. 180.) Northumbrian learning and the rich libraries of ancient and Anglo-Saxon literature were destroyed by the Danes, who, in their incursions, showed for a long time peculiar animosity to monks and monasteries. Although the service of this early Anglo-Saxon Church was partly in the vernacular, and large portions, if not all, of the Gospels had been translated, little remains to us of its early religious literature. The translations of the Gospel into Anglo-Saxon that have come down to us are to be attributed to a late period.

**9th Century.—The Bulgarian Church.**—“In the beginning of this 9th century, a sister of the reigning Bulgarian king, Bogoris, had fallen as a captive into the keeping of the Greek emperor. For thirty-eight years she lived at Constantinople, and was there instructed in the doctrines of the Christian Faith. Meanwhile, the administration passed into the hands of the empress Regent, Theodora. She was interested in a certain monk named Cyprianus, who had been taken prisoner by the Bulgarians, and with a view to his redemption, she opened negotiations with Bogoris. An exchange of prisoners was finally effected. The sister of Bogoris was restored to him, while Cyprianus was permitted to return to Constantinople. Before the release of the pious monk, however, he had striven, though quite unavailingly, to win the Bulgarian prince to the service of the Cross. These fruitless endeavors were supplemented by the entreaties of the king’s sister, on her return from Constantinople. . . . At last, fear snapped the fetters which love had failed to disengage. . . . His baptism was celebrated at midnight with profoundest secrecy. The rite was administered by no less a personage than the patriarch Photius. He emphasized the solemnity of the occasion by presenting the neophyte with a lengthy treatise on Christianity, theoretical and practical, considered mainly in its bearings on the duties of a monarch. The emperor Michael stood sponsor by proxy, and the Bulgarian king received, as his Christian name, that of his imperial godfather. . . . The battle-cries of theology rang over Christendom, and the world was regaled with the spectacle of a struggle between the rival Churches for the possession of Bulgaria, a country till recently so conspicuously destitute of dogma of any kind. The Bulgarians themselves, doubtless much astonished at the uproar for their sake, and, surely, more perplexed than ever by the manners and customs of Christianity, began to waver in their adherence to the Western Church, and to exhibit symptoms of an inclination to transfer their allegiance to Constantinople. The strife went on for years. At last, A. D. 877, the Latin clergy having been dismissed from the country, Pope John VIII. solemnly expostulated, protesting against the Greek proclivities of the Bulgarians, and predicting dire results from their identity with a Church which was rarely free from heresy in one form or another. Nevertheless, the Byzantine leanings of Bulgaria did cul-

minate in union with the Eastern Church. A Greek archbishop and bishops of the same communion, settled in the country. . . . 'The Eastern branch' of the Slavonic languages, properly so called, 'comprehends the Russian, with various local dialects, the Bulgarian, and the Illyrian. The most ancient document of this Eastern branch is the so-called ecclesiastical Slavonic, i. e., the ancient Bulgarian, into which Cyrillus and Methodius translated the Bible in the middle of the 9th century. This is still the authorized version of the Bible for the whole Slavonic race, and to the student of the Slavonic languages it is what Gothic is to the student of German.'"—G. F. Maclear, *Conversion of the West: The Slavs*, pp. 54-69.

**9th Century.—Conversion of Moravia.**—"In the opening years of the 9th century, Moravia stretched from the Bavarian borders to the Hungarian river Drina, and from the banks of the Danube, beyond the Carpathian mountains, to the river Stryl in Southern Poland. Into this territory Christianity had been ushered as early as A. D. 801, by Charlemagne, who, as his custom was, enforced baptism at the point of the sword, at least as far as the king was concerned. Efforts were subsequently made by the archbishops of Salzburg and Passau to fan this first feeble flicker into something like a flame. But no success attended their exertions. Paganism was overpoweringly strong, and Christianity not only weak, but rude and uncouth in type. . . . The story of this country, during the process of emancipation from paganism, is but a repetition of the incidents with which, in neighbouring states, we have already become familiar. Ramifications of the work of Cyril and Methodius extended into Servia. The Slavonic alphabet made way there, as in Bohemia and Moravia, for Christianity. The Servians 'enjoyed the advantage of a liturgy which was intelligible to them; and we find that, early in the 10th century, a considerable number of Slavonian priests from all the dioceses were ordained by the bishop of Nona, who was himself a Slavonian by descent.'"—G. F. Maclear, *Conversion of the West: The Slavs*, ch. 4.

**9th-10th Centuries.—The Eastern Church as a missionary Church.**—"If the missionary spirit is the best evidence of vitality in a church, it certainly was not wanting in the Eastern Church during the ninth and tenth centuries of our era. This period witnessed the conversion to Christianity of the principal Slavonic peoples, whereby they are both linked with Constantinople, and bound together by those associations of creed, as well as race, which form so important a factor in the European politics of the present day. The Moravians, the Bulgarians, and the Russians were now brought within the fold of the Church; and the way was prepared for that vast extension of the Greek communion by which it has spread, not only throughout the Balkan peninsula and the lands to the north of it, but wherever Russian influence is found—as far as the White Sea on the one side, and Kamtehtka on the other, and into the heart of Central Asia. The leaders in this great work were the two brothers, Cyril and Methodius, who in consequence of this, have since been known as the Apostles of the Slavonians. What Mezzop did for the Armenians, what Ulfilas did for the Goths, was accomplished for that race by Cyril

in the invention of a Slavonic alphabet, which from this cause is still known by the name of the Cyrillic. The same teacher, by his translation of the Scriptures into their tongue, provided them with a literary language, thereby producing the same result which Luther's Bible subsequently effected for Germany, and Dante's *Divina Commedia* for Italy. It is no matter for surprise that, throughout the whole of this great branch of the human race—even amongst the Russians, who owed their Christianity to another source—the names of these two brothers should occupy the foremost place in the calendar of Saints. It is not less significant that their names are not even mentioned by the Byzantine historians."—H. F. Tozer, *The Church and the Eastern Empire*, ch. 7.

**9th-11th Centuries.—The Western Church as a missionary Church.**—"The earlier missions of the Western Church have been described, but it is noteworthy that again and again missions to the same regions are necessary. It requires such a map as the one accompanying this article to make plain the slowness of its diffusions and the long period needed to produce even a nominally Christian Europe. "The views of Charlemagne for the conquest and conversion of the Northern heathens [see SAXONS; A. D. 772-804], were not confined to the limits, wide as they were, of Saxony. The final pacification effected at Salz, seemed to open his eyes to more extensive enterprises in prospect. Political may have combined with religious motives in inducing him to secure the peace of his new frontiers, by enlisting the tribes of Denmark under the banner of the Cross, and he conceived the idea of planting a church in the neighbourhood of Hamburg, which should become a missionary centre. This plan, though interrupted by his death, was not neglected by his son Louis le Debonnaire, or 'the Pious.' . . . But it is easier to propose such a plan than find one willing to carry it out. The well-known ferocity of the Northmen long deterred any one from offering himself for such a duty. At length he received intelligence from Wala, the abbot of Corbey, near Amiens, that one of his monks was not unwilling to undertake the perilous enterprise. The intrepid volunteer was Anskar."—G. F. Maclear, *Conversion of the West: The Northmen*, ch. 2.—"In 823, Harold, the king of Jutland, and claimant of the crown of Denmark, came to seek the help of Louis the Pious, the son, and one of the successors, of Charlemagne. . . . On Harold's return to Denmark he was accompanied by Anskar, who well deserves to be called the apostle of Scandinavia. . . . Thus Anskar and Autbert set out in the train of Harold, and during the journey and voyage a kindly feeling sprang up between the royal and the missionary families. Harold got no cordial greeting from his proud heathen subjects when he announced to them that he had done homage to the emperor, and that he had embraced the gospel. He seems to have been very sincere and very earnest in his endeavours to induce his nobles and subjects to abandon idolatry and embrace Christianity. To expect that he was altogether judicious in these efforts would be to suppose that he had those views regarding the relation that ought to subsist between rulers and subjects, . . . views regarding liberty of conscience and the right of private judgment. . . . The result was that

after two years, in 828, he was compelled to abdicate the throne. . . . The position of Anskar, difficult as it was while Harold was on the throne, became still more difficult after his abdication. . . . But just at the time when the door was shut against him in Denmark, another was opened in Sweden, which promised to be wilder and more effectual. . . . He was kindly received by the Swedish king, who gave him permission to preach, and his subjects freedom to accept and profess the gospel of Christ. As Anskar had been led to expect, so he found, many Christian captives, who had been brought from other countries,—France, Germany, Britain, Ireland,—and who, having been as sheep without a shepherd, gladly received from Anskar those consolations and exhortations which were fitted to alleviate the sorrows of their captivity. . . . After a year and a half's stay in Sweden, Anskar returned home, and gladdened the heart of the good emperor, and doubtless of many others, by the cheering prospect he was able to present of the acceptance of the gospel by the Swedes. He was now made nominally bishop of Hamburg, but with the special design of superintending and conducting missionary operations both in Denmark and Sweden. . . . Horik, king of Denmark, who had driven Harold from his throne, . . . had been hitherto an uncompromising enemy of the gospel. Anskar undertook the management of some political negotiations with him, and in the conduct of them made so favourable an impression on him that he refused to have any other negotiator or ambassador of the German king at his court. He treated him as a personal friend, and gave him full liberty to conduct missionary operations. These operations he conducted with his usual zeal, and by God's blessing, with much success. Many were baptized. The Christians of Germany and Holland traded more freely with the Danes than before, and the Danes resorted in larger numbers as traders to Holland and Germany; and in these and other ways a knowledge of the gospel, and some apprehension of the blessings which it brings with it, were diffused among the people. . . . Although the Norwegians were continually coming into contact, in the varying relations of war and peace, with the Swedes and the Danes, the French and the Germans, the English and the Irish, and although in this way some knowledge of the Christian system must have been diffused among them, yet the formal introduction of it into their country was a full century later than its introduction into Denmark and Sweden."—Thomas Smith, *Medieval Missions*, pp. 122-138.—"The conversions in Denmark were confined to the mainland. The islands still remained pagan, while human victims continued to be offered till the Emperor Henry I. extorted from Gorm, the first king of all Denmark, in A. D. 934, protection for the Christians throughout his realm, and the abolition of human sacrifices. In Sweden, for seventy years after Anskar's death, the nucleus of a Christian Church continued to be restricted to the neighbourhood of Birka, and the country was hardly visited by Christian missionaries."—G. F. Maclear, *Conversion of the West: The Northmen*, ch. 2.—"It is very remarkable that, in the whole history of the introduction of Christianity into Norway and Iceland, extending over a period of a century and a half, we meet

not with the name of any noted bishop, or ecclesiastic, or missionary. There were, no doubt, ecclesiastics employed in the work, and these would appear to have been generally Englishmen; but they occupied a secondary place, almost their only province being to baptize those whom the kings compelled to submit to that ordinance. The kings were the real missionaries; and one cannot help feeling a kind of admiration for the ferocious zeal which one and another of them manifested in the undertaking,—even as the Lord commended the unjust steward because he had done wisely, although his wisdom was wholly misdirected. The most persistent and the most successful of these missionary kings was Olaf the Thiek, who came from England in 1017, and set himself with heart and soul to the work of the demolition of heathenism, and the substitution of Christianity as the national religion."—Thomas Smith, *Medieval Missions*, pp. 140-141.

**10th Century.—The Russian Church.**—"In the middle of the 10th century, the widowed Princess Olga, lately released from the cares of regency, travelled from Kief to Constantinople. Whether her visit had political objects, or whether she was prompted to pay it solely, as some say, by a desire to know more of the holy faith of which only glimpses had been vouchsafed her at home, cannot be positively decided. But her sojourn in the imperial city was a turning-point in her career. Baptism was administered to her by the patriarch Polyuctes, the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus officiating as sponsor. Polyuctes then solemnly addressed the princess, predicting that through her instrumentality Russia should be richly blessed. 'Olga,' writes M. Mouravieff, 'now become Helena by baptism, that she might resemble both in name and deed the mother of Constantine the Great, stood meekly bowing down her head, and drinking in, as a sponge that is thirsty of moisture, the instructions of the prelate.' . . . Some latent impressions favourable to Christianity her youngest grandson, Vladimir, doubtless owed to her. Nevertheless when, at the death of his brother Yaropolk, for which indeed he was held responsible, he mounted the throne, no signs of a gracious character revealed themselves. He was, on the contrary, a bitter and bigoted pagan. . . . It seems to have occurred to many missionaries of varying types, that a chief of such mark should not be left at the mercy of his own violent passions. The spiritual well-being of Vladimir accordingly became the object of laborious journeys, of much exertion, and of redundant eloquence. . . . Last of all came a Greek emissary. He was neither 'a priest nor a missionary, but a philosopher.' . . . Like Bogoria, the wild Russian chief was greatly moved. . . . The following year the king laid before the elders of his council the rival plans of these variously recommended forms of faith, and solicited their advice. The nobles mused awhile, and then counselled their master to ascertain how each religion worked at home. This, they thought, would be more practical evidence than the plausible representations of professors. On this suggestion Vladimir acted. Envoys were chosen,—presumably, for their powers of observation,—and the embassy of inquiry started. 'This public agreement,' says the historian of the Russian Church, 'explains in some degree the sudden

and genera! acceptance of Christianity which shortly after followed in Russia. It is probable that not only the chiefs, but the common people also, were expecting and ready for the change.' A report, far from encouraging, was in due time received from the ambassadors. Of the German and Roman, as well as the Jewish, religions in daily life, they spoke in very disparaging terms, while they declared the Mussulman creed, when reduced to practice, to be utterly out of the question. Disappointed in all these quarters, they now proceeded, by command, to Constantinople, or, as the Russians called it, Tzaragorod. . . . Singularly enough, the Russian envoys, accustomed, as we must suppose them to have been, only to the barest simplicity of life, had complained not only of the paucity of decoration in the Latin churches, but of a lack of beauty in their appointments. Thus the preparations of the patriarch were accurately fitted to their expectant frame of mind. They were led into the church of S. Sophia, gleaming with variegated marbles, and porphyries, and jasper, at that time 'the masterpiece of Christian architecture.' The building glittered with gold, and rich mosaics. The service was that of a high festival, either of St. John Chrysostom, or of the Death of the Virgin, and was conducted by the patriarch in person, clad in his most gorgeous vestments. . . . On their return to Vladimir, they dilated with eager delight on the wonders they had seen. The king listened gravely to their glowing account of 'the temple, like which there was none upon earth.' After sweetness, they protested, bitterness would be unbearable, so that—whatever others might do—they at all events should at once abandon heathenism. While the king hesitated, his boyars turned the scale by reminding him that if the creed of the Greeks had not indeed had much to recommend it, his pious and sagacious grandmother, Princess Olga, would not have loved and obeyed it. Her name acted like a talisman. Vladimir resolved to conform to Christianity. But still, fondly clinging to the habits of his forefathers, he cherished the idea of wooing and winning his new religion by the sword. . . . Under the auspices of the sovereign,

the stately church of St. Basil soon arose, on the very spot recently occupied by the temple of Perun. Kiev became the centre of Christian influence, whence evangelizing energies radiated in all directions. Schools and churches were built, while Michael, the first metropolitan, attended by his bishops, 'made progresses into the interior of Russia, everywhere baptizing and instructing the people.' The Greek canon law came into force, and the use of the service-book and choral music of the Greek communion became general, while, in the Slavonic Scriptures and Liturgy of Cyril and Methodius, a road was discovered which led straight to the hearts of the native population. 'Cyril and Methodius, if any one, must be considered as anticipatio, as the first Christian teachers of Russia; their rude alphabet first instructed the Russian nation in letters, and, by its quaint Greek characters, still testifies in every Russian book, and on every Russian house or shop, the Greek source of the religion and literature of the empire.'—G. F. Maclean, *Conversion of the West: The Slaves*, ch. 5.

"As in the first centuries it was necessary that the heaven of Christianity should gradually penetrate the entire intellectual life of the cultivated nations, before a new spiritual creation, striking its root in the forms of the Grecian and Roman culture, which Christianity appropriated, could in these forms completely unfold itself; so after the same manner it was necessary that the heaven of Christianity which . . . had been introduced into the masses of the untutored nations, should gradually penetrate their whole inward life, before a new and peculiar spiritual creation could spring out of it, which should go on to unfold itself through the entire period of the middle ages. And the period in which we now are must be regarded as still belonging to the epoch of transition from that old spiritual creation which flourished on the basis of Grecian and Roman culture to the new one."—A. Neander, *General Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church*, v. 3, p. 456.—We leave the author's sentence incomplete, that it may express the more fully all the subsequent history of Christianity.

**CHRISTINA**, Queen-regent of Spain, A. D. 1833-1841. . . . **Christina**, Queen of Sweden, A. D. 1633-1654.

**CHRISTINOS**, The. See SPAIN: A. D. 1833-1846.

**CHRISTOPHER I.**, King of Denmark, A. D. 1252-1250. . . . **Christopher II.**, A. D. 1319-1334. . . . **Christopher III.**, King of Denmark, Sweden and Norway, A. D. 1439-1448.

**CHRYSE**.—Vague reports of a region called Chryse (the Golden), somewhere beyond the Ganges, and of an island bearing the same name, off the mouths of the Ganges, as well as of another island called Argyre (the Silver Island), were prevalent among the early Roman geographical writers. They probably all had reference to the Malay peninsula, which Ptolemy called the Golden Chersonese.—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 25.

**CHRYSLER'S FARM**, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1813 (OCTOBER—NOVEMBER).

**CHRYSOBULUM**. See GOLDEN BULL, BYZANTINE.

**CHRYSOPLIS**.—Modern Scutari, opposite Constantinople; originally the port of the city of Chalcedon.

**CHRYSOPLIS**, Battle of (A. D. 323). See ROME: A. D. 305-323.

**CHUMARS**. See CASTE SYSTEM OF INDIA. **CHUMASHAN FAMILY**, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: CHUMASHAN FAMILY.

**CHUR**, The Bishopric of. See TYROL, and SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1396-1499.

**CHURCH**, The Armenian. See ARMENIAN CHURCH.

**CHURCH OF BOHEMIA**, The Utraquist National. See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1434-1457.

**CHURCH IN BRAZIL**, Disestablishment of the. See BRAZIL: A. D. 1889-1891.

**CHURCH OF ENGLAND**, Origin and Establishment. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1527-1534; 1531-1563; and 1535-1539.

The Six Articles. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1539.

The completed Church-reform under Edward VI. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1547-1553.

The doubtful conflict of religions. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1553.

**Romanism restored by Mary.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1555-1558.

**Recovery of Protestantism under Elizabeth.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1558-1588.

**The Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1550.

**Rise of Puritanism.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1559-1560; 1561-1565 (?).

**The Despotism of Laud.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1633-1640.

**Rise of the Independents.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1638-1640.

**The Root and Branch Bill.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1641 (MARCH—MAY).

**The Westminster Assembly.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1643 (JULY), and 1646 (MARCH).

**The Solemn League and Covenant.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1643 (JULY—SEPTEMBER).

**The Restoration.—The Savoy Conference.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1661 (APRIL—JULY).

**The Act of Uniformity and persecution of Nonconformists.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1662-1665.

**Charles' Declaration of indulgence, and the Test Act.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1672-1673, and 1687.

**James' Declaration of Indulgence.—Trial of the seven Bishops.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1687-1688.

**The Church and the Revolution.—The Non-Jurors.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1689 (APRIL—AUGUST).

**A. D. 1704.—Queen Anne's Bounty.** See QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.

**A. D. 1711-1714.—The Occasional Conformity Bill and the Schism Act.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1711-1714.

**A. D. 1833-1845.—The Oxford or Tractarian Movement.** See OXFORD OR TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT.

**CHURCH OF FRANCE.** See GALLICAN CHURCH.

**CHURCH, The Greek or Eastern.** See CHRISTIANITY: A. D. 830-1054.

**CHURCH OF IRELAND, Disestablishment of the.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1868-1870.

**CHURCH OF LATTER DAY SAINTS.** See MORMONISM: A. D. 1830-1880.

**CHURCH OF ROME.** See PAPACY.

**CHURCH, The Russian.—The great schism known as Raskol.** See RUSSIA: A. D. 1655-1659.

**CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.—Its birth.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1547-1557.

**The First Covenant.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1557.

**Rebellion and triumph of the Lords of the Congregation.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1558-1560.

**Restoration of Episcopacy.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1572.

**The First National Covenant.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1581.

**The Black Acts.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1584.

**Appropriation of Church lands.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1587.

**The Five Articles of Perth.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1618.

**Laud's liturgy and Jenny Geddes' stool.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1637.

**The signing of the National Covenant.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1638.

**The First Bishops' War.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1638-1640.

**The Second Bishops' War.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1640.

**The Westminster Assembly.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1643 (JULY).

**The Solemn League and Covenant.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1643 (JULY—SEPTEMBER).

**Montrose and the Covenanters.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1644-1645.

**The restored king and restored prelacy.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1660-1666.

**Persecutions of the Covenanters.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1669-1679; 1679; 1691-1699.

**The Revolution and re-establishment of the Presbyterian Church.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1688-1690.

**The Disruption.—Formation of the Free Church.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1843.

**CHURUBUSCO, Battle of.** See MEXICO: A. D. 1847 (MARCH—SEPTEMBER).

**CIBALIS, Battle of (A. D. 313).** See ROME: A. D. 305-325.

**CIBOLA, The Seven Cities of.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PUEBLOS.

**CICERO, and the last years of the Roman Republic.** See ROME: B. C. 69-63, to 44-42.

**CILICIA.—KILIKIA.**—An ancient district in the southeastern corner of Asia Minor, bordering on Syria. It was a satrapy of the Persian Empire, then a part of the kingdom of the Seleucids, and afterwards a Roman province. The chief city of Cilicia was Tarsus, a very ancient commercial emporium, whose people were noted for mental acuteness. The Apostle Paul is to be counted among the distinguished natives of Tarsus, and a quite remarkable number of eminent teachers of philosophy were from the same birth-place.

**CILICIA, Pirates of.**—During the Mithridatic wars piracy was developed to alarming proportions in the eastern parts of the Mediterranean Sea. Distracted by civil conflicts and occupied by foreign ones, simultaneously, the Ionians, for a considerable period, gave no proper heed to the growth of this lawlessness, until they found their commerce half destroyed and Rome and Italy actually threatened with starvation by the intercepting of their supplies from abroad. The pirates flourished under the protection and encouragement of the king of Pontus, at whose instance they established their chief headquarters, their docks, arsenals and magazines, at various points on the coast of Cilicia. Hence the name Cilician came to be applied to all the pirates of the time. This era of piracy was brought to an end, at last, by Pompey, who was sent against them, B. C. 67, with extraordinary powers conferred by the law known as the Lex Gabinia. He proceeded to his undertaking with remarkable energy and ability, and his hunting down of the freebooters which he accomplished effectually within three months from the day his operations began, was really the most brilliant exploit of his life.—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 7, ch. 63.

ALSO IN: C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 1.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, v. 3, ch. 6-7.

**CILICIAN GATES.**—A pass through the Taurus range of mountains, opening from Capadocia into Cilicia, was anciently called the

**Pylo Cilicis** or **Cilician Gates**. The city of Tyana was situated at the entrance to the pass. Both Xenophon and Alexander, who traversed it, seem to have regarded the pass as one which no army could force if properly defended.—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 10, sect. 2, and ch. 12, sect. 1.

**CILURNUM**.—A Roman city in Britain, "the extensive ruins of which, well described as a British Pompeii, are visible near the modern hamlets of Chesters."—T. Wright, *Celt. Roman and Saxon*, ch. 5.

**CIMARRONES, The**. See AMERICA: A. D. 1572-1580, and JAMAICA: A. D. 1655-1706.

**CIMBRI AND TEUTONES, The**.—"For a considerable period [second century, B. C.] an 'unsettled people' had been wandering along the northern verge of the country occupied by the Celts on both sides of the Danube. They called themselves the Cimbri, that is, the Champions, or, as their enemies translated it, the robbers; a designation, however, which to all appearance had become the name of the people even before their migration. They came from the north, and the first Celtic people with whom they came in contact were, so far as is known, the Boii, probably in Bohemia. More exact details as to the cause and the direction of their migration have not been recorded by contemporaries and cannot be supplied by conjecture. . . . But the hypothesis that the Cimbri, as well as the similar horde of the Teutones which afterwards joined them, belonged in the main not to the Celtic nation, to which the Romans at first assigned them, but to the Germanic, is supported by the most definite facts: viz., by the existence of two small tribes of the same name—remnants left behind to all appearance in their primitive seats—the Cimbri in the modern Denmark, the Teutones in the north-east of Germany in the neighbourhood of the Baltic, where Pytheas, a contemporary of Alexander the Great, makes mention of them thus early in connection with the amber trade; by the insertion of the Cimbri and Teutones in the list of the Germanic peoples among the Ingævones alongside of the Chauci; by the judgment of Cæsar, who first made the Romans acquainted with the distinction between the Germans and the Celts, and who includes the Cimbri, many of whom he must himself have seen, among the Germans; and lastly, by the very names of the people and the statements as to their physical appearance and habits. . . . On the other hand it is conceivable enough that such a horde, after having wandered perhaps for many years, and having doubtless welcomed every brother-in-arms who joined it in its movements near to or within the land of the Celts, would include a certain amount of Celtic elements. . . . When men afterwards began to trace the chain, of which this emigration, the first Germanic movement which touched the orbit of ancient civilization, was a link, the direct and living knowledge of it had long passed away."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 4, ch. 5.—"The name Kymri, or Cymri, still exists. It is the name that the Welsh give themselves, but I am not aware that any other people have called them by that name. These Kymri are a branch of the great Celtic people, and this resemblance of the words Kymri and Cimbri has led many modern writers to assume that the Cimbri were also a Celtic

people, as many of the ancient writers name them. But these ancient writers are principally the later Greeks, who are no authority at all on such a matter. . . . The name Cimbri has perished in Germany, while that of the Teutones, by some strange accident, is now the name of the whole Germanic population."—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, v. 2, ch. 4.

**ALSO IN: W. Ilne, Hist. of Rome, bk. 7, ch. 9.**  
**B. C. 113-102.—Battles with the Romans.**—The Cimbri and the Teutones made their first appearance on the Roman horizon in the year 113 B. C. when they entered Noricum. The Noricans were an independent people, as yet, but accepted a certain protection from Rome, and the latter sent her consul, Carbo, with an army, to defend them. Carbo made an unfortunate attempt to deal treacherously with the invaders and suffered an appalling defeat. Then the migrating barbarians, instead of pressing into Italy, on the heels of the flying Romans, turned westward through Helvetia to Gaul, and occupied themselves for four years in ravaging that unhappy country. In 100 B. C., having gathered their plunder into the fortified town of Aduatua and left it well protected, they advanced into the Roman province of Narbo, Southern Gaul, and demanded land to settle upon. The Romans resisted and were again overwhelmingly beaten. But even now the victorious host did not venture to enter Italy, and nothing is known of its movements until 105 B. C., when a third Roman army was defeated in Roman Gaul and its commander taken prisoner and slain. The affrighted Romans sent strong re-enforcements to the Rhone; but jealousy between the consul who commanded the new army and the proconsul who retained command of the old delivered both of them to destruction. They were virtually annihilated, Oct. 6, B. C. 105, at Arausio (Orange), on the left bank of the Rhone. It is said that 80,000 Roman soldiers perished on that dreadful field, besides half as many more of camp followers. "This much is certain," says Mommsen, "that only a few out of the two armies succeeded in escaping, for the Romans had fought with the river in their rear. It was a calamity which materially and morally surpassed the day of Cannæ." In the panic which this disaster caused at Rome the constitution of the Republic was broken down. Marius, conqueror of Jugurtha, was recalled from Africa and not only re-elected to the Consulship, but invested with the office for five successive years. He took command in Gaul and found that the formidable invaders had moved off into Spain. This gave him time, fortunately, for the organizing and disciplining of his demoralized troops. When the barbarians reappeared on the Rhone in the summer of 102 B. C., he faced them with an army worthy of earlier Roman times. They had now resolved, apparently, to force their way, at all hazards, into Italy, and had divided their increasing host, to move on Rome by two routes. The Cimbri, reinforced by the Tigorini, who had joined them, made a circuit to the Eastern Alps, while the Teutones, with Ambrones and Tougeni for confederates crossed the Rhone and attacked the defenders of the western passes. Failing to make any impression on the fortified camp of Marinus the Teutones rashly passed it, marching straight for the coast road to Italy. Marius

cautiously followed and after some days gave battle to the barbarians, in the district of Aquæ Sextiæ, a few miles north of Massilia. The Romans that day took revenge for Arnusio with awful interest. The whole barbaric horde was annihilated. "So great was the number of dead bodies that the land in the neighborhood was made fertile by them, and the people of Massilia used the bones for fencing their vineyards." Meantime the Cimbrî and their fellows had reached and penetrated the Brenner pass and were in the valley of the Adige. The Roman army stationed there had given way before them, and Marius was needed to roll the invasion back. He did so, on the 30th of July B. C. 101, when the Cimbrî were destroyed, at a battle fought on the Raudine Plain near Verceilæ, as completely as the Teutones had been destroyed at Aquæ Sextiæ.—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 4, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 7, ch. 9.

**CIMBRIAN CHERSONESUS.**—The modern Danish promontory of Jutland; believed to have been the home of the Cimbrî before they migrated southwards and invaded Gaul.

**CIMINIAN FOREST, The.**—The mountains of Viterbo, which formed anciently the frontier of Rome towards Etruria, were then covered with a thick forest—"the 'silva Cimînia' of which Livy gives so romantic a description. It was, however, nothing but a natural division between two nations which were not connected by friendship, and wished to have little to do with each other. . . . This forest was by no means like the 'silva Hercynia' with which Livy compares it, but was of just such an extent that, according to his own account, the Romans only wanted a couple of hours to march through it."—B. G. Niebuhr, *Lects. on the Hist. of Rome*, lect. 44.

**CIMMERIANS, The.**—"The name Cimmerians appears in the Odyssey,—the fable describes them as dwelling beyond the ocean-stream, immersed in darkness and unblest by the rays of Helios. Of this people as existent we can render no account, for they had passed away, or lost their identity and become subject, previous to the commencement of trustworthy authorities: but they seem to have been the chief occupants of the Tauric Chersonese (Crimea) and of the territory between the peninsula and the river Tyras (Dneister) at the time when the Greeks first commenced their permanent settlements on those coasts in the seventh century B. C. The numerous localities which bore their name, even in the time of Herodotus, after they had ceased to exist as a nation,—as well as the tombs of the Cimmerian kings then shown near the Tyras,—sufficiently attest the fact; and there is reason to believe that they were—like their conquerors and successors the Scythians—a nomadic people, mare-milkers, moving about with their tents and herds, suitably to the nature of those unbroken steppes which their territory presented, and which offered little except herbage in profusion. Strabo tells us—on what authority we do not know—that they, as well as the Trères and other Thracians, had desolated Asia Minor more than once before the time of Ardy's [King of Lydia, seventh century B. C.] and even earlier than Homer."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 17.—See, also, CUMÆ.

**CIMON, Career of.** See ATHENS: B. C. 477-462, to 450-449.

**CIMON, Peace of.** See ATHENS: B. C. 460-449.

**CINCINNATI: A. D. 1788.**—The founding and naming of the city.—In 1787 "an offer was made to Congress by John Cleve S; ymes [afterwards famous for his theory that the earth is hollow, with openings at the poles], to buy two millions of acres between the Little and the Great Miamis. Symmes was a Jerseyman of wealth, had visited the Shawanese country, had been greatly pleased with its fertility, and had come away declaring that every acre in the wildest part was worth a silver dollar. It was too, he thought, only a question of time, and a very short time, when this value would be doubled and tripled. Thousands of immigrants were pouring into this valley each year, hundreds of thousands of acres were being taken up, and the day would soon come when the rich land along the Miamis and the Ohio would be in great demand. There was therefore a mighty fortune in store for the lucky speculator who should buy land from Congress for five shillings an acre and sell it to immigrants for twenty. But . . . his business lagged, and though his offer to purchase was made in August, 1787, it was the 15th of May, 1788, before the contract was closed. In the meantime he put out a pamphlet and made known his terms of sale. A copy soon fell into the hands of Matthias Denman. He became interested in the scheme and purchased that section on which now stands the city of Cincinnati. One third he kept, one third he sold to Robert Patterson, and the remainder to John Filson. The conditions of the purchase from Symmes gave them two years in which to begin making clearings and building huts. But the three determined to lose no time, and at once made ready to lay out a city directly opposite that spot where the waters of the Licking mingled themselves with the Ohio. Denman and Patterson were no scholars. But Filson had once been a schoolmaster, knew a little of Latin and something of history, and to him was assigned the duty of choosing a name for the town. . . . He determined to make one, and produced a word that was a most absurd mixture of Latin, Greek and French. He called the place Losantiville, which, being interpreted, means the city opposite the mouth of the Licking. A few weeks later the Indians scalped him."—J. B. McMaster, *Hist. of the People of the U. S.*, v. 1, p. 516.—The name given a little later to Filson's settlement was conferred on it by General St. Clair, Governor of the Territory, in honor of the Society of the Cincinnati. See NORTHWEST TERRITORY OF THE U. S.: A. D. 1788-1802.

ALSO IN: F. W. Miller, *Cincinnati's Beginnings*.  
A. D. 1863.—Threatened by John Morgan's Rebel Raid. See UNITED STATES OF AM.; A. D. 1863 (JULY: KENTUCKY).

**CINCINNATI, The Society of the.**—"Men of the present generation who in childhood rummaged in their grandmothers' cosy garrets cannot fail to have come across scores of musty and worm-eaten pamphlets, their yellow pages crowded with italics and exclamation points, inveighing in passionate language against the wicked and dangerous Society of the Cincinnati. Just before the army [of the American Revolu-

tion] was disbanded, the officers, at the suggestion of General Knox, formed themselves [April, 1783] into a secret society, for the purpose of keeping up their friendly intercourse and cherishing the heroic memories of the struggle in which they had taken part. With the fondness for classical analogies which characterized that time, they likened themselves to Cincinnatus, who was taken from the plow to lead an army, and returned to his quiet farm so soon as his warlike duties were over. They were modern Cincinnati. A constitution and by-laws were established for the order, and Washington was unanimously chosen to be its president. Its branches in the several states were to hold meetings each Fourth of July, and there was to be a general meeting of the whole society every year in the month of May. French officers who had taken part in the war were admitted to membership, and the order was to be perpetuated by descent through the eldest male representatives of the families of the members. It was further provided that a limited membership should from time to time be granted, as a distinguished honour, to able and worthy citizens, without regard to the memories of the war. A golden American eagle attached to a blue ribbon edged with white was the sacred badge of the order; and to this emblem especial favour was shown at the French court, where the insignia of foreign states were generally, it is said, regarded with jealousy. No political purpose was to be subserved by this order of the Cincinnati, save in so far as the members pledged to one another their determination to promote and cherish the union between the states. In its main intent the society was to be a kind of masonic brotherhood, charged with the duty of aiding the widows and the orphan children of its members in time of need. Innocent as all this was, however, the news of the establishment of such a society was greeted with a howl of indignation all over the country. It was thought that its founders were inspired by a deep-laid political scheme for centralizing the government and setting up a hereditary aristocracy. . . . The absurdity of the situation was quickly realized by Washington, and he prevailed upon the society, in its first annual meeting of May, 1784, to abandon the principle of hereditary membership. The agitation was thus allayed, and in the presence of graver questions the much-dreaded brotherhood gradually ceased to occupy popular attention."—J. Fiske, *The Critical Period of Am. Hist.*, ch. 3.—J. B. McMaster, *Hist. of the People of the U. S.*, v. 1, ch. 2.—"The hereditary succession was never abandoned. A recommendation to that effect was indeed made to the several State Societies, at the first General Meeting in Philadelphia. . . . But the proposition, unwillingly urged, was accepted in deprecatory terms by some, and by others it was totally rejected. . . . At the second General Meeting, it was resolved 'that the alterations could not take effect until they had been agreed to by all the State Societies.' They never were so agreed to, and consequently the original Institution remains in full force. Those Societies that accepted the proposed alterations unconditionally, of course perished with their own generation."—A. Johnston, *Some Acc't of the Soc. of the Cincinnati (Penn. Hist. Soc. Memoirs, v. 6, pp. 51-53)*.—"The claim to membership has latterly been determined not by strict

primogeniture, but by a 'just elective preference, especially in the line of the first-born,' who has a moral but not an absolutely indisputable right; and membership has always been renewed by election. . . . Six only of the original thirteen states—Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and South Carolina—are still [in 1873] represented at the General Meetings. The largest society, that of Massachusetts, consisting originally of 343 members, now [1873] numbers less than 80; that of New York, from 230 had in 1858 decreased to 73; the 268 of Pennsylvania to about 60; the 110 of New Jersey, in 1866, to 60; and the 131 of South Carolina was, in 1849, reduced to 71."—F. S. Drake, *Memorials of the Soc. of the Cincinnati of Mass.*, p. 37.

**CINCO DE MAYO, Battle of (1862).** See MEXICO; A. D. 1861-1867.

**CINE, The.**—Kinsfolk of the head of the tribe, among the ancient Irish.

**CINQ MARS, Conspiracy of.** See FRANCE; A. D. 1641-1642.

**CINQUE PORTS, The.**—"Hastings, Sandwich, Dover, Romney, Hythe—this is the order in which the Cinque Ports were ranked in the times when they formed a flourishing and important confederation. Winchelsea and Rye were added to these five. . . . soon after the Norman Conquest. . . . The new comers were officially known as 'the two Ancient Towns.' When therefore we wish to speak of this famous corporation with strict accuracy we say, 'The five Cinque Ports and two Ancient Towns.' The repetition of the number 'five' in this title probably never struck people so much as we might expect, since it very soon came to be merely a technical term, the French form of the word being pronounced, and very often spelt 'Synke' or 'Sinke,' just as if it was the English 'Slnk' . . . . The difference between the Cinque Ports and the rest of the English coast towns is plainly indicated by mediæval custom, since they were generally spoken of collectively as 'The Ports.' . . . Most writers upon this subject . . . have been at pains to connect the Cinque Ports by some sort of direct descent with the five Roman stations and fortresses which, under the Comes Littoris Saxonici [see SAXON SHORE, COUNT OF], guarded the south-eastern shores of Britain."—M. Burrows, *The Cinque Ports*, ch. 1-3.—"Our kings have thought them [the Cinque Ports] worthy a peculiar regard; and, in order to secure them against invasions, have granted them a particular form of government. They are under a keeper, who has the title of Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports (an officer first appointed by William the Conqueror), who has the authority of an admiral among them, and issues out writs in his own name. The privileges anciently annexed to these ports and their dependents were [among others]: An exemption from all taxes and tolls. . . . A power to punish foreigners, as well as natives, for theft. . . . A power to raise mounds or banks in any man's land against breaches of the sea. . . . To convert to their own use such goods as they found floating on the sea; those thrown out of ships in a storm; and those driven ashore when no wreck or ship was to be seen. To be a guild or fraternity, and to be allowed the franchises of court-leet and court-baron. A power to assemble and keep a portmote or parliament for the Cinque Ports.



. . . Their barons to have the privilege of supporting the canopy over the king's head at his coronation. In return for these privileges the Cinque Ports were required to fit out 57 ships, each manned with 21 men and a boy, with which they were to attend the king's service for 15 days at their own expense; but if the state of affairs required their assistance any longer they were to be paid by the crown. . . . As the term baron occurs continually throughout all the charters of the Ports, it may not be improper to inform our readers that it is of the same import as burgess or freeman. . . . The representatives of the Ports in parliament are to this day styled barons." The post of Warden of the Cinque Ports, "formerly considered of so much honour and consequence, is now converted into a patent sinecure place, for life, with a salary of £4,000 a year."—*Hist. of the Boroughs of Great Britain; together with the Cinque Ports*, v. 3.—The office of Warden of the Cinque Ports has been held during the present century by Mr. Pitt, the Earl of Liverpool, the Duke of Wellington, the Earl of Dalhousie, Viscount Palmerston, and Earl Granville.

**CINTRA, Convention of.** See SPAIN: A. D. 1808-1809 (AUGUST—JANUARY).

**CIOMPI, Tumult of the.** See FLORENCE: A. D. 1378-1427.

**CIRCARS, OR SIKKARS, The northern.** See INDIA: A. D. 1758-1761.

**CIRCASSIANS.** See CAUCASUS.

**CIRCLES OF GERMANY, The.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1493-1519.

**CIRCUMCELLIONES, The.** See DONA-TISTS.

**CIRCUMNAVIGATION OF THE WORLD: A. D. 1519-1522.—Magellan's voyage: the first in history.** See AMERICA: A. D. 1519-1524.

**A. D. 1577-1580.—Drake's voyage.** See AMERICA: A. D. 1572-1580.

**CIRCUS, Factions of the Roman.**—"The race, in its first institution [among the Romans], was a simple contest of two chariots, whose drivers were distinguished by white and red liveries; two additional colours, a light green and a cerulean blue, were afterwards introduced; and as the races were repeated twenty-five times, one hundred chariots contributed in the same day to the pomp of the circens. The four factions soon acquired a legal establishment and a mysterious origin, and their fanciful colours were derived from the various appearances of nature in the four seasons of the year. . . . Another interpretation preferred the elements to the seasons, and the struggle of the green and blue was supposed to represent the conflict of the earth and sea. Their respective victories announced either a plentiful harvest or a prosperous navigation, and the hostility of the husbandmen and mariners was somewhat less absurd than the blind ardour of the Roman people, who devoted their lives and fortunes to the colour which they had espoused. . . . Constantino adopted the follies, though not the virtues, of ancient Rome; and the same factions which had agitated the circus raged with redoubled fury in the hippodrome. Under the reign of Anastasius [A. D. 491-518] this popular frenzy was inflamed by religious zeal; and the greens, who had treacherously concealed stones and daggers under

baskets of fruit, massacred, at a solemn festival, 3,000 of their blue adversaries. From the capital this pestilence was diffused into the provinces and cities of the East, and the sportive distinction of two colours produced two strong and irreconcilable factions, which shook the foundations of a feeble government. . . . A sedition, which almost laid Constantinople in ashes, was excited by the mutual hatred and momentary reconciliation of the two factions." This fearful tumult, which acquired the name of the Nika sedition, from the cry, "Nika" (vanquish), adopted by the rioters, broke out in connection with the celebration of the festival of the Ides of January, A. D. 532. For five days the city was given up to the mob and large districts in it were burned, including many churches and other stately edifices. The emperor Justinian would have abandoned his palace and throne, but for the heroic opposition of his consort, Theodora. On the sixth day, the imperial authority was re-established by the great soldier, Belisarius, after 30,000 citizens had been slain in the hippodrome and in the streets.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 40.

**CIRCUS MAXIMUS AT ROME, The.**—"The races and wild beast shows in the circi were among the most ancient and most favourite Roman amusements, and the buildings dedicated to these sports were numerous, and nearly equal in magnificence to the amphitheatres. The Circus Maximus, which was first provided with permanent seats for the spectators as early as the time of Tarquinius Priscus, was successively restored and ornamented by the republican government in 327 and 174 B. C. and by Julius Cæsar, Augustus, Claudius, Domitian and Trajan. The result was a building which, in dimensions and magnificence, rivalled the Coliseum, but has, unfortunately, proved far less durable, scarcely a vestige of it now being left."—R. Burn, *Rome and the Campagna*, int. and ch. 12.—See, also, FORUM BOARIUM.

**CIRENCESTER, Origin of.** See CORINTHUM.

**CIRRHA.** See DELPHI.

**CIRRHÆAN, OR KIRRHÆAN WAR, The.** See ATHENS: B. C. 610-586, and DELPHI.

**CIRTA.**—An ancient Numidian city. The modern town of Constantina in Algeria is on its site. See NUMIDIANS.

**CISALPINE GAUL (GALLIA CISALPINA).** See ROME: B. C. 390-347.

**CISALPINE REPUBLIC.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1796-1797 (OCTOBER—APRIL); 1797 (MAY—OCTOBER); 1799 (APRIL—SEPTEMBER); and 1801-1803.

**CISLEITHANIA.** See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1866-1867.

**CISPADANE GAUL.**—Cisalpine Gaul south of the Padus, or Po. See PADUS.

**CISPADANE REPUBLIC, The.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1796-1797 (OCTOBER—APRIL), and 1797 (MAY—OCTOBER).

**CISSIA (KISSIA).** See ELAM.

**CISTERCIAN ORDER.**—The Monastery of Cîteaux.—"Harding was an Englishman who spent his boyhood in the monastery of Sherborne in Dorset, till he was seized with a passion for wandering and for study which led him first to Scotland, then to Gaul, and at last to Rome. It chanced that on his return thence, passing through the duchy of Burgundy, he stopped at the abbey of Molêmes. As he saw the ways and

habits familiar to his childhood reproduced in those of the monks, the wanderer's heart yearned for the peaceful life which he had forsaken; he took the vows, and became a brother of the house. But when, with the zeal of a convert, he began to look more closely into his monastic obligations, he perceived that the practice of Molêmes, and indeed of most other monasteries, fell very far short of the strict rule of S. Benedict. He remonstrated with his brethren till they had no rest in their minds. At last after long and anxious debates in the chapter, the abbot determined to go to the root of the matter, and appointed two brethren, whose learning was equalled by their piety, to examine diligently the original rule and declare what they found in it. The result of their investigations justified Harding's reproaches and caused a schism in the convent. The majority refused to alter their accustomed ways; finding they were not to be reformed, the zealous minority, consisting of Robert the abbot, Harding himself (or Stephen as he was called in religion) and sixteen others equally 'stiff-necked in their holy obstinacy,' left Molêmes, and sought a new abode in the wilderness. The site which they chose—in the diocese of Chalon-sur-Saône, not far from Dijon—was no happy valley, no 'green retreat' such as the earlier Benedictine founders had been wont to select. It was a dismal swamp overgrown with brushwood, a forlorn, dreary, unhealthy spot, from whose marshy character the new house took its name of 'the Cistern'—Cistellum, commonly called Cîteaux. There the little band set to work in 1098 to carry into practice their views of monastic duty. . . . Three-and-twenty daughter houses were brought to completion during his [Harding's] life-time. One of the earliest was Pontigny, founded in 1114, and destined in after-days to become inseparably associated with the name of another English saint. Next year there went forth another Cistercian colony, whose glory was soon to eclipse that of the mother-house itself. Its leader was a young monk called Bernard, and the place of its settlement was named Clairvaux. From Burgundy and Champagne the 'White Monks,' as the Cistercians were called from the colour of their habit, soon spread over France and Normandy. In 1128 they crossed the sea and made an entrance into their founder's native land."—K. Norgate, *England under the Angevin Kings*, v. 1, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: S. R. Maitland, *The Dark Ages*, 21. **CITEAUX, The Monastery of.** See CISTERCIAN ORDER.

**CITIES, Chartered.** See COMMUNE; also BOROUGHS, and GUILDS.

**CITIES, Free, of Italy.** See ITALY: A. D. 1056-1152, and after.

**CITIES, Imperial and Free, of Germany.**—"The territorial disintegration of Germany [see GERMANY: 13TH CENTURY] had introduced a new and beneficial element into the national life, by allowing the rise and growth of the free cities. These were of two classes: those which stood in immediate connection with the Empire, and were practically independent republics; and those which, while owing some dependence upon spiritual or temporal princes, had yet conquered for themselves a large measure of self-government. The local distribution of the former, which is curiously unequal, depended

upon the circumstances which attended the dissolution of the old tribal dukedoms. Wherever some powerful house was able to seize upon the inheritance, free cities were few: wherever the contrary was the case, they sprang up in abundance. In Swabia and on the Rhine there were more than a hundred; Franconia on the contrary counted only Nürnberg and five smaller cities: Westphalia, Dortmund and Herford; while in Bavaria, Regensburg stood alone. . . . The Imperial free cities . . . were self-governed, under constitutions in which the aristocratic and the democratic elements mingled in various proportions: they provided for their own defence: they were republics, in the midst of States where the personal will of the ruler counted for more and more. . . . In these cities the refined and luxurious civilization, to which the princes were indifferent, and on which the knights waged predatory war, found expression in the pursuit of letters and the cultivation of the arts of life. There, too, the Imperial feeling, which was elsewhere slowly dying out of the land, retained much of its force. The cities held, so to speak, directly of the Empire, to which they looked for protection against powerful and lawless neighbours, and they felt that their liberties and privileges were bound up with the maintenance of the general order. . . . In them, too, as we might naturally expect, religious life put on a freer aspect."—C. Beard, *Martin Luther and the Reformation*, p. 16.—"Prior to the peace of Luneville [1801], Germany possessed 133 free cities, called Reichstädte. A Reichstadt ('civitas imperii') was a town under the immediate authority of the Emperor, who was represented by an imperial official called a Vogt or Schultheis. The first mention of the term 'civitas imperii' (imperial city) occurs in an edict of the emperor Frederick II. [1214-1250], in which Lubek was declared a 'civitas imperii' in perpetuity. In a later edict, of the year 1287, we find that King Rudolf termed the following places 'civitates regni' (royal cities), viz., Frankfort, Friedberg, Wetzlar, Oppenheim, Wesel, and Boppard. All these royal cities subsequently became imperial cities in consequence of the Kings of Germany being again raised to the dignity of Emperors. During the reign of Louis the Bavarian [1314-1347] Latin ceased to be the official language, and the imperial towns were designated in the vernacular 'Reichstat.' In course of time the imperial towns acquired, either by purchase or conquest, their independence. Besides the Reichstädte, there were Freistädte, or free towns, the principal being Cologne, Basle, Mayence, Ratisbon, Spire, and Worms. The free towns appear to have enjoyed the following immunities:—1. They were exempt from the oath of allegiance to the Emperor. 2. They were not bound to furnish a contingent for any expedition beyond the Alps. 3. They were free from all imperial taxes and duties. 4. They could not be pledged. 5. They were distinguished from the imperial towns by not having the imperial eagle emblazoned on the municipal escutcheon." Subsequently "the free towns were placed on the same footing as the Reichstädte, and the term 'Freistadt,' or free town, was disused. The government of the imperial towns was in the hands of a military and civil governor. . . . On the imperial towns becoming independent, the administration of the town was

entrusted to a college of from four to twenty-four persons, according to the population, and the members of this kind of town council were called either Rathsmann, Rathsfreund, or Rathsherr, which means councilman or adviser. The town councillors appear to have selected one or more of their number as presidents, with the title of Rathmeister, Burgermeister, or Stadtmeister. . . . Many of the imperial towns gained their autonomy either by purchase or force of arms. In like manner we find that others either lost their privileges or voluntarily became subjects of some burgrave or ecclesiastical prince, e. g., Cologne, Worms, and Spire placed themselves under the jurisdiction of their respective archbishops, whereas Altenburg, Chemnitz and Zwickau were seized by Frederick the Quarrelsome in his war with the Emperor; whilst others, like Hagenua, Colmar, Landau, and Strasburg, were annexed or torn from the German Empire. As the Imperial towns increased in wealth and power they extended the circle of their authority over the surrounding districts, and, in order to obtain a voice in the affairs of the empire, at length demanded that the country under their jurisdiction should be represented at the Reichstag (Imperial Diet). To accomplish this, they formed themselves into Bunds or confederations to assert their claims, and succeeded in forcing the Emperor and the princes to allow their representatives to take part in the deliberations of the Diet. The principal confederations brought into existence by the struggles going on in Germany were the Rhenish and Saxon Bunds, and the Hansa (see HANSA TOWNS). . . . At the Diet held at Augsburg in 1474, it appears that almost all the imperial towns were represented, and in 1648, on the peace of Westphalia, when their presence in the Diet was formally recognized, they were formed into a separate college. . . . By the peace of Lunéville four of the imperial towns, viz., Aix-la-Chapelle, Cologne, Spire, and Worms, were ceded to France. In 1803, all the imperial towns lost their autonomy with the exception of the following six:—Augsburg, Nuremberg, Frankfurt, Lubeck, Hamburg, and Bremen; and in 1806 the first three, and in 1810 the others, shared the same fate, but in 1815, on the fall of Napoleon, Bremen, Hamburg, Lubeck, and Frankfurt, recovered their freedom, and were admitted as members of the German Bund, which they continued to be up to the year 1866."—W. J. Wyatt, *Hist. of Prussia*, v. 2, pp. 427-432.—"According to the German historians the period of the greatest splendour of these towns was during the 14th and 15th centuries. . . . In the 16th century they still enjoyed the same prosperity, but the period of their decay was come. The Thirty-Years War hastened their fall, and scarcely one of them escaped destruction and ruin during that period. Nevertheless, the treaty of Westphalia mentions them positively, and asserts their position as immediate states, that is to say, states which depended immediately upon the Emperor; but the neighbouring Sovereigns, on the one hand, and on the other the Emperor himself, the exercise of whose power, since the Thirty-Years War, was limited to the lesser vassals of the empire, restricted their sovereignty within narrower and narrower limits. In the 18th century, 51 of them were still in existence, they filled two benches at the

diet, and had an independent vote there; but, in fact, they no longer exercised any influence upon the direction of general affairs. At home they were all heavily burthened with debts, partly because they continued to be charged for the Imperial taxes at a rate suited to their former splendour, and partly because their own administration was extremely bad. It is very remarkable that this bad administration seemed to be the result of some secret disease which was common to them all, whatever might be the form of their constitution. . . . Their population decreased, and distress prevailed in them. They were no longer the abodes of German civilization; the arts left them, and went to shine in the new towns created by the Sovereigns, and representing modern society. Trade visoured them—their ancient energy and patriotic vigour disappeared. Hamburg almost alone still remained a great centre of wealth and intelligence, but this was owing to causes quite peculiar to herself."—A. de Tocqueville, *State of Society in France before 1789*, note C.—See also, HANSA TOWNS.—Of the 48 Free Cities of the Empire remaining in 1803, 42 were then robbed of their franchises, under the exigencies of the Treaty of Lunéville (see GERMANY: A. D. 1801-1803). After the Peace of Pressburg only three survived, namely, Hamburg, Lubeck and Bremen (see GERMANY: A. D. 1805-1806). These were annexed to France by Napoleon in 1810.—See FRANCE: A. D. 1810 (FEBRUARY—DECEMBER). The Congress of Vienna, in 1815, restored freedom to them, and to Frankfurt, likewise, and they became members of the Germanic Confederation then formed.—See VIENNA, THE CONGRESS OF.—Lubeck gave up its privileges as a free city in 1866, joining the Prussian Customs Union. Hamburg and Bremen did the same in 1888, being absorbed in the Empire. This extinguished the last of the "free cities." See GERMANY: A. D. 1888.

**CITY.** See BOROUGH.

**CITY OF THE VIOLET CROWN.**—"Ancient poets called Athens 'The City of the Violet Crown,' with an unmistakable play upon the name of the Ionian stock to which it belonged, and which called to mind the Greek word for violet."—G. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State*, pt. 3, ch. 3.

**CITY REPUBLICS, Italian.** See ITALY: A. D. 1056-1152.

**CIUDAD RODRIGO:** A. D. 1810-1812.—"Once besieged and captured by the French and by the English. See SPAIN: A. D. 1810-1812.

**CIVES ROMANI AND PEREGRINI.**—"Before the Social or Marsic war (B. C. 90) there were only two classes within the Roman dominions who were designated by a political name, Cives Romani, or Roman citizens, and Peregrini, a term which comprehended the Latini, the Socii and the Provinciales, such as the inhabitants of Sicily. The Cives Romani were the citizens of Rome, the citizens of Roman colonies and the inhabitants of the Municipia which had received the Roman citizenship."—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, ch. 17.—Also, ROME: B. C. 90-88.

**CIVIL RIGHTS BILL.** The First. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1866 (April).—The Second, and its declared unconstitutionality. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1875.

**CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM IN ENGLAND.**—"It was not till long after 1832 that the inherent mischief of the partisan system [of appointments in the national civil service] became manifest to the great body of thinking people. When that result was attained, the final struggle with patronage in the hands of members of Parliament began on a large scale. It seems to have been, even then, foreseen by the best informed that it could not be removed by any partisan agency. They began to see the need of some method by which fitness for the public service could be tested otherwise than by the fiat of a member of Parliament or the vote of the Cabinet or the Treasury. What that method should be was one of the great problems of the future. No government had then solved it. That there must be tests of fitness independent of any political action, or mere official influence, became more and more plain to thinking men. The leaders of the great parties soon began to see that a public opinion in favor of such tests was being rapidly developed, which seriously threatened their power, unless the party system itself could be made more acceptable to the people. . . . There was an abundance of fine promises made. But no member gave up his patronage—no way was opened by which a person of merit could get into an office or a place except by the favor of the party or the condescension of a member. The partisan blockade of every port of entry to the public service, which made it tenfold easier for a decayed butler or an incompetent cousin of a member or a minister, than for the promising son of a poor widow, to pass the barrier, was, after the Reform Bill as before, rigidly maintained. Fealty to the party and work in its ranks—subserviency to members and to ministers—and electioneering on their behalf—these were the virtues before which the ways to office and the doors of the Treasury were opened. Year by year, the public discontent with the whole system increased. . . . During the Melbourne administration, between 1834 and 1841, a demand for examinations, as a condition for admission to the service, came from two very different quarters. One was the higher officials, who declared that they could not do the public work with such poor servants as the partisan system supplied. The other was the more independent, thoughtful portion of the people, who held it to be as unjust as it was demoralizing for members of Parliament and other officers to monopolize the privilege of saying who might enter the public service. Lord Melbourne then yielded so far as to allow pass examinations to be instituted in some of the larger offices; and he was inclined to favor competitive examinations, but it was thought to be too great an innovation to attempt at once. These examinations—several of them being competitive—introduced by public officers in self-defence many years previous to 1853, had before that time produced striking results. In the Poor Law Commission, for example, they had brought about a reform that arrested public attention. Under the Committee on Education, they had caused the selection of teachers so much superior 'that higher salaries were bidden for them for private service.' . . . These examinations were steadily extended from office to office down to the radical change made in 1853. . . . It had been provided, long before 1853,

that those designed for the civil service of India, should not only be subjected to a pass examination, but should, before entering the service, be subjected to a course of special instruction at Haileybury College, a sort of civil West Point. This College was abolished in 1854, but equivalent instruction was elsewhere provided for. The directors had the patronage of nomination for such instruction. . . . If it seems strange that a severe course of study, for two years in such a college, was not sufficient to weed out the incompetents which patronage forced into it, we must bear in mind that the same influence which sent them there was used to keep them there. . . . Both the Derby and the Aberdeen administrations, in 1852 and 1853, took notice that the civil service was in a condition of peril to British India; and, without distinction of party, it was agreed that radical reforms must be promptly made. There was corruption, there was inefficiency, there was disgraceful ignorance, there was a humiliating failure in the government to command the respect of the more intelligent portion of the people of India, and there was a still more alarming failure to overawe the unruly classes. It was as bad in the army as in the civil offices. . . . There was, in short, a hotbed of abuses prolific of those influences which caused the fearful outbreak of 1857. It was too late when reform was decided upon, to prevent the outbreak, but not too late to save British supremacy in India. A change of system was entered upon in 1853. The 36th and 37th clauses of the India act of that year provided 'that all powers, rights, and privileges of the court of directors of the said India Company to nominate or appoint persons to be admitted as students . . . shall cease; and that, subject to such regulations as might be made, any person, being a natural born subject of her Majesty, who might be desirous of presenting himself, should be admitted to be examined as a candidate.' Thus, it will be seen, Indian patronage received its death-blow, and the same blow opened the door of study for the civil service of India to every British citizen. . . . In 1853, the British Government had reached a final decision that the partisan system of appointments could not be longer tolerated. Substantial control of nominations by members of Parliament, however guarded by restrictions and improved by mere pass examinations, had continued to be demoralizing in its effect upon elections, vicious in its influence upon legislation, and fatal to economy and efficiency in the departments. . . . The administration, with Lord Aberdeen at its head, promptly decided to undertake a radical and systematic reform. . . . It was decided that, in the outset, no application should be made to Parliament. The reform should be undertaken by the English Executive . . . for the time being. The first step decided upon was an inquiry into the exact condition of the public service. Sir Stafford Northcote (the present Chancellor of the Exchequer) and Sir Charles Trevelyan were appointed in 1853 to make such inquiry and a report. They submitted their report in November of the same year. . . . A system of competitive examinations . . . [was] recommended. . . . The report was accompanied with a scheme for carrying the examinations into effect, from which I quote the following passages. . . . 'Such a measure will exercise the happiest influ-

ence in the education of the lower classes throughout England, acting by the surest of all motives—the desire a man has of bettering himself in life. . . . They will have attained their situations in an independent manner through their own merits. The sense of this conduct cannot but induce self-respect and diffuse a wholesome respect among the lower no less than the higher classes of official men. . . . The effect of it in giving a stimulus to the education of the lower classes can hardly be overestimated. Such was the spirit of the report. This was the theory of the merit system, then first approved by an English administration for the home government. I hardly need repeat that the examinations referred to as existing were (with small exception) mere pass examinations, and that the new examinations proposed were open, competitive examinations. . . . But the great feature of the report, which made it really a proposal for the introduction of a new system, was its advocacy of open competition. Except the experiment just put on trial in India, no nation had adopted that system. It was as theoretical as it was radical. . . . A chorus of ridicule, indignation, lamentation, and wrath arose from all the official and partisan places of politics. The government saw that a further struggle was at hand. It appeared more clear than ever that Parliament was not a very hopeful place in which to trust the tender years of such a reform. . . . The executive caused the report to be spread broadcast among the people, and also requested the written opinions of a large number of persons of worth and distinction both in and out of office. The report was sent to Parliament, but no action upon it was requested. . . . About the time that English public opinion had pronounced its first judgment upon the official report, and before any final action had been taken upon it, the Aberdeen administration went out. . . . Lord Palmerston came into power early in 1855, than whom, this most practical of nations never produced a more hard-headed, practical statesman. . . . Upon his administration fell the duty of deciding the fate of the new system advocated in the report. . . . He had faith in his party, and believed it would gain more by removing grave abuses than by any partisan use of patronage. . . . Making no direct appeal to Parliament, and trusting to the higher public opinion, Lord Palmerston's administration advised that an order should be made by the Queen in Council for carrying the reform into effect; and such an order was made on the 21st of May, 1855."—D. B. Eaton, *Civil Service in Great Britain*.

**CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM IN THE UNITED STATES.**—"The question as to the Civil Service [in the United States] arises from the fact that the president has the power of appointing a vast number of petty officials, chiefly postmasters and officials concerned with the collection of the federal revenue. Such officials have properly nothing to do with politics, they are simply the agents or clerks or servants of the national government in conducting its business; and if the business of the national government is to be managed on such ordinary principles of prudence as prevail in the management of private business, such servants ought to be selected for personal merit and retained for life or during good behaviour. It did

not occur to our earlier presidents to regard the management of the public business in any other light than this. But as early as the beginning of the present century a vicious system was growing up in New York and Pennsylvania. In those states the appointive offices came to be used as bribes or as rewards for partisan services. By securing votes for a successful candidate, a man with little in his pocket and nothing in particular to do could obtain some office with a comfortable salary. It would be given to him as a reward, and some other man, perhaps more competent than himself, would have to be turned out in order to make room for him. A more effective method of driving good citizens 'out of politics' could hardly be devised. It called to the front a large class of men of coarse moral fibre. . . . The civil service of these states was seriously damaged in quality, politics degenerated into a wild scramble for offices, salaries were paid to men who did little or no public service in return, and the line which separates taxation from robbery was often crossed. About the same time there grew up an idea that there is something especially democratic, and therefore meritorious, about 'rotation in office.'" On the change of party which took place upon the election of Jackson to the presidency in 1828, "the methods of New York and Pennsylvania were applied on a national scale. Jackson cherished the absurd belief that the administration of his predecessor Adams had been corrupt, and he turned men out of office with a keen zest. During the forty years between Washington's first inauguration and Jackson's the total number of removals from office was 74, and out of this number 5 were defaulters. During the first year of Jackson's administration the number of changes made in the civil service was about 2,000. Such was the abrupt inauguration upon a national scale of the so-called Spoils System. The phrase originated with W. L. Marcy, of New York, who, in a speech in the senate in 1831 declared that 'to the victors belong the spoils.' . . . In the canvass of 1840 the Whigs promised to reform the civil service, and the promise brought them many Democratic votes; but after they had won the election they followed Jackson's example. The Democrats followed in the same way in 1845, and from that time down to 1865 it was customary at each change of party to make a 'clean sweep' of the offices. Soon after the Civil War the evils of the system began to attract serious attention on the part of thoughtful people."—J. Fiske, *Civil Gov't in the U. S.*, pp. 261-264.—"It was not until 1867 that any important move was made [toward a reform]. . . . This was by Mr. Jencks, of Rhode Island, who introduced a bill, made an able report and several speeches in its behalf. Unfortunately, death soon put an end to his labors and deprived the cause of an able advocate. But the seed he had sown bore good fruit. Attention was so awakened to the necessity of reform, that President Grant, in his message in 1870, called the attention of Congress to it, and that body passed an act in March, 1871, which authorized the President to prescribe, for admission to the Civil Service, such regulations as would best promote its efficiency, and ascertain the fitness of each candidate for the position he sought. For this purpose, it says, he may 'employ suitable persons to conduct such inquiries, and may prescribe their duties, and establish

regulations for the conduct of persons who may receive appointments in the Civil Service.' In accordance with this act, President Grant appointed a Civil Service Commission, of which George William Curtis was made chairman, afterwards succeeded by Dorman B. Eaton, and an appropriation of \$25,000 was made by Congress to defray its expenses. A like sum was voted next year; but after that nothing was granted until June, 1882, when, instead of \$25,000 asked for by the President, \$15,000 was grudgingly appropriated. It is due to Mr. Elias W. Burt, Naval Officer in New York, who had long been greatly interested in the subject of Reform, to say that he deserves the credit of having been the first to introduce open competitive examinations. Before the appointment of Grant's committee, he had held such an examination in his office. . . . Under Grant's commission, open competitive examinations were introduced in the departments at Washington, and Customs Service at New York, and in part in the New York Postoffice. Although this commission labored under many disadvantages in trying a new experiment, it was able to make a very satisfactory report, which was approved by the President and his cabinet. . . . The rules adopted by Grant's commission were prepared by the chairman, Mr. Curtis. They were admirably adapted for their purpose, and have served as the basis of similar rules since then. The great interest taken by Mr. Curtis at that time, and the practical value of his work, entitled him to be regarded as the leader of the Reform. . . . Other able men took an active part in the movement, but the times were not propitious, public sentiment did not sustain them, and Congress refused any further appropriation, although the President asked for it. As a consequence, Competitive Examinations were everywhere suspended, and a return made to 'pass examinations.' And this method continued in use at Washington until July, 1883, after the passage of the Civil Service Reform Act. . . . President Hayes favored reform of the Civil Service, and strongly urged it in his messages to Congress; yet he did things not consistent with his professions, and Congress paid little attention to his recommendations, and gave him no effectual aid. But we owe it to him that an order was passed in March, 1879, enforcing the use of competitive examinations in the New York Custom House. The entire charge of this work was given to Mr. Burt by the Collector. . . . In 1880, Postmaster James revived the competitive methods in some parts of his office. . . . When the President, desiring that these examinations should be more general and uniform, asked Congress for an appropriation, it was refused. But, notwithstanding this, competitive examinations continued to be held in the New York Custom House and Postoffice until the passage of the Reform Act of 1883. Feeling that more light was needed upon the methods and progress of reform in other countries, President Hayes had formally requested Mr. Dorman B. Eaton to visit England for the purpose of making such inquiries. Mr. Eaton spent several months in a careful, thorough examination; and his report was transmitted to Congress in December, 1879, by the President, in a message which described it as an elaborate and comprehensive history of the whole subject. This report was afterwards embodied in Mr. Eaton's 'Civil Service in Great

Britain.' . . . For this invaluable service Mr. Eaton received no compensation from the Government, not even his personal expenses to England having been paid. And to Mr. Eaton is due, also, the credit of originating Civil Service Reform Associations."—H. Lambert, *The Progress of Civil Service Reform in the United States*, pp. 6-10.—"The National Civil Service Reform League was organized at Newport, R. I., on the 11th of August, 1881. It was the result of a conference among members of civil service reform associations that had spontaneously arisen in various parts of the country for the purpose of awakening public interest in the question, like the clubs of the Sons of Liberty among our fathers, and the anti-slavery societies among their children. The first act of the League was a resolution of hearty approval of the bill then pending in Congress, known as the Pendleton bill. Within less than two years afterward the Civil Service law was passed in Congress by a vote in the Senate of 38 yeas to 5 nays, 33 Senators being absent, and in the House only a week later, by a vote of 155 yeas to 47 nays, 87 members not voting. In the House the bill was put upon its passage at once, the Speaker permitting only thirty minutes for debate. This swift enactment of righteous law was due, undoubtedly, to the panic of the party of administration, a panic which saw in the disastrous result of the recent election a demand of the country for honest politics; and it was due also to the exulting belief of the party of opposition that the law would essentially weaken the dominant party by reducing its patronage. The sudden and overwhelming vote was that of a Congress of which probably the members had very little individual knowledge or conviction upon the subject. But the instinct in regard to intelligent public opinion was undoubtedly sure, and it is intelligent public opinion which always commands the future. . . . The passage of the law was the first great victory of the ten years of the reform movement. The second is the demonstration of the complete practicability of reform attested by the heads of the largest offices of administration in the country. In the Treasury and Navy departments, the New York Custom House and Post Office, and other important custom houses and post offices, without the least regard to the wishes or the wrath of that remarkable class of our fellow-citizens, known as political bosses, it is conceded by officers, wholly beyond suspicion of party independence, that, in these chief branches of the public service, reform is perfectly practicable and the reformed system a great public benefit. And, although as yet these offices are by no means thoroughly reorganized upon reform principles, yet a quarter of the whole number of places in the public service to which the reformed methods apply are now included within those methods."—G. W. Curtis, *Address at Annual Meeting of the National Civil-Service Reform League*, 1891.

**CIVILIS, Revolt of.** See BATAVIANS: A. D. 69.

**CIVITA-CASTELLANA, Battle of (1798).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1798-1799 (AUGUST-APRIL).

**CIVITELLA, Siege of (1557).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1547-1559.

**CLAIR-ON-EPTE, Treaty of.** See NORMANS: A. D. 876-911.

**CLAIRVAUX, The Monastery of.**—St. Bernard, "the greatest reformer of the abuses of

the monastic life, if not the greatest monk in history [A. D. 1091-1153] . . . revived the practice in the monastery of Cîteaux, which he first entered, and in that of Clairvaux, which he afterwards founded, of the sternest discipline which had been enjoined by St. Benedict. He became the ideal type of the perfect monk. . . . He was not a Pope, but he was greater than any Pope of his day, and for nearly half a century the history of the Christian Church is the history of the influence of one monk, the Abbot of Clairvaux."—C. J. Stille, *Studies in Medieval Hist.*, ch. 12.—"The convent of Cîteaux was found too small for the number of persons who desired to join the society which could boast of so eminent a saint. Finding his influence beneficial, Bernard proceeded to found a new monastery. The spot which he chose for his purpose was in a wild and gloomy vale, formerly known as the Valley of Wormwood. . . . The district pertained to the bishopric of Langres; and here Bernard raised his far famed abbey of Clairvaux."—H. Stebbing, *Hist. of Christ's Univ. Church*, ch. 26.

ALSO IN: A. Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, v. 3.—W. F. Hoop, *Ecclesiastical Biog.*, v. 2.—J. C. Morison, *Life and Times of St. Bernard*.—See, also, CISTERCIAN ORDER.

**CLANS, Highland.**—"The word Clan signifies simply children or descendants, and the clan name thus implies that the members of it are or were supposed to be descended from a common ancestor or eponymus, and they were distinguished from each other by their patronymics, the use of surnames in the proper sense being unknown among them. [See **GENS, ROMAN.**] . . . In considering the genealogies of the Highland clans we must bear in mind that in the early state of the tribal organisation the pedigree of the sept or clan, and of each member of the tribe, had a very important meaning. Their rights were derived through the common ancestor, and their relation to him, and through him to each other, indicated their position in the succession, as well as their place in the allocation of the tribe land. In such a state of society the pedigree occupied the same position as the title-deed of the feudal system, and the Sennachies were as much the custodiers of the rights of families as the mere panegyrist of the clan. . . . During the 16th century the clans were brought into direct contact with the Crown, and in the latter part of it serious efforts were made by the Legislature to establish an efficient control over them. These gave rise to the Acts of 1587 and 1594 . . . ; but they were followed in a few years by an important Statute, which had a powerful effect upon the position of the clans, and led to another great change in the theory of their descent. . . . The chiefs of the clans thus found themselves compelled to defend their rights upon grounds which could compete with the claims of their eager opponents, and to maintain an equality of rank and prestige with them in the Herald's Office, which must drive them to every device necessary to effect their purpose; and they would not hesitate to manufacture titles to the land when they did not exist, and to put forward spurious pedigrees better calculated to maintain their position than a native descent had lost its value and was too weak to serve their purpose. From this period MS. histories of the leading Highland families

began to be compiled, in which these pretensions were advanced and spurious charters inserted. . . . The form which these pretentious genealogies took was that of making the eponymus or male ancestor of the clan a Norwegian, Dane, or Norman, or a cadet of some distinguished family, who succeeded to the chiefship and to the territory of the clan by marriage with the daughter and heiress of the last of the old Celtic line, thus combining the advantage of a descent which could compete with that of the great Norman families with a feudal succession to their lands; and the new form of the clan genealogy would have the greater tendency to assume this form where the clan name was derived not from a personal name or patronymic but from a personal epithet of its founder. . . . The conclusion, then, to which [an] analysis of the clan pedigrees which have been popularly accepted at different times has brought us, is that, so far as they profess to show the origin of the different clans, they are entirely artificial and untrustworthy, but that the older genealogies may be accepted as showing the descent of the clan from its eponymus or founder, and within reasonable limits for some generations beyond him, while the later spurious pedigrees must be rejected altogether. It may seem surprising that such spurious pedigrees and fabulous origins should be so readily credited by the Clan families as genuine traditions, and receive such prompt acceptance as the true fount from which they sprung; but we must recollect that the fabulous history of Hector Boece was as rapidly and universally adopted as the genuine annals of the national history, and became rooted in those parts of the country to which its fictitious events related as local traditions. When Hector Boece invested the obscure usurper Grig with the name and attributes of a fictitious king, Gregory the Great, and connected him with the royal line of kings, the Clan Gregor at once recognised him as their eponymous ancestor, and their descent from him is now implicitly believed in by all the MacGregors. It is possible, however, from these genealogies, and from other indications, to distribute the clans in certain groups, as having apparently a closer connection with each other, and these groups we hold in the main to represent the great tribes into which the Gaelic population was divided before they became broken up into clans. The two great tribes which possessed the greater part of the Highlands were the Gallgaidheal or Gael in the west, who had been under the power of the Norwegians, and the great tribe of the Moravians, or Men of Moray, in the Central and Eastern Highlands. To the former belong all the clans descended of the Lords of the Isles, the Campbells and Macleods probably representing the older inhabitants of their respective districts; to the latter belong in the main the clans brought in the old Irish genealogies from the kings of Dalriada of the tribe of Lorn, among whom the old Mormaers of Moray appear. The group containing the Clan Andres or old Rosses, the Mackenzies and Mathesons, belong to the tribe of Ross, the Clan Donnachy to Athole, the Clan Lawren to Strathern, and the Clan Pharlane to Lennox, while the group containing the MacNabs, Clan Gregor, and Mackinnons, appear to have emerged from Glendochart, at least to be connected with the old Columban monasteries. The Clans, properly

so called, were thus of native origin; the surnames partly of native and partly of foreign descent."—W. F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, bk. 3, ch. 9 (p. 3).

**CLARENDON**, The Constitutions and the Assize of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1162-1170.

**CLARIAN ORACLE**, The. See ORACLES OF THE GREEKS.

**CLARK, George Rogers**, and the conquest of the Northwest. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778-1779.

**CLAUDIUS**, Roman Emperor, A. D. 41-54. .... Claudius II., A. D. 268-270.

**CLAVERHOUSE AND THE COVENANTERS**. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1679; 1681-1689, and 1690 (JULY).

**CLAY, Henry**, and the war of 1812. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1810-1812. .... Negotiation of the Treaty of Ghent. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1814 (DECEMBER).

.... And the Tariff question. See TARIFF LEGISLATION (UNITED STATES): A. D. 1810-1824, and 1832; and UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1828-1833. .... And the Missouri Compromise. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1818-1821.

.... In the Cabinet of President John Quincy Adams. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1825-1828. .... Defeat in the Presidential election. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1844. .... The Compromise Measures of 1850. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1850.

**CLAYBANKS AND CHARCOALS**.—During the American civil war the Conservative and Radical factions in Missouri were sometimes called Claybanks and Charcoals.—J. G. Nicolay and J. Hay, *Abraham Lincoln*, v. 8, p. 204.

**CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY**, The. See NICARAGUA: A. D. 1850.

**CLEAR GRITS**. See CANADA: A. D. 1840-1867.

**CLEISTHENES**, Constitution of. See ATHENS: B. C. 510-507.

**CLEMENT II**, Pope, A. D. 1046-1047. .... **Clement III**, Pope, A. D. 1187-1191. .... **Clement IV**, Pope, A. D. 1265-1268. .... **Clement V**, Pope, A. D. 1305-1314. .... **Clement VI**, Pope, A. D. 1342-1352. .... **Clement VII**, Pope, A. D. 1378-1394 (Antipope at Avignon). .... **Clement VII**, Pope, A. D. 1523-1534. .... **Clement VIII**, Pope, A. D. 1591-1605. .... **Clement IX**, Pope, A. D. 1667-1669. .... **Clement X**, Pope, A. D. 1670-1676. .... **Clement XI**, Pope, A. D. 1700-1721. .... **Clement XII**, Pope, A. D. 1730-1740. .... **Clement XIII**, Pope, A. D. 1758-1769. .... **Clement XIV**, Pope, A. D. 1769-1774.

**CLEOMENIC (KLEOMENIC) WAR**, The. See GREECE: B. C. 280-146.

**CLEOPATRA AND CÆSAR**. See ALEXANDRIA: B. C. 48-47. .... And Mark Antony. See ROME: B. C. 31.

**CLEOPATRA'S NEEDLES**.—"The two obelisks known as Cleopatra's Needles were originally set up by Thothmes III. at Heliopolis. Augustus transferred them to Alexandria, where they remained until recently. At present (July, 1880) one ornaments the Thames Embankment [London] while the other is on its way to the United States of America."—G. Rawlinson, *Hist. of Ancient Egypt*, ch. 20, note.—The obelisk last mentioned now stands in Central Park, New York, having been brought over and erected by Commander Goringe, at the expense of the late William H. Vanderbilt.—H. H. Goringe, *Egypt-*

*tian Obelisks*.—See, also, EGYPT: ABOUT B. C. 1700-1400.

**CLEPHES**, King of the Lombards, A. D. 573-580.

**CLERGY**, Benefit of. See BENEFIT OF CLERGY.

**CLERGY RESERVES**. See CANADA: A. D. 1837.

**CLERMONT**. See GERGOVIA OF THE ARVERNE.

**CLERMONT, The Council of**.—Speech of Pope Urban. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1094.

**CLERUCHI**. See KLEUCHI.

**CLEVELAND, Grover**: First Presidential election and administration. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1884 to 1889. .... Defeat in Presidential election. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1888. .... Second Presidential election. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1892.

**CLEVELAND**: The founding and naming of the City (1796). See OHIO: A. D. 1786-1796.

**CLICHY CLUB**.—CLICHYANS, The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1797 (SEPTEMBER).

**CLIENTES, Roman**.—"To [the Roman] family or household united under the control of a living master, and the clan which originated out of the breaking up of such households, there further belonged the dependents or 'listeners' (elientes, from 'cluere'). This term denoted not the guests, that is, the members of similar circles who were temporarily sojourning in another household than their own, and still less the slaves who were looked upon in law as the property of the household and not as members of it, but those individuals who, while they were not free burgesses of any commonwealth, yet lived within one in a condition of protected freedom. The class included refugees who had found a reception with a foreign protector, and those slaves in respect to whom their master had for the time being waived the exercise of his rights, and so conferred on them practical freedom. This relation had not properly the character of a relation 'de jure,' like the relation of a man to his guest or to his slave: the client remained non-free, although good faith and use and wont alleviated in his case the condition of non-freedom. Hence the 'listeners' of the household (elientes) together with the slaves strictly so-called formed the 'body of servants' ('familia') dependent on the will of the 'burgess' ('patronus,' like 'patricius')."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 1, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: Fustel De Coulanges, *The Ancient City*, bk. 4, ch. 1 and 6.

**CLINTON, Dewitt**, and the Erie Canal. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1817-1825.

**CLINTON, George**, The first Governor of New York. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1777.

**CLINTON, General Sir Henry**, and the war of the American Revolution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775 (APRIL—MAY); 1776 (JUNE), (AUGUST); 1778 (JUNE); 1778-1779; 1780 (FEBRUARY—AUGUST); 1781 (JANUARY).

**CLINTONIANS AND BUCKTAILS**. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1817-1819.

**CLISSAU OR CLISSOW, Battle of (1702)**. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1701-1707.

**CLIVE'S CONQUESTS AND RULE IN INDIA**. See INDIA: A. D. 1743-1752, to 1757-1772.



**CLOACA MAXIMA OF ROME, The.**

"Even at the present day there stands unchanged the great sewer, the 'cloaca maxima,' the object of which, it may be observed, was not merely to carry away the refuse of the city, but chiefly to drain the large lake which was formed by the Tiber between the Capitoline, Aventine and Palatine, then extended between the Palatine and Capitoline, and reached as a swamp as far as the district between the Quirinal and Viminal. This work, consisting of three semicircles of immense square blocks, which, though without mortar, have not to this day moved a knife's breadth from one another . . . equalling the pyramids in extent and massiveness, far surpasses them in the difficulty of its execution. It is so gigantic, that the more one examines it the more inconceivable it becomes how even a large and powerful state could have executed it. . . . Whether the cloaca maxima was actually executed by Tarquinius Priscus or by his son Superbus is a question about which the ancients themselves are not agreed, and respecting which true historical criticism cannot presume to decide. But thus much may be said, that the structure must have been completed before the city encompassed the space of the seven hills and formed a compact whole. . . . But such a work cannot possibly have been executed by the powers of a state such as Rome is said to have been in those times."—B. G. Niebuhr, *Lect. on the Hist. of Rome, lects. 5 and 8.*

**CLODOMIR, King of the Franks, at Orleans, A. D. 511-524.**

**CLONARD, Monastery of.**—A great monastery founded in Meath, Ireland, by St. Finian, in the sixth century, "which is said to have contained no fewer than 3,000 monks and which became a great training-school in the monastic life." The twelve principal disciples of Finian were called the "Twelve Apostles of Ireland," St. Columba being the chief.—W. F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland, bk. 2, ch. 2.*

**CLONTARF, Battle of.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1014.

**CLONTARF MEETING, The.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1841-1848.

**CLOSTER-SEVEN, Convention of.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1757 (JULY-DECEMBER), and 1758.

**CLOTHAIRE I., King of the Franks, A. D. 511-561. . . . Clothaire II., King of the Franks (Neustria), A. D. 584-628; (Austrasia), 613-622; Burgundy, 613-628. . . . Clothaire III., King of the Franks (Neustria and Burgundy), A. D. 660-670. . . . Clothaire IV., King of the Franks (Austrasia), A. D. 717-719.**

**CLOVIS, King of the Franks, A. D. 481-511. . . . Clovis II., King of the Franks (Neustria), A. D. 638-654; (Austrasia), 650-654; (Burgundy), 638-654. . . . Clovis III., King of the Franks (Neustria and Burgundy), A. D. 691-695.**

**CLUBS, Ancient Greek.** See LESCHE, HETÆRES, ERANI and THIASI.

**The Beef Steak.**—"In 1735 there was formed in the capital [London] the celebrated Beef Steak Club, or 'Sublime Society of Beef Steaks,' as its members always desired to be designated. The origin of this club is singular, and was in this wise. Rich, a celebrated harlequin, and patentee of Covent Garden Theatre in the time of George II., while engaged during the daytime in direct-

ing and controlling the arrangements of the stage scenery was often visited by his friends, of whom he had a very numerous circle. One day, while the Earl of Peterborough was present, Rich felt the pangs of hunger so keenly that he cooked a beef-steak and invited the earl to partake of it, which he did, relishing it so greatly that he came again, bringing some friends with him on purpose to taste the same fare. In process of time the beef-steak dinner became an institution. Some of the chief wits and greatest men of the nation, to the number of 24, formed themselves into a society, and took as their motto 'Steaks and Liberty.' Among its early celebrities were Bubb Doddington, Aaron Hill, Dr. Hoadley, Richard Glover, the two Colmans, Garrick and John Beard. The number of the 'steaks' remained at its original limit until 1785, when it was augmented by one, in order to secure the admission of the *Heir-Apparent*."—W. C. Sydney, *England and the English in the 18th Century, ch. 6 (z. 1).*

**The Brothers'.**—In 1711, a political club which took this name was founded in London by Henry St. John, afterwards Lord Bolingbroke, to counteract the "extravagance of the Kit Cat" and "the drunkenness of the Beefsteak." "This society . . . continued for some time to restrain the outburst of those elements of disunion with which the Harley ministry was so rife. To be a member of this club was esteemed a distinguished honour. They addressed each other as 'brother'; and we find their ladies in their correspondence claiming to be enrolled as sisters. The members of this club were the Dukes of Ormond, Shrewsbury, Beaufort; the Earls of Oxford, Arran, Jersey, Orrery, Bathurst; Lords Harley, Duplin, Masham; Sir Robert Raymond, Sir William Windham, Col. Hill, Col. Desney, St. John, Granville, Arbuthnot, Prior, Swift, and Friend."—G. W. Cooke, *Memoirs of Bolingbroke, v. 1, ch. 10.*

**The Chichy.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1797 (SEPTEMBER).

**The French Revolutionary.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1790.

**The Hampden.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1816-1820.

**Dr. Johnson's.**—"During his literary career Dr. Johnson assisted in the foundation of no fewer than three clubs, each of which was fully deserving of the name. In 1749 he established a club at a house in Ivy Lane, Paternoster Row, and only the year before he died he drafted a code of rules for a club, of which the members should hold their meetings, thrice in each week, at the Essex Head in the Strand; an establishment which was then kept by a former servant of his old friends the Thrales. Those members who failed to put in an appearance at the club were required to forfeit the sum of two pence. There is an interesting account of one of the meetings of the Ivy Lane Club, at which Johnson presided, in Sir John Inawkins's biography of him. . . . The next club with which Johnson became acquainted was the most influential of them all, and was the one which is now chiefly remembered in connection with his name. It was, however, a plant of slow and gradual growth. The first meeting of its members, who exulted in the designation of 'The Club,' was held in 1763 at a hostelry called the Turk's Head, situated in Gerard Street, Soho. 'The

Club' retained that title until after the funeral of Garrick, when it was always known as 'The Literary Club.' As its numbers were small and limited, the admission to it was an honour greatly coveted in political, legal, and literary circles. 'The Club' originated with Sir Joshua Reynolds, then President of the Royal Academy, who at first restricted its numbers to nine, these being Reynolds himself, Samuel Johnson, Edmund Burke, Dr. Christopher Nugent (an accomplished Roman Catholic physician), Bennet Langton, Topham Beauclerk, Sir John Hawkins, Oliver Goldsmith, and M. Chamier, Secretary in the War Office. The members assembled every Monday evening punctually at seven o'clock, and, having partaken of an inexpensive supper, conversed on literary, scientific and artistic topics till the clock indicated the hour of retiring. The numbers of the Literary Club were subsequently augmented by the enrolment of Garrick, Edward Gibbon, Lord Charlemont, Sir William Jones, the eminent Oriental linguist, and James Boswell, of biographical fame. Others were admitted from time to time, until in 1791 it numbered 35. In December, 1772, the day of meeting was altered to Friday, and the weekly suppers were commuted to fortnightly dinners during the sitting of parliament. Owing to the conversion of the original tavern into a private house, the club moved, in 1783, first to Prince's, in Sackville Street; next to Le Teller's in Dover Street; then, in 1792, to Parsloe's in St. James's Street; and lastly, in February, 1799, to the Thatched House Tavern in St. James's Street, where it remained until long after 1848.—W. C. Sydney, *England and the English in the 18th Century*, ch. 6 (e. 1).

**The King's Head.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1678-1679.

**The Kit Cat.**—"The Kit Cat Club was instituted in 1699. Its most illustrious members were Congreve, Prior, Sir John Vanbrugh, the Earl of Orrery, and Lord Somers; but the members becoming more numerous, the most violent party obtained the majority, and the Earl and his friends were less regular in their attendance. . . . The Kit Cat took its name from a pastry-cook [Christopher Katt], whose pies formed a regular dish at the suppers of the club."—G. W. Cooke, *Memoirs of Bolingbroke*, v. 1, ch. 10, *foot-note*.

ALSO IN: J. Timbs, *Clubs and Club Life in London*, pp. 47-53.—W. C. Sydney, *England and the English in the 18th century*, ch. 6.

**The Mohocks.** See MOHOCKS.

**The October and the March.**—"The October Club came first into importance in the latest years of Anne, although it had existed since the last decade of the 17th century. The stout Tory squires met together in the 'Bell' Tavern, in narrow, dirty King Street, Westminster, to drink October ale, under Dahl's portrait of Queen Anne, and to trouble with their fierce uncompromising Jacobitism the fluctuating purposes of Harley and the crafty counsels of St. John. The genius of Swift tempered their hot zeal with the cool air of his 'advice.' Then the wilder spirits seceded, and formed the March Club, which retained all the angry Jacobitism of the parent body, but lost all its importance."—J. McCarthy, *Hist. of the Four Georges*, v. 1, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: W. C. Sydney, *England and the English in the 18th century*, ch. 6.

**CLUBMEN.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1645 (JULY—AUGUST).

**CLUGNY, OR CLUNY, The Monastery of.**—The famous monastery of Clugny, or Cluny, was founded A. D. 910, at Cluny, near Macon, in Burgundy, by the abbot Count Bruno, who had previously established and ruled the monastery of Gigny, near Lyons. It was founded under the auspices and at the expense of William, Count of Auvergne, commonly called William the Pious. "In the disastrous times which followed the death of Charles the Great and the failure of his scheme to reorganize the Western world under a single head, the discipline of the religious houses fell with everything else; fell, not perhaps quite so soon, yet by the end of the ninth century had fallen almost as low as it was possible to fall. But here symptoms of a moral reaction showed themselves earlier than elsewhere. The revival dates from 910, the year of the foundation of the Monastery of Clugny in Burgundy, which was destined to exercise an enormous influence on the future of the Church. While matters at Rome were at their worst, there were silently training there the men who should inaugurate a new state of things [notably Hildebrand, afterwards Pope Gregory VII.] Already, so one said at the time, the whole house of the Church was filled with the sweet savour of the ointment there poured out. It followed that wherever in any religious house there were any aspirations after a higher life, any longings for reformation, that house affiliated itself to Clugny; thus beginning to constitute a Congregation, that is a cluster of religious houses, scattered it might be over all Christendom, but owning one rule, acknowledging the superiority of one mother house, and receiving its abbots and priors from thence. In the Clugnyan Congregation, for example, there were about two thousand houses in the middle of the twelfth century—these mostly in France; the Abbot, or Arch-Abbot, as he was called, of Clugny, being a kind of Pope of Monasticism, and for a long time, the Pope excepted, quite the most influential Church-ruler in Christendom."—R. C. Trench, *Lect's on Medieval Ch. Hist.*, ch. 8.

ALSO IN: S. R. Maitland, *The Dark Ages*, ch. 18-26.—A. F. Villemain, *Life of Gregory VII.*, bk. 1.—S. R. Gardiner and J. B. Mullinger, *Int. to the Study of Eng. Hist.*, ch. 3, sect. 8.—E. F. Henderson, *Select Hist. Docs. of the Middle Ages*, bk. 3, no. 4.

**CLUNIAN MONKS.** See CLUNY.

**CLUSIUM, Battle of (B. C. 83).** See ROME: B. C. 88-78.

**CLYPEUS, The.**—The round iron shield of the Romans.—E. Guhl and W. Koner, *Life of the Greeks and Romans*, sect. 107.

**CNOSSUS.** See CRETE.

**CNUT.** See CANUTE.

**CNYDUS, Battle of (B. C. 394).** See GREECE: B. C. 399-387.

**COAHUILTECAN FAMILY, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: COAHUILTECAN FAMILY.

**COAJIRO, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: COAJIRO.

**COALITION MINISTRY OF FOX AND LORD NORTH.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1782-1783; and 1783-1787.

**COALITIONS AGAINST NAPOLEON.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1805 (JANUARY—APRIL);

GERMANY: A. D. 1812-1813, and 1813 (MAY-AUGUST), and FRANCE: A. D. 1814-1815.

**COALITIONS AGAINST REVOLUTIONARY FRANCE.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (MARCH-SEPTEMBER); 1798-1799 (AUGUST-APRIL).

**COBBLER'S LEAGUE, The.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1524-1525.

**COBDEN, Richard, and the Free Trade movement.** See TARIFF LEGISLATION (ENGLAND): A. D. 1836-1839; 1842; 1845-1846; and the same (FRANCE): A. D. 1853-1860.

**COBDEN-CHEVALIER COMMERCIAL TREATY, The.** See TARIFF LEGISLATION (FRANCE): A. D. 1853-1860.

**COBURG, Origination of the Dukedom of.** See SAXONY: A. D. 1180-1533.

**COCCIUM.**—An important Roman town in Britain, the remains of which are supposed to be found at Ribchester.—T. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon*, ch. 5.

**COCHIBO, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ANDESIANS.

**COCHIQUMA, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ANDESIANS.

**COCO TRIBES.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: GUCK OF COCO GROUP.

**COCOOONS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: MARIPOSAN FAMILY.

**COCOSATES, The.** See AQUITAINE, THE ANCIENT TRIBES.

**COD, Cape:** A. D. 1602.—Named by Bartholomew Gosnold. See AMERICA: A. D. 1602-1605.

**A. D. 1605.—Called Cap Blanc by Champlain.** See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1603-1605.

**A. D. 1609.—Named New Holland by Hudson.** See AMERICA: A. D. 1609.

**CODE NAPOLEON, The.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1801-1804.

**CODES.** See LAWS, &c.

**CODS, The.** See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1345-1354; and 1482-1493.

**CÆLE-SYRIA.**—"Hollow Syria"—the long, broad, fertile and beautiful valley which lies between the Libanus and Antilibanus ranges of mountains, and is watered by the Orontes and the Leontes or Littany rivers. "Few places in the world are more remarkable, or have a more stirring history, than this wonderful vale."—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: Babylonia*, ch. 1.

**CÆNOBIUM.—CÆNOBITES.**—"The word 'Cænobium' is equivalent to 'monasterium' in the later sense of that word. Cassian distinguishes the word thus. 'Monasterium,' he says, 'may be the dwelling of a single monk, Cænobium must be of several; the former word,' he adds, 'expressed only the place, the latter the manner of living.'"—I. G. Smith, *Christian Monasticism*, p. 40.

ALSO IN: J. Bingham, *Antiq. of the Christ. Ch.*, bk. 7, ch. 2, sect. 3.

**CÖFAN, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ANDESIANS.

**COGNOMEN, NOMEN, PRÆNOMEN.** See GENS, ROMAN.

**COHORTS.** See LEGION, ROMAN.

**COIMBRA: Early history.** See PORTUGAL: EARLY HISTORY.

**COLBERT, The System of.—Colbertism.** See TARIFF LEGISLATION: A. D. 1664-1687 (FRANCE). Also, FRANCE: A. D. 1661-1681.

**COLCHESTER, Origin of.**—When Cæsar first opened to the Romans some knowledge of Britain, the site of modern Colchester was occupied by an "oppidum," or fastness of the Trinobantes, which the Romans called Camulodunum. A little later, Camulodunum acquired some renown as the royal town of the Trinobuntine king, or prince, Cunobelin, — the Cymbeline of Shakespeare. It was after the death of Cunobelin, and when his son Caracetus was king, during the reign of the emperor Claudius, that the Romans began their actual conquest of Britain. Claudius was present, in person, when Camulodunum was taken, and he founded there the first Roman colony in the island, calling it Claudiana Victricensis. That name was too cumbersome to be preserved; but the colonial character of the town caused it to be called Colonia-cæster, the Colonia fortress, — abbreviated, in time, to Colne-cæster, and, finally, to Colchester. The colony was destroyed by the Iceni, at the time of their rising, under Boadicea, but was reconstituted and grew into an important Roman town.—C. L. Cutts, *Colchester*, ch. 1-6.

**A. D. 1648.—The Roundhead siege and capture.**—On the collapse of the Royalist rising of 1648, which produced what is called the Second Civil War of the Puritan revolutionary period, Colchester received the "wreck of the insurrection," so far as London and the surrounding country had lately been threatened by it. Troops of cavaliers, under Sir Charles Lucas and Lord Capel, having collected in the town, were surrounded and beleaguered there by Fairfax, and held out against their besiegers from June until late in August. "After two months of the most desperate resistance, Colchester, conquered by famine and sedition, at last surrendered (Aug. 27); and the next day a court-martial condemned to death three of its bravest defenders, Sir Charles Lucas, Sir George Lisle, and Sir Bernard Gascoign, as an example, it was said, to future rebels who might be tempted to imitate them. In vain did the other prisoners, Lord Capel at their head, entreat Fairfax to suspend the execution of the sentence, or at least that they should all undergo it, since all were alike guilty of the offence of these three. Fairfax, excited by the long struggle, or rather intimidated by Ireton, made no answer, and the condemned officers were ordered to be shot on the spot." Gascoign, however, was reprieved at the last moment.—F. P. Guizot, *Hist. of the Eng. Revolution*, bk. 3.

ALSO IN: C. R. Markham, *Life of the Great Lord Fairfax*, ch. 26-27.

**COLCHIANS, The.**—"The Colchians appear to have been in part independent, in part subject to Persia. Their true home was evidently that tract of country [on the Euxine] about the river Phasis. . . . Here they first became known to the commercial Greeks, whose early dealings in this quarter seem to have given rise to the poetic legend of the Argonauts. The limits of Colchis varied at different times, but the natural bounds were never greatly departed from. They were the Euxine on the east, the Caucasus on the north, the mountain range which forms the watershed between the Phasis (Rion) and the Cyrus (Kur) on the west, and the high ground

between Batoum and Kars (the Moschian mountains) on the south. . . . The most interesting question connected with the Colchians is that connected with their nationality. They were a black race dwelling in the midst of whites, and in a country which does not tend to make its inhabitants dark complexioned. That they were comparatively recent immigrants from a hotter climate seems therefore to be certain. The notion entertained by Herodotus of their Egyptian extraction appears to have been a conjecture of his own. . . . Perhaps the modern theory that the Colchians were immigrants from India is entitled to some share of our attention. . . . If the true Colch were a colony of blacks, they must have become gradually absorbed in the white population proper to the country."—G. Rawlinson, *History of Herodotus*, bk. 7, app. 1.—See, also, ALABODIANS.

**COLD HARBOR, First and second battles of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JUNE—JULY; VIRGINIA), and 1864 (MAY—JUNE; VIRGINIA).

**COLDEN, Cadwallader, The lieutenant-governorship of.** See NEW YORK: A. D. 1773-1774 to 1775 (APRIL—SEPTEMBER).

**COLIGNY, Admiral de, and the religious wars in France.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1560-1563 to 1572. . . . **American Colonies.** See FLORIDA: A. D. 1562-1563, 1564-1565, and 1565.

**COLLAS, The.** See PERU: THE ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

**COLLEGA.**—Numerous associations called "collegia" existed in ancient Rome, having various purposes. Some were religious associations (*collegia templorum*); some were organizations of clerks or scribes; some were guilds of workmen; some appear to have had a political character, although the political clubs were more commonly called "sodalitates."—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, v. 3, ch. 11.

**COLLINE GATE, Battle of the (B. C. 83).** See ROME: B. C. 88-78.

**COLLOT D'HERBOIS, and the French Revolutionary Committee of Public Safety.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (JUNE—OCTOBER), to 1794-1795 (JULY—APRIL).

**COLMAR, Cession to France.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1648.

**COLMAR, Battle of (1674).** See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1674-1678.

**COLOGNE: Origin.** See COLONIA AGRIPPINENSIS.

**The Electorate.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1125-1152.

**In the Hanseatic League.** See HANSA TOWNS.

**COLOMAN.** See KOLOMAN.

**COLOMBEY-NOUILLY, OR BORNAY, Battle of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1870 (JULY—AUGUST).

**COLOMBIA, United States of.** See COLOMBIAN STATES.

**COLOMBIAN STATES, The.**—This general title will be used, for convenience, to cover, for considerable periods of their history, the territory now divided between the republics of Venezuela, Ecuador, and the United States of Colombia (formerly New Granada), the latter embracing the Isthmus of Panama. The history of these countries being for a long time substan-

tially identical in the main, and only distinguishable at intervals, it seems to be difficult to do otherwise than hold it, somewhat arbitrarily, under one heading, until the several currents of events part company distinctly.

**The aboriginal inhabitants.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES; CHIRCHA.

**A. D. 1536-1731.**—The Spanish conquest of New Granada.—Creation of the new vice-royalty.—"For some time after the illustrious failure of the attempt of Las Casas to found a colony on the Pearl coast of Cumana, the northern portion of Spanish South America, from the Orinoco westwards, is almost lost to history. The powers working for good had signally failed, and the powers of evil seemed to have it almost all their own way. . . . Lying behind these extensive coasts to the westward in the interior, is the region to which the Spaniards gave the name of the kingdom of New Granada, the name being applied in consequence of a resemblance which was detected between the plain around Santa Fé de Bogotá and the royal Vega which adjoins the historical Moorish capital. New Granada was a most extensive region, comprising as it did the entire country from sea to sea in the north, lying between 60° and 78° longitude, and from 6° to 15° of latitude." The Spanish conquest of New Granada was achieved in the main by Ximenes de Quesada, who invaded the country from the north, although the governor of Qu to, Benalcazar, entered it likewise from the south. "Ximenes de Quesada came to America about the year 1535, in the suite of the Governor of Santa Marta, by whom he was selected to lead an expedition against the Chibchas, who dwell on the plain of Bogotá and around the headwaters of the Magdalena. Setting out in April 1536 with 800 men, he succeeded in pushing his way through the forest and across innumerable streams. He contrived to subsist for eight months, during which he traversed 450 miles, enduring meanwhile the very utmost exertions and privations that human nature could support. . . . When he had surmounted the natural difficulties in his path, his remaining force consisted of but 166 men, with 60 horses. On March 2d, 1537, he resumed his advance; and, as usually happened, the mere sight of his horsemen terrified the Indians into submission. At Tunja, according to the Spanish historians, he was treacherously attacked whilst resting in the palace of one of the chiefs. . . . In any case, the chief was taken, and, after much slaughter, Ximenes found himself the absolute possessor of immense riches, one golden lantern alone being valued at 6,000 ducats. From Tunja Ximenes marched upon the sacred city of Iraca, where two Spanish soldiers accidentally set fire to the great Temple of the Sun. The result was that, after a conflagration which lasted several days, both the city and the temple were utterly destroyed. . . . On the 9th of August, 1538, was founded the city of Bogotá. Ximenes was soon here joined by Frederman, a subject of the Emperor Charles V., with 160 soldiers, with whom he had been engaged in conquering Venezuela; and likewise by Benalcazar, the conqueror of Quito. This latter warrior had crossed the continent in triumph at the head of 150 Spaniards, together with a multitude of native followers." In the intrigues and jealous rivalries between the three which

followed, Ximenes de Quesada was pushed aside, at first, and even fled and banished by the Emperor; but in the end he triumphed and was appointed marshal of the kingdom of New Granada. "On his return to Bogotá in 1551, he, to his credit, exhibited an energy in protecting the people of the country against their invaders, equal to that which he had displayed in effecting their conquest. Ten years later he commanded a force organized to repel an attack from the ruler of Venezuela; shortly after which he was appointed Adelantado of the Kingdom of New Granada. He devoted three years, and an enormous amount of toil and money, to an absurd expedition in quest of the fabled *El Dorado* [see *EL DONADO*]." Quesada died of leprosy in 1572. Until 1718 the kingdom of New Granada remained subject to the Viceroy of Peru. In that year the Viceroyalty of Peru "was divided into two portions, the northern region, from the frontiers of Mexico as far as to the Orinoco, and on the Southern Sea from Veragua to Tumbez, forming the Viceroyalty of New Granada, of which the capital was Bogotá. To this region, likewise, was assigned the inland province of Quito. The Viceroyalty of New Granada, in fact, comprised what now [1884] forms the Republic of Venezuela, the United States of Columbia, and the Republic of Ecuador." In 1731 "it was deemed expedient to detach from the Viceroyalty of New Granada the provinces of Venezuela, Maracaibo, Varinas, Cumana, and Spanish Guyana, and to form them into a separate Captain-Generalship, the residence of the ruler being fixed at Caracas in Venezuela."—R. G. Watson, *Spanish and Portuguese South America*, v. 2, ch. 9.

**A. D. 1810-1819.**—The struggle for independence and its achievement.—Miranda and Simon Bolivar.—The Earthquake in Venezuela.—The founding of the Republic of Colombia.—"The Colombian States occupy the first place in the history of South American independence. . . . The Colombian States were first in the struggle because they were in many ways nearest to Europe. It was through them that intercourse between the Pacific coast and Europe was mainly carried on: Porto Bello and Cartagena were thus the main inlets of European ideas. . . . Besides, there was here constant communication with the West Indies; and government, population and wealth were less centralised than in the more important vicerealties of Mexico and Peru. The Indians of New Granada had always been a restless race, and the increase of taxation which was resorted to for the defence of the coast in the war with Great Britain (1777-1783) produced discontents among the whole population, both red and white. . . . The French Revolution, coming soon afterwards, was another link in the chain of causes. . . . In Venezuela, which the industry of its inhabitants had raised from a poor mission district to a thriving commercial province, the progress of modern ideas was yet faster. . . . The conquest of Trinidad by England in 1797 gave a new turn to the movement. . . . It was from Trinidad that the first attempts were made to excite the Spanish colonists to revolution. Francis Miranda, by whom this was done, was a type of many other men to whom is due the credit of leading the South American peoples to independence. He was a native of Caracas,

and when a young man had held a French commission in the American War of Independence. On his return to Venezuela in 1783 he found the populace, as we have already mentioned, in an excited state, and finding that he was suspected of designs for liberating his own country, he went to Europe, and again attached himself to the French service. . . . Being proscribed by the Directory, he turned to England, and . . . when the war [between England and Spain] broke out afresh in 1804, and England sent out an expedition to invade Buenos Ayres, Miranda believed that his opportunity was come. In 1806, by English and American aid, he sailed from Trinidad and landed with 500 men on the coast of Venezuela. But the 'Colombian Army,' as Miranda named it, met with a cool reception among the people. His utter inability to meet the Spanish forces compelled him to retreat to Trinidad, nor did he reappear on the continent until after the revolution of 1810. The principal inhabitants of Caracas had been meditating the formation of a provisional government, on the model of the juntas of Spain, ever since the abdication of the king [see SPAIN: A. D. 1807-1808]; but it was not until 1810, when the final victory of Napoleon in Spain appeared certain, that they made a decisive movement in favour of independence. Spain, for the time at least, was now blotted out of the list of nations. Acting, therefore, in the name of Ferdinand VII., they deposed the Spanish colonial officers, and elected a supreme junta or council. Similar juntas were soon established in New Granada, at Santa Fé, Quito, Cartagena, and the other chief towns of the Viceroyalty . . . and the fortune of the patriot party in new Granada, from their close neighbourhood, was closely linked with that of the Venezuelans. The Regency of Cadiz, grasping for itself all the rights and powers of the Spanish nation, determined to reduce the colonists to subjection. They therefore declared the port of Caracas in a state of blockade, as the British government had done in the previous generation with that of Boston; and, as in the case of Boston, this resolution of the Regency amounted to a declaration of war. . . . A congress of all the provinces of Venezuela now met at Caracas, and published a declaration of independence on the 5th of July, 1811, and those of Mexico and New Granada soon followed. . . . The powers of nature seemed to conspire with the tyranny of Europe to destroy the young South American Republic. On the 26th of March, 1812, Venezuela was visited by a fearful earthquake, which destroyed the capital [Caracas] and several other towns, together with 20,000 people, and many others perished of hunger and in other ways. This day was Holy Thursday; and the superstitious people, prompted by their priests, believed this awful visitation to be a judgment from God for their revolt. The Spanish troops, under Monteverde, now began a fresh attack on the disquieted Venezuelans. Miranda, who on his return had been placed at the head of the army, had in the meantime overrun New Granada, and laid the foundation of the future United States of Colombia. But the face of affairs was changed by the news of the earthquake. Smitten with despair, his soldiers now deserted to the royalists; he lost ground everywhere; the fortress of Puerto Cavello, commanded by the

great Bolivar, then a colonel in the service of the Republic, was surrendered through treachery. On the 25th of June Miranda himself capitulated, with all his forces; and Venezuela fell once more into the hands of the royalists. Miranda himself was arrested, in defiance of the terms of the surrender, and perished in an European dungeon, as Toussaint had perished a few years before. . . . Monteverde emptied the prisons of fair occupants, and filled them with the families of the principal citizens of the republic; and Caraccas became the scene of a Reign of Terror. After Miranda's capitulation, Bolivar had gone to New Granada, which still maintained its independence, and entered into the service of that republic. Bolivar now reappeared in a new character, and earned for himself a reputation in the history of the new world which up to a certain point ranks with that of Washington. Simon Bolivar, like Miranda, was a native of Caraccas. . . . Like Miranda, he had to some extent learned modern ideas by visiting the old world and the United States. When the cruelties of Monteverde had made Venezuela ripe for a new revolt, Bolivar reappeared on his native soil at the head of a small body of troops from the adjacent republic. The successes which he gained so incensed the royalists that they refused quarter to their prisoners, and war to the death ('guerra a muerte') was proclaimed. All obstacles disappeared before Bolivar's generalship, and on the 4th of August, 1813, he publicly entered Caraccas, the fortress of Puerto Cavello being now the only one in the possession of the royalists. Bolivar was hailed with the title of the liberator of Venezuela. He was willing to see the republic restored; but the inhabitants very properly feared to trust at this time to anything but a military government, and vested the supreme power in him as dictator (1814). The event indeed proved the necessity of a military government. The defeated royalists raised fresh troops, many thousands of whom were negro slaves, and overran the whole country; Bolivar was benten at La Puerta, and forced to take refuge a second time in New Granada; and the capital fell again into the hands of the royalists. . . . The War of Independence had been undertaken against the Regency; and had Ferdinand, on his restoration to the throne in 1814, shown any signs of conciliation, he might yet have recovered his American provinces. But the government persisted in its course of absolute repression. . . . New Granada, where Bolivar was general in chief of the forces, was the only part where the insurrection survived; and in 1815 a fleet containing 10,000 men under General Morillo arrived off Carthagena, its principal port. . . . Carthagena was only provisioned for a short time; and Bolivar, overpowered by numbers, quitted the soil of the continent and went to the West Indies to seek help to relieve Carthagena, and maintain the contest for liberty. Obtaining assistance in Hayti, he fitted out an expedition "which sailed in April from the port of Aux Cayes. Bolivar landed near Cumana, in the eastern extremity of Venezuela, and from this point he gradually advanced westwards, gaining strength by slow degrees. In the meantime, after a siege of 116 days, Carthagena surrendered; 5,000 of its inhabitants had perished of hunger. Both provinces were

now in Morillo's hands. Fancying himself completely master of the country, he proceeded to wreak a terrible vengeance on the Granadines. But at the news of Bolivar's reappearance, though yet at a distance, the face of affairs changed. . . . His successes in the year 1817 were sure, though slow; in 1818, after he had been joined by European volunteers, they were brilliant. Bolivar beat the royalists in one pitched battle after another [Sagamoso, July 1, 1819, and Pantano de Burgas, July 25]; and at length a decisive victory was won by his lieutenant, Santander, at Boyaca, in New Granada, August 1, 1819. This battle, in which some hundreds of British and French auxiliaries fought on the side of liberty, completely freed the two countries from the yoke of Spain."—E. J. Payne, *Hist. of European Colonies*, ch. 16.

ALSO IN: C. S. Cochrane, *Journal of a Residence in Colombia*, v. 1, ch. 6-8.—II. Brownell, *N. and S. America Illustrated*, pp. 316-334.—C. Cushing, *Simon Bolivar (N. Am. Rev., Jan., 1829, and Jan., 1830)*.—II. L. V. D. Holstein, *Memoirs of Bolivar*, ch. 3-20.—Major Flintner, *Hist. of the Revolution of Caraccas*.

A. D. 1819-1830.—The glory and the fall of Bolivar.—Dissolution of the Colombian Federation.—Tyranny under the Liberator, and monarchical schemes.—Three days after the battle of Boyaca, Bolivar entered Bogota in triumph. "A congress met in December and decided that Venezuela and Nueva Granada should form one republic, to be called Colombia. Morillo departed for Europe in 1820, and the victory gained by Bolivar at Carabobo on June 24, 1821, decided the fate of Colombia. In the following January General Bolivar assembled an army at Popayan to drive the Spaniards out of the province of Quito. His second in command, General Sucre, led an advanced guard, which was reinforced by a contingent of volunteers from Peru, under Santa Cruz. The Spanish General Ramirez was entirely defeated in the battle of Pichincha, and Quito was incorporated with the new republic of Colombia."—C. R. Markham, *Colonial Hist. of S. America (Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v. 8, ch. 5)*.—"The provinces of New Granada and Venezuela, together with the Presidency of Quito, now sent delegates to the convention of Cucuta, in 1821, and there decreed the union of the three countries as a single state by the name of the Republic of Colombia. The first Colombian federal constitution was concocted by the united wisdom of the delegates; and the result might easily have been foreseen. It was a farrago of crude and heterogeneous ideas. Some of its features were imitated from the American political system, some from the English, some from the French. . . . Bolivar of course became President; and the Republic had need of him. The task of liberation was not yet completed. Carthagena, and many other strong places, remained in Spanish hands. Bolivar reduced these one by one, and the second decisive victory of Carabobo, in 1823, finally secured Colombian freedom. The English claim the chief share in the battle of Carabobo; for the British legion alone carried the main Spanish position, losing in the feat two-thirds of its numbers. The war now fast drew to its close. The republic was able to contest with the invaders the dominion of the sea: General Padilla, on the 23rd of July, 1823, totally destroyed the Spanish fleet:

and the Spanish commander finally capitulated at Puerto Cavello in December. All these hard-won successes were mainly owing to the bravery and resolution of Bolívar. Bolívar deserves to the full the reputation of an able and patriotic soldier. He was now set free . . . to render important services to the rest of South America: and among the heroes of independence perhaps his name will always stand first. But Bolívar the statesman was a man very different from Bolívar the general. He was alternately timid and arbitrary. He was indeed afraid to touch the problems of statesmanship which awaited him: but instead of leading the Colombian people through independence to liberty, he stubbornly set his face against all measures of political or social reform. His fall may be said to have begun with the moment when his military triumphs were complete. The disaffection to the constitution of the leading people in Venezuela and Ecuador [the new name given to the old province of Quito, indicating its position at the equator] in 1826 and 1827, was favoured by the Provincial governors, Paez and Mosquera; and Bolívar, instead of resisting the disintegration of the state, openly favoured the military dictatorships which Paez and Mosquera established. This policy foreshadowed the reign of absolutism in New Granada itself. Bolívar . . . had now become not only the constitutional head of the Colombian federation, but also the military head of the Peruvian republics [see PERU: A. D. 1820-1826, 1825-1826, and 1826-1876]; and there can be no doubt that he intended the Colombian constitution to be reduced to the Peruvian model. As a first step towards reuniting all the South American nations under a military government, Paez, beyond reasonable doubt, with Bolívar's connivance, proclaimed the independence of Venezuela, April 30th, 1826. This practically broke up the Colombian federation: and the destruction of the constitution, so far as it regarded New Granada itself, soon followed. Bolívar had already resorted to the usual devices of military tyranny. The terrorism of Sbirri, arbitrary arrests, the assumption of additional executive powers, and, finally, the suppression of the vice-presidency, all pointed one way. . . . At length, after the practical secession of Venezuela and Ecuador under their military rulers, Congress decreed a summons for a Convention, which met at Ocaña in March, 1828. . . . The liberals, who were bent on electoral reform and decentralization, were paralyzed by the violent bearing of the Bolivian leaders: and Bolívar quartered himself in the neighbourhood, and threatened the Convention at the head of an army of 3,000 veterans. He did not, however, resort to open force. Instead of this, he ordered his party to recede from the Convention: and this left the Convention without the means of making a quorum. From this moment the designs of Bolívar were unmistakable. The dissolution of the Convention, and the appointment of Bolívar as Dictator, by a junta of notables, followed as a matter of course; and by the 'Organic decree' of August 1828, Bolívar assumed the absolute sovereignty of Colombia. A reign of brute force now followed: but the triumph of Bolívar was only ephemeral. . . . The Federation was gone: and it became a question of securing military rule in the separate provinces. A portentous change now occurred in Ecuador. The democratic party

under Flores triumphed over the Bolivians under Mosquera: and Paez assured his chief that no help was to be expected from Venezuela. At the Convention of Bogota, in 1830, though it was packed with Bolívar's nominees, it became clear that the liberator's star had set at last. . . . This convention refused to vote him President. Bolívar now withdrew from public life: and a few months later, December 17, 1830, he died broken-hearted at San Pedro, near Santa Martha. Bolívar, though a patriot as regarded the struggle with Spain, was in the end a traitor to his fellow citizens. Recent discoveries leave little doubt that he intended to found a monarchy on the ruins of the Spanish dominion. England and France, both at this time strongly conservative powers, were in favour of such a scheme; and a Prince of the House of Bourbon had already been nominated to be Bolívar's successor."—E. J. Payne, *Hist. of European Colonies*, ch. 16.—"About one month before his death, General Bolívar, the so-called 'Liberator' of South America, wrote a letter to the late General Flores of Ecuador, in which the following remarkable passages occur, which have never before been published in the English language: 'I have been in power for nearly 20 years, from which I have gathered only a few definite results: 1. America, for us, is ungovernable. 2. He who dedicates his services to a revolution, plows the sea. 3. The only thing that can be done in America, is to emigrate. 4. This country will inevitably fall into the hands of the unbridled rabble, and little by little become a prey to petty tyrants of all colors and races.'"—F. Hassaurek, *Four Years among Spanish-Americans*, ch. 12.

ALSO IN: J. M. Spence, *The Land of Bolívar*, v. 1, ch. 7.—E. B. Eastwick, *Venezuela*, ch. 11 (*Battle of Carabobo*).

**A. D. 1821-1854.—Emancipation of slaves.**—The abolition of slavery in the three republics of New Granada, Venezuela and Ecuador was initiated in the Republic of Colombia, while it embraced them all. "By a law of the 21st of July, 1821, it was provided that the children of slaves, born after its publication in the principal cities of the republic, should be free. . . . Certain revenues were appropriated to the creation of an emancipation fund in each district. . . . Aside from a certain bungling looseness with which almost all Spanish-American laws are drawn, it [the act of 1821] contains some very sensible regulations, and served to lay a solid foundation for the work of emancipation, since completed by the three republics which then constituted Colombia." In Ecuador the completion of emancipation was reached in 1854.—F. Hassaurek, *Four Years among Spanish-Americans*, pp. 330-333.

**A. D. 1826.—The Congress of Panama.**—"The proposition for assembling this body emanated from Bolívar, who, in 1823, as president of Colombia, invited the governments of Mexico, Peru, Chile, and Buenos Ayres, to form a confederacy of the Spanish-American states, by means of plenipotentiaries to be convened, in the spirit of classic analogy, in the isthmus of Panama. To this invitation the governments of Peru and Mexico promptly acceded, Chile and Buenos Ayres neglected or declined to be represented in the assembly, for the reasons which we shall presently state. This magnificent idea of a second Achaean League seized on the imagina-

ions of many speculative and of some practical men in America and Europe, as destined to create a new era in the political history of the world by originating a purer system of public law, and almost realizing Bernardin de Saint Pierre's league of the modern nations. In its original shape, it was professedly a plan of a belligerent nature, having for its main object to combine the revolutionized states against the common enemy. But time was required for carrying it into effect. Meanwhile the project, magnified by the course of events, began to change its complexion. The United States were invited to participate in the Congress, so as to form an American policy, and a rallying point for American interests, in opposition to those of Europe; and, after the discussions which are so familiar to all, the government of the United States accepted the invitation, and despatched its representatives to Panama. . . . In the interval, between the proposal of the plan and its execution, Central America was added to the family of American nations, and agreed to take part in the Congress. At length, after many delays, this modern Amphictyonic Council, consisting of plenipotentiaries from Colombia, Central America, Peru and Mexico, assembled in the city of Panama, June 22, 1826, and in a session of three weeks concluded various treaties; one of perpetual union, league, and confederation; others relating to the contingents which the confederates should contribute for the common defence; and another for the annual meeting of the Congress in time of war. Having thus promptly despatched their private affairs, the assembly adjourned to Tacubaya in Mexico, on account of the insalubrious climate of Panama, before the delegation of the United States had arrived; since when it has justly acquired the epithet of 'intronvable,' and probably never will reassemble in its original form. Is there not a secret history of all this? Why did Chile and Buenos Ayres refuse to participate in the Congress? Why has it now vanished from the face of the earth? The answer given in South America is, that Bolívar proposed the assembly as part of a grand scheme of ambition,—ascribed to him by the republican party, and not without some countenance from his own conduct,—for establishing a military empire to embrace the whole of Spanish-America, or at least an empire uniting Colombia and the two Perus. To give the color of plausibility to the projected assembly, the United States were invited to be represented; and it is said Bolívar did not expect, nor very graciously receive, their acceptance of the invitation."—C. Cushing, *Bolívar and the Bolivian Constitution* (*N. A. Rev.*, Jan., 1830).—In the United States "no question, in its day, excited more heat and intemperate discussion, or more feeling between a President and Senate, than this proposed mission to the Congress of American nations at Panama; and no heated question ever cooled off and died out so suddenly and completely. . . . Though long since sunk into oblivion, and its name almost forgotten, it was a master subject on the political theatre during its day; and gave rise to questions of national and of constitutional law, and of national policy, the importance of which survive the occasion from which they sprung; and the solution of which (as then solved), may be some guide to future action, if similar questions again

occur. Besides the grave questions to which the subject gave rise, the subject itself became one of unusual and painful excitement. It agitated the people, made a violent debate in the two Houses of Congress, inflamed the passions of parties and individuals, raised a tempest before which Congress bent, made bad feeling between the President [John Quincy Adams] and the Senate; and led to the duel between Mr. Randolph and Mr. Clay. It was an administration measure, and pressed by all the means known to an administration. It was evidently relied upon as a means of acting upon the people—as a popular movement which might have the effect of turning the tide which was then running high against Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay. . . . Now, the chief benefit to be derived from its retrospect—and that indeed is a real one—is a view of the firmness with which was then maintained, by a minority, the old policy of the United States, to avoid entangling alliances and interference with the affairs of other nations;—and the exposition of the Monroe doctrine, from one so competent to give it as Mr. Adams."—T. H. Benton, *Thirty Years' View*, ch. 25 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: G. F. Tucker, *The Monroe Doctrine*, ch. 3.—C. Schurz, *Life of Henry Clay*, ch. 11 (v. 1).—*International Am. Conference* (of 1880): *Repts. and Discussions*, v. 4, *Hist. appendix*.

A. D. 1830-1886.—**Revolutions and civil wars.**—The New Confederation (1863) of the United States of Colombia.—The Republic of Colombia.—"New Granada was obliged in 1830 to recognize the disruption of Colombia, which had long been an accomplished fact. From this date the three states have a separate history, which is very much of a piece, though Venezuela was for some years preserved from the intestine commotions which have from the beginning distracted New Granada and Ecuador. . . . Mosquera, who had won the election which decided the fate of Bolívar did not long occupy the presidency. . . . Mosquera was soon driven out by General Urdanete, who was now at the head of the conservative or Bolivian party. But after the death of their leader, this party suffered a natural relapse, and Urdanete was overthrown early in 1831. The history of New Granada may be said really to commence with the presidency of Bolívar's old rival and companion in arms, Santander, who was elected under the constitution of 1832. . . . His presidency . . . was a comparatively bright episode: and with its termination in 1836 begins the dark and troubled period which the Granadines emphatically designate by the name of the 'Twelve Years.' The scanty measure of liberalism which Santander had dealt out to the people was now withdrawn. Marquez, his successor, was a sceptic in politics and a man of infirm will. . . . Now began the ascendancy of clericalism, of absolutist oligarchy, and of government by the galleys. This same system continued under President Herrán, who was elected in 1841; and then appeared on the scene, as his chief minister, the famous Dr. Ospina," who brought back the Jesuits and curtailed the constitution. Liberalism again gained ground, electing General Lopez to the presidency in 1849 and once more expelling the Jesuits. In April 1854 a radical revolution overturned the constitution and President Obando was declared dictator. The conservatives rallied, however, and regained possession of the government before



the close of the year. In 1857 Ospina entered on the presidency and civil war soon raged throughout the country. "After a hundred fights the revolution triumphed in July, 1861. . . . Mosquera, who was now in possession of the field, was a true pupil of Bolívar's, and he thought the time had come for reviving Bolívar's plans. . . . In 1863 Mosquera's new Federal Constitution was proclaimed. Henceforth each State [of the eight federal States into which the 44 provinces of New Granada were divided] became practically independent under its own President; and to mark the change the title of the nation was altered. At first it was called the Granadine Confederation; but it afterwards took the name of Colombia [the United States of Colombia], which had formerly been the title of the larger Confederation under Bolívar. Among the most important facts in recent Colombian history is the independence of the State of Panama, which has become of great importance through the construction of the railway connecting the port of Colon, or Aspinwall, as it was named by the Americans, on the Atlantic, with that of Panama on the Pacific. This railway was opened in 1855; and in the same year Panama declared itself a sovereign state. The State of Panama, after many years of conservative domination, has now perhaps the most democratic government in the world. The President is elected for two years only, and is incapable of re-election. Panama has had many revolutions of its own; nor has the new Federal Constitution solved all the difficulties of the Granadine government. In 1867 Mosquera was obliged to have recourse to a coup d'état, and declared himself dictator, but he was soon afterwards arrested; a conservative revolution took place; Mosquera was banished; and Gutierrez became President. The liberals, however, came back the next year, under Ponce. Since 1874 [the date of writing being 1879] General Perez has been President of Colombia."—E. J. Payne, *Hist. of European Colonies*, ch. 16.—"The federal Constitution of 1863 was clearly formed on the model of the Constitution of the United States of America. It remained in force until 1880, when it was superseded by a law which gave the State a centralized organization and named it the 'Republic of Colombia.'"—*Const. of the Republic of Colombia, with Hist. Intro.* by B. Moses (*Sup. to Annals of Am. Acad. of Pol. and Soc. Science*, Jan., 1893).

**A. D. 1885-1891.—The Revolution of 1885.—The constitution of 1886.—The presidency of Dr. Nuñez.**—"Cartagena is virtually the centre of political power in Colombia, for it is the residence of President Nuñez, a dictator without the name. Before the revolution of 1885, during which Colon was burned and the Panama Railway protected by American marines, the States enjoyed a large measure of home rule. The insurgents who were defeated in that struggle were Radicals and advanced Liberals. They were making a stand against centralized government, and they were overthrown. When the followers of Dr. Nuñez were victorious, they transformed the constitutional system of the country. . . . Dr. Nuñez, who had entered public life as a Radical agitator, swung completely around the circle. As the leader of the National party he became the ally of Clericalism, and the defender of ecclesiastical privilege. Being a man of unrivalled capacity for directing public

affairs and enforcing party discipline, he has established a highly centralized military government without incurring unpopularity by remaining constantly in sight and openly exercising authority. . . . Strong government has not been without its advantages; but the system can hardly be considered either republican or democratic. . . . Of all the travesties of popular government which have been witnessed in Spanish America, the political play enacted in Bogotá and Cartagena is the most grotesque. Dr. Nuñez is known as the titular President of the Republic. His practice is to go to the capital at the beginning of the presidential term, and when he has taken the oath of office to remain there a few weeks until all matters of policy and discipline are arranged among his followers. He then retires to his country-seat in Cartagena, leaving the vice-President to bear the burdens of state."—I. N. Ford, *Tropical America*, ch. 12.

**A. D. 1892.—Re-election of President Nuñez.**—In 1892, Dr. Rafael Nuñez was elected President for a fourth term, the term of office being six years.—*Statesman's Year-book*, 1893.

**COLONI.** See **DEBITITUS**.

**COLONIA AGRIPPENSIS.**—Agrippina, the daughter of Germanicus and the mother of Nero, founded on the Rhine the Colonia Agrippensis (modern Cologne)—probably the only colony of Roman veterans ever established under female auspices. The site had been previously occupied by a village of the Ubi. "It is curious that this abnormal colony has, alone of all its kindred foundations, retained to the present day the name of Colonia."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 50.

**COLONIA, URUGUAY.** See **ARGENTINE REPUBLIC**: A. D. 1580-1777.

**COLONIZATION SOCIETY, The American.** See **SLAVERY, NEGRO**: A. D. 1816-1847.

**COLONNA, The.** See **ROME**: 13TH-14TH CENTURIES, and A. D. 1347-1354; also **PAPACY**: A. D. 1294-1348.

**COLONUS, The.** See **SLAVERY, MEDIEVAL**: **GERMANY**.

**COLORADO**: A. D. 1803-1848.—Acquisition of the eastern part in the Louisiana Purchase and the western part from Mexico. See **LOUISIANA**: A. D. 1798-1803; and **MEXICO**: A. D. 1848.

**A. D. 1806-1876.—Early explorations.—Gold discoveries.—Territorial and state organization.**—The first American explorer to penetrate to the mountains of Colorado was Lieutenant Zebulon Pike, sent out with a small party by General Wilkinson, in 1806. He approached within 15 miles of the Rocky Mountain Peak which bears his name. A more extensive official exploration of the country was made in 1819 by Major Stephen H. Long, whose report upon the whole region drained by the Missouri, Arkansas and Platte rivers and their tributaries was unfavorable and discouraging. Fremont's explorations, which touched Colorado, were made in 1843-44. "The only persons encountered in the Rocky mountains by Frémont at this time were the few remaining traders and their former employés, now their colonists, who lived with their Mexican and Indian wives and half-breed children in a primitive manner of life, usually under the protection of some defensive structure called a fort. The first American

families in Colorado were a part of the Mormon battalion of 1840, who, with their wives and children, resided at Pueblo from September to the spring and summer of the following year, when they joined the Mormon emigration to Salt Lake. . . . Measures were taken early in March, 1847, to select locations for two United States forts between the Missouri and the Rocky mountains, the sites selected being those now occupied by Kearney City and Fort Laramie. . . . Up to 1853 Colorado's scant population still lived in or near some defensive establishment, and had been decreasing rather than increasing for the past decade, owing to the hostility of the Indians." In 1858 the first organized searching or prospecting for gold in the region was begun by a party of Cherokee Indians and whites. Other parties soon followed; the search succeeded; and the Pike's Peak mining region was speedily swarming with eager adventurers. In the fall of 1858 two rival towns were laid out on the opposite sides of Cherry Creek. They were named respectively Auraria and Denver. The struggle for existence between them was bitter, but brief. Auraria succumbed and Denver survived, to become the metropolis of the Mountains. The first attempt at political organization was made at the Auraria settlement, in November, 1858, and took the form of a provisional territorial organization, under the name of the Territory of Jefferson; but the provisional government did not succeed in establishing its authority, opposed as it was by conflicting claims to territorial jurisdiction on the part of Utah, New Mexico, Kansas, Nebraska, and Dakota. At length, on the 28th of February, 1861, an act of Congress became law, by which the proposed new territory was duly created, but not bearing the name of Jefferson. "The name of Colorado was given to it at the suggestion of the man selected for its first governor. . . . 'Some,' says Gilpin, 'wanted it called Jefferson, some Arcadia. . . . I said the people have to a great extent named the States after the great rivers of the country . . . and the great feature of that country is the great Colorado river.'" Remaining in the territorial condition until July 1876, Colorado was then admitted to the Union as a state.—H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States*, v. 20: *Colorado*, ch. 2-6.

**COLOSSEUM, OR COLISEUM, The.—**

"The Flavian Amphitheatre, or Colosseum, was built by Vespasian and Titus in the lowest part of the valley between the Caelian and Esquiline Hills, which was then occupied by a large artificial pool for naval fights ('Naumachia'). . . . The exact date of the commencement of the Colosseum is doubtful, but it was opened for use in A. D. 80. . . . As built by the Flavian Emperors the upper galleries ('maeniani') were of wood, and these, as in the case of the Circus Maximus, at many times caught fire from lightning and other causes, and did much damage to the stone-work of the building."—J. H. Middleton, *Ancient Rome in 1885*, ch. 10.

ALSO IN: J. H. Parker, *Archaeology of Rome*, pt. 7.—R. Burn, *Rome and the Campagna*, ch. 9, pt. 2.—See, also, *ROME*: A. D. 70-96.

**COLOSSUS OF RHODES.** See *RHODES*.

**COLUMBAN CHURCH, The.**—The church, or the organization of Christianity, in Scotland, which resulted from the labors of the Irish missionary, Columba, in the sixth century, and

which spread from the great monastery that he founded on the little island of Iona, or Ia, or Iii, near the greater island of Mull. The church of Columba, "not only for a time embraced within its fold the whole of Scotland north of the Firths of Forth and Clyde, and was for a century and a half the national church of Scotland, but was destined to give to the Angles of Northumbria the same form of Christianity for a period of thirty years." It represented some differences from the Roman church which two centuries of isolation had produced in the Irish church, from which it sprang.—W. F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, bk. 2, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: Count de Montalembert, *The Monks of the West*, bk. 9 (c. 3).—G. F. Maclear, *Conversion of the West: The Celts*, ch. 7-10.—See *CHRISTIANITY*: 5TH-9TH CENTURIES, and 597-800.

**COLUMBIA, The District of.** See *WASHINGTON (CITY)*: A. D. 1791.

**A. D. 1850.—Abolition of slave-trade in.** See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1850.

**A. D. 1867.—Extension of suffrage to the Negroes.** See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1867 (JANUARY).

**COLUMBIA, S. C., The burning of.** See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1865 (FEBRUARY)—*MARCH*: *THE CAROLINAS*.

**COLUMBIA, Tenn., Engagement at.** See *UNITED STATES OF AM.*: A. D. 1864 (NOVEMBER: *TENNESSEE*).

**COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION, The World's.** See *CHICAGO*: A. D. 1892-1893.

**COLUMBIAN ORDER, The.** See *TAMMANY SOCIETY*.

**COLUMBUS, Voyages of.** See *AMERICA*: A. D. 1484-1492; 1492; 1493-1496; 1498-1505.

**COMANA.**—Comana, an ancient city of Cappadocia, on the river Sarus (Sihoon) was the seat of a priesthood, in the temple of Enyo, or Bellona, so venerated, so wealthy and so powerful that the chief priest of Comana counted among the great Asiatic dignitaries in the time of Caesar.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Rep.*, v. 5, ch. 22.

**COMANCHE, The.** See *AMERICAN ABORIGINALS*: SHOSHONEAN FAMILY, and KICWAN FAMILY, and APACHE GROUP.

**COMANS, The.** See *KIPCHAKS*; *PATCHINAKS*; *COSSACKS*, and *HUNGARY*: A. D. 1114-1301.

**COMBAT, Judicial.** See *WAGER OF BATTLE*.

**COMES LITTORIS SAXONICI.** See *SAXON SHORE, COUNT OF*.

**COMES PALATII.** See *PALATINE COUNTS*.

**COMITATUS.—COMITES.—GESITHS.**

—**THEGNS.**—Comitatus is the name given by Tacitus to a body of warlike companions among the ancient Germans "who attached themselves in the closest manner to the chieftain of their choice. They were in many cases the sons of the nobles who were ambitious of renown or of a perfect education in arms. The princes provided for them horses, arms, and such rough equipment as they wanted. These and plentiful entertainment were accepted instead of wages. In time of war the comites fought for their chief, at once his defenders and the rivals of his prowess. . . . In the times of forced and unwelcome rest they were thoroughly idle; they cared neither for farming nor for hunting, but spent the time in feasting and in sleep. . . . Like the Frank king,

the Anglo-Saxon king seems to have entered on the full possession of what had been the right of the elective principes [to nominate and maintain a comitatus, to which he could give territory and political power]; but the very principle of the comitatus had undergone a change from what it was in the time of Tacitus, when it reappears in our historians, and it seems to have had in England a peculiar development and a bearing of special importance on the constitution. In Tacitus the comites are the personal following of the principes; they live in his house, are maintained by his gifts, fight for him in the field. If there is little difference between companions and servants, it is because civilization has not yet introduced voluntary helplessness. . . . Now the king, the perpetual principes and representative of the race, conveys to his personal following public dignity and importance. His gesiths and thegns are among the great and wise men of the land. The right of having such dependents is not restricted to him, but the gesith of the earldorman or bishop is simply a retainer, a pupil or a ward; the free household servants of the ceorl are in a certain sense his gesiths also. But the gesiths of the king are his guard and private council; they may be endowed by him from the folkland and admitted by him to the witegamenot. . . . The Danish huscarls of Canute are a late reproduction of what the familia of the Northumbrian kings must have been in the eighth century. . . . The development of the comitatus into a territorial nobility seems to be a feature peculiar to English history. . . . The Lombard gasind, and the Bavarian sindman were originally the same thing as the Anglo-Saxon gesith. But they sank into the general mass of vassalage as it grew up in the ninth and tenth centuries. . . . Closely connected with the gesith is the thegn; so closely that it is scarcely possible to see the difference except in the nature of the employment. The thegn seems to be primarily the warrior gesith; in this idea Alfred uses the word as translating the 'miles' of Bede. He is probably the gesith who has a particular military duty in his master's service. But he also appears as a landowner. The ceorl who has acquired five hides of land, and a special appointment in the king's hall, with other judicial rights, becomes thegn-worthy. . . . And from this point, the time of Athelstan, the gesith is lost sight of, except very occasionally; the more important members of the class having become thegns, and the lesser sort sinking into the ranks of mere servants to the king. The class of thegns now widens; on the one hand the name is given to all who possess the proper quantity of land, whether or no they stand in the old relation to the king; on the other the remains of the old nobility place themselves in the king's service. The name of thegn covers the whole class which after the Conquest appears under the name of knights, with the same qualification in land and nearly the same obligations. It also carried so much of nobility as is implied in hereditary privilege. The thegn-born are contrasted with the ceorl-born; and are perhaps much the same as the gesithceund. . . . Under the name of thegn are included however various grades of dignity. The class of king's thegns is distinguished from that of the medial thegns, and from a residuum that falls in rank below the latter. . . . The very name, like that of the gesith, has different senses

in different ages and kingdoms; but the original idea of military service runs through all the meanings of thegn, as that of personal association is traceable in all the applications of gesith." — W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 2, sect. 14 and ch. 6, sect. 63-65.

ALSO IN: T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders*, bk. 4, ch. 7.— See, also, COUNT AND DUKE.

**COMITIA CENTURIATA.**—"Under the original constitution of Rome, the patricians alone . . . enjoyed political rights in the state, but at the same time they were forced to bear the whole burden of political duties. In these last were included, for example, the tilling of the king's fields, the construction of public works and buildings . . . ; citizens alone, also, were liable to service in the army. . . . The political burdens, especially those connected with the army, grew heavier, naturally, as the power of Rome increased, and it was seen to be an injustice that one part of the people, and that, too, the smaller part, should alone feel their weight. This led to the first important modification of the Roman constitution, which was made even before the close of the regal period. According to tradition, its author was the king Servius Tullius, and its general object was to make all men who held land in the state liable to military service. It thus conferred no political rights on the plebeians, but assigned to them their share of political duties. . . . According to tradition, all the freeholders in the city between the ages of 17 and 60, with some exceptions, were divided, without distinction as to birth, into five classes ('classis,' 'a summondo,' 'calo') for service in the infantry according to the size of their estates. Those who were excepted served as horsemen. These were selected from among the very richest men in the state. . . . Of the five classes of infantry, the first contained the richest men. . . . The members of the first class were required to come to the battle array in complete armor, while less was demanded of the other four. Each class was subdivided into centuries or bodies of a hundred men each, for convenience in arranging the army. There were in all 193 centuries. . . . This absolute number and this apportionment were continued, as the population increased and the distribution of wealth altered, until the name century came to have a purely conventional meaning, even if it had any other in the beginning. Henceforth a careful census was taken every fourth year, and all freeholders were made subject to the 'tributum.' The arrangement of the people thus described was primarily made simply for military purposes. . . . Gradually, however, this organization came to have political significance, until finally these men, got together for what is the chief political duty in a primitive state, enjoyed what political privileges there were. . . . In the end, this 'exercitus' of Servius Tullius formed another popular assembly, the Comitia Centuriata, which supplanted the comitia curiata entirely, except in matters connected with the religion of the family and very soon of purely formal significance. This organization, therefore, became of the highest civil importance, and was continued for civil purposes long after the army was marshalled on quite another plan."—A. Tigue, *Development of the Roman Const.*, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 6, ch. 1.—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq.*, ch. 4.

**COMITIA CURIATA.**—"In the beginning, any member of any one of the clans which were included in the three original Roman tribes, was a Roman citizen. So, too, were his children born in lawful wedlock, and those who were adopted by him according to the forms of law. Illegitimate children, on the other hand, were excluded from the number of citizens. These earliest Romans called themselves patricians (patricii, 'children of their fathers'), for some reason about which we cannot be sure. Perhaps it was in order to distinguish themselves from their illegitimate kinsmen and from such other people as lived about, having no pretense of blood connection with them, and who were, therefore, incapable of contracting lawful marriages, according to the patrician's view of this religious ceremony. The patricians . . . were grouped together in families, clans and tribes, partly on the basis of blood relationship, but chiefly on the basis of common religious worship. Besides these groups, there was still another in the state, the curia, or 'ward,' which stood between the clan and the tribe. In the earliest times, tradition said, ten families formed a clan, ten clans a curia and ten curia a tribe. These numbers, if they ever had any historical existence, could not have sustained themselves for any length of time in the case of the clans and families, for such organisms of necessity would increase and decrease quite irregularly. About the nature of the curia we have practically no direct information. The organization had become a mere name at an early period in the city's history. Whether the members of a curia thought of themselves as having closer kinship with one another than with members of other curia is not clear. We know, however, that the curiae were definite political subdivisions of the city, perhaps like modern wards, and that each curia had a common religious worship for its members' participation. Thus much, at any rate, is significant, because it has to do with the form of Rome's primitive popular assembly. When the king wanted to harangue the people ('populus,' cf. 'popular,' 'to devastate') he called them to a 'contio' (compounded of 'co' and 'venio'). But if he wanted to propose to them action which implied a change in the organic law of the state, he summoned them to a comitia (compounded of 'con' and 'co'). To this the name comitia curiata was given, because its members voted by curia. Each curia had one vote, the character of which was determined by a majority of its members, and a majority of the curia decided the matter for the comitia."—A. Tigue, *Development of the Roman Const.*, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 1, ch. 5.—F. De Coulanges, *The Ancient City*, bk. 3, ch. 1, and bk. 4 ch. 1.—See, also, COMITIA CURIATA, and CONTIONES.

**COMITIA TRIBUTA, The.** See ROME: B. C. 472-471.

**COMMAGENE, Kingdom of.**—A district of northern Syria, between Cilicia and the Euphrates, which acquired independence during the disorders which broke up the empire of the Seleucide, and was a separate kingdom during the last century B. C. It was afterwards made a Roman province. Its capital was Samosata.

**COMMENDATION.** See BENEFICIUM.

**COMMERCIIUM.** See MUNICIPIUM.

**COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC SAFETY, The French Revolutionary.** See FRANCE:

A. D. 1793 (MARCH—JUNE), and (JUNE—OCTOBER).

**COMMITTEE ON THE CONDUCT OF THE WA<sup>Y</sup>, The.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861-1862 (DECEMBER—MARCH: VIRGINIA).

**COMMODUS, Roman Emperor, A. D. 180-192.**

**COMMON LAW, English.**—"The municipal law of England, or the rule of civil conduct prescribed to the inhabitants of this kingdom, may with sufficient propriety be divided into two kinds; the 'lex non scripta,' the unwritten or common law; and the 'lex scripta,' the written or statute law. The 'lex non scripta,' or unwritten law, includes not only general customs, or the common law properly so called, but also the particular customs of certain parts of the kingdom; and likewise those particular laws that are by custom observed only in certain courts and jurisdictions. When I call these parts of our law 'leges non scriptae,' I would not be understood as if all those laws were at present merely oral, or communicated from the former ages to the present solely by word of mouth. . . . But, with us at present, the monuments and evidences of our legal customs are contained in the records of the several courts of justice, in books of reports and judicial decisions, and in the treatises of learned sages of the profession, preserved and handed down to us from the times of highest antiquity. However, I therefore style these parts of our law 'leges non scriptae,' because their original institution and authority are not set down in writing, as Acts of Parliament are, but they receive their binding power, and the force of laws, by long and immemorial usage, and by their universal reception throughout the kingdom."—Sir W. Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of Eng., int.*, sect. 3.

ALSO IN: H. S. Maine, *Ancient Law*, ch. 1.—J. N. Pomeroy, *Int. to Municipal Law*, sects. 37-42.

**COMMON LOT, OR COMMON LIFE, Brethren of the.** See BRETHERN OF THE COMMON LOT.

**"COMMON SENSE" (Paine's Pamphlet), The influence of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776 (JANUARY—JUNE).

**COMMONS, The.** See ESTATES, THE THREE.

**COMMONS, House of.** See PARLIAMENT, THE ENGLISH, and KNIGHTS OF THE SHIRE.

**COMMONWEALTH OF ENGLAND, Establishment of the.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1649 (FEBRUARY).

**COMMUNE, The.**—The commonalty; the commons. In feudal usage, the term signified, as defined by Littré, the body of the bourgeois or burghers of a town who had received a charter which gave them rights of self-government. "In France the communal constitution was during this period (12th century) encouraged, although not very heartily, by Lewis VI., who saw in it one means of fettering the action of the barons and bishops and securing to himself the support of a strong portion of his people. In some cases the commune of France is, like the guild, a voluntary association, but its objects are from the first more distinctly political. In some parts of the kingdom the towns had risen against their lords in the latter half of the eleventh century, and had retained the fruits of

their hard-won victories. In others, they possessed, in the remaining fragments of the Karolingian constitution, some organisation that formed a basis for new liberties. The great number of charters granted in the twelfth century shows that the policy of encouraging the third estate was in full sway in the royal councils, and the king by ready recognition of the popular rights gained the affections of the people to an extent which has few parallels in French history. The French charters are in both style and substance very different from the English. The liberties which are bestowed are for the most part the same, exemption from arbitrary taxation, the right to local jurisdiction, the privilege of enfranchising the villein who has been for a year and a day received within the walls, and the power of electing the officers. But whilst all the English charters contain a confirmation of free and good customs, the French are filled with an enumeration of bad ones. . . . The English have an ancient local constitution the members of which are the recipients of the new grant, and guilds of at least sufficient antiquity to render their confirmation typical of the freedom now guaranteed; French *communia* is a new body which, by the action of a sworn confederacy, has wrung from its oppressors a deliverance from hereditary bondage. . . . The commune lacks too the ancient element of festive religious or mercantile association which is so conspicuous in the history of the guild. The idea of the latter is English, that of the former is French or Gallic. Yet notwithstanding these differences, the substantial identity of the privileges secured by these charters seems to prove the existence of much international sympathy. The ancient liberties of the English were not unintelligible to the townsmen of Normandy; the rising freedom of the German cities roused a corresponding ambition in the towns of Flanders; and the struggles of the Italian municipalities awoke the energies of the cities of Provence. All took different ways to win the same liberties. . . . The German *hansa* may have been derived from England; the *communa* of London was certainly derived from France. . . . The *communa* of London, and of those other English towns which in the twelfth century aimed at such a constitution, was the old English guild in a new French garb: it was the ancient association, but directed to the attainment of municipal rather than mercantile privileges."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 11.

—“Oppression and insurrection were not the sole origin of the communes. . . . Two causes, quite distinct from feudal oppression, viz., Roman traditions and Christian sentiments, had their share in the formation of the communes and in the beneficial results thereof. The Roman municipal regimen, which is described in M. Guizot's ‘*Essais sur l'Histoire de France*’ (1st Essay, pp. 1–44), [also in ‘*Hist. of Civilization*,’ v. 2, lect. 2] did not every where perish with the Empire; it kept its footing in a great number of towns, especially in those of Southern Gaul.”—F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 19.

ALSO IN: Sir J. Stephen, *Lects. on the Hist. of France*, lect. 5.—See FRANCE: A. D. 1070–1125; also, CURIA, MUNICIPAL, and GUILDS OF FLANDERS.

**COMMUNE, The Flemish.** See GUILDS OF FLANDERS.

**COMMUNE OF PARIS, The Revolutionary, of 1792.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1792 (AUGUST).

The rebellion of the. See FRANCE: A. D. 1871 (MARCH—MAY).

**COMMUNE, The Russian.** See MIR.

**COMMUNE, The Swiss.** See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1848–1890.

**COMMUNEROS, The.** See STAIN: A. D. 1814–1827.

**COMNENIAN DYNASTY.**—The dynasty of Byzantine emperors founded, A. D. 1081, by Alexius Comnenos, and consisting of Alexius I., John II., Manuel I., Alexius II., and Andronicus I., who was murdered A. D. 1185. See CONSTANTINOPLE: A. D. 1081.

**COMPAGNACCI, The.** See FLORENCE: A. D. 1490–1498.

**COMPASS, Introduction of the Mariner's.**

—“It is perhaps impossible to ascertain the epoch when the polarity of the magnet was first known in Europe. The common opinion which ascribes its discovery to a citizen of Amalfi in the 14th century, is undoubtedly erroneous. Gulot de Provins, a French poet who lived about the year 1200, or, at the latest, under St. Louis, describes it in the most unequivocal language: James de Vitry, a bishop in Palestine, before the middle of the 13th century, and Guido Gninizzelli, an Italian poet of the same time, are equally explicit. The French, as well as Italians, claim the discovery as their own; but whether it were due to either of these nations, or rather learned from their intercourse with the Saracens, is not easily to be ascertained. . . . It is a singular circumstance, and only to be explained by the obstinacy with which men are apt to reject improvements, that the magnetic needle was not generally adopted in navigation till very long after the discovery of its properties, and even after their peculiar importance had been perceived. The writers of the 13th century, who mention the polarity of the needle, mention also its use in navigation; yet Capmany has found no distinct proof of its employment till 1403, and does not believe that it was frequently on board Mediterranean ships at the latter part of the preceding age.”—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 9, pt. 2, *with note*.—“Both Chaucer, the English, and Barbour, the Scottish, poet, allude familiarly to the compass in the latter part of the 14th century.”—G. L. Craik, *Hist. of British Commerce*, v. 1, p. 138:—“We have no certain information of the directive tendency of the natural magnet being known earlier than the middle or end of the 11th century (in Europe, of course). . . . That it was known at this date and its practical value recognized, is shown by a passage from an Icelandic historian, quoted by Hanstien in his treatise of Terrestrial Magnetism. In this extract an expedition from Norway to Iceland in the year 868 is described; and it is stated that three ravens were taken as guides, for, adds the historian, ‘in those times seamen had no loadstone in the northern countries.’ This history was written about the year A. D. 1068, and the allusion I have quoted obviously shows that the author was aware of natural magnets having been employed as a compass. At the same time it fixes a limit of the discovery in northern countries. We find no mention of artificial magnets being so employed till about a

century later."—Sir W. Thompson, *quoted by R. F. Burton in Ultima Thule*, v. 1, p. 312.

**COMPIÈGNE**, Capture of the Maid of Orleans (1430). See FRANCE: A. D. 1429-1431.

**COMPOUND HOUSEHOLDER**, The.

See ENGLAND: A. D. 1863-1868.

**COMPROMISE**, The Crittenden. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1860 (DECEMBER).

**COMPROMISE**, The Flemish, of 1565. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1562-1566.

**COMPROMISE**, The Missouri. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1818-1821.

**COMPROMISE MEASURES OF 1850**, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1850.

**COMPROMISE TARIFF OF 1833**, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1828-1833.

**COMPURGATION**.—Among the Teutonic and other peoples, in early times, one accused of a crime might clear himself by his own oath, supported by the oaths of certain compurgators, who bore witness to his trustworthiness. See WAGER OF LAW.

**COMSTOCK LODGE**, Discovery of the. See NEVADA: A. D. 1848-1864.

**COMUM**, Battle of (B. C. 196). See ROME: B. C. 295-191.

**CONCIONES**, The Roman. See CONTIONES, THE.

**CONCON**, Battle of (1892). See CHILE: A. D. 1885-1891.

**CONCORD**.—Beginning of the War of the American Revolution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775 (APRIL).

**CONCORDAT OF BOLOGNA**, The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1515-1518.

**CONCORDAT OF NAPOLEON**, The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1801-1804.

**CONCORDAT OF 1813**, The. See PAPACY: A. D. 1808-1814.

**CONDÉ**, The first Prince Louis de, and the French wars of religion. See FRANCE: A. D. 1560-1563, and 1563-1570.

**CONDÉ**, The Second Prince Louis de (called The Great).—Campaigns in the Thirty Years War, and the war with Spain. See FRANCE: A. D. 1642-1643; 1643; GERMANY: A. D. 1640-1645; 1643-1644. . . . In the wars of the Fronde. See FRANCE: A. D. 1647-1648; 1649; 1650-1651; 1651-1653. . . . Campaigns against France in the service of Spain. See FRANCE: A. D. 1653-1656, and 1655-1658. . . . Last campaigns. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1672-1674, and 1674-1678.

**CONDÉ**, The House of. See BOURBON, THE HOUSE OF.

**CONDÉ**: A. D. 1793.—Siege and capture by the Austrians. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (JULY—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1794.—Recovery by the French. See FRANCE: A. D. 1794 (MARCH—JULY).

**CONDORE, OR KONDUR**, Battle of (1758). See INDIA: A. D. 1758-1761.

**CONDOTTIERE**.—In the general meaning of the word, a conductor or leader; applied specially, in Italian history, to the professional military leaders of the 13th and 14th centuries, who made a business of war very much as a modern contractor makes a business of railroad construction, and who were open to engagement, with the troops at their command, by any prince, or any free city whose offers were satisfactory.

**CONDRUSI**, The. See BELGIE.

**CONESTOGAS**, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SUSQUEHANNA.

**CONFEDERACY OF DELOS, OR THE DELIAN**. See GREECE: B. C. 478-477, and ATHENS: B. C. 466-454, and after.

**CONFEDERATE STATES OF AM.**—Constitution and organization of the government. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (FEBRUARY).

**CONFEDERATION**, Articles of (U. S. of Am.). See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777-1781.

**CONFEDERATION**, Australian. See AUSTRALIA: A. D. 1885-1892.

**CONFEDERATION**, The Germanic, of 1814. See GERMANY: A. D. 1814-1820. . . . Of 1870. See GERMANY: A. D. 1870 (SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER).

**CONFEDERATION**, The North German. See GERMANY: A. D. 1866.

**CONFEDERATION**, The Swiss. See SWITZERLAND.

**CONFEDERATION OF THE BRITISH AMERICAN PROVINCES**. See CANADA: A. D. 1867.

**CONFEDERATION OF THE RHINE**, The. See GERMANY: A. D. 1805-1806; 1806 (JANUARY—AUGUST); and 1813 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER); also, FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (JANUARY—MARCH).

**CONFESSION OF AUGSBURG**. See PAPACY: A. D. 1530-1531.

**CONFLANS**, Treaty of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1461-1468.

**CONFUCIANISM**. See CHINA: THE RELIGIONS.

**CONGO FREE STATE**, The Founding of the.—“Since Leopold II.’s accession to the throne [of Belgium], his great object has been to secure colonial possessions to Belgium for her excess of population and production. To this end he founded, in October, 1876, with the aid of eminent African explorers, the International African Association. Its object was to form committees in several countries, with a view to the collection of funds, and to the establishment of a chain of stations across Africa, passing by Lake Tanganyika, to assist future explorers. Accordingly committees were formed, whose presidents were as follows: in England, the Prince of Wales; in Germany the Crown Prince; in Italy the King’s brother; in France, M. de Lesseps; and in Belgium, King Leopold. Sums of money were subscribed, and stations were opened from Bagomoyo (just south of Zanzibar) to Lake Tanganyika; and when toward the close of 1877, Stanley reappeared on the Atlantic coast and revealed the immense length of the marvelous Congo River, King Leopold at once turned his attention in that direction. That he might not put himself forward prematurely, he acted under cover of an association and a committee of exploration, which were in reality formed and entirely supported by the King’s energy and by the large sums of money that he lavished upon them. Through this association King Leopold maintained Stanley for five years on the Congo. During this time a road was made from the coast to Stanley Pool, where the navigable portion of the Upper Congo commences; and thus was formed the basis of the future empire. During this period Stanley signed no less than four thousand treaties or

concessions of territory, on which upward of two thousand chiefs had placed their marks in sign of adhesion. At a cost of many months of transportation, necessitating the employment of thousands of porters, light steamers were placed on the upper river which was explored as far as Stanley Falls. Its numerous tributaries also were followed up as far as the rapids that interrupt their courses. Many young Belgian officers and other adventurous explorers established themselves on the banks of the Congo and the adjoining river, the Kouillou, and founded a series of stations, each occupied by one or two Europeans and by a few soldiers from Zanzibar. In this way the country was insensibly taken possession of in the most pacific manner, without a struggle and with no bloodshed whatever; for the natives, who are of a very gentle disposition, offered no resistance. The Senate of the United States, which was called upon, in 1884, to give an opinion on the rights of the African Association, made a careful examination of the matter, and recognized the legality of the claims and title deeds submitted to them. A little later, in order to mark the formation of a state, the Congo Association adopted as its flag a gold star on a blue ground. A French lawyer, M. Deloume, in a very well-written pamphlet entitled 'Le Droit des Gens dans l'Afrique Equatoriale,' has proved that this proceeding was not only legitimate, but necessary. The embryo state, however, lacked one essential thing, namely, recognition by the civilized powers. It existed only as a private association, or, as a hostile publicist expressed it, as 'a state in shares, indulging in pretensions of sovereignty.' Great difficulties stood in the way of realizing this essential condition. Disputes, on the one hand with France and on the other with Portugal, appeared inevitable. . . . King Leopold did not lose heart. In 1882 he obtained from the French government an assurance that, while maintaining its rights to the north of Stanley Pool, it would give support to the International Association of the Congo. With Portugal it seemed very difficult to come to an understanding. . . . Prince Bismarck took part in the matter, and in the German Parliament praised highly the work of the African Association. In April, 1884, he proposed to France to come to an understanding, and to settle all difficulties by general agreement. From this proposition sprang the famous Berlin conference, the remarkable decisions of which we shall mention later. At the same time, before the conference opened, Germany signed an agreement with the International Association of the Congo, in which she agreed to recognize its flag as that of a state, in exchange for an assurance that her trade should be free, and that German subjects should enjoy all the privileges of the most favored nations. Similar agreements were entered upon with nearly all the other countries of the globe. The delegates of the Association were accepted at the conference on the same footing as those of the different states that were represented there, and on February 26, the day on which the act was signed, Bismarck expressed himself as follows: 'The new State of the Congo is destined to be one of the chief safe-guards of the work we have in view, and I sincerely trust that its development will fulfill the noble aspirations of its august founder.' Thus the Congo Inter-

national Association, hitherto only a private enterprise, seemed now to be recognized as a sovereign state, without having, however, as yet assumed the title. But where were the limits of its territory. . . . Thanks to the interference of France, after prolonged negotiations an understanding was arrived at on February 15, 1885, by which both parties were satisfied. They agreed that Portugal should take possession of the southern bank of the Congo, up to its junction with the little stream Uango, above Nokki, and also of the district of Kubinda forming a wedge that extends into the French territory on the Atlantic Ocean. The International Congo Association—for such was still its title—was to have access to the sea by a strip of land extending from Manyanga (west of Leopoldville) to the ocean, north of Banana, and comprising in addition to this port, Boma and the important station of Vivi. These treaties granted the association 931,285 square miles of territory, that is to say, a domain eighty times the size of Belgium, with more than 7,500 miles of navigable rivers. The limits fixed were, on the west, the Kuango, an important tributary of the Congo; on the south, the sources of the Zambesi; on the east, the Lakes Bangweolo, Moero, and Tanganyika, and a line passing through Lake Albert Edward to the river Ouelle; on the north, a line following the fourth degree of latitude to the Mobangi River on the French frontier. The whole forms one eleventh part of the African continent. The association became transformed into a state in August 1885, when King Leopold, with the authorization of the Belgian Chambers, notified the powers that he should assume the title of Sovereign of the Independent State of the Congo, the union of which with Belgium was to be exclusively personal. The Congo is, therefore, not a Belgian colony, but nevertheless the Belgian Chambers have recently given valuable assistance to the King's work; first, in taking, on July 26, 1889, 10,000,000 francs' worth of shares in the railway which is to connect the seaport of Matadi with the river-port of Leopoldville, on Stanley Pool, and secondly by granting a loan of 25,000,000 francs to the Independent State on August 4, 1890. The King, in a will laid before Parliament, bequeaths all his African possessions to the Belgian nation, authorizing the country to take possession of them after a lapse of ten years."—E. de Laveleye, *The Division of Africa (The Forum, Jan., 1891)*.

Also in: H. M. Stanley, *The Congo, and the Founding of its Free State*.

**CONGREGATION OF THE ORATORY, The.**—"Philip of Neri, a young Florentine of good birth (1515-1595; canonised 1622) . . . In 1548 instituted at Rome the Society of the Holy Trinity, to minister to the wants of the pilgrims at Rome. But the operations of his mission gradually extended till they embraced the spiritual welfare of the Roman population at large, and the reformation of the Roman clergy in particular. No figure is more serene and more sympathetic to us in the history of the Catholic reaction than that of this latter-day 'apostle of Rome.' From his association, which followed the rule of St. Augustine, sprang in 1575 the Congregation of the Oratory at Rome, famous as the seminary of much that is most admirable in the labours of the Catholic clergy."—A. W. Ward, *The Counter-Reformation*, p. 30.

—"In the year 1766, there were above a hundred Congregations of the Oratory of S. Phillip in Europe and the East Indies; but since the revolutions of the last seventy years many of these have ceased to exist, while, on the contrary, within the last twelve years two have been established in England."—Mrs. Hoop, *Life of S. Phillip Neri*, ch. 24.

ALSO IN: H. L. S. Lear, *Priently Life in France*, ch. 4.

**CONGREGATIONALISM.** See INDEPENDENTS.

**CONGRESS, Colonial, at Albany.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1754.

**CONGRESS, Continental, The First.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1774 (SEPTEMBER), and (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER). . . . **The Second.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775 (MAY—AUGUST).

**CONGRESS, The First American.** See UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: A. D. 1690.

**CONGRESS, The Pan-American.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1889-1890.

**CONGRESS, The Stamp Act.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1765.

**CONGRESS OF AIX-LA-CHAPELLE, The.** See AIX-LA-CHAPELLE, THE CONGRESS AND TREATY.

**CONGRESS OF BERLIN.** See TURKS: A. D. 1878.

**CONGRESS OF PANAMA.** See COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1826.

**CONGRESS OF PARIS.** See RUSSIA: A. D. 1854-1856, and DECLARATION OF PARIS.

**CONGRESS OF RASTADT, The.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1799 (APRIL—SEPTEMBER).

**CONGRESS OF VERONA, The.** See VERONA, THE CONGRESS OF.

**CONGRESS OF VIENNA.** See VIENNA, CONGRESS OF.

**CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.**—"The Constitution created Congress and conferred upon it powers of legislation for national purposes, but made no provision as to the method by which these powers should be exercised. In consequence Congress has itself developed a method of transacting its business by means of committees. The Federal Legislature consists of two Houses—the Senate, or Upper and less numerous branch, and the House of Representatives, or the Lower and more numerous popular branch. The Senate is composed of two members from each State elected by the State legislatures for a term of six years, one third of whom retire every two years. The presiding officer is the Vice-President. Early in each session the Senate chooses a President pro tempore, so as to provide for any absence of the Vice-President, whether caused by death, sickness, or for other reasons. The House of Representatives is at present [1891] composed of 332 members and four delegates from the Territories. These delegates, however, have no vote, though they may speak. The House is presided over by a Speaker, elected at the beginning of each [Congress]. A quorum for business is, in either House, a majority. Congress meets every year in the beginning of December. Each Congress lasts two years and holds two sessions—a long and a short session. The long session lasts from December to midsummer [or until the two Houses agree upon an adjournment]. The short session

lasts from December, when Congress meets again, until the 4th of March. The term of office then expires for all the members of the House and for one-third of the Senators. The long session ends in even years (1880 and 1882, etc.), and the short session in odd years (1881 and 1883). Extra sessions may be called by the President for urgent business. In the early part of the November preceding the end of the short session of Congress occurs the election of Representatives. Congressmen then elected do not take their seats until thirteen months later, that is, at the re-assembling of Congress in December of the year following, unless an extra session is called. The Senate frequently holds secret, or, as they are called, executive sessions, for the consideration of treaties and nominations of the President, in which the House of Representatives has no voice. It is then said to sit with closed doors. An immense amount of business must necessarily be transacted by a Congress that legislates for nearly 63,000,000 of people. . . . Lack of time, of course, prevents a consideration of each bill separately by the whole legislature. To provide a means by which each subject may receive investigation and consideration, a plan is used by which the members of both branches of Congress are divided into committees. Each committee busies itself with a certain class of business, and bills when introduced are referred to this or that committee for consideration, according to the subjects to which the bills relate. . . . The Senate is now divided between 50 and 60 committees, but the number varies from session to session. . . . The House of Representatives is organized into 60 committees [appointed by the Speaker], ranging, in their number of members, from thirteen down. . . . The Committee of Ways and Means, which regulates customs duties and excise taxes, is by far the most important. . . . Congress ordinarily assembles at noon and remains in session until 4 or 5 P. M., though towards the end of the term it frequently remains in session until late in the night. . . . There is still one feature of Congressional government which needs explanation, and that is the caucus. A caucus is the meeting of the members of one party in private, for the discussion of the attitude and line of policy which members of that party are to take on questions which are expected to arise in the legislative halls. Thus, in Senate caucus, is decided who shall be members of the various committees. In these meetings is frequently discussed whether or not the whole party shall vote for or against this or that important bill, and thus its fate is decided before it has even come up for debate in Congress."—W. W. and W. F. Willoughby, *Govt. and Administration of the U. S.* (Johns Hopkins Univ. Studies, series i., nos. 1-2), ch. 9.

ALSO IN: W. Wilson, *Congressional Government*, ch. 2-4.—J. Bryce, *The Am. Commonwealth*, pt. 1, ch. 10-21 (s. 1).—A. L. Dawes, *How we are Governed*, ch. 2.—*The Federalist*, nos. 51-65.—J. Story, *Commentaries on the Const. of the U. S.*, bk. 3, ch. 8-31 (s. 2-3).

**CONI.—Sieges (1744 and 1799).** See ITALY: A. D. 1744; and FRANCE: A. D. 1799 (AUGUST—DECEMBER).

**CONIBO, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ANDESIANS.

**CONNAUGHT, Transplantation of the Irish people into.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1653.



**CONNECTICUT: The River and the Name.**—"The first discoveries made of this part of New England were of its principal river and the fine meadows lying upon its bank. Whether the Dutch at New Netherlands, or the people of New Plymouth, were the first discoverers of the river is not certain. Both the English and the Dutch claimed to be the first discoverers, and both purchased and made a settlement of the lands upon it nearly at the same time. . . . From this fine river, which the Indians call Quonehtacut, or Connecticut, (in English the long river) the colony originally took its name."—H. Trumbull, *His. of Conn.*, ch. 2.—According to Dutch accounts, the river was entered by Adriaen Block, ascended to latitude 41° 48', and named Fresh River, in 1614. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1610-1614.

**The Aboriginal inhabitants.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**A. D. 1631.**—The grant to Lord Say and Sele, and others.—In 1631, the Earl of Warwick granted to Lord Say and Sele, Lord Brooke, Sir Richard Saltonstall, and others, "the territory between Narragansett River and southwest towards New York for 120 miles and west to the Pacific Ocean, or, according to the words of President Clap of Yale College, 'from Point Judith to New York, and from thence a west line to the South Sea, and if we take Narragansett River in its whole length the tract will extend as far north as Worcester. It comprehends the whole of the colony of Connecticut and more. This was called the old patent of Connecticut, and had been granted the previous year, 1630, by the Council of Plymouth [or Council for New England] to the Earl of Warwick. Yet before the English had planted settlements in Connecticut the Dutch had purchased of the Pequots land where Hartford now stands and erected a small trading fort called 'The House of Good Hope.'"—C. W. Bowen, *Boundary Disputes of Conn.*, p. 15.—In 1635, four years after the Connecticut grant, said to have been derived originally from the Council for New England, in 1630, had been transferred by the Earl of Warwick to Lord Say and Sele and others, the Council made an attempt, in connivance with the English court, to nullify all its grants, to regain possession of the territory of New England and to parcel it out by lot among its own members. In this attempted parcelling, which proved ineffectual, Connecticut fell to the lot of the Earl of Carlisle, the Duke of Lennox, and the Duke of Hamilton. Modern investigation seems to have found the alleged grant from the Council of Plymouth, or Council for New England, to the Earl of Warwick, in 1630, to be mythical. "No one has ever seen it, or has heard of any one who claims to have seen it. It is not mentioned even in the grant from Warwick to the Say and Sele patentees in 1631. . . . The deed is a mere quit-claim, which warrants nothing and does not even assert title to the soil transferred. . . . Why the Warwick transaction took this peculiar shape, why Warwick transferred, without showing title, a territory which the original owners granted anew to other patentees in 1635, are questions which are beyond conjecture."—A. Johnston, *Connecticut*, ch. 2.—See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1635.

**A. D. 1634-1637.**—The pioneer settlements.—"In October, 1634, some men of Plymouth, led by William Holmes, sailed up the Connecti-

cut river, and, after bandying threats with a party of Dutch who had built a rude fort on the site of Hartford, passed on and fortified themselves on the site of Windsor. Next year Governor Van Twiller sent a company of seventy men to drive away these intruders, but after reconnoitering the situation the Dutchmen thought it best not to make an attack. Their little stronghold at Hartford remained unmolested by the English, and, in order to secure the communication between this advanced outpost and New Amsterdam, Van Twiller decided to build another fort at the mouth of the river, but this time the English were beforehand. Rumours of Dutch designs may have reached the ears of Lord Say and Sele and Lord Brooke—'fanatic Brooke, as Scott calls him in 'Marmion'—who had obtained from the Council for New England a grant of territory on the shores of the Sound. These noblemen chose as their agent the younger John Winthrop, son of the Massachusetts governor, and this new-comer arrived upon the scene just in time to drive away Van Twiller's vessel and build an English fort which in honour of his two patrons he called 'Say-Brooke.' Had it not been for seeds of discontent already sown in Massachusetts, the English hold upon the Connecticut valley might perhaps have been for a few years confined to these two military outposts at Windsor and Saybrooke. But there were people in Massachusetts who did not look with favour upon the aristocratic and theocratic features of its polity. The provision that none but church-members should vote or hold office was by no means unanimously approved. . . . Cotton declared that democracy was no fit government either for church or for commonwealth, and the majority of the ministers agreed with him. Chief among those who did not was the learned and eloquent Thomas Hooker, pastor of the church at Newtown. . . . There were many in Newtown who took Hooker's view of the matter; and there, as also in Watertown and Dorchester, which in 1633 took the initiative in framing town governments with selectmen, a strong disposition was shown to evade the restrictions upon the suffrage. While such things were talked about, in the summer of 1633, the adventurous John Oldham was making his way through the forest and over the mountains into the Connecticut valley, and when he returned to the coast his glowing accounts set some people to thinking. Two years afterward, a few pioneers from Dorchester pushed through the wilderness as far as the Plymouth men's fort at Windsor, while a party from Watertown went farther and came to a halt upon the site of Wethersfield. A larger party, bringing cattle and such goods as they could carry, set out in the autumn and succeeded in reaching Windsor. . . . In the next June, 1636, the Newtown congregation, a hundred or more in number, led by their sturdy pastor, and bringing with them 160 head of cattle, made the pilgrimage to the Connecticut valley. Women and children took part in this pleasant summer journey; Mrs. Hooker, the pastor's wife, being too ill to walk, was carried on a litter. Thus, in the memorable year in which our great university was born, did Cambridge become, in the true Greek sense of a much-abused word, the metropolis or 'mother town' of Hartford. The migration at once became strong in numbers. During the past

twelvemonth a score of ships had brought from England to Massachusetts more than 3,000 souls, and so great an accession made further movement easy. Hooker's pilgrims were soon followed by the Dorchester and Watertown congregations, and by the next May 800 people were living in Windsor, Hartford, and Wethersfield. As we read of these movements, not of individuals, but of organic communities, united in allegiance to a church and its pastor, and fervid with the instinct of self-government, we seem to see Greek history renewed, but with centuries of added political training. For one year a board of commissioners from Massachusetts governed the new towns, but at the end of that time the towns chose representatives and held a General Court at Hartford, and thus the separate existence of Connecticut was begun. As for Springfield, which was settled about the same time by a party from Roxbury, it remained for some years doubtful to which state it belonged."—J. Fiske, *The Beginnings of New Eng.*, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: J. G. Palfrey, *Hist. of N. Eng.*, v. 1, ch. 11.—G. L. Walker, *Hist. of the First Church in Hartford*, ch. 4-5.—M. A. Green, *Springfield, 1636-1886*, ch. 1.

**A. D. 1636-1639.**—**The constitutional evolution.**—"It must be noted that [the] Newtown, Watertown, and Dorchester migrations had not been altogether a simple transfer of individual settlers from one colony to another. In each of these migrations a part of the people was left behind, so that the Massachusetts towns did not cease to exist. And yet each of them brought its Massachusetts magistrates, its ministers (except Watertown), and all the political and ecclesiastical machinery of the town; and at least one of them (Dorchester) had hardly changed its structure since its members first organized in 1630 at Dorchester in England. The first settlement of Connecticut was thus the migration of three distinct and individual town organizations out of the jurisdiction of Massachusetts and into absolute freedom. It was the Massachusetts town system set loose in the wilderness. At first the three towns retained even their Massachusetts names; and it was not until the eighth court meeting, February 21 1636 (7), that it was decided that 'the plantacon nowe called Newtowne shalbe called & named by the name of Harteforde Towne, likewise the plantacon nowe called Watertowne shalbe called & named Wythersfeld,' and 'the plantacon called Dorchester shalbe called Windsor.' On the same day the boundaries between the three towns were 'agreed' upon, and thus the germ of the future State was the agreement and union of the three towns. Accordingly, the subsequent court meeting at Hartford, May 1, 1637, for the first time took the name of the 'Genrall Corte,' and was composed, in addition to the town magistrates who had previously held it, of 'committees' of three from each town. So simply and naturally did the migrated town system evolve, in this binal assembly, the seminal principle of the Senate and House of Representatives of the future State of Connecticut. The Assembly further showed its consciousness of separate existence by declaring 'an offensive warr ag' the Pequoit,' assigning the proportions of its miniature army and supplies to each town, and appointing a commander. . . . So complete are the features of State-hood, that we may fairly assign May 1, 1637, as the proper birthday of

Connecticut. No king, no Congress, presided over the birth: its seed was in the towns. January 14, 1638 (9), the little Commonwealth formed the first American Constitution at Hartford. So far as its provisions are concerned, the King, the Parliament, the Plymouth Council, the Warwick grant, the Say and Sele grant, might as well have been non-existent: not one of them is mentioned. . . . This constitution was not only the earliest but the longest in continuance of American documents of the kind, unless we except the Rhode Island charter. It was not essentially altered by the charter of 1662, which was practically a royal confirmation of it; and it was not until 1818 that the charter, that is the constitution of 1639, was superseded by the present constitution. Connecticut was absolutely a state in 1639 as in 1776."—A. Johnston, *The Genesis of a New Eng. State* (*Johns Hopkins Univ. Studies*, no. 11).—The following is the text of these "Fundamental Orders" adopted by the people dwelling on Connecticut River, January 14, 1638 (9), which formed the first of written constitutions: "FORASMUCH as it hath pleased the Almighty God by the wise disposition of his diuine p'uidence so to Order and dispose of things that we the Inhabitants and Residents of Windsor, Harteford and Wethersfield are now colohabiting and dwelling in and vpon the River of Conectecotte and the Lands thereunto adioyning; And well knowing where a people are gathered together the word of God requires that to manytayne the peace and vnion of such a people there should be an orderly and decent Government established according to God, to order and dispose of the affayres of the people at all seasons as occasion shall require; doe therefore assotiate and conioyne our selues to be as one Publike State or Comonwelth; and doe, for our selues and our Successors and such as shall be adioyned to vs att any tyme hereafter, enter into Combination and Confederation together, to manytayne and p'serue the liberty and purity of the gospell of our Lord Jesus w<sup>ch</sup> we now p'fesse, as also the discipline of the Churches, w<sup>ch</sup> according to the truth of the said gospell is now practised amongst vs; As also in o' Cinell Affaires to be guided and governed according to such Lawes, Rules, Orders and decrees as shall be made, ordered & decreed, as followeth:—  
1. It is Ordered, sentenced and decreed, that there shall be yerely two generall Assemblies or Courts, the one on the second thursday in April, the other the second thursday in September following; the first shall be called the Courte of Election, wherein shall be yerely Chosen fro tyme to tyme soe many Magestrats and other publike Officers as shall be found requisite: Whereof one to be chosen Gouvernour for the yeare ensueing and vntill another be chosen, and noe other Magistrate to be chosen for more than one yeare; p'uided alwaynes there be sixe chosen besides the Gouvernour; w<sup>ch</sup> being chosen and sworne according to an Oath recorded for that purpose shall haue power to administer iustice according to the Lawes here established, and for want thereof according to the rule of the word of God; w<sup>ch</sup> choise shall be made by all that are admitted freemen and haue taken the Oath of Fidellity, and doe colohabite w<sup>in</sup> this Jurisdiction, (hauling beene admitted Inhabitants by the maior p't of the Towne wherein they lye,) or the mayor p'te of such as shall be then p'sent. 2. It is Ordered,

sentenced and decreed, that the Election of the aforesaid Magestrats shall be on this manner: every p'son p'sent and qualified for choyse shall bring in (to the p'sons deputed to receave thē) one single pap' w<sup>th</sup> the name of him written in yt whom he desires to haue Governour, and he that hath the greatest nūber of papers shall be Governour for that yeare. And the rest of the Magestrats or publike Officers to be chosen in this manner: The Secretary for the tyme being shall first read the names of all that are to be put to choise and then shall severally nominate them distinctly, and every one that would haue the p'son nominated to be chosen shall bring in one single paper written vpon, and he that would not haue him chosen shall bring in a blanke: and every one that hath more written papers then blanks shall be a Magistrat for that yeare; w<sup>th</sup> papers shal be receaved and told by one or more that shall be then chosen by the court and sworne to be faythfull therein: but in case there should not be sixe chosen as aforesaid, besids the Governour, out of those w<sup>th</sup> are nominated, then he or they w<sup>th</sup> haue the most written pap's shall be a Magestrato or Magestrats for the ensuing yeare, to make vp the foresaid nūber. 3. It is Ordered, sentenced and decreed, that the Secretary shall not nominate any p'son, nor shall any p'son be chosen newly into the Magistracy w<sup>th</sup> was not p'pounded in some Generall Courte before, to be nominated the next Election; and to that end yt shall be lawfull for ech of the Townes aforesaid by their deputies to nominate any two wh<sup>ch</sup> they conceave fite to be put to election; and the Courte may ad<sup>d</sup> so many more as they iudge requisitt. 4. It is Ordered, sentenced and decreed that noe p'son be chosen Governour aboue once in two yeares, and that the Governour be always a mēber of some approved congregation, and formerly of the Magistracy w<sup>th</sup> in this Jurisdiction; and all the Magestrats Freemen of this Comonwealth; and that no Magestrato or other publike officer shall execute any p'te of his or their Office before they are severally sworne, w<sup>th</sup> shall be done in the face of the Courte if they be p'sent, and in case of absence by some deputed for that purpose. 5. It is Ordered, sentenced and decreed, that to the aforesaid Courte of Election the seuerall Townes shall send their deputies, and when the Elections ended they may p'ceed in any publike sea: as at other Courts. Also the other Generall Courte in September shall be for makinge of lawes, and any other publike occasion, w<sup>th</sup> concerns the good of the Comonwealth. 6. It is Ordered, sentenced and decreed, that the Gou'nor shall, ether by himselfe or by the secretary, send out summons to the Constables of eu' Towne for the caulcing of these two standing Courts, on month at lest before their seuerall tymes: And also if the Gou'nor and the greatest p'te of the Magestrats see cause vpon any speciall occasion to call a generall Courte, they may giue order to the secretary soe to doe w<sup>th</sup> in fowerteene dayes warning; and if vrgent necessity so require, vpon a shorter notice, giueing sufficient grownds for yt to the deputies when they meete, or els be questioned for the same; And if the Gou'nor and Mayor p'te of Magestrats shall ether neglect or refuse to call the two Generall standing Courts or ether of thē, as also at other tymes when the occasions of the Comonwealth require, the Freemen thereof, or the Mayor p'te of them, shall petition to them soe to doe: if

then yt be ether denied or neglected the said Freemen or the Mayor p'te of them shall haue power to giue order to the Constables of the seuerall Townes to doe the same, and so may meete together, and chuse to themselves a Moderator, and may p'ceed to do any Acte of power, w<sup>th</sup> any other Generall Courte may. 7. It is Ordered, sentenced and decreed that after there are warrants giuen out for any of the said Generall Courts, the Constable or Constables of ech Towne shall forthw<sup>th</sup> give notice distinctly to the inhabitants of the same, in some Publike Assembly or by goeing or sending frō howse to howse, that at a place and tyme by him or them lymited and sett, they meet and assemble thē selues togeth<sup>r</sup> to elect and chuse certen deputies to be att the Generall Courte then following to agitate the afayres of the comonwealth; w<sup>th</sup> said Deputies shall be chosen by all that are admitted Inhabitants in the seuerall Townes and haue taken the oath of fidelity; p'uided that non be chosen a Deputy for any Generall Courte w<sup>th</sup> is not a Freeman of this Comonwealth. The foresaid deputies shall be chosen in manner following: every p'son that is p'sent and qualified as before exp'ssed, shall bring the names of such, written in seuerall papers, as they desire to haue chosen for that Imployment, and these 3 or 4, more or lesse, being the nūber agreed on to be chosen for that tyme, that haue greatest nūber of papers written for thē shall be deputies for that Courte; whose names shall be endorsed on the backe side of the warrant and returned into the Courte, w<sup>th</sup> the Constable or Constables hand vnto the same. 8. It is Ordered, sentenced and decreed, that Wyndsor, Hartford and Wethersfield shall haue power, ech Towne, to send fower of their freemen as deputies to every Generall Courte; and whatsoever other Townes shall be hereafter added to this Jurisdiction, they shall send so many deputies as the Courte shall iudge meete, a reasonable p'portion to the nūber of Freemen that are in the said Townes being to be attended therein; w<sup>th</sup> deputies shall haue the power of the whole Towne to giue their voats and allowance to all such lawes and orders as may be for the publike good, and unto w<sup>th</sup> the said Townes are to be bownd. 9. It is ordered and decreed, that the deputies thus chosen shall haue power and liberty to appoynt a tyme and a place of meeting together before any Generall Courte to advise and consult of all such things as may concerne the good of the publike, as also to examine their owne Elections, whether according to the order, and if they or the gretest p'te of them find any election to be illegal they may se and such for p'sent frō their meeting, and returne the same and their reasons to the Courte; and if yt proue true, the Courte may fyne the p'ty or p'tyes so intruding and the Towne, if they see cause, and giue out a warrant to goe to a newe election in a legall way, either in p'te or in whole. Also the said deputies shall haue power to fyne any that shall be disorderly at their meetings, or fo not coming in due tyme or place according to appoyntment; and they may returne the said fynes into the Courte if yt be refused to be paid, and the treasurer to take notice of yt, and to estrecte or levy the same as he doth other fynes. 10. It is Ordered, sentenced and decreed, that every Generall Courte except such as through neglecte of the Gou'nor and the greatest p'te of Magestrats the Freemen themselves doe call, shall consist of

the Governour, or some one chosen to moderate the Court, and 4 other Magestrats at lest, w<sup>th</sup> the mayor p<sup>te</sup> of the deputies of the severall Townes legally chosen; and in case the Freemen or mayor p<sup>te</sup> of thē, through neglect or refusall of the Governour and mayor p<sup>te</sup> of the magestrats, shall call a Courte, y<sup>e</sup> shall consist of the mayor p<sup>te</sup> of Freemen that are p<sup>sent</sup> or their deputies, w<sup>th</sup> a Moderator chosen by thē: In w<sup>th</sup> said General Courts shall consist the supreme power of the Comonwelth, and they only shall have power to make laws or repeale thē, to graunt leuyes, to admitt of Freemen, dispose of lands vndisposed of, to severall Townes or p<sup>sons</sup>, and also shall have power to call either Courte or Magistrate or any other p<sup>son</sup> whatsoever into question for any misdemeanour, and may for just causes displace or deale otherwise according to the nature of the offence; and also may deale in any other matter that concerns the good of this comon welth, excepte election of Magestrats, w<sup>th</sup> shall be done by the whole body of Freemen. In w<sup>th</sup> Courte the Governour or Moderator shall have power to order the Courte to glue liberty of spech, and silence vnreasonable and disorderly speakings, to put all things to voate, and in case the voate be equal to haue the casting voice. But non of these Courts shall be adioined or dissolved w<sup>th</sup>out the consent of the maior p<sup>te</sup> of the Court. 11. It is ordered, sentenced and decreed, that when any General Courte vpon the occasions of the Comonwelth haue agreed vpon any sume or somes of m<sup>ny</sup> to be leuyed vpon the severall Townes w<sup>th</sup> in this Jurisdiction, that a Committee be chosen to sett out and appoynt w<sup>th</sup> shall be the p<sup>portion</sup> of euery Towne to pay of the said leuy, p<sup>vid</sup>ed the Comittees be made vp of an equal n<sup>uber</sup> out of each Tow<sup>ne</sup>. 14<sup>th</sup> January, 1638, the 11 Orders abovesaid are voted."—*Public Records of the Colony of Connecticut*, v. 1.

A. D. 1637.—The Pequot War. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1637.

A. D. 1638.—The planting of New Haven Colony.—"In the height of the Hutchinson controversy [see MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1636-1638], John Davenport, an eminent nonconformist minister from London, had arrived at Boston, and with him a wealthy company, led by two merchants, Theophilus Eaton and Edward Hopkins. Alarmed at the new opinions and religious agitations of which Massachusetts was the seat, notwithstanding very advantageous offers of settlement there, they preferred to establish a separate community of their own, to be forever free from the innovations of error and licentiousness. Eaton and others sent to explore the coast west of the Connecticut, selected a place for settlement near the head of a spacious bay at Quinnapick [or Quinnipiac], or, as the Dutch called it, Red Ifill, where they built a hut and spent the winter. They were joined in the spring [April, 1638] by the rest of their company, and Davenport preached his first sermon under the shade of a spreading oak. Presently they entered into what they called a 'plantation covenant,' and a communication being opened with the Indians, who were but few in that neighborhood, the lands of Quinnapick were purchased, except a small reservation on the east side of the bay, the Indians receiving a few presents and a promise of protection. A tract north of the bay, ten miles in one direction and thirteen in the other,

was purchased for ten coats, and the colonists proceeded to lay out in squares the ground-plan of a spacious city, to which they presently gave the name of New Haven."—R. Hildreth, *Hist. of the U. S.*, v. 1, ch. 9.—"They formed their political association by what they called a 'plantation covenant,' 'to distinguish it from a church covenant, which could not at that time be made.' In this compact they resolved, 'that, as in matters that concern the gathering and ordering of a church, so likewise in all public offices which concern civil order, as choice of magistrates and officers, making and repealing of laws; dividing allotments of inheritance, and all things of like nature,' they would 'be ordered by the rules which the Scriptures hold forth.' It had no external sanction, and comprehended no acknowledgment of the government of England. The company consisted mostly of Londoners, who at home had been engaged in trade. In proportion to their numbers, they were the richest of all the plantations. Like the settlers on Narragansett Bay, they had no other title to their lands than that which they obtained by purchase from the Indians."—J. G. Palfrey, *Hist. of New Eng.*, v. 1, ch. 13.

Also 18: C. H. Levermore, *The Republic of New Haven*, ch. 1.

A. D. 1639.—The Fundamental Agreement of New Haven.—"In June, 1639, the whole body of settlers [at Quinnapick, or New Haven] came together to frame a constitution. A tradition, seemingly well founded, says that the meeting was held in a large barn. According to the same account, the purpose for which they had met and the principles on which they ought to proceed were set forth by Davenport in a sermon. 'Wisdom hath builded her house, she hath hewn out seven pillars,' was the text. There is an obvious connection between this and the subsequent choice of seven of the chief men to lay the foundation of the constitution. . . . Davenport set forth the general system on which the constitution ought to be framed. The two main principles which he laid down were, that Scripture is a perfect and sufficient rule for the conduct of civil affairs, and that church-membership must be a condition of citizenship. In this the colonists were but imitating the example of Massachusetts. . . . After the sermon, five resolutions [followed by a sixth, constituting together what was called the 'fundamental agreement' of New Haven Colony], formally introducing Davenport's proposals, were carried. If a church already existed, it was not considered 'to form a basis for the state. Accordingly a fresh one was framed by a curiously complicated process. As a first step, twelve men were elected. These twelve were instructed, after a due interval for consideration, to choose seven out of their own number, who should serve as a nucleus for the church. At the same time an oath was taken by the settlers, which may be looked on as a sort of preliminary and provisional test of citizenship, pledging them to accept the principles laid down by Davenport. Sixty-three of the inhabitants took the oath, and their example was soon followed by fifty more. By October, four months after the original meeting, the seven formally established the new commonwealth. They granted the rights of a freeman to all who joined them, and who were recognized members either of the church at New Haven or

of any other approved church. The freemen thus chosen entered into an agreement to the same effect as the oath already taken. They then elected a Governor and four Magistrates, or, as they were for the present called, a Magistrate and four Deputies. . . . The functions of the Governor and Magistrates were not defined. Indeed, but one formal resolution was passed as to the constitution of the colony, namely, 'that the Word of God shall be the only rule attended unto in ordering the affairs of government.'—J. A. Doyle, *The English in Am.: The Puritan Colonies*, v. 1, ch. 6.—'Of all the New England colonies, New Haven was most purely a government by compact, by social contract. . . . The free planters . . . signed each their names to their voluntary compact, and ordered that 'all planters hereafter received in this plantation should submit to the said fundamental agreement, and testify the same by subscribing their names.' It is believed that this is the sole instance of the formation of an independent civil government by a general compact wherein all the parties to the agreement were legally required to be actual signers thereof. When this event occurred, John Locke was in his seventh year, and Rousseau was a century away.'—C. H. Levermore, *The Republic of New Haven*, p. 23.

**A. D. 1640-1655.**—The attempted New Haven colonization on the Delaware.—Fresh quarrels with the Dutch. See NEW JERSEY: A. D. 1640-1655.

**A. D. 1643.**—The confederation of the colonies.—The progress and state of New Haven and the River Colony. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1643.

**A. D. 1650.**—Settlement of boundaries with the Dutch of New Netherland. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1650.

**A. D. 1656-1661.**—The persecution of Quakers. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1656-1661.

**A. D. 1660-1663.**—The beginning of boundary conflicts with Rhode Island. See RHODE ISLAND: A. D. 1660-1663.

**A. D. 1660-1664.**—The protection of the regicides at New Haven.—'Against the colony of New Haven the king had a special grudge. Two of the regicide judges, who had sat in the tribunal which condemned his father, escaped to New England in 1660 and were well received there. They were gentlemen of high position. Edward Whalley was a cousin of Cromwell and Hampden. . . . The other regicide, William Goffe, as a major-general in Cromwell's army, had won such distinction that there were some who pointed to him as the proper person to succeed the Lord Protector on the death of the latter. He had married Whalley's daughter. Soon after the arrival of these gentlemen, a royal order for their arrest was sent to Boston. . . . The king's detectives hotly pursued them through the woodland paths of New England, and they would soon have been taken but for the aid they got from the people. Many are the stories of their hairbreadth escapes. Sometimes they took refuge in a cave on a mountain near New Haven, sometimes they hid in friendly cellars; and once, being hard put to it, they skulked under a wooden bridge, while their pursuers on horseback galloped by overhead. After lurking about New Haven and Milford for two or three years, on hearing of the

expected arrival of Colonel Nichols and his commission [the royal commission appointed to take possession of the American grant lately made by the king to his brother, the Duke of York], they sought a more secluded hiding place near Hadley, a village lately settled far up the Connecticut river, within the jurisdiction of Massachusetts. Here the avengers lost the trail, the pursuit was abandoned, and the weary regicides were presently forgotten. The people of New Haven had been especially zealous in shielding the fugitives. . . . The colony, moreover, did not officially recognize the restoration of Charles II. to the throne until that event had been commonly known in New England for more than a year. For these reasons, the wrath of the king was specially roused against New Haven.'—J. Flske, *The Beginnings of New Eng.*, pp. 192-194.

Also in: G. H. Hollister, *Hist. of Conn.*, v. 1, ch. 11.

**A. D. 1662-1664.**—The Royal Charter and annexation of New Haven to the River Colony.

—'The Restoration in England left the New Haven colony under a cloud in the favor of the new government; it had been tardy and ungracious in its proclamation of Charles II.; it had been especially remiss in searching for the regicide colonels, Goffe and Whalley; and any application for a charter would have come from New Haven with a very ill grace. Connecticut was under no such disabilities; and it had in its Governor, John Winthrop [the younger, son of the first governor of Massachusetts], a man well calculated to win favor with the new King. . . . In March, 1660, the General Court solemnly declared its loyalty to Charles II., sent the Governor to England to offer a loyal address to the King and ask him for a charter, and laid aside £500 for his expenses. Winthrop was successful, and the charter was granted April 20, 1662. The acquisition of the charter raised the Connecticut leaders to the seventh heaven of satisfaction. And well it might, for it was a grant of privileges with hardly a limitation. Practically the King had given Winthrop 'carte blanche,' and allowed him to frame the charter to suit himself. It incorporated the freemen of Connecticut as a 'body corporate and politique,' by the name of 'The Governor and Company of the English Colony of Connecticut in New England in America.' . . . The people were to have all the liberties and immunities of free and natural subjects of the King, as if born within the realm. It granted to the Governor and Company all that part of New England south of the Massachusetts line and west of the 'Norroganutt River commonly called Norroganutt Bay' to the South Sea, with the 'Islands thereunto adioyninge.' . . . It is difficult to see more than two points in which it [the charter] altered the constitution adopted by the towns in 1639. There were now to be two deputies from each town; and the boundaries of the Commonwealth now embraced the rival colony of New Haven. . . . New Haven did not submit without a struggle, for not only her pride of separate existence but the supremacy of her ecclesiastical system was at stake. For three years a succession of diplomatic notes passed between the General Court of Connecticut and 'our honored friends of New Haven, Milford, Branford, and Guilford.' . . . In October, 1664, the Connecticut General Court appointed the New Haven magistrates commissioners for

their towns, 'with magistraticall powers,' established the New Haven local officers in their places for the time, and declared oblivion for any past resistance to the laws. In December, Milford having already submitted, the remnant of the New Haven General Court, representing New Haven, Guilford, and Branford, held its last meeting and voted to submit, 'with a salvo jure of our former rights and claims, as a people who have not yet been heard in point of plea.' The next year the laws of New Haven were laid aside forever, and her towns sent deputies to the General Court at Hartford. . . . In 1791 the General Court . . . voted that its annual October session should thereafter be held at New Haven. This provision of a double capital was incorporated into the constitution of 1818, and continued until in 1873 Hartford was made sole capital."—A. Johnston, *The Genesis of a New Eng. State*, pp. 25-28.

ALSO IN: B. Trumbull, *Hist. of Conn.*, v. 1, ch. 12.—*Public Records of the Colony of Conn.*, 1665-78.

A. D. 1664.—**Royal grant to the Duke of York, in conflict with the charter.** See NEW YORK: A. D. 1664.

A. D. 1666.—**The New Haven migration to Newark, N. J.** See NEW JERSEY: A. D. 1664-1667.

A. D. 1674-1675.—**Long Island and the western half of the colony granted to the Duke of York.**—In 1674, after the momentary recovery of New York by the Dutch, and its re-surrender to the English, "the king issued a new patent for the province, in which he not only included Long Island, but the territory up to the Connecticut River, which had been assigned to Connecticut by the royal commissioners. The assignment of Long Island was regretted, but not resisted; and the island which is the natural sea-wall of Connecticut passed, by royal decree, to a province whose only natural claim to it was that it barely touched it at one corner. The revival of the duke's claim to a part of the mainland was a different matter, and every preparation was made for resistance. In July, 1675, just as King Phillip's war had broken out in Plymouth, hasty word was sent from the authorities at Hartford to Captain Thomas Bull at Saybrook that Governor Andros of New York was on his way through the Sound for the purpose, as he avowed, of aiding the people against the Indians. Of the two evils, Connecticut rather preferred the Indians. Bull was instructed to inform Andros, if he should call at Saybrook, that the colony had taken all precautions against the Indians, and to direct him to the actual scene of conflict, but not to permit the landing of any armed soldiers. 'And you are to keep the king's colors standing there, under his majesty's lieutenant, the governor of Connecticut; and if any other colors be set up there, you are not to suffer them to stand. . . . But you are in his majesty's name required to avoid striking the first blow; but if they begin, then you are to defend yourselves, and do your best to secure his majesty's interest and the peace of the whole colony of Connecticut in our possession.' Andros came and landed at Saybrook, but confined his proceedings to reading the duke's patent against the protest of Bull and the Connecticut representatives."—A. Johnston, *Connecticut*, ch. 12.—*Rept. of Regents of the*

*University on the Boundaries of the State of N. Y.*, p. 21.

ALSO IN: C. W. Bowen, *The Boundary Disputes of Conn.*, pp. 70-72.

A. D. 1674-1678.—**King Philip's War.** See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1674-1675; 1675; 1676-1678.

A. D. 1685-1687.—**The hostile king and the hidden charter.**—**Sir Edmund Andros in possession of the government.**—"During the latter years of the reign of Charles II. the king had become so reckless of his pledges and his faith that he did not scruple to set the dangerous example of violating the charters that had been granted by the crown. Owing to the friendship that the king entertained for Winthrop, we have seen that Connecticut was favored by him to a degree even after the death of that great man. But no sooner had Charles demised and the sceptre passed into the hands of his bigoted brother, King James II., than Connecticut was called upon to contend against her sovereign for liberties that had been affirmed to her by the most solemn muniments known to the law of England. The accession of James II. took place on the 6th day of February 1685, and such was his haste to violate the honor of the crown that, early in the summer of 1685, a quo warranto was issued against the governor and company of Connecticut, citing them to appear before the king, within eight days of St. Martin's, to show by what right and tenor they exercised certain powers and privileges." This was quickly followed by two other writs, conveyed to Hartford by Edward Randolph, the implacable enemy of the colonies. "The day of appearance named in them was passed long before the writs were served." Mr. Whiting was sent to England as the agent of the colony, to exert such influences as might be brought to bear against the plainly hostile and unscrupulous intentions of the king; but his errand was fruitless. "On the 28th of December another writ of quo warranto was served upon the governor and company of the colony. This writ bore date the 23d of October, and required the defendants to appear before the king 'within eight days of the purification of the Blessed Virgin.' . . . Of course, the day named was not known to the English law, and was therefore no day at all in legal contemplation." Already, the other New England colonies had been brought under a provisional general government, by commissioners, of whom Joseph Dudley was named president. President Dudley "addressed a letter to the governor and council, advising them to resign the charter into the king's hands. Should they do so, he undertook to use his influence in behalf of the colony. They did not deem it advisable to comply with the request. Indeed they had hardly time to do so before the old commission was broken up, and a new one granted, superseding Dudley and naming Sir Edmund Andros governor of New England. Sir Edmund arrived in Boston on the 19th of December, 1686, and the next day he published his commission and took the government into his hands. Scarcely had he established himself, when he sent a letter to the governor and company of Connecticut, acquainting them with his appointment, and informing them that he was commissioned by the king to receive their charter if they would give it up to him."—G. H. Hollister, *Hist. of Conn.*, v. 1, ch. 14.—On

receipt of the communication from Andros, "the General Court was at once convened, and by its direction a letter was addressed to the English Secretary of State, earnestly pleading for the preservation of the privileges that had been granted to them. For the first time they admitted the possibility that their petition might be denied, and in that case requested to be united to Massachusetts. This was construed by Sir Edmund as a virtual surrender; but as the days went by he saw that he had mistaken the spirit and purpose of the colony. Andros finally decided to go in person to Connecticut. He arrived at Hartford the last day of October, attended by a retinue of 60 officers and soldiers. The Assembly, then in session, received him with every outward mark of respect. After this formal exchange of courtesies, Sir Edmund publicly demanded the charter, and declared the colonial government dissolved. Tradition relates that Governor Treat, in calm but earnest words, remonstrated against this action. . . . The debate was continued until the shadows of the early autumnal evening had fallen. After candles were lighted, the governor and his council seemed to yield; and the box supposed to contain the charter was brought into the room, and placed upon the table. Suddenly the lights were extinguished. Quiet reigned in the room, and in the dense crowd outside the building. The candles were soon relighted; but the charter had disappeared, and after the most diligent search could not be found. The common tradition has been, that it was taken under cover of the darkness by Captain Joseph Wadsworth, and hidden by him in the hollow trunk of a venerable and noble oak tree standing near the entrance-gate of Governor Wyllys's mansion. The charter taken by Captain Wadsworth was probably the duplicate, and remained safely in his possession for several years. There is reason to believe that, some time before the coming of Andros to Hartford, the original charter had been carefully secreted, and the tradition of later times makes it probable that, while the duplicate charter that was taken from the table was hidden elsewhere, the original charter found a safe resting place in the heart of the tree that will always be remembered as The Charter Oak. This tree is said to have been preserved by the early settlers at the request of the Indians. 'It has been the guide of our ancestors for centuries,' they said, 'as to the time of planting our corn. When the leaves are the size of a mouse's ears, then is the time to put it in the ground.' The record of the Court briefly states that Andros, having been conducted to the governor's seat by the governor himself, declared that he had been commissioned by his Majesty to take on him the government of Connecticut. The commission having been read, he said that it was his Majesty's pleasure to make the late governor and Captain John Allyn members of his council. The secretary handed their common seal to Sir Edmund, and afterwards wrote these words inclosing the record: 'His Excellency, Sir Edmund Andros, Knight, Captain-General and Governor of his Majesty's Territory and Dominion in New England, by order from his Majesty, King of England, Scotland and Ireland, the 31st of October, 1687, took into his hands the government of this colony of Connecticut, it being by his Majesty annexed to the Massachusetts and

other colonies under his Excellency's government. Finis.' Andros soon disclosed a hand of steel beneath the velvet glove of plausible words and fair promises."—E. B. Sanford, *Hist. of Conn.*, ch. 16.

ALSO IN: J. G. Palfrey, *Hist. of New Eng.*, bk. 3, ch. 13 (v. 3).—See, also, NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1680, and MASSACHUSETTS: 1671-1686.

A. D. 1689-1697.—King William's War. See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1689-1690; and 1692-1697.

A. D. 1689-1701.—The reinstatement of the charter government.—"April, 1689, came at last. The people of Boston, at the first news of the English Revolution, clapped Andros into custody. May 9, the old Connecticut authorities quietly resumed their functions, and called the assembly together for the following month. William and Mary were proclaimed with great fervor. Not a word was said about the disappearance or reappearance of the charter; but the charter government was put into full effect again, as if Andros had never interrupted it. An address was sent to the king, asking that the charter be no further interfered with; but operations under it went on as before. No decided action was taken by the home government for some years, except that its appointment of the New York governor, Fletcher, to the command of the Connecticut militia, implied a decision that the Connecticut charter had been superseded. Late in 1693, Fitz John Winthrop was sent to England as agent to obtain a confirmation of the charter. He secured an emphatic legal opinion from Attorney General Somers, backed by those of Treby and Ward, that the charter was entirely valid, Treby's concurrent opinion taking this shape: 'I am of the same opinion, and, as this matter is stated, there is no ground of doubt.' The basis of the opinion was that the charter had been granted under the great seal; that it had not been surrendered under the common seal of the colony, nor had any judgment of record been entered against it; that its operation had merely been interfered with by overpowering force; that the charter therefore remained valid; and that the peaceable submission of the colony to Andros was merely an illegal suspension of lawful authority. In other words, the passive attitude of the colonial government had disarmed Andros so far as to stop the legal proceedings necessary to forfeit the charter, and their prompt action, at the critical moment, secured all that could be secured under the circumstances. William was willing enough to retain all possible fruit of James's tyranny, as he showed by enforcing the forfeiture of the Massachusetts charter; but the law in this case was too plain, and he ratified the lawyers' opinion in April, 1694. The charter had escaped its enemies at last, and its escape is a monument of one of the advantages of a real democracy. . . . Democracy had done more for Connecticut than class influence had done for Massachusetts."—A. Johnston, *Connecticut*, ch. 12.—"The decisions which established the rights of Connecticut included Rhode Island. These two commonwealths were the portion of the British empire distinguished above all others by the largest liberty. Each was a nearly perfect democracy under the shelter of a monarchy. . . . The crown, by reserving to itself the right of appeal, had still a method of interfering in the internal

affairs of the two republics. Both of them were included among the colonies in which the lords of the robe advised a complete restoration of the prerogatives of the crown. Both were named in the bill which, in April, 1701, was introduced into parliament for the abrogation of all American charters. The journals of the house of lords relate that Connecticut was publicly heard against the measure, and contended that its liberties were held by contract in return for services that had been performed; that the taking away of so many charters would destroy all confidence in royal promises, and would afford a precedent dangerous to all the chartered corporations of England. Yet the bill was read a second time, and its principle, as applied to colonies, was advocated by the mercantile interest and by 'great men' in England. The impending war with the French postponed the purpose till the accession of the house of Hanover."—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S. (Author's last revision)*, pt. 3, ch. 3 (p. 2).

**A. D. 1690.—The first Colonial Congress.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1690.

**A. D. 1702-1711.—Queen Anne's War.** See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1702-1710; and CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1711-1713.

**A. D. 1744-1748.—King George's War and the taking of Louisbourg.** See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1744; 1745; and 1745-1748.

**A. D. 1753-1799.—Western territorial claims.—Settlements in the Wyoming Valley.—Conflicts with the Penn colonists.** See PENNSYLVANIA: A. D. 1753-1799.

**A. D. 1754.—The Colonial Congress at Albany, and Franklin's plan of union.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1754.

**A. D. 1755-1760.—The French and Indian War, and conquest of Canada.** See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1750-1753; 1755; 1756; 1756-1757; 1758; 1759; 1760; NOVA SCOTIA: A. D. 1749-1755; 1755; OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1748-1754; 1754; 1755; CAPE BRETON ISLAND: A. D. 1758-1760.

**A. D. 1760-1765.—The question of taxation by Parliament.—The Sugar Act.—The Stamp Act.—The Stamp Act Congress.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1760-1775; 1763-1764; 1765; and 1766.

**A. D. 1765.—The revolt against the Stamp Act.**—"The English government understood very well that the colonies were earnestly opposed to the Stamp Act, but they had no thought of the storm of wrath and resistance which it would arouse. It was a surprise to many of the leaders of public affairs in America. . . . Governor Fitch and Jared Ingersoll, with other prominent citizens who had done all in their power to oppose the scheme of taxation . . . counseled submission. They mistook the feeling of the people. . . . The clergy were still the leaders of public opinion, and they were united in denunciation of the great wrong. Societies were organized under the name of the Sons of Liberty, the secret purpose of which was to resist the Stamp Act by violent measures if necessary. . . . Mr. Ingersoll, who had done all in his power to oppose the bill, after its passage decided to accept the position of stamp agent for Connecticut. Franklin urged him to take the place, and no one doubted his motives in accepting it. The people of Connecticut, however, were not pleased with this action. . . .

He was visited by a crowd of citizens, who inquired impatiently if he would resign." Ingersoll put them off with evasive replies for some time; but finally there was a gathering of a thousand men on horseback, from Norwich, New London, Windham, Lebanon and other towns, each armed with a heavy peled club, who surrounded the obstinate stamp agent at Wethersfield and made him understand that they were in deadly earnest. "'The cause is not worth dying for,' said the intrepid man, who would never have flinched had he not felt that, after all, this band of earnest men were in the right. A formal resignation was given him to sign. . . . After he had signed his name, the crowd cried out, 'Swear to it!' He begged to be excused from taking an oath. 'Then shout Liberty and Property,' said the now good-natured company. To this he had no objection, and waved his hat enthusiastically as he repeated the words. Having given three cheers, the now hilarious party dined together." Ingersoll was then escorted to Hartford, where he read his resignation publicly at the court-house.—E. B. Sanford, *Hist. of Connecticut*, ch. 29.

**A. D. 1766.—The repeal of the Stamp Act.—The Declaratory Act.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1766.

**A. D. 1766-1768.—The Townshend duties.—The Circular Letter of Massachusetts.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1766-1767, and 1767-1768.

**A. D. 1768-1770.—The quartering of troops in Boston.—The "Massacre" and the removal of the troops.** See BOSTON: A. D. 1768, and 1770.

**A. D. 1769-1784.—The ending of slavery.** See SLAVERY, NEGRO: A. D. 1769-1785.

**A. D. 1770-1773.—Repeal of the Townshend duties except on tea.—Committees of Correspondence instituted.—The tea ships and the Boston Tea-party.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1770, and 1772-1773; and BOSTON: A. D. 1773.

**A. D. 1774.—The Boston Port Bill, the Massachusetts Act, and the Quebec Act.—The First Continental Congress.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1774.

**A. D. 1775.—The beginning of the War of the American Revolution.—Lexington.—Concord.—New England in arms and Boston beleaguered.—Ticonderoga.—Bunker Hill.—The Second Continental Congress.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775.

**A. D. 1776.—Assumes to be a "free, sovereign and independent State."**—"In May, 1776, the people had been formally released from their allegiance to the crown; and in October the general assembly passed an act assuming the functions of a State. The important section of the act was the first, as follows: 'That the ancient form of civil government, contained in the charter from Charles the Second, King of England, and adopted by the people of this State, shall be and remain the civil Constitution of this State, under the sole authority of the people thereof, independent of any king or prince whatever. And that this Republic is, and shall forever be and remain, a free, sovereign and independent State, by the name of the State of Connecticut.' The form of the act speaks what was doubtless always the belief of the people, that their charter derived its validity, not from



the will of the crown, but from the assent of the people. And the curious language of the last sentence, in which 'this Republic' declares itself to be 'a free, sovereign, and independent State,' may serve to indicate something of the appearance which state sovereignty doubtless presented to the Americans of 1776-89."—A. Johnston, *Connecticut*, ch. 16.—See, also, UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776-1779.

**A. D. 1776-1783.—The war and the victory.—Independence achieved.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776 to 1783.

**A. D. 1778.—The massacre at the Wyoming settlement.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778 (JULY).

**A. D. 1779.—Tryon's marauding expeditions.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778-1779.

**A. D. 1786.—Partial cession of western territorial claims to the United States.—The Western Reserve in Ohio.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1781-1786; PENNSYLVANIA: A. D. 1753-1769; and OHIO: A. D. 1786-1796.

**A. D. 1788.—Ratification of the Federal Constitution.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1787-1789.

**A. D. 1814.—The Hartford Convention.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1814 (DECEMBER).

**CONNECTICUT TRACT, The.** See NEW YORK: A. D. 1786-1790.

**CONNUBIUM.** See MUNICIPIUM.

**CONON, Pope, A. D. 686-687.**

**CONOYS.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**CONRAD I., King of the East Franks (Germany), (the first of the Saxon line), A. D. 911-919. . . . Conrad II., King of the Romans (King of Germany), A. D. 1024-1039; King of Italy, 1026-1039; King of Burgundy, 1032-1039; Emperor, 1027-1039. . . . Conrad III., King of Germany (the first of the Swabian or Hohenstauffen dynasty), 1137-1152. . . . Conrad IV., King of Germany, 1250-1254.**

**CONSCRIPT FATHERS.**—The Roman senators were so called,—“*Patres Conscripti*.” The origin of the designation has been much discussed, and the explanation which has found most acceptance is this: that when, at the organization of the Republic, there was a new creation of senators, to fill the ranks, the new senators were called “*conscripti*” (“added to the roll”) while the older ones were called “*patres*” (“fathers”), as before. Then the whole senate was addressed as “*Patres et Conscripti*,” which lapsed finally into “*Patres-Conscripti*.”—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 1, ch. 4.

**CONSCRIPTION, The first French.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1798-1799 (AUGUST—APRIL).

**CONSCRIPTION IN THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (MARCH).

**CONSERVATIVE PARTY, The English.**—The name “*Conservative*,” to replace that of *Tory* (see ENGLAND: A. D. 1680 for the origin of the latter) as a party designation, was first introduced in 1831, by Mr. John Wilson Croker, in an article in the *Quarterly Review*. “It crept slowly into general favour, although some few there were who always held out against it, encouraged by the example of the late leader of the party, Lord Beaconsfield, who was not at all likely to extend a welcome to anything which

came with Mr. Croker's mark upon it.”—L. J. Jennings, *The Croker Papers*, v. 2, p. 198.

**CONSIGLIO DI CREDENZA.** See ITALY: A. D. 1056-1152.

**CONSISTORY, The Papal.** See CURIA, PAPAL.

**CONSISTORY COURTS OF THE BISHOPS.**—“The duties of the officials of these courts resembled in theory the duties of the censors under the Roman Republic. In the middle ages, a lofty effort had been made to overpass the common limitations of government, to introduce punishment for sins as well as crimes, and to visit with temporal penalties the breach of the moral law. . . . The administration of such a discipline fell as a matter of course, to the clergy. . . . Thus arose throughout Europe a system of spiritual surveillance over the habits and conduct of every man, extending from the cottage to the castle, taking note of all wrong dealing, of all oppression of man by man, of all licentiousness and profligacy, and representing upon earth, in the principles by which it was guided, the laws of the great tribunal of Almighty God. Such was the origin of the church courts, perhaps the greatest institutions yet devised by man. But to aim at these high ideals is as perilous as it is noble; and weapons which may be safely trusted in the hands of saints become fatal implements of mischief when saints have ceased to wield them. . . . The Consistory Courts had continued into the sixteenth century with unrestricted jurisdiction, although they had been for generations merely perennially flowing fountains, feeding the ecclesiastical exchequer. The moral conduct of every English man and woman remained subject to them. . . . But between the original design and the degenerate counterfeit there was this vital difference,—that the censures were no longer spiritual. They were commuted in various gradations for pecuniary fines, and each offence against morality was rated at its specific money value in the Episcopal tables. Suspension and excommunication remained as ultimate penalties; but they were resorted to only to compel unwilling culprits to accept the alternative. The misdemeanours of which the courts took cognizance were ‘offences against chastity,’ ‘heresy,’ or ‘matter sounding thereunto,’ ‘witchcraft,’ ‘drunkenness,’ ‘scandal,’ ‘defamation,’ ‘impatience words,’ ‘broken promises,’ ‘untruth,’ ‘absence from church,’ ‘speaking evil of saints,’ ‘non-payment of offerings,’ and other delinquencies incapable of legal definition.”—J. A. Froude, *Hist. of England*, ch. 3.

**CONSPIRACY BILL, The.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1858-1859.

**CONSTABLE, The.**—“The name is derived from the ‘*comes stabuli*’ of the Byzantine court, and appears in the west as early as the days of Gregory of Tours. The duties of the constables of France . . . and those of the constables of Naples . . . are not exactly parallel with [those of] the constables of England. In Naples the constable kept the king's sword, commanded the army, appointed the quarters, disciplined the troops and distributed the sentinels; the marshals and all other officers being his subordinates. The French office was nearly the same. In England, however, the marshal was not subordinate to the constable. Probably the English marshals fulfilled the duties which had been in Normandy discharged by the constables. The marshal is

more distinctly an officer of the court, the constable one of the castle or army. . . . The constable . . . exercised the office of quartermaster-general of the court and army and succeeded to the duties of the Anglo-Saxon staller."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 11, sect. 123, and note.

**CONSTABLE OF FRANCE.**—"No other dignity in the world has been held by such a succession of great soldiers as the office of Constable of France. The Constable was originally a mere officer of the stables, but his power had increased by the suppression of the office of Grand Seneschal, and by the time of Philip Augustus he exercised control over all the military forces of the crown. He was the general in chief of the army and the highest military authority in the kingdom. The constables had for four centuries been leaders in the wars of France, and they had experienced strange and varied fortunes. The office had been bestowed on the son of Simon de Montfort, and he for this honor had granted to the king of France his rights over those vast domains which had been given his father for his pious conquests. [See ALBIGENES: A. D. 1217-1229.] It had been bestowed on Raoul de Nesle, who fell at Courtrai, where the French nobility suffered its first defeat from Flemish boors; on Bertrand de Guesclin, the last of the great warriors, whose deeds were sung with those of the paladins of Charlemagne; on Clisson, the victor of Roosebeck [or Rosebecque]; on Armagnac, whose name has a bloody preeminence among the leaders of the fierce soldiery who ravaged France during the English wars; on Buchan, whose Scotch valor and fidelity gained him this great trust among a foreign people; on Richemont, the companion of Joan Dare; on Saint Pol, the ally of Charles the Bold, the betrayer and the victim of Louis XI.; on the Duke of Bourbon, who won the battle of Pavia against his sovereign, and led his soldiers to that sack of Rome which made the ravages of Genseric and Alaric seem mild; on Anne of Montmorenci, a prominent actor in every great event in France from the battle of Pavia against Charles V. to that of St. Denis against Coligni; on his son, the companion of Henry IV. in his youth, and his trusted adviser in his age. . . . The sword borne by such men had been bestowed [1621] on Luines, the hero of an assassination, who could not drill a company of infantry; it was now [1622] given to the hero of many battles [the Duke of Lesdeguières], and the great office was to expire in the hands of a great soldier."—J. B. Perkins, *France under Mazarin*, v. 1, p. 94.

**CONSTANCE, The Council of.** See PAPACY: A. D. 1414-1418.

**CONSTANCE, Peace of (1183).** See ITALY: A. D. 1174-1183.

**CONSTANS I., Roman Emperor, A. D. 337-350. . . . Constans II., Roman Emperor (Eastern), A. D. 641-668.**

**CONSTANTINA, The taking of (1837).** See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1830-1846.

**CONSTANTINE, Pope, A. D. 708-715. . . . Constantine I. (called The Great), Roman Emperor, A. D. 306-337. . . . The Conversion. See ROME: A. D. 323. . . . The Forged Donation. See PAPACY: A. D. 774 (?). . . . Constantine II., Roman Emperor, A. D. 337-340. . . . Constantine III., Roman Emperor in the East,**

**A. D. 641. . . . Constantine IV. (called Pogonatus), Roman Emperor in the East, A. D. 668-685. . . . Constantine V. (called Copronymus), Emperor in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), A. D. 741-775. . . . Constantine VI., Emperor in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), A. D. 780-797. . . . Constantine VII. (called Porphyrogenitus), Emperor in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), A. D. 911-950. . . . Constantine VIII. (colleague of Constantine VII.), Emperor in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), A. D. 944. . . . Constantine IX., Emperor in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), A. D. 963-1028. . . . Constantine X., Emperor in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), A. D. 1042-1054. . . . Constantine XI., Emperor in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), A. D. 1059-1067. . . . Constantine XII., nominal Greek Emperor in the East, about A. D. 1071. . . . Constantine XIII. (Palæologus), Greek Emperor of Constantinople, A. D. 1448-1453. . . . Constantine the Usurper. See BRITAIN: A. D. 407.**

**CONSTANTINOPLE: A. D. 330.—Transformation of Byzantium.**—"Constantine had for some time contemplated the erection of a new capital. The experience of nearly half a century had confirmed the sagacity of Diocletian's selection of a site on the confines of Europe and Asia [Nicomedia] as the whereabouts in which the political centre of gravity of the Empire rested. At one time Constantine thought of adopting the site of ancient Troy, and is said to have actually commenced building a new city there. . . . More prosaic reasons ultimately prevailed. The practical genius of Constantine recognized in the town of Byzantium, on the European side of the border line between the two continents, the site best adapted for his new capital. All subsequent ages have applauded his discernment, for experience has endorsed the wisdom of the choice. By land, with its Asian suburb of Chrysopolis [modern Scutari], it practically spanned the narrow strait and joined Europe and Asia; by sea, it was open on one side to Spain, Italy, Greece, Africa, Egypt, Syria; on the other to the Euxine, and so by the Danube it had easy access to the whole of that important frontier between the Empire and the barbarians; and round all the northern coasts of the sea it took the barbarians in flank. . . . The city was solemnly dedicated with religious ceremonies on the 11th of May, 330, and the occasion was celebrated, after the Roman fashion, by a great festival, largesses and games in the hippodrome, which lasted forty days. The Emperor gave to the city institutions modelled after those of the ancient Rome."—E. L. Cutts, *Constantine the Great*, ch. 29.—"The new walls of Constantine stretched from the port to the Propontis . . . at the distance of fifteen stadia from the ancient fortification, and, with the city of Byzantium, they enclosed five of the seven hills which, to the eyes of those who approach Constantinople, appear to rise above each other in beautiful order. About a century after the death of the founder, the new buildings . . . already covered the narrow ridge of the sixth and the broad summit of the seventh hill. . . . The buildings of the new city were executed by such artificers as the reign of Constantine could afford; but they were decorated by the hands of the most celebrated masters of the age of Pericles and Alexander. . . . By his commands the cities of Greece and Asia were despoiled of their most

valuable ornaments."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 17.—"The new city was an exact copy of old Rome. . . . It was inhabited by senators from Rome. Wealthy individuals from the provinces were likewise compelled to keep up houses at Constantinople, pensions were conferred upon them, and a right to a certain amount of provisions from the public stores was annexed to these dwellings. Eighty thousand loaves of bread were distributed daily to the inhabitants of Constantinople. . . . The tribute of grain from Egypt was appropriated to supply Constantinople, and that of Africa was left for the consumption of Rome."—G. Finlay, *Greece under the Romans*, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: J. B. Bury, *Hist. of the later Roman Empire*, bk. 1, ch. 5 (v. 1).

**A. D. 363-518.**—**The Eastern Court from Valens to Anastasius.**—**Tumults at the capital.** See **ROME**: A. D. 363-379 to 400-518.

**A. D. 378.**—**Threatened by the Goths.** See **GOths**: A. D. 379-382.

**A. D. 400.**—**Popular rising against the Gothic soldiery.**—**Their expulsion from the city.** See **ROME**: A. D. 400-518.

**A. D. 511-512.**—**Tumults concerning the Trisagion.**—During the reign of Anastasius, at Constantinople, the fierce controversy which had raged for many years throughout the empire, between the Monophysites (who maintained that the divine and the human natures in Christ were one), and the adherents of the Council of Chalcedon (which declared that Christ possessed two natures in one person), was embittered at the imperial capital by opposition between the emperor, who favored the Monophysites, and the patriarch who was strict in Chalcedonian orthodoxy. In 511, and again in 512, it gave rise to two alarming riots at Constantinople. On the first occasion, a Monophysite or Eutychian party "burst into the Chapel of the Archangel in the Imperial Palace and dared to chant the *Te Deum* with the addition of the forbidden words, the war-cry of many an Eutychian mob, 'Who wast crucified for us.' The Trisagion, as it was called, the thrice-repeated cry to the Holy One, which Isaac in his vision heard uttered by the seraphim, became, by the addition of these words, as emphatic a statement as the Monophysite party could desire of their favourite tenet that God, not man, breathed out his soul unto death outside the gates of Jerusalem. . . . On the next Sunday the Monophysites sang the verse which was their war-cry in the great Basilica itself." The riot which ensued was quieted with difficulty by the patriarch, to whom the emperor humbled himself. But in the next year, on a fast-day (Nov. 6) the Monophysites gave a similar challenge, singing the Trisagion with the prohibited words added, and "again psalmody gave place to blows; men wounded and dying lay upon the floor of the church. . . . The orthodox mob streamed from all parts into the great forum. There they swarmed and swayed to and fro all that day and all that night, shouting forth, not the greatness of the Ephesian Diana, but 'Holy, Holy, Holy,' without the words 'Who wast crucified.' They hewed down the monks,—a minority of their class,—who were on the side of the imperial creed, and burned their monasteries with fire." After two days of riot, the aged emperor humbled himself to the mob, in the great Circus, offered to

abdicate the throne and made peace by promises to respect the decrees of Chalcedon.—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders*, bk. 4, ch. 10.—See, also, **NESTORIAN AND MONOPHYSITE CONTROVERSY**.

**A. D. 532.**—**The Sedition of Nika.** See **CIRCUS, FACTIONS OF THE ROMAN**.

**A. D. 542.**—**The Plague.** See **PLAGUE**: A. D. 542-594.

**A. D. 553.**—**General Council.** See **THREE CHAPTERS, THE DISPUTE OF THE**.

**A. D. 626.**—**Attacked by the Avars and Persians.** See **ROME**: A. D. 505-628.

**A. D. 668-675.**—**First siege by the Saracens.**—"Forty-six years after the flight of Mahomet from Mecca his disciples appeared in arms under the walls of Constantinople. They were animated by a genuine or fictitious saying of the prophet, that, to the first army which besieged the city of the Cæsars, their sins were forgiven. . . . No sooner had the Caliph Moawiyah [the first of the Omniade caliphs, seated at Damascus], suppressed his rivals and established his throne, than he aspired to expiate the guilt of civil blood by the success of this holy expedition; his preparations by sea and land were adequate to the importance of the object; his standard was entrusted to Sophian, a veteran warrior. . . . The Greeks had little to hope, nor had their enemies any reasons of fear, from the courage and vigilance of the reigning Emperor, who disgraced the name of Constantine, and imitated only the inglorious years of his grandfather Heraclius. Without delay or opposition, the naval forces of the Saracens passed through the unguarded channel of the Hellespont, which even now, under the feeble and disorderly government of the Turks, is maintained as the natural bulwark of the capital. The Arabian fleet cast anchor and the troops were disembarked near the palace of Hebdomon, seven miles from the city. During many days, from the dawn of light to the evening, the line of assault was extended from the golden gate to the Eastern promontory. . . . But the besiegers had formed an insufficient estimate of the strength and resources of Constantinople. The solid and lofty walls were guarded by numbers and discipline; the spirit of the Romans was rekindled by the last danger of their religion and empire; the fugitives from the conquered provinces more successfully renewed the defence of Damascus and Alexandria; and the Saracens were dismayed by the strange and prodigious effects of artificial fire. This firm and effectual resistance diverted their arms to the more easy attempts of plundering the European and Asiatic coasts of the Propontis; and, after keeping the sea from the month of April to that of September, on the approach of winter they retreated four score miles from the capital, to the isle of Cyzicus, in which they had established their magazine of spoil and provisions. So patient was their perseverance, or so languid were their operations, that they repeated in the six following summers the same attack and retreat, with a gradual abatement of hope and vigour, till the mischances of shipwreck and disease, of the sword and of fire, compelled them to relinquish the fruitless enterprise. They might bewail the loss, or commemorate the martyrdom, of 30,000 Moslems who fell in the siege of Constantinople. . . . The event of the siege revived, both in the East and West, the reputation of the Roman arms, and

cast a momentary shade over the glories of the Saracens. . . . A peace, or truce of thirty years was ratified between the two Empires; and the stipulation of an annual tribute, fifty horses of a noble breed, fifty slaves, and 3,000 pieces of gold, degraded the majesty of the commander of the faithful."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 52.

**A. D. 680.—General Council.** See MONOTHEISTIC CONTROVERSY.

**A. D. 717-718.—The second siege by the Saracens.**—"When Leo [the Isaurian] was raised to the [Byzantine] throne [A. D. 717], the empire was threatened with immediate ruin. Six emperors had been dethroned within the space of twenty-one years. . . . The Bulgarians and Slavonians wasted Europe up to the walls of Constantinople; the Saracens ravaged the whole of Asia Minor to the shores of the Bosphorus. . . . The Caliph Suleiman, who had seen one private adventurer succeed the other in quick succession on the imperial throne, deemed the moment favourable for the final conquest of the Christians; and, reinforcing his brother's army [in Asia Minor], he ordered him to lay siege to Constantinople. The Saracen empire had now reached its greatest extent. From the banks of the Sihan and the Indus to the shores of the Atlantic in Mauretania and Spain, the order of Suleiman was implicitly obeyed. . . . The army Moslemah led against Constantinople was the best-appointed that had ever attacked the Christians: it consisted of 80,000 warriors. The Caliph announced his intention of taking the field in person with additional forces, should the capital of the Christians offer a protracted resistance to the arms of Islam. The whole expedition is said to have employed 180,000 men. . . . Moslemah, after capturing Pergamus, marched to Abydos, where he was joined by the Saracen fleet. He then transported his army across the Hellespont, and marching along the shore of the Propontis, invested Leo in his capital both by land and sea. The strong walls of Constantinople, the engines of defence with which Roman and Greek art had covered the ramparts, and the skill of the Byzantine engineers, rendered every attempt to carry the place by assault hopeless, so that the Saracens were compelled to trust to the effect of a strict blockade for gaining possession of the city. . . . The besiegers encamped before Constantinople on the 15th August 717. The Caliph Suleiman died before he was able to send any reinforcements to his brother. The winter proved unusually severe." Great numbers of the warriors from the south were destroyed by the inclemency of a climate to which they had not become inured; many more died of famine in the Moslem camp, while the besieged city was plentifully supplied. The whole undertaking was disastrous from its beginning to its close, and, exactly one year from the pitching of his camp under the Byzantine walls, "on the 15th of August 718, Moslemah raised the siege, after ruining one of the finest armies the Saracens ever assembled. . . . Few military details concerning Leo's defence of Constantinople have been preserved, but there can be no doubt that it was one of the most brilliant exploits of a warlike age. . . . The vanity of Gallic writers has magnified the success of Charles Martel over a plundering expedition of the Spanish Arabs into a marvellous victory, and attributed the de-

liverance of Europe from the Saracen yoke to the valour of the Franks. A veil has been thrown over the talents and courage of Leo, a soldier of fortune, just seated on the imperial throne, who defeated the long-planned schemes of conquest of the Caliph Wadd and Suleiman. It is unfortunate that we have no Isaurian literature. . . . The war was languidly carried on for some years and the Saracens were gradually expelled from most of their conquests beyond Mount Taurus."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine Empire from 716 to 1057*, ch. 1.

**A. D. 747.—The Great Plague.** See PLAGUE: A. D. 744-748.

**A. D. 754.—The Iconoclastic Council.** See ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY.

**A. D. 865.—First attack by the Russians.**—"In the year 865, a nation hitherto unknown made its first appearance in the history of the world, where it was destined to act no unimportant part. Its entrance into the political system of the European nations was marked by an attempt to take Constantinople, a project which it has often revived. . . . In the year 862, Rurik, a Scandinavian or Varangian chief, arrived at Novgorod, and laid the first foundation of the state which has grown into the Russian empire. The Russian people, under Varangian domination, rapidly increased in power, and reduced many of their neighbours to submission. . . . From what particular circumstance the Russians were led to make their daring attack on Constantinople is not known. The Emperor Michael [III.] had taken the command of an army to act against the Saracens, and Oryphas, admiral of the fleet, acted as governor of the capital during his absence. Before the Emperor had commenced his military operations, a fleet of 200 Russian vessels of small size, taking advantage of a favourable wind, suddenly passed through the Bosphorus, and anchored at the mouth of the Black River in the Propontis, about 18 miles from Constantinople. This Russian expedition had already plundered the shores of the Black Sea, and from its station within the Bosphorus it ravaged the country about Constantinople, and plundered the Prince's Islands, pillaging the monasteries and slaying the monks as well as the other inhabitants. The Emperor, informed by Oryphas of the attack on his capital hastened to its defence. . . . It required no great exertions on the part of the imperial officers to equip a force sufficient to attack and put to flight these invaders; but the horrid cruelty of the barbarians and the wild daring of their Varangian leaders, made a profound impression on the people of Constantinople."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine Empire*, bk. 1, ch. 3, sect. 3.

**A. D. 907-1043.—Repeated attacks by the Russians.**—"Notwithstanding an active and increasing commercial intercourse between the Greeks and the Russians, Constantinople was exposed, during the tenth century and part of the eleventh, to repeated attacks from the masterful Varangians and their subjects. In the year 907, a fleet of 200 Russian vessels or boats swarmed into the Propontis, and laid waste the shores in the neighbourhood of Constantinople. "It is not improbable that the expedition was undertaken to obtain indemnity for some commercial losses sustained by imperial negligence, monopoly or oppression. The subjects of the emperor were murdered, and the Russians amused themselves

with torturing their captives in the most barbarous manner. At length Leo [VI.] purchased their retreat by the payment of a large sum of money. . . . These hostilities were terminated by a commercial treaty in 912." There was peace under this treaty until 941, when a third attack on Constantinople was led by Igor, the son of Rurik. But it ended most disastrously for the Russians and Igor escaped with only a few boats. The result was another important treaty, negotiated in 945. In 970 the Byzantine Empire was more seriously threatened by an attempt on the part of the Russians to subdue the kingdom of Bulgaria; which would have brought them into the same dangerous neighborhood to Constantinople that the Russia of our own day has labored so hard to reach. But the able soldier John Zimisce happened to occupy the Byzantine throne; the Russian invasion of Bulgaria was repelled and Bulgaria, itself, was reannexed to the Empire, which pushed its boundaries to the Danube, once more. For more than half a century, Constantinople was undisturbed by the covetous ambition of her Russian fellow Christians. Then they invaded the Bosphorus again with a formidable armament; but the expedition was wholly disastrous and they retreated with a loss of 15,000 men. "Three years elapsed before peace was re-established; but a treaty was then concluded and the trade at Constantinople placed on the old footing. From this period the alliance of the Russians with the Byzantine Empire was long uninterrupted; and as the Greeks became more deeply imbued with ecclesiastical prejudices, and more hostile to the Latin nations, the Eastern Church became, in their eyes, the symbol of their nationality, and the bigoted attachment of the Russians to the same religious formalities obtained for them from the Byzantine Greeks the appellation of the most Christian nation."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine Empire, from 716 to 1057*, bk. 2, ch. 3, sect. 2.

**A. D. 1081.—Sacked by the rebel army of Alexius Comnenus.**—Alexius Comnenus, the emperor who occupied the Byzantine throne at the time of the First Crusade, and who became historically prominent in that connection, acquired his crown by a successful rebellion. He was collaterally of the family of Isaac Comnenus, (Isaac I.) who had reigned briefly in 1057-1059,—he, too, having been, in his imperial office, the product of a revolution. But the interval of twenty-two years had seen four emperors come and go—two to the grave and two into monastic seclusion. It was the last of these—Neciphorus III. (Botanites) that Alexius displaced, with the support of an army which he had previously commanded. One of the gates of the capital was betrayed to him by a German mercenary, and he gained the city almost without a blow. "The old Emperor consented to resign his crown and retire into a monastery. Alexius entered the imperial palace, and the rebel army commenced plundering every quarter of the city. Natives and mercenaries vied with one another in license and rapine. No class of society was sacred from their lust and avarice, and the inmates of monasteries, churches, and palaces were alike plundered and insulted. This sack of Constantinople by the Slavonians, Bulgarians, and Greeks in the service of the families of Comnenus, Ducas,

and Paleologos, who crept treacherously into the city, was a fit prologue to its sufferings when it was stormed by the Crusaders in 1204. From this disgraceful conquest of Constantinople by Alexius Comnenus, we must date the decay of its wealth and civic supremacy, both as a capital and a commercial city. . . . The power which was thus established in rapine terminated about a century later in a bloody vengeance inflicted by an infuriated populace on the last Emperor of the Comnenian family, Andronicus I. Constantinople was taken on the 1st of April, 1081, and Alexius was crowned in St. Sophia's next day."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine and Greek Empires, from 716 to 1453*, bk. 3, ch. 1.

**A. D. 1204.—Conquest and brutal sack by Crusaders and Venetians.** See CRUSADER; A. D. 1201-1203; and BYZANTINE EMPIRE: A. D. 1203-1204.

**A. D. 1204-1261.—The Latin Empire and its fall.—Recovery by the Greeks.** See ROMANIA, THE EMPIRE OF, and BYZANTINE EMPIRE: A. D. 1204-1205.

**A. D. 1261.—Great privileges conceded to the Genoese.—Pera and its citadel Galata given up to them.** See GENOA: A. D. 1261-1269.

**A. D. 1261-1453.—The restored Greek Empire.**—On the 25th of July, A. D. 1261, Constantinople was surprised and the last Latin emperor expelled by the fortunate arms of Michael Paleologus, the Greek usurper at Nicaea. (See GREEK EMPIRE OF NICAEA.) Twenty days later Michael made his triumphal entry into the ancient capital. "But after the first transport of devotion and pride, he sighed at the dreary prospect of solitude and ruin. The palace was defiled with smoke and dirt and the gross intemperance of the Franks; whole streets had been consumed by fire, or were decayed by the injuries of time; the sacred and profane edifices were stripped of their ornaments; and, as if they were conscious of their approaching exile, the industry of the Latins had been confined to the work of pillage and destruction. Trade had expired under the pressure of anarchy and distress, and the numbers of inhabitants had decreased with the opulence of the city. It was the first care of the Greek monarch to reinstate the nobles in the palaces of their fathers. . . . He repopled Constantinople by a liberal invitation to the provinces, and the brave 'volunteers' were seated in the capital which had been recovered by their arms. Instead of banishing the factories of the Pisans, Venetians, and Genoese, the prudent conqueror accepted their oaths of allegiance, encouraged their industry, confirmed their privileges and allowed them to live under the jurisdiction of their proper magistrates. Of these nations the Pisans and Venetians preserved their respective quarters in the city; but the services and power of the Genoese [who had assisted in the reconquest of Constantinople] deserved at the same time the gratitude and the jealousy of the Greeks. Their independent colony was first planted at the seaport town of Heraclea in Thrace. They were speedily recalled, and settled in the exclusive possession of the suburb of Galata, an advantageous post, in which they revived the commerce and insulted the majesty of the Byzantine Empire. The recovery of Constantinople was celebrated as the era of a new Empire." The new empire thus

established in the ancient Roman capital of the east made some show of vigor at first. Michael Palaeologus "wrested from the Franks several of the noblest islands of the Archipelago—Lesbos, Chios, and Rhodes. His brother Constantine was sent to command in Malvasia and Sparta; and the Eastern side of the Morea, from Argos and Napoli to Cape Tamaris, was repossessed by the Greeks. . . . But in the prosecution of these Western conquests the countries beyond the Hellespont were left naked to the Turks; and their depredations verified the prophecy of a dying senator, that the recovery of Constantinople would be the ruin of Asia." Not only was Asia Minor abandoned to the new race of Turkish conquerors—the Ottomans—but those most aggressive of the proselytes of Islam were invited in the next generation to cross the Bosphorus, and to enter Thrace as partisans in a Greek civil war. Their footing in Europe once gained, they devoured the distracted and feeble empire piece by piece, until little remained to it beyond the capital itself. Long before the latter-fell, the empire was a shadow and a name. In the very suburbs of Constantinople, the Genoese podesta, at Pera or Galata, had more power than the Greek Emperor; and the rival Italian traders, of Genoa, Venice and Pisa, fought their battles under the eyes of the Byzantines with indifference, almost, to the will or wishes, the opposition or the help of the latter. "The weight of the Roman Empire was scarcely felt in the balance of these opulent and powerful republics. . . . The Roman Empire (I smile in transcribing the name) might soon have sunk into a province of Genoa, if the ambition of the republic had not been checked by the ruin of her freedom and naval power. A long contest of 130 years was determined by the triumph of Venice. . . . Yet the spirit of commerce survived that of conquest; and the colony of Pera still awed the capital and navigated the Euxine, till it was involved by the Turks in the final servitude of Constantinople itself."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 62-63.

ALSO IN: G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine and Greek Empires*, bk. 4, ch. 2.—See, also, TURKS (THE OTTOMANS): A. D. 1240-1326; 1326-1359; 1360-1389; 1389-1403, &c.

A. D. 1348-1355.—**WAR WITH THE GENOESE.—Alliance with Venice and Aragon.**—John Cantacuzenos, who usurped the throne in 1347, "had not reigned a year before he was involved in hostilities with the Genoese colony of Galata, which had always contained many warm partisans of the house of Paleologos [displaced by Cantacuzenos]. This factory had grown into a flourishing town, and commanded a large portion of the Golden Horn. During the civil war, the Genoese capitalists had supplied the regency with money, and they now formed almost every branch of the revenue which the imperial government derived from the port. . . . The financial measures of the new emperor reduced their profits. . . . The increased industry of the Greeks, and the jealousy of the Genoese, led to open hostilities. The colonists of Galata commenced the war in a treacherous manner, without any authority from the republic of Genoa (1348). With a fleet of only eight large and some small galleys they attacked Constantinople while Cantacuzenos was absent from the capital, and burned several buildings and the greater

part of the fleet he was then constructing. The Empress Irene, who administered the government in the absence of her husband, behaved with great prudence and courage and repulsed a bold attack of the Genoese. Cantacuzenos hastened to the capital, where he spent the winter in repairing the loss his fleet had sustained. As soon as it was ready for action, he engaged the Genoese in the port, where he hoped that their naval skill would be of no avail, and where the numerical superiority of his ships would insure him a victory. He expected, moreover, to gain possession of Galata itself by an attack on the land side while the Genoese were occupied at sea. The cowardly conduct of the Greeks, both by sea and land, rendered his plans abortive. The greater part of his ships were taken, and his army retreated without making a serious attack. Fortunately for Cantacuzenos, the colonists of Galata received an order from the Senate of Genoa to conclude peace. . . . Their victory enabled them to obtain favourable terms, and to keep possession of some land they had seized, and on which they soon completed the construction of a new citadel. The friendly disposition manifested by the government of Genoa induced Cantacuzenos to send ambassadors to the Senate to demand the restoration of the island of Chios, which had been conquered by a band of Genoese exiles in 1346. A treaty was concluded, by which the Genoese were to restore the island to the Emperor of Constantinople in ten years. . . . But this treaty was never carried into execution, for the exiles at Chios set both the republic of Genoa and the Greek Empire at defiance, and retained their conquest." The peace with Genoa was of short duration. Cantacuzenos was bent upon expelling the Genoese from Galata, and as they were now involved in the war with the Venetians which is known as the war of Caffa he hoped to accomplish his purpose by joining the latter. "The Genoese had drawn into their hands the greater part of the commerce of the Black Sea. The town of Tana or Azof was then a place of great commercial importance, as many of the productions of India and China found their way to western Europe from its warehouses. The Genoese, in consequence of a quarrel with the Tartars, had been compelled to suspend their intercourse with Tana, and the Venetians, availing themselves of the opportunity, had extended their trade and increased their profits. The envy of the Genoese led them to obstruct the Venetian trade and capture Venetian ships, until at length the disputes of the two republics broke out in open war in 1348. In the year 1351, Cantacuzenos entered into an alliance with Venice, and joined his forces to those of the Venetians, who had also concluded an alliance with Peter the Ceremonious, king of Aragon. Nicholas Pisani, one of the ablest admirals of the age, appeared before Constantinople with the Venetian fleet; but his ships had suffered severely from a storm, and his principal object was attained when he had convoyed the merchantmen of Venice safely into the Black Sea. Cantacuzenos, however, had no object but to take Galata; and, expecting to receive important aid from Pisani, he attacked the Genoese colony by sea and land. His assault was defeated in consequence of the weakness of the Greeks and the lukewarmness of the Venetians. Pisani retired

to Negropont, to effect a junction with the Catalan fleet; and Pagano Doria, who had pursued him with a superior force, in returning to Galata to pass the winter, stormed the town of Heraclea on the Sea of Marmora, where Cantacuzenos had collected large magazines of provisions, and carried off a rich booty, with many wealthy Greeks, who were compelled to ransom themselves by paying large sums to these captors. Cantacuzenos was now besieged in Constantinople. . . . The Genoese, unable to make any impression on the city, indemnified themselves by ravaging the Greek territory on the Black Sea. . . . Early in the year 1352, Pisani returned to Constantinople with the Catalan fleet, under Ponzio da Santapace, and a great battle was fought between the allies and the Genoese, in full view of Constantinople and Galata. The scene of the combat was off the island of Prote, and it received the name of Vrachopagos from some sunken rocks, of which the Genoese availed themselves in their manoeuvres. The honour of a doubtful and bloody day rested with the Genoese. . . . Pisani soon quitted the neighbourhood of Constantinople, and Cantacuzenos, having nothing more to hope from the Venetian alliance . . . concluded a peace with the republic of Genoa. In this war he had exposed the weakness of the Greek empire, and the decline of the maritime force of Greece, to all the states of Europe. The treaty confirmed all the previous privileges and encroachments of the colony of Galata and other Genoese establishments in the Empire."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine and Greek Empires*, 716-1453, bk. 4, ch. 2, sect. 4.—The retirement of the Greeks from the contest did not check the war between Genoa and Venice and the other allies of the latter, which was continued until 1355. The Genoese were defeated, August 29, 1353, by the Venetians and Catalans, in a great battle fought near Lojera, on the northern coast of Sardinia, losing 41 galleys and 4,500 or 5,000 men. They obtained their revenge the next year, on the 4th of November, when Paganino Doria surprised the Venetian admiral, Pisani, at Portolongo, opposite the island of Sapienza, as he was preparing to go into winter-quarters. "The Venetians sustained not so much a defeat as a total discomfiture; 450 were killed; an enormous number of prisoners, loosely calculated at 6,000, and a highly valuable booty in prizes and stores, were taken." In June, 1355, the war was ended by a treaty which excluded Venice from all Black Sea ports except Caffa.—W. C. Hazlitt, *Hist. of the Venetian Republic*, ch. 18-19 (v. 3).

ALSO IN: F. A. Parker, *The Fleets of the World*, pp. 88-94.

**A. D. 1453.—Conquest by the Turks.**—Mahomet II., son of Amurath II., came to the Ottoman throne, at the age of twenty-one, in 1451. "The conquest of Constantinople was the first object on which his thoughts were fixed at the opening of his reign. The resolution with which he had formed this purpose expressed itself in his stern reply to the ambassadors of the Emperor, offering him tribute if he would renounce the project of building a fort on the European shore of the Bosphorus, which, at the distance of only five miles from the capital, would give him the command of the Black Sea. He ordered the envoys to retire, and threatened to flay alive any who should dare to bring him a

similar message again. The fort was finished in three months and garrisoned with 400 janizaries; a tribute was exacted of all vessels that passed, and war was formally declared by the Sultan, Constantine [Constantine Paleologus, the last Greek Emperor] made the best preparations in his power for defence; but he could muster only 600 Greek soldiers." In order to secure aid from the Pope and the Italians, Constantine united himself with the Roman Church. A few hundred troops were then sent to his assistance; but, at the most, he had only succeeded in manning the many miles of the city wall with 9,000 men, when, in April, 1453, the Sultan invested it. The Turkish army was said to number 250,000 men, and 420 vessels were counted in the accompanying fleet. A summons to surrender was answered with indignant refusal by Constantine, "who had calmly resolved not to survive the fall of the city," and the final assault of the furious Turks was made on the 29th of May, 1453. The heroic Emperor was slain among the last defenders of the gate of St. Romanos, and the janizaries rode over his dead body as they charged into the streets of the fallen Roman capital. "The despairing people—senators, priests, monks, nuns, husbands, wives and children—sought safety in the church of St. Sophia. A prophecy had been circulated that here the Turks would be arrested by an angel from heaven, with a drawn sword; and hither the miserable multitude crowded, in the expectation of supernatural help. The conquerors followed, sword in hand, slaughtering those whom they encountered in the street. They broke down the doors of the church with axes, and, rushing in, committed every act of atrocity that a frantic thirst for blood and the inflamed passions of demons could suggest. All the unhappy victims were divided as slaves among the soldiers, without regard to blood or rank, and hurried off to the camp; and the mighty cathedral, so long the glory of the Christian world, soon presented only traces of the orgies of hell. The other quarters of the city were plundered by other divisions of the army. . . . About noon the Sultan made his triumphal entry by the gate of St. Romanos, passing by the body of the Emperor, which lay concealed among the slain. Entering the church, he ordered a mollah to ascend the bema and announce to the Mussulmans that St. Sophia was now a mosque, consecrated to the prayers of the true believers. He ordered the body of the Emperor to be sought, his head to be exposed to the people, and afterwards to be sent as a trophy, to be seen by the Greeks, in the principal cities of the Ottoman Empire. For three days the city was given up to the indescribable horrors of pillage and the license of the Mussulman soldiery. Forty thousand perished during the sack of the city and fifty thousand were reduced to slavery."—C. C. Felton, *Greece, Ancient and Modern: Fourth course*, lect. 6.

ALSO IN: G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine and Greek Empires from 716 to 1453*, bk. 4, ch. 2.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 68.

**A. D. 1453-1481.—The city repopulated and rebuilt.—Creation of the Turkish Stamboul.**—"It was necessary for Mohammed II. to repopulate Constantinople, in order to render it the capital of the Othoman Empire. The installation of an

orthodox Patriarch calmed the minds of the Greeks, and many who had emigrated before the siege gradually returned, and were allowed to claim a portion of their property. But the slow increase of population, caused by a sense of security and the hope of gain, did not satisfy the Sultan, who was determined to see his capital one of the greatest cities of the East, and who knew that it had formerly exceeded Damascus, Bagdad and Cairo, in wealth, extent and population. From most of his subsequent conquests Mohammed compelled the wealthiest of the inhabitants to emigrate to Constantinople, where he granted them plots of land to build their houses. . . . Turks, Greeks, Servians, Bulgarians, Albanians, and Lazos, followed one another in quick succession, and long before the end of his reign Constantinople was crowded by a numerous and active population, and presented a more flourishing aspect than it had done during the preceding century. The embellishment of his capital was also the object of the Sultan's attention. . . . Mosques, minarets, fountains and tombs, the great objects of architectural magnificence among the Mussulmans, were constructed in

every quarter of the city. . . . The picturesque beauty of the Stamboul of the present day owes most of its artificial features to the Ottoman conquest, and wears a Turkish aspect. The Constantinople of the Byzantine Empire disappeared with the last relics of the Greek Empire. The traveller who now desires to view the vestiges of a Byzantine capital, and examine the last relics of Byzantine architecture, must continue his travels eastward to Trebizond."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine and Greek Empires, from 716 to 1453*, bk. 4, ch. 2, sect. 7.

A. D. 1807.—Threatened by a British fleet. See TURKS: A. D. 1806-1807.

CONSTANTINOPLE, Conference of (1877). See TURKS: A. D. 1861-1877.

CONSTANTINUS I., Roman Emperor, A. D. 305-306. . . . Constantius II., A. D. 337-361.

CONSTITUTION, The battles of the frigates. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812-1813, and 1814.

CONSTITUTION OF ARAGON AND CASTILE (the old monarchy). See CORTES, THE EARLY SPANISH.

## CONSTITUTION OF THE ARGENTINE REPUBLIC.

The subjoined text of the Constitution of the Argentine Republic is a translation "from the official edition of 1863," taken from R. Napp's work on "The Argentine Republic," prepared for the Central Argentine Commission on the Centenary Exhibition at Philadelphia, 1876. According to the "Statesman's Year-Book" of 1893, there have been no modifications since 1860:

### Part I.

**Article 1.** The Argentine Nation adopts the federal-republican, and representative form of Government, as established by the present Constitution.

**Art. 2.** The Federal Government shall maintain the Apostolic Roman Catholic Faith.

**Art. 3.** The authorities of the Federal Government shall reside in the city which a special law of Congress may declare the capital of the Republic, subsequently to the cession by one or more of the Provincial Legislatures, of the territory about to be federalized.

**Art. 4.** The Federal Government shall administer the expenses of the Nation out of the revenue in the National Treasury, derived from import and export duties; from the sale and lease of the public lands; from postage; and from such other taxes as the General Congress may equitably and proportionably lay upon the people; as also, from such loans and credits as may be decreed by it in times of national necessity, or for enterprises of national utility.

**Art. 5.** Each Province shall make a Constitution for itself, according to the republican representative system, and the principles, declarations and guarantees of this Constitution; and which shall provide for (secure) Municipal Government, primary education and the administration of justice. Under these conditions the Federal Government shall guarantee to each Province the exercise and enjoyment of its institutions.

**Art. 6.** The Federal Government shall intervene in the Provinces to guarantee the republican

form of Government, or to repel foreign invasion, and also, on application of their constituted authorities, should they have been deposed by sedition or by invasion from another Province, for the purpose of sustaining or re-establishing them.

**Art. 7.** Full faith shall be given in each Province to the public acts, and judicial proceedings of every other Province; and Congress may by general laws, prescribe the manner in which such acts and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof.

**Art. 8.** The citizens of each Province shall be entitled to all the rights, privileges and immunities, inherent to the citizens of all the several Provinces. The reciprocal extradition of criminals between all the Provinces, is obligatory.

**Art. 9.** Throughout the territory of the Nation, no other than the National Custom-Houses shall be allowed, and they shall be regulated by the tariffs sanctioned by Congress.

**Art. 10.** The circulation of all goods produced or manufactured in the Republic, is free within its borders, as also, that of all species of merchandise which may be dispatched by the Custom-Houses of entry.

**Art. 11.** Such articles of native or foreign production, as well as cattle of every kind, which pass from one Province to another, shall be free from all transit-duties, and also the vehicles, vessels or animals, which transport them; and no tax, let it be what it may, can be henceforward imposed upon them on account of such transit.

**Art. 12.** Vessels bound from one Province to another, shall not be compelled to enter, anchor, or pay transit-duties; nor in any case can preferences be granted to one port over another, by any commercial laws or regulations.

**Art. 13.** New Provinces may be admitted into the Nation; but no Province shall be erected within the territory of any other Province, or Provinces, nor any Province be formed by the junction of various Provinces, without the con-



sent of the legislatures of the Provinces concerned, as well as of Congress.

**Art. 14.** All the inhabitants of the Nation shall enjoy the following rights, according to the laws which regulate their exercise: viz., to labor and to practice all lawful industry, to trade and navigate; to petition the authorities; to enter, remain in, travel over and leave, Argentine territory; to publish their ideas in the public press without previous censure; to enjoy and dispose of their property; to associate for useful purposes; to profess freely their religion; to teach and to learn.

**Art. 15.** In the Argentine Nation there are no slaves; the few which now exist shall be free from the date of the adoption of this Constitution, and a special law shall regulate the indemnity acknowledged as due by this declaration. All contracts for the purchase and sale of persons is a crime, for which those who make them, as well as the notary or functionary which authorizes them, shall be responsible, and the slaves who in any manner whatever may be introduced, shall be free from the sole fact that they tread the territory of the Republic.

**Art. 16.** The Argentine Nation does not admit the prerogatives of blood nor of birth; in it, there are no personal privileges or titles of nobility. All its inhabitants are equal in presence of the law, and admissible to office without other condition than that of fitness. Equality is the basis of taxation as well as of public-posts.

**Art. 17.** Property is inviolable, and no inhabitant of the Nation can be deprived of it, save by virtue of a sentence based on law. The expropriation for public utility must be authorized by law and previously indemnified. Congress alone shall impose the contributions mentioned in Art. 4. No personal service shall be exacted save by virtue of law, or of a sentence founded on law. Every author or inventor is the exclusive proprietor of his work, invention or discovery, for the term which the law accords to him. The confiscation of property is henceforward and forever, stricken from the Argentine penal-code. No armed body can make requisitions, nor exact assistance of any kind.

**Art. 18.** No inhabitant of the Nation shall suffer punishment without a previous judgment founded on a law passed previously to the cause of judgment, nor be judged by special commissions, or withdrawn from the Judges designated by law before the opening of the cause. No one shall be obliged to testify against himself; nor be arrested, save by virtue of a written order from a competent authority. The defense at law both of the person and his rights, is inviolable. The domicile, private papers and epistolary correspondence, are inviolable; and a law shall determine in what cases, and under what imputations, a search-warrant can proceed against and occupy them. Capital punishment for political causes, as well as every species of torture and whippings, are abolished forever. The prisons of the Nation shall be healthy and clean, for the security, and not for the punishment, of the criminals detained in them, and every measure which under pretext of precaution may mortify them more than such security requires, shall render responsible the judge who authorizes it.

**Art. 19.** Those private actions of men that in nowise offend public order and morality, or injure a third party, belong alone to God, and are

beyond the authority of the magistrates. No inhabitant of the Nation shall be compelled to do what the law does not ordain, nor be deprived of anything which it does not prohibit.

**Art. 20.** Within the territory of the Nation, foreigners shall enjoy all the civil rights of citizens; they can exercise their industries, commerce or professions, in accordance with the laws; own, buy and sell real-estate; navigate the rivers and coasts; freely profess their religion, and testate and marry. They shall not be obliged to become citizens, nor to pay forced contributions. Two years previous residence in the Nation shall be required for naturalization, but the authorities can shorten this term in favour of him who so desires it, under the allegation and proof of services rendered to the Republic.

**Art. 21.** Every Argentine citizen is obliged to arm himself in defense of his country and of this Constitution, according to the laws which Congress shall ordain for the purpose, and the decrees of the National Executive. For the period of ten years from the day on which they may have obtained their citizenship, this service shall be voluntary on the part of the naturalized.

**Art. 22.** The people shall not deliberate nor govern save by means of their Representatives and Authorities, created by this Constitution. Every armed force or meeting of persons which shall arrogate to itself the rights of the people, and petition in their name, is guilty of sedition.

**Art. 23.** In the event of internal commotion or foreign attack which might place in jeopardy the practice of this Constitution, and the free action of the Authorities created by it, the Province or territory where such disturbance exists shall be declared in a state of siege, all constitutional guarantees being meantime suspended there. But during such suspension the President of the Republic cannot condemn nor apply any punishment per se. In respect to persons, his power shall be limited to arresting and removing them from one place to another in the Nation, should they not prefer to leave Argentine territory.

**Art. 24.** Congress shall establish the reform of existing laws in all branches, as also the trial by Jury.

**Art. 25.** The Federal Government shall foment European immigration; and it cannot restrict, limit, nor lay any impost upon, the entry upon Argentine territory, of such foreigners as come for the purpose of cultivating the soil, improving manufactures, and introducing and teaching the arts and sciences.

**Art. 26.** The navigation of the interior rivers of the Nation is free to all flags, subject only to such regulations as the National Authority may dictate.

**Art. 27.** The Federal Government is obliged to strengthen the bonds of peace and commerce with foreign powers, by means of treaties which shall be in conformity with the principles of public law laid down in this Constitution.

**Art. 28.** The principles, rights and guarantees laid down in the foregoing articles, cannot be altered by any laws intended to regulate their practice.

**Art. 29.** Congress cannot grant to the Executive, nor the provincial legislatures to the Governor of Provinces, any "extraordinary faculties," nor the "sum of the public power," nor "renunciations or supremacies" by which the lives,

honor or fortune of the Argentines shall be at the mercy of any Government or person whatever. Acts of this nature shall be irremediably null and void, and shall subject those who frame, vote, or sign them, to the pains and penalties incurred by those who are infamous traitors to their country.

**Art. 30.** This Constitution can be reformed in whole or in part. The necessity for the reform shall be declared by Congress by at least a two-thirds vote; but it can only be accomplished by a convention called ad hoc.

**Art. 31.** This Constitution, and the laws of the Nation which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made or which shall be made with Foreign Powers, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the authorities of every Province shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any Province to the contrary notwithstanding, excepting in the case of Buenos-Aires, in the treaties ratified after the compact of Nov. 11th, 1859.

**Art. 32.** The Federal Congress shall not dictate laws restricting the liberty of the press, nor establish any federal jurisdiction over it.

**Art. 33.** The enumeration in this Constitution of certain rights and guarantees, shall not be construed to deny or disparage other rights and guarantees, not enumerated; but which spring from the principle of popular sovereignty, and the republican form of Government.

**Art. 34.** The Judges of the Federal courts shall not be Judges of Provincial tribunals at the same time; nor shall the federal service, civil as well as military, constitute a domicile in the Province where it may be exercised, if it be not habitually that of the employé; it being understood by this, that all Provincial public-service is optional in the Province where such employé may casually reside.

**Art. 35.** The names which have been successively adopted for the Nation, since the year 1810 up to the present time; viz., the United Provinces of the Rio de la Plata, Argentine Republic and Argentine Confederation, shall henceforward serve without distinction, officially to designate the Government and territory of the Provinces, whilst the words Argentine Nation shall be employed in the making and sanction of the laws.

#### Part II.—Section I.

**Article 36.** All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress composed of two Chambers, one of National Deputies, and the other of Senators of the Provinces and of the capital.

##### Chapter I.

**Article 37.** The Chamber of Deputies shall be composed of representatives elected directly by the people of the Provinces, for which purpose each one shall be considered as a single electoral district, and by a simple plurality of votes in the ratio of one for each 20,000 inhabitants, or for a fraction not less than 10,000.

**Art. 38.** The deputies for the first Legislature shall be nominated in the following proportion: for the Province of Buenos-Aires, twelve; for that of Córdoba, six; for Catamarca, three; Corrientes, four; Entre-Ríos, two; Jujui, two; Mendoza, three; Rioja, two; Salta, three; Santiago, four; San Juan, two; Santa-Fé, two; San Luis, two; and for that of Tucumán, three.

**Art. 39.** For the second Legislature a general census shall be taken, and the number of Deputies be regulated by it; thereafter, this census shall be decennial.

**Art. 40.** No person shall be a Deputy who shall not have attained the age of twenty-five years, have been four years in the exercise of citizenship, and be a native of the Province which elects him, or a resident of it for the two years immediately preceding.

**Art. 41.** For the first election, the provincial Legislatures shall regulate the method for a direct election of the National Deputies. Congress shall pass a general law for the future.

**Art. 42.** The Deputies shall hold their place for four years, and are re-eligible; but the House shall be renewed each biennial, by halves; for which purpose those elected to the first Legislature, as soon as the session opens, shall decide by lot who shall leave at the end of the first period.

**Art. 43.** In case of vacancy, the Government of the Province or of the capital, shall call an election for a new member.

**Art. 44.** The origination of the tax-laws and those for the recruiting of troops, belongs exclusively to the House of Deputies.

**Art. 45.** It has the sole right of impeaching before the Senate, the President, Vice-President, their Ministers, and the members of the Supreme Court and other inferior Tribunals of the Nation, in suits which may be undertaken against them for the improper discharge of, or deficiency in, the exercise of their functions; or for common crimes, after having heard them, and declared by a vote of two thirds of the members present, that there is cause for proceeding against them.

#### Chapter II.

**Article 46.** The Senate shall be composed of two Senators from each Province, chosen by the Legislatures thereof by plurality of vote, and two from the capital elected in the form prescribed for the election of the President of the Nation. Each Senator shall have one vote.

**Art. 47.** No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained the age of thirty years, been six years a citizen of the Nation, enjoy an annual rent or income of two thousand hard-dollars, and be a native of the Province which elects him, or a resident of the same for the two years immediately preceding.

**Art. 48.** The Senators shall enjoy their trust for nine years, and are indefinitely re-eligible; but the Senate shall be renewed by thirds each three years, and shall decide by lot, as soon as they be all re-united, who shall leave at the end of the first and second triennial periods.

**Art. 49.** The Vice-President of the Nation shall be President of the Senate; but shall have no vote, except in a case of a tie.

**Art. 50.** The Senate shall choose a President pro-tempore who shall preside during the absence of the Vice-President, or when he shall exercise the office of President of the Nation.

**Art. 51.** The Senate shall have sole power to try all impeachments presented by the House of Deputies. When sitting for that purpose they shall be under oath. When the President of the Nation is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside. No person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of the members present.

**Art. 52.** Judgment in case of impeachment shall not extend farther than to removal from

office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the Nation. But the party convicted shall, nevertheless, be liable to indictment, trial, judgment and punishment according to law, before the ordinary tribunals.

**Art. 53.** It belongs, moreover, to the Senate, to authorize the President to declare martial law in one or more points of the Republic, in case of foreign aggression.

**Art. 54.** When any seat of a Senator be vacant by death, resignation or other reason, the Government to which the vacancy belongs, shall immediately proceed to the election of a new member.

**Chapter III.**

**Article 55.** Both Chambers shall meet in ordinary session, every year from the 1st May until the 30th September. They can be extraordinarily convoked, or their session be prolonged by the President of the Nation.

**Art. 56.** Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members. Neither of them shall enter into session without an absolute majority of its members; but a smaller number may compel absent members to attend the sessions, in such terms and under such penalties as each House may establish.

**Art. 57.** Both Houses shall begin and close their sessions simultaneously. Neither of them whilst in sessions can suspend its meetings for more than three days, without the consent of the other.

**Art. 58.** Each House may make its rules of proceeding, and with the concurrence of two-thirds punish its members for disorderly behavior in the exercise of their functions, or remove, and even expel them from the House, for physical or moral incapacity occurring after their incorporation; but a majority of one above one half of the members present, shall suffice to decide questions of voluntary resignation.

**Art. 59.** In the act of their incorporation the Senators and Deputies shall take an oath to properly fulfil their charge, and to act in all things in conformity to the prescriptions of this Constitution.

**Art. 60.** No member of Congress can be indicted, judicially interrogated, or molested for any opinion or discourse which he may have uttered in fulfilment of his Legislative duties.

**Art. 61.** No Senator or Deputy, during the term for which he may have been elected, shall be arrested, except when taken 'in flagrante' commission of some crime which merits capital punishment or other degrading sentence; an account thereof shall be rendered to the Chamber he belongs to, with a verbal process of the facts.

**Art. 62.** When a complaint in writing be made before the ordinary courts against any Senator or Deputy, each Chamber can by a two-thirds vote, suspend the accused in his functions and place him at the disposition of the competent judge for trial.

**Art. 63.** Each of the Chambers can cause the Ministers of the Executive to come to their Hall, to give such explanations or information as may be considered convenient.

**Art. 64.** No member of Congress can receive any post or commission from the Executive, without the previous consent of his respective Cham-

ber, excepting such as are in the line of promotion.

**Art. 65.** The regular ecclesiastics cannot be members of Congress, nor can the Governors of Provinces represent the Province which they govern.

**Art. 66.** The Senators and Deputies shall be remunerated for their services, by a compensation to be ascertained by law.

**Chapter IV.**

**Article 67.** The Congress shall have power:—  
 1. To legislate upon the Custom-Houses and establish import duties; which, as well as all appraisements for their collection, shall be uniform throughout the Nation, it being clearly understood that these, as well as all other national contributions, can be paid in any money at the just value which may be current in the respective Provinces. Also, to establish export duties. 2. To lay direct taxes for determinate periods, whenever the common defense and general welfare require it, which shall be uniform throughout the territory of the Nation. 3. To borrow money on the credit of the Nation. 4. To determine the use and sale of the National lands. 5. To establish and regulate a National Bank in the capital, with branches in the Provinces, and with power to emit bills. 6. To regulate the payment of the home and foreign debts of the Nation. 7. To annually determine the estimates of the National Administration, and approve or reject the accounts of expenses. 8. To grant subsidies from the National Treasury to those Provinces, whose revenues, according to their budgets, do not suffice to cover the ordinary expenses. 9. To regulate the free navigation of the interior rivers, open such ports as may be considered necessary, create and suppress Custom-Houses, but without suppressing those which existed in each Province at the time of its incorporation. 10. To coin money, regulate the value thereof and of foreign coin, and adopt a uniform system of weights and measures for the whole Nation. 11. To decree civil, commercial, penal and mining Codes, but such Codes shall have no power to change local jurisdiction; their application shall belong to the Federal or Provincial courts, in accordance with such things or persons as may come under their respective jurisdiction; especially, general laws embracing the whole Nation, shall be passed upon naturalization and citizenship, subject to the principle of native citizenship; also upon bankruptcy, the counterfeiting of current-money and public State documents; and such laws as may be required for the establishment of trial by Jury. 12. To regulate commerce by land and sea with foreign nations, and between the Provinces. 13. To establish and regulate the general post-offices and post-roads of the Nation. 14. To finally settle the National boundaries, fix those of the Provinces, create new Provinces, and determine by a special legislation, the organization and governments, which such National territories as are beyond the limits assigned to the Province, should have. 15. To provide for the security of the frontiers; preserve peaceful relations with the Indians, and promote their conversion to Catholicism. 16. To provide all things conducive to the prosperity of the country, to the advancement and happiness of the Provinces, and to the increase of enlightenment, decreeing plans for general and university instruction, promoting

industry, immigration, the construction of railways, and navigable canals, the peopling of the National lands, the introduction and establishment of new industries, the importation of foreign capital and the exploration of the interior rivers, by protection laws to these ends, and by temporary concessions and stimulating recompenses. 17. To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court, create and suppress public offices, fix their attributes, grant pensions, decree honors and general amnesties. 18. To accept or reject the resignation of the President or Vice-President of the Republic, and declare new elections; to make the scrutiny and rectification of the same. 19. To ratify or reject the treaties made with other Nations and the Concordats with the Apostolic See, and regulate the patronage of advowsons throughout the Nation. 20. To admit religious orders within the Nation, other than those already existing. 21. To authorize the Executive to declare war and make peace. 22. To grant letters of marque and reprisal, and to make rules concerning prizes. 23. To fix the land and sea forces in time of peace and war; and to make rules and regulations for the government of said forces. 24. To provide for calling forth the militia of all, or a part of, the Provinces, to execute the laws of the Nation, suppress insurrections or repel invasions. To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining said militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the Nation, reserving to the Provinces respectively, the appointment of the corresponding chiefs and officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress. 25. To permit the introduction of foreign troops within the territory of the Nation, and the going beyond it of the National forces. 26. To declare martial law in any or various points of the Nation in case of domestic commotion, and ratify or suspend the declaration of martial law made by the executive during the recess. 27. To exercise exclusive legislation over the territory of the National capital, and over such other places acquired by purchase or cession in any of the Provinces, for the purpose of establishing forts, arsenals, warehouses, or other needful national buildings. 28. To make all laws and regulations which shall be necessary for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all others vested by the present Constitution in the Government of the Argentine Nation.

#### Chapter V.

**Article 68.** Laws may originate in either of the Houses of Congress, by bills presented by their members or by the Executive, excepting those relative to the objects treated of in Art. 44.

**Art. 69.** A bill being approved by one House wherein it originated, shall pass for discussion to the other House. Being approved by both, it shall pass to the Executive of the Nation for his examination; and should it receive his approbation he shall publish it as law.

**Art. 70.** Every bill not returned within ten working-days by the Executive, shall be taken as approved by him.

**Art. 71.** No bill entirely rejected by one House, can be presented again during that year. But should it be only amplified or corrected by the revising House, it shall return to that wherein it originated; and if there the additions or cor-

rections be approved by an absolute majority, it shall pass to the Executive. If the additions or corrections be rejected, it shall return to the revising House, and if here they be again sanctioned by a majority of two-thirds of its members, it shall pass to the other House, and it shall not be understood that the said additions and corrections are rejected, unless two-thirds of the members present should so vote.

**Art. 72.** A bill being rejected in whole or in part by the Executive, he shall return it with his objections to the House in which it originated; here it shall be debated again; and if it be confirmed by a majority of two-thirds, it shall pass again to the revising House. If both Houses should pass it by the same majority, it becomes a law, and shall be sent to the Executive for promulgation. In such case the votes of both Houses shall be by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons so voting shall be recorded, as well as the objections of the Executive, and shall be immediately published in the daily-press. If the Houses differ upon the objections, the bill cannot be renewed during that year.

**Art. 73.** The following formula shall be used in the passage of the laws: "The Senate and Chamber of Deputies of the Argentine Nation in Congress assembled, etc. decree, or sanction, with the force of law."

#### Section II.—Chapter I.

**Article 74.** The Executive power of the Nation shall be exercised by a citizen, with the title of "President of the Argentine Nation."

**Art. 75.** In case of the sickness, absence from the capital, death, resignation or dismissal of the President, the Executive power shall be exercised by the Vice-President of the Nation. In case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability of the President and Vice-President of the Nation, Congress will determine which public functionary shall then fill the Presidency, until the disability be removed or a new President be elected.

**Art. 76.** No person except a natural-born citizen or a son of a natural-born citizen brought forth abroad, shall be eligible as President or Vice-President of the Nation; he is required to belong to the Apostolic-Roman-Catholic communion, and possess the other qualifications required to be elected Senator.

**Art. 77.** The President and Vice-President shall hold office during the term of six years; and cannot be re-elected except after an interval of an equal period.

**Art. 78.** The President of the Nation shall cease in his functions the very day on which his period of six years expires, and no event whatever which may have interrupted it, can be a motive for completing it at a later time.

**Art. 79.** The President and Vice-President shall receive a compensation from the National Treasury, which cannot be altered during the period for which they shall have been elected. During the same period they cannot exercise any other office nor receive any other emolument from the Nation, or any of its Provinces.

**Art. 80.** The President and Vice-President before entering upon the execution of their offices, shall take the following oath administered by the President of the Senate (the first time by the President of the Constituent Congress) in Congress assembled: "I (such an one) swear by

God our Lord, and by these Holy Evangelists, that I will faithfully and patriotically execute the office of President (or Vice-President) of the Nation, and observe and cause to be faithfully observed, the Constitution of the Argentine Nation. If I should not do so, let God and the Nation indict me."

### Chapter II.

**Article 81.** The election of the President and Vice-President of the Nation, shall be made in the following manner:—The capital and each of the Provinces shall by direct vote nominate a board of electors, double the number of Deputies and Senators which they send to Congress, with the same qualifications and under the same form as those prescribed for the election of Deputies. Deputies or Senators, or officers in the pay of the Federal Government cannot be electors. The electors being met in the National-capital and in that of their respective Provinces, four months prior to the conclusion of the term of the out-going President, they shall proceed by signed ballots, to elect a President, and Vice-President, one of which shall state the person as President, and the other the person as Vice-President, for whom they vote. Two lists shall be made of all the individuals elected as President, and other two also, of those elected as Vice-President, with the number of votes which each may have received. These lists shall be signed by the electors, and shall be remitted closed and sealed, two of them (one of each kind) to the President of the Provincial Legislature, and to the President of the Municipality in the capital, among whose records they shall remain deposited and closed; the other two shall be sent to the President of the Senate (the first time to the President of the Constituent Congress).

**Art. 82.** The President of the Senate (the first time that of the Constituent Congress) all the lists being received, shall open them in the presence of both Houses. Four members of Congress taken by lot and associated to the Secretaries, shall immediately proceed to count the votes, and to announce the number which may result in favor of each candidate for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency of the Nation. Those who have received an absolute majority of all the votes in both cases, shall be immediately proclaimed President and Vice-President.

**Art. 83.** In case there be no absolute majority, on account of a division of the votes, Congress shall elect one of the two persons who shall have received the highest number of votes. If the first majority should have fallen to a single person, and the second to two or more, Congress shall elect among all the persons who may have obtained the first and second majorities.

**Art. 84.** This election shall be made by absolute plurality of votes, and voting by name. If, on counting the first vote, no absolute majority shall have been obtained, a second trial shall be made, limiting the voting to the two persons who shall have obtained the greatest number of suffrages at the first trial. In case of an equal number of votes, the operation shall be repeated, and should the result be the same, then the President of the Senate (the first time that of the Constituent Congress) shall decide it. No scrutiny or rectification of these elections can be made, unless three-fourth parts of all the members of the Congress be present.

**Art. 85.** The election of the President and Vice-President of the Nation, shall be concluded in a single meeting of the Congress, and thereafter, the result and the electoral lists shall be published in the daily press.

### Chapter III.

**Article 86.** The President of the Nation has the following attributes:—1. He is the supreme chief of the Nation, and is charged with the general administration of the country. 2. He issues such instructions and regulations as may be necessary for the execution of the laws of the Nation, taking care not to alter their spirit with regulative exceptions. 3. He is the immediate and local chief of the National capital. 4. He participates in making the laws according to the Constitution; and sanctions and promulgates them. 5. He nominates the Judges of the Supreme Court and of the inferior Federal tribunals, and appoints them by and with the consent and advice of the Senate. 6. He has power to pardon or commute penalties against officers subject to Federal jurisdiction, preceded by a report of the proper Tribunal, excepting in case of impeachment by the House of Deputies. 7. He grants retiring-pensions, leaves of absence and pawnbrokers' licences, in conformity to the laws of the Nation. 8. He exercises the rights of National Patronage in the presentation of Bishops for the cathedrals, choosing from a ternary nomination of the Senate. 9. He grants letters-patent or retains the decrees of the Councils, the bulls, briefs and rescripts of the Holy Roman Pontiff, by and with the consent of the Supreme Court, and must require a law for the same when they contain general and permanent dispositions. 10. He appoints and removes Ministers Plenipotentiary and Chargé d'Affaires, by and with the consent and advice of the Senate; and himself alone appoints and removes the Ministers of his Cabinet, the officers of the Secretaryships, Consular Agents, and the rest of the employes of the Administration whose nomination is not otherwise ordained by this Constitution. 11. He annually opens the Sessions of Congress, both Houses being united for this purpose in the Senate Chamber, giving an account to Congress on this occasion of the state of the Nation, of the reforms provided by the Constitution, and recommending to its consideration such measures as may be judged necessary and convenient. 12. He prolongs the ordinary meetings of Congress or convokes it in extra session, when a question of progress or an important interest so requires. 13. He collects the rents of the Nation and decrees their expenditure in conformity to the law or estimates of the Public expenses. 14. He negotiates and signs those treaties of peace, of commerce, of navigation, of alliance, of boundaries and of neutrality, requisite to maintain good relations with foreign powers; he receives their Ministers and admits their Consuls. 15. He is commander in chief of all the sea and land forces of the Nation. 16. He confers, by and with the consent of the Senate, the high military grades in the army and navy of the Nation; and by himself on the field of battle. 17. He disposes of the land and sea forces, and takes charge of their organization and distribution according to the requirements of the Nation. 18. By the authority and approval of Congress, he declares war and grants letters of marque and

reprisal. 19. By and with the consent of the Senate, in case of foreign aggression and for a limited time, he declares martial law in one or more points of the Nation. In case of internal commotion he has this power only when Congress is in recess, because it is an attribute which belongs to this body. The President exercises it under the limitations mentioned in Art. 23. 20. He may require from the chiefs of all the branches and departments of the Administration, and through them from all other employes, such reports as he may believe necessary, and they are compelled to give them. 21. He cannot absent himself from the capital of the Nation without permission of Congress. During the recess he can only do so without permission on account of important objects of public service. 22. The President shall have power to fill all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions, which shall expire at the end of their next session.

#### Chapter IV.

**Article 87.** Five Minister-Secretaries; to wit, of the Interior; of Foreign Affairs; of Finance; of Justice, Worship and Public Instruction; and of War and the Navy; shall have under their charge the dispatch of National affairs, and they shall counter-sign and legalize the acts of the President by means of their signatures, without which requisite they shall not be effectual. A law shall determine the respective duties of the Ministers.

**Art. 88.** Each Minister is responsible for the acts which he legalizes, and collectively, for those which he agrees to with his colleagues.

**Art. 89.** The Ministers cannot determine anything whatever, by themselves, except what concerns the economical and administrative regimen of their respective Departments.

**Art. 90.** As soon as Congress opens, the Ministers shall present to it a detailed report of the State of the Nation, in all that relates to their respective Departments.

**Art. 91.** They cannot be Senators or Deputies without resigning their places as Ministers.

**Art. 92.** The Ministers can assist at the meetings of Congress and take part in its debates, but they cannot vote.

**Art. 93.** They shall receive for their services a compensation established by law, which shall not be increased or diminished, in favor or against, the actual incumbents.

#### Section III.—Chapter I.

**Article 94.** The Judicial Power of the Nation shall be exercised by a Supreme Court of Justice, and by such other inferior Tribunals as Congress may establish within the dominion of the Nation.

**Art. 95.** The President of the Nation cannot in any case whatever, exercise Judicial powers, arrogate to himself any knowledge of pending causes, or reopen those which have terminated.

**Art. 96.** The Judges of the Supreme Court and of the lower National-Tribunals, shall keep their places *quamdiu se bene gesserit*, and shall receive for their services a compensation determined by law, which shall not be diminished in any manner whatever during their continuance in office.

**Art. 97.** No one can be a member of the Supreme Court of Justice, unless he shall have been an attorney at law of the Nation for eight years,

and shall possess the qualifications required for a Senator.

**Art. 98.** At the first installation of the Supreme Court, the individuals appointed shall take an oath administered by the President of the Nation, to discharge their functions, by the good and legal administration of Justice according to the prescriptions of this Constitution. Thereafter, the oath shall be taken before the President of the Court itself.

**Art. 99.** The Supreme Court shall establish its own internal and economical regulations, and shall appoint its subaltern employes.

#### Chapter II.

**Article 100.** The Judicial power of the Supreme Court and the lower National-Tribunals, shall extend to all cases arising under this Constitution, the laws of the Nation with the reserve made in clause 11 of Art. 67, and by treaties with foreign nations; to all cases affecting ambassadors, public Ministers and foreign Consuls; to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction; to controversies to which the Nation shall be party; to controversies between two or more Provinces; between a Province and the citizens of another; between the citizens of different Provinces; and between a Province or its citizens, against a foreign State or citizen.

**Art. 101.** In these cases the Supreme Court shall exercise an appellate jurisdiction according to such rules and exceptions as Congress may prescribe; but in all cases affecting ambassadors, ministers and foreign consuls, or those in which a Province shall be a party, it shall exercise original and exclusive jurisdiction.

**Art. 102.** The trial of all ordinary crimes except in cases of impeachment, shall terminate by jury, so soon as this institution be established in the Republic. These trials shall be held in the same Province where the crimes shall have been committed, but when not committed within the frontiers of the Nation, but against International Law, Congress shall determine by a special law the place where the trial shall take effect.

**Art. 103.** Treason against the Nation shall only consist in levying war against it, or in adhering to its enemies, giving them aid and comfort. Congress shall fix by a special law the punishment of treason; but it cannot go beyond the person of the criminal, and no attainer of treason shall work corruption of blood to relatives of any grade whatever.

**Art. 104.** The Provinces keep all the powers not delegated by this Constitution to the Federal Government, and those which were expressly reserved by special compacts at the time of their incorporation.

**Art. 105.** They create their own local institutions and are governed by these. They elect their own Governors, their Legislators and other Provincial functionaries, without intervention from the Federal Government.

**Art. 106.** Each Province shall make its own Constitution in conformity with the dispositions of Art. 5.

**Art. 107.** The Provinces with the consent of Congress can celebrate contracts among themselves for the purposes of administering justice and promoting economical interests and works of common utility, and also, can pass protective laws for the purpose with their own resources, of promoting manufactures, immigration, the

building of railways and canals, the peopling of their lands, the introduction and establishment of new industries, the import of foreign-capital and the exploration of their rivers.

**Art. 108.** The Provinces cannot exercise any powers delegated to the Nation. They cannot celebrate compacts of a political character, nor make laws on commerce or internal or external navigation; nor establish Provincial Custom-Houses, nor coin money, nor establish Banks of emission, without authority of Congress; nor make civil, commercial, penal or mining Codes after Congress shall have sanctioned those provided for in this Constitution; nor pass laws upon citizenship or naturalization; bankruptcy, counterfeiting money or public State-documents; nor lay tonnage dues; nor arm vessels of war or

**CONSTITUTION OF THE AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN EMPIRE.** Introduced in 1867. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1866-1867, and 1866-1887.

raise armies, save in the case of foreign invasion, or of a danger so imminent that it admits of no delay, and then an account thereof must be immediately given to the Federal Government; or name or receive foreign agents; or admit new religious orders.

**Art. 109.** No Province can declare or make war to another Province. Its complaints must be submitted to the Supreme Court of Justice and be settled by it. Hostilities de facto are acts of civil-war and qualified as seditious and tumultuous, which the General Government must repress and suffocate according to law.

**Art. 110.** The Provincial Governors are the natural agents of the Federal Government to cause the fulfillment of the laws of the Nation. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1880-1891.

**CONSTITUTION OF BELGIUM.** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1830-1884.

**CONSTITUTION OF BOLIVIA.** See PERU: A. D. 1825-1826, and 1826-1876.

### CONSTITUTION OF BRAZIL.

The following text of the Constitution of the United States of Brazil, adopted February 24, 1891, is taken from a translation published in Bulletin No. 7 of the Bureau of American Republics, Washington:

We, the representatives of the Brazilian people, united in constitutional congress, to organize a free and democratic régime, do establish, decree and promulgate the following constitution of the Republic of the United States of Brazil:

**Article 1.** The Brazilian nation, adopting as a form of government the Federal Republic proclaimed November 15, 1889, constitutes itself, by the perpetual and indissoluble union of its former provinces, the United States of Brazil.

**Art. 2.** Each of the former provinces shall constitute a State, and the former municipal district shall form the Federal District, continuing to be the capital of the Union until the following article shall be carried into effect.

**Art. 3.** In the center there is allotted as the property of the Union a zone of 14,400 square kilometres, which in due time shall be laid off for the establishment of the future federal capital. *Sole paragraph.*—After the change of site of the capital, the present Federal District shall constitute a State.

**Art. 4.** The States shall have the right to incorporate themselves one with another, subdivide themselves, dismember themselves to join with others or form new States, with the consent of the respective local legislatures in two successive annual sessions and the approval of the national Congress.

**Art. 5.** It shall be the duty of each State to provide, at its own expense, for the necessities of its government and administration; but the Union shall extend assistance to any State which, in case of public calamity, shall demand it.

**Art. 6.** The Federal Government shall not interfere in matters pertaining peculiarly to the States, save: (1) To repel foreign invasion, or the invasion of one State by another. (2) To maintain the federative republican form of government. (3) To reestablish order and tranquility in the States at the request of the respective governments.

(4) To assure the execution of the laws and federal decrees.

**Art. 7.** It is the exclusive prerogative of the Union to decree: (1) Duties on imports from foreign countries. (2) Duties of entry, departure, and stay of vessels; the coasting trade for national articles being free of duties, as well as for foreign merchandise that has already paid an import duty. (3) Stamp duties, save the restrictions imposed by article 0, § 1, No. 1. (4) Postal and federal telegraphic taxes. § 1. The Union alone shall have the power: (1) To establish banks of emission. (2) To create and maintain custom-houses. § 2. The taxes decreed by the Union shall be uniform for all the States. § 3. The laws of the Union and the acts and decisions of its authorities shall be executed throughout the country by federal officials, except that the enforcement of the former may be committed to the governments of the States, with the consent of the said States.

**Art. 8.** The Federal Government is forbidden to make distinctions and preferences in favor of the ports of any of the States against those of others.

**Art. 9.** The States alone are competent to decree taxes: (1) On the exportation of merchandise of their own production. (2) On landed property. (3) On the transmission of property. (4) On industries and professions. § 1. The States also have the exclusive right to decree: (1) Stamp duties on instruments emanating from their respective governments and business of their internal economy. (2) Contributions touching their own telegraphs and postal service. § 2. The products of the other States are exempt from imposition in the State whence they are exported. § 3. It is lawful for a State to levy duties on imports of foreign goods only when intended for consumption in its own territory; but it shall, in such case, cover into the federal treasury the amount of duties collected. § 4. The right is reserved to the States of establishing telegraph lines between the different points of their own territory, and between these and those of other States not served by federal lines; but

the Union may take possession of them when the general welfare shall require.

**Art. 10.** The several States are prohibited from taxing the federal property or revenue, or anything in the service of the Union, and vice versa.

**Art. 11.** It is forbidden to the States, as well as to the Unions: (1) To impose duties on the products of the other States, or of foreign countries, in transit through the territory of any State, or from one State to another, as also on the vehicles, whether by land or water, by which they are transported. (2) To establish, aid, or embarrass the exercise of religious worship. (3) To enact *ex post facto* laws.

**Art. 12.** In addition to the sources of revenue set forth in articles 7 and 9, it shall be lawful for the Union, as well as for the States, cumulatively or otherwise, to create any others whatsoever which may not be in contravention of the terms of articles 7, 9, and 11, § 1.

**Art. 13.** The right of the Union and of the States to legislate in regard to railways and navigation of internal waters shall be regulated by federal law. *Sole paragraph.*—The coastwise trade shall be carried on in national vessels.

**Art. 14.** The land and naval forces are permanent national institutions, intended for the defense of the country from foreign attack and the maintenance of the laws of the land. Within the limits of the law, the armed forces are from their nature held to obedience, each rank to its superior, and bound to support all constitutional institutions.

**Art. 15.** The legislative, executive, and judicial powers are organs of the national sovereignty, harmonious and independent among themselves.

**Art. 16.** The legislative power is vested in the national Congress, with the sanction of the President of the Republic. § 1. The national Congress is composed of two branches, the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate. § 2. The elections for senators and for deputies shall be held simultaneously throughout the country. § 3. No person shall be senator and deputy at the same time.

**Art. 17.** The Congress shall assemble in the federal capital on the 3d day of May of each year, unless some other day shall be fixed by law, without being convoked, and shall continue in session 4 months from the date of the opening, and may be prorogued, adjourned, or convoked in extraordinary session. § 1. The Congress alone shall have the power to deliberate on the prorogation or extension of its session. § 2. Each legislature shall last for 3 years. § 3. The governor of any State in which there shall be a vacancy in the representation, including the case of resignation, shall order a new election to be held at once.

**Art. 18.** The Chamber and the Senate shall hold their sessions apart and in public, unless otherwise resolved by a majority vote, and shall deliberate only when, in each of the chambers, there shall be present an absolute majority of its members. *Sole paragraph.*—To each of the chambers shall belong the right to verify and recognize the powers of its members, to choose its own presiding officers, to organize its internal government, to regulate the service of its own police rules, and to choose its own secretaries.

**Art. 19.** The deputies and senators can not be held to account for their opinions, expressions, and votes in the discharge of their mandate.

**Art. 20.** Deputies and senators, from the time of receiving their certificate of election until a new election, can not be arrested or proceeded against criminally without the permission of their respective chambers, except in the case of a flagrant crime, in which bail is inadmissible. In such case, the prosecution being carried to exclusive decision, the prosecuting authority shall send the court records to the respective chamber for its decision on the prosecution of the charge, unless the accused shall prefer immediate judgment.

**Art. 21.** The members of the two chambers, on taking their seats, shall take a formal obligation, in public session, to perform their duties faithfully.

**Art. 22.** During the sessions the senators and deputies shall receive an equal pecuniary salary and mileage, which shall be fixed by Congress at the end of each session for the following one.

**Art. 23.** No member of the Congress, from the time of his election, can make contracts with the executive power or receive from it any paid commission or employment. § 1. Exceptions to this prohibition are: (1) Diplomatic missions. (2) Commissions or military commands. (3) Advancement in rank and legal promotion. § 2. No deputy or senator, however, can accept an appointment for any mission, commission, or command mentioned in Nos. 1 and 2 of the preceding paragraph, without the consent of the chamber to which he belongs, when such acceptance would prevent the exercise of his legislative duties, except in case of war or such as involve the honor or integrity of the nation.

**Art. 24.** No deputy or senator can be president or form part of a directory of any bank, company, or enterprise which enjoys the favors of the Federal Government defined in and by law. *Sole paragraph.*—Nonobservance of the provisions of the foregoing article by any deputy or senator shall involve the loss of his seat.

**Art. 25.** The legislative commission shall be incompatible with the exercise of any other functions during the sessions.

**Art. 26.** The conditions for eligibility to the national Congress are: (1) To be in possession of the rights of Brazilian citizenship and to be registered as a voter. (2) For the Chamber, to have been for more than 4 years a Brazilian citizen; and for the Senate, for more than 6 years. This provision does not include those citizens referred to in No. 4, article 69.

**Art. 27.** The Congress shall by special legislation declare the cases of electoral incompetency.

**Art. 28.** The Chamber of Deputies shall be composed of the representatives of the people, elected by the States and the Federal District by direct suffrage, the representation of the minority being guaranteed. § 1. The number of the deputies shall be fixed by law in such a way as not to exceed one for each 70,000 inhabitants, and that there shall not be less than four for each State. § 2. To this end the Federal Government shall at once order a census to be taken of the population of the Republic, which shall be revised every 10 years.

**Art. 29.** To the Chamber belongs the initiative in the adjournment of the legislative sessions and in all legislation in regard to taxation, to the determination of the size of the army and navy, in the discussion of propositions from the executive power, and in the decision to proceed or not



in charges against the President of the Republic under the terms of article 53, and against the ministers of state in crimes connected with those of the said President.

**Art. 30.** The Senate shall be composed of citizens eligible under the terms of article 20 and more than 35 years of age, to the number of three senators for each State and three for the Federal District, chosen in the same manner as the deputies.

**Art. 31.** The mandate of a senator shall continue for 9 years, and one-third of the Senate shall be renewed every 3 years. *Sole paragraph.* — A senator elected in place of another shall exercise his mandate during the remainder of the term of the latter.

**Art. 32.** The Vice President of the Republic shall be the president of the Senate, where he shall vote only in case of tie, and shall be replaced in case of absence or impediment by the vice president of that body.

**Art. 33.** The Senate alone shall have the power to try and sentence the President of the Republic and the other federal officers designated by the constitution, under the conditions and in the manner which it prescribes. § 1. The Senate, when sitting as a tribunal of justice, shall be presided over by the president of the federal supreme court. § 2. It shall not pass sentence of condemnation unless two-thirds of its members be present. § 3. It shall not impose other penalties than the loss of office and prohibition from holding any other, without prejudice to the action of ordinary justice against the condemned.

**Art. 34.** The national Congress shall have exclusive power: (1) To estimate the revenue, and fix the expenditures of the Federal Government annually, and take account of the receipts and expenditures of each financial budget. (2) To authorize the executive to contract loans and make other operations of credit. (3) To legislate in regard to the public debt and furnish means for its payment. (4) To control the collection and disposition of the national revenue. (5) To regulate international commerce, as well as that of the States with each other and with the Federal District; to establish and regulate the collection of customs duties in the ports, create or abolish warehouses of deposit. (6) To legislate in regard to navigation of rivers running through more than one State, or through foreign territory. (7) To determine the weight, value, inscription, type, and denomination of the currency. (8) To create banks of emission, legislate in regard to this emission and to tax it. (9) To fix the standard of weights and measures. (10) To determine definitely the boundaries of the States between each other, those of the Federal District, and those of the national territory with the adjoining nations. (11) To authorize the Government to declare war, if there be no recourse to arbitration or in case of failure of this, and to make peace. (12) To decide definitively in regard to treaties and conventions with foreign nations. (13) To remove the capital of the Union. (14) To extend aid to the States in the case referred to in article 5. (15) To legislate in regard to federal postal and telegraph service. (16) To adopt the necessary measures for the protection of the frontiers. (17) To fix every year the number of the land and naval forces. (18) To make laws for the organization of the army and navy. (19) To grant or refuse to foreign forces passage through

the territory of the country to carry on military operations. (20) To mobilize and make use of the national guard or local militia in the cases designated by the Constitution. (21) To declare a state of siege at one or more points in the national territory, in the emergency of an attack by foreign forces, or internal disturbance, and to approve or suspend the state of siege proclaimed by the executive power or its responsible agents in the absence of the Congress. (22) To regulate the conditions and methods of elections for federal offices throughout the country. (23) To legislate upon the civil, criminal, and commercial laws and legal procedures of the federal judiciary. (24) To establish uniform naturalization laws. (25) To create and abolish federal public offices, to fix the duties of the same, and designate their salaries. (26) To organize the federal judiciary according to the terms of article 55 and the succeeding, section 3. (27) To grant amnesty. (28) To commute and pardon penalties imposed upon federal officers for offenses arising from their responsibility. (29) To make laws regarding Government lands and mines. (30) To legislate in regard to the municipal organization of the Federal District, as well as to the police, the superior instruction and other services which in the capital may be reserved for the Government of the Union. (31) To govern by special legislation those points of the territory of the Republic needed for the establishment of arsenals, other establishments or institutions for federal uses. (32) To settle cases of extradition between the States. (33) To enact such laws and resolutions as may be necessary for the exercise of the powers belonging to the Union. (34) To enact the organic laws necessary for the complete execution of the requirements of the Constitution. (35) To prorogue and adjourn its own sessions.

**Art. 35.** It shall belong likewise to the Congress, but not exclusively: (1) To watch over the Constitution and the laws, and provide for necessities of a federal character. (2) To promote in the country the development of literature, the arts, and sciences, together with immigration, agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, without privileges such as would obstruct the action of the local governments. (3) To create institutions of higher instruction and of high school education in the States. (4) To provide for high school instruction in the Federal District.

**Art. 36.** Save the exceptions named in article 27, all bills may originate, indifferently, in the Chamber or in the Senate, and may be introduced by any of their members.

**Art. 37.** A bill, after being passed in one of the chambers, shall be submitted to the other, and, if the latter shall approve the same, it shall send it to the executive, who, if he approve it, shall sanction and promulgate it. § 1. If, however, the President of the Republic shall consider it unconstitutional, or contrary to the good of the nation, he shall refuse his sanction to the same within 10 working days, counted from the day on which he received it (the bill), and shall return it, within the same period, to the chamber in which it originated, with his reasons for his refusal. § 2. The failure of the executive to signify his disapproval within the above-named 10 days shall be considered as an approval, and in case his sanction be refused after the close of the

session of the Congress, the President shall make public his reasons therefor. § 3. The bill sent back to the chamber where it originated shall be discussed and voted upon by call of names, and shall be considered as passed if it obtain two-thirds of the votes of the members present; and, in this case, it shall be sent to the other chamber, whence, if it receive the same majority, it shall return, as a law, to the executive to be formally promulgated. § 4. The sanction and promulgation shall be effected in the following forms: (1) "The national Congress enacts and I sanction the following law (or resolution)." (2) "The national Congress enacts and I promulgate the following law (or resolution)."

**Art. 38.** If the law be not promulgated by the President of the Republic within 48 hours, in the cases provided for in §§ 2 and 3 of the preceding article, the president of the Senate, or the vice president, if the former shall not do so in the same space of time, shall promulgate it, making use of the following formula: "I, president (or vice president) of the Senate, make known to whomsoever these presents may come, that the national Congress enacts and promulgates the following law (or resolution)."

**Art. 39.** A bill from one chamber, amended in the other, shall return to the former, which, if it accept the amendments, shall send it, changed to conform with the same, to the executive. § 1. In the contrary case, it shall go back to the amending chamber, where the alterations shall be considered as approved, if they receive the vote of two-thirds of the members present; in the latter case, the bill shall return to the chamber where it originated, and there the amendments can be rejected only by a two-thirds vote. § 2. If the alterations be rejected by such vote, the bill shall be submitted without them to the approval of the executive.

**Art. 40.** Bills finally rejected or not approved, shall not be presented again in the same legislative session.

**Art. 41.** The executive power shall be exercised by the President of the United States of Brazil, as elective chief of the nation. § 1. The Vice President, elected simultaneously with the President, shall serve in place of the latter in case of impediment and succeed him in case of vacancy in the Presidency. § 2. In case of impediment or vacancy in the Vice Presidency, the following officers, in the order named, shall be called to the Presidency: The vice president of the Senate, the president of the Chamber of Deputies, the president of the federal supreme court. § 3. The following are the conditions of eligibility to the Presidency or Vice Presidency of the Republic: (1) Must be a native of Brazil. (2) Must be in the exercise of political rights. (3) Must be more than 35 years of age.

**Art. 42.** In case of vacancy from any cause in the Presidency or Vice Presidency before the expiration of the first 2 years of the Presidential term, a new election shall be held.

**Art. 43.** The President shall hold his office during 4 years, and is not eligible for reelection for the next succeeding term. § 1. The Vice President who shall fill the Presidency during the last year of the Presidential term shall not be eligible to the Presidency for the next term of that office. § 2. On the same day on which his Presidential term shall cease the President shall, without fail, cease to exercise the functions of

his office, and the newly elected President shall at once succeed him. § 3. If the latter should be hindered or should fail to do so, the succession shall be effected in accordance with §§ 1 and 2 of article 41. § 4. The first Presidential term shall expire on the 15th of November, 1894.

**Art. 44.** On taking possession of his office, the President, in a session of the Congress, or, if it be not assembled, before the federal supreme court, shall pronounce the following affirmation: "I promise to maintain the federal Constitution and comply with its provisions with perfect loyalty, to promote the general welfare of the Republic, to observe its laws, and support the union, integrity, and independence of the nation."

**Art. 45.** The President and Vice President shall not leave the national territory without the permission of the Congress, under penalty of loss of office.

**Art. 46.** The President and Vice President shall receive the salary fixed by the Congress in the preceding Presidential term.

**Art. 47.** The President and Vice President shall be chosen by direct suffrage of the nation and an absolute majority of the votes. § 1. The election shall take place on the first day of March in the last year of the Presidential term, and the counting of the votes cast at the different precincts shall at once be made in the respective capitals of the States and in the federal capital. The Congress shall make the count at its first session of the same year, with any number of members present. § 2. If none of those voted for shall have received an absolute majority, the Congress shall elect, by a majority of votes of those present, one of the two who, in the direct election, shall have received the highest number of votes. In case of a tie the older shall be considered elected. § 3. The manner of the election and of the counting of the votes shall be regulated by ordinary legislation. § 4. The relatives, both by consanguinity and by marriage, in the first and second degrees, of the President and Vice President shall be ineligible for the offices of President and Vice President, provided the said officials are in office at the time of the election or have left the office even 6 months before.

**Art. 48.** To the President of the Republic shall belong the exclusive right to—(1) Sanction, promulgate, and make public the laws and resolutions of the Congress; issue decrees, instructions, and regulations for their faithful execution. (2) Choose and dismiss at will the cabinet officers. (3) Exercise or appoint some one to exercise supreme command over the land and naval forces of the United States of Brazil, as well as over the local police, when called to arms for the internal or external defense of the Union. (4) Govern and distribute, under the laws of the Congress, according to the necessities of the National Government, the land and naval forces. (5) Dispose of the offices, both military and civil, of a federal character, with the exceptions specified in the Constitution. (6) Pardon crimes and commute penalties for offenses subject to federal jurisdiction, save in the cases mentioned in article 34, No. 28, and article 52, § 2. (7) Declare war and make peace, under the provisions of article 34, No. 11. (8) Declare war at once in case of foreign invasion or aggression. (9) Give an annual statement to the national Congress of the condition of the country, with a recommenda-

tion of pressing provisions and reforms, through a message, which he shall send to the secretary of the Senate on the day of the opening of the legislative session. (10) Convoke the Congress in extra session. (11) Appoint the federal judges when proposed by the supreme court. (12) Appoint the members of the federal supreme court and ministers of the diplomatic corps, with the approval of the senate; and, in the absence of the Congress, appoint them in commission until considered by the senate. (13) Appoint the other members of the diplomatic corps and consular agents. (14) Maintain relations with foreign states. (15) Declare, directly, or through his responsible agents, a state of siege at any point of the national territory, in case of foreign aggression or serious internal disturbance. (Article 6, No. 3; article 34, No. 21; and article 80.) (16) Set on foot international negotiations, celebrate agreements, conventions, and treaties, always ad referendum to the Congress, and approve those made by the States in conformity with article 65, submitting them when necessary to the authority of the Congress.

**Art. 49.** The President of the Republic shall be assisted by the ministers of state (cabinet officers), agents of his confidence, who sign the acts and preside over their respective departments into which the federal administration is divided.

**Art. 50.** The cabinet ministers shall not exercise any other employment or function of a public nature, be eligible to the Presidency or Vice Presidency of the Union, or be elected deputy or senator. *Sole paragraph.*—Any deputy or senator, who shall accept the position of cabinet minister, shall lose his seat in the respective chamber, and a new election shall at once be held, in which he shall not be voted for.

**Art. 51.** The cabinet ministers shall not appear at the sessions of the Congress, and shall communicate with that body in writing only or by personal conference with the committees of the chambers. The annual report of the ministers shall be addressed to the President of the Republic, and distributed to all the members of the Congress.

**Art. 52.** The cabinet ministers shall not be responsible to the Congress or to the courts for advice given to the President of the Republic. § 1. They shall be responsible, nevertheless, with respect to their acts, for crimes defined in the law. § 2. For common crimes and those for which they are responsible they shall be prosecuted and tried by the federal supreme court, and for those committed jointly with the President of the Republic, by the authority competent to judge this latter.

**Art. 53.** The President of the United States of Brazil shall be brought to trial and judgment, after the Chamber of Deputies shall have decided that he should be tried on the charges made against him, in the federal supreme court, in the case of common crimes, and in those of responsibility, in the Senate. *Sole paragraph.*—As soon as it shall be decided to try him on the charges brought, the President shall be suspended in the exercise of the duties of his office.

**Art. 54.** Crimes of responsibility on the part of the President of the Republic are such as are directed against—(1) The political existence of the Union. (2) The Constitution and the form of the Federal Government. (3) The free exercise of the political powers. (4) The legal enjoyment

and exercise of political or individual rights. (5) The internal security of the country. (6) The purity of the administration. (7) The constitutional keeping and use of the public funds. (8) The financial legislation enacted by the Congress. § 1. These offenses shall be defined in a special law. § 2. Another law shall provide for the charges, the trial, and the judgment. § 3. Both these laws shall be enacted in the first session of the first Congress.

**Art. 55.** The judicial power of the Union shall be lodged in a federal supreme court, sitting in the capital of the Republic, and as many inferior federal courts and tribunals, distributed through the country, as the Congress shall create.

**Art. 56.** The federal supreme court shall be composed of fifteen justices, appointed under the provisions of article 48, No. 12, from among the oldest thirty citizens of well-known knowledge and reputation who may be eligible to the Senate.

**Art. 57.** The federal justices shall hold office for life, being removable solely by judicial sentence. § 1. Their salaries shall be fixed by law of the Congress, and can not be diminished. § 2. The Senate shall try the members of the federal supreme court for crimes of responsibility, and this latter the lower federal judges.

**Art. 58.** The federal courts shall choose their presidents from among their own members, and shall organize their respective clerical corps. § 1. In these corps the appointment and dismissal of the respective clerks, as well as the filling of the judicial offices in the respective judicial districts, shall belong to the presidents of the respective courts. § 2. The President of the Republic shall appoint from among the members of the federal supreme court the attorney-general of the Republic, whose duties shall be defined by law.

**Art. 59.** To the federal supreme court shall belong the duty of—(1) Trying and judging by original and exclusive jurisdiction—(a) The President of the Republic for common crimes, and the cabinet ministers in the cases specified in article 52. (b) The ministers of the diplomatic corps for common crimes and those of responsibility. (c) Cases and disputes between the States and the Union, or between the States one with another. (d) Disputes and claims between foreign states and the Union, or between foreign nations and the States. (e) Conflicts between the federal courts one with another, or between these and those of the States, as well as those between the courts of one State and those of another. (2) Deciding, on appeal, questions pronounced upon by the lower federal courts and tribunals, as well as those mentioned in § 1 of the present article and in article 60. (3) Reviewing the proceedings of finished trials, under the provisions of article 81. § 1. Decisions of State courts in last appeal can be carried to the federal supreme court—(a) When the validity or application of the federal laws or treaties is called in question and the decision of the State court shall be against the same. (b) When the validity of laws or acts of the governments of the States in respect to the Constitution or of the federal laws is contested and the State court shall have decided in favor of the validity of the acts or laws in question. § 2. In the cases which involve the application of the laws of the States, the federal court shall consult the jurisprudence of the local tribunals, and vice versa, the State court shall consider

that of the federal tribunals when the interpretation of the laws of the Union is involved.

**Art. 60.** It shall belong to the federal courts to decide—(a) Cases in which the plaintiff or the defendant shall rest the case on some provision of the federal Constitution. (b) All suits brought against the Government of the Union or the national treasury based on constitutional provisions, on the laws and regulations of the executive power, or on contracts made with the said Government. (c) Suits arising from compensations, claims, indemnification of damages, or any others whatsoever brought by the Government of the Union against private individuals, and vice versa. (d) Litigations between a State and the citizens of another, or between citizens of different States having differences in their laws. (e) Suits between foreign states and Brazilian citizens. (f) Actions begun by foreigners, and based either on contracts with the Federal Government or on conventions or treaties of the Union with other nations. (g) Questions of maritime law and navigation, whether on the sea or on the rivers and lakes of the country. (h) Questions of international law, whether criminal or civil. (i) Political crimes. § 1. Congress is forbidden to commit any part of the federal jurisdiction to the State courts. § 2. Sentences and orders of the federal judges will be executed by federal court officers, and the local police shall assist them when called upon by the same.

**Art. 61.** The decisions of the State courts or tribunals in matters within their competence shall put an end to the suits and questions, except as to (1) habeas corpus, or (2) effects of a foreigner deceased in cases not provided for by convention or treaty. In such cases there shall be voluntary recourse to the federal supreme court.

**Art. 62.** The State courts shall not have the power to intervene in questions submitted to the federal tribunals, or to annul, alter, or suspend the sentences or orders of these latter; and, reciprocally, the federal judiciary can not interfere in questions submitted to the State courts, or annul, alter, or suspend their decisions or orders, except in the cases provided in this Constitution.

**Art. 63.** Each State shall be governed by the constitution and laws which it shall adopt, respect being observed for the constitutional principles of the Union.

**Art. 64.** The unexplored mines and wild lands lying within the States shall belong to these States respectively; and to the Union only as much territory as may be necessary for the defense of the frontiers, for fortifications, military works, and federal railways. *Sole paragraph.*—The national properties, not necessary for the service of the Union, shall pass to the domain of the States in whose territory they may be situated.

**Art. 65.** The States shall have the right to—(1) Conclude agreements and conventions among themselves, if such be not of a political character. (Article 48, No. 16.) (2) Exercise in general any and every power or right not denied expressly by the Constitution, or implicitly in its express terms.

**Art. 66.** It is forbidden to the States to—(1) Refuse to recognize public documents of the Union, or of any of the States, of a legislative, administrative, or judicial character. (2) Reject the currency or notes issued by banks, which

circulate by act of the Federal Government. (3) Make or declare war, one with another, or make reprisals. (4) Refuse the extradition of criminals demanded by the justice of other States, or of the Federal District, in conformity with the laws of Congress which relate to this subject. (Article 41, No. 32.)

**Art. 67.** Save the restrictions specified in the Constitution, and the federal laws, the Federal District shall be governed directly by the municipal authorities. *Sole paragraph.*—Expenses of a local character in the capital of the Republic must be provided for exclusively by the municipal authorities.

**Art. 68.** The States shall organize themselves in such a manner as to assure the autonomy of the municipalities in everything that concerns their peculiar interests.

**Art. 69.** The following shall be Brazilian citizens: (1) Natives of Brazil, though of foreign parentage (father), provided he be not in the service of his nation. (2) Sons of a Brazilian father, and illegitimate sons of a Brazilian mother, born in foreign parts, if they take up their residence (domicile) in the republic. (3) Sons of a Brazilian father who may be in another country in the service of the Republic, although they do not make their domicile in Brazil. (4) Foreigners, who, being in Brazil on the 15th of November, 1889, shall not declare, within 6 months from the time when the Constitution enters into force, their desire to preserve their original nationality. (5) Foreigners who possess property (real estate) in Brazil and are married to Brazilian women, or have Brazilian children, provided they reside in Brazil, unless they shall declare their intention of not changing their nationality. (6) Foreigners naturalized in any other way.

**Art. 70.** Citizens of more than 21 years of age, and registered according to law, shall be electors. § 1. The following shall not be registered as electors for federal or State elections: (1) Beggars. (2) Persons ignorant of the alphabet. (3) Soldiers on pay, except alumni of the military schools of higher instruction. (4) Members of monastic orders, companies, congregations, or communities of whatsoever denomination, who are subject to vows of obedience, rule, or statute, which implies the surrender of individual liberty. § 2. Citizens who can not be registered shall not be eligible.

**Art. 71.** The rights of the Brazilian citizen can be suspended or lost only in the following cases: § 1. The rights may be suspended—(a) For physical or moral incapacity. (b) For criminal conviction, during the operation of the sentence. § 2. They may be lost—(a) By naturalization in a foreign country. (b) By acceptance of employment or pension from a foreign power, without permission of the federal executive. § 3. The means of reacquiring lost rights of the Brazilian citizen shall be specified by federal law.

**Art. 72.** The Constitution secures to Brazilians and foreigners residing in the country the inviolability of their rights touching individual liberty, and security, and property, in the following terms: § 1. No person shall be forced to do, or leave undone, anything whatever, except by virtue of law. § 2. Before the law all persons are equal. The Republic does not recognize privileges of birth, or titles of nobility, and abolishes all existing honorary orders, with all their prerogatives and decorations, as well as all

hereditary and conciliar titles. § 3. All persons and religious professions may exercise, publicly and freely, the right of worship, and may associate themselves for that purpose, acquire property, observance being had to the provisions of the common law. § 4. The Republic recognizes only the civil marriage, the celebration of which shall be gratuitous. § 5. The cemeteries shall be secular in character, and be managed by the municipal authorities, being free to all religious sects for the exercise of their respective rites as regards their members, provided they do not offend public morals or the laws. § 6. The instruction given in the public institutions shall be secular. § 7. No sect or church shall receive official aid, nor be dependent on, nor connected with, the Government of the Union, or of the States. § 8. All persons have the right of free association and assembly, without arms; and the police force shall not intervene, except to maintain the public order. § 9. Any person whatsoever shall have the right to address, by petition, the public powers, denounce abuses of the authorities, and appeal to the responsibility of the accused. § 10. In time of peace any person may, without passport, enter or leave the territory of the Republic, with his fortune and goods, whenever and however he may choose. § 11. The house is the inviolable asylum of the person; no one can enter it at night without the consent of the inhabitant, except to aid the victims of a crime or disaster; nor by day, unless in the cases and in the form prescribed by law. § 12. The expression of opinion shall be free, in respect to whatever subject, through the press or through the tribune, without subjection to censorship, each one being responsible for the abuses he may commit, in the cases and in the form prescribed by law. Anonymous publications are forbidden. § 13. Cases of flagrante delicto alone excepted, no arrest shall be made, unless after declaration of the charge (save in cases determined by law), and by written order of the competent authorities. § 14. No person shall be kept in prison without charge formally made, save the exceptions mentioned in the law, or taken to prison, or detained there, if he give bail, in cases where such is lawful. § 15. No person shall be condemned, except by competent authority, and in virtue of law already existing and in the form prescribed by it. § 16. The law shall secure to the accused the fullest defense by all the resources and means essential to the same, including the notice of the charge, delivered to the prisoner within 24 hours and signed by the proper authority along with the names of the accusers and witnesses. § 17. The rights of property are maintained in all their plenitude, and no disappropriation shall be made, except from necessity or public utility, and indemnity shall, in such cases, be made beforehand. Mines belong to the owners of the soil, under the limitations to be established by the law to encourage the development of this branch of industry. § 18. Correspondence under seal is inviolable. § 19. No penalty shall extend beyond the person of the delinquent. § 20. The penalty of the galleys is abolished, as also judicial banishment. § 21. The death penalty is abolished, except in the cases under military law in time of war. § 22. The habeas corpus shall always be granted when the individual suffers violence or compulsion, through illegality or abuse of power, or considers

himself in imminent danger of the same. § 23. There shall be no privileged tribunal, except in such cases as, from their nature, belong to special courts. § 24. The free exercise of any profession, moral, intellectual, or industrial, is guaranteed. § 25. Industrial inventions belong to their authors, to whom the law will grant a temporary privilege, or to whom the Congress will give a reasonable premium, when it is desirable to make the invention public property. § 26. To authors of literary and artistic works is guaranteed the exclusive right of reproducing them through the press or by any other mechanical process, and their heirs shall enjoy the same right during the space of time determined by the law. § 27. The law shall also secure the rights of property in trade-marks. § 28. No Brazilian can be deprived of his civil and political rights on account of religious belief or duty, nor be exempted from the performance of any civic duty. § 29. Those who shall claim exemption from any burden imposed by the laws of the Republic on its citizens, on account of religious belief, or who shall accept any foreign decoration or title of nobility, shall lose all their political rights. § 30. No tax of any kind shall be collected except in virtue of a law authorizing the same. § 31. The institution of trial by jury is maintained.

**Art. 73.** Public offices, civil or military, are accessible to all Brazilian citizens, always observing the conditions of particular capacity fixed by the law; but the accumulation of remunerations is forbidden.

**Art. 74.** Commissions, offices, and positions not subject to removal are guaranteed in all their plenitude.

**Art. 75.** Only such public officials as have become infirm in the service of the nation shall be retired on pay.

**Art. 76.** Officers of the army and navy shall lose their commissions only in case of condemnation to more than 2 years in prison, pronounced in judgment by the competent tribunals.

**Art. 77.** There shall be a special court for the trial of military offenses committed by soldiers or marines. § 1. This court shall be composed of a supreme military tribunal, whose members shall hold their seats for life, and of the councils necessary for the formulation of the charge and the judgment of the crimes. § 2. The organization and powers of the supreme military tribunal shall be determined by law.

**Art. 78.** The enumeration of the rights and guarantees expressed in the Constitution does not exclude other guarantees and rights, not enumerated, but resulting from the form of government established and principles settled by said Constitution.

**Art. 79.** The citizen vested with the functions of either of these three federal powers shall not exercise those of another.

**Art. 80.** Any part of the territory of the Union may be declared in state of siege, and the constitutional guarantees suspended for a determined period, whenever the security of the Republic so demands in case of foreign aggression or intestine disturbance. (Article 34, No. 21.) § 1. The power to execute the above provision may, if the Congress be not in session and the country be in imminent peril, be used by the federal executive. (Article 48, No. 15.) § 2. In the exercise of this power, during the state of siege, the executive shall be restricted to the following

measures of repression against persons: (1) To their detention in a place not allotted to persons accused of common crimes. (2) To banishment to other parts of the national territory. § 3. As soon as the Congress shall have assembled, the President of the Republic shall make a report to that body of the exceptional measures which may have been taken. § 4. The authorities who shall have ordered such measures shall be responsible for any abuses that may have been committed.

**Art. 81.** In criminal cases, trials concluded may be reviewed at any time, in favor of the condemned parties, by the federal supreme court, for the purpose of correcting or of confirming the sentence. § 1. The law shall determine the cases and the form of such revision, which may be asked for by the condemned, by any one of the people, or by the attorney-general of the Republic, *ex officio*. § 2. In such revision the penalties imposed by the sentence reviewed can not be increased. § 3. The provisions of the present article are applicable to military trials.

**Art. 82.** Public officers shall be strictly responsible for the abuses and omissions that occur in the exercise of the duties of their offices, as well as for the indulgences and negligences for which they do not hold their subordinates responsible. *Sole paragraph.*—They shall all be bound by formal obligation, on taking possession of their offices, to discharge the lawful duties of the same.

**Art. 83.** Until revoked, the laws of the ancien régime shall remain in force, in as far as they are not, explicitly or implicitly, contrary to the system of government established by the Constitution, and to the principles laid down in the same.

**Art. 84.** The federal government guarantees the payment of the public debt, both internal and foreign.

**Art. 85.** The officers of the line and of the annexed classes of the navy shall have the same commissions and advantage as those of the army of corresponding rank.

**Art. 86.** Every Brazilian shall be bound to military service in defense of the country and the Constitution, as provided by the federal laws.

**Art. 87.** The federal army shall be made up of contingents which the states and the Federal District are bound to furnish, constituted in conformity with the annual law regulating the number of the forces. § 1. The general organization of the army shall be determined by a federal law, in accordance with No. 18 of article 34. § 2. The Union shall have charge of the military instruction of the troops and of the higher military instruction. § 3. Compulsory recruiting for military purposes is abolished. § 4. The army and navy shall be made up by volunteering without bounties, or, if this means be not sufficient, by lot previously determined. The crews for the navy shall be made up from the naval school, the schools of marine apprentices, and the merchant marine, by means of lot.

**Art. 88.** In no case, either directly or indirectly, alone or in alliance with another nation, shall the United States of Brazil engage in a war of conquest.

**Art. 89.** A tribunal of accounts shall be instituted for the auditing of the receipt and expense accounts and examining into their legality before their presentation to the Congress. The mem-

bers of this tribunal shall be appointed by the President of the Republic, with the approval of the Senate, and can lose their seats only by sentence.

**Art. 90.** The Constitution may be amended, at the initiative of the national Congress, or of the legislatures of the States. § 1. An amendment shall be considered as proposed, when, having been presented by one-fourth, at least, of the members of either house of the Congress, it shall have been accepted in three readings (discussions) by two-thirds of the votes in both houses of the Congress, or when it shall have been asked for by two-thirds of the States represented, each one by a majority of the votes of its legislature, said votes to be taken in the course of 1 year. § 2. The proposed amendment shall be considered approved, if, in the following year, after three discussions, it shall have been adopted by a majority of two-thirds of the votes in the two houses of the Congress. § 3. The amendment adopted shall be published with the signatures of the presidents and clerks of the two chambers, and be incorporated into the Constitution as a part of the same. § 4. No project having a tendency to abolish the federative republican form, or the equal representation of the States in the Senate, shall be admitted for consideration in the Congress.

**Art. 91.** This Constitution, after approval, shall be promulgated by the president of the Congress and signed by the members of the same.

#### Temporary Provisions.

**Article 1.** After the promulgation of this Constitution, the Congress, in joint assembly, shall choose consecutively, by an absolute majority of votes in the first balloting, and, if no candidate shall receive such, by a plurality in the second balloting, the President and Vice President of the United States of Brazil. § 1. This election shall be in two distinct ballotings, for the President and Vice President respectively, the ballots for President being taken and counted, in the first place, and afterwards for Vice President. § 2. The President and Vice President, thus elected, shall occupy the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the Republic during the first Presidential term. § 3. For said election there shall be no incompatibilities admitted. § 4. As soon as said election shall be concluded, the Congress shall consider as terminated its mission in joint session and, separating into Chamber and Senate, shall enter upon the exercise of its functions as defined by law, on the 15th of June of the present year, and can not in any case be dissolved. § 5. In the first year of the first legislature, among its preparatory measures, the Senate shall designate the first and second third of its members, whose term of office shall cease at the end of the first and second 3-year terms. § 6. The discrimination shall be made in three lists, corresponding to the three classes, allotting to them the senators of each State and of the Federal District according to the number of votes received by them respectively, so as to allot to the third for the last 3 years the one receiving the highest number of votes in the Federal District and in each State, and to the other two-thirds the remaining two names in the order of the number of votes received by them respectively. § 7. In case of tie, the oldest shall be preferred, and if the ages are equal, the choice shall be made by lot.

**Art. 2.** The State which, by the end of the year 1892, shall not have adopted its constitution, shall, by act of the federal legislative power, be placed under that of one of the other States, which it shall judge most suitable, until the State thus subjected to said constitution shall amend it in the manner provided in the same.

**Art. 3.** As fast as the States shall be organized, the Federal Government shall deliver to them the administration of the services which belong to them, and shall settle the responsibility of the federal administration in all that relates to said services and to the payment of the respective officials.

**Art. 4.** While, during the period of organization of their services, the States shall be engaged in regulating their expenses, the Federal Government shall, for this purpose, open special credits to them, under conditions determined by the Congress.

**Art. 5.** In the States which shall become organized the classification of the revenues established in the Constitution shall enter into force.

**Art. 6.** In the first appointments for the federal magistracy and for that of the States, the preference shall be given to the justices and magistrates of the higher courts of the greatest note. Such as are not admitted into the new organization of the judiciary, and have served 30 years, shall be retired on full pay. Those who have

served for less than 30 years shall continue to receive their salaries until they shall be employed, or retired with pay corresponding to their length of service. The payment of salaries of magistrates retired or set aside shall be made by the Federal Government.

**Art. 7.** **J. D. Pedro de Alcantara**, ex-Emperor of Brazil, a pension is granted, to run from the 15th of November, 1889, sufficient to guarantee him a decent subsistence during his lifetime. The Congress, at its first session, shall fix the amount of said pension.

**Art. 8.** The Federal Government shall acquire for the nation the house in which Dr. Benjamin Constant Botelho de Magalhães died, and shall have placed on it a memorial slab in memory of that great patriot, the founder of the Republic. *Sole paragraph.*—The widow of the said Dr. Benjamin Constant shall have, during her lifetime, the usufruct of the said house. We order, then, all the authorities to whom the recognition and execution of this Constitution belongs, to execute it and have it executed and observed faithfully and fully in all its provisions. Let the same be published and observed throughout the territory of the nation. Hall of the sessions of the National Constitutional Congress, in the city of Rio de Janeiro, in the year 1891, and the third of the Republic. See BRAZIL: 1889-1891.

**CONSTITUTION OF CALIFORNIA.**—For an account of the main features of this

singular constitution, see CALIFORNIA: A. D. 1877-1880.

CONSTITUTION OF CANADA.

**A. D. 1774.**—The Quebec Act. See CANADA: A. D. 1763-1774.

**A. D. 1791.**—The Constitutional Act. See CANADA: A. D. 1791.

**A. D. 1840.**—The Union Act. See CANADA: A. D. 1840-1867.

**A. D. 1867.**—The British North America Act.—The history of the Confederation of the provinces of British North America, forming the Dominion of Canada, is given briefly under CANADA: A. D. 1867. The following is the text of the Act of the Parliament of Great Britain by which the Confederation was formed and its constitution established:

An Act for the Union of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, and the Government thereof; and for purposes connected therewith. 29TH MARCH, 1867.

WHEREAS the Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick have expressed their desire to be federally united into one Dominion under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom: And whereas such a Union would conduce to the welfare of the Provinces and promote the interests of the British Empire; And whereas on the establishment of the Union by authority of Parliament it is expedient, not only that the Constitution of the Legislative Authority in the Dominion be provided for, but also that the nature of the Executive Government therein be declared: And whereas it is expedient that provision be made for the eventual admission into the Union of other parts of British North America: Be it therefore enacted and declared

by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

**1.** This Act may be cited as The British North America Act, 1867.

**2.** The provisions of this Act referring to Her Majesty the Queen extend also to the heirs and successors of Her Majesty, Kings and Queens of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

**3.** It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, to declare by Proclamation that, on and after a day therein appointed, not being more than six months after the passing of this Act, the Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick shall form and be one Dominion under the name of Canada; and on and after that day those three Provinces shall form and be one Dominion under that name accordingly.

**4.** The subsequent provisions of this Act shall, unless it is otherwise expressed or implied, commence and have effect on and after the Union, that is to say, on and after the day appointed for the Union taking effect in the Queen's Proclamation; and in the same provisions, unless it is otherwise expressed or implied, the name Canada shall be taken to mean Canada as constituted under this Act.

**5.** Canada shall be divided into four Provinces, named Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick.

**6.** The parts of the Province of Canada (as it exists at the passing of this Act) which formerly

constituted respectively the Provinces of Upper Canada and Lower Canada shall be deemed to be severed, and shall form two separate Provinces. The part which formerly constituted the Province of Upper Canada shall constitute the Province of Ontario; and the part which formerly constituted the Province of Lower Canada shall constitute the Province of Quebec.

7. The Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall have the same limits as at the passing of this Act.

8. In the general census of the population of Canada, which is hereby required to be taken in the year one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one, and in every tenth year thereafter, the respective populations of the four Provinces shall be distinguished.

9. The Executive Government and authority of and over Canada is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.

10. The provisions of this Act referring to the Governor General extend and apply to the Governor General for the time being of Canada, or other the Chief Executive Officer or Administrator, for the time being carrying on the Government of Canada on behalf and in the name of the Queen, by whatever title he is designated.

11. There shall be a Council to aid and advise in the Government of Canada, to be styled the Queen's Privy Council for Canada; and the persons who are to be members of that Council shall be from time to time chosen and summoned by the Governor General and sworn in as Privy Councillors, and members thereof may be from time to time removed by the Governor General.

12. All powers, authorities, and functions which under any Act of the Parliament of Great Britain, or of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or of the Legislature of Upper Canada, Lower Canada, Canada, Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick, are at the Union vested in or exercisable by the respective Governors or Lieutenant Governors of those Provinces, with the advice, or with the advice and consent, of the respective Executive Councils thereof, or in conjunction with those Councils, or with any number of members thereof, or by those Governors or Lieutenant Governors individually, shall, as far as the same continue in existence and capable of being exercised after the Union in relation to the Government of Canada, be vested in and exercisable by the Governor General, with the advice or with the advice and consent of or in conjunction with the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, or any members thereof, or by the Governor General individually, as the case requires, subject nevertheless (except with respect to such as exist under Acts of the Parliament of Great Britain or of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland) to be abolished or altered by the Parliament of Canada.

13. The provisions of this Act referring to the Governor General in Council shall be construed as referring to the Governor General acting by and with the advice of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada.

14. It shall be lawful for the Queen, if Her Majesty thinks fit, to authorize the Governor General from time to time to appoint any person or any persons, jointly or severally, to be his Deputy or Deputies within any part or parts of

Canada, and in that capacity to exercise during the pleasure of the Governor General such of the powers, authorities, and functions of the Governor General as the Governor General deems it necessary and expedient to assign to him or them, subject to any limitations or directions expressed or given by the Queen; but the appointment of such a Deputy or Deputies shall not affect the exercise by the Governor General himself of any power, authority or function.

15. The Command-in-Chief of the Land and Naval Militia, and of all Naval and Military Forces, of and in Canada, is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.

16. Until the Queen otherwise directs, the seat of Government of Canada shall be Ottawa.

17. There shall be one Parliament for Canada, consisting of the Queen, an Upper House styled the Senate, and the House of Commons.

18. The privileges, immunities, and powers to be held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Senate and by the House of Commons, and by the members thereof respectively, shall be such as are from time to time defined by Act of the Parliament of Canada, but so that the same shall never exceed those at the passing of this Act held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and by the members thereof.

19. The Parliament of Canada shall be called together not later than six months after the Union.

20. There shall be a Session of the Parliament of Canada once at least in every year, so that twelve months shall not intervene between the last sitting of the Parliament in one Session and its first sitting in the next Session.

21. The Senate shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, consist of seventy-two members, who shall be styled Senators.

22. In relation to the constitution of the Senate, Canada shall be deemed to consist of three divisions—1. Ontario; 2. Quebec; 3. The Maritime Provinces, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; which three divisions shall (subject to the provisions of this Act) be equally represented in the Senate as follows: Ontario by twenty-four Senators; Quebec by twenty-four Senators; and the Maritime Provinces by twenty-four Senators, twelve thereof representing Nova Scotia, and twelve thereof representing New Brunswick. In the case of Quebec each of the twenty-four Senators representing that Province shall be appointed for one of the twenty-four Electoral Divisions of Lower Canada specified in Schedule A. to chapter one of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada.

23. The qualification of a Senator shall be as follows:—(1) He shall be of the full age of thirty years; (2) He shall be either a natural born subject of the Queen, or a subject of the Queen naturalized by an Act of the Parliament of Great Britain, or of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or of the Legislature of one of the Provinces of Upper Canada, Lower Canada, Canada, Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick, before the Union, or of the Parliament of Canada after the Union; (3) He shall be legally or equitably seized as of freehold for his own use and benefit of lands or tenements held in free and common socage, or seized or possessed for his own use and benefit of



lands or tenements held in franc-alleu or in roture, within the Province for which he is appointed, of the value of four thousand dollars, over and above all rents, dues, debts, charges, mortgages, and incumbrances due or payable out of or charged on or affecting the same: (4) His real and personal property shall be together worth \$4,000 over and above his debts and liabilities: (5) He shall be resident in the Province for which he is appointed: (6) In the case of Quebec he shall have his real property qualification in the Electoral Division for which he is appointed, or shall be resident in that Division.

24. The Governor General shall from time to time, in the Queen's name, by instrument under the Great Seal of Canada, summon qualified persons to the Senate; and, subject to the provisions of this Act, every person so summoned shall become and be a member of the Senate and a Senator.

25. Such persons shall be first summoned to the Senate as the Queen by warrant under Her Majesty's Royal Sign Manual thinks fit to approve, and their names shall be inserted in the Queen's Proclamation of Union.

26. If at any time on the recommendation of the Governor General the Queen thinks fit to direct that three or six members be added to the Senate, the Governor General may by summons to three or six qualified persons (as the case may be), representing equally the three divisions of Canada, add to the Senate accordingly.

27. In case of such addition being at any time made the Governor General shall not summon any person to the Senate, except on a further like direction by the Queen on the like recommendation, until each of the three divisions of Canada is represented by twenty-four Senators and no more.

28. The number of Senators shall not at any time exceed seventy-eight.

29. A Senator shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, hold his place in the Senate for life.

30. A Senator may by writing under his hand addressed to the Governor General resign his place in the Senate, and thereupon the same shall be vacant.

31. The place of a Senator shall become vacant in any of the following cases: (1) If for two consecutive Sessions of the Parliament he fails to give his attendance in the Senate: (2) If he takes an oath or makes a declaration or acknowledgment of allegiance, obedience, or adherence to a foreign power, or does an act whereby he becomes a subject or citizen, or entitled to the rights or privileges of a subject or citizen of a foreign power: (3) If he is adjudged bankrupt or insolvent, or applies for the benefit of any law relating to insolvent debtors, or becomes a public defaulter: (4) If he is attainted of treason or convicted of felony or of any infamous crime: (5) If he ceases to be qualified in respect of property or of residence; provided, that a Senator shall not be deemed to have ceased to be qualified in respect of residence by reason only of his residing at the seat of the Government of Canada while holding an office under that Government requiring his presence there.

32. When a vacancy happens in the Senate by resignation, death, or otherwise, the Governor General shall by summons to a fit and qualified person fill the vacancy.

33. If any question arises respecting the qualification of a Senator or a vacancy in the Senate the same shall be heard and determined by the Senate.

34. The Governor General may from time to time, by instrument under the Great Seal of Canada, appoint a Senator to be Speaker of the Senate, and may remove him and appoint another in his stead.

35. Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, the presence of at least fifteen Senators, including the Speaker, shall be necessary to constitute a meeting of the Senate for the exercise of its powers.

36. Questions arising in the Senate shall be decided by a majority of voices, and the Speaker shall in all cases have a vote, and when the voices are equal the decision shall be deemed to be in the negative.

37. The House of Commons shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, consist of one hundred and eighty-one members, of whom eighty-two shall be elected for Ontario, sixty-five for Quebec, nineteen for Nova Scotia, and fifteen for New Brunswick.

38. The Governor General shall from time to time, in the Queen's name, by instrument under the Great Seal of Canada, summon and call together the House of Commons.

39. A Senator shall not be capable of being elected or of sitting or voting as a member of the House of Commons.

40. Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick shall, for the purposes of the election of members to serve in the House of Commons, be divided into Electoral Districts as follows:—(1) Ontario shall be divided into the Counties, Ridings of Counties, Cities, parts of Cities, and Towns enumerated in the first Schedule to this Act, each whereof shall be an Electoral District, each such District as numbered in that Schedule being entitled to return one member. (2) Quebec shall be divided into sixty-five Electoral Districts, composed of the sixty-five Electoral Divisions into which Lower Canada is at the passing of this Act divided under chapter two of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, chapter seventy-five of the Consolidated Statutes for Lower Canada, and the Act of the Province of Canada of the twenty-third year of the Queen, chapter one, or any other Act amending the same in force at the Union, so that each such Electoral Division shall be for the purposes of this Act an Electoral District entitled to return one member. (3) Each of the eighteen Counties of Nova Scotia shall be an Electoral District. The County of Halifax shall be entitled to return two members, and each of the other Counties one member. (4) Each of the fourteen Counties into which New Brunswick is divided, including the City and County of St. John, shall be an Electoral District; the City of St. John shall also be a separate Electoral District. Each of those fifteen Electoral Districts shall be entitled to return one member.

41. Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several Provinces at the Union relative to the following matters or any of them, namely,—the qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected or to sit or vote as members of the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly in the

several Provinces, the voters at elections of such members, the oaths to be taken by voters, the returning officers, their powers and duties, the proceedings at elections, the periods during which elections may be continued, the trial of controverted elections, and proceedings incident thereto, the vacating of seats of members, and the execution of new writs in case of seats vacated otherwise than by dissolution,—shall respectively apply to elections of members to serve in the House of Commons for the same several Provinces. Provided that, until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, at any election for a Member of the House of Commons for the District of Algoma, in addition to persons qualified by the law of the Province of Canada to vote, every male British subject aged twenty-one years or upwards, being a householder, shall have a vote.

**42.** For the first election of members to serve in the House of Commons the Governor General shall cause writs to be issued by such person, in such form, and addressed to such returning officers as he thinks fit. The person issuing writs under this section shall have the like powers as are possessed at the Union by the officers charged with the issuing of writs for the election of members to serve in the respective House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly of the Province of Canada, Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick; and the Returning Officers to whom writs are directed under this section shall have the like powers as are possessed at the Union by the officers charged with the returning of writs for the election of members to serve in the same respective House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly.

**43.** In case a vacancy in the representation in the House of Commons of any Electoral District happens before the meeting of the Parliament, or after the meeting of the Parliament before provision is made by the Parliament in this behalf, the provisions of the last foregoing section of this Act shall extend and apply to the issuing and returning of a writ in respect of such vacant District.

**44.** The House of Commons on its first assembling after a general election shall proceed with all practicable speed to elect one of its members to be Speaker.

**45.** In case of a vacancy happening in the office of Speaker by death, resignation or otherwise, the House of Commons shall with all practicable speed proceed to elect another of its members to be Speaker.

**46.** The Speaker shall preside at all meetings of the House of Commons.

**47.** Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, in case of the absence for any reason of the Speaker from the chair of the House of Commons for a period of forty-eight consecutive hours, the House may elect another of its members to act as Speaker, and the member so elected shall during the continuance of such absence of the Speaker have and execute all the powers, privileges, and duties of Speaker.

**48.** The presence of at least twenty members of the House of Commons shall be necessary to constitute a meeting of the House for the exercise of its powers, and for that purpose the Speaker shall be reckoned as a member.

**49.** Questions arising in the House of Commons shall be decided by a majority of voices

other than that of the Speaker, and when the voices are equal, but not otherwise, the Speaker shall have a vote.

**50.** Every House of Commons shall continue for five years from the day of the return of the writs for choosing the House (subject to be sooner dissolved by the Governor General), and no longer.

**51.** On the completion of the census in the year one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four Provinces shall be re-adjusted by such authority, in such manner and from such time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules:—(1) Quebec shall have the fixed number of sixty-five members; (2) There shall be assigned to each of the other Provinces such a number of members as will bear the same proportion to the number of its population (ascertained at such census) as the number sixty-five bears to the number of the population of Quebec (so ascertained); (3) In the computation of the number of members for a Province a fractional part not exceeding one-half of the whole number requisite for entitling the Province to a member shall be disregarded; but a fractional part exceeding one-half of that number shall be equivalent to the whole number; (4) On any such re-adjustment the number of members for a Province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the Province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding re-adjustment of the number of members for the Province is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one-twentieth part or upwards; (5) Such re-adjustment shall not take effect until the termination of the then existing Parliament.

**52.** The number of members of the House of Commons may be from time to time increased by the Parliament of Canada, provided the proportionate representation of the Provinces prescribed by this Act is not thereby disturbed.

**53.** Bills for appropriating any part of the public revenue, or for imposing any tax or impost, shall originate in the House of Commons.

**54.** It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address, or bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to that House by message of the Governor General in the Session in which such vote, resolution, address, or bill is proposed.

**55.** Where a bill passed by the Houses of the Parliament is presented to the Governor General for the Queen's assent, he shall declare according to his discretion, but subject to the provisions of this Act and to Her Majesty's instructions, either that he assents thereto in the Queen's name, or that he withholds the Queen's assent, or that he reserves the bill for the signification of the Queen's pleasure.

**56.** Where the Governor General assents to a bill in the Queen's name, he shall by the first convenient opportunity send an authentic copy of the Act to one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, and if the Queen in Council within two years after receipt thereof by the Secretary of State thinks fit to disallow the Act, such disallowance (with a certificate of the Secre-

tary of State of the day on which the Act was received by him) being signified by the Governor General, by speech or message to each of the Houses of the Parliament, or by proclamation, shall annul the Act from and after the day of such signification.

**57.** A bill reserved for the signification of the Queen's pleasure shall not have any force unless and until within two years from the day on which it was presented to the Governor General for the Queen's assent, the Governor General signifies, by speech or message to each of the Houses of the Parliament or by proclamation, that it has received the assent of the Queen in Council. An entry of every such speech, message, or proclamation shall be made in the Journal of each House, and a duplicate thereof duly attested shall be delivered to the proper officer to be kept among the Records of Canada.

**58.** For each Province there shall be an officer, styled the Lieutenant Governor, appointed by the Governor General in Council by instrument under the Great Seal of Canada.

**59.** A Lieutenant Governor shall hold office during the pleasure of the Governor General; but any Lieutenant Governor appointed after the commencement of the first Session of the Parliament of Canada shall not be removable within five years from his appointment, except for cause assigned, which shall be communicated to him in writing within one month after the order for his removal is made, and shall be communicated by message to the Senate and to the House of Commons within one week thereafter if the Parliament is then sitting, and if not then within one week after the commencement of the next Session of the Parliament.

**60.** The salaries of the Lieutenant Governors shall be fixed and provided by the Parliament of Canada.

**61.** Every Lieutenant Governor shall, before assuming the duties of his office, make and subscribe before the Governor General, or some person authorized by him, oaths of allegiance and office similar to those taken by the Governor General.

**62.** The provisions of this Act referring to the Lieutenant Governor extend and apply to the Lieutenant Governor for the time being of each Province or other the chief executive officer or administrator for the time being carrying on the government of the Province, by whatever title he is designated.

**63.** The Executive Council of Ontario and of Quebec shall be composed of such persons as the Lieutenant Governor from time to time thinks fit, and in the first instance of the following officers, namely:—The Attorney-General, the Secretary and Registrar of the Province, the Treasurer of the Province, the Commissioner of Crown Lands, and the Commissioner of Agriculture and Public Works, with in Quebec the Speaker of the Legislative Council and the Solicitor General.

**64.** The Constitution of the Executive Authority in each of the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, continue as it exists at the Union until altered under the authority of this Act.

**65.** All powers, authorities, and functions which under any Act of the Parliament of Great Britain, or of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or of the

Legislature of Upper Canada, Lower Canada, or Canada, were or are before or at the Union vested in or exercisable by the respective Governors or Lieutenant Governors of those Provinces, with the advice, or with the advice and consent, of the respective Executive Councils thereof, or in conjunction with those Councils, or with any number of members thereof, or by those Governors or Lieutenant Governors individually, shall, as far as the same are capable of being exercised after the Union in relation to the Government of Ontario and Quebec, respectively, be vested in, and shall or may be exercised by the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario and Quebec respectively, with the advice or with the advice and consent of or in conjunction with the respective Executive Councils, or any members thereof, or by the Lieutenant Governor individually, as the case requires, subject nevertheless (except with respect to such as exist under Acts of the Parliament of Great Britain, or of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland), to be abolished or altered by the respective Legislatures of Ontario and Quebec.

**66.** The provisions of this Act, referring to the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall be construed as referring to the Lieutenant Governor of the Province acting by and with the advice of the Executive Council thereof.

**67.** The Governor General in Council may from time to time appoint an administrator to execute the office and functions of Lieutenant Governor during his absence, illness, or other inability.

**68.** Unless and until the Executive Government of any Province otherwise directs with respect to that Province, the seats of Government of the Provinces shall be as follows, namely,—of Ontario, the City of Toronto; of Quebec, the City of Quebec; of Nova Scotia, the City of Halifax; and of New Brunswick, the City of Fredericton.

**69.** There shall be a Legislature for Ontario consisting of the Lieutenant Governor and of one House, styled the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

**70.** The Legislative Assembly of Ontario shall be composed of eighty-two members, to be elected to represent the eighty-two Electoral Districts set forth in the first Schedule to this Act.

**71.** There shall be a Legislature for Quebec consisting of the Lieutenant Governor and of two Houses, styled the Legislative Council of Quebec and the Legislative Assembly of Quebec.

**72.** The Legislative Council of Quebec shall be composed of twenty-four members, to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in the Queen's name, by instrument under the Great Seal of Quebec, one being appointed to represent each of the twenty-four Electoral Divisions of Lower Canada in this Act referred to, and each holding office for the term of his life, unless the Legislature of Quebec otherwise provides under the provisions of this Act.

**73.** The qualifications of the Legislative Councillors of Quebec shall be the same as those of the Senators for Quebec.

**74.** The place of a Legislative Councillor of Quebec shall become vacant in the cases, 'mutatis mutandis' in which the place of Senator becomes vacant.

**75.** When a vacancy happens in the Legislative Council of Quebec, by resignation, death, or otherwise, the Lieutenant Governor, in the Queen's name, by instrument under the Great Seal of Quebec, shall appoint a fit and qualified person to fill the vacancy.

**76.** If any question arises respecting the qualification of a Legislative Councillor of Quebec, or a vacancy in the Legislative Council of Quebec, the same shall be heard and determined by the Legislative Council.

**77.** The Lieutenant Governor may from time to time, by instrument under the Great Seal of Quebec, appoint a member of the Legislative Council of Quebec to be Speaker thereof, and may remove him and appoint another in his stead.

**78.** Until the Legislature of Quebec otherwise provides, the presence of at least ten members of the Legislative Council, including the Speaker, shall be necessary to constitute a meeting for the exercise of its powers.

**79.** Questions arising in the Legislative Council of Quebec shall be decided by a majority of voices, and the Speaker shall in all cases have a vote, and when the voices are equal the decision shall be deemed to be in the negative.

**80.** The Legislative Assembly of Quebec shall be composed of sixty-five members, to be elected to represent the sixty-five Electoral Divisions or Districts of Lower Canada in this Act referred to, subject to alteration thereof by the Legislature of Quebec: Provided that it shall not be lawful to present to the Lieutenant Governor of Quebec for assent any bill for altering the limits of any of the Electoral Divisions or Districts mentioned in the second Schedule to this Act, unless the second and third readings of such bill have been passed in the Legislative Assembly with the concurrence of the majority of the members representing all those Electoral Divisions or Districts, and the assent shall not be given to such bills unless an address has been presented by the Legislative Assembly to the Lieutenant Governor stating that it has been so passed.

**81.** The Legislatures of Ontario and Quebec respectively shall be called together not later than six months after the Union.

**82.** The Lieutenant Governor of Ontario and of Quebec shall from time to time, in the Queen's name, by instrument under the Great Seal of the Province, summon and call together the Legislative Assembly of the Province.

**83.** Until the Legislature of Ontario or of Quebec otherwise provides, a person accepting or holding in Ontario or in Quebec any office, commission, or employment, permanent or temporary, at the nomination of the Lieutenant Governor, to which an annual salary, or any fee, allowance, emolument, or profit of any kind or amount whatever from the Province is attached, shall not be eligible as a member of the Legislative Assembly of the respective Province, nor shall he sit or vote as such; but nothing in this section shall make ineligible any person being a member of the Executive Council of the respective Province, or holding any of the following offices, that is to say, the offices of Attorney-General, Secretary and Registrar of the Province, Treasurer of the Province, Commissioner of Crown Lands, and Commissioner of Agriculture and Public Works, and, in Quebec, Solicitor-General, or shall disqualify him to sit or vote in

the House for which he is elected, provided he is elected while holding such office.

**84.** Until the Legislatures of Ontario and Quebec respectively otherwise provide, all laws which at the Union are in force in those Provinces respectively, relative to the following matters, or any of them, namely,—the qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected or to sit or vote as members of the Assembly of Canada, the qualifications or disqualifications of voters, the oaths to be taken by voters, the Returning Officers, their powers and duties, the proceedings at elections, the periods during which such elections may be continued, and the trial of controverted elections and the proceedings incident thereto, the vacating of the seats of members and the issuing and execution of new writs in case of seats vacated otherwise than by dissolution, shall respectively apply to elections of members to serve in the respective Legislative Assemblies of Ontario and Quebec. Provided that until the Legislature of Ontario otherwise provides, at any election for a member of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario for the District of Algoma, in addition to persons qualified by the law of the Province of Canada to vote, every male British subject, aged twenty-one years or upwards, being a householder, shall have a vote.

**85.** Every Legislative Assembly of Ontario and every Legislative Assembly of Quebec shall continue for four years from the day of the return of the writs for choosing the same (subject nevertheless to either the Legislative Assembly of Ontario or the Legislative Assembly of Quebec being sooner dissolved by the Lieutenant Governor of the Province), and no longer.

**86.** There shall be a session of the Legislature of Ontario and of that of Quebec once at least in every year, so that twelve months shall not intervene between the last sitting of the Legislature in each Province in one session and its first sitting in the next session.

**87.** The following provisions of this Act respecting the House of Commons of Canada, shall extend and apply to the Legislative Assemblies of Ontario and Quebec, that is to say,—the provisions relating to the election of a Speaker originally and on vacancies, the duties of the Speaker, the absence of the Speaker, the quorum, and the mode of voting, as if those provisions were here re-enacted and made applicable in terms to each such Legislative Assembly.

**88.** The constitution of the Legislature of each of the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, continue as it exists at the Union until altered under the authority of this Act; and the House of Assembly of New Brunswick existing at the passing of this Act shall, unless sooner dissolved, continue for the period for which it was elected.

**89.** Each of the Lieutenant Governors of Ontario, Quebec, and Nova Scotia shall cause writs to be issued for the first election of members of the Legislative Assembly thereof in such form and by such person as he thinks fit, and at such time and addressed to such Returning Officer as the Governor General directs, and so that the first election of member of Assembly for any Electoral District or any subdivision thereof shall be held at the same time and at the same places as the election for a member to serve in the

House of Commons of Canada for that Electoral District.

**90.** The following provisions of this Act respecting the Parliament of Canada, namely,— the provisions relating to appropriation and tax bills, the recommendation of money votes, the assent to bills, the disallowance of Acts, and the signification of pleasure on bills reserved,— shall extend and apply to the Legislatures of the several Provinces as if those provisions were here re-enacted and made applicable in terms to the respective Provinces and the Legislatures thereof, with the substitution of the Lieutenant Governor of the Province for the Governor General, of the Governor General for the Queen and for a Secretary of State, of one year for two years, and of the Province for Canada.

**91.** It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of Canada, in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the Provinces; and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms of this section, it is hereby declared that (notwithstanding anything in this Act) the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated, that is to say,— 1. The Public Debt and Property. 2. The regulation of Trade and Commerce. 3. The raising of money by any mode or system of Taxation. 4. The borrowing of money on the public credit. 5. Postal service. 6. The Census and Statistics. 7. Militia, Military and Naval Service, and Defence. 8. The fixing of and providing for the salaries and allowances of civil and other officers of the Government of Canada. 9. Beacons, Buoys, Lighthouses, and Sable Island. 10. Navigation and Shipping. 11. Quarantine and the establishment and maintenance of Marine Hospitals. 12. Sea coast and inland Fisheries. 13. Ferries between a Province and any British or Foreign country, or between two Provinces. 14. Currency and Coinage. 15. Banking, incorporation of banks, and the issue of paper money. 16. Savings Banks. 17. Weights and Measures. 18. Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes. 19. Interest. 20. Legal tender. 21. Bankruptcy and Insolvency. 22. Patents of invention and discovery. 23. Copyrights. 24. Indians, and lands reserved for the Indians. 25. Naturalization and Aliens. 26. Marriage and Divorce. 27. The Criminal Law, except the Constitution of Courts of Criminal Jurisdiction, but including the Procedure in Criminal Matters. 28. The Establishment, Maintenance, and Management of Penitentiaries. 29. Such classes of subjects as are expressly excepted in the enumeration of the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the Provinces. And any matter coming within any of the classes of subjects enumerated in this section shall not be deemed to come within the class of matters of a local or private nature comprised in the enumeration of the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the Provinces.

**92.** In each Province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming

within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated; that is to say,— 1. The amendment from time to time, notwithstanding anything in this Act, of the Constitution of the Province, except as regards the office of Lieutenant Governor. 2. Direct Taxation within the Province in order to the raising of a Revenue for Provincial purposes. 3. The borrowing of money on the sole credit of the Province. 4. The establishment and tenure of Provincial offices and the appointment and payment of Provincial officers. 5. The management and sale of the Public Lands belonging to the Province and of the timber and wood thereon. 6. The establishment, maintenance, and management of public and reformatory prisons in and for the Province. 7. The establishment, maintenance, and management of hospitals, asylums, charities, and eleemosynary institutions in and for the Province, other than marine hospitals. 8. Municipal institutions in the Province. 9. Shop, saloon, tavern, auctioneer, and other licenses in order to the raising of a revenue for Provincial, local, or municipal purposes. 10. Local works and undertakings other than such as are of the following classes,— *a.* Lines of steam or other ships, railways, canals, telegraphs, and other works and undertakings connecting the Province with any other or others of the Provinces, or extending beyond the limits of the Province; *b.* Lines of steamships between the Province and any British or foreign country. *c.* Such works as, although wholly situate within the Province, are before or after their execution declared by the Parliament of Canada to be for the general advantage of Canada or for the advantage of two or more of the Provinces. 11. The incorporation of companies with Provincial objects. 12. The solemnization of marriage in the Province. 13. Property and civil rights in the Province. 14. The administration of justice in the Province, including the constitution, maintenance, and organization of Provincial Courts, both of civil and of criminal jurisdiction, and including procedure in Civil matters in those Courts. 15. The imposition of punishment by fine, penalty, or imprisonment for enforcing any law of the Province made in relation to any matter coming within any of the classes of subjects enumerated in this section. 16. Generally all matters of a merely local or private nature in the Province.

**93.** In and for each Province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions: (1) Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the Province at the Union. (2) All the powers, privileges, and duties at the Union by law conferred and imposed in Upper Canada on the separate schools and school trustees of the Queen's Roman Catholic subjects shall be and the same are hereby extended to the dissentient schools of the Queen's Protestant and Roman Catholic subjects in Quebec. (3) Where in any Province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the Union or is thereafter established by the Legislature of the Province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any Act or decision of any Provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant

or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education: (4) In case any such Provincial law as from time to time seems to the Governor General in Council requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this section is not made, or in case any decision of the Governor General in Council on any appeal under this section is not duly executed by the proper Provincial authority in that behalf, then and in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions of this section and of any decision of the Governor General in Council under this section.

**94.** Notwithstanding anything in this Act, the Parliament of Canada may make provision for the uniformity of all or any of the laws relative to property and civil rights in Ontario, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, and of the procedure of all or any of the Courts in those three Provinces; and from and after the passing of any Act in that behalf the power of the Parliament of Canada to make laws in relation to any matter comprised in any such Act shall, notwithstanding anything in this Act, be unrestricted; but any Act of the Parliament of Canada making provision for such uniformity shall not have effect in any Province unless and until it is adopted and enacted as law by the Legislature thereof.

**95.** In each Province the Legislature may make laws in relation to Agriculture in the Province, and to Immigration into the Province; and it is hereby declared that the Parliament of Canada may from time to time make laws in relation to Agriculture in all or any of the Provinces, and to Immigration into all or any of the Provinces; and any law of the Legislature of a Province relative to Agriculture or to Immigration shall have effect in and for the Province as long and as far only as it is not repugnant to any Act of the Parliament of Canada.

**96.** The Governor General shall appoint the Judges of the Superior, District, and County Courts in each Province, except those of the Courts of Probate in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

**97.** Until the laws relative to property and civil rights in Ontario, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, and the procedure of the Courts in those Provinces, are made uniform, the Judges of the Courts of those Provinces appointed by the Governor General shall be selected from the respective Bars of those Provinces.

**98.** The Judges of the Courts of Quebec shall be selected from the Bar of that Province.

**99.** The Judges of the Superior Courts shall hold office during good behaviour, but shall be removable by the Governor General on address of the Senate and House of Commons.

**100.** The salaries, allowances, and pensions of the Judges of the Superior, District, and County Courts (except the Courts of Probate in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick), and of the Admiralty Courts in cases where the Judges thereof are for the time being paid by salary, shall be fixed and provided by the Parliament of Canada.

**101.** The Parliament of Canada may, notwithstanding anything in this Act, from time to time, provide for the constitution, maintenance, and organization of a general Court of Appeal

for Canada, and for the establishment of any additional Courts for the better administration of the Laws of Canada.

**102.** All duties and revenues over which the respective Legislatures of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick before and at the Union had and have power of appropriation, except such portions thereof as are by this Act reserved to the respective Legislatures of the Provinces, or are raised by them in accordance with the special powers conferred on them by this Act, shall form one Consolidated Revenue Fund, to be appropriated for the public service of Canada in the manner and subject to the charges in this Act provided.

**103.** The Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada shall be permanently charged with the costs, charges, and expenses incident to the collection, management, and receipt thereof, and the same shall form the first charge thereon, subject to be reviewed and audited in such manner as shall be ordered by the Governor General in Council until the Parliament otherwise provides.

**104.** The annual interest of the public debts of the several Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick at the Union shall form the second charge on the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

**105.** Unless altered by the Parliament of Canada, the salary of the Governor General shall be ten thousand pounds sterling money of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, and the same shall form the third charge thereon.

**106.** Subject to the several payments by this Act charged on the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, the same shall be appropriated by the Parliament of Canada for the public service.

**107.** All stocks, cash, banker's balances, and securities for money belonging to each Province at the time of the Union, except as in this Act mentioned, shall be the property of Canada, and shall be taken in reduction of the amount of the respective debts of the Provinces at the Union.

**108.** The public works and property of each Province, enumerated in the third schedule to this Act, shall be the property of Canada.

**109.** All lands, mines, minerals, and royalties belonging to the several Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick at the Union, and all sums then due or payable for such lands, mines, minerals, or royalties, shall belong to the several Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in which the same are situate or arise, subject to any trusts existing in respect thereof, and to any interest other than that of the Province in the same.

**110.** All assets connected with such portions of the public debt of each Province as are assumed by that Province shall belong to that Province.

**111.** Canada shall be liable for the debts and liabilities of each Province existing at the Union.

**112.** Ontario and Quebec conjointly shall be liable to Canada for the amount (if any) by which the debt of the Province of Canada exceeds at the Union sixty-two million five hundred thousand dollars, and shall be charged with interest at the rate of five per centum per annum thereon.

**113.** The assets enumerated in the fourth Schedule to this Act belonging at the Union to

the Province of Canada shall be the property of Ontario and Quebec conjointly.

**114.** Nova Scotia shall be liable to Canada for the amount (if any) by which its public debt exceeds at the Union eight million dollars, and shall be charged with interest at the rate of five per centum per annum thereon.

**115.** New Brunswick shall be liable to Canada for the amount (if any) by which its public debt exceeds at the Union seven million dollars, and shall be charged with interest at the rate of five per centum per annum thereon.

**116.** In case the public debt of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick do not at the Union amount to eight million dollars and seven million dollars respectively, they shall respectively receive by half-yearly payments in advance from the Government of Canada interest at five per centum per annum on the difference between the actual amounts of their respective debts and such stipulated amounts.

**117.** The several provinces shall retain all their respective public property not otherwise disposed of in this Act, subject to the right of Canada to assume any lands or public property required for fortifications or for the defence of the country.

**118.** The following sums shall be paid yearly by Canada to the several Provinces for the support of their Governments and Legislatures: Ontario, eighty thousand dollars; Quebec, seventy thousand dollars; Nova Scotia, sixty thousand dollars; New Brunswick, fifty thousand dollars; [total] two hundred and sixty thousand dollars; and an annual grant in aid of each Province shall be made, equal to eighty cents per head, of the population as ascertained by the census of one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, and in the case of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, by each subsequent decennial census until the population of each of those two Provinces amounts to four hundred thousand souls, at which rate such grant shall thereafter remain. Such grant shall be in full Settlement of all future demands on Canada, and shall be paid half-yearly in advance to each Province; but the Government of Canada shall deduct from such grants, as against any Province, all sums chargeable as interest on the Public Debt of that Province in excess of the several amounts stipulated in this Act.

**119.** New Brunswick shall receive by half-yearly payments in advance from Canada, for the period of ten years from the Union, an additional allowance of sixty-three thousand dollars per annum; but as long as the Public Debt of that Province remains under seven million dollars a deduction equal to the interest at five per centum per annum on such deficiency shall be made from that allowance of sixty-three thousand dollars.

**120.** All payments to be made under this Act, or in discharge of liabilities created under any Act of the Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick respectively, and assumed by Canada, shall, until the Parliament of Canada otherwise directs, be made in such form and manner as may from time to time be ordered by the Governor General in Council.

**121.** All articles of the growth, produce, or manufacture of any one of the Provinces shall, from and after the Union, be admitted free into each of the other Provinces.

**122.** The Customs and Excise Laws of each Province shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, continue in force until altered by the Parliament of Canada.

**123.** Where Customs duties are, at the Union, leviable on any goods, wares or merchandises in any two Provinces, those goods, wares and merchandises may, from and after the Union, be imported from one of those Provinces into the other of them on proof of payment of the Customs duty leviable thereon in the Province of exportation, and on payment of such further amount (if any) of Customs duty as is leviable thereon in the Province of Importation.

**124.** Nothing in this Act shall affect the right of New Brunswick to levy the lumber dues provided in chapter fifteen, of title three, of the Revised Statutes of New Brunswick, or in any Act amending that act before or after the Union, and not increasing the amount of such dues; but the lumber of any of the Provinces other than New Brunswick shall not be subjected to such dues.

**125.** No lands or property belonging to Canada or any Province shall be liable to taxation.

**126.** Such portions of the duties and revenues over which the respective Legislatures of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick had before the Union power of appropriation as are by this Act reserved to the respective Governments or Legislatures of the Provinces, and all duties and revenues raised by them in accordance with the special powers conferred upon them by this act, shall in each Province form one Consolidated Revenue Fund to be appropriated for the public service of the Province.

**127.** If any person being at the passing of this Act a member of the Legislative Council of Canada, Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick, to whom a place in the Senate is offered, does not within thirty days thereafter, by writing under his hand, addressed to the Governor General of the Province of Canada, or to the Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick (as the case may be), accept the same, he shall be deemed to have declined the same; and any person who, being at the passing of this Act a member of the Legislative Council of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, accepts a place in the Senate, shall thereby vacate his seat in such Legislative Council.

**128.** Every member of the Senate or House of Commons of Canada shall before taking his seat therein, take and subscribe before the Governor General or some person authorized by him, and every member of a Legislative Council or Legislative Assembly of any Province shall before taking his seat therein, take and subscribe before the Lieutenant Governor of the Province, or some person authorized by him, the oath of allegiance contained in the fifth Schedule to this Act; and every member of the Senate of Canada and every member of the Legislative Council of Quebec shall also, before taking his seat therein, take and subscribe before the Governor General, or some person authorized by him, the declaration of qualification contained in the same Schedule.

**129.** Except as otherwise provided by this Act, all laws in force in Canada, Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick at the Union, and all courts of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and all legal

commissions, powers and authorities, and all officers, judicial, administrative, and ministerial, existing therein at the Union, shall continue in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick respectively, as if the Union had not been made, subject nevertheless (except with respect to such as are enacted by or exist under Acts of the Parliament of Great Britain or of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland), to be repealed, abolished or altered by the Parliament of Canada, or by the Legislature of the respective Province, according to the authority of the Parliament or of that Legislature under this Act.

**130.** Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all officers of the several Provinces having duties to discharge in relation to matters other than those coming within the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the Provinces shall be officers of Canada, and shall continue to discharge the duties of their respective offices under the same liabilities, responsibilities and penalties as if the Union had not been made.

**131.** Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, the Governor General in Council may from time to time appoint such officers as the Governor General in Council deems necessary or proper for the effectual execution of this Act.

**132.** The Parliament and Government of Canada shall have all powers necessary or proper for performing the obligations of Canada or of any Province thereof, as part of the British Empire towards foreign countries, arising under treaties between the Empire and such foreign countries.

**133.** Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Houses of Parliament of Canada and of the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec; and both those languages shall be used in the respective records and journals of those Houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any Court of Canada established under this Act, and in or from all or any of the Courts of Quebec. The Acts of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both those languages.

**134.** Until the Legislature of Ontario or of Quebec otherwise provides, the Lieutenant Governors of Ontario and Quebec may each appoint under the Great Seal of the Province the following officers, to hold office during pleasure, that is to say,—the Attorney General, the Secretary and Registrar of the Province, the Treasurer of the Province, the Commissioner of Crown Lands and the Commissioner of Agriculture and Public Works, and, in the case of Quebec, the Solicitor General; and may, by order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council from time to time prescribe the duties of those officers and of the several departments over which they shall preside or to which they shall belong, and of the officers and clerks thereof; and may also appoint other and additional officers to hold office during pleasure, and may from time to time prescribe the duties of those officers, and of the several departments over which they shall preside or to which they shall belong, and of the officers and clerks thereof.

**135.** Until the Legislature of Ontario or Quebec otherwise provides, all rights, powers,

duties, functions, responsibilities or authorities at the passing of this Act vested in or imposed on the Attorney General, Solicitor General, Secretary and Registrar of the Province of Canada, Minister of Finance, Commissioner of Crown Lands, Commissioner of Public Works, and Minister of Agriculture and Receiver General, by any law, statute or ordinance of Upper Canada, Lower Canada, or Canada, and not repugnant to this Act, shall be vested in or imposed on any officer to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor for the discharge of the same or any of them; and the Commissioner of Agriculture and Public Works shall perform the duties and functions of the office of Minister of Agriculture at the passing of this Act imposed by the law of the Province of Canada as well as those of the Commissioner of Public Works.

**136.** Until altered by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, the Great Seals of Ontario and Quebec respectively, shall be the same or of the same design, as those used in the Provinces of Upper Canada and Lower Canada respectively before their Union as the Province of Canada.

**137.** The words "and from thence to the end of the then next ensuing Session of the Legislature," or words to the same effect, used in any temporary Act of the Province of Canada not expired before the Union, shall be construed to extend and apply to the next Session of Parliament of Canada, if the subject matter of the Act is within the powers of the same as defined by this Act, or to the next Sessions of the Legislatures of Ontario and Quebec respectively, if the subject matter of the Act is within the powers of the same as defined by this Act.

**138.** From and after the Union, the use of the words "Upper Canada," instead of "Ontario," or "Lower Canada" instead of "Quebec," in any deed, writ, process, pleading, document, matter or thing, shall not invalidate the same.

**139.** Any Proclamation under the Great Seal of the Province of Canada, issued before the Union to take effect at a time which is subsequent to the Union, whether relating to that Province or to Upper Canada, or to Lower Canada, and the several matters and things therein proclaimed shall be and continue of like force and effect as if the Union had not been made.

**140.** Any proclamation which is authorized by any Act of the Legislature of the Province of Canada to be issued under the Great Seal of the Province of Canada, whether relating to that Province or to Upper Canada, or to Lower Canada, and which is not issued before the Union, may be issued by the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario or of Quebec, as its subject matter requires, under the Great Seal thereof; and from and after the issue of such Proclamation the same and the several matters and things therein proclaimed shall be and continue of the like force and effect in Ontario or Quebec as if the Union had not been made.

**141.** The Penitentiary of the Province of Canada shall, until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, be and continue the Penitentiary of Ontario and of Quebec.

**142.** The division and adjustment of the debts, credits, liabilities, properties and assets of Upper Canada and Lower Canada shall be referred to the arbitration of three arbitrators, one chosen by the Government of Ontario, one by the Government of Quebec, and one by the



Government of Canada; and the selection of the Arbitrator shall not be made until the Parliament of Canada and the Legislatures of Ontario and Quebec have met; and the arbitrator chosen by the Government of Canada shall not be a resident either in Ontario or in Quebec.

**143.** The Governor General in Council may from time to time order that such and so many of the records, books, and documents of the Province of Canada as he thinks fit shall be appropriated and delivered either to Ontario or to Quebec, and the same shall henceforth be the property of that Province; and any copy thereof or extract therefrom, duly certified by the officer having charge of the original thereof shall be admitted as evidence.

**144.** The Lieutenant Governor of Quebec may from time to time, by Proclamation under the Great Seal of the Province, to take effect from a day to be appointed therein, constitute townships in those parts of the Province of Quebec in which townships are not then already constituted, and fix the metes and bounds thereof.

**145.** Inasmuch as the Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick have joined in a declaration that the construction of the Intercolonial Railway is essential to the consolidation of the Union of British North America, and to the assent thereto of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and have consequently agreed that provision should be made for its immediate construction by the Government of Canada: Therefore, in order to give effect to that agreement, it shall be the duty of the Government and Parliament of Canada to provide for the commencement, within six months after the Union, of a railway connecting the River St. Lawrence with the City of Halifax in Nova Scotia, and for the construction thereof without intermission, and the completion thereof with all practicable speed.

**146.** It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, on Addresses from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada, and from the Houses of the respective Legislatures of the Colonies or Provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, and British Columbia, to admit those Colonies or Provinces, or any of them, into the Union, and on Address from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada to admit Rupert's Land and the North-western Territory, or either of them, into the Union, on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the Addresses expressed and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this Act, and the provisions of any Order in Council in that behalf shall have effect as if they had been enacted by the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

**147.** In case of the admission of Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, or either of them, each shall be entitled to a representation in the Senate of Canada of four members, and (notwithstanding anything in this Act) in case of the admission of Newfoundland the normal number of Senators shall be seventy-six and their maximum number shall be eighty-two; but Prince Edward Island when admitted shall be deemed to be comprised in the third of the three divisions into which Canada is, in relation to the constitution of the Senate, divided by this Act, and accordingly, after the admission of Prince Edward Island, whether Newfoundland is ad-

mitted or not, the representation of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in the Senate shall, as vacancies occur, be reduced from twelve to ten members respectively, and the representation of each of those Provinces shall not be increased at any time beyond ten, except under the provisions of this Act for the appointment of three or six additional Senators under the direction of the Queen.

**A. D. 1871.—British North America Act, 1871.**—An Act respecting the Establishment of Provinces in the Dominion of Canada. [29TH JUNE, 1871.]

WHEREAS doubts have been entertained respecting the powers of the Parliament of Canada to establish Provinces in territories admitted, or which may hereafter be admitted, into the Dominion of Canada, and to provide for the representation of such Provinces in the said Parliament, and it is expedient to remove such doubts, and to vest such powers in the said Parliament: Be it enacted by the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords, Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—

**1.** This Act may be cited for all purposes as The British North America Act, 1871.

**2.** The Parliament of Canada may from time to time establish new Provinces in any territories forming for the time being part of the Dominion of Canada, but not included in any Province thereof, and may, at the time of such establishment, make provision for the constitution and administration of any such Province, and for the passing of laws for the peace, order and good government of such Province, and for its representation in the said Parliament.

**3.** The Parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the Legislature of any Province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish, or otherwise alter the limits of such Province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said Legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any Province affected thereby.

**4.** The Parliament of Canada may from time to time make provision for the administration, peace, order, and good government of any territory not for the time being included in any Province.

**5.** The following Acts passed by the said Parliament of Canada, and intituled respectively: "An Act for the temporary government of Rupert's Land and the North-Western Territory when united with Canada;" and "An Act to amend and continue the Act thirty-two and thirty-three Victoria, chapter three, and to establish and provide for the government of the Province of Manitoba," shall be and be deemed to have been valid and effectual for all purposes whatsoever from the date at which they respectively received the assent, in the Queen's name, of the Governor General of the said Dominion of Canada.

**6.** Except as provided by the third section of this Act, it shall not be competent for the Parliament of Canada to alter the provisions of the last mentioned Act of the said Parliament in so far as it relates to the Province of Manitoba, or of any other Act hereafter establishing new Prov-

inces in the said Dominion, subject always to the right of the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba to alter from time to time the provisions of any law respecting the qualification of electors and members of the Legislative Assembly, and to make laws respecting elections in the said Province.

**A. D. 1875.—Parliament of Canada Act, 1875.**—An Act to remove certain doubts with respect to the powers of the Parliament of Canada, under Section 18 of the British North America Act, 1867. [19TH JULY, 1875.]

WHEREAS by section 18 of The British North America Act, 1867, it is provided as follows:—“The privileges, immunities, and powers to be held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Senate and by the House of Commons, and by the members thereof respectively, shall be such as are from time to time defined by Act of the Parliament of Canada, but so that the same shall never exceed those at the passing of this Act held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and by the members thereof.” And whereas doubts have arisen with regard to the power of defining by an Act of the Parliament of Canada, in pursuance of the said section, the said privileges, powers or immunities; and it is expedient to remove such doubts: Be it therefore enacted by the Queen’s Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—

1. Section 18 of The British North America Act, 1867, is hereby repealed, without prejudice to anything done under that section, and the following section shall be substituted for the section so repealed:—The privileges, immunities, and powers to be held, enjoyed and exercised by the Senate and by the House of Commons, and by the members thereof respectively, shall be such as are from time to time defined by Act of the Parliament of Canada, but so that any Act of the Parliament of Canada defining such privileges, immunities and powers shall not confer any privileges, immunities, or powers exceeding those at the passing of such Act held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and by the members thereof.

2. The Act of the Parliament of Canada passed in the thirty-first year of the reign of her present Majesty, chapter twenty-four, intitled An Act to provide for oaths to witnesses being administered in certain cases for the purposes of

either House of Parliament, shall be deemed to be valid, and to have been valid as from the date at which the royal assent was given thereto by the Governor General of the Dominion of Canada.

3. This Act may be cited as The Parliament of Canada Act, 1875.

**A. D. 1886.—British North America Act, 1886.**—An Act respecting the Representation in the Parliament of Canada of Territories which for the time being form part of the Dominion of Canada, but are not included in any Province. [23TH JUNE, 1886.]

WHEREAS it is expedient to empower the Parliament of Canada to provide for the representation in the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, or either of them, of any territory which for the time being forms part of the Dominion of Canada, but is not included in any Province: Be it therefore enacted by the Queen’s Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in the present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—

1. The Parliament of Canada may from time to time make provision for the representation in the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, or in either of them, of any territories which for the time being form part of the Dominion of Canada, but are not included in any Province thereof.

2. Any Act passed by the Parliament of Canada before the passing of this Act for the purpose mentioned in this Act shall, if not disallowed by the Queen, be, and shall be deemed to have been, valid and effectual from the date at which it received the assent, in Her Majesty’s name, of the Governor-General of Canada. It is hereby declared that any Act passed by the Parliament of Canada, whether before or after the passing of this Act, for the purpose mentioned in this Act, or in The British North America Act, 1871, has effect, notwithstanding anything in The British North America Act, 1867, and the number of Senators or the number of Members of the House of Commons specified in the last-mentioned Act is increased by the number of Senators or of Members, as the case may be, provided by any such Act of the Parliament of Canada for the representation of any provinces or territories of Canada.

3. This Act may be cited as The British North America Act, 1886. This Act and The British North America Act, 1867, and The British North America Act, 1871, shall be construed together, and may be cited together as The British North America Acts, 1867 to 1886.

**CONSTITUTION OF (OR FOR) THE CAROLINAS (Locke’s).** See NORTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1669–1693.

**CONSTITUTION OF CHILE.** See CHILE: A. D. 1833–1884, and 1885–1891.

**CONSTITUTION OF CLEISTHENES.** See ATHENS: B. C. 510–507.

**CONSTITUTION OF COLOMBIA.** See COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1830–1886, and 1885–1891.

**CONSTITUTION OF THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (FEBRUARY).

**CONSTITUTION OF CONNECTICUT (1639—the Fundamental Agreement of New**

Haven). See CONNECTICUT: A. D. 1636–1639, and 1639.

**CONSTITUTION OF DENMARK.** See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (DENMARK—ICELAND): A. D. 1849–1874.

**CONSTITUTION OF THE DUTCH REPUBLIC, or the United Netherlands.** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1584–1585.

**CONSTITUTION OF ENGLAND.**—“Our English Constitution was never made, in the sense in which the Constitutions of many other countries have been made. There never was any moment when Englishmen drew out their political system in the shape of a formal document, whether as the carrying out of any abstract political theories or as the imitation of

the past or present system of any other nation. There are indeed certain great political documents, each of which forms a landmark in our political history. There is the Great Charter [see ENGLAND: A. D. 1215], the Petition of Rights [same: A. D. 1625-1628, and 1628], the Bill of Rights [same: A. D. 1689 (October)]. But not one of these gave itself out as the enactment of anything new. All claimed to set forth, with new strength, it might be, and with new clearness, those rights of Englishmen which were already old. . . . The life and soul of English law has ever been precedent; we have always held that whatever our fathers once did their sons have a right to do again."—E. A. Freeman, *The Growth of the English Constitution*, ch. 2.—"It is, in the first place, necessary to have a clear understanding of what we mean when we talk about 'the English Constitution.' Few terms in our language have been more laxly employed. . . . Still, the term, 'the English Constitution' is susceptible of full and accurate explanation: though it may not be easy to set it lucidly forth, without first investigating the archaeology of our history, rather more deeply than may suit hasty talkers and superficial thinkers. . . . Some furious Jacobins, at the close of the last century, used to clamour that there was no such thing as the English Constitution, because it could not be produced in full written form, like that of the United States. . . . But an impartial and earnest investigator may still satisfy himself that England has a constitution, and that there is ample cause why she should cherish it. And by this it is meant that he will recognise and admire, in the history, the laws and the institutions of England, certain great leading principles, which have existed from the earliest period of our nationality down to the present time; expanding and adapting themselves to the progress of society and civilization, advancing and varying in development, but still essentially the same in substance and spirit. These great primeval and enduring principles are the principles of the English Constitution. And we are not obliged to learn them from imperfect evidences or precarious speculation; for they are imperishably recorded in the Great Charter, and in Charters and Statutes connected with and confirmatory of Magna Charta [see ENGLAND: A. D. 1215]. . . . These

great primeval and enduring principles of our Constitution are as follows: The government of the country by an hereditary sovereign, ruling with limited powers, and bound to summon and consult a parliament of the whole realm, comprising hereditary peers and elective representatives of the commons. That without the sanction of parliament no tax of any kind can be imposed; and no law can be made, repealed, or altered. That no man be arbitrarily fined or imprisoned, that no man's property or liberties be impaired, and that no man be in any way punished, except after a lawful trial. Trial by jury. That justice shall not be sold or delayed. These great constitutional principles can all be proved, either by express terms or by fair implication, from Magna Carta, and its . . . supplement [the statute 'Confirmatio Cartarum']. Their vigorous development was aided and attested in many subsequent statutes, especially in the Petition of Rights and the Bill of Rights. . . . Lord Chatham called these three 'The Bible of the English Constitution,' to which appeal is to be made on every grave political question."—E. S. Creasy, *Rise and Progress of the Eng. Const.*, ch. 1.—"The fact that our constitution has to be collected from statutes, from legal decisions, from observation of the course of conduct of the business of politics; that much of what is written is of a negative sort, stating what the Crown and its ministers cannot do; that there is no part of it which an omnipotent Parliament may not change at will; all this is a puzzle not only to foreign jurists who are prepared to say, with DeTocqueville, that the English constitution does not exist, but to ourselves who are prepared to maintain that it is a monument, if only we can find it, of political sagacity. Those who praise it call it flexible; those who criticise it unstable."—Sir W. R. Anson, *The Law and Custom of the Const.*, pt. 1, p. 35.

ALSO IN: W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng. in its Origin and Development*.—H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng.: Henry VII. to Geo. II.*—T. E. May, *Const. Hist. of Eng., 1760-1860*.—R. Gneist, *Hist. of the Eng. Const.*—E. Fischel, *The Eng. Const.*—W. Bugehot, *The Eng. Const.*—E. Boutmy, *The Eng. Const.*—See, also, PARLIAMENT, THE ENGLISH, and CABINET, THE ENGLISH.

## CONSTITUTION OF FRANCE.

A. D. 1791.—The Constitution accepted by Louis XVI. See FRANCE: A. D. 1789-1791, and 1791 (JULY-SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1793 (or the Year One).—The Jacobin Constitution. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (JUNE-OCTOBER).

A. D. 1795 (or the Year Three).—The Constitution of the Directory. See FRANCE: A. D. 1795 (JUNE-SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1799.—The Constitution of the Consulate. See FRANCE: A. D. 1799 (NOVEMBER-DECEMBER).

A. D. 1814.—The Constitution of the Restoration. See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (APRIL-JUNE).

A. D. 1848.—The Constitution of the Second Republic. See FRANCE: A. D. 1848 (APRIL-DECEMBER).

A. D. 1852.—The Constitution of the Second Empire. See FRANCE: A. D. 1851-1852.

A. D. 1875-1889.—The Constitution of the Third Republic.—The circumstances of the framing and adoption in 1875 of the Constitution of the Third Republic will be found narrated under FRANCE: A. D. 1871-1876. The following is the text of the organic law of 1875, with the later amendatory and supplemental enactments, down to July 17, 1889, as translated and edited, with an historical introduction, by Mr. Charles F. A. Currier, and published in the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, March, 1893. It is reproduced here with the kind permission of the President of the Academy, Professor Edmund J. James:

**1875. Law on the Organization of the Public Powers. February 25.**

ARTICLE 1. The legislative power is exercised by two assemblies: the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate. The Chamber of Deputies is elected by universal suffrage, under the conditions determined by the electoral law. The composition, the method of election, and the powers of the Senate shall be regulated by a special law.<sup>1</sup>

ART. 2. The President of the Republic is chosen by an absolute majority of votes of the Senate and Chamber of Deputies united in National Assembly. He is elected for seven years. He is re-eligible.

ART. 3. The President of the Republic has the initiative of the laws, concurrently with the members of the two Chambers. He promulgates the laws when they have been voted by the two Chambers; he looks after and secures their execution. He has the right of pardon; amnesty can be granted by law only. He disposes of the armed force. He appoints to all civil and military positions. He presides over national festivals; envoys and ambassadors of foreign powers are accredited to him. Every act of the President of the Republic must be countersigned by a Minister.

ART. 4. As vacancies occur on and after the promulgation of the present law, the President of the Republic appoints, in the Council of Ministers, the Councilors of State in ordinary service. The Councilors of State thus chosen may be dismissed only by decree rendered in the Council of Ministers. The Councilors of State chosen by virtue of the law of May 24, 1872, cannot, before the expiration of their powers, be dismissed except in the manner determined by that law. After the dissolution of the National Assembly, revocation may be pronounced only by resolution of the Senate.

ART. 5. The President of the Republic may, with the advice of the Senate, dissolve the Chamber of Deputies before the legal expiration of its term. [In that case the electoral colleges are summoned for new elections within the space of three months.]

ART. 6. The Ministers are jointly and severally ('solidairement') responsible to the Chambers for the general policy of the government, and individually for their personal acts. The President of the Republic is responsible in case of high treason only.<sup>2</sup>

ART. 7. In case of vacancy by death or for any other reason, the two Chambers assembled together proceed at once to the election of a new President. In the meantime the Council of Ministers is invested with the executive power.<sup>3</sup>

ART. 8. The Chambers shall have the right by separate resolutions, taken in each by an absolute majority of votes, either upon their own initiative or upon the request of the President of the Republic, to declare a revision of the Constitutional Laws necessary. After each of the two Chambers shall have come to this decision, they shall meet together in National Assembly to proceed with the revision. The acts effecting revision of the constitutional laws, in whole or

in part, must be by an absolute majority of the members composing the National Assembly. [During the continuance, however, of the powers conferred by the law of November 20, 1873, upon Marshal de MacMahon, this revision can take place only upon the initiative of the President of the Republic.]

[ART. 9. The seat of the Executive Power and of the two Chambers is at Versailles.]

**1875. Law on the Organization of the Senate. February 24.**

ARTICLE 1. The Senate consists of three hundred members: Two hundred and twenty-five elected by the departments and colonies, and seventy-five elected by the National Assembly.]

[ART. 2. The departments of the Seine and Nord elect each five senators. The following departments elect four senators each: Seine-Inférieure, Pas-de-Calais, Gironde, Rhône, Finistère, Côtes-du-Nord. The following departments elect three senators each: Loire-Inférieure, Saône-et-Loire, Ille-et-Vilaine, Seine-et-Oise, Isère, Puy-de-Dôme, Somme, Bouches-du-Rhône, Aisne, Loire, Manche, Maine-et-Loire, Morbihan, Dordogne, Haute-Garonne, Charente-Inférieure, Calvados, Sarthe, Ilérault, Basses-Pyrénées, Gard, Aveyron, Vendée, Orne, Oise, Vosges, Allier. All the other departments elect two senators each. The following elect one senator each: The Territory of Belfort, the three departments of Algeria, the four colonies: Martinique, Guadeloupe, Réunion and the French Indies.]

[ART. 3. No one can be senator unless he is a French citizen, forty years of age at least, and enjoying civil and political rights.]

[ART. 4. The senators of the departments and colonies are elected by an absolute majority and by 'scrutin de liste', by a college meeting at the capital of the department or colony and composed: (1) of the deputies; (2) of the general councilors; (3) of the arrondissement councilors; (4) of delegates elected, one by each municipal council, from among the voters of the commune. In the French Indies the members of the colonial council or of the local councils are substituted for the general councilors, arrondissement councilors and delegates from the municipal councils. They vote at the capital of each district.]

[ART. 5. The senators chosen by the Assembly are elected by 'scrutin de liste' and by an absolute majority of votes.]

[ART. 6. The senators of the departments and colonies are elected for nine years and renewable by thirds every three years. At the beginning of the first session the departments shall be divided into three series containing an equal number of senators each. It shall be determined by lot which series shall be renewed at the expiration of the first and second triennial periods.]

[ART. 7. The senators elected by the Assembly are irremovable. Vacancies by death, by resignation, or for any other reason, shall, within the space of two months, be filled by the Senate itself.]

<sup>1</sup> Amended by constitutional law of August 14, 1884, *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> Repealed by constitutional law of June 21, 1879, *infra*.

<sup>3</sup> By the constitutional law of August 14, 1884, it was provided that Articles 1 to 7 of this law should no longer have a constitutional character; and they were repealed by the law of December 9, 1884, *infra*.

<sup>1</sup> See law of November 30, 1873, *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> See laws of February 24, and August 2, 1875, *infra*.

<sup>3</sup> Amended by constitutional law of August 14, 1884, *infra*.

<sup>4</sup> See Art. 12, law of July 16, 1875, *infra*.

<sup>5</sup> See Arts. 3 and 11, law of July 16, 1875, *infra*.

ART. 8. The Senate has, concurrently with the Chamber of Deputies, the initiative and passing of laws. Money bills, however, must first be introduced in, and passed by the Chamber of Deputies.

ART. 9. The Senate may be constituted a Court of Justice to judge either the President of the Republic or the Ministers, and to take cognizance of attacks made upon the safety of the State.

ART. 10. Elections to the Senate shall take place one month before the time fixed by the National Assembly for its own dissolution. The Senate shall organize and enter upon its duties the same day that the National Assembly is dissolved.

ART. 11. The present law shall be promulgated only after the passage of the law on the public powers.<sup>1</sup>

### 1875. Law on the Relations of the Public Powers. July 16.

ARTICLE 1. The Senate and the Chamber of Deputies shall assemble each year the second Tuesday of January, unless convened earlier by the President of the Republic. The two Chambers continue in session at least five months each year. The sessions of each begin and end at the same time. [On the Sunday following the opening of the session, public prayers shall be addressed to God in the churches and temples, to invoke His aid in the labors of the Chambers.]<sup>2</sup>

ART. 2. The President of the Republic pronounces the closure of the session. He may convene the Chambers in extra session. He must convene them if, during the recess, an absolute majority of the members of each Chamber request it. The President may adjourn the Chambers. The adjournment, however, must not exceed one month, nor take place more than twice in the same session.

ART. 3. One month at least before the legal expiration of the powers of the President of the Republic, the Chambers must be called together in National Assembly and proceed to the election of a new President. In default of a summons, this meeting shall take place, as of right, the fifteenth day before the expiration of those powers. In case of the death or resignation of the President of the Republic, the two Chambers shall reassemble immediately, as of right. In case the Chamber of Deputies, in consequence of Article 5 of the law of February 25, 1875, is dissolved at the time when the presidency of the Republic becomes vacant, the electoral colleges shall be convened at once, and the Senate shall reassemble as of right.

ART. 4. Every meeting of either of the two Chambers which shall be held at a time other than the common session of both is illegal and void, except the case provided for in the preceding article, and that when the Senate meets as a court of justice; and in this last case, judicial duties alone shall be performed.

ART. 5. The sittings of the Senate and of the Chamber of Deputies are public. Nevertheless each Chamber may meet in secret session, upon the request of a fixed number of its members, determined by the rules. It decides by absolute majority whether the sitting shall be resumed in public upon the same subject.

<sup>1</sup> *i. e.*, the law of February 25, 1875, *supra*.

<sup>2</sup> Repealed by law of August 14, 1884, *infra*.

ART. 6. The President of the Republic communicates with the Chambers by messages, which are read from the tribune by a Minister. The Ministers have entrance to both Chambers, and must be heard when they request it. They may be represented, for the discussion of a specific bill, by commissioners designated by decree of the President of the Republic.

ART. 7. The President of the Republic promulgates the laws within the month following the transmission to the Government of the law finally passed. He must promulgate, within three days, laws whose promulgation shall have been declared urgent by an express vote in each Chamber. Within the time fixed for promulgation the President of the Republic may, by a message with reasons assigned, request of the two Chambers a new discussion, which cannot be refused.

ART. 8. The President of the Republic negotiates and ratifies treaties. He communicates them to the Chambers as soon as the interests and safety of the State permit. Treaties of peace, and of commerce, treaties which involve the finances of the State, those relating to the persons and property of French citizens in foreign countries, shall become definitive only after having been voted by the two Chambers. No cession, no exchange, no annexation of territory shall take place except by virtue of a law.

ART. 9. The President of the Republic cannot declare war except by the previous assent of the two Chambers.

ART. 10. Each Chamber is the judge of the eligibility of its members, and of the legality of their election; it alone can receive their resignation.

ART. 11. The bureau<sup>1</sup> of each Chamber is elected each year for the entire session, and for every extra session which may be held before the ordinary session of the following year. When the two Chambers meet together as a National Assembly, their bureau consists of the President, Vice-Presidents and Secretaries of the Senate.

ART. 12. The President of the Republic may be impeached by the Chamber of Deputies only, and tried by the Senate only. The Ministers may be impeached by the Chamber of Deputies for offences committed in the performance of their duties. In this case they are tried by the Senate. The Senate may be constituted a court of Justice, by a decree of the President of the Republic, issued in the Council of Ministers, to try all persons accused of attempts upon the safety of the State. If procedure is begun by the ordinary courts, the decree convening the Senate may be issued any time before the granting of a discharge. A law shall determine the method of procedure for the accusation, trial and judgment.<sup>2</sup>

ART. 13. No member of either Chamber shall be prosecuted or held responsible on account of any opinions expressed or votes cast by him in the performance of his duties.

ART. 14. No member of either Chamber shall, during the session, be prosecuted or arrested for any offence or misdemeanor, except on the authority of the Chamber of which he is a

<sup>1</sup> The bureau of the Senate consists of a president, four vice-presidents, six secretaries and three questors; the bureau of the Chamber of Deputies is the same, except that there are eight secretaries instead of six.

<sup>2</sup> Fixed by law of April 10, 1880.

member, unless he be caught in the very act. The detention or prosecution of a member of either Chamber is suspended for the session, and for its [the Chamber's] entire term, if it demands it.

1879. **Law Revising Article 9 of the Constitutional Law of February 25, 1875.** June 21.

Article 9 of the constitutional law of February 25, 1875, is repealed.

1884. **Law Partially Revising the Constitutional Laws, August 14.**

ARTICLE 1. Paragraph 2 of Article 5 of the constitutional law of February 25, 1875, on the Organization of the Public Powers, is amended as follows: "In that case the electoral colleges meet for new elections within two months, and the Chamber within the ten days following the close of the elections."

ART. 2. To Paragraph 3 of Article 8 of the same law of February 25, 1875, is added the following: "The Republican form of the Government cannot be made the subject of a proposed revision. Members of families that have reigned in France are ineligible to the presidency of the Republic."

ART. 3. Articles 1 to 7 of the constitutional law of February 24, 1875, on the Organization of the Senate, shall no longer have a constitutional character.<sup>1</sup>

ART. 4. Paragraph 3 of Article 1 of the constitutional law of July 16, 1875, on the Relation of the Public Powers, is repealed.

1875. **Law on the Election of Senators.** August 2.

ARTICLE 1. A decree of the President of the Republic, issued at least six weeks in advance, determines the day for the elections to the Senate, and at the same time that for the choice of delegates of the municipal councils. There must be an interval of at least one month between the choice of delegates and the election of senators.

ART. 2. Each municipal council elects one delegate. The election is without debate, by secret ballot, and by an absolute majority of votes. After two ballots a plurality is sufficient, and in case of an equality of votes, the oldest is declared elected. If the Mayor is not a member of the municipal council, he presides, but shall not vote.<sup>2</sup> On the same day and in the same way an alternate is elected, who takes the place of the delegate in case of refusal or inability to serve.<sup>3</sup> The choice of the municipal councils shall not extend to a deputy, a general councilor, or an arrondissement councilor.<sup>4</sup> All communal electors, including the municipal councilors, are eligible without distinction.

ART. 3. In the communes where a municipal committee exists, the delegate and alternate shall be chosen by the old council.<sup>5</sup>

ART. 4. If the delegate was not present at the election, the Mayor shall see to it that he is notified within twenty-four hours. He must transmit to the Prefect, within five days, notice of his acceptance. In case of refusal or silence, he is replaced by the alternate, who is then placed upon the list as the delegate of the commune.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> And may therefore be amended by ordinary legislation. See the law of December 9, 1884, *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> Amended by Art. 8, law of December 9, 1884, *infra*.

<sup>3</sup> See Art. 4, law of February 24, 1875, *supra*.

<sup>4</sup> See Art. 3, law of December 9, 1884, *infra*.

ART. 5. The official report of the election of the delegate and alternate is transmitted at once to the Prefect; it states the acceptance or refusal of the delegates and alternates, as well as the protests raised, by one or more members of the municipal council, against the legality of the election. A copy of this official report is posted on the door of the town hall.<sup>1</sup>

ART. 6. A statement of the results of the election of delegates and alternates is drawn up within a week by the Prefect; this is given to all requesting it, and may be copied and published. Every elector may, at the bureaux of the prefecture, obtain information and a copy of the list, by communes, of the municipal councilors of the department, and, at the bureaux of the sub-prefectures a copy of the list, by communes, of the municipal councilors of the arrondissement.

ART. 7. Every communal elector may, within three days, address directly to the Prefect a protest against the legality of the election. If the Prefect deems the proceedings illegal, he may request that they be set aside.

ART. 8. Protests concerning the election of the delegate or alternate are decided, subject to an appeal to the Council of State, by the council of the prefecture, and, in the colonies, by the privy council. A delegate whose election is annulled because he does not satisfy the conditions demanded by law, or on account of informality, is replaced by the alternate. In case the election of the delegate and alternate is rendered void, as by the refusal or death of both after their acceptance, new elections are held by the municipal council on a day fixed by an order of the Prefect.<sup>1</sup>

ART. 9. Eight days, at the latest, before the election of senators, the Prefect, and, in the colonies, the Director of the Interior, arranges the list of the electors of the department in alphabetical order. The list is communicated to all demanding it, and may be copied and published. No elector has more than one vote.

ART. 10. The deputies, the members of the general council, or of the arrondissement councils, who have been announced by the returning committees, but whose powers have not been verified, are enrolled upon the list of electors and are allowed to vote.

ART. 11. In each of the three departments of Algeria the electoral college is composed: (1) of the deputies; (2) of the members of the general councils, of French citizenship; (3) of delegates elected by the French members of each municipal council from among the communal electors of French citizenship.

ART. 12. The electoral college is presided over by the President of the civil tribunal of the capital of the department or colony. The President is assisted by the two oldest and two youngest electors present at the opening of the meeting. The bureau thus constituted chooses a secretary from among the electors. If the President is prevented [from presiding] his place is taken by the Vice-President [of the civil tribunal], and, in his absence, by the oldest justice.

ART. 13. The bureau divides the electors in alphabetical order into sections of at least one hundred voters each. It appoints the President

<sup>1</sup> See Art. 8, law of December 9, 1884, *infra*.

and Inspectors of each of these sections. It decides all questions and contests which may arise in the course of the election, without, however, power to depart from the decisions rendered by virtue of Article 8 of the present law.

ART. 14. The first ballot begins at eight o'clock in the morning and closes at noon. The second begins at two o'clock and closes at four o'clock. The third, if it takes place, begins at six o'clock and closes at eight o'clock. The results of the ballotings are determined by the bureau and announced the same day by the President of the electoral college.<sup>1</sup>

ART. 15. No one is elected senator on either of the first two ballots unless he receives: (1) an absolute majority of the votes cast; and (2) a number of votes equal to one-fourth of the total number of electors registered. On the third ballot a plurality is sufficient, and, in case of an equality of votes, the oldest is elected.

ART. 16. Political meetings for the nomination of senators may take place conformably to the rules laid down by the law of June 6, 1868<sup>2</sup> subject to the following conditions: I. These meetings may be held from the date of the election of delegates up to the day of the election [of senators] inclusive; II. They must be preceded by a declaration made, at latest, the evening before, by seven senatorial electors of the arrondissement, and indicating the place, the day and the hour the meeting is to take place, and the names, occupation and residence of the candidates to be presented; III. The municipal authorities will see to it that no one is admitted to the meeting unless he is a deputy, general councillor, arrondissement councillor, delegate or candidate. The delegate will present, as a means of identification, a certificate from the Mayor of his commune, the candidate a certificate from the official who shall have received the declaration mentioned in the preceding paragraph.<sup>3</sup>

ART. 17. Delegates who take part in all the ballotings shall, if they demand it, receive from the State, upon the presentation of their letter of summons, countersigned by the President of the electoral college, a remuneration for traveling expenses, which shall be paid to them upon the same basis and in the same manner as that given to jurors by Articles 35, 90 and following, of the decree of June 18, 1811. A public administrative regulation shall determine the method of fixing the amount and the method of payment of this remuneration.<sup>4</sup>

ART. 18. Every delegate who, without lawful reason, shall not take part in all the ballotings, or, having been hindered, shall not have given notice to the alternate in sufficient season, shall, upon the demand of the public prosecutor, be punished by a fine of fifty francs by the civil tribunal of the capital.<sup>5</sup> The same penalty may be imposed upon the alternate who, after having been notified by letter, telegram, or notice personally delivered in due season, shall not have taken part in the election.

ART. 19. Every attempt at corruption by the employment of means enumerated in Articles 177 and following, of the Penal Code, to influ-

ence the vote of an elector, or to keep him from voting, shall be punished by imprisonment of from three months to two years, and a fine of from fifty to five hundred francs, or by one of these two penalties alone. Article 463 of the Penal Code shall apply to the penalties imposed by the present article.<sup>1</sup>

ART. 20. It is incompatible for a senator to be: I. Councillor of State, Maitre de Requetes, Prefect or Sub-Prefect, except Prefect of the Seine and Prefect of Police; II. Member of the courts of appeal ("appel"),<sup>2</sup> or of the tribunals of first instance, except public prosecutor at the court of Paris; III. General Paymaster, Special Receiver, official or employe of the central administration of the ministries.

ART. 21. The following shall not be elected by the department or the colony included wholly or partially in their jurisdiction, during the exercise of their duties and during the six months following the cessation of their duties by resignation, dismissal, change of residence, or other cause: I. The First Presidents, Presidents, and members of the courts of appeal ("appel"); II. The Presidents, Vice-Presidents, Examining Magistrates, and members of the tribunals of first instance; III. The Prefect of Police; Prefects and Sub-Prefects, and Prefectorial General Secretaries; the Governors, Directors of the Interior, and General Secretaries of the Colonies; IV. The Chief Arrondissement Engineers and Chief Arrondissement Road-Surveyors; V. The School Rectors and Inspectors; VI. The Primary School Inspectors; VII. The Archbishops, Bishops, and Vicars General; VIII. The officers of all grades of the land and naval force; IX. The Division Commissaries and the Military Deputy Commissaries; X. The General Paymasters and Special Receivers of Money; XI. The Supervisors of Direct and Indirect Taxes, of Registration of Lands and of Posts; XII. The Guardians and Inspectors of Forests.

ART. 22. A senator elected in several departments, must let his choice be known to the President of the senate within ten days following the verification of the elections. If a choice is not made in this time, the question is settled by lot in open session. The vacancy shall be filled within one month and by the same electoral body. The same holds true in case of an invalidated election.

ART. 23. If by death or resignation the number of senators of a department is reduced by one-half, the vacancies shall be filled within the space of three months, unless the vacancies occur within the twelve months preceding the triennial elections. At the time fixed for the triennial elections, all vacancies shall be filled which have occurred, whatever their number and date.<sup>1</sup>

[ART. 24. The election of senators chosen by the National Assembly takes place in public sitting, by "scrutin de liste," and by an absolute majority of votes, whatever the number of ballotings.

ART. 25. When it is necessary to elect successors of senators chosen by virtue of Article 7 of the law of February 24, 1875, the Senate pro-

<sup>1</sup> See Article 8, law of December 9, 1884, *in fra*.

<sup>2</sup> This law has been superseded by a law of June 30, 1881.

<sup>3</sup> Done by decree of December 26, 1875.

<sup>4</sup> Of the department.

<sup>5</sup> France is divided into twenty-six judicial districts, in each of which there is a court d'appel. There are similar courts in Algeria and the colonies. The Cour de Cassation is the supreme court of appeal for all France, Algeria and the colonies.

ceeds in the manner indicated in the preceding article].<sup>1</sup>

ART. 26. Members of the Senate receive the same salary as members of the Chamber of Deputies.<sup>2</sup>

ART. 27. There are applicable to elections to the Senate all the provisions of the electoral law relating: I. to cases of unworthiness and incapacity; II. to offences, prosecutions, and penalties; III. to election proceedings, in all respects not contrary to the provisions of the present law.

**Temporary Provisions.**

ART. 28. For the first election of members of the Senate, the law which shall determine the date of the dissolution of the National Assembly shall fix, without regard to the intervals established by Article 1, the date on which the municipal councils shall meet for the election of delegates and the day for the election of Senators. Before the meeting of the municipal councils, the National Assembly shall proceed to the election of those Senators whom it is to choose.

ART. 20. The provisions of Article 21, by which an interval of six months must elapse between the cessation of duties and election, shall not apply to officials, except Prefects and Sub-Prefects, whose duties shall have ceased either before the promulgation of the present law or within twenty days following.

**1875. Law on the Election of Deputies.\* November 30.**

ARTICLE 1. The deputies shall be chosen by the voters registered: I. upon the lists drawn up in accordance with the law of July 7, 1874; II. upon the supplementary list including those who have lived in the commune six months. Registration upon the supplementary list shall take place conformably to the laws and regulations now governing the political electoral lists, by the committees and according to the forms established by Articles 1, 2 and 8 of the law of July 7, 1874. Appeals relating to the formation and revision of either list shall be carried directly before the Civil Chamber of the Court of Appeal ("Cassation"). The electoral lists drawn up March 31, 1875, shall serve until March 31, 1876.

ART. 2. The soldiers of all ranks and grades, of both the land and naval forces, shall not vote when they are with their regiment, at their post or on duty. Those who, on election day, are in private residence, in non-activity or in possession of a regular leave of absence, may vote in the commune on the lists of which they are duly registered. This last provision applies equally to officers on the unattached list or on the reserve list.

ART. 3. During the electoral period, circulars and platforms ("professions de foi") signed by the candidates, placards and manifestoes signed by one or more voters, may, after being deposited with the public prosecutor, be posted and distributed without previous authorization. The distribution of ballots is not subjected to this deposit.<sup>4</sup> Every public or municipal official is forbidden to distribute ballots, platforms and cir-

lars of candidates. The provisions of Article 19 of the organic law of August 2, 1875, on the elections of Senators, shall apply to the elections of deputies.

ART. 4. Balloting shall continue one day only. The voting occurs at the chief place of the commune; each commune may nevertheless be divided, by order of the Prefect, into as many sections as may be demanded by local circumstances and the number of voters. The second ballot shall take place the second Sunday following the announcement of the first ballot, according to the provisions of Article 65, of the law of March 15, 1849.

ART. 5. The method of voting shall be according to the provisions of the organic and regulating decrees of February 2, 1852. The ballot is secret. The voting lists used at the elections in each section, signed by the President and Secretary, shall remain deposited for eight days at the Secretary's office at the town hall, where they shall be communicated to every voter requesting them.

ART. 6. Every voter is eligible, without any tax qualification, at the age of twenty-five years.

ART. 7. No soldier or sailor forming part of the active forces of land or sea may, whatever his rank or position, be elected a member of the Chamber of Deputies. This provision applies to soldiers and sailors on the unattached list or in non-activity, but does not extend to officers of the second section of the list of the general staff, nor to those who, kept in the first section for having been commander-in-chief in the field, have ceased to be employed actively, nor to officers who, having privileges attached to the retired list, are sent to or maintained at their homes while awaiting the settlement of their pension. The decision by which the officer shall have been permitted to establish his rights on the retired list shall become, in this case, irrevocable. The rule laid down in the first paragraph of the present Article shall not apply to the reserve of the active army nor to the territorial army.

ART. 8. The exercise of public duties paid out of the treasury of the State is incompatible with the office of deputy. Consequently every official elected deputy shall be superseded in his duties if, within the eight days following the verification of powers, he has not signified that he does not accept the office of deputy. There are excepted from the preceding provisions the duties of Minister, Under Secretary of State, Ambassador, Minister Plenipotentiary, Prefect of the Seine, Prefect of Police, First President of the Court of Appeal ("cassation"), First President of the Court of Accounts, First President of the Court of Appeal ("appel") of Paris, Attorney General at the Court of Appeal ("cassation"), Attorney General at the Court of Accounts, Attorney General at the Court of Appeal ("appel") of Paris, Archbishop and Bishop, Consistorial Presiding Pastor in consistorial districts whose capital has two or more pastors, Chief Rabbi of the Central consistory, Chief Rabbi of the Consistory of Paris.

ART. 9. There are also excepted from the provisions of Article 8: I. titular professors of chairs which are filled by competition or upon the nomination of the bodier where the vacancy occurs; II. persons who have been charged with a temporary mission. All missions continuing more than six months cease to be temporary and are governed by Article 8 above.

<sup>1</sup> Articles 24 and 25 repeated by law of December 9, 1884, *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> See Article 17, law of November 30, 1875, *infra*.

<sup>3</sup> See, *infra*, the laws of June 16, 1883, and February 13, 1880, amending the electoral law.

<sup>4</sup> See, however, a law of December 20, 1878, by which deposit is made necessary.



ART. 10. The official preserves the rights which he has acquired to a retiring pension, and may, after the expiration of his term of office, be restored to active service. The civil official who, having had twenty years of service at the date of the acceptance of the office of deputy, and shall be fifty years of age at the time of the expiration of this term of office, may establish his rights to an exceptional retiring pension. This pension shall be regulated according to the third Paragraph of Article 12 of the law of June 9, 1853. If the official is restored to active service after the expiration of his term of office, the provisions of Article 3, Paragraph 2, and Article 23 of the law of June 9, 1853, shall apply to him. In duties where the rank is distinct from the employment, the official, by the acceptance of the office of deputy, loses the employment and preserves the rank only.

ART. 11. Every deputy appointed or promoted to a salaried public position ceases to belong to the Chamber by the very fact of his acceptance; but he may be re-elected, if the office which he occupies is compatible with the office of deputy. Deputies who become Ministers or Under-Secretaries of State are not subjected to a re-election.

ART. 12. There shall not be elected by the arrondissement or the colony included wholly or partially in their jurisdiction, during the exercise of their duties or for six months following the expiration of their duties due to resignation, dismissal, change of residence, or any other cause: I. The First-Presidents, Presidents, and members of the Courts of Appeal ("appel"); II. The Presidents, Vice-Presidents, Titular Judges, Examining Magistrates, and members of the tribunals of first instance; III. The Prefect of Police; the Prefects and General Secretaries of the Prefectures; the Governors, Directors of the Interior, and General Secretaries of the Colonies; IV. The Chief Arrondissement Engineers and Chief Arrondissement Road-Surveyors; V. The School Rectors and Inspectors; VI. The Primary School Inspectors; VII. The Archbishops, Bishops, and Vicars General; VIII. The General Paymasters and Special Receivers of Money; IX. The Supervisors of Direct and Indirect Taxes, of Registration of Lands, and of Posts; X. The Guardians and Inspectors of Forests. The Sub-Prefects shall not be elected in any of the arrondissements of the department where they perform their duties.

ART. 13. Every imperative mandate is null and void.

ART. 14. Members of the Chamber of Deputies are elected by single districts. Each administrative arrondissement shall elect one deputy. Arrondissements having more than 100,000 inhabitants shall elect one deputy in addition for every additional 100,000 inhabitants or fraction of 100,000. Arrondissements of this kind shall be divided into districts whose boundaries shall be established by law and may be changed only by law.

ART. 15. Deputies shall be chosen for four years. The Chamber is renewable integrally.

ART. 16. In case of vacancy by death, resignation, or otherwise, a new election shall be held within three months of the date when the vacancy occurred. In case of option, the vacancy shall be filled within one month.

when a deputy had been elected from two or more districts.

ART. 17. The deputies shall receive a salary. This salary is regulated by Articles 96 and 97 of the law of March 15, 1849, and by the provisions of the law of February 16, 1872.

ART. 18. No one is elected on the first ballot unless he receives: (1) an absolute majority of the votes cast; (2) a number of votes equal to one-fourth of the number of voters registered. On the second ballot a plurality is sufficient. In case of an equality of votes, the oldest is declared elected.

ART. 19. Each department of Algeria elects one deputy.

ART. 20. The voters living in Algeria in a place not yet made a commune, shall be registered on the electoral list of the nearest commune. When it is necessary to establish electoral districts, either for the purpose of grouping mixed communes in each of which the number of voters shall be insufficient, or to bring together voters living in places not formed into communes the decrees for fixing the seat of these districts shall be issued by the Governor-General, upon the report of the Prefect or of the General commanding the division.

ART. 21. The four colonies to which senators have been assigned by the law of February 24, 1875, on the organization of the Senate, shall choose one deputy each.

ART. 22. Every violation of the prohibitive provisions of Article 3, Paragraph 3, of the present law shall be punished by a fine of from sixteen francs to three hundred francs. Nevertheless the criminal courts may apply Article 463 of the Penal Code. The provisions of Article 6 of the law of July 7, 1874, shall apply to the political electoral lists. The decree of January 29, 1871, and the laws of April 10, 1871, May 2, 1871, and February 18, 1873, are repealed. Paragraph 11 of Article 15 of the organic decree of February 2, 1852, is also repealed, in so far as it refers to the law of May 21, 1836, on lotteries, reserving, however, to the courts the right to apply to convicted persons Article 42 of the Penal Code. The provisions of the laws and decrees now in force, with which the present law does not conflict, shall continue to be applied.

ART. 23. The provision of Article 12 of the present law by which an interval of six months must elapse between the expiration of duties and election, shall not apply to officials, except Prefects and Sub-Prefects, whose duties shall have ceased either before the promulgation of the present law or within the twenty days following it.

**1879. Law Relating to the Seat of the Executive Power and of the Chambers at Paris. July 22.**

ARTICLE 1. The seat of the Executive Power and of the two Chambers is at Paris.

ART. 2. The Palace of the Luxemburg and the Palais-Bourbon are assigned, the first to the use of the Senate, the second to that of the Chamber of Deputies. Nevertheless each of the Chambers is authorized to choose, in the city of Paris, the palace which it wishes to occupy.

ART. 3. The various parts of the palace of Versailles now occupied by the Senate and Chamber of Deputies preserve their arrangements. Whenever, according to Articles 7 and 8 of the law of February 25, 1875, on the organization of the public powers, a meeting of the National Assem-

bly takes place, it shall sit at Versailles, in the present hall of the Chamber of Deputies. Whenever, according to Article 9 of the law of February 24, 1875, on the organization of the Senate, and Article 12 of the constitutional law of July 16, 1875, on the relations of the public powers, the Senate shall be called upon to constitute itself a Court of Justice, it shall indicate the town and place where it proposes to sit.

ART. 4. The Senate and Chamber of Deputies will sit at Paris on and after November 3 next.

ART. 5. The Presidents of the Senate and Chamber of Deputies are charged with the duty of securing the external and internal safety of the Chambers over which they preside. To this end they have the right to call upon the armed force and every authority whose assistance they judge necessary. The demands may be addressed directly to all officers, commanders, or officials, who are bound to obey immediately, under the penalties established by the laws. The Presidents of the Senate and Chamber of Deputies may delegate to the questors or to one of them their right of demanding aid.

ART. 6. Petitions to either of the Chambers can be made and presented in writing only. It is forbidden to present them in person or at the bar.

ART. 7. Every violation of the preceding article, every provocation, by speeches uttered publicly, or by writings, or printed matter, posted or distributed, to a crowd upon the public ways, having for an object the discussion, drawing up, or carrying to the Chambers or either of them, of petitions, declarations, or addresses—whether or not any results follow such action—shall be punished by the penalties enumerated in Paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the law of June 7, 1848.

ART. 8. The preceding provisions do not diminish the force of the law of June 7, 1848, on riotous assemblies.

ART. 9. Article 463 of the Penal Code applies to the offences mentioned in the present law.

**1884. Law Amending the Organic Laws on the Organization of the Senate and the Elections of Senators. December 9.**

ARTICLE 1. The Senate consists of three hundred members, elected by the departments and the colonies. The present members, without any distinction between senators elected by the National Assembly or the Senate and those elected by the departments and colonies, maintain their term of office during the time for which they have been chosen.

ART. 2. The department of the Seine elects ten senators. The department of the Nord elects eight senators. The following departments elect five senators each: Côtes-du-Nord, Finistère, Gironde, Ille-et-Vilaine, Loire, Loire-Inférieure, Pas-de-Calais, Rhône, Saône-et-Loire, Seine-Inférieure. The following departments elect four senators each: Aisne, Bouches-du-Rhône, Charente-Inférieure, Dordogne, Haute-Garonne, Isère, Maine-et-Loire, Manche, Morbihan, Puy-de-Dôme, Seine-et-Oise, Somme. The following departments elect three senators each: Ain, Allier, Ardèche, Ardennes, Aube, Aude, Aveyron, Calvados, Charente, Cher, Corrèze, Corse, Côte-d'Or, Creuse, Doubs, Drôme, Eure, Eure-et-Loir, Gard, Gers, Hérault, Indre, Indre-et-Loire, Jura, Landes, Loir-et-Cher, Haute-Loire, Lot, Lot-et-Garonne, Marne, Haute-Marne, Mayenne, Meurthe-et-Moselle, Meuse, Nièvre,

Oise, Orne, Basses-Pyrénées, Haute-Saône, Sarthe, Savoie, Haute-Savoie, Seine-et-Marne, Deux-Sèvres, Tarn, Var, Vendée, Vienne, Haute-Vienne, Vosges, Yonne. The following departments elect two senators each: Basses-Alpes, Hautes-Alpes, Alpes-Maritimes, Ariège, Cantal, Lozère, Hautes-Pyrénées, Pyrénées-Orientales, Tarn-et-Garonne, Vaucluse. The following elect one senator each: the Territory of Belfort, the three departments of Algeria, the four colonies: Martinique, Guadeloupe, Réunion and French Indies.

ART. 3. In the departments where the number of senators is increased by the present law, the increase shall take effect as vacancies occur among the life senators. To this end, within eight days after the vacancy occurs, it shall be determined by lot what department shall be called upon to elect a senator. This election shall take place within three months of the determination by lot. Furthermore, if the vacancy occurs within six months preceding the triennial election, the vacancy shall be filled at that election. The term of office in this case shall expire at the same time as that of the other senators belonging to the same department.

ART. 4. No one shall be a senator unless he is a French citizen, forty years of age, at least, and enjoying civil and political rights. Members of families that have reigned in France are ineligible to the Senate.

ART. 5. The soldiers of the land and naval forces cannot be elected senators. There are excepted from this provision: I. The Marshals and Admirals of France; II. The general officers maintained without limit of age in the first section of the list of the general staff and not provided with a command; III. The general officers placed in the second section of the list of the general staff; IV. Soldiers of the land and naval forces who belong either to the reserve of the active army or to the territorial army.

ART. 6. Senators are elected by "scrutin de liste," by a college meeting at the capital of the department or colony, and composed: (1) of the Deputies; (2) of the General Councilors; (3) of the Arrondissement Councilors; (4) of delegates elected from among the voters of the commune, by each Municipal Council. Councils composed of ten members shall elect one delegate. Councils composed of twelve members shall elect two delegates. Councils composed of sixteen members shall elect three delegates. Councils composed of twenty-one members shall elect six delegates. Councils composed of twenty-three members shall elect nine delegates. Councils composed of twenty-seven members shall elect twelve delegates. Councils composed of thirty members shall elect fifteen delegates. Councils composed of thirty-two members shall elect eighteen delegates. Councils composed of thirty-four members shall elect twenty-one delegates. Councils composed of thirty-six members or more shall elect twenty-four delegates. The Municipal Council of Paris shall elect thirty delegates. In the French Indies the members of the local councils take the place of Arrondissement Councilors. The Municipal Council of Pondichéry shall elect five delegates. The Municipal Council of Karikal shall elect three delegates. All the other communes shall elect two delegates each. The balloting takes place at the capital of each district.

ART. 7. Members of the Senate are elected for nine years. The Senate is renewed every three years according to the order of the present series of departments and colonies.

ART. 8. Articles 2 (paragraphs 1 and 2), 3, 4, 5, 8, 14, 16, 19 and 23 of the organic law of August 2, 1875, on the Elections of Senators are amended as follows: "Art. 2 (paragraphs 1 and 2). In each Municipal Council the election of delegates takes place without debate and by secret ballot, by "scrutin de liste" and by an absolute majority of votes cast. After two ballots a plurality is sufficient, and in case of an equality of votes the oldest is elected. The procedure and method is the same for the election of alternates. Councils having one, two, or three delegates to choose shall elect one alternate. Those choosing six or nine delegates elect two alternates. Those choosing twelve or fifteen delegates elect three alternates. Those choosing eighteen or twenty-one delegates elect four alternates. Those choosing twenty-four delegates elect five alternates. The Municipal Council of Paris elects eight alternates. The alternates take the place of delegates in case of refusal or inability to serve, in the order determined by the number of votes received by each of them.

ART. 3. In communes where the duties of a Municipal Council are performed by a special delegation organized by virtue of Article 44 of the law of April 5, 1884, the senatorial delegates and alternates shall be chosen by the old council. ART. 4.

If the delegates were not present at the election, notice is given them by the Mayor within twenty-four hours. They must within five days notify the Prefect of their acceptance. In case of declination or silence they shall be replaced by the alternates, who are then placed upon the list as the delegates of the commune.

ART. 5. The official report of the election of delegates and alternates is transmitted at once to the Prefect. It indicates the acceptance or declination of the delegates and alternates, as well as the protests made by one or more members of the Municipal Council against the legality of the election. A copy of this official report is posted on the door of the town hall. ART. 8.

Protests concerning the election of delegates or alternates are decided, subject to an appeal to the Council of State, by the Council of the Prefecture, and, in the colonies, by the Privy Council. Delegates whose election is set aside because they do not satisfy the conditions demanded by law, or because of informality, are replaced by the alternates. In case the election of a delegate and of an alternate is rendered void, as by the refusal or death of both after their acceptance, new elections are held by the Municipal Council on a day fixed by decree of the Prefect. ART. 14. The first ballot begins at eight o'clock in the morning and closes at noon. The second begins at two o'clock and closes at four o'clock. The third begins at seven o'clock and closes at ten o'clock. The results of the ballots are determined by the bureau and announced immediately by the President of the electoral college. ART. 16. Political meetings for the nomination of senators may be held from the date of the promulgation of the decree summoning the electors up to the day of the election inclusive. The declaration prescribed by Article 2 of the law of June 30, 1881, shall be made by two voters, at least. The forms and regulations

of this Article, as well as those of Article 3, shall be observed. The members of Parliament elected or electors in the department, the senatorial electors, delegates and alternates, and the candidates, or their representatives, may alone be present at these meetings. The municipal authorities will see to it that no other person is admitted. Delegates and alternates shall present as a means of identification a certificate from the Mayor of the commune; candidates or their representatives a certificate from the official who shall have received the declaration mentioned in Paragraph 2. ART. 19. Every attempt at corruption or constraint by the employment of means enumerated in Articles 177 and following of the Penal Code, to influence the vote of an elector or to keep him from voting, shall be punished by imprisonment of from three months to two years, and by a fine of from fifty francs to five hundred francs, or by one of these penalties alone. Article 463 of the Penal Code is applicable to the penalties provided for by the present article. ART. 23. Vacancies caused by the death or resignation of senators shall be filled within three months; moreover, if the vacancy occurs within the six months preceding the triennial elections, it shall be filled at those elections."

ART. 9. There are repealed: (1) Articles 1 to 7 of the law of February 24, 1875, on the organization of the Senate; (2) Articles 24 and 25 of the law of August 2, 1875, on the elections of senators.

#### Temporary Provision.

In case a special law on parliamentary incompatibilities shall not have been passed at the date of the next senatorial elections, Article 8, of the law of November 30, 1875, shall apply to those elections. Every official affected by this provision, who has had twenty years of service and is fifty years of age at the date of his acceptance of the office [of senator], may establish his right to a proportional retiring pension, which shall be governed by the third paragraph of Article 12, of the law of June 9, 1853.

#### 1885. Law Amending the Electoral Law. June 16.

[ARTICLE 1.<sup>1</sup> The members of the Chamber of Deputies are elected by "scrutin de liste."

ART. 2. Each department elects the number of deputies assigned to it in the table<sup>2</sup> annexed to the present law, on the basis of one deputy for seventy thousand inhabitants, foreign residents not included. Account shall be taken, nevertheless, of every fraction smaller than seventy thousand.<sup>3</sup> Each department elects at least three deputies. Two deputies are assigned to the territory of Belfort, six to Algeria, and ten to the colonies, as is indicated by the table. This table can be changed by law only.

ART. 3. The department forms a single electoral district.]

ART. 4. Members of families that have reigned in France are ineligible to the Chamber of Deputies.

ART. 5. No one is elected on the first ballot unless he receives: (1) an absolute majority of

<sup>1</sup> Articles 1, 2 and 3 repealed by the law of February 13, 1889, *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> This table may be found in the *Bulletin des Lois*, twelfth series, No. 15,518; and in the *Journal Officiel* for June 17, 1885, p. 3074.

<sup>3</sup> *i. e.*, fractions of less than 70,000 are entitled to a deputy.

the votes cast; (2) a number of votes equal to one-fourth of the total number of voters registered. On the second ballot a plurality is sufficient. In case of an equality of votes, the oldest of the candidates is declared elected.

ART. 6. Subject to the case of a dissolution foreseen and regulated by the Constitution, the general elections take place within sixty days preceding the expiration of the powers of the Chamber of Deputies.

ART. 7. Vacancies shall not be filled which occur in the six months preceding the renewal of the Chamber.

**1887. Law on Parliamentary Incompatibilities. December 26.**

Until the passage of a special law on parliamentary incompatibilities, Articles 8 and 9 of the law of November 30, 1875, shall apply to senatorial elections. Every official affected by this provision who has had twenty years of service and is fifty years of age at the time of his acceptance of the office [of senator], may establish his rights to a proportional retiring pension, which shall be governed by the third paragraph of Article 12 of the law of June 9, 1853.

**1889. Law Re-establishing Single Districts for the Election of Deputies. February 13.**

ARTICLE 1. Articles 1, 2 and 3 of the law of June 16, 1885, are repealed.

ART. 2. Members of the Chamber of Deputies are elected by single districts. Each administrative arrondissement in the departments, and each municipal arrondissement at Paris and at Lyons, elects one deputy. Arrondissements whose population exceeds one hundred thousand inhabitants elect an additional deputy for every one hundred thousand or fraction of one hundred thousand inhabitants. The arrondissements are in this case divided into districts, a table of which is annexed to the present law and can be changed by a law only.

<sup>1</sup> This table may be found in the *Journal Officiel* for February 14, 1889, pp. 76 and following; and in the *Bulletin des Lois*, twelfth series, No. 20,475.

ART. 3. One deputy is assigned to the territory of Belfort, six to Algeria, and ten to the colonies, as is indicated by the table.

ART. 4. On and after the promulgation of the present law, until the renewal of the Chamber of Deputies, vacancies occurring in the Chamber of Deputies shall not be filled.

**1889. Law on Multiple Candidatures. July 17.**

ARTICLE 1. No one may be a candidate in more than one district.

ART. 2. Every citizen who offers himself or is offered at the general or partial elections must, by a declaration signed or countersigned by himself, and duly legalized, make known in what district he means to be a candidate. This declaration is deposited, and a provisional receipt obtained therefor, at the Prefecture of the department concerned, the fifth day, at latest, before the day of election. A definitive receipt shall be delivered within twenty-four hours.

ART. 3. Every declaration made in violation of Article 1 of the present law is void and not to be received. If declarations are deposited by the same citizen in more than one district, the earliest in date is alone valid. If they bear the same date, all are void.

ART. 4. It is forbidden to sign or post placards, to carry or distribute ballots, circulars, or platforms in the interest of a candidate who has not conformed to the requirements of the present law.

ART. 5. Ballots bearing the name of a citizen whose candidacy is put forward in violation of the present law shall not be included in the return of votes. Posters, placards, platforms, and ballots posted or distributed to support a candidacy in a district where such candidacy is contrary to the law, shall be removed or seized.

ART. 6. A fine of ten thousand francs shall be imposed on the candidate violating the provisions of the present law, and one of five thousand francs on all persons acting in violation of Article 4 of the present law.

## CONSTITUTION OF GERMANY.

**13th-17th Centuries.—The Old (Holy Roman) Empire.—The Golden Bull.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1125-1153; 1347-1403; and DIET, THE GERMANIC.

**A. D. 1815.—The Confederation.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1814-1820.

**A. D. 1871.—The New Empire.**—On the 18th day of January, 1871; at Versailles, King William of Prussia assumed the title of German Emperor. On the 16th of April following the Emperor issued a proclamation, by and with the consent of the Council of the German Confederation, and of the Imperial Diet, decreeing the adoption of a constitution for the Empire. See GERMANY: A. D. 1871 (JANUARY) and (APRIL). The following is a translation of the text of the Constitution, as transmitted by the American Minister at Berlin to his Government:

His Majesty the King of Prussia, in the name of the North German Union, His Majesty the King of Bavaria, His Majesty the King of Württemberg, His Royal Highness the Grand Duke of Baden, and His Royal Highness the Grand Duke of Hesse, and by Rhine for those

parts of the Grand Duchy of Hesse which are situated south of the Main, conclude an eternal alliance for the protection of the territory of the confederation, and of the laws of the same, as well as for the promotion of the welfare of the German people. This confederation shall bear the name of the German Empire, and shall have the following constitution.

### I.—Territory.

**Article 1.** The territory of the confederation shall consist of the States of Prussia, with Lauenburg, Bavaria, Saxony, Württemberg, Baden, Hesse, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Saxe-Weimar, Mecklenburg-Strelitz, Oldenburg, Brunswick, Saxe-Meiningen, Saxe-Altenburg, Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, Anhalt, Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt, Schwarzburg-Sondershausen, Waldeck, Reuss of the elder branch, Reuss of the younger branch, Schaumburg-Lippe, Lippe, Lubeck, Bremen, and Hamburg.

### II.—Legislation of the Empire.

**Article 2.** Within this territory the Empire shall have the right of legislation according to the provisions of this constitution, and the laws

of the Empire shall take precedence of those of each individual state. The laws of the Empire shall be rendered binding by imperial proclamation, such proclamation to be published in a journal devoted to the publication of the laws of the Empire, (*Reichsgesetzblatt*.) If no other period shall be designated in the published law for it to take effect, it shall take effect on the fourteenth day after the day of its publication in the law-journal at Berlin.

**Article 3.** There is one citizenship for all Germany, and the citizens or subjects of each state of the federation shall be treated in every other state thereof as natives, and shall have the right of becoming permanent residents, of carrying on business, of filling public offices, and may acquire all civil rights on the same conditions as those born in the state, and shall also have the same usage as regards civil prosecutions and the protection of the laws. No German shall be limited, in the exercise of this privilege, by the authorities of his native state, or by the authorities of any other state of the confederation. The regulations governing the care of paupers, and their admission into the various parishes, are not affected by the principle enunciated in the first paragraph. In like manner those treaties shall remain in force which have been concluded between the various states of the federation in relation to the custody of persons who are to be banished, the care of sick, and the burial of deceased citizens. With regard to the rendering of military service to the various states, the necessary laws will be passed hereafter. All Germans in foreign countries shall have equal claims upon the protection of the Empire.

**Article 4.** The following matters shall be under the supervision of the Empire and its legislature: 1. The privilege of carrying on trade in more than one place; domestic affairs and matters relating to the settlement of natives of one state in the territory of another; the right of citizenship; the issuing and examination of passports; surveillance of foreigners and of manufactures, together with insurance business, so far as these matters are not already provided for by article 3 of this constitution, (in Bavaria, however, exclusive of domestic affairs and matters relating to the settlement of natives of one state in the territory of another;) and likewise matters relating to colonization and emigration to foreign countries. 2. Legislation concerning customs duties and commerce, and such imposts as are to be applied to the uses of the Empire. 3. Regulation of weights and measures, of the coinage, together with the emission of funded and unfunded paper money. 4. Banking regulations in general. 5. Patents for inventions. 6. The protection of literary property. 7. The organization of a general system of protection for German trade in foreign countries; of German navigation, and of the German flag on the high seas; likewise the organization of a general consular representation of the Empire. 8. Railway matters, (subject in Bavaria to the provisions of article 46,) and the construction of means of communication by land and water for the purposes of home defense and of general commerce. 9. Rafting and navigation upon those waters which are common to several States, and the condition of such waters, as likewise river and other water dues. 10. Postal and telegraphic affairs; but in Bavaria and Hungary these shall

be subject to the provisions of article 52. 11. Regulations concerning the execution of judicial sentences in civil matters, and the fulfillment of requisitions in general. 12. The authentication of public documents. 13. General legislation regarding the law of obligations, criminal law, commercial law, and the law of exchange; likewise judicial proceedings. 14. The imperial army and navy. 15. The surveillance of the medical and veterinary professions. 16. The press, trades' unions, &c.

**Article 5.** The legislative power of the Empire shall be exercised by the federal council and the diet. A majority of the votes of both houses shall be necessary and sufficient for the passage of a law. When a law is proposed in relation to the army or navy, or to the imposts specified in article 35, the vote of the presiding officer shall decide in case of a difference of opinion in the federal council, if said vote shall be in favor of the retention of the existing arrangements.

### III.—Federal Council.

**Article 6.** The federal council shall consist of the representatives of the states of the confederation, among whom the votes shall be divided in such a manner that Prussia, including the former votes of Hanover, the electorate of Hesse, Holstein, Nassau, and Frankfort shall have 17 votes; Bavaria, 6 votes; Saxony, 4 votes; Würtemberg, 4 votes; Baden, 3 votes; Hesse, 3 votes; Mecklenburg-Schwerin, 2 votes; Saxe-Weimar, 1 vote; Mecklenburg-Strelitz, 1 vote; Oldenburg, 1 vote; Brunswick, 2 votes; Saxe-Meiningen, 1 vote; Saxe-Altenburg, 1 vote; Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, 1 vote; Anhalt, 1 vote; Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt, 1 vote; Schwarzburg-Sondershausen, 1 vote; Waldeck, 1 vote; Reuss, elder branch, 1 vote; Reuss, younger branch, 1 vote; Schaumburg-Lippe, 1 vote; Lippe, 1 vote; Lubeck, 1 vote; Bremen, 1 vote; Hamburg, 1 vote; total 58 votes. Each member of the confederation shall appoint as many delegates to the federal council as it has votes; the total of the votes of each state shall, however, be cast by only one delegate.

**Article 7.** The federal council shall take action upon—1. The measures to be proposed to the diet and the resolutions passed by the same. 2. The general provisions and regulations necessary for the execution of the laws of the Empire, so far as no other provision is made by said laws. 3. The defects which may be discovered in the execution of the laws of the Empire, or of the provisions and regulations heretofore mentioned. Each member of the confederation shall have the right to introduce motions, and it shall be the duty of the presiding officer to submit them for deliberation. Legislative action shall take place by simple majority, with the exceptions of the provisions in articles 5, 37, and 78. Votes not represented or instructed shall not be counted. In the case of a tie, the vote of the presiding officer shall decide. When legislative action upon a subject which does not affect, according to the provisions of this constitution, the whole Empire is taken, the votes of only those states of the confederation shall be counted which shall be interested in the matter in question.

**Article 8.** The federal council shall appoint from its own members permanent committees—1. On the army and the fortifications. 2. On naval affairs. 3. On duties and taxes. 4. On commerce and trade. 5. On railroads, post

7  
Wiesbaden

offices, and telegraphs. 6. On the judiciary. 7. On accounts. In each of these committees there shall be representatives of at least four states of the confederation, beside the presiding officer, and each state shall be entitled to only one vote in the same. In the committee on the army and fortifications Bavaria shall have a permanent seat; the remaining members of it, as well as the members of the committee on naval affairs, shall be appointed by the Emperor; the members of the other committees shall be elected by the federal council. These committees shall be newly formed at each session of the federal council, *i. e.*, each year, when the retiring members shall again be eligible. Besides, there shall be appointed in the federal council a committee on foreign affairs, over which Bavaria shall preside, to be composed of the plenipotentiaries of the Kingdoms of Bavaria, Saxony, and Würtemberg, and of two plenipotentiaries of the other states of the Empire, who shall be elected annually by the federal council. Clerks shall be placed at the disposal of the committees to perform the necessary work appertaining thereto.

**Article 9.** Each member of the federal council shall have the right to appear in the diet, and shall be heard there at any time when he shall so request, to represent the views of his government, even when the same shall not have been adopted by the majority of the council. Nobody shall be at the same time a member of the federal council and of the diet.

**Article 10.** The Emperor shall afford the customary diplomatic protection to the members of the federal council.

#### IV.—Presidium.

**Article 11.** The King of Prussia shall be the president of the confederation, and shall have the title of German Emperor. The Emperor shall represent the Empire among nations, declare war, and conclude peace in the name of the same, enter into alliances and other conventions with foreign countries, accredit ambassadors, and receive them. For a declaration of war in the name of the Empire, the consent of the federal council shall be required, except in case of an attack upon the territory of the confederation or its coasts. So far as treaties with foreign countries refer to matters which, according to article 4, are to be regulated by the legislature of the Empire, the consent of the federal council shall be required for their ratification, and the approval of the diet shall be necessary to render them valid.

**Article 12.** The Emperor shall have the right to convene the federal council and the diet, and to open, adjourn, and close them.

**Article 13.** The convocation of the federal council and the diet shall take place annually, and the federal council may be called together for the preparation of business without the diet; the latter, however, shall not be convoked without the federal council.

**Article 14.** The convocation of the federal council shall take place as soon as demanded by one-third of its members.

**Article 15.** The chancellor of the Empire, who shall be appointed by the Emperor, shall preside in the federal council, and supervise the conduct of its business. The chancellor of the Empire shall have the right to delegate the power to represent him to any member of the federal council.

**Article 16.** The necessary bills shall be laid before the diet in the name of the Emperor, in accordance with the resolutions of the federal council, and they shall be represented in the diet by members of the federal council or by special commissioners appointed by said council.

**Article 17.** To the Emperor shall belong the right to prepare and publish the laws of the Empire. The laws and regulations of the Emperor shall be published in the name of the Empire, and require for their validity the signature of the chancellor of the Empire, who thereby becomes responsible for their execution.

**Article 18.** The Emperor shall appoint the officers of the Empire, require them to take the oath of allegiance, and dismiss them when necessary. Officials appointed to an office of the Empire from one of the states of the confederation shall enjoy the same rights to which they were entitled in their native states by their official position, provided no other legislative provision shall have been made previously to their entrance into the service of the Empire.

**Article 19.** If states of the confederation shall not fulfill their constitutional duties, proceedings may be instituted against them by military execution. This execution shall be ordered by the federal council, and enforced by the Emperor.

#### V.—Diet.

**Article 20.** The members of the diet shall be elected by universal suffrage, and by direct secret ballot. Until regulated by law, which is reserved by section 5 of the election law of May 31, 1869 (*Bundesgesetzblatt*, 1869, section 145.), 48 delegates shall be elected in Bavaria, 17 in Würtemberg, 14 in Baden, 6 in Hesse, south of the river Main, and the total number of delegates shall be 382.

**Article 21.** Officials shall not require a leave of absence in order to enter the diet. When a member of the diet accepts a salaried office of the Empire, or a salaried office in one of the states of the confederation, or accepts any office of the Empire, or of a state, with which a high rank or salary is connected, he shall forfeit his seat and vote in the diet, but may recover his place in the same by a new election.

**Article 22.** The proceedings of the diet shall be public. Truthful reports of the proceedings of the public sessions of the diet shall subject those making them to no responsibility.

**Article 23.** The diet shall have the right to propose laws within the jurisdiction of the Empire, and to refer petitions addressed to it to the federal council or the chancellor of the Empire.

**Article 24.** Each legislative period of the diet shall last three years. The diet may be dissolved by a resolution of the federal council, with the consent of the Emperor.

**Article 25.** In the case of a dissolution of the diet, new elections shall take place within a period of 60 days, and the diet shall reassemble within a period of 90 days after the dissolution.

**Article 26.** Unless by consent of the diet, an adjournment of that body shall not exceed the period of 30 days, and shall not be repeated during the same session, without such consent.

**Article 27.** The diet shall examine into the legality of the election of its members and decide thereon. It shall regulate the mode of transacting business, and its own discipline, by establish-

ing rules therefor, and elect its president, vice-presidents, and secretaries.

**Article 28.** The diet shall pass laws by absolute majority. To render the passage of laws valid, the presence of the majority of the legal number of members shall be required. When passing laws which do not affect the whole Empire, according to the provisions of this constitution, the votes of only those members shall be counted who shall have been elected in those states of the confederation which the laws to be passed shall affect.

**Article 29.** The members of the diet shall be the representatives of the entire people, and shall not be subject to orders and instructions from their constituents.

**Article 30.** No member of the diet shall at any time suffer legal prosecution on account of his vote, or on account of utterances made while in the performance of his functions, or be held responsible outside of the diet for his actions.

**Article 31.** Without the consent of the diet, none of its members shall be tried or punished, during the session, for any offense committed, except when arrested in the act of committing the offense, or in the course of the following day. The same rule shall apply in the case of arrests for debt. At the request of the diet, all legal proceedings instituted against one of its members, and likewise imprisonment, shall be suspended during its session.

**Article 32.** The members of the diet shall not be allowed to draw any salary, or be compensated as such.

#### VI.—Customs and Commerce.

**Article 33.** Germany shall form a customs and commercial union, having a common frontier for the collection of duties. Such territories as cannot, by reason of their situation, be suitably embraced within the said frontier, shall be excluded. It shall be lawful to introduce all articles of commerce of a state of the confederation into any other state of the confederation, without paying any duty thereon, except so far as such articles are subject to taxation therein.

**Article 34.** The Hansatic towns, Bremen and Hamburg, shall remain free ports outside of the common boundary of the customs union, retaining for that purpose a district of their own, or of the surrounding territory, until they shall request to be admitted into the said union.

**Article 35.** The Empire shall have the exclusive power to legislate concerning everything relating to the customs, the taxation of salt and tobacco manufactured or raised in the territory of the confederation; concerning the taxation of manufactured brandy and beer, and of sugar and sirup prepared from beets or other domestic productions. It shall have exclusive power to legislate concerning the mutual protection of taxes upon articles of consumption levied in the several states of the Empire; against embezzlement; as well as concerning the measures which are required, in granting exemption from the payment of duties, for the security of the common customs frontier. In Bavaria, Würtemberg, and Baden, the matter of imposing duties on domestic brandy and beer is reserved for the legislature of each country. The states of the confederation shall, however, endeavor to bring about uniform legislation regarding the taxation of these articles.

**Article 36.** The imposing of duties and excises on articles of consumption, and the collec-

tion of the same (article 35,) is left to each state of the confederation within its own territory, so far as this has been done by each state heretofore. The Emperor shall have the supervision of the institution of legal proceedings by officials of the empire, whom he shall designate as adjuncts to the custom or excise offices, and boards of directors of the several states, after hearing the committee of the Confederate Council on customs and revenues. Notices given by these officials as to defects in the execution of the laws of the Empire (article 35) shall be submitted to the confederate council for action.

**Article 37.** In taking action upon the rules and regulations for the execution of the laws of the Empire, (article 35,) the vote of the presiding officer shall decide, whenever he shall pronounce for upholding the existing rule or regulation.

**Article 38.** The amounts accruing from customs and other revenues designated in article 35 of the latter, so far as they are subject to legislation by the diet, shall go to the treasury of the Empire. This amount is made up of the total receipts from the customs and other revenues, after deducting therefrom—1. Tax compensations and reductions in conformity with existing laws or regulations. 2. Reimbursements for taxes unduly imposed. 3. The costs for collection and administration, viz.: a. In the department of customs, the costs which are required for the protection and collection of customs on the frontiers and in the frontier districts. b. In the department of the duty on salt, the costs which are used for the pay of the officers charged with collecting and controlling these duties in the salt mines. c. In the department of duties on beet-sugar and tobacco, the compensation which is to be allowed, according to the resolutions of the confederate council, to the several state governments for the costs of the collection of these duties. d. Fifteen per cent. of the total receipts in the departments of the other duties. The territories situated outside of the common customs frontier shall contribute to the expenses of the Empire by paying an 'aversum,' (a sum of acquittance.) Bavaria, Würtemberg, and Baden shall not share in the revenues from duties on liquors and beer, which go into the treasury of the Empire, nor in the corresponding portion of the aforesaid 'aversum.'

**Article 39.** The quarterly statements to be regularly made by the revenue officers of the federal states at the end of every quarter, and the final settlements (to be made at the end of the year, and after the closing of the account-books) of the receipts from customs, which have become due in the course of the quarter, or during the fiscal year, and the revenues of the treasury of the Empire, according to article 38, shall be arranged by the boards of directors of the federal states, after a previous examination in general summaries in which every duty is to be shown separately; these summaries shall be transmitted to the federal committee on accounts. The latter provisional'ly fixes, every three months, taking as a basis these summaries, the amount due to the treasury of the Empire from the treasury of each state, and it shall inform the federal council and the federal States of this act; furthermore, it shall submit to the federal council, annually, the final statement of these amounts, with its remarks. The federal council shall act upon the fixing of these amounts.



**Article 40.** The terms of the customs-union treaty of July 8, 1867, remain in force, so far as they have not been altered by the provisions of this constitution, and as long as they are not altered in the manner designated in articles 7 and 78.

#### VII. — Railways.

**Article 41.** Railways, which are considered necessary for the defense of Germany or for purposes of general commerce, may be built for the account of the Empire by a law of the Empire, even in opposition to the will of those members of the confederation through whose territory the railroads run, without detracting from the rights of the sovereign of that country; or private persons may be charged with their construction and receive rights of expropriation. Every existing railway company is bound to permit new railroad lines to be connected with it, at the expense of these latter. All laws granting existing railway companies the right of injunction against the building of parallel or competition lines are hereby abolished throughout the Empire, without detriment to rights already acquired. Such right of injunction can henceforth not be granted in concessions to be given hereafter.

**Article 42.** The governments of the federal states bind themselves, in the interest of general commerce, to have the German railways managed as a uniform net-work, and for this purpose to have the lines constructed and equipped according to a uniform system.

**Article 43.** Accordingly, as soon as possible, uniform arrangements as to management, shall be made, and especially shall uniform regulations be instituted for the police of the railroads. The Empire shall take care that the administrative officers of the railway lines keep the roads always in such a condition as is required for public security, and that they be equipped with the necessary rolling stock.

**Article 44.** Railway companies are bound to establish such passenger trains of suitable velocity as may be required for ordinary travel, and for the establishment of harmonizing schedules of travel; also, to make provision for such freight trains as may be necessary for commercial purposes, and to establish, without extra remuneration, offices for the direct forwarding of passengers and freight trains, to be transferred, when necessary, from one road to another.

**Article 45.** The Empire shall have control over the tariff of fares. The same shall endeavor to cause — 1. Uniform regulations to be speedily introduced on all German railway lines. 2. The tariff to be reduced and made uniform as far as possible, and particularly to cause a reduction of the tariff for the transport of coal, coke, wood, minerals, stone, salt, crude iron, manure, and similar articles, for long distances, as demanded by the interests of agriculture and industry, and to introduce a one-penny tariff as soon as practicable.

**Article 46.** In case of distress, especially in case of an extraordinary rise in the price of provisions, it shall be the duty of the railway companies to adopt temporarily a low special tariff, to be fixed by the Emperor, on motion of the competent committee, for the forwarding of grain, flour, vegetables, and potatoes. This tariff shall, however, not be less than the lowest rate for raw produce existing on the said line. The foregoing provisions, and those of articles 42

to 45, shall not apply to Bavaria. The imperial government has, however, the power, also with regard to Bavaria, to establish, by way of legislation, uniform rules for the construction and equipment of such railways as may be of importance for the defense of the country.

**Article 47.** The managers of all railways shall be required to obey, without hesitation, requisitions made by the authorities of the Empire for the use of their roads for the defense of Germany. Particularly shall the military and all material of war be forwarded at uniform reduced rates.

#### VIII. — Mails and Telegraphs.

**Article 48.** The mails and telegraphs shall be organized and managed as state institutions throughout the German Empire. The legislation of the empire in regard to postal and telegraphic affairs, provided for in article 4, does not extend to those matters whose regulation is left to the managerial arrangement, according to the principles which have controlled the North German administration of mails and telegraphs.

**Article 49.** The receipts of mails and telegraphs are a joint affair throughout the Empire. The expenses shall be paid from the general receipts. The surplus goes into the treasury of the Empire. (Section 12.)

**Article 50.** The Emperor has the supreme supervision of the administration of mails and telegraphs. The authorities appointed by him are in duty bound and authorized to see that uniformity be established and maintained in the organization of the administration and in the transaction of business, as also in regard to the qualifications of employes. The Emperor shall have the power to make general administrative regulations, and also exclusively to regulate the relations which are to exist between the post and telegraph offices of Germany and those of other countries. It shall be the duty of all officers of the post-office and telegraph department to obey imperial orders. This obligation shall be included in their oath of office. The appointment of superior officers (such as directors, counselors, and superintendents,) as they shall be required for the administration of the mails and telegraphs, in the various districts; also the appointment of officers of the posts and telegraphs (such as inspectors or comptrollers,) acting for the aforesaid authorities in the several districts, in the capacity of supervisors, shall be made by the Emperor for the whole territory of the German Empire, and these officers shall take the oath of fealty to him as a part of their oath of office. The governments of the several states shall be informed in due time, by means of imperial confirmation and official publication, of the aforementioned appointments, so far as they may relate to their territories. Other officers required by the department of mails and telegraphs, as also all officers to be employed at the various stations, and for technical purposes, and hence officiating at the actual centers of communication, &c., shall be appointed by the respective governments of the states. Where there is no independent administration of inland mails or telegraphs, the terms of the various treaties are to be enforced.

**Article 51.** In assigning the surplus of the post-office department to the treasury of the Empire for general purposes, (article 49,) the following proceeding is to be observed in con-



sideration of the difference which has heretofore existed in the clear receipts of the post-office departments of the several territories, for the purpose of securing a suitable equalization during the period of transition below named. Of the post-office surplus, which accumulated in the several mail districts during the five years from 1861 to 1865, an average yearly surplus shall be computed, and the share which every separate mail district has had in the surplus resulting therefrom for the whole territory of the Empire shall be fixed upon by a percentage. In accordance with the proportion thus made, the several states shall be credited on the account of their other contributions to the expenses of the empire with their quota accruing from the postal surplus in the Empire, for a period of eight years subsequent to their entrance into the post-office department of the Empire. At the end of the said eight years this distinction shall cease, and any surplus in the post-office department shall go, without division, into the treasury of the Empire, according to the principle enunciated in article 49. Of the quota of the post-office department surplus resulting during the aforementioned period of eight years in favor of the Hanseatic towns, one-half shall every year be placed at the disposal of the Emperor, for the purpose of providing for the establishment of uniform post-offices in the Hanseatic towns.

Article 52. The stipulations of the foregoing articles 48 to 51 do not apply to Bavaria and Würtemberg. In their stead the following stipulation shall be valid for these two states of the confederation. The Empire alone is authorized to legislate upon the privileges of the post-office and telegraph departments, on the legal position of both institutions toward the public, upon the franking privilege and rates of postage, and upon the establishment of rates for telegraphic correspondence into Hanseatic towns. Exclusive, however, of managerial arrangements, and the fixing of tariffs for internal communication within Bavaria and Würtemberg. In the same manner the Empire shall regulate postal and telegraphic communication with foreign countries, excepting the immediate communication of Bavaria and Würtemberg with their neighboring states, not belonging to the Empire, in regard to which regulation the stipulations in article 49 of the postal treaty of November 23, 1867, remains in force. Bavaria and Würtemberg shall not share in the postal and telegraphic receipts which belong to the treasury of the Empire.

#### IX. — Marine and Navigation.

Article 53. The navy of the Empire is a united one, under the supreme command of the Emperor. The Emperor is charged with its organization and arrangement, and he shall appoint the officers and officials of the navy, and in his name these and the seamen are to be sworn in. The harbor of Kiel and the harbor of the Jade are imperial war harbors. The expenditures required for the establishment and maintenance of the navy and the institutions connected therewith shall be defrayed from the treasury of the Empire. All sea-faring men of the Empire, including machinists and hands employed in ship-building, are exempt from service in the army, but obliged to serve in the imperial navy. The apportionment of men to supply the wants of the navy shall be made according to the actual sea-faring population,

and the quota furnished in accordance herewith by each state shall be credited to the army account.

Article 54. The merchant vessels of all states of the confederation shall form a united commercial marine. The Empire shall determine the process for ascertaining the tonnage of sea-going vessels, shall regulate the issuing of tonnage-certificates and sea-letters, and shall fix the conditions to which a permit for commanding a sea-going vessel shall be subject. The merchant vessels of all the states of the confederation shall be admitted on an equal footing to the harbors, and to all natural and artificial water-courses of the several states of the confederation, and shall receive the same usage therein. The duties which shall be collected from sea-going vessels, or levied upon their freights, for the use of naval institutions in the harbors, shall not exceed the amount required for the maintenance and ordinary repair of these institutions. On all natural water-courses, duties are only to be levied for the use of special establishments, which serve for facilitating commercial intercourse. These duties, as well as the duties for navigating such artificial channels, which are property of the state, are not to exceed the amount required for the maintenance and ordinary repair of the institutions and establishments. These rules apply to rafting, so far as it is carried on on navigable water-courses. The levying of other or higher duties upon foreign vessels or their freights than those which are paid by the vessels of the federal states or their freights does not belong to the various states, but to the Empire.

Article 55. The flag of the war and merchant navy shall be black, white, and red.

#### X. — Consular Affairs.

Article 56. The Emperor shall have the supervision of all consular affairs of the German Empire, and he shall appoint consuls, after hearing the committee of the federal council on commerce and traffic. No new state consulates are to be established within the jurisdiction of the German consuls. German consuls shall perform the functions of state consuls for the states of the confederation not represented in their district. All the now existing state consulates shall be abolished, as soon as the organization of the German consulates shall be completed, in such a manner that the representation of the separate interests of all the federal states shall be recognized by the federal council as secured by the German consulates.

#### XI. — Military Affairs of the Empire.

Article 57. Every German is subject to military duty, and in the discharge of this duty no substitute can be accepted.

Article 58. The costs and the burden of all the military system of the Empire are to be borne equally by all the federal states and their subjects, and no privileges or molestations to the several states or classes are admissible. Where an equal distribution of the burdens cannot be effected 'in natura' without prejudice to the public welfare, affairs shall be equalized by legislation in accordance with the principles of justice.

Article 59. Every German capable of bearing arms shall serve for seven years in the standing army, ordinarily from the end of his twentieth to the beginning of his twenty-eighth year; the first three years in the army of the field, the last

four years in the reserve; during the next five years he shall belong to the militia. In those states of the confederation in which heretofore a longer term of service than twelve years was required by law, the gradual reduction of the required time of service shall take place in such a manner as is compatible with the interests and the war-footing of the army of the Empire. As regards the emigration of men belonging to the reserve, only those provisions shall be in force which apply to the emigration of members of the militia.

**Article 60.** The strength of the German army in time of peace shall be, until the 31st December, 1871, one per cent. of the population of 1867, and shall be furnished by the several federal states in proportion to their population. In future the strength of the army in time of peace shall be fixed by legislation.

**Article 61.** After the publication of this constitution the full Prussian military system of legislation shall be introduced without delay throughout the Empire, as well the statutes themselves as the regulations, instructions, and ordinances issued for their execution, explanation, or completion; thus, in particular, the military penal code of April 3, 1845; the military orders of the penal court of April 3, 1845; the ordinance concerning the courts of honor of July 20, 1843; the regulations with respect to recruiting, time of service, matters relating to the service and subsistence, to the quartering of troops, claims for damages, mobilizing, &c., for times of peace and war. Orders for the attendance of the military upon religious services is, however, excluded. When a uniform organization of the German army shall have been established, a comprehensive military law for the Empire shall be submitted to the Emperor and the federal council for their action in accordance with the constitution.

**Article 62.** For the purpose of defraying the expenses of the whole German army, and the institutions connected therewith, the sum of 225 (two hundred and twenty-five) thalers shall be placed at the disposal of the Emperor until the 31st of December, 1871, for each man in the army on the peace-footing, according to article 60. (See section 12.) After the 31st of December, 1871, the payment of these contributions of the several states to the imperial treasury must be continued. The strength of the army in time of peace, which has been temporarily fixed in article 60, shall be taken as a basis for calculating these amounts until it shall be altered by a law of the Empire. The expenditure of this sum for the whole army of the Empire and its establishments shall be determined by a budget law. In determining the budget of military expenditures, the lawfully established organization of the imperial army, in accordance with this constitution, shall be taken as a basis.

**Article 63.** The total land force of the Empire shall form one army, which, in war and in peace, shall be under the command of the Emperor. The regiments, &c., throughout the whole German army shall bear continuous numbers. The principal colors and the cut of the garments of the Royal Prussian army shall serve as a pattern for the rest of the army. It is left to commanders of contingent forces to choose the external badges, cockades, &c. It shall be the duty and the right of the Emperor to take care that,

throughout the German army, all divisions be kept full and well equipped, and that unity be established and maintained in regard to organization and formation, equipment, and command in the training of the men, as well as in the qualification of the officers. For this purpose the Emperor shall be authorized to satisfy himself at any time of the condition of the several contingents, and to provide remedies for existing defects. The Emperor shall determine the strength, composition, and division of the contingents of the imperial army, and also the organization of the militia, and he shall have the right to designate garrisons within the territory of the confederation, as also to call any portion of the army into active service. In order to maintain the necessary unity in the care, arming, and equipment of all troops of the German army, all orders hereafter to be issued for the Prussian army shall be communicated in due form to the commanders of the remaining contingents by the committee on the army and fortifications, provided for in article 8, No. 1.

**Article 64.** All German troops are bound implicitly to obey the orders of the Emperor. This obligation shall be included in the oath of allegiance. The commander-in-chief of a contingent, as well as all officers commanding troops of more than one contingent, and all commanders of fortresses, shall be appointed by the Emperor. The officers appointed by the Emperor shall take the oath of fealty to him. The appointment of generals, or of officers performing the duties of generals, in a contingent force, shall be in each case subject to the approval of the Emperor. The Emperor has the right with regard to the transfer of officers, with or without promotion, to positions which are to be filled in the service of the Empire, be it in the Prussian army or in other contingents, to select from the officers of all the contingents of the army of the Empire.

**Article 65.** The right to build fortresses within the territory of the Empire shall belong to the Emperor, who, according to section 12, shall ask for the appropriation of the necessary means required for that purpose, if not already included in the regular appropriation.

**Article 66.** If not otherwise stipulated, the princes of the Empire and the senates shall appoint the officers of their respective contingents, subject to the restriction of article 64. They are the chiefs of all the troops belonging to their respective territories, and are entitled to the honors connected therewith. They shall have especially the right to hold inspections at any time, and receive, besides the regular reports and announcements of changes for publication, timely information of all promotions and appointments concerning their respective contingents. They shall also have the right to employ, for police purposes, not only their own troops but all other contingents of the army of the Empire who are stationed in their respective territories.

**Article 67.** The unexpended portion of the military appropriation shall, under no circumstances, fall to the share of a single government, but at all times to the treasury of the Empire.

**Article 68.** The Emperor shall have the power, if the public security of the Empire demands it, to declare martial law in any part thereof, until the publication of a law regulating the grounds, the form of announcement, and the effects of such a declaration, the provisions of the

Prussian law of June 4, 1851, shall be substituted therefor. (Laws of 1851, page 451.)

**Addition to section XI.**

The provisions contained in this section shall go into effect in Bavaria as provided for in the treaty of alliance of November 23, 1870, (Bundesgesetzblatt, 1871, section 9,) under III, section 5, in Württemberg, as provided for in the military convention of November 21-25, 1870, (Bundesgesetzblatt, 1870, section 658.)

**XII.—Finances of the Empire.**

**Article 69.** All receipts and expenditures of the Empire shall be estimated yearly, and included in the financial estimate. The latter shall be fixed by law before the beginning of the fiscal year, according to the following principles:

**Article 70.** The surplus of the previous year, as well as the customs duties, the common excise duties, and the revenues derived from the postal and telegraph service, shall be applied to the defrayal of all general expenditure. In so far as these expenditures are not covered by the receipts, they shall be raised, as long as no taxes of the Empire shall have been established, by assessing the several states of the Empire according to their population, the amount of the assessment to be fixed by the Chancellor of the Empire in accordance with the budget agreed upon.

**Article 71.** The general expenditure shall be, as a rule, granted for one year; they may, however, in special cases, be granted for a longer period. During the period of transition fixed in Article 60, the financial estimate, properly classified, of the expenditures of the army shall be laid before the federal council and the diet for their information.

**Article 72.** An annual report of the expenditure of all the receipts of the Empire shall be rendered to the federal council and the diet, through the Chancellor of the Empire.

**Article 73.** In cases of extraordinary requirements, a loan may be contracted in accordance with the laws of the Empire, such loan to be granted by the Empire.

**Addition to section XII.**

Articles 69 and 71 apply to the expenditures for the Bavarian army only according to the provisions of the addition to section XI of the treaty of November 23, 1870; and article 72 only so far as is required to inform the federal council and the diet of the assignment to Bavaria of the required sum for the Bavarian army.

**XIII.—Settlement of Disputes and Modes of Punishment.**

**Article 74.** Every attempt against the existence, the integrity, the security, or the constitution of the German Empire; finally, any offense committed against the federal council, the diet, a member of the federal council, or of the diet, a magistrate or public official of the Em-

pire, while in the execution of his duty, or with reference to his official position, by word, writing, printing, signs, or caricatures, shall be judicially investigated, and upon conviction punished in the several states of the Empire, according to the laws therein existing, or which shall hereafter exist in the same, according to which laws a similar offense against any one of the states of the Empire, its constitution, legislature, members of its legislature, authorities or officials is to be judged.

**Article 75.** For those offenses, specified in Article 74, against the German Empire, which, if committed against one of the states of the Empire, would be deemed high treason, the superior court of appeals of the three free Hanseatic towns at Lubeck shall be the competent deciding tribunal in the first and last resort. More definite provisions as to the competency and the proceedings of the superior court of appeals shall be adopted by the Legislature of the Empire. Until the passage of a law of the Empire, the existing competency of the courts in the respective states of the Empire, and the provisions relative to the proceedings of those courts, shall remain in force.

**Article 76.** Disputes between the different states of the confederation, so far as they are not of a private nature, and therefore to be decided by the competent authorities, shall be settled by the federal council, at the request of one of the parties. Disputes relating to constitutional matters in those of the states of the confederation whose constitution contains no provision for the settlement of such differences, shall be adjusted by the federal council, at the request of one of the parties, or, if this cannot be done, they shall be settled by the legislative power of the confederation.

**Article 77.** If in one of the states of the confederation justice shall be denied, and no sufficient relief can be procured by legal measures, it shall be the duty of the federal council to receive substantiated complaints concerning denial or restriction of justice, which are to be judged according to the constitution and the existing laws of the respective states of the confederation, and thereupon to obtain judicial relief from the confederate government in the matter which shall have given rise to the complaint.

**XIV.—General Provision.**

Amendments of the constitution shall be made by legislative enactment. They shall be considered as rejected when 14 votes are cast against them in the federal council. The provisions of the constitution of the Empire, by which fixed rights of individual states of the confederation are established in their relation to the whole, shall only be modified with the consent of that state of the confederation which is immediately concerned.

**CONSTITUTION OF JAPAN.**

The following text of the Constitution of the Empire of Japan, promulgated by the Emperor, February 11, 1889, is from a pamphlet published at Johns Hopkins University on the occasion of a meeting of professors, students and guests, April 17, 1889, to celebrate its promulgation:

Having, by virtue of the glories of Our Ancestors, ascended the throne of a lineal succession unbroken for ages eternal; desiring to promote the welfare of, and to give development to the moral and intellectual faculties of Our beloved subjects, the very same that have been favoured

with the benevolent care and affectionate vigilance of Our Ancestors; and hoping to maintain the prosperity of the State, in concert with Our people and with their support, We hereby promulgate, in pursuance of Our Imperial Rescript of the 14th day of the 10th month of the 14th year of Meiji, a fundamental law of State, to exhibit the principles, by which We are to be guided in Our conduct, and to point out to what Our descendants and Our subjects and their descendants are forever to conform. The rights of sovereignty of the State, We have inherited from Our Ancestors, and We shall bequeath them to Our descendants. Neither We nor they shall in future fail to wield them, in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution hereby granted. We now declare to respect and protect the security of the rights and of the property of Our people, and to secure to them the complete enjoyment of the same, within the extent of the provisions of the present Constitution and of the law. The Imperial Diet shall first be convoked for the 23d year of Meiji, and the time of its opening shall be the date, when the present Constitution comes into force. When in the future it may become necessary to amend any of the provisions of the present Constitution, We or Our successors shall assume the initiative right, and submit a project for the same to the Imperial Diet. The Imperial Diet shall pass its vote upon it, according to the conditions imposed by the present Constitution, and in no otherwise shall Our descendants or Our subjects be permitted to attempt any alteration thereof. Our Ministers of State, on Our behalf, shall be held responsible for the carrying out of the present Constitution, and Our present and future subjects shall forever assume the duty of allegiance to the present Constitution. [His Imperial Majesty's Sign-Manual.] The 11th day of the 2nd month of the 22nd year of Meiji. [Countersigned by Ministers.]

### Chapter I.

**Article I.** The Empire of Japan shall be reigned over and governed by a line of Emperors unbroken for ages eternal.

**Article II.** The Imperial Throne shall be succeeded to by Imperial male descendants, according to the provisions of the Imperial House Law.

**Article III.** The Emperor is sacred and inviolable.

**Article IV.** The Emperor is the head of the Empire, combining in Himself the rights of sovereignty, and exercises them, according to the provisions of the present Constitution.

**Article V.** The Emperor exercises the legislative power with the consent of the Imperial Diet.

**Article VI.** The Emperor gives sanction to laws, and orders them to be promulgated and executed.

**Article VII.** The Emperor convokes the Imperial Diet, opens, closes, and prorogues it, and dissolves the House of Representatives.

**Article VIII.** The Emperor, in consequence of an urgent necessity to maintain public safety or to avert public calamities, issues, when the Imperial Diet is not sitting, Imperial Ordinances in the place of law. Such Imperial Ordinances are to be laid before the Imperial Diet at its next session, and when the Diet does not approve the said Ordinances, the Government shall declare them to be invalid for the future.

**Article IX.** The Emperor issues, or causes to be issued, the Ordinances necessary for the carrying out of the laws, or for the maintenance of the public peace and order, and for the promotion of the welfare of the subjects. But no Ordinance shall in any way alter any of the existing laws.

**Article X.** The Emperor determines the organization of the different branches of the administration, and the salaries of all civil and military officers, and appoints and dismisses the same. Exceptions especially provided for in the present Constitution or in other laws, shall be in accordance with the respective provisions (bearing thereon).

**Article XI.** The Emperor has the supreme command of the Army and Navy.

**Article XII.** The Emperor determines the organization and peace standing of the Army and Navy.

**Article XIII.** The Emperor declares war, makes peace, and concludes treaties.

**Article XIV.** The Emperor proclaims the law of siege. The conditions and effects of the law of siege shall be determined by law.

**Article XV.** The Emperor confers titles of nobility, rank, orders, and other marks of honor.

**Article XVI.** The Emperor orders amnesty, pardon, commutation of punishment, and rehabilitation.

**Article XVII.** A Regency shall be instituted in conformity with the provisions of the Imperial House Law. The Regent shall exercise the powers appertaining to the Emperor in His name.

### Chapter II.

**Article XVIII.** The conditions necessary for being a Japanese subject shall be determined by law.

**Article XIX.** Japanese subjects may, according to qualifications determined in law or ordinances, be appointed to civil or military offices equally, and may fill any other public offices.

**Article XX.** Japanese subjects are amenable to service in the Army or Navy, according to the provisions of law.

**Article XXI.** Japanese subjects are amenable to the duty of paying taxes, according to the provisions of law.

**Article XXII.** Japanese subjects shall have the liberty of abode and of changing the same within the limits of law.

**Article XXIII.** No Japanese subject shall be arrested, detained, tried, or punished, unless according to law.

**Article XXIV.** No Japanese subject shall be deprived of his right of being tried by the judges determined by law.

**Article XXV.** Except in the cases provided for in the law, the house of no Japanese subject shall be entered or searched without his consent.

**Article XXVI.** Except in the cases mentioned in the law, the secrecy of the letters of every Japanese subject shall remain inviolate.

**Article XXVII.** The right of property of every Japanese subject shall remain inviolate. Measures necessary to be taken for the public benefit shall be provided for by law.

**Article XXVIII.** Japanese subjects shall, within limits not prejudicial to peace and order, and not antagonistic to their duties as subjects, enjoy freedom of religious belief.

**Article XXIX.** Japanese subjects shall, within the limits of law, enjoy the liberty of speech, writing, publication, public meetings, and associations.

**Article XXX.** Japanese subjects may present petitions, by observing the proper forms of respect, and by complying with the rules specially provided for the same.

**Article XXXI.** The provisions contained in the present Chapter shall not affect the exercise of the powers appertaining to the Emperor in times of war or in cases of a national emergency.

**Article XXXII.** Each and every one of the provisions contained in the preceding Articles of the present Chapter, that are not in conflict with the laws or the rules and discipline of the Army and Navy, shall apply to the officers and men of the Army and of the Navy.

**Chapter III.**

**Article XXXIII.** The Imperial Diet shall consist of two Houses, a House of Peers and a House of Representatives.

**Article XXXIV.** The House of Peers shall, in accordance with the Ordinance concerning the House of Peers, be composed of the members of the Imperial Family, of the orders of nobility, and of those persons who have been nominated thereto by the Emperor.

**Article XXXV.** The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members elected by the people according to the provisions of the Law of Election.

**Article XXXVI.** No one can at one and the same time be a member of both Houses.

**Article XXXVII.** Every law requires the consent of the Imperial Diet.

**Article XXXVIII.** Both Houses shall vote upon projects of law submitted to it by the Government, and may respectively initiate projects of law.

**Article XXXIX.** A Bill, which has been rejected by either the one or the other of the two houses, shall not be again brought in during the same session.

**Article XL.** Both Houses can make representations to the Government, as to laws or upon any other subject. When, however, such representations are not accepted, they cannot be made a second time during the same session.

**Article XLI.** The Imperial Diet shall be convoked every year.

**Article XLII.** A session of the Imperial Diet shall last during three months. In case of necessity, the duration of a session may be prolonged by Imperial Order.

**Article XLIII.** When urgent necessity arises, an extraordinary session may be convoked, in addition to the ordinary one. The duration of an extraordinary session shall be determined by Imperial Order.

**Article XLIV.** The opening, closing, prolongation of session, and prorogation of the Imperial Diet, shall be effected simultaneously for both Houses. In case the House of Representatives has been ordered to dissolve, the House of Peers shall at the same time be prorogued.

**Article XLV.** When the House of Representatives has been ordered to dissolve, Members shall be caused by Imperial Order to be newly elected, and the new House shall be convoked within five months from the day of dissolution.

**Article XLVI.** No debate can be opened and no vote can be taken in either House of the Imperial Diet, unless not less than one-third of the whole number of the members thereof is present.

**Article XLVII.** Votes shall be taken in both Houses by absolute majority. In the case of a tie vote, the President shall have the casting vote.

**Article XLVIII.** The deliberations of both Houses shall be held in public. The deliberations may, however, upon demand of the Government or by resolution of the House, be held in secret sitting.

**Article XLIX.** Both Houses of the Imperial Diet may respectively present addresses to the Emperor.

**Article L.** Both Houses may receive petitions presented by subjects.

**Article LI.** Both Houses may enact, besides what is provided for in the present Constitution and in the Law of the Houses, rules necessary for the management of their internal affairs.

**Article LII.** No member of either House shall be held responsible outside the respective Houses, for any opinion uttered or for any vote given in the House. When, however, a Member himself has given publicity to his opinions by public speech, by documents in printing or in writing, or by any other similar means he shall, in the matter, be amenable to the general law.

**Article LIII.** The members of both Houses shall, during the session, be free from arrest, unless with the consent of the House, except in cases of flagrant delicts, or of offences connected with a state of internal commotion or with a foreign trouble.

**Article LIV.** The Ministers of State and the Delegates of the Government may, at any time, take seats and speak in either House.

**Chapter IV.**

**Article LV.** The respective Ministers of State shall give their advice to the Emperor, and be responsible for it. All Laws, Imperial Ordinances, and Imperial Rescripts of whatever kind, that relate to the affairs of the State, require the countersignature of a Minister of State.

**Article LVI.** The Privy Council shall, in accordance with the provisions for the organization of the Privy Council, deliberate upon important matters of State, when they have been consulted by the Emperor.

**Chapter V.**

**Article LVII.** The Judicature shall be exercised by the Courts of Law according to law, in the name of the Emperor. The organization of the Courts of Law shall be determined by law.

**Article LVIII.** The judges shall be appointed from among those, who possess proper qualifications according to law. No judge shall be deprived of his position, unless by way of criminal sentence or disciplinary punishment. Rules for disciplinary punishment shall be determined by law.

**Article LIX.** Trials and judgments of a Court shall be conducted publicly. When, however, there exists any fear that such publicity may be prejudicial to peace and order, or to the maintenance of public morality, the public trial may be suspended by provision of law or by the decision of the Court of Law.

**Article LX.** All matters, that fall within the competency of a special Court, shall be specially provided for by law.

**Article LXI.** No suit at law, which relates to rights alleged to have been infringed by the legal measures of the executive authorities, and which shall come within the competency of the Court of Administrative Litigation specially established by law, shall be taken cognizance of by a Court of Law.

**Chapter VI.**

**Article LXII.** The imposition of a new tax or the modification of the rates (of an existing one) shall be determined by law. However, all such administrative fees or other revenue having the nature of compensation shall not fall within the category of the above clause. The raising of national loans and the contracting of other liabilities to the charge of the National Treasury, except those that are provided in the Budget, shall require the consent of the Imperial Diet.

**Article LXIII.** The taxes levied at present shall, in so far as they are not remodelled by new law, be collected according to the old system.

**Article LXIV.** The expenditure and revenue of the State require the consent of the Imperial Diet by means of an annual Budget. Any and all expenditures overpassing the appropriations set forth in the Titles and Paragraphs of the Budget, or that are not provided for in the Budget, shall subsequently require the approbation of the Imperial Diet.

**Article LXV.** The Budget shall be first laid before the House of Representatives.

**Article LXVI.** The expenditures of the Imperial House shall be defrayed every year out of the National Treasury, according to the present fixed amount for the same, and shall not require the consent thereto of the Imperial Diet, except in case an increase thereof is found necessary.

**Article LXVII.** Those already fixed expenditures based by the Constitution upon the powers appertaining to the Emperor, and such expenditures as may have arisen by the effect of law, or that appertain to the legal obligations of the Government, shall be neither rejected nor reduced by the Imperial Diet, without the concurrence of the Government.

**Article LXVIII.** In order to meet special requirements, the Government may ask the consent of the Imperial Diet to a certain amount as a Continuing Expenditure Fund, for a previously fixed number of years.

**Article LXIX.** In order to supply deficiencies which are unavoidable, in the Budget, and to

meet requirements unprovided for in the same, a Reserve Fund shall be provided in the Budget.

**Article LXX.** When the Imperial Diet cannot be convoked, owing to the external or internal condition of the country, in case of urgent need for the maintenance of public safety, the Government may take all necessary financial measures, by means of an Imperial Ordinance. In the case mentioned in the preceding clause, the matter shall be submitted to the Imperial Diet at its next session, and its approbation shall be obtained thereto.

**Article LXXI.** When the Imperial Diet has not voted on the Budget, or when the Budget has not been brought into actual existence, the Government shall carry out the Budget of the preceding year.

**Article LXXII.** The final account of the expenditures and revenue of the State shall be verified and confirmed by the Board of Audit, and it shall be submitted by the Government to the Imperial Diet, together with the report of verification of the said Board. The organization and competency of the Board of Audit shall be determined by law separately.

**Chapter VII.**

**Article LXXIII.** When it has become necessary in future to amend the provisions of the present Constitution, a project to that effect shall be submitted to the Imperial Diet by Imperial Order. In the above case, neither House can open the debate, unless not less than two-thirds of the whole number of Members are present, and no amendment can be passed, unless a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present is obtained.

**Article LXXIV.** No modification of the Imperial House Law shall be required to be submitted to the deliberation of the Imperial Diet. No provision of the present Constitution can be modified by the Imperial House Law.

**Article LXXV.** No modification can be introduced into the Constitution, or into the Imperial House Law, during the time of a Regency.

**Article LXXVI.** Existing legal enactments, such as laws, regulations, Ordinances, or by whatever names they may be called, shall, so far as they do not conflict with the present Constitution, continue in force. All existing contracts or orders, that entail obligations upon the Government, and that are connected with expenditure shall come within the scope of Art. LXVII.

**CONSTITUTION OF LYCURGUS.—**

"The constitution of Lykourgos was especially adapted to make heroes, and it made them. To serve his country and die for her, this was the Spartan's chief ambition. 'Victory or death!' was their war-cry; honor, their supreme law. 'That most to be admired in Lykourgos,' says Xenophon, 'is that he was able to make a noble death seem preferable to a dishonored life. This great lawgiver provided for the happiness of the brave man, and devoted the coward to infamy. . . . At Sparta men would be ashamed to sit at table with the coward, to touch his weapons or his hand; in the games neither party will receive him. He has the lowest place at the dances and the dramatic representations. In the street he is pushed aside by younger men. His daughters share in his disgrace; they are excluded from public feasts, and can obtain no husbands.'—V.

Duruy, *Hist. of Greece*, v. 1, sect. 2, p. 467.—Mr. Grote remarks upon the "unparalleled steadiness" of the Spartan constitution ascribed to Lycurgus, which was maintained "for four or five successive centuries, in the midst of governments like the Grecian, all of which had undergone more or less of fluctuation. No considerable revolution—not even any palpable or formal change—occurred in it from the days of the Messenian war down to those of Agis III.: in spite of the irreparable blow which the power and territory of the state sustained from Epameinondas and the Thebans, the form of government nevertheless remained unchanged. It was the only government in Greece which could trace an unbroken peaceable descent from a high antiquity and from its real or supposed founder."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 6 (v. 2).—See SPARTA, THE CONSTITUTION.

## CONSTITUTION OF MEXICO.

The following translated text of the Constitution of Mexico is from Bulletin No. 9 of the Bureau of the American Republics, published in July, 1891:

**Preamble.**—In the name of God and with the authority of the Mexican people. The representatives of the different States, of the District and Territories which compose the Republic of Mexico, called by the Plan proclaimed in Ayutla the 1st of March, 1854, amended in Acapulco the 11th day of the same month and year, and by the summons issued the 17th of October, 1855, to constitute the nation under the form of a popular, representative, democratic republic, exercising the powers with which they are invested, comply with the requirements of their high office, decreeing the following political Constitution of the Mexican Republic, on the indestructible basis of its legitimate independence, proclaimed the 16th of September, 1810, and completed the 27th of September, 1821.

**Article 1.** The Mexican people recognize that the rights of man are the basis and the object of social institutions. Consequently they declare that all the laws and all the authorities of the country must respect and maintain the guarantees which the present Constitution establishes.

**Art. 2.** In the Republic all are born free. Slaves who set foot upon the national territory recover, by that act alone, their liberty, and have a right to the protection of the laws.

**Art. 3.** Instruction is free. The law shall determine what professions require a diploma for their exercise, and with what requisites they must be issued.

**Art. 4.** Every man is free to adopt the profession, industrial pursuit, or occupation which suits him, the same being useful and honorable, and to avail himself of its products. Nor shall any one be hindered in the exercise of such profession, industrial pursuit, or occupation, unless by judicial sentence when such exercise attacks the rights of a third party, or by governmental resolution, dictated in terms which the law marks out, when it offends the rights of society.

**Art. 5.** No one shall be obliged to give personal services without just compensation, and without his full consent. The state shall not permit any contract, pact, or agreement to be carried into effect which has for its object the diminution, loss, or irrevocable sacrifice of the liberty of man, whether it be for the sake of labor, education, or a religious vow. The law, consequently, may not recognize monastic orders, nor may it permit their establishment, whatever may be the denomination or object with which they claim to be formed.\* Neither may an agreement be permitted in which anyone stipulates for his proscription or banishment.

**Art. 6.** The expression of ideas shall not be the object of any judicial or administrative inquisition, except in case it attacks morality, the rights of a third party, provokes some crime or misdemeanor, or disturbs public order.

**Art. 7.** The liberty to write and to publish writings on any subject whatsoever is inviolable. No law or authority shall establish previous censure, nor require security from authors or printers,

nor restrict the liberty of the press, which has no other limits than respect of private life, morality, and the public peace. The crimes which are committed by means of the press shall be judged by the competent tribunals of the Federation, or by those of the States, those of the Federal District and the Territory of Lower California, in accordance with their penal laws.\*

**Art. 8.** The right of petition, exercised in writing in a peaceful and respectful manner, is inviolable; but in political matters only citizens of the Republic may exercise it. To every petition must be returned a written opinion by the authority to whom it may have been addressed, and the latter is obliged to make the result known to the petitioner.

**Art. 9.** No one may be deprived of the right peacefully to assemble or unite with others for any lawful object whatsoever, but only citizens of the Republic may do this in order to take part in the political affairs of the country. No armed assembly has a right to deliberate.

**Art. 10.** Every man has a right to possess and carry arms for his security and legitimate defence. The law shall designate what arms are prohibited and the punishment which those shall incur who carry them.

**Art. 11.** Every man has a right to enter and to go out of the Republic, to travel through its territory and change his residence, without the necessity of a letter of security, passport, safe-conduct, or other similar requisite. The exercise of this right shall not prejudice the legitimate faculties of the judicial or administrative authority in cases of criminal or civil responsibility.

**Art. 12.** There are not, nor shall there be recognized in the Republic, titles of nobility, or prerogatives, or hereditary honors. Only the people, legitimately represented, may decree recompenses in honor of those who may have rendered or may render eminent services to the country or to humanity.

**Art. 13.** In the Mexican Republic no one may be judged by special law nor by special tribunals. No person or corporation may have privileges, or enjoy emoluments, which are not compensation for a public service and are established by law. Martial law may exist only for crimes and offences which have a definite connection with military discipline. The law shall determine with all clearness the cases included in this exception.

**Art. 14.** No retroactive law shall be enacted. No one may be judged or sentenced except by laws made prior to the act, and exactly applicable to it, and by a tribunal which shall have been previously established by law.

**Art. 15.** Treaties shall never be made for the extradition of political offenders, nor for the extradition of those violators of the public order who may have held in the country where they committed the offence the position of slaves; nor agreements or treaties in virtue of which may be altered the guarantees and rights which this Constitution grants to the man and to the citizen.

\* This sentence was introduced into the original article September 25, 1873, with other less important amendments.

\* This article was amended May 15, 1883, by introducing the last sentence as a substitute for the following: "The crimes of the press shall be judged by one jury which attends the fact and by another which applies the law and designates the punishment."



**Art. 16.** No one may be molested in his person, family, domicile, papers and possessions, except in virtue of an order written by the competent authority, which shall establish and assign the legal cause for the proceedings. In the case of in flagrante delicto any person may apprehend the offender and his accomplices, placing them without delay at the disposal of the nearest authorities.

**Art. 17.** No one may be arrested for debts of a purely civil character. No one may exercise violence in order to reclaim his rights. The tribunals shall always be prompt to administer justice. This shall be gratuitous, judicial costs being consequently abolished.

**Art. 18.** Imprisonment shall take place only for crimes which deserve corporal punishment. In any state of the process in which it shall appear that such a punishment might not be imposed upon the accused, he shall be set at liberty under bail. In no case shall the imprisonment or detention be prolonged for default of payment of fees, or of any furnishing of money whatever.

**Art. 19.** No detention shall exceed the term of three days, unless justified by a writ showing cause of imprisonment and other requisites which the law establishes. The mere lapse of this term shall render responsible the authority that orders or consents to it, and the agents, ministers, wardens, or jailers who execute it. Any maltreatment in the apprehension or in the confinement of the prisoners, any injury which may be inflicted without legal ground, any tax or contribution in the prisons, is an abuse which the laws must correct and the authorities severally punish.

**Art. 20.** In every criminal trial the accused shall have the following guarantees: I. That the grounds of the proceedings and the name of the accuser, if there shall be one, shall be made known to him. II. That his preparatory declaration shall be taken within forty-eight hours, counting from the time he may be placed at the disposal of the judge. III. That he shall be confronted with the witnesses who testify against him. IV. That he shall be furnished with the data which he requires and which appear in the process, in order to prepare for his defence. V. That he shall be heard in defence by himself or by counsel, or by both, as he may desire. In case he should have no one to defend him, a list of official defenders shall be presented to him, in order that he may choose one or more who may suit him.

**Art. 21.** The application of penalties properly so called belongs exclusively to the judicial authority. The political or administrative authorities may only impose fines, as correction, to the extent of five hundred dollars, or imprisonment to the extent of one month, in the cases and manner which the law shall expressly determine.

**Art. 22.** Punishments by mutilation and infamy, by branding, flogging, the bastinado, torture of whatever kind, excessive fines, confiscation of property, or any other unusual or extraordinary penalties, shall be forever prohibited.

**Art. 23.** In order to abolish the penalty of death, the administrative power is charged to establish, as soon as possible, a penitentiary system. In the meantime the penalty of death shall be abolished for political offences, and shall not be extended to other cases than treason during foreign war, highway robbery, arson, parricide, homicide with treachery, premeditation or ad-

vantage, to grave offences of the military order, and piracy, which the law shall define.

**Art. 24.** No criminal proceeding may have more than three instances. No one shall be tried twice for the same offence, whether by the judgment he be absolved or condemned. The practice of absolving from the instance is abolished.

**Art. 25.** Sealed correspondence which circulates by the mails is free from all registry. The violation of this guarantee is an offence which the law shall punish severely.

**Art. 26.** In time of peace no soldier may demand quarters, supplies, or other real or personal service without the consent of the proprietor. In time of war he shall do this only in the manner prescribed by the law.

**Art. 27.** Private property shall not be appropriated without the consent of the owner, except for the sake of public use, and with previous indemnification. The law shall determine the authority which may make the appropriation and the conditions under which it may be carried out. No corporation, civil or ecclesiastical, whatever may be its character, denomination, or object, shall have legal capacity to acquire in proprietorship or administer for itself real estate, with the single exception of edifices destined immediately and directly to the service and object of the institution.\*

**Art. 28.** There shall be no monopolies, nor places of any kind for the sale of privileged goods, nor prohibitions under titles of protection to industry. There shall be excepted only those relative to the coining of money, to the mails, and to the privileges which, for a limited time, the law may concede to inventors or perfectors of some improvement.

**Art. 29.** In cases of invasion, grave disturbance of the public peace, or any other cases whatsoever which may place society in great danger or conflict, only the President of the Republic in concurrence with the Council of Ministers and with the approbation of the Congress of the Union, and, in the recess thereof, of the permanent deputation, may suspend the guarantees established by this Constitution, with the exception of those which assure the life of man; but such suspension shall be made only for a limited time, by means of general provisions, and without being limited to a determined person. If the suspension should take place during the session of Congress, this body shall concede the authorizations which it may esteem necessary in order that the Executive may meet properly the situation. If the suspension should take place during the recess, the permanent deputation shall convoke the Congress without delay in order that it may make the authorizations.

**Art. 30.** Mexicans are— I. All those born, within or without the Republic, of Mexican parents. II. Foreigners who are naturalized in conformity with the laws of the Federation. III. Foreigners who acquire real estate in the Republic or have Mexican children; provided they do not manifest their resolution to preserve their nationality.

**Art. 31.** It is an obligation of every Mexican— I. To defend the independence, the territory, the honor, the rights and interests of his country. II. To contribute for the public expenses, as well of the Federation as of the State and municipality

\* See Article 3 of Additions to the Constitution.



in which he resides, in the proportional and equitable manner which the laws may provide.

**Art. 32.** Mexicans shall be preferred to foreigners in equal circumstances, for all employments, charges, or commissions of appointment by the authorities, in which the condition of citizenship may not be indispensable. Laws shall be issued to improve the condition of Mexican laborers, rewarding those who distinguish themselves in any science or art, stimulating labor, and founding practical colleges and schools of arts and trades.

**Art. 33.** Foreigners are those who do not possess the qualifications determined in Article 30. They have a right to the guarantees established by . . . [Articles 1-29] of the present Constitution, except that in all cases the Government has the right to expel pernicious foreigners. They are under obligation to contribute to the public expenses in the manner which the laws may provide, and to obey and respect the institutions, laws, and authorities of the country, subjecting themselves to the judgments and sentences of the tribunals, without power to seek other protection than that which the laws concede to Mexican citizens.

**Art. 34.** Citizens of the Republic are all those who, having the quality of Mexicans, have also the following qualifications: I. Eighteen years of age if married, or twenty-one if not married. II. An honest means of livelihood.

**Art. 35.** The prerogatives of the citizen are—**I.** To vote at popular elections. **II.** The privilege of being voted for for any office subject to popular election, and of being selected for any other employment or commission, having the qualifications established by law. **III.** To associate to discuss the political affairs of the country. **IV.** To take up arms in the army or in the national guard for the defence of the Republic and its institutions. **V.** To exercise in all cases the right of petition.

**Art. 36.** Every citizen of the Republic is under the following obligations: **I.** To be inscribed on the municipal roll, stating the property which he has, or the industry, profession, or labor by which he subsists. **II.** To enlist in the national guard. **III.** To vote at popular elections in the district to which he belongs. **IV.** To discharge the duties of the offices of popular election of the Federation, which in no case shall be gratuitous.

**Art. 37.** The character of citizen is lost—**I.** By naturalization in a foreign country. **II.** By serving officially the government of another country or accepting its decorations, titles, or employments without previous permission from the Federal Congress; excepting literary, scientific, and humanitarian titles, which may be accepted freely.

**Art. 38.** The law shall prescribe the cases and the form in which may be lost or suspended the rights of citizenship and the manner in which they may be regained.

**Art. 39.** The national sovereignty resides essentially and originally in the people. All public power emanates from the people, and is instituted for their benefit. The people have at all times the inalienable right to alter or modify the form of their government.

**Art. 40.** The Mexican people voluntarily constitute themselves a democratic, federal, representative republic, composed of States free and sovereign in all that concerns their internal gov-

ernment, but united in a federation established according to the principles of this fundamental law.

**Art. 41.** The people exercise their sovereignty by means of Federal officers in cases belonging to the Federation, and through those of the States in all that relates to the internal affairs of the States within the limits respectively established by this Federal Constitution, and by the special Constitutions of the States, which latter shall in no case contravene the stipulations of the Federal Compact.

**Art. 42.** The National Territory comprises that of the integral parts of the Federation and that of the adjacent islands in both oceans.

**Art. 43.** The integral parts of the Federation are: the States of Aguascalientes, Colima, Chiapas, Chihuahua, Durango, Guanajuato, Guerrero, Jalisco, Mexico, Michoacan, Nuevo Leon and Coahuila, Oajaca, Puebla, Querétaro, San Luis Potosi, Sinaloa, Sonora, Tabasco, Tamaulipas, Tlaxcala, Valle de Mexico, Veracruz, Yucatan, Zacatecas, and the Territory of Lower California.

**Art. 44.** The States of Aguascalientes, Chiapas, Chihuahua, Durango, Guerrero, Mexico, Puebla, Querétaro, Sinaloa, Sonora, Tamaulipas, and the Territory of Lower California shall preserve the limits which they now have.

**Art. 45.** The States of Colima and Tlaxcala shall preserve in their new character of States the limits which they have had as Territories of the Federation.

**Art. 46.** The State of the Valley of Mexico shall be formed of the territory actually composing the Federal District, but the erection into a State shall only have effect when the supreme Federal authorities are removed to another place.

**Art. 47.** The State of Nuevo Leon and Coahuila shall comprise the territory which has belonged to the two distinct States of which it is now formed, except the part of the hacienda of Bonanza, which shall be reincorporated in Zacatecas, on the same terms in which it was before its incorporation in Coahuila.

**Art. 48.** The States of Guanajuato, Jalisco, Michoacan, Oajaca, San Luis Potosi, Tabasco, Veracruz, Yucatan, and Zacatecas shall recover the extension and limits which they had on the 31st of December, 1852, with the alterations the following Article establishes.

**Art. 49.** The town of Contepec, which has belonged to Guanajuato, shall be incorporated in Michoacan. The municipality of Ahualulco, which has belonged to Zacatecas, shall be incorporated in San Luis Potosi. The municipalities of Ojo-Caliente and San Francisco de los Adames, which have belonged to San Luis, as well as the towns of Nueva Tlaxcala and San Andres del Teul, which have belonged to Jalisco, shall be incorporated in Zacatecas. The department of Tuxpan shall continue to form a part of Veracruz. The canton of Huimanguillo, which has belonged to Veracruz, shall be incorporated in Tabasco.\*

\* Besides the twenty-four States which are mentioned in this section there have been created subsequently, according to executive decrees issued in accordance with the Constitution, the four following:

XXV. That of Campeche, separated from Yucatan.

XXVI. That of Coahuila, separated from Nuevo Leon.

XXVII. That of Hidalgo, in territory of the ancient State of Mexico, which formed the second military district.

XXVIII. That of Morelos, in territory also of the ancient State of Mexico, which formed the third military district.

**Art. 50.** The supreme power of the Federation is divided for its exercise into legislative, executive, and judicial. Two or more of these powers shall never be united in one person or corporation, nor the legislative power be deposited in one individual.

**Art. 51.** The legislative power of the nation is deposited in a general Congress, which shall be divided into two houses, one of Deputies and the other of Senators.\*

**Art. 52.** The House of Deputies shall be composed of representatives of the nation, elected in their entire number every two years by Mexican citizens.

**Art. 53.** One deputy shall be elected for each forty thousand inhabitants, or for a fraction which exceeds twenty thousand. The territory in which the population is less than that determined in this article shall, nevertheless, elect one deputy.

**Art. 54.** For each deputy there shall be elected one alternate.

**Art. 55.** The election for deputies shall be indirect in the first degree, and by secret ballot, in the manner which the law shall prescribe.

**Art. 56.** In order to be eligible to the position of a deputy it is required that the candidate be a Mexican citizen in the enjoyment of his rights; that he be fully twenty-five years of age on the day of the opening of the session; that he be a resident of the State or Territory which makes the election, and that he be not an ecclesiastic. Residence is not lost by absence in the discharge of any public trust bestowed by popular election.

**Art. 57.** The positions of Deputy and of Senator are incompatible with any Federal commission or office whatsoever for which a salary is received.

**Art. 58.** The Deputies and the Senators from the day of their election to the day on which their trust is concluded, may not accept any commission or office offered by the Federal Executive, for which a salary is received, except with the previous license of the respective house. The same requisites are necessary for the alternates of Deputies and Senators when in the exercise of their functions. A. The Senate is composed of two Senators for each State and two for the Federal District. The election of Senators shall be indirect in the first degree. The Legislature of each State shall declare elected the person who shall have obtained the absolute majority of the votes cast, or shall elect from among those who shall have obtained the relative majority in the manner which the electoral law shall prescribe. For each Senator there shall be elected an alternate. B. The Senate shall be renewed one-half every two years. The Senators named in the second place shall go out at the end of the first two years, and thereafter the half who have held longer. C. The same qualifications are required for a Senator as for a Deputy, except that of age, which must be at least thirty years on the day of the opening of the session.

**Art. 59.** The Deputies and Senators are privileged from arrest for their opinions manifested in the performance of their duties, and shall never be liable to be called to account for them.

**Art. 60.** Each house shall judge of the election of its members, and shall solve the doubts which may arise regarding them.

\*The original form of this article was as follows: "The exercise of the supreme legislative power is vested in one assembly, which shall be denominated Congress of the Union."

**Art. 61.** The houses may not open their sessions nor perform their functions without the presence in the Senate of at least two-thirds, and in the House of Deputies of more than one-half of the whole number of their members, but those present of one or the other body must meet on the day indicated by the law and compel the attendance of absent members under penalties which the law shall designate.

**Art. 62.** The Congress shall have each year two periods of ordinary sessions: the first, which may be prorogued for thirty days, shall begin on the 16th of September and end on the 15th of December, and the second, which may be prorogued for fifteen days, shall begin the 1st of April and end the last day of May.

**Art. 63.** At the opening of the sessions of the Congress the President of the Union shall be present and shall pronounce a discourse in which he shall set forth the state of the country. The President of the Congress shall reply in general terms.

**Art. 64.** Every resolution of the Congress shall have the character of a law or decree. The laws and decrees shall be communicated to the Executive, signed by the Presidents of both houses and by a Secretary of each of them, and shall be promulgated in this form: "The Congress of the United States of Mexico decrees:" (Text of the law or decree.)

**Art. 65.** The right to initiate laws or decrees belongs: I. To the President of the Union. II. To the Deputies and Senators of the general Congress. III. To the Legislatures of the States.

**Art. 66.** Bills presented by the President of the Republic, by the Legislatures of the States, or by deputations from the same, shall pass immediately to a committee. Those which the Deputies or the Senators may present shall be subjected to the procedure which the rules of debate may prescribe.

**Art. 67.** Every bill which shall be rejected in the house where it originated, before passing to the other house, shall not again be presented during the sessions of that year.

**Art. 68.** The second period of sessions shall be destined, in all preference, to the examination of and action upon the estimates of the following fiscal year, to passing the necessary appropriations to cover the same, and to the examination of the accounts of the past year, which the Executive shall present.

**Art. 69.** The last day but one of the first period of sessions the Executive shall present to the House of Deputies the bill of appropriations for the next year following and the accounts of the preceding year. Both shall pass to a committee of five Representatives appointed on the same day, which shall be under obligation to examine said documents, and present a report on them at the second session of the second period.

**Art. 70.** The formation of the laws and of the decrees may begin indiscriminately in either of the two houses, with the exception of bills which treat of loans, taxes, or imposts, or of the recruiting of troops, all of which must be discussed first in the House of Deputies.

**Art. 71.** Every bill, the consideration of which does not belong exclusively to one of the houses, shall be discussed successively in both, the rules of debate being observed with reference to the form, the intervals, and manner of proceeding in discussions and voting. A. A bill having been

approved in the house where it originated, shall pass for its discussion to the other house. If the latter body should approve it, it will be remitted to the Executive, who, if he shall have no observations to make, shall publish it immediately. II. Every bill shall be considered as approved by the Executive if not returned with observations to the house where it originated within ten working days, unless during this term Congress shall have closed or suspended its sessions, in which case the return must be made the first working day on which it shall meet. C. A bill rejected wholly or in part by the Executive must be returned with his observations to the house where it originated. It shall be discussed again by this body, and if it should be confirmed by an absolute majority of votes, it shall pass again to the other house. If by this house it should be sanctioned with the same majority, the bill shall be a law or decree, and shall be returned to the Executive for promulgation. The voting on the law or decree shall be by name. D. If any bill should be rejected wholly in the house in which it did not originate, it shall be returned to that in which it originated with the observations which the former shall have made upon it. If having been examined anew it should be approved by the absolute majority of the members present, it shall be returned to the house which rejected it, which shall again take it into consideration, and if it should approve it by the same majority it shall pass to the Executive, to be treated in accordance with division A; but, if it should reject it, it shall not be presented again until the following sessions. E. If a bill should be rejected only in part, or modified, or receive additions by the house of revision, the new discussion in the house where it originated shall treat only of the rejected part, or of the amendments or additions, without being able to alter in any manner the articles approved. If the additions or amendments made by the house of revision should be approved by the absolute majority of the votes present in the house where it originated, the whole bill shall be passed to the Executive, to be treated in accordance with division A. But if the additions or amendments made by the house of revision should be rejected by the majority of the votes in the house where it originated, they shall be returned to the former, in order that the reasons of the latter may be taken into consideration; and if by the absolute majority of the votes present said additions or amendments shall be rejected in this second revision, the bill, in so far as it has been approved by both houses, shall be passed to the Executive, to be treated in accordance with division A; but if the house of revision should insist, by the absolute majority of the votes present, on said additions or amendments, the whole bill shall not be again presented until the following sessions, unless both houses agree by the absolute majority of their members present that the law or decree shall be issued solely with the articles approved, and that the parts added or amended shall be reserved to be examined and voted in the following sessions. F. In the interpretation, amendment, or repeal of the laws or decrees, the rules established for their formation shall be observed. G. Both houses shall reside in the same place, and they shall not remove to another without first agreeing to the removal and on the time and manner of making it, designating the same point for the meeting of both. But if both houses,

agreeing to the removal, should differ as to time, manner, or place, the Executive shall terminate the difference by choosing one of the places in question. Neither house shall suspend its sessions for more than three days without the consent of the other. II. When the general Congress meets in extra sessions, it shall occupy itself exclusively with the object or objects designated in the summons; and if the special business shall not have been completed on the day on which the regular session should open, the extra sessions shall be closed nevertheless, leaving the points pending to be treated of in the regular sessions. The Executive of the Union shall not make observations on the resolutions of the Congress when this body prorogues its sessions or exercises functions of an electoral body or a jury.

Art. 72. The Congress has power— I. To admit new States or Territories into the Federal Union, incorporating them in the nation. II. To erect Territories into States when they shall have a population of eighty thousand inhabitants and the necessary elements to provide for their political existence. III. To form new States within the limits of those existing, it being necessary to this end— 1. That the fraction or fractions which asked to be erected into a State shall number a population of at least one hundred and twenty thousand inhabitants. 2. That it shall be proved before Congress that they have elements sufficient to provide for their political existence. 3. That the Legislatures of the States, the territories of which are in question, shall have been heard on the expediency or in expediency of the establishment of the new State, and they shall be obliged to make their report within six months, counted from the day on which the communication relating to it shall have been remitted to them. 4. That the Executive of the Federation shall likewise be heard, who shall send his report within seven days, counted from the date on which he shall have been asked for it. 5. That the establishment of the new State shall have been voted for by two-thirds of the Deputies and Senators present in their respective houses. 6. That the resolution of Congress shall have been ratified by the majority of the Legislatures of the States, after examining a copy of the proceedings; provided that the Legislatures of the States whose territory is in question shall have given their consent. 7. If the Legislatures of the States whose territory is in question shall not have given their consent, the ratification mentioned in the preceding clause must be made by two-thirds of the Legislatures of the other States. A. The exclusive powers of the House of Deputies are— 1. To constitute itself an Electoral College in order to exercise the powers which the law may assign to it, in respect to the election of the Constitutional President of the Republic, Magistrates of the Supreme Court, and Senators for the Federal District. 2. To judge and decide upon the resignations which the President of the Republic or the Magistrates of the Supreme Court of Justice may make. The same power belongs to it in treating of licenses solicited by the first. 3. To watch over, by means of an inspecting committee from its own body, the exact performance of the business of the chief auditorship. 4. To appoint the principal officers and other employes of the same. 5. To constitute itself a jury of accusation, for the high functionaries of whom Article 103 of this Constitution treats. 6. To

examine the accounts which the Executive must present annually, to approve the annual estimate of expenses, and to initiate the taxes which in its judgment ought to be decreed to cover these expenses. B. The exclusive powers of the Senate are—i. To approve the treaties and diplomatic conventions which the Executive may make with foreign powers. ii. To ratify the appointments which the President of the Republic may make of ministers, diplomatic agents, consuls-general, superior employes of the Treasury, colonels and other superior officers of the national army and navy, on the terms which the law shall provide. iii. To authorize the Executive to permit the departure of national troops beyond the limits of the Republic, the passage of foreign troops through the national territory, the station of squadrons of other powers for more than a month in the waters of the Republic. iv. To give its consent in order that the Executive may dispose of the national guard outside of their respective States or Territories, determining the necessary force. v. To declare, when the Constitutional legislative and executive powers of a State shall have disappeared, that the case has arrived for appointing to it a provisional Governor, who shall call elections in conformity with the Constitutional laws of the said State. The appointment of Governor shall be made by the Federal Executive with the approval of the Senate, and in its recesses with the approval of the Permanent Commission. Said functionary shall not be elected Constitutional Governor at the elections which are had in virtue of the summons which he shall issue. vi. To decide political questions which may arise between the powers of a State, when any of them may appear with this purpose in the Senate, or when on account of said questions Constitutional order shall have been interrupted during a conflict of arms. In this case the Senate shall dictate its resolution, being subject to the general Constitution of the Republic and to that of the State. The law shall regulate the exercise of this power and that of the preceding. vii. To consult itself a jury of judgment in accordance with Article 105 of this Constitution. C. Each of the houses may, without the intervention of the other—i. Dictate economic resolutions relative to its internal regimen. ii. Communicate within itself, and with the Executive of the Union, by means of committees from its own body. iii. Appoint the employes of its secretaryship, and make the internal regulations for the same. iv. Issue summons for extraordinary elections, with the object of filling the vacancies of their respective members. v. To regulate definitely the limits of the States, terminating the differences which may arise between them relative to the demarcation of their respective territories, except when these difficulties have a contentious character. v. To change the residence of the supreme powers of the Federation. vi. To establish the internal order of the Federal District and Territories, taking as a basis that the citizens shall choose by popular election the political, municipal, and judicial authorities, and designating the taxes necessary to cover their local expenditure. vii. To approve the estimates of the Federal expenditure, which the Executive must annually present to it, and to impose the necessary taxes to cover them. viii. To give rules under which the Executive may make loans on the credit of the nation; to approve said loans,

and to recognize and order the payment of the national debt. ix. To establish tariffs on foreign commerce, and to prevent, by means of general laws, onerous restrictions from being established with reference to the commerce between the States. x. To issue codes, obligatory throughout the Republic, of mines and commerce, comprehending in this last banking institutions. xi. To create and suppress public Federal employments and to establish, augment, or diminish their salaries. xii. To ratify the appointments which the Executive may make of ministers, diplomatic agents, and consuls, of the higher employes of the Treasury, of the colonels and other superior officers of the national army and navy. xiii. To approve the treaties, contracts, or diplomatic conventions which the Executive may make. xiv. To declare war in view of the data which the Executive may present to it. xv. To regulate the manner in which letters of marque may be issued; to dictate laws according to which must be declared good or bad the prizes on sea and land, and to issue laws relating to maritime rights in peace and war. xvi. To permit or deny the entrance of foreign troops into the territory of the Republic, and to consent to the station of squadrons of other powers for more than a month in the waters of the Republic. xvii. To permit the departure of national troops beyond the limits of the Republic.\* xviii. To raise and maintain the army and navy of the Union, and to regulate their organization and service. xix. To establish regulations with the purpose of organizing, arming, and disciplining the national guard, reserving respectively to the citizens who compose it the appointment of the commanders and officers, and to the States the power of instructing it in conformity with the discipline prescribed by said regulations. xx. To give its consent in order that the Executive may control the national guard outside of its respective States and Territories, determining the necessary force. xxi. To dictate laws on naturalization, colonization, and citizenship. xxii. To dictate laws on the general means of communication and on the post-office and mails. xxiii. To establish mints, fixing the conditions of their operation, to determine the value of foreign money, and adopt a general system of weights and measures. xxiv. To fix rules to which must be subject the occupation and sale of public lands and the price of these lands. xxv. To grant pardons for crimes cognizable by the tribunals of the Federation. xxvi. To grant rewards or recompense for eminent services rendered to the country or humanity. xxvii. To prorogue for thirty working days the first period of its ordinary sessions. xxviii. To form rules for its internal regulation, to take the necessary measures to compel the attendance of absent members, and to correct the faults or omissions of those present. xxix. To appoint and remove freely the employes of its secretaryship and those of the chief auditorship, which shall be organized in accordance with the provisions of the law. xxx. To make all laws which may be necessary and proper to render effective the foregoing powers and all others granted by this Constitution and the authorities of the Union.†

\* Amended by Section II, Clause III., Article 72, of the law of the 13th of November, 1874.

† See respecting this Article the additions A, B, and C to Article 72 of the law of the 13th of November, already cited.

**Art. 73.** During the recess of Congress there shall be a Permanent Deputation composed of twenty-nine members, of whom fifteen shall be Deputies and fourteen Senators, appointed by their respective houses the evening before the close of the sessions.

**Art. 74.** The attributes of the Permanent Deputation are—**I.** To give its consent to the use of the national guard in the cases mentioned in Article 72, Clause XX. **II.** To determine by itself, or on the proposal of the Executive, after hearing him in the first place, the summons of Congress, or of one house alone, for extra sessions, the vote of two-thirds of the members present being necessary in both cases. The summons shall designate the object or objects of the extra sessions. **III.** To approve the appointments which are referred to in Article 85, Clause III. **IV.** To administer the oath of office to the President of the Republic, and to the Justices of the Supreme Court, in the cases provided by this Constitution.\* **V.** To report upon all the business not disposed of, in order that the Legislature which follows may immediately take up such unfinished business.

**Art. 75.** The exercise of the supreme executive power of the Union is vested in a single individual, who shall be called "President of the United States of Mexico."

**Art. 76.** The election of President shall be indirect in the first degree and by secret ballot, in such manner as may be prescribed by the electoral law.

**Art. 77.** To be eligible to the position of President, the candidate must be a Mexican citizen by birth, in the exercise of his rights, be fully thirty-five years old at the time of the election, not belong to the ecclesiastical order, and reside in the country at the time the election is held.

**Art. 78.** The President shall enter upon the performance of the duties of his office on the first of December, and shall continue in office four years, being eligible for the Constitutional period immediately following; but he shall remain incapable thereafter to occupy the presidency by a new election until four years shall have passed, counting from the day on which he ceased to perform his functions.

**Art. 79.** In the temporary default of the President of the Republic, and in the vacancy before the installation of the newly-elected President, the citizen who may have performed the duties of President or Vice-President of the Senate, or of the Permanent Commission in the periods of recess, during the month prior to that in which said default may have occurred, shall enter upon the exercise of the executive power of the Union. **A.** The President and Vice-President of the Senate and of the Permanent Commission shall not be re-elected to those offices until a year after having held them. **B.** If the period of sessions of the Senate or of the Permanent Commission shall begin in the second half of a month, the default of the President of the Republic shall be covered by the President or Vice-President who may have acted in the Senate or in the Permanent Commission during the first half of the said month. **C.** The Senate and the Permanent Commission shall renew, the last day of each month, their Presidents and Vice-Presidents. For these

offices the Permanent Commission shall elect, alternatively, in one month two Deputies and in the following month two Senators. **D.** When the office of President of the Republic is vacant, the functionary who shall take it constitutionally as his substitute must issue, within the definite term of fifteen days, the summons to proceed to a new election, which shall be held within the term of three months, and in accordance with the provisions of Article 76 of this Constitution. The provisional President shall not be eligible to the presidency at the elections which are held to put an end to his provisional term. **E.** If, on account of death or any other reason, the functionaries who, according to this law, should take the place of the President of the Republic, might not be able in any absolute manner to do so, it shall be taken, under predetermined conditions, by the citizen who may have been President or Vice-President of the Senate or the Permanent Commission in the month prior to that in which they discharged those offices. **F.** When the office of President of the Republic shall become vacant within the last six months of the constitutional period, the functionary who shall take the place of the President shall terminate this period. **G.** To be eligible to the position of President or Vice-President of the Senate or of the Permanent Commission, one must be a Mexican citizen by birth. **H.** If the vacancy in the office of President of the Republic should occur when the Senate and Permanent Commission are performing their functions in extra sessions, the President of the Commission shall fill the vacancy, under conditions indicated in this article. **I.** The Vice-President of the Senate or of the Permanent Commission shall enter upon the performance of the functions which this Article confers upon them, in the vacancies of the office of President of the Senate or of the Permanent Commission, and in the periods only while the impediment lasts. **J.** The newly-elected President shall enter upon the discharge of his duties, at the latest, sixty days after that of the election. In case the House of Deputies shall not be in session, it shall be convened in extra session, in order to make the computation of votes within the term mentioned.

**Art. 80.** In the vacancy of the office of President, the period of the newly-elected President shall be computed from the first of December of the year prior to that of his election, provided he may not have taken possession of his office on the date which Article 78 determines.

**Art. 81.** The office of President of the Union may not be resigned, except for grave cause, approved by Congress, before whom the resignation shall be presented.

**Art. 82.** If for any reason the election of President shall not have been made and published by the first of December, on which the transfer of the office should be made, or the President-elect shall not have been ready to enter upon the discharge of his duties, the term of the former President shall end nevertheless, and the supreme executive power shall be deposited provisionally in the functionary to whom it belongs according to the provisions of the reformed Article 79 of this Constitution.

**Art. 83.** The President, on taking possession of his office, shall take an oath before Congress, and in its recess before the Permanent Commission, under the following formula: "I swear to

\* See the Amendment of September 25, 1873, Art. 4.

perform loyally and patriotically the duties of President of the United States of Mexico, according to the Constitution, and seek in everything for the welfare and prosperity of the Union.\*

**Art. 84.** The President may not remove from the place of the residence of the Federal powers, nor lay aside the exercise of his functions, without grave cause, approved by the Congress, and in its recesses by the Permanent Commission.

**Art. 85.** The powers and obligations of the President are the following: I. To promulgate and execute the laws passed by the Congress of the Union, providing, in the administrative sphere, for their exact observance. II. To appoint and remove freely the Secretaries of the Cabinet, to remove the diplomatic agents and superior employés of the Treasury, and to appoint and remove freely the other employés of the Union whose appointment and removal are not otherwise provided for in the Constitution or in the laws. III. To appoint ministers, diplomatic agents, consuls-general, with the approval of Congress, and, in its recess, of the Permanent Commission. IV. To appoint, with the approval of Congress, the colonels and other superior officers of the national army and navy, and the superior employés of the treasury. V. To appoint the other officers of the national army and navy, according to the laws. VI. To control the permanent armed force by sea and land for the internal security and external defence of the Federation. VII. To control the national guard for the same objects within the limits established by Article 73, Clause XX. VIII. To declare war in the name of the United States of Mexico, after the passage of the necessary law by the Congress of the Union. IX. To grant letters of marque, subject to bases fixed by the Congress. X. To direct diplomatic negotiations and make treaties with foreign powers, submitting them for the ratification of the Federal Congress. XI. To receive ministers and other envoys from foreign powers. XII. To convoke Congress in extra sessions when the Permanent Commission shall consent to it. XIII. To furnish the judicial power with that assistance which may be necessary for the prompt exercise of its functions. XIV. To open all classes of ports, to establish maritime and frontier custom-houses and designate their situation. XV. To grant, in accordance with the laws, pardons to criminals sentenced for crimes within the jurisdiction of the Federal tribunals. XVI. To grant exclusive privileges, for a limited time and according to the proper law, to discoverers, inventors, or perfecters of any branch of industry.

**Art. 86.** For the dispatch of the business of the administrative department of the Federation there shall be the number of Secretaries which the Congress may establish by a law, which shall provide for the distribution of business and prescribe what shall be in charge of each Secretary.

**Art. 87.** To be a Secretary of the Cabinet it is required that one shall be a Mexican citizen by birth, in the exercise of his rights, and fully twenty-five years old.

**Art. 88.** All the regulations, decrees, and orders of the President must be signed by the Secretary of the Cabinet who is in charge of the department to which the subject belongs. Without this requisite they shall not be obeyed.

**Art. 89.** The Secretaries of the Cabinet, as soon as the sessions of the first period shall be opened, shall render an account to the Congress of the state of their respective departments.

**Art. 90.** The exercise of the judicial power of the Federation is vested in a Supreme Court of Justice and in the district and circuit courts.

**Art. 91.** The Supreme Court of Justice shall be composed of eleven judges, four supernumeraries, one fiscal, and one attorney-general.

**Art. 92.** Each of the members of the Supreme Court of Justice shall remain in office six years, and his election shall be indirect in the first degree, under conditions established by the electoral law.

**Art. 93.** In order to be elected a member of the Supreme Court of Justice it is necessary that one be learned in the science of the law in the judgment of the electors, more than thirty-five years old, and a Mexican citizen by birth, in the exercise of his rights.

**Art. 94.** The members of the Supreme Court of Justice, on entering upon the exercise of their charge, shall take an oath before Congress, and, in its recesses, before the Permanent Commission, in the following form: "Do you swear to perform loyally and patriotically the charge of Magistrate of the Supreme Court of Justice, which the people have conferred upon you in conformity with the Constitution, seeking in everything the welfare and prosperity of the Union?"

**Art. 95.** A member of the Supreme Court of Justice may resign his office only for grave cause, approved by the Congress, to whom the resignation shall be presented. In the recesses of the Congress the judgment shall be rendered by the Permanent Commission.

**Art. 96.** The law shall establish and organize the circuit and district courts.

**Art. 97.** It belongs to the Federal tribunals to take cognizance of — I. All controversies which may arise in regard to the fulfilment and application of the Federal laws, except in the case in which the application affects only private interests; such a case falls within the competence of the local judges and tribunals of the common order of the States, of the Federal District, and of the Territory of Lower California. II. All cases pertaining to maritime law. III. Those in which the Federation may be a party. IV. Those that may arise between two or more States. V. Those that may arise between a State and one or more citizens of another State. VI. Civil or criminal cases that may arise under treaties with foreign powers. VII. Cases concerning diplomatic agents and consuls.

**Art. 98.** It belongs to the Supreme Court of Justice, in the first instance, to take cognizance of controversies which may arise between one State and another, and of those in which the Union may be a party.

**Art. 99.** It belongs also to the Supreme Court of Justice to determine the questions of jurisdiction which may arise between the Federal tribunals, between these and those of the States, or between the courts of one State and those of another.

**Art. 100.** In the other cases comprehended in Article 97, the Supreme Court of Justice shall be a court of appeal or, rather, of last resort, according to the graduation which the law may make in the jurisdiction of the circuit and district courts.

\* See the Amendments and Additions of September 25, 1873.

\* See Additions to the Constitution, September 25, 1873.

**Art. 101.** The tribunals of the Federation shall decide all questions which arise— I. Under laws or acts of whatever authority which violate individual guarantees. II. Under laws or acts of the State authority which violate or restrain the sovereignty of the States. III. Under laws or acts of the State authority which invade the sphere of the Federal authority.

**Art. 102.** All the judgments which the preceding article mentions shall be had on petition of the aggrieved party, by means of judicial proceedings and forms which shall be prescribed by law. The sentence shall be always such as to affect private individuals only, limiting itself to defend and protect them in the special case to which the process refers, without making any general declaration respecting the law or act which gave rise to it.

**Art. 103.** The Senators, the Deputies, the members of the Supreme Court of Justice, and the Secretaries of the Cabinet are responsible for the common crimes which they may commit during their terms of office, and for the crimes, misdemeanors, and negligence into which they may fall in the performance of the duties of said office. The Governors of the States are likewise responsible for the infraction of the Constitution and Federal laws. The President of the Republic is also responsible; but during the term of his office he may be accused only for the crimes of treason against the country, express violation of the Constitution, attack on the freedom of election, and grave crimes of the common order. The high functionaries of the Federation shall not enjoy any Constitutional privilege for the official crimes, misdemeanors, or negligence into which they may fall in the performance of any employment, office, or public commission which they may have accepted during the period for which, in conformity with the law, they shall have been elected. The same shall happen with respect to those common crimes which they may commit during the performance of said employment, office or commission. In order that the cause may be initiated when the high functionary shall have returned to the exercise of his proper functions, proceeding should be undertaken in accordance with the provision of Article 104 of this Constitution.

**Art. 104.** If the crime should be a common one, the House of Representatives, formed into a grand jury, shall declare, by an absolute majority of votes, whether there is or is not ground to proceed against the accused. In the negative case, there shall be no ground for further proceedings; in the affirmative, the accused shall be, by the said act, deprived of his office, and subjected to the action of the ordinary tribunals.

**Art. 105.** The houses shall take cognizance of official crimes, the House of Deputies as a jury of accusation, the Senators as a jury of judgment. The jury of accusation shall have for its object to declare, by an absolute majority of votes, whether the accused is or is not culpable. If the declaration should be absolute, the functionary shall continue in the exercise of his office; if it should be condemnatory, he shall be immediately deprived of his office, and shall be placed at the disposal of the Senate. The latter, formed into a jury of judgment, and, with the presence of the criminal and of the accuser, if there should be one, shall proceed to apply, by an absolute majority of votes, the punishment which the law designates.

**Art. 106.** A judgment of responsibility for official crimes having been pronounced, no favor of pardon may be extended to the offender.

**Art. 107.** The responsibility for official crimes and misdemeanors may be required only during the period in which the functionary remains in office, and one year thereafter.

**Art. 108.** With respect to demands of the civil order, there shall be no privilege or immunity for any public functionary.

**Art. 109.** The States shall adopt for their internal regimen the popular, representative, republican form of government, and may provide in their respective Constitutions for the reelection of the Governors in accordance with what Article 78 provides for the President of the Republic.

**Art. 110.** The States may regulate among themselves, by friendly agreements, their respective boundaries; but those regulations shall not be carried into effect without the approval of the Congress of the Union.

**Art. 111.** The States may not in any case— I. Form alliances, treaties, or coalitions with another State, or with foreign powers, excepting the coalition which the frontier States may make for offensive or defensive war against the Indians. II. Grant letters of marque or reprisal. III. Coin money, or emit paper money or stamped paper.

**Art. 112.** Neither may any State, without the consent of the Congress of the Union: I. Establish tonnage duties, or any port duty, or impose taxes or duties upon importations or exportations. II. Have at any time permanent troops or vessels of war. III. Make war by itself on any foreign power except in cases of invasion or of such imminent peril as to admit of no delay. In these cases the State shall give notice immediately to the President of the Republic.

**Art. 113.** Each State is under obligation to deliver without delay the criminals of other States to the authority that claims them.

**Art. 114.** The Governors of the States are obliged to publish and cause to be obeyed the Federal laws.

**Art. 115.** In each State of the Federation entire faith and credit shall be given to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of all the other States. The Congress may, by means of general laws, prescribe the manner of proving said acts, records, and proceedings, and the effect thereof.

**Art. 116.** The powers of the Union are bound to protect the States against all invasion or external violence. In case of insurrection or internal disturbance they shall give them like protection, provided the Legislature of the State, or the Executive, if the Legislature is not in session, shall request it.

**Art. 117.** The powers which are not expressly granted by this Constitution to the Federal authorities are understood to be reserved to the States.

**Art. 118.** No person may at the same time hold two Federal elective offices; but if elected to two, he may choose which of them he will fill.

**Art. 119.** No payment shall be made which is not comprehended in the budget or determined by a subsequent law.

**Art. 120.** The President of the Republic, the members of the Supreme Court of Justice, the Deputies, and other public officers of the Federa-



tion, who are chosen by popular election, shall receive a compensation for their services, which shall be determined by law and paid by the Federal Treasury. This compensation may not be renounced, and any law which augments or diminishes it shall not have effect during the period for which a functionary holds the office.

**Art. 121.** Every public officer, without any exception, before taking possession of his office, shall take an oath to maintain this Constitution and the laws which emanate from it.\*

**Art. 122.** In time of peace no military authority may exercise more functions than those which have close connection with military discipline. There shall be fixed and permanent military commands only in the castles, fortresses, and magazines which are immediately under the government of the Union; or in encampments, barracks, or depots which may be established outside of towns for stationing troops.

**Art. 123.** It belongs exclusively to the Federal authorities to exercise, in matters of religious worship and external discipline, the intervention which the laws may designate.

**Art. 124.** The States shall not impose any duty for the simple passage of goods in the internal commerce. The Government of the Union alone may decree transit duties, but only with respect to foreign goods which cross the country by international or interoceanic lines, without being on the national territory more time than is necessary to traverse it and depart to the foreign country. They shall not prohibit, either directly or indirectly, the entrance to their territory, or the departure from it, of any merchandise, except on police grounds; nor burden the articles of national production on their departure for a foreign country or for another State. The exemptions from duties which they concede shall be general; they may not be decreed in favor of the products of specified origin. The quota of the import for a given amount of merchandise shall be the same, whatever may have been its origin, and no heavier burden may be assigned to it than that which the similar products of the political entity in which the import is decreed bear. The national merchandise shall not be submitted to definite route nor to inspection or registry on the ways, nor any fiscal document be demanded for its internal circulation. Nor shall they burden foreign merchandise with a greater quota than that which may have been permitted them by the Federal law to receive.

**Art. 125.** The forts, military quarters, magazines, and other edifices necessary to the govern-

ment of the Union shall be under the immediate inspection of the Federal authorities.

**Art. 126.** This Constitution, the laws of the Congress of the Union which emanate from it, and all the treaties made or which shall be made by the President of the Republic, with the approval of Congress, shall be the supreme law of the whole Union. The judges of each State shall be guided by said Constitution, law, and treaties in spite of provisions to the contrary which may appear in the Constitutions or laws of the States.

**Art. 127.** The present Constitution may be added to or reformed. In order that additions or alterations may become part of the Constitution, it is required that the Congress of the Union, by a vote of two-thirds of the members present, shall agree to the alterations or additions, and that these shall be approved by the majority of the Legislatures of the States. The Congress of the Union shall count the votes of the Legislatures and make the declaration that the reforms or additions have been approved.

**Art. 128.** This Constitution shall not lose its force and vigor even if its observance be interrupted by a rebellion. In case that by any public disturbance a government contrary to the principles which it sanctions shall be established, as soon as the people recover their liberty its observance shall be reestablished, and in accordance with it and the laws which shall have been issued in virtue of it, shall be judged not only those who shall have figured in the government emanating from the rebellion, but also those who shall have cooperated with it.

**Additions.**

**Art. 1.** The State and the Church are independent of one another. The Congress may not pass laws establishing or prohibiting any religion.

**Art. 2.** Marriage is a civil contract. This and the other acts relating to the civil state of persons belong to the exclusive jurisdiction of the functionaries and authorities of the civil order, within limits provided by the laws, and they shall have the force and validity which the same attribute to them.

**Art. 3.** No religious institution may acquire real estate or capital fixed upon it, with the single exception established in Article 27 of this Constitution.

**Art. 4.** The simple promise to speak the truth and to comply with the obligations which have been incurred, shall be substituted for the religious oath, with its effects and penalties.

**CONSTITUTION OF NETHERLANDS KINGDOM.** After 1830, this became the King-

dom of Holland. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1830-1832, and 1830-1884.

**CONSTITUTION OF NORWAY.**

"On May 17, 1814, . . . a constitution was granted to Norway. The Fundamental Law of the constitution (Grundlov), which almost every peasant farmer now-a-days has framed and hung up in the chief room of his house, bears the date the 4th of November 1814."—C. F. Keary, *Norway and the Norwegians*, ch. 13.—The following is the text of the constitution as granted in 1814:

\* See the Additions of September 25, 1873.

**Title I.**

**Article 1.** The kingdom of Norway is a free, independent, indivisible, and inalienable state, united to Sweden under the same king. The form of its government is limited, hereditary, and monarchical.

**2.** The Lutheran evangelical religion shall continue to be the ruling religion of the kingdom; those of the inhabitants which profess it



are bound to bring up their children in its tenets; Jesuits and monastic orders shall not be prohibited in the kingdom. The admission of Jews into the kingdom shall always be, as formerly, prohibited.

### Title II.

**Article 1.** The executive power is declared to be in the person of the king.

**2.** The king shall always profess the evangelical Lutheran religion, which he shall maintain and protect.

**3.** The person of the king is sacred; he can neither be blamed or accused.

**4.** The succession is lineal, and collateral, such as it is determined by the order of succession decreed by the general estates of Sweden, and sanctioned by the king in the Act of the 26th September 1810, of which a translation is annexed to this Constitution. Of the number of legitimate heirs, is comprehended the child in its mother's womb, which, as soon as it shall be born, after the death of its father, takes the place which is due to him in the line of succession. When a Prince, heir of the re-united crowns of Norway and Sweden, shall be born, his name, and the day of his birth shall be announced at the first Storting, and inscribed in the registers.

**5.** Should there not be found any prince, a legitimate heir to the throne, the king can propose his successor at the Storting of Norway, and at the same time to the states general of Sweden. As soon as the king shall have made the proposition, the representatives of the two nations shall choose from among them a committee, invested with the right of determining the election, in case the king's proposition should not, by the plurality of voices, be approved of separately by the representatives of each of the countries. The number of members of this committee, shall be composed of an equal number of Norwegians and Swedes, so that the step to follow in the election shall be regulated by a law which the king shall propose at the same time to the next Storting, and the states general of Sweden. They shall draw by lot one out of the committee for its member.

**6.** The Storting\* of Norway, and the states general of Sweden shall concert to fix by a law the king's majority; if they cannot agree, a committee, taken from the representatives of the two nations, shall decide it in the manner established by article 5th, title 2nd. As soon as the king shall have attained the years of majority fixed by the law, he shall publicly declare that he is of age.†

**7.** When the king comes of age he shall take into his hands the reins of government, and make the following oath to the Storting: "I swear, on my soul and conscience, to govern the kingdom of Norway conformably to its constitution and laws." If the Storting is not then assembled, this oath shall be deposited in writing in the council, and solemnly repeated by the king at the first Storting, either viva voce or by writing, by the person whom he shall be appointed to this effect.

**8.** The coronation of the king shall take place when he is of age, in the cathedral of Dronheim,

\*The national assembly, or general estates of the kingdom.

†A law of the Storting, 18th July 1815, and sanctioned by the king, declared that the king is major on arriving at the age of eighteen years.

at the time and with those ceremonies that shall be fixed by himself.

**9.** The king shall pass some time in Norway yearly, unless this is prevented by urgent circumstances.

**10.** The king shall exclusively choose a council of Norwegians, citizens, who shall have attained the seventieth year of their age. This council shall be composed at least of a minister of state, and seven other members. In like manner the king can create a viceroy or a government. The king shall arrange the affairs between the members of the council, in such manner as he shall consider expedient. Besides these ordinary members of council, the king, or in his absence the viceroy (or the government jointly with the ordinary members of council) may on particular occasions, call other Norwegians, citizens, to sit there, provided they are not members of the Storting. The father and son, or two brothers, shall not, at the same time, have a seat in the council.

**11.** The king shall appoint a governor of the kingdom in his absence, and on failure it shall be governed by the viceroy or a governor, with five at least of the members of council. They shall govern the kingdom in the name and behalf of the king; and they shall observe inviolably, as much the principles contained in this fundamental law as those relative precepts the king shall lay down in his instructions. They shall make a humble report to the king upon those affairs they have decided. All matters shall be decided by plurality of votes. If the votes happen to be equal, the viceroy or governor, or in their absence the first member of council, shall have two.

**12.** The prince royal or his eldest son can be viceroy; but this can only occur when they have attained the majority of the king. In the case of a governor, either a Norwegian or a Swede may be nominated. The viceroy shall remain in the kingdom, and shall not be allowed to reside in a foreign one beyond three months each year. When the king shall be present, the viceroy's functions shall cease. If there is no viceroy, but only a governor, the functions of the latter shall also cease, in which event he is only the first member of council.

**13.** During the residence of the king in Sweden, he shall always have near him the minister of state of Norway, and two of the members of the Norwegian council, when they shall be annually changed. These are charged with similar duties, and the same constitutional responsibility attaches to them as to the sitting council in Norway; and it is only in their presence that state affairs shall be decided by the king. All petitions addressed to the king by Norwegian citizens ought, first, to be transmitted to the Norwegian council, that they may be duly considered previously to decisions being pronounced. In general, no affairs ought to be decided before the council has expressed an opinion, in case it should be met with important objections. The minister of state of Norway ought to report the affairs, and he shall be responsible for expedition in the resolutions which shall have been taken.

**14.** The king shall regulate public worship and its rites, as well as all assemblies that have religion for their object, so that ministers of religion may observe their forms prescribed to them.

15. The king can give and abolish ordinances which respect commerce, the custom-house, manufactures, and police. They shall not, however, be contrary to the constitution nor the laws adopted by the Storting. They shall have provisional force until the next Storting.

16. The king shall in general regulate the taxes imposed by the Storting. The public treasurer of Norway shall remain in Norway, and the revenues shall only be employed towards the expenses of Norway.

17. The king shall superintend the manner in which the domains and crown property of the state are employed and governed, in the manner fixed by the Storting, and which shall be most advantageous to the country.

18. The king in council has the right to pardon criminals when the supreme tribunal has pronounced its opinion. The criminal has the choice of receiving pardon from the king or of submitting to the punishment to which he is condemned. In the causes which the Odelsting would have ordered to be carried to the Riksgret, there can be no other pardon but that which shall liberate from a capital punishment.

19. The king, after having heard his Norwegian council, shall dispose of all the civil, ecclesiastic, and military employments. Those who assist in the functions shall swear obedience and fidelity to the constitution and to the king. The princes of the royal family cannot be invested with any civil employment; yet the prince royal, or his eldest son, may be nominated viceroy.

20. The governor of the kingdom, the minister of state, other members of council, and those employed in the functions connected with these offices, the envoys and consuls, superior magistrates, civil and ecclesiastic commanders of regiments, and other military bodies, governors of fortresses, and commanders-in-chief of ships of war, shall, without previous arrest, be deposed by the king and his Norwegian council. As to the pension to be granted to those employed they shall be decided by the first Storting. In the mean time, they shall enjoy two-third parts of their former salary. The others employed can only be suspended by the king, and they shall afterwards be brought before the tribunals, but cannot be deposed excepting by order of an arrest, and the king cannot make them change their situations contrary to their will.

21. The king can confer orders of knighthood on whomsoever he chooses, in reward of distinguished services, which shall be published; but he can confer no other rank, with the title, than that which is attached to every employment. An order of knighthood does not liberate the person on whom it is conferred from those duties common to all citizens, and particular titles are not conferred in order to obtain situations in the state. Such persons shall preserve the title and rank attached to those situations which they have occupied. No person can, for the future, obtain personal, mixed, or hereditary privileges.

22. The king elects and dismisses, whenever he thinks proper, all the officers attached to his court.

23. The king is commander-in-chief of all the forces, by sea and land, in the kingdom, and these cannot be increased or diminished without the consent of the Storting. They will not be ceded to the service of any foreign power, and troops belonging to a foreign power (except

auxiliary troops in case of a hostile invasion,) cannot enter the country without the consent of the Storting. During peace, the Norwegian troops shall be stationed in Norway, and not in Sweden. Notwithstanding this the king may have in Sweden a Norwegian guard, composed of volunteers, and may for a short time, not exceeding six weeks in a year, assemble troops in the environs of the two countries, for exercising; but in case there are more than 3,000 men, composing the army of one of the two countries, they cannot in time of peace enter the other.\* The Norwegian army and gun-boats shall not be employed without the consent of the Storting. The Norwegian fleet shall have dry docks, and during peace its stations and harbours in Norway. Ships of war of both countries shall be supplied with the seamen of the other, so long as they shall voluntarily engage to serve. The landwehr, and other Norwegian forces, which are not calculated among the number of troops of the line, shall never be employed beyond the frontiers of the kingdom of Norway.

24. The king has the right of assembling troops, commencing war, making peace, concluding and dissolving treaties, sending ministers to, and receiving those of, foreign courts. When he begins war he ought to advise the council of Norway, consult it, and order it to prepare an address on the state of the kingdom, relative to its finances, and proper means of defence. On this the king shall convoke the minister of state of Norway, and those of the council of Sweden, at an extraordinary assembly, when he shall explain all those relative circumstances that ought to be taken into consideration; with a representation of the Norwegian council, and a similar one on the part of Sweden, upon the state of the kingdom, shall then be presented. The king shall then require advice upon these objects; and each shall be inserted in a register, under the responsibility imposed by the constitution, when the king shall then adopt that resolution which he judges most proper for the benefit of the state.

25. On this occasion all the members of council must be present, if not prevented by some lawful cause, and no resolution ought to be adopted unless one half of the members are present. In Norwegian affairs, which, according to the fifteenth article, are decided in Sweden, no resolution shall be taken unless the minister of state of Norway and one of the members of council, or two members, are present.

26. The representations respecting employments, and other important acts, excepting those of a diplomatic and military nature, properly so called, shall be referred to the council by him who is one of the members in the department charged with it, who shall accordingly draw up the resolution adopted in council.

27. If any member of council is prevented from appearing, and referring the affairs which belong to his peculiar department, he shall be replaced in this office by one of the others appointed to this purpose, either by the king, if personally present, and if not, by him who has precedence in the council, jointly with the other members composing it. Should several of these be prevented

\* The law of the Storting, 5th July 1816, bears, that troops of the line shall be employed beyond the frontiers of the kingdom, and the interpretation given by it to that law is, that troops of the line shall be employed beyond the frontiers of the two kingdoms.

from appearing, so that only one half of the ordinary number is present, the other employed in the offices shall in like manner have right to sit in council; and in that event it shall be afterwards referred to the king, who decides if they ought to continue to exercise this office.

**28.** The council shall keep a register of all affairs that may come under its consideration. Every individual who sits in it shall be at liberty to give his opinion freely, which the king is obliged to hear; but it is reserved to his majesty to adopt resolutions after he has consulted his own mind. If a member of council finds that the king's resolution is contrary to the form of government, the laws of the kingdom, or injurious to the state, he shall consider it his duty to oppose it, and record his opinion in the register accordingly; but he who remains silent shall be presumed to have agreed with the king, and shall be responsible for it, even in the case of being referred to at a future period; and the Odelsthing is empowered to bring him before the Rigsret.

**29.** All the orders issued by the king (military affairs excepted) shall be countersigned by the Norwegian minister of state.

**30.** Resolutions made in absence of the king, by the council in Norway, shall be publicly proclaimed and signed by the viceroy, or the governor and council, and countersigned by him who shall have referred them, and he is further responsible for the accuracy and dispatch with the register in which the resolution is entered.

**31.** All representations relative to the affairs of this country, as well as writings concerning them, must be in the Norwegian language.

**32.** The heir-apparent to the throne, if a son of the reigning king, shall have the title of prince royal, the other legitimate heirs to the crown shall be called princes, and the king's daughters princesses.

**33.** As soon as the heir shall have attained the age of eighteen, he shall have a right to sit in council, without, however, having a vote, or any responsibility.

**34.** No prince of the blood shall marry without permission of the king, and in case of contravention, he shall forfeit his right to the crown of Norway.

**35.** The princes and princesses of the royal family, shall not, so far as respects their persons, be bound to appear before other judges, but before the king or whomsoever he shall have appointed for that purpose.

**36.** The minister of state of Norway, as well as the two members of council who are near the king, shall have a seat and deliberative voice in the Swedish council, where objects relative to the two kingdoms shall be treated of. In affairs of this nature the advice of the council ought also to be understood, unless these require quick dispatch, so as not to allow time.

**37.** If the king happens to die, and the heir to the throne is under age, the council of Norway, and that of Sweden, shall assemble, and mutually call a convocation of the Storting in Norway and Diet of Sweden.

**38.** Although the representatives of the two kingdoms should have assembled, and regulated the administration during the king's minority, a council composed of an equal number of Norwegian and Swedish members shall govern the kingdoms, and follow their fundamental recip-

cal laws. The minister of state of Norway who sits in this council, shall draw by ballot in order to decide on which of its members the preference shall happen to fall.

**39.** The regulations contained in the two last articles shall be always equally adopted after the constitution of Sweden. It belongs to the Swedish council, in this quality, to be at the head of government.

**40.** With respect to more particular and necessary affairs that might occur in cases under the three former articles, the king shall propose to the first Storting in Norway, and at the first Diet in Sweden, a law having for its basis the principle of a perfect equality existing between the two kingdoms.

**41.** The election of guardians to be at the head of government during the king's minority, shall be made after the same rules and manner formerly prescribed in the second title, Article 5th, concerning the election of an heir to the throne.

**42.** The individuals who in the cases under the 38th and 39th articles, are at the head of government, shall be, the Norwegians at the Storting of Norway, and shall take the following oath: "I swear, on my soul and conscience, to govern the kingdom conformably to its constitution and laws;" and the Swedes shall also make a similar oath. If there is not a Storting or Diet, it shall be deposited in writing in the council, and afterwards repeated at the first of these when they happen to assemble.

**43.** As soon as the governments have ceased, they shall be restored to the king, and the Storting.

**44.** If the Storting is not convoked, agreeably to what is expressed in the 38th and 39th articles, the supreme tribunal shall consider it as an imperious duty, at the expiration of four weeks, to call a meeting.

**45.** The charge of the education of the king, in case his father may not have left in writing instructions regarding it, shall be regulated in the manner laid down under the 5th and 41st articles. It is held to be an invariable rule, that the king during his minority shall learn the Norwegian language.

**46.** If the masculine line of the royal family is extinct, and there has not been elected a successor to the throne, the election of a new dynasty shall be proceeded in, and after the manner prescribed under the 5th article. In the mean time the executive power shall be exercised agreeably to the 41st article.

### Title III.

**Article 1.** Legislative power is exercised by the Storting, which is constituted of two houses, namely, the Lagthing and Odelsthing.

**2.** None shall have a right to vote but Norwegians, who have attained twenty-five years, and resided in the country during five years. 1. Those who are exercising, or who have exercised functions. 2. Possess land in the country, which has been let for more than five years. 3. Are burghesses of some city, or possess either in it, or some village, a house, or property of the value of at least three hundred bank crowns in silver.

**3.** There shall be drawn up in cities by the magistrates, and in every parish by the public authority and the priest, a register of all the in-

habitants who are voters. They shall also note in it without delay, those changes which may successively take place. Before being inscribed in the register, every one shall take an oath, before the tribunal, of fidelity to the constitution.

4. Right of voting is suspended in the following cases: 1. By the accusation of crime before a tribunal; 2. By not attaining the proper age; 3. By insolvency or bankruptcy, until creditors have obtained their payment in whole, unless it can be proved that the former has arisen from fire, or other unforeseen events.

5. The right of voting is forfeited definitively: 1. By condemnation to the house of correction, slavery, or punishment for defamatory language; 2. By acceptance of the service of a foreign power, without the consent of government. 3. By obtaining the right of citizen in a foreign country. 4. By conviction of having purchased and sold votes, and having voted in more than one electoral assembly.

6. The electoral assemblies and districts are held every three years, and shall finish before the end of the month of December.

7. Electoral assemblies shall be held for the country, at the manor-house of the parish, the church, town-hall, or some other fit place. In the country they shall be directed by the first minister and assistants; and in towns, by magistrates and sheriffs; election shall be made in the order appointed by the registers. Disputes concerning the right of voting shall be decided by the directors of the assembly, from whose judgment an appeal may be made to the Storting.

8. Before proceeding to the election, the constitution shall be read with a loud voice in the cities, by the first magistrate, and in the country by the curate.

9. In cities, an elector shall be chosen by fifty eligible inhabitants. They shall assemble eight days after, in the place appointed by the magistrate, and choose, either from amongst themselves, or from others who are eligible in the department of their election, a fourth of their number to sit at the Storting, that is after the manner of three to six in choosing one; seven to ten in electing two; eleven to fourteen in choosing three, and fifteen to eighteen in electing four; which is the greatest number permitted to a city to send. If these consist of less than 150 eligible inhabitants, they shall send the electors to the nearest city, to vote conjointly with the electors of the former, when the two shall only be considered as forming one district.\*

10. In each parish in the country the eligible inhabitants shall choose in proportion to their number electors in the following manner; that is to say, a hundred may choose one; two to three hundred, three; and so on in the same proportion.† Electors shall assemble a month after, in the place appointed by the bailiff, and choose, either from amongst themselves or the others of

the bailiwick eligible, a tenth of their own number to sit at the Storting, so that five to fourteen may choose one; fifteen to twenty-four may choose two of them; twenty-five to thirty-four, three; thirty-five and beyond it, four. This is the greatest number.

11. The powers contained in the 9th and 10th articles shall have their proper force and effect until next Storting. If it is found that the representatives of cities constitute more or less than one-third of those of the kingdom, the Storting, as a rule for the future, shall have right to change these powers in such a manner that representatives of the cities may join with those of the country, as one to two; and the total number of representatives ought not to be under seventy-five, nor above one hundred.

12. Those eligible, who are in the country, and are prevented from attending by sickness, military service, or other proper reasons, can transmit their votes in writing to those who direct the electoral assemblies, before their termination.

13. No person can be chosen a representative, unless he is thirty years of age, and has resided ten years in the country.

14. The members of council, those employed in their offices, officers of the court, and its pensioners, shall not be chosen as representatives.

15. Individuals chosen to be representatives, are obliged to accept of the election, unless prevented by motives considered lawful by the electors, whose judgment may be submitted to the decision of the Storting. A person who has appeared more than once as representative at an ordinary Storting, is not obliged to accept of the election for the next ordinary Storting. If legal reasons prevent a representative from appearing at the Storting, the person who after him has most votes shall take his place.

16. As soon as representatives have been elected, they shall receive a writing in the country from the superior magistrate, and in the cities from the magistrate, also from all the electors, as a proof that they have been elected in the manner prescribed by the constitution. The Storting shall judge of the legality of this authority.

17. All representatives have a right to claim an indemnification in travelling to and returning from the Storting; as well as subsistence during the period they shall have remained there.

18. During the journey, and return of representatives, as well as the time they may have attended the Storting, they are exempted from arrest; unless they are seized in some flagrant and public act, and out of the Storting they shall not be responsible for the opinions they may have declared in it. Every one is bound to conform himself to the order established in it.

19. Representatives, chosen in the manner above declared, compose the Storting of the kingdom of Norway.

20. The opening of the Storting shall be made the first lawful day in the month of February, every three years, in the capital of the kingdom, unless the king, in extraordinary circumstances, by foreign invasion or contagious disease, fixes on some other city of the kingdom. Such change ought then to be early announced.

21. In extraordinary cases, the king has the right of assembling the Storting, without respect to the ordinary time. The king will then cause to be issued a proclamation, which is to be read in all the principal churches six weeks at

\* A law passed 8th February 1816, contains this amendment. Twenty-five electors and more shall not elect more than three representatives, which shall be, ad interim, the greatest number which the bailiwick can send; and, consequently, out of which the number of representatives in the country, which are sixty-one, shall be diminished from fifty to fifty-three.

† If future Stornings discover the number of representatives of towns from an increase of population should amount to thirty, the same Storting shall have right to augment of new the number of representatives of the country, in the manner fixed by the principles of the constitution, which shall be held as a rule in future.

least previous to the day fixed for the assembling of members of the Storthing at the place appointed.

**22.** Such extraordinary Storthing may be dissolved by the king when he shall judge fit.

**23.** Members of the Storthing shall continue in the exercise of their office during three consecutive years, as much during an extraordinary as any ordinary Storthing that might be held during this time.

**24.** If an extraordinary Storthing is held at a time when the ordinary Storthing ought to assemble, the functions of the first will cease, as soon as the second shall have met.

**25.** The extraordinary Storthing, no more than the ordinary, can be held if two-thirds of the members do not happen to be present.

**26.** As soon as the Storthing shall be organized, the king, or the person who shall be appointed by him for that purpose, shall open it by an address, in which he is to describe the state of the kingdom, and those objects to which he directs the attention of the Storthing. No deliberation ought to take place in the king's presence. The Storthing shall choose from its members one-fourth part to form the Lagthing, and the other three-fourths to constitute the Odelsting. Each of these houses shall have its private meetings, and nominate its president and secretary.

**27.** It belongs to the Storthing,—1. To make and abolish laws, establish imposts, taxes, custom-houses, and other public acts, which shall, however, only exist until the 1st of July of that year, when a new Storthing shall be assembled, unless this last is expressly renewed by them. 2. To make loans, by means of the credit of the state. 3. To watch over the finances of the state. 4. To grant sums necessary for its expenses. 5. To fix the yearly grant for the maintenance of the king and viceroy, and also appendages of the royal family; which ought not, however, to consist in landed property. 6. To exhibit the register of the sitting council in Norway, and all the reports, and public documents (the affairs of military command excepted), and certified copies, or extracts of the registers kept by the ministers of state and members of council near the king, or the public documents, which shall have been produced. 7. To communicate whatever treaties the king shall have concluded in the name of the state with foreign powers, excepting secret articles, provided these are not in contradiction with the public articles. 8. To require all individuals to appear before the Storthing on affairs of state, the king and royal family excepted. This is not, however, applicable to the princes of the royal family, as they are invested with other offices than that of viceroy. 9. To examine the lists of provisional pensions; and to make such alterations as shall be judged necessary. 10. To name five revisers, who are annually to examine the accounts of the state, and publish printed extracts of these, which are to be remitted to the revisers also every year before the 1st of July. 11. To naturalize foreigners.

**28.** Laws ought first to be proposed to the Odelsting, either by its own members or the government, through one of the members of council. If the proposition is accepted, it shall be sent to the Lagthing, who approve or reject it; and in the last case return it accompanied with remarks. These shall be weighed by the Odelsting, which sets the proposed law aside, or

remits it to the Lagthing, with or without alterations. When a law shall have been twice proposed by the Odelsting to the Lagthing, and the latter shall have rejected it a second time, the Storthing shall assemble, when two-thirds of the votes shall decide upon it. Three days at least ought to pass between each of those deliberations.

**29.** When a resolution proposed by the Odelsting shall be approved by the Lagthing, or by the Storthing alone, a deputation of these two houses to the Storthing shall present it to the king if he is present, and if not, to the viceroy, or Norwegian council, and require it may receive the royal sanction.

**30.** Should the king approve of the resolution, he subscribes to it, and from that period it is declared to pass into a public law. If he disapproves he returns it to the Odelsting, declaring that at this time he does not give it his sanction.

**31.** In this event, the Storthing, then assembled, ought to submit the resolution to the king, who may proceed in it in the same manner if the first ordinary Storthing presents again to him the same resolution. But if, after reconsideration, it is still adopted by the two houses of the third ordinary Storthing, and afterwards submitted to the king, who shall have been intreated not to withhold his sanction to a resolution that the Storthing, after the most mature deliberations, believes to be useful; it shall acquire the strength of a law, even should it not receive the king's signature before the closing of the Storthing.

**32.** The Storthing shall sit as long as it shall be judged necessary, but not beyond three months, without the king's permission. When the business is finished, or after it has assembled for the time fixed, it is dissolved by the king. His Majesty gives, at the same time, his sanction to the decrees not already decided, either in corroborating or rejecting them. All those not expressly sanctioned are held to be rejected by him.

**33.** Laws are to be drawn up in the Norwegian language, and (those mentioned in 31st article excepted) in name of the king, under the seal of the kingdom, and in these terms:—"We, &c. Be it known, that there has been submitted to us a decree of the Storthing (of such a date) thus expressed (follows the resolution); We have accepted and sanctioned as law the said decree, in giving it our signature, and seal of the kingdom."

**34.** The king's sanction is not necessary to the resolutions of the Storthing, by which the legislative body,—1. Declares itself organized as the Storthing, according to the constitution. 2. Regulates its internal police. 3. Accepts or rejects writs of present members. 4. Confirms or rejects judgments relative to disputes respecting elections. 5. Naturalizes foreigners. 6. And in short, the resolution by which the Odelsting orders some member of council to appear before the tribunals.

**35.** The Storthing can demand the advice of the supreme tribunal in judicial matters.

**36.** The Storthing will hold its sittings with open doors, and its acts shall be printed and published, excepting in cases where a contrary measure shall have been decided by the plurality of votes.

**37.** Whoever molests the liberty and safety of the Storthing, renders himself guilty of an act of high treason towards the country.

## Title IV.

**Article 1.** The members of the Lagthing and supreme tribunal composing the Rigsret, judge in the first and last instance of the affairs entered upon by the Odelsting, either against the members of council or supreme tribunal for crimes committed in the exercise of their offices, or against the members of Storting for acts committed by them in a similar capacity. The president of the Lagthing has the precedence in the Rigsret.

2. The accused can, without declaring his motive for so doing, refuse, even a third part of the members of the Rigsret, provided, however, that the number of persons who compose this tribunal be not reduced to less than fifteen.

3. The supreme tribunal shall judge in the last instance, and ought not to be composed of a lesser number than the resident and six assessors.

4. In time of peace the supreme tribunal, with two superior officers appointed by the king, constitutes a tribunal of the second and last resort in all military affairs which respect life, honour, and loss of liberty for a time beyond the space of three months.

5. The arrests of the supreme tribunal shall not in any case be called upon to be submitted to revision.

6. No person shall be named member of the supreme tribunal, if he has not attained at least thirty years of age.

## Title V.

**Article 1.** Employments in the states shall be conferred only on Norwegian citizens, who profess the Evangelical Lutheran religion — have sworn fidelity to the constitution and king, speak the language of the country, and are,—1. Either born in the kingdom of parents who were then subjects of the state. 2. Or born in a foreign country, their father and mother being Norwegians, and at that period not the subjects of another state. 3. Or, who on the 17th May, 1814, had a permanent residence in the kingdom, and did not refuse to take an oath to maintain the independence of Norway. 4. Or who in future shall remain ten years in the kingdom. 5. Or who have been naturalized by the Storting. Foreigners, however, may be nominated to these official situations in the university and colleges, as well as to those of physicians, and consuls in a foreign country. In order to succeed to an office in the superior tribunal, the person must be thirty years old; and to fill a place in the inferior magistracy,—a judge of the tribunal of first instance, or a public receiver, he must be twenty-five.

2. Norway does not acknowledge herself owing any other debt than that of her own.

3. A new general code, of a civil and criminal nature, shall first be published; or, if that is impracticable, at the second ordinary Storting. Meantime, the laws of the state, as at present existing, shall preserve their effect, since they are not contrary to this fundamental law, or provisional ordinances published in the interval. Permanent taxes shall continue to be levied until next Storting.

4. No protecting dispensation, letter of respite, or restitutions, shall be granted after the new general code shall be published.

5. No persons can be judged but in conformity to the law, or be punished until a tribunal shall

have taken cognizance of the charges directed against them. Torture shall never take place.

6. Laws shall have no retro-active effect.

7. Fees due to officers of justice are not to be combined with rents payable to the public treasury.

8. Arrest ought not to take place excepting in cases and in the manner fixed by law. Illegal arrests, and unlawful delays, render him who occasions them responsible to the person arrested. Government is not authorized to employ military force against the members of the state, but under the forms prescribed by the laws, unless an assembly which disturbs the public tranquillity does not instantly disperse after the articles of the code concerning sedition shall have been read aloud three times by the civil authorities.

9. The liberty of the press shall be established. No person can be punished for a writing he has ordered to be printed or published, whatever may be the contents of it, unless he has, by himself or others, wilfully declared, or prompted others to, disobedience of the laws, contempt for religion, and constitutional powers, and resistance to their operations; or has advanced false and defamatory accusations against others. It is permitted to every one to speak freely his opinion on the administration of the state, or on any other object whatever.

10. New and permanent restrictions on the freedom of industry are not to be granted in future to any one.

11. Domiciliary visits are prohibited, excepting in the cases of criminals.

12. Refuge will not be granted to those who shall be bankrupts.

13. No person can in any case forfeit his landed property, and fortune.

14. If the interest of the state requires that any one should sacrifice his moveable or immovable property for the public benefit, he shall be fully indemnified by the public treasury.

15. The capital, as well as the revenues of the domains of the church, can be applied only for the interests of the clergy, and the prosperity of public instruction. The property of benevolent institutions shall be employed only for their profit.

16. The right of the power of redemption called *Odelstret*\*, and that of possession, called *Afædesret* (father's right), shall exist. Particular regulations, which will render these of utility to the states and agriculture, shall be determined by the first or second Storting.

17. No county, barony, majorat or "fidei commissi"† shall be created for the future.

18. Every citizen of the state, without regard to birth or fortune, shall be equally obliged, during a particular period, to defend his country.‡ The application of this principle and its restrictions, as well as the question of ascertaining to what point it is of benefit to the country, that this obligation should cease at the age of twenty-five,—shall be abandoned to the decision

\* In virtue of the right of "Odelstret," members of a family to whom certain lands originally pertained, can reclaim and retake possession of the same, even after the lapse of centuries, provided these lands are representative of the title of the family; that is, if for every ten years successively they shall have judicially made reservation of their right. This custom, injurious perhaps to the progress of agriculture, does, however, attach the peasants to their native soil.

† Entail.

‡ Every person is obliged to serve from twenty-one to twenty-three, and not after.

of the first ordinary Storting, after they shall have been discharged by a committee; in the meantime, vigorous efforts shall preserve their effect.

**19.** Norway shall retain her own language, her own finances and coin; institutions which shall be determined upon by laws.

**20.** Norway has the right of having her own flag of trade and war, which shall be a union flag.

**21.** If experience should show the necessity of changing some part of this fundamental law, a proposition to this purpose shall be made to an

**CONSTITUTION OF PLYMOUTH COLONY (Compact of the Pilgrim Fathers).** See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1620.

ordinary Storting, published and printed; and it only pertains to the next ordinary Storting to decide if the change proposed ought to be effectual or not. Such alteration, however, ought never to be contrary to the principles of this fundamental law; and should only have for its object those modifications in which particular regulations do not alter the spirit of the constitution. Two-thirds of the Storting ought to agree upon such a change. Christiania, 4th November, 1814. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (NORWAY): A. D. 1814-1815.

**CONSTITUTION OF POLAND (The old).** See POLAND: A. D. 1573, and 1578-1652. ....(of 1791). See POLAND: A. D. 1791-1793.

**CONSTITUTION OF PRUSSIA.**

The following text of the Constitution granted by Frederick William, King of Prussia, on the 31st of January, 1850, with subsequent alterations, is a translation made by Mr. Charles Lowe, and published in the appendix to his Life of Prince Bismarck, 1855.

WE, Frederick William, &c., hereby proclaim and give to know that, whereas the Constitution of the Prussian State, promulgated by us on the 5th December, 1848, subject to revision in the ordinary course of legislation, and recognised by both Chambers of our Kingdom, has been submitted to the prescribed revision; we have finally established that Constitution in agreement with both Chambers. Now, therefore, we promulgate, as a fundamental law of the State, as follows:—

**Article 1.**—All parts of the Monarchy in its present extent form the Prussian State Territory.

**Article 2.**—The limits of this State Territory can only be altered by law.

**Article 3.**—The Constitution and the laws determine under what conditions the quality and civil rights of a Prussian may be acquired, exercised, and forfeited.

**Article 4.**—All Prussians are equal before the law. Class privileges there are none. Public offices, subject to the conditions imposed by law, are equally accessible to all who are competent to hold them.

**Article 5.**—Personal freedom is guaranteed. The forms and conditions under which any limitation thereof, especially arrest, is permissible, will be determined by law.

**Article 6.**—The domicile is inviolable. Intrusion and search therein, as well as the seizing of letters and papers, are only allowed in legally settled cases.

**Article 7.**—No one may be deprived of his lawful judge. Exceptional tribunals and extraordinary commissions are inadmissible.

**Article 8.**—Punishments can only be threatened or inflicted according to the law.

**Article 9.**—Property is inviolable. It can only be taken or curtailed from reasons of public weal and expediency, and in return for statutory compensation which, in urgent cases at least, shall be fixed beforehand.

**Article 10.**—Civil death and confiscation of property, as punishments, are not possible.

**Article 11.**—Freedom of emigration can only be limited by the State, with reference to military service. Migration fees may not be levied.

**Article 12.**—Freedom of religious confession, of meeting in religious societies (Art. 30 and 31), and of the common exercise of religion in private and public, is guaranteed. The enjoyment of civil and political rights is independent of religious belief, yet the duties of a citizen or a subject may not be impaired by the exercise of religious liberty.

**Article 13.**—Religious and clerical societies, which have no corporate rights, can only acquire those rights by special laws.

**Article 14.**—The Christian religion is taken as the basis of those State institutions which are connected with the exercise of religion—all religious liberty guaranteed by Art. 12 notwithstanding.

**Article 15.\***—The Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches, as well as every other religious society, regulate and administer their own affairs in an independent manner, and remain in possession and enjoyment of the institutions, foundations, and moneys intended for their purposes of public worship, education, and charity.

**Article 16.\***—Intercourse between religious societies and their superiors shall be unobstructed. The making public of Church ordinances is only subject to those restrictions imposed on all other publications.

**Article 17.**—A special law will be passed with respect to Church patronage, and to the conditions on which it may be abolished.

**Article 18.\***—Abolished is the right of nominating, proposing, electing, and confirming, in the matter of appointments to ecclesiastical posts, in so far as it belongs to the State, and is not based on patronage or special legal titles.

**Article 19.**—Civil marriage will be introduced in accordance with a special law, which shall also regulate the keeping of a civil register.

**Article 20.**—Science and its doctrines are free.

**Article 21.**—The education of youth shall be sufficiently cared for by public schools. Parents and their substitutes may not leave their children or wards without that education prescribed for the public folk-schools.

\* Affected by the F. k laws of 1875, and by the act of 1887 which repealed them. See GERMANY: A. D. 1873-1887.



**Article 22.**—Every one shall be at liberty to give instruction, and establish institutions for doing so, providing he shall have given proof of his moral, scientific, and technical capacity to the State authorities concerned.

**Article 23.**—All public and private institutions of an educational kind are under the supervision of authorities appointed by the State. Public teachers have the rights and duties of State servants.

**Article 24.**—In the establishment of public folk-schools,\* confessional differences shall receive the greatest possible consideration. Religious instruction in the folk-schools will be superintended by the religious societies concerned. Charge of the other (external) affairs of the folk-schools belongs to the Parish (Commune). With the statutory co-operation of the Commune, the State shall appoint teachers in the public folk-schools from the number of those qualified (for such posts).

**Article 25.**—The means for establishing, maintaining, and enlarging the public folk-schools shall be provided by the Communes, which may, however, be assisted by the State in proven cases of parochial inability. The obligations of third persons—based on special legal titles—remain in force. The State, therefore, guarantees to teachers in folk-schools a steady income suitable to local circumstances. In public folk-schools education shall be imparted free of charge.

**Article 26.**—A special law will regulate all matters of education.

**Article 27.**—Every Prussian is entitled to express his opinion freely by word, writing, print, or artistic representation. Censorship may not be introduced; every other restriction on freedom of the Press will only be imposed by law.

**Article 28.**—Offences committed by word, writing, print, or artistic representation will be punished in accordance with the general penal code.

**Article 29.**—All Prussians are entitled to meet in closed rooms, peacefully and unarmed, without previous permission from the authorities. But this provision does not apply to open-air meetings, which are subject to the law with respect to previous permission from the authorities.

**Article 30.**—All Prussians have the right to assemble (in societies) for such purposes as do not contravene the penal laws. The law will regulate, with special regard to the preservation of public security, the exercise of the right guaranteed by this and the preceding article.

**Article 31.**—The law shall determine the conditions on which corporate rights may be granted or refused.

**Article 32.**—The right of petitioning belongs to all Prussians. Petitions under a collective name are only permitted to authorities and corporations.

**Article 33.**—The privacy of letters is inviolable. The necessary restrictions of this right, in cases of war and of criminal investigation, will be determined by law.

**Article 34.**—All Prussians are bound to bear arms. The extent and manner of this duty will be fixed by law.

**Article 35.**—The army comprises all sections of the standing army and the Landwehr (terri-

torial forces). In the event of war, the King can call out the Landsturm in accordance with the law.

**Article 36.**—The armed force (of the nation) can only be employed for the suppression of internal troubles, and the execution of the laws, in the cases and manner specified by statute, and on the requisition of the civil authorities. In the latter respect exceptions will have to be determined by law.

**Article 37.**—The military judiciary of the army is restricted to penal matters, and will be regulated by law. Provisions with regard to military discipline will remain the subject of special ordinances.

**Article 38.**—The armed force (of the nation) may not deliberate either when on or off duty; nor may it otherwise assemble than when commanded to do so. Assemblies and meetings of the Landwehr for the purpose of discussing military institutions, commands and ordinances, are forbidden even when it is not called out.

**Article 39.**—The provisions of Arts. 5, 6, 29, 30, and 32 will only apply to the army in so far as they do not conflict with military laws and rules of discipline.

**Article 40.**—The establishment of feudal tenures is forbidden. The Feudal Union still existing with respect to surviving fiefs shall be dissolved by law.

**Article 41.**—The provisions of Art. 40 do not apply to Crown fiefs or to non-State fiefs.

**Article 42.**—Abolished without compensation, in accordance with special laws passed, are: 1. The exercise or transfer of judicial power connected with the possession of certain lands, together with the dues and exemptions accruing from this right; 2. The obligations arising from patriarchal jurisdiction, vassalage, and former tax and trading institutions. And with these rights are also abolished the counter-services and burdens hitherto therewith connected.

**Article 43.**—The person of the King is inviolable.

**Article 44.**—The King's Ministers are responsible. All Government acts (documentary) of the King require for their validity the approval of a Minister, who thereby assumes responsibility for them.

**Article 45.**—The King alone is invested with executive power. He appoints and dismisses Ministers. He orders the promulgation of laws, and issues the necessary ordinances for their execution.

**Article 46.**—The King is Commander-in-Chief of the army.

**Article 47.**—The King fills all posts in the army, as well as in other branches of the State service, in so far as not otherwise ordained by law.

**Article 48.**—The King has the right to declare war and make peace, and to conclude other treaties with foreign governments. The latter require for their validity the assent of the Chambers in so far as they are commercial treaties, or impose burdens on the State, or obligations on its individual subjects.

**Article 49.**—The King has the right to pardon, and to mitigate punishment. But in favour of a Minister condemned for his official acts, this right can only be exercised on the motion of that Chamber whence his indictment emanated. Only by special law can the King suppress inquiries already instituted.

\* We cannot translate "Volkschule" better than by "folk-school."



**Article 50.**—The King may confer orders and other distinctions, not carrying with them privileges. He exercises the right of coinage in accordance with the law.

**Article 51.**—The King convokes the Chambers, and closes their sessions. He may dissolve both at once, or only one at a time. In such a case, however, the electors must be assembled within a period of 60 days, and the Chambers summoned within a period of 90 days respectively after the dissolution.

**Article 52.**—The King can adjourn the Chambers. But without their assent this adjournment may not exceed the space of 30 days, nor be repeated during the same session.

**Article 53.**—The Crown, according to the laws of the Royal House, is hereditary in the male line of that House in accordance with the law of primogeniture and agnatic succession.

**Article 54.**—The King attains his majority on completing his 18th year. In presence of the united Chambers he will take the oath to observe the Constitution of the Monarchy steadfastly and inviolably, and to rule in accordance with it and the laws.

**Article 55.**—Without the consent of both Chambers the King cannot also be ruler of foreign realms (Reiche).

**Article 56.**—If the King is a minor, or is otherwise lastingly prevented from ruling himself, the Regency will be undertaken by that agnate (Art. 53) who has attained his majority and stands nearest the Crown. He has immediately to convoke the Chambers, which, in united session, will decide as to the necessity of the Regency.

**Article 57.**—If there be no agnate of age, and if no legal provision has previously been made for such a contingency, the Ministry of State will convoke the Chambers, which shall then elect a Regent in united session. And until the assumption of the Regency by him, the Ministry of State will conduct the Government.

**Article 58.**—The Regent will exercise the powers invested in the King in the latter's name; and, after institution of the Regency, he will take an oath before the united Chambers to observe the Constitution of the Monarchy steadfastly and inviolably, and to rule in accordance with it and the laws. Until this oath is taken, the whole Ministry of State for the time being will remain responsible for all acts of the Government.

**Article 59.**—To the Crown Trust Fund appertains the annuity drawn from the income of the forests and domains.

**Article 60.**—The Ministers, as well as the State officials appointed to represent them, have access to each Chamber, and must at all times be listened to at request. Each Chamber can demand the presence of the Ministers. The Ministers are only entitled to vote in one or other of the Chambers when members of it.

**Article 61.**—On the resolution of a Chamber the Ministers may be impeached for the crime of infringing the Constitution, of bribery, and of treason. The decision of such a case lies with the Supreme Tribunal of the Monarchy sitting in United Senates. As long as two Supreme Tribunals co-exist, they shall unite for the above purpose. Further details as to matters of responsibility, (criminal) procedure (thereupon), and punishments, are reserved for a special law.

**Article 62.**—The legislative power will be exercised in common by the King and by two Cham-

bers. Every law requires the assent of the King and the two Chambers. Money bills and budgets shall first be laid before the Second Chamber; and the latter (i. e., budgets) shall either be wholly approved by the First Chamber, or rejected altogether.

**Article 63.**—In the event only of its being urgently necessary to maintain public security, or deal with an unusual state of distress when the Chambers are not in session, ordinances, which do not contravene the Constitution, may be issued with the force of law, on the responsibility of the whole Ministry. But these must be laid for approval before the Chambers at their next meeting.

**Article 64.**—The King, as well as each Chamber, has the right of proposing laws. Bills that have been rejected by one of the Chambers, or by the King, cannot be re-introduced in the same session.

**Articles 65-68.**—The First Chamber is formed by royal ordinance, which can only be altered by a law to be issued with the approval of the Chambers. The First Chamber is composed of members appointed by the King, with hereditary rights, or only for life.

**Article 69.**—The Second Chamber consists of 430 members.\* The electoral districts are determined by law. They may consist of one or more Circles (Arrondissements), or of one or more of the larger towns.

**Article 70.**—Every Prussian who has completed his 25th year (i. e., attained his majority), and is capable of taking part in the elections of the Commune where he is domiciled, is entitled to act as a primary voter (Urwähler). Any one who is entitled to take part in the election of several Communes, can only exercise his right as primary voter in one Commune.

**Article 71.**—For every 250 souls of the population, one (secondary) elector (Wahlmann) shall be chosen. The primary voters fall into three classes, in proportion to the amount of direct taxes they pay—and in such a manner as that each class will represent a third of the sum-total of the taxes paid by the primary voters. This sum-total is reckoned:—(a) by Parishes, in case the Commune does not form of itself a primary electoral district. (b) by (Government) Districts (Bezirke), in case the primary electoral district consists of several Communes. The first class consists of those primary voters, highest in the scale of taxation, who pay a third of the total. The second class consists of those primary voters, next highest in the scale, whose taxes form a second third of the whole; and the third class is made up of the remaining tax-payers (lowest in the scale) who contribute the other third of the whole. Each class votes apart, and for a third of the secondary electors. These classes may be divided into several voting sections, none of which, however, must include more than 500 primary voters. The secondary voters are elected in each class from the number of the primary voters in their district, without regard to the classes.

**Article 72.**—The deputies are elected by the secondary voters. Details will be regulated by an electoral law, which must also make the necessary provision for those cities where flour and slaughter duties are levied instead of direct taxes.

\* Originally 850 only—a number which, in 1851, was increased by 2, for the Principality of Hohenzollern, and in 1867 by 80 for the annexed provinces.

**Article 73.**—The legislative period of the Second Chamber is fixed at three years.

**Article 74.**—Eligible as deputy to the Second Chamber is every Prussian who has completed his thirtieth year, has forfeited none of his civil rights in consequence of a valid judicial sentence, and has been a Prussian subject for three years. The president and members of the Supreme Chamber of Accounts cannot sit in either House of the Diet (Landtag).

**Article 75.**—After the lapse of a legislative period the Chambers will be elected anew, and the same in the event of dissolution. In both cases, previous members are re-eligible.

**Article 76.**—Both Houses of the Diet of the Monarchy shall be regularly convened by the King in the period from the beginning of November in each year till the middle of the following January, and otherwise as often as circumstances require.

**Article 77.**—The Chambers will be opened and closed by the King in person, or by a Minister appointed by him to do so, at a combined sitting of the Chambers. Both Chambers shall be simultaneously convened, opened, adjourned, and closed. If one Chamber is dissolved, the other shall be at the same time prorogued.

**Article 78.**—Each Chamber will examine the credentials of its members, and decide thereupon. It will regulate its own order of business and discipline by special ordinances, and elect its president, vice-presidents, and office-bearers. Civil servants require no leave of absence in order to enter the Chamber. If a member of the Chamber accepts a salaried office of the State, or is promoted in the service of the State to a post involving higher rank or increase of pay, he shall lose his seat and vote in the Chamber, and can only recover his place in it by re-election. No one can be member of both Chambers.

**Article 79.**—The sittings of both Chambers are public. On the motion of its president, or of ten members, each Chamber may meet in private sitting—at which this motion will then have to be discussed.

**Article 80.**—Neither of the Chambers can pass a resolution unless there be present a majority of the legal number of its members. Each Chamber passes its resolutions by absolute majority of votes, subject to any exceptions that may be determined by the order of business for elections.

**Article 81.**—Each Chamber has the separate right of presenting addresses to the King. No one may in person present to the Chambers, or to one of them, a petition or address. Each Chamber can transmit the communications made to it to the Ministers, and demand of them an answer to any grievances thus conveyed.

**Article 82.**—Each Chamber is entitled to appoint commissions of inquiry into facts—for its own information.

**Article 83.**—The members of both Chambers are representatives of the whole people. They vote according to their simple convictions, and are not bound by commissions or instructions.

**Article 84.**—For their votes in the Chamber they can never be called to account, and for the opinions they express therein they can only be called to account within the Chamber, in virtue of the order of business. No member of a Chamber can, without its assent, be had up for examination, or be arrested during the Parlia-

mentary session for any penal offence, unless he be taken in the act, or in the course of the following day. A similar assent shall be necessary in the case of arrest for debts. All criminal proceedings against a member of the Chamber, and all arrests for preliminary examination, or civil arrest, shall be suspended during the Parliamentary session on demand from the Chamber concerned.

**Article 85.**—The members of the Second Chamber shall receive out of the State Treasury travelling expenses and daily fees, according to a statutory scale; and renunciation thereof shall be inadmissible.

**Article 86.**—The judicial power will be exercised in the name of the King, by independent tribunals subject to no other authority but that of the law. Judgment shall be executed in the name of the King.

**Article 87.**—The judges will be appointed for life by the King, or in his name. They can only be removed or temporarily suspended from office by judicial sentence, and for reasons foreseen by the law. Temporary suspension from office (not ensuing on the strength of a law), and involuntary transfer to another place, or to the retired list, can only take place from the causes and in the form mentioned by law, and in virtue of a judicial sentence. But these provisions do not apply to cases of transfer, rendered necessary by changes in the organisation of the courts or their districts.

**Article 88** (*abolished*).

**Article 89.**—The organisation of the tribunals will only be determined by law.

**Article 90.**—To the judicial office only those can be appointed who have qualified themselves for it as prescribed by law.

**Article 91.**—Courts for special kinds of affairs, and, in particular, tribunals for trade and commerce, shall be established by statute in those places where local needs may require them. The organisation and jurisdiction of such courts, as well as their procedure and the appointment of their members, the special status of the latter, and the duration of their office, will be determined by law.

**Article 92.**—In Prussia there shall only be one supreme tribunal.

**Article 93.**—The proceedings of the civil and criminal courts shall be public. But the public may be excluded by an openly declared resolution of the court, when order or good morals may seem endangered (by their admittance). In other cases publicity of proceedings can only be limited by law.

**Article 94.**—In criminal cases the guilt of the accused shall be determined by jurymen, in so far as exceptions are not determined by a law issued with the previous assent of the Chambers. The formation of a jury-court shall be regulated by a law.

**Article 95.**—By a law issued with the previous assent of the Chambers, there may be established a special court whereof the jurisdiction shall include the crimes of high treason, as well as those crimes against the internal and external security of the State, which may be assigned to it by law.

**Article 96.**—The competence of the courts and of the administrative authorities shall be determined by law. Conflicts of authority between the courts and the administrative authorities shall be settled by a tribunal appointed by law.

**Article 97.**—A law shall determine the conditions on which public, civil, and military officials may be sued for wrongs committed by them in exceeding their functions. But the previous assent of official superiors need not be requested.

**Article 98.**—The special legal status (*Rechtsverhältnisse*) of State officials (including advocates and solicitors) not belonging to the judicial class, shall be determined by a law, which, without restricting the Government in the choice of its executive agents, will grant civil servants proper protection against arbitrary dismissal from their posts or diminution of their pay.

**Article 99.**—All income and expenditure of the State must be pre-estimated for every year, and be presented in the Budget, which shall be annually fixed by a law.

**Article 100.**—Taxes and dues for the State Treasury may only be raised in so far as they shall have been included in the Budget or ordained by special laws.

**Article 101.**—In the matter of taxes there must be no privilege of persons. Existing tax-laws shall be subjected to a revision, and all such privileges abolished.

**Article 102.**—State and Communal officers can only levy dues on the strength of a law.

**Article 103.**—The contracting of loans for the State Treasury can only be effected on the strength of a law; and the same holds good of guarantees involving a burden to the State.

**Article 104.**—Budget transgressions require subsequent approval by the Chambers. The Budget will be examined and audited by the Supreme Chamber of Accounts. The general Budget accounts of every year, including tabular statistics of the National Debt, shall, with the comments of the Supreme Chamber of Accounts, be laid before the Chambers for the purpose of exonerating the Government. A special law will regulate the establishment and functions of the Supreme Chamber of Accounts.

**Article 105.**—The representation and administration of the Communes, Arrondissements and Provinces of the Prussian State, will be determined in detail by special laws.

**Article 106.**—Laws and ordinances become binding after having been published in the form prescribed by law. The examination of the validity of properly promulgated Royal ordinances is not within the competence of the authorities, but of the Chambers.

**Article 107.**—The Constitution may be altered by ordinary legislative means; and such alteration shall merely require the usual absolute majority in both Chambers on two divisions (of the House), between which there must elapse a period of at least twenty-one days.

**Article 108.**—The members of both Chambers, and all State officials, shall take the oath of fealty and obedience to the King, and swear conscientiously to observe the Constitution. The army will not take the oath to the Constitution.

**Article 109.**—Existing taxes and dues will continue to be raised; and all provisions of existing statute-books, single laws, and ordinances, which do not contravene the present Constitution, will remain in force until altered by law.

**Article 110.**—All authorities holding appointments in virtue of existing laws will continue their activity pending the issue of organic laws affecting them.

**Article 111.**—In the event of war or revolution, and pressing danger to public security therefrom ensuing, Articles 5, 6, 7, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 36 of the Constitution may be suspended for a certain time, and in certain districts—the details to be determined by law.

**Article 112.**—Until issue of the law contemplated in Article 26, educational matters will be controlled by the laws at present in force.

**Article 113.**—Prior to the revision of the criminal code, a special law will deal with offences committed by word, writing, print, or artistic representation.

**Article 114** (*abolished*).

**Article 115.**—Until issue of the electoral law contemplated in Article 72, the ordinance of 30th May, 1849, touching the return of deputies to the Second Chamber, will remain in force; and with this ordinance is associated the provisional electoral law for elections to the Second Chamber in the Hohenzollern Principalities of 30th April, 1851.

**Article 116.**—The two supreme tribunals still existing shall be combined into one—to be organised by a special law.

**Article 117.**—The claims of State officials appointed before the promulgation of the Constitution shall be taken into special consideration by the Civil Servant Law.

**Article 118.**—Should changes in the present Constitution be rendered necessary by the German Federal Constitution to be drawn up on the basis of the Draft of 26th May, 1849, such alterations will be decreed by the King; and the ordinances to this effect laid before the Chambers, at their first meeting. The Chambers will then have to decide whether the changes thus provisionally ordained harmonise with the Federal Constitution of Germany.

**Article 119.**—The Royal oath mentioned in Article 54, as well as the oath prescribed to be taken by both Chambers and all State officials, will have to be tendered immediately after the legislative revision of the present Constitution (Articles 62 and 108).

In witness whereof we have hereunto set our signature and seal.

Given at Charlottenburg, the 31st January, 1850. (Signed) FRIEDRICH WILHELM.

In connection with Article 44 the course of domestic and parliamentary politics drew forth the following Declaratory Rescript from the German Emperor and King of Prussia, in 1882:—"The right of the King to conduct the Government and policy of Prussia according to his own discretion is limited by the Constitution (of January 31, 1850), but not abolished. The Government acts (documentary) of the King require the counter-signature of a Minister, and, as was also the case before the Constitution was issued, have to be represented by the King's Ministers; but they nevertheless remain Government acts of the King, from whose decisions they result, and who thereby constitutionally expresses his will and pleasure. It is therefore not admissible, and leads to obscuration of the constitutional rights of the King, when their exercise is so spoken of as if they emanated from the Ministers for the time being responsible for them, and not from the King himself. The Constitution of Prussia is the expression of the monarchical tradition of this country, whose development is based on the living and actual re-

lations of its Kings to the people. These relations, moreover, do not admit of being transferred to the Ministers appointed by the King, for they attach to the person of the King. Their preservation, too, is a political necessity for Prussia. It is, therefore, my will that both in Prussia and in the Legislative Bodies of the realm (or Reich), there may be no doubt left as to my own constitutional right and that of my successors to personally conduct the policy of my Government; and that the theory shall always be gainsaid that the [doctrine of the] inviolability of the person of the King, which has always existed in Prussia, and is enunciated by Article 43 of the Constitution, or the necessity of a responsible co-signature of my Government acts, deprives them of the character of Royal and independent decisions. It is the duty of my Ministers to support

my constitutional rights by protecting them from doubt and obscurity, and I expect the same from all State servants (Beamten) who have taken to me the official oath. I am far from wishing to impair the freedom of elections, but in the case of those officials who are intrusted with the execution of my Government acts, and may, therefore, in conformity with the disciplinary law forfeit their situations, the duty solemnly undertaken by their oath of service also applies to the representation by them of the policy of my Government during election times. The faithful performance of this duty I shall thankfully acknowledge, and I expect from all officials that, in view of their oath of allegiance, they will refrain from all agitation against my Government also during elections.—Berlin, January 4, 1882.—WILHELM VON BISMARCK. To the Ministry of State."

**CONSTITUTION OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.** See ROME: B. C. 31—A. D. 14, and A. D. 284—305.

**CONSTITUTION OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC.** See ROME: B. C. 500, to B. C. 286; also COMITIA CENTURIATA; COMITIA CURIATA; CONSULS, ROMAN; CONSULAR TRIBUNES; SENATE, ROMAN; PLEBEIANS.

**CONSTITUTION OF SOLON.** See ATHENS: B. C. 504.

**CONSTITUTION OF SPAIN (1812).** See SPAIN: A. D. 1814—1827, . . . (1869). See SPAIN: A. D. 1806—1873, . . . (The Early Kingdoms.) See CORTES.

**CONSTITUTION OF SULLA.** See ROME: B. C. 88—78.

## CONSTITUTION OF SWEDEN.

"Four fundamental laws account for the present political constitution of Sweden: the law concerning the form of government (regeringsformen) dated June 6, 1809; the law on representation (riksdags-ordningen), June 22, 1866; the order of succession (successions-ordningen), Sept. 26, 1810; and the law on the liberty of the press (tryckfrihets-förordningen), July 10, 1812. The union with Norway is regulated by the act of union (riks-akten), Aug. 6, 1815. . . . The representation of the nation, since the law of June 22, 1809, rests not as formerly on the division of the nation into four orders, but on election only. Two chambers, having equal authority, compose the diet. The members of the first chamber are elected for three years by the 'landstingen' (specles of provincial assemblies) and by the 'stadsfullmäktige' (municipal councillors) of cities which do not sit in the 'landsting.'—*Lalor's Cyclopaedia of Political Science*, v. 3, pp. 834—835. —"The First Chamber consists (1892) of 147 members, or one deputy for every 30,000 of the population. The election of the members takes place by the 'Landstings,' or provincial representations, 25 in number, and the municipal corporations of the towns, not already represented in the 'Landstings,' Stockholm, Göteborg, Malmö and Norrköping. All members of the First Chamber must be above 35 years of age, and must have possessed for at least three years previous to the election either real property to the taxed value of 80,000 kroner, or 4,444 l., or an annual income of 4,000 kroner, or 223 l. They are elected for the term of nine years, and obtain no payment for their services. The Second Chamber consists (Autumn 1892) of 228 members, of whom 76 are elected by the towns and 140 by the rural districts, one representative being returned for every 10,000 of the population of towns, one for every 'Domsaga,' or rural district, of under 40,000 inhabitants, and two for rural districts of

over 40,000 inhabitants. All natives of Sweden, aged 21, possessing real property to the taxed value of 1,000 kroner, or 56 l., or farming, for a period of not less than five years, landed property to the taxed value of 6,000 kroner, or 333 l., or paying income tax on an annual income of 800 kroner, or 45 l., are electors; and all natives, aged 25, possessing, and having possessed at least one year previous to the election, the same qualifications, may be elected members of the Second Chamber. The number of qualified electors to the Second Chamber in 1890 was 288,006, or 6.0 of the population; only 110,896, or 38.5 of the electors actually voted. In the smaller towns and country districts the election may either be direct or indirect, according to the wish of the majority. The election is for the term of three years, and the members obtain salaries for their services, at the rate of 1,200 kroner, or 67 l., for each session of four months, besides travelling expenses. . . . The members of both Chambers are elected by ballot, both in town and country."—*Statesman's Year-book*, 1893, p. 965.—"The Diet, or Riksdag, assembles every year, in ordinary session, on the 15th of January, or the day following, if the 15th is a holiday. It may be convoked in extraordinary session by the king. In case of the decease, absence, or illness of the king, the Diet may be convoked extraordinarily by the Council of State, or even, if this latter neglects to do so, by the tribunals of second instance. The king may dissolve the two chambers simultaneously, or one of them alone, during the ordinary sessions, but the new Diet assembles after the three months of the dissolution, and can only be dissolved again four months after resuming its sitting. The king dissolves the extraordinary session when he deems proper. . . . The Diet divides the right of initiative with the king: the consent of the synod is necessary for ecclesiastical laws. . . . Every three

years the Diet names a commission of twenty-four members (twelve from each chamber), charged with the duty of electing six persons who are commissioned under the presidency of the Procureur general of the Diet to watch over the liberty of the press."—G. Demombynes, *Constitutions Européennes*, v. 1, pp. 84-90.—The following is the text of the Constitution as adopted in 1809, the subsequent modifications of which are indicated above:

Form of government adopted by the King and the Estates of the Swedish Realm, at Stockholm, on the 6th of June, 1809; together with the Alterations afterwards introduced.

We Charles, by the Grace of God, King of the Swedes, the Goths, and the Vandals, &c. &c. &c. Heir to Norway, Duke of Sleswick-Holstein, Stormarn, and Dittmarsen, Count of Oldenburg and Delmenhorst, &c. &c. make known, that having unlimited confidence in the estates of the realm, charged them with drawing up a new form of government, as the perpetual groundwork of the prosperity and independence of our common native land, We do hereby perform a dear and pleasing duty in promulgating the fundamental law (which has been) upon mature deliberation, framed and adopted by the estates of the realm, and presented unto Us this day, together with their free and unanimous offer of the Swedish crown. Having with deep emotion and an affectionate interest in the prosperity of a nation which has afforded Us so striking a proof of confidence and attachment, complied with their request, We trust to our endeavors to promote its happiness, as the reciprocal rights and duties of the monarch and the subjects have been marked so distinctly, that, without encroachment on the sacred nature and power of majesty, the constitutional liberty of the people is protected. We do therefore hereby adopt, sanction, and ratify this form of government, such as it follows here:—

We the underwritten representatives of the Swedish realm, counts, barons, bishops, knights, nobles, clergymen, burghers, and peasants, assembled at a general Diet, in behalf of ourselves and our brethren at home, Do hereby make known, that, having by the late change of government, to which we, the deputies of the Swedish people, gave our unanimous assent, exercised our rights of drawing up a new and improved constitution, we have, in repealing those fundamental laws, which down to this day have been in force more or less; viz.,—The Form of Government of the 21st of August 1772, the Act of Union and Security, of the 21st of February and the 3d of April 1789, the Ordinance of Diet, of the 24th of January 1617, as well as all those laws, acts, statutes, and resolutions comprehended under the denomination of fundamental laws;—We have Resolved to adopt for the kingdom of Sweden and its dependencies the following constitution, which from henceforth shall be the chief fundamental law of the realm, reserving to Ourselves, before the expiration of the present Diet, to consider the other fundamental laws, mentioned in the 85th article of this constitution.

**Article 1.** The kingdom of Sweden shall be governed by a king, who shall be hereditary in that order of succession which the estates will further hereafter determine.

**2.** The king shall profess the pure evangelical faith, such as is contained and declared in the

Augsburlgan Confession, and explained in the Decree of the Diet at Upsala in the year 1593.

**3.** The majesty of the king shall be held sacred and inviolable; and his actions shall not be subject to any censure.

**4.** The king shall govern the realm alone, in the manner determined by this constitution. In certain cases, however, (to be specified) he shall take the opinion of a council of state, which shall be constituted of well-informed, experienced, honest, and generally-esteemed native Swedes, noblemen and commoners, who profess the pure evangelical faith.

**5.** The council of state shall consist of nine members, viz., the minister of state and justice, who shall always be a member of the king's supreme court of judicature, the minister of state for foreign affairs, six counsellors of state, three of whom at least must have held civil offices, and the chancellor of the court, or aulic chancellor. The secretaries of state shall have a seat and vote in the council, when they have to report matters there, and in cases that belong to their respective departments. Father and son, or two brothers, shall not be permitted to be constant members of the council of state.

**6.** The secretaries of state shall be four, viz.—One for military affairs; a second for public economy, mining, and all other affairs connected with the civil and interior administration; a third for the finances of the realm, inland and foreign commerce, manufactures, &c.; and the fourth, for affairs relating to religion, public education, and charities.

**7.** All affairs of government shall be laid before the king, and decided in a council of state: those of a ministerial nature, however, excepted, concerning the relations of the realm with foreign powers, and matters of military command, which the king decides in his capacity of commander-in-chief of the land and naval forces.

**8.** The king can make no decision in matters in which the council of state are to be heard, unless at least three counsellors of state, and the secretary of state whom it concerns, or his deputy-secretary, are present.—All the members of the council shall, upon due notice, attend all deliberations deemed of importance, and which concern the general administration of the affairs of the kingdom; such as questions for adopting new statutes, repealing or altering those in existence, introducing new institutions in the different branches of the administration, &c.

**9.** Minutes shall be kept of all matters which shall come before the king in his council of state. The ministers of state, the counsellors of state, the aulic chancellor, and the secretaries of state or deputy-secretaries, shall be peremptorily bound to deliver their opinions; it is, however, the prerogative of the king to decide. Should it, however, unexpectedly occur, that the decisions of the king are evidently contrary to the constitution and the common law of the realm, it shall in that case be the duty of the members of the council of state to make spirited remonstrances against such decision or resolution. Unless a different opinion has been recorded in the minutes (for then the counsellors present shall be considered as having advised the king to the adopted measure), the members of the council shall be responsible for their advices, as enacted in the 106th article.

**10.** Necessary informations having been demanded and obtained from the proper boards, authorities, and functionaries, the affairs for deliberation shall be prepared by the secretary of state and eight skilful and impartial men, consisting of four nobles and four commoners, in order to their being laid before the king in the council of state.—The secretary, as well as all the other members of this committee (which are nominated by the king) for preparing the general affairs of the kingdom, shall upon all occasions, when so met, deliver their opinions to the minutes, which shall afterwards be reported to the king and the council of state.

**11.** As to the management of the ministerial affairs, they may be prepared and conducted in the manner which appears most suitable to the king. It appertains to the minister for foreign affairs to lay such matters before him in the presence of the aulic chancellor, or some other member of the council, if the chancellor cannot attend. In the absence of the minister of state this duty devolves upon the aulic chancellor, or any other member of the council of state, whom his majesty may appoint. After having ascertained the opinions of these official persons entered in the minutes, and for which they shall be responsible, the king shall pronounce his decision in their presence. It shall be the duty of the aulic chancellor to keep the minutes on these occasions. The king shall communicate to the council of state the information on these topics as may be necessary, in order that they may have a general knowledge even of this branch of the administration.

**12.** The king can enter into treaties and alliances with foreign powers, after having ascertained, as enacted in the preceding article, the opinion of the minister of state for foreign affairs, and of the aulic chancellor.

**13.** When the king is at liberty to commence war, or conclude peace, he shall convoke an extraordinary council of state: the ministers of state, the counsellors of state, the aulic chancellor, and the secretaries of state; and, after having explained to them the circumstances which require their consideration, he shall desire their opinions thereon, which each of them shall individually deliver, on the responsibility defined in the 107th article. The king shall thereafter have a right to adopt the resolutions, or make such decision as may appear to him most beneficial for the kingdom.

**14.** The king shall have the supreme command of the military forces by sea and land.

**15.** The king shall decide in all matters of military command, in the presence of that minister or officer to whom he has entrusted the general management thereof. It shall be the duty of this person to give his opinion, under responsibility, upon the resolutions taken by the king, and in case of these being contrary to his advice, he shall be bound to enter his objections and counsel in the minutes, which the king must confirm by his own signature. Should this minister or official person find the resolutions of the king to be of a dangerous tendency, or founded on mistaken or erroneous principles, he shall advise his majesty to convoke two or more military officers of a superior rank into a council of war. The king shall, however, be at liberty to comply with or to reject this proposition for a council of war; and if approved of, he may take what no-

tion he pleases of the opinions of such council, which shall, however, be entered in the minutes.

**16.** The king shall promote the exercise of justice and right, and prevent partiality and injustice. He shall not deprive any subject of life, honour, liberty, and property, without previous trial and sentence, and in that order which the laws of the country prescribe. He shall not disturb, or cause to be disturbed, the peace of any individual in his house. He shall not banish any from one place to another, nor constrain, or cause to be constrained, the conscience of any; but shall protect every one in the free exercise of his religion, provided he does not thereby disturb the tranquillity of society, or occasion public offence. The king shall cause every one to be tried in that court to which he properly belongs.

**17.** The king's prerogative of justice shall be invested in twelve men, learned in the law, six nobles, and six commoners, who have shown knowledge, experience, and integrity in judicial matters. They shall be styled counsellors of justice, and constitute the king's supreme court of justice.

**18.** The supreme court of justice shall take cognizance of petitions to the king for cancelling sentences which have obtained legal force, and granting extension of time in lawsuits, when it has been, through some circumstances, forfeited.

**19.** If information be sought by judges or courts of justice concerning the proper interpretation of the law, the explanation thus required shall be given by the said supreme court.

**20.** In time of peace, all cases referred from the courts martial shall be decided in the supreme court of justice. Two military officers of a superior degree, to be nominated by the king, shall, with the responsibility of judges, attend and have a vote in such cases in the supreme court. The number of judges may not, however, exceed eight. In time of war, all such cases shall be tried as enacted by the articles of war.

**21.** The king, should he think fit to attend, shall have right to two votes in causes decided by the supreme court. All questions concerning explanations of the law shall be reported to him, and his suffrages counted, even though he should not have attended the deliberations of the court.

**22.** Causes of minor importance may be decided in the supreme court by five members, or even four, if they are all of one opinion; but in causes of greater consequence seven counsellors, at least, must attend. More than eight members of the supreme court, or four noblemen and four commoners, may not be at one time in active service.

**23.** All the decrees of the supreme court of justice shall issue in the king's name, and under his hand and seal.

**24.** The cases shall be prepared in the "king's inferior court for revision of judiciary affairs," in order to be laid before, or produced in the supreme court.

**25.** In criminal cases the king has a right to grant pardon, to mitigate capital punishment, and to restore property forfeited to the crown. In applications, however, of this kind, the supreme court shall be heard, and the king give his decision in the council of state.

**26.** When matters of justice are laid before the council of state, the minister of state and justice, and, at least, two counsellors of state, two members of the supreme court, and the chan-

cellor of justice shall attend, who must all deliver their opinions to the minutes, according to the general instruction for the members of the council of state, quoted in the 91st article.

**27.** The king shall nominate, as chancellor of justice, a juris-consult, an able and impartial man, who has previously held the office of a judge. It shall be his chief duty, as the highest legal officer or attorney general of the king, to prosecute, either personally or through the officers or fiscals under him, in all such cases as concern the public safety and the rights of the crown, on the king's behalf, to superintend the administration of justice, and to take cognizance of, and correct, errors committed by judges or other legal officers in the discharge of their official duties.

**28.** The king, in his council of state, has a right to appoint native Swedes to all such offices and places within the kingdom for which the king's commissions are granted. The proper authorities shall, however, send in the names of the candidates to be put in nomination for such employments. The king may, likewise, appoint foreigners of eminent talents to military offices, without, however, entrusting to them the command of the fortresses of the realm. In preferences the king shall only consider the merits and the abilities of the candidates, without any regard to their birth. Ministers and counsellors of state and of justice, secretaries of state, judges, and all other civil officers, must always be of the pure evangelical faith.

**29.** The archbishop and bishops shall be elected as formerly, and the king nominates one of the three candidates proposed to him.

**30.** The king appoints, as formerly, the incumbents of rectories in the gift of the crown. As to the consistorial benefices, the parishioners shall be maintained in their usual right of election.

**31.** Citizens, who are freemen of towns, shall enjoy their privilege as heretofore, of proposing to the king three candidates for the office of burgomaster or mayor, one of whom the king selects. The aldermen and secretaries of the magistracy of Stockholm shall be elected in the same manner.

**32.** The king appoints envoys to foreign courts and the officers of the embassies, in the presence of the minister of state for foreign affairs and the aulic chancellor.

**33.** When offices, for which candidates are proposed, are to be filled up, the members of the council of state shall deliver their opinions on the qualifications and merits of the applicants. They shall also have right to make respectful remonstrances against the nomination of the king respecting other offices.

**34.** The new functionaries created by this constitution, viz.—the ministers and counsellors of state and counsellors of justice, shall be paid by the crown, and may not hold any other civil offices. The two ministers of state are the highest functionaries of the realm. The counsellors of state shall hold the rank of generals, and the counsellors of justice that of lieutenant-generals.

**35.** The minister of state for foreign affairs, the counsellors of state, the presidents of the public boards, the grand governor of Stockholm, the deputy governor, and the chief magistrate of police in the city, the aulic chancellor, the chancellor of justice, the secretaries of state, the governors or lord-lieutenants of provinces, field marshals, generals and admirals of all de-

grees, adjutant generals, adjutant in chief, adjutants of the staff, the governors of fortresses, captain lieutenants, and officers of the king's life guards, colonels of the regiments, and officers second in command in the foot and horse guards, lieutenant-colonels in the brigade of the life regiments, chiefs of the artillery of the royal engineers, ministers, envoys, and commercial agents with foreign powers, and official persons employed in the king's cabinet for the foreign correspondence, and at the embassies, as holding pieces of trust, can be removed by the king, when he considers it necessary for the benefit of the realm. The king shall, however, signify his determination in the council of state, the members whereof shall be bound to make respectful remonstrances, if they see it expedient.

**36.** Judges, and all other official persons, not included in the preceding article, cannot be suspended from their situations without legal trial, nor be translated or removed to other places, without having themselves applied for these.

**37.** The king has power to confer dignities on those who have served their country with fidelity, bravery, virtue, and zeal. He may also promote to the order of counts and barons, persons, who by eminent merits have deserved such an honour. Nobility and the dignity of a count and baron, granted from this time, shall no longer devolve to any other than the individual himself thus created a noble, and after him, to the oldest of his male issue in a direct descending line, and this branch of the family being extinct, to the nearest male descendant of the ancestor.

**38.** All despatches and orders emanating from the king, excepting such as concern military affairs, shall be countersigned by the secretary who has submitted them to the council, and is responsible for their being conformable to the minutes. Should the secretary find any of the decisions made by the king to be contrary to the spirit of the constitution, he shall make his remonstrances respecting the same, in the council of state. Should the king still persist in his determination, it shall then be the duty of the secretary to refuse his countersign, and resign his place, which he may not resume until the estates of the realm shall have examined and approved of his conduct. He shall, however, in the mean time, receive his salary, and all the fees of his office as formerly.

**39.** If the king wishes to go abroad, he shall communicate his resolution to the council of state, in a full assembly, and take the opinion of all its members, as enacted in the ninth article. During the absence of the king he may not interfere with the government, or exercise the regal power, which shall be carried on, in his name, by the council of state; the council of state cannot, however, confer dignities or create counts, barons, and knights; and all officers appointed by the council shall only hold their places ad interim.

**40.** Should the king be in such a state of health as to be incapable of attending to the affairs of the kingdom, the council of state shall conduct the administration, as enacted in the preceding article.

**41.** The king shall be of age after having completed eighteen years. Should the king die before the heir of the crown has attained this age, the government shall be conducted by the council of state, acting with regal power and authority, in the name of the king, until the estates



of the realm shall have appointed a provisional government or regency; and the council of state is enjoined strictly to conform to the enactments of this constitution.

42. Should the melancholy event take place, that the whole royal family became extinct on the male side, the council of state shall exercise the government with regal power and authority, until the estates have chosen another royal house, and the new king has taken upon himself the government. All occurrences or things having reference to the four last articles, shall be determined by the whole council of state and the secretaries of state.

43. When the king takes the field of battle, or repairs to distant parts of the kingdom, he shall constitute four of the members of the council of state to exercise the government in those affairs which he is pleased to prescribe.

44. No prince of the royal family shall be permitted to marry without having obtained the consent of the king, and in the contrary case shall forfeit his right of inheritance to the kingdom, both for himself and descendants.

45. Neither the crown prince, or any other prince of the royal family, shall have any appanage or civil place. The princes of the blood may, however, bear titles of dukedoms and principalities, as heretofore, but without any claims upon those provinces.

46. The kingdom shall remain divided, as heretofore, into governments, under the usual provincial administrations. No governor-general shall, from this time, be appointed within the kingdom.

47. The courts of justice, superior as well as inferior, shall administer justice according to the laws and statutes of the realm. The provincial governors, and all other public functionaries, shall exercise the offices entrusted to them according to existing regulations; they shall obey the orders of the king, and be responsible to him if any act is done contrary to law.

48. The court of the king is under his own management, and he may at his own pleasure appoint or discharge all his officers and attendants there.

49. The estates of the realm shall meet every fifth year. In the decree of every Diet the day shall be fixed for the next meeting of the estates. The king may, however, convoke the estates to an extraordinary Diet before that time.

50. The Diets shall be held in the capital, except when the invasion of an enemy, or some other important impediment, may render it dangerous for the safety of the representatives.

51. When the king or council convokes the estates, the period for the commencement of the Diet shall be subsequent to the thirtieth, and within the fiftieth day, to reckon from that day when the summons has been proclaimed in the churches of the capital.

52. The king names the speakers of the nobles, the burghers and the peasants: the archbishop is, at all times, the constant speaker of the clergy.

53. The estates of the realm shall, immediately after the opening of the Diet, elect the different committees, which are to prepare the affairs intended for their consideration. Such committees shall consist in,—a constitutional committee, which shall take cognizance of questions concerning proposed alterations in the fundamental laws, report thereupon to the representatives,

and examine the minutes held in the council of state;—a committee of finances, which shall examine and report upon the state and management of the revenues;—a committee of taxation, for regulating the taxes;—a committee of the bank for inquiring into the administration of the affairs of the national bank;—a law committee for digesting propositions concerning improvements in the civil, criminal, and ecclesiastical laws;—a committee of public grievances and matters of economy, to attend to the defects in public institutions, suggest alterations, &c.

54. Should the king desire a special committee for deliberating with him on such matters as do not come within the cognizance of any of the other committees, and are to be kept secret, the estates shall select it. This committee shall, however, have no right to adopt any resolutions, but only to give their opinion on matters referred to them by the king.

55. The representatives of the realm shall not discuss any subject in the presence of the king, nor can any other committee than the one mentioned in the above article hold their deliberations before him.

56. General questions started at the meetings or the orders of the estates, cannot be immediately discussed or decided, but shall be referred to the proper committees, which are to give their opinion thereupon. The propositions or report of the committees shall, in the first instance, without any alteration or amendment, be referred to the estates at the general meetings of all the orders. If at these meetings, observations should be made which may prevent the adoption of the proposed measure, these objections shall be communicated to the committee, in order to its being examined and revised. A proposition thus prepared having been again referred to the estates, it shall remain with them to adopt it, with or without alterations, or to reject it altogether. Questions concerning alterations in the fundamental laws, shall be thus treated:—If the constitutional committee approves of the suggestion of one of the representatives, or the committee reports in favour of or against a measure proposed by the king, the opinion of the committee shall be referred to the estates, who may discuss the topic, but not come to any resolution during that Diet.—If at the general meetings of the orders no observations are made against the opinion of the committee, the question shall be postponed till the Diet following, and then be decided solely by yes or no, as enacted in the 75th article of the ordinance of Diet.—If, on the contrary, objections are urged at the general meetings of the orders against the opinion of the committee, these shall be referred back for its reconsideration. If all the orders be of one opinion, the question shall be postponed for final decision, as enacted above. Should again a particular order differ from the other orders, twenty members shall be elected from among every order, and added to the committee, for adjusting the differences. The question being thus prepared, shall be decided at the following Diet.

57. The ancient right of the Swedish people, of imposing taxes on themselves, shall be exercised by the estates only at a general Diet.

58. The king shall at every Diet lay before the committee of finances the state of the revenues in all their branches. Should the crown have obtained subsidies through treaties with for-



elign powers, these shall be explained in the usual way.

59. The king shall refer to the decision of this committee to determine what the government may require beyond the ordinary taxation, to be raised by an extraordinary grant.

60. No taxes of any description whatever can be increased without the express consent of the estates. The king may not farm or let on lease the revenues of state, for the sake of profit to himself and the crown; nor grant monopolies to private individuals, or corporations.

61. All taxes shall be paid to the end of that term for which they have been imposed. Should, however, the estates meet before the expiration of that term, new regulations shall take place.

62. The funds required by government having been ascertained by the committee of finances, it shall rest with the estates whether to assign proportionate means, and also to determine how the various sums granted shall be appropriated.

63. Besides these means, two adequate sums shall be voted and set apart for the disposal of the king, after he has consulted the council of state,—for the defence of the kingdom, or some other important object;—the other sum to be deposited in the national bank, in case of war, after the king has ascertained the opinion of the council and convened the estates. The seal of the order for this latter sum may not be broken, nor the money be paid by the commissioners of the bank, till the summons to Diet shall have been duly proclaimed in the churches of the capital.

64. The ordinary revenues of the land, as well as the extraordinary grants which may be voted by the estates, shall be at the disposal of the king for the civil list and other specified purposes.

65. The above means may not be applied but for the assigned purposes, and the council of state shall be responsible if they permit any deviation in this respect, without entering their remonstrances in the minutes, and pointing out what the constitution in this case ordains.

66. The funds of amortissement or national debt, shall remain, as heretofore, under the superintendence and direction of the estates, who have guaranteed or come under a responsibility for the national debt; and after having received the report of the committee of finances on the affairs of that establishment, the estates will provide, through a special grant, the requisite means for paying the capital as well as the interest of this debt, in order that the credit of the kingdom may be maintained.

67. The deputy of the king shall not attend the meetings of the directors or commissioners of the funds of amortissement, on any other occasion than when the directors are disposed to take his opinion.

68. The means assigned for paying off the national debt shall not, under any pretence or condition, be appropriated to other purposes.

69. Should the estates, or any particular order, entertain doubts either in allowing the grant proposed by the committee of finances, or as to the participation in the taxes, or the principles of the management of the funds of amortissement, these doubts shall be communicated to the committee for their further consideration.—If the committee cannot coincide in the opinions of the estates, or a single order, it shall depute some members to explain circumstances. Should this order still persist in its opinion, the question

shall be decided by the resolution of three orders. If two orders be of one, and the other two of a different opinion, thirty new members of every order shall be added to the committee—the committee shall then vote conjointly, and not by orders, with folded billets, for adopting, or rejecting, unconditionally the proposition of the committee.

70. The committee of taxation shall at every Diet suggest general principles for dividing the future taxes, and the amount having been fixed, the committee shall also propose how these are to be paid, referring their proposition to the consideration and decision of the states.

71. Should a difference of opinion arise between the orders, as to these principles and the mode of applying them, and dividing the taxes; or, what hardly can be presumed, any order decline participating in the proposed taxation, the order, which may thus desire some alteration, shall communicate their views to the other representatives, and suggest in what mode this alteration may be effected without frustrating the general object. The committee of taxation having again reported thereon to the estates, they, the estates, shall decide the question at issue. If three orders object to the proposition of the committee, it shall be rejected. If, again, three orders oppose the demands of a single order, or if two be of an opinion contrary to that of the other two, the question shall be referred to the committee of finances, with an additional number of members, as enacted in the above article. If the majority of this committee assent to the proposition of the committee of taxation, in those points concerning which the representatives have disagreed, the proposition shall be considered as the general resolution of the estates. Should it, on the contrary, be negated by a majority of votes, or be rejected by three orders, the committee of taxation shall propose other principles for levying and dividing the taxes.

72. The national bank shall remain, as formerly, under the superintendence and guarantee of the estates, and the management of directors selected from among all the orders, according to existing regulations. The states alone can issue bank-notes, which are to be recognized as the circulating medium of the realm.

73. No troops, new taxes or imposts, either in money or kind, can be levied without the voluntary consent of the estates, in the usual order, as aforesaid.

74. The king shall have no right to demand or levy any other aid for carrying on war, than that contribution of provisions which may be necessary for the maintenance of the troops during their march through a province. These contributions shall, however, be immediately paid out of the treasury, according to the fixed price-current of provisions, with an augmentation of a moiety, according to this valuation. Such contributions may not be demanded for troops which have been quartered in a place, or are employed in military operations, in which case they shall be supplied with provisions from the magazines.

75. The annual estimation of such rentes as are paid in kind shall be fixed by deputies elected from among all the orders of the estates.

76. The king cannot, without the consent of the estates, contract loans within or without the kingdom, nor burthen the land with any new debts.

**77.** He cannot also, without the consent of the estates, vend, pledge, mortgage, or in any other way alienate domains, farms, forests, parks, preserve of game, meadows, pasture-land, fisheries, and other appurtenances of the crown. These shall be managed according to the instructions of the estates.

**78.** No part of the kingdom can be alienated through sale, mortgage, donation, or in any other way whatever.

**79.** No alteration can be effected in the standard value of the coin, either for enhancing or deteriorating it, without the consent of the estates.

**80.** The land and naval forces of the realm shall remain on the same footing, till the king and the estates may think proper to introduce some other principles. No regular troops can be raised, without the mutual consent of the king and the estates.

**81.** This form of government and the other fundamental laws cannot be altered or repealed, without the unanimous consent of the king and the estates. Questions to this effect cannot be brought forward at the meetings of the orders, but must be referred to the constitutional committee, whose province it is to suggest such alterations in the fundamental laws, as may be deemed necessary, useful, and practicable. The estates may not decide on such proposed alterations at the same Diet. If all the orders agree about the alteration, it shall be submitted to the king, through the speakers, for obtaining his royal sanction. After having ascertained the opinion of the council, the king shall take his resolution, and communicate to the estates either his approbation or reasons for refusing it. In the event of the king proposing any alteration in the fundamental laws, he shall, after having taken the opinion of the council, deliver his proposition to the estates, who shall, without discussing it, again refer it to the constitutional committee. If the committee coincide in the proposition of the king, the question shall remain till next Diet. If again the committee is averse to the proposition of the king, the estates may either reject it immediately or adjourn it to the following Diet. In the case of all the orders approving of the proposition, they shall request that a day be appointed to declare their consent in the presence of his majesty, or signify their disapprobation through their speakers.

**82.** What the estates have thus unanimously resolved and the king sanctioned, concerning alterations in the fundamental laws, or the king has proposed and the estates approved of, shall for the future have the force and effect of a fundamental law.

**83.** No explanation of the fundamental laws may be established by any other mode or order, than that prescribed by the two preceding articles. Laws shall be applied according to their literal sense.

**84.** When the constitutional committee find no reason for approving of the proposition, made by a representative concerning alterations or explanations of the fundamental laws, it shall be the duty of the committee to communicate to him, at his request, their opinion, which the proposer of the resolution may publish, with his own motion, and under the usual responsibility of authors.

**85.** As fundamental laws of the present form of government, there shall be considered the ordi-

nance of Diet, the order of succession, and the act concerning universal liberty of the press.

**86.** By the liberty of the press is understood the right of every Swedish subject to publish his writings, without any impediment from the government, and without being responsible for them, except before a court of justice, or liable to punishment, unless their contents be contrary to a clear law, made for the preservation of public peace. The minutes, or protocols, or the proceedings, may be published in any case, excepting the minutes kept in the council of state and before the king in ministerial affairs, and those matters of military command; nor may the records of the bank, and the office of the funds of amortissement, or national debt, be printed.

**87.** The estates, together with the king, have the right to make new and repeal old laws. In this view such questions must be proposed at the general meetings of the orders of the estates, and shall be decided by them, after having taken the opinion of the law committee, as laid down in the 56th article. The proposition shall be submitted, through the speakers, to the king, who, after having ascertained the opinion of the council of state and supreme court, shall declare either his royal approbation, or motives for withholding it. Should the king desire to propose any alteration in the laws, he shall, after having consulted the council of state and supreme court, refer his proposition, together with their opinion, to the deliberation of the states, who, after having received the report of the law committee, shall decide on the point. In all such questions the resolution of three orders shall be considered as the resolution of the estates of the realm. If two orders are opposed to the other two, the proposition is negatived, and the law is to remain as formerly.

**88.** The same course, or mode of proceeding, shall be observed in explaining the civil, criminal, and ecclesiastical laws, as in making these. Explanations concerning the proper sense of the law given by the supreme court in the name of the king, in the interval between the Diets, may be rejected by the states, and shall not afterwards be valid, or cited by the courts of judicature.

**89.** At the general meetings of the orders of the estates, questions may be proposed for altering, explaining, repealing, and issuing acts concerning public economy; and the principles of public institutions of any kind may be discussed. These questions shall afterwards be referred to the committee of public grievances and economical affairs, and then be submitted to the decision of the king, in a council of state. When the king is pleased to invite the estates to deliberate with him on questions concerning the general administration, the same course shall be adopted as is prescribed for questions concerning the laws.

**90.** During the deliberations of the orders, or their committees, no questions shall be proposed but in the way expressly prescribed by this fundamental law, concerning either appointing or removing of officers, decisions and resolutions of the government and courts of law, and the conduct of private individuals and corporations.

**91.** When the king, in such cases as those mentioned in the 39th article, is absent from the kingdom longer than twelve months, the council shall convoke the estates to a general Diet, and

cause the summons to be proclaimed within fifteen days from the above time, in the churches of the capital, and speedily afterwards in the other parts of the kingdom. If the king, after being informed thereof, does not return to the kingdom, the estates shall adopt such measures as they deem most beneficial for the country.

**92.** The same shall be enacted in case of any disease or ill health of the king, which might prevent him from attending to the affairs of the kingdom for more than twelve months.

**93.** When the heir of the crown, at the decease of the king, is under age, the council of state shall issue summons to the representatives to meet. The estates of the realm shall have the right, without regard to the will of a deceased king concerning the administration, to appoint one or several guardians, to rule in the king's name, according to this fundamental law, till the king becomes of age.

**94.** Should it ever happen that the royal family become extinct in the male line, the council of state shall convene the estates, to elect another royal family to rule conformably to this fundamental law.

**95.** Should, contrary to expectation, the council of state fail to convoke the estates, in the cases prescribed by the 91st, 93d, and 94th articles, it shall be the positive duty of the directors of the house of nobles, the chapters throughout the kingdom, the magistrates in the capital, and the governors in the provinces, to give public notice thereof, in order that elections of deputies to the Diet may forthwith take place, and the estates assemble to protect their privileges and rights of the kingdom. Such a Diet shall be opened on the fiftieth day from that period when the council of state had proclaimed the summons in the churches of the capital.

**96.** The estates shall at every Diet appoint an officer, distinguished for integrity and learning in the law, to watch over, as their deputy, the conduct of the judges and other official men, and who shall, in legal order and at the proper court, arraign those who in the performance of their offices have betrayed negligence and partiality, or else have committed any illegal act. He shall, however, be liable to the same responsibility as the law prescribes for public prosecutors in general.

**97.** This deputy or attorney-general of the estates shall be chosen by twelve electors out of every order.

**98.** The electors shall at the same time they choose the said attorney-general, elect a person possessing equal or similar qualities to succeed him, in case of his death before the next Diet.

**99.** The attorney-general may, whenever he pleases, attend the sessions of all the superior and inferior courts, and the public offices, and shall have free access to their records and minutes; and the king's officers shall be bound to give him every assistance.

**100.** The attorney-general shall at every Diet present a report of the performance of his office, explaining the state of the administration of justice in the land, noticing the defects in the existing laws, and suggesting new improvements. He shall also, at the end of each year, publish a general statement concerning these.

**101.** Should the supreme court, or any of its members, from interest, partiality, or negligence, judge so wrong that an individual, contrary to law and evidence, did lose or might have lost life,

liberty, honour, or property, the attorney-general shall be bound, and the chancellor of justice authorised, to arraign the guilty, according to the laws of the realm, in the court after mentioned.

**102.** This court is to be denominated the court of justice for the realm, and shall be formed by the president in the superior court of Swea, the presidents of all the public boards, four senior members of the council of state, the highest commander of the troops within the capital, and the commander of the squadron of the fleet stationed at the capital, two of the senior members of the superior court of Swea, and the senior member of all the public boards. Should any of the officers mentioned above decline attending this court, he shall be legally responsible for such a neglect of duty. After trial, the judgment shall be publicly announced: no one can alter such a sentence. The king may, however, extend pardon to the guilty, but not admitting him any more into the service of the kingdom.

**103.** The estates shall at every Diet nominate a jury of twelve members from out of each order, for deciding if the members of the supreme court of justice have deserved to fill their important places, or if any member, without having been legally convicted for the faults mentioned in the above articles, yet ought to be removed from office.

**104.** The estates shall not resolve themselves into a court of justice, nor enter into any special examination of the decrees, verdicts, resolutions of the supreme court.

**105.** The constitutional committee shall have right to demand the minutes of the council of state, except those which concern ministerial or foreign affairs, and matters of military command, which may only be communicated as far as these have a reference to generally known events, specified by the committee.

**106.** Should the committee find from these minutes that any member of the council of state has openly acted against the clear dictates of the constitution, or advised any infringement either of the same or of the other laws of the realm, or that he had omitted to remonstrate against such a violation, or caused and promoted it by wilfully concealing any information, the committee shall order the attorney-general to institute the proper proceedings against the guilty.

**107.** If the constitutional committee should find that any or all the members of the council of state have not consulted the real interest of the kingdom, or that any of the secretaries of state have not performed his or their official duties with impartiality, activity, and skill, the committee shall report it to the estates, who, if they deem it necessary, may signify to the king their wish of having those removed, who may thus have given dissatisfaction. Questions to this effect may be brought forward at the general meetings of the orders, and even be proposed by any of the committees. These cannot, however, be decided until the constitutional committee have delivered their opinion.

**108.** The estates shall at every Diet appoint six individuals, two of whom must be learned in the law, besides the attorney-general, to watch over the liberty of the press. These deputies shall be bound to give their opinion as to the legality of publications, if such be requested by the authors. These deputies shall be chosen by six electors out of every order.

**109.** Diets may not last longer than three months from the time that the king has informed the representatives of the state of the revenues. Should, however, the estates at the expiration of that time not have concluded their deliberations, they may demand the Diet to be prolonged for another month, which the king shall not refuse. If again, contrary to expectation, the estates at the expiration of this term have not regulated the civil list, the king shall dissolve the Diet, and taxation continue in its former state till the next meeting of representatives.

**110.** No representative shall be responsible for any opinion uttered at meetings of the orders, or of the committees, unless by the express permission of at least five-sixths of his own order: nor can a representative be banished from the Diet. Should any individual or body, either civil or military, endeavour to offer violence to the estates, or to any individual representative, or presume to interrupt and disturb their deliberations, it shall be considered as an act of treason, and it rests with the estates to take legal cognizance of such an offence.

**111.** Should any representative, after having announced himself as such, be insulted, either at the Diet or on his way to or from the same, it shall be punished as a violation of the peace of the king.

**112.** No official person may exercise his official authority (his authority in that capacity) to

influence the elections of deputies to the Diet, under pain of losing his place.

**113.** Individuals elected for regulating the taxation shall not be responsible for their lawful deeds in this their capacity.

**114.** The king shall leave the estates in undisturbed possession of their liberties, privileges, and immunities. Modifications which the prosperity of the realm may demand can only be done with the general concurrence and consent of the estates and the sanction of the king. Nor can any new privileges be granted to one order, without the consent of the other, and the sanction of the sovereign.

This we have confirmed by our names and seals, on the sixth day of the month of June, in the year after the birth of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and nine.

On behalf of the Nobles, M. Ankersvard. On behalf of the Clergy, Jac. Ax. Lindblom. On behalf of the Burgliers, H. N. Schwan. On behalf of the Peasantry, Lars Olsson, Speakers.

The above form of government we have not only acknowledged Ourselves, but do also command all our faithful subjects to obey it; in confirmation of which, we have thereto affixed our manual signature and the seal of the realm. In the city of our royal residence, Stockholm, on the sixth day of the month of June, in the year after the birth of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and nine.

CHARLES.

## CONSTITUTION OF THE SWISS CONFEDERATION.

After the Sonderbund secession and war of 1847 (see SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1803-1848), the task of drawing up a Constitution for the Confederacy was confided to a committee of fourteen members, and the work was finished on the 14th of April, 1848. "The project was submitted to the Cantons, and accepted at once by thirteen and a half; others joined during the summer, and the new Constitution was finally promulgated with the assent of all on the 12th September. Hence arose the seventh and last phase of the Confederation, by the adoption of a Federal Constitution for the whole of Switzerland, being the first which was entirely the work of Swiss, without any foreign influence, although its authors had studied that of the United States. . . . It was natural that, as in process of time commerce and industry were developed, and as the differences between the legislation of the various Cantons became more apparent, a revision of the first really Swiss Confederation should be necessary. This was proposed both in 1871 and 1872, but the partisans of a further centralization, though successful in the Chambers, were defeated upon an appeal to the popular vote on the 12th of May 1872, by a majority of between five and six thousand, and by thirteen Cantons to nine. The question was, however, by no means settled, and in 1874 a new project of revision more acceptable to the partisans of cantonal independence, was adopted by the people, the numbers being 340,199, to 198,013. The Cantons were about two to one in favour of the revision, 14½ declaring for and 7½ against it. This Constitution bears date the 29th May, 1874, and has since been added to and altered in certain particulars." — Sir F. O. Adams and C. D. Cunningham, *The*

*Swiss Confederation*, ch. 1.—"Since 1848, . . . Switzerland has been a federal state, consisting of a central authority, the Bund, and 19 entire and six half states, the Cantons; to foreign powers she presents an united front, while her internal policy allows to each Canton a large amount of independence. . . . The basis of all legislative division is the Commune or Gemeinde, corresponding in some slight degree to the English Parish. The commune in its legislative and administrative aspect or 'Einwohnergemeinde' is composed of all the inhabitants of a Commune. It is self-governing and has the control of the local police; it also administers all matters connected with pauperism, education, sanitary and funeral regulations, the fire brigade, the maintenance of public peace and trusteeships. . . . At the head of the Commune is the Gemeinderath, or Communal Council, whose members are elected from the inhabitants for a fixed period. It is presided over by an Ammann, or Mayor, or President. . . . Above the Commune on the ascending scale comes the Canton. . . . Each of the 19 Cantons and 6 half Cantons is a sovereign state, whose privileges are nevertheless limited by the Federal Constitution, particularly as regards legal and military matters: the Constitution also defines the extent of each Canton, and no portion of a Canton is allowed to secede and join itself to another Canton. . . . Legislative power is in the hands of the 'Volk'; in the political sense of the word the 'Volk' consists of all the Swiss living in the Canton, who have passed their 20th year and are not under disability from crime or bankruptcy. The voting on the part of the people deals mostly with alterations in the cantonal constitution, treaties, laws, decisions of the

First Council involving expenditures of Frs. 100,000 and upward, and other decisions which the Council considers advisable to subject to the public vote, which also determines the adoption of propositions for the creation of new laws, or the alteration or abolition of old ones, when such a plebiscite is demanded by a petition signed by 5,000 voters. . . . The First Council (Grosse Rath) is the highest political and administrative power of the Canton. It corresponds to the 'Chamber' of other countries. Every 1,300 inhabitants of an electoral circuit send one member. . . . The Kleine Rath or special council (corresponding to the 'Ministerium' of other continental countries) is composed of three members and has three proxies. It is chosen by the First Council for a period of two years. It superintends all cantonal institutions and controls the various public boards. . . . The populations of the 23 sovereign Cantons constitute together the Swiss Confederation."—P. Hauri, *Sketch of the Constitution of Switzerland (in Strickland's The Engadine)*.

The following text of the Federal Constitution of the Swiss Confederation is a translation from parallel French and German texts, by Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, of Harvard College. It appeared originally in "Old South Leaflets," No. 18, and is now reprinted under permission from Professor Hart, who has most kindly revised his translation throughout and introduced the later amendments, to July, 1893.

**In the Name of Almighty God.—The Swiss Confederation**, desiring to confirm the alliance of the Confederates, to maintain and to promote the unity, strength, and honor of the Swiss nation, has adopted the Federal Constitution following:

**Chapter 1. General Provisions.—ARTICLE 1.** The peoples of the twenty-two sovereign Cantons of Switzerland, united by this present alliance, viz.: Zurich, Bern, Luzern, Uri, Schwyz, Unterwalden (Upper and Lower), Glarus, Zug, Freiburg, Solothurn, Basel (urban and rural), Schaffhausen, Appenzell (the two Rhodes), St. Gallen, Grisons, Aargau, Thurgau, Ticino, Vaud, Valais, Neuchâtel, and Geneva, form in their entirety the Swiss Confederation.

**ART. 2.** The purpose of the Confederation is, to secure the independence of the country against foreign nations, to maintain peace and order within, to protect the liberty and the rights of the Confederates, and to foster their common welfare.

**ART. 3.** The Cantons are sovereign, so far as their sovereignty is not limited by the Federal Constitution; and, as such, they exercise all the rights which are not delegated to the federal government.

**ART. 4.** All Swiss are equal before the law. In Switzerland there are neither political dependents, nor privileges of place, birth, persons, or families.

**ART. 5.** The Confederation guarantees to the Cantons their territory, their sovereignty, within the limits fixed by Article 3, their Constitutions, the liberty and rights of the people, the constitutional rights of citizens, and the rights and powers which the people have conferred on those in authority.

**ART. 6.** The Cantons are bound to ask of the Confederation the guaranty of their Constitutions. This guaranty is accorded, provided: (a) that the

Constitutions contain nothing contrary to the provisions of the Federal Constitution. (b) That they assure the exercise of political rights, according to republican forms, representative or democratic. (c) That they have been ratified by the people, and may be amended whenever the majority of all the citizens demand it.

**ART. 7.** All separate alliances and all treaties of a political character between the Cantons are forbidden. On the other hand the Cantons have the right to make conventions among themselves upon legislative, administrative or judicial subjects; in all cases they shall bring such conventions to the attention of the federal officials, who are authorized to prevent their execution, if they contain anything contrary to the Confederation, or to the rights of other Cantons. Should such not be the case, the covenanting Cantons are authorized to require the coöperation of the federal officials in carrying out the convention.

**ART. 8.** The Confederation has the sole right of declaring war, of making peace, and of concluding alliances and treaties with foreign powers, particularly treaties relating to tariffs and commerce.

**ART. 9.** By exception the Cantons preserve the right of concluding treaties with foreign powers, respecting the administration of public property, and border and police intercourse; but such treaties shall contain nothing contrary to the Confederation or to the rights of other Cantons.

**ART. 10.** Official intercourse between Cantons and foreign governments, or their representatives, shall take place through the Federal Council. Nevertheless, the Cantons may correspond directly with the inferior officials and officers of a foreign State, in regard to the subjects enumerated in the preceding article.

**ART. 11.** No military capitulations shall be made.

**ART. 12.** No members of the departments of the federal government, civil and military officials of the Confederation, or federal representatives or commissioners, shall receive from any foreign government any pension, salary, title, gift, or decoration. Such persons, already in possession of pensions, titles, or decorations, must renounce the enjoyment of pensions and the bearing of titles and decorations during their term of office. Nevertheless, inferior officials may be authorized by the Federal Council to continue in the receipt of pensions. No decoration or title conferred by a foreign government shall be borne in the federal army. No officer, non-commissioned officer, or soldier shall accept such distinction.

**ART. 13.** The Confederation has no right to keep up a standing army. No Canton or Half-Canton shall, without the permission of the federal government keep up a standing force of more than three hundred men; the mounted police [gendarmerte] is not included in this number.

**ART. 14.** In case of differences arising between Cantons, the States shall abstain from violence and from arming themselves; they shall submit to the decision to be taken upon such differences by the Confederation.

**ART. 15.** In case of sudden danger of foreign attack, the authorities of the Cantons threatened shall request the aid of other members of the Confederation and shall immediately notify the federal government; the subsequent action of

the latter shall not thereby be precluded. The Cantons summoned are bound to give aid. The expenses shall be borne by the Confederation.

ART. 16. In case of internal disturbance, or if the danger is threatened by another Canton, the authorities of the Canton threatened shall give immediate notice to the Federal Council, in order that that body may take the measures necessary, within the limits of its power (Art. 102, §§ 3, 10, 11), or may summon the Federal Assembly. In extreme cases the authorities of the Canton are authorized, while giving immediate notice to the Federal Council, to ask the aid of other Cantons, which are bound to afford such aid. If the executive of the Canton is unable to call for aid, the federal authority having the power may, and if the safety of Switzerland is endangered shall, intervene without requisition. In case of federal intervention, the federal authorities shall take care that the provisions of Article 5 be observed. The expenses shall be borne by the Canton asking aid or occasioning federal intervention, except when the Federal Assembly otherwise decides on account of special circumstances.

ART. 17. In the cases mentioned in Articles 15 and 16, every Canton is bound to afford undisturbed passage for the troops. The troops shall immediately be placed under federal command.

ART. 18. Every Swiss is bound to perform military service. Soldiers who lose their lives or suffer permanent injury to their health, in consequence of federal service, are entitled to aid from the Confederation for themselves or their families, in case of need. Each soldier shall receive without expense his first equipment, clothing, and arms. The weapon remains in the hands of the soldier, under conditions which shall be prescribed by federal legislation. The Confederation shall enact uniform provisions as to an exemption tax.

ART. 19. The federal army is composed: (a) Of the cantonal military corps. (b) Of all Swiss who do not belong to such military corps, but are nevertheless liable to military service. The Confederation exercises control over the army and the material of war provided by law. In cases of danger, the Confederation has also the exclusive and direct control of men not included in the federal army, and of all other military resources of the Cantons. The Cantons have authority over the military forces of their territory, so far as this right is not limited by the Federal Constitution or laws.

ART. 20. The laws on the organization of the army are passed by the Confederation. The enforcement of military laws in the Cantons is intrusted to the cantonal officials, within limits which shall be fixed by federal legislation, and under the supervision of the Confederation. Military instruction of every kind pertains to the Confederation. The same applies to the arming of troops. The furnishing and maintenance of clothing and equipment is within the power of the Cantons; but the Cantons shall be credited with the expenses therefor, according to a regulation to be established by federal legislation.

ART. 21. So far as military reasons do not prevent, bodies of troops shall be formed out of the soldiers of the same Cantons. The composition of these bodies of troops, the maintenance of their effective strength, the appointment and promotion of officers of these bodies of troops,

belong to the Cantons, subject to general provisions which shall be established by the Confederation.

ART. 22. On payment of a reasonable indemnity, the Confederation has the right to use or acquire drill-grounds and buildings intended for military purposes, within the Cantons, together with the appurtenances thereof. The terms of the indemnity shall be settled by federal legislation.

ART. 23. The Confederation may construct at its own expense, or may aid by subsidies, public works which concern Switzerland or a considerable part of the country. For this purpose it may expropriate property, on payment of a reasonable indemnity. Further enactments upon this matter shall be made by federal legislation. The Federal Assembly may forbid public works which endanger the military interests of the Confederation.

ART. 24. The Confederation has the right of superintendence over dike and forest police in the upper mountain regions. It may cooperate in the straightening and embankment of torrents as well as in the afforesting of the districts in which they rise. It may prescribe the regulations necessary to assure the maintenance of these works, and the preservation of existing forests.

ART. 25. The Confederation has power to make legislative enactments for the regulation of the right of fishing and hunting, particularly with a view to the preservation of the large game in the mountains, as well as for the protection of birds useful to agriculture and forestry.

ART. 26. Legislation upon the construction and operation of railroads is in the province of the Confederation.

ART. 27. The Confederation has the right to establish, besides the existing Polytechnic School, a Federal University and other institutions of higher instruction, or to subsidize institutions of such nature. The Cantons provide for primary instruction, which shall be sufficient, and shall be placed exclusively under the direction of the secular authority. It is compulsory and, in the public schools, free. The public schools shall be such that they may be frequented by the adherents of all religious sects, without any offense to their freedom of conscience or of belief. The Confederation shall take the necessary measures against such Cantons as shall not fulfill these duties.

ART. 28. The customs are in the province of the Confederation. It may levy export and import duties.

ART. 29. The collection of the federal customs shall be regulated according to the following principles: 1. Duties on imports: (a) Materials necessary for the manufactures and agriculture of the country shall be taxed as low as possible. (b) It shall be the same with the necessities of life. (c) Luxuries shall be subjected to the highest duties. Unless there are imperative reasons to the contrary, these principles shall be observed also in the conclusion of treaties of commerce with foreign powers. 2. The duties on exports shall also be as low as possible. 3. The customs legislation shall include suitable provisions for the continuance of commercial and market intercourse across the frontier. The above provisions do not prevent the Confederation from making temporary exceptional provisions, under extraordinary circumstances.

ART. 30. The proceeds of the customs belong to the Confederation. The indemnity ceases which hitherto has been paid to the Cantons for the redemption of customs, for road and bridge tolls, customs duties and other like dues. By exception, and on account of their international alpine roads, the Cantons of Uri, Grisons, Ticino, and Valais receive an annual indemnity, which, considering all the circumstances, is fixed as follows: Uri, 80,000 francs. Grisons, 200,000 francs. Ticino, 200,000 francs. Valais, 50,000 francs. The Cantons of Uri and Ticino shall receive in addition, for clearing the snow from the Saint Gotthard road, an annual indemnity of 40,000 francs, so long as that road shall not be replaced by a railroad.

ART. 31. The freedom of trade and of industry is guaranteed throughout the whole extent of the Confederation. The following subjects are excepted: (a) The salt and gunpowder monopoly, the federal customs, import duties on wines and other spirituous liquors, and other taxes on consumption expressly permitted by the Confederation, according to article 32. (b) [Added by Amendment of Dec. 22, 1885.] The manufacture and sale of alcohol, under Article 32 (l). (c) [Added by Amendment of Dec. 22, 1885.] Drinking places, and the retail trade in spirituous liquors; but nevertheless the Cantons may by legislation subject the business of keeping drinking places, and the retail trade in spirituous liquors, to such restrictions as are required for the public welfare. (d) [Originally (b)] Measures of sanitary police against epidemics and cattle diseases. (e) [Originally (c)] Provisions in regard to the exercise of trades and manufactures, in regard to taxes imposed thereon, and in regard to the police of the roads. These provisions shall not contain anything contrary to the principle of freedom of trade and manufacture.

ART. 32. The Cantons are authorized to collect the import duties on wines and other spirituous liquors, provided in Article 31 (a), always under the following restrictions: (a) The collection of these import duties shall in no wise impede transportation: commerce shall be obstructed as little as possible and shall not be burdened with any other dues. (b) If the articles imported for consumption are reexported from the Canton, the duties paid on importation shall be refunded, without further charges. (c) Products of Swiss origin shall be less burdened than those of foreign countries. (d) The existing import duties on wines and other spirituous liquors of Swiss origin shall not be increased by the Cantons which already levy them. Such duties shall not be established upon such articles by Cantons which do not at present collect them. (e) The laws and ordinances of the Cantons on the collection of import duties shall, before their going into effect, be submitted to the federal government for approval, in order that it may, if necessary, cause the enforcement of the preceding provisions. All the import duties now levied by the Cantons, as well as the similar duties levied by the Communes, shall cease, without indemnity, at the end of the year 1890.

ART. 32 (i). [Amendment of Dec. 22, 1885.] The Confederation is authorized by legislation to make regulations for the manufacture and sale of alcohol. In this legislation those products which are intended for exportation, or which have been subjected to a process excluding them

from use as a beverage, shall be subjected to no tax. Distillation of wine, fruit, and their by-products, of gentian root, juniper berries, and similar products, is not subject to federal legislation as to manufacture or tax. After the cessation of the import duties on spirituous liquors, provided for in Article 32 of the Constitution, the trade in liquors not distilled shall not be subjected by the Cantons to any special taxes or to other limitations than those necessary for protection against adulterated or noxious beverages. Nevertheless, the powers of the Cantons, defined in Article 31, are retained over the keeping of drinking places, and the sale at retail of quantities less than two liters. The net proceeds resulting from taxation on the sale of alcohol belong to the Cantons in which the tax is levied. The net proceeds to the Confederation from the internal manufacture of alcohol, and the corresponding addition to the duty on imported alcohol, are divided among all the Cantons, in proportion to the actual population as ascertained from time to time by the next preceding federal census. Out of the receipts therefrom the Cantons must expend not less than one tenth in combating drunkenness in its causes and effects. [For additional articles of this Amendment see Temporary Provisions, Article 6, at the end of this Constitution.]

ART. 33. The Cantons may require proofs of competency from those who desire to practice a liberal profession. Provision shall be made by federal legislation by which such persons may obtain certificates of competency which shall be valid throughout the Confederation.

ART. 34. The Confederation has power to enact uniform provisions as to the labor of children in factories, and as to the duration of labor fixed for adults therein, and as to the protection of workmen against the operation of unhealthy and dangerous manufactures. The transactions of emigration agents and of organizations for insurance, not instituted by the State, are subject to federal supervision and legislation.

ART. 34 (l). [Amendment of Dec. 17, 1890.] The Confederation shall by law provide for insurance against sickness and accident, with due regard for existing sick-benefit funds. The Confederation may require participation therein, either by all persons or by particular classes of the population.

ART. 35. The opening of gaming houses is forbidden. Those which now exist shall be closed Dec. 31, 1877. The concessions which may have been granted or renewed since the beginning of the year 1871 are declared invalid. The Confederation may also take necessary measures concerning lotteries.

ART. 36. The posts and telegraphs in all Switzerland are controlled by the Confederation. The proceeds of the posts and telegraphs belong to the federal treasury. The rates shall, for all parts of Switzerland, be fixed according to the same principle and as fairly as possible. Inviolable secrecy of letters and telegrams is guaranteed.

ART. 37. The Confederation exercises general oversight over those roads and bridges in the maintenance of which it is interested. The sums due to the Cantons mentioned in Article 30, on account of their international alpine roads, shall be retained by the federal government if such roads are not kept by them in suitable condition.



ART. 38. The Confederation exercises all the exclusive rights pertaining to coinage. It has the sole right of coining money. It establishes the monetary system, and may enact provisions, if necessary, for the rate of exchange of foreign coins.

[ART. 39. (Abrogated by the article following it). *The Confederation has the power to issue by law general provisions for the issue and redemption of bank notes. But it shall not create any monopoly for the issue of bank notes, nor make such notes a legal tender.*]

ART. 39. [Substitute for former Art. 39, adopted Oct. 18, 1891.] The Confederation has the exclusive power to issue bank notes and other like currency. The Confederation may exercise the exclusive power over the issue of bank notes through a National Bank carried on under a special department of administration; or it may assign the right to a central joint stock bank hereafter to be created, which shall be administered under the coöperation and supervision of the Confederation; but the privilege to take over the bank, by paying a compensation, shall be retained. The bank possessed of the exclusive right to issue notes shall have for its chief function to regulate the circulation of money in Switzerland and to facilitate exchange. To the Cantons shall be paid at least two-thirds of the net profits of the bank beyond a reasonable interest or a reasonable dividend to the stockholders, and the necessary transfers to the reserve fund. The bank and its branches shall not be subjected to taxation by the Cantons. The Confederation shall not make bank notes and other like currency legal tender, except in urgent need in time of war. The principal office of the bank and the details of its organization, as well as in general the carrying into effect this article, shall be determined by federal law.

ART. 40. The Confederation fixes the standard of weights and measures. The Cantons, under the supervision of the Confederation, enforce the laws relating thereto.

ART. 41. The manufacture and the sale of gunpowder throughout Switzerland pertain exclusively to the Confederation. Powders used for blasting and not suitable for shooting are not included in the monopoly.

ART. 42. The expenditures of the Confederation are met as follows: (a) Out of the income from federal property. (b) Out of the proceeds of the federal customs levied at the Swiss frontier. (c) Out of the proceeds of the posts and telegraphs. (d) Out of the proceeds of the powder monopoly. (e) Out of half of the gross receipts from the tax on military exemptions levied by the Cantons. (f) Out of the contributions of the Cantons, which shall be determined by federal legislation, with special reference to their wealth and taxable resources.

ART. 43. Every citizen of a Canton is a Swiss citizen. As such he may participate, in the place where he is domiciled, in all federal elections and popular votes, after having duly proven his qualification as a voter. No person can exercise political rights in more than one Canton. The Swiss settled as a citizen outside his native Canton enjoys in the place where he is domiciled, all the rights of the citizens of the Canton, including all the rights of the communal citizen. Participation in municipal and corporate property, and the right to vote upon

purely municipal affairs, are excepted from such rights, unless the Canton by legislation has otherwise provided. In cantonal and communal affairs, he gains the right to vote after a residence of three months. Cantonal laws relating to the right of Swiss citizens to settle outside the Cantons in which they were born, and to vote on communal questions, are submitted for the approval of the Federal Council.

ART. 44. No Canton shall expel from its territory one of its own citizens, nor deprive him of his rights, whether acquired by birth or settlement. [Origine ou cité.] Federal legislation shall fix the conditions upon which foreigners may be naturalized, as well as those upon which a Swiss may give up his citizenship in order to obtain naturalization in a foreign country.

ART. 45. Every Swiss citizen has the right to settle anywhere in Swiss territory, on condition of submitting a certificate of origin, or a similar document. By exception, settlement may be refused to or withdrawn from, those who, in consequence of a penal conviction, are not entitled to civil rights. In addition, settlement may be withdrawn from those who have been repeatedly punished for serious offenses, and also from those who permanently come upon the charge of public charity, and to whom their Commune or Canton of origin, as the case may be, refuses sufficient succor, after they have been officially asked to grant it. In the Cantons where the poor are relieved in their place of residence the permission to settle, if it relates to citizens of the Canton, may be coupled with the condition that they shall be able to work, and that they shall not, in their former domicile in the Canton of origin, have permanently become a charge on public charity. Every expulsion on account of poverty must be approved by the government of the Canton of domicile, and previously announced to the government of the Canton of origin. A Canton in which a Swiss establishes his domicile may not require security, nor impose any special obligations for such establishment. In like manner the Communes cannot require from Swiss domiciled in their territory other contributions than those which they require from their own subjects. A federal law shall establish the maximum fee to be paid the Chancery for a permit to settle.

ART. 46. Persons settled in Switzerland are, as a rule, subjected to the jurisdiction and legislation of their domicile, in all that pertains to their personal status and property rights. The Confederation shall by law make the provisions necessary for the application of this principle and for the prevention of double taxation of a citizen.

ART. 47. A federal law shall establish the distinction between settlement and temporary residence, and shall at the same time make the regulations to which Swiss temporary residents shall be subjected as to their political rights and their civil rights.

ART. 48. A federal law shall provide for the regulation of the expenses of the illness and burial of indigent persons amenable to one Canton, who have fallen ill or died in another Canton.

ART. 49. Freedom of conscience and belief is inviolable. No person can be constrained to take part in a religious society, to attend religious instruction, to perform a religious rite, or to incur



penalties of any kind whatever on account of religious opinion. The person who exercises the parent's or guardian's authority has the right, conformably to the principles above stated, to regulate the religious education of children up to the age of sixteen completed years. The exercise of civil or political rights shall not be abridged by any provisions or conditions whatever of an ecclesiastical or religious kind. No person shall, on account of a religious belief, release himself from the accomplishment of a civil duty. No person is bound to pay taxes of which the proceeds are specifically appropriated to the actual expenses of the worship of a religious body to which he does not belong. The details of the carrying out of this principle are reserved for federal legislation.

ART. 50. The free exercise of religious worship is guaranteed within the limits compatible with public order and good morals. The Cantons and the Confederation may take suitable measures for the preservation of public order and of peace between the members of different religious bodies, and also against encroachments of ecclesiastical authorities upon the rights of citizens and of the State. Contests in public and private law, which arise out of the formation or the division of religious bodies, may be brought by appeal before the competent federal authorities. No bishopric shall be created upon Swiss territory without the consent of the Confederation.

ART. 51. The order of the Jesuits, and the societies affiliated with them, shall not be received into any part of Switzerland; and all action in church and school is forbidden to its members. This prohibition may be extended also, by federal ordinance, to other religious orders, the action of which is dangerous to the state or disturbs the peace between sects.

ART. 52. The foundation of new convents or religious orders, and the reestablishment of those which have been suppressed, are forbidden.

ART. 53. The civil status and the keeping of records thereof is subject to the civil authority. The Confederation shall by law enact detailed provisions upon this subject. The control of places of burial is subject to the civil authority. It shall take care that every deceased person may be decently interred.

ART. 54. The right of marriage is placed under the protection of the Confederation. No limitation upon marriage shall be based upon sectarian grounds, nor upon the poverty of either of the contractants, nor on their conduct, nor on any other consideration of good order. A marriage contracted in a Canton or in a foreign country, conformably to the law which is there in force, shall be recognized as valid throughout the Confederation. By marriage the wife acquires the citizenship of her husband. Children born before the marriage are made legitimate by the subsequent marriage of their parents. No tax upon admission or similar tax shall be levied upon either party to a marriage.

ART. 55. The freedom of the press is guaranteed. Nevertheless the Cantons by law enact the measures necessary for the suppression of abuses. Such laws are submitted for the approval of the Federal Council. The Confederation may enact penalties for the suppression of press offenses committed against it or its authorities.

ART. 56. Citizens have the right of forming associations, provided that there be in the pur-

pose of such associations, or in the means which they employ, nothing unlawful or dangerous to the state. The Cantons by law take the measures necessary for the suppression of abuses.

ART. 57. The right of petition is guaranteed.

ART. 58. No person shall be deprived of his constitutional judge. Therefore no extraordinary tribunal shall be established. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction is abolished.

ART. 59. Suits for personal claims against a solvent debtor having a domicile in Switzerland, must be brought before the judge of his domicile; in consequence, his property outside the Canton in which he is domiciled may not be attached in suits for personal claims. Nevertheless, with reference to foreigners, the provisions of international treaties shall not thereby be affected. Imprisonment for debt is abolished.

ART. 60. All the Cantons are bound to treat the citizens of two other confederated States like those of their own State in legislation and in all judicial proceedings.

ART. 61. Civil judgments definitely pronounced in any Canton may be executed anywhere in Switzerland.

ART. 62. The exit duty on property [traite foraine] is abolished in the interior of Switzerland, as well as the right of redemption [droit de retrait] by citizens of one Canton against those of other confederated States.

ART. 63. The exit duty on property is abolished as respects foreign countries, provided reciprocity be observed.

ART. 64. The Confederation has power to make laws: On legal competency. On all legal questions relating to commerce and to transactions affecting chattels (law of commercial obligations, including commercial law and law of exchange). On literary and artistic copyright. On the protection of new patterns and forms, and of inventions which are represented in models and are capable of industrial application. [Amendment of Dec. 20, 1887.] On the legal collection of debts and on bankruptcy. The administration of justice remains with the Cantons, save as affected by the powers of the Federal Court.

[ART. 65. (Abrogated by Amendment of June 20, 1879.) The death penalty is abolished; nevertheless the provisions of military law in time of war shall be observed. Corporal punishment is abolished.]

ART. 65. [Amendment of June 20, 1879.] No death penalty shall be pronounced for a political crime. Corporal punishment is abolished.

ART. 66. The Confederation by law fixes the limits within which a Swiss citizen may be deprived of his political rights.

ART. 67. The Confederation by law provides for the extradition of accused persons from one Canton to another; nevertheless, extradition shall not be made obligatory for political offenses and offenses of the press.

ART. 68. Measures are taken by federal law for the incorporation of persons without country (Heimathlosen), and for the prevention of new cases of that nature.

ART. 69. Legislation concerning measures of sanitary police against epidemic and cattle diseases, causing a common danger, is included in the powers of the Confederation.

ART. 70. The Confederation has power to expel from its territory foreigners who endanger the internal or external safety of Switzerland.

**Chapter II.—ART. 71.** With the reservation of the rights of the people and of the Cantons (Articles 89 and 121), the supreme authority of the Confederation is exercised by the Federal Assembly, [Assemblée fédérale; Bundesversammlung] which consists of two sections or councils, to wit: (A) The National Council. (B) The Council of States.

**ART. 72.** The National Council [Conseil National; Nationalrath] is composed of representatives of the Swiss people, chosen in the ratio of one member for each 20,000 persons of the total population. Fractions of upwards of 10,000 persons are reckoned as 20,000. Every Canton, and in the divided Cantons every Half-Canton, chooses at least one representative.

**ART. 73.** The elections for the National Council are direct. They are held in federal electoral districts, which in no case shall be formed out of parts of different Cantons.

**ART. 74.** Every Swiss who has completed twenty years of age, and who in addition is not excluded from the rights of a voter by the legislation of the Canton in which he is domiciled, has the right to vote in elections and popular votes. Nevertheless, the Confederation by law may establish uniform regulations for the exercise of such right.

**ART. 75.** Every lay Swiss citizen who has the right to vote is eligible for membership in the National Council.

**ART. 76.** The National Council is chosen for three years, and entirely renewed at each general election.

**ART. 77.** Representatives to the Council of States, members of the Federal Council, and officials appointed by that Council, shall not at the same time be members of the National Council.

**ART. 78.** The National Council chooses out of its own number, for each regular or extraordinary session, a President and a Vice-President. A member who has held the office of President during a regular session is ineligible either as President or Vice-President at the next regular session. The same member may not be Vice-President during two consecutive regular sessions. When the votes are equally divided the President has a casting vote; in elections he votes in the same manner as other members.

**ART. 79.** The members of the National Council receive a compensation out of the federal treasury.

**ART. 80.** The Council of States [Conseil des États; Ständerath] consists of forty-four representatives of the Cantons. Each Canton appoints two representatives; in the divided Cantons, each Half-State chooses one.

**ART. 81.** The members of the National Council and those of the Federal Council may not be representatives in the Council of States.

**ART. 82.** The Council of States chooses out of its own number for each regular or extraordinary session a President and a Vice-President. Neither the President nor the Vice-President can be chosen from among the representatives of the Canton from which the President has been chosen for the regular session next preceding. Representatives of the same Canton cannot occupy the position of Vice-President during two consecutive regular sessions. When the votes are equally divided the President has a casting vote; in elections he votes in the same manner as the other members.

**ART. 83.** Representatives in the Council of States receive a compensation from the Cantons.

**ART. 84.** The National Council and the Council of States consider all the subjects which the present Constitution places within the competence of the Confederation, and which are not assigned to any other federal authority.

**ART. 85.** The subjects within the competence of the two Councils are particularly the following: 1. Laws on the organization of and election of federal authorities. 2. Laws and ordinances on subjects which by the Constitution are placed within the federal competence. 3. The salary and compensation of members of the federal governing bodies and of the Federal Chancery; the creation of federal offices and the determination of salaries therefor. 4. The election of the Federal Council, of the Federal Court, and of the Chancellor, and also of the Commander-in-chief of the federal army. The Confederation may by law assign to the Federal Assembly other powers of election or of confirmation. 5. Alliances and treaties with foreign powers, and also the approval of treaties made by the Cantons between themselves or with foreign powers; nevertheless the treaties made by the Cantons shall be brought before the Federal Assembly only in case the Federal Council or another Canton protests. 6. Measures for external safety and also for the maintenance of the independence and neutrality of Switzerland; the declaration of war and the conclusion of peace. 7. The guaranty of the Constitution and of the territory of the Cantons; intervention in consequence of such guaranty; measures for the internal safety of Switzerland, for the maintenance of peace and order; amnesty and pardon. 8. Measures for the preservation of the Constitution, for carrying out the guaranty of the cantonal constitutions, and for fulfilling federal obligations. 9. The power of controlling the federal army. 10. The determination of the annual budget, the audit of public accounts, and federal ordinances authorizing loans. 11. The superintendence of federal administration and of federal courts. 12. Protests against the decisions of the Federal Council upon administrative conflicts. (Art. 113.) 13. Conflicts of jurisdiction between federal authorities. 14. The amendment of the federal Constitution.

**ART. 86.** The two Councils assemble annually in regular session upon a day to be fixed by the standing orders. They are convened in extra session by the Federal Council upon the request either of one fourth of the members of the National Council, or of five Cantons.

**ART. 87.** In either Council a quorum is a majority of the total number of its members.

**ART. 88.** In the National Council and in the Council of States a majority of those voting is required.

**ART. 89.** Federal laws, enactments, and resolutions shall be passed only by the agreement of the two Councils. Federal laws shall be submitted for acceptance or rejection by the people, if the demand is made by 30,000 voters or by eight Cantons. The same principle applies to federal resolutions which have a general application, and which are not of an urgent nature.

**ART. 90.** The Confederation shall by law establish the forms and intervals to be observed in popular votes.

ART. 91. Members of either Council vote without instructions.

ART. 92. Each Council takes action separately. But in the case of the elections specified in Article 85, § 4, of pardons, or of deciding a conflict of jurisdiction (Art. 85, § 13), the two Councils meet in joint session, under the direction of the President of the National Council, and a decision is made by the majority of the members of both Councils present and voting.

ART. 93. Measures may originate in either Council, and may be introduced by any of their members. The Cantons may by correspondence exercise the same right.

ART. 94. As a rule, the sittings of the Councils are public.

ART. 95. The supreme direction and executive authority of the Confederation is exercised by a Federal Council [Conseil fédéral; Bundesrath], composed of seven members.

ART. 96. The members of the Federal Council are chosen for three years by the Councils in joint session from among all the Swiss citizens eligible to the National Council. But not more than one member of the Federal Council shall be chosen from the same Canton. The Federal Council is chosen anew after each election of the National Council. Vacancies which occur in the course of the three years are filled at the first ensuing session of the Federal Assembly, for the remainder of the term of office.

ART. 97. The members of the Federal Council shall not, during their term of office, occupy any other office, either in the service of the Confederation or in a Canton, or follow any other pursuit, or exercise a profession.

ART. 98. The Federal Council is presided over by the President of the Confederation. There is a Vice-President. The President of the Confederation and the Vice-President of the Federal Council are chosen for one year by the Federal Assembly from among the members of the Council. The retiring President shall not be chosen as President or Vice-President for the year ensuing. The same member shall not hold the office of Vice-President during two consecutive years.

ART. 99. The President of the Confederation and the other members of the Federal Council receive an annual salary from the federal treasury.

ART. 100. A quorum of the Federal Council consists of four members.

ART. 101. The members of the Federal Council have the right to speak but not to vote in either house of the Federal Assembly, and also the right to make motions on the subject under consideration.

ART. 102. The powers and the duties of the Federal Council, within the limits of this Constitution, are particularly the following: 1. It conducts federal affairs, conformably to the laws and resolutions of the Confederation. 2. It takes care that the Constitution, federal laws and ordinances, and also the provisions of federal concordats, be observed; upon its own initiative or upon complaint, it takes measures necessary to cause these instruments to be observed, unless the consideration of redress be among the subjects which should be brought before the Federal Court, according to Article 113. 3. It takes care that the guaranty of the cantonal constitutions be observed. 4. It intro-

duces bills or resolutions into the Federal Assembly, and gives its opinion upon the proposals submitted to it by the Councils or the Cantons. 5. It executes the laws and resolutions of the Confederation and the judgments of the Federal Court, and also the compromises or decisions in arbitration upon disputes between Cantons. 6. It makes those appointments which are not assigned to the Federal Assembly, Federal Court, or other authority. 7. It examines the treaties made by Cantons with each other, or with foreign powers, and approves them, if proper. (Art. 85, § 5.) 8. It watches over the external interests of the Confederation, particularly the maintenance of its international relations, and is, in general, intrusted with foreign relations. 9. It watches over the external safety of Switzerland, over the maintenance of independence and neutrality. 10. It watches over the internal safety of the Confederation, over the maintenance of peace and order. 11. In cases of urgency, and when the Federal Assembly is not in session, the Federal Council has power to raise the necessary troops and to employ them, with the reservation that it shall immediately summon the Councils if the number of troops exceeds two thousand men, or if they remain in arms more than three weeks. 12. It administers the military establishments of the Confederation, and all other branches of administration committed to the Confederation. 13. It examines such laws and ordinances of the Cantons as must be submitted for its approval; it exercises supervision over such departments of the cantonal administration as are placed under its control. 14. It administers the finances of the Confederation, introduces the budget, and submits accounts of receipts and expenses. 15. It supervises the conduct of all the officials and employees of the federal administration. 16. It submits to the Federal Assembly at each regular session an account of its administration and a report of the condition of the Confederation, internal as well as external, and calls attention to the measures which it deems desirable for the promotion of the general welfare. It also makes special reports when the Federal Assembly or either Council requires it.

ART. 103. The business of the Federal Council is distributed by departments among its members. This distribution has the purpose only of facilitating the examination and despatch of business; decisions emanate from the Federal Council as a single authority.

ART. 104. The Federal Council and its departments have power to call in experts on special subjects.

ART. 105. A Federal Chancery [Chancellerie fédérale; Bundeskanzlei], at the head of which is placed the Chancellor of the Confederation, conducts the secretary's business for the Federal Assembly and the Federal Council. The Chancellor is chosen by the Federal Assembly for the term of three years, at the same time as the Federal Council. The Chancery is under the special supervision of the Federal Council. A federal law shall provide for the organization of the Chancery.

ART. 106. There shall be a Federal Court [Tribunal fédéral; Bundesgericht] for the administration of justice in federal concerns. There shall be, moreover, a jury for criminal cases. (Art. 112.)

ART. 107. The members and alternates of the Federal Court shall be chosen by the Federal Assembly, which shall take care that all three national languages are represented therein. A law shall establish the organization of the Federal Court and of its sections, the number of judges and alternates, their term of office, and their salary.

ART. 108. Any Swiss citizen eligible to the National Council may be chosen to the Federal Court. The members of the Federal Assembly and of the Federal Council, and officials appointed by those authorities, shall not at the same time belong to the Federal Court. The members of the Federal Court shall not, during their term of office, occupy any other office, either in the service of the Confederation or in a Canton, nor engage in any other pursuit, nor practice a profession.

ART. 109. The Federal Court organizes its own Chancery and appoints the officials thereof.

ART. 110. The Federal Court has jurisdiction in civil suits: 1. Between the Confederation and the Cantons. 2. Between the Confederation on the one part and corporations or individuals on the other part, when such corporations or individuals are plaintiffs, and when the amount involved is of a degree of importance to be determined by federal legislation. 3. Between Cantons. 4. Between Cantons on one part and corporations or individuals on the other part, when one of the parties demands it, and the amount involved is of a degree of importance to be determined by federal legislation. It further has jurisdiction in suits concerning the status of persons not subjects of any government (heimathlos), and the conflicts which arise between Communes of different Cantons respecting the right of local citizenship. [Droit de cité.]

ART. 111. The Federal Court is bound to give judgment in other cases when both parties agree to abide by its decision, and when the amount involved is of a degree of importance to be determined by federal legislation.

ART. 112. The Federal Court, assisted by a jury to decide upon questions of fact, has criminal jurisdiction in: 1. Cases of high treason against the Confederation, of rebellion or violence against federal authorities. 2. Crimes and misdemeanors against the law of nations. 3. Political crimes and misdemeanors which are the cause or the result of disturbances which occasion armed federal intervention. 4. Cases against officials appointed by a federal authority, where such authority relegates them to the Federal Court.

ART. 113. The Federal Court further has jurisdiction: 1. Over conflicts of jurisdiction between federal authorities on one part and cantonal authorities on the other part. 2. Disputes between Cantons, when such disputes are upon questions of public law. 3. Complaints of violation of the constitutional rights of citizens, and complaints of individuals for the violation of concordats or treaties. Conflicts of administrative jurisdiction are reserved, and are to be settled in a manner prescribed by federal legislation. In all the fore-mentioned cases the Federal Court shall apply the laws passed by the Federal Assembly and those resolutions of the Assembly which have a general import. It shall in like manner conform to treaties which shall have been ratified by the Federal Assembly.

ART. 114. Besides the cases specified in Articles 110, 112, and 113, the Confederation may by law place other matters within the jurisdiction of the Federal Court; in particular, it may give to that court powers intended to insure the uniform application of the laws provided for in Article 64.

ART. 115. All that relates to the location of the authorities of the Confederation is a subject for federal legislation.

ART. 116. The three principal languages spoken in Switzerland, German, French, and Italian, are national languages of the Confederation.

ART. 117. The officials of the Confederation are responsible for their conduct in office. A federal law shall enforce this responsibility.

CHAPTER III. *[(These four articles abrogated by the four articles following them, 118-122.) Art. 118. The Federal Constitution may at any time be amended.]*

ART. 119. *Amendment is secured through the forms required for passing federal laws.*

ART. 120. *When either Council of the Federal Assembly passes a resolution for amendment of the Federal Constitution and the other Council does not agree; or when fifty thousand Swiss voters demand amendment, the question whether the Federal Constitution ought to be amended is, in either case, submitted to a vote of the Swiss people, voting yes or no. If in either case the majority of the Swiss citizens who vote pronounce in the affirmative, there shall be a new election of both Councils for the purpose of preparing amendments.*

ART. 121. *The amended Federal Constitution shall be in force when it has been adopted by the majority of Swiss citizens who take part in the vote thereon and by a majority of the States. In making up a majority of the States the vote of a Half-Canton is counted as half a vote. The result of the popular vote in each Canton is considered to be the vote of the State.*

ART. 118. [Amendment of July 5, 1891.] The Federal Constitution may at any time be amended as a whole or in part.

ART. 110. [Amendment of July 5, 1891.] General revision is secured through the forms required for passing the federal laws.

ART. 120. When either Council of the Federal Assembly passes a resolution for general revision and the other Council does not agree; or when fifty thousand Swiss voters demand general revision the question whether there shall be such a revision must, in either case, be submitted to the popular vote of the Swiss people. If, in either case, the majority of the Swiss citizens who vote on the question pronounce in the affirmative, there shall be a new election of both Councils for the purpose of preparing a general revision.

ART. 121. [Amendment of July 5, 1891.] Specific amendments may be brought forward either through a Proposition of the People [Volksanregung] (Initiative) or by Federal legislation. A Proposition of the People means a demand supported by fifty thousand Swiss voters, either for suspension, repeal, or alteration of specified articles of the Federal Constitution. If by means of the method of Proposition of the People several different subjects are brought forward either for alteration or for incorporation into the Federal Constitution, each one of those separate subjects must be presented in a separate demand

for a popular vote [Initiativbegehren]. The demand for a popular vote may take the form either of a request in general terms, or of a definite draft. If such a demand be made in the form of a request in general terms and the Councils of the Federal Assembly agree thereto, the said Councils shall thereupon prepare a specific amendment of the purport indicated by those asking amendment; and such specific amendment shall be submitted to the people and to the states for their acceptance or rejection. In case the Councils of the Federal Assembly do not agree thereto, the question of specific amendment shall then be subjected to the people for a popular vote; and in case the majority of the Swiss voters vote therefor, an amendment of the purport indicated by the vote of the people shall then be prepared by the Federal Assembly. In case the request shall take the form of a specific draft and the Federal Assembly agree thereto, the draft is then to be submitted to the people and the States for acceptance or rejection. If the Federal Assembly shall not agree thereto it may either prepare a substitute draft for itself, or it may propose the rejection of the proposition. The proposition to reject such substitute draft or proposition shall be submitted to the vote of the people and of the States at the same time with the general Proposition of the People.

ART. 122. [Amendment of July 5, 1891.] The procedure upon the Proposition of the People and the popular votes concerning amendment of the Federal Constitution, shall be regulated in detail by a Federal Law.

ART. 123. [Amendment of July 5, 1891.] The amended Federal Constitution or the specific amendments proposed, as the case may be, shall be in force when adopted by the majority of the Swiss citizens who take part in the vote thereon and by a majority of the Cantons. In making up the majority of the States the vote of a half of each Canton is counted as half a vote. The result of the popular vote in each Canton is considered to be the vote of this state.

**Temporary Provisions.** ARTICLE 1. The proceeds of the posts and customs shall be divided upon the present basis, until such time as the Confederation shall take upon itself the military expenses up to this time borne by the Cantons. Federal legislation shall provide, besides, that the loss which may be occasioned to the finances of certain Cantons by the sum of the charges which result from Articles 20, 30, 36 (§ 2), and 42 (c), shall fall upon such Cantons only gradually, and shall not attain its full effect till after a transition period of some years. Those Cantons which, at the going into effect of Article 20 of the Constitution, have not fulfilled

the military obligations which are imposed upon them by the former Constitution, or by federal laws, shall be bound to carry them out at their own expense.

ART. 2. The provisions of the federal laws and of the cantonal concordats, constitutions or cantonal laws, which are contrary to this Constitution, cease to have effect by the adoption of the Constitution or the publication of the laws for which it provides.

ART. 3. The new provisions relating to the organization and jurisdiction of the Federal Court take effect only after the publication of federal laws thereon.

ART. 4. A delay of five years is allowed to Cantons for the establishment of free instruction in primary public education. (Ar. 27.)

ART. 5. Those persons who practice a liberal profession, and who, before the publication of the federal law provided for in Article 33, have obtained a certificate of competence from a Canton or a joint authority representing several Cantons, may pursue that profession throughout the Confederation.

ART. 6. [Amendment of Dec. 22, 1885. For the remainder of this amendment see article 32 (ii).] If a federal law for carrying out Article 32 (ii) be passed before the end of 1890, the import duties levied on spirituous liquors by the Cantons and Communes, according to Article 32, cease on the going into effect of such law. If, in such case, the shares of any Canton or Commune, out of the sums to be divided, are not sufficient to equal the average annual net proceeds of the taxes they have levied on spirituous liquors in the years 1880 to 1884 inclusive, the Cantons and Communes affected shall, till the end of 1890, receive the amount of the deficiency out of the amount which is to be divided among the other Cantons according to population; and the remainder only shall be divided among such other Cantons and Communes, according to population. The Confederation shall further provide by law that for such Cantons or Communes as may suffer financial loss through the effect of this amendment, such loss shall not come upon them immediately in its full extent, but gradually up to the year 1895. The indemnities thereby made necessary shall be previously taken out of the net proceeds designated in Article 32 (ii), paragraph 4.

Thus resolved by the National Council to be submitted to the popular vote of the Swiss people and of the Cantons, Bern, January 31, 1874. Ziegler, President. Schiess, Secretary.

Thus resolved by the Council of States, to be submitted to the popular vote of the Swiss people and of the Cantons, Bern, January 31, 1874. A. Kopp, President. J.-L. Lutsch, Secretary.

## CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

A. D. 1781.—The Articles of Confederation. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777-1781, and 1783-1787.

A. D. 1787-1789, and 1791-1870.—A sketch of the history of the framing and adoption of the Federal Constitution of the United States will be found under UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1787, and 1787-1789. The following text of the original instrument, with the subsequent amend-

ments to it, is one prepared by Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, and is the result of a careful comparison with the original manuscripts, preserved in the State Department at Washington. "It is intended to be absolutely exact in word, spelling, capitalization and punctuation. A few headings and paragraph numbers, inserted for convenience of reference, are indicated by brackets." "Those parts of the Constitution which were temporary in

their nature, or which have been superseded or altered by later amendments, are included within the signs [ ].” This text, originally printed in the “American History Leaflets,” is reproduced with Professor Hart’s consent. The paragraphing has been altered, to economize space, but it is otherwise exactly reproduced:

“WE THE PEOPLE of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

**Article 1.** *Section 1.* All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives. *Section 2* [§ 1.] The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.\* [§ 2.] No Person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty-five Years, and been seven Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen. [§ 3.] Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, [which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons.†] The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct. The Number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty Thousand, but each State shall have at Least one Representative; [and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to chuse three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New-York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and Georgia three.‡] [§ 4.] When vacancies happen in the Representation from any State, the Executive Authority thereof shall issue Writs of Election to fill such Vacancies. [§ 5.] The House of Representatives shall chuse their Speaker and other Officers; and shall have the sole Power of Impeachment. *Section 3.* [§ 1.] The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof, for six Years; and each Senator shall have one Vote. [§ 2.] Immediately after they shall be assembled in Consequence of the first Election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three Classes. The Seats of the Senators of the first Class shall be vacated at the Expiration of the second Year, of the second Class at the Expiration of the fourth Year, and of the third Class at the Expiration of

the sixth Year, so that one third may be chosen every second Year; and if Vacancies happen by Resignation, or otherwise, during the Recess of the Legislature of any State, the Executive thereof may make temporary Appointments until the next Meeting of the Legislature, which shall then fill such Vacancies. [§ 3.] No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty Years, and been nine Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen. [§ 4.] The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no Vote, unless they be equally divided. [§ 5.] The Senate shall chuse their other Officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the Absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the Office of President of the United States. [§ 6.] The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments. When sitting for that Purpose, they shall be on Oath or Affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside; and no Person shall be convicted without the Concurrence of two thirds of the Members present. [§ 7.] Judgment in Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, Trust or Profit under the United States; but the Party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial, Judgment and Punishment, according to Law. *Section 4.* [§ 1.] The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of chusing Senators. [§ 2.] The Congress shall assemble at least once in every Year, and such Meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by Law appoint a different Day. *Section 5.* [§ 1.] Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business; but a smaller Number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the Attendance or absent Members, in such Manner, and under such Penalties as each House may provide. [§ 2.] Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behaviour, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member. [§ 3.] Each House shall keep a Journal of its Proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such Parts as may in their Judgment require Secrecy; and the Yeas and Nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the Desire of one fifth of those Present, be entered on the Journal. [§ 4.] Neither House, during the Session of Congress, shall, without the Consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other Place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting. *Section 6.* [§ 1.] The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all Cases, except Treason, Felony and Breach of the Peace, be privileged from Arrest during their Attendance at the Session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same;

\* Modified by Fourteenth Amendment.  
 † Superseded by Fourteenth Amendment.  
 ‡ Temporary clause.

and for any Speech or Debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other Place. [§ 2.] No Senator or Representative shall, during the Time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil Office under the Authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the Emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time; and no Person holding any Office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his Continuance in Office. *Section 7.* [§ 1.] All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills. [§ 2.] Every Bill shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a Law, be presented to the President of the United States: If he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his Objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the Objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such Reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the Bill, it shall be sent, together with the Objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a Law. But in all such Cases the Votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and Nays, and the Names of the Persons voting for and against the Bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively. If any Bill shall not be returned by the President within ten Days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a Law, in like Manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their Adjournment prevent its Return, in which Case it shall not be a Law. [§ 3.] Every Order, Resolution, or Vote to which the Concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of Adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the same shall take Effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the Rules and Limitations prescribed in the Case of a Bill. *Section 8.* The Congress shall have Power [§ 1.] To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; [§ 2.] To borrow Money on the credit of the United States; [§ 3.] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes; [§ 4.] To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States; [§ 5.] To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures; [§ 6.] To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States; [§ 7.] To establish Post Offices and post Roads; [§ 8.] To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries; [§ 9.] To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court; [§ 10.] To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and

Offences against the Law of Nations; [§ 11.] To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water; [§ 12.] To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years; [§ 13.] To provide and maintain a Navy; [§ 14.] To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces; [§ 15.] To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions; [§ 16.] To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress; [§ 17.] To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;— And [§ 18.] To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof. *Section 9.* [§ 1.] [The Migration or Importation of such Persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the Year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a Tax or duty may be imposed on such Importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each Person.]\* [§ 2.] The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it. [§ 3.] No Bill of Attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed.† [§ 4.] No Capitation, or other direct, Tax shall be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or Enumeration herein before directed to be taken. [§ 5.] No Tax or Duty shall be laid on Articles exported from any State. [§ 6.] No Preference shall be given by any Regulation of Commerce or Revenue to the Ports of one State over those of another: nor shall Vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay Duties in another. [§ 7.] No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time. [§ 8.] No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.‡ *Section 10.* [§ 1.] No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and

\* Temporary provision.

† Extended by the first eight Amendments.

‡ Extended by Ninth and Tenth Amendments.

silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility. [§ 2.] No State shall, without the Consent of the Congress, lay any Imposts or Duties on Imports or Exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its Inspection Laws; and the net Produce of all Duties and Imposts, laid by any State on Imports or Exports, shall be for the Use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such Laws shall be subject to the Revision and Controul of the Congress. [§ 3.] No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any Duty of Tonnage, keep Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.\*

**Article II. Section 1. [§ 1.]** The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his Office during the Term of four Years, and, together with the Vice President, chosen for the same Term, be elected, as follows [§ 2.] Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress; but no Senator or Representative, or Person holding an Office of Trust or Profit under the United States, shall be appointed an Elector. [The Electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by Ballot for two Persons, of whom one at least shall not be an Inhabitant of the same State with themselves. And they shall make a List of all the Persons voted for, and of the Number of Votes for each; which List they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the Seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the Presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the Certificates, and the Votes shall then be counted. The Person having the greatest Number of Votes shall be the President, if such Number be a Majority of the whole Number of Electors appointed; and if there be more than one who have such Majority, and have an equal Number of Votes, then the House of Representatives shall immediately chuse by Ballot one of them for President; and if no Person have a Majority, then from the five highest on the List the said House shall in like Manner chuse the President. But in chusing the President, the Votes shall be taken by States, the Representation from each State having one Vote; A quorum for this Purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two thirds of the States, and a Majority of all the States shall be necessary to a Choice. In every Case, after the Choice of the President, the Person having the greatest Number of Votes of the Electors shall be the Vice President. But if there should remain two or more who have equal Votes, the Senate shall chuse from them by Ballot the Vice President.] [§ 3.] The Congress may determine the Time of chusing the Electors, and the Day on which they shall give their Votes; which Day shall be the same throughout the United

States. [§ 4.] No Person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States. [§ 5.] In Case of the Removal of the President from Office, or of his Death, Resignation, or Inability to discharge the Powers and Duties of the said Office, the Same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by Law provide for the Case of Removal, Death, Resignation, or Inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what Officer shall then act as President, and such Officer shall act accordingly, until the Disability be removed, or a President shall be elected. [§ 6.] The President shall, at stated Times, receive for his Services, a Compensation, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the Period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that Period any other Emolument from the United States, or any of them. [§ 7.] Before he enter on the Execution of his Office, he shall take the following Oath or Affirmation:—"I do solemnly swear (or 'affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office "of President of the United States, and will to "the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and "defend the Constitution of the United States."

**Section 2. [§ 1.]** The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of the executive Departments, upon any Subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offences against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment. [§ 2.] He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law; but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments. [§ 3.] The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate, by granting Commissions which shall expire at the End of their next Session. **Section 3.** He shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their Consideration such Measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary Occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in Case of Disagreement between them, with Respect to the Time of Adjournment, he may adjourn them to such Time as he shall think proper; he shall receive Ambassadors and other public Ministers; he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed, and shall Commission all the Officers of the United States. **Section 4.** The President,

\*Extended by Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments.

†Superseded by Twelfth Amendment.



Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

**Article III. Section 1.** The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behaviour, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services, a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office. **Section 2.** [§ 1.] The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;—to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls;—to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction;—to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party;—to Controversies between two or more States;—between a State and Citizens of another State;—between Citizens of different States,—between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects. [§ 2.] In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make. [§ 3.] The Trial of all Crimes, except in Cases of Impeachment, shall be by Jury; and such Trial shall be held in the State where the said Crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the Trial shall be at such Place or Places as the Congress may by Law have directed. **Section 3.** [§ 1.] Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort. No Person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses to the same overt Act, or on Confession in open Court. [§ 2.] The Congress shall have Power to declare the Punishment of Treason, but no Attainder of Treason shall work Corruption of Blood, or Forfeiture except during the Life of the Person attainted.

**Article IV. Section 1.** Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general Laws prescribe the Manner in which such Acts, Records and Proceedings shall be proved, and the Effect thereof. **Section 2.** [§ 1.] The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States. [§ 2.] A Person charged in any State with Treason, Felony, or other Crime, who shall flee from Justice, and be found in another State, shall on Demand of the executive Authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having Jurisdiction of the Crime. [§ 3.] [No Person held to Service

or Labour in one State, under the Laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in Consequence of any Law or Regulation therein, be discharged from such Service or Labour, but shall be delivered up on Claim of the Party to whom such Service or Labour may be due.]\* **Section 3.** [§ 1.] New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or Parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress. [§ 2.] The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State. **Section 4.** The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.

**Article V.** The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that [no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and]† that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

**Article VI.** [§ 1.] All Debts contracted and Engagements entered into, before the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.‡ [§ 2.] This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding. [§ 3.] The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.

**Article VII.** The Ratification of the Conventions of nine States, shall be sufficient for the Establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the Same.

\* Limited by Eleventh Amendment.  
† Extended by Fourteenth Amendment.

\* Superseded by Thirteenth Amendment.  
† Temporary provision.  
‡ Extended by Fourteenth Amendment, Section 4.

DONE in Convention by the Unanimous Consent of the States present the Seventeenth Day of September in the Year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and Eighty seven and of the Independence of the United States of America the Twelfth In Witness whereof We have hereunto subscribed our names.

Go WASHINGTON—Presidt and deputy from Virginia.

	DELAWARE.	
Geo: Read	John Dickinson	
Gunning Bedford jun	Richard Bassett	
	Jaco: Broom	
	NEW HAMPSHIRE.	
John Langdon	Nicholas Gilman	
	MASSACHUSETTS.	
Nathaniel Gorham	Rufus King	
	MARYLAND.	
James McHenry	Dan of St. Thos. Jenifer	
	Danl Carroll	
	CONNECTICUT.	
Wm. Saml. Johnson	Roger Sherman	
	VIRGINIA.	
John Blair—	James Madlson Jr.	
	NEW YORK.	
	Alexander Hamilton	
	NORTH CAROLINA.	
Wm. Blount	Richd. Dobbs Spaight	
	Hu Williamson	
	NEW JERSEY.	
Wil: Livingston	Wm: Paterson.	
David Brearley	Jona: Dayton	
	SOUTH CAROLINA.	
J. Rutledge,	Charles Pinckney	
Charles Cotesworth	Pierce Butler.	
Pinckney		
	PENNSYLVANIA.	
B Franklin	Thos. Fitz Simons	
Thomas Mifflin	Jared Ingersoll	
Robt. Morris	James Wilson.	
Geo. Clymer	Gouv Morris	
	GEORGIA.	
William Few	Abr Baldwin *	

ARTICLES In addition to and Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America, proposed by Congress, and ratified by the Legislatures of the several States, pursuant to the fifth Article of the original Constitution. †

[Article I.] Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

[Article II.] A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

[Article III.] No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

[Article IV.] The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to

\* These signatures have no other legal force than that of attestation.

† This heading appears only in the joint resolution submitting the first ten amendments.

be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

[Article V.] No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

[Article VI.] In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

[Article VII.] In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

[Article VIII.] Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

[Article IX.] The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

[Article X.] The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.\*

[Article XI.] The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State. †

[Article XII.] The Electors shall meet in their respective states, and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same state with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice-President, and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice-President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate;—The President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted;—The person having the greatest number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number

\* Amendments First to Tenth appear to have been in force from Nov. 3, 1791. [See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1791.]

† Proclaimed to be in force Jan. 8, 1796.

be a majority of the whole number of Electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by states, the representation from each state having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the states, and a majority of all the states shall be necessary to a choice. And if the House of Representatives shall not choose a President whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon them, before the fourth day of March next following, then the Vice-President shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional disability of the President.—The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-President, shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of Electors appointed, and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice-President; a quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States.\*

**Article XIII.** *Section 1.* Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction. *Section 2.* Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.†

**Article XIV.** *Section 1.* All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. *Section 2.* Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States

according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State. *Section 3.* No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability. *Section 4.* The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void. *Section 5.* The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.\*

**Article XV.** *Section 1.* The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.—*Section 2.* The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.—†

CONSTITUTION OF VENEZUELA.

The following text is taken from Bulletin No. 34 of the Bureau of the American Republics:

**Article 1.** The States that the constitution of March 28, 1864, declared independent and united to form the Venezuelan Federation, and that on April 27, 1881, were denominated Apure, Bolívar, Barquisimeto, Barcelona, Carabobo, Cojedes, Cumaná, Falcón, Guzmán Blanco, Guárico, Guayana, Guzmán, Maturín, Nueva Esparta, Portuguesa, Táchira, Trujillo, Yaracuy, Zamora, and Zulia are constituted into nine grand political bodies, viz: The State of Bermudez, composed of Barcelona, Cumaná, and Maturín; the State of Miranda, composed of Bolívar, Guzmán

Blanco, Guárico, and Nueva Esparta; the State of Carabobo, composed of Carabobo and Nirgua; the State of Zamora, composed of Cojedes, Portuguesa, and Zamora; the State of Lara, composed of Barquisimeto and Yaracuy, except the department of Nirgua; the State of Los Andes, composed of Guzmán, Trujillo, and Táchira; the State of Bolívar, composed of Guayana and Apure; the State of Zulia, and also the State of Falcón. And they are thus constituted to continue one only nation, free, sovereign, and independent, under the title of the United States of Venezuela.

\* Proclaimed to be in force Sept. 25, 1864.  
† Proclaimed to be in force Dec. 18, 1865. [See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (JANUARY).]

\* Proclaimed to be in force July 28, 1898. [See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865-1866 (DECEMBER-APRIL); 1866 (JUNE), and 1866-1867 (OCTOBER-MARCH).]  
† Proclaimed to be in force Mar. 30, 1870. [See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1869-1870.]

**Art. 2.** The boundaries of these great States are determined by those that the law of April 28, 1856, that arranged the last territorial division, designated for the ancient provinces until it shall be re-formed.

**Art. 3.** The boundaries of the United States of the Venezuelan Federation are the same that in 1810 belonged to the old Captaincy-General of Venezuela.

**Art. 4.** The States that are grouped together to form the grand political bodies will be called Sections. These are equal among themselves; the constitutions prescribed for their internal organization must be harmonious with the federative principles established by the present compact, and the sovereignty not delegated resides in the State without any other limitations than those that devolve from the compromise of association.

**Art. 5.** These are Venezuelans, viz: 1st, All persons that may have been or may be born on Venezuelan soil, whatever may be the nationality of their parents; 2d, The children of a Venezuelan father or mother that may have been born on foreign soil, if they should come to take up their domicile in the country and express the desire to become citizens; 3d, Foreigners that may have obtained naturalization papers; and, 4th, Those born or that shall be born in any of the Spanish-American republics or in the Spanish Antilles, provided that they may have taken up their residence in the territory of the Republic and express a willingness to become citizens.

**Art. 6.** Those that take up their residence and acquire nationality in a foreign country do not lose the character of Venezuelans.

**Art. 7.** Males over twenty-one years of age are qualified Venezuelan citizens, with only the exceptions contained in this constitution.

**Art. 8.** All Venezuelans are obliged to serve the nation according to the prescriptions of the laws, sacrificing his property and his life, if necessary, to defend the country.

**Art. 9.** Venezuelans shall enjoy, in all the States of the Union, the rights and immunities inherent to their condition as citizens of the Federation, and they shall also have imposed upon them there the same duties that are required of those that are natives or domiciled there.

**Art. 10.** Foreigners shall enjoy the same civil rights as Venezuelans and the same security in their persons and property. They can only take advantage of diplomatic means in accordance with public treaties and in cases when right permits it.

**Art. 11.** The law will determine the right applicable to the condition of foreigners, according as they may be domiciled or in transit.

**Art. 12.** The States that form the Venezuelan Federation reciprocally recognize their respective autonomies; they are declared equal in political entity, and preserve, in all its plenitude, the sovereignty not expressly delegated in this constitution.

**Art. 13.** The States of the Venezuelan Federation oblige themselves — 1st, To organize themselves in accord with the principles of popular, elective, federal, representative, alternative, and responsible government; 2d, To establish the fundamental regulations of their interior regulation and government in entire conformity with the principles of this constitution; 3d, To defend themselves against all violence that threatens the sectional independence or the integrity of the

Venezuelan Federation; 4th, To not alienate to a foreign power any part of their territory, nor to implore its protection, nor to establish or cultivate political or diplomatic relations with other nations, since this last is reserved to the Federal power; 5th, To not combine or ally themselves with another nation, nor to separate themselves to the prejudice of the nationality of Venezuela and her territory; 6th, To cede to the nation the territory that may be necessary for the Federal district; 7th, To cede to the Government of the Federation the territory necessary for the erection of forts, warehouses, shipyards, and penitentiaries, and for the construction of other edifices indispensable to the general administration; 8th, To leave to the Government of the Federation the administration of the Amazonas and Guajira territories and that of the islands which pertain to the nation, until it may be convenient to elevate them to another rank; 9th, To reserve to the powers of the Federation all legislative or executive jurisdiction concerning maritime, coastwise, and fluvial navigation, and the national roads, considering as such those that exceed the limits of a State and lead to the frontiers of others and to the Federal district; 10th, To not subject to contributions the products or articles upon which national taxes are imposed, or those that are by law exempt from tax before they have been offered for consumption; 11th, To not impose contributions on cattle, effects, or any class of merchandise in transit for another State, in order that traffic may be absolutely free, and that in one section the consumption of others may not be taxed; 12th, To not prohibit the consumption of the products of other States nor to tax their productions with greater general or municipal taxes than those paid on products raised in the locality; 13th, To not establish maritime or territorial custom-houses for the collection of imports, since there will be national ones only; 14th, To recognize the right of each State to dispose of its natural products; 15th, To cede to the Government of the Federation the administration of mines, public lands, and salt mines, in order that the first may be regulated by a system of uniform working and that the latter may be applied to the benefit of the people; 16th, To respect the property, arsenals, and forts of the nation; 17th, To comply with and cause to be complied with and executed the Constitution and laws of the federation and the decrees and orders that the federal power, the tribunals, and courts may expedite in use of their attributes and legal faculties; 18th, To give entire faith to and to cause to be complied with and executed the public acts and judicial procedures of the other States; 19th, To organize their tribunals and courts for the administration of justice in the State and to have for all of them the same substantive civil and criminal legislation and the same laws of civil and criminal procedure; 20th, To present judges for the court of appeals and to submit to the decision of this supreme tribunal of the States; 21st, To incorporate the extradition of criminals as a political principle in their respective Constitutions; 22d, To establish direct and public suffrage in popular elections, making it obligatory and endorsing it in the electoral registry. The vote of the suffragist must be cast in full and public session of the respective board; it will be inscribed in the registry books that the

law prescribes for elections, which can not be substituted in any other form, and the elector, for himself or by another at his request in case of impediment or through ignorance, will sign the memorandum entry of his vote, and without this requisite it can not be claimed that in reality he has voted; 23d, To establish a system of primary education and that of arts and trades; 24th, To reserve to the powers of the Federation the laws and provisions necessary for the creation, conservation, and progress of general schools, colleges, or universities designed for the teaching of the sciences; 25th, To not impose duties upon the national employes, except in the quality of citizens of the State and inasmuch as these duties may not be incompatible with the national public service; 26th, To furnish the proportional contingent that pertains to them to compose the national public forces in time of peace or war; 27th, To not permit in the States of the Federation forced enlistments and levies that have or may have for their object an attack on liberty or independence or a disturbance of the public order of the Nation, of other States, or of another Nation; 28th, To preserve a strict neutrality in the contentions that may arise in other States; 29th, To not declare or carry on war in any case, one State with another; 30th, To defer and submit to the decision of the Congress or the High Federal Court in all the controversies that may arise between two or more States when they can not, between themselves and by pacific measures, arrive at an agreement. If, for any cause, they may not designate the arbiter to whose decision they may submit, they leave it, in fact, to the High Federal Court; 31st, To recognize the competency of Congress and of the court of appeals to take cognizance of the causes that, for treason to the country or for the infraction of the Constitution and laws of the Federation, may be instituted against those that exercise executive authority in the States, it being their duty to incorporate this precept in their constitutions. In these trials the modes of procedure that the general laws prescribe will be followed and they will be decided in consonance with those laws; 22d, To have as the just income of the States, two-thirds of the total product of the impost collected as transit tax in all the custom-houses of the Republic and two-thirds of that collected from mines, public lands, and salt mines administered by the Federal Power and to distribute this income among all the States of the Federation in proportion to the population of each; 33d, To reserve to the Federal Power the amount of the third part of the income from transit tax, the production of mines, public lands, and salt mines, to be invested in the improvement of the country; 34th, To keep far away from the frontier those individuals that, through political motives, take refuge in a State, provided that the State interested requests it.

**Art. 14.** The nation guarantees to Venezuelans: 1st, The inviolability of life, capital punishment being abolished in spite of any law that establishes it; 2d, Property, with all its attributes, rights and privileges, will only be subjected to contributions decreed by legislative authority, to judicial decision, and to be taken for public works after indemnity and condemnation; 3d, The inviolability and secrecy of correspondence and other private papers; 4th, The domestic hearth, that can not be approached ex-

cept to prevent the perpetration of crime, and this itself must be done in accordance with law; 5th, Personal liberty, and consequently (1) forced recruiting for armed service is abolished, (2) slavery is forever proscribed, (3) slaves that tread the soil of Venezuela are free, and (4) nobody is obliged to do that which the law does not command, nor is impeded from doing that which it does not prohibit; 6th, The freedom of thought, expressed by word or through the press, is without any restriction to be submitted to previous censure. In cases of calumny or injury or prejudice to a third party, the aggrieved party shall have every facility to have his complaints investigated before competent tribunals of justice in accordance with the common laws; 7th, The liberty of traveling without passport, to change the domicile, observing the legal formalities, and to depart from and return to the Republic, carrying off and bringing back his or her property; 8th, The liberty of industry and consequently the proprietorship of discoveries and productions. The law will assign to the proprietors a temporary privilege or the mode of indemnity in case that the author agrees to its publication; 9th, The liberty of reunion and assembling without arms, publicly or privately, the authorities being prohibited from exercising any act of inspection or coercion; 10th, The liberty of petition, with the right of obtaining action by resolution; petition can be made by any functionary, authority or corporation. If the petition shall be made in the name of various persons, the first five will respond for the authenticity of the signatures and all for the truth of the assertions; 11th, The liberty of suffrage at popular elections without any restriction except to males under eighteen years of age; 12th, The liberty of instruction will be protected to every extent. The public power is obliged to establish gratuitous instruction in primary schools, the arts, and trades; 13th, Religious liberty; 14th, Individual security, and, therefore (1) no Venezuelan can be imprisoned or arrested in punishment for debts not founded in fraud or crime; (2) nor to be obliged to lodge or quarter soldiers in his house; (3) nor to be judged by special commissions or tribunals, but by his natural judges and by virtue of laws dictated before the commission of the crime or act to be judged; (4) nor to be imprisoned nor arrested without previous summary information that a crime meriting corporal punishment has been committed, and a written order from the functionary that orders the imprisonment, stating the cause of arrest, unless the person may be caught in the commission of the crime; (5) nor to be placed in solitary confinement for any cause; (6) nor to be obliged to give evidence, in criminal causes, against himself or his blood relations within the fourth degree of consanguinity or against his relations by marriage within the second degree, or against husband or wife; (7) nor to remain in prison when the reasons that caused the imprisonment have been dissipated; (8) nor to be sentenced to corporal punishment for more than ten years; (9) nor to remain deprived of his liberty for political reasons when order is reestablished.

**Art. 15.** Equality: in virtue of which (1) all must be judged by the very same laws and subjected to equal duty, service and contributions; (2) no titles of nobility, hereditary honors, and distinctions will be conceded, nor employments

or offices the salaries or emoluments of which continue after the termination of service; (3) no other official salutation than "citizen" and "you" will be given to employes and corporations. The present enumeration does not impose upon the States the obligation to accord other guarantees to their inhabitants.

**Art. 16.** The laws in the States will prescribe penalties for the infractions of these guarantees, establishing modes of procedure to make them effective.

**Art. 17.** Those who may issue, sign, or execute, or order executed any decrees, orders, or resolutions that violate or in any manner infringe upon the guarantees accorded to Venezuelans are culpable and must be punished according to the law. Every citizen is empowered to bring charges.

**Art. 18.** The National Legislature will be composed of two chambers, one of Senators and another of Deputies.

**Art. 19.** The States will determine the mode of election of Deputies.

**Art. 20.** To form the Chamber of Deputies, each State will name, by popular election in accordance with paragraph 22 of Article 13 of this Constitution, one Deputy for each thirty-five thousand inhabitants and another for an excess not under fifteen thousand. In the same manner it will elect alternates in equal number to the principals.

**Art. 21.** The Deputies will hold office for four years, when they will be renewed in their entirety.

**Art. 22.** The prerogatives of the chamber of Deputies are: First, to examine the annual account that the President of the United States of Venezuela must render; second, to pass a vote of censure of the Ministers of the Cabinet, in which event their posts will be vacant; third, to hear charges against the persons in charge of the office of the National Executive for treason to the country, for infraction of the constitution, or for ordinary crimes; against the ministers and other National employes for infraction of the Constitution and laws and for fault in the discharge of their duties according to article 75 of this constitution and of the general laws of the Republic. This attribute is preventative and neither contracts nor diminishes those that other authorities have to judge and punish.

**Art. 23.** When a charge is instituted by a Deputy or by any corporation or individual the following rules will be observed: (1) there will be appointed, in secret session, a commission of three deputies; (2) the commission will, within three days, render an opinion, declaring whether or not there is foundation for instituting a cause; (3) the Chamber will consider the information and decide upon the cause by the vote of an absolute majority of the members present, the accusing Deputy abstaining from voting.

**Art. 24.** The declaration that there is foundation for the cause operates to suspend from office the accused and incapacitates him for the discharge of any public function during the trial.

**Art. 25.** To form this Chamber each State, through its respective legislature, will elect three principal Senators and an equal number of alternates to supply the vacancies that may occur.

**Art. 26.** To be a Senator it is required that he shall be a Venezuelan by birth and thirty years of age.

**Art. 27.** The Senators will occupy their posts for four years and be renewed in their entirety.

**Art. 28.** It is the prerogative of the Senate to substantiate and decide the causes initiated in the Chamber of Deputies.

**Art. 29.** If the cause may not have been concluded during the sessions, the Senate will continue assembled for this purpose only until the cause is finished.

**Art. 30.** The National Legislature will assemble on the 20th day of February of each year or as soon thereafter as possible at the capital of the United States without the necessity of previous notice. The sessions will last for seventy days to be prolonged until ninety days at the judgment of the majority.

**Art. 31.** The Chambers will open their sessions with two-thirds of their number at least; and, in default of this number, those present will assemble in preparatory commission and adopt measures for the concurrence of the absentees.

**Art. 32.** The sessions having been opened, they may be continued by two-thirds of those that may have installed them, provided that the number be not less than half of all the members elected.

**Art. 33.** Although the Chambers deliberate separately, they may assemble together in the Congress when the constitution and laws provide for it or when one of the two Chambers may deem it necessary. If the Chamber that is invited shall agree, it remains to it to fix the day and the hour of the joint session.

**Art. 34.** The sessions will be public and secret at the will of the Chamber.

**Art. 35.** The Chambers have the right: (1) to make rules to be observed in the sessions and to regulate the debates; (2) to correct infractors; (3) to establish the police force in the hall of sessions; (4) to punish or correct spectators who create disorder; (5) to remove the obstacles to the free exercise of their functions; (6) to command the execution of their private resolutions; (7) to judge of the qualifications of their members and to consider their resignations.

**Art. 36.** One of the Chambers cannot suspend its sessions nor change its place of meeting without the consent of the other; in case of disagreement they will reassemble together and execute that which the majority resolves.

**Art. 37.** The exercise of any other public function, during the sessions, is incompatible with those of a Senator or Deputy. The law will specify the remunerations that the members of the national Legislature shall receive for their services. And whenever an increase of said remunerations is decreed, the law that sanctions it will not begin to be in force until the following period when the Chambers that sanctioned it shall have been renewed in their entirety.

**Art. 38.** The Senators and Deputies shall enjoy immunity from the 20th day of January of each year until thirty days after the close of the sessions and this consists in the suspension of all civil or criminal proceeding, whatever may be its origin or nature; when any one shall perpetrate an act that merits corporal punishment the investigation shall continue until the end of the summing up and shall remain in this state while the term of immunity continues.

**Art. 39.** The Congress will be presided over by the President of the Senate and the presiding

officer of the Chamber of Deputies will act as Vice-President.

**Art. 40.** The members of the Chambers are not responsible for the opinions they express or the discourses they pronounce in session.

**Art. 41.** Senators and deputies that accept office or commission from the National Executive thereby leave vacant the posts of legislators in the Chambers to which they were elected.

**Art. 42.** Nor can senators and deputies make contracts with the general Government or conduct the prosecution of claims of others against it.

**Art. 43.** The National Legislature has the following prerogatives: (1) to dissolve the controversies that may arise between two or more States; (2) to locate the Federal District in an unpopulated territory not exceeding three miles square, where will be constructed the capital city of the Republic. This district will be neutral territory, and no other elections will be there held than those that the law determines for the locality. The district will be provisionally that which the constituent assembly designated or that which the National Legislature may designate; (3) to organize everything relating to the custom-houses, whose income will constitute the treasure of the Union until these incomes are supplied from other sources; (4) to dispose in everything relating to the habitation and security of ports and seacoasts; (5) to create and organize the postal service and to fix the charges for transportation of correspondence; (6) to form the National Codes in accordance with paragraph 19, article 13 of this Constitution; (7) to fix the value, type law, weight, and cologne of national money, and to regulate the admission and circulation of foreign money; (8) to designate the coat-of-arms and the national flag which will be the same for all the States; (9) to create, abolish, and fix salaries for national offices; (10) to determine everything in relation to the national debt; (11) to contract loans upon the credit of the nation; (12) to dictate necessary measures to perfect the census of the current population and the national statistics; (13) to annually fix the armed forces by sea and land and to dictate the army regulations; (14) to decree rules for the formation and substitution of the forces referred to in the preceding clause; (15) to declare war and to require the National Executive to negotiate peace; (16) to ratify or reject the contracts for national public works made by the President with the approval of the Federal Council, without which requisite they will not be carried into effect; (17) to annually fix the estimates for public expenses; (18) to promote whatever conduces to the prosperity of the country and to its advancement in the general knowledge of the arts and sciences; (19) to fix and regulate the national weights and measures; (20) to grant amnesties; (21) to establish, under the names of territories, special regulations for the government of regions inhabited by unconquered and uncivilized Indians. Such territories will be under the immediate supervision of the Executive of the Union; (22) to establish the modes of procedure and to designate the penalties to be imposed by the Senate in the trials originated in the Chamber of Deputies; (24) to increase the basis of population for the election of deputies; (25) to permit or refuse the admission of foreigners into the service of the Republic; (26) to make laws in respect to retirements from the military service and army

pensions; (27) to dictate the law of responsibility on the part of all national employes and those of the States for infraction of the constitution and the general laws of the Union; (28) to determine the mode of conceding military rank or promotion; (29) to elect the Federal Council provided for in this constitution and to convoke the alternates of the senators and deputies who may have been chosen for it.

**Art. 44.** Besides the preceding enumeration the National Legislature may pass such laws of general character as may be necessary, but in no case can they be promulgated, much less executed, if they conflict with this constitution, which defines the prerogatives of the public powers in Venezuela.

**Art. 45.** The laws and decrees of the National Legislature may be proposed by the members of either chamber, provided that the respective projects are conformed to the rules established for the Parliament of Venezuela.

**Art. 46.** After a project may have been presented, it will be read and considered in order to be admitted; and if it is, it must undergo three discussions, with an interval of at least one day between each, observing the rules established for debate.

**Art. 47.** The projects approved in the chamber in which they were originated will be passed to the other for the purposes indicated in the preceding article, and if they are not rejected they will be returned to the chamber whence they originated, with the amendments they may have undergone.

**Art. 48.** If the chamber of their origin does not agree to the amendments, it may insist and send its written reasons to the other. They may be discussed together in Congress and deliberate, in a special commission, over the mode of agreement. But if this can not be reached, the project will be of no effect after the chamber of its origin separately decides upon the ratification of its insistence.

**Art. 49.** Upon the passing of the projects from one to the other chamber, the days on which they have been discussed will be stated.

**Art. 50.** The law reforming another law must be fully engrossed and the former law, in all its parts, will be annulled.

**Art. 51.** In the laws this form will be used: "The Congress of the United States of Venezuela decrees."

**Art. 52.** The projects defeated in one legislature cannot be reintroduced except in another.

**Art. 53.** The projects pending in a chamber at the close of the sessions must undergo the same three discussions in succeeding legislatures.

**Art. 54.** Laws are annulled with the same formalities established for their sanction.

**Art. 55.** When the ministers of Cabinet may have sustained, in a chamber, the unconstitutionality of a project by word or in writing, and, notwithstanding this, it may have been sanctioned as law, the National Executive, with the affirmative vote of the Federal Council, will suspend its execution and apply to the legislatures of the States, asking their vote in the matter.

**Art. 56.** In case of the foregoing article, each State will represent one vote expressed by the majority of the members of the legislature present, and the result will be sent to the High Federal Court in this form: "I confirm" or "I reject."

**Art. 57.** If a majority of the legislatures of the States agree with the Federal Executive, the High Federal Court will confirm the suspension, and the Federal Executive himself will render an account to the next Congress relative to all that has been done in the matter.

**Art. 58.** The laws will not be observed until after being published in the solemn form established.

**Art. 59.** The faculty conceded to sanction a law is not to be delegated.

**Art. 60.** No legislative disposition will have a retroactive effect, except in matters of judicial procedure and that which imposes a lighter penalty.

**Art. 61.** There will be a Federal Council composed of one senator and one deputy for each State and of one more deputy for the Federal District, who will be elected by the Congress each two years from among the respective representations of the States composing the Federation and from that of the Federal District. This election will take place in the first fifteen days of the meeting of Congress, in the first and third year of the constitutional period.

**Art. 62.** The Federal Council elects from its members the President of the United States of Venezuela, and in the same manner the person who shall act in his stead in case of his temporal or permanent disability during his term. The elector of a person to be President of the United States of Venezuela who is not a member of the Federal Council, as well as of those who may have to act in his stead in case of his temporal or permanent disability, is null of right and void of efficacy.

**Art. 63.** The members of the Federal Council hold office for two years, the same as the President of the United States of Venezuela, whose term is of equal duration; and neither he nor they can be reelected for the term immediately succeeding, although they may return to occupy their posts as legislators in the chambers to which they belong.

**Art. 64.** The Federal Council resides in the district and exercises the functions prescribed in this constitution. It cannot deliberate with less than an absolute majority of all its members; it dictates the interior regulations to be observed in its deliberations, and annually appoints the person who shall preside over its sessions.

**Art. 65.** The prerogatives of the President of Venezuela are: (1) To appoint and remove the cabinet ministers; (2) to preside over the cabinet, in whose discussions he will have a vote, and to inform the Council of all the matters that refer to the General Administration; (3) to receive and welcome public ministers; (4) to sign the official letters to the Sovereigns or Presidents of other countries; (5) to order the execution of the laws and decrees of the National Legislature, and to take care that they are complied with and executed; (6) to promulgate the resolutions and decrees that may have been proposed and received the approbation of the Federal Council, in conformity with article 66 of this constitution; (7) to organize the Federal District and to act therein as the chief civil and political authority established by this constitution; (8) to issue registers of navigation to national vessels; (9) to render an account to Congress, within the first eight days of its annual session, of the cases in which, with the approval of the Federal Council, he may have exercised all or any of the faculties accorded

to him in article 66 of this compact; (10) to discharge the other functions that the national laws entrust to him.

**Art. 66.** Besides the foregoing prerogatives, that are personal to the president of the United States of Venezuela, he can, with the deliberate vote of the Federal Council, exercise the following: (1) To protect the Nation from all exterior attack; (2) to administer the public lands, mines, and salt mines of the States as their delegate; (3) to convoke the National Legislature in its regular sessions, and in extraordinary session when the gravity of any subject demands it; (4) to nominate persons for diplomatic positions, consuls-general, and consuls; those named for the first and second positions must be Venezuelans by birth; (5) to direct negotiations and celebrate all kinds of treaties with other nations, submitting these to the National Legislature; (6) to celebrate contracts of national interest in accordance with the laws and to submit them the legislatures for their approval; (7) to nominate the employes of hacienda, which nominations are not to be made by any other authority. It is required that these employes shall be Venezuelans by birth; (8) to remove and suspend employes of his own free motion, ordering them to be tried if there should be cause for it; (9) to declare war in the name of the Republic when Congress shall have decreed it; (10) in the case of foreign war he can, first, demand from the States the assistance necessary for the national defense; second, require, in anticipation, the contributions and negotiate the loans decreed by the National Legislature; third, arrest or expel persons who pertain to the nation with which war is carried on and who may be opposed to the defense of the country; fourth, to suspend the guarantees that may be incompatible with the defense of the country, except that of life; fifth, to select the place to which the General Power of the Federation may be provisionally translated when there may be grave reasons for it; sixth, to bring to trial for treason to the country those Venezuelans who may be, in any manner, hostile to the national defense; seventh, to issue registers to corsairs and privateers and to prescribe the laws that they must observe in cases of capture; (11) to employ the public force and the powers contained in numbers 1, 2, and 5 of the preceding clause with the object of re-establishing constitutional order in case of armed insurrection against the institutions of the Nation; (12) to dispose of the public force for the purpose of quelling every armed collision between two or more States, requiring them to lay down their arms and submit their controversies to the arbitration to which they are pledged by number 30, article 14 of this constitution; (13) to direct the war and to appoint the person who shall command the army; (14) to organize the national force in time of peace; (15) to concede general or particular exemptions; (16) to defend the territory designated for the Federal District when there may be reasons to apprehend that it will be invaded by hostile forces.

**Art. 67.** The President of the United States of Venezuela shall have the ministers for his cabinet that the law designates. It will determine their functions and duties and will organize their bureaus.

**Art. 68.** To be a minister of the cabinet it is required that the person shall be twenty-five



years of age, a Venezuelan by birth or five years of naturalization.

**Art. 69.** The ministers are the natural and proper organs of the President of the United States of Venezuela. All his acts must be subscribed by them and without such requisite they will not be complied with nor executed by the authorities, employees, or private persons.

**Art. 70.** All the acts of the ministers must be conformed to this Constitution and the laws; their personal responsibility is not saved, although they may have the written order of the President.

**Art. 71.** The settlement of all business, except the fiscal affairs of the bureaus, will be determined in the council of ministers, and their responsibility is collective and consolidated.

**Art. 72.** The ministers, within the five first sessions of each year, will render an account to the Chambers of what they may have done or propose to do in their respective branches. They will also render written or verbal reports that may be requested of them, reserving only that which, in diplomatic affairs, it may not be convenient to publish.

**Art. 73.** Within the same period, they will present to the National Legislature the estimates of public expenditures and the general account of the past year.

**Art. 74.** The ministers have the right to be heard in the Chambers, and are obliged to attend when they may be called upon for information.

**Art. 75.** The ministers are responsible: (1) for treason to the country; (2) for infraction of this Constitution or the laws; (3) for malversation of the public funds; (4) for exceeding the estimates in their expenditures; (5) for subornation or bribery in the affairs under their charge or in the nominations for public employees; (6) for failure in compliance with the decisions of the Federal Council.

**Art. 76.** The High Federal Court will be composed of as many judges as there may be States of the Federation and with the following qualities: (1) A judge must be a Venezuelan by birth; (2) he must be thirty years of age.

**Art. 77.** For the nomination of judges of the High Federal Court the Congress will convene on the fifteenth day of its regular sessions and will proceed to group together the representation of each State from which to form a list of as many candidates for principal judges and an equal number of alternates as there may be States of the Federation. The Congress, in the same or following session, will elect one principal and one alternate for each State, selecting them from the respective lists.

**Art. 78.** The law will determine the different functions of the judges and other officers of the High Federal Court.

**Art. 79.** The judges and their respective alternates will hold office for four years. The principals and their alternates in office can not accept during this period any office in the gift of the executive without previous resignation and lawful acceptance. The infraction of this disposition will be punished with four years of disability to hold public office in Venezuela.

**Art. 80.** The matters within the competence of the High Federal Court are: (1) to take cognizance of civil or criminal causes that may be instituted against diplomatic officers in those cases permitted by the law of nations; (2) to take cognizance of causes ordered by the President to be

instituted against cabinet ministers when they may be accused according to the cases provided for in this Constitution. In the matter of the necessity of suspension from office, they will request the President to that effect and he will comply; (3) to have jurisdiction of the causes of responsibility instituted against diplomatic agents accredited to another nation for the wrong discharge of their functions; (4) to have jurisdiction in civil trials when the nation is defendant and the law sanctions it; (5) to dissipate the controversies that may arise between the officials of different States in political order in the matter of jurisdiction or competence; (6) to take cognizance of all matters of political nature that the States desire to submit for their consideration; (7) to declare which may be the law in force when the national and State laws may be found to conflict with each other; (8) to have jurisdiction in the controversies that may result from contracts or negotiations celebrated by the president of the federation; (9) to have jurisdiction in causes of imprisonment; (10) to exercise other prerogatives provided for by law.

**Art. 81.** The Court of Appeals referred to in paragraph 20, article 13 of this Constitution, is the tribunal of the states; it will be composed of as many judges as there are states of the federation, and their terms of office will last for four years.

**Art. 82.** A judge of the Court of Appeals must have the following qualifications: (1) he must be an attorney at law in the exercise of his profession, and must have had at least six years practice; (2) he must be a Venezuelan, thirty years of age.

**Art. 83.** Every four years the legislature of each State will form a list of as many attorneys, with the qualifications expressed in the preceding article, as there are States, and will remit it, duly certified, to the Federal Council in order that this body, from the respective lists, may select a judge for each State in the organization of this high tribunal.

**Art. 84.** After the Federal Council may have received the lists from all the States, it will proceed, in public session, to verify the election; forming thereafter a list of the attorneys not elected, in order that from this general list, which will be published in the official paper, the permanent vacancies that may occur in the Court of Appeals may be filled by lot. The temporary vacancies will be filled according to law.

**Art. 85.** The Court of Appeals will have the following prerogatives: (1) to take cognizance of criminal causes or those of responsibility that may be instituted against the high functionaries of the different States, applying the laws of the States themselves in matters of responsibility, and in case of omission of the promulgation of a law of constitutional precept, it will apply to the cause in question the general laws of the land; (2) to take cognizance and to decide in cases of appeal in the form and terms directed by law; (3) to annually report to the National Legislature the difficulties that stand in the way of uniformity in the matter of civil or criminal legislation; (4) to dispose of the rivalries that may arise between the officers or functionaries of judicial order in the different States of the federation and amongst those of a single State, provided that the authority to settle them does not exist in the State.

**Art. 86.** The National Executive is exercised by the Federal Council, the President of the United States of Venezuela, or the person who fills his vacancies, in union with the cabinet ministers who are his organs. The President of Venezuela must be a Venezuelan by birth.

**Art. 87.** The functions of National Executive can not be exercised outside of the federal district except in the case provided for in number 5, paragraph 10, article 66 of the Constitution. When the President, with the approval of the Council, shall take command of the army or absent himself from the district on account of matters of public interest that demand it, he can not exercise any functions and will be replaced by the Federal Council in accordance with article 62 of this Constitution.

**Art. 88.** Everything that may not be expressly assigned to the general administration of the nation in this Constitution is reserved to the States.

**Art. 89.** The tribunals of justice in the States are independent; the causes originated in them will be concluded in the same States without any other review than that of the Court of Appeals in the cases provided for by law.

**Art. 90.** Every act of Congress and of the National Executive that violates the rights guaranteed to the States in this Constitution, or that attacks their independence, must be declared of no effect by the High Court, provided that a majority of the legislatures demands it.

**Art. 91.** The public national force is divided into naval and land troops, and will be composed of the citizen militia that the States may organize according to law.

**Art. 92.** The force at the disposal of the federation will be organized from citizens of a contingent furnished by each State in proportion to its population, calling to service those citizens that should render it according to their internal laws.

**Art. 93.** In case of war the contingent can be augmented by bodies of citizen militia up to the number of men necessary to fill the draft of the National Government.

**Art. 94.** The National Government may change the commanders of the public force supplied by the States in the cases and with the formalities provided for in the national military law and then their successors will be called for from the States.

**Art. 95.** The military and civil authority can never be exercised by the same person or corporation.

**Art. 96.** The nation, being in possession of the right of ecclesiastical patronage, will exercise it as the law upon the subject may direct.

**Art. 97.** The Government of the Federation will have no other resident employes with jurisdiction or authority in the States than those of the States themselves. The officers of hacienda, those of the forces that garrison national fortresses, arsenals created by law, navy-yards, and habilitated ports, that only have jurisdiction in matters peculiar to their respective offices and within the limits of the forts and quarters that they command, are excepted; but even these must be subject to the general laws of the State in which they reside. All the elements of war now existing belong to the National Government; nevertheless it is not to be understood that the States are prohibited from acquiring those that they may need for domestic defense.

**Art. 98.** The National Government can not station troops nor military officers with command

in a State, although they may be from that or another State, without permission of the government of the State in which the force is to be stationed.

**Art. 99.** Neither the National Executive nor those of the States can resort to armed intervention in the domestic contentions of a State; it is only permitted to them to tender their good offices to bring about a pacific solution in the case.

**Art. 100.** In case of a permanent or temporary vacancy in the office of President of the United States of Venezuela, the States will be immediately informed as to who has supplied the vacancy.

**Art. 101.** Exportation in Venezuela is free and no duty can be placed upon it.

**Art. 102.** All usurped authority is without effect and its acts are null. Every order granted for a requisition, direct or indirect, by armed force or by an assemblage of people in subversive attitude is null of right and void of efficacy.

**Art. 103.** The exercise of any function not conferred by the constitution or laws is prohibited to every corporation or authority.

**Art. 104.** Any citizen may accuse the employes of the nation or the States before the chamber of deputies, before their respective superiors in office, or before the authorities designated by law.

**Art. 105.** No payment shall be made from the National Treasury for which Congress has not expressly provided in the annual estimate, and those that may infringe this rule will be civilly responsible to the National Treasury for the sums they have paid out. In every payment from the public Treasury the ordinary expenses will be preferred to the extraordinary charges.

**Art. 106.** The offices of collection and disbursement of the national taxes shall be always separate, and the officers of collection may disburse only the salaries of their respective employes.

**Art. 107.** When, for any reason, the estimate of appropriations for a fiscal period have not been made, that of the immediately preceding period will continue in force.

**Art. 108.** In time of elections, the public national force or that of the States themselves will remain closely quartered during the holding of popular elections.

**Art. 109.** In international treaties of commerce and friendship this clause will be inserted, to wit: "all the disagreements between the contracting parties must be decided without an appeal to war, by the decision of a power or friendly powers."

**Art. 110.** No individual can hold more than one office within the gift of Congress and the National Executive. The acceptance of any other is equivalent to resignation of the first. Officials that are removable will cease to hold office upon accepting the charge of a Senator or Deputy when they are dependents of the National Executive.

**Art. 111.** The law will create and designate other national tribunals that may be necessary.

**Art. 112.** National officers can not accept gifts, commissions, honors, or emoluments from a foreign nation without permission from the National Legislature.

**Art. 113.** Armed force can not deliberate; it is passive and obedient. No armed body can make requisitions nor demand assistance of any kind, but from the civil authorities, and in the mode and form prescribed by law.

**Art. 114.** The Nation and the States will promote foreign immigration and colonization in accordance with their respective laws.

**Art. 115.** A law will regulate the manner in which national officers, upon taking charge of their posts, shall take the oath to comply with their duties.

**Art. 116.** The National Executive will negotiate with the Governments of America over treaties of alliance or confederation.

**Art. 117.** The law of Nations forms a part of the National Legislation; its dispositions will be specially in force in cases of civil war, which can be terminated by treaties between the belligerents who will have to respect the humanitarian customs of Christians and civilized nations, the guarantee of life being, in every case, inviolable.

**Art. 118.** This constitution can be reformed by the National Legislature if the legislatures of the States desire it, but there shall never be any reform except in the parts upon which the majority of the States coincide; also a reform can be made upon one or more points when two-thirds of the members of the National Legislature, deliberating separately and by the proceedings established to sanction the laws, shall accord it; but, in this second case, the amendment voted shall be submitted to the legislatures of the States, and it will stand sanctioned in the point or points that may have been ratified by them.

**CONSTITUTION OF THE WATAUGA ASSOCIATION** (the first Western American Commonwealth). See TENNESSEE: A. D. 1769-1772.

**CONSTITUTIONS OF CLARENDON.**—The "Constitutions of Clarendon" were a series of declarations drawn up by a council which King Henry II. of England convened at Clarendon, near Winchester, in 1164, and which were intended to determine the law on various points in dispute between the Crown and the laity, on one side, and the Church on the other. The issues in question were those which brought Henry into collision with Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury. The general provisions embodied in the Constitutions of Clarendon "would now be scarcely challenged in the most Catholic country in the world. 1. During the vacancy of any archbishopric, bishopric, abbey, or priory of royal foundation, the estates were to be in the custody of the Crown. Elections to these preferments were to be held in the royal chapel, with the assent of the king and council. 2. In every suit to which a clerk was a party, proceedings were to commence before the king's justices, and these justices were to decide whether the case was to be tried before a spiritual or a civil court. If it was referred to a spiritual court, a civil officer was to attend to watch the trial, and if a clerk was found guilty of felony the Church was to cease to protect him. 3. No tenant-in-chief of the king, or officer of his household, was to be excommunicated, or his lands laid under an interdict, until application had been first made to the king, or, in his absence, to the chief justice. 4. Laymen were not to be indicted in a bishop's court, either for perjury or other similar offence, except in the bishop's presence by a lawful prosecutor and with lawful witnesses. If the accused was of so high rank that no prosecutor would appear, the bishop might require the sheriff to call a jury to inquire into the case. 5. Archbishops, bishops, and other

**Art. 119.** This constitution will take effect from the day of its official promulgation in each State, and in all public acts and official documents there will be cited the date of the Federation to begin with February 20, 1850, and the date of the law to begin with March 28, 1864.

**Art. 120.** The constitutional period for the offices of the General Administration of the Republic will continue to be computed from February 20, 1852, the date on which the reformed constitution took effect.

**Art. 121.** For every act of civil and political life of the States of the Federation, its basis of population is that which is determined in the last census approved by the National Legislature.

**Art. 122.** The Federal Constitution of April 27, 1851, is repealed. Done in Caracas, in the Palace of the Federal Legislative Corps, and sealed with the seal of Congress on the 9th day of April, 1891. The 28th year of the Law and the 33rd year of the Federation.

(Here follow the signatures of the Presidents, Vice-Presidents, and Second Vice-Presidents of the Senate and Chamber of Deputies, together with those of the Senators and Deputies of the various States, followed by those of the President and the ministers of his cabinet.) See VENEZUELA: A. D. 1869-1892.

great persons were forbidden to leave the realm without the king's permission. 6. Appeals were to be from the archdeacon to the bishop, from the bishop to the archbishop, from the archbishop to the king, and no further; that, by the king's mandate, the case might be ended in the archbishop's court. The last article the king afterwards explained away. It was one of the most essential, but he was unable to maintain it; and he was rash, or he was ill-advised, in raising a second question, on which the pope would naturally be sensitive, before he had disposed of the first."—J. A. Froude, *Life and Times of Becket*, pp. 31-32.—See ENGLAND: A. D. 1162-1170.

**CONSTITUTIONS, Roman Imperial.** See CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS.

**CONSTITUTIONAL UNION PARTY,** The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1860 (APRIL—NOVEMBER).

**CONSUL, Roman.**—When the Romans had rid themselves of their kings and established a republic, or, rather, an aristocratic government, "the civil duties of the king were given to two magistrates, chosen for a year, who were at first called 'pretors' or 'generals,' 'judices' or 'judges,' or consules (cf. con 'together' and sallo 'to leap') or 'colleagues.' In the matter of their power, no violent departure was made from the imperium of the king. The greatest limitation on the consuls was the short period for which they were at the head of the state; but even here they were thought of, by a fiction, as voluntarily abdicating at the expiration of their term, and as nominating their successors, although they were required to nominate the men who had already been selected in the 'comitia centuriata.' Another limitation was the result of the dual character of the magistracy. The imperium was not divided between the consuls, but each possessed it in full, as the king had before. When, therefore, they did not agree, the veto of the one prevailed over the proposal of the other, and there was no

action."—A. Tighe, *Development of the Roman Const.*, ch. 4.—"As judges, the consuls occupied altogether the place of the kings. They decided the legal disputes of the citizens either personally or by deputy. Their criminal jurisdiction was probably limited to the most important cases. . . . In the warlike state of the Romans the military character of the consuls was no doubt most prominent and most important. When the consul led the army into the field he possessed the unlimited military power of the kings (the imperium). He was entrusted with the direction of the war, the distribution of the booty, and the first disposal of the conquered land. . . . The oldest designation for the consuls, therefore, was derived from their military quality, for they were called pretors, that is, commanders. It was, however, precisely in war that the division of power among two colleagues must often have proved prejudicial. . . . and the necessity of unity in the direction of affairs was felt to be indispensable. The dictatorship served this purpose. By decree of the senate one of the consuls could be charged with naming a dictator for six months, and in this officer the full power of the king was revived for a limited period. The dictatorship was a formal suspension of the constitution of the republic. . . . Military was substituted for common law, and Rome, during the time of the dictatorship, was in a state of siege."—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 2, ch. 1, and bk. 6, ch. 3-5.—In the later years of the Roman empire, "two consuls were created by the sovereigns of Rome and Constantinople for the sole purpose of giving a date to the year and a festival to the people. But the expenses of this festival, in which the wealthy and the vain aspired to surpass their predecessors, insensibly arose to the enormous sum of four score thousand pounds; the wisest senators declined a useless honour which involved the certain ruin of their families, and to this reluctance I should impute the frequent chasms in the last age of the consular Fasti. . . . The succession of consuls finally ceased in the thirteenth year of Justinian [A. D. 541] whose despotic temper might be grieved by the final extinction of a title which admonished the Romans of their ancient freedom. Yet the annual consulship still lived in the minds of the people; they fondly expected its speedy restoration. . . . and three centuries elapsed after the death of Justinian before that obsolete dignity, which had been suppressed by custom, could be abolished by law. The imperfect mode of distinguishing each year by the name of a magistrate was usefully supplied by the date of a permanent era."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 40.—"There were no consuls in 531 and 532. The Emperor held the office alone in 533, and with a colleague in 534. Belisarius was sole consul in 535. The two following years, having no consuls of their own, were styled the First and Second after the Consulship of Belisarius. John of Cappadocia gave his name to the year 538, and the years 539 and 540 had again consuls, though one only for each year. In 541 Albinus Basilus sat in the curule chair, and he was practically the last of the long list of warriors, orators, demagogues, courtiers, which began (in the year 509 B. C.) with the names of Lucius Junius Brutus and Lucius Tarquinius Collatinus. All the rest of the years of Justinian, twenty-four in number, were reckoned as Post Consulatum

Basilii."—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders*, bk. 5, ch. 14.—See, also, ROME; B. C. 509.

**CONSULAR TRIBUNES, Roman.**—The plebeians of Rome having demanded admission for their order to the consulship, a compromise was arranged, B. C. 444, which settled that, thereafter, "the people should be free to elect either consuls—that is, patricians according to the old law—or in their place other officers under the title of 'military tribunes with consular power,' consisting of patricians and plebeians. . . . It is not reported in what respect the official competency of the consular tribunes was to differ from that of the consuls. Still, so much is plain, that the difference consisted not alone in name. The number of the consular tribunes was in the beginning fixed at three."—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 2, ch. 11.

**CONSULATE GOVERNMENT OF FRANCE, The.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1790 (NOVEMBER)—DECEMBER.

**CONTINENTAL ARMY.**—"The Continentals" of the American Revolution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775 (MAY—AUGUST).

**CONTINENTAL CURRENCY, The.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1780 (JANUARY—APRIL).

**CONTINENTAL SYSTEM OF NAPOLEON, The.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1801-1802, and 1806-1810.

**CONTIONES, OR CONCIONES.**—The contiones, or conciones, at Rome, were assemblies of the people, "less formal than the comitia," held for the mere purpose of discussing public questions, and incapable of passing any binding resolution. "They could not be called together by anybody except the magistrates, neither had every man the liberty of speaking in them, or making proposals or of declaring his opinion; . . . but even in this limited manner public questions could be discussed and the people could be enlightened. . . . The custom of discussing public questions in the contiones became general after the comitia of the tribes had obtained full legislative competency."—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 6, ch. 1.—See, also, COMITIA CURIATA.

**CONTRABANDS.**—In the early part of the American civil war of 1861-65, the escaped slaves of the Confederates, who came within the Union lines, were called contrabands, General Butler having supplied the term by declaring them to be "contraband of war." See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (MAY).

**CONTRERAS, Battle of.** See MEXICO: A. D. 1847 (MARCH)—SEPTEMBER.

**CONVENT.** See MONASTERY.

**CONVENTICLE ACT, The.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1662-1665.

**CONVENTION, The French National, of the great Revolution.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1792 (AUGUST), and 1792 (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER), to 1795 (OCTOBER)—DECEMBER.

**CONVOCACTION.**—The assemblies of the clergy in the two ecclesiastical provinces of England are called the Convocation of Canterbury and the Convocation of York. The former, which is the superior body, frequently receives the name of Convocation, simply. It is constituted upon the model of Parliament, and is, in fact, the Parliament of the Church of England. It has two Houses: the upper one consisting of

the Archbishop and his Bishops; the lower one composed of deans, archdeacons and proctors, representing the inferior clergy. The Convocation of York has but one House. Since 1716 Convocation has possessed slight powers.

**CONWAY CABAL, The.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777-1778.

**COOMASSIE, Burning of.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1873-1880.

**COPAIC REEDS.** See BEOTIA.

**COPAN, Ruins of.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: MAYAS; and MEXICO, ANCIENT.

**COPEHAN FA' LY, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: COPEHAN FAMILY.

**COPENHAGEN: A. D. 1362.**—Taken and pillaged by the Hanseatic League. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1018-1397.

**A. D. 1658-1660.**—Sieges by Charles X. of Sweden. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1644-1697.

**A. D. 1700.**—Surrender to Charles XII. of Sweden. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1697-1700.

**A. D. 1801.**—Bombardment by the English fleet. See FRANCE: A. D. 1801-1802.

**A. D. 1807.**—Bombardment of the city by the English.—Seizure of the fleet. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1807-1810.

**COPPERHEADS.**—During the American Civil War, the Democratic Party in the Northern States "comprised two well-recognized classes: The Anti-War (or Peace) Democrats, commonly called 'Copperheads,' who sympathized with the Rebellion, and opposed the War for the Union; and the War (or Union) Democrats, who favored a vigorous prosecution of the War for the preservation of the Union."—J. A. Logan, *The Great Conspiracy*, p. 574, *foot-note*.—See, also, UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (OCTOBER).

**COPREY BRIDGE, Battle of.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1644 (JANUARY—JULY).

**COPTS, The.**—The descendants of the ancient Egyptian race, who form to this day the larger part of the population of Egypt. See EGYPT: ORIGIN OF THE ANCIENT PEOPLE.

**COPTOS.**—Destroyed by Diocletian. See ALEXANDRIA: A. D. 296.

**COR, The.** See EPHRAI.

**CORBIE, Spanish capture of (1636).** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1635-1638.

**CORCYRA.** See KORKYRA.

**CORDAY, Charlotte, and the assassination of Marat.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (JULY).

**CORDELIERS.** See MENDICANT ORDERS.

**CORDELIERS, Club of the.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1790.

**CORDOVA (Spain): A. D. 711.**—Surrender to the Arab-Moors. See SPAIN: A. D. 711-713.

**A. D. 756-1031.**—The Caliphate at. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST AND EMPIRE: A. D. 756-1031.

**A. D. 1235.**—Capture by the King of Castile. See SPAIN: A. D. 1212-1238.

**CORDOVA (Mexico), Treaty of.** See MEXICO: A. D. 1820-1826.

**CORDYENE.** See GORDYENE.

**COREA.** See COREA in Supplement (vol. 5).

**COREISH, KOREISH.** See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST AND EMPIRE: A. D. 609-632.

**COREY, Martha and Giles, The execution for witchcraft of.** See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1692.

**CORFINIUM, Cæsar's Capture of.** See ROME: B. C. 50-49.

**CORFU, Ancient.** See KORKYRA.

**A. D. 1216-1880.**—Since the fall of the Greek Empire.—Corfu was won by the Venetians in the early years of the Latin conquest of the Greek empire (1216), but was presently lost, to come back again into the possession of the republic 170 years later. "No part of Greece has been so often cut off from the Greek body. Under Pyrrhos and Agathoklès, no less than under Michael Angelos and Roger, it obeyed: a Epeiros or Sicilian master. . . . At last, after yet another turn of Sicilian rule, it passed for 400 years [1388-1797] to the great commonwealth [of Venice]. In our own day Corfu was not added to free Greece till long after the deliverance of Atlea and Peloponnèsos. But, under so many changes of foreign masters, the island has always remained part of Europe and of Christendom. Alone among the Greek lands, Corfu has never passed under barbarian rule. It has seen the Turk only, for one moment, as an invader [see TURKS: A. D. 1714-1718], for another moment as a nominal overlord."—E. A. Freeman, *Historical Geog. of Europe*, p. 408.—See IONIAN ISLANDS: To 1814.

**CORINIUM.**—A Roman city in Britain, on the site of which is the modern city of Cirencester. Some of the richest mosaic pavements found in England have been uncovered there.—T. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon*, ch. 5.

**CORINTH.**—Corinth, the chief city and state, in ancient times, of the narrow isthmus which connects Peloponnèsus with northern Greece, "owed everything to her situation. The double sea by the isthmus, the confluence of the high road of the whole of Hellas, the rocky citadel towering aloft over land and sea, through which rushed—or around which flowed—an abundance of springs; all these formed so extraordinary a commixture of advantages, that, if the intercourse with other countries remained undisturbed, they could not but call forth an important city. As in Argolis, so on the isthmus also, other besides Dorian families had in the days of the migration helped to found the new state. . . . By the side of the Dorian, five non-Dorian tribes existed in Corinth, attesting the multitude and variety of population, which were kept together as one state by the royal power of the Heraclidæ, supported by the armed force of the Dorians. In the ninth century [B. C.] the royal power passed into the hands of a branch of the Heraclidæ deriving its descent from Bacchis [one of the earliest of the kings]; and it was in the extraordinary genius of this royal line that the greatness of the city originated. The Bacchiadæ opened the city to the immigration of the industrious settlers who hoped to make their fortunes more speedily than elsewhere at this meeting point of all Greek highroads of commerce. They cherished and advanced every invention of importance. . . . They took commerce into their own hands, and established the tramway on the isthmus, along which ships were, on rollers, transported from one gulf to the other. . . . They converted the gulf which had hitherto taken its name from Crisa into the Corinthian, and secured its narrow

inlet by means of the fortified place of Molycria. . . . They continued their advance along the coast and occupied the most important points on the Acropolis."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 2, ch. 1.

**B. C. 745-725.—Constitutional Revolution.—End of Monarchy.—The prytanes.—Commercial progress.**—A violent contention which arose between two branches of the Bacchiadae "no doubt gave the nobles of Corinth power and opportunity to end the struggle by a change in the constitution, and by the discontinuance of the monarchy; this occurred in the year 745 B. C., after eight generations of kings. . . . Yet the place at the head of the commonwealth was not to be entirely taken away from the ancient royal house. A presiding chief (a prytanis), newly elected each year by the whole nobility from the members of the royal race, was henceforward to conduct the government [see PRYTANIS]. It was a peculiar arrangement which this change introduced into Corinth. We may assume that the sovereignty was transferred to the nobles collectively, or to their representative. This representation seems to have been so regulated that each of the eight tribes sent an equal number of members to the Gerousia, i. e. the council of elders. . . . But the first of these eight tribes, to which belonged the royal family, was privileged. From it was chosen the head of the state, an office for which only a Bacchiad was eligible—that is, only a member of the old royal house, which took the foremost place in the first tribe. This clan of the Bacchiadae is said to have contained 200 men. 'They were numerous and wealthy,' says Strabo. Accordingly the royal house did not exclusively retain the first rank in the state, but only in conjunction with the families connected with it by kindred and race. . . . The new constitution of Corinth, the government by nobles, under the dynastic presidency of one family, became a type for other cantons. It was a Corinthian of the Bacchiadae who, twenty or thirty years after the introduction of the prytanes, regulated the oligarchy of the Thebans and gave them laws (about 725 B. C.) . . . The fall of the monarchy in Corinth at first brought with it disastrous consequences for the power and prestige of the commonwealth. The communities of the Megarians—either because the new government made increased demands upon them, or because they considered their allegiance had ceased with the cessation of monarchy, and thought the moment was favourable—deserted Corinth and asserted their freedom. The five communities on the isthmus united together around the territory of Megara, lying in the plain by the Saronic Gulf, where the majority of the Doric tribes had settled; the city of Megara, in the vicinity of two ancient fortresses. . . . became the chief centre of the communities, now associated in one commonwealth. . . . The important progress of Corinth under the prytany of the Bacchiadae was not due to successes upon the mainland, but in another sphere. For navigation and commerce no canton in Hellas was more favourably situated. Lying on the neck of the isthmus, it extended from sea to sea, an advantageous position which had indeed first attracted the Phoenicians thither in ancient times. . . . Corinth, says Thucydides, was always from the first a centre of commerce, and abounded in wealth; for the popu-

lation within and without the Peloponnesus communicated with each other more in ancient times by land across the Isthmus than by sea. But when the Hellenes became more practised in navigation, the Corinthians with their ships put down piracy and established marts on both sides; and through this influx of riches their city became very powerful."—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 3, ch. 3 (p. 2).

**B. C. 509-506.—Opposition to the desire of Sparta to restore tyranny at Athens.** See ATHENS: B. C. 509-506.

**B. C. 481-479.—Congress and organized Hellenic union against Persia.** See GREECE: B. C. 481-479.

**B. C. 458-456.—Alliance with Ægina in unsuccessful war with Athens and Megara.** See GREECE: B. C. 458-456.

**B. C. 440.—Opposition to Spartan interference with Athens in Samos.** See ATHENS: B. C. 440-437.

**B. C. 435-432.—Quarrel with Korkyra.—Interference of Athens.—Events leading to the Peloponnesian War.** See GREECE: B. C. 435-432.

**B. C. 432.—Great sea-fight with the Korkyrians and Athenians.** See GREECE: B. C. 432.

**B. C. 429-427.—The Peloponnesian War: sea-fights and defeats.—Fruitless aid to the Mitylenæans.** See GREECE: B. C. 429-427.

**B. C. 421.—Opposition to the Peace of Nicias.** See GREECE: B. C. 421-418.

**B. C. 415-413.—Help to Syracuse against the Athenians.** See SYRACUSE: B. C. 415-413.

**B. C. 395-387.—Confederacy against Sparta.—The Corinthian War.—Battle on the Nemea.—The Peace of Antalcidas.** See GREECE: B. C. 399-387.

**B. C. 368-365.—Attempt of Epaminondas to surprise the city.—Attempt of the Athenians.** See GREECE: B. C. 371-362.

**B. C. 337.—Congress of Greek states to acknowledge the hegemony of Philip of Macedonia.** See GREECE: B. C. 357-336.

**B. C. 244.—Capture by Antigonos Gonatus, king of Macedon.** See MACEDONIA, &c.: B. C. 277-244.

**B. C. 243-146.—In the Achaian League.** See GREECE: B. C. 280-146.

**B. C. 146.—Sack by the Romans.** See GREECE: B. C. 280-146.

**B. C. 44.—Restoration by Cæsar.**—"In the desolate land of Greece, Cæsar, besides other plans, . . . busied himself above all with the restoration of Corinth. Not only was a considerable burgess-colony conducted thither, but a plan was projected for cutting through the isthmus, so as to avoid the dangerous circumnavigation of the Peloponnesus and to make the whole traffic between Italy and Asia pass through the Corintho-Saronic gulf."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 5, ch. 11.—"Cæsar sent to Corinth a large number of freedmen, and other settlers were afterwards sent by Augustus; but it is certain that many Greeks came to live in the new Corinth, for it became a Greek town. Corinth was a mass of ruins when the new settlers came, and while they were removing the rubbish, they grubbed up the burial places, where they found a great number of earthen figures and bronze urns, which they sold at a high price and filled Rome with them."—

G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, v. 5, ch. 32.—“Corinth rapidly rose under these auspices, became a centre of commerce and art, and took the lead among the cities of European Hellas. Here was established the seat of the Roman government of Achæia, and its population, though the representations we have received of it are extravagant, undoubtedly exceeded that of any Grecian rival.”—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 40.

A. D. 267.—Ravaged by the Goths. See **GOths**: A. D. 258-267.

A. D. 395.—Plundered by the Goths. See **GOths**: A. D. 395.

A. D. 1146.—Sacked by the Normans of Sicily.—Abduction of silk weavers. See **BYZANTINE EMPIRE**: A. D. 1146.

A. D. 1445.—Destruction by the Turks.—The fortifications of the Isthmus of Corinth were stormed and the Peloponnesus invaded by Amurath II. in 1445. “Corinth itself, a city sanctified by its antiquity, by its gods, by its arts, by the beauty of its women, by its fountains, its cypresses, its very ruins themselves, whence its unrivalled situation had always restored it, fell anew, buried in its flames, by the hands of Tourakhan, that ancient and ambitious vizier of Amurath. Its flames were seen from Athens, from Ægina, from Lepanto, from Cytheron, from Pinodus. The inhabitants, as also those of Patras, were led into slavery in Asia, to the number of 60,000.”—A. Lamartine, *Hist. of Turkey*, bk. 11, sect. 10.

A. D. 1463-1464.—Unsuccessful siege by the Venetians.—Fortification of the Isthmus. See **GREECE**: A. D. 1454-1470.

A. D. 1687.—Taken by the Venetians. See **TURKS**: A. D. 1684-1690.

A. D. 1822.—Revolt, siege and capture by the Turks. See **GREECE**: A. D. 1821-1820.

**CORINTH, Miss.**, Siege and Battle. See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1863 (APRIL—MAY; TENNESSEE—MISSISSIPPI), and (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER; MISSISSIPPI).

**CORINTH CANAL, The.**—“On Sunday [August 6, 1893] the canal across the Isthmus of Corinth—[projected by Cæsar—see **ROME**: B. C. 45-44] begun by Nero, and completed, nearly 2,000 years later, by a Greek engineer, M. Matsas—was opened by the King of Greece, who steamed through the canal in his yacht, accompanied by a procession consisting of four Greek torpedo-boats and other vessels, including three English men-of-war and an English despatch-boat. The canal . . . will be practicable for all but the largest vessels.”—*The Spectator*, Aug. 12, 1893.

**CORINTHIAN TALENT.** See **TALENT**.  
**CORINTHIAN WAR, The.** See **GREECE**: B. C. 399-387.

**CORIONDI, The.** See **IRELAND, TRIBES OF ANCIENT**.

**CORITANI, OR CORITAVI.**—A British tribe which occupied the lower valley of the Trent and its vicinity. See **BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES**.

**CORN LAWS (English) and their repeal.** See **TARIFF LEGISLATION (ENGLAND)**: A. D. 1817 1828; 1836-1839; 1842; and 1845-1846.

**CORNABII, OR CORNAVII, The.**—An ancient British tribe which dwelt near the mounds

of the Dee and the Mersey. See **BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES**.

**CORNWALL, Duchy of.**—In the division of the spoils of his conquest of England, William the Conqueror gave to his brother Robert almost the whole shire of Cornwall, besides other vast estates. “Out of those possessions,” says Mr. Freeman, “arose that great Earldom, and afterwards Duchy, of Cornwall, which was deemed too powerful to be trusted in the hands of any but men closely akin to the royal house, and the remains of which have for ages formed the appanage of the heir-apparent to the Crown.”—See, also, **WALES, PRINCE OF**.

**CORNWALLIS, Charles, Lord.**—In the **War of the American Revolution**. See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1776 (AUGUST), (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER); 1780 (FEBRUARY—AUGUST); 1780-1781; 1781 (JANUARY—MAY); 1781 (MAY—OCTOBER). . . . **Indian administration.** See **INDIA**: A. D. 1785-1793. . . . **Irish administration.** See **IRELAND**: A. D. 1798-1800.

**CORON, Battle of (B. C. 287).** See **MACEDONIA, &c.**: B. C. 297-280.

**CORONADO, Expedition of.** See **AMERICAN ABORIGINES; PUEBLOS**.

**CORONATION.**—“The royal consecration in its most perfect form included both coronation and unction. The wearing of a crown was a most ancient sign of royalty, into the origin of which it is useless now to inquire; but the solemn rite of crowning was borrowed from the Old Testament by the Byzantine Cæsars; the second Theodosius was the first emperor crowned with religious ceremonies in Christian times. The introduction of the rite of anointing is less certainly ascertained. It did not always accompany coronation, and, although usual with the later emperors is not recorded in the case of the earlier ones.”—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 6, sect. 60.

**CORONATION STONE.** See **SCOTLAND: 8TH-9TH CENTURIES**; also, **LIA FAIL**.

**CORONEIA, Battles of (B. C. 447 and B. C. 394).** See **GREECE**: B. C. 449-445; and B. C. 399-387.

**CORPS DE BELGIQUE.** See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1864 (OCTOBER).

**CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS, The.**—“The *Corpus Juris Civilis* represents the Roman law in the form which it assumed at the close of the ancient period (a thousand years after the decennial legislation of the Twelve Tables), and through which mainly it has acted upon modern times. It was compiled in the Eastern Roman Empire (the Western ceased in 476 A. D.) under the Emperor Justinian, . . . who reigned 527-565 A. D. The plan of the work, as laid out by [his great law-minister] Tribonian, included two principal parts, to be made from the constitutions of the Roman emperors, and from the treatises of the Roman lawyers. The ‘constitutions’ (law-utterances) of the emperors consisted of—1. ‘Orationes,’ proposals of law, submitted to and adopted by the Senate; 2. ‘Edicta,’ laws issued directly by the emperor as head of the state; 3. ‘Mandata,’ instructions addressed by the emperor to high officers of law and justice; 4. ‘Decreta,’ decisions given by the emperor in cases brought before him by appeal or otherwise; 5. ‘Rescripta,’ answers returned by the emperor when consulted on questions of law by parties in

a suit or by magistrates. . . . Three or four collections had already been made, in which the most important constitutions were selected from the mass, presented in a condensed form, and arranged according to their subjects. The last and most elaborate of these collections was the Theodosian Code, compiled about a century before the accession of Justinian; it is still in great part extant. . . . The new Codex Constitutionum, prepared in little more than a year, was published in April, 529. The next work was to digest the treatises of the most eminent law writers. Thirty-nine were selected, nearly all of whom lived between 100 B. C. and 250 A. D. Their books (2,000 in number) were divided among a body of collaborators (sixteen besides Tribonian), each of whom from the books assigned to him extracted what he thought proper . . . and putting the extracts (9,000 in all) under an arranged series of heads. . . . The Digest—or Pandects (all-receiving), as it is also called from the multiplicity of its sources—was issued with authority of law, in December, 529. . . . While the Digest or Pandects forms much the largest fraction of the Corpus Juris, its relative value and importance are far more than proportionate to its extent. The Digest is, in fact, the soul of the Corpus. . . . To bring the Codex Constitutionum into better conformity with the Digest, it was revised in 534 and issued as we now have it in November of that year. . . . The Corpus Juris includes also an elementary text-book, the Institutiones (founded on the 'Institutiones' of Gaius, who flourished about 150). . . . The Institutes, Digest and Codex were given, as a complete body of law, to the law-schools at Constantinople, Rome, Berytus, Alexandria, Caesarea, to be studied in their five years' curriculum. In the courts it was to supersede all earlier authorities. . . . Later statutes of Justinian, arranged in order of time, form the Novels ('novellae constitutione,' most of them in Greek), the last component of the Corpus Juris."

—J. Hadley, *Int. to Roman Law*, lect. 1.

ALSO IN: J. E. Goudmit, *The Pandects*.

**CORREGIDOR.** See **ALCALDE**.

**CORSICA: Early history.**—"The original inhabitants of Corsica are supposed to have been Ligurians, but at a very early period the people had commercial intercourse with Spain, Ionia and Tuscany. The island was subsequently occupied by the Carthaginians, who, however, were expelled by the Romans during the first Punic war. A few years later Corsica came under the dominion of Rome, and that way was nominally maintained until the downfall of the Empire. It then fell under the dominion of the Vandals, and after their expulsion owned successively the rule of the Goths, the Saracens and the Pisans, and finally of the Genoese. It came into the possession of the latter people in the year 1120. Pisa subsequently made several attempts to drive out her rivals, but they were in the end void of results. But in 1448, Genoa, having sustained great losses in the constant wars in which she was engaged, was induced to surrender the administration of Corsica and of her colonies in the Levant to a corporation known as the Bank of St George. From that time the island was administered by governors appointed by the Bank of St George, almost precisely in the manner in which, in England, up to 1859, the East Indies were administered by an 'imperium

in imperio.'"—G. B. Malleson, *Studies from Genoese History*, ch. 3.

**A. D. 1558-1559.—Revolt against the Genoese rule, and re-subjection.** See **GENOA: A. D. 1538-1559**; and **FRANCE: A. D. 1547-1559**.

**A. D. 1729-1769.—The Struggle for independence.—Romance of King Theodore.—The Paolis.—Cession to France.**—"The revolt of 1558 was renewed in 1564, but ended in 1567, upon the death of its leader, Sampiero. For the next century and a half, Corsica remained inactive; "depressed and miserable under renewed Genoese exactions and tyrannies, but too exhausted to resume hostilities. In 1729, however, fighting again broke out, suddenly roused by one of the many private wrongs then pressing upon the lower orders, and the rebellion soon spread over the whole island. It was well organized under two leaders of energy and ability, and was more determined in its measures than ever. . . . Genoa had recourse to the emperor of Germany, from whom she bought several thousand mercenaries, who were sent across the sea to try their skill upon these unconquerable islanders. . . . The courage and chivalry of his insular foes . . . won for them the regard of the opposing General Wachtendonk; and, chiefly through his mediation, a treaty, supposed to be favourable to the islanders, was concluded between Genoa and the Corte legislative assembly in 1732. Wachtendonk remained in the island another year to see the treaty carried out, and in June, 1734, the German general returned to his own country. . . . But he had scarcely retired before the treaty was broken. Genoa began anew her system of illegal arrests and attempted assassinations; and, once more, the people arose under Hyacinth Paoli, an obscure native of the little village of Morosaglia, but a man of spirit and talent, and a scholar. Under the direction of this man, and of Giannetti, his colleague, a democratic constitution, in the highest degree prudent and practical, was framed for the Corsican people. . . . Early in the next year occurred a strange and romantic adventure in this adventurous country. A man, handsome and well-dressed, surrounded by obsequious courtiers, and attended by every luxury, landed in the island from a vessel well-furnished with gold, ammunition, and arms. This man was a German adventurer, Baron Theodore von Neuhoff, who, after a romantic youth, had suddenly conceived a desire to become king of Corsica. He was a man of great talent and personal fascination, of good judgment, and enthusiastic disposition. He had fallen in love with the bravery and determination of the Corsicans, and longed to head such a nation. He had put himself into communication with the leading islanders; and, having really some little influence at the continental courts, persuaded them that he had much more. He offered to obtain such assistance from foreign potentates, by his persuasions, as should effectually oust the Genoese; and, in return, requested the crown of Corsica. His genius and his enthusiasm were so great, and his promises so dazzling, that, after some hesitation, the poor Corsicans, in their despair, seized upon this last straw; and in March, 1736, Theodore was crowned king. His exertions for the good of this country were untiring. He established manufactures and promoted with all his power art and commerce, at the same time



that, with all the force of his genius, he endeavoured to persuade foreign powers to lend their assistance to his new subjects in the field. His style of living meanwhile was regal and sumptuous. . . . Towards the conclusion of his first year of sovereignty, Theodore left Corsica on a continental tour, with the avowed object of hastening the promised succour. In two years he returned, bringing with him three large and several smaller war vessels, handsomely laden with ammunition, which had actually been raised by means of his talents and persuasive faculties, chiefly amongst the Dutch. But, meanwhile, the Corsicans had had other affairs to which to attend. France had interfered at the request of Genoa; and negotiations were actively going on, when the arrival of the pseudo-king could only interrupt. Theodore, although now so well attended, found himself unheeded and disregarded; and after a few months was forced to leave his new kingdom to its fate, and to return to the continent. Five years later, in 1743, he again returned, again well equipped, this time with English vessels, but with the same ill success. Convinced now that his chance was over and his dream of royalty destroyed, Theodore returned to England with a sore heart, spending his remaining years in this asylum for dethroned kings and ruined adventurers. His tomb may be seen in Westminster Abbey. For the next five and twenty years the war continued between Corsica and Genoa, still fought out on the blood-deluged plains of the unhappy little island. But the republic of Genoa was now long past her prime, and her energies were fading into senility; and, had it not been for the ever-increasing assistance of France, her intrepid foes would long ere this have got the better of her. In May, 1768, a treaty was signed between Genoa and France, by which the republic ceded her now encumbered claims on Corsica to her ally, and left her long-oppressed victim to fight the contest out with the French troops. During this time, first Gaffori, then Pasquale Paoli, were the leaders of the people. Gaffori, a man of refinement, and a hero of skill and intrepidity, was murdered in a *vendetta* in 1753, and in 1755 Pasquale, youngest son of the old patriot Hyacinth Paoli, left his position as officer in the Neapolitan service, and landed, by the general desire of his own people, at Aleria, to undertake the command of the Corsican army. . . . From 1764 to 1768 a truce was concluded between the foes. . . . In August, 1768, the truce was to expire; but, before the appointed day had arrived, an army of 20,000 French suddenly swooped down upon the luckless island. . . . It was a hopeless struggle for Corsica; but the heroism of the undaunted people moved all Europe to sympathy. . . . The Corsicans at first got the better of their formidable foe, at the Bridge of G. . . . in the taking of Borgo, and in other lesser actions. . . . Meanwhile, the country was being destroyed, and the troops becoming exhausted. . . . The battle of Ponte Nuovo, on the 9th of May, 1769, at once and forever annihilated the Corsican cause. . . . After this victory, the French rapidly gained possession of the whole island, and shortly afterwards the struggle was abandoned. . . . In the same year, 1769, Napoleon Buonaparte was born in the house out of the Place du Marché at Ajaccio. 'I was born,' he said himself in a

letter to Paoli, 'the year my country died.'—G. Forde, *A Lady's Tour in Corsica*, v. 2, ch. 18. ALSO IN: P. Fitzgerald, *Kings and Queens of an Hour*, ch. 1.—J. Boswell, *Journal of a Tour to Corsica*.

A. D. 1794.—Conquest by the English. See FRANCE: A. D. 1794 (MARCH—JULY).

A. D. 1796.—Evacuated by the English.—Reoccupied by the French. See FRANCE: A. D. 1796 (SEPTEMBER).

CORTENUOVA, Battle of (1236). See ITALY: A. D. 1183-1250.

CORTES, HERNANDO, 'Conquest of Mexico by.' See MEXICO: A. D. 1510 to 1521-1524.

CORTES, The early Spanish.—The old monarchical constitutions of Castile and Aragon.—'The earliest instance on record of popular representation in Castile occurred at Burgos, in 1169; nearly a century antecedent to the celebrated Leicester parliament. Each city had but one vote, whatever might be the number of its representatives. A much greater irregularity, in regard to the number of cities required to send deputies to cortes [the name signifying 'court'] on different occasions, prevailed in Castile, than had ever existed in England; though, previously to the 15th century, this does not seem to have proceeded from any design of infringing on the liberties of the people. The nomination of these was originally vested in the householders at large, but was afterwards confined to the municipalities,—a most mischievous alteration, which subjected their election eventually to the corrupt influence of the crown. They assembled in the same chamber with the higher orders of the nobility and clergy, but on questions of moment, retired to deliberate by themselves. After the transaction of other business, their own petitions were presented to the sovereign, and his assent gave them the validity of laws. The Castilian commons, by neglecting to make their money grants depend on corresponding concessions from the crown, relinquished that powerful check on its operations so beneficially exerted in the British parliament, but in vain contended for even there till a much later period than that now under consideration. Whatever may have been the right of the nobility and clergy to attend in cortes, their sanction was not deemed essential to the validity of legislative acts; for their presence was not even required in many assemblies of the nation which occurred in the 14th and 15th centuries. The extraordinary power thus committed to the commons was, on the whole, unfavorable to their liberties. It deprived them of the sympathy and cooperation of the great orders of the state, whose authority alone could have enabled them to withstand the encroachments of arbitrary power, and who, in fact, did eventually desert them in their utmost need. . . . The Aragonese cortes was composed of four branches, or arms; the *ricos hombres*, or great barons; the lesser nobles, comprehending the knights; the clergy; and the commons. The nobility of every denomination were entitled to a seat in the legislature. The *ricos hombres* were allowed to appear by proxy, and a similar privilege was enjoyed by baronial heiresses. The number of this body was very limited, twelve of them constituting a quorum. The arm of the ecclesiastics embraced an ample

delegation from the inferior as well as higher clergy. It is affirmed not to have been a component of the national legislature until more than a century and a half after the admission of the commons. Indeed, the influence of the church was much less sensible in Aragon than in the other kingdoms of the Peninsula. . . . The commons enjoyed higher consideration and civil privileges. For this they were perhaps somewhat indebted to the example of their Catalan neighbors, the influence of whose democratic institutions naturally extended to other parts of the Aragonese monarchy. The charters of certain cities accorded to the inhabitants privileges of nobility, particularly that of immunity from taxation; while the magistrates of others were permitted to take their seats in the order of hidalgos. From a very early period we find them employed in offices of public trust, and on important missions. The epoch of their admission into the national assembly is traced as far back as 1133, several years earlier than the commencement of popular representation in Castile. Each city had the right of sending two or more deputies selected from persons eligible to its magistracy; but with the privilege of only one vote, whatever might be the number of its deputies. Any place which had been once represented in cortes might always claim to be so. By a statute of 1307, the convocation of the states, which had been annual, was declared biennial. The kings, however, paid little regard to this provision, rarely summoning them except for some specific necessity. The great officers of the crown, whatever might be their personal rank, were jealously excluded from their deliberations. . . . It was in the power of any member to defeat the passage of a bill, by opposing to it his veto or dissent, formally registered to that effect. He might even interpose his negative on the proceedings of the house, and thus put a stop to the prosecution of all further business during the session. This anomalous privilege, transcending even that claimed in the Polish diet, must have been too invidious in its exercise, and too pernicious in its consequences, to have been often resorted to. This may be inferred from the fact that it was not formally repealed until the reign of Philip II., in 1592. . . . The cortes exercised the highest functions, whether of a deliberative, legislative, or judicial nature. It had a right to be consulted on all matters of importance, especially on those of peace and war. No law was valid, no tax could be imposed, without its consent; and it carefully provided for the application of the revenue to its destined uses. It determined the succession to the crown, removed obnoxious ministers, reformed the household and domestic expenditure of the monarch, and exercised the power, in the most unreserved manner, of withholding supplies, as well as of resisting what it regarded as an encroachment on the liberties of the nation. . . . The statute-book affords the most unequivocal evidence of the fidelity with which the guardians of the realm discharged the high trust reposed in them, in the numerous enactments it exhibits for the security both of person and property. Almost the first page which meets the eye in this venerable record contains the General Privilege, the Magna Charta, as it has been well denominated, of Aragon. It was granted by Peter the Great to the cortes at Sara-

gossa, in 1283. It embraces a variety of provisions for the fair and open administration of justice; for ascertaining the legitimate powers intrusted to the cortes; for the security of property against exactions of the crown; and for the conservation of their legal immunities to the municipal corporations and the different orders of nobility. . . . The Aragonese, who rightly regarded the General Privilege as the broadest basis of their liberties, repeatedly procured its confirmation by succeeding sovereigns. . . . The judicial functions of the cortes have not been sufficiently noticed by writers. They were extensive in their operation, and gave it the name of the General Court."—W. H. Prescott, *Hist. of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, introd., sect. 1-2.*—"Castile bore a closer analogy to England in its form of civil polity than France or even Aragon. But the frequent disorders of its government and a barbarous state of manners rendered violations of law much more continual and flagrant than they were in England under the Plantagenet dynasty. And besides these practical mischiefs, there were two essential defects in the constitution of Castile, through which perhaps it was ultimately subverted. It wanted those two brilliants in the coronet of British liberty, the representation of freeholders among the commons, and trial by jury. The cortes of Castile became a congress of deputies from a few cities, public spirited, indeed, and intrepid, as we find them in bad times, to an eminent degree, but too much limited in number, and too unconnected with the territorial aristocracy, to maintain a just balance against the crown. . . . Perhaps in no European monarchy except our own was the form of government more interesting than in Aragon, as a fortunate temperament of law and justice with the royal authority. . . . Blancas quotes a noble passage from the acts of cortes in 1451. 'We have always heard of old time, and it is found by experience, that seeing the great barrenness of this land, and the poverty of the realm, if it were not for the liberties thereof, the folk would go hence to live and abide in other realms and lands more fruitful.' This high spirit of freedom had long animated the Aragonese. After several contests with the crown in the reign of James I., not to go back to earlier times, they compelled Peter III. in 1283 to grant a law called the General Privilege, the Magna Charta of Aragon, and perhaps a more full and satisfactory basis of civil liberty than our own." They further "established a positive right of maintaining their liberties by arms. This was contained in the Privilege of Union granted by Alfonso III. in 1287, after a violent conflict with his subjects; but which was afterwards so completely abolished, and even eradicated from the records of the kingdom, that its precise words have never been recovered. . . . That watchfulness over public liberty which originally belonged to the aristocracy of ricos hombres . . . and which was afterwards maintained by the dangerous Privilege of Union, became the duty of a civil magistrate whose office and functions are the most pleasing feature in the constitutional history of Aragon. The Justiza or Justiciary of Aragon has been treated by some writers as a sort of anomalous magistrate. . . . But I do not perceive that his functions were, in any essential respect, different from those of the chief justice of England, divided,

from the time of Edward I., among the judges of the King's Bench. . . . All the royal as well as territorial judges were bound to apply for his opinion in case of legal difficulties arising in their courts, which he was to certify within eight days. By subsequent statutes of the same reign it was made penal for any one to obtain letters from the king, impeding the execution of the Justiza's process, and they were declared null. Inferior courts were forbidden to proceed in any business after his prohibition. . . . There are two parts of his remedial jurisdiction which deserve special notice. These are the processes of *juris firma*, or *firma del derecho*, and of *manifestation*. The former bears some analogy to the writs of 'pone' and 'certiorari' in England, through which the Court of King's Bench exercises its right of withdrawing a suit from the jurisdiction of inferior tribunals. But the Aragonese *juris firma* was of more extensive operation. . . . The process termed *manifestation* afforded as ample security for personal liberty as that of *juris firma* did for property."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 4 (p. 2).—For some account of the loss of the old constitutional liberties of Castile and Aragon, under Charles V., see SPAIN: A. D. 1518–1522.—"The councils or meetings of the bishops after the reconquest, like the later Councils of Toledo, were always 'jussu regis,' and were attended by counts and magnates 'ad videndum sine ad audendum verbum Domini.' But when the ecclesiastical business was ended, it was natural that the lay part of the assembly should discuss the affairs of the kingdom and of the people; and insensibly this after-part of the proceeding grew as the first part diminished in importance. The exact date when the Council merged into the Curia or Cortes is difficult to determine; Señor Colmeiro takes the so-named Council of Leon in 1020 as the true starting-point of the latter. The early monarchy of Spain was elective, and the acclamation of the assembled people (plebs) was at least theoretically necessary to render the king's election valid. The presence of the citizens at the Cortes or Zamora, though stated by Sandoval and Morales, is impugned by Señor Colmeiro; but at the Council of Oviedo in 1115 were present bishops of Spain and Portugal 'cum principibus et plebe praeclatae regionis,' and these latter also subscribed the Acts. Still, though present and making their influence more and more felt, there is no record of a true representation of cities until Alfonso IX. convoked the Cortes of Leon in 1188, 'cum archiepiscopo, et episcopis, et magnatibus regni mei et cum electis civibus ex singulis civitatibus'; from this time the three estates—clergy, nobles, citizens—were always represented in the Cortes of Leon. Unfortunately, the political development of Castille did not synchronize with that of Leon. In general, that of Castille was fully half a century later. We pass by more than doubtful the alleged presence of citizens at Burgos 'n 1169; the 'majores civitatum et villarum at the Cortes of Carrion in 1182 were not deputies, but the judges or governors of twenty-eight cities. It is not till the united Cortes of both kingdoms met at Seville in 1250, that we find true representation in Castille. Castille was always more feudal than Leon. It is in this want of simultaneous development, and in the presence of privileged classes, that we find the germ of the

evils which eventually destroyed the liberties of Spain. Neither the number of deputies nor of the cities represented was ever fixed; at Burgos, in 1315, we find 200 deputies (*procuradores*) from 100 cities; gradually the number sank till seven—been, and finally twenty-two, cities alone were represented. The deputies were chosen from the municipality either by lot, by rotation, or by election; they were the mere spokesmen of the city councils, whose mandate was imperative. Their payment was at first by the cities, but, after 1422, by the king; and there are constant complaints that the salary was insufficient. The reign of Juan II. (1406–54) was fatal to the liberties of Castille; the answers to the demands and petitions of the deputies were deferred; and, in fact, if not in form, the law that no tax should be levied without consent of the Cortes was constantly violated. Still, but for the death of Prince Juan, in 1497, and the advent of the Austrian dynasty with the possession of the Low Countries, the old liberties might yet have been recovered. . . . With the Cortes of Toledo, in 1538, ended the meeting of the three estates. The nobility first, then the clergy, were eliminated from the Cortes, leaving only the protectors of the cities to become servile instruments for the purposes of taxation."—W. Webster, *Review of Colmeiro's "Cortes de los Antiguos Reinos de Leon y de Castilla"* (*Academy*, Aug. 10, 1884).

**CORUNNA, Battle of (1809).** See SPAIN: A. D. 1808–1809 (AUGUST—JANUARY).

**CORUPEDIUM, Battle of.**—A battle fought in western Phrygia, B. C. 281, in which Lysimachus, one of the disputants for Alexander's empire, was defeated by Seleucus, and slain.—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 60.

**CORVÉE.**—One of the feudal rights possessed in France (under the old regime, before the Revolution) "by the lord of the manor over his subjects, by means of which he could employ for his own profit a certain number of their days of labour, or of their oxen and horses. The 'Corvée à volonté,' that is to say, at the arbitrary will of the Seigneur, had been completely abolished [before the Revolution]; forced labour had been for some time past confined to a certain number of days a-year."—A. de Tocqueville, *On the State of Society in France before 1789*, note 4 E. (p. 409).

**CORVUS, The Roman.** See PUNIC WAR, THE FIRST.

**COS, OR KJS.**—One of the islands in the Ægean call'd the Sporades, near the Carian coast of Asia Minor. The island was sacred to Asclepius, or Æsculapeus, and was the birth-place of the celebrated physician Hippocrates, as well as of the painter Apelles. It was an Æolian colony, but joined the Dorian confederacy.

**COSIMO DE' MEDICI, The ascendancy at Florence of.** See FLORENCE: A. D. 1433–1464.

**COSMOS, COSMIOS, COSMOPOLIS.** See DEMIURGI.

**COSSACKS, The.**—"The origin of the Cossack tribes is lost in the obscurity of ages; and many celebrated historians are still divided in opinion as to whence the term Cossack, or rather Kosaque, is properly to be derived. This word, indeed, is susceptible of so many etymological explanations, as scarcely to offer for any one of them decided grounds of preference. Everything, however, would seem to favour the belief

that the word Cossack, or Kosaque, was in much earlier use in the vicinity of the Caucasus than in the Ukraine. . . . Sherer, in his 'Annals of Russia Minor,' (*La Petite Russie*.) traces back the origin of the Cossacks to the ninth century; but he does not support his assertion by any facts clothed with the dignity of historical truth. It appears certain, however, that the vast pasture lands between the Don and the Dnieper, the country lying on the south of Kïow, and traversed by the Dnieper up to the Black Sea, was the principal birthplace of the Cossacks. When, in 1242, Batukhan came with 500,000 men to take possession of the empire which fell to his share of the vast inheritance left by Telingis Khan [see *MONGOLS*: A. D. 1239-1294], he extirpated many nations and displaced many others. One portion of the Komans flying from the horrors of this terrific storm, and arriving on the borders of the Caspian Sea, on the banks of the Iaik, (now Ouralsek,) turned to the left, and took refuge between the embouchures of that river, where they dwelt in small numbers, apart from their brethren, in a less fertile climate. These were, incontestably, the progenitors of the Cossacks of the Iaik, who are, historically, scarcely important enough for notice. . . . At the approach of this formidable invasion towards the Don, that portion of the Komans located on the left bank took refuge in the marshes, and in the numerous islands formed by that river near its embouchure. Here they found a secure retreat; and from thence, having, from their new position, acquired maritime habits and seafaring experience, they not only, themselves, resorted to piracy as a means of existence, but likewise enlisted in a formidable confederacy, for purposes of rapine and pillage, all the roving and discontented tribes in their surrounding neighbourhood. These latter were very numerous. The Tartars, ever but indifferent scamen, had not the courage to join them in these piratical expeditions. This division of the Komans is indubitably the parent stock of the modern Cossacks of the Don, by far the most numerous of the Cossack tribes: by amalgamation, however, with whole hosts of Tartar and Calmuck hordes, lawless, desperate, and nomadic as themselves, they lost, in some degree, the primitive and deeply marked distinctive character of their race. The Komans of the Dnieper offered no more energetic resistance to the invading hordes of Batukhan than had been shown by their brethren of the Don: they dispersed in various directions, and from this people flying at the advance of the ferocious Tartars descended a variety of hordes, who occasionally figure in history as distinct and independent nations. . . . [They] ultimately found a permanent resting-place in the wild islets of the Dnieper, below the cataracts, where dwelt already a small number of their ancient compatriots, who had escaped the general destruction of their nation. This spot became the cradle of the Cossacks of the Ukraine, or of the tribes known in after times as the Polish Cossacks. When Gnedynuri, Grand Duke of Lithuania, after having defeated twelve Russian princes on the banks of the Pierna, conquered Kïow with its dependencies in 1320, the wandering tribes scattered over the steppes of the Ukraine owned his allegiance. After the victories of Olgierd, of Vitold, and of Ladislas Jagellon, over the Tartars and the Russians,

large bodies of Scythian militia, known subsequently by the comprehensive denomination of Cossacks, or Kosaqucs, served under these conquerors: and after the union of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania with Poland, in 1386, they continued under the dominion of the grand dukes of Lithuania, forming, apparently, an intermediate tribe or caste, superior to the peasantry and inferior to the nobles. At a later period, when the Ukraine was annexed to the Polish crown, they passed under the protection of the kings of Poland. . . . Although there may, doubtless, exist several species or castes of Cossacks, had to whom Russia in order to impose on Europe, is pleased to give as many different names, yet there never have been, nor will there ever be, properly speaking, more than two principal tribes of the Cossack nation, namely the Cossacks of the Don, or Don-Cossacks, and the Cossacks of the Black Sea, known in ancient times as the Polish Cossacks, or Zaporowsey Kozaey. . . . The Cossacks [of the Don] . . . have rendered signal service to Russia, which, ever since the year 1549, has taken them under her protection, without, however, the existence of any official act, treaty, or stipulation, confirming their submission to that power. . . . The Don-Cossacks enjoy a certain kind of liberty and independence; they have a hetman, attaman, or chief, nominated by the Emperor of Russia; and to this chief they yield an obedience more or less willing and implicit; in general, they are commanded only by Cossack officers, who take equal rank in the Russian army. They have a separate war administration of their own; although they are compelled to furnish a stated number of recruits who serve in a manner for life, inasmuch as they are rarely discharged before attaining sixty years of age: on the whole, their condition is happier than that of the rest of the Russian population. They belong to the Greek-Russian church. The existence of this small republic of the Don, in the very heart of the most despotic and most extensive empire in the world, appears to constitute a problem, the solution of which is not as yet definitely known, and the ultimate solution of which yet remains to be ascertained." —H. Krasinski, *The Cossacks of the Ukraine*, ch. 1.—The Cossacks of the Ukraine transferred their allegiance from the King of Poland to the Czar of Russia in 1654, after a revolt led by their hetman, Bogdan Khmelnitski, in which they were assisted by the neighboring Tartars, and which was accompanied by terrible scenes of slaughter and destruction. See *POLAND*: A. D. 1648-1654.

**COSSÆANS**, The. See *KOSSÆANS*.

**COSTA RICA**: A. D. 1502.—Discovery by Columbus. See *AMERICA*: A. D. 1498-1505.

A. D. 1813-1871.—Independence of Spain.—Brief annexation to Mexico.—The failures of federation, the wars and revolutions of Central America. See *CENTRAL AMERICA*: A. D. 1821-1871.

A. D. 1850.—The Clayton Bulwer Treaty and the projected Nicaragua Canal. See *NICARAGUA*: A. D. 1850.

**COSTANOAN FAMILY**, The. See *AMERICAN ABORIGINALS*: COSTANOAN FAMILY.

**COSTER**, Laurent, and the invention of printing. See *PRINTING*: A. D. 1430-1450.

**COTARII**. See *SLAVERY*, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN: ENGLAND.

**COTTON OF CARTHAGE, The.**—"There were two land-locked docks or harbours, opening the one into the other, and both, it would seem, the work of human hands. . . . The outer harbour was rectangular, about 1,400 feet long and 1,100 broad, and was appropriated to merchant vessels; the inner was circular like a drinking cup, whence it was called the Cothon, and was reserved for ships of war. It could not be approached except through the merchant harbour, and the entrance to this last was only 70 feet wide, and could be closed at any time by chains. The war harbour was entirely surrounded by quays, containing separate docks for 220 ships. In front of each dock were two Ionic pillars of marble, so that the whole must have presented the appearance of a splendid circular colonnade. Right in the centre of the harbour was an island, the headquarters of the admiral."—R. B. Smith, *Carthage and the Carthaginians*, ch. 20.

**COTSETI.** See SLAVERY, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN: ENGLAND.

**COTTON, Rev. John, and the colony of Massachusetts Bay.** See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1631-1636.

**COTTON FAMINE, The.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1861-1865.

**COTTON-GIN: Eli Whitney's invention and its effects.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1818-1821.

**COTTON MANUFACTURE: The great inventions in spinning and weaving.**—"Cotton had been used in the extreme East and in the extreme West from the earliest periods of which we have any record. The Spaniards, on their discovery of America, found the Mexicans clothed in cotton. . . . But though the use of cotton had been known from the earliest ages, both in India and America, no cotton goods were imported into Europe; and in the ancient world both rich and poor were clothed in silk, linen, and wool. The industrious Moors introduced cotton into Spain. Many centuries afterwards cotton was imported into Italy, Saxony and the Low Countries. Isolated from the rest of Europe, with little wealth, little industry, and no roads; rent by civil commotions; the English were the last people in Europe to introduce the manufacture of cotton goods into their own homes. Towards the close of the 16th century, indeed, cotton goods were occasionally mentioned in the Statute Book, and the manufacture of the cottons of Manchester was regulated by Acts passed in the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth. But there seem to be good reasons for concluding that Manchester cottons, in the time of the Tudors, were woollen goods, and did not consist of cotton at all. More than a century elapsed before any considerable trade in cotton attracted the attention of the legislature. The woollen manufacturers complained that people were dressing their children in printed cottons; and Parliament was actually persuaded to prohibit the introduction of Indian printed calicoes. Even an Act of Parliament, however, was unable to extinguish the growing taste for Indian cottons. . . . The taste for cotton led to the introduction of calico-printing in London; Parliament in order to encourage the new trade, was induced to sanction the importation of plain cotton cloths from India under a duty. The demand, which was thus created for calicoes, probably promoted their manufacture at home. . . . Up to the mid-

dle of the last century cotton goods were really never made at all. The so-called cotton manufactures were a combination of wool or linen and cotton. No Englishman had been able to produce a cotton thread strong enough for the warp. . . . The superior skill of the Indian manufacturers enabled them to use cotton for a warp; while clumsy workmanship made the use of cotton for a warp unattainable at home. In the middle of the 18th century, then, a piece of cotton cloth in the true sense of the term, had never been made in England. The so-called cotton goods were all made in the cottages of the weavers. The yarn was carded by hand; it was spun by hand; it was worked into cloth by a hand loom. . . . The operation of weaving was, however, much more rapid than that of spinning. The weaver consumed more weft than his own family could supply him with; and the weavers generally experienced the greatest difficulty in obtaining sufficient yarn. About the middle of the 18th century the ingenuity of two persons, a father and a son, made this difference more apparent. The shuttle had originally been thrown by the hand from one end of the loom to the other. John Kay, a native of Bury, by his invention of the fly-shuttle [patented in 1733], saved the weaver from this labour. . . . Robert Kay, John Kay's son, added the drop-box, by means of which the weaver was able to use any one of three shuttles, each containing a different coloured weft, without the trouble of taking them from and replacing them in the lathe.' By means of these inventions the productive power of each weaver was doubled. . . . Carding and roving were both slowly performed. . . . The trade was in this humble and primitive state when a series of extraordinary and unparalleled inventions revolutionised the conditions on which cotton had been hitherto prepared. A little more than a century ago John Hargreaves, a poor weaver in the neighbourhood of Blackburn, was returning home from a long walk, in which he had been purchasing a further supply of yarn for his loom. As he entered his cottage, his wife Jenny accidentally upset the spindle which she was using. Hargreaves noticed that the spindles which were now thrown into an upright position, continued to revolve, and that the thread was still spinning in his wife's hand. The idea immediately occurred to him that it would be possible to connect a considerable number of upright spindles with one wheel, and thus multiply the productive power of each spinner. . . . Hargreaves succeeded in keeping his admirable invention secret for a time; but the powers of his machine soon became known. His ignorant neighbours hastily concluded that a machine, which enabled one spinner to do the work of eight, would throw multitudes of persons out of employment. A mob broke into his house and destroyed his machine. Hargreaves himself had to retire to Nottingham, where, with the friendly assistance of another person, he was able to take out a patent [1770] for the spinning-jenny, as the machine, in compliment to his industrious wife, was called. The invention of the spinning-jenny gave a new impulse to the cotton manufacture. But the . . . yarn spun by the jenny, like that which had previously been spun by hand, was neither fine enough nor hard enough to be employed as warp, and linen or woollen threads had consequently to be used for this purpose. In

the very year, however, in which Hargreaves moved from Blackburn to Nottingham, Richard Arkwright [who began life as a barber's assistant] took out a patent [1769] for his still more celebrated machine. . . . 'After many years of intense and painful application,' he invented his memorable machine for spinning by rollers; and laid the foundations of the gigantic industry which has done more than any other trade to concentrate in this country the wealth of the world. . . . He passed the thread over two pairs of rollers, one of which was made to revolve much more rapidly than the other. The thread, after passing the pair revolving slowly, was drawn into the requisite tenacity by the rollers revolving at a higher rapidity. By this simple but memorable invention Arkwright succeeded in producing thread capable of employment as warp. From the circumstance that the mill at which his machinery was first erected was driven by water power, the machine received the somewhat inappropriate name of the water frame; the thread spun by it was usually called the water twist. Invention of the spinning-jenny and the water frame would have been useless if the old system of hand-carding had not been superseded by a more efficient and more rapid process. Just as Arkwright applied rotatory motion to spinning, so Lewis Paul introduced revolving cylinders for carding cotton. . . . This extraordinary series of inventions placed an almost unlimited supply of yarn at the disposal of the weaver. But the machinery, which had thus been introduced, was still incapable of providing yarn fit for the finer qualities of cotton cloth. . . . This defect, however, was removed by the ingenuity of Samuel Crompton, a young weaver residing near Bolton. Crompton succeeded in combining in one machine the various excellences 'of Arkwright's water frame and Hargreaves' jenny.' Like the former, his machine, which from its nature is happily called the mule, 'has a system of rollers to reduce the roving; and like the latter it has spindles without bobbins to give the twist. . . . The effects of Crompton's great invention may be stated epigrammatically. . . . The natives of India could spin a pound of cotton into a thread 119 miles long.' The English succeed in spinning the same thread to a length of 160 miles. Yarn of the finest quality was at once at the disposal of the weaver. . . . The ingenuity of Hargreaves, Arkwright and Crompton had been exercised to provide the weaver with yarn. . . . The spinster had beaten the weaver. . . . Edmund Cartwright, a clergyman residing in Kent, happened to be staying at Matlock in the summer of 1784, and to be thrown into the company of some Manchester gentlemen. The conversation turned on Arkwright's machinery, and 'one of the company observed that, as soon as Arkwright's patent expired, so many mills would be erected and so much cotton spun that hands would never be found to weave it.' Cartwright replied 'that Arkwright must then set his wits to work to invent a weaving mill.' . . . Within three years he had himself proved that the invention was practicable by producing the powerloom. Subsequent inventors improved the idea which Cartwright had originated, and within fifty years from the date of his memorable visit to Matlock there were not less than 100,000 powerlooms at work in Great Britain alone. . . . Other inventions, less generally remembered, were

hardly less wonderful or less beneficial than these. . . . Scheele, the Swedish philosopher, discovered in 1774 the bleaching properties of chlorine, or oxy muriatic acid. Berthollet, the French chemist, conceived the idea of applying the acid to bleaching cloth. . . . In the same year in which Watt and Henry were introducing the new acid to the bleacher, Bell, a Scotchman, was laying the foundations of a trade in printed calicoes. 'The old method of printing was by blocks of sycamore.' . . . This clumsy process was superseded by cylinder printing. . . . Such are the leading inventions, which made Great Britain in less than a century the wealthiest country in the world."—S. Walpole, *Hist. of Eng. from 1815*, v. 1, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: R. W. C. Taylor, *Introd. to a Hist. of the Factory System*, ch. 10.—E. Baines, *Hist. of the Cotton Manufacture in Great Britain*.—A. Üre, *The Cotton Manufacture of Great Britain*.

**COULMIERS, Battle of (1870).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1870-1871.

**COUNCIL BLUFFS, The Mormons at.** See MORMONISM: A. D. 1846-1848.

**COUNCIL FOR NEW ENGLAND.** See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1620-1623; 1621-1631; and 1635.

**COUNCIL OF BLOOD, The.** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1567.

**COUNCIL OF FIVE HUNDRED, The Athenian.** See ATHENS: B. C. 510-507. . . . **The French.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1795 (JUNE-SEPTEMBER).

**COUNCIL OF TEN, The.** See VENICE: A. D. 1032-1319.

**COUNCIL OF THE ANCIENTS, The.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1795 (JUNE-SEPTEMBER).

**COUNCIL, THE PRIVY.** See PRIVY COUNCIL.

**COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH, General or Ecumenical.**—There are seven councils admitted by both the Greek and Latin churches as ecumenical (or ecumenical)—that is general, or universal. The Roman Catholics recognize thirteen more, making twenty in all—as follows: 1. The synod of apostles in Jerusalem. 2. The first Council of Nice, A. D. 325 (see NICEÆA, THE FIRST COUNCIL). 3. The first Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381. 4. The first Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431. 5. The Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451. 6. The second Council of Constantinople, A. D. 553. 7. The third Council of Constantinople, A. D. 681. 8. The second Council of Nice, A. D. 787. 9. The fourth Council of Constantinople, A. D. 869. 10. The first Lateran Council, A. D. 1123. 11. The second Lateran Council, A. D. 1139. 12. The third Lateran Council, A. D. 1179. 13. The fourth Lateran Council, A. D. 1215. 14. The first œcumenical synod of Lyon, A. D. 1245. 15. The second œcumenical synod of Lyon, A. D. 1274. 16. The Synod of Vienne in Gaul, A. D. 1311. 17. The Council of Constance, A. D. 1414 (see PAPACY: A. D. 1414-1418). 18. The Council of Basel, A. D. 1431 (see PAPACY: A. D. 1431-1448). 19. The Council of Trent, A. D. 1545 (see PAPACY: A. D. 1537-1563). 20. The Council of the Vatican, A. D. 1869 (see PAPACY: A. D. 1869-1870).

**COUNT AND DUKE, Roman.**—Origin of the titles.—"The defence of the Roman empire was at length committed [under Constantine and his successors] to eight masters-general of the

cavalry and infantry. Under their orders thirty-five military commanders were stationed in the provinces—three in Britain, six in Gaul, one in Spain, one in Italy, five on the Upper and four on the Lower Danube, in Asia eight, three in Egypt, and four in Africa. The titles of Counts and Dukes, by which they were properly distinguished, have obtained in modern languages so very different a sense that the use of them may occasion some surprise. But it should be recollected that the second of those appellations is only a corruption of the Latin word which was indiscriminately applied to any military chief. All these provincial generals were therefore dukes; but no more than ten among them were dignified with the rank of counts or companions, a title of honour, or rather of favour, which had been recently invented in the court of Constantine. A gold belt was the ensign which distinguished the office of the counts and dukes."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 17.—"The Duke and the Count of modern Europe—what are they but the Generals and Companions (Duces and Comites) of a Roman province? Why or when they changed places, the Duke climbing up into such unquestioned pre-eminence over his former superior the Count, I know not, nor yet by what process it was discovered that the latter was the precise equivalent of the Scandinavian Jarl."—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders*, bk. 1, ch. 3.

**COUNT OF THE DOMESTICS.**—In the organization of the Imperial Household, during the later period of the Roman empire, the officers called Counts of the Domestics "commanded the various divisions of the household troops, known by the names of Domestici and Protectores, and thus together replaced the Prætorian Prefect of the earlier days of the Empire. . . . Theoretically, their duties would not greatly differ from those of a Colonel in the Guards."—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders*, bk. 1, ch. 3.

**COUNT OF THE SACRED LARGESSES.**—In the later Roman empire, "the Count who had charge of the Sacred (i. e. Imperial) Bounty, should have been by his title simply the Grand Almoner of the Empire. . . . In practice, however, the minister who took charge of the Imperial Largesses had to find ways and means for every other form of Imperial expenditure. . . . The Count of the Sacred Largesses was therefore in fact the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the Empire."—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders*, bk. 1, ch. 3.

**COUNT OF THE SAXON SHORE.** See SAXON SHORE.

**COUNT PALATINE.** See PALATINE, COUNTS.

**COUNTER-REFORMATION, The.** See PAPACY: A. D. 1534-1540; 1537-1563; 1565-1603.

**COUNTRY PARTY, The.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1672-1673.

**COUP D'ÉTAT OF LOUIS NAPOLEON, The.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1851; and 1851-1852.

**COUREURS DE BOIS.**—"Out of the beaver trade [in the 17th century] rose a huge evil, baneful to the growth and the morals of Canada. All that was most active and vigorous in the colony took to the woods, and escaped from the control of intendants, councils and priests, to the savage freedom of the wilderness.

Not only were the possible profits great, but, in the pursuit of them, there was a fascinating element of adventure and danger. The bush rangers, or coureurs de bois, were to the king an object of horror. They defeated his plans for the increase of the population, and shocked his native instinct of discipline and order. Edict after edict was directed against them; and more than once the colony presented the extraordinary spectacle of the greater part of its young men turned into forest outlaws. . . . We hear of seigniories abandoned; farms turning again into forests; wives and children left in destitution. The exodus of the coureurs de bois would take at times the character of an organized movement. The famous Du Lhut is said to have made a general combination of the young men of Canada to follow him into the woods. Their plan was to be absent four years, in order that the edicts against them might have time to relent. The intendant Duchesneau reported that 800 men out of a population of less than 10,000 souls had vanished from sight in the immensity of a boundless wilderness. Whereupon the king ordered that any person going into the woods without a license should be whipped and branded for the first offence, and sent for life to the galleys for the second. . . . Under such leaders as Du Lhut, the coureurs de bois built forts of palisades at various points throughout the West and Northwest. They had a post of this sort at Detroit some time before its permanent settlement, as well as others on Lake Superior and in the Valley of the Mississippi. They occupied them as long as it suited their purposes, and then abandoned them to the next comer. Michillimackinac was, however, their chief resort."—F. Parkman, *The Old Regime in Canada*, ch. 17.

**COURLAND, Christian conquest of.** See LIVONIA: 12TH-13TH CENTURIES.

**COURT BARON.** See MANORS.

**COURT CUSTOMARY.** See MANORS.

**COURT-LEET.** See MANORS, and SAC AND SOC.

**COURT OF CHANCERY.** See CHANCELLOR.

**COURT OF COMMON PLEAS.** See CURIA REGIS.

**COURT OF HIGH COMMISSION.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1559; and A. D. 1686.

**COURT OF KING'S BENCH.** See CURIA REGIS.

**COURT, SUPREME, of the United States.** See SUPREME COURT.

**COURTRAI:** A. D. 1382.—Pillaged and burned by the French. See FLANDERS: A. D. 1382.

A. D. 1646.—Siege and capture by the French. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1645-1646.

A. D. 1648.—Taken by the Spaniards. See NETHERLANDS (SPANISH PROVINCES): A. D. 1647-1648.

A. D. 1667.—Taken by the French. See NETHERLANDS (THE SPANISH PROVINCES): A. D. 1667.

A. D. 1668.—Ceded to France. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1668.

A. D. 1679.—Restored to Spain. See NIMOUEN, THE PEACE OF.

**COURTRAI, The Battle of.**—The battle of Courtrai (July 11, A. D. 1302), in which the

barons and knights of France were fearfully slaughtered by the sturdy burghers of Flanders, was sometimes called the Day of the Spurs, on account of the great number of gilt spurs which was taken from the bodies of the dead and hung up by the victors in Courtrai cathedral.—G. W. Kitchen, *Hist. of France*, bk. 3, ch. 10, sect. 2.—See Flanders: A. D. 1299-1304.

**COURTS OF LOVE.** See PROVENCE: A. D. 1179-1207.

**COUTHON, and the French Revolutionary Committee of Public Safety.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (JUNE—OCTOBER), to 1794 (JULY).

**COUTRAS, Battle of (1597).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1584-1590.

**COVADONGA, Cave of.** See SPAIN: A. D. 713-737.

**COVENANT, The Halfway.** See BOSTON: A. D. 1657-1669.

**COVENANT, The Solemn League and.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1643 (JULY—SEPTEMBER).

**COVENANTS.**—The name given to the signers and supporters of the Scottish National Covenant (see SCOTLAND: A. D. 1557, 1581 and 1638) and afterwards to all who adhered to the Kirk of Scotland. The war of Montrose with the Covenanters will be found narrated under SCOTLAND: A. D. 1644-1645. For the story of the persecution which they suffered under the restored Stuarts, see SCOTLAND: A. D. 1660-1666; 1669-1679; 1679; and 1681-1689.

**COVENANTS, The Scottish.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1557-1581; and 1638.

**COWBOYS.**—During the War of the American Revolution, "there was a vena' and bloody set which hung on the skirts of the British army, well known as Cow-boys. They were plunderers and ruffians by profession, and came to have their name from their cattle-stealing. Some of the most cruel and disgraceful murders and barbarities of the war were perpetrated by them. Whenever they were caught they were hung up at once."—C. W. Elliott, *The New Eng. Hist.*, v. 2, p. 372.—See, also, UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1780 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER).

**COWPENS, Battle of the (1781).** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1780-1781.

**CRACOW: A. D. 1702.**—Taken by Charles XII. of Sweden. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1701-1707.

**A. D. 1793-1794.**—Occupied by the Russians.—Rising of the citizens.—Surrender and cession to Austria. See POLAND: A. D. 1793-1796.

**A. D. 1815.**—Creation of the Republic. See VIENNA, THE CONGRESS OF.

**A. D. 1831-1846.**—Occupation by the Austrians, Russians and Prussians.—Extinction of the Republic.—Annexation to Austria. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1815-1846.

**CRADLE OF LIBERTY.** See FANEUIL HALL.

**CRAFT-GUILDS.** See GUILDS, MEDIEVAL.

**CRAGIE TRACT, The.** See NEW YORK: A. D. 1786-1799.

**CRAL.—KRALE.**—"The princes of Servia (Ducage, Famil, Dalmaticæ, &c., c. 2-4, 9) were styled 'despots' in Greek, and Cral in their native idiom (Ducage, Gloss. Græc., p. 751). That title, the equivalent of king, appears to be of Slavonic origin, from whence it has been borrowed by the Hungarians, the modern Greeks,

and even by the Turks (Leunclavius, Pandect. Turc., p. 422), who reserve the name of Padishah for the Emperor."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 63, note.—See, also, BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES: A. D. 1341-1356 (SERVIA).

**CRANNOGES.** See LAKE DWELLING.

**CRANNON (KRANNON), Battle of (B. C. 322).** See GREECE: B. C. 323-322.

**CRÆONNE, Battle of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (JANUARY—MARCH).

**CRASSUS AND THE FIRST TRIUMVIRATE.** See ROME: B. C. 78-68, to 57-52.

**CRATER, Battle of the Petersburg.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (JULY: VIRGINIA).

**CRATERUS, AND THE WARS OF THE DIADOCHI.** See MACEDONIA: B. C. 323-316.

**CRANGALIDÆ, The.** See HIERODULI.

**CRAYFORD, Battle of (A. D. 457).**—The second battle fought between the Britons and the invading Jutes, under Hengest, for the possession of southeastern Britain. See ENGLAND: A. D. 449-473.

**CRÉCY, Battle of (1346).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1337-1360.

**CREDIT MOBILIER SCANDAL.**—On the meeting of the Congress of the United States in December, 1872, attention was called by the Speaker to charges made in the preceding canvass "that the Vice-President, the Vice-President elect, the Secretary of the Treasury, several Senators, the Speaker of the House, and a large number of Representatives had been bribed, during the years 1867 and 1868, by presents of stock in a corporation known as the Credit Mobilier [organized to contract for building the Union Pacific Railroad] to vote and act for the benefit of the Union Pacific Railroad Company. On his motion, an investigating committee was appointed, L. P. Poland, of Vermont, being chairman. The Poland Committee reported February 18th, 1873, recommending the expulsion of Oakes Ames, of Massachusetts, for 'selling to members of Congress shares of the stock of the Credit Mobilier below their real value, with intent thereby to influence the votes of such members,' and of James Brooks, of New York, for receiving such stock. The House modified the proposed expulsion into an 'absolute condemnation' of the conduct of both members."—A. Johnston, *Hist. of Am. Politics*, pp. 219-220.—*Rept. of Select Com. (42d Cong., 3d sess., H. R. rept. no. 77).*

Also in: J. B. Crawford, *The Credit Mobilier of Am.*

**CREEKS.**—Creek Wars. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: MUSKHOGEAN FAMILY; also UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1813-1814 (AUGUST—APRIL), and FLORIDA: A. D. 1816-1818.

**CRÉES, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

**CRÉFELD, Battle of.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1758.

**CREMA, Siege of (1159-1160).** See ITALY: A. D. 1154-1163.

**CREMONA: The Roman Colony.**—Siege by the Gauls. See ROME: B. C. 295-191.

**A. D. 69.**—Destruction by the Flavians. See ROME: A. D. 69.

**A. D. 1702.**—Defeat of the French. See ITALY (SAVOY AND PIEDMONT): A. D. 1701-1713.



**CREOLE.**—"In Europe it is very common to attach to the term Creole the idea of a particular complexion. This is a mistake. The designation Creole [in Spanish American regions] properly belongs to all the natives of America born of parents who have emigrated from the Old World, be those parents Europeans or Africans. There are, therefore, white as well as black Creoles. . . . The term Creole is a corruption of the Spanish word 'criollo,' which is derived from 'criar,' to create or to foster. The Spaniards apply the term 'criollo' not merely to the human race, but also to animals propagated in the colonies, but of pure European blood: thus they have creole horses, bullocks, poultry, &c."—J. J. Von Tschudi, *Travels in Peru*, ch. 5, and *foot-note*.—"The term Creole is commonly applied in books to the native of a Spanish colony descended from European ancestors, while often the popular acceptation conveys the idea of an origin partly African. In fact, its meaning varies in different times and regions, and in Louisiana alone has, and has had, its broad and its close, its earlier and its later, significance. For instance, it did not here first belong to the descendants of Spanish, but of French settlers. But such a meaning implied a certain excellence of origin, and so came early to include any native of French or Spanish descent by either parent, whose pure non-mixture with the slave race entitled him to social rank. Much later the term was adopted by, not conceded to, the natives of European-African, or Creole-African blood, and is still so used among themselves. At length the spirit of commerce availed itself of the money value of so honored a title, and broadened its meaning to take in any creature or thing of variety or manufacture peculiar to Louisiana, that might become an object of sale, as Creole ponies, chickens, cows, shoes, eggs, wagons, baskets, cabbages, etc. . . . There are no English, Scotch, Irish, Western, or Yankee Creoles, these all being included under the distinctive term 'Americans.' . . . There seems to be no more serviceable definition of the Creoles of Louisiana or of New Orleans than to say they are the French-speaking, native, ruling class."—G. E. Waring, Jr., and G. W. Cable, *Hist. and Present Condition of New Orleans (Tenth Census of the U. S., v. 19, p. 218)*.

**CREONES, The.** See BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.

**CRESCENT, The Order of the.**—A Turkish Order instituted in 1799 by the reforming sultan, Selim III. Lord Nelson, after the victory of Aboukir, was the first to receive this decoration.

**CRÉSPY IN VALOIS, Treaty of (1544).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1532-1547.

**CRETAN LABYRINTH.** See LABYRINTHS.

**CRETE.**—"The institutions of the Cretan state show in many points so great a similarity to those of Sparta, that it is not surprising if it seemed to the ancients as though either Crete were a copy of Sparta, or Sparta of Crete. Meanwhile this similarity may be explained, apart from intentional imitation, by the community of nationality, which, under like conditions, must produce like institutions. For in Crete, as in Laconia, Dorians were the ruling people, who had subdued the old inhabitants of the island and placed them in a position of subordination. . . . It is, however, beyond doubt that settle-

ments were made in Crete by the Phoenicians, and that a large portion of the island was subjected to them. In the historical period, it is true, we no longer find them here; we find, on the contrary, only a number of Greek states, all moreover Dorian. Each of these consisted of a city with its surrounding district, in which no doubt also smaller cities in their turn were found standing in a relation of subordination to the principal city. For that each city of the 'ninety-citied' or 'hundred-citied' Isle, as Homer calls it, formed also an independent state, will probably not be supposed. As independent states our authorities give us reason to recognize about seventeen. The most important of these were in earlier times Cnossus, Gortyn and Cydonia."—G. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State*, pt. 3, ch. 2.—See ASIA MINOR: THE GREEK COLONIES.

**B. C. 68-66.—The Roman Conquest.**—The Romans came into collision with the Cretans during their conflict with the Cilician pirates. The Cretans, degenerate and half-piratical themselves, had formed an alliance with the professional buccaners, and defeated, off Cydonia, a Roman fleet that had been sent against the latter, B. C. 71. They soon repented of the provocation they had offered and sent envoys to Rome to buy peace by heavy bribes; but neither the penitence nor the bribes prevailed. Three years passed, however, before the proconsul, Quintus Metellus, appeared in Crete (B. C. 68) to exact satisfaction, and two years more were spent in overcoming the stubborn resistance of the islanders. The taking of Cydonia cost Metellus a bloody battle and a prolonged siege. Cnossus and other towns held out with equal courage. In the end, however, Crete was added to the conquered dominions of Rome. At the last of the struggle there occurred a conflict of jurisdiction between Metellus and Pompey, and their respective forces fought with one another on the Cretan soil.—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 5, ch. 4.

**A. D. 823.—Conquest by the Saracens.**—"The reign of Al Hakem, the Omniade Caliph of Spain, was disturbed by continual troubles; and some theological disputes having created a violent insurrection in the suburbs of Cordova, about 15,000 Spanish Arabs were compelled to emigrate in the year 815. The greater part of these desperadoes established themselves at Alexandria, where they soon took an active part in the civil wars of Egypt. The rebelion of Thomas [an officer who disputed the Byzantine throne with Michael II.], and the absence of the naval forces of the Byzantine Empire from the Archipelago, left the island of Crete unprotected. The Andalusian Arabs of Alexandria availed themselves of this circumstance to invade the island, and establish a settlement on it, in the year 823. Michael was unable to take any measures for expelling the invaders, and an event soon happened in Egypt which added greatly to the strength of this Saracen colony. The victories of the lieutenants of the Caliph Almamun compelled the remainder of the Andalusian Arabs to quit Alexandria; so that Abou Haf, called by the Greeks Apochaps, joined his countrymen in Crete with forty ships, determined to make the new settlement their permanent home. It is said by the Byzantine writers that they commenced their conquest of the island by destroying their fleet, and con-

structing a strong fortified camp, surrounded by an immense ditch, from which it received the name of Chandak, now corrupted by the western nations into Candia. . . . The Saracens retained possession of Crete for 135 years."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine Empire*, from 716 to 1057, bk. 1, ch. 3.—During the stay of these piratical Andalusian Arabs at Alexandria, "they cut in pieces both friends and foes, pillaged the churches and mosques, sold above 6,000 Christian captives, and maintained their station in the capital of Egypt till they were oppressed by the forces and presence of Almamon himself."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 52.

ALSO IN: S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of Spain and Portugal*, bk. 3, ch. 1.

A. D. 961-963.—Recovery from the Saracens.—"In the subordinate station of great domestic, or general of the East, he [Nicephorus Phocas, afterwards emperor, on the Byzantine throne], reduced the island of Crete, and extirpated the nest of pirates who had so long defied, with impunity, the majesty of the Empire. . . . Seven months were consumed in the siege of Candia; the despair of the native Cretans was stimulated by the frequent aid of their brethren of Africa and Spain; and, after the massy wall and double ditch had been stormed by the Greeks, a hopeless conflict was still maintained in the streets and houses of the city. The whole island was subdued in the capital, and a submissive people accepted, without resistance, the baptism of the conqueror."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 52.

A. D. 1204-1205.—Acquired by the Venetians. See BYZANTINE EMPIRE: A. D. 1204-1205.

A. D. 1645-1669.—The long siege of Candia.—Surrender to the Turks. See TURKS: A. D. 1645-1669.

A. D. 1715.—Complete Expulsion of the Venetians by the Turks. See TURKS: A. D. 1714-1718.

A. D. 1866-1868.—Unsuccessful revolt.—Struggle for independence.—Turkish concession of the Organic Regulation. See GREECE: A. D. 1862-1881.

CRÈTE, Party of the.—Crétois. See FRANCE: A. D. 1795 (APRIL).

CRIMEA, OR CRIM TARTARY: Early history. See TAURICA; also BOSPORUS, CITY AND KINGDOM.

7th Century.—Conquest and occupation by the Khazars. See KHAZARS.

12th-13th Centuries.—Genoese commercial colonies. See GENOA: A. D. 1261-1299.

13th-14th Centuries.—The khanate to Krim. See MONGOLS: A. D. 1238-1391.

A. D. 1475.—Conquest by the Ottoman Turks. See TURKS (THE OTTOMANS): A. D. 1451-1481.

A. D. 1571.—Expedition of the Khan to Moscow.—The city stormed and sacked. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1569-1571.

A. D. 1735-1738.—Russian invasions and fruitless conquests. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1725-1739.

A. D. 1774.—The khanate declared independent of the Porte. See TURKS: A. D. 1768-1774.

A. D. 1776-1784.—The process of acquisition by Russia.—Final recognition of Russian

sovereignty by the Sultan. See TURKS: A. D. 1776-1792.

A. D. 1853-1855.—War of Russia with Turkey and her allies.—Siege of Sebastopol. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1853-1854, to 1854-1856.

CRISIS OF 1837, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1835-1837.

CRISIS OF 1857. See TARIFF LEGISLATION (UNITED STATES): A. D. 1846-1861.

CRISSA.—Crissæan or Sacred War. See DELPHI.

CRITTENDEN COMPROMISE, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1860 (DECEMBER).

CROATANS, The. See AMERICA: A. D. 1587-1590.

CROATIA: 7th Century.—Slavonic occupation and settlement. See BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES, 7TH CENTURY (SERVIA, CROATIA, BOSNIA, ETC.)

A. D. 1102.—Subjection and annexation to Hungary. See HUNGARY: A. D. 973-1114.

A. D. 1576.—Transferred to the Duke of Styria.—Military colonization. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1567-1604.

CROIA, Turkish massacre at. See GREECE: A. D. 1454-1479.

CROMLECHS.—Rude stone monuments found in many parts of the British Islands, France, and elsewhere usually formed by three or more huge, rough, upright stones, with a still larger stone lying flatly upon them. In France these are called Dolmens. They were formerly thought to be "Druids altars," to which notion they owe the name Cromlechs; but it is now very generally concluded by archaeologists that they were constructed for burial chambers, and that originally, in most cases, they were covered with mounds of earth, forming the well known barrows, or grave mounds, or tumuli.—L. Jewett, *Grave Mounds*.

ALSO IN: T. Wright, *The Celt, the Roman and the Saxon*.—Sir J. Lubbock, *Prehistoric Times*, ch. 5.—See, also, AMORITES.

CROMPTON'S MULE, The invention of. See COTTON MANUFACTURES.

CROMWELL, Oliver.—Campaigns and Protectorate. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1644 to 1658-1660; and IRELAND: A. D. 1649-1650.

CROMWELL, Thomas, and the suppression of the Monasteries. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1535-1539.

CROMWELLIAN SETTLEMENT OF IRELAND. See IRELAND: A. D. 1653.

CROMWELL'S IRONSIDES. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1643 (MAY).

CROSS, The "True."—Its capture by the Persians and recovery by Heraclius. See ROME: A. D. 565-628; and JERUSALEM: A. D. 615.

CROSS KEYS, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (MAY—JUNE: VIRGINIA).

CROTON.—KROTON. See SYBARIS.

CROTONA, Battle of (A. D. 983). See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 800-1016.

CROWN, The iron. See LOMBARDY, THE IRON CROWN OF.

CROWN OF INDIA, The Order of the.—An order, for women, instituted by Queen Victoria in 1878.

**CROWN POINT; A. D. 1727.**—Fort built by the French. See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1700-1735.

**A. D. 1755.**—English Expedition against. See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1755 (SEPTEMBER).

**A. D. 1759.**—Abandoned to the English by the French. See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1759 (JULY—AUGUST).

**A. D. 1775.**—Surprise and capture by the Americans. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775 (MAY).

**CROWS, OR UPSAROKAS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SIOUAN FAMILY.

**CRUITHNIGH.—CRUITHNIANS.**—The Irish name of the Picts and Scots of ancient Ireland and Scotland. See SCOTLAND: THE PICTS AND SCOTS.

**CRUSADES: Causes and introductory events.**—"Like all the great movements of mankind, the Crusades must be traced to the coincidence of many causes which influenced men of various nations and discordant feelings, at the same period of time, to pursue one common end with their whole heart. Religious zeal, the fashion of pilgrimages, the spirit of social development, the energies that lead to colonisation or conquest, and commercial relations, only lately extended so widely as to influence public opinion, all suddenly received a deep wound. Every class of society felt injured and insulted, and unity of action was created as if by a divine impulse. The movement was facilitated by the circumstance that Europe began to adopt habits of order just at the time when Asia was thrown into a state of anarchy by the invasions of the Seljouk Turks. Great numbers of pilgrims had always passed through the Byzantine empire to visit the holy places in Palestine. We still possess an itinerary of the road from Bordeaux to Jerusalem, by the way of Constantinople, written in the fourth century for the use of pilgrims. Though the disturbed and impoverished state of Europe, after the fall of the Western Empire, diminished the number of pilgrims, still, even in times of the greatest anarchy, many passed annually through the Eastern Empire to Palestine. The improvement which dawned on the western nations during the eleventh century, and the augmented commerce of the Italians, gave additional importance to the pilgrimage to the East. About the year 1064, during the reign of Constantine X., an army or caravan of seven thousand pilgrims passed through Constantinople, led by the Archbishop of Mentz and four bishops. They made their way through Asia Minor, which was then under the Byzantine government; but in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem they were attacked by the Bedouins, and only saved from destruction by the Saracen emir of Rama, who hastened to their assistance. These pilgrims are reported to have lost 3,000 of their number, without being able to visit either the Jordan or the Dead Sea. The invasions of the Seljouks [see TURKS (THE SELJUKS): A. D. 1073-1092] increased the disorders in Palestine. . . . In the year 1076 the Seljouk Turks took possession of Jerusalem, and immediately commenced harassing the pilgrims with unheard-of exactions. The Saracens had in general viewed the pilgrims with favour, as men engaged in fulfilling a pious duty, or pursuing lawful gain with praiseworthy

industry, and they had levied only a reasonable toll on the pilgrims, and a moderate duty on their merchandise; while in consideration of these imposts, they had established guards to protect them on the roads by which they approached the holy places. The Turks, on the contrary, acting like mere nomads, uncertain of retaining possession of the city, thought only of gratifying their avarice. They plundered the rich pilgrims and insulted the poor. The religious feelings of the Christians were irritated, and their commerce ruined; a cry for vengeance arose throughout all Europe, and men's minds were fully prepared for an attempt to conquer Palestine, when Peter the Hermit began to preach that it was a sacred duty to deliver the tomb of Christ from the hands of the Infidels." — G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine and Greek Empires*, bk. 3, ch. 2, sect. 1.

**A. D. 1094.**—The Council of Clermont.—Pope Urban II., one of two rival pontiffs then contending for recognition by the Church, entered with great eagerness into the movement stirred by Peter the Hermit, and gave it a powerful impulse through his support, while obtaining for himself, at the same time, a decisive advantage over his competitor, by the popularity of the agitation. A great Council was convened at Piacenza, A. D. 1094, and a second at Clermont, in the autumn of the same year, to deliberate upon the action to be taken. The city of Clermont could not contain the vast multitude of bishops, clergy and laity which assembled, and an army of many thousands was tented in the surrounding country. To that excited congregation, at a meeting in the great square of Clermont, Pope Urban addressed a speech which is one of the notable utterances of history. "He began by detailing the miseries endured by their brethren in the Holy Land; how the plains of Palestine were desolated by the outrageous heathen, who with the sword and the firebrand carried wailing into the dwellings and flames into the possessions of the faithful; how Christian wives and daughters were defiled by pagan lust; how the altars of the true God were desecrated, and the relics of the saints trodden under foot. 'You,' continued the eloquent pontiff (and Urban II. was one of the most eloquent men of the day), 'you, who hear me, and who have received the true faith, and been endowed by God with power, and strength, and greatness of soul,—whose ancestors have been the prop of Christendom, and whose kings have put a barrier against the progress of the infidel,—I call upon you to wipe off these impurities from the face of the earth, and lift your oppressed fellow-Christians from the depths into which they have been trampled.' . . . The warmth of the pontiff communicated itself to the crowd, and the enthusiasm of the people broke out several times ere he concluded his address. He went on to portray, not only the spiritual but the temporal advantages that would accrue to those who took up arms in the service of the cross. Palestine was, he said, a land flowing with milk and honey, and precious in the sight of God, as the scene of the grand events which had saved mankind. That land, he promised, should be divided among them. Moreover, they should have full pardon for all their offences, either against God or man. 'Go, then,' he added, 'in explanation of your sins; and

go assured, that after this world shall have passed away, imperishable glory shall be yours in the world which is to come.' The enthusiasm was no longer to be restrained, and loud shouts interrupted the speaker; the people exclaiming as if with one voice, 'Dieu le veuil! Dieu le veuil!' . . . The news of this council spread to the remotest parts of Europe in an incredibly short space of time. Long before the fleetest horseman could have brought the intelligence, it was known by the people in distant provinces; a fact which was considered as nothing less than supernatural. But the subject was in everybody's mouth, and the minds of men were prepared for the result. The enthusiastic merely asserted what they wished, and the event tallied with their prediction."—C. Mackay, *Memoirs of Extraordinary Popular Delusions: The Crusades*, (v. 2).

ALSO IN: H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, bk. 7, ch. 6.

**A. D. 1094-1095.—Peter the Hermit and his appeal.**—"About twenty years after the conquest of Jerusalem by the Turks, the holy sepulchre was visited by an hermit of the name of Peter, a native of Amiens, in the province of Picardy in France. His resentment and sympathy were excited by his own injuries, and the oppression of the Christian name; he mingled his tears with those of the patriarch, and earnestly inquired, if no hopes of relief could be entertained from the Greek emperors of the East. The patriarch exposed the vices and weakness of the successors of Constantine. 'I will rescue,' exclaimed the hermit, 'the martial nations of Europe in your cause;' and Europe was obedient to the call of the hermit. The astonished patriarch dismissed him with epistles of credit and complaint, and no sooner did he land at Bari, than Peter hastened to kiss the feet of the Roman pontiff. His stature was small, his appearance contemptible; but his eye was keen and lively, and he possessed that vehemence of speech which seldom fails to impart the persuasion of the soul. He was born of a gentleman's family (for we must now adopt a modern idiom), and his military service was under the neighbouring counts of Boulogne, the heroes of the first crusade. Invigorated by the approbation of the pontiff, this zealous missionary traversed, with speed and success, the provinces of Italy and France. His diet was abstemious, his prayers long and fervent, and the alms which he received with one hand, he distributed with the other; his head was bare, his feet naked, his meagre body was wrapt in a coarse garment; he bore and displayed a weighty crucifix; and the ass on which he rode was sanctified in the public eye by the service of the man of God. He preached to innumerable crowds in the churches, the streets, and the highways. . . . When he painted the sufferings of the natives and pilgrims of Palestine, every heart was melted to compassion; every breast glowed with indignation, when he challenged the warriors of the age to defend their brethren and rescue their Saviour: his ignorance of art and language was compensated by sighs and tears, and ejaculations; and Peter supplied the deficiency of reason by loud and frequent appeals to Christ and his Mother, to the saints and angels of paradise, with whom he had personally conversed. The most perfect orator of Athens might have envied the success

of his eloquence; the rustic enthusiast inspired the passions which he felt, and Christendom expected with impatience the counsels and decrees of the supreme pontiff."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 58.

ALSO IN: J. C. Robertson, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, bk. 6, ch. 4 (v. 4).

**A. D. 1096-1099.—The First Great Movement.**—"The first army of Crusaders to set out on the long march to Jerusalem was a mob of men, women and children which had not patience to wait for the organized movement of the military leaders. They gathered in vast numbers on the banks of the Moselle and the Meuse, in the spring of 1096, with Peter the Hermit for their chosen chief. There were nine knights, only, in the swarm, and but few who had horses to ride, or efficient arms to bear, or provisions to feed upon. Knowing nothing, and therefore fearing nothing, they marched away, through France, Germany, Hungary and beyond begging food where they could and subsisting by pillage when it needed. A knight called Walter the Penniless led the van, and Peter followed, with his second division, by a somewhat different route. Walter escaped serious trouble until he reached the country of the savage Bulgarians. Peter's senseless mob provoked the just wrath of the Hungarians by storming the small city of Semlin and slaying 4,000 of its inhabitants. The route of both was lined with the bones of thousands who perished of hunger, of exposure, of disease, and by the swords of Hungarians and Bulgarians. A third and a fourth host of like kind followed in their wake, led by a monk, Gotschalk, a priest named Volkmar, and a Count Emicon. These terrorized even more all the countries through which they passed,—especially where Jews were to be hunted and killed,—and were destroyed in Hungary to almost the last man. Peter and Walter reached Constantinople with 100,000 followers, it is said, even yet, after all who had fallen by the way. Still refusing to wait for the better appointed expeditions that were in progress, and still appalling eastern Christendom by their lawless barbarities, they passed into Asia Minor, and their miserable career soon came to an end. Attacking the Turks in the city of Nicea,—which had become the capital of the Seljouk sultan of Roum,—they were beaten, routed, scattered, slaughtered, until barely 3,000 of the great host escaped. "Of the first Crusaders," says Gibbon, "300,000 had already perished before a single city was rescued from the infidels,—before their graver and more noble brethren had completed the preparations of their enterprise." Meantime the knights and princes of the crusade had gathered their armies and were now (in the summer of 1096) beginning to move eastward, by different routes. Not one of the greater sovereigns of Europe had enlisted in the undertaking. The chiefs of one armament were Godfrey de Bouillon, duke of the Lower Lorraine, or Brabant; his brothers, Eustace, count of Boulogne, and Baldwin; his cousin, Baldwin de Bourg, with Baldwin, count of Hainaut, Dudo de Contz, and other knights celebrated in the "Jerusalem Delivered" of Tasso. This expedition followed nearly the route of Peter the Hermit, through Hungary and Bulgaria, giving hostages for its orderly conduct and winning the good-will of those coun-

tries, even multiplied as they were by the foregoing mobs. Another larger following from France was led by Hugh, count of Vermandois, brother of the king of France; Robert, duke of Normandy, eldest son of William the Conqueror; Stephen, count of Blois, the Conqueror's son-in-law, and Robert, count of Flanders. These took the road into Italy, and to Bari, whence, after spending the winter, waiting for favorable weather, they were transported by ships to Greece, and pursued their march to Constantinople. They were followed by a contingent from southern Italy, under Bohemond, the Norman prince of Tarentum, son of Robert Guiscard, and his knightly cousin, Tancred. A fourth army, gathered in southern France by count Raymond of Toulouse and Bishop Adhemar, the appointed legate and representative of the pope, chose still another route, through Lombardy, Dalmatia and Macedonia, into Thrace. On passing through the territories of the Byzantine emperor (Alexius I.), all the crusaders experienced his distrust, his duplicity, and his cautious ill-will — which, under the circumstances were natural enough. Alexius managed so well that he extorted from each of the princes an acknowledgment of his rights of sovereignty over the region of their expected conquests, with an oath of fealty and homage, and he pushed them across the Bosphorus so adroitly that no two had the opportunity to unite their forces under the walls of Constantinople. Their first undertaking in Asia [May and June, A. D. 1097] was the siege of Nizem, and they beleaguered it with an army which Gibbon believes to have been never exceeded within the compass of a single camp. Here, again, they were mastered by the cunning diplomacy of the Greek emperor. When the sultan of Roum yielded his capital, he was persuaded to surrender it to Alexius, and the imperial banner protected it from the rage of the discomfited crusaders. But they revenged themselves on the Turk at Dorylaeum, where he attacked them during their subsequent march, and where he suffered a defeat which ended all fighting in Asia Minor. Baldwin, brother of Godfrey, now improved his opportunities by stealing away from the army, with a few hundred knights and men, to make conquests on his own account; with such success that he won the city of Edessa, with a sweep of country around it, and founded a principality which subsisted for half a century. The rest fared on, meeting no opposition from infidel swords, but sickening and dying by thousands, from heat and from want of water and food, until they came to Antioch. There, the Turkish emir in command, with a stout garrison of horse and foot, had prepared for a stubborn defence, and he held the besiegers at bay for seven months, while they starved in their ill-supplied camps. The city was delivered to them by a traitor, at length, but prince Bohemond, the crafty Norman, secured the benefit of the treason to himself, and forced his compatriots to concede to him the sovereignty of Antioch. The sufferings of the crusaders did not end with the taking of the city. They brought famine and pestilence upon themselves anew by their greedy and sensual indulgence, and they were soon under siege in their own turn, by a great army which the Turks had brought against them. Death and desertion were in rivalry to thin their wasted ranks. The

survivors were in gloom and despair, when an opportune miracle occurred to excite them afresh. A lance, which visions and apparitions certified to be the very spear that pierced the Redeemer's side, was found buried in a church at Antioch. Under the stimulus of this amazing discovery they sallied from the town and dispersed the great army of the Turks in utter rout. Still the quarrels of the leaders went on, and ten months more were consumed before the remains of the Latin army advanced to Jerusalem. It was June, A. D. 1099, when they saw the Holy City and assailed its formidable walls. Their number was now reduced to 40,000, but their devotion and their ardent resolve were unshaken, and after a siege of little more than a month they forced an entrance by storm. Then they spared neither age nor sex until they had killed all who denied the Savior of mankind — the Prince of Peace. — E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 58.

ALSO IN: J. F. Michaud, *Hist. of the Crusades*, bk. 1. — W. Besant and E. H. Palmer, *Jerusalem*, ch. 6. — C. Mills, *Hist. of the Crusades*, ch. 2-6. — See, also, JERUSALEM: A. D. 1099.

A. D. 1099-1144. — The Latin conquests in the east. — The Kingdom of Jerusalem. See JERUSALEM: A. D. 1099-1144.

A. D. 1101-1102. — The after-wave of the first movement. — "The tales of victory brought home by the pilgrims excited the most extravagant expectations in the minds of their auditors, and nothing was deemed capable of resisting European valour. The pope called upon all who had taken the cross to perform their vow, the emperor Henry IV. had the crusade preached, in order to gain favour with the clergy and laity. Many princes now resolved to visit in person the new empire founded in the East. Three great armies assembled: the first in Italy under the archbishop of Milan, and the two counts of Milan; the second in France under Hugh the Great and Stephen of Blois [who had deserted their comrades of the first expedition at Antioch, and] who were shame and remorse urged to perform their vow, William, duke of Guenne and count of Poitou, who mortgaged his territory to William Rufus of England to procure funds, the count of Nevers, the duke of Burgundy, the bishops of Laon and Soissons; the third in Germany, under the bishop of Saltzburg, the aged duke Welf of Bavaria, Conrad the master of the horse to the emperor, and many other knights and nobles. Ida also, the margravine of Austria, declared her resolution to share the toils and dangers of the way, and pay her vows at the tomb of Christ. Vast numbers of women of all ranks accompanied all these armies, — nay, in that of the duke of Guenne, who was inferior to none in valour, but united to it the qualities of a troubadour and glee-man, there appeared whole troops of young women. The Italian pilgrims were the first to arrive at Constantinople. They set out early in the spring, and took their way through Carinthia, Hungary, and Bulgaria. Though the excesses committed by them were great, the emperor gave them a kind reception, and the most prudent and friendly advice respecting their future progress. While they abode at Constantinople, Conrad and the count of Blois, and the duke of Burgundy, arrived, and at Whitsonide they all passed over, and encamped at Nicomedia." With ignorant fatu-

ity, and against all experienced advice, the new Crusaders resolved to direct their march to Haggad and to overthrow the caliphate. The first body which advanced was cut to pieces by the Turks on the banks of the Halys, and only a few thousands, out of more than one hundred thousand, are said to have made their escape by desperate flight. The second and third armies were met successively by the victorious Moslems, before they had advanced so far, and were even more completely annihilated. The latter body contained, according to the chroniclers of the time, 150,000 pilgrims, of whom scarcely one thousand were saved from slavery or death. The men fell under the swords of the Turks; the women and girls, in great numbers, finished out their days in the harems of the East. Out of the wreck of the three vast armaments a slender column of 10,000 men was got together after some weeks at Antioch and led to Jerusalem (A. D. 1102). Most of these perished in subsequent battles, and very few ever saw Europe again. "Such was the fruitless termination of this second great movement of the West, in which perhaps a third of a million of pilgrims left their homes, never to revisit them."—T. Keightley, *The Crusaders*, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: J. F. Michaud, *Hist. of the Crusades*, bk. 4.

A. D. 1104-1111.—Conquest of maritime cities of Syria and Palestine.—Destruction of the Library of Tripoli.—"The prosperity and the safety of Jerusalem appeared closely connected with the conquest of the maritime cities of Syria and Palestine; it being by them alone that it could receive succour, or establish prompt and easy communications with the West. The maritime nations of Europe were interested in seconding, in this instance, the enterprises of the king of Jerusalem. . . . From the period of the first crusades, the Pisans and the Genoese had constantly sent vessels to the seas of the East; and their fleets had aided the Christians in several expeditions against the Mussulmans. A Genoese fleet had just arrived in the seas of Syria when Baldwin undertook the siege of Ptolemais [Acre]. The Genoese were invited to assist in this conquest; but as religion was not the principle to bring them into action, they required, in return for their assistance and their labour, that they should have a third of the booty; they likewise stipulated to have a separate church for themselves, and a national factory and tribunal in the conquered city. Ptolemais was besieged by land and sea, and after a bloody resistance of twenty days, the inhabitants and the garrison proposed to surrender, and implored the clemency of the conquerors. The city opened its gates to the Christians, and the inhabitants prepared to depart, taking with them whatever they deemed most valuable; but the Genoese, at the sight of such rich booty, paid no respect to the capitulation, and massacred without pity a disarmed and defenceless people. . . . In consequence of this victory, several places which the Egyptians still held on the coasts of Syria fell into the hands of the Christians." Among those was the city of Tripoli. "Raymond, Count de St. Gilles and of Thoulouse, one of the companions of Godfrey, after having wandered for a long time about Asia, had died before this place, of which he had commenced the siege. In memory of his exploits in the first crusade, the rich territory of Tripoli

was created a county, and became the inheritance of his family. This territory was celebrated for its productions. . . . A library established in this city, and celebrated through all the East, contained the monuments of the ancient literature of the Persians, the Arabians, the Egyptians, and the Greeks. A hundred copyists were there constantly employed in transcribing manuscripts. . . . After the taking of the city, a priest attached to Count Bernard de St. Gilles, entered the room in which were collected a vast number of copies of the Koran, and as he declared the library of Tripoli contained only the impious books of Mahomet, it was given up to the flames. . . . Ibbicia, situated on the smiling and fertile shores of Phœnicia, Sarepta, where St. Jerome saw still in his day the tower of Isaiah; and Berytus, famous in the early days of the church for its school of eloquence, shared the fate of Tripoli, and became baronies bestowed upon Christian knights. After these conquests, the Pisans, the Genoese, and several warriors who had followed Baldwin in his expeditions, returned into Europe; and the king of Jerusalem, abandoned by these useful allies, was obliged to employ the forces which remained in repulsing the invasions of the Saracens."—J. F. Michaud, *Hist. of the Crusades*, v. 1, bk. 5.

A. D. 1147-1149.—The Second Great Movement.—During the reign of Fulk, the fourth king of Jerusalem, the Latin power in Palestine and its neighboring territories began to be seriously shaken by a vigorous Turkish prince named Zenghi, on whom the sultan Maimoud had conferred the government of all the country west of the Tigris. It was the first time since the coming of the Christians of the West that the whole strength of Islam in that region had been so nearly gathered into one strong hand, to be used against them, and they felt the effect speedily, being themselves weakened by many quarrels. In 1143 King Fulk died, leaving the crown to a young son, Baldwin III.,—a boy of thirteen, whose mother governed in his name. The next year Zenghi captured the important city of Edessa, and consternation was produced by his successes. Europe was then appealed to for help against the advancing Turk, and the call from Jerusalem was taken up by St. Bernard of Clairvaux, "the irresistible enthusiast, whose influence accomplished, in his time, whatever he willed to have done. Just half a century after Peter the Hermit, St. Bernard preached a Second Crusade, and with almost equal effect, notwithstanding the better knowledge now possessed of all the hardships and perils of the expedition. This time, royalty took the lead. King Conrad of Germany commanded a great army from that country, and another host followed King Louis VII. from France. "Both armies marched down the Danube, to Constantinople, in the summer of 1147. At the same moment King Roger [of Naples], with his fleet, attacked, not the Turks, but the Greek seaport towns of the Morea. Manuel [the Byzantine emperor] thereupon, convinced that the large armies were designed for the destruction of his empire in the first place, with the greatest exertions, got together troops from all his provinces, and entered into a half-alliance with the Turks of Asia Minor. The mischief and ill-feeling was increased by the lawless conduct of the German hordes; the Greek troops attacked them more

than once whereupon numerous voices were raised in Louis's headquarters to demand open war against the faithless Greeks. The kings were fully agreed not to permit this, but on arriving in Constantinople they completely fell out, for, while Louis made no secret of his warm friendship for Roger, Conrad promised the Emperor of Constantinople to attack the Normans as soon as the Crusade should be ended. This was a bad beginning for a united campaign in the East, and moreover, at every step eastward, new difficulties arose. The German army, broken up into several detachments, and led without ability or prudence, was attacked in Asia Minor by the Emir of Iconium, and cut to pieces, all but a few hundred men. The French, though better appointed, also suffered severe losses in that country, but contrived nevertheless, to reach Antioch with a very considerable force, and from thence might have carried the project which the second Baldwin had conceived in vain, namely, the defence of the northeastern frontier, upon which, especially since Zenki [Zenghi] had made his appearance, the life or death of the Christian states depended. But in vain did Prince Raymond of Antioch try to prevail upon King Louis to take this view, and to attack without delay the most formidable of all their adversaries, Nouredin [son of Zenghi, now dead]. Louis would not hear or do anything till he had seen Jerusalem and prayed at the Holy Sepulchre. . . . In Jerusalem he [King Louis] was welcomed by Queen Melisende (now regent, during her son's minority, after Fulco's death), with praise and gratitude, because he had not taken part in the distant wars of the Prince of Antioch, but had reserved his forces for the defence of the holy city of Jerusalem. It was now resolved to lead the army against Damascus, the only Turkish town whose Emir had always refused to submit to either Zenki or Nouredin. Nevertheless Nouredin instantly collected all his available forces, to succour the besieged town. . . . But he was spared further exertion by the jealous disagreement of the Christians, who began to take thought as to what should be done with Damascus when they took it. The Syrian barons concluded that they would prefer to leave the city in Turkish hands, and by treacherous manoeuvres they forced king Louis to raise the siege. "The German king, long since tired of his powerless position, returned home in the autumn of 1148, and Louis, after much pressing, stayed a few months longer, and reached Europe in the following spring. The whole expedition . . . had been wrecked, without honour and without result, by the most wretched personal passions, and the most narrow and selfish policy."—H. Von Sybel, *Hist. and Literature of the Crusades*, ch. 3.—"So ended in utter shame and ignominy the Second Crusade. The event seemed to give the lie to the glowing promises and prophecies of St. Bernard. So vast had been the drain of population to feed this holy war that, in the phrase of an eye-witness, the cities and castles were empty, and scarcely one man was left to seven women; and now it was known that the fathers, the husbands, the sons, or the brothers of these miserable women would see their earthly homes no more. The cry of anguish charged Bernard with the crime of sending them forth on an errand in which they had done absolutely nothing and had reaped only

wretchedness and disgrace. For a time Bernard himself was struck dumb: but he soon remembered that he had spoken with the authority of God and his vicergerent, and that the guilt or failure must lie at the door of the pilgrims."—G. W. Cox, *The Crusades*, ch. 5.

A. D. 1187.—The loss of Jerusalem. See JERUSALEM: A. D. 1149-1187.

A. D. 1188-1192.—The Third Great Movement.—When the news reached Europe that Saladin, the redoubtable new champion of Islam had expelled the Christians and the Cross from Jerusalem, polluting once more the precincts of the Holy Sepulchre, the effect produced was something not easily understood at the present day. If we may believe historians of the time, the pope (Urban III.) died of grief; "Christians forgot all the ills of their own country to weep over Jerusalem. . . . Luxury was banished from cities; injuries were forgotten and alms were given abundantly. Christians slept upon ashes, clothed themselves in haircloth, and expiated their disorderly lives by fasting and mortification. The clergy set the example; the morals of the cloister were reformed, and cardinals, condemning themselves to poverty, promised to repair to the Holy Land, supported on charity by the way. These pious reformations did not last long; but men's minds were not the less prepared for a new crusade by them, and all Europe was soon roused by the voice of Gregory VIII., who exhorted the faithful to assume the cross and take up arms."—J. F. Michaud, *Hist. of the Crusades*, bk. 7.—"The emperor Frederic Barbarossa and the kings of France and England assumed the cross; and the tardy magnitude of their armaments was anticipated by the maritime states of the Mediterranean and the ocean. The skilful and provident Italians first embarked in the ships of Genoa, Pisa, and Venice. They were speedily followed by the most eager pilgrims of France, Normandy and the Western Isles. The powerful succour of Flanders, Frise, and Denmark filled near a hundred vessels; and the northern warriors were distinguished in the field by a lofty stature and a ponderous battle-axe. Their increasing multitudes could no longer be confined within the walls of Tyre [which the Latins still held], or remain obedient to the voice of Conrad [Marquis of Montferrat, who had taken command of the place and repelled the attacks of Saladin]. They pitied the misfortunes and revered the dignity of Lusignan [the nominal king of Jerusalem, lately captive in Saladin's hands], who was released from prison, perhaps to divide the army of the Franks. He proposed the recovery of Ptolemais, or Acre, thirty miles to the south of Tyre; and the place was first invested [July, 1189] by 2,000 horse and 30,000 foot under his nominal command. I shall not expatiate on the story of this memorable siege, which lasted near two years, and consumed, in a narrow space, the forces of Europe and Asia. . . . At the sound of the holy trumpet the Moslems of Egypt, Syria, Arabia, and the Oriental provinces assembled under the servant of the prophet: his camp was pitched and removed within a few miles of Acre; and he laboured, night and day, for the relief of his brethren and the annoyance of the Franks. . . . In the spring of the second year, the royal fleets of France and England cast anchor in the bay of Acre, and the siege was more vigorously prosecuted by the



youthful emulation of the two kings, Phillip Augustus and Richard Plantagenet. After every resource had been tried, and every hope was exhausted, the defenders of Acre submitted to their fate. . . . By the conquest of Acre the Latin powers acquired a strong town and a convenient harbour; but the advantage was most dearly purchased. The minister and historian of Saladin computes, from the report of the enemy, that their numbers, at different periods, amounted to 500,000 or 600,000; that more than 100,000 Christians were slain; that a far greater number was lost by disease or shipwreck." On the reduction of Acre, king Phillip Augustus returned to France, leaving only 500 knights and 10,000 men behind him. Meantime, the old emperor, Frederick Barbarossa, coming by the landward route, through the country of the Greeks and Asia Minor, with a well-trained army of 20,000 knights and 50,000 men on foot, had perished by the way, drowned in a little Cilician torrent, and only 5,000 of his troops had reached the camp at Acre. Old as he was, (he was seventy when he took the cross) Barbarossa might have changed the event of the Crusade if he had reached the scene of conflict; for he had brains with his valor and character with his ferocity, which Richard Cœur de Lion had not. The latter remained another year in the Holy Land; recovered Cesarea and Jaffa; threatened Saladin in Jerusalem seriously, but to no avail; and stirred up more and fiercer quarrels among the Christians than had been customary, even on the soil which was sacred to them. In the end, a treaty was arranged which displeased the more devout on both sides. "It was stipulated that Jerusalem and the holy sepulchre should be open, without tribute or vexation, to the pilgrimage of the Latin Christians; that, after the demolition of Ascalon, they should inclusively possess the sea-coast from Jaffa to Tyre; that the count of Tripoli and the prince of Antioch should be comprised in the truce; and that, during three years and three months, all hostilities should cease. . . . Richard embarked for Europe, to seek a long captivity and a premature grave; and the space of a few months concluded the life and glories of Saladin."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 59.—"A halo of false glory surrounds the Third Crusade from the associations which connect it with the lion-hearted king of England. The exploits of Richard I. have stirred to enthusiasm the dullest of chroniclers, have furnished themes for jubilant eulogies, and have shed over his life that glamour which cheats even sober-minded men when they read the story of his prototype Achilles in the tale of Troy. . . . When we turn from the picture to the reality, we shall see in this Third Crusade an enterprise in which the fiery zeal which does something towards redeeming the savage brutalities of Godfrey and the first crusaders is displaced by base and sordid greed, by intrigues utterly of the earth earthy, by wanton crimes from which we might well suppose that the sun would hide away its face; and in the leaders of this enterprise we shall see men in whom morally there is scarcely a single quality to relieve the monotonous blackness of their infamy; in whom, strategically, a very little generalship comes to the aid of a blind brute force."—G. W. Cox, *The Crusades*, ch. 7.

Also in: Mrs. W. Busk, *Medieval Popes, Emperors, Kings and Crusaders*, bk. 2, ch. 12, and bk. 3, ch. 1-2.

**A. D. 1196-1197.—The Fourth Expedition.**—A crusading expedition of German barons and their followers, which went to the Holy Land, by way of Italy, in 1196, is generally counted as the Fourth Crusade, though some writers look upon it as a movement supplementary to the Third Crusade. The Germans, who numbered some 40,000, do not seem to have been welcomed by the Christians of Palestine. The latter preferred to maintain the state of peace then prevailing; but the new crusaders forced hostilities at once. Saladin was dead; his brother Saphadin accepted the challenge to war with prompt vigor and struck the first hard blow, taking Jaffa, with great slaughter, and demolishing its fortifications. But Saphadin was presently defeated in a battle fought between Tyre and Sidon, and Jaffa was recovered, together with other towns and most of the coast. But, a little later, the Germans suffered, in their turn, a most demoralizing reverse at the castle of Thoron, which they besieged, and were further disturbed, in the midst of their depression, by news of the death of their emperor, Henry VI. A great part of them, thereupon, returned home. Those who remained, or many of them, occupied Jaffa, where they were attacked, a few months later, and cut to pieces.—G. W. Cox, *The Crusades*, ch. 8.

**A. D. 1201-1203.—The Fifth Movement.—Treachery of the Venetians.—Conquest of Constantinople.**—"Every traveller returning from Syria brought a prayer for immediate help from the survivors of the Third Crusade. It was necessary to act at once if any portion even of the wreck of the kingdom of Jerusalem were to be saved. Innocent the Third, and some, at least, of the statesmen of the West were fully alive to the progress which Islam had made since the departure of the Western kings. In 1197, however, after five years of weary waiting, the time seemed opportune for striking a new blow for Christendom. Saladin, the great Sultan, had died in 1193, and his two sons were already quarrelling about the partition of his empire. The contending divisions of the Arab Moslems were at this moment each bidding for the support of the Christians of Syria. The other great race of Mahometans which had threatened Europe, the Seljukian Turks, had made a halt in their progress through Asia Minor. . . . Other special circumstances which rendered the moment favourable for a new crusade, combined with the profound conviction of the statesmen of the West of the danger to Christendom from the progress of Islam, urged Western Europe to take part in the new enterprise. The reigning Pope, Innocent III., was the great moving spirit of the Fourth Crusade." The popular preacher of the Crusade was found in an ignorant priest named Fulco, of Neuilly, whose success in kindling public enthusiasm was almost equal to that of Peter the Hermit. Vast numbers took the cross, with Theobald, count of Champagne, Louis, count of Blois and Chartres, Simon de Montfort, Walter of Brienne, Baldwin, count of Flanders, Hugh of St. Pol, Geoffrey de Villehardouin, marshal of Champagne and future historian of the Crusade, and many other prominent knights and princes among the leaders. The young count of Champagne was the chosen chief; but he sickened and died and his place was taken by Boniface, marquis of Montferrat. It was the decision of the leaders



that the expedition should be directed in the first instance against the Moslem power in Egypt, and that it should be conveyed to the attack of Egypt by sea. Venice, alone, seemed to be able to furnish ships, sailors and supplies for so great a movement, and a contract with Venice for the service was concluded in the spring of 1201. But Venice was mercenary, unscrupulous and treacherous, caring for nothing but commercial gain. Before the crusaders could gather at her port for embarkation, she had betrayed them to the Moslems. By a secret treaty with the sultan of Egypt, the fact of which is coming more and more conclusively to light, she had undertaken to frustrate the Crusade, and to receive important commercial privileges at Alexandria as compensation for her treachery. When, therefore, in the early summer of 1202, the army of the Crusade was collected at Venice to take ship, it encountered difficulties, discouragements and ill-treatments which thickened daily. The number assembled was not equal to expectation. Some had gone by sea from Flanders; some by other routes. But Venice had provided transport for the whole, and inflexibly demanded pay for the whole. The money in hand was not equal to this claim. The summer was lost in disputes and attempted compromises. Many of the crusaders withdrew in disgust and went home. At length, in defiance of the censures of the pope and of the bitter opposition of many leaders and followers of the expedition, there was a bargain struck, by the terms of which the crusaders were to assist the Venetians in taking and plundering the Christian city of Zara, a dreaded commercial rival on the Dalmatian coast of the Adriatic, belonging to the king of Hungary, himself one of the promoters of the very crusade which was now to be turned against him. The infamous compact was carried out. Zara was taken, and in the end it was totally destroyed by the Venetians. In the meantime, the doomed city was occupied by the crusading army through the winter, while a still more perfidious plot was being formed. Old Dandolo, the blind doge of Venice, was the master spirit of it. He was helped by the influence of Philip, one of the two rivals then fighting for the imperial crown in Germany and Italy. Philip had married a daughter of Isaac II. (Angelos), made emperor at Constantinople on the fall of the dynasty of Comnenus, and that feeble prince had lately been dethroned by his brother. The son and heir of Isaac, named Alexius, had escaped from Constantinople and had made his way to Philip imploring help. Either Philip conceived the idea, or it was suggested to him, that the armament of the Crusade might be employed to place the young Alexius on the throne of his father. To the Venetians the scheme was more than acceptable. It would frustrate the Crusade, which they had pledged themselves to the sultan of Egypt to accomplish; it would satisfy their ill-will towards the Byzantines, and, more important than all else, it would give them an opportunity to secure immeasurable advantages over their rivals in the great trade which Constantinople held at command. The marquis of Montferrat, commander of the Crusade, had some grievances of his own and some ambitions of his own, which made him favorable to the new project, and he was easily won to it. The three influences thus combined—those of Philip, of Dandolo, and of Montferrat—

overcame all opposition. Some who opposed were bribed, some were intimidated, some were deluded by promises, some deserted the ranks. Pope Innocent remonstrated, appealed and threatened in vain. The pilgrim host, "changed from a crusading army into a filibustering expedition," set sail from Zara in the spring of the year 1203, and was landed, the following June, not on the shores of Egypt or Syria, but under the walls of Constantinople. Its conquest, pillage and brutally destructive treatment of the great city are described in another place.—E. Pears, *The Fall of Constantinople*, ch. 8-13.

ALSO IN: G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine and Greek Empires*, 710-1453, bk. 3, ch. 3.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 59.—See, also, *BYZANTINE EMPIRE: A. D. 1208-1204.*

**A. D. 1201-1283.—Against the heathen Slavonians on the Baltic.** See *LIVONIA: 12TH-13TH CENTURIES*; and *PRUSSIA: 13TH CENTURY.*

**A. D. 1209-1242.—Against the Albigenses.** See *ALBIGENSES.*

**A. D. 1212.—The Children's Crusade.**—"The religious wars fostered and promoted vice; and the failure of army after army was looked on as a clear manifestation of God's wrath against the sins of the camp. This feeling was roused to its highest pitch when, in the year 1212, certain priests—Nicolas was the name of one of these mischievous madmen—went about France and Germany calling on the children to perform what the fathers, through their wickedness, had been unable to effect, promising that the sea should be dry to enable them to march across; that the Saracens would be miraculously stricken with a panic at the sight of them; that God would, through the hands of children only, whose lives were yet pure, work the recovery of the Cross and the Sepulchre. Thousands—it is said fifty thousand—children of both sexes responded to the call. They listened to the impassioned preaching of the monks, believed their lying miracles, their visions, their portents, their references to the Scriptures, and, in spite of all that their parents could do, rushed to take the Cross, boys and girls together, and streamed along the roads which led to Marseilles and Genoa, singing hymns, waving branches, replying to those who asked whither they were going, 'We go to Jerusalem to deliver the Holy Sepulchre,' and shouting their rallying cry, 'Lord Jesus, give us back thy Holy Cross.' They admitted whoever came, provided he took the Cross; the infection spread, and the children could not be restrained from joining them in the towns and villages along their route. Their miserable parents put them in prison; they escaped; they forbade them to go; the children went in spite of prohibition. They had no money, no provisions, no leaders; but the charity of the towns they passed through supported them. At their rear streamed the usual tail of camp followers. . . . There were two main bodies. One of these directed its way through Germany, across the Alps, to Genoa. On the road they were robbed of all the gifts which had been presented them; they were exposed to heat and want, and a very many either died on the march or wandered away from the road and so became lost to sight; when they reached Italy they dispersed about the country, seeking food, were stripped by the villagers, and in some cases were reduced to slavery. Only seven thousand out of

their number arrived at Genoa. Here they stayed for some days. They looked down upon the Mediterranean, hoping that its bright waves would divide to let them pass. But they did not; there was no miracle wrought in their favour; a few of noble birth were received among the Genoese families, and have given rise to distinguished houses of Genoa; among them is the house of Vivaldi. The rest, disappointed and disheartened, made their way back again, and got home at length, the girls with the loss of their virtue, the boys with the loss of their belief, all barefooted and in rags, laughed at by the towns they went through, and wondering why they had ever gone at all. This was the end of the German army. That of the French was not so fortunate, for none of them ever got back again at all. When they arrived at Marseilles, thinned probably by the same causes as those which had dispersed the Germans, they found, like their brethren, that the sea did not open a path for them, as had been promised. Perhaps some were disheartened and went home again. But fortune appeared to favour them. There were two worthy merchants at Marseilles, named Hugh Ferrens, and William Porcus, Iron Hugh and Pig William, who traded with the East, and had in port seven ships, in which they proposed to convey the children to Palestine. With a noble generosity they offered to take them for nothing, all for love of religion, and out of the pure kindness of their hearts. Of course this offer was accepted with joy, and the seven vessels laden with the happy little Crusaders, singing their hymns and flying their banners, sailed out from Marseilles, bound for the East, accompanied by William the Good and Hugh the Pious. It was not known to the children, of course, that the chief trade of these merchants was the lucrative business of kidnapping Christian children for the Alexandrian market. It was so, however, and these respectable tradesmen had never before made so splendid a coup. Unfortunately, off the Island of St. Peter, they encountered bad weather, and two ships went down with all on board. What must have been the feelings of the philanthropists, Pig William and Iron Hugh, at this misfortune? They got, however, five ships safely to Alexandria, and sold all their cargo, the Sultan of Cairo buying forty of the boys, whom he brought up carefully and apart, intending them, doubtless, for his best soldiers. A dozen refusing to change their faith were martyred. None of the rest ever came back. Nobody in Europe seems to have taken much notice of this extraordinary episode."—W. Beasant and E. H. Palmer, *Jerusalem*, ch. 18.

ALSO IN: J. H. Michund, *Hist. of the Crusades*, app. no. 28.—G. Z. Gray, *The Children's Crusade*.

**A. D. 1212.—Against the Moors in Spain.**  
See SPAIN: A. D. 1146-1232.

**A. D. 1216-1229.—The Sixth Movement.—Frederic II. in Jerusalem.**—For six years after the betrayal of the vows of the crusaders of 1202-1204—who sacked Constantinople instead of rescuing Jerusalem—the Christians of Palestine were protected by a truce with Saphadin, the brother of Saladin, who had succeeded the latter in power. Hostilities were then rashly provoked by the always foolish Latins, and they soon found themselves reduced to sore straits, calling upon Europe for fresh help. Pope Innocent III.

did not scruple to second their appeal. A new crusade was preached with great earnestness, and a general Council of the Church—the Fourth of Lateran—was convened for the stimulation of it. "The Fifth Crusade [or the Sixth, as more commonly numbered], the result of this resolution, was divided in the sequel into three maritime expeditions: the first [A. D. 1216] consisting principally of Hungarians under their king, Andrew; the second [A. D. 1218] composed of Germans, Italians, French and English nobles and their followers; and the third [A. D. 1228] led by the Emperor Frederic II. in person. . . . Though the King of Hungary was attended by the flower of a nation which, before its conversion to Christianity, had been the scourge and terror of Western Europe, the arms of that monarch, even aided by the junction of numerous German crusaders under the dukes of Austria and Bavaria, performed nothing worthy of notice: and after a single campaign in Palestine, in which the Mussulman territories were ineffectually ravaged, the fickle Andrew deserted the cause and returned with his forces to Europe. His defection did not prevent the duke of Austria, with the German crusaders, from remaining, in concert with the King of Jerusalem, his barons, and the knights of the three religious orders, for the defence of Palestine; and, in the following year, the constancy of these faithful champions of the Cross was rewarded by the arrival of numerous reinforcements from Germany. . . . It was resolved to change the scene of warfare from the narrow limits of the Syrian shore to the coast of Egypt, . . . and the situation of Damietta, at the mouth of the Nile, pointed out that city as the first object of attack." After a siege of seventeen months, during which both the besieged and the besiegers suffered horribly, from famine and from pestilence, Damietta was taken (A. D. 1219). Nine-tenths of its population of 80,000 had perished. "Both during the siege and after the capture of Damietta, the invasion of Egypt had filled the infidels with consternation; and the alarm which was betrayed in their counsels proved that the crusaders, in choosing that country for the theatre of operations, had assailed the Mussulman power in its most vital and vulnerable point. Of the two sons of Saphadin, Coradinus and Camel, who were now uneasily seated on the thrones of Damascus and Cairo, the former, in despair of preserving Jerusalem, had already demolished its fortifications; and the brothers agreed in repeatedly offering the cession of the holy city and of all Palestine to the Christians, upon the single condition of their evacuating Egypt. Every object which had been ineffectually proposed in repeated Crusades, since the fatal battle of Tiberias, might now have been gloriously obtained by the acceptance of these terms, and the King of Jerusalem, the French and English leaders, and the Teutonic knights, all eagerly desired to embrace the offer of the Sultans. But the obstinate ambition and cupidity of the surviving papal legate, Cardinal Pelagius, of the Italian chief tactics, and of the knights of the other two religious orders, by holding out the rich prospect of the conquest and plunder of Egypt, overruled every wise and temperate argument in the Christian councils, and produced a rejection of all compromise with the infidels. After a winter of luxurious inaction, the legate led the

crusading host from Damietta toward Cairo (A. D. 1220)." The expedition was as disastrous in its result as it was imbecile in its leadership. The whole army, caught by the rising of the Nile, was placed in so helpless a situation that it was glad to purchase escape by the surrender of Damietta and the evacuation of Egypt. The retreat of the greater part of these crusaders did not end until they had reached home. Pope Honorius III. (who had succeeded Innocent III. in 1216) strove to shift responsibility for the failure from his wretched legate to the Emperor Frederic II., who had thus far evaded the fulfilment of his crusading promises and vows, being occupied in struggles with the papacy. At length, in 1228, Frederic embarked for Palestine with a small force, pursued by the maledictions of the pope, who denounced him for daring to assume the Cross while under the ban of the church, as much as he had denounced him before for neglecting it. But the free-thinking Hohenstaufen cared little, apparently, and went his way, shunned scrupulously by all pious souls, including the knights of Palestine, except those of the Teutonic order. With the help of the latter he occupied and re fortified Jaffa and succeeded in concluding a treaty with the Sultan which restored Jerusalem to the Christians, reserving certain rights to the Mahometans; giving up likewise Bethlehem, Nazareth and some other places to the Christians, and securing peace for ten years. Frederic had married, a few years before, for his second empress, Yolande, daughter and heiress of the titular king of Jerusalem, John de Brienne. With the hand of this princess, he received from her father a solemn transfer of all his rights to that shadowy throne. He now claimed those rights, and, entering Jerusalem, with the Teutonic knights (A. D. 1229), he crowned himself its king. The patriarch, the Templars and the Hospitaliers refused to take part in the ceremony; the pope denounced Frederic's advantageous treaty as soon as he had news of it, and all that it gained for the Christians of Palestine was thrown away by them as speedily as possible.—Major Procter, *Hist. of the Crusades*, ch. 5, sect. 2.—"No Crusader, since Godfrey de Bouillon, had effected so much as Frederick the Second. What would he not have obtained, had the Pope, the Patriarch and the Orders given him their hearty cooperation?"—T. L. Klinton, *Hist. of Frederick II.*, ch. 8.

A. D. 1238-1280.—Against the Bogomiles. See BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES: 9TH-16TH CENTURIES (BOSNIA, ETC.)

A. D. 1242.—The Invasion of Palestine by the Carismians. See JERUSALEM: A. D. 1242.

A. D. 1248-1254.—The Seventh Movement.—Expedition of Saint Louis to Egypt.—The Seventh Crusade was undertaken, with little aid from other countries, by the devout and wonderfully Christian-like young king of France, Louis IX., afterwards canonized, and known in history as St. Louis. "He carried it out with a picked army, furnished by the feudal chivalry and by the religious and military orders dedicated to the service of the Holy Land. The Isle of Cyprus was the trusting-place appointed for all the forces of the expedition. Louis arrived there on the 12th of September, 1248, and reckoned upon remaining there only a few days; for it was Egypt that he was in a hurry to reach.

The Christian world was at that time of opinion that, to deliver the Holy Land, it was necessary first of all to strike a blow at Islamism in Egypt, wherein its chief strength resided. But scarcely had the crusaders formed a junction in Cyprus, when the vices of the expedition and the weaknesses of its chief began to be manifest. Louis, unshakable in his religious zeal, was wanting in clear ideas and fixed resolves as to the carrying out of his design. . . . He did not succeed in winning a majority in the council of chiefs over to his opinion as to the necessity for a speedy departure for Egypt; it was decided to pass the winter in Cyprus. . . . At last a start was made from Cyprus in May, 1249, and, in spite of violent gales of wind which dispersed a large number of vessels, they arrived on the 4th of June before Damietta. . . . Having become masters of Damietta, St. Louis and the crusaders committed the same fault there as in the Isle of Cyprus: they halted there for an indefinite time. They were expecting fresh crusaders; and they spent the time of expectation in quarrelling over the partition of the booty taken in the city. They made away with it, they wasted it blindly. . . . Louis saw and deplored these irregularities, without being in a condition to stop them. At length, on the 20th of November, 1249, after more than five months' inactivity at Damietta, the crusaders put themselves once more in motion, with the determination of marching upon Babylon, that outskirts of Cairo, now called Old Cairo, which the greater part of them, in their ignorance, mistook for the real Babylon, and where they flattered themselves they would find immense riches, and avenge the olden sufferings of the Hebrew captives. The Mussulmans had found time to recover from their first fright, and to organize, at all points, a vigorous resistance. On the 8th of February, 1250, a battle took place twenty leagues from Damietta, at Mansourah ('the city of victory'), on the right bank of the Nile. . . . The battle-field was left that day to the crusaders; but they were not allowed to occupy it as conquerors, for, three days afterwards, on the 11th of February, 1250, the camp of St. Louis was assailed by clouds of Saracens, horse and foot, Mamelukes and Bedouins. All surprise had vanished, the Mussulmans measured at a glance the numbers of the Christians, and attacked them in full assurance of success, whatever heroism they might display; and the crusaders themselves indulged in no more self-illusion, and thought only of defending themselves. Lack of provisions and sickness soon rendered defence almost as impossible as attack; every day saw the Christian camp more and more encumbered with the famine-stricken, the lying, and the dead; and the necessity for retreating became evident." An attempt to negotiate with the enemy failed, because they insisted on the surrender of the king as hostage,—which none would concede. "On the 5th of April, 1250, the crusaders decided upon retreating. This was the most deplorable scene of a deplorable drama; and at the same time it was, for the king, an occasion for displaying, in their most sublime and attractive traits, all the virtues of the Christian. Whilst sickness and famine were devastating the camp, Louis made himself visitor, physician and comforter; and his presence and his words exercised upon the worst cases a searching influ-

ence. . . . When the 5th of April, the day fixed for the retreat, had come, Louis himself was ill and much enfeebled. He was urged to go aboard one of the vessels which were to descend the Nile, carrying the wounded and the most suffering; but he refused absolutely, saying, 'I don't separate from my people in the hour of danger.' He remained on land, and when he had to move forward he fainted away. When he came to himself, he was amongst the last to leave the camp. . . . At four leagues distance from the camp it had just left, the rear-guard of the crusaders, harassed by clouds of Saracens, was obliged to halt. Louis could no longer keep on his horse. 'He was put up at a house,' says Joinville, 'and laid, almost dead, upon the lap of a tradeswoman from Paris; and it was believed that he would not last till evening.'" The king, in this condition, with the whole wreck of his army,—only 10,000 in number remaining to him,—were taken prisoners. Their release from captivity was purchased a month later by the surrender of Damietta and a ransom-payment of 500,000 livres. They made their way to St. Jean d' Acre, in Palestine, whence many of them returned home. But King Louis, with some of his knights and men-at-arms—how many is not known—stayed yet in the Holy Land for four years, striving and hoping against hope to accomplish something for the deliverance of Jerusalem, and expending "in small works of piety, sympathy, protection, and care for the future of the Christian population in Asia, his time, his strength, his pecuniary resources, and the ardor of a soul which could not remain idly abandoned to sorrowing over great desires unsatisfied." The good and pious but ill-guided king returned to France in the summer of 1254, and was received with great joy.—F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 17.

ALSO IN: Sire De Joinville, *Memoirs of Saint Louis*, pt. 2.—J. F. Michaud, *Hist. of the Crusades*, bks. 13-14.

**A. D. 1252.—The movement of "the Pastors."**—On the arrival in France of the news of the disastrous failure of Saint Louis's expedition to Egypt, there occurred an outbreak of fanaticism as insensate as that of the children's crusade of forty years before. It was said to have originated with a Hungarian named Jacob, who began to proclaim that Christ rejected the great ones of the earth from His service, and that the deliverance of the Holy City must be accomplished by the poor and humble. "Shepherds left their flocks, labourers laid down the plough, to follow his footsteps. . . . The name of Pastors was given to these village crusaders. . . . At length, assembled to the number of more than 100,000, these redoubtable pilgrims left Paris and divided themselves into several troops, to repair to the coast, whence they were to embark for the East. The city of Orleans, which happened to be in their passage, became the theatre of frightful disorders. The progress of their enormities at length created serious alarm in the government and the magistracy; orders were sent to the provinces to pursue and disperse these turbulent and seditious bands. The most numerous assemblage of the Pastors was fixed to take place at Bourges, where the 'master of Hungary' [Jacob] was to perform miracles and communicate the will of Heaven. Their arrival in that

city was the signal for murder, fire and pillage. The irritated people took up arms and marched against these disturbers of the public peace; they overtook them between Mortemer and Villeneuve-sur-le-Cher, where, in spite of their numbers, they were routed, and received the punishment due to their brigandages. Jacob had his head cut off by the blow of an axe; many of his companions and disciples met with death on the field of battle, or were consigned to punishment; the remainder took to flight."—J. F. Michaud, *Hist. of the Crusades*, bk. 14.

**A. D. 1256-1259.—Against Eccelino di Romano.** See VERONA; A. D. 1230-1259.

**A. D. 1270-1271.—The last undertakings.—Saint Louis at Tunis.—Prince Edward in Palestine.**—"For seven years after his return to France, from 1254 to 1261, Louis seemed to think no more about them [the crusades], and there is nothing to show that he spoke of them even to his most intimate confidants; but, in spite of his apparent calmness, he was living, so far as they were concerned, in a continual ferment of imagination and internal fever, even flattering himself that some favorable circumstance would call him back to his interrupted work. . . . In 1261, Louis held, at Paris, a Parliament, at which, without any talk of a new crusade, measures were taken which revealed an idea of it. . . . In 1263 the crusade was openly preached. . . . All objections, all warnings, all anxieties came to nothing in the face of Louis's fixed idea and pious passion. He started from Paris on the 16th of March, 1270, a sick man almost already, but with soul content, and probably the only one without misgiving in the midst of all his comrades. It was once more at Aigues-Mortes that he went to embark. All was as yet dark and undecided as to the plan of the expedition. . . . Steps were taken at hap-hazard with full trust in Providence and utter forgetfulness that Providence does not absolve men from foresight. . . . It was only in Sardinia, after four days' halt at Cagliari, that Louis announced to the chiefs of the crusade, assembled aboard his ship, the 'Mountjoy,' that he was making for Tunis, and that their Christian work would commence there. The king of Tunis (as he was then called), Mohammed Mostanser, had for some time been talking of his desire to become a Christian, if he could be efficiently protected against the seditious of his subjects. Louis welcomed with transport the prospect of Mussulman conversions. . . . But on the 17th of July, when the fleet arrived before Tunis, the admiral, Florent de Varennes, probably without the king's orders, and with that want of reflection which was conspicuous at each step of the enterprise, immediately took possession of the harbor and of some Tunisian vessels as prize, and sent word to the king 'that he had only to support him and that the disembarkation of the troops might be effected with perfect safety.' Thus war was commenced at the very first moment against the Mussulman prince whom there had been promise of seeing before long a Christian. At the end of a fortnight, after some fight between the Tunisians and the crusaders, so much political and military blindness produced its natural consequences. The re-enforcements promised to Louis by his brother Charles of Anjou, king of Sicily, had not arrived; provisions were falling short; and the heats of an African summer were working

havoc amongst the army with such rapidity that before long there was no time to bury the dead; but they were cast pell-mell into the ditch which surrounded the camp, and the air was tainted thereby. On the 3d of August Louis was attacked by the epidemic fever." On the 25th of August he died. His son and successor, Philip III., held his ground before Tunis until November, when he gladly accepted a payment of money from the Tunisian prince for withdrawing his army. Disaster followed him. A storm destroyed part of his fleet, with 4,000 or 5,000 men, and sunk all the treasure he had received from the Moslems. On the journey home through Italy his wife met with an accident which ended her life and that of her prematurely born child. The young king arrived at Paris, May, 1271, bringing the remains of five of his family for burial at St Denis; his wife, his son, his father, his brother, and his brother-in-law,—all victims of the fatal crusade. While France was thus burying the last of her crusaders, Prince Edward (afterwards King Edward I.) of England, landed in Syria at the head of a few hundred knights and men at arms. Joined by the Templars and Hospitalers, he had an army of 6,000 or 7,000 men, with which he took Nazareth and made there a bloody sacrifice to the memory of the gentle Nazarene. He did nothing more. Being wounded by an assassin, he arranged a truce with the Sultan of Egypt and returned home. His expedition was the last from Europe which strove with the Moslems for the Holy Land. The Christians of Palestine, who still held Acre and Tyre, Sidon and a few other coast cities, were soon afterwards overwhelmed, and the dominion of the Crescent in Syria was undisputed any more by force of arms, though many voices cried vainly against it. The spirit of the Crusades had expired.—F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 17.

ALSO IN: J. F. Michaud, *Hist. of the Crusades*, bk. 15.

A. D. 1291.—The end of the Christian Kingdom of Jerusalem. See JERUSALEM: A. D. 1291.

A. D. 1299.—The last campaign of the Templars.—"After the fall of Acre [A. D. 1291] the headquarters of the Templars were established at Limisso in the island of Cyprus, and urgent letters were sent to Europe for succour." In 1295, James de Molay, the head of the English province, became Grand Master, and soon after his arrival in Palestine he entered into an alliance with Ghazan Khan, the Mongol ruler of Persia, who had married a Christian princess of Armenia and was not unfriendly to the Christians, as against the Mamluks of Egypt, with whom he was at war. The Mongol Khan invited the Templars to join him in an expedition against the Sultan of Egypt, and they did so in the spring of 1299, at Antioch. "An army of 30,000 men was placed by the Mogul emperor under the command of the Grand Master, and the combined forces moved up the valley of the Orontes towards Damascus. In a great battle fought at Hems, the troops of the sultans of Damascus and Egypt were entirely defeated and pursued with great slaughter until nightfall. Aleppo, Hems, Damascus, and all the principal cities, surrendered to the victorious arms of the Moguls, and the Templars once again entered Jerusalem in triumph, visited the Holy Sepulchre

and celebrated Easter on Mount Zion." The khan sent ambassadors to Europe, offering the possession of Palestine to the Christian powers if they would give him their alliance and support, but none responded to the call. Ghazan Khan fell ill and withdrew from Syria; the Templars retreated to Cyprus once more and their military career, as the champions of the Cross, was at an end.—C. G. Addison, *The Knights Templars*, ch. 6.

ALSO IN: H. H. Howarth, *Hist. of the Mongols*, pt. 3, ch. 8.

Effects and consequences of the Crusades in Europe.—"The principle of the crusades was a savage fanaticism; and the most important effects were analogous to the cause. Each pilgrim was ambitious to return with his sacred spoils, the relics of Greece and Palestine; and each relic was preceded and followed by a train of miracles and visions. The belief of the Catholics was corrupted by new legends, their practice by new superstitions; and the establishment of the inquisition, the mendicant orders of monks and friars, the last abuse of indulgences, and the final progress of idolatry, flowed from the baleful fountain of the holy war. The active spirit of the Latins preyed on the vitals of their reason and religion; and if the ninth and tenth centuries were the times of darkness, the thirteenth and fourteenth were the age of absurdity and fable. . . . Some philosophers have applauded the propitious influence of these holy wars, which appear to me to have checked rather than forwarded the maturity of Europe."

—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 61.—"The crusades may be considered as material pilgrimages on an enormous scale, and their influence upon general morality seems to have been altogether pernicious. Those who served under the cross would not indeed have lived very virtuously at home; but the confidence in their own merits which the principle of such expeditions inspired must have aggravated the ferocity and dissoluteness of their ancient habits. Several historians attest the deprivation of morals which existed, both among the crusaders and in the states formed out of their conquests."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 9, pt. 1.—"It was not possible for the crusaders to travel through so many countries, and to behold their various customs and institutions, without acquiring information and improvement. Their views enlarged; their prejudices wore off; new ideas crowded into their minds; and they must have been sensible, on many occasions, of the rusticity of their own manners when compared with those of a more polished people. . . . Accordingly, we discover, soon after the commencement of the crusades, greater splendour in the courts of princes, greater pomp in public ceremonies, a more refined taste in pleasure and amusements, together with a more romantic spirit of enterprise spreading gradually over Europe; and to these wild expeditions, the effect of superstition and folly, we owe the first gleams of light which tended to dispel barbarism and ignorance. But the beneficial consequences of the crusades took place slowly; their influence upon the state of property, and, consequently, of power, in the different kingdoms of Europe, was more immediate as well as discernible."—W. Robertson, *View of the Progress of Soc. in Europe*, sect. 1.—"The cru-

sades are not, in my mind, either the popular delusions that our cheap literature has determined them to be, nor papal conspiracies against kings and peoples, as they appear to the Protestant controversialist; nor the savage outbreaks of expiring barbarism, thirsting for blood and plunder, nor volcanic explosions of religious intolerance. I believe them to have been, in their deep sources, and in the minds of their best champions, and in the main tendency of their results, capable of ample justification. They were the first great effort of mediæval life to go beyond the pursuit of selfish and isolated ambitions; they were the trial-feat of the young world, essaying to use, to the glory of God and the benefit of man, the arms of its new knight-hood. . . . That in the end they were a benefit to the world no one who reads can doubt; and that in their course they brought out a love for all that is heroic in human nature, the love of freedom, the honour of prowess, sympathy with sorrow, perseverance to the last and patient endurance without hope, the chronicles of the age abundantly prove; proving, moreover, that it was by the experience of those times that the forms of those virtues were realized and presented to posterity."—W. Stubbs, *Seventeen Lects. on the History of Mediæval and Modern Hist.*, lect. 8.—"Though begun under the name and influence of religious belief, the crusades deprived religious ideas, I shall not say of their legitimate share of influence, but of their exclusive and despotic possession of the human mind. This result, though undoubtedly unforeseen, arose from various causes. The first was evidently the novelty, extent, and variety of the scene which displayed itself to the crusaders; what generally happens to travellers happened to them. It is mere common-place to say, that travelling gives freedom to the mind; that the habit of observing different nations, different manners and different opinions, enlarges the ideas, and disengages the judgment from old prejudices. The same thing happened to those nations of travellers who have been called the crusaders; their minds were opened and raised by having seen a multitude of different things, by having become acquainted with other manners than their own. They found themselves also placed in connexion with two states of civilization, not only different from their own, but more advanced—the Greek state of society on the one hand, and the Mussulman on the other. . . . It is curious to observe in the chronicles the impression made by the crusaders on the Mussulmans, who regarded them at first as the most brutal, ferocious, and stupid barbarians they had ever seen. The crusaders, on their part, were struck with the riches and elegance of manners which they observed among the Mussulmans. These first impressions were succeeded by frequent relations between the Mussulmans and Christians. These became more extensive and important than is commonly believed. . . . There is another circumstance which is worthy of notice. Down to the time of the crusades, the court of Rome, the centre of the Church, had been very little in communication with the laity, unless through the medium of ecclesiastics; either legates sent by the court of Rome, or the whole body of the bishops and clergy. There were always some laymen in direct relation with Rome; but upon the whole,

it was by means of churchmen that Rome had any communication with the people of different countries. During the crusades, on the contrary, Rome became a halting-place for a great portion of the crusaders, either in going or returning. A multitude of laymen were spectators of its policy and its manners, and were able to discover the share which personal interest had in religious disputes. There is no doubt that this newly-acquired knowledge inspired many minds with a boldness hitherto unknown. When we consider the state of the general mind at the termination of the crusades, especially in regard to ecclesiastical matters, we cannot fail to be struck with a singular fact: religious notions underwent no change, and were not replaced by contrary or even different opinions. Thought, notwithstanding, had become more free; religious creeds were not the only subject on which the human mind exercised its faculties; without abandoning them, it began occasionally to wander from them, and to take other directions. . . . The social state of society had undergone an analogous change. . . . Without entering into the details . . . we may collect into a few general facts the influence of the crusades on the social state of Europe. They greatly diminished the number of petty fiefs, petty domains, and petty proprietors; they concentrated property and power in a smaller number of hands. It is from the time of the crusades that we may observe the formation and growth of great fiefs—the existence of feudal power on a large scale. . . . This was one of the most important results of the crusades. Even in those cases where small proprietors preserved their fiefs, they did not live upon them in such an insulated state as formerly. The possessors of great fiefs became so many centres around which the smaller ones were gathered, and near which they came to live. During the crusades, small proprietors found it necessary to place themselves in the train of some rich and powerful chief, from whom they received assistance and support. They lived with him, shared his fortune, and passed through the same adventures that he did. When the crusaders returned home, this social spirit, this habit of living in intercourse with superiors continued to subsist, and had its influence on the manners of the age. . . . The extension of the great fiefs, and the creation of a number of central points in society, in place of the general dispersion which previously existed, were the two principal effects of the crusades, considered with respect to their influence upon feudalism. As to the inhabitants of the towns, a result of the same nature may easily be perceived. The crusades created great civic communities. Petty commerce and petty industry were not sufficient to give rise to communities such as the great cities of Italy and Flanders. It was commerce on a great scale—maritime commerce, and, especially, the commerce of the East and West, which gave them birth; now it was the crusades which gave to the maritime commerce the greatest impulse it had yet received. On the whole, when we survey the state of society at the end of the crusades, we find that the movement tending to dissolution and dispersion, the movement of universal localization (if I may be allowed such an expression), had ceased, and had been succeeded by a movement in the contrary direction, a movement of centralization. All

things tended to mutual approximation; small things were absorbed in great ones, or gathered round them. Such was the direction then taken by the progress of society."—F. Guizot, *Hist. of Civilization*, lect. 8 (v. 1).

**A. D. 1383.**—The Bishop of Norwich's Crusade in Flanders. See FLANDERS: A. D. 1383.

**A. D. 1420-1431.**—Crusade against the Hussites. See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1419-1434.

**A. D. 1442-1444.**—Christian Europe against the Turks. See TURKS (THE OTTOMANS): A. D. 1402-1451.

**A. D. 1467-1471.**—Crusade instigated by the Pope against George Podiebrad, king of Bohemia. See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1458-1471.

#### CRYPTEIA, The. See KRYPTEIA.

**CTESIPHON.**—"The Parthian monarchs, like the Mogul sovereigns of Hindostan, delighted in the pastoral life of their Scythian ancestors, and the imperial camp was frequently pitched in the plain of Ctesiphon, on the eastern banks of the Tigris, at the distance of only three miles from Seleucia. The innumerable attendants on luxury and despotism resorted to the court, and the little village of Ctesiphon insensibly swelled into a great city. Under the reign of Marcus, the Roman generals penetrated as far as Ctesiphon and Seleucia. They were received as friends by the Greek colony; they attacked as enemies the seat of the Parthian kings; yet both cities experienced the same treatment. The sack and conflagration of Seleucia, with the massacre of 300,000 of the inhabitants, tarnished the glory of the Roman triumph, Seleucia, already exhausted by the neighborhood of a too powerful rival, sunk under the fatal blow; but Ctesiphon, in about thirty-three years, had sufficiently recovered its strength to maintain an obstinate siege against the emperor Severus. The city was, however, taken by assault; the king, who defended it in person, escaped with precipitation; 100,000 captives and a rich booty rewarded the fatigues of the Roman soldiers. Notwithstanding these misfortunes, Ctesiphon succeeded to Babylon and Seleucia as one of the great capitals of the East."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 8.—In 637 A. D. Ctesiphon passed into the possession of the Saracens. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST AND EMPIRE: A. D. 632-651.

ALSO IN: G. Rawlinson, *Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy*, ch. 6.—See, also, MEDAIN.

**CUATOS, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PAMPAS TRIBES.

**CUBA:** A. D. 1492-1493.—Discovery by Columbus. See AMERICA: A. D. 1492; and 1493-1496.

**A. D. 1511.**—Spanish conquest and occupation of the island.—"Of the islands, Cuba was the second discovered; but no attempt had been made to plant a colony there during the lifetime of Columbus; who, indeed, after skirting the whole extent of its southern coast, died in the conviction that it was part of the continent. At length, in 1511, Diego, the son and successor of the 'admiral,' who still maintained the seat of government in Hispaniola, finding the mines much exhausted there, proposed to occupy the neighbouring island of Cuba, or Fernandina, as it is called, in compliment to the Spanish monarch. He prepared a small force for the conquest, which he placed under the command of Don Diego

Velasquez. . . . Velasquez, or rather his lieutenant Narvaez, who took the office on himself of scouring the country, met with no serious opposition from the inhabitants, who were of the same family with the effeminate natives of Hispaniola." After the conquest, Velasquez was appointed governor, and established his seat of government at St. Jago, on the southeast corner of the island.—W. H. Prescott, *Conquest of Mexico*, bk. 2, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: Sir A. Helps, *Spanish Conquest in America*, bk. 7.

**A. D. 1514-1851.**—Slow development of the island.—Capture of Havana by the English.—Discontent with Spanish rule.—Conspiracies of revolution.—"Velasquez founded many of the towns of the island, the first of which was Baracoa, then Bayamo, and in 1514 Trinidad, Santo Espiritu, Puerto Principe; next, in 1515, Santiago de Cuba, as also, in the same year, the town of Habana. . . . This period (1511-1607) is particularly interesting to the general reader from the fact that in it the explorations of Hernandez de Cadaba and Grijalva to Darien, Yucatan, etc., were inaugurated, — events which had so much to do with the spread of Spanish rule and discovery, paving the way as they did for the exploration of Mexico under Hernando Cortes, who, in the early history of Cuba, figures largely as the lieutenant of the Governor Velasquez. . . . In 1524, Diego Velasquez died, — his death hastened, it is said, by the troubles brought upon him by his disputes with his insubordinate lieutenant, Cortes. . . . In the history of the improvement of the island, his government will bear favorable comparison with many of the later governments; and while that great evil, slavery, was introduced into the island in his time, so also was the sugar cane. . . . Up to 1538, there seems to be nothing specially striking in the general history of the island, if we except the constant attacks with fire and sword of the 'slibusteros,' or pirates of all nations, from which most all the sea-coast towns suffered more or less; but in that year there arrived at Santiago de Cuba a man destined to play an important part in the history and discovery of the new world, and named as Provincial Governor of Florida as well as of Cuba, — I allude to Hernando de Soto, who brought with him 10 large vessels, prepared and fitted out expressly for the conquest of the new Spanish territory of Florida. After much care and preparation, this expedition started out from the city of Habana, the 12th of May [see FLORIDA: A. D. 1528-1542]. . . . In this period, also, was promulgated that order, secured, it is believed, by the noble efforts of Padre Las Casas, prohibiting the enslaving of the aborigines; while, also, such had become its importance as a town, all vessels directed to and from Mexico were ordered to stop at Havana. In the period of years that elapsed from 1607 to 1763, the island seems to have been in a perfect state of lethargy, except the usual changes of its many Governors, and the raids made upon it by pirates, or by more legalized enemies in the form of French and English men-of-war. In this latter year, however, occurred an event of much import, from the fact that after it, or upon its occurrence, the Government of Spain was led to see the great importance of Cuba, and particularly Havana, as the 'Key to the New



World,—this event was the taking of Havana by the English. On the 6th of June, 1762, three arrived off the port of Havana an English squadron of 33 ships and frigates, with some 200 transports, bringing with them a force of nearly 20,000 men of all arms, under command of the Duke of Albemarle. This formidable armament, the largest that America had ever seen, laid siege to the city of Havana, whose garrison consisted at that time of only about 2,700 regulars and the volunteers that took up arms immediately for the defense of the place. . . . The garrison, however, made a very gallant and prolonged defense, notwithstanding the smallness of their numbers, and finally, surrendering, were permitted to march out with the honors of war, the English thus coming into possession of the most important defences on the coast, and, subsequently, taking possession of the town of Matanzas. Remaining in possession of this portion of the Island of Cuba for many months (until July 6, 1763), the English, by importing negro labor to cultivate the large tracts of wild land, and by shipping large quantities of European merchandize, gave a start to the trade and traffic of the island that pushed it far on its way to the state of prosperity it has now reached; but by the treaty of peace, at Paris, in February, 1763 [see Seven Years War], was restored to Spain the portion of the island wrested from her by the English. . . . In this period (1762–1801) the island made rapid advances in improvement and civilization, many of the Captains-General of this period doing much to improve the towns and the people, beautifying the streets, erecting buildings, etc. In 1763, a large emigration took place from Florida, and in 1795 the French emigrants from Santo Domingo came on to the island in large numbers. . . . From 1801, rapid increase in the prosperity of the island has taken place. . . . At various times insurrections, some of them quite serious in their nature, have shown what the natural desire of the native population is for greater privileges and freedom. . . . In 1823, there was a society of 'soles,' as it was called, formed for the purpose of freeing the island, having at its head young D. Francisco Lemus, and living for its pretext that the island was about to be sold to England. In 1829, there was discovered the conspiracy of the Black Eagle, as it was called (Aguila Negra), an attempt on the part of the population to obtain their freedom, some of the Mexican settlers in the island being prominent in it. The insurrection, or attempt at one, by the blacks in 1844, was remarkable for its widespread ramifications among the slaves of the island, as well as its thorough organization,—the intention being to murder all the whites on the island. Other minor insurrections there were, but it remained for Narciso Lopez, with a force of some 300 men, to make the most important attempt [1851], in which he lost his life, to free the island."—S. Hazard, *Cuba with Pen and Pencil*, pp. 547–550.

ALSO IN: M. M. Ballou, *Hist. of Cuba*, ch. 1–3.—Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713–1783, ch. 38 (v. 4).—J. Entick, *Hist. of the Late War*, v. 5, pp. 363–386.—D. Turnbull, *Cuba*, ch. 22–24.

A. D. 1845–1860.—Acquisition coveted by the slave-power in the United States.—Attempted purchase.—Filibustering schemes.—

**The Ostend Manifesto.**—"When the Spanish colonies in America became independent, they abolished slavery. Apprehensive that the republics of Mexico and Columbia would be anxious to wrest Cuba and Porto Rico from Spain, secure their independence, and introduce into those islands the idea, if they did not establish the fact, of freedom, the slave-masters [of the United States] at once sought to guard against what they deemed so calamitous an event. . . . But after the annexation of Texas, there was a change of feeling and purpose, and Cuba, from being an object of dread, became an object of vehement desire. The propagandists, strengthened and emboldened by that signal triumph, now turned their eyes towards this beautiful 'isle of the sea,' as the theatre of new exploits; and they determined to secure the 'gem of the Antilles' for the coronet of their great and growing power. During Mr. Polk's administration an attempt was made to purchase it, and the sum of \$100,000,000 was offered therefor. But the offer was promptly declined. What, however, could not be bought it was determined to steal, and filibustering movements and expeditions became the order of the day. For no sooner was President Taylor inaugurated than he found movements on foot in that direction; and, in August, 1849, he issued a proclamation, affirming his belief that an 'armed expedition' was being fitted out 'against Cuba or some of the provinces of Mexico,' and calling upon all good citizens 'to discountenance and prevent any such enterprise.' In 1851 an expedition, consisting of some 500 men, sailed from New Orleans under Lopez, a Cuban adventurer. But though it effected a landing, it was easily defeated, and its leader and a few of his followers were executed. Soon afterward, a secret association, styling itself the Order of the Lone Star, was formed in several of the Southern cities, having a similar object in view; but it attracted little notice and accomplished nothing. . . . In August, 1854, President Pierce instructed Mr. Marcy, his Secretary of State, to direct Buchanan, Mason and Soule, ministers respectively at the courts of London, Paris and Madrid, to convene in some European city and confer with each other in regard to the matter of gaining Cuba to the United States. They met accordingly, in October, at Ostend. The results of their deliberations were published in a manifesto, in which the reasons are set forth for the acquisition; and the declaration was made that the Union could never enjoy repose and security 'as long as Cuba is not embraced within its boundaries.' But the great source of anxiety, the controlling motive, was the apprehension that, unless so annexed, she would 'be Africanized and become a second San Domingo,' thus 'seriously to endanger' the Union. This paper attracted great attention and caused much astonishment. It was at first received with incredulity, as if there had been some mistake or imposition practised. . . . But there was no mistake. . . . It was the deliberate utterance of the conference, and it received the indorsement of Mr. Pierce and his administration. The Democratic national conventions of 1850 and of 1860 were quite as explicit as were the authors of the Ostend manifesto 'in favor of the acquisition of Cuba.'—H. Wilson, *Hist. of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America*, v. 2, ch. 47.



ALSO IN: H. Von Holst, *Const. and Pol. Hist. of the U. S.*, v. 4, ch. 2, and v. 5, ch. 1.—G. T. Curtis, *Life of James Buchanan*, v. 2, ch. 6.—M. M. Hallou, *Hist. of Cuba*, ch. 3.—J. J. Roche, *The Story of the Filibusters*, ch. 3.

**CUBIT, The.**—"The length of the Egyptian foot is . . . shown to be equal to 1.013 English foot, or 12.16 inches (0.3086 metre) and the cubit to 18.24 English inches, or 0.463 metre. This cubit was identical with the Phœnician or Olympic cubit, afterwards adopted in Greece. . . . The second of the two Egyptian cubits was the royal cubit, or cubit of Memphis, of seven palms or twenty-eight digits. . . . The mean length of the Egyptian royal cubit is . . . ascertained to be 20.67 English inches, or 525 mm. . . . There is much conflict of opinion as to the actual length of the several cubits in use by the Jews at different periods; but the fact that Moses always mentions the Egyptian measures . . . as well as the Egyptian weights . . . proves that the Hebrews originally brought their weights and measures from Egypt. . . . In his dissertation on cubits, Sir Isaac Newton states grounds for his opinion that the sacred cubit of the Jews was equal to 24.7 of our inches, and that the royal cubit of Memphis was equivalent to five-sixths of this sacred Jewish cubit, or 20.6 inches."—H. W. Chisholm, *On the Science of Weighing and Measuring*, ch. 2.

**CUCUTA, The Convention of.** See COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1819-1890.

**CUFA.** See RUSSORAI and KUFA.

**CUICIDH, The.** See TUATH, THE.

**CULDEES, The.**—It used to be set forth by religious historians that the Culdees were an ancient religious fraternity in Scotland, probably founded by Columba, the saintly Irish missionary of the sixth century, and having its principal seat in Iona; that they "were the lights of Scotland in a dark and superstitious age"; that they struggled for several centuries against the errors and the oppressive pretensions of Rome, and that "the strength and vigor of the Reformation in Scotland, where the Papal power received its first and most decisive check, may be traced not indirectly to the faith, the doctrines, and the spirit of the ancient Culdees." It was claimed for the Presbyterian Church that its form of church government prevailed among the Culdees, while the supporters of Episcopacy found evidences to the contrary. But all these views, with all the controversies fomented by them, have been dissipated by modern historical investigation. The facts gathered by Dean Reeves and published in 1864, in his work on the "Culdees of the British Islands," supported by the more recent studies of Mr. W. F. Skene, are now generally accepted. Says Mr. Skene, (*Celtic Scotland*, bk. 2, p. 6): "It is not till after the expulsion of the Columban monks from the kingdom of the Picts, in the beginning of the eighth century, that the name of Culdee appears. To Adamnan, to Eddi and to Bede it was totally unknown. They knew of no body of clergy who bore this name, and in the whole range of ecclesiastical history there is nothing more utterly destitute of authority than the application of this name to the Columban monks of the sixth and seventh centuries, or more utterly baseless than the fabric which has been raised upon that assumption." Mr. Skene's conclusion is that the

Culdees sprang from an ascetic order called Delcoie or God-worshippers; that in Irish the name became Ceile De, thence corrupted into Culdee; that they were hermits, who became in time associated in communities, and were finally brought under the canonical rule of the Roman church, along with the secular clergy.

**CULEUS, The.** See AMPHORA.

**CULHUACAN.** See MEXICO, ANCIENT: THE TOLTEC EMPIRE.

**CULLODEN, Battle of (1746).** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1745-1746.

**CULM, OR KULM, Battle of.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1813 (AUGUST).

**CULTURKAMPF, The.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1873-1887.

**CUMÆ.—CUMÆAN SIBYL.**—"Earlier than 735 B. C. . . . though we do not know the precise era of its commencement, there existed one solitary Grecian establishment in the Tyrrhenian Sea,—the Campanian Cumæ, near Cape Misenum; which the more common opinion of chronologists supposed to have been founded in 1050 B. C. and which has even been carried back by some authors to 1180 B. C. . . . We may at least feel certain that it is the most ancient Grecian establishment in any part of Italy. . . . The Campanian Cumæ—known almost entirely by this its Latin designation—received its name and a portion of its inhabitants from the Æolic Kymê in Asia Minor. . . . Cumæ, situated on the neck of the peninsula which terminates in Cape Misenum, occupied a lofty and rocky hill overhanging the sea and difficult of access on the land side. . . . In the hollow rock under the very walls of the town was situated the cavern of the prophetic Sibyl,—a parallel and reproduction of the Gergithian Sibyl, near Kymê in Æolis; in the immediate neighborhood, too, stood the wild woods and dark lake of Avernus, consecrated to the subterranean gods, and offering an establishment of priests, with ceremonies evoking the dead, for purposes of prophecy or for solving doubts and mysteries. It was here that Grecian imagination localized the Cimmerians and the fable of Odysseus; and the Cumæans derived gains from the numerous visitors to this holy spot, perhaps hardly less than those of the inhabitants of Krissa from the vicinity of Delphi. Of the relations of these Cumæans with the Hellenic world generally, we unfortunately know nothing; but they seem to have been in intimate connection with Rome during the time of the kings, and especially during that of the last king Tarquin,—forming the intermediate link between the Greek and Latin world, whereby the feelings of the Teukrians and Gergitheans near the Æolic Kymê and the legendary stories of Trojan as well as Grecian heroes,—Æneas and Odysseus—passed into the antiquarian imagination of Rome and Latium. The writers of the Augustan age knew Cumæ only in its decline, and wondered at the vast extent of its ancient walls, yet remaining in their time. But during the two centuries prior to 500 B. C. these walls inclosed a full and thriving population, in the plenitude of prosperity."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 22.—See, also, SIBYL.

**CUMANS, OR KOMANS, The.** See HUNGARY: A. D. 1114-1301.

**CUMBERLAND GAP, The capture of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER: TENNESSEE).

**CUMBRIA: The British kingdom.**—"The Britons of Cumbria occupy a tolerably large space on the map, but a very small one in history;—their annals have entirely perished;—and nothing authentic remains concerning them, except a very few passages, wholly consisting of incidental notices relating to their subjection and their misfortunes. Romance would furnish much more; for it was in Cumbria that Rhydder, or Roderic the magnificent, is therein represented to have reigned, and Merlin to have prophesied, Arthur held his court in merry Carlisle; and Peredur, the Prince of Sunshine, whose name we find amongst the princes of Strathclyde, is one of the great heroes of the 'Mabinogion,' or tales of youth, long preserved by tradition amongst the Cymri. These fantastic personages, however, are of importance in one point of view, because they show, what we might otherwise forget—that from the Ribble in Lancashire, or thereabouts, up to the Clyde, there existed a dense population composed of Britons, who preserved their national language and customs, agreeing in all respects with the Welsh of the present day. So that even in the tenth century, the ancient Britons still inhabited the greater part of the western coast of the island, however much they had been compelled to yield to the political supremacy of the Saxon invaders. The 'Regnum Cumbrense' comprehended many districts, probably governed by petty princes or Reguli, in subordination to a chief monarch or Pendragon. Reged appears to have been somewhere in the vicinity of Annandale. Strathclyde is of course the district or vale of Clydesdale. In this district, or state, was situated Alcluyd, or Dunbritton, now Dumbarton, where the British kings usually resided; and the whole Cumbrian kingdom was not infrequently called Strathclyde, from the ruling or principal state; just as the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland is often designated in common language as 'England,' because England is the portion where the monarch and legislature are found. Many dependencies of the Cumbrian kingdom extended into modern Yorkshire, and Leeds was the frontier town between the Britons and the Angles. . . . The kings of Cumbria became the vassals, or 'men,' of the Anglo-Saxon kings. Eugenius had thus submitted to Athelstane. Of the nature of the obligation I shall speak hereafter. The Anglo-Saxon kings appear to have been anxious to extend and confirm their supremacy; Edmund proceeded against Donald, or Dumnall, the Scottish King of Cumbria (A. D. 945), with the most inveterate and implacable hostility. . . . Edmund, having thus obtained possession of Cumbria, granted the country to Malcolm, King of the Scots, upon condition, as the chroniclers say, of being his co-operator, both by sea and by land. . . . From this period the right of the Scottish kings or princes to the kingdom of Cumbria, as vassals of the English crown, seems to have been fully admitted; and the rights of the Scottish kings to the 'Earldom of Cumberland'—for such it was afterwards termed—were founded upon Edmund's grant. The Britons of Strathclyde, and Reged, and Cumbria, gradually melted away into the surrounding population; and, losing their language, ceased to be discernible as a separate race. Yet it is most probable that this process was not wholly completed until a comparatively recent

period."—F. Palgrave, *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, ch. 11.—Cumbria and Cambria (Wales), the two states long maintained by the Britons, against the Angles and Saxons, bore, in reality, the same name, Cumbria being the more correct form of it. The earliest development of the so-called Welsh poetry seems to have been in Cumbria rather than in Wales. Taliesin and Aneirin were Cumbrian bards, and Arthur, if any historical personage stands behind his glistening shadow, was probably a Cumbrian hero.—J. Rhys, *Celtic Britain*.

ALSO IN: W. F. Skene, *The Four Ancient Books of Wales*.—See, also, KYMRV, ALCLYDE, and SCOTLAND: 10TH-11TH CENTURIES.

**CUNARD LINE, The founding of the.** See STEAM NAVIGATION: ON THE OCEAN.

**CUNAXA, Battle of (B. C. 401).** See PERSIA: B. C. 401-400.

**CUNEIFORM WRITING.**—The characters employed for the written languages of ancient Babylonia and Assyria, have been called cuneiform, from the Latin *cuneus*, a wedge, because the marks composing them are wedge-shaped. All knowledge of those characters and of the languages expressed in them had been lost for many centuries, and its recent recovery is one of the most marvelous achievements of our age. "Travellers had discovered inscriptions engraved in cuneiform, or, as they were also termed, arrow-headed characters, on the ruined monuments of Persepolis and other ancient sites in Persia. Some of these monuments were known to have been erected by the Achaemenian princes—Darius, the son of Hystaspes, and his successors—and it was therefore inferred that the inscriptions also had been carved by order of the same kings. The inscriptions were in three different systems of cuneiform writing; and since the three kinds of inscription were always placed side by side, it was evident that they represented different versions of the same text. . . . It was clear that the three versions of the Achaemenian inscriptions were addressed to the three chief populations of the Persian Empire, and that the one which invariably came first was composed in ancient Persian, the language of the sovereign himself. Now this Persian version happened to offer the decipherer less difficulties than the two others which accompanied it. The number of distinct characters employed in writing it did not exceed forty, while the words were divided from one another by a slanting wedge. Some of the words contained so many characters that it was plain that these latter must denote letters and not syllables, and that consequently the Persian cuneiform system must have consisted of an alphabet, and not of a syllabary. It was further plain that the inscriptions had to be read from left to right, since the ends of all the lines were exactly underneath one another on the left side, whereas they terminated irregularly on the right. . . . The clue to the decipherment of the inscriptions was first discovered by the successful guess of a German scholar, Grotefend. Grotefend noticed that the inscriptions generally began with three or four words, one of which varied, while the others remained unchanged. The variable word had three forms, though the same form always appeared on the same monument. Grotefend, therefore, conjectured that this word represented the name of a king, the words which followed it being royal titles." Working on this conject-

ure, he identified the three names with Darius, Xerxes and Artaxerxes, and one of the supposed titles with a Zend word for "king," which gave him a considerable part of the cuneiform alphabet. He was followed in the work by Burnouf, Lassen and Sir Henry Rawlinson, until, finally, Assyrian inscriptions were read with "almost as much certainty as a page of the Old Testament."—A. H. Sayce, *Fresh Light from the ancient monuments*, ch. 1.

**CUNIBERTUS**, King of the Lombards, A. D. 691-700.

**CUNIMARÉ**, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: GUCK or COCO GROUP.

**CURDS, OR KURDS**, The. See CARDUCHI.

**CURFEW-BELL**, The.—"Except from its influence upon the imagination, it would be hardly worth while to notice the legend of the curfew-bell, so commonly supposed to have been imposed by William [the Conqueror] upon the English, as a token of degradation and slavery; but the 'squilla di lontano, che paga il giorno planger che si muore,' was a universal custom of police throughout the whole of mediæval Europe, not unconnected with devotional feeling."—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and Eng.*, v. 3, p. 627.—"In the year [1061] after King Henry's death [Henry I. of France], in a Synod held at Caen by the Duke's authority [Duke William of Normandy, who became in 1066 the Conqueror and King of England], and attended by Bishops, Abbots, and Barons, it was ordered that a bell should be rung every evening, at hearing of which prayer should be offered, and all people should get within their houses and shut their doors. This odd mixture of piety and police seems to be the origin of the famous and misrepresented Curfew. Whatever was its object, it was at least not ordained as any special hardship on William's English subjects."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of the Norman Conquest of Eng.*, ch. 12, sect. 3 (v. 3).

**CURIA**, Ancient Roman. See COMMITTA CURIATA.

**CURIA**, Municipal, of the later Roman empire.—**Decuriones**.—"It is only necessary in this work to describe the general type of the municipal organization which existed in the provinces of the Roman Empire after the time of Constantine. . . . The proprietors of land in the Roman provinces generally dwelt in town; and cities, as a protection against brigands and man-stealers. Every town had an agricultural district which formed its territory, and the landed proprietors constituted the municipality. The whole local authority was vested in an oligarchical senate called the Curia, consisting probably of one hundred of the wealthiest landed proprietors in the city or township. This body elected the municipal authorities and officers, and filled up vacancies in its own body. It was therefore independent of the proprietors from among whom it was taken, and whose interests it ought to have represented. The Curia—not the body of landed proprietors—formed therefore the Roman municipality. The Curia was used by the imperial government as an instrument of fiscal extortion."—G. Finlay, *Greece under the Romans*, ch. 2, sect. 1.—"When the progress of fiscal tyranny had almost sapped the vigor of society, the decuriones [members of the municipal curiæ, called, also, curiales] . . . being held jointly responsible for the taxation, became the

veriest slaves of the empire. Responsible jointly for the taxes, they were, by the same token, responsible for their colleagues and their successors; their estates were made the securities of the imperial dues; and if any estate was abandoned by its proprietor, they were compelled to occupy it and meet the imposts exigible from it. Yet they could not relinquish their offices; they could not leave the city except by stealth; they could not enter the army, or the priesthood, or any office which might relieve them from municipal functions. . . . Even the children of the Curial were ascribed to his functions, and could engage in no course of life inconsistent with the onerous and intolerable duty. In short, this dignity was so much abhorred that the lowest plebeian shunned admission to it, the members of it made themselves bondmen, married slave-women, or joined the barbaric hordes in order to escape it; and malefactors, Jews and heretics were sometimes condemned to it, as an appropriate penalty for their offenses."—P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul*, bk. 2, ch. 8.

ALSO IN: T. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, bk. 3, ch. 9.—F. Guizot, *Hist. of Civilization*, v. 2 (p. 1, France), lect. 2.—See, also ROME: A. D. 363-376.

**CURIA**, Papal.—**College of Cardinals**.—**Consistory**.—"The Court of Rome, commonly called the Roman Curia, consisted of a number of dignified ecclesiasties who assisted the Pope in the executive administration. The Pontiff's more intimate advisers, or, as we should say, his privy council, were the College of Cardinals [see PAPACY: A. D. 1059], consisting of a certain number of cardinal bishops, cardinal priests, and cardinal deacons. The cardinal deacons, at first seven and afterwards fourteen in number, were originally ecclesiastics appointed as overseers and guardians of the sick and poor in the different districts of Rome. Equal to them in rank were the fifty cardinal priests, as the chief priests of the principal Roman churches were called; who, with the cardinal deacons, formed, in very early times, the presbytery, or senate of the Bishop of Rome. . . . According to some authorities, cardinal bishops were instituted in the 9th century; according to others not till the 11th, when seven bishops of the dioceses nearest to Rome—Ostia, Porto, Velletri, Tusculum, Preneste, Tibur, and the Sabines—were adopted by the Pope partly as his assistants in the service of the Lateran, and partly in the general administration of the Church. In process of time, the appointment of such cardinal bishops was extended not only to the rest of Italy but also to foreign countries. Though the youngest of the cardinals in point of time, cardinal bishops were the highest in rank, and enjoyed the pre-eminence in the College. Their titles were derived from their dioceses. . . . But they were also called by their own names. The number of the cardinals was indefinite and varying. The Council of Basle endeavoured to restrict it to 24. But this was not carried out, and Pope Sixtus V. at length fixed the number at 70. The Council called the Consistory, which advised with the Pope both in temporal and ecclesiastical matters, was ordinarily private, and confined to the cardinals alone; though on extraordinary occasions, and for solemn purposes of state, as in the audiences of foreign ambassadors, &c., other prelates, and even distinguished laymen, might

appear in it."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, v. 1, p. 38.

**CURIA REGIS OF THE NORMAN KINGS.**—"The Curia Regis [under the Norman Kings of England], the supreme tribunal of judicature, of which the Exchequer was the financial department or session, was . . . the court of the king sitting to administer justice with the advice of his counsellors; those counsellors being, in the widest acceptation, the whole body of tenants-in-chief, but in the more limited usage, the great officers of the household and specially appointed judges. The great gatherings of the national council may be regarded as full sessions of the Curia Regis, or the Curia Regis as a perpetual committee of the national council."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 11, sect. 127.—"Not long after the granting of Magna Charta, the Curia Regis was permanently divided into three committees or courts, each taking a certain portion of the business: (1) Fiscal matters were confined to the Exchequer; (2) civil disputes, where neither the king's interest nor any matter savouring of a criminal nature were involved, were decided in the Common Pleas; and (3) the court of King's Bench retained all the remaining business and soon acquired the exclusive denomination of the ancient Curia Regis. But the same staff of judges was still retained for all three courts, with the chief justiciar at their head. Towards the end of Henry III.'s reign, the three courts received each a distinct staff, and on the abolition by Edward I. of the office of chief justiciar, the only remaining bond of union being severed, they became completely separated. Some trace of their ancient unity of organization always survived, however, in the court of Exchequer Chamber; until at length after six centuries of independent existence they were again united by the Judicature Act, 1873. Together with the Court of Chancery and the Probate, Divorce and Admiralty courts, they now form divisions of a consolidated High Court of Justice, itself a branch of the Supreme Court of Judicature."—T. P. Taswell-Langmead, *Eng. Const. Hist.*, p. 154.—"The Aula Regia, or Curia Regis . . . has been described in various and at first sight contradictory terms. Thus it has been called the highest Law Court, the Ministry of the King, a Legislative Assembly, &c. The apparent inconsistency of these descriptions vanishes on closer inspection, and throws great light on medieval history. For the Curia Regis possessed every attribute which has been ascribed to it."—A. V. Dicey, *The Privy Council*, pt. 1.

ALSO IN: R. Gneist, *Hist. of the Eng. Const.*, ch. 19.

**CURIALES.** See CURIA, MUNICIPAL.  
**CURIOSOLITÆ, The.** See VENETI OF WESTERN GAUL.

**CURTIS, George W., and Civil-Service Reform.** See CIVIL SERVICE REFORM IN THE UNITED STATES.

**CURULE ÆDILES.** See ROME: B. C. 494-492.

**CURULE CHAIR.**—In ancient Rome, "certain high offices of state conferred upon the holder the right of using, upon public occasions, an ivory chair of peculiar form. This chair was termed *Sella Curulis*. . . . This was somewhat in the form of a modern camp-stool."—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq.*, ch. 2 and 4.

**CURZOLA, Battle of (1298).** See GENOA: A. D. 1261-1299.

**CUSCO: The Capital of the Inca of Peru.** See PERU: A. D. 1533-1548.

**CUSH.—CUSHITES.**—"Genesis, like the Hebrews of later date, includes under the name of Cush the nations dwelling to the South, the Nubians, Ethiopians and tribes of South Arabia."

—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, bk. 2, ch. 1.—See, also, HAMITES, and ARABIA.

**CUSHING, Lieutenant William B.—Destruction of the rain Albemarle.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1804 (OCTOBER: NORTH CAROLINA).

**CUSTER'S LAST BATTLE.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1876.

**CUSTOMS DUTIES.** See TARIFF.

**CUSTOMS UNION, The German (Zollverein).** See TARIFF: A. D. 1834.

**CUSTOZZA, Battles of (1848 and 1866).** See ITALY: A. D. 1848-1849; and 1862-1866.

**CUTLER, Manasseh, and the Ordinance of 1787.** See NORTHWEST TERRITORY OF THE U. S.: A. D. 1787.

**CUYRIRI, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINALS: GUCK OR COCO GROUP.

**CYCLADES, The.—**

"Among the Ionic portion of Hellas are to be reckoned (besides Athens) Eubœa, and the numerous group of islands included between the southernmost Eubœan promontory, the eastern coast of Peloponnesus, and the northwestern coast of Krête. Of these islands some are to be considered as outlying prolongations, in a southeasterly direction, of the mountain-system of Attica; others of that of Eubœa; while a certain number of them lie apart from either system, and seem referable to a volcanic origin. To the first class belong Keôs, Kythnos, Seriphos, Pholegandros, Sikinos, Gyaros, Syra, Paros, and Antiparos; to the second class Andros, Tênos, Mykonos, Dêlos, Naxos, Amorgos; to the third class Kimôlos, Mêlos, Thêra. These islands passed amongst the ancients by the general name of the Cyclades and the Sporades; the former denomination being commonly understood to comprise those which immediately surrounded the sacred island of Dêlos,—the latter being given to those which lay more scattered and apart. But the names are not applied with uniformity or steadiness even in ancient times: at present, the whole group are known to us by the title of Cyclades."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 12.

**CYDONIA, Battles and siege of (B. C. 71-68).** See CÆRE: B. C. 68-66.

**CYLON, Conspiracy of.** See ATHENS: B. C. 612-595.

**CYMBELINE, Kingdom of.** See COLCHES-TELL, ORIGIN OF.

**CYMRU, The.** See KYMRY, THE.

**CYNOSARGES AT ATHENS, The.** See GYMNASIA, GREEK.

**CYNOSCEPHALÆ, Battle of (B. C. 364).**

—The battle in which Pelopidas, the Theban patriot, friend and colleague of Epaminondas, was slain. It was fought B. C. 364, in Thessaly, near Pharsalus, on the heights called Cynoscephalæ, or the Dog's Heads, and delivered the Thessalian cities from the encroachments of the tyrant of Phere.—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 40.

(B. C. 197). See GREECE: B. C. 214-146.

**CYNOSSEMA, Naval battle of.**—Two successive naval battles fought, one in July and the second in October, B. C. 411, between the Athenians and the Peloponnesian allies, in the Hellespont, are jointly called the Battle of Cynossema. The name was taken from the headland called Cynossema, or the "Dog's Tomb," "ennobled by the legend and the chapel of the Trojan queen Hecuba." The Athenians had the advantage in both encounters, especially in the latter one, when they were joined by Alcibiades, with reinforcements, just in time to decide the doubtful fortunes of the day.—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 4, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 63.—See GREECE: B. C. 411-407.

**CYNURIANS, The.** See KYNURIANS.

**CYPRUS: Origin of the name.**—"The Greek name of the island was derived from the abundance in which it produced the beautiful plant ('Copher') which furnishes the 'al-henna,' coveted throughout the East for the yellow dye which it communicates to the nails. It was rich in mines of copper, which has obtained for it the name by which it is known in the modern languages of the West."—J. Kenrick, *Phœnicia*, ch. 4.

**Early History.**—"The first authentic record with regard to Cyprus is an inscription on an Egyptian tombstone of the 17th century B. C., from which it appears that the island was conquered by Thothmes III. of Egypt, in whose reign the exodus of the Children of Israel is supposed to have taken place. This was no doubt anterior to the establishment of any Greek colonies, and probably, also, before the Phœnicians had settled in the island. . . . As appears from various inscriptions and other records, Cyprus became subject successively to Egypt, as just mentioned, to Assyria, to Egypt again in 568 B. C., when it was conquered by Amasis, and in 525 B. C. to Persia. Meanwhile the power of the Greeks had been increasing. . . . The civilization of the West was about to assert itself at Marathon and Salamis; and Cyprus, being midway between East and West, could not fail to be involved in the coming conflict. On the occasion of the Ionic revolt [see PERSIA: B. C. 521-493] the Greek element in Cyprus showed its strength; and in 502 B. C. the whole island, with the single exception of the Phœnician town of Anathus, took part with the Ionians in renouncing the authority of the Persian king." But in the war which followed, the Persians, aided by the Phœnicians of the mainland, reconquered Cyprus, and the Cyprian Greeks were long disheartened. They recovered their courage, however, about 410 B. C. when Evagoras, a Greek of the royal house of Teucer, made himself master of Salamis, and finally established a general sovereignty over the island—even extending his power to the mainland and subjugating Tyre. "The reign of Evagoras is perhaps the most brilliant period in the history of Cyprus. Before his death, which took place in 374 B. C., he had raised the island from the position of a mere dependency of one or other of the great Eastern monarchies, had gained for it a place among the leading states of Greece, and had solved the question as to which division of the ancient world the Cyprian people should be assigned. Consequently when, some forty years later, the power of Persia was shattered by Alexander the Great at the battle of Issus, the kings of the island hastened to offer

him their submission as the leader of the Greek race, and sent 120 ships to assist him in the siege of Tyre." After Alexander's death, Cyprus was disputed between Antigonus and Ptolemy. (See MACEDONIA: B. C. 310-301.) The king of Egypt secured the prize, and the island remained under the Greek-Egyptian crown, until it passed, with the rest of the heritage of the Ptolemys to the Romans. "When the [Roman] empire was divided, on the death of Constantine the Great, Cyprus, like Malta, passed into the hands of the Byzantine Emperors. Like Malta, also, it was exposed to frequent attacks from the Arabs; but, although they several times occupied the island and once held it for no less than 160 years, they were always expelled again by the Byzantine Emperors, and never established themselves there as firmly as they did in Malta. The crusades first brought Cyprus into contact with the western nations of modern Europe."—C. P. Lucas, *Hist. Geog. of British Colonies*, sect. 1, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: R. H. Lavg, *Cyprus*, ch. 1-8.—F. Von Loher, *Cyprus*, ch. 12 and 30.—L. P. Di Cesnola, *Cyprus; its ancient cities*, &c.

**B. C. 58.—Annexed to the Roman Dominions.**—"The annexation of Cyprus was decreed in 606 [B. C. 58] by the people [of Rome], that is, by the leaders of the democracy, the support given to piracy by the Cypriots being alleged as the official reason why that course should now be adopted. Marcus Cato, intrusted by his opponents with the execution of this measure, came to the island without an army; but he had no need of one. The king [a brother of the king of Egypt] took poison; the inhabitants submitted without offering resistance to their inevitable fate, and were placed under the governor of Cilicia."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 5, ch. 4.

**A. D. 117.—Jewish insurrection.**—"This rich and pleasant territory [the island of Cyprus] had afforded a refuge to the Jews of the continent through three generations of disturbance and alarm, and the Hebrew race was now [A. D. 117] probably not inferior there in number to the native Syrians or Greeks. On the first outburst of a Jewish revolt [against the Roman domination, in the last year of the reign of Trajan] the whole island fell into the hands of the insurgents, and became an arsenal and rallying point for the insurrection, which soon spread over Egypt, Cyrene and Mesopotamia. The leader of the revolt in Cyprus bore the name of Artemion, but we know no particulars of the war in this quarter, except that 240,000 of the native population is said to have fallen victims to the exterminating fury of the insurgents. When the rebellion was at last extinguished in blood, the Jews were forbidden thenceforth to set foot on the island; and even if driven thither by stress of weather, the penalty of death was mercilessly enforced. . . . The Jewish population of Cyrenaica outnumbered the natives. . . . The hostility of the Jews in these parts was less directed against the central government and the Roman residents than the native race. . . . Of these 220,000 are said to have perished."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 65.

**A. D. 1191.—Conquest by Richard Cœur de Lion.—Founding of the Latin Kingdom.**—During the civil strife and confusion of the last years of the Comnenian dynasty of emperors at Constantinople, one of the members of the family,

Isaac Comnenos, secured the sovereignty of Cyprus and assumed the title of emperor. With the alliance of the king of Sicily, he defeated the Byzantine forces sent against him, and was planted securely, to all appearance, on his newly built throne at the time of the Third Crusade. Circumstances at that time (A. D. 1191) gave him a fatal opportunity to provoke the English crusaders. First, he seized the property and imprisoned the crews of three English ships that were wrecked on the Cyprian coast. Not satisfied with that violence, he refused shelter from the storm to a vessel which bore Berengaria of Navarre, the intended wife of King Richard. "The king of England immediately sailed to Cyprus; and when Isaac refused to deliver up the shipwrecked crusaders, and to restore their property, Richard landed his army and commenced a series of operations, which ended in his conquering the whole island, in which he abolished the administrative institutions of the Eastern Empire, enslaving the Greek race, introducing the feudal system, by which he riveted the chains of a foreign domination, and he gave it as a present to Guy of Lusignan, the titular king of Jerusalem, who became the founder of a dynasty of Frank kings in Cyprus."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine and Greek Empires*, from 716 to 1453, bk. 3, ch. 3, sect. 1.—Before giving Cyprus to Guy of Lusignan, Richard had sold the island to the Templars, and Guy had to pay the knights heavily for the extinguishment of their rights. Richard, therefore, was rather a negotiator than a giver in the transaction.—W. Stubbs, *Seventeen Lects. on the Study of Mediæval and Modern History*, lect. 8.

A. D. 1192-1489.—The kingdom under the house of Lusignan.—"The house of Lusignan maintained itself in Cyprus for nearly three centuries, during which, although fallen somewhat from the blessedness which had been broken up by Isaac Comnenos, the island seems to have retained so much fertility and prosperity as to make its later history very dark by contrast. . . . Guy, we are told, received Cyprus for life only, and did homage for the island to Richard. As he already bore the title of king, the question whether he should hold Cyprus as a kingdom does not seem to have arisen. . . . On his death, in April, 1194, Richard putting in no claim for the reversion, his brother, Amalric of Lusignan, constable of Palestine, entered on the possession as his heir. . . . Amalric succeeded to the crown of Jerusalem; the crown of Jerusalem, which, after the year 1269, became permanently united with that of Cyprus, was an independent crown, and the king of Jerusalem an anointed king: the union of the crowns therefore seems to have precluded any question as to the tenure by which the kingdom of Cyprus should be held. . . . The homage then due to Richard, or to the crown of England, ceased at the death of Guy."—W. Stubbs, *Seventeen Lects. on the Study of Mediæval and Modern Hist.*, lect. 8.—See, also, JERUSALEM: A. D. 1291.

A. D. 1291-1310.—The Knights Hospitallers of St. John. See HOSPITALIERS OF ST. JOHN: A. D. 1118-1310.

A. D. 1489-1570.—A Venetian dependency.—The last reigning king of Cyprus was James II., a bastard brother of Queen Charlotte, whom he drove from the Cypriot throne in 1464. This king married a Venetian lady, Caterina Cornaro,

in 1471 and was declared to be "the son-in-law of the Republic." The unscrupulous republic is said to have poisoned its son-in-law in order to secure the succession. He died in 1473, and a son, born after his death, lived but two years. Cyprus was then ruled by the Venetians for fifteen years in the name of Caterina, who finally renounced her rights wholly in favor of the republic. After 1489, until its conquest by the Turks, Cyprus was a Venetian dependency, in form as well as in fact, but tributary to the Sultan of Egypt.—W. Stubbs, *Seventeen Lects. on the Study of Mediæval and Modern Hist.*, lect. 8.

A. D. 1570-1571.—Conquest by the Turks. See TURKS: A. D. 1566-1571.

A. D. 1821.—Turkish massacre of Christians. See GREECE: A. D. 1821-1829.

A. D. 1878.—Control surrendered by Turkey to England. See TURKS: A. D. 1878, THE TREATIES OF SAN STEFANO AND BERLIN.

CYREANS, The. See PERSIA: B. C. 401-400.

CYRENAICA.—CYRENE.—KYRENE.

—A city, growing into a kingdom, which was founded at an early day by the Greeks, on that projecting part of the coast of Libya, or northern Africa, which lies opposite to Greece. The first settlers were said to have been from the little island of Thera, whose people were bold and enterprising. The site they chose "was of an unusual nature, especially for islanders, and lay several miles away from the sea, the shores of which were devoid of natural bays for anchorage. But, with this exception, every advantage was at hand: instead of the narrow stony soil of their native land, they found the most fertile corn-fields, a broad table-land with a healthy atmosphere and watered by fresh springs; a well-wooded coast-land, unusually well adapted for all the natural products which the Hellenes deemed essential; while in the background spread mysteriously the desert, a world passing the comprehension of the Hellenes, out of which the Libyan tribes came to the shore with horses and camels, with black slaves, with apes, parrots and other wonderful animals, with dates and rare fruits. . . . An abundant spring of water above the shore was the natural point at which the brown men of the deserts and the mariners assembled. Here regular meetings became customary. The bazaar became a permanent market, and the market a city which arose on a grand scale, broad and lofty, on two rocky heights, which jut out towards the sea from the plateau of the desert. This city was called Cyrene. . . . Large numbers of population immigrated from Crete, the islands and Peloponnesus. A large amount of new land was parcelled out, the Libyans were driven back, the landing-place became the port of Apollonia, and the territory occupied by the city itself was largely extended. Cyrene became, like Massalia, the starting point of a group of settlements, the centre of a small Greece: Barca and Hesperides [afterwards called Berenice] were her daughters. Gradually a nation grew up, which extended itself and its agriculture, and contrived to cover a large division of African land with Hellenic culture. This was the new era which commenced for Cyrene with the reign of the third king, the Battus who, on account of the marvellously rapid rise of his kingdom, was celebrated as 'the fortunate' in all

Hellas. The Battlads [the family or dynasty of Battus] were soon regarded as a great power."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 2, ch. 3.—Cyrenaica became subject to Egypt under the Ptolemys, and was then usually called Pentapolis, from the five cities of Cyrene, Apollonia, Arsinoë (formerly Teuchira), Berenice (formerly Hesperis, or Hesperides) and Ptolemais (the port of Barca). Later it became a province of the Roman Empire, and finally, passing under Mahometan rule, sank to its present state, as a district, called Barca, of the kingdom of Tripoli.—Cyrene was especially famous for the production of a plant called silphium—supposed to be assafoetida—on which the ancients seem to have set an extraordinary value. This was one of the principal sources of the wealth of Cyrene.—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 8, sect. 1, and ch. 12, sect. 2.

**B. C. 525.**—Tributary to Persia. See EGYPT: B. C. 525-332.

**B. C. 322.**—Absorbed in the Kingdom of Egypt by Ptolemy Lagus. See EGYPT: B. C. 323-30.

**B. C. 97.**—Transferred to the Romans by will.—"In the middle of this reign [of Ptolemy, called Lathyrus, king of Egypt] died Ptolemy Apion, king of Cyrene. He was the half-brother of Lathyrus and Alexander, and having been made king of Cyrene by his father Euergetes II., he had there reigned quietly for twenty years. Being between Egypt and Carthage, then called the Roman province of Africa, and having no army which he could lead against the Roman legions, he had placed himself under the guardianship of Rome; he had bought a truce during his lifetime, by making the Roman people his heirs in his will, so that on his death they were to have his kingdom. Cyrene had been part of Egypt for above two hundred years, and was usually governed by a younger son or brother of the king. But on the death of Ptolemy Apion,

the Roman senate, who had latterly been grasping at everything within their reach, claimed his kingdom as their inheritance, and in the flattering language of their decree by which the country was enslaved, they declared Cyrene free."—S. Sharpe, *Hist. of Egypt*, ch. 11.

**A. D. 117.**—Jewish insurrection. See CYPRUS: A. D. 117.

**A. D. 516.**—Destroyed by Chosroes. See EGYPT: A. D. 616-638.

**7th Century.**—Mahometan conquest. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 647-709.

**CYRUS, The empire of.** See PERSIA: B. C. 549-521.

**CYRUS THE YOUNGER, The expedition of.** See PERSIA: B. C. 401-400.

**CYZICUS: B. C. 411-410, Battles at.** See GREECE: B. C. 411-407.

**B. C. 74.**—Siege by Mithridates.—Cyzicus, which had then become one of the largest and wealthiest cities of Asia Minor, was besieged for an entire year (B. C. 74-73) by Mithridates in the third Mithridatic war. The Roman Consul Lucullus came to the relief of the city and succeeded in gaining a position which blockaded the besiegers and cut off their supplies. In the end, Mithridates retreated with a small remnant only, of his great armament, and never recovered from the disaster.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, v. 3, ch. 1.

**A. D. 267.**—Capture by the Goths. See GOTTIS: A. D. 258-267.

**CZAR, OR TZAR.** See RUSSIA: A. D. 1547.

**CZARTORISKYS, The, and the fall of Poland.** See POLAND: A. D. 1763-1773.

**CZASLAU, OR CHOTUSITZ, Battle of (A. D. 1742).** See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1742 (JANUARY—MAY).

**CZEKHS, The.** See BOHEMIA: ITS PEOPLE.

## D.

**DACHTELFIELD, The.** See SAXONS: A. D. 772-804.

**DACIA, The Dacians.**—Ancient Dacia embraced the district north of the Danube between the Theiss and the Dniester. "The Dacians [at the time of Augustus, in the last half century B. C.] occupied the whole of what now forms the southern part of Hungary, the Banat and Transylvania. . . . The more prominent part which they henceforth assumed in Roman history was probably owing principally to the immediate proximity in which they now found themselves to the Roman frontier. The question of the relation in which the Dacians stood to the Gete, whom we find in possession of these same countries at an earlier period, was one on which there existed considerable difference of opinion among ancient writers: but the prevailing conclusion was that they were only different names applied to the same people. Even Strabo, who describes them as distinct, though cognate tribes, states that they spoke the same language. According to his distinction the Gete occupied the easterly regions, adjoining the Euxine, the Dacians the western, bordering on the Germans."—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 20, sect. 1.

**A. D. 102-106.**—Trajan's conquest.—At the beginning of the second century, when Trajan conquered the Dacians and added their country to the Roman Empire, "they may be considered as occupying the broad block of land bounded by the Theiss, the Carpathians, the lower Danube or Ister, and the Pruth." In his first campaign, A. D. 102, Trajan penetrated the country to the heart of modern Transylvania, and forced the Dacians to give him battle at a place called Tapæ, the site of which is not known. He routed them with much slaughter, as they had been routed at the same place, Tapæ, sixteen years before, in one of the ineffectual campaigns directed by Domitian. They submitted, and Trajan established strong Roman posts in the country; but he had scarcely reached Rome and celebrated his triumph there, before the Dacians were again in arms. In the spring of the year 104, Trajan repaired to the lower Danube in person, once more, and entered the Dacian country with an overwhelming force. This time the subjugation was complete, and the Romans established their occupation of the country by the founding of colonies and the building of roads. Dacia was now made a Roman province, and "the language of the Empire became,



and to this day substantially remains, the national tongue of the inhabitants. . . . Of the Dacian province, the last acquired and the first to be surrendered of the Roman possessions, if we except some transient occupations, soon to be commemorated, in the East, not many traces now exist; but even these may suffice to mark the moulding power of Roman civilization. . . . The accents of the Roman tongue still echo in the valleys of Hungary and Wallachia; the descendants of the Dacians at the present day repudiate the appellation of Wallachs, or strangers, and still claim the name of Románi.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 63.

A. D. 270.—Given up to the Goths. See **GOths**: A. D. 268-270.

4th Century.—Conquest by the Huns. See **GOths** (VISIGOTHS): A. D. 376, and **HUNS**: A. D. 433-453.

6th Century.—Occupied by the Avars. See **AVARS**.

Modern history. See **BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES**.

**DACOITS**. See **DAKOITS**.

**DACOTAS**. See **AMERICAN ABORIGINES**: **SIOUAN FAMILY**, and **PAWNEE (CADDOAN) FAMILY**.

**DEGSASTAN, Battle of**.—Fought, A. D. 603, between the Northumbrians and the Scots of Dalriada, the army of the latter being almost wholly destroyed.

**DAGOBERT I.**, King of the Franks (Neustria), A. D. 628-638; (Austria), 632-633; (Burgundy), 628-638. . . . **Dagobert II.**, King of the Franks (Austria), A. D. 673-678. . . . **Dagobert III.**, King of the Franks (Neustria and Burgundy), A. D. 711-715.

**DAHIS**, The. See **BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES**, 14TH-19TH CENTURIES (SERVIA).

**DAHLGREN, Admiral John A.**—Siege of Charleston. See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1863 (JULY, and AUGUST)—DECEMBER: S. CAROLINA.

**DAHLGREN, Ulric**.—Raid to Richmond. See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1864 (FEBRUARY)—MARCH: VIRGINIA.

**DAKOITS**.—**DAKOTEE**.—The Dakoits of India, who were suppressed soon after the Thugs, were "robbers by profession, and even by birth." Dakoitee "was established upon a broad basis of hereditary caste, and was for the most part an organic state of society. 'I have always followed the trade of my ancestors, Dakoitee,' said Lukha, a noted Dakoite, who subsequently became approver. 'My ancestors held this profession before me,' said another, 'and we train boys in the same manner. In my caste if there were any honest persons, i. e., not robbers, they would be turned out.'" The hunting down of the Dakoits was begun in 1838, under the direction of Colonel Sleeman, who had already hunted down the Thugs.—J. W. Kaye, *The Administration of the East India Co.*, pt. 3, ch. 3.

**DAKOTA, North and South**: A. D. 1803.—Embraced in the Louisiana Purchase. See **LOUISIANA**: A. D. 1798-1803.

A. D. 1834-1838.—Partly joined, in succession, to Michigan, Wisconsin, and Iowa Territories. See **WISCONSIN**: A. D. 1805-1848.

A. D. 1889.—Admission to the Union. See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1889-1890.

**DAKOTAS**. See **AMERICAN ABORIGINES**: **SIOUAN FAMILY** and **PAWNEE (CADDOAN) FAMILY**.

**DALAI LAMA**. See **LAMA**.

**DALCASSIANS**.—The people of North Munster figure prominently under that name in early Irish history.—T. Moore, *Hist. of Ireland*, v. 2.

**DALHOUSIE, Lord**, The India administration of. See **INDIA**: A. D. 1845-1849; 1848-1856; and 1852.

**DALMATIA**.—"The narrow strip of land on the eastern side of the Adriatic on which the name of Dalmatia has settled down has a history which is strikingly analogous to its scenery. . . . As the cultivation and civilization of the land lies in patches, as harbours and cities alternate with barren hills, so Dalmatia has played a part in history only by fits and starts. This fitful kind of history goes on from the days of Greek colonies and Illyrian piracy to the last war between Italy and Austria. But of continuous history, steadily influencing the course of the world's progress, Dalmatia has none to show."—E. A. Freeman, *Subject and Neighbour Lands of Venice*, pp. 85-87.

ALSO IN: T. G. Jackson, *Dalmatia, the Quarnero and Istria*, ch. 1-2.—See, also, **ILLYRICUM OF THE ROMANS**; **SALONA**; and **BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES**.

6th-7th Centuries: Slavonic occupation. See **SLAVONIC PEOPLES**: 6TH and 7TH CENTURIES; also, **BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES**: 7TH CENTURY.

A. D. 944.—Beginning of Venetian Conquest. See **VENICE**: A. D. 810-901.

A. D. 1102.—Conquest by the king of Hungary. See **HUNGARY**: A. D. 972-1114.

14th Century.—Conquest from the Venetians by Louis the Great of Hunga. See **HUNGARY**: A. D. 1301-1442.

16th Century.—The Uscocks. See **USCOCKS**. A. D. 1694-1696.—Conquests by the Venetians. See **TURKS**: A. D. 1684-1696.

A. D. 1699.—Cession in great part to Venice by the Turks. See **HUNGARY**: 1698-1699.

A. D. 1797.—Acquisition by Austria. See **FRANCE**: A. D. 1797 (MAY)—OCTOBER.

A. D. 1805.—Ceded by Austria to the kingdom of Italy. See **GERMANY**: A. D. 1805-1806.

A. D. 1809.—Incorporated in the Illyrian Provinces of Napoleon. See **GERMANY**: A. D. 1809 (JULY)—SEPTEMBER.

A. D. 1814.—Restored to Austria.—Austria recovered possession of Dalmatia under the arrangements of the Congress of Vienna.

**DALRIADA**.—"A district forming the north-east corner of Ireland and comprising the north half of the county of Antrim, was called Dalriada. It appears to have been one of the earliest settlements of the Scots among the Picts of Ulster and to have derived its name from its supposed founder Cairbre, surnamed Righfhada or Riada. It lay exactly opposite the peninsula of Kintyre [Scotland] from whence it was separated by a part of the Irish channel of no greater breadth than about fourteen miles; and from this Irish district the colony of Scots, which was already Christian [fifth century] passed over and settled in Kintyre and in the island of Isla"—establishing a Scotch Dalriada.—W. F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, bk. 1, ch. 3.—For some account of the Scotch Dalriada, see **SCOTLAND**: 7TH CENTURY.



**DAMASCUS, Kingdom of.**—The kingdom of Damascus, or "Aram of Damascus" as it was entitled, was formed soon after that Syrian region threw off the yoke of dependence which David and Solomon had imposed upon it. "Rezon, the outlaw, was its founder. Hader, or Hadad, and Rimmon, were the chief divinities of the race, and from them the line of its kings derived their names,—Hadad, Ben-hadad, Hadad-ezer, Tabrimmon."—Dean Stanley, *Lects. on the Hist. of the Jewish Church*, lect. 33.—"Though frequently captured and plundered in succeeding centuries by Egypt and Assyria, neither of those nations was able to hold it long in subjection because of the other. It was probably a temporary repulse of the Assyrians, under Sialmaneser II., by the Damascus general Naaman to which reference is made in 2 Kings v. 1: 'by him the Lord had given deliverance unto Syria'. . . After the great conquerors of Egypt and Asia, each in his day, had captured and plundered Damascus, it was taken without resistance by Parmenio for Alexander the Great [B. C. 333]. In it Pompey spent the proudest year of his life, 64 B. C., distributing at his pleasure the thrones of the East to the vassals of Rome. Cleopatra had received the city as a love-gift from Mark Antony, and Tiberius had bestowed it upon Herod the Great, before Aretis of Petra, the father of the princess whom Herod Antipas divorced for Herodias's sake, and the ruler whose officers watched the city to prevent the escape of Paul, made it, we know not how, a part of his dominions."—W. B. Wright, *Ancient Cities*, ch. 7.

A. D. 634.—Conquest by the Arabs. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 632-630.

A. D. 661.—Becomes the seat of the Caliphate. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 661.

A. D. 763.—The Caliphate transferred to Bagdad. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 763.

A. D. 1148-1217.—Capital of the Atabeg and the Ayoubite sultans. See SALADIN, THE EMPIRE OF.

A. D. 1401.—Sack and massacre by Timour. See TIMOUR.

A. D. 1832.—Capture by Mehemed Ali. See TURKS: A. D. 1831-1840.

**DAMASUS II.**, Pope, A. D. 1048, July to August.

**DAMIETTA**: A. D. 1219-1220.—Siege, capture and surrender by the Crusaders. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1216-1229.

A. D. 1249-1250.—Capture and loss by Saint Louis. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1248-1254.

A. D. 1252.—Destruction by the Mamelukes.—"Two years after the deliverance of the king [Saint Louis], and whilst he was still in Palestine, the Mamelukes, fearing a fresh invasion of the Franks, in order to prevent their enemies from taking Damietta and fortifying themselves in that city, entirely destroyed it. Some years after, as their fears were not yet removed, and the second crusade of Louis IX. spread fresh alarms throughout the East, the Egyptians caused immense heaps of stone to be cast into the mouth of the Nile, in order that the Christian fleets might not be able to sail up the river. Since that period a new Damietta has been built at a small distance from the site of the former city."—J. F. Michaud, *Hist. of the Crusades*, bk. 14.

**DAMNONIA**. See BRITAIN: 6TH CENTURY.

**DAMNONII, OR DAMNII, The.** See DUMNONII.

**DAMOISEL. — DAMOISELLE. — DONZELLO.**—"In mediæval Latin 'domicella' is used for the unmarried daughter of a prince or noble, and 'domicellus,' contracted from 'domicellus,' the diminutive of 'dominus,' for the son. These words are the forerunners of the old French 'dâmoisel' in the masculine, and 'damoiselle' in the feminine gender. Froissart calls Richard, prince of Wales, son of Edward: 'le jeune damoisil Richard.' In Romance the word is indifferently 'damoysel' and 'danzel,' in Italian 'donzello.' All of these are evidently titles under the same notion as that of child and 'enfant,' of which the idea belongs to the knights of an earlier period."—R. T. Hampson, *Origines Patrie*, p. 328.

**DANAÏDE, The.** See ARGOS.—ARGOLIS.  
**DANCING PLAGUE.** See PLAGUE, A. D. 1874.

**DANDRIDGE, Engagement at.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863-1864 (DECEMBER—APRIL: TENNESSEE—MISSISSIPPI).

**DANEGELD, The.**—"A tax of two shillings on the hide of land, originally levied as tribute to the Danes under Ethelred, but continued [even under the Plantagenets], like the income tax, as a convenient ordinary resource."—W. Stubbs, *The Early Plantagenets*, p. 53.—See ENGLAND: A. D. 979-1016.

**DANELAGH, OR DANELAGA, OR DANELAU.**—The district in England held by the Danes after their treaty with Alfred the Great, extending south to the Thames, the Lea and the Ouse; north to the Tyne; west of the mountain district of Yorkshire, Westmoreland and Cumberland. "Over all this region the traces of their colonization abound in the villages whose names end in by, the Scandinavian equivalent of the English tun or ham."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 7, sect. 77.—See, also, ENGLAND: A. D. 855-880.

**DANES AS VIKINGS.** See, also, NORMANS.—NORTHMEN.

In England. See ENGLAND: A. D. 855-880, 979-1016, and 1016-1042; also NORMANS: A. D. 787-880.

In Ireland. See IRELAND: 9TH-10TH CENTURIES.

**DANITES, The.** See MORMONISM: A. D. 1830-1846.

**DANTE AND THE FACTIONS OF FLORENCE.** See FLORENCE: A. D. 1295-1300; and 1301-1313.

**DANTON AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1791 (OCTOBER), to 1793-1794 (NOVEMBER—JUNE).

**DANTZIC**: In the Hanseatic League. See HANSA TOWNS.

A. D. 1577.—Submission to the king of Poland. See POLAND: A. D. 1574-1590.

A. D. 1793.—Acquisition by Prussia. See POLAND: A. D. 1793-1796.

A. D. 1806-1807.—Siege and capture by the French. See GERMANY: A. D. 1807 (FEBRUARY—JUNE).

A. D. 1807.—Declared a free state. See GERMANY: A. D. 1807 (JUNE—JULY).

A. D. 1813.—Siege and capture by the Allies. See GERMANY: A. D. 1813 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER).

**DARA.**—One of the capitals of the Parthian kings, the site of which has not been identified.

**DARA, Battle of (A. D. 529).** See PERSIA: A. D. 524-537.

**DARDANIANS OF THE TROAD.** See TROJA; and ASIA MINOR: THE GREEK COLONIES; also, AMORITES.

**DARIEN, The Isthmus of.** See PANAMA. **The Scottish colony.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1695-1699.

**DARINI, The.** See IRELAND, TRIBES OF EARLY CELTIC INHABITANTS.

**DARIUS, King of Persia,** B. C. 521-486. . . . **Darius II.,** B. C. 425-405. . . . **Darius III. (Codomannus),** B. C. 336-331.

**DARK AGES, The.**—The historical period, so-called, is nearly identical with that more commonly named the Middle Ages; but its duration may be properly considered as less by a century or two. From the 5th to the 13th century is a definition of the period which most historians would probably accept. See MIDDLE AGES.

**DARORIGUM.**—Modern Vannes. See VENETI OF WESTERN GAUL.

**DAR-UL-ISLAM AND DAR-UL-HARB.**—"The Koran divides the world into two portions, the House of Islam, Dar-ul-Islam, and the House of War, Dar-ul-harb. It has generally been represented by Western writers on the institutes of Mahometanism and on the habits of Mahometan nations, that the Dar-ul-harb, the House of War, comprises all lands of the misbelievers. . . . There is even a widely-spread idea among superficial talkers and writers that the holy hostility, the Jihad [or Dhihad] of Mussulmans against non-Mussulmans is not limited to warfare between nation and nation; but that 'it is a part of the religion of every Mahometan to kill as many Christians as possible, and that by counting up a certain number killed, they think themselves secure of heaven.' But careful historical investigators, and statesmen long practically conversant with Mahometan populations have exposed the fallacy of such charges against those who hold the creed of Islam. . . . A country which is under Christian rulers, but in which Mahometans are allowed free profession of their faith, and peaceable exercise of their ritual, is not a portion of the House of War, of the Dar-ul-harb; and there is no religious duty of warfare, no Jihad, on the part of true Mussulmans against such a state. This has been of late years formally determined by the chief authorities in Mahometan law with respect to British India."—Sir E. S. Creasy, *Hist. of the Ottoman Turks*, ch. 6.

**DASTAGERD.**—The favorite residence of the last great Persian king and conqueror, Chosroes (A. D. 500-529), was fixed at Dastagerd, or Artemita, sixty miles north of Ctesiphon, and east of the Tigris. His palaces and pleasure grounds were of extraordinary magnificence.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 46.

**DASYUS.** See INDIA: THE ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

**DAUPHINS OF FRANCE.**—**DAUPHINE.**—In 1349, Philip VI., or Philip de Valois, of France, acquired by purchase from Humbert II., count of Vienno, the sovereignty of the province of Dauphiné. This principality became from that time the appanage of the eldest sons of the kings of France and gave them

their peculiar name or title of the Dauphins. The title in question had been borne by the counts of Vienno (in Dauphiné), "on account of the dolphin which they carried upon their helmets and on their armorial bearings."—E. De Bonnehose, *Hist. of France*, bk. 2, ch. 2, footnote.

ALSO IN: E. Smedley, *Hist. of France*, pt. 1, ch. 9.—See, also, BURGUNDY: A. D. 1127-1378.

**DAVENPORT, John, and the founding of New Haven Colony.** See CONNECTICUT: A. D. 1638, and 1630.

**DAVID, King of Israel and Judah.** See JEWS: THE KINGDOMS OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH, and JERUSALEM: CONQUEST, &c. . . . **David I., King of Scotland,** A. D. 1124-1153. . . . **David II.,** 1320-1370.

**DAVIS, Jefferson.**—Election to the Presidency of the rebellious "Confederate States." See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (FEBRUARY). . . . **Flight and capture.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (APRIL—MAY).

**DAVOUT, Marshal, Campaigns of.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1806 (OCTOBER); 1806-1807; 1807 (FEBRUARY—JUNE); also RUSSIA: A. D. 1812; and GERMANY: A. D. 1812-1813; 1813 (AUGUST), (OCTOBER—DECEMBER).

**DAY OF BARRICADES, The.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1584-1589.

**DAY OF DUPES, The.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1630-1632.

**DAY OF THE SECTIONS, The.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1795 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER).

**DAYAKS, OR DYAKS, The.** See MALAYAN RACE.

**DEAK, Francis, and the recovery of Hungarian nationality.** See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1866-1867.

**DEAN FOREST.**—The "Royal Forest of Dean," situated in the southwestern angle of the county of Gloucester, England, between the Severn and the Wye, is still so extensive that it covers some 23,000 acres, though much reduced from its original dimensions. Its oaks and its iron mines have played important parts in British history. The latter were worked by the Romans and still give employment to a large number of miners. The former were thought to be so essential to the naval power of England that the destruction of the Forest is said to have been one of the special duties prescribed to the Spanish Armada.—J. C. Brown, *Forests of Eng.*

**DEANE, Silas, and the American transactions with Beaumarchais in France.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776-1778.

**DEARBORN, General Henry, and the War of 1812.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812 (JUNE—OCTOBER), (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER); A. D. 1813 (OCTOBER—NOVEMBER).

**DEBRECZIN, Battle of (1849).** See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1848-1849.

**DEBT, Laws concerning: Ancient Greek.**—At Athens, in the time of Solon (6th century, B. C.) the Thetes—"the cultivating tenants, metayers and small proprietors of the country . . . are exhibited as weighed down by debts and dependence, and driven in large numbers out of a state of freedom into slavery—the whole mass of them (we are told) being in debt to the rich, who were proprietors of the greater part of the soil. They had either borrowed money for their own necessities, or they tilled the lands of the rich as dependent tenants, pay-

ing a stipulated portion of the produce, and in this capacity they were largely in arrear. All the calamitous effects were here seen of the old harsh law of debtor and creditor—once prevalent in Greece, Italy, Asia, and a large portion of the world—combined with the recognition of slavery as a legitimate status, and of the right of one man to sell himself as well as that of another man to buy him. Every debtor unable to fulfil his contract was liable to be adjudged as the slave of his creditor, until he could find means either of paying it or working it out; and not only he himself, but his minor sons and unmarried daughters and sisters also, whom the law gave him the power of selling. The poor man thus borrowed upon the security of his body (to translate literally the Greek phrase) and upon that of the persons in his family. So severely had these oppressive contracts been enforced, that many debtors had been reduced from freedom to slavery in Attica itself,—many others had been sold for exportation,—and some had only hitherto preserved their own freedom by selling their children. . . . To their relief Solon's first measure, the memorable *Seisachtheia*, shaking off of burthens, was directed. The relief which it afforded was complete and immediate. It cancelled at once all those contracts in which the debtor had borrowed on the security either of his person or of his land; it forbade all future loans or contracts in which the person of the debtor was pledged as security: it deprived the creditor in future of all power to imprison, or enslave, or extort work from, his debtor, and confined him to an effective judgment at law authorizing the seizure of the property of the latter. It swept off all the numerous mortgage pillars from the landed properties in Attica, leaving the land free from all past claims. It liberated and restored to their full rights all debtors actually in slavery under previous legal adjudication; and it even provided the means (we do not know how) of re-purchasing in foreign lands, and bringing back to a renewed life of liberty in Attica, many insolvents who had been sold for exportation. And while Solon forbade every Athenian to pledge or sell his own person into slavery, he took a step farther in the same direction by forbidding him to pledge or sell his son, his daughter, or an unmarried sister under his tutelage—excepting only the case in which either of the latter might be detected in unchastity. . . . One thing is never to be forgotten in regard to this measure, combined with the concurrent amendments introduced by Solon in the law—it settled finally the question to which it referred. Never again do we hear of the law of debtor and creditor as disturbing Athenian tranquillity. The general sentiment which grew up at Athens, under the Solonian money-law and under the democratical government, was one of high respect for the sanctity of contracts. . . . There can be little doubt that under the Solonian law, which enabled the creditor to seize the property of his debtor, but gave him no power over the person, the system of money-lending assumed a more beneficial character.”—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 11 (c. 3).

**Ancient Roman.**—“The hold of the creditor was on the person of the debtor. The obligation of a debt was a tying up or binding, or bondage, of the person: the payment was a solution, a loosing or release of the person from that

bondage. The property of the debtor was not a pledge for the debt. It could be made so by special agreement, though in the earliest law only by transferring it at once to the ownership of the creditor. Without such special agreement, the creditor whose debtor failed to pay could not touch his property. Even when the debtor had been prosecuted and condemned to pay, if he still failed, the creditor could not touch his property. He could seize his person—I speak now of the early law, in the first centuries of the republic—and after holding him in rigorous confinement for sixty days, with opportunities, however, either to pay himself or get somebody to pay for him, if payment still failed, he could sell him as a slave, or put him to death; if there were several creditors, they could cut his body into pieces and divide it among them. This extreme severity was afterward softened; but the principle remained long unchanged, that the hold of the creditor was on the person of the debtor. If the debtor obstinately and to the last refused to surrender his property, the creditor could not touch it.”—J. Hadley, *Introd. to Roman Law*, lect. 10. —“During the first half of the Samnite war [B. C. 326-304], but in what year is uncertain, there was passed that famous law which prohibited personal slavery for debt. No creditor might for the future attach the person of his debtor, but he might only seize his property; and all those whose personal freedom was pledged for their debts (*nexi*), were released from their liability, if they could swear that they had property enough to meet their creditor's demands. It does not appear that this great alteration in the law was the work of any tribune, or that it arose out of any general or deliberate desire to soften the severity of the ancient practice. It was occasioned, we are told, by one scandalous instance of abuse of power on the part of a creditor. . . . But although personal slavery for debt was thus done away with, yet the consequences of insolvency were much more serious at Rome than they are in modern Europe. He whose property had once been made over to his creditors by the praetor's sentence, became, *ipso facto*, infamous; he lost his tribe, and with it all his political rights; and the forfeiture was irrevocable, even though he might afterwards pay his debts to the full; nor was it even in the power of the censors to replace him on the roll of citizens. So sacred a thing did credit appear in the eyes of the Romans.”—T. Arnold, *Hist. of Rome*, ch. 33 (c. 2).

**In England.**—“Debt has been regarded as a crime by primitive society in every part of the world. In Palestine, as in Rome, the creditor had power over the person of the debtor, and misfortune was commonly treated with a severity which was not always awarded to crime [Levit. xxv., 39-41, and 2 Kings iv., 1]. In this country [England] the same system was gradually introduced in Plantagenet times. The creditor, who had been previously entitled to seize the goods, or even the land of the debtor, was at last authorised to seize his person. In one sense, indeed, the English law was, in this respect, more irrational than the cruel code of the Jews, or the awful punishment [death and dismemberment or slavery—Gibbon, ch. 44] which the law of the Twelve Tables reserved for debtors. In Palestine the creditor was, at

least, entitled to the service of the debtor or of his children, and the slave had the prospect of an Insolvent Debtor's Relief Act in the Sabbath-day year. Even the law of the Twelve Tables allowed the creditors to sell the debtor into slavery, instead of resorting to the horrible alternative of partitioning his body. But in England the creditors had no such choice. They had nothing to do but to throw the debtor into prison; and by his imprisonment deprive themselves of the only chance of his earning money to pay their debt. A law of this kind was intolerable to a commercial people. The debtor languished in gaol, the creditor failed to obtain payment of his debt. When trade increased in Tudor times, the wits of legislators were exercised in devising some expedient for satisfying the creditor without imprisoning the debtor. The Chancellor was authorised to appoint commissioners empowered to divide the debtor's property among the creditors. By an Act of Anne the debtor who complied with the law was released from further liability, and was practically enabled to commence life anew. In 1826, a debtor was allowed to procure his own bankruptcy; while in 1831, commissioners were appointed to carry out the arrangements which had been previously conducted under the Court of Chancery. The law of bankruptcy which was thus gradually developed by the legislation of three centuries only applied to persons in trade. No one who was not a trader could become a bankrupt; the ordinary debtor became as a matter of course an insolvent, and passed under the insolvent laws. The statutes, moreover, omitted to give any very plain definition of a trader. The distinction between trader and non-trader which had been gradually drawn by the Courts was not based on any very clear principle. A person who made bricks on his own estate of his own clay was not a trader; but a person who bought the clay and then made the bricks was a trader. Farmers, again, were exempt from the bankruptcy law; but farmers who purchased cattle for sale at a profit were liable to it. The possibility, moreover, of a trader being made a bankrupt depended on the size of his business. A petitioning creditor in bankruptcy was required to be a person to whom at least £100 was due; if two persons petitioned, their debts were required to amount to £150; if more than two persons petitioned, to £200. A small shopkeeper, therefore, who could not hope to obtain credit for £200, £150, or £100, could not become a bankrupt; he was forced to become an insolvent. The treatment of the insolvent was wholly different from that of the bankrupt. The bankruptcy law was founded on the principle that the goods and not the person of the debtor should be liable for the debt; the insolvency law enabled the person of the debtor to be seized, but provided no machinery for obtaining his goods. . . . Up to 1838 the first step in insolvency was the arrest of the debtor. Any person who made a deposition on oath that some other person was in debt to him, could obtain his arrest on what was known as 'mesne process.' The oath might possibly be untrue; the debt might not be due; the warrant issued on the sworn deposition as a matter of course. But, in addition to the imprisonment on mesne process, the insolvent could be imprisoned for a further period on what was known as 'final process.'

Imprisonment on mesne process was the course which the creditor took to prevent the flight of the debtor; imprisonment on final process was the punishment which the Court awarded to the crime of debt. Such a system would have been bad enough if the debtors' prisons had been well managed. The actual condition of these prisons almost exceeds belief. Dickens, indeed, has made the story of a debtor's imprisonment in the Marshalsea familiar to a world of readers. . . . The Act of 1813 had done something to mitigate the misery which the law occasioned. The Court which was constituted by it released 50,000 debtors in 13 years. But large numbers of persons were still detained in prison for debt. In 1827 nearly 6,000 persons were committed in London alone for debt. The Common Law Commissioners, reporting in 1830, declared that the loud and general complaints of the law of insolvency were well founded; and Cottenham, in 1838, introduced a bill to abolish imprisonment for debt in all cases. The Lords were not prepared for so complete a remedy; they declined to abolish imprisonment on final process, or to exempt from imprisonment on mesne process, persons who owed more than £20, and who were about to leave the country. Cottenham, disappointed at these amendments, decided on strengthening his own hands by instituting a fresh inquiry. He appointed a commission in 1839, which reported in 1840, and which recommended the abolition of imprisonment on final process, and the union of bankruptcy and insolvency. In 1841, in 1842, in 1843, and in 1844 Cottenham introduced bills to carry out this report. The bills of 1841, 1842, and 1843 were lost. The bill of 1844 was not much more successful. Brougham declared that debtors who refused to disclose their property, who refused to answer questions about it, who refused to give it up, or who fraudulently made away with it, as well as debtors who had been guilty of gross extravagance, deserved imprisonment. He introduced an alternative bill giving the Court discretionary power to imprison them. The Lords, bewildered by the contrary counsels of two such great lawyers as Cottenham and Brougham, decided on referring both bills to one Select Committee. The Committee preferred Brougham's bill, amended it, and returned it to the House. This bill became ultimately law. It enabled both private debtors and traders whose debts amounted to less than the sums named in the Bankruptcy Acts to become bankrupts; and it abolished imprisonment in all cases where the debt did not exceed £20.—S. Walpole, *Hist. of Eng. from 1815, ch. 17 (v. 4)*.

In the United States.—"In New York, by the act of April 26, 1831, c. 300, and which went into operation on March 1st, 1832, arrest and imprisonment on civil process at law, and on execution in equity founded upon contract, were abolished. The provision under the act was not to apply to any person who should have been a non-resident of the state for a month preceding (and even this exception was abolished by the act of April 25th, 1840); nor to proceedings as for a contempt to enforce civil remedies; nor to actions for fines and penalties; nor to suits founded in torts . . . nor on promises to marry; or for moneys collected by any public officer; or for misconduct or neglect in office, or in any professional employment. The plaintiff, however,

in any suit, or upon any judgment or decree, may apply to a judge for a warrant to arrest the defendant, upon affidavit stating a debt or demand due, to more than \$50; and that the defendant is about to remove property out of the jurisdiction of the court, with intent to defraud his creditors; or that he has property or rights in action which he fraudulently conceals; or public or corporate stock, money, or evidences of debt, which he unjustly refuses to apply to the payment of the judgment or decree in favor of the plaintiff; or that he has assigned, or is about to assign or dispose of his property, with intent to defraud his creditors; or has fraudulently contracted the debt, or incurred the obligation respecting which the suit is brought. If the judge shall be satisfied, on due examination, of the truth of the charge, he is to commit the debtor to jail, unless he complies with certain prescribed conditions or some one of them, and which are calculated for the security of the plaintiff's claim. Nor is any execution against the body to be issued on justices' judgments, except in cases essentially the same with those above stated.

. . . By the New York act of 1846, c. 150, the defendant is liable for imprisonment as in actions for wrong, if he be sued and judgment pass against him in actions on contracts for moneys received by him (and it applies to all male persons) in a fiduciary character. The legislature of Massachusetts, in 1834 and 1842, essentially abolished arrest and imprisonment for debt, unless on proof that the debtor was about to abscond. As early as 1790, the constitution of Pennsylvania established, as a fundamental principle, that debtors should not be continued in prison after surrender of their estates in the mode to be prescribed by law, unless in cases of a strong presumption of fraud. In February, 1819, the legislature of that state exempted women from arrest and imprisonment for debt; and this provision as to women was afterwards applied in New York to all civil actions founded upon contract. . . . Females were first exempted from imprisonment for debt in Louisiana and Mississippi; and imprisonment for debt, in all cases free from fraud, is now abolished in each of those states. The commissioners in Pennsylvania, in their report on the Civil Code, in January, 1835, recommended that there be no arrest of the body of the debtor on mesne process, without an affidavit of the debt, and that the defendant was a non-resident, or about to depart without leaving sufficient property, except in cases of force, fraud, or deceit, verified by affidavit. This suggestion was carried into effect by the act of the legislature of Pennsylvania of July 12th, 1842, entitled 'An Act to abolish imprisonment for debt, and to punish fraudulent debtors.' In New Hampshire, imprisonment on mesne process and execution for debt existed under certain qualifications, until December 23, 1840, when it was abolished by statute, in cases of contract and debts accruing after the first of March, 1841. In Vermont, imprisonment for debt, on contracts made after first January, 1839, is abolished, as to resident citizens, unless there be evidence that they are about to abscond with their property; so, also, the exception in Mississippi applies to cases of torts, frauds, and meditated concealment, or fraudulent disposition of property." —J. Kent, *Commentaries on American Law*; ed. by O. W. Holmes, Jr., v. 2 (foot-note).—"In

many states the Constitution provides (A) that there shall be no imprisonment for debt: Ind. C. 1, 23; Minn. C. 1, 12; Kan. C. B. Rts. 16; Md. C. 3, 38; N. C. C. 1, 16; Mo. C. 2, 16; Tex. C. 1, 18; Ore. C. 1, 19; Nev. C. 1, 14; S. C. C. 1, 20; Ga. C. 1, 1, 21; Ala. C. 1, 21; Miss. C. 1, 11; Fla. C. Decl'n Rts. 15. (B) That there shall be no imprisonment for debt (1) in any civil action on mesne or final process, in seven states: O. C. 1, 15; Io. C. 1, 19; Neb. C. 1, 20; Tenn. C. 1, 18; Ark. C. 2, 16; Cal. C. 1, 15; Ore. C. 1, 15; Ariz. B. Rts. 18. (2) In any action or judgment founded upon contract, in three states: N. J. C. 1, 17; Mich. C. 6, 33; Wis. C. 1, 16. (C) In six, that there shall be no person imprisoned for debt in any civil action when he has delivered up his property for the benefit of his creditors in the manner prescribed by law: Vt. C. 2, 33; R. I. C. 1, 11; Pa. C. 1, 16; Ill. C. 2, 12; Ky. C. 13, 19; Col. C. 2, 12. . . . But the above principles are subject to the following exceptions in the several states respectively: (1) a debtor may be imprisoned in criminal actions: Tenn. So (2) for the non-payment of fines or penalties imposed by law: Mo. So (3) generally, in civil or criminal actions, for fraud: Vt., R. I., N. J., Pa., O., Ind., Ill., Mich., Io., Minn., Kan., Neb., N. C., Ky., Ark., Cal., Ore., Nev., Col., S. C., Fla., Ariz. And so, in two, the legislature has power to provide for the punishment of fraud and for reaching property of the debtor concealed from his creditors: Ga. C. 1, 2, 6; La. C. 233. So (4) absconding debtors may be imprisoned: Ore. Or debtors (5) in cases of libel or slander: Nev. (6) In civil cases of tort generally: Cal., Col. (7) In cases of malicious mischief: Cal. (8) Or of breach of trust: Mich., Ariz. (9) Or of moneys collected by public officers, or in any professional employment: Mich., Ariz. —F. J. Stimson, *Am. Statute Law: Digest of Const's and Civil Public Statutes of all the States and Territories relating to Persons and Property, in force Jan. 1, 1886*, art. 8.

**DÉCADÉ OF THE FRENCH REPUBLICAN CALENDAR.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (OCTOBER). The new republican calendar.  
**DECAMISADOS, The.** See SPAIN: A. D. 1814-1827.

**DECATUR, Commodore Stephen.**—Burning of the "Philadelphia." See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1803-1805. . . . In the War of 1812. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812-1813; 1814.

**DECCAN, The.** See INDIA: THE NAME; and IMMIGRATION AND CONQUESTS OF THE ARYAS.

**DECELIAN WAR, The.** See GREECE: B. C. 413.

**CECEMVIRS, The.** See ROME: B. C. 451-449.

**DECIUS: Roman Emperor.** A. D. 249-251.

**DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE (American).** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776 (JANUARY—JUNE), and (JULY); also, INDEPENDENCE HALL.

**DECLARATION OF PARIS, The.**—"At the Congress of Paris in 1856, subsequently to the conclusion of the treaty, which ended the Crimean war [see RUSSIA: A. D. 1854-1856], a declaration of principles was signed on April 16th, by the plenipotentiaries of all the powers represented there, which contained four articles:

'First, Privateering is and remains abolished. Second, The neutral flag covers enemies' goods, with the exception of contraband of war. Third, Neutral goods, except of contraband of war, are not liable to capture under an enemy's flag. Fourth, Blockades, to be binding, must be effective—that is to say, maintained by a force really sufficient to prevent access to the coast of the enemy.' The adherence of other powers was requested to these principles, and all joined in signing it except the United States, Spain, and Mexico. The objection on the part of the United States was stated in a circular letter by Mr. Marcy, then Secretary of State, who "maintained that the right to resort to privateers is as incontestable as any other right appertaining to belligerents; and reasoned that the effect of the declaration would be to increase the maritime preponderance of Great Britain and France, without even benefiting the general cause of civilization; while, if public ships retained the right of capturing private property, the United States, which had at that time a large mercantile marine and a comparatively small navy, would be deprived of all means of retaliation. . . . The President proposes, therefore [wrote Mr. Marcy] to add to the first proposition contained in the declaration of the Congress of Paris the following words: 'and that the private property of the subjects and citizens of a belligerent on the high seas shall be exempted from seizure by public armed vessels of the other belligerent, except it be contraband.' . . . Among the minor states of Europe there was complete unanimity and a general readiness to accept our amendment to the rules"; but England opposed, and the offered amendment was subsequently withdrawn. "Events . . . have shown that . . . our refusal to accept the Declaration of Paris has brought the world nearer to the principles which we proposed, which became known as the 'Marcy amendment for the abolition of war against private property on the seas.'"—E. Schuyler, *American Diplomacy*, ch. 7.

ALSO IN: F. Wharton, *Digest of the International law of the U. S.*, ch. 17, sect. 342 (v. 8).—H. Adams, *Historical Essays*, ch. 6.—See, also, PRIVATEERS.

**DECLARATION OF RIGHTS.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1689 (JANUARY—FEBRUARY).

**DECLARATION OF THE RIGHTS OF MAN, French Revolutionary.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1789 (AUGUST—OCTOBER).

**DECLARATORY ACT, The.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1766.

**DECRETA, Roman imperial.** See CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS.

**DECRETALS, The False.** See PAPACY: A. D. 829-847.

**DECUMÆ.** See VECTIGAL.

**DECUMATES LAND.** See AGRICULTURE: DECUMATES, also ALEMANNI; and SUEVI.

**DECURIONES.** See CURIA, MUNICIPAL, OF THE LATER ROMAN EMPIRE.

**DEDITTIUS.—COLONUS.—SERVUS.**—"The poor Provincial [of the provinces of the Roman empire at the time of the breaking up in the fifth century] who could not fly to the Goths because his whole property was in land, hunted to despair by the tax-gatherer, would transfer that land to some wealthy neighbour, apparently on condition of receiving a small life annuity out of it. He was then called the Dedit-

tius (or Surrenderer) of the new owner, towards whom he stood in a position of a certain degree of dependence. Not yet, however, were his sorrows or those of his family at an end, for the tax-gatherer still regarded him as responsible for his land. . . . On his death his sons, who had utterly lost their paternal inheritance, and still found themselves confronted with the claim for taxes, were obviously without resource. The next stage of the process accordingly was that they abdicated the position of free citizens and implored the great man to accept them as Coloni, a class of labourers, half-free, half-enslaved, who may perhaps with sufficient accuracy be compared to the serfs 'adscripti glebæ' of the middle ages. . . . Before long they became mere slaves (Servi) without a shadow of right or claim against their new lords."—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, bk. 1, ch. 10.—With the "increase of great estates and simultaneous increase in the number of slaves (so many Goths were made slaves by Claudius [A. D. 268-270], to give one instance, that there was not a district without them), the small proprietors could no longer maintain the fruitless struggle, and, as a class, wholly disappeared. Some, no doubt, became soldiers; others crowded into the already overflowing towns; while others voluntarily resigned their freedom, attached themselves to the land of some rich proprietor, and became his villeins, or coloni. But this was not the chief means by which this class was formed and increased. . . . After a successful war these serfs were given . . . to landed proprietors without payment; and in this way not only was the class of free peasants diminished or altogether destroyed—a happier result—the slave system was directly attacked. The coloni themselves were not slaves. The codes directly distinguish them from slaves, and in several imperial constitutions they are called 'ingenui.' They could contract a legal marriage and could hold property. . . . On the other hand, the coloni were like slaves in that they were liable to personal punishment. . . . A colonus was indissolubly attached to the land, and could not get quit of the tie, even by enlisting as a soldier. The proprietor could sell him with the estate, but had no power whatever of selling him without it; and if he sold the estate, he was compelled to sell the coloni along with it. . . . The position of these villeins was a very miserable one. . . . These coloni in Gaul, combined together, were joined by the free peasants still left [A. D. 287], whose lot was not less wretched than their own, and forming into numerous bands, spread themselves over the country to pillage and destroy. They were called Bagaudæ, from a Celtic word meaning a mob or riotous assembly; and under this name recur often in the course of the next century both in Gaul and Spain."—W. T. Arnold, *The Roman System of Provincial Administration*, ch. 4.

**DEEMSTERS.** See MANX KINGDOM, THE.

**DEFENDERS.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1784.

**DEFENESTRATION AT PRAGUE,**

**The.** See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1611-1618.

**DEFETERDARS.** See SUBLIME PORTE.

**DEICOLÆ, The.** See CULDEES.

**DEIRA, The kingdom of.**—One of the kingdoms of the Angles, covering what is now called the East Riding of Yorkshire, with some territory beyond it. Sometimes it was united with

the kingdom of Bernicia, north of it, to form the greater kingdom of Northumbria. See ENGLAND: A. D. 547-633.

**DEKARCHIES.** See SPARTA: B. C. 404-403.

**DEKELEIA.—DEKELEIAN WAR.** See GREECE: B. C. 413.

**DELATION.—DELATORS.**—Under the empire, there was soon bred at Rome an infamous class of men who bore a certain resemblance—with significant contrasts likewise—to the sycophants of Athens. They were known as delators, and their occupation was delation. "The delator was properly one who gave notice to the fiscal officers of moneys that had become due to the treasury of the state, or more strictly to the emperor's *fiscus*." But the title was extended to informers generally, who dragged their fellow-citizens before the tribunals for alleged violations of law. Augustus made delation a profession by attaching rewards to the information given against transgressors of his marriage laws. Under the successor of Augustus, the sullen and auspicious Tiberius, delation received its greatest encouragement and development. "According to the spirit of Roman criminal procedure, the informer and the pleader were one and the same person. There was no public accuser, . . . but the spy who discovered the delinquency was himself the man to demand of the senate, the pretor or the judge, an opportunity of proving it by his own eloquence and ingenuity. The odium of prosecution was thus removed from the government to the private delator."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 44.—See, also, ROME: A. D. 14-37.

**DELAWARE BAY; A. D. 1609.—Discovered by Henry Hudson.** See AMERICA: A. D. 1609.

The error perpetuated in its name.—"Almost every writer on American history that I have met with appears to have taken pains to perpetuate the stereotyped error that 'Lord Delaware touched at this bay in his passage to Virginia in 1610.' . . . Lord Delaware himself, in his letter of the 7th of July, 1610, giving an account of his voyage to Virginia, not only makes no mention of that bay, or of his approaching it, but expressly speaks of his first reaching the American coast on the '6th of June, at what time we made land to the southward of our harbor, the Chesilplock Bay.' The first European who is really known to have entered the bay, after Hudson, was Capt. Samuel Argall [July 1610]. . . . The name of Lord Delaware, however, seems to have been given to the bay soon afterwards by the Virginians."—J. R. Brodhead, *Hist. of the State of N. Y.*, v. 1, app., note D.

**DELAWARE: A. D. 1629-1631.—The Dutch occupancy and first settlement.**—The first attempt at settlement on the Delaware was made by the Dutch, who claimed the country in right of Hudson's discovery and Mey's exploration of the Bay, notwithstanding the broad English claim, which covered the whole of it as part of an indefinite Virginia. In 1629, pursuant to the patroon ordinance of the Dutch West India Company, which opened New Netherland territory to private purchasers, "Samuel Godyn and Samuel Blommaert, both directors of the Amsterdam Chamber, bargained with the natives for the soil from Cape Henlopen to the mouth of

Delaware river; in July, 1630, this purchase of an estate more than thirty miles long was ratified at Fort Amsterdam by Minuit [then Governor of New Netherland] and his council. It is the oldest deed for land in Delaware, and comprises the water-line of the two southern counties of that state. . . . A company was soon formed to colonize the tract acquired by Godyn and Blommaert. The first settlement in Delaware, older than any in Pennsylvania, was undertaken by a company, of which Godyn, Van Rensselaer, Blommaert, the historian De Laet, and a new partner, David Petersen de Vries, were members. By joint enterprise, in December, 1630, a ship of 18 guns, commanded by Pieter Heyes, and laden with emigrants, store of seeds, cattle and agricultural implements, embarked from the Texel, partly to cover the southern shore of Delaware Bay with fields of wheat and tobacco, and partly for a whale fishery on the coast. . . . Early in the spring of 1631, the . . . vessel reached its destination, and just within Cape Henlopen, on Lewes Creek, planted a colony of more than thirty souls. The superintendent of the settlement was intrusted to Gillis Hosset. A little fort was built and well beset with palisades; the arms of Holland were affixed to a pillar; the country received the name Swaanendael; the water that of Godyn's Bay. The voyage of Heyes was the cradling of a state. That Delaware exists as a separate commonwealth is due to this colony. According to English rule, occupancy was necessary to complete a title to the wilderness; and the Dutch now occupied Delaware. On the 5th of May, Heyes and Hosset, in behalf of Godyn and Blommaert, made a further purchase from Indian chiefs of the opposite coast of Cape May, for twelve miles on the bay, on the sea, and in the interior; and, in June, this sale of a tract twelve miles square was formally attested at Manhattan. Animated by the courage of Godyn, the patroons of Swaanendael fitted out a second expedition under the command of De Vries. But, before he set sail, news was received of the destruction of the fort, and the murder of its people. Hasset, the commandant, had caused the death of an Indian chief; and the revenge of the savages was not appeased till not one of the emigrants remained alive. De Vries, on his arrival, found only the ruins of the house and its palisades, half consumed by fire, and here and there the bones of the colonists."—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S.*, pt. 2, ch. 13 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: J. R. Brodhead, *Hist. of the State of N. Y.*, v. 1, ch. 7.

**A. D. 1632.—Embraced in the Maryland grant to Lord Baltimore.** See MARYLAND: A. D. 1632.

**A. D. 1634.—Embraced in the Palatine grant of New Albion.** See NEW ALBION.

**A. D. 1638-1640.—The planting of the Swedish colony.**—"William Usselinx, a distinguished merchant in Stockholm, was the first to propose to the Swedish government a scheme for planting a colony in America. He was a native of Antwerp, and had resided in Spain, Portugal and the Azores, at a time when the spirit of foreign adventure pervaded every class of society. . . . In the year 1624 he proposed to the Swedish monarch, Gustavus Adolphus, a plan for the organization of a trading company, to extend its operations to Asia, Africa, America and Terra Magellanica. . . . Whether



Usellinx had ever been in America is uncertain, but he had, soon after the organization of the Dutch West India Company, some connection with it, and by this and other means was able to give ample information in relation to the country bordering on the Delaware, its soil, climate, and productions. . . . His plan and contract were translated into the Swedish language by Schrader, the royal interpreter, and published to the nation, with an address strongly appealing both to their piety and their love of gain. The king recommended it to the States, and an edict dated at Stockholm, July 2d, 1636, was issued by royal authority, in which people of all ranks were invited to encourage the project and support the Company. Books were opened for subscription to the stock . . . and Gustavus pledged the royal treasure for its support to the amount of 400,000 dollars. . . . The work was ripe for execution, when the German war [the Thirty Years War], and afterwards the king's death, prevented it, and rendered the fair prospect fruitless. . . . The next attempt on the part of the Swedes to plant a colony in America was more successful. But there has been much difference among historians in relation to the period when that settlement was made. . . . It is owing to the preservation, among the Dutch records at Albany, of an official protest issued by Kieft, the Governor at New Amsterdam, that we do certainly know the Swedes were here in the spring of 1638. Peter Minuit, who conducted to our shore the first Swedish colony, had been Commercial Agent, and Director General of the Dutch West India Company, and Governor of the New Netherlands. . . . At this time Christina, the infant daughter of Gustavus Adolphus, had ascended the throne of Sweden. . . . Under the direction of Oxenstern, the celebrated chancellor of Sweden, whose wisdom and virtue have shed a glory on the age in which he lived, the patent which had been granted in the reign of Gustavus to the company formed under the influence of Usellinx was renewed, and its privileges extended to the citizens of Germany. Minuit, being now out of employment, and probably deeming himself injured by the conduct of the Dutch Company [which had displaced him from the governorship of the New Netherlands, through the influence of the patrons, and appointed Wouter Van Twiller, a clerk, to succeed him], had determined to offer his services to the crown of Sweden. . . . Minuit laid before the chancellor a plan of procedure, urged a settlement on the Delaware, and offered to conduct the enterprise. Oxenstern represented the case to the queen . . . and Minuit was commissioned to command and direct the expedition."—B. Ferris, *Hist. of the Original Settlements on the Delaware*, pt. 1, ch. 2-3.—"With two ships laden with provisions and other supplies requisite for the settlement of emigrants in a new country, and with fifty colonists, Minuit sailed from Sweden late in 1637, and entered Delaware Bay in April, 1638. He found the country as he had left it, without white inhabitants. Minqua Kill, now Wilmington, was selected as the place for the first settlement, where he bought a few acres of land of the natives, landed his colonists and stores, erected a fort, and began a small plantation. He had conducted his enterprise with some secrecy, that he might avoid collision with the Dutch; but the watchful eyes of their agents soon dis-

covered him, and reported his presence to the director at New Amsterdam. Kieft [successor to Van Twiller] had just arrived, and it became one of his first duties to notify a man who had preceded him in office that he was a trespasser and warn him off. Minuit, knowing that Kieft was powerless to enforce his protest, being without troops or money, paid no attention to his missive, and kept on with his work. . . . He erected a fort of considerable strength, named Christina, for the Swedish queen, and garrisoned it with 24 soldiers. Understanding the character of the Indians, he conciliated their sachems by liberal presents and secured the trade. In a few months he was enabled to load his ships with peltries and despatch them to his patrons. . . . The colony had to all appearance a promising future. . . . Within two years, however, their prospects were clouded. The Company had failed to send out another ship with supplies and merchandise for the Indian trade. Provisions failed, trade fell off, and sickness began to prevail. . . . They resolved to remove to Manhattan, where they could at least have 'enough to eat.' On the eve of 'breaking up' to carry their resolution into effect, success came from an unexpected quarter. The fame of New Sweden, as the colony was called, of its fertile lands and profitable trade, had reached other nations of Europe. In Holland itself a company was formed to establish a settlement under the patronage of the Swedish Company." This Dutch company "freighted a ship with colonists and supplies, which fortunately arrived when the Swedish colony was about to be broken up and the country abandoned. The spirits of the Swedes were revived. . . . Their projected removal was indefinitely deferred and they continued their work with fresh vigor. The Dutch colonists were located in a settlement by themselves, only a few miles from Fort Christina. They were loyal to the Swedes. . . . In the autumn of the same year, 1640, Peter Hollarclandre, who had been appointed deputy governor of the colony, and Moens Kling, arrived from Sweden with three ships laden with provisions and merchandise for the straitened colonists. They also brought out a considerable company of new emigrants. New Sweden was now well established and prosperous. More lands were bought, and new settlements were made. Peter Minuit died the following year."—G. W. Schuyler, *Colonial New York*, v. 1, *introduct.*, sect. 2.

Also in: I. Acrelius, *Hist. of New Sweden* (*Penn. Hist. Soc. Mem.*, v. 11) ch. 1.—*Docs. relative to Col. Hist. of N. Y.*, v. 12.—G. B. Keen, *New Sweden* (*Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am.*, v. 4, ch. 9).—J. F. Jameson, *Willem Usellinx* (*Papers of the Am. Hist. Assn.*, v. 2, no. 3).

A. D. 1640-1643.—Intrusions of the English from New Haven. See NEW JERSEY: A. D. 1640-1655.

A. D. 1640-1656.—The struggle between the Swedes and the Dutch and the final victory of the latter.—"The [Swedish] colony grew to such importance that John Printz, a lieutenant-colonel of cavalry, was sent out in 1642 as governor, with orders for developing industry and trade. He took pains to command the mouth of the river, although the Dutch had established Fort Nassau on its eastern bank, and the Swedish settlements were on the western bank exclusively. Collisions arose between the Dutch and the



Swedes, and when the former put up the arms of the States General on the completion of a purchase of lands from the Indians, Printz in a passion ordered them to be torn down. The Swedes gained in strength while the Dutch lost ground in the vicinity. In 1648 the Dutch attempted to build a trading post on the Schuylkill, when they were repulsed by force by the Swedes. Individuals seeking to erect houses were treated in the same way. The Swedes in turn set up a stockade on the disputed ground. Director Stuyvesant found it necessary in 1651 to go to confer with Printz with a view to holding the country against the aggressive English. The Indians were called into council and confirmed the Dutch title, allowing the Swedes little more than the site of Fort Christina. Fort Casimir was erected lower down the river, to protect Dutch interests. The two rulers agreed to be friends and allies, and so continued for three years. The distress of the Swedish colony led to appeals for aid from the home country whither Governor Printz had returned. In 1654 help was given, and a new governor, John Claude Rysingh, marked his coming by the capture of Fort Casimir, pretending that the Dutch West India Company authorized the act. The only revenge the Dutch could take was the seizure of a Swedish vessel which by mistake ran into Manhattan Bay. But the next year orders came from Holland exposing the fraud of Rysingh, and directing the expulsion of the Swedes from the South River. A fleet was organized and Director Stuyvesant recovered Fort Casimir without firing a gun. After some parley Fort Christina was also surrendered. Such Swedes as would not take the oath of allegiance to the Dutch authorities were sent to the home country. Only twenty persons accepted the oath, and of three cerygmens two were expelled, and the third escaped like treatment by the sudden outbreak of Indian troubles. In 1656 the States General and Sweden made these transactions matter of international discussion. The Swedes presented a protest against the action of the Dutch, and it was talked over, but the matter was finally dropped. In the same year the West India Company sold its interests on the South River to the city of Amsterdam, and the colony of New Amstel was erected, so that the authority of New Netherland was extinguished."

—E. H. Roberts, *New York*, v. 1, ch. 7.

ALSO IN: E. Armstrong, *Intro. to the Record of Upsalo* (*Hist. Soc. of Penn. Memoirs*, v. 7).—B. Ferris, *Hist. of the Original Settlements on the Delaware*, pt. 1, ch. 6-7.—S. Hazard, *Annals of Penn.*, pp. 62-228.—*Rept. of the Amsterdam Chamber of the W. I. Co.* (*Docs. relative to Col. Hist. of N. Y.*, v. 1, pp. 587-646).

**A. D. 1664.—Conquest by the English, and annexation to New York.**—"Five days after the capitulation of New Amsterdam [surrendered by the Dutch to the English, Aug. 29, 1664—see *NEW YORK*: A. D. 1664] Nicolls, with Cartwright and Maverick . . . commissioned their colleague, Sir Robert Carr, to go," with three ships and an adequate military force, "and reduce the Delaware settlements. Carr was instructed to promise the Dutch the possession of all their property and all their present privileges, 'only that they change their masters.' To the Swedes he was to 'remonstrate their happy return under a monarchical government, and his

majesty's good inclination to that nation.' To Lord Belth:ore's officers in Maryland, he was to declare that their proprietor's pretended right to the Delaware being 'a doubtful case,' possession would be kept for the king 'till his majesty is informed and satisfied otherwise.' . . . The Swedes were soon made friends," but the Dutch attempted [October] some resistance, and yielded only after a couple of broadsides from the ships had killed three and wounded ten of their garrison. "Carr now landed . . . and claimed the pillage for himself as 'won by the sword.' Assuming an authority independent of Nicolls, he claimed to be the 'sole and chief commander and disposer' of all affairs on the Delaware." His acts of rapacity and violence, when reported to his fellow commissioners, at New York, were condemned and repudiated, and Nicolls, the presiding commissioner, went to the Delaware in person to displace him. "Carr was severely rebuked, and obliged to give up much of his ill-gotten spoil. Nevertheless, he could not be persuaded to leave the place for some time. The name of New Amstel was now changed to New Castle, and an infantry garrison established there. . . . Captain John Carr was appointed commander of the Delaware, in subordination to the government of New York, to which it was annexed 'as an appendage'; and thus affairs remained for several years."—J. R. Brodhead, *Hist. of the State of N. Y.*, v. 2, ch. 2.

**A. D. 1673.—The Dutch reconquest.** See *NEW YORK*: A. D. 1673.

**A. D. 1674.—Final recovery by the English.** See *NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND)*: A. D. 1674.

**A. D. 1674-1760.—In dispute between the Duke of York and the Proprietary of Maryland.**—**Grant by the Duke to William Penn.** See *PENNSYLVANIA*: A. D. 1682; 1685; and 1700-1767.

**A. D. 1691-1702.—The practical independence of Penn's "lower counties" acquired.**—"In April, 1691, with the reluctant consent of William Penn, the 'territories,' or 'lower counties,' now known as the State of Delaware, became for two years a government by themselves under Markham. . . . The disturbance by Keith [see *PENNSYLVANIA*: A. D. 1692-1696] creating questions as to the administration of justice, confirmed the disposition of the English government to subject Pennsylvania to a royal commissioner; and in April 1693, Benjamin Fletcher, appointed governor by William and Mary, once more united Delaware to Pennsylvania." But Penn, restored to his authority . . . 1694, could not resist the jealousies which tended so strongly to divide the Delaware territories from Pennsylvania proper. "In 1702, Pennsylvania convened its legislature apart, and the two colonies were never again united. The lower counties became almost an independent republic; for, as they were not included in the charter, the authority of the proprietary over them was by sufferance only, and the executive power intrusted to the governor of Pennsylvania was too feeble to restrain the power of their people. The legislature, the tribunals, the subordinate executive officers of Delaware knew little of external control."—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S. (author's last revision)*, pt. 3, ch. 2 (p. 2).—The question of jurisdiction over Delaware was involved throughout in the boundary dispute between the proprietaries of Pennsylvania and Maryland. See *PENNSYLVANIA*: A. D. 1685; and 1700-1767.

**A. D. 1760-1766.**—The question of taxation by Parliament.—The Stamp Act and its repeal.—The Declaratory Act.—The First Continental Congress. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1760-1775; 1763-1764; 1765; and 1766.

**A. D. 1766-1774.**—Opening events of the Revolution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1766-1767 to 1774; and BOSTON: A. D. 1768 to 1773.

**A. D. 1775.**—The beginning of the war of the American Revolution.—Lexington.—Concord.—Action taken on the news.—Ticonderoga.—The siege of Boston.—Bunker Hill.—The Second Continental Congress. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775.

**A. D. 1775.**—Further introduction of slaves prohibited. See SLAVERY, NEGRO: A. D. 1776-1808.

**A. D. 1776-1783.**—The War of Independence.—Peace with Great Britain. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776 to 1783.

**A. D. 1777-1779.**—Withholding ratification from the Articles of Confederation. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1781-1780.

**A. D. 1787.**—The adoption and ratification of the Federal Constitution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1787, and 1787-1789.

**A. D. 1861 (April).**—Refusal of troops on the call of President Lincoln. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (APRIL).

**DELAWARE RIVER,** Washington's passage of the. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776-1777.

**DELAWARES, The.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: DELAWARES.

**DELFT;** Assassination of the Prince of Orange (1584). See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1581-1584.

**DELHI;** 11th Century.—Capture by Mahmud of Gazna. See TURKS: A. D. 999-118.

**A. D. 1192-1290.**—The capital of the Mamluke or Slave dynasty. See INDIA: A. D. 977-1290.

**A. D. 1399.**—Sack and massacre by Timour. See TIMOUR.

**A. D. 1526-1605.**—The founding of the Mogul Empire by Babar and Akbar. See INDIA: A. D. 1399-1605.

**A. D. 1739.**—Sack and massacre by Nadir Shah. See INDIA: A. D. 1602-1748.

**A. D. 1760-1761.**—Taken and plundered by the Mahrattas.—Then by the Afghans.—Collapse of the Mogul Empire. See INDIA: A. D. 1747-1761.

**A. D. 1857.**—The Sepoy Mutiny.—Massacre of Europeans.—Explosion of the magazine.—English siege and capture of the city. See INDIA: A. D. 1857 (MAY—AUGUST) and (JUNE—SEPTEMBER).

**DELIAN CONFEDERACY.** See GREECE: B. C. 473-477; and ATHENS: B. C. 466-454, and after.

**DELIAN FESTIVAL.** See DELOS.

**DELIIUM, Battle of (B. C. 424).**—A serious defeat suffered by the Athenians in the Peloponnesian War, B. C. 424, at the hands of the Thebans and other Boeotians. It was consequent upon the seizure by the Athenians of the Boeotian temple of Delium—a temple of Apollo—on the sea-coast, about five miles from Tanagra, which they fortified and intended to hold. After

the defeat of the army which was returning from this exploit, the garrison left at Delium was besieged and mostly captured. Among the hoplites who fought at Delium was the philosopher Socrates. The commander Hippocrates was slain.—Thucydides, *History*, bk. 4, sect. 89-100.

ALSO IN: G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 53.—See GREECE: B. C. 424-421.

**DELOS.**—Delos, the smallest island of the group called the Cyclades, but the most important in the eyes of the Ionian Greeks, being their sacred isle, the fabled birthplace of Apollo and long the chief seat and center of his worship. "The Homeric Hymn to Apollo presents to us the island of Delos as the centre of a great periodical festival in honour of Apollo, celebrated by all the cities, insular and continental, of the Ionic name. What the date of this hymn is, we have no means of determining; Thucydides quotes it, without hesitation, as the production of Homer, and, doubtless, it was in his time universally accepted as such,—though modern critics concur in regarding both that and the other hymns as much later than the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. It cannot probably be later than 600 B. C. The description of the Ionic visitors presented to us in this hymn is splendid and imposing; the number of their ships, the display of their thery, the beauty of their women, the athletic exhibitions as well as the matches of song and dance,—all these are represented as making an ineffaceable impression on the spectator: 'the assembled Ionians look as if they were beyond the reach of old age or death.' Such was the magnificence of which Delos was the periodical theatre, and which called forth the voices and poetical genius not merely of itinerant bards, but also of the Delian maidens in the temple of Apollo, during the century preceding 500 B. C. At that time it was the great central festival of the Ionians in Asia and Europe."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 12.—During the war with Persia, Delos was made the common treasury of the Greeks; but Athens subsequently took the custody and management of the treasury to herself and reduced Delos to a dependency. The island was long the seat of an extensive commerce, and Delian bronze was of note in the arts.

**B. C. 490.**—Spared by the Persians. See GREECE: B. C. 490.

**B. C. 477.**—The Delian Confederacy. See GREECE: B. C. 473-477; and ATHENS: B. C. 466-454, and after.

**B. C. 461-454 (?).**—Removal of the Confederate treasury to Athens. See ATHENS: B. C. 466-454.

**B. C. 425-422.**—Purifications.—"In the midst of the losses and turmoil of the [Peloponnesian] war it had been determined [at Athens] to offer a solemn testimony of homage to Apollo on Delos, [B. C. 425]—a homage doubtless connected with the complete cessation of the pestilence, which had lasted as long as the fifth year of the war. The solemnity consisted in the renewed consecration of the entire island to the divine Giver of grace; all the coffins containing human remains being removed from Delos, and Rhenea appointed to be henceforth the sole burial-place. This solemnity supplemented the act formerly performed by the orders of Pisistratus, and it was doubtless in the present instance also intended, by means of a brilliant renewal of the Delian

celebration, to strengthen the power of Athens in the island sea, to give a festive centre to the Ionic world. . . . But the main purpose was clearly one of morality and religion. It was intended to calm and edify the minds of the citizens.—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 4, ch. 2.—Three years later (B. C. 422) the Athenians found some reason for another purification of Delos which was more radical, consisting in the expulsion of all the inhabitants from the island. The unfortunate Delians found an asylum at Adramyttium in Asia, until they were restored to their homes next year, through the influence of the Delphic oracle.—Thucydides, *History*, bk. 5, sect. 1.

**B. C. 88.—Pontic Massacre.**—Early in the first war of Mithridates with the Romans (B. C. 88), Delos, which had been made a free port and had become the emporium of Roman commerce in the east, was seized by a Pontic fleet, and pillaged, 20,000 Italians being massacred on the island. The treasures of Delos were sent to Athens and the island restored to the Athenian control.—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 7, ch. 17.

**B. C. 69.—Ravaged by Pirates.**—“Almost under the eyes of the fleet of Lucullus, the pirate Athenodorus surprised in 69 [B. C. 69] the island of Delos, destroyed its far-famed shrines and temples, and carried off the whole population into slavery.”—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 5, ch. 2.

**Slave Trade under the Romans.**—“Trade and Sarmatha were the Guinea Coast of the Romans. The entrepôt of this trade was Delos, which had been made a free port by Rome after the conquest of Macedonia. Strabo tells us that in one day 10,000 slaves were sold there in open market. Such were the vile uses to which was put the Sacred Island, once the treasury of Greece.”—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 5, ch. 48.

**DELPHI.—KRISSA (CRISSA).—KIRRHA (CIRRHA).**—“In those early times when the Homeric Hymn to Apollo was composed the town of Krissa [in Phocis, near Delphi] appears to have been great and powerful, possessing all the broad plain between Parnassus, Kirrha, and the gulf, to which latter it gave its name, —and possessing also, what was a property not less valuable, the adjoining sanctuary of Pytho itself, which the Hymn identifies with Krissa, not indicating Delphi as a separate place. The Krissæans, doubtless, derived great profits from the number of visitors who came to visit Delphi, both by land and by sea, and Kirrha was originally only the name for their seaport. Gradually, however, the port appears to have grown in importance at the expense of the town; . . . while at the same time the sanctuary of Pytho with its administrators expanded into the town of Delphi, and came to claim an independent existence of its own. . . . In addition to the above facts, already sufficient in themselves as seeds of quarrel, we are told that the Kirrhæans abused their position as masters of the avenue to the temple by sea, and levied exorbitant tolls on the visitors who landed there. . . . Besides such offence against the general Grecian public, they had also incurred the enmity of their Phocian neighbours by outrages upon women, Phocian as well as Argæan, who were returning from the temple. Thus stood the case, apparently, about 595 B. C.,

when the Amphiktyonic meeting interfered . . . to punish the Kirrhæans. After a war of ten years, the first Sacred War in Greece, this object was completely accomplished, by a joint force of Thessalians under Eurylochus, Sikyonians under Kleisthenes, and Athenians under Alkmeon; the Athenian Solon being the person who originated and enforced, in the Amphiktyonic council, the proposition of interference. Kirrha . . . was destroyed, or left to subsist merely as a landing place; and the whole adjoining plain was consecrated to the Delphian god, whose domains thus touched the sea. . . . The fate of Kirrha in this war is ascertained: that of Krissa is not so clear, nor do we know whether it was destroyed, or left subsisting in a position of inferiority with regard to Delphi. From this time forward, the Delphian community appears as substantive and autonomous, exercising in their own right the management of the temple; though we shall find, on more than one occasion, that the Phocians contest this right. . . . The spoils of Kirrha were employed by the victorious allies in founding the Pythian Games. The octennial festival hitherto celebrated at Delphi in honour of the god, including no other competition except in the harp and the pæan, was expanded into comprehensive games on the model of the Olympic, with matches not only of music, but also of gymnastics and chariots, —celebrated, not at Delphi itself, but on the maritime plain near the ruined Kirrha, —and under the direct superintendence of the Amphiktyons themselves. . . . They were celebrated in the latter half of summer, or first half of every third Olympic year. . . . Nothing was conferred but wreaths of laurel.”—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 28.—See, also, **ATHENS**: B. C. 610-586; **PYTHO**; **ORACLES OF THE GREEKS**; and **AMPHIKTYONIC COUNCIL**.

**B. C. 357-338.—Seizure by the Phocians.—The Sacred Wars.—Deliverance by Philip of Macedon.—War with Amphissa.** See **GREECE**: B. C. 357-336.

**B. C. 279.—Discomfiture of the Gauls.** See **GAULS**: B. C. 280-279.

**DELPHIC ORACLE, The.** See **ORACLES OF THE GREEKS**.

**DELPHIC SIBYL, The.** See **SIBYLS**.

**DEMES.—DEMI.** See **PHYLÆ**; also, **ATHENS**: B. C. 510-507.

**DEMETES, The.**—One of the tribes of ancient Wales. See **BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES**.

**DEMETRIUS, the Impostor.** See **RUSSIA**: A. D. 1538-1683. . . . **Demetrius Polioretetes, and the wars of the Diadochi.** See **MACEDONIA**: B. C. 315-310, 310-301; also **GREECE**: B. C. 307-197; and **RHODES**: B. C. 305-304.

**DEMIURGI.—COSMOS.—TAGOS OR TAGUS.**—Of the less common titles applied among the ancient Greeks to their supreme magistrates, are “Cosmos, or Cosmos and Tagos (signifying Arranger and Commander), the former of which we find in Crete, the latter in the Thessalian cities. With the former we may compare the title of Cosmopolis, which was in use among the Epizephyrian Locrians. A more frequent title is that of Demiurgi, a name which seems to imply a constitution no longer oligarchical, but which bestowed certain rights on the Demos. In the time of the Peloponnesian war magistrates of this kind existed in

Elis and in the Arcadian Mantinea. . . . The title is declared by Grammarians to have been commonly used among the Dorians. . . . A similar title is that of Demochus, which the supreme magistrates of Thebes in Bœotia seem to have borne. . . . The Atyni at Epidaurus and Argos we have already mentioned."—G. Fichmann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State*, pt. 2, ch. 5.

**DEMOCRATIC, OR DEMOCRATIC REPUBLICAN PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1789-1792; 1825-1828; 1845-1846.

**DEMOSTHENES, the general at Spac-teria and at Syracuse.** See GREECE: B. C. 425, and SYRACUSE: B. C. 415-413; and ATHENS: B. C. 415-413. . . . Demosthenes the orator, The Philippics, and the Death of. See GREECE: B. C. 357-336, 351-348, and 323-322; and ATHENS: B. C. 350-338, and 336-322.

**DEMOTIC WRITING.** See HIEROGLYPHICS.

**DEMUCHUS.** See DEMIURGI.

**DENAIN, Battle of (1712).** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1710-1712.

**DENARIUS, The.** See AS.

**DENVERMONDE.**—Surrender of the Spaniards (1584). See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1584-1585.

**DENIS, King of Portugal.** A. D. 1270-1323.

**DENMARK.** See SCANDINAVIAN STATES.

**DENNEWITZ, OR JÜTERBOGK, Battle of.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1813 (SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER).

**DENNIKON, Peace of (1531).** See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1531-1648.

**DENVER, The founding of.** See COLORADO: A. D. 1800-1876.

**DEORHAM, Battle of.**—Fought A. D. 577, near Bath, England, between the invading West Saxons and the Britons. The victory of the former gave them possession of the lower valley of the Severn and practically completed the Saxon conquest of England.—J. R. Green, *The Making of England*, pp. 125-131.

**DERBEND, Pass of.** See JUROIPACH.

**DERBY-DISRAELI MINISTRIES, The.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1851-1852; 1858-1859; and 1868-1870.

**DERRY.** See LONDONDERRY.

**DE RUSSY, Fort, Capture of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MARCH—MAY, LOUISIANA).

**DESERET, The proposed state of.** See UTAH: A. D. 1849-1850.

**DESMONDS, The.** See GERALDINES.

**DESMOULINS, Camille, and the French Revolution.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1789 (JULY); 1790; 1792 (AUGUST), to 1793-1794 (NOVEMBER—JUNE).

**DESPOT OF EPIRUS.**—"The title of despot, by which they [the mediæval princes of Epirus] are generally distinguished, was a Byzantine honorary distinction, never borne by the earlier members of the family until it had been conferred on them by the Greek Emperor."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of Greece from its conquest by the Crusaders*, ch. 6, sect. 1.—See EPIRUS: A. D. 1204-1850.

**DESPOTS, Greek.** See TYRANTS. . . . Italian. See ITALY: A. D. 1250-1520.

**DESSAU, Battle of (1626).** See GERMANY: A. D. 1624-1626.

**DESTRIERS.—PALFREYS.**—"A cavaliere or man-at-arms was accompanied by one 'Destriero' or strong war-horse, and one or two, sometimes three, mounted squires who led the animal fully caparisoned; or carried the helmet, lance and shield of their master; these 'Destrieri' ('rich and great horses' as Villani calls them), were so named because they were led on the right hand without any rider, and all ready for mounting; the squire's horses were of an inferior kind called 'Ronzini,' and on the 'Palafreni' or palfreys the knight rode when not in battle."—H. E. Napier, *Florentine History*, v. 1, p. 633.

**DESTROYING ANGELS, OR DAN-ITES.** See MORMONISM: A. D. 1830-1846.

**DETROIT: First occupied by the Coureurs de Bois.** See COUREURS DE BOIS.

**A. D. 1686-1701.**—The first French forts.—Cadillac's founding of the city.—At the beginning of the war called "Queen Anne's War" (1702) "Detroit had already been established. In June, 1701, la Mothe Cadillac, with a Jesuit father and 100 men, was sent to construct a fort and occupy the country; hence he is spoken of as the founder of the city. In 1686, a fort [called Fort St. Joseph] had been constructed to the south of the present city, where Fort Gratiot now stands, but it soon fell into decay and was abandoned. It was not the site selected by Cadillac."—W. Kingsford, *Hist. of Canada*, v. 2, p. 408.—"Fort St. Joseph was abandoned in the year 1688. The establishment of Cadillac was destined to a better fate and soon rose to distinguished importance among the western outposts of Canada."—F. Parkman, *The Conspiracy of Pontiac*, v. 1, p. 213.

**A. D. 1701-1755.**—Importance to the French. See CANADA: A. D. 1700-1735.

**A. D. 1712.**—Siege by the Foxes and Massacre of that tribe. See CANADA: A. D. 1711-1713.

**A. D. 1760.**—The French settlement when surrendered to the English.—"The French inhabitants here are settled on both sides of the river for about eight miles. When I took possession of the country soon after the surrender of Canada [see CANADA: A. D. 1760], they were about 2,500 in number, there being near 500 that bore arms (to whom I administered oaths of allegiance) and near 300 dwelling houses. Our fort here is built of stockadoes, is about 25 feet high, and 1,200 yards in circumference. . . . The inhabitants raise wheat and other grain in abundance, and have plenty of cattle, but they enrich themselves chiefly by their trade with the Indians, which is here very large and lucrative."—Major R. Rogers, *Concise Acct. of N. Am.*, p. 168.

**A. D. 1763.**—Pontiac's Siege. See PONTIAC'S WAR.

**A. D. 1775-1783.**—Held by the British throughout the War of Independence. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778-1779, CLARK'S CONQUEST.

**A. D. 1805.**—Made the seat of government of the Territory of Michigan. See INDIANA: A. D. 1800-1818.

**A. D. 1812.**—The surrender of General Hull. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812 (JUNE—OCTOBER).

**A. D. 1813.**—American recovery. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812-1813.

**DETTINGEN, Battle of (1743).** See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1743.

**DEUSDEDIT, Pope, A. D. 615-618.**

**DEUTSCH.** Origin of the name. See GERMANY: THE NATIONAL NAME.

**DEUTSCHBROD, Battle of (1422).** See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1419-1434.

**DEVA.**—One of the Roman garrison towns in Britain, on the site of which is modern Chester, taking its name from the castra or fortified station of the legions. It was the station of the 20th legion.—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 8, ch. 5.

**DEVE-BOYUN, Battle of (1878).** See TURKS: A. D. 1877-1878.

**DEVIL'S CAUSEWAY, The.**—The popular name of an old Roman road in England which runs from Silchester to London.

**DEVIL'S HOLE, The ambushade and massacre at.**—On the 13th of September, 1763, during the progress of Pontiac's War, a train of wagons and packhorses, traversing the Niagara portage between Lewiston and Fort Schlosser, guarded by an escort of 24 soldiers, was ambuscaded by a party of Seneca warriors at the place called the Devil's Hole, three miles below the Niagara cataract. Seventy of the whites were slain, and only three escaped.—F. Parkman, *The Conspiracy of Pontiac*, ch. 21 (p. 2).

**DEVON COMMISSION, The.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1843-1848.

**DEVONSHIRE, in the British age.** See DUMNONII.

**DE WITT, John, the administration and the murder of.** See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1651-1660, to 1672-1674.

**DHIHAD.** See DAR-UL-ISLAM.

**DIACRII, The.** See ATHENS: B. C. 594.

**DIADOCHI, The.**—The immediate successors of Alexander the Great, who divided his empire, are sometimes so-called. "The word diadochi means 'successors,' and is used to include Antigonus, Ptolemy, Seleucus, Lysimachus, etc.—the actual companions of Alexander."—J. P. Mahaffy, *Story of Alexander's Empire*, ch. 5.—See MACEDONIA: B. C. 323-316.

**DIAMOND, Battle of the (1795).** See IRELAND: A. D. 1795-1796.

**DIAMOND DISCOVERY IN SOUTH AFRICA (1867).** See GRIQUAS.

**DIAMOND NECKLACE, The affair of the.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1784-1785.

**DIASPORA, The.**—A name applied to the Jews scattered throughout the Roman world.

**DIAZ, Porfirio, The Mexican presidency of.** See MEXICO: A. D. 1867-1888.

**DICASTERIA.**—The great popular court, or jury, in ancient Athens, called the Hellæa, or Heliastæ consisting at one time of six thousand chosen citizens, was divided into ten sections, called Dicasteria. Their places of meeting also bore the same name.—G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State*, pt. 3, ch. 3.—See ATHENS: B. C. 445-431.

**DICKINSON, John, in the American Revolution.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1767-1788; 1774 (SEPTEMBER); 1776 (JULY).

**DICTATOR, Roman.** See CONSULS, ROMAN.

**DIDIAN LAW, The.** See ORCHIAN, FANNIAN, DIDIAN LAWS.

**DIDIER, OR DESIDERIUS, King of the Lombards, A. D. 759-774.**

**DIDYMÆUM, The oracle of.** See ORACLES OF THE GREEKS.

**DIEDENHOFEN, Battle of (1639).** See GERMANY: A. D. 1634-1639.

**DIEPPE.—Bombardment and destruction by an English fleet.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1694.

**DIES ATRI.**—The days on which the Romans thought it unlucky to undertake business of importance— for example, the day after the Calends, Nones and Ides of each month—were called Dies Atri.—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq.*, ch. 11.

**DIES FASTI.—Dies Nefasti.—Dies Festi.** See FASTI, and LUDI.

**DIET.**—"An assembly, council, . . . Parliament. . . The peculiar sense of the word undoubtedly arose from a popular etymology that connected it with the Lat. 'dies,' a day, esp. a set day, a day appointed for public business; whence, by extension, a meeting for business, an assembly."—W. W. Skeat, *Etymological dict.*

**The Germanic.**—"The annual general councils and special councils of Charles the Great did not long survive him, and neither his descendants nor their successors revived them. They were compelled, to be sure, both by custom and by policy to advise with the chief men of the kingdom before taking any important step or doing anything that depended for success on their consent and coöperation, but they varied the number of their counsellors and the time, place, and manner of consulting them to suit their own convenience. Great formal assemblies of counsellors summoned from all parts of the realm were termed Imperial Diets (Reichstage); small, or local, or informal assemblies of a similar kind were known as Court Diets (Hoftage). Princes and other royal vassals, margraves, palgraves, Graves, barons, and even royal Dienstmannen were indiscriminately summoned, but the Diets were in no sense representative bodies until the Great Interregnum [see GERMANY: A. D. 1250-1272] when certain cities, acquired such influence in public affairs that they were invited to send delegates. The first Diet in which they participated was held at Worms in February, 1255, by King William of Holland. Most of the cities of the Rhenish League were there represented, and they constituted an important factor of the assembly. The affairs of the church shared attention with temporal affairs in the Diets until the Popes succeeded in making good their claims to supremacy in spiritual matters. Thereafter they were altogether left to synods and church councils. . . . Imperial Diets and Court Diets continued to be held at irregular intervals, whenever and wherever it pleased the king to convene them, but Imperial Diets were usually held in Imperial cities. These were not such heterogeneous assemblies as formerly, for few royal vassals, except princes, and no royal Dienstmannen whatever were now invited to attend. Graves and barons, and prelates who were not princes, continued to be summoned, but the number and influence of the Graves and barons in the Diets steadily waned. Imperial cities were for many years only occasionally asked to participate, that is to say, only when the king had especial need of their good offices, but in the latter half of the 14th century they began to be regularly summoned. Imperial Diets were so frequently held during the Hussite

War and thereafter, that it became pretty well settled what persons and what cities should take part in them, and only those persons and those cities that were entitled to take part in them were regarded as Estates of the realm. In the 15th century they developed into three chambers or colleges, viz., the College of Electors [see GERMANY: A. D. 1125-1152], the College of Princes, Graves, and Barons, usually called the Council of Princes of the Empire (Reichsfürstentath), and the College of Imperial Cities. The Archbishop of Mentz presided in the College of Electors, and the Archbishop of Salzburg and the Duke of Austria presided alternately in the Council of Princes of the Empire. The office of presiding in the College of Imperial Cities devolved upon the Imperial city in which the Diet sat. The king and members of both the upper Colleges sometimes sent deputies to represent them, instead of attending in person. In 1474 the cities adopted a method of voting which resulted in a division of their College into two benches, called the Rhenish Bench and the Swabian Bench, because the Rhenish cities were conspicuous members of the one, and the Swabian cities conspicuous members of the other. In the Council of Princes, at least, no regard was had to the number of votes cast, but only to the power and influence of the voters, whence a measure might pass the Diet by less than a majority of the votes present. Having passed, it was proclaimed as the law of the realm, upon receiving the king's assent, but was only effective law in so far as the members of the Diet, present or absent, assented to it. . . . Not a single Imperial Diet was summoned between 1613 and 1640. The king held a few Court Diets during that long interval, consisting either of the Electors alone, or of the Electors and such other Princes of the Empire as he chose to summon. The conditions of membership, and the manner of voting in the College of Electors and the College of Imperial Cities remained unchanged. . . . The cities long strove in vain to have their votes recognized as of equal weight with the others, but the two upper Colleges insisted on regarding them as summoned for consultation only, until the Peace of Westphalia settled the matter by declaring that 'a decisive vote (votum decisivum) shall belong to the Free Imperial Cities not less than to the rest of the Estates of the Empire.' Generally, but not always, the sense of each College was expressed by the majority of votes cast. The Peace of Westphalia provided that 'in religious matters and all other business, when the Estates cannot be considered one body (corpus), as: also when the Catholic Estates and those of the Augsburg Confession go into two parts (in duas partes euntibus), a mere amicable agreement shall settle the differences without regard to majority of votes.' When the 'going into parts,' (itio in partes) took place each College deliberated in two bodies, the Corpus Catholicorum and the Corpus Evangelicorum. The king no longer attended the Imperial Diets in person, but sent commissioners instead, and it was now the common practice of members of both the upper Colleges to send deputies to represent them."—S. E. Turner, *Sketch of the Germanic Constitution*, ch. 4, 5, and 6.—The establishment of a permanent diet, attended, not by the electors in person, but by their representatives, is one of the most

striking peculiarities of Leopold's reign" (Leopold I., 1657-1705). This came about rather accidentally than with intention, as a consequence of the unusual prolongation of the session of a general diet which Rudolph convoked at Ratisbon, soon after his accession to the throne. "So many new and important objects . . . occurred in the course of the deliberations that the diet was unusually prolonged, and at last rendered perpetual, as it exists at present, and distinguishes the Germanic constitution as the only one of its kind—not only for a certain length of time, as was formerly, and as diets are generally held in other countries, where there are national states; but the diet of the Germanic empire was established by this event for ever. The diet acquired by this circumstance an entirely different form. So long as it was only of short duration, it was always expected that the emperor, as well as the electors, princes, counts and prelates, if not all, yet the greatest part of them, should attend in person. . . . It is true, it had long been customary at the diets of Germany, for the states to deliver their votes occasionally by means of plenipotentiaries; but it was then considered only as an exception, whereas it was now established as a general rule, that all the states should send their plenipotentiaries, and never appear themselves. . . . The whole diet, therefore, imperceptibly acquired the form of a congress, consisting solely of ministers, similar in a great degree to a congress where several powers send their envoys to treat of peace. In other respects, it may be compared to a congress held in the name of several states in perpetual alliance with each other, as in Switzerland, the United Provinces, and as somewhat of a similar nature exists at present in North America; but with this difference,—that in Germany the assembly is held under the authority of one common supreme head, and that the members do not appear merely as deputies, or representatives invested with full power by their principals, which is only the case with the imperial cities; but so that every member of the two superior colleges of the empire is himself an actual sovereign of a state, who permits his minister to deliver his vote in his name and only according to his prescription."—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of the Germanic Empire*, bk. 3, ch. 3 (v. 3)—(quoting Putter's *Historical Development of the Germanic Const.*)—Of the later Diet, of the Germanic Confederation, something may be learned under GERMANY: A. D. 1814-1820, and 1848 (MARCH-SEPTEMBER).

**DIFFIDATION, The Right of.** See LAND-FRIEDE.

**DIGITI.** See FOOT, THE ROMAN.

**DIJON, Battle at.** See BURGUNDIANS: A. D. 500.

**DIJON, Origin of.**—Dijon, the old capital of the Dukes of Burgundy, was originally a strong camp-city—an "urbs quadrata"—of the Romans, known as the Castrum Divionense. Its walls were 30 feet high, 15 feet thick, and strengthened with 33 towers.—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders*, bk. 4, ch. 9.

**DILEMITES, The.** See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 815-945.

**DIMETIA.** See BRITAIN: 6th CENTURY.

**DINAN, Battle of (1597).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1593-1598.

**DINANT, Destruction of.**—In the 15th century, down to the year 1466, Dinant was a populous and thriving town. It was included in the little state of the prince-bishop of Liège, and was involved in the war of the Duke of Burgundy with Liège, which ruined both Liège and Dinant. "It was inhabited by a race of industrious artisans, preëminent for their skill in the manufacture of copper. The excellence of their workmanship is attested by existing specimens—organ-screens, baptismal fonts, and other ecclesiastical decorations. But the fame of Dinant had been chiefly spread by its production of more common and useful articles, especially of kitchen utensils,—'pots and pans and similar wares,'—which, under the name of 'Dinanderie,' were known to housewives throughout Europe." In the course of the war a party of rude young men from Dinant gave deep, unforgivable provocation to the Duke of Burgundy by caricaturing and questioning the paternity of his son, the count of Charolais, afterwards Duke Charles the Bold. To avenge this insult nothing less than the destruction of the whole city would satisfy the implacable and ferocious Burgundians. It was taken by the count of Charolais in August, 1466. His first proceeding was to sack the town, in the most thorough and deliberate manner. Then 800 of the more obnoxious citizens were tied together in pairs and drowned in the Meuse, while others were hanged. This accomplished, the surviving women, children and priests were expelled from the town and sent empty-handed to Liège, while the men were condemned to slavery, with the privilege of ransoming themselves at a heavy price, if they found anywhere the means. Finally, the torch was applied, Dinant was burned, and contractors were subsequently employed by the Duke for several months, to demolish the ruins and remove the very materials of which the city had been built.—J. F. Kirk, *Hist. of Charles the Bold*, bk. 1, ch. 8-9.

ALSO IN: E. de Monstrelet (Johnes), *Chronicles*, bk. 3, ch. 138-139.—Phillip de Commines, *Mémoires*, bk. 2, ch. 1.

**DINWIDDIE COTTAGE HOUSE, Action at.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (MARCH—APRIL: VIRGINIA).

**DIQBOLY, The.**—Pericles "was the proposer of the law [at Athens] which instituted the 'Dioboly,' or free gift of two obols to each poor citizen, to enable him to pay the entrance-money at the theatre during the Dionysia."—C. W. C. Oman, *Hist. of Greece*, p. 271.—See ATHENS: B. C. 435-431.

**DIOCESSES OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.**—"The civil government of the empire was distributed [under Constantine and his successors] into thirteen great dioceses, each of which equalled the just measure of a powerful kingdom. The first of these dioceses was subject to the jurisdiction of the Count of the East. The place of Augustal Prefect of Egypt was no longer filled by a Roman knight, but the name was retained. . . . The eleven remaining dioceses—of Asiatic, Pontica, and Thrace; of Macedonia, Dacia and Pannonia, or Western Illyricum; of Italy and Africa; of Gaul, Spain, and Britain—were governed by twelve vicars or vice-prefects."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 17.—See PRÆTORIAN PRÆ-FECTS.

**DIOCLETIAN, Roman Emperor.** See ROME: A. D. 284-305. . . . **Abdication.**—"The ceremony of his abdication was performed in a spacious plain about three miles from Nicomedia [May 1, A. D. 305]. The Emperor ascended a lofty throne, and, in a speech full of reason and dignity, declared his intention, both to the people and to the soldiers who were assembled on this extraordinary occasion. As soon as he had divested himself of the purple, he withdrew from the gazing multitude, and, traversing the city in a covered chariot, proceeded without delay to the favourite retirement [Salona] which he had chosen in his native country of Dalmatia."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 13.—See, also, SALONA.

**DIOKLES, Laws of.**—A code of laws framed at Syracuse, immediately after the Athenian siege, by a commission of ten citizens the chief of whom was one Dioklès. These laws were extinguished in a few years by the Dionysian tyranny, but revived after a lapse of sixty years. The code is "also said to have been copied in various other Sicilian cities, and to have remained in force until the absorption of all Sicily under the dominion of the Romans."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 81.

**DIONYSIA AT ATHENS.**—"The four principal Attik Dionysiak festivals were (1) the Dionysia Mikra, the Lesser or Rural Dionysia; (2) the Dionysia Lenaia; (3) the Anthesteria; and (4) the Dionysia Megala, the Greater or City Dionysia. The Rural Dionysia, celebrated yearly in the month Posideon (Dec.—Jan.) throughout the various townships of Attike, was presided over by the demarch or mayor. The celebration occasioned a kind of rustic carnival, distinguished like almost all Bækchik festivals, by gross intemperance and licentiousness, and during which slaves enjoyed a temporary freedom, with licence to insult their superiors and behave in a boisterous and disorderly manner. It is brought vividly before us in the 'Acharnes' of Aristophanes. . . . The Anthesteria, or Feast of Flowers, celebrated yearly in the month Anthesterion (Feb.—March), . . . lasted for three days, the first of which was called Pithoigia, or Tap-barrel-day, on which they opened the casks and tried the wine of the previous year. . . . The Dionysia Megala, the Greater or City Dionysia, celebrated yearly in the month Elaphebolion (March—April) was presided over by the Archon Eponymos, so-called because the year was registered in his name, and who was first of the nine. The order of the solemnities was as follows:—I. The great public procession. . . . II. The chorus of Youths. III. The Komos, or band of Dionysiak revellers, whose ritual is best illustrated in Milton's exquisite poem. IV. The representation of Comedy and Tragedy; for at Athenal the stage was religion and the theatre a temple. At the time of this great festival the capital was filled with rustics from the country townships, and strangers from all parts of Hellas and the outer world."—R. Brown, *The Great Dionysiak Myth*, ch. 6.

**DIONYSIAN TYRANNY AT SYRACUSE, The.** See SYRACUSE: B. C. 397-396, and 344.

**DIPLAX, The.** See TRULUM.  
**DIPYLUM, The.** See CERAMICUS OF ATHENS.  
**DIRECTORY, The French.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1795 (JUNE—SEPTEMBER); (OCTOBER—DECEMBER); 1797 (SEPTEMBER).



**DISINHERITED BARONS, The.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1332-1333.

**DISRAELI-DERBY AND BEACONSFIELD MINISTRIES.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1851-1852; 1858-1859; 1868-1870; and 1873-1880.

**DISRUPTION OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1843.

**DISSENTERS, OR NONCONFORMISTS, English; First bodies organized.—Persecutions under Charles II. and Anne.—Removal of Disabilities.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1559-1560; 1602-1605; 1672-1673; 1711-1714; 1827-1828.

**DISTRIBUTION OF THE SURPLUS, The.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1835-1837.

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, The.** See WASHINGTON (CITY): A. D. 1791.

**DIX, The.** See SUBLIME PORTE.

**DIVODURUM.**—The Gallic name of the city afterwards called Mediomatrici—now Metz.

**DIVONA.**—Modern Cahors. See CADURCI.

**DIWANI.** See INDIA: A. D. 1757-1772.

**DIX, General John A.: Message to New Orleans.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1860-1861 (DECEMBER—FEBRUARY).

**DJEM, OR JEM, Prince, The Story of.** See TURKS: A. D. 1481-1520.

**DOAB, The English acquisition of the.** See INDIA: A. D. 1798-1805.

**DOBRIN, Knights of the Order of the Brethren of.** See PRUSSIA: 13TH CENTURY.

**DOBRUDJA, The.**—The peninsula formed between the Danube, near its mouth, and the Black Sea.

**DOBUNI, The.**—A tribe of ancient Britons who held a region between the two Avons. See BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.

**DOCTISM.**—"We note another phase of gnosticism in the doctrine so directly and warmly combated in the epistles of John; we refer to doctism—that is, the theory which refused to recognize the reality of the human body of Christ."—E. Reuss, *Hist. of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age*, p. 323.

**DODONA.** See HELLAS.

**DOGE.** See VENICE: A. D. 697-810.

**DOGGER BANKS, Naval Battle of the (1781).** See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1746-1787.

**DOKIMASIA.**—"All magistrates [in ancient Athens] whether elected by cheironomia or by lot, were compelled, before entering upon their office, to subject themselves to a Dokimasia, or scrutiny into their fitness for the post."—G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State*, pt. 3, ch. 3.

**DÖLICHOCEPHALIC MEN.**—A term used in ethnology, signifying "long-headed," as distinguishing one class of skulls among the remains of primitive men, from another class called brachycephalic, or "broad-headed."

**DOLLINGER, Doctor, and the dogma of Papal Infallibility.** See PAPACY: A. D. 1869-1870.

**DOLMENS.** See CROMLECHS.

**DOMESDAY, OR DOOMSDAY BOOK.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1085-1086.

**DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, The.** See HAYTI: A. D. 1804-1880.

**DOMINICANS.** See MENDICANT ORDERS; also, INQUISITION: A. D. 1203-1525.

**DOMINION OF CANADA.—DOMINION DAY.** See CANADA: A. D. 1807.

**DOMINUS.** See IMPERATOR, FINAL SIGNIFICATION OF THE ROMAN TITLE.

**DOMITIAN, Roman Emperor.** A. D. 81-96.

**DOMITZ, Battle of (1635).** See GERMANY: A. D. 1634-1639.

**DON JOHN OF AUSTRIA.** See JOHN (DON) OF AUSTRIA.

**DON PACIFICO AFFAIR, The.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1840-1850; and GREECE: A. D. 1840-1850.

**DONALD BANE, King of Scotland.** A. D. 1093-1098 (expelled during part of the period by Duncan II.).

**DONATI, The.** See FLORENCE: A. D. 1295-1300, and 1301-1313.

**DONATION OF CONSTANTINE.** See PAPACY: A. D. 774(?).

**DONATION OF THE COUNTESS MATILDA.** See PAPACY: A. D. 1077-1102.

**DONATIONS OF PEPIN AND CHARLEMAGNE.** See PAPACY: A. D. 755-774.

**DONATISTS, The.**—"The Donatist controversy was not one of doctrine, but of ecclesiastical discipline; the contested election for the archbishopric of Carthage. Two competitors, Cecilius and Donatus, had been concurrently elected while the church was yet in a depressed state, and Africa subject to the tyrant Maxentius [A. D. 306-312]. Scarcely had Constantine subdued that province, when the two rivals referred their dispute to him. Constantine, who still publicly professed paganism, but had shown himself very favourable to the Christians, instituted a careful examination of their respective claims, which lasted from the year 312 to 315, and finally decided in favour of Cecilius. Four hundred African bishops protested against this decision; from that time they were designated by the name of Donatists. . . . In compliance with an order of the emperor, solicited by Cecilius, the property of the Donatists was seized and transferred to the antagonist body of the clergy. They revenged themselves by pronouncing sentence of excommunication against all the rest of the Christian world. . . . Persecution on one side and fanaticism on the other were perpetuated through three centuries, up to the period of the extinction of Christianity in Africa. The wandering preachers of the Donatist faction had no other means of living than the alms of their flocks. . . . As might be expected, they outdid each other in extravagance, and soon gave in to the most frantic ravings: thousands of peasants, drunk with the effect of these exhortations, forsook their ploughs and fled to the deserts of Getulia. Their bishops, assuming the title of captives of the saints, put themselves at their head, and they rushed onward, carrying death and desolation into the adjacent provinces; they were distinguished by the name of Circumcelliones: Africa was devastated by their ravages."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 4. Also in: P. Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, v. 2, ch. 6.

**DONAUWÜRTH: A. D. 1632.**—Taken by Gustavus Adolphus. See GERMANY: A. D. 1631-1632.

**A. D. 1704.**—Taken by Marlborough. See GERMANY: A. D. 1704.

**DONELSON, Fort, Capture of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JANUARY—FEBRUARY); KENTUCKY—TENNESSEE).



**DONGAN CHARTER, The.** See NEW YORK (CITY): A. D. 1686.

**DONUM.** See TALLAGE.

**DONUS I., Pope, A. D. 676-678.... Donus II., Pope, A. D. 974-975.**

**DONZELLO.** See D'AMOISEL.

**DOOMS OF INE, The.**—"These laws were republished by King Alfred as 'The Dooms of Ine' who [Ine] came to the throne in A. D. 688. In their first clause they claim to have been recorded by King Ine with the counsel and teaching of his father Cenred and of Hedde, his bishop (who was Bishop of Winchester from A. D. 676 to 705) and of Eorcenweld, his bishop (who obtained the see of London in 675); and so, if genuine, they seem to represent what was settled customary law in Wessex during the last half of the seventh century."—F. Seebohm, *English Village Community*, ch. 4.

**DOOMSDAY, OR DOMESDAY BOOK.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1085-1086.

**DOORANEES, OR DURANEES, The.** See INDIA: A. D. 1747-1761.

**DORDRECHT, OR DORT, Synod of.** See DORT; also, NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1603-1619.

**DORIA, Andrew, The deliverance of Genoa by.** See ITALY: A. D. 1527-1529.

**DORIANS AND IONIANS, The.**—"Out of the great Pelasgian population [see PELASGIANS], which covered Anterior Asia Minor and the whole European peninsular land, a younger people had issued forth separately, which we find from the first divided into two races. These main races we may call, according to the two dialects of the Greek language, the Dorian and the Ionian, although these names are not generally used until a later period to designate the division of the Hellenic nation. No division of so thorough a bearing could have taken place unless accompanied by an early local separation. We assume that the two races parted company while yet in Asia Minor. One of them settles in the mountain-cantons of Northern Hellas, the other along the Asiatic coast. In the latter the historic movement begins. With the aid of the art of navigation, learnt from the Phœnicians the Asiatic Greeks at an early period spread over the sea; domesticating themselves in lower Egypt, in countries colonized by the Phœnicians, in the whole Archipelago, from Crete to Thrace; and from their original as well as from their subsequent seats send out numerous settlements to the coast of European Greece, first from the East side, next, after conquering their timidity, also taking in the country, beyond Cape Malea from the West. At first they land as pirates and enemies, then proceed to permanent settlements in gulfs and straits of the sea, and by the mouths of rivers, where they unite with the Pelasgian population. The different periods of this colonization may be judged of by the forms of divine worship, and by the names under which the maritime tribes were called by the natives. Their rudest appearance is as Carians; as Leleges their influence is more beneficent and permanent."—Dr. E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 1, ch. 2.—In the view of Dr. Curtius, the later migration of Ionian tribes from Southern Greece to the coasts of Asia Minor,—which is an undoubted historic fact,—was really a return "into the home of their ancestors"—"the ancient home of the great Ionic race." Whether that be the true view or not, the movement in question was

connected, apparently, with important movements among the Dorian Greeks in Greece itself. These latter, according to all accounts, and the agreement of all historians, were long settled in Thessaly, at the foot of Olympus (see GREECE: THE MIGRATIONS). It was there that their moral and political development began; there that they learned to look at Olympus as the home of the gods, which all Greeks afterwards learned to do from them. "The service rendered by the Dorian tribe," says Dr. Curtius, "lay in having carried the germs of national culture out of Thessaly, where the invasion of ruder peoples disturbed and hindered their farther growth, into the land towards the south, where these germs received an unexpectedly new and grand development. . . . A race claiming descent from Heracles united itself in this Thessalian coast-district with the Dorians and established a royal dominion among them. Ever afterwards Heracliæ and Dorians remained together, but without ever forgetting the original distinction between them. In their seats by Olympus the foundations were laid of the peculiarity of the Dorians in political order and social customs; at the foot of Olympus was their real home."—*The same*, bk. 1, ch. 4.—From the neighborhood of Olympus the Dorians moved southwards and found another home in "the fertile mountain-recess between Parnassus and Ceta, . . . the most ancient Doris known to us by name." Their final movement was into Peloponnesus, which was "the most important and the most fertile in consequences of all the migrations of Grecian races, and which continued, even to the latest periods to exert its influence upon the Greek character." Thenceforward the Dorians were the dominant race in Peloponnesus, and to their chief state, Lacedæmonia, or Sparta, was generally conceded the headship of the Hellenic family. This Doric occupation of Peloponnesus, the period of which is supposed to have been about 1100 B. C., no doubt caused the Ionic migration from that part of Greece and colonization of Asia Minor.—C. O. Müller, *Hist. and Antiquities of the Doric race*, bk. 1, ch. 3.—The subsequent division of the Hellenic world between Ionians and Dorians is thus defined by Schömann: "To the Ionians belong the inhabitants of Attica, the most important part of the population of Eubœa, and the islands of the Ægean included under the common name of Cyclades, as well as the colonists both on the Lydian and Carian coasts of Asia Minor and in the two larger islands of Chios and Samos which lie opposite. To the Dorians within the Peloponnesus belong the Spartans, as well as the dominant populations of Argos, Sicyon, Phlius, Corinth, Troezen and Epidaurus, together with the island of Ægina; outside the Peloponnesus, but nearest to it, were the Megarid, and the small Dorian Tetrapolis [also called Pentapolis and Tripolis] near Mount Parnassus; at a greater distance were the majority of the scattered islands and a large portion of the Carian coasts of Asia Minor and the neighbouring islands, of which Cos and Rhodes were the most important. Finally, the ruling portion of the Cretan population was of Dorian descent."—G. F. Schömann, *Antiquities of Greece: The State*, pt. 1, ch. 1.—See, also, GREECE: THE MIGRATIONS; ASIA MINOR: THE GREEK COLONIES; HERACLIÆ; SPARTA; and ÆOLIANS.

**DORIS AND DRYOPIS.**—"The little territory [in ancient Greece] called Doris and Dryopis occupied the southern declivity of Mount Eta, dividing Phokis on the north and northwest from the Etolians, Eubœans and Mallians. That which was called Doris in the historical times, and which reached in the times of Herodotus nearly as far eastward as the Mallic gulf, is said to have formed a part of what had been once called Dryopis; a territory which had comprised the summit of Eta as far as the Sperchius, northward, and which had been inhabited by an old Hellenic tribe called Dryopes. The Dorians acquired their settlement in Dryopis by gift from Héraklès, who, along with the Mallians (so ran the legend), had expelled the Dryopes and compelled them to find for themselves new seats at Hermonë, and Asinë, in the Argolic peninsula of Peloponnesus,—at Styra and Karystus in Eubœa,—and in the island of Kythnos; it is only in these five last-mentioned places that history recognizes them. The territory of Doris was distributed into four little townships,—Pindus, or Akyphas, Boon, Kytinion and Erineon. . . . In itself this tetrapolis is so insignificant that we shall rarely find occasion to mention it; but it acquired a factitious consequence by being regarded as the metropolis of the great Dorian cities in Peloponnesus, and receiving on that ground special protection from Sparta."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: C. O. Müller, *Hist. and Antiq. of the Doric Race*, bk. 1, ch. 2.—See also, DORIANS AND IONIANS.

**DORMANS, Battle of (1575).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1573-1576.

**DORNACH, Battle of (1499).** See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1396-1499.

**DORR REBELLION, The.** See RHODE ISLAND: A. D. 1841-1843.

**DORT, OR DORDRECHT, The Synod of.**—"In the low-countries the supreme government, the states general, interfered [in the Calvinistic controversy], and in the year 1618 convoked the first and only synod bearing something of the character of a general council that has been convened by protestants. It assembled at Dort, and continued its sittings from November till May following. Its business was to decide the questions at issue between the Calvinists and Arminians; the latter party were also termed remonstrants. James [I.] was requested to send over representatives for the English Church, and chose four divines:—Carlton bishop of Llandaff, Hall dean of Worcester, afterwards bishop successively of Exeter and Norwich, Davenant afterwards bishop of Salisbury, and Dr. S. Ward of Cambridge. They were men of learning and moderation. . . . The history of this famous synod is told in various ways. Its decisions were in favour of the doctrines termed Calvinistic, and the remonstrants were expelled from Holland. . . . The majority were even charged by the other party with having bound themselves by an oath before they entered upon business, to condemn the remonstrants."—J. B. Marsden, *Hist. of Early Puritans*, p. 329.—See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1608-1619.

**DORYLAEUM, Battle of (1097).** See CRUSADES: A. D. 1096-1099.

**DOUAI: A. D. 1667.—Taken by the French.** See NETHERLANDS (THE SPANISH PROVINCES): A. D. 1667.

A. D. 1668.—Ceded to France. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1668.

A. D. 1710.—Siege and capture by Marlborough. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1710-1712.

**DOUAI, The Catholic Seminary at.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1572-1603.

**DOUBLOON.—DOBLON.** See SPANISH COINS.

**DOUGHFACES.**—"The "Missouri Compromise," of 1820, in the United States, "was a Northern measure, carried by Northern votes. With some the threats of disunion were a sufficient influence; some, whom in the debate Randolph [John Randolph, of Virginia] called doughfaces, did not need even that. . . . There has been always a singular servility in the character of a portion of the American people. In that class the slaveholder has always found his Northern servitor. Randolph first gave it a name to live by in the term doughface."—W. C. Bryant and S. H. Gay, *Popular Hist. of the U. S.*, v. 4, pp. 270 and 294.

**DOUGLAS, Stephen A., and the doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1854. . . . **Defeat in Presidential election.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1860 (APRIL—NOVEMBER).

**DOURO, Battle of the (1580).** See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1579-1580. . . . **Wellington's passage of the.** See SPAIN: A. D. 1800 (FEBRUARY—JULY).

**DOVER, Roman Origin of.** See DUBRIS.

**DOVER, Tenn., Battle at.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (FEBRUARY—APRIL: TENNESSEE).

**DOVER, Treaty of.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1668-1670.

**DOWLAH, Surajah, and the English in India.** See INDIA: A. D. 1755-1757, and 1757.

**DRA CHMA.** See TALENT.

**DRACONIAN LAWS.** See ATHENS: B. C. 624.

**DRAFT RIOTS, The.** See NEW YORK (CITY): A. D. 1863.

**DRAGON.—PENDRAGON.**—A title sometimes given in Welsh poetry to a king or great military leader. Supposed to be derived from the figure of a dragon on their flags, which they borrowed from the Romans. See CUMBRIA.

**DRAGONADES, The.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1681-1698.

**DRAKE'S PIRACIES, and his famous voyage.** See AMERICA: A. D. 1572-1580.

**DRANGIANS, The.** See SARANGIANS.

**DRAPIER'S LETTERS, The.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1722-1724.

**DRAVIDIAN RACES.** See TURANIAN RACES; also, INDIA: THE ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

**DRED SCOTT CASE, The.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1857.

**DREPANA, Naval battle at, B. C. 249.** See PUNIC WAR, THE FIRST.

**DRESDEN: A. D. 1756.—Capture and occupation by Frederick the Great.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1756.

A. D. 1759-1760.—Capture by the Austrians.—Bombardment by Frederick. See GERMANY: A. D. 1750 (JULY—NOVEMBER), and 1760.

A. D. 1813.—Occupied by the Prussians and Russians.—Taken by the French.—Invaded by the Allies.—Great battle before the city

and victory for Napoleon.—French reverses.—St Cyr's surrender. See GERMANY: A. D. 1812-1813; 1813 (APRIL—MAY); (AUGUST); (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER); and (OCTOBER—DECEMBER).

**DRESDEN, Treaty of.** See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1744-1745.

**DREUX, Battle of (1562).** See FRANCE: A. D. 1560-1563.

**DROGHEDA, OR TREDAH, Cromwell's massacre at.** See IRELAND: A. D. 1640-1650.

**DROITWICH, Origin of.** See SALINÆ.

**DROMONES.**—A name given to the light galleys of the Byzantine empire.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 53.

**DRUIDS.**—The priesthood of a religion which existed among the Celts of Gaul and Britain before they were Christianized. "Greek and Roman writers give us very little information on this subject and the early Welsh records and poetry none at all. Modern Welsh writers have, however, made up for this want in their genuine literature by inventing an elaborate Druidical system of religion and philosophy which, they pretend, survived the introduction of Christianity and was secretly upheld by the Welsh herds in the Middle Ages. This Neo-Druidic imposture has found numerous adherents."—W. K. Sullivan, *Article, "Celtic Literature," Encyc. Brit.*—"Pliny, alluding to the Druids' predilection for groves of oak, adds the words: 'ut inde appellati quoque interpretatione Græca possint Druidæ videri.' . . . Had he possessed knowledge enough of the Gaulish language, he would have seen that it supplied an explanation which rendered it needless to have recourse to Greek, namely in the native word 'dru,' which we have in 'Drumeton,' or the sacred Oak-grove, given by Strabo as the name of the place of assembly of the Gaulians. In fact, one has, if I am not mistaken, been skeptic with regard to this etymology, not so much on phonological grounds as from failing exactly to see how the oak could have given its name to such a famous organization as the druidic one must be admitted to have been. But the parallels just indicated, as showing the importance of the sacred tree in the worship of Zeua and the gods representing him among nations other than the Greek one, help to throw some light on this point. According to the etymology here alluded to, the Druids would be the priests of the god associated or identified with the oak; that is, as we are told, the god who seemed to those who were familiar with the pagan theology of the Greeks, to stand in the same position in Gaulish theology that Zeua did in the former. This harmonizes thoroughly with all that is known about the Druids."—J. Rhys, *Hibbert Lects.*, 1886, on *Celtic Heathendom*, lect. 2, pt. 2.—"Our traditions of the Scottish a 1 Irish Druids are evidently derived from a time when Christianity had long been established. These insular Druids are represented as being little better than conjurers, and their dignity is as much diminished as the power of the king is exaggerated. . . . He is a Pharaoh or Belshazzar with a troop of wizards at his command; but his Druids are sorcerers and rain-doctors. . . . The Druids of Strabo's description walked in scarlet and gold brocade and wore golden collars and bracelets; but their doctrines may have been much the same as those of the soothsayers by the Severn, the Irish medicine-men or those rustic wizards by

the Loire. . . . After the conversion of Ireland was accomplished the Druids disappear from history. Their mystical powers were transferred without much alteration to the abbots and bishops who ruled the 'families of the saluta.'"—C. Elton, *Origins of English Hist.*, ch. 10.

ALSO IN: Julius Caesar, *Gaulic War*, bk. 6, ch. 13-18.—Strabo, *Geog.*, bk. 4, ch. 4, sect. 4-6.—For an account of the final destruction of the Druids, in their last retreat, on the island of Mona, or Anglesey, see BRITAIN: A. D. 61.

**DRUMCLOG, The Covenanters at.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1679 (MAY—JUNE).

**DRURY'S BLUFF, Battle of.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MAY; VIRGINIA) THE ARMY OF THE JAMES.

**DRUSUS, Germanic campaigns of.** See GERMANY: B. C. 12-9.

**DRYOPIONS, The.**—One of the aboriginal nations of ancient Greece, whose territory was in the valley of the Spercheus and extended as far as Parnassus and Thermopylæ; but who were afterwards widely dispersed in many colonies. It is, says C. O. Müller, "historically certain that a great part of the Dryopians were consecrated as a subject people to the Pythian Apollo (an usage of ancient times, of which there are many instances) and that for a long time they served as such."—*Hist. and Antiq. of the Doric Race*, bk. 1, ch. 2.—See, also, DORIS; and HERODULI.

**DUBARRY, Countess, Ascendancy of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1723-1774.

**DUBH GALLS.** See IRELAND: 9TH-10TH CENTURIES.

**DUBIENKA, Battle of (1792).** See POLAND: A. D. 1791-1792.

**DUBITZA: Taken by the Austrians (1787).** See TURKS: A. D. 1776-1792.

**DUBLIN: The Danish Kingdom.** See IRELAND: 9TH-10TH CENTURIES; also NORMANS.—NORTHMEN: 8TH-9TH CENTURIES.

A. D. 1014.—The battle of Clontarf and the great defeat of the Danes. See IRELAND: A. D. 1014.

A. D. 1170.—Taken by the Norman-English. See IRELAND: A. D. 1160-1175.

A. D. 1646-1649.—Sieges in the Civil War. See IRELAND: A. D. 1646-1649.

A. D. 1750.—The importance of the city.—"In the middle of the 18th century it was in dimensions and population the second city in the empire, containing, according to the most trustworthy accounts, between 100,000 and 120,000 inhabitants. Like most things in Ireland, it presented vivid contrasts, and strangers were equally struck with the crowds of beggars, the inferiority of the inns, the squalid wretchedness of the streets of the old town, and with the noble proportions of the new quarter, and the brilliant and hospitable society that inhabited it. The Liffey was spanned by four bridges, and another on a grander scale was undertaken in 1753. St. Stephen's Green was considered the largest square in Europe. The quays of Dublin were widely celebrated."—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng.*, 18th Century, ch. 7 (p. 2).

**DUBRIS, OR DUBRÆ.**—The Roman port on the east coast of Britain which is now known as Dover. In Roman times, as now, it was the principal landing-place on the British side of the channel.—T. Wright, *Celt. Roman and Saxon*, ch. 5.

**DUCAT**, Spanish. See SPANISH COINS.  
**DUCES**. See COUNT AND DUKE.  
**DUDLEY**, Thomas, and the colony of Massachusetts Bay. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1629-1630, and after.

**DUFFERIN**, Lord.—The Indian Administration of. See INDIA: A. D. 1880-1888.

**DU GUESCLIN'S CAMPAIGNS**. See FRANCE: A. D. 1360-1380.

**DUKE, The Roman**.—Origin of the title. See COUNT AND DUKE.

**DUKE'S LAWS**, The. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1665.

**DULGIBINI AND CHASAURI**, The.—“These people [tribes of the ancient Germans] first resided near the head of the Lippe, and <sup>†</sup> were removed to the settlements of the Chamavi and the Angrevarii, who had expelled the Bructeri.”—Tacitus, *Germany*, ch. 34, *Oxford trans.*, note.—See, also, SAXONS.

**DUMBARTON**, Origin of. See ALCLYDE.

**DUMBARTON CASTLE**, Capture of (1571).—Dumbarton Castle, held by the party of Mary Queen of Scots, in the civil war which followed her deposition and detention in England, was captured in 1571, for the regent Lennox, by an extraordinary act of daring on the part of one Capt. Crawford.—P. F. Tytler, *Hist. of Scotland*, v. 3, ch. 10.

**DUMNONIA, OR DAMNONIA**, The kingdom of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 477-527.

**DUMNONII**, The.—“It is . . . a remarkable circumstance that the Dumnonii, whom we find in the time of Ptolemy occupying the whole of the southwestern extremity of Britain, including both Devonshire and Cornwall, and who must therefore have been one of the most powerful nations in the island, are never once mentioned in the history of the conquest of the country by the Romans; nor is their name found in any writer before Ptolemy. . . . The conjecture of Mr. Beale Poste . . . that they were left in nominal independence under a native king . . . appears to me highly probable.”—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 23, note B.—There appears to have been a northern branch of the Dumnonii or Damnonii, which held an extensive territory on the Clyde and the Forth. See BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.

**DUMOURIEZ**, Campaigns and treason of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1792 (SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER); 1792-1793; and 1793 (FEBRUARY—APRIL).

**DUNBAR**, A. D. 1296.—Battle. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1290-1305.

A. D. 1339.—Siege.—The fortress of Dunbar, besieged by the English under the Earl of Salisbury in 1339, was successfully defended in the absence of the governor, the Earl of March, by his wife, known afterwards in Scotch history and tradition as “Black Agnes of Dunbar.”

A. D. 1650.—Battle. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1650 (SEPTEMBER).

**DUNCAN I.**, King of Scotland, A. D. 1038-1039. . . . Duncan II., A. D. 1094-1095.

**DUNDALK**, Battle of (1318). See IRELAND: A. D. 1314-1318.

**DUNDEE (CLAVERHOUSE) AND THE COVENANTERS**. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1679 (MAY—JUNE); 1681-1689; and 1689 (JULY).

**DUNDEE**: A. D. 1645.—Pillaged by Montrose. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1644-1645.

A. D. 1651.—Storm and massacre by Monk. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1651 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER).

**DUNES**, Battle of the (1658). See ENGLAND: A. D. 1655-1658.

**DUNKELD**, Battle of. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1689 (AUGUST).

**DUNKIRK**: A. D. 1631.—Unsuccessful siege by the Dutch. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1621-1633.

A. D. 1646.—Siege and capture by the French.—Importance of the port.—Its harborage of pirates. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1645-1646.

A. D. 1652.—Recovered by the Spaniards. See FRANCE: A. D. 1652.

A. D. 1658.—Acquired by Cromwell for England. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1655-1658; and FRANCE: A. D. 1655-1658.

A. D. 1662.—Sold by Charles II. to France. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1662.

A. D. 1713.—Fortifications and harbor destroyed. See UTRECHT: A. D. 1712-1713.

A. D. 1748.—Demolition of fortifications again stipulated. See AIX-LA-CHAPELLE: THE CONGRESS.

A. D. 1763.—The demolition of fortifications pledged once more. See SEVEN YEARS WAR: THE TREATIES.

A. D. 1793.—Unsuccessful siege by the English. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (JULY—DECEMBER); PROGRESS OF THE WAR.

**DUNMORE**, Lord, and the end of royal government in Virginia. See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1775 (JUNE); and 1775-1776.

**DUNMORE'S WAR**. See OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1774.

**DUNNICHEN**, Battle of (A. D. 685). See SCOTLAND: 7TH CENTURY.

**DUPLEIX AND THE FRENCH IN INDIA**. See INDIA: A. D. 1743-1752.

**DUPONT**, Admiral Samuel F.—Naval attack on Charleston. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (APRIL: SOUTH CAROLINA).

**DÜPPEL**, Siege and capture of (1864). See GERMANY: A. D. 1861-1866.

**DUPPELN**, Battle of (1848). See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (DENMARK): A. D. 1848-1862.

**DUPPLIN MOOR**, Battle of (1332). See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1332-1333.

**DUQUESNE**, Fort. See PITTSBURGH.

**DURA**, Treaty of.—The humiliating treaty of peace concluded with the Persians, A. D. 363, after the defeat and death of the Roman emperor Julian, by his successor Jovian.—G. Rawlinson, *Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy* ch. 10.

**DURANEES, OR DOORANEES**, The. See INDIA: A. D. 1747-1761.

**DURAZZO**, Neapolitan dynasty of. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1343-1389; 1386-1414, and ITALY: A. D. 1412-1447.

**DURBAR, OR DARBAR**.—An audience-room in the palace of an East Indian prince. Hence applied to a formal audience or levee given by the governor-general of India, or by one of the native princes.—*Century Dictionary*.

**DURHAM, OR NEVILLE'S CROSS**, Battle of (A. D. 1346). See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1333-1370.

**DUROBRIVÆ.**—A name given to two Roman towns in Britain, one of which has been identified with modern Rochester, the other with the town of Castor, near Peterborough.

**DUROBRIVIAN WARE.** See **CASTOR WARE.**

**DUROCOBRIVÆ.**—An important market-town in Roman Britain, supposed to have been situated at or near modern Dunstable.—T. Wright, *Cat. Roman and Saxon*, ch. 5.

**DUOTRIGES.**—One of the tribes of ancient Britain whose home was in the modern county of Dorset. See **BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.**

**DUOVERNUM.**—A Roman town in Britain, identified with the modern Canterbury. Durovernum was destroyed by the Jutes in 455. See **ENGLAND**: A. D. 449-473.

**DUTCH EAST INDIA COMPANY.** See **EAST INDIA COMPANY, THE DUTCH.**

**DUTCH GAP CANAL.** See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1864 (AUGUST: VIRGINIA).

**DUTCH REPUBLIC, The constitution and declared independence of the.** See

**NETHERLANDS**: A. D. 1577-1581, and 1584-1585.

**DUTCH WEST INDIA COMPANY.** See **NEW YORK**: A. D. 1621-1646; and **BRAZIL**: A. D. 1510-1661.

**DÜTLINGEN, OR TUTTLINGEN, Battle of (1643).** See **GERMANY**: A. D. 1643-1644.

**DYAKS, OR DAYAKS, The.** See **MALAYAN RACE.**

**DYRRHACHIUM: The founding of.** See **KORRYVA.**

**Provoking cause of the Peloponnesian War.** See **GREECE**: B. C. 435-432.

**B. C. 48.—Cæsar's reverse.** See **ROME**: B. C. 48.

**A. D. 1081-1082.—Siege by Robert Guiscard.** See **BYZANTINE EMPIRE**: A. D. 10<sup>th</sup>-1085.

**A. D. 1204.—Acquired by the Despot of Epirus.** See **EPHROS**: A. D. 1204-1330.

**DYRRHACHIUM, Peace of.** See **GREECE**: B. C. 214-146.

**DYVED.** See **BRITAIN**: 6<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY.

## E.

**EADMUND, EADWINE, ETC.** See **EDMUND, ETC.**

**EALDORMAN.**—"The chieftains of the first settlers in our own island bore no higher title than Ealdorman or Heretoga. . . . The name of Ealdorman is one of a large class; among a primitive people age implies command and command implies age; hence in a somewhat later stage of language the elders are simply the rulers and the eldest are the highest in rank, without any thought of the number of years which they may really have lived. It is not perfectly clear in what the authority or dignity of the King exceeded that of the Ealdorman. . . .

Even the smallest Kingdom was probably formed by the union of the districts of several Ealdormen."—E. A. Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, ch. 3, sect. 1.—"The organisation of the shire was of much the same character as that of the hundred [each shire containing, however, a number of hundreds], but it was ruled by an ealdorman as well as by a gerefa, and in some other respects bore evidence of its previous existence as an independent unity. Its gemot was not only the scir-gemot but the fole-gemot also, the assembly of the people; its ealdorman commanded not merely the military force of the hundreds, but the lords of the franchises and the church vassals with their men. Its gerefa or sheriff collected the fiscal as well as the local imposts. Its ealdorman was one of the king's witas. The ealdorman, the princeps of Tacitus, and princeps, or satrapa, or subregulus of Bede, the dux of the Latin chroniclers and the comes of the Normans, was originally elected in the general assembly of the nation. . . . The hereditary principle appears however in the early days of the kingdom as well as in those of Edward the Confessor; in the case of an under-kingdom being annexed to a greater the old royal dynasty seems to have continued to hand down its delegated authority from father to son. The under-kings of Hwicca thus continued to act as ealdormen under Mercia for a century; and the ealdormanship of the Gyrrwas or fen-countrymen seems likewise to have been hereditary. The

title of ealdorman is thus much older than the existing division of shires, nor was it ever the rule for every shire to have an ealdorman to itself as it had its sheriff. . . . But each shire was under an ealdorman, who sat with the sheriff and bishop in the folkmoot, received a third part of the profits of the jurisdiction, and commanded the military force of the whole division. From the latter character he derived the name of heretoga, leader of the host ('hero'), or dux, which is occasionally given him in charters."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 5, sects. 48-49.

**EARL.**—"The title of earl had begun to supplant that of ealdorman in the reign of Ethelred; and the Danish jarl, from whom its use in this sense was borrowed, seems to have been more certainly connected by the tie of comitatus with his king than the Anglo-Saxon ealdorman need be supposed to have been."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 6, sect. 66.—See, also, **EARL AND EALDORMAN.**

**EARLDOMS, English: Canute's creation.** See **ENGLAND**: A. D. 1016-1042.

**The Norman change.** See **PALATINE, THE ENGLISH COUNTIES.**

**EARLY, General Jubal, Campaigns in the Shenandoah.** See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1864 (MAY-JUNE: VIRGINIA); (JULY: VIRGINIA—MARYLAND); (AUGUST—OCTOBER: VIRGINIA); and 1865 (FEBRUARY—MARCH: VIRGINIA).

**EARTHQUAKE: B. C. 464.—Sparta.** See **MESSENIAN WAR, THE THIRD.**

**A. D. 115.—At Antioch.** See **ANTIOCH**: A. D. 115.

**A. D. 365.—In the Roman world.**—"In the second year of the reign of Valentinian and Valens [A. D. 365], on the morning of the 21st day of July, the greater part of the Roman world was shaken by a violent and destructive earthquake. The impression was communicated to the waters; the shores of the Mediterranean were left dry by the sudden retreat of the sea. . . . But the tide soon returned with the weight

of an immense and irresistible deluge, which was severely felt on the coasts of Sicily, of Dalmatia, of Greece and of Egypt. . . . The city of Alexandria annually commemorated the fatal day on which 50,000 persons had lost their lives in the inundation."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 26.

A. D. 526.—In the reign of Justinian. See ANTIQ: A. D. 526; also, BERYTUS.

A. D. 1692.—In Jamaica. See JAMAICA: A. D. 1692.

A. D. 1755.—At Lisbon. See LISBON: A. D. 1755.

A. D. 1812.—In Venezuela. See COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1810-1819.

**EAST AFRICA ASSOCIATIONS, British and German.** See AFRICA: A. D. 1884-1889.

**EAST ANGLIA.**—The kingdom formed in Britain by that body of the Angles which settled in the eastern district now embraced in the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk (North-folk and South-folk).

**EAST INDIA COMPANY, The Dutch:** A. D. 1602.—Its formation and first enterprises. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1594-1620.

A. D. 1652.—Settlement at Cape of Good Hope. See SOUTH AFRICA: A. D. 1486-1806.

A. D. 1799.—Its dissolution. See FRANCE: A. D. 1799 (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER).

**EAST INDIA COMPANY, The English:** A. D. 1600-1702.—Its rise and early undertakings. See INDIA: A. D. 1600-1702.

A. D. 1773.—Constitution of the Company changed by the Acts of Lord North. See INDIA: A. D. 1770-1778.

A. D. 1813-1833.—Deprived of its monopoly of trade.—Reconstitution of government. See INDIA: A. D. 1823-1833.

A. D. 1858.—The end of its rule. See INDIA: A. D. 1858.

**EAST INDIA COMPANY, The French.** See INDIA: A. D. 1665-1743.

**EAST INDIES, Portuguese in the.** See INDIA: A. D. 1498-1580.

**EASTERN CHURCH, The.** See CHRISTIANITY: A. D. 330-1054.

**EASTERN EMPIRE, The.** See ROME: 717-800; and BYZANTINE EMPIRE.

**EASTERN QUESTION, The.**—"For a number of generations in Europe there has been one question that, carelessly or maliciously touched upon, has never failed to stimulate strife and discord among the nations. This is 'the Eastern Question,' the problem how to settle the disputes, political and religious, in the east of Europe."—H. Murdock, *The Reconstruction of Europe*, p. 17.—The first occasion in European politics on which the problems of the Ottoman empire received the name of the Eastern Question seems to have been that connected with the revolt of Mehemet Ali in 1831 (See TURKS: A. D. 1831-1840). M. Guizot, in his "Memoirs," when referring to that complication, employs the term, and remarks: "I say the Eastern Question, for this was in fact the name given by all the world to the quarrel between the Sultan Mahmoud, and his subject the Pacha of Egypt, Mehemet Ali. Why was this sounding title applied to a local contest? Egypt is not the whole Ottoman empire. The Ottoman empire is not the

entire East. The rebellion, even the dismemberment of a province, cannot comprise the fate of a sovereignty. The great states of Western Europe have alternately lost or acquired, either by internal dissension or war, considerable territories; yet under the aspect of these circumstances no one has spoken of the Western question. Why then has a term never used in the territorial crises of Christian Europe, been considered and admitted to be perfectly natural and legitimate when the Ottoman empire is in argument? It is that there is at present in the Ottoman empire no local or partial question. If a shock is felt in a corner of the edifice, if a single stone is detached, the entire building appears to be, and is in fact, ready to fall. . . . The Egyptian question was in 1839 the question of the Ottoman empire itself. And the question of the Ottoman empire is in reality the Eastern question, not only of the European but of the Asiatic East; for Asia is now the theatre of the leading ambitions and rivalries of the great powers of Europe; and the Ottoman empire is the highway, the gate, and the key of Asia."—F. P. Guizot, *Memoirs to Illustrate the History of My Own Time*, v. 4, p. 322.—The several occasions since 1840 on which the Eastern Question has troubled Europe may be found narrated under the following captions: RUSSIA: A. D. 1853-1854, to 1854-1855; TURKS: A. D. 1861-1877, 1877-1878, and 1878; also BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES.—Among English writers, the term "the Eastern Question" has acquired a larger meaning, which takes in questions connected with the advance of Russia upon the Afghan and Persian frontiers.—Duke of Argyll, *The Eastern Question*.—See AFGHANISTAN: A. D. 1859-1881.

**EATON, Dorman B., and Civil-Service Reform.** See CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM IN THE UNITED STATES.

**EBBSDORF, OR LUNEBURG HEATH, Battle of.**—A great and disastrous battle of the Germans with the Danes, or Northmen, fought Feb. 2, 880. The Germans were terribly beaten, and nearly all who survived the fight were swept away into captivity and slavery. The slain received "martyrs' honours; and their commemoration was celebrated in the Sachsen-land churches till comparatively recent times. An unexampled sorrow was created throughout Saxony by this calamity, which, for a time, exhausted the country;—Scandinavia and Jutland and the Baltic Isles resounded with exultation."—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and England*, bk. 1, ch. 4.

**EBBSFLEET.**—The supposed first landing-place in Britain of the Jutes, under Hengest, A. D. 449 or 450, when English history, as English, begins. It was also the landing-place, A. D. 597, of Augustine and his fellow missionaries when they entered the island to undertake the conversion of its new inhabitants to Christianity. Ebbsfleet is in the Isle of Thanet, at the mouth of the Thames. See ENGLAND: 449-473, and 597-685.

**EBERSBURG, Battle of.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1809 (JANUARY—JUNE).

**EBIONISM.**—The heresy (so branded) of a sect of Jewish Christians, which spread somewhat extensively in the second, third and fourth centuries. "The characteristic marks of Ebionism in all its forms are: degradation of Christianity to the level of Judaism; the principle of

the universal and perpetual validity of the Mosaic law; and emittion to the apostle Paul." The name of the Ebionites came from a Hebrew word signifying "poor."—P. Schaaf, *Hist. of the Christian Church, second period, ch. 4, sect. 68.*

**EBLANI, The.** See IRELAND, TRIBES OF EARLY CELTIC INHABITANTS.

**EBORACUM, OR EBURACUM.**—The military capital of Roman Britain, and afterwards of the Anglian kingdoms of Deira and Northumbria. In Old English its name became Eborfawick, whence, by further corruption, resulted the modern English name York. The city was one of considerable splendor in Roman times, containing the imperial palace with many temples and other imposing buildings. See ENGLAND: A. D. 457-633.

**EBURONES, Destruction of the.**—The Eburones were a strong Germanic tribe, who occupied in Cesar's time 'he country between Liège and Cologne, and whose ancestors were said to have formed part of the great migrant horde of the Cimbric and Teutones. Under a young chief, Ambiorix, they had taken the lead in the formidable revolt which occurred among the Belgic tribes, B. C. 54-53. Cesar, when he had suppressed the revolt, determined to bring destruction on the Eburones, and he executed his purpose in a singular manner. He circulated a proclamation through all the neighboring parts of Gaul and Germany, declaring the Eburones to be traitors to Rome and outlaws, and offering them and their goods as common prey to any who would fall on them. This drew the surrounding barbarians like vultures to a feast, and the wretched Eburones were soon hunted out of existence. Their name disappeared from the annals of Gaul.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch. 10.*

ALSO IN: Cesar, *Gallo Wars, bk. 5, ch. 25-58; bk. 8, ch. 1-84.*—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v. 4, ch. 13-14.*—See, also, BELGÆ.

**ECBATANA.**—"The Southern Ecbatana or Agbatana,—which the Medes and Persians themselves knew as Hagmatân,—was situated, as we learn from Polybius and Diodorus, on a plain at the foot of Mount Orontes, a little to the east of the Zagros range. The notices of these authors . . . and others, render it as nearly certain as possible that the site was that of the modern town of Hamadan. . . . The Median capitals have never yet attracted a scientific expedition. . . . The chief city of northern Media, which bore in later times the names of Gaze, Gazaca, or Canzaca, is thought to have been also called Ecbatana, and to have been occasionally mistaken by the Greeks for the southern or real capital."—G. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies: Media, ch. 1.*

**ECCELINO, OR EZZELINO DI ROMANO,** The tyranny of, and the crusade against. See VERONA: A. D. 1236-1259.

**ECCLESIA.**—The general legislative assembly of citizens in ancient Athens and Sparta.—G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State, pt. 8.*

ALSO IN: G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, ch. 31.*—See ATHENS: B. C. 445-429.

**ECCLESIASTICAL TITLES BILL, The.** See PAPACY: A. D. 1850.

**ECENI, OR ICENI, The.** See BRITAIN: A. D. 61.

**ECGBERHT, King of Wessex, A. D. 800-836.**

**ECKMÜHL, Battle of.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1809 (JANUARY-JUNE).

**ECNOMUS, Naval battle of (B. C. 256).** See PUNIC WAR, THE FIRST.

**ECORCHEURS, Les.**—In the later period of the Hundred Years War, after the death of the Maid of Orleans, when the English were being driven from France and the authority of the king was not yet established, lawless violence prevailed widely. "Adventurers spread themselves over the provinces under a name, 'the Skinners,' Les Ecorcheurs, which sufficiently betokens the savage nature of their outrages, if we trace it to even its mildest derivation, stripping shirts, not skins."—E. Smedley, *Hist. of France, pt. 1, ch. 14.*

**ECTHESIS OF HERACLIUS.** See MONOTHELITE CONTROVERSY.

**ÉCU, The order of the.** See BOURBON, THE HOUSE OF.

**ECUADOR: Aboriginal inhabitants.** See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ANDESANS.

**The aboriginal kingdom of Quito and its conquest by the Peruvians and the Spaniards.**

—"Of the old Quito nation which inhabited the highlands to the north and south of the present capital, nothing is known to tradition but the name of its last king, Quito, after whom his subjects were probably called. His domains were invaded and conquered by the nation of the Caras, or Carans, who had come by sea in balsas (rafts) from parts unknown. These Caras, or Carans, established the dynasty of the Seyris at Quito, and extended their conquests to the north and south, until checked by the warlike nation of the Puruhas, who inhabited the present district of Riobamba. . . . In the reign of Huacopco Duchicela, the 13th Seyri, the Peruvian Incas commenced to extend their conquests to the north. . . . About the middle of the 15th century the Inca Tupac Yupanqui, father of Huaynacapac, invaded the dominions of the Seyris, and after many bloody battles and sieges, conquered the kingdom of Puruha and returned in triumph to Cuzco. Huacopco survived his loss but a few years. He is said to have died of grief, and was succeeded by his son Cacha, the 15th and last of the Seyris. Cacha Duchicela at once set out to recover his paternal dominions. Although of feeble health, he seems to have been a man of energy and intrepidity. He fell upon the garrison which the Inca had left at Mocha, put it to the sword, and reoccupied the kingdom of Puruha, where he was received with open arms. He even carried his banners further south, until checked by the Cañares, the inhabitants of what is now the district of Cuenca, who had voluntarily submitted to the Inca, and now detained the Seyri until Huaynacapac, the greatest of the Inca dynasty, came to their rescue." On the plain of Tlocajas, and again on the plain of Hatuntaqui, great battles were fought, in both of which the Seyri was beaten, and in the last of which he fell. "On the very field of battle the faithful Caranquis proclaimed Pacha, the daughter of the fallen king, as their Seyri. Huaynacapac now regulated his conduct by policy. He ordered the dead king to be buried with all the honors due to royalty, and made offers of marriage to young Pacha, by whom he was not refused. . . . The issue of the marriage was Atahualpa, the last of the native rulers of Peru. . . . As prudent and highly politic as the con-



duct of Huaynacpac is generally reputed to have been, so imprudent and unpollitic was the division of the empire which he made on his death bed, bequeathing his paternal dominions to his first-born and undoubtedly legitimate son, Huascar, and to Atahualpa the kingdom of Quito. He might have foreseen the evil consequences of such a partition. His death took place about the year 1525. For five or seven years the brothers lived in peace." Then quarrels arose, leading to civil war, resulting in the defeat and death of Huascar. Atahualpa had just become master of the weakened and shaken empire of the Incas, when the invading Spaniards, under Pizarro, fell on the doomed land and made its riches their own. The conquest of the Spaniards did not include the kingdom of Quito at first, but was extended to the latter in 1533 by Sebastian de Benalcazar, whom Pizarro had put in command of the Port of San Miguel. Excited by stories of the riches of Quito, and invited by ambassadors from the Cañares, the old enemies of the Quito tribes, Benalcazar, "without orders or permission from Pizarro . . . left San Miguel, at the head of about 150 men. His second in command was the monster Juan de Ampudia." The fate of Quito was again decided on the plain of Tioajas, where Rumiñagui, a chief who had seized the vacant throne, made a desperate but vain resistance. He gained time, however, to remove whatever treasures there may have been at Quito beyond the reach of its rapacious conquerors, and "where he hid them is a secret to the present day. . . . Traditions of the great treasures hidden in the mountains by Rumiñagui are eagerly repeated and believed at Quito. . . . Having removed the gold and killed the Virgins of the Sun, and thus placed two objects so eagerly coveted by the invaders beyond their reach, Rumiñagui set fire to the town, and evacuated it with all his troops and followers. It would be difficult to describe the rage, mortification and despair of the Spaniards, on finding smoking ruins instead of the treasures which they had expected. . . . Thousands of innocent Indians were sacrificed to their disappointed cupidity. . . . Every nook and corner of the province was searched; but only in the sepulchres some little gold was found. . . . Of the ancient buildings of Quito no stone was left upon the other, and deep excavations were made under them to search for hidden treasures. Hence there is no vestige left at Quito of its former civilization; not a ruin, not a wall, not a stone to which the traditions of the past might cling. . . . On the 28th of August, 1534, the Spanish village of Quito [San Francisco de Quito] was founded."—F. Hassaurek, *Four Years among Spanish Americans*, ch. 16.

ALSO IN: W. H. Prescott, *Hist. of Cong. of Peru*, bk. 3, ch. 2 (v. 1), and ch. 9 (v. 2).

In the empire of the Incas. See PERU: THE EMPIRE OF THE INCAS.

A. D. 1542.—The Audiencia of Quito established. See AUDIENCIAS.

A. D. 1821-1854.—Emancipation of slaves. See COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1821-1854.

A. D. 1822-1888.—Confederated with New Granada and Venezuela in the Colombian Republic.—Dissolution of the Confederacy.—The rule of Flores.—In 1822 "the Province of Quito was incorporated into the Colombian Republic [see COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1819-1830]. It was now divided into three depart-

ments on the French system; and the southernmost of these received its name from the Equator (Ecuador) which passes through it. Shortly after Venezuela had declared itself independent of the Colombian Republic [1826—see, as above], the old province of Quito did the same, and placed its fortunes in the hands of one of Bolívar's lieutenants, named Flores. The name of Ecuador was now extended to all three departments. Flores exercised the chief authority for 15 years. The constitution limited the Presidency to four; but Flores made an arrangement with one of his lieutenants called Roca-Fuerte, by which they succeeded each other, the outgoing President becoming governor of Guayaquil. In 1843 Flores found himself strong enough to improve upon this system. He called a convention, which reformed the constitution in a reactionary sense, and named him dictator for ten years. In 1845 the liberal reaction had set all over Colombia; and it soon became too strong for Flores. Even his own supporters began to fail him, and he agreed to quit the country on being paid an indemnity of \$20,000." During the next 15 years Ecuador was troubled by the plots and attempts of Flores to regain his lost power. In 1860, with Peruvian help, he succeeded in placing one of his party, Dr. Moreno, in the presidency, and he, himself, became governor of Guayaquil. In August, 1875, Moreno was assassinated.—E. J. Payne, *Hist. of European Colonies*, pp. 251-252.—After the assassination of President Moreno, "the clergy succeeded in seating Dr. Antonio Barrero in the presidential chair by a peaceful and overwhelming election. . . . Against his government the liberal party made a revolution, and, September 8, 1876, succeeded in driving him from power, seating in his place General Ygnacio de Veintemilla, who was one of Barrero's officers, bound to him by many ties. . . . He called an obedient convention at Ambato, in 1878, which named him President ad interim, and framed a constitution, the republicanism of which it is difficult to find. Under this he was elected President for four years, terminating 30th August, 1882, without right of re-election except after an interval of four years."—G. E. Church, *Rept. on Ecuador (Senate Ex. Doc. 69, U. S. 47th Cong., 2d Sess., v. 3)*.—President Veintemilla seized power as a Dictator, by a pronouncement, April 2, 1882; but civil war ensued and he was overthrown in 1883. Senor José M. P. Caamaño was then chosen Provisional President, and in February, 1884, he was elected President, by the Legislative body. He was succeeded in 1888 by Don Antonio Flores.—*Statesman's Year-book*, 1889.

ECUMENICAL, OR ECUMENICAL COUNCIL.—A general or universal council of the Christian Church. See COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH.

EDDAS, The.—"The chief depositories of the Norse mythology are the Elder or Saemund's Edda (poetry) and the Younger or Snorre's Edda (prose). In Icelandic Edda means 'great-grandmother,' and some think this appellation refers to the ancient origin of the myths it contains. Others connect it with the Indian 'Veda' and the Norse 'vide,' (Swedish 'vela,' to know)." —R. B. Anderson, *Norse Mythology*, ch. 7.—"The word Edda is never found at all in any of the



dialects of the Old Northern tongue, nor indeed in any other tongue known to us. The first time it is met with is in the Lay of Rígh, where it is used as a title for great-grandmother, and from this poem the word is cited (with other terms from the same source) in the collection at the end of *Scaldskaparmál*. How or why Snorri's book on the Poetic Art came to be called Edda we have no actual testimony. . . . Snorri's work, especially the second part of it, *Scaldskaparmál*, handed down in copies and abridgments through the Middle Ages, was looked on as setting the standard and ideal of poetry. It seems to have kept up indeed the very remembrance of court-poetry, the memory of which, but for it, would otherwise have perished. But though the mediæval poets do not copy Edda (i. e., Snorri's rules) they constantly allude to it, and we have an unbroken series of phrases from 1340 to 1640 in which Edda is used as a synonym for the technical laws of the court-metre (a use, it may be observed, entirely contrary to that of our own days).—G. Vigfusson and F. Y. Powell, *Corpus Poeticum Boreale*, v. 1, *introd.*, sect. 4.

**EDDESSA (Macedonia).**—Edessa, or *Ægæ*, the ancient Macedonian capital, "a place of primitive antiquity, according to a Phrygian legend the site of the gardens of Midas, at the northern extremity of Mount Bermius, where the Lydians comes forth from the mountains. . . . *Ægæ* was the natural capital of the land. With its foundation the history of Macedonia had its beginning; *Ægæ* is the germ out of which the Macedonian empire grew."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, bk. 7, ch. 1.—See, also, MACEDONIA.

**EDDESSA (Mesopotamia).** See OSRIGENE.

**The Church.** See CHRISTIANITY: A. D. 33-100, and 100-312.

**The Theological School.** See NESTORIANS.

**A. D. 260.**—Battle of. See PERSIA: A. D. 220-327.

**A. D. 1097-1144.**—The Frank principality.—On the march of the armies of the First Crusade, as they approached Syria, Baldwin, the able, selfish and self-willed brother of Godfrey of Bouillon, left the main body of the crusaders, with a band of followers, and moved off eastwards, seeking the prizes of a very worldly ambition, and leaving his devoted comrades to rescue the holy sepulchre without his aid. Good fortune rewarded his enterprise and he secured possession of the important city of Edessa. It was governed by a Greek prince, who owed allegiance to the Byzantine emperor, but who paid tribute to the Turks. "It had surrendered to Pouzan, one of the generals of Malek-shah, in the year 1087, but during the contests of the Turks and Saracens in the north of Syria it had recovered its independence. Baldwin now sullied the honour of the Franks, by exciting the people to murder their governor Theodore, and rebel against the Byzantine authority [other historians say that he was guilty of no more than a passive permission of these acts]; he then took possession of the place in his own name and founded the Frank principality of Edessa, which lasted about 47 years."—G. Finlay, *Hist. of Byzantine and Greek Empires*, A. D. 716-1453, bk. 3, ch. 2, sect. 1.—See, also, CRUSADES: A. D. 1096-1099, and 1147-1149; also, JERUSALEM: A. D. 1099-1144.

**EDGAR, King of Scotland,** A. D. 1098-1107.

.... **Edgar, King of Wessex,** A. D. 958-975.

**EDGE COTE, Battle of.** See BANBURY, BATTLE OF.

**EDGEHILL OR KEYNTON, Battle of.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1642 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER).

**EDHEL.** See ADEL.

**EDHILING, OR ÆDHILING, The.** See ETHELING.

**EDICT OF NANTES, and its revocation.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1598-1599, and 1681-1698.

**EDICT OF RESTITUTION, The.** See GERMANY: A. D. 1627-1629.

**EDICTS, Roman imperial.** See CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS.

**EDINBURGH: Origin of the city.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 547-633.

**11th Century.**—Made the capital of Scotland. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1066-1093.

**A. D. 1544.**—Destroyed by the English. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1544-1548.

**A. D. 1559-1560.**—Seized by the Lords of the Congregation.—The Treaty of July, 1560. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1558-1560.

**A. D. 1572-1573.**—In the civil war. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1570-1573.

**A. D. 1637.**—Laud's Liturgy and the tumult at St. Giles'. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1637.

**A. D. 1638.**—The signing of the National Covenant. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1638.

**A. D. 1650.**—Surrender to Cromwell.—Siege and reduction of the Castle. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1650 (SEPTEMBER); and 1651 (AUGUST).

**A. D. 1688.**—Rioting and revolution. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1688-1690.

**A. D. 1707.**—The city at the time of the union.—"Edinburgh, though still but a small town, excited the admiration of travellers who were acquainted with the greatest cities of England and the Continent; nor was their admiration entirely due to the singular beauty of its situation. The quaint architecture of the older houses—which sometimes rose to the height of nine, ten or eleven stories—indeed, carried back the mind to very barbarous times; for it was ascribed to the desire of the population to live as near as possible to the protection of the castle. The filth of the streets in the early years of the 18th century was indescribable. . . . The new quarter, which now strikes every stranger by its spacious symmetry, was not begun till the latter half of the 18th century, but as early as 1723 an English traveller described the High Street as 'the stateliest street in the world'. . . . Under the influence of the Kirk the public manners of the town were marked by much decorum and even austerity, but the populace were unusually susceptible of fierce political enthusiasm, and when excited they were extremely formidable. . . . A city guard, composed chiefly of fierce Highlanders, armed and disciplined like regular soldiers, and placed under the control of the magistrates, was established in 1696; and it was not finally abolished till the present century. Edinburgh, at the beginning of the 18th century, was more than twice as large as any other Scotch town. Its population at the time of the union slightly exceeded 30,000, while that of Glasgow was not quite 15,000, that of Dundee not quite 10,000, and that of Perth about 7,000."—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng. in the 18th Century*, ch. 5 (v. 2).

**A. D. 1736.—The Porteous Riot.**—"The circumstances of the Porteous Riot are familiar wherever the English tongue is spoken, because they were made the dramatic opening of one of his finest stories by that admirable genius who, like Shakespeare in his plays, has conveyed to plain men more of the spirit and action of the past in noble fiction, than they would find in most professed chronicles of fact. The early scenes of the 'Heart of Midlothian' are an accurate account of the transaction which gave so much trouble to Queen Caroline and the minister [Walpole]. A smuggler who had excited the popular imagination by his daring and his chivalry was sentenced to be hanged; after his execution the mob pressed forward to cut down his body: Porteous, the captain of the City Guard, ordered his men to fire, and several persons were shot dead: he was tried for murder, convicted, and sentenced, but at the last moment a reprieve arrived from London, to the intense indignation of a crowd thirsting for vengeance: four days later, under mysterious ring-leaders who could never afterwards be discovered, fierce throngs suddenly gathered together at nightfall to the beat of drum, broke into the prison, dragged out the unhappy Porteous, and sternly hanged him on a dyer's pole close by the common place of public execution."—J. Morley, *Walpole*, ch. 9.

ALSO IN: J. McCarthy, *Hist. of the Four Georges*, ch. 24 (v. 2).

**A. D. 1745.—The Young Pretender in the city.** See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1745-1746.

**A. D. 1779.—No-Popery riots.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1778-1780.

**EDINGTON, OR ETHANDUN, Battle of** (A. D. 878). See ENGLAND: A. D. 855-880.

**EDMUND, King of Wessex, A. D. 940-947.**  
... Edmund Ironside, King of Wessex, A. D. 1016.

**EDOMITES, OR IDUMEANS, The.**—"From a very early period the Edomites were the chief of the nations of Arabia Petrea. Amongst the branches sprung, according to Arab tradition, from the primitive Amalika they correspond to the Arcam, and the posterity of Esau, after settling amongst them as we have seen, became the dominant family from which the chiefs were chosen. The original habitation of the Edomites was Mount Seir, whence they spread over all the country called by the Greeks Gebulene, that is the prolongation of the mountains joining on the north the land of Moab into the Valley of Arabia, and the surrounding heights. . . . Saul successfully fought the Edomites; under David, Joab and Abishai, his generals, completely defeated them, and David placed garrisons in their towns. In their ports of Elath and Ezlongeber were built the fleets sent to India by Hiram and Solomon. . . . After the schism of the ten tribes, the Edomites remained dependent on the King of Judah."—F. Lenormant, *Manual of Ancient Hist. of the East*, bk. 7, ch. 4.—See, also, NABATHEANS; JEWS: THE EARLY HEBREW HISTORY; and AMALEKITES.

**EDRED, King of Wessex, A. D. 947-955.**

**EDRISITES, The.**—After the revolt of Moorish or Mahometan Spain from the caliphate of Bagdad, the African provinces of the Moslems assumed independence, and several dynasties became seated—among them that of the Edrisites, which founded the city and kingdom of Fez, and which reigned from A. D. 829 to 907.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Emp.*, ch. 52.—See, also, MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 715-750.

## EDUCATION.

### Ancient.

**Egypt.**—"In the education of youth [the Egyptians] were particularly strict; and 'they knew,' says Plato, 'that children ought to be early accustomed to such gestures, looks, and motions as are decent and proper; and not to be suffered either to hear or learn any verses and songs other than those which are calculated to inspire them with virtue; and they consequently took care that every dance and ode introduced at their feasts or sacrifices should be subject to certain regulations.'"—Sir J. G. Wilkinson, *The Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, v. 1, p. 321.—"The children were educated according to their station and their future position in life. They were kept in strict subjection by their parents, and respect to old age was particularly inculcated; the children of the priests were educated very thoroughly in writing of all kinds, hieroglyphic, hieratic, and demotic, and in the sciences of astronomy, mathematics, etc. The Jewish deliverer Moses was educated after the manner of the priests, and the 'wisdom of the Egyptians' became a proverbial expression among the outside nations, as indicating the utmost limit of human knowledge."—E. A. W. Budge, *The Dwellers on the Nile*, ch. 10.—"On the education of the Egyptians, Diodorus makes the following remarks:—"The children of the

priests are taught two different kinds of writing, — what is called the sacred, and the more general; and they pay great attention to geometry and arithmetic. For the river, changing the appearance of the country very materially every year, is the cause of many and various discussions among neighbouring proprietors about the extent of their property; and it would be difficult for any person to decide upon their claims without geometrical reasoning, founded on actual observation. Of arithmetic they have also frequent need, both in their domestic economy, and in the application of geometrical theorems, besides its utility in the cultivation of astronomical studies; for the orders and motions of the stars are observed at least as industriously by the Egyptians as by any people whatever; and they keep record of the motions of each for an incredible number of years, the study of this science having been, from the remotest times, an object of national ambition with them. . . . But the generality of the common people learn only from their parents or relations that which is required for the exercise of their peculiar professions, . . . a few only being taught anything of literature, and those principally the better class of artificers.' Hence it appears they were not confined to any particular rules in the mode of educating their children, and it depended upon a parent to choose

the degree of instruction he deemed most suitable to their mode of life and occupations, as among other civilised nations."—Sir J. G. Wilkinson, *The Manners and Customs of the Egyptians*, v. 1, pp. 175–176.—“There is nothing like being a scribe,’ the wise say; ‘the scribe gets all that is upon earth.’ . . . The scribe is simply a man who knows how to read and write, to draw up administrative formulas, and to calculate interest. The instruction which he has received is a necessary complement of his position if he belongs to a good family, whilst if he be poor it enables him to obtain a lucrative situation in the administration or at the house of a wealthy personage. There is, therefore, no sacrifice which the smaller folk deem too great, if it enables them to give their sons the acquirements which may raise them above the common people, or at least insure a less miserable fate. If one of them, in his infancy, displays any intelligence, they send him, when about six or eight years old, to the district school, where an old pedagogue teaches him the rudiments of reading, writing, and arithmetic. Towards ten or twelve years old, they withdraw him from the care of this first teacher and apprentice him to a scribe in some office, who undertakes to make him a ‘learned scribe.’ The child accompanies his master to his office or work-yard, and there passes entire months in copying letters, circulars, legal documents, or accounts, which he does not at first understand, but which he faithfully remembers. There are books for his use full of copies taken from well-known authors, which he studies perpetually. If he requires a brief, precise report, this is how Ennana worded one of his:—‘I reached Elephantine and accomplished my mission. I reviewed the infantry and the chariot soldiers from the temples, as well as the servants and subordinates who are in the houses of Pharaoh’s . . . officials. As my journey is for the purpose of making a report in the presence of his Majesty, . . . the course of my business is as rapid as that of the Nile; you need not, therefore, feel anxious about me.’ There is not a superfluous word. If, on the other hand, a petition in a poetical style be required, see how Pentouit asked for a holiday. ‘My heart has left me, it is travelling and does not know how to return, it sees Memphis and hastens there. Would that I were in its place. I remain here, busy following my heart, which endeavours to draw me towards Memphis. I have no work in hand, my heart is tormented. May it please the god Ptah to lead me to Memphis, and do thou grant that I may be seen walking there. I am at leisure, my heart is watching, my heart is no longer in my bosom, languor has seized my limbs; my eye is dim, my ear hardened, my voice feeble, it is a failure of all my strength. I pray thee remedy all this.’ The pupil copies and recopies, the master inserts forgotten words, corrects the faults of spelling, and draws on the margin the signs or groups unskillfully traced. When the book is duly finished and the apprentice can write all the formulas from memory, portions of phrases are detached from them, which he must join together, so as to combine new formulas; the master then entrusts him with the composition of a few letters, gradually increasing the number and adding to the difficulties. As soon as he has fairly mastered the ordinary daily routine his education is ended,

and an unimportant post is sought for. He obtains it and then marries, becoming the head of a family, sometimes before he is twenty years old; he has no further ambition, but is content to vegetate quietly in the obscure circle where fate has thrown him.”—G. Maspero, *Life in Ancient Egypt and Assyria*, ch. 1.—“In the schools, where the poor scribe’s child sat on the same bench beside the offspring of the rich, to be trained in discipline and wise learning, the masters knew how by timely words to goad on the lagging diligence of the ambitious scholars, by holding out to them the future reward which awaited youths skilled in knowledge and letters. Thus the slumbering spark of self-esteem was stirred to a flame in the youthful breast, and emulation was stimulated among the boys. The clever son of the poor man, too, might hope by his knowledge to climb the ladder of the higher classes, for neither his birth nor position raised any barrier, if only the youth’s mental power justified fair hopes for the future. In this sense, the restraints of caste did not exist, and neither descent nor family hampered the rising career of the clever. Many a monument consecrated to the memory of some nobleman gone to his long home, who during life had held high rank at the court of Pharaoh, is decorated with the simple but laudatory inscription, ‘His ancestors were unknown people.’ It is a satisfaction to avow that the training and instruction of the young interested the Egyptians in the highest degree. For they fully recognised in this the sole means of cultivating their national life, and of fulfilling the high civilizing mission which Providence seemed to have placed in their hands. But above all things they regarded justice, and virtue had the highest price in their eyes.”—H. Brugsch-Bey, *Hist. of Egypt under the Pharaohs*, v. 1, p. 22.

**Babylonia and Assyria.**—“The primitive Chaldeans were pre-eminently a literary people, and it is by their literary relics, by the scattered contents of their libraries, that we can know and judge them. As befitted the inventors of a system of writing, like the Chinese they set the highest value on education, even though examinations may have been unknown among them. Education, however, was widely diffused. . . . Assur-bani-pul’s library was open to the use and enjoyment of all his subjects, and the syllabaries, grammars, lexicons, and reading-books that it contained, show the extent to which not only their own language was studied by the Assyrians, but the dead language of ancient Accad as well. It became as fashionable to compose in this extinct tongue as it is now-a-days to display one’s proficiency in Latin prose, and ‘dog-Accadian’ was perpetrated with as little remorse as ‘dog-Latin’ at the present time. One of the Babylonian cylinders found by General di Cesnola in the temple-treasure of Kurium, which probably belongs to the period of Nebuchadnezzar’s dynasty, has a legend which endeavours to imitate the inscriptions of the early Accadian princes; but the very first word, by an unhappy error, betrays the insufficient knowledge of the old language possessed by its composer. Besides a knowledge of Accadian, the educated Assyrian was required to have also a knowledge of Aramaic, which had now become the ‘lingua franca’ of trade and diplomacy; and we find the Rabshakel (Rab-sakki), or prime minister, who was

sent against Hezekiah by Sennacherib, acquainted with Hebrew as well. The grammatical and lexical works in the library of Nineveh are especially interesting, as being the earliest attempts of the kind of which we know, and it is curious to find the Hamiltonian method of learning languages forestalled by the scribes of Assurbani-pal. In this case, as in all others, the first enquiries into the nature of speech, and the first grammars and dictionaries, were due to the necessity of comparing two languages together; it was the Accadian which forced the Semitic Assyrian or Babylonian to study his own tongue. And already in these first efforts the main principles of Semitic grammar are laid down clearly and definitely."—A. H. Sayce, *Babylonian Literature*, pp. 71-72.—"The Babylonians were the Chinese of the ancient world. They were essentially a reading and writing people. . . . The books were for the most part written upon clay with a wooden reed or metal stylus, for clay was cheap and plentiful, and easily impressed with the wedge-shaped lines of which the characters were composed. But besides clay, papyrus and possibly also parchment were employed as writing materials. . . . The use of clay for writing purposes extended, along with Babylonian culture, to the neighbouring populations of the East. . . . It is astonishing how much matter can be compressed into the compass of a single tablet. The cuneiform system of writing allowed the use of many abbreviations—thanks to its 'ideographic' nature—and the characters were frequently of a very minute size. Indeed, so minute is the writing on many of the Assyrian (as distinguished from the Babylonian) tablets that it is clear not only that the Assyrian scribes and readers must have been decidedly short-sighted, but also that they must have made use of magnifying glasses. We need not be surprised, therefore, to learn that Sir A. H. Layard discovered a crystal lens, which had been turned on a lathe, upon the site of the great library of Nineveh. . . . To learn the cuneiform syllabary was a task of much time and labour. The student was accordingly provided with various means of assistance. The characters of the syllabary were classified and named; they were further arranged according to a certain order, which partly depended on the number of wedges or lines of which each was composed. Moreover, what we may term dictionaries were compiled. . . . To learn the signs, however, with their multitudinous phonetic values and ideographic significations, was not the whole of the labour which the Babylonian boy had to accomplish. The cuneiform system of writing, along with the culture which had produced it, had been the invention of the non-Semitic Accado-Sumerian race, from whom it had been borrowed by the Semites. In Semitic hands the syllabary underwent further modifications and additions, but it bore upon it to the last the stamp of its alien origin. On this account alone, therefore, the Babylonian student who wished to acquire a knowledge of reading and writing was obliged to learn the extinct language of the older population of the country. There was, however, another reason which even more imperatively obliged him to study the earlier tongue. A large proportion of the ancient literature, more especially that which related to religious subjects, was written in Accado-Sumerian. Ever the law-cases of earlier times,

which formed precedents for the law of a later age, were in the same language. In fact, Accado-Sumerian stood in much the same relation to the Semitic Babylonians that Latin has stood to the modern inhabitants of Europe. . . . Besides learning the syllabary, therefore, the Babylonian boy had to learn the extinct language of Accad and Sumer. . . . The study of foreign tongues naturally brought with it an inquisitiveness about the languages of other people, as well as a passion for etymology. . . . But there were other things besides languages which the young student in the schools of Babylonia and Assyria was called upon to learn. Geography, history, the names and nature of plants, birds, animals, and stones, as well as the elements of law and religion, were all objects of instruction. The British Museum possesses what may be called the historical exercise of some Babylonian lad in the age of Nebuchadnezzar or Cyrus, consisting of a list of the kings belonging to one of the early dynasties, which he had been required to learn by heart. . . . A considerable proportion of the inhabitants of Babylonia could read and write. The contract tablets are written in a variety of running hands, some of which are as bad as the worst that passes through the modern post. Every legal document required the signatures of a number of witnesses, and most of these were able to write their own names. . . . In Assyria, however, education was by no means so widely spread. Apart from the upper and professional classes, including the men of business, it was confined to a special body of men—the public scribes. . . . There was none of that jealous exclusion of women in ancient Babylonia which characterizes the East of today, and it is probable that boys and girls pursued their studies at the same schools. The education of a child must have begun early."—A. H. Sayce, *Social Life among the Babylonians*, ch. 3.

**China.**—"It is not, perhaps, generally known that Peking contains an ancient university; for, though certain buildings connected with it have been frequently described, the institution itself has been but little noticed. It gives, indeed, so few signs of life that it is not surprising it should be overlooked. . . . If a local situation be deemed an essential element of identity, this old university must yield the palm of age to many in Europe, for in its present site it dates, at most, only from the Yuen, or Mongol, dynasty, in the beginning of the fourteenth century. But as an imperial institution, having a fixed organization and definite objects, it carries its history, or at least its pedigree, back to a period far anterior to the founding of the Great Wall. Among the Regulations of the House of Chow, which flourished a thousand years before the Christian era, we meet with it already in full-blown vigor, and under the identical name which it now bears, that of Kwotzekien, or 'School for the Sons of the Empire.' It was in its glory before the light of science dawned on Greece, and when Pythagoras and Plato were pumping their secrets from the priests of Heliopolis. And it still exists, but it is only an embodiment of 'life in death': its halls are toms, and its officers living mummies. In the 13th Book of the Chowle (see Rites de Techeou, traduction par Édouard Biot), we find the functions of the heads of the Kwotzekien laid down with a good deal of minuteness. The presidents were to

admonish the Emperor of that which is good and just, and to instruct the Sons of the State in the 'three constant virtues' and the 'three practical duties'—in other words, to give a course of lectures on moral philosophy. The vice-presidents were to reprove the Emperor for his faults (i. e., to perform the duty of official censors) and to discipline 'the Sons of the State in the sciences and arts'—viz., in arithmetic, writing, music, archery, horsemanship and ritual ceremonies. . . . The old curriculum is religiously adhered to, but greater latitude is given, as we shall have occasion to observe, to the term 'Sons of the State.' In the days of Chow, this meant the heir-apparent, princes of the blood, and children of the nobility. Under the T'ang dynasty it signifies men of defective scholarship throughout the provinces, who purchase literary degrees, and more specifically certain indigent students of Peking, who are aided by the imperial bounty. The Kwotzekien is located in the northeastern angle of the Tartar city, with a temple of Confucius attached, which is one of the finest in the Empire. The main edifice (that of the temple) consists of a single story of imposing height, with a porcelain roof of tent-like curvature. . . . It contains no seats, as all comers are expected to stand or kneel in presence of the Great Teacher. Neither does it boast anything in the way of artistic decoration, nor exhibit any trace of that neatness and taste which we look for in a sacred place. Perhaps its vast area is designedly left to dust and emptiness, in order that nothing may intervene to disturb the mind in the contemplation of a great name which receives the homage of a nation. . . . In an adjacent block or square stands a pavilion known as the 'Imperial Lecture-room,' because it is incumbent on each occupant of the Dragon throne to go there at least once in his life-time to hear a discourse on the nature and responsibilities of his office. . . . A canal spanned by marble bridges encircles the pavilion, and arches of glittering porcelain, in excellent repair, adorn the grounds. But neither these nor the pavilion itself constitutes the chief attraction of the place. Under a long corridor which encloses the entire space may be seen as many as one hundred and eighty-two columns of massive granite, each inscribed with a portion of the canonical books. These are the 'Stone Classics'—the entire 'Thirteen,' which formed the staple of a Chinese education, being here enshrined in a material supposed to be imperishable. Among all the Universities in the world, the Kwotzekien is unique in the possession of such a library. This is not, indeed, the only stone library extant—another of equal extent being found at Singanfu, the ancient capital of the T'angs. But, that too, was the property of the Kwotzekien ten centuries ago, when Singan was the seat of empire. The 'School for the Sons of the Empire' must needs follow the migrations of the court; and that library, costly as it was, being too heavy for transportation, it was thought best to supply its place by the new edition which we have been describing. . . . In front of the temple stands a forest of columns of scarcely inferior interest. They are three hundred and twenty in number, and contain the university roll of honor, a complete list of all who since the founding of the institution have attained to the dignity of the doctorate. Allow to each an average of two hundred names, and we have an army of doctors sixty thousand strong! (By the

doctorate I mean the third or highest degree.) All these received their investiture at the Kwotzekien, and, throwing themselves at the feet of its president, enrolled themselves among the 'Sons of the Empire.' They were not, however—at least the most of them were not—in any proper sense alumni of the Kwotzekien, having pursued their studies in private, and won their honors by public competition in the halls of the Civil-service Examining Board. . . . There is an immense area occupied by lecture-rooms, examination-halls and lodging-apartments. But the visitor is liable to imagine that these, too, are consecrated to a monumental use—so rarely is a student or a professor to be seen among them. Ordinarily they are as desolate as the halls of Baulbec or Pulmyra. In fact, this great school for the 'Sons of the Empire' has long ceased to be a seat of instruction, and degenerated into a mere appendage of the civil-service competitive examinations on which it hangs as a dead weight, corrupting and debasing instead of advancing the standard of national education."—W. A. P. Martin, *The Chinese, their Education, Philosophy and Letters*, pp. 85-90.

**Persia.**—"All the best authorities are agreed that great pains were taken by the Persians—or, at any rate, by those of the leading clans—in the education of their sons. During the first five years of his life the boy remained wholly with the women, and was scarcely, if at all, seen by his father. After that time his training commenced. He was expected to rise before dawn, and to appear at a certain spot, where he was exercised with other boys of his age in running, slinging stones, shooting with the bow, and throwing the javelin. At seven he was taught to ride, and soon afterward he was allowed to begin to hunt. The riding included, not only the ordinary management of the horse, but the power of jumping on and off his back when he was at speed, and of shooting with the bow and throwing the javelin with unerring aim, while the horse was still at full gallop. The hunting was conducted by state-officers, who aimed at forming by its means in the youths committed to their charge all the qualities needed in war. The boys were made to bear extremes of heat and cold, to perform long marches, to cross rivers without wetting their weapons, to sleep in the open air at night, to be content with a single meal in two days, and to support themselves occasionally on the wild products of the country, acorns, wild pears and the fruit of the terebinth-tree. On days when there was no hunting they passed their mornings in athletic exercises, and contests with the bow or the javelin, after which they dined simply on the plain food mentioned above as that of the men in the early times, and then employed themselves during the afternoon in occupations regarded as not illiberal—for instance, in the pursuits of agriculture, planting, digging for roots, and the like, or in the construction of arms and hunting implements, such as nets and springs. Hardy and temperate habits being secured by this training, the point of morals on which their preceptors mainly insisted was the rigid observance of truth. Of intellectual education they had but little. It seems to have been no part of the regular training of a Persian youth that he should learn to read. He was given religious notions and a certain amount of moral knowledge by means of legendary

poems, in which the deeds of gods and heroes were set before him by his teachers, who recited or sung them in his presence, and afterwards required him to repeat what he had heard, or, at any rate, to give some account of it. This education continued for fifteen years, commencing when the boy was five, and terminating when he reached the age of twenty. The effect of this training was to render the Persian an excellent soldier and a most accomplished horseman. . . . At fifteen years of age the Persian was considered to have attained to manhood, and was enrolled in the ranks of the army, continuing liable to military service from that time till he reached the age of fifty. Those of the highest rank became the body-guard of the king, and these formed the garrison of the capital. . . . Others, though liable to military service, did not adopt arms as their profession, but attached themselves to the Court and looked to civil employment, as satraps, secretaries, attendants, ushers, judges, inspectors, messengers. . . . For trade and commerce the Persians were wont to express extreme contempt."—G. Rawlinson, *The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World*, v. 3, pp. 238-242.—After the death of Cyrus, according to Xenophon, the Persians degenerated, in the education of their youth and otherwise. "To educate the youth at the gates of the palace is still the custom," he says; "but the attainment and practice of horsemanship are extinct, because they do not go where they can gain applause by exhibiting skill in that exercise. Whereas, too, in former times, the boys, hearing causes justly decided there, were considered by that means to learn justice, that custom is altogether altered; for they now see those gain their causes who offer the highest bribes. Formerly, also, boys were taught the virtues of the various productions of the earth, in order that they might use the serviceable, and avoid the noxious; but now they seem to be taught those particulars that they may do as much harm as possible; at least there are nowhere so many killed or injured by poison as in that country."—Xenophon, *Cyropaedia and Hellenics*; trans. by J. S. Watson and H. Dale, pp. 284-285.

**Judæa.**—"According to the statement of Josephus, Moses had already prescribed 'that boys should learn the most important laws, because that is the best knowledge and the cause of prosperity.' 'He commanded to instruct children in the elements of knowledge (reading and writing), to teach them to walk according to the laws, and to know the deeds of their forefathers. The latter, that they might imitate them; the former, that growing up with the laws they might not transgress them, nor have the excuse of ignorance.' Josephus repeatedly commends the zeal with which the instruction of the young was carried on. 'We take most pains of all with the instruction of children, and esteem the observance of the laws and the piety corresponding with them the most important affair of our whole life.' 'If any one should question one of us concerning the laws, he would more easily repeat all than his own name. Since we learn them from our first consciousness, we have them, as it were, engraven on our souls; and a transgression is rare, but the averting of punishment impossible.' In like manner does Philo express himself: 'Since the Jews esteem their laws as divine revelations, and are instructed in the knowledge of

them from their earliest youth, they bear the image of the law in their souls.' . . . In view of all this testimony it cannot be doubted, that in the circles of genuine Judaism boys were from their tenderest childhood made acquainted with the demands of the law. That this education in the law was, in the first place, the duty and task of parents is self-evident. But it appears, that even in the age of Christ, care was also taken for the instruction of youth by the erection of schools on the part of the community. . . . The later tradition that Joshua ben Gamla (Jesus the son of Gamaliel) enacted that teachers of boys . . . should be appointed in every province and in every town, and that children of the age of six or seven should be brought to them, is by no means incredible. The only Jesus the son of Gamaliel known to history is the high priest of that name, about 63-65 after Christ. . . . It must therefore be he who is intended in the above notice. As his measures presuppose a somewhat longer existence of boys' schools, we may without hesitation transfer them to the age of Christ, even though not as a general and established institution. The subject of instruction, as already appears from the above passages of Josephus and Philo, was as good as exclusively the law. For only its inculcation in the youthful mind, and not the means of general education, was the aim of all this zeal for the instruction of youth. And indeed the earliest instruction was in the reading and inculcation of the text of scripture. . . . Habitual practice went hand in hand with theoretical instruction. For though children were not actually bound to fulfil the law, they were yet accustomed to it from their youth up."—E. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ*, v. 2, pp. 47-50.

—In the fourth century B. C. the Council of Seventy Elders "instituted regularly appointed readings from the Law; on every sabbath and on every week day a portion from the Pentateuch was to be read to the assembled congregation. Twice a week, when the country people came up from the villages to market in the neighbouring towns, or to appeal at the courts of justice, some verses of the Pentateuch, however few, were read publicly. At first only the learned were allowed to read, but at last it was looked upon as so great an honour to belong to the readers, that every one attempted or desired to do so. Unfortunately the characters in which the Torah was written were hardly readable. Until that date the text of the Torah had been written in the ancient style with Phœnician or old Babylonian characters, which could only be deciphered by practised scribes. . . . From the constant reading of the Law, there arose among the Judæans an intellectual activity and vigour, which at last gave a special character to the whole nation. The Torah became their spiritual and intellectual property, and their own inner sanctuary. At this time there sprang up other important institutions, namely, schools, where the young men could stimulate their ardour and increase their knowledge of the Law and its teachings. The intellectual leaders of the people continually enjoined on the rising generation, 'Bring up a great many disciples.' And what they enjoined so strenuously they themselves must have assisted to accomplish. One of these religious schools (Beth-Waad) was probably established in Jerusalem. The teach-

ers were called scribes (sopherim) or wise men; the disciples, pupils of the wise (Talmude Chachamin). The wise men or scribes had a twofold work; on the one hand they had to explain the Torah, and on the other, to make the laws applicable to each individual and to the community at large. This supplementary interpretation was called 'explanation' (Midrash); it was not altogether arbitrary, but rested upon certain rules laid down for the proper interpretation of the law. The supreme council and the houses of learning worked together, and one completed the other. A hardly perceptible, but most important movement was the result; for the descendants of the Judæans of that age were endowed with a characteristic, which they might otherwise have claimed as inborn, the talent for research and the intellectual penetration, needed for turning and returning words and data, in order to discover some new and hidden meaning."—H. Graetz, *Hist. of the Jews*, v. 1, ch. 20.

—**Schools of the Prophets.**—"In his [Samuel's] time we first hear of what in modern phraseology are called the Schools of the Prophets. Whatever be the precise meaning of the peculiar word, which now came first into use as the designation of these companies, it is evident that their immediate mission consisted in uttering religious hymns or songs, accompanied by musical instruments—psaltery, tabret, pipe and harp, and cymbals. In them, as in the few solitary instances of their predecessors, the characteristic element was that the silent seer of visions found an articulate voice, gushing forth in a rhythmical flow, which at once riveted the attention of the hearer. These, or such as these, were the gifts which under Samuel were now organized, if one may say so, into a system."—Denn Stanley, *Lects. on the Hist. of the Jewish Church*, lect. 18.

**Greece.**—A description of the Athenian education of the young is given by Plato in one of his dialogues: "Education," he says, "and admonition commence in the first years of childhood, and last to the very end of life. Mother and nurse and father and tutor are quarrelling about the improvement of the child as soon as ever he is able to understand them: he cannot say or do anything without their setting forth to him that this is just and that is unjust; this is honourable, that is dishonourable; this is holy, that is unholy; do this and abstain from that. And if he obeys, well and good; if not, he is straightened by threats and blows, like a piece of warped wood. At a later stage they send him to teachers, and enjoin them to see to his manners even more than to his reading and music; and the teachers do as they are desired. And when the boy has learned his letters and is beginning to understand what is written, as before he understood only what was spoken, they put into his hands the works of great poets, which he reads at school; in these are contained many admonitions, and many tales, and praises, and encomia of ancient famous men, which he is required to learn by heart, in order that he may imitate or emulate them and desire to become like them. Then, again, the teachers of the lyre take similar care that their young disciple is temperate and gets into no mischief; and when they have taught him the use of the lyre, they introduce him to the poems of other excellent poets, who are the lyric poets; and these they set to music, and make their harmonies and rhythms quite familiar to the children, in order

that they may learn to be more gentle, and harmonious, and rhythmical, and so more fitted for speech and action; for the life of men in every part has need of harmony and rhythm. Then they send them to the master of gymnastic, in order that their bodies may better minister to the virtuous mind, and that the weakness of their bodies may not force them to play the coward in war or on any other occasion. This is what is done by those who have the means, and those who have the means are the rich; their children begin education soonest and leave off latest. When they have done with masters, the state again compels them to learn the laws, and live after the pattern which they furnish, and not after their own fancies; and just as in learning to write, the writing-master first draws lines with a style for the use of the young beginner, and gives him the tablet and makes him follow the lines, so the city draws the laws, which were the invention of good lawgivers who were of old times; these are given to the young man, in order to guide him in his conduct whether as ruler or ruled; and he who transgresses them is to be corrected, or, in other words, called to account, which is a term used not only in your country, but also in many others. Now when there is all this care about virtue private and public, why, Socrates, do you still wonder and doubt whether virtue can be taught?"—Plato, *Protagoras* (*Dialogues*; trans. by Jovett, v. 1).—The ideas of Aristotle on the subject are in the following: "There can be no doubt that children should be taught those useful things which are really necessary, but not all things; for occupations are divided into liberal and illiberal; and to young children should be imparted only such kinds of knowledge as will be useful to them without vulgarizing them. And any occupation, art, or science, which makes the body or soul or mind of the freeman less fit for the practice or exercise of virtue, is vulgar; wherefore we call those arts vulgar which tend to deform the body, and likewise all paid employments, for they absorb and degrade the mind. There are also some liberal arts quite proper for a freeman to acquire, but only in a certain degree, and if he attend to them too closely, in order to obtain perfection in them, the same evil effects will follow. The object also which a man sets before him makes a great difference; if he does or learns anything for his own sake or for the sake of his friends, or with a view to excellence, the action will not appear illiberal; but if done for the sake of others, the very same action will be thought menial and servile. The received subjects of instruction, as I have already remarked, are partly of a liberal and partly of an illiberal character. The customary branches of education are in number four; they are—(1) reading and writing, (2) gymnastic exercises, (3) music, to which is sometimes added (4) drawing. Of these, reading and writing and drawing are regarded as useful for the purposes of life in a variety of ways, and gymnastic exercises are thought to infuse courage. Concerning music a doubt may be raised—in our own day most men cultivate it for the sake of pleasure, but originally it was included in education, because nature herself, as has been often said, requires that we should be able, not only to work well, but to use leisure well; for, as I must repeat once and again, the first principle of all action is leisure. Both are required, but leisure is better than occupation; and therefore the ques-



tion must be asked in good earnest, what ought we to do when at leisure? Clearly we ought not to be amusing ourselves, for then amusement would be the end of life. But if this is inconceivable, and yet amid serious occupations amusement is needed more than at other times (for he who is hard at work has need of relaxation, and amusement gives relaxation, whereas occupation is always accompanied with exertion and effort), at suitable times we should introduce amusements, and they should be our medicines, for the emotion which they create in the soul is a relaxation, and from the pleasure we obtain rest. . . . It is clear then that there are branches of learning and education which we must study with a view to the enjoyment of leisure, and these are to be valued for their own sake; whereas those kinds of knowledge which are useful in business are to be deemed necessary, and exist for the sake of other things. And therefore our fathers admitted music into education, not on the ground either of its necessity or utility, for it is not necessary, nor indeed useful in the same manner as reading and writing, which are useful in money-making, in the management of a household, in the acquisition of knowledge and in political life, nor like drawing, useful for a more correct judgment of the works of artists, nor again like gymnastic, which gives health and strength; for neither of these is to be gained from music. There remains, then, the use of music for intellectual enjoyment in leisure; which appears to have been the reason of its introduction, this being one of the ways in which it is thought that a freeman should pass his leisure. . . . We are now in a position to say that the ancients witness to us; for their opinion may be gathered from the fact that music is one of the received and traditional branches of education. Further, it is clear that children should be instructed in some useful things,—for example, in reading and writing,—not only for their usefulness, but also because many other sorts of knowledge are acquired through them. With a like view they may be taught drawing, not to prevent their making mistakes in their own purchases, or in order that they may not be imposed upon in the buying or selling of articles, but rather because it makes them judges of the beauty of the human form. To be always seeking after the useful does not become free and exalted souls. . . . We reject the professional instruments and also the professional mode of education in music—and by professional we mean that which is adopted in contests, for in this the performer practises the art, not for the sake of his own improvement, but in order to give pleasure, and that of a vulgar sort, to his hearers. For this reason the execution of such music is not the part of a freeman but of a paid performer, and the result is that the performers are vulgarized, for the end at which they aim is bad.”—Aristotle, *Politics* (*Jowett's Translation*), bk. 8.—“The most striking difference between early Greek education and ours was undoubtedly this: that the physical development of boys was attended to in a special place and by a special master. It was not thought sufficient for them to play the chance games of childhood; they underwent careful bodily training under a very fixed system, which was determined by the athletic contests of after life. . . . When we compare what the Greeks afforded to their boys, we find it divided into two contrasted kinds of exer-

cise: hunting, which was practised by the Spartans very keenly, and no doubt also by the Eleans and Arcadians, as may be seen from Xenophon's 'Tract on (Hare) Hunting'; and gymnastics, which in the case of boys were carried on in the so-called palaestra, a sort of open-air gymnasium (in our sense) kept by private individuals as a speculation, and to which the boys were sent, as they were to their ordinary school-master. We find that the Spartans, who had ample scope for hunting with dogs in the glens and coverts of Mount Taygetus, rather despised mere exercises of dexterity in the palaestra, just as our sportsmen would think very little of spending hours in a gymnasium. But those Greeks who lived in towns like Athens, and in the midst of a thickly populated and well-cultivated country, could not possibly obtain hunting, and therefore found the most efficient substitute. Still we find them very far behind the English in their knowledge or taste for out-of-door games. . . . The Greeks had no playgrounds beyond the palaestra or gymnasium; they had no playgrounds in our sense, and though a few proverbs speak of swimming as a universal accomplishment which boys learned, the silence of Greek literature on the subject makes one very suspicious as to the generality of such training. . . . In one point, certainly, the Greeks agreed more with the modern English than with any other civilised nation. They regarded sport as a really serious thing. . . . The names applied to the exercising-places indicate their principal uses. Palaestra means a wrestling place; gymnasium originally a place for naked exercise, but the word early lost this connotation and came to mean mere physical training. . . . In order to leave home and reach the palaestra safely as well as to return, Greek boys were put under the charge of a pedagogue, in no way to be identified (as it now is) with a school-master. . . . I think we may be justified in asserting that the study of the epic poets, especially of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, was the earliest intellectual exercise of schoolboys, and, in the case of fairly educated parents, even anticipated the learning of letters. For the latter is never spoken of as part of a mother's or of home education. Reading was not so universal or so necessary as it now is. . . . We may assume that books of Homer were read or recited to growing boys, and that they were encouraged or required to learn them off by heart. This is quite certain to all who estimate justly the enormous influence ascribed to Homer, and the principles assumed by the Greeks to have underlain his work. He was universally considered to be a moral teacher, whose characters were drawn with a moral intent, and for the purpose of example or avoidance. . . . Accordingly the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were supposed to contain all that was useful, not only for godliness, but for life. All the arts and sciences were to be derived (by interpretation) from these sacred texts. . . . In early days, and in poor towns, the place of teaching was not well appointed, nay, even in many places, teaching in the open air prevailed. . . . This was . . . like the old hedge schools of Ireland, and no doubt of Scotland too. They also took advantage, especially in hot weather, of colonnades, or shady corners among public buildings, as at Winchester the summer term was called cloister-time, from a similar practice, even in that wealthy foundation, of instructing in the cloisters. On the other hand, properly appointed schools in



respectable towns were furnished with some taste, and according to traditional notions. . . . We may be sure that there were no tables or desks, such furniture being unusual in Greek houses; it was the universal custom, while reading or writing, to hold the book or roll on the knee—to us an inconvenient thing to do, but still common in the East. There are some interesting sentences, given for exercise in Greek and Latin, in the little known 'Interpretamenta' of Dositheus, now edited and explained by German scholars. The entry of the boy is thus described, in parallel Greek and Latin: 'First I salute the master, who returns my salute: Good morning, master; good morning, school fellows. Give me my place, my seat, my stool. Sit closer. Move up that way. This is my place, I took it first.' This mixture of politeness and wrangling is amusing, and no doubt to be found in all ages. It seems that the seats were movable. . . . The usual subdivision of education was into three parts; letters, . . . including reading, writing, counting, and learning of the poets; music in the stricter sense, including singing and playing on the lyre; and lastly gymnastic, which included dancing. . . . It is said that at Sparta the education in reading and writing was not thought necessary, and there have been long discussions among the learned whether the ordinary Spartan in classical days was able to read. We find that Aristotle adds a fourth subject to the three above named—drawing, which he thinks requisite, like music, to enable the educated man to judge rightly of works of art. But there is no evidence of a wide diffusion of drawing or painting among the Greeks, as among us. . . . Later on, under the learned influences of Alexandria, and the paid professoriate of Roman days, subjects multiplied with the decline of mental vigour and spontaneity of the age, and children began to be pestered, as they now are, with a quantity of subjects, all thought necessary to a proper education, and accordingly all imperfectly acquired. This was called the encyclical education, which is preserved in our Encyclopedia of knowledge. It included, (1) grammar, (2) rhetoric, (3) dialectic, (4) arithmetic, (5) music, (6) geometry, (7) astronomy, and these were divided into the earlier Trivium, and the later Quadrivium."—J. P. Mahaffy, *Old Greek Education*, ch. 3-5.—"Reading was taught with the greatest pains, the utmost care was taken with the intonation of the voice, and the articulation of the throat. We have lost the power of distinguishing between accent and quantity. The Greeks did not acquire it without long and anxious training of the ear and the vocal organs. This was the duty of the phonnascus. Homer was the common study of all Greeks. The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were at once the Bible, the Shakespeare, the Robinson Crusoe, and the Arabian Nights of the Hellenic race. Long passages and indeed whole books were learnt by heart. The Greek, as a rule, learnt no language but his own. Next to reading and repetition came writing, which was carefully taught. Composition naturally followed, and the burden of correcting exercises, which still weighs down the backs of schoolmasters, dates from these early times. Closely connected with reading and writing is the art of reckoning, and the science of numbers leads us easily to music. Plato considered arithmetic as the best spur to a sleepy and uninstructed spirit;

we see from the Platonic dialogues how mathematical problems employed the mind and thoughts of young Athenians. Many of the more difficult arithmetical operations were solved by geometrical methods, but the Greeks carried the art of teaching numbers to considerable refinement. They used the abacus, and had an elaborate method of finger reckoning, which was serviceable up to 10,000. Drawing was the crowning accomplishment to this vestibule of training. By the time the fourteenth year was completed, the Greek boy would have begun to devote himself seriously to the practice of athletics."—O. Brown- ing, *An Introduction to the History of Educational Theories*, ch. 1.—"It has sometimes been imagined that in Greece separate edifices were not erected as with us expressly for school-houses, but that both the didaskalos and the philosopher taught their pupils in fields, gardens or shady groves. But this was not the common practice, though many schoolmasters appear to have had no other place wherein to assemble their pupils than the portico of a temple or some sheltered corner in the street, where in spite of the din of business and the throng of passengers the worship of learning was publicly performed. . . . But these were the schools of the humbler classes. For the children of the noble and the opulent spacious structures were raised, and furnished with tables, desks,—for that peculiar species of grammateion which resembled the plate cupboard, can have been nothing but a desk,—forms, and whatsoever else their studies required. Mention is made of a school at Chios which contained one hundred and twenty boys, all of whom save one were killed by the falling in of the roof. . . . The apparatus of an ancient school was somewhat complicated: there were mathematical instruments, globes, maps, and charts of the heavens, together with boards whereon to trace geometrical figures, tablets, large and small, of box-wood, fir, or ivory, triangular in form, some folding with two, and others with many leaves; books too and paper, skins of parchment, wax for covering the tablets, which, if we may believe Aristophanes, people sometimes ate when they were hungry. To the above were added rulers, reed-pens, pen-cases, pen-knives, pencils, and last, though not least, the rod which kept them to the steady use of all these things. At Athens these schools were not provided by the State. They were private speculations, and each master was regulated in his charges by the reputation he had acquired and the fortunes of his pupils. Some appear to have been extremely moderate in their demands. . . . The earliest task to be performed at school was to gain a knowledge of the Greek characters, large and small, to spell next, next to read. . . . In teaching the art of writing their practice nearly resembled our own. . . . These things were necessarily the first step in the first class of studies, which were denominated music, and comprehended everything connected with the development of the mind; and they were carried to a certain extent before the second division called gymnastics was commenced. They reversed the plan commonly adopted among ourselves, for with them poetry preceded prose, a practice which, coöperating with their susceptible temperament, impressed upon the national mind that imaginative character for which it was preeminently distinguished. And the poets in whose works they were first initiated were of all the most poetical,

the authors of lyrical and dithyrambic pieces, selections from whose verses they committed to memory, thus acquiring early a rich store of sentences and imagery ready to be added in argument or illustration, to furnish familiar allusions or to be woven into the texture of their style. . . . Among the other branches of knowledge most necessary to be studied, and to which they applied themselves nearly from the outset, was arithmetic, without some inkling of which, a man, in Plato's opinion, could scarcely be a citizen at all. . . . The importance attached to this branch of education, nowhere more apparent than in the dialogues of Plato, furnishes one proof that the Athenians were preëminently men of business, who in all their admiration for the good and beautiful never lost sight of those things which promote the comfort of life, and enable a man effectually to perform his ordinary duties. With the same views were geometry and astronomy pursued. . . . The importance of music, in the education of the Greeks, is generally understood. It was employed to effect several purposes. First, to soothe and mollify the fierceness of the national character, and prepare the way for the lessons of the poets, which, delivered amid the sounding of melodious strings, when the soul was rapt and elevated by harmony, by the excitement of numbers, by the magic of the sweetest associations, took a firm hold upon the mind, and generally retained it during life. Secondly, it enabled the citizens gracefully to perform their part in the amusements of social life, every person being in his turn called upon at entertainments to sing or play upon the lyre. Thirdly, it was necessary to enable them to join in the sacred choruses, rendered frequent by the piety of the state, and for the due performance in old age of many offices of religion, the sacerdotal character belonging more or less to all the citizens of Athens. Fourthly, as much of the learning of a Greek was martial and designed to fit him for defending his country, he required some knowledge of music that on the field of battle his voice might harmoniously mingle with those of his countrymen, in chaunting those stirring, impetuous, and terrible melodies, called *preas*, which preceded the first shock of fight. For some, or all of these reasons, the science of music began to be cultivated among the Hellenes at a period almost beyond the reach even of tradition."—J. A. St. John, *The Hellenes*, bk. 2, ch. 4.—"In thinking of Greek education as furnishing a possible model for us moderns, there is one point which it is important to bear in mind: Greek education was intended only for the few, for the wealthy and well-born. Upon all others, upon slaves, barbarians, the working and trading classes, and generally upon all persons spending their lives in pursuit of wealth or any private ends whatsoever, it would have seemed to be thrown away. Even well-born women were generally excluded from most of its benefits. The subjects of education were the sons of full citizens, themselves preparing to be full citizens, and to exercise all the functions of such. The duties of such persons were completely summed up under two heads, duties to the family and duties to the State, or, as the Greeks said, æconomic and political duties. The free citizen not only acknowledged no other duties besides these, but he looked down upon persons who sought occupation in any other sphere. Economy and Politics, however, were very comprehensive terms. The for-

mer included the three relations of husband to wife, father to children, and master to slaves and property; the latter, three public functions, legislative, administrative, and judiciary. All occupations not included under these six heads the free citizen left to slaves or resident foreigners. Money-making, in the modern sense, he despised, and, if he devoted himself to art or philosophy, he did so only for the benefit of the State."—T. Davidson, *Aristotle*, bk. 1, ch. 4.—**Spartan Training.**—"From his birth every Spartan belonged to the state, which decided . . . whether he was likely to prove a useful member of the community, and extinguished the life of the sickly or deformed infant. To the age of seven however the care of the child was delegated to its natural guardians, yet not so as to be left wholly to their discretion, but subject to certain established rules of treatment, which guarded against every mischievous indulgence of parental tenderness. At the end of seven years began a long course of public discipline, which grew constantly more and more severe as the boy approached toward manhood. The education of the young was in some degree the business of all the elder citizens; for there was none who did not contribute to it, if not by his active interference, at least by his presence and inspection. But it was placed under the especial superintendence of an officer selected from the men of most approved worth; and he again chose a number of youths, just past the age of twenty, and who most eminently united courage with discretion, to exercise a more immediate command over the classes, into which the boys were divided. The leader of each class directed the sports and tasks of his young troop, and punished their offences with military rigour, but was himself responsible to his elders for the mode in which he discharged his office. The Spartan education was simple in its objects; it was not the result of any general view of human nature, or of any attempt to unfold its various capacities: it aimed at training men who were to live in the midst of difficulty and danger, and who could only be safe themselves while they held rule over others. The citizen was to be always ready for the defence of himself and his country, at home and abroad, and he was therefore to be equally fitted to command and to obey. His body, his mind, and his character were formed for this purpose, and for no other: and hence the Spartan system, making directly for its main end, and rejecting all that was foreign to it, attained, within its own sphere, to a perfection which it is impossible not to admire. The young Spartan was perhaps unable either to read or write: he scarcely possessed the elements of any of the arts or sciences by which society is enriched or adorned; but he could run, leap, wrestle, hurl the disk, or the javelin, and wield every other weapon, with a vigour and agility, and grace which were no where surpassed. These however were accomplishments to be learnt in every Greek palaestra: he might find many rivals in all that he could do; but few could approach him in the firmness with which he was taught to suffer. From the tender age at which he left his mother's lap for the public schools, his life was one continued trial of patience. Coarse and scanty fare, and this occasionally withheld, a light dress, without any change in the depth of winter, a bed of reeds, which he himself gathered from the Eurotas, blows exchanged with his comrades,

stripes inflicted by his governors, more by way of exercise than of punishment, inured him to every form of pain and hardship. . . . The Muses were appropriately honoured at Sparta with a sacrifice on the eve of a battle, and the union of the spear and the lyre was a favourite theme with the Laconian poets, and those who sang of Spartan customs. Though bred in the discipline of the camp, the young Spartan, like the hero of the *Iliad*, was not a stranger to music and poetry. He was taught to sing, and to play on the flute and the lyre: but the strains with which his memory was stored, and to which his voice was formed, were either sacred hymns, or breathed a martial spirit; and it was because they cherished such sentiments that the Homeric lays, if not introduced by Lycurgus, were early welcomed at Sparta. . . . As these musical exercises were designed to cultivate, not so much an intellectual, as a moral taste; so it was probably less for the sake of sharpening their ingenuity, than of promoting presence of mind, and promptness of decision, that the boys were led into the habit of answering all questions proposed to them, with a ready, pointed, sententious brevity, which was a proverbial characteristic of Spartan conversation. But the lessons which were most studiously inculcated, more indeed by example than by precept, were those of modesty, obedience, and reverence for age and rank; for these were the qualities on which, above all others, the stability of the commonwealth reposed. The gait and look of the Spartan youths, as they passed along the streets, observed Xenophon, breathed modesty and reserve. In the presence of their elders they were bashful as virgins, and silent as statues, save when a question was put to them. . . . In truth, the respect for the laws, which rendered the Spartan averse to innovation at home, was little more than another form of that awe with which his early habits inspired him for the magistrates and the aged. With this feeling was intimately connected that quick and deep sense of shame, which shrank from dishonour as the most dreadful of evils, and enabled him to meet death so calmly, when he saw in it the will of his country. —C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, v. 1, ch. 8.

—**Free-School Ideas in Greece.**—“It is a prevalent opinion that common schools, as we now have them, were an American invention. No legislation, it is asserted, taxing all in order that all may be taught can be traced back further than to the early laws of Massachusetts. Those who deny this assertion are content with showing something of the sort in Scotland and Germany a generation or two before the landing of the Plymouth pilgrims. The truth is, however, that, as much of our social wit is now credited to the ancient Greeks, something of our educational wisdom ought to be. Two centuries ago John Locke, as an able political writer, was invited to draw up a code of fundamental laws for the new colony of Carolina, and in like manner, more than 2,300 years ago, Charondas, a master of a similar type in Magna Græcia, was called to a similar task. This was to frame a series of statutes for the government of a Greek colony founded about 446 B. C., in the foot of Italy. This colony was Thurii, and conspicuous among the enactments of Charondas was the following: ‘Charondas made a law unlike those of lawgivers before him, for he enacted that the sons of the citizens should all learn letters (or writing) . . .

the city making payment to the teachers. He thought that the poor, not able to pay wages themselves, would otherwise fall of the best training. He counted writing the most important study, and with reason. Through writing, most things in life, and those the most useful, are accomplished — as ballots, epistles, laws, covenants. Who can sufficiently praise the learning of letters? . . . Writing alone preserves the most brilliant utterances of wise men and the oracles of gods, nay philosophy and all culture. All these things it alone hands down to all future generations. Wherefore nature should be viewed as the source of life, but the source of living well we should consider the culture derived from writing. Inasmuch, then, as illiterates are deprived of a great good, Charondas came to their help, judging them worthy of public care and outlay. Former legislators had caused the sick to be attended by physicians at the public expense, thinking their bodies worthy of cure. He did more, for he cured souls afflicted with ignorance. The doctors of the body we pray that we may never need, while we would fain abide for ever with those who minister to the mind diseased.’—This extract is from the ‘*Bibliotheca Historica*’ of Diodorus Siculus (Book x. § 13), who was flourishing at the birth of Christ and was the most painstaking chronicler of the Augustan age. The legislation is worth notice for more than one reason. It rebukes the self-conceit of those who hold that the education of all at the charge of all is an idea born in our own time or country. It has also been strangely unnoticed by historians who ought to have kept it before the people.”—*The Nation*, March 24, 1892, pp. 230–231.

—**Socrates and the Philosophical Schools.**—“Before the rise of philosophy, the teacher of the people had been the rhapsode, or public reciter; after that event he gradually gives place to the sophist (. . . one who makes wise), as he later with more modesty calls himself, the philosopher (. . . lover of wisdom). The history of Greece for centuries is, on its inner side, a history of the struggle between what the rhapsode represents and what the philosopher represents, between popular tradition and common sense on the one hand, and individual opinion and philosophy on the other. The transition from the first to the second of these mental conditions was accomplished for the world, once for all, by the Greeks.”—T. Davidson, *Aristotle*, bk. 1, ch. 5.—“There is no instance on record of a philosopher whose importance as a thinker is so closely bound up with the personality of the man as it was in the case of Socrates. . . . His teaching was not of a kind to be directly imparted and faithfully handed down, but could only be left to propagate itself freely by stirring up others to a similar self-culture. . . . The youth and early manhood of Socrates fall in the most brilliant period of Grecian history. Born during the last years of the Persian war, he was a near contemporary of all those great men who adorned the age of Pericles. As a citizen of Athens he could enjoy the opportunities afforded by a city, which united every means of culture by its unrivalled fertility of thought. Poverty and low birth were but slender obstacles in the Athens of Pericles. . . . Socrates, no doubt, began life by learning his father’s trade, . . . which he probably never practised, and certainly soon gave up. He considered it to be his special calling to labour

for the moral and intellectual improvement of himself and others—a conviction which he felt so strongly that it appeared to him in the light of a divine revelation. Moreover he was confirmed in it by a Delphic oracle, which, of course, must not be regarded as the cause of, but rather as an additional support to his reforming zeal. . . . To be independent, he tried, like the Gods, to rise superior to his wants; and by carefully practising self-denial and abstemiousness, he was really able to boast that his life was more pleasant and more free from troubles than that of the rest of mankind. Thus he was able to devote his whole powers to the service of others, without asking or taking reward; and thus he became so engrossed by his labours for his native city, that he rarely passed its boundaries or even went outside its gates. He did not, however, feel himself called upon to take part in the affairs of the state. . . . Any one convinced as he was, that care for one's own culture must precede care for public business, and that a thorough knowledge of self, together with a deep and many-sided experience, was a necessary condition of public activity, must have thought that, to educate individuals by influence, was the more pressing need, and have held that he was doing his country a better service by educating able statesmen for it, than by actually discharging a statesman's duties. Accordingly, Socrates never aimed at being anything but a private citizen. . . . Just as little was he desirous of being a public teacher like the Sophists. He not only took no pay, but he gave no methodical course. He did not profess to teach, but to learn in common with others, not to force his convictions upon them, but to examine theirs; not to pass the truth that came to hand like a coin fresh from the mint, but to stir up a desire for truth and virtue, to point out the way to it, to overthrow what was spurious, and to seek out real knowledge. Never weary of talking, he was on the look out for every opportunity of giving an instructive and moral turn to the conversation. Day by day he was about in the market and public promenades, in schools and workshops, ever ready to converse with friends or strangers, with citizens and foreigners, but always prepared to lead them to higher subjects; and whilst thus in his higher calling serving God, he was persuaded that he was also serving his country in a way that no one else could do. Deeply as he deplored the decline of discipline and education in his native city, he felt that he could depend but little on the Sophists, the moral teachers of his day. The attractive powers of his discourse won for him a circle of admirers, for the most part consisting of young men of family, drawn to him by the most varied motives, standing to him in various relations, and coming to him, some for a longer, others for a shorter time. For his own part, he made it his business not only to educate these friends, but to advise them in everything, even in worldly matters. But out of this changing, and in part loosely connected, society, a nucleus was gradually formed of decided admirers,—a Socratic school, which we must consider united far less by a common set of doctrines, than by a common love for the person of Socrates.”—E. Zeller, *Socrates and the Socratic Schools*, ch. 3.—“Nowhere, except in Athens, do we hear of a philosophic body with endowments, legal succession,

and the other rights of a corporation. This idea, which has never since died out of the world, was due to Plato, who bequeathed his garden and appointments in the place called after the hero Hekademos, to his followers. But he was obliged to do it in the only form possible at Athens. He made it a religious foundation, on the basis of a fixed worship to the Muses. . . . The head or President of Plato's 'Association of the Muses,' was the treasurer and manager of the common fund, who invited guests to their feasts, to which each member contributed his share. . . . The members had, moreover, a right to attend lectures and use the library or scientific appointments, such as maps, which belonged to the school. It was this endowment on a religious basis which saved the income and position of Plato's school for centuries. . . . This then is the first Academy, so often imitated in so many lands, and of which our colleges are the direct descendants. . . . The school of Plato, then governed by Xenocrates, being the bequest of an Athenian citizen who understood the law, seems never to have been assailed. The schools of Epicurus and Zeno were perhaps not yet recognised. But that of Theophrastus, perhaps the most crowded, certainly the most strictly philo-Macedonian, . . . this was the school which was exiled, and which owed its rehabilitation not only to the legal decision of the courts, but still more to the large views of King Demetrius, who would not tolerate the persecution of opinion. But it was the other Demetrius, the philosopher, the pupil of Aristotle, the friend of Theophrastus, to whom the school owed most, and to whom the world owes most in the matter of museums and academies, next after Plato. For this was the man who took care, during his Protectorate of Athens in the interest of Casander, to establish a garden and 'peripatos' for the Peripatetic school, now under Theophrastus. . . . It is remarkable that the Stoic school—it too the school of aliens—did not establish a local foundation or succession, but taught in public places, such as the Painted Portico. In this the Cynical tone of the Porch comes out. Hence the succession depended upon the genius of the leader.”—J. P. Mahaffy, *Greek Life and Thought*, ch. 7.—An account of the Academy, the Lyceum, etc., will be found under the caption GYMNASIA.—**University of Athens.**—“Some scholars. . . may doubt if there was anything at Athens which could answer to the College Life of modern times. Indeed it must be owned that formal history is nearly silent on the subject, that ancient writers take little notice of it, and such evidences as we have are drawn almost entirely from a series of inscriptions on the marble tablets, which were covered with the ruins and the dust of ages, till one after another came to light in recent days, to add fresh pages to the story of the past. Happily they are both numerous and lengthy, and may be already pieced together in an order which extends for centuries. They are known to Epigraphic students as the records which deal with the so-called Ephēbi; with the youths, that is, just passing into manhood, for whom a special discipline was provided by the State, to fit them for the responsibilities of active life. It was a National system with a many-sided training; the teachers were members of the Civil Service; the registers were public documents, and, as such, belonged to the Archives of the

State. The earlier inscriptions of the series date from the period of Macedonian ascendancy, but in much earlier times there had been forms of public drill prescribed for the Ephebi. . . . We find from a decree, which, if genuine, dates even from the days of Pericles, that the young men of Coa were allowed by special favour to share the discipline of the Athenian Ephebi. Soon afterwards others were admitted on all sides. The aliens who had gained a competence as merchants or as bankers, found their sons welcomed in the ranks of the oldest families of Athens; strangers flocked thither from distant countries, not only from the isles of Greece, and from the coasts of the Ægean, but, as Hellenic culture made its way through the far East, students even of the Semitic race were glad to enrol their names upon the College registers, where we may still see them with the marks of their several nationalities affixed. The young men were no longer, like soldiers upon actual service, beginning already the real work of life, and on that account, perhaps, the term was shortened from the two years to one; but the old associations lasted on for ages, even in realistic Athens, which in early politics at least had made so clean a sweep. The outward forms were still preserved, the soldier's drill was still enforced, and though many another feature had been added, the whole institution bore upon its face the look rather of a Military College than of a training school for a scholar or a statesman. The College year began somewhat later than the opening of the civil year, and it was usual for all the students to matriculate together; that is, to enter formally their names upon the registers, which were copied afterwards upon the marble tablets, of which large fragments have survived. . . . 'To put the gown on,' or, as we should say, 'to be a gownsman,' was the phrase which stood for being a member of the College; and the gown, too, was of black, as commonly among ourselves. But Philostratus tells us, by the way, that a change was made from black to white at the prompting of Herodes Atticus, the munificent and learned subject of the Antonines, who was for many years the presiding genius of the University of Athens. The fragment of an inscription lately found curiously confirms and supplements the writer's statement. . . . The members of the College are spoken of as 'friends' and 'messmates'; and it is probable that some form of conventional life prevailed among them, without which the drill and supervision, which are constantly implied in the inscriptions, could scarcely have been enforced by the officials. But we know nothing of any public buildings for their use save the gymnasia, which in all Greek towns were the centres of educational routine, and of which there were several well known at Athens. . . . The College did not try to monopolise the education of its students. It had, indeed, its own tutors or instructors, but they were kept for humbler drill; it did not even for a long time keep an organist or choir-master of its own; it sent its students out for teaching in philosophy and rhetoric and grammar, or, in a word, for all the larger and more liberal studies. Nor did it favour any special set of tenets to the exclusion of the rest. It encouraged impartially all the schools of higher thought. . . . The Head of the College held the title of Cosmetes, or of rector. . . . The Rector, appointed only for a

year by popular election, was no merely honorary head, but took an important part in the real work of education. He was sometimes clothed with priestly functions. . . . The system of education thus described was under the control of the government throughout. . . . It may surprise us that our information comes almost entirely from the inscriptions, and that ancient writers are all nearly silent on the subject. . . . But there was little to attract the literary circles in arrangements so mechanical and formal; there was too much of outward pageantry, and too little of real character evolved."—W. W. Capes, *University Life in Ancient Athens*, ch. 1.—J. H. Newman, *Historical Sketches*, ch. 4.—The reign of the Emperor Justinian "may be signalised as the fatal epoch at which several of the noblest institutions of antiquity were abolished. He shut the schools of Athens (A. D. 529), in which an uninterrupted succession of philosophers, supported by a public stipend, had taught the doctrines of Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, and Epicurus, ever since the time of the Antonines. They were, it is true, still attached to paganism, and even to the arts of magic."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Fall of the Roman Empire*, v. 1, ch. 10.—See ATHENS: A. D. 529.

**Alexandria.**—"Ptolemy, upon whom, on Alexander's death, devolved the kingdom of Egypt, supplies us with the first great instance of what may be called the establishment of Letters. He and Eumenes may be considered the first founders of public libraries. . . . A library, however, was only one of two great conceptions brought into execution by the first Ptolemy; and as the first was the embalming of dead genius, so the second was the endowment of living. . . . Ptolemy, . . . prompted, or at least, encouraged, by the celebrated Demetrius of Phalerus, put into execution a plan for the formal endowment of literature and science. The fact indeed of the possession of an immense library seemed sufficient to render Alexandria a University; for what could be a greater attraction to the students of all lands, than the opportunity afforded them of intellectual converse, not only with the living, but with the dead, with all who had anywhere at any time thrown light upon any subject of inquiry? But Ptolemy determined that his teachers of knowledge should be as stationary and as permanent as his books; so, resolving to make Alexandria the seat of a 'Studium Generale,' he founded a College for its domicile, and endowed that College with ample revenues. Here, I consider, he did more than has been commonly done, till modern times. It requires considerable knowledge of mediæval Universities to be entitled to give an opinion; as regards Germany, for instance, or Poland, or Spain; but, as far as I have a right to speak, such an endowment has been rare down to the sixteenth century, as well as before Ptolemy. . . . To return to the Alexandrian College. It was called the Museum,—a name since appropriated to another institution connected with the seats of science. . . . There was a quarter of the city so distinct from the rest in Alexandria, that it is sometimes spoken of as a suburb. It was pleasantly situated on the water's edge, and had been set aside for ornamental buildings, and was traversed by groves of trees. Here stood the royal palace, here the theatre and amphitheatre; here the gymnasia and stadium; here

the famous Serapeum. And here it was, close upon the Port, that Ptolemy placed his Library and College. As might be supposed, the building was worthy of its purpose; a noble portico stretched along its front, for exercise or conversation, and opened upon the public rooms devoted to disputations and lectures. A certain number of Professors were lodged within the precincts, and a handsome hall, or refectory, was provided for the common meal. The Prefect of the house was a priest, whose appointment lay with the government. Over the Library a dignified person presided. . . . As to the Professors, so liberal was their maintenance, that a philosopher of the very age of the first foundation called the place a 'bread basket,' or a 'bird coop'; yet, in spite of accidental exceptions, so careful on the whole was their selection, that even six hundred years afterwards, Ammianus describes the Museum under the title of 'the lasting abode of distinguished men.' Philostratus, too, about a century before, calls it 'a table gathering together celebrated men.' . . . As time went on new Colleges were added to the original Museum; of which one was a foundation of the Emperor Claudius, and called after his name. . . . A diversity of teachers secured an abundance of students. 'Hither,' says Cave, 'as to a public emporium of polite literature, congregated, from every part of the world, youthful students, and attended the lectures in Grammar, Rhetoric, Poetry, Philosophy, Astronomy, Music, Medicine, and other arts and sciences'; and hence proceeded, as it would appear, the great Christian writers and doctors, Clement, . . . Origen, Anatolius, and Athanasius. St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, in the third century, may be added; he came across Asia Minor and Syria from Pontus, as to a place, says his namesake of Nyssa, 'to which young men from all parts gathered together, who were applying themselves to philosophy.' As to the subjects taught in the Museum, Cave has already enumerated the principal; but he has not done justice to the peculiar character of the Alexandrian school. From the time that science got out of the hands of the pure Greeks, into those of a power which had a talent for administration, it became less theoretical, and bore more distinctly upon definite and tangible objects. . . . Egyptian Antiquities were investigated, at least by the disciples of the Egyptian Manetho, fragment of whose history are considered to remain; while Carthaginian and Etruscan had a place in the studies of the Claudian College. The Museum was celebrated, moreover, for its grammarians; the work of Hephæstion 'de Metris' still affords matter of thought to a living Professor of Oxford; and Aristarchus, like the Athenian Priscian, has almost become the nickname for a critic. Yet, eminent as is the Alexandrian school in these departments of science, its fame rests still more securely upon its proficiency in medicine and mathematics. Among its physicians is the celebrated Galen, who was attracted thither from Pergamus; and we are told by a writer of the fourth century, that in his time the very fact of a physician having studied at Alexandria, was an evidence of his science which superseded further testimonials. As to Mathematics, it is sufficient to say, that, of four great ancient names, on whom the modern science is founded, three came from Alexan-

dria. Archimedes indeed was a Syracusan; but the Museum may boast of Apollonius of Perga, Diophantus, a native Alexandrian, and Euclid, whose country is unknown. To these illustrious names, may be added, Eratosthenes of Cyrene, to whom astronomy has obligations so considerable; Pappus; Theon; and Ptolemy, said to be of Pelusium, whose celebrated system, called after him the Ptolemaic, reigned in the schools till the time of Copernicus, and whose Geography, dealing with facts, not theories, is in repute still. Such was the celebrated 'Studium' or University of Alexandria; for a while in the course of the third and fourth centuries, it was subject to reverses, principally from war. The whole of the Bruchion, the quarter of the city in which it was situated, was given to the flames; and, when Hilarion came to Alexandria, the holy hermit, whose rule of life did not suffer him to lodge in cities, took up his lodgment with a few solitaries among the ruins of its edifices. The schools, however, and the library continued; the library was reserved for the Caliph Omar's famous judgment; as to the schools, even as late as the twelfth century, the Jew, Benjamin of Tudela, gives us a surprising report of what he found in Alexandria."—J. H. Newman, *Historical Sketches: Rise and Progress of Universities*, ch. 8.—"In the three centuries which intervened between Alexander and Augustus, Athens was preëminently the training school for philosophy. Rhodes, on the other hand, as the only Greek state of political importance in which a career of grand and dignified activity was open for the orator, distinguished itself in the study of eloquence, while Alexandria rested its fame chiefly on the excellence of its instruction in Philology and Medicine. At a subsequent period the last mentioned University obtained even greater celebrity as having given birth to a school of philosophers who endeavored to combine into a species of theosophic doctrine the mental science of Europe with the more spiritual minded and profoundly human religions of the East. In the third century Alexandria became conspicuous as the headquarters of the Eclectics and Neo-Platonists."—E. Kirkpatrick, *Hist'l Development of Superior Instruction* (*Barnard's Am. Journal of Education*, v. 24, pp. 466-467).

**Rome.**—"If we cast a final glance at the question of education, we shall find but little to say of it, as far as regards the period before Cicero. In the republican times the state did not trouble itself about the training of youth: a few prohibitory regulations were laid down, and the rest left to private individuals. Thus no public instruction was given; public schools there were, but only as private undertakings for the sake of the children of the rich. All depended on the father; his personal character and the care taken by the mother in education decided the development of the child's disposition. Books there were none; and therefore they could not be put into the hands of children. A few rugged hymns, such as those of the Sallii and Arval brothers, with the songs in Fescennine verse, sung on festivals and at banquets, formed the poetical literature. A child would hear, besides, the dirges, or memorial verses, composed by women in honour of the dead, and sometimes, too, the public panegyrics pronounced on their departed relatives, a distinction accorded to women also from the time of Camillus. Whatever was taught a boy by father or

mother, or acquired externally to the house, was calculated to make the Roman 'virtus' appear in his eyes the highest aim of his ambition; the term including self-mastery, an unbending firmness of will, with patience, and an iron tenacity of purpose in carrying through whatever was once acknowledged to be right. The Greek palestra and its naked combatants always seemed strange and offensive to Roman eyes. In the republican times the exercises of the gymnasium were but little in fashion; though riding, swimming, and other warlike exercises were industriously practised, as preparations for the campaign. The slave *pædagogus*, assigned to young people to take charge of them, had a higher position with the Romans than the Greeks; and was not allowed to let his pupils out of his sight till their twentieth year. The Latin *Odyssey* of *Livius Andronicus* was the school-book first in use; and this and *Ennius* were the only two works to create and foster a literary taste before the destruction of Carthage. The freedman *Sp. Carvilius* was the first to open a school for higher education. After this the Greek language and literature came into the circle of studies, and in consequence of the wars in Sicily, Macedonia, and Asia, families of distinction kept slaves who knew Greek. Teachers quickly multiplied, and were either liberti, or their descendants. No free-born Roman would consent to be a paid teacher, for that was held to be a degradation. The Greek language remained throughout the classical one for Romans: they even made their children begin with Homer. As, by the seventh century of the republic, *Ennius*, *Plautus*, *Pæuvius*, and *Terence*, had already become old poets, dictations were given to scholars from their writings. The interpretation of *Virgil* began under *Augustus*, and by this time the younger Romans were resorting to Athens, Rhodes, Apollonia, and Mitylene, in order to make progress in Greek rhetoric and philosophy. As Roman notions were based entirely on the practical and the useful, music was neglected as a part of education; while, as a contrast, boys were compelled to learn the laws of the twelve tables by heart. *Cicero*, who had gone through this discipline with other boys of his time, complains of the practice having begun to be set aside; and *Scipio Æmilianus* deplored, as an evil omen of degeneracy, 'the sending of boys and girls to the academies . . . actors, where they learnt dancing and singing, in company with young women of pleasure. In one of these schools were to be found as many as five hundred young persons, all being instructed in postures and motions of the most abandoned kind. . . . On the other hand, the gymnastic exercises, which had once served the young men as a training for war, fell into disuse, having naturally become objectless and burdensome, now that, under *Augustus*, no more Roman citizens chose to enlist in the legions. Still slavery was, and continued to be, the foremost cause of the depravation of youth, and of an evil education. . . . It was no longer the mothers who educated their own children: they had neither inclination nor capacity for such duty, for mothers of the stamp of *Cornelia* had disappeared. Immediately on its birth, the child was intrusted to a Greek female slave, with some male slave, often of the worst description, to help her. . . . The young Roman was not educated in the constant companionship of youths of his own age, under equal discipline: surrounded by

his father's slaves and parasites, and always accompanied by a slave when he went out, he hardly received any other impressions than such as were calculated to foster conceit, indolence, and pride in him."—*J. J. Dollinger, The Gentle and the Jew, v. 2, pp. 279-281.*—**Higher Education under the Empire.**—"Besides schools of high eminence in Mytilene, Ephesus, Smyrna, Sidon, etc., we read that Apollonia enjoyed so high a reputation for eloquence and political sciences as to be entrusted with the education of the heir-apparent of the Roman Empire. Antioch was noted for a Museum modelled after that of the Egyptian metropolis, and Tarsus boasted of Gymnasia and a University which Strabo does not hesitate to describe as more than rivaling those of Athens and Alexandria. There can be little doubt that the philosophers, rhetoricians, and grammarians who swarmed in the princely retinues of the great Roman aristocracy, and whose schools abounded in all the most wealthy and populous cities of the empire east and west, were prepared for their several callings in some one or other of these institutions. Strabo tells us . . . that Rome was overrun with Alexandrian and Syrian grammarians, and *Juvenal* describes one of the *Quirites* of the ancient stamp as emigrating in sheer disgust from a city which from these causes had become thoroughly and utterly Greek. . . . That external inducements were held out amply sufficient to prevail upon poor and ambitious men to qualify themselves at some cost for vocations of this description is evident from the wealth to which, as we are told, many of them rose from extreme indigence and obscurity. *Suetonius*, in the still extant fragment of his essay 'de claris rhetoribus,' after alluding to the immense number of professors and doctors met with in Rome, draws attention to the frequency with which individuals who had distinguished themselves as teachers of rhetoric had been elevated into the senate, and advanced to the highest dignities of the state. That the profession of a philologist was occasionally at least well remunerated is evident from the facts recorded by the same author in his work 'de claris grammaticis,' sect. 3. He there mentions that there were at one time upwards of twenty well attended schools devoted to this subject at Rome, and that one fortunate individual, *Q. Remmius Palaemon*, derived four hundred thousand sesterces, or considerably above three thousand a year, from instruction in philology alone. *Julius Caesar* conferred the citizenship, together with large bounties in money, and immunity from public burthens, on distinguished rhetoricians and philologists, in order to encourage their presence at Rome. . . . That individuals who thus enjoyed an income not greatly below the revenues of an English Bishopric were not, as the name might lead us to imagine, employed in teaching the accidents of grammar, but possessed considerable pretensions to that higher and more thoughtful character of the scholar which it has been reserved for modern Europe to exhibit in perfection, is not only in itself highly probable, but supported by the distinctest and most unimpeachable evidence. *Seneca* tells us that history was amongst the subjects professed by grammarians, and *Cicero* regards the most thorough and refined perception of all that pertains to the spirit and individuality of the author as an in-



dispensable requisite in those who undertake to give instruction in this subject. . . . The grammatici appear to have occupied a position very closely analogous to that of the teachers of collegiate schools in England, and the gymnastical professors in Germany."—E. Kirkpatrick, *Hist. Development of Superior Instruction (Barnard's Am. Journal of Education, v. 24, pp. 468-470.*

### Mediæval.

**The Chaos of Barbaric Conquest.**—"The utter confusion subsequent upon the downfall of the Roman Empire and the irruption of the Germanic races was causing, by the mere brute force of circumstance, a gradual extinction of scholarship too powerful to be arrested. The teaching of grammar for ecclesiastical purposes was insufficient to check the influence of many causes leading to this overthrow of learning. It was impossible to communicate more than a mere tincture of knowledge to students separated from the classical tradition, for whom the antecedent history of Rome was a dead letter. The meaning of Latin words derived from the Greek was lost. . . . Theological notions, grotesque and childish; beyond description, found their way into etymology and grammar. The three persons of the Trinity were discovered in the verb, and mystic numbers in the parts of speech. Thus analytical studies like that of language came to be regarded as an open field for the exercise of the mythologising fancy; and etymology was reduced to a system of ingenious punning. . . . Virgil, the only classic who retained distinct and living personality, passed from poet to philosopher, from philosopher to Sibyl, from Sibyl to magician, by successive stages of transmutation, as the truth about him grew more dim and the faculty to apprehend him weakened. Forming the staple of education in the schools of the grammarians, and metamorphosed by the vulgar consciousness into a wizard, he waited on the extreme verge of the dark ages to take Dante by the hand, and lead him, as the type of human reason, through the realms of Hell and Purgatory."—J. A. Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy: the Revival of Learning, ch. 2.*

**4th-5th Centuries.**—"If institutions could do all, if laws supplied and the means furnished to society could do everything, the intellectual state of Gaulish civil society at this epoch [4th-5th centuries] would have been far superior to that of the religious society. The first, in fact, alone possessed all the institutions proper to second the development of mind, the progress and empire of ideas. Roman Gaul was covered with large schools. The principal were those of Trèves, Bordeaux, Autun, Toulouse, Poitiers, Lyons, Narbonne, Arles, Marseilles, Vienne, Besançon, &c. Some were very ancient; those of Marseilles and of Autun, for example, dated from the first century. They were taught philosophy, medicine, jurisprudence, literature, grammar, astrology, all the sciences of the age. In the greater part of these schools, indeed, they at first taught only rhetoric and grammar; but towards the fourth century, professors of philosophy and law were everywhere introduced. Not only were these schools numerous, and provided with many chairs, but the emperors continually took the professors of new measures into favor. Their interests are, from Constantine to Theodosius the younger, the subject of

frequent imperial constitutions, which sometimes extended, sometimes confirmed their privileges. . . . After the Empire was divided among many masters, each of them concerned himself rather more about the prosperity of his states and the public establishments which were in them. Thence arose a momentary amelioration, of which the schools felt the effects, particularly those of Gaul, under the administration of Constantius Chlorus, of Julian, and of Gratian. By the side of the schools were, in general, placed other analogous establishments. Thus, at Trèves there was a grand library of the imperial palace, concerning which no special information has reached us, but of which we may judge by the details which have reached us concerning that of Constantinople. This last had a librarian and seven scribes constantly occupied—four for Greek, and three for Latin. They copied both ancient and new works. It is probable that the same institution existed at Trèves, and in the great towns of Gaul. Civil society, then, was provided with means of instruction and intellectual development. It was not the same with religious society. It had at this epoch no institution especially devoted to teaching; it did not receive from the state any aid to this particular aim. Christians, as well as others, could frequent the public schools; but most of the professors were still pagans. . . . It was for a long time in the inferior classes, among the people, that Christianity was propagated, especially in the Gauls, and it was the superior classes which followed the great schools. Moreover, it was hardly until the commencement of the fourth century that the Christians appeared there, and then but few in number. No other source of study was open to them. The establishments which, a little afterwards, became, in the Christian church, the refuge and sanctuary of instruction, the monasteries, were hardly commenced in the Gauls. It was only after the year 300 that the two first were founded by St. Martin—one at Ligugé, near Poitiers, the other at Marmontiers, near Tours; and they were devoted rather to religious contemplation than to teaching. Any great school, any special institution devoted to the service and to the progress of intellect, was at that time, therefore, wanting to the Christians. . . . All things in the fifth century, attest the decay of the civil schools. The contemporaneous writers, Sidonius Apollinaris and Mamertius Claudianus, for example, deplore it in every page, saying that the young men no longer studied, that professors were without pupils, that science languished and was being lost. . . . It was especially the young men of the superior classes who frequented the schools; but these classes . . . were in rapid dissolution. The schools fell with them; the institutions still existed, but they were void—the soul had quitted the body. The intellectual aspect of Christian society was very different. . . . Institutions began to rise, and to be regulated among the Christians of Gaul. The foundation of the greater portion of the large monasteries of the southern provinces belongs to the first half of the fifth century. . . . The monasteries of the south of Gaul were philosophical schools of Christianity; it was there that intellectual men meditated, discussed, taught; it was from thence that new ideas, daring thoughts, heresies, were sent forth. . . . Towards the end of the sixth century, everything is changed:



there are no longer civil schools; ecclesiastical schools alone subsist. Those great municipal schools of Trèves, of Poitiers, of Vienne, of Bordeaux, &c., have disappeared; in their place have arisen schools called cathedral or episcopal schools, because each episcopal see had its own. The cathedral school was not always alone; we find in certain dioceses other schools, of an uncertain nature and origin, wrecks, perhaps, of some ancient civil school, which, in becoming metamorphosed, had perpetuated itself. . . . The most flourishing of the episcopal schools from the sixth to the middle of the eighth century were those of: 1. Poitiers. There were many schools in the monasteries of the diocese at Poitiers taught at Ligugé, at Anson, &c. 2. Paris. 3. LeMans. 4. Bourges. 5. Clermont. There was another school in the town where they taught the Theodosian code; a remarkable circumstance, which I do not find elsewhere. 6. Vienne. 7. Châlons-sur-Saone. 8. Arles. 9. Gap. The most flourishing of the monastic schools of the same epoch were those of: 1. Luxeuil, in Franche-Comté. 2. Fontenelle, or Saint Vandrille, in Normandy; in which were about 300 students. 3. Sithiu, in Normandy. 4. Saint Médard, at Soissons. 5. Lerens. It were easy to extend this list; but the prosperity of monastic schools was subject to great vicissitudes; they flourished under a distinguished abbot, and declined under his successor. Even in nunneries, study was not neglected; that which Saint Cesaire founded at Arles contained, at the commencement of the sixth century, two hundred monks, for the most part occupied in copying books, sometimes religious books, sometimes, probably, even the works of the ancients. The metamorphosis of civil schools into ecclesiastical schools was complete. Let us see what was taught in them. We shall often find in them the names of sciences formerly professed in the civil schools, rhetoric, logic, grammar, geometry, astrology, &c.; but these were evidently no longer taught except in their relations to theology. This is the foundation of the instruction: all was turned into commentary of the Scriptures, historical, philosophical, allegorical, moral, commentary. They desired only to form priests; all studies, whatsoever their nature, were directed towards this result. Sometimes they went even further: they rejected the profane sciences themselves, whatever might be the use made of them." —F. Guizot, *History of Civilization to the French Revolution*, v. 2, lect. 4 and 16.

**Ireland.—Scotland.—Schools of Iona.**—Popular accounts represent St. Patrick as "founding at least a hundred monasteries, and even those who consider that the greater number of the Irish colleges were raised by his followers after his death, admit the fact of his having established an episcopal monastery and school at Armagh, where he and his clergy carried out the same rule of life that he had seen followed in the churches of Gaul. . . . The school, which formed a portion of the Cathedral establishment, soon rose in importance. Gildas taught here for some years before joining St. Cadoc at Llancarvan; and in process of time the number of students, both native and foreign, so increased that the university, as we may justly call it, was divided into three parts, one of which was devoted entirely to students of the Anglo-Saxon race. Grants for the support of the schools were made by the

Irish kings in the eighth century; and all through the troublous times of the ninth and tenth centuries, when Ireland was overrun by the Danes, and so many of her sanctuaries were given to the flames, the succession of divinity professors at Armagh remained unbroken, and has been carefully traced by Usher. We need not stop to determine how many other establishments similar to those of Armagh were really founded in the lifetime of St. Patrick. In any case the rapid extension of the monastic institute in Ireland, and the extraordinary ardour with which the Irish cenobites applied themselves to the cultivation of letters remain undisputed facts. 'Within a century after the death of St. Patrick,' says Bishop Nicholson, 'the Irish seminaries had so increased that most parts of Europe sent their children to be educated here, and drew thence their bishops and teachers.' The whole country for miles round Leighlin was denominated the 'land of saints and scholars.' By the ninth century Armagh could boast of 7,000 students, and the schools of Cashel, Dindaleathglass, and Lisamore vied with it in renown. This extraordinary multiplication of monastic seminaries and scholars may be explained partly by the constant immigration of British refugees who brought with them the learning and religious observances of their native cloisters, and partly by that sacred and irresistible impulse which animates a newly converted people to heroic acts of sacrifice. In Ireland the infant church was not, as elsewhere, watered with the blood of martyrs. . . . The bards, who were to be found in great numbers among the early converts of St. Patrick, had also a considerable share in directing the energies of their countrymen to intellectual labour. They formed the learned class, and on their conversion to Christianity were readily disposed to devote themselves to the culture of sacred letters. . . . It would be impossible, within the limits of a single chapter, to notice even the names of all the Irish seats of learning, or of their most celebrated teachers, every one of whom has his own legend in which sacred and poetic beauties are to be found blended together. One of the earliest monastic schools was that erected by Enda, prince of Orgiel, in that western island called from the wild flowers which even still cover its rocky soil, Aran-of-the-Flowers, a name it afterwards exchanged for that of Ara-na-naomh, or Aran-of-the-Saints. . . . A little later St. Finian founded his great school of Clonard, whence, says Usher, issued forth a stream of saints and doctors, like the Greek warriors from the wooden horse. . . . This desolate wilderness was soon peopled by his disciples, who are said to have numbered 3,000, of whom the twelve most eminent are often termed the Twelve Apostles of Ireland. . . . Among them none were more famous than St. Columba, St. Kieran, and St. Brendan. The first of these is known to every English reader as the founder of Iona, and Kieran, the carpenter's son, as he is called, is scarcely less renowned among his own countrymen. . . . It was in the year 563 that St. Columba, after founding the monasteries of Doire-Calgaisich and Dair-nagh in his native land, and incurring the enmity of one of the Irish kings, determined on crossing over into Scotland in order to preach the faith to the Northern Picts. Accompanied by twelve companions, he passed the Channel in a rude wicker boat covered with skins, and landed at Port-na-Currachan, on a spot

now marked by a heap of huge conical stones. Conall, king of the Albanian Scots, granted him the island of I, Hl, or Al, hitherto occupied by the Druids, and there he erected the monastery which, in time, became the mother of three hundred religious houses. . . . Iona, or I-Colum-kil, as it was called by the Irish, came to be looked on as the chief seat of learning, not only in Britain, but in the whole Western world. 'Thither, as from a nest,' says Odonellus, playing on the Latin name of the founder, 'these sacred doves took their flight to every quarter.' They studied the classics, the mechanical arts, law, history, and physic. They improved the arts of husbandry and horticulture, supplied the rude people whom they had undertaken to civilise with ploughshares and other utensils of labour, and taught them the use of the forge, in the mysteries of which every Irish monk was instructed from his boyhood. They transferred to their new homes all the learning of Armagh or Clonard. . . . In every college of Irish origin, by whomsoever they were founded or on whatever soil they flourished, we thus see study blended with the duties of the missionary and the cenobite. They were religious houses, no doubt, in which the celebration of the Church office was often kept up without intermission by day and night; but they were also seminaries of learning, wherein sacred and profane studies were cultivated with equal success. Not only their own monasteries but those of every European country were enriched with their manuscripts, and the researches of modern biblioplists are continually disintercing from German or Italian libraries a Horace, or an Ovid, or a Sacred Codex whose Irish gloss betrays the hand which traced its delicate letters."—A. T. Drane, *Christian Schools and Scholars*, ch. 2.

**Charlemagne.**—"If there ever was a man who by his mere natural endowments soared above other men, it was Charlemagne. His life, like his stature, was colossal. Time never seemed wanting to him for anything that he willed to accomplish, and during his ten years campaign against the Saxons and Lombards, he contrived to get leisure enough to study grammar, and render himself tolerably proficient as a Latin writer in prose and verse. He found his tutors in the cities that he conquered. When he became master of Pisa, he gained the services of Peter of Pisa, whom he set over the Palatine school, which had existed even under the Merovingian kings, though as yet it was far from enjoying the fame to which it was afterwards raised by the teaching of Alcuin. He possessed the art of turning enemies into friends, and thus drew to his court the famous historian, Paul Warnefrid, deacon of the Church of Rome, who had previously acted as secretary to Didier, king of the Lombards. . . . Another Italian scholar, St. Paulinus, of Aquileja, was coaxed into the service of the Frankish sovereign after his conquest of Friuli; I will not say that he was bought, but he was certainly paid for by a large grant of confiscated territory made over by diploma to 'the Venerable Paulinus, master of the art of grammar.' But none of these learned personages were destined to take so large a part in that revival of learning which made the glory of Charlemagne's reign, as our own countryman Alcuin. It was in 781, on occasion of the king's second visit to Italy, that the meeting took place at Parma, the result of which was to fix the

English scholar at the Frankish court. Having obtained the consent of his own bishop and sovereign to this arrangement, Alcuin came over to France in 782, bringing with him several of the best scholars of York, among whom were Wizo, Fredegis, and Sigulf. Charlemagne received him with joy, and assigned him three abbeyes for the maintenance of himself and his disciples, those namely, of Ferrières, St. Lupus of Troyes, and St. Josse in Ponthieu. From this time Alcuin held the first place in the literary society that surrounded the Frankish sovereign, and filled an office the duties of which were as vast as they were various. Three great works at once claimed his attention, the correction of the liturgical books, the direction of the court academy, and the establishment of other public schools throughout the empire. . . . But it was as head of the Palatine school that Alcuin's influence was chiefly to be felt in the restoration of letters. Charlemagne presented himself as his first pupil, together with the three princes, Pepin, Charles, and Louis, his sister Gisla and his daughter Richtrude, his councillors Adalard and Angilbert, and Eginhard his secretary. Such illustrious scholars soon found plenty to imitate their example, and Alcuin saw himself called on to lecture daily to a goodly crowd of bishops, nobles, and courtiers. The king wished to transform his court into a new Athens preferable to that of ancient Greece, in so far as the doctrine of Christ is to be preferred to that of Plato. All the liberal arts were to be taught there, but in such a way as that each should bear reference to religion, for this was regarded as the final end of of all learning. Grammar was studied in order better to understand the Holy Scriptures and to transcribe them more correctly; music, to which much attention was given, was chiefly confined to the ecclesiastical chant; and it was principally to explain the Fathers and refute errors contrary to the faith that rhetoric and dialectics were studied. 'In short,' says Crevier, 'the thought both of the king and of the scholar who laboured with him was to refer all things to religion, nothing being considered as truly useful which did not bear some relation to that end.' At first Alcuin allowed the study of the classic poets, and in his boyhood, as we know, he had been a greater reader of Virgil than of the Scriptures. . . . The authors whose study Charlemagne and Alcuin desired to promote, were not so much Virgil and Cicero, as St. Jerome and St. Augustine; and Charlemagne, in his excessive admiration of those Fathers, gave utterance to the wish that he had a dozen such men at his court. The 'City of God' was read at the royal table, and the questions addressed by the court students to their master turned rather on the obscurities of Holy Writ than the difficulties of prosody. In one thing, however, they betrayed a classic taste, and that was in their selection of names. The Royal Academicians all rejoiced in some literary soubriquet; Alcuin was Flaccus; Angilbert, Homer; but Charlemagne himself adopted the more scriptural appellation of David. The eagerness with which this extraordinary man applied himself to acquire learning for himself, and to extend it throughout his dominions, is truly admirable, when we remember the enormous labours in which he was constantly engaged."—A. T. Drane, *Christian Schools and Scholars*, ch. 5.—See, also, SCHOOL OF THE PALACE, CHARLEMAONE'S.

**England : King Alfred.**—King Alfred "gathered round him at his own court the sons of his nobility to receive, in conjunction with his own children, a better education than their parents would be able or willing to give them in their own households. To this assemblage of pupils Asser has attached the name of school, and a violent controversy once distracted the literary world concerning the sense in which the word was to be understood, and whether it was not the beginning or origin of a learned institution still existing. In speaking of this subject, Asser has taken occasion to enumerate and describe the children who were born to Alfred from his wife Elswitha daughter of Ethelred the 'Big,' alderman of the Gaini, and a noble of great wealth and influence in Mercia. 'The sons and daughters,' says Asser, 'which he had by his wife above mentioned I, were Ethelred the eldest, after whom came Edward, then Ethelgiva, then Ethelswitha, and Ethelwerd, besides those who died in their infancy, one of whom was Edmund. Ethelfled, when she arrived at a marriageable age, was united to Ethelred, earl of Mercia; Ethelgiva was dedicated to God, and submitted to the rules of a monastic life; Ethelwerd, the youngest, by the Divine counsels and admirable prudence of the king, was consigned to the schools of learning, where, with the children of almost all the nobility of the country, and many also who were not noble, he prospered under the diligent care of his teachers. Books in both languages, namely, in Latin and Saxon, were read in the school. They also learned to write; so that, before they were of an age to practise many arts, namely hunting and such other pursuits as befit noble men, they became studious and clever in the liberal arts. Edward and Ethelswitha were bred up in the king's court, and received great attention from their servants and nurses; nay, they continue to this day, with the love of all about them, and shew affability, and even gentleness, towards all, both foreigners and natives, and are in complete subjection to their father; nor, among their other studies which appertain to this life and are fit for noble youths, are they suffered to pass their time idly and unprofitably, without learning the liberal arts; for they have carefully learned the Psalms and Saxon books, especially the Saxon Poems, and are continually in the habit of making use of books.' The schools of learning, to which Asser alludes in this passage, as formed for the use of the king's children and the sons of his nobles, are again mentioned elsewhere by the same author, as 'the school which he had studiously collected together, consisting of many of the nobility of his own nation;' and in a third passage, Asser speaks of the 'sons of the nobility who were bred up in the royal household.' It is clear, then, from these expressions, that the king's exertions to spread learning among his nobles and to educate his own children, were of a most active and personal nature, unconnected with any institutions of a more public character: the school was kept in his own household, and not in a public seat of learning. We may perhaps adduce these expressions of Asser as militating against the notion, that an University or Public Seminary of Learning existed in the days of Alfred. Though it is most probable that the several monasteries, and other societies of monks and churchmen, would employ a portion of their idle time in teaching youth, and prosecuting their

own studies; yet there is no proof that an authorized seat of learning, such as the Universities of Oxford or Cambridge, existed in England, until many hundred years after the time of Alfred."—J. A. Giles, *Life and Times of Alfred the Great*, ch. 21.

**Saracenic and Moorish learning.**—"Even as early as the tenth century, persons having a taste for learning and for elegant amenities found their way into Spain from all adjoining countries; a practice in subsequent years still more indulged in, when it became illustrated by the brilliant success of Gilbert, who . . . passed from the Infidel University of Cordova to the papacy of Rome. The khalifs of the West carried out the precepts of Ali, the fourth successor of Mohammed, in the patronage of literature. They established libraries in all their chief towns; it is said that not fewer than seventy were in existence. To every mosque was attached a public school, in which the children of the poor were taught to read and write, and instructed in the precepts of the Koran. For those in easier circumstances there were academies, usually arranged in twenty-five or thirty apartments, each calculated for accommodating four students; the academy being presided over by a rector. In Cordova, Granada, and other great cities, there were universities frequently under the superintendence of Jews; the Mohammedan maxim being that the real learning of a man is of more public importance than any particular religious opinions he may entertain. In this they followed the example of the Asiatic khalif, Haroun Alraschid, who actually conferred the superintendence of his schools on John Masuë, a Nestorian Christian. The Mohammedan liberality was in striking contrast with the intolerance of Europe. . . . In the universities some of the professors of polite literature gave lectures on Arabic classical works; others taught rhetoric or composition, or mathematics, or astronomy. From these institutions many of the practices observed in our colleges were derived. They held Commencements, at which poems were read and orations delivered in presence of the public. They had also, in addition to these schools of general learning, professional ones, particularly for medicine. With a pride perhaps not altogether inexcusable, the Arabians boasted of their language as being the most perfect spoken by man. . . . It is not then surprising that, in the Arabian schools, great attention was paid to the study of language, and that so many celebrated grammarians were produced. By these scholars, dictionaries, similar to those now in use, were composed; their copiousness is indicated by the circumstance that one of them consisted of sixty volumes, the definition of each word being illustrated or sustained by quotations from Arab authors of acknowledged repute. They had also lexicons of Greek, Latin, Hebrew; and cyclopedias such as the Historical Dictionary of Sciences of Mohammed Ibn Abdallah, of Granada."—J. W. Draper, *Hist. of the Intellectual Development of Europe*, v. 2, ch. 2.—"The Saracenic kings formed libraries of unparalleled size and number. That of Ilaem amounted to 600,000 volumes, of which 44 were employed in the mere catalogue. Upwards of 70 public libraries were established in his dominions. 100,000 volumes were numbered in the library of Cairo, and were freely lent to the studious citizen. The taste of the sovereign communicated itself to the subject, and a private

doctor declared that his books were sufficient to load 400 camels. Nor were the Saracens less attentive to the foundation of schools and colleges. Eighty of the latter institutions adorned Cordova in the reign of Hakem; in the fifteenth century fifty were scattered over the city and plain of Granada. 200,000 dinars (about £100,000 sterling) were expended on the foundation of a single college at Baghdad. It was endowed with an annual revenue of 15,000 dinars, and was attended by 6,000 students. The princes of the house of Omeia honoured the Spanish academies by their presence and studies, and competed, not without success, for the prizes of learning. Numerous schools for the purpose of elementary instruction were founded by a long series of monarchs. . . . in this manner. The Arabians, within two centuries, constructed an apparatus for mental improvement which Lucretius had not been equalled save in Alexandria, and to which the Church, after ruling the intellect of Europe for more than five hundred years, could offer no parallel.—*The Intellectual Revival of the Middle Ages (Westminster Review, January, 1876).*

**Scholasticism.—Schoolmen.**—In the later times of the Roman empire, "the loss of the dignity of political freedom, the want of the cheerfulness of advancing prosperity, and the substitution of the less philosophical structure of the Latin language for the delicate intellectual mechanism of the Greek, fixed and augmented the prevalent feebleness and barrenness of intellect. Men forgot, or feared, to consult nature, to seek for new truths, to do what the great discoverers of other times had done; they were content to consult libraries, to study and defend old opinions, to talk of what great geniuses had said. They sought their philosophy in accredited treatises, and dared not question such doctrines as they there found. . . . In the mean time the Christian religion had become the leading subject of men's thoughts; and divines had put forward its claims to be, not merely the guide of men's lives, and the means of reconciling them to their heavenly Master, but also to be a Philosophy in the widest sense in which the term had been used;—a consistent speculative view of man's condition and nature, and of the world in which he is placed. . . . It was held, without any regulating principle, that the philosophy which had been bequeathed to the world by the great geniuses of heathen antiquity, and the philosophy which was deduced from, and implied by, the Revelations made by God to man, must be identical; and, therefore, that Theology is the only true philosophy. . . . This view was confirmed by the opinion which prevailed, concerning the nature of philosophical truth; a view supported by the theory of Plato, the practice of Aristotle, and the general propensities of the human mind: I mean the opinion that all science may be obtained by the use of reasoning alone;—that by analyzing and combining the notions which common language brings before us, we may learn all that we can know. Thus Logic came to include the whole of Science; and accordingly this Aetard expressly maintained. . . . Thus a Universal Science was established, with the authority of a Religious Creed. Its universality rested on erroneous views of the relation of words and truth; its pretensions as a science were admitted by the servile temper of men's intellects; and its religious authority was assigned it, by making all

truth part of religion. And as Religion claimed assent within her own jurisdiction under the most solemn and imperative sanctions, Philosophy shared in her imperial power, and dissent from their doctrines was no longer blameless or allowable. Error became wicked, dissent became heresy; to reject the received human doctrines, was nearly the same as to doubt the Divine declarations. The Scholastic Philosophy claimed the assent of all believers. The external form, the details, and the text of this Philosophy, were taken, in a great measure, from Aristotle; though, in the spirit, the general notions, and the style of interpretation, Plato and the Platonists had no inconsiderable share. . . . It does not belong to our purpose to consider either the theological or the metaphysical doctrines which form so large a portion of the treatises of the schoolmen. Perhaps it may hereafter appear, that some light is thrown on some of the questions which have occupied metaphysicians in all ages, by that examination of the history of the Progressive Sciences in which we are now engaged; but till we are able to analyze the leading controversies of this kind, it would be of little service to speak of them in detail. It may be noticed, however, that many of the most prominent of them refer to the great question, 'What is the relation between actual things and general terms?' Perhaps in modern times, the actual things would be more commonly taken as the point to start from; and men would begin by considering how classes and universals are obtained from individuals. But the schoolmen, founding their speculations on the received modes of considering such subjects, to which both Aristotle and Plato had contributed, travelled in the opposite direction, and endeavored to discover how individuals were deduced from genera and species;—what was 'the Principle of Individuation.' This was variously stated by different reasoners. Thus Bonaventura solves the difficulty by the aid of the Aristotelian distinction of Matter and Form. The individual derives from the Form the property of being something, and from the Matter the property of being that particular thing. Duns Scotus, the great adversary of Thomas Aquinas in theology, placed the principle of Individuation in 'a certain determining positive entity,' which his school called *Hæcceity* or 'thisness.' Thus an individual man is Peter, because his humanity is combined with *Petreity*. The force of abstract terms is a curious question, and some remarkable experiments in their use had been made by the Latin Aristotelians before this time. In the same way in which we talk of the quantity and quality of a thing, they spoke of its 'quiddity.' We may consider the reign of mere disputation as fully established at the time of which we are now speaking [the Middle Ages]; and the only kind of philosophy henceforth studied was one in which no sound physical science had or could have a place."—V. Whewell, *Hist. of the Inductive Sciences*, bk. 4, ch. 4 (v. 1).—"Scholasticism was philosophy in the service of established and accepted theological doctrines. . . . More particularly, Scholasticism was the reproduction of ancient philosophy under the control of ecclesiastical doctrine. . . . The name of Scholastics (*doctores scholastici*) which was given to the teachers of the *septem liberales artes* [seven liberal arts] (grammar, dialectic, rhetoric, in the *Trivium*; arithmetic, geometry, music and astron-

omy, in the Quadrivium), or at least some of them, in the Cloister-Schools founded by Charlemagne, as also to teachers of theology, was afterwards given to all who occupied themselves with the sciences, and especially with philosophy. . . . Johannes Scotus, or Erigena [ninth century] is the earliest noteworthy philosopher of the Scholastic period. He was of Scottish nationality, but was probably born and brought up in Ireland. At the call of Charles the Bald he emigrated to France."—F. Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy*, v. 1, pp. 355-484.—"Scholasticism, at the last, from the prodigious mental activity which it kept up, became a tacit universal insurrection against authority: it was the swelling of the ocean before the storm. . . . It was a sign of a great awakening of the human mind when theologians thought it both their duty and their privilege to philosophize. There was a vast waste of intellectual labor, but still it was intellectual labor, and, as we shall see, it was not in the end unfruitful."—C. J. Stillé, *Studies in Medieval History*, ch. 13.—"Scholasticism had its hour of glory, its erudite detectors, its eloquent professors, chief among whom was Abelard (1079-1142). . . . At a time when printing did not exist, when manuscript copies were rare, a teacher who combined knowledge with the gift of speech was a phenomenon of incomparable interest, and students flocked from all parts of Europe to take advantage of his lectures. Abelard is the most brilliant representative of the scholastic pedagogy, with an original and personal tendency towards the emancipation of the mind. 'It is ridiculous,' he said, 'to preach to others what we can neither make them understand nor understand ourselves.' With more boldness than Saint Anselm, he applied dialectics to theology, and attempted to reason out the grounds of his faith. The seven liberal arts constituted what may be called the secondary instruction of the Middle Age, such as was given in the claustral or conventual schools, and later, in the universities. The liberal arts were distributed into two courses of study, known as the 'trivium' and the 'quadrivium.' The 'trivium' comprised grammar (Latin grammar, of course), dialectics, or logic, and rhetoric; and the 'quadrivium,' music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy. It is important to note the fact that this programme contains only abstract and formal studies,—no real and concrete studies. The sciences which teach us to know man and the world, such as history, ethics, the physical and natural sciences, were omitted and unknown, save perhaps in a few convents of the Benedictines. Nothing which can truly educate man, and develop his faculties as a whole, enlists the attention of the Middle Age. From a course of study thus limited there might come skillful reasoners and men formidable in argument, but never fully developed men. The methods employed in the ecclesiastical schools of the Middle Age were in accord with the spirit of the times, when men were not concerned about liberty and intellectual freedom; and when they thought more about the teaching or dogmas than about the training of the intelligence. The teachers recited or read their lectures, and the pupils learned by heart. The discipline was harsh. Corrupt human nature was distrusted. In 1363, pupils were forbidden the use of benches and chairs, on the pretext that such high seats were an encouragement to pride. For securing

obedience, corporal chastisements were used and abused. The rod is in fashion in the fifteenth as it was in the fourteenth century. 'There is no other difference,' says an historian, 'except that the rods in the fifteenth century are twice as long as those in the fourteenth.'"—G. Compayré, *The Hist. of Pedagogy*; trans. by W. H. Payne, ch. 4.

**Universities, Their Rise.—Abelard.**—"Up to the end of the eleventh century the instruction was, speaking generally, and allowing for transitory periods of revival, and for a few exceptional schools, a shrunken survival of the old 'trivium et quadrivium.' The lessons, when not dictated and learnt by heart from notes, were got up from bald epitomes. All that was taught, moreover, was taught solely with a view to 'pious uses.' Criticism did not exist; the free spirit of speculation could not, of course, exist. . . . As we approach the period which saw the birth of those institutions known as *Studia Publica* or *Generalia*, and ere long to be known as 'universities,' we have to extend our vision and recognize the circumstances of the time, and those changes in the social condition of Europe which made great central schools possible—schools to be frequented not merely by the young ecclesiastic, but by laymen. Among other causes which led to the diffusion of a demand for education among the laity, was, I think, the institution or reorganization of municipalities. It was about the end of the eleventh century that the *civie Communes* (*Communa*) began to seek and obtain, from royal and other authorities, charters of incorporation constituting their internal government and conferring certain freedoms and privileges as against the encroachment of lay and ecclesiastical feudal barons. . . . About the same time, and somewhat prior to this, trade guilds had been formed in many cities for mutual protection, the advancement of commerce, and the internal regulation of the various crafts. There immediately followed a desire for schools in the more important commercial towns. In Italy such schools arose in Bologna, Milan, Brescia, and Florence; and in Germany they arose in Altbek, Hamburg, Breslau, Nordhausen, Stettin, Leipsic, and Nürnberg. The distinctive characteristic of these city schools was, that they do not seem to have been under the direct control of the Church, or to have been always taught by priests; further, that the native tongue (German or Italian, as the case might be) was taught. Reading, writing, and a little arithmetic seem to have formed the staple of the instruction. The custom of dictating, writing down, and then learning by heart what was written—universal in the schools of the preceding centuries—was, of course, still followed in these burgh schools. This custom was almost inevitable. . . . Increased communication with Africa and the East through the Crusades had introduced men to a standard of learning among the Arabs, unknown in Europe. Outside the school, the order of chivalry had introduced a new and higher ethical spirit than had been known in the previous centuries. Civic communities and trade guilds were forming themselves and seeking charters of incorporation. Above all, the Crusades, by stimulating the ardour and exciting the intellects of men, had unsettled old convention by bringing men of all ranks within the sacred circle of a common enthusiasm, and into contact with foreign civilizations. The desire for a higher education,

and the impulse to more profound investigation, that characterized the beginning and course of the twelfth century, was thus only a part of a widespread movement, political and moral. . . . While the Romano-Hellenic schools had long disappeared, there still existed, in many towns, episcopal schools of a high class, many of which might be regarded as continuations of the old imperial provincial institutions. . . . In Bologna and Paris, Rheims and Naples, it was so. The arts curriculum professed in these centres was, for the time and state of knowledge, good. These schools, indeed, had never quite lost the fresh impulse given by Charlemagne and his successors. . . . According to my view of educational history, the great 'studia publica' or 'generalia' arose out of them. They were themselves, in a narrow sense, already 'studia publica.' . . . Looking, first, to the germ out of which the universities grew, I think we must say that the universities may be regarded as a natural development of the cathedral and monastery schools; but if we seek for an external motive force urging men to undertake the more profound and independent study of the liberal arts, we can find it only in the Saracenic schools of Bagdad, Babylon, Alexandria, and Cordova. . . . To fix precisely the date of the rise of the first specialized schools or universities is impossible, for the simple reason that they were not founded. . . . The simplest account of the new university origins is the most correct. It would appear that certain active-minded men of marked eminence began to give instruction in medical subjects at Salerno, and in law at Bologna, in a spirit and manner not previously attempted, to youths who had left the monastery and cathedral schools, and who desired to equip themselves for professional life. Pupils flocked to them; and the more able of these students, finding that there was a public demand for this higher specialized instruction, remained at headquarters, and themselves became teachers or doctors. The Church did not found universities any more than it founded the order of chivalry. They were founded by a concurrence (not wholly fortuitous) of able men who had something they wished to teach, and of youths who desired to learn. None the less were the acquiescence and protection of Church and State necessary in those days for the fostering of these infant seminaries. . . . Of the three great schools which we have named, there is sufficient ground for believing that the first to reach such a development as to entitle it to the name of a *studium generale* or university was the 'Schola Salernitana,' although it never was a university, technically speaking."—S. S. Laurie, *Rise and Early Constitution of Universities*, lect. 6-7.—"Ideas, till this time scattered, or watched over in the various ecclesiastical schools, began to converge to a common centre. The great name of University was recognised in the capital of France, at the moment that the French tongue had become almost universal. The conquests of the Normans, and the first crusade, had spread its powerfully philosophic idiom in every direction, to England, to Sicily, and to Jerusalem. This circumstance alone invested France, central France, Paris, with an immense attractive power. By degrees, Parisian French became a proverb. Feudalism had found its political centre in the royal city; and this city was about to become the capital of human thought. The beginner of this revolution was not a priest, but a

handsome young man of brilliant talents, amiable and of noble family. None wrote love verses, like his, in the vulgar tongue; he sang them, too. Besides, his erudition was extraordinary for that day. He alone, of his time, knew both Greek and Hebrew. May be, he had studied at the Jewish schools (there were many in the South), or under the rabbins of Troyes, Vitry, or of Orléans. There were then in Paris two leading schools: the old Episcopal school of the parvis Notre Dame, and that of St. Geneviève, on the hill, where shone William of Champenoux. Abelard joined his pupils, submitted to him his doubts, puzzled him, laughed at him, and closed his mouth. He would have served Anselm of Laon the same, had not the professor, being a bishop, expelled him from his diocese. In this fashion this knight-errant of logic went on, unhorsing the most celebrated champions. He himself declared that he had only renounced tilt and tourney through his passion for intellectual combats. Henceforward, victorious and without a rival, he taught at Paris and Melun, the residence of Louis-le-Gros, and the lords flocked to hear him; anxious to encourage one of themselves, who had discomfited the priests on their own ground, and had silenced the ablest clerks. Abelard's wonderful success is easily explained. All the lore and learning which had been smothered under the heavy, dogmatical forms of clerical instruction, and hidden in the rude Latin of the middle age, suddenly appeared arrayed in the simple elegance of antiquity, so that men seemed for the first time to hear and recognise a human voice. The daring youth simplified and explained everything; presenting philosophy in a familiar form, and bringing it home to men's bosoms. He hardly suffered the obscure or supernatural to rest on the hardest mysteries of faith. It seemed as if till then the Church had lisped and stammered; while Abelard spoke. All was made smooth and easy. He treated religion courteously and handled her gently, but she melted away in his hands. Nothing embarrassed the fluent speaker: he reduced religion to philosophy, and morality to humanity. 'Crime,' he said, 'consists not in the act, but in the intention.' It followed, that there was no such thing as sins of habit or of ignorance—"They who crucified Jesus, not knowing him to have been the Saviour, were guilty of no sin." What is original sin?—"Less a sin, than a punishment." But then, wherefore the redemption and the passion, if there was no sin?—"It was an act of pure love. God desired to substitute the law of love for that of fear."—J. Michelet, *History of France*, v. 1, bk. 4, ch. 4.—"It is difficult, by a mere perusal of Abelard's works, to understand the effect he produced upon his hearers by the force of his argumentation, whether studied or improvised, and by the ardor and animation of his eloquence, and the grace and attractiveness of his person. But the testimony of his contemporaries is unanimous; even his adversaries themselves render justice to his high oratorical qualities. No one ever reasoned with more subtlety, or handled the dialectic tool with more address; and assuredly, something of these qualities is to be found in the writings he has left us. But the intense life, the enthusiastic ardor, which enlivened his discourses, the beauty of his face, and the charm of his voice cannot be imparted by cold manuscripts. Héloïse, whose name is inseparably linked with

that of her unfortunate husband, and whom Charles de Rémusat does not hesitate to call 'the first of women'; who, in any case, was a superior person of her time; Héloïse, who loved Abelard with 'an immoderate love,' and who, under the veil of a 'religieuse' and throughout the practice of devotional duties, remained faithful to him until death; Héloïse said to him in her famous letter of 1136: 'Thou hast two things especially which could instantly win thee the hearts of all women: the charm thou knowest how to impart to thy voice in speaking and singing.' External gifts combined with intellectual qualities to make of Abelard an incomparable seducer of minds and hearts. Add to this an astonishing memory, a knowledge as profound as was compatible with the resources of his time, and a vast erudition which caused his contemporaries to consider him a master of universal knowledge. . . . How can one be astonished that with such qualities Abelard gained an extraordinary ascendancy over his age; that, having become the intellectual ruler and, as it were, the dictator of the thought of the twelfth century, he should have succeeded in attracting to his chair and in retaining around it thousands of young men; the first germ of those assemblages of students who were to constitute the universities several years later? . . . It is not alone by the outward success of his scholastic apostolate that Abelard merits consideration as the precursor of the modern spirit and the promoter of the foundation of the universities; it is also by his doctrine, or at least by his method. . . . No one claims that Abelard was the first who, in the Middle Ages, had introduced dialectics into theology, reason into authority. In the ninth century, Scotus Erigena had already said: 'Authority is derived from reason.' Scholasticism, which is nothing but logic enlightening theology, an effort of reason to demonstrate dogma, had begun before Abelard; but it was he who gave movement and life to the method by lending it his power and his renown."—G. Comptayré, *Abelard*, pt. 1, ch. 2-3.

**Latin Language.**—"Greek was an unknown tongue: only a very few of the Latin classics received a perfunctory attention; Boethius was preferred to Cicero, and the Moral Sentences ascribed to Cato to either. Rules couched in barbarous Latin verse were committed to memory. Aristotle was known only in incorrect Latin translations, which many of the taught, and some of the teachers probably, supposed to be the originals. Matters were not mended when the student, having passed through the preliminary course of arts, advanced to the study of the sciences. Theology meant an acquaintance with the 'Sentences' of Peter Lombard, or, in other cases, with the 'Summa' of Thomas Aquinas; in medicine, Galen was an authority from which there was no appeal. On every side the student was fenced round by traditions and prejudices, through which it was impossible to break. In truth, he had no means of knowing that there was a wider and fairer world beyond. Till the classical revival came, every decade made the yoke of prescription heavier, and each generation of students, therefore, a feebler copy of the last."—C. Beard, *Martin Luther and the Reformation*, ch. 3.—"What at first had been everywhere a Greek became in Western Europe a Latin religion. The discipline of Rome maintained the body of doctrine which the thought of

Greece had defined. A new Latin version, superseding alike the venerable Greek translation of the Old Testament and the original words of Evangelists and Apostles, became the received text of Holy Scripture. The Latin Fathers acquired an authority scarcely less binding. The ritual, lessons, and hymns of the Church were Latin. Ecclesiastics transacted the business of civil departments requiring education. Libraries were arminories of the Church; grammar was part of her drill. The humblest scholar was enlisted in her service: she recruited her ranks by founding Latin schools. 'Education in the rudiments of Latin,' says Hallam, 'was imparted to a greater number of individuals than at present;' and, as they had more use for it than at present, it was longer retained. If a boy of humble birth had a taste for letters, or if a boy of high birth had a distaste for arms, the first step was to learn Latin. His foot was then on the ladder. He might rise by the good offices of his family to a bishopric, or to the papacy itself by merit and the grace of God. Latin enabled a Greek from Tarsus (Theodore) to become the founder of learning in the English church; and a Yorkshireman (Alcuin) to organize the schools of Charlemagne. Without Latin, our English Winfrid (St. Boniface) could not have been apostle of Germany and reformer of the Frankish Church; or the German Albert, master at Paris of Thomas Aquinas; or Nicholas Breakspere, Pope of Rome. With it, Western Christendom was one vast field of labor: calls for self-sacrifice, or offers of promotion, might come from north or south, from east or west. Thus in the Middle Ages Latin was made the groundwork of education; not for the beauty of its classical literature, nor because the study of a dead language was the best mental gymnastic, or the only means of acquiring a masterly freedom in the use of living tongues, but because it was the language of educated men throughout Western Europe, employed for public business, literature, philosophy, and science; above all, in God's providence, essential to the unity, and therefore enforced by the authority of, the Western Church."—C. S. Parker, *Essay on the History of Classical Education* (quoted in Dr. Henry Barnard's "Letters, Essays and Thoughts on Studies and Conduct," p. 467).

**France.**—"The countries of western Europe, leavened, all of them, by the one spirit of the feudal and catholic Middle Age, formed in some sense one community, and were more associated than they have been since the feudal and catholic unity of the Middle Age has disappeared and given place to the divided and various life of modern Europe. In the mediæval community France held the first place. It is now well known that to place in the 15th century the revival of intellectual life and the re-establishment of civilisation, and to treat the period between the 5th century, when ancient civilisation was ruined by the barbarians, and the 15th, when the life and intellect of this civilisation reappeared and transformed the world, as one chaos, is a mistake. The chaos ends about the 10th century; in the 11th there truly comes the first re-establishment of civilisation, the first revival of intellectual life; the principal centre of this revival is France, its chief monuments of literature are in the French language, its chief monuments of art are the French cathedrals. This revival fills the 12th and



13th centuries with its activity and with its works; all this time France has the lead; in the 14th century the lead passes to Italy; but now comes the commencement of a wholly new period, the period of the Renaissance properly so called, the beginning of modern European life, the ceasing of the life of the feudal and catholic Middle Age. The anterior and less glorious Renaissance, the Renaissance within the limits of the Middle Age itself, a revival which came to a stop and could not successfully develop itself, but which has yet left profound traces in our spirit and our literature,—this revival belongs chiefly to France. France, then, may well serve as a typical country wherein to trace the mediæval growth of intellect and learning; above all she may so stand for us, whose connection with her in the Middle Age, owing to our Norman kings and the currency of her language among our cultivated class, was so peculiarly close; so close that the literary and intellectual development of the two countries at that time intermingles, and no important event can happen in that of the one without straightway affecting and interesting that of the other. . . . With the hostility of the long French Wars of Edward the Third comes the estrangement, never afterwards diminishing but always increasing.”—M. Arnold, *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, ch. 1.—**University of Paris.**—“The name of Abelard recalls the European celebrity and immense intellectual ferment of this school [of Paris] in the 12th century. But it was in the first year of the following century, the 13th, that it received a charter from Philip Augustus, and thenceforth the name of University of Paris takes the place of that of School of Paris. Forty-nine years later was founded University College, Oxford, the oldest college of the oldest English University. Four nations composed the University of Paris,—the nation of France, the nation of Picardy, the nation of Normandy, and (signal mark of the close intercourse which then existed between France and us!) the nation of England. The four nations united formed the faculty of arts. The faculty of theology was created in 1257, that of law in 1271, that of medicine in 1274. Theology, law, and medicine had each their Dean; arts had four Procurators, one for each of the four nations composing this faculty. Arts elected the rector of the University, and had possession of the University chest and archives. The pre-eminence of the Faculty of Arts indicates, as indeed does the very development of the University, an idea, gradually strengthening itself, of a lay instruction to be no longer absorbed in theology, but separable from it. The growth of a lay and modern spirit in society, the preponderance of the crown over the papacy, of the civil over the ecclesiastical power, is the great feature of French history in the 14th century, and to this century belongs the highest development of the University. . . . The importance of the University in the 13th and 14th centuries was extraordinary. Men’s minds were possessed with a wonderful zeal for knowledge, or what was then thought knowledge, and the University of Paris was the great fount from which this knowledge issued. The University and those depending on it made at this time, it is said, actually a third of the population of Paris; when the University went on a solemn occasion in procession to Saint Denis, the head of the procession, it is said, had reached St. Denis before the end of it

had left its starting place in Paris. It had immunities from taxation, it had jurisdiction of its own, and its members claimed to be exempt from that of the provost of Paris; the kings of France strongly favoured the University, and leaned to its side when the municipal and academical authorities were in conflict; if at any time the University thought itself seriously aggrieved, it had recourse to a measure which threw Paris into dismay,—‘t’ shut up its schools and suspended its lectures.’ In a body of this kind the discipline could not be strict, and the colleges were created to supply centres of discipline which the University in itself,—an apparatus merely of teachers and lecture-rooms,—did not provide. The 14th century is the time when, one after another, with wonderful rapidity, the French colleges appeared. Navarre, Montaigu, Harcourt, names so familiar in the school annals of France, date from the first quarter of the 14th century. The College of Navarre was founded by the queen of Philip the Fair, in 1304; the College of Montaigu, where Erasmus, Rabelais, and Ignatius Loyola were in their time students, was founded in 1314 by two members of the family of Montaigu, one of them Archbishop of Rouen. The majority of these colleges were founded by magnates of the church, and designed to maintain a certain number of bursars, or scholars, during their university course. . . . Along with the University of Paris there existed in France, in the 14th century, the Universities of Orleans, Angers, Toulouse, and Montpellier. Orleans was the great French school for the study of the civil law. . . . The civil law was studiously kept away from the University of Paris, for fear it should drive out other studies, and especially the study of theology; so late as the year 1679 there was no chair of Roman or even of French law in the University of Paris. The strength of this University was concentrated on theology and arts, and its celebrity arose from the multitude of students which in these branches of instruction it attracted.”—M. Arnold, *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, ch. 1.—**The Sorbonne.**—The University of Paris acquired the name of “the Sorbonne” “from Robert of Sorbon, aulic chaplain of St. Louis, who established one of the 63 colleges of the University. . . . The name of Sorbonne was first applied to the theological faculty only; but at length the whole University received this designation.”—J. Alzog, *Manual of Universal Church History*, v. 3, p. 24, foot-note.—**The Nations.**—“The precise date of the organization at Paris of the four Nations which maintained themselves there until the latest days of the university escapes the most minute research. Neither for the Nations nor for the Faculties was there any sudden blossoming, but rather a slow evolution, an insensible preparation for a definite condition. Already at the close of the twelfth century there is mention in contemporary documents of the various provinces of the school of Paris. The Nations are mentioned in the bulls of Gregory IX. (1231) and of Innocent III. (1245). In 1245, they already elect their attendants by bundles. In 1249, the existence of the four Nations—France, Picardy, Normandy, and England—is proved by their quarrels over the election of a rector. . . . Until the definitive constitution of the Faculties, that is, until 1270 or 1280, the four Nations included the totality of students and masters. After the



formation of the Faculties, the four Nations comprised only the members of the Faculty of Arts and those students of other Faculties who had not yet obtained the grade of Bachelor of Arts. The three superior Faculties, Theology, Medicine, and Law, had nothing in common thenceforward with the Nations. . . . At Bologna, as at Paris, the Nations were constituted in the early years of the thirteenth century, but under a slightly different form. There the students were grouped in two distinct associations, the Ultramontanes and the Citramontanes, the foreigners and the Italians, who formed two universities, the Transalpine and the Cisalpine, each with its chiefs, who were not styled procurators but counsellors; the first was composed of eighteen Nations and the second of seventeen. At Padua twenty-two Nations were enumerated. Montpellier had only three in 1339,—the Catalans, the Burgundians, the Provençais; each subdivided, however, into numerous groups. Orleans had ten; France, Germany, Lorraine, Burgundy, Champagne, Picardy, Normandy, Touraine, Guyenne, and Scotland; Poitiers had four; France, Aquitaine, Touraine, and Berry; Prague had four also, in imitation of Paris; Lerida had twelve, in imitation of Bologna, etc. But whether more or less numerous, and whatever their special organization, the Nations in all the universities bore witness to that need of association which is one of the characteristics of the Middle Ages. . . . One of the consequences of their organization was to prevent the blending and fusion of races, and to maintain the distinction of provinces and nationalities among the pupils of the same university."—G. Compayré, *Abelard*, pt. 2, ch. 2.

**Italy: Revived Study of Roman Law.**—"It is known that Justinian established in Rome a school of law, similar to those of Constantinople and Berytus. When Rome ceased to be subject to Byzantine rule, this law-school seems to have been transferred to Ravenna, where it continued to keep alive the knowledge of the Justinian system. That system continued to be known and used, from century to century, in a tradition never wholly interrupted, especially in the free cities of Northern Italy. It seems even to have penetrated beyond Italy into Southern France. But it was destined to have, at the beginning of the twelfth century, a very extraordinary revival. This revival was part of a general movement of the European mind which makes its appearance at that epoch. The darkness which settled down on the world, at the time of the barbarian invasions, had its midnight in the ninth and tenth centuries. In the eleventh, signs of progress and improvement begin to show themselves, becoming more distinct towards its close, when the period of the Crusades was opening upon Europe. Just at this time we find a famous school of law established in Bologna, and frequented by multitudes of pupils, not only from all parts of Italy, but from Germany, France, and other countries. The basis of all its instruction was the *Corpus Juris Civilis* [see *CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS*]. Its teachers, who constitute a series of distinguished jurists extending over a century and a half, devoted themselves to the work of expounding the text and elucidating the principles of the *Corpus Juris*, and especially the *Digest*. From the form in which they recorded and handed down the results of their studies, they have obtained the

name of glossators. On their copies of the *Corpus Juris* they were accustomed to write glosses, i. e., brief marginal explanations and remarks. These glosses came at length to be an immense literature. . . . Here, then, in this school of the glossators, at Bologna, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the awakened mind of Europe was brought to recognize the value of the *Corpus Juris*, the almost inexhaustible treasure of juristic principles, precepts, conceptions, reasonings, stored up in it."—Jas. Hadley, *Introd. to Roman Law*, lect. 2.—**University of Bologna.**—"In the twelfth century the law school of the University of Bologna eclipsed all others in Europe. The two great branches of legal study in the middle ages, the Roman law and the canon law, began in the teaching of Imerius and Gratian at Bologna in the first half of the twelfth century. At the beginning of this century the name of university first replaces that of school; and it is said that the great university degree, that of doctor, was first instituted at Bologna, and that the ceremony for conferring it was devised there. From Bologna the degree and its ceremonial travelled to Paris. A bull of Pope Honorius, in 1230, says that the study of 'bonæ literæ' had at that time made the city of Bologna famous throughout the world. Twelve thousand students from all parts of Europe are said to have been congregated there at once. The different nations had their colleges, and of colleges at Bologna there were fourteen. These were founded and endowed by the liberality of private persons; the university professors, the source of attraction to this multitude of students, were paid by the municipality, who found their reward in the fame, business, and importance brought to their town by the university. The municipalities of the great cities of northern and central Italy were not slow in following the example of Bologna; in the thirteenth century Padua, Modena, Piacenza, Parma, Ferrara, had each its university. Frederick II. founded that of Naples in 1224; in the fourteenth century were added those of Pavia, Perugia, Pisa, and Turin. Colleges of examiners, or, as we should say, boards, were created by Papal bull to examine in theology, and by imperial decree to examine in law and medicine. It was in these studies of law and medicine that the Italian universities were chiefly distinguished."—M. Arnold, *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, ch. 9.—"The Bologna school of jurisprudence was several times threatened with total extinction. In the repeated difficulties with the city the students would march out of the town, bound by a solemn oath not to return; and if a compromise was to be effected, a papal dispensation from that oath must first be obtained. Generally on such occasions, the privileges of the university were reaffirmed and often enlarged. In other cases, a quarrel between the pope and the city, and the ban placed over the latter, obliged the students to leave; and then the city often planned and furthered the removal of the university. King Frederic II., in 1226, during the war against Bologna, dissolved the school of jurisprudence, which seems to have been not at all affected thereby, and he formally recalled that ordinance in the following year. Originally the only school in Bologna was the school of jurisprudence, and in connection with it alone a university could be formed. . . . Subsequently eminent teachers of medicine and the liberal arts appeared, and their

pupils, too, sought to form a university and to choose their own rector. As late as 1295 this innovation was disputed by the jurists and interdicted by the city, so that they had to connect themselves with the university of jurisprudence. But a few years later we find them already in possession again of a few rectors, and in 1316 their right was formally recognized in a compromise between the university of jurisprudence and the city. The students called themselves 'philosophi et medici' or 'physici'; also by the common name of 'artistæ.' Finally a school of theology, founded by pope Innocent VI., was added in the second half of the 14th century; it was placed under the bishop, and organized in imitation of the school at Paris, so that it was a 'universitas magistrorum,' not 'scholarium.' As, however, by this arrangement the students of theology in the theological university had no civil privileges of their own, they were considered individually as belonging to the 'artistæ.' From this time Bologna had four universities, two of jurisprudence, the one of medicine and philosophy, and the theological, the first two having no connection with the others, forming a unit, and therefore frequently designated as one university."—F. C. Savigny, *The Universities of the Middle Ages* (Barnard's *Am. Journal of Education*, v. 22, pp. 278–279).—**Other Universities.**—"The oldest and most frequented university in Italy, that of Bologna, is represented as having flourished in the twelfth century. Its prosperity in early times depended greatly on the personal conduct of the principal professors, who, when they were not satisfied with their entertainment, were in the habit of seceding with their pupils to other cities. Thus high schools were opened from time to time in Modena, Reggio, and elsewhere by teachers who broke the oaths that bound them to reside in Bologna, and fixed their centre of education in a rival town. To make such temporary changes was not difficult in an age when what we have to call an university, consisted of masters and scholars, without college buildings, without libraries, without endowments, and without scientific apparatus. The technical name for such institutions seems to have been 'studium scholasticum,' Italianised into 'studio' or 'studio pubblico.' Among the more permanent results of these secessions may be mentioned the establishment of the high school at Vicenza by translation from Bologna in 1204, and the opening of a school at Arezzo under similar circumstances in 1215; the great University of Padua first saw the light in consequence of political discords forcing the professors to quit Bologna for a season. The first half of the thirteenth century witnessed the foundation of these 'studi' in considerable numbers. That of Vercelli was opened in 1228, the municipality providing two certified copyists for the convenience of students who might wish to purchase textbooks. In 1224 the Emperor Frederick II., to whom the south of Italy owed a precocious eminence in literature, established the University of Naples by an Imperial diploma. With a view to rendering it the chief seat of learning in his dominions, he forbade the subjects of the Regno to frequent other schools, and suppressed the University of Bologna by letters general. Thereupon Bologna joined the Lombard League, defied the Emperor, and refused to close the schools, which numbered at that period about ten thou-

sand students of various nationalities. In 1227 Frederick revoked his edict, and Bologna remained thenceforward unmolested. Political and internal vicissitudes, affecting all the Italian universities at this period, interrupted the prosperity of that of Naples. In the middle of the thirteenth century Salerno proved a dangerous rival. . . . An important group of 'studi pubblici' owed their origin to Papal or Imperial charters in the first half of the fourteenth century. That of Perugia was founded in 1307 by a Bull of Clement V. That of Rome dated from 1304, in which year Boniface VIII. gave it a constitution by a special edict; but the translation of the Papal See to Avignon caused it to fall into premature decadence. The University of Pisa had already existed for some years, when it received a charter in 1343 from Clement VI. That of Florence was first founded in 1321. . . . The subjects taught in the high schools were Canon and Civil Law, Medicine, and Theology. These faculties, important for the professional education of the public, formed the staple of the academical curriculum. Chairs of Rhetoric, Philosophy, and Astronomy were added according to occasion, the last sometimes including the study of judicial astrology. If we enquire how the humanists or professors of classic literature were related to the universities, we find that, at first at any rate, they always occupied a second rank. The permanent teaching remained in the hands of jurists, who enjoyed life engagements at a high rate of pay, while the Latinists and Grecians could only aspire to the temporary occupation of the Chair of Rhetoric, with salaries considerably lower than those of lawyers or physicians."—J. A. Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy: the Revival of Learning*, ch. 3.—"Few of the Italian universities show themselves in their full vigour till the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, when the increase of wealth rendered a more systematic care for education possible. At first there were generally three sorts of professorships—one for civil law, another for canonical law, the third for medicine; in course of time professorships of rhetoric, of philosophy, and of astronomy were added, the last commonly, though not always, identical with astrology. The salaries varied greatly in different cases. Sometimes a capital sum was paid down. With the spread of culture competition became so active that the different universities tried to entice away distinguished teachers from one another, under which circumstances Bologna is said to have sometimes devoted the half of its public income (20,000 ducats) to the university. The appointments were as a rule made only for a certain time, sometimes for only half a year, so that the teachers were forced to lead a wandering life, like actors. Appointments for life were, however, not unknown. . . . Of the chairs which have been mentioned, that of rhetoric was especially sought by the humanist; yet it depended only on his familiarity with the matter of ancient learning whether or no he could aspire to those of law, medicine, philosophy, or astronomy. The inward conditions of the science of the day were as variable as the outward conditions of the teacher. Certain jurists and physicians received by far the largest salaries of all, the former chiefly as consulting lawyers for the suits and claims of the state which employed them. . . . Personal intercourse between the teachers and the taught, public disputations, the constant use

of Latin and often of Greek, the frequent changes of lecturers and the scarcity of books, gave the studies of that time a colour which we cannot represent to ourselves without effort. There were Latin schools in every town of the least importance, not by any means merely as preparatory to higher education, but because, next to reading, writing, and arithmetic, the knowledge of Latin was a necessity; and after Latin came logic. It is to be noted particularly that these schools did not depend on the Church, but on the municipality; some of them, too, were merely private enterprises. This school system, directed by a few distinguished humanists, not only attained a remarkable perfection of organisation, but became an instrument of higher education in the modern sense of the phrase."—J. Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Period of the Renaissance in Italy*, v. 1, pt. 3, ch. 5.

**Germany.—Prague and its Offspring.**—"The earliest university in Germany was that of Prague. It was in 1348, under the Emperor Charles IV., when the taste for letters had revived so signally in Europe, when England may be said to have possessed her two old universities already for three centuries, Paris her Sorbonne already for four, that this university was erected as the first of German Universities. The idea originated in the mind of the Emperor, who was educated in Paris, at the university of that town, and was eagerly taken up by the townspeople of that ancient and wealthy city, for they foresaw that alliance would shower upon them if they could induce a numerous crowd of students to flock together within their walls. But the Pope and the Emperor took an active part in favouring and authorizing the institution; they willingly granted to it wide privileges, and made it entirely independent of Church and State. The teaching of the professors, and the studies of the students, were submitted to no control whatever. After the model of the University of Paris, they divided themselves into different faculties, and made four such divisions—one for divinity, another for medical science, a third for law, and a fourth for philosophy. The last order comprised those who taught and learned the fine arts and the sciences, which two departments were separate at Sorbonne. All the German universities have preserved this outward constitution, and in this, as in many other circumstances, the precedent of Prague has had a prevailing influence on her younger sister institutions. The same thing may be said particularly of the disciplinary tone of the university. In other countries, universities sprang from rigid clerical and monastic institutions, or bore a more or less ecclesiastical character which imposed upon them certain more retired habits, and a severer kind of discipline. Prague took from the beginning a course widely different. The students, who were partly Germans, partly of Slavonian blood, enjoyed a boundless liberty. They lodged in the houses of the townspeople, and by their riches, their mental superiority, and their number (they are recorded to have been as many as twenty thousand in the year 1400), became the undisputed masters of the city. The professors and the inhabitants of Prague, far from checking them, rather protected the prerogatives of the students, for they found out that all their prosperity depended on them. . . . Not two generations had passed since the erec-

tion of an institution thus constituted, before Huss and Jerome of Prague began to teach the necessity of an entire reformation of the Church. The phenomenon is characteristic of the bold spirit of inquiry that must have grown up at the new University. However, the political consequences that attended the promulgation of such doctrines led almost to the dissolution of the University itself. For, the German part of the students broke up, in consequence of repeated and serious quarrels that had taken place with the Bohemian and Slavonic party, and went to Leipzig, where straightway a new and purely German University was erected. While Prague became the seat of a protracted and sanguinary war, a great number of Universities rose into existence around it, and attracted the crowds that had formerly flocked to the Bohemian capital. It appeared as if Germany, though it had received the impulse from abroad, would leave all other countries behind itself in the erection and promotion of these learned institutions, for all the districts of the land vied with each other in creating universities. Thus arose those of Rostock, Ingolstadt, Vienna, Heidelberg, Cologne, Erfurt, Tübingen, Greifswalde, Trèves, Mayence and Bâles—schools which have partly disappeared again during the political storms of subsequent ages. The beginning of the sixteenth century added to them one at Frankfort on the Oder, and another, the most illustrious of all, Wittenberg. Everyone who is acquainted with the history and origin of the Reformation, knows what an important part the latter of these universities took in the weighty transactions of those times. . . . Wittenberg remained by no means the only champion of Protestantism. At Marburg, Jena, Königsberg, and Helmstadt, universities of a professedly Protestant character were erected. These schools became the cradle and nurseries of the Reformation."—*The Universities of Germany (Dublin University Magazine, v. 46, pp. 83-85)*.—"The German universities of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were founded in the following order: Prague, 1348; Vienna, 1388; Erfurt, 1392; Leipsic, 1409; Rostock, 1419; Greifswald, 1456; Freiburg, 1457; Ingolstadt, 1472; Tübingen, 1477; and Mayence, 1477. Thus, it will be seen that they were established in quick succession—an unmistakable proof of the growing scientific interest of the age."—F. V. N. Painter, *Hist. of Education, ch. 3, sect. 5 (k)*.

**Netherlands.**—"Tradition reports that a school had . . . been founded at Utrecht, by some zealous missionary, in the time of Charles Martel, at which his son Pepin received his education. However this may have been, the renown of the Utrecht School of St. Martin is of very ancient date. . . . During the invasion by the Normans, this school at Utrecht was suppressed, but was reestablished in 917, and regained its former renown. The Emperor, Henry the Fowler, placed here his three sons, Otto, Henry and Bruno, to be educated, of whom the last became afterward archbishop of Cologne and archduke of Lottringen, and was noted for his extraordinary learning and friendship for the poet Prudentius. At the beginning of the 12th century, Utrecht possessed no less than five flourishing schools, several of which had each a 'rector' in addition to the priests who had the general control. At about the same time, several convents became distinguished as educational institutions, especi-

ally those of Egmond, Nymwegen, Middleburg, in Zealand, and Adjuwert, near Gröningen. In Holland, as in Belgium, in addition to the schools that were attached to the cathedrals, convents, and chapters, there were established in the course of the twelfth century, by the more wealthy communities, public schools especially designed for the instruction of the citizens and laity. It is also worthy of notice that the authority to open such schools was always derived from the counts—by whom it was conferred, sometimes upon the cities as an especial privilege, and sometimes upon merely private persons as a mark of particular favor. The jurisdiction of the feudal lords was the same here as in Belgium; but while in the latter country, with the exception perhaps of the elementary schools in some of the cities, the right of supervision everywhere devolved upon the chapters, instruction in these public schools of Holland was wholly withdrawn from the clergy, and they were made essentially secular in their character. The privilege of thus establishing schools was conferred upon some of the cities at the following dates: Dort, by Count Floris V., A. D. 1200; the Hague, 1323—Leyden, 1324—and Rotterdam in 1328, by William III.; Delft and Amsterdam, in 1334, by William IV.; Leyden again, 1357—Haren, 1358—Alkmar, 1398—Hoorn, 1358 and 1390—the Hague, 1393—Schiedam and Oudewater, 1394—and Rotterdam, in 1402, by Albert of Bavaria. These schools, adds Stallaert, on the authority of Buddingh, were generally styled 'School en Schryfambacht,' 'Schoolen en Kosten,' (school and writing offices, schools and clerks' houses,) and the 'Schoolmeesters' (school-masters) were looked upon as professional men or craftsmen—as was the case also in Belgium, where they formed distinct guilds and fraternities. These public schools of Holland were divided into 'large' and 'small' schools, (grooten en bijn-schoolen,) Latin being taught in the first division. The institution at Zwolle, attained special notoriety in the fourteenth century, under the direction of the celebrated Johan Cele. According to Thomas à Kempis and Ten Bussche, its pupils numbered about a thousand, gathered from Holland, Belgium, and the principal provinces of Germany."—*Public Instruction in Holland* (*Barnard's Am. Journal of Education*, v. 14).

**England.—Early Oxford.**—"The University of Oxford did not spring into being in any particular year, or at the bidding of any particular founder: it was not established by any formal charter of incorporation. Taking its rise in a small and obscure association of teachers and learners, it developed spontaneously into a large and important body, long before its existence was recognised by prince or by prelate. There were certainly schools at Oxford in the reign of Henry I., but the previous history of the place does not throw much light on their origin, or explain the causes of their popularity. The town seems to have grown up under the shadow of a nunnery, which is said to have been founded by St. Frideswyde as far back as the eighth century. Its authentic annals, however, begin with the year 912, when it was occupied and annexed by Edward the Elder, King of the West Saxons. . . . Oxford was considered a place of great strategical importance in the eleventh century. Its position on the borders of Mercia and Wessex rendered it also particularly convenient

for parleys between Englishmen and Danes, and for great national assemblies. . . . Retaining for a while its rank as one of the chief centres of political life in the south of England, and as a suitable meeting-place for parliaments and synods, Oxford became thenceforward more and more distinctively known as a seat of learning and a nursery of clerks. The schools which existed at Oxford before the reign of King John, are so seldom and so briefly noticed in contemporary records, that it would be difficult to show how they developed into a great university, if it were not for the analogy of kindred institutions in other countries. There can be little doubt, however, that the idea of a university, the systems of degrees and faculties, and the nomenclature of the chief academical officers, were alike imported into England from abroad. . . . In the earliest and broadest sense of the term, a university had no necessary connexion with schools or literature, being merely a community of individuals bound together by some more or less acknowledged tie. Regarded collectively in this light, the inhabitants of any particular town might be said to constitute a university, and in point of fact the Commonalty of the townsmen of Oxford was sometimes described as a university in formal documents of the middle ages. The term was, however, specially applied to the whole body of persons frequenting the schools of a large studium. Ultimately it came to be employed in a technical sense as synonymous with studium, to denote the institution itself. This last use of the term seems to be of English origin, for the University of Oxford is mentioned as such in writs and ordinances of the years 1238, 1240, and 1253, whereas the greater seat of learning on the banks of the Seine was, until the year 1263, styled 'the University of the Masters,' or 'the University of the Scholars,' of Paris. The system of academical degrees dates from the second half of the twelfth century."—H. C. M. Lyte, *A History of the University of Oxford*, ch. 1. —"In the early Oxford . . . of the twelfth and most of the thirteenth centuries, colleges with their statutes were unknown. The University was the only corporation of the learned, and she struggled into existence after hard fights with the town, the Jews, the Friars, the Papal courts. The history of the University begins with the thirteenth century. She may be said to have come into being as soon as she possessed common funds and rents, as soon as fines were assigned, or benefactions contributed to the maintenance of scholars. Now the first recorded fine is the payment of fifty-two shillings by the townsmen of Oxford as part of the compensation for the hanging of certain clerks. In the year 1214 the Papal Legate, in a letter to his 'beloved sons in Christ, the burgesses of Oxford,' bade them excuse the 'scholars studying in Oxford' half the rent of their halls, or hospitia, for the space of ten years. The burghers were also to do penance, and to feast the poorer students once a year; but the important point is, that they had to pay that large yearly fine 'propter suspendium clericorum'—all for the hanging of the clerks. Twenty-six years after this decision of the Legate, Robert Grosseteste, the great Bishop of Lincoln, organized the payment and distribution of the fine, and founded the first of the chests, the chest of St. Frideswyde. These chests were a kind of Mont de Piété, and they had them

was at first the favourite form of benefaction. Money was left in this or that chest, from which students and masters would borrow, on the security of pledges, which were generally books, cups, daggers, and so forth. Now, in this affair of 1214 we have a strange passage of history, which happily illustrates the growth of the University. The beginning of the whole affair was the quarrel with the town, which in 1209, had hanged two clerks, 'in contempt of clerical liberty.' The matter was taken up by the Legate—in those bad years of King John, the Pope's viceroy in England—and out of the humiliation of the town the University gained money, privileges, and halls at low rental. These were precisely the things that the University wanted. About these matters there was a constant strife, in which the Kings as a rule, took part with the University. . . . Thus gradually the University got the command of the police, obtained privileges which enslaved the city, and became masters where they had once been despised, starving scholars. . . . The result, in the long run, was that the University received from Edward III. 'a most large charter, containing many liberties, some that they had before, and others that he had taken away from the town.' Thus Edward granted to the University 'the custody of the assize of bread, wine, and ale,' the supervising of measures and weights, and the power of clearing the streets of the town and suburbs. Moreover, the Mayor and the chief Burghers were condemned yearly to a sort of public penance and humiliation on St. Scholastica's Day. Thus, by the middle of the fourteenth century, the strife of Town and Gown had ended in the complete victory of the latter."—A Lang, *Oxford*, ch. 2.—"To mark off the Middle Age from the Modern Period of the University is certainly very difficult. Indeed the earlier times do not form a homogeneous whole, but appear perpetually shifting and preparing for a new state. The main transition however was undoubtedly about the middle of the fourteenth century; and the Reformation, a remarkable crisis, did but confirm what had been in progress for more than a century and a half: so that the Middle Age of the University contained the thirteenth century, and barely the former half of the fourteenth. . . . There is no question, that during this Middle Age the English Universities were distinguished far more than ever afterwards by energy and variety of intellect. Later times cannot produce a concentration of men eminent in all the learning and science of the age, such as Oxford and Cambridge then poured forth, mightily influencing the intellectual development of all Western Christendom. Their names indeed may warn us against an indiscriminating disparagement of the Monasteries, as 'hotbeds of ignorance and stupidity'; when so many of those worthies were monks of the Benedictine, Franciscan, Dominican, Carmelite, or reformed Augustinian order. But in consequence of this surpassing celebrity, Oxford became the focus of a prodigious congregation of students, to which nothing afterwards bore comparison. The same was probably true of Cambridge in relative proportion. . . . A tolerably well authenticated account, attacked of late by undue scepticism, fixes [the number of] those of Oxford at thirty thousand, in the middle of the thirteenth century. The want indeed of contemporary evidence

must make us cautious of yielding absolute belief to this: in fact we have no document on this matter even as old as the Reformation. . . . Not only did the Church and the new orders of Monks draw great numbers thither, but the Universities themselves were vast High Schools, comprising boys and even children. It is not extravagant, if Cambridge was not yet in great repute, to imagine fifteen thousand students of all ages at Oxford, and as many more attendants. Nor was it at all difficult to accommodate them in the town, when Oxford contained three hundred Halls and Inns: and as several students dwelt in one room, and were not careful for luxury, each building on an average might easily hold one hundred persons. The style of Architecture was of the simplest and cheapest kind, and might have been easily run up on a sudden demand: and a rich that country, with abundant water carriage, needed not to want provisions. That the numbers were vast, is implied by the highly respectable evidence which we have, that as many as three thousand migrated from Oxford on the riots of 1209; although the Chronicler expressly states that not all joined in the secession. In the reign of Henry III. the reduced numbers are reckoned at fifteen thousand. After the middle of the fourteenth century, they were still as many as from three to four thousand; and after the Reformation they mount again to five thousand. On the whole therefore the computation of thirty thousand, as the maximum, may seem, if not positively true, yet the nearest approximation which we can expect. Of Cambridge we know no more than that the numbers were much lower than at Oxford. . . . While in the general, there was a substantial identity between the scholastic learning of Oxford and of Paris, yet Oxford was more eager in following positive science;—and this, although such studies were disparaged by the Church, and therefore by the public. Indeed originally the Church had been on the opposite side; but the speculative tendency of the times had carried her over, so that speculation and theology went hand in hand. In the middle of the thirteenth century we may name Robert Grosseteste and John Basingstock, as cultivating physical science, and (more remarkable still) the Franciscan Roger Bacon: a man whom the vulgar held to be equal to Merlin and Michael Scott as a magician, and whom posterity ranks by the noblest spirits of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, in all branches of positive science,—except theology. A biography of Roger Bacon should surely be written! Unfortunately, we know nothing as to the influence of these men on their times, nor can we even learn whether the University itself was at all interested in their studies. . . . We have . . . a strange testimony to the interest which in the beginning of the fourteenth century the mass of the students took in the speculation of their elders; for the street rows were carried on under the banners of Nominalists and Realists. . . . The coarse and ferocious manners prevalent in the Universities of the Middle Ages are every where in singular contrast to their intellectual pretensions: but the Universities of the Continent were peaceful, decorous, dignified,—compared with those of England. The storms which were elsewhere occasional, were at Oxford the permanent atmosphere. For nearly two centuries our 'Foster Mother' of Oxford lived in a din of uninterrupted

furious warfare; nation against nation, school against school, faculty against faculty. Halls, and finally Colleges, came forward as combatants; and the University, as a whole, against the Town; or against the Bishop of Lincoln; or against the Archbishop of Canterbury. Nor was Cambridge much less pugnacious."—V. A. Huber, *The English Universities*, v. 1, ch. 3.—Cambridge.—“Various facts and circumstances . . . lend probability to the belief that, long before the time when we have certain evidence of the existence of Cambridge as a university, the work of instruction was there going on. The Cumborium of the Roman period, the Grantebycgr of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, the Grantebrige of Domesday, must always have been a place of some importance. It was the meeting-place of two great Roman roads,—Akeman Street, running east and west, and the Via Devana, traversing the north and the south. . . . Confined at first to the rising ground on the left bank of the river, it numbered at the time of the Norman Conquest as many as four hundred houses, of which twenty-seven were pulled down to make way for the castle erected by William the Conqueror. . . . Under the castle walls, with the view, it would seem, of making some atonement for many a deed of violence and wrong, the Norman sheriff, Picot by name, founded the Church of St. Giles, and instituted in connection with it a small body of secular canons. . . . The year 1112 was marked by the occurrence of an event of considerable importance in connection with the subsequent history of the university. The canons of St. Giles, attended by a large concourse of the clergy and laity, crossed the river, and took up their abode in a new and spacious priory at Barnwell. . . . The priory at Barnwell, which always ranked among the wealthiest of the Cambridge foundations, seems from the first to have been closely associated with the university; and the earliest university exhibitions were those founded by William de Kilkenny, bishop of Ely from 1254 to 1257, for two students of divinity, who were to receive annually the sum of two marks from the priory. In the year 1133 was founded the nunnery of St. Rhadegund, which, in the reign of Henry VII., was converted into Jesus College; and in 1135 a hospital of Augustinian canons, dedicated to St. John the Evangelist, was founded by Henry Frost, a burgess of the town. . . . It was . . . a very important foundation, inasmuch as it not only became by conversion in the sixteenth century the College of St. John the Evangelist, but was also . . . the foundation of which Peterhouse, the earliest Cambridge college, may be said to have been in a certain sense the offshoot. . . . In the year 1299 there broke out at Paris a feud of more than ordinary gravity between the students and the citizens. Large numbers of the former migrated to the English shores; and Cambridge, from its proximity to the eastern coast, and as the centre where Prince Louis, but a few years before, had raised the royal standard, seems to have attracted the great majority. . . . The university of Cambridge, like that of Oxford, was modelled mainly on the university of Paris. Its constitution was consequently oligarchic rather than democratic, the government being entirely in the hands of the teaching body, while the bachelors and undergraduates had no share in the passing of new laws and regulations.”—J.

B. Mullinger, *A History of the University of Cambridge*, ch. 1-2.—“The earliest existing college at Cambridge is St. Peter's, generally called Peterhouse, historically founded A. D. 1257, in the reign of Henry III. The Universities are known merely by their situation; as Oxford, Cambridge, Durham, St. Andrews; but each college has a name, according to the taste of its founder or first members. These names may be divided into two classes, those named from the founder, as Pembroke, Clare, Gonville and Caius (this had two founders, the restorer being Dr. Kaye, who Latinized his name into Caius, always pronounced Key's), King's (from King Henry VI.),—Queens' (from the queens both of Henry VI. and Edward IV.), Sidney Sussex, and Downing;—and those named for beatified persons and objects of worship,—St. Peter's, St. John's, St. Catharine's, St. Mary Magdalene, Corpus Christi, Emmanuel, Jesus Christ's, Trinity and Trinity Hall. The apparent impiety of these names, which in one case of an ancient name now changed, was absolutely revolting, entirely passes off with a few days' use. St. Catharine's soon becomes Cats, and St. Mary Magdalene is always called Maudlin. You readily admit the superiority of Trinity over Corpus ale; go to see a friend who lives on Christ's piece; and hear with regret, that in the boat races Emmanuel has been bumped by Jesus; an epithet being probably prefixed to the last name. These names of course were given in monkish times,—Trinity by Henry VIII., but all the colleges except one were founded before the reign of James I. . . . The seventeen colleges . . . are distinct corporations. Their foundations, resources, buildings, governing authorities and students, are entirely separate from each other. Nor has any one college the least control in any other. The plan, however, is much the same in all. The presiding authority is in most cases called the Master, or speaking more generally, the Head; while the net proceeds of all the college funds — for the vast wealth supposed to belong to the University really is in the hands of the separate colleges — are distributed among certain of the graduates, called Fellows, who with the Head constitute the corporation. These corporations give board and lodging on various terms to such students as choose to enter the college and comply with its rules, in order to receive its assistance in obtaining the honors of the University; and each college offers its own peculiar inducements to students. . . . The whole body of the colleges, taken together, constitutes the University. All those who after residing seven years at some college, have taken the degree of Master of Arts, or a higher one, and keep their name on the college lists by a small payment, vote at the University elections for members of Parliament and all other officers, and manage its affairs. . . . The colleges, at certain intervals, present such students as comply with their conditions to University authorities for matriculation, for certain examinations, and for the reception of degrees; and until one receives the degree of Master of Arts, he must remain a member of some college, not necessarily one and the same, to hold any University privileges. After this stage, he may, under certain conditions, break up all his college connections, and yet remain in the University.”—W. Everett, *On the Cam.*, lect. . . .

Spain and Portugal.—“Salamanca was founded in the 13th century, and received its statutes

in the year 1422, out of which was developed the following constitution. The rector, with eight 'consillarii,' all students, who could appoint their successors, administered the university. The doctors render the oath of obedience to the rector. The 'domscholaster' is the proper judge of the school; but he swears obedience to the rector. A bachelor of law must have studied six years, and after five years more he could become licentiate. In filling a paid teachership, the doctor was chosen next in age of those holding the diploma, unless a great majority of the scholars objected, in which case the rector and council decided. This liberal constitution for the scholars is in harmony with the code of Alphonse X., soon after 1250, in which the liberty of instruction was made a general principle of law. This constitution continued in Salamanca into the 17th century, for Retes speaks of a disputation which the rector held at that time under his presidency. Alcalá university was established by cardinal Ximenes, in 1510, for the promotion of the study of theology and philosophy, for which reason it contained a faculty of canon, but not of civil law. The center of the university was the college of St. Udefons, consisting of thirty-three prebendaries, who could be teachers or scholars, since for admission were required only poverty, the age of twenty, and the completion of the course of the preparatory colleges. These thirty-three members elected annually a rector and three counsellors, who controlled the entire university. Salaried teachers were elected, not by the rector and council alone, but by all the students. It had wide reputation. When visited by Francis I., while a prisoner of Spain, he was welcomed by 11,000 students. The Coimbra university, in Portugal, received statutes in 1309, from king Dionysius, with a constitution similar to those just mentioned.—F. C. Savigny, *The Universities of the Middle Ages* (Barnard's Am. Journal of Education, v. 22, p. 324).

#### Renaissance.

"Modern education begins with the Renaissance. The educational methods that we then begin to discern will doubtless not be developed and perfected till a later period; the new doctrines will pass into practice only gradually, and with the general progress of the times. But from the sixteenth century education is in possession of its essential principles. . . . The men of the sixteenth century having renewed with classical antiquity an intercourse that had been too long interrupted, it was natural that they should propose to the young the study of the Greeks and the Romans. What is called secondary instruction really dates from the sixteenth century. The crude works of the Middle Age are succeeded by the elegant compositions of Athens and Rome, henceforth made accessible to all through the art of printing; and, with the reading of the ancient authors, there reappear through the fruitful effect of imitation, their qualities of correctness in thought, of literary taste, and of elegance in form. In France, as in Italy, the national tongues, moulded, and, as it were, consecrated by writers of genius, become the instruments of an intellectual propaganda. Artistic taste, revived by the rich products of a race of incomparable artists, gives an extension to the horizon of life, and creates a new class of emotions. Finally, the Protestant Reform develops

individual thought and free inquiry, and at the same time, by its success, it imposes still greater efforts on the Catholic Church. This is not saying that everything is faultless in the educational efforts of the sixteenth century. First, as is natural for innovators, the thought of the teachers of this period is marked by enthusiasm rather than by precision. They are more zealous in pointing out the end to be attained, than exact in determining the means to be employed. Besides, some of them are content to emancipate the mind, but forget to give it proper direction. Finally, others make a wrong use of the ancients; they are too much preoccupied with the form and the purity of language; they fall into Cicero-manía, and it is not their fault if a new superstition, that of rhetoric, does not succeed the old superstition, that of the Syllogism."—G. Compayré, *The Hist. of Pedagogy*, ch. 5 (sect. 92-93).

**Rabelais' Gargantua.**—Rabelais' description of the imaginary education of Gargantua gives us the educational ideas of a man of genius in the 16th century: "Gargantua," he writes, "awaked, then, about four o'clock in the morning. Whilst they were rubbing him, there was read unto him some chapter of the Holy Scripture aloud and clearly, with a pronunciation fit for the matter, and herewith was appointed a young page born in Basché, named Anagnostes. According to the purpose and argument of that lesson, he oftentimes gave himself to revere, adore, pray, and send up his supplications to that good God whose word did show His majesty and marvellous judgments. Then his master repeated what had been read, expounding unto him the most obscure and difficult points. They then considered the face of the sky, if it was such as they had observed it the night before, and into what signs the sun was entering, as also the moon for that day. This done, he was appareled, combed, curled, trimmed and perfumed, during which time they repeated to him the lessons of the day before. He himself said them by heart, and upon them grounded practical cases concerning the estate of man, which he would prosecute sometimes two or three hours, but ordinarily they ceased as soon as he was fully clothed. Then for three good hours there was reading. This done, they went forth, still conferring of the substance of the reading, and disported themselves at ball, tennis, or the 'pile trigone,' gallantly exercising their bodies, as before they had done their minds. All their play was but in liberty, for they left off when they pleased, and that was commonly when they did sweat, or were otherwise weary. Then were they very well dried and rubbed, shifted their shirts, and walking soberly, went to see if dinner was ready. Whilst they stayed for that, they did clearly and eloquently recite some sentences that they had retained of the lecture. In the mean time Master Appetite came, and then very orderly sat they down at table. At the beginning of the meal there was read some pleasant history of ancient prowess, until he had taken his wine. Then, if they thought good, they continued reading, or began to discourse merrily together; speaking first of the virtue, propriety, efficacy, and nature of all that was served in at that table; of bread, of wine, of water, of salt, of flesh, fish, fruits, herbs, roots, and of their dressing. By means whereof, he learned in a little time all the passages that on these subjects are to be found in Pliny, Athenæus, Dioscorides,

Julius, Pofflux, Galen, Porphyrius, Oppian, Polybius, Heliodorus, Aristotle, Elian, and others. Whilst they talked of these things, many times, to be the more certain, they caused the very books to be brought to the table, and so well and perfectly did he in his memory retain the things above said, that in that time there was not a physician that knew half so much as he did. Afterwards they conferred of the lessons read in the morning, and ending their repast with some conserve of quince, he washed his hands and eyes with fair fresh water, and gave thanks unto God in some fine canticle, made in praise of the divine bounty and munificence. This done, they brought in cards, not to play, but to learn a thousand pretty tricks and new inventions, which were all grounded upon arithmetic. By this means he fell in love with that numerical science, and every day after dinner and supper he passed his time in it as pleasantly as he was wont to do at cards and dice. . . . After this they recreated themselves with singing musically, in four or five parts, or upon a set theme, as it best pleased them. In matter of musical instruments, he learned to play the lute, the spinet, the harp, the German flute, the flute with nine holes, the violin, and the sackbut. This hour thus spent, he betook himself to his principal study for three hours together, or more, as well to repeat his matutinal lectures as to proceed in the book wherein he was, as also to write handsome,; to draw and form the antique and Roman letters. This being done, they went out of their house, and with them a young gentleman of Touraine, named Gymnast, who taught the art of riding. Changing then his clothes, he mounted on any kind of horse, which he made to bound in the air, to jump the ditch, to leap the palisade, and to turn short in a ring both to the right and left hand. . . . The time being thus bestowed, and himself rubbed, cleansed, and refreshed with other clothes, they returned fair and softly; and passing through certain meadows, or other grassy places, beheld the trees and plants, comparing them with what is written of them in the books of the ancients, such as Theophrastus, Dioscorides, Marinus, Pliny, Nicander, Macer, and Galen, and carried home to the house great handfuls of them, whereof a young page called Rhizotomos had charge—together with hoes, picks, spuds, pruning-knives, and other instruments requisite for herboring. Being come to their lodging, whilst supper was making ready, they repeated certain passages of that which had been read, and then sat down at table. . . . During that repast was continued the lesson read at dinner as long as they thought good: the rest was spent in good discourse, learned and profitable. After that they had given thanks, they set themselves to sing musically, and play upon harmonious instruments, or at those pretty sports made with cards, dice or eups,—thus made merry till it was time to go to bed; and sometimes they would go, like visits unto learned men, or to such as had been travellers in strange countries. At full night they went into the most open place of the house to see the face of the sky, and there beheld the comets, if any were, as likewise the figures, situations, aspects, oppositions, and conjunctions of the stars. Then with his master did he briefly recapitulate, after the manner of the Pythagoreans, that which he had read, seen, learned, done, and understood in the whole course of that day.

Then they prayed unto God the Creator, falling down before Him, and strengthening their faith towards Him, and glorifying Him for His boundless bounty; and, giving thanks unto Him for the time that was past, they recommended themselves to His divine clemency for the future. Which being done, they entered upon their repose."—W. Besant, *Readings in Rabelais*, pp. 20-29.

**Germany.**—"The schools of France and Italy owed little to the great modern movement of the Renaissance. In both these countries that movement operated, in both it produced mighty results; but of the official establishments for instruction it did not get hold. In Italy the mediæval routine in those establishments at first opposed a passive resistance to it; presently came the Catholic reaction, and sedulously shut it out from them. In France the Renaissance did not become a power in the State, and the routine of the schools sufficed to exclude the new influence till it took for itself other channels than the schools. But in Germany the Renaissance became a power in the State; allied with the Reformation, where the Reformation triumphed in German countries the Renaissance triumphed with it, and entered with it, into the public schools. Melancthon and Erasmus were not merely enemies and subverters of the dominion of the Church of Rome, they were eminent humanists; and with the great but single exception of Luther, the chief German reformers were all of them distinguished friends of the new classical learning, as well as of Protestantism. The Romish party was in German countries the ignorant party also, the party untouched by the humanities and by culture. Perhaps one reason why in England our schools have not had the life and growth of the schools of Germany and Holland is to be found in the separation, with us, of the power of the Reformation and the power of the Renaissance. With us, too, the Reformation triumphed and got possession of our schools; but our leading reformers were not at the same time, like those of Germany, the nation's leading spirits in intellect and culture. In Germany the best spirits of the nation were then the reformers; in England our best spirits,—Shakspeare, Bacon, Spenser,—were men of the Renaissance, not men of the Reformation, and our reformers were men of the second order. The Reformation, therefore, getting hold of the schools in England was a very different force, a force far inferior in light, resources, and prospects, to the Reformation getting hold of the schools in Germany. But in Germany, nevertheless, as Protestant orthodoxy grew petrified like Catholic orthodoxy, and as, in consequence, Protestantism flagged and lost the powerful impulse with which it started, the school flagged also, and in the middle of the last century the classical teaching of Germany, in spite of a few honourable names like Gesner's, Ernesti's, and Heyne's, seems to have lost all the spirit and power of the 16th century humanists, to have been sinking into a mere church appendage, and fast becoming torpid. A theological student, making his livelihood by teaching till he could get appointed to a parish, was the usual school-master. 'The schools will never be better,' said their great renovator, Friedrich August Wolf, the well-known critic of Homer, 'so long as the school-masters are theologians by profession. A theolog-



ical course in a university, with its smattering of classics, is about as good a preparation for a classical master as a course of feudal law would be.' Wolf's coming to Halle in 1783, invited by Von Zedlitz, the minister for public worship under Frederick the Great, a sovereign whose civil projects and labours were not less active and remarkable than his military, marks an era from which the classical schools of Germany, reviving the dormant spark planted in them by the Renaissance, awoke to a new life."—M. Arnold, *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, ch. 14.—It is surprising to learn "how much was left untaught, in the sixteenth century, in the schools. Geography and history were entirely omitted in every scheme of instruction, mathematics played but a subordinate part, while not a thought was bestowed either upon natural philosophy or natural history. Every moment and every effort were given to the classical languages, chiefly to the Latin. But we should be overhasty, should we conclude, without further inquiry, that these branches, thus neglected in the schools, were therefore every where untaught. Perhaps they were reserved for the university alone, and there, too, for the professors of the philosophical faculty, as is the case even at the present day with natural philosophy and natural history; nay, logic, which was a regular school study in the sixteenth century, is, in our day, widely cultivated at the university. We must, therefore, in order to form a just judgment upon the range of subjects taught in the sixteenth century, as well as upon the methods of instruction, first cast a glance at the state of the universities of that period, especially in the philosophical faculties. A prominent source of information on this point is to be found in the statutes of the University of Wittenberg, revised by Melancthon, in the year 1545. The theological faculty appears, by these statutes, to have consisted of four professors, who read lectures on the Old and New Testaments,—chiefly on the Psalms, Genesis, Isaiah, the Gospel of John, and the Epistle to the Romans. They also taught dogmatics, commenting upon the Nicene creed and Augustine's book, 'De spiritu et litera.' The Wittenberg lecture schedule for the year 1561, is to the same effect; only we have here, besides exegesis and dogmatics, catechetics likewise. According to the statutes, the philosophical faculty was composed of ten professors. The first was to read upon logic and rhetoric; the second, upon physics, and the second book of Pliny's natural history; the third, upon arithmetic and the 'Sphere' of John de Sacro Busto; the fourth, upon Euclid, the 'Theorie Planetarum' of Burbaeh, and Ptolemy's 'Almagest'; the fifth and sixth, upon the Latin poets and Cicero; the seventh, who was the 'Pelagogns,' explained to the younger class, Latin Grammar, Linaccer 'de cuncta structura Latini sermonis,' Terence, and some of Plautus; the eighth, who was the 'Physicus,' explained Aristotle's 'Physics and Dioscorides'; the ninth gave instruction in Hebrew; and the tenth reviewed the Greek Grammar, read lectures on Greek Classics at intervals, also on one of St. Paul's Epistles, and, at the same time, on ethics. . . . Thus the philosophical faculty appears to have been the most fully represented at Wittenberg, as it included ten professors, while the theological had but four, the medical but three. . . . We have a . . . criterion by which

to judge of the limited nature of the studies of that period, as compared with the wide field which they cover at the present day, in the then almost total lack of academical apparatus and equipments. The only exception was to be found in the case of libraries; but, how meager and insufficient all collections of books must have been at that time, when books were few in number and very costly, will appear from the fund, for example, which was assigned to the Wittenberg library; it yielded annually but one hundred gulden, (about \$63,) with which, 'for the profit of the university and chiefly of the poorer students therein, the library may be adorned and enriched with books in all the faculties and in every art, as well in the Hebrew and Greek tongues.' Of other apparatus, such as collections in natural history, anatomical museums, botanical gardens, and the like, we find no mention; and the less, inasmuch as there was no need of them in elucidation of such lectures as the professors ordinarily gave. When Paul Eber, the theologian, read lectures upon anatomy, he made no use of dissection."—K. von Raumer, *Universities in the Sixteenth Century* (*Barnard's Am. Journal of Education*, v. 5, pp. 535-540).—**Luther and the Schools.**—"Luther . . . felt that, to strengthen the Reformation, it was requisite to work on the young, to improve the schools, and to propagate throughout Christendom the knowledge necessary for a profound study of the holy Scriptures. This, accordingly, was one of the objects of his life. He saw it in particular at the period which we have reached, and wrote to the councillors of all the cities of Germany, calling upon them to found Christian schools. 'Dear sirs,' said he, 'we annually expend so much money on arquebuses, roads, and dikes; why should we not spend a little to give one or two schoolmasters to our poor children? God stands at the door, and knocks; blessed are we if we open to him. Now the word of God abounds. O my dear Germans, buy, buy, while the market is open before your houses. . . . Busy yourselves with the children,' continues Luther, still addressing the magistrates; 'for many parents are like ostriches; they are hardened towards their little ones, and satisfied with having laid the egg, they care nothing for it afterwards. The prosperity of a city does not consist merely in heaping up great treasures, in building strong walls, in erecting splendid mansions, in possessing glittering arms. If madmen fall upon it, its ruin will only be the greater. The true wealth of a city, its safety, and its strength, is to have many learned, serious, worthy, well-educated citizens. And whom must we blame because there are so few at present, except you magistrates, who have allowed our youth to grow up like trees in a forest?' Luther particularly insisted on the necessity of studying literature and languages: 'What use is there, it may be asked, in learning Latin, Greek, and Hebrew? We can read the Bible very well in German. Without languages,' replies he, 'we could not have received the gospel. . . . Languages are the scabbard that contains the sword of the Spirit; they are the casket that guards the jewels; they are the vessel that holds the wine; and as the gospel says, they are the baskets in which the loaves and fishes are kept to feed the multitude. If we neglect the languages, we shall not only eventually lose the gospel, but be unable to speak or

write in Latin or in German. No sooner did men cease to cultivate them than Christendom declined, even until it fell under the power of the pope. But now that languages are again honored, they shed such light that all the world is astonished, and every one is forced to acknowledge that our gospel is almost as pure as that of the apostles themselves. In former times the holy fathers were frequently mistaken, because they were ignorant of languages. . . . If the languages had not made me positive as to the meaning of the word, I might have been a pious monk, and quietly preached the truth in the obscurity of the cloister; but I should have left the pope, the sophists, and their antichristian empire still unshaken."—J. H. Merle d'Aubigné, *Hist. of the Reformation of the 16th Century*, bk. 10, ch. 9 (v. 3).

—Luther, in his appeal to the municipal magistrates of Germany, calls for the organization of common schools to be supported at public cost. "Finally, he gives his thought to the means of recruiting the teaching service. 'Since the greatest evil in every place is the lack of teachers, we must not wait till they come forward of themselves; we must take the trouble to educate them and prepare them.' To this end Luther keeps the best of the pupils—boys and girls, for a longer time in school; gives them special instructors, and opens libraries for their use. In his thought he never distinguishes women teachers from men teachers; he wants schools for girls as well as for boys. Only, not to burden parents and divert children from their daily labor, he requires but little time for school duties. . . . 'My opinion is [he says] that we must send the boys to school one or two hours a day, and have them learn a trade at home for the rest of the time. It is desirable that these two occupations march side by side.' . . . Luther gives the first place to the teaching of religion: 'Is it not reasonable that every Christian should know the Gospel at the age of nine or ten?' Then come the languages, not, as might be hoped, the mother tongue, but the learned languages, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. Luther had not yet been sufficiently rid of the old spirit to comprehend that the language of the people ought to be the basis of universal instruction. He left to Comenius the glory of making the final separation of the primary school from the Latin school. . . . Physical exercises are not forgotten in Luther's pedagogical regulations. But he attaches an especial importance to singing. 'Unless a schoolmaster know how to sing, I think him of no account.' 'Music,' he says again, 'is a half discipline which makes men more indulgent and more mild.' At the same time that he extends the programme of studies, Luther introduces a new spirit into methods. He wishes more liberty and more joy in the school. 'Solomon,' he says, 'is a truly royal schoolmaster. He does not, like the monks, forbid the young to go into the world and be happy. Even as Anselm said: 'A young man turned aside from the world is like a young tree made to grow in a vase.' The monks have imprisoned young men like birds in their cage. It is dangerous to isolate the young.' . . . Do not let ourselves imagine, however, that Luther at once exercised a decisive influence on the current education of his day. A few schools were founded, called writing schools; but the Thirty Years' War, and other events, interrupted the movement of which Luther has the honor of

having been the originator. . . . In the first half of the seventeenth century, Ratich, a German, and Comenius, a Slave, were, with very different degrees of merit, the heirs of the educational thought of Luther. With something of the charlatan and the demagogue, Ratich devoted his life to propagating a novel art of teaching, which he called didactics, and to which he attributed marvels. He pretended, by his method of languages, to teach Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, in six months. But nevertheless, out of many strange performances and lofty promises, there issue some thoughts of practical value. The first merit of Ratich was to give the mother tongue, the German language, the precedence over the ancient languages."—G. Compayré, *The Hist. of Pedagogy*, ch. 6 (sect. 130-134).

**Netherlands.**—"When learning began to revive after the long sleep of the Middle Ages, Italy experienced the first impulse. Next came Germany and the contiguous provinces of the Low Countries. The force of the movement in these regions is shown by an event of great importance, not always noticed by historians. In 1400, there was established at Deventer, in the north-eastern province of the Netherlands, an association or brotherhood, usually called Brethren of the Life in Common [see BRETHREN OF THE COMMON LOT]. In their strict lives, partial community of goods, industry in manual labor, fervent devotion, and tendency to mysticism, they bore some resemblance to the modern Moravians. But they were strikingly distinguished from the members of this sect by their earnest cultivation of knowledge, which was encouraged among themselves and promoted among others by schools, both for primary and advanced education. In 1430, the Brethren had established forty-five branches, and by 1460 more than thrice that number. They were scattered through different parts of Germany and the Low Countries, each with its school subordinate to the head college at Deventer. It was in these schools, in the middle of the fifteenth century, that a few Germans and Netherlanders were, as Hallam says, roused to acquire that extensive knowledge of the ancient languages which Italy as yet exclusively possessed. Their names should never be omitted in any remembrance of the revival of letters; for great was their influence upon subsequent times. Chief among these men were Wessels, of Groningen, 'one of those who contributed most steadily to the purification of religion'; Hegius of Deventer, under whom Erasmus obtained his early education, and who probably was the first man to print Greek north of the Alps; Dringeborg, who founded a good school in Alsace; and Longius, who presided over one at Munster. Thanks to the influence of these pioneers in learning, education had made great progress among the Netherlanders by the middle of the sixteenth century. . . . We have the testimony of the Italian Guicciardini to the fact that before the outbreak of the war with Spain even the peasants in Holland could read and write well. As the war went on, the people showed their determination that in this matter there should be no retrogression. In the first Synod of Dort, held in 1574, the clergy expressed their opinion upon the subject by passing a resolution or ordinance which, among other things, directed 'the servants of the Church' to obtain from the magistrates in every locality a permis-

sion for the appointment of schoolmasters, and an order for their compensation as in the past. Before many years had elapsed the civil authorities began to establish a general school system for the country. In 1582, the Estates of Friesland decreed that the inhabitants of towns and villages should, within the space of six weeks, provide good and able Reformed schoolmasters, and those who neglected so to do would be compelled to accept the instructors appointed for them. This seems to have been the beginning of the supervision of education by the State, a system which soon spread over the whole republic. In these schools, however, although they were fostered by the State, the teachers seem, in the main, to have been paid by their pupils. But as years went on, a change came about in this part of the system. It probably was aided by the noteworthy letter which John of Nassau, the oldest brother of William the Silent, the noble veteran who lived until 1606, wrote to his son Lewis William, Stadtholder of Friesland. In this letter, which is worthy of a place on the walls of every schoolhouse in America, the gallant young stadtholder is instructed to urge on the States-General 'that they, according to the example of the pope and Jesuits, should establish free schools, where children of quality as well as of poor families, for a very small sum, could be well and christianly educated and brought up. This would be the greatest and most useful work, and the highest service that you could ever accomplish for God and Christianity, and especially for the Netherlands themselves. . . . In summa, one may jeer at this as popish trickery, and undervalue it as one will: there still remains in the work an inexpressible benefit. Soldiers and patriots thus educated, with a true knowledge of God and a Christian conscience, item, churches and schools, good libraries, books, and printing-presses, are better than all armies, arsenals, armories, munitions, alliances, and treaties that can be had: 'Imagined in the world.' Such were the words by which the Patriarch of the Nassus urged upon his countrymen a common-school system. In 1609, when the Pilgrim Fathers took up their residence in Leyden, the school had become the common property of the people, and was paid for among other municipal expenses. It was a land of schools supported by the State—a land, according to Motley, 'where every child went to school, where almost every individual inhabitant could write and read, where even the middle classes were proficient in mathematics and the classics, and could speak two or more modern languages.' Does any reader now ask whence the settlers of Plymouth, who came directly from Holland, and the other settlers of New England whose Puritan brethren were to be found in thousands throughout the Dutch Republic, derived their ideas of schools first directed, and then supported by the State?—**Leyden University.**—To commemorate the deliverance of Leyden from the Spanish siege in 1574 (see NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1573-1574), "and as a reward for the heroism of the citizens, the Prince of Orange, with the consent of the Estates of the province, founded the University of Leyden. Still, the figure of allegiance remained; the people were only fighting for their constitutional rights, and so were doing their duty to the sovereign. Hence the charter of the university ran in the name of Philip, who was

credited with its foundation, as a reward to his subjects for their rebellion against his evil counsellors and servants, 'especially in consideration of the differences of religion, and the great burdens and hardships borne by the citizens of our city of Leyden during the war with such faithfulness.' Motley calls this 'ponderous irony,' but the Hollanders were able lawyers and intended to build on a legal basis. This event marks an epoch in the intellectual history of Holland and of the world. . . . The new university was opened in 1575, and from the outset took the highest rank. . . . Making, a few years ago, of its famous senate chamber, Niebuhr called it 'the most memorable room of Europe in the history of learning.' The first curator was John Van der Does, who had been military commandant of the city during the siege. He was of a distinguished family, but was still more distinguished for his learning, his poetical genius, and his valor. Endowed with ample funds, the university largely owed its marked pre-eminence to the intelligent foresight and wise munificence of its curators. They sought out and obtained the most distinguished scholars of all nations, and to this end spared neither pains nor expense. Diplomatic negotiation and even princely mediation were often called in for the acquisition of a professor. Hence it was said that it surpassed all the universities of Europe in the number of its scholars of renown. These scholars were treated with princely honors. . . . The 'mech:anicals' of Holland, as Elizabeth called them, may not have paid the accustomed worship to rank, but to genius and learning they were always willing to do homage. Space would fall for even a brief account of the great men, foreign and native, who illuminated Leyden with their presence. . . . But it was not alone in scholarship and in scientific research that the University of Leyden gave an impetus to modern thought. Theological disputes were developed there at times, little tempests which threatened destruction to the institution, but they were of short duration. The right of conscience was always respected, and in the main the right of full and public discussion. . . . When it was settled that dissenters could not be educated in the English universities, they flocked to Leyden in great numbers, making that city, next to Edinburgh, their chief resort. Eleven years after the opening of the University of Leyden, the Estates of democratic Friesland, amid the din of war, founded the University of Franeker, an institution which was to become famous as the home of Arminius. . . . Both of these universities were perpetually endowed with the proceeds of the ecclesiastical property which had been confiscated during the progress of the war."

—D. Campbell, *The Puritan in Holland, England, and America*, ch. 2, 20, and 3.

**England.**—"In contemplating the events of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, in their influence on English civilisation, we are reminded once more of the futility of certain modern aspirations. No amount of University Commissions, nor of well-meant reforms, will change the nature of Englishmen. It is impossible, by distributions of University prizes and professorships, to attract into the career of letters that proportion of industry and ingenuity which, in Germany for example, is devoted to the scholastic life. Politics, trade, law, sport, religion,

will claim their own in England, just as they did at the Revival of Letters. The illustrious century which Italy employed in unburying, appropriating, and enjoying the treasures of Greek literature and art, our fathers gave, in England, to dynastic and constitutional squabbles, and to religious broils. The Renaissance in England, and chiefly in Oxford, was like a bitter and changeful spring. There was an hour of genial warmth, there breathed a wind from the south, in the lifetime of Chaucer; then came frosts and storms; again the brief sunshine of court favour shone on literature for a while, when Henry VIII. encouraged study, and Wolsey and Fox founded Christ Church and Corpus Christi College, once more the bad days of religious strife returned, and the promise of learning was destroyed. Thus the chief result of the awakening thought of the fourteenth century in England was not a lively delight in literature, but the appearance of the Lollards. The intensely practical genius of our race turned, not to letters, but to questions about the soul and its future, about property and its distribution. The Lollards were put down in Oxford; 'the tares were weeded out' by the House of Lancaster, and in the process the germs of free thought, of originality, and of a rational education, were destroyed. 'Wyclivism did domineer among us,' says Wood; and, in fact, the intellect of the University was absorbed, like the intellect of France during the heat of the Jansenist controversy, in defending or assailing '267 damned conclusions,' drawn from the books of Wyclife. The University 'lost many of her children through the profession of Wyclivism.'—A. Lang, *Oxford*, ch. 3.

—**Colet and St. Paul's School.**—Dr. John Colet, appointed Dean of St. Paul's in 1505, "resolved, whilst living and in health, to devote his patrimony to the foundation of a school in St. Paul's Churchyard, wherein 153 children, without any restriction as to nation or country, who could already read and write, and were of 'good parts and capacities,' should receive a sound Christian education. The 'Latin adulterate, which ignorant blind fools brought into this world,' poisoning thereby 'the old Latin speech, and the very Roman tongue used in the time of Tully and Sallust, and Virgil and Terence, and learned by St. Jerome, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine,'—all that 'abusion which the later blind world brought in, and which may rather be called Blotterature than Literature,'—should be 'utterly banished and excluded' out of this school. The children should be taught good literature, both Latin and Greek, 'such authors that have with wisdom joined pure chaste eloquence'—'specially Christian authors who wrote their wisdom in clean and chaste Latin, whether in prose or verse; for,' said Colet, 'my intent is by this school specially to increase knowledge, and worshipping of God and Our Lord Jesus Christ, and good Christian life and manners in the children.' . . . The building consisted of one large room, divided into an upper and lower school by a curtain, which could be drawn at pleasure, and the charge of the two schools devolved upon a high-master and a sub-master respectively. The forms were arranged so as each to seat sixteen boys, and were provided each with a raised desk, at which the head-boy sat as president. The building also embraced an entrance-porch and a little chapel for divine service. Dwelling-

houses were erected, adjoining the school, for the residence of the two masters; and for their support, Colet obtained, in the spring of 1510, a royal license to transfer to the Wardens and Guild of Mercers in London, real property to the value of £53 per annum (equivalent to at least £530 of present money). Of this the head-master was to receive as his salary £35 (say £350) and the under-master £18 (say £180) per annum. Three or four years after, Colet made provision for a chaplain to conduct divine service in the chapel, and to instruct the children in the Catechism, the Articles of the faith, and the Ten Commandments,—in English; and ultimately, before his death, he appears to have increased the amount of the whole endowment to £122 (say £1,200) per annum. So that it may be considered, roughly, that the whole endowment, including the buildings, cannot have represented a less sum than £30,000 or £40,000 of present money. And if Colet thus sacrificed so much of his private fortune to secure a liberal (and it must be conceded his was a liberal) provision for the remuneration of the masters who should educate his 153 boys, he must surely have had deeply at heart the welfare of the boys themselves. And, in truth, it was so. Colet was like a father to his schoolboys. . . . It was not to be expected that he should find the school-books of the old grammarians in any way adapted to his purpose. So at once he set his learned friends to work to provide him with new ones. The first thing wanted was a Latin Grammar for beginners. Linacre undertook to provide this want, and wrote with great pains and labour, a work in six books, which afterwards came into general use. But when Colet saw it, at the risk of displeasing his friend, he put it altogether aside. It was too long and too learned for his 'little beginners.' So he condensed within the compass of a few pages two little treatises, an 'Accidence' and a 'Syntax,' in the preface to the first of which occur the gentle words quoted above. These little books, after receiving additions from the hands of Erasmus, Lilly, and others, finally became generally adopted and known as Lilly's Grammar. This rejection of his Grammar seems to have been a sore point with Linacre, but Erasmus told Colet not to be too much concerned about it. . . . Erasmus, in the same letter in which he spoke of Linacre's rejected Grammar . . . put on paper his notions of what a schoolmaster ought to be, and the best method of teaching boys, which he fancied Colet might not altogether approve, as he was wont somewhat more to despise rhetoric than Erasmus did. He stated his opinion that—"In order that the teacher might be thoroughly up to his work, he should not merely be a master of one particular branch of study. He should himself have travelled through the whole circle of knowledge. In philosophy he should have studied Plato and Aristotle, Theophrastus and Plotinus; in Theology the Sacred Scriptures, and after them Origen, Chrysostom, and Basil among the Greek fathers, and Ambrose and Jerome among the Latin fathers; among the poets, Homer and Ovid; in geography, which is very important in the study of history, Pomponius Mela, Ptolemy, Pliny, Strabo. He should know what ancient names of rivers, mountains, countries, cities, answer to the modern ones; and the same of trees, animals, instruments, clothes, and

gems, with regard to which it is incredible how ignorant even educated men are. He should take note of little facts about agriculture, architecture, military and culinary arts, mentioned by different authors. He should be able to trace the origin of words, their gradual corruption in the languages of Constantinople, Italy, Spain, and France. Nothing should be beneath his observation which can illustrate history or the meaning of the poets. But you will say what a load you are putting on the back of the poor teacher! It is so; but I burden one to relieve the many. I want the teacher to have traversed the whole range of knowledge, that it may spare each of his scholars doing it. A diligent and thoroughly competent master might give boys a fair proficiency in both Latin and Greek, in a shorter time and with less labour than the common run of pedagogues take to teach their bubble.' On receipt of this . . . Colet wrote to Erasmus: . . . 'What! I shall not approve!' So you say! What is there of Erasmus's that I do not approve?"—F. Seeböhm, *The Oxford Reformers*, ch. 6.—**Ascham and "The Scholmaster."**—Roger Ascham, the friend of Lady Jane Grey and the tutor of Queen Elizabeth, was born in 1515, and died in 1568. "It was partly with the view to the instruction of his own children, that he commenced the 'Schol-master,' the work by which he is most and best known, to which he did not live to set the last hand. He communicated the design and import of the book in a letter to Sturmlius, in which he states, that not being able to leave his sons a large fortune, he was resolved to provide them with a preceptor, not one to be hired for a great sum of money, but marked out at home with a homely pen. In the same letter he gives his reasons for employing the English language, the capabilities of which he clearly perceived and candidly acknowledged, a high virtue for a man of that age, who perhaps could have written Latin to his own satisfaction much more easily than his native tongue. But though the benefit of his own offspring might be his ultimate object, the immediate occasion of the work was a conversation at Cecil's, at which Sir Richard Sackville expressed great indignation at the severities practiced at Eton and other great schools, so that boys actually ran away for fear of merciless flagellation. This led to the general subject of school discipline, and the defects in the then established modes of tuition. Ascham coinciding with the sentiments of the company, and proceeding to explain his own views of improvement, Sackville requested him to commit his opinions to paper and the 'Schol-master' was the result. It was not published till 1670. . . . We . . . quote a few passages, which throw light upon the author's good sense and good nature. To all violent coercion, and extreme punishment, he was decidedly opposed:—'I do agree,' says he, 'with all good school-masters in all these points, to have children brought to good perfectness in learning, to all honesty in manners; to have all faults rightly amended, and every vice severely corrected, but for the order and way that leadeth rightly to these points, we somewhat differ.' 'Love is better than fear, gentleness than beating, to bring up a child rightly in learning.' 'I do assure you there is no such whetstone to sharpen a good wit, and encourage a will to learning, as is praise.' . . .

'The scholar is commonly bent for the making, when the master were more worthy to be bent for the mending, or rather marring, of the same; the master many times being as ignorant as the child what to say properly and fitly to the matter.' . . . 'This will I say, that even the wisest of your great benders do as oft punish nature as they do correct faults. Yea many times the better nature is the sorer punished. For if one by quickness of wit take his lesson readily, another by hardness of wit taketh it not so speedily; the first is always commended, the other is commonly punished, when a wise school-master should rather discreetly consider the right disposition of both their natures, and not so much weigh what either of them is able to do, as what either of them is likely to do hereafter. For this I know, not only by reading of books in my study, but also by experience of life abroad in the world, that those which be commonly the wisest, the best learned, and best men also, when they be old, were never commonly the quickest of wit when they were young. Quick wits commonly be apt to take, unapt to keep. Some are more quick to enter speedily than be able to pierce far, even like unto oversharp tools, whose edges be very soon turned.'—H. Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria*, pp. 328-330.

**Jesuit Teaching and Schools.**—"The education of youth is set forth in the Formula of Approval granted by Paul III. in 1540," to the plans of Ignatius Loyola for the foundation of the Society of Jesus, "as the first duty embraced by the new Institute. . . . Although the new religions were not at once able to begin the establishment of colleges, yet the plan of those afterwards founded, was gradually ripening in the sagacious mind of St. Ignatius, who looked to these institutions as calculated to oppose the surest bulwarks against the progress of heresy. The first regular college of the Society was that established at Gandia in 1546, through the zeal of St. Francis Borgia, third General of the Society; and the regulations by which it was governed, and which were embodied in the constitutions, were extended to all the Jesuit colleges afterwards founded. The studies were to include theology, both positive and scholastic, as well as grammar, poetry, rhetoric, and philosophy. The course of philosophy was to last three years, that of theology four; and the Professors of Philosophy were enjoined to treat their subject in such a way as to dispose the mind for the study of theology, instead of setting up faith and reason in opposition to one another. The theology of St. Thomas, and the philosophy of Aristotle, were to be followed, except on those points where the teaching of the latter was opposed to the Catholic faith."—A. T. Drane, *Christian Schools and Scholars*, p. 708.—"As early as the middle of the sixteenth century . . . [the Society of Jesus] had several colleges in France, particularly those of Billom, Mauriac, Rodez, Tournon, and Pamiers. In 1561 it secured a footing in Paris, notwithstanding the resistance of the Parliament, of the university, and of the bishops themselves. A hundred years later it counted nearly fourteen thousand pupils in the province of Paris alone. The college of Clermont, in 1651, enrolled more than two thousand young men. The middle and higher classes assuaged to the colleges of the society an ever-increasing membership. At the end of the seventeenth century,

the Jesuits could inscribe on the roll of honor of their classes a hundred illustrious names, among others those of Condé and Luxembourg, Flécher and Bossuet, Lamolignon and Séguier, Descartes, Cornélie, and Molière. In 1710 they controlled six hundred and twelve colleges and a large number of universities. They were the real masters of education, and they maintained this educational supremacy till the end of the eighteenth century. Voltaire said of these teachers: 'The Fathers taught me nothing but Latin and nonsense.' But from the seventeenth century, opinions are divided, and the encomiums of Bacon and Descartes must be offset by the severe judgment of Leibnitz. 'In the matter of education,' says this great philosopher, 'the Jesuits have remained below mediocrity.' Directly to the contrary, Bacon had written: 'As to whatever relates to the instruction of the young, we must consult the schools of the Jesuits, for there can be nothing that is better done.' . . . A permanent and characteristic feature of the educational policy of the Jesuits is, that, during the whole course of their history, they have deliberately neglected and disdained primary instruction. The earth is covered with their Latin colleges; and wherever they have been able, they have put their hands on the institutions for university education; but in no instance have they founded a primary school. Even in their establishment for secondary instruction, they entrust the lower classes to teachers who do not belong to their order, and reserve to themselves the direction of the higher classes."—G. Compayré, *Hist. of Pedagogy*, pp. 141-143.—See, also, JESUITS: A. D. 1540-1556.—"The Jesuits owed their success partly to the very narrow task which they set themselves, little beyond the teaching of Latin style, and partly to the careful training which they gave their students, a training which often degenerated into mere mechanical exercise. But the mainspring of their influence was the manner in which they worked the dangerous force of emulation. Those pupils who were most distinguished at the end of each month received the rank of pretor, censor, and decurion. The class was divided into two parts, called Romans and Carthaginians, Greeks and Trojans. The students sat opposite each other, the master in the middle, the walls were hung with swords, spears and shields which the contending parties carried off in triumph as the prize of victory. These pupils' contests wasted a great deal of time. The Jesuits established public school festivals, at which the pupils might be exhibited, and the parents flattered. They made their own school books, in which the requirements of good teaching were not so important as the religious objects of the order. They preferred extracts to whole authors; if they could not prune the classics to their fancy they would not read them at all. What judgment are we to pass on the Jesuit teaching as a whole? It deserves praise on two accounts. First, it maintained the dignity of literature in an age which was too liable to be influenced by considerations of practical utility. It maintained the study of Greek in France at a higher level than the University, and resisted the assaults of ignorant parents on the fortress of Hellenism. Secondly, it seriously set itself to understand the nature and character of the individual pupil, and to suit the manner of education to the mind that was to receive it. Whatever

may have been the motives of Jesuits in gaining the affections, and securing the devotion of the children under their charge; whether their desire was to develop the individuality which they probed, or to destroy it in its germ, and plant a new nature in its place; it must be admitted that the loving care which they spent upon their charge was a new departure in education, and has become a part of every reasonable system since their time. Here our praise must end. . . . They amused the mind instead of strengthening it. They occupied in frivolities such as Latin verses the years which they feared might otherwise be given to reasoning and the acquisition of solid knowledge. . . . Celebrated as the Jesuit schools have been, they have owed much more to the fashion which filled them with promising scholars, than to their own excellence in dealing with their material. . . . They have never stood the test of modern criticism. They have no place in a rational system of modern education,"—O. Browning, *Introd. to the Hist. of Educational Theories*, ch. 8.

#### Modern: European Countries.

**Austria.**—"The annual appropriations passed by Parliament allow the minister of public instruction \$8,307,774 for all kinds of public educational institutions, elementary and secondary schools, universities, technical and art schools, museums, and philanthropic institutions. Generally, this principle is adhered to by the state, to subsidize the highest institutions of learning most liberally, to share the cost of maintaining secondary schools with church and community, and to leave the burden of maintaining elementary schools almost entirely to the local or communal authorities. . . . In the Austrian public schools no distinctions are made with the pupils as regards their religious confessions. The schools are open to all, and are therefore common schools in the sense in which that term is employed with us. In Prussia it is the policy of the Government to separate the pupils of different religious confessions in . . . elementary, but not to separate them in secondary schools. In Austria and Hungary, special teachers of religion for the elementary and secondary schools are employed; in Prussia, this is done only in secondary schools, while religion is taught by the secular teachers in elementary schools. This is a very vital difference, and shows how much nearer the Austrian schools have come to our ideal of a common school."—U. S. Comm'r of Education, *Report*, 1889-90, pp. 465-466.

**Belgium.**—"The treaty of Paris, of March 30, 1814, fixed the boundary of the Netherlands, and united Holland and Belgium. In these new circumstances, the system of public instruction became the subject of much difficulty between the Calvinists of the northern provinces and the Catholics of the southern. The government therefore undertook itself to manage the organization of the system of instruction in its three grades. . . . William I. desired to free the Belgians from French influence, and with this object adopted the injudicious measure of attempting to force the Dutch language upon them. He also endeavored to familiarize them with Protestant ideas, and to this end determined to get the care of religious instruction exclusively into the hands of the state. But the clergy were energetic in asserting their rights; the boldness of the Belgian

deputies to the States-General increased daily; and the project for a system of public and private instruction which was laid before the second chamber on the 26th November, 1829, was very unfavorably received by the Catholics. The government very honorably confessed its error by repealing the obnoxious ordinances of 1825. But it was too late, and the Belgian provinces were lost to Holland. On the 12th October, 1830, the provisory government repealed all laws restricting the freedom of instruction, and the present system, in which liberty of instruction and governmental aid and supervision are recognized, commenced."—*Public Instruction in Belgium* (*Harvard's Am. Journal of Education*, v. 8, pp. 582-583).

**Denmark.**—"Denmark has long been noted for the excellence of her schools. . . . The perfection and extension of the system of popular instruction date from the beginning of the eighteenth century, when Bishop Thestrup, of Aalberg, caused 6 parish schools to be established in Copenhagen and when King Frederick IV. (1699-1730) had 240 school-houses built. . . . Christian VI. (1730-1746), . . . ordained in 1739 the establishment of common or parish schools in every town and in every larger village. The branches of instruction were to be religion, reading, writing, and arithmetic. No one was to be allowed to teach unless he had shown himself qualified to the satisfaction of the clergyman of the parish. . . . Many difficulties, however (especially the objections of the landed proprietors, who had their own schools on their estates), hindered the free development of the common school system, and it was not until 1814 that a new and more favorable era was inaugurated by the law of July 29 of that year. According to this law the general control of the schools is in the hands of a minister of public instruction and subordinate superintendents for the several departments of the kingdom."—*Education in Denmark* (*U. S. Bureau of Education, Circulars of Information*, 1877, no. 2), pp. 40-41.—"With a population in 1890 of 2,185,157, the pupils enrolled in city and rural schools in Denmark numbered 231,940, or about 10 per cent. of the population receiving the foundation of an education. In 1881 the illiterates to 100 recruits numbered 0.36; in Sweden at that date, the per cent. was 0.39."—*U. S. Comm'r of Education, Report*, 1889-90, p. 523.

**England: Oxford and Cambridge.**—"Oxford and Cambridge, as establishments for education, consist of two parts—the University proper, and of the Colleges. The former, original and essential, is founded, controlled, and privileged by public authority, for the advantage of the nation. The latter, accessory and contingent, are created, regulated, and endowed by private munificence, for the interest of certain favored individuals. Time was, when the Colleges did not exist, and the University was there; and were the Colleges again abolished, the University would remain entire. The former, founded solely for education, exists only as it accomplishes the end of its institution; the latter, founded principally for aliment and habitation, would still exist, were all education abandoned within their walls. The University, as a national establishment, is necessarily open to the lieges in general; the Colleges, as private institutions, might universally do, as some have actually done—close their gates upon all, except their foundation members. The Uni-

versities and Colleges are thus neither identical, nor vicarious of each other. If the University ceases to perform its functions, it ceases to exist; and the privileges accorded by the nation to the system of public education legally organized in the University, can not, without the consent of the nation—far less without the consent of the academical legislature—be lawfully transferred to the system of private education precariously organized in the Colleges, and over which neither the State nor the University have any control. They have, however, been unlawfully usurped. Through the suspension of the University, and the usurpation of its functions and privileges by the Collegial bodies, there has arisen the second of two systems, diametrically opposite to each other.—The one, in which the University was paramount, is ancient and statutory; the other, in which the Colleges have the ascendancy, is recent and illegal.—In the former, all was subservient to public utility, and the interests of science; in the latter, all is sacrificed to private monopoly, and to the convenience of the teacher. . . . In the original constitution of Oxford, as in that of all the older Universities of the Parisian model, the business of instruction was not confided to a special body of privileged professors. The University was governed, the University was taught, by the graduates at large. Professor, Master, Doctor, were originally synonymous. Every graduate had an equal right of teaching publicly in the University the subjects competent to his faculty, and to the rank of his degree; nay, every graduate incurred the obligation of teaching publicly, for a certain period, the subjects of his faculty, for such was the condition involved in the grant of the degree itself."—*Sir Wm. Hamilton, Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, etc.: Education*, ch. 4.

**England: The "Great Public Schools."**—"What is a public school in England? "The question is one of considerable difficulty. To some extent, however, the answer has been furnished by the Royal Commission appointed in 1861 to inquire into the nature and application of the endowments and revenues, and into the administration and management of certain specified colleges and schools commonly known as the Public Schools Commission. Nine are named in the Queen's letter of appointment, viz., Eton, Winchester, Westminster, the Charterhouse, St. Paul's, Merchant Taylors', Harrow, Rugby, and Shrewsbury. The reasons probably which suggested this selection were, that the nine named foundations had in the course of centuries emerged from the mass of endowed grammar-schools, and had made for themselves a position which justified their being placed in a distinct category, and classed as 'public schools.' It will be seen as we proceed that all these nine have certain features in common, distinguishing them from the ordinary grammar-schools which exist in almost every country town in England. Many of these latter are now waking up to the requirements of the new time and following the example of their more illustrious sisters. The most notable examples of this revival are such schools as those at Sherborne, Giggleswick, and Tunbridge Wells, which, while remodelling themselves on the lines laid down by the Public Schools Commissioners, are to some extent providing a training more adapted to the means and requirements of our middle classes in the nineteenth century than can

be found at any of the nine public schools. But twenty years ago the movement which has since made such astonishing progress was scarcely felt in quiet country places like these, and the old endowments were allowed to run to waste in a fashion which is now scarcely credible. The same impulse which has put new life into the endowed grammar-schools throughout England has worked even more remarkably in another direction. The Victorian age bids fair to rival the Elizabethan in the number and importance of the new schools which it has founded and will hand on to the coming generation. Marlborough, Halleybury, Uppingham, Rossall, Clifton, Cheltenham, Hatley, Malvern, and Wellington College, are nine schools which have taken their place in the first rank. . . . In order, then, to get clear ideas on the general question, we must keep these three classes of schools in mind — the nine old foundations recognized in the first instance by the Royal Commission of 1861; the old foundations which have remained local grammar-schools until within the last few years, but are now enlarging their bounds, conforming more or less to the public-school system, and becoming national institutions; and, lastly, the modern foundations which started from the first as public schools, professing to adapt themselves to the new circumstances and requirements of modern English life. The public schools of England fall under one or other of these categories. . . . We may now turn to the historic side of the question, dealing first, as is due to their importance, with the nine schools of our first category. The oldest, and in some respects most famous of these, is Winchester School, or, as it was named by its founder William of Wykeham, the College of St. Mary of Winchester, founded in 1382. Its constitution still retains much of the impress left on it by the great Bishop of the greatest Plantagenet King, five centuries ago. Toward the end of the fourteenth century Oxford was already the center of English education, but from the want of grammar-schools boys went up by hundreds untaught in the simplest rudiments of learning, and when there lived in private hostels or lodging-houses, in a vast throng, under no discipline, and exposed to many hardships and temptations. In view of this state of things, William of Wykeham founded his grammar-school at Winchester and his college at Oxford, binding the two together, so that the school might send up properly trained scholars to the university, where they would be received at New College, in a suitable academical home, which should in its turn furnish governors and masters for the school. . . . Next in date comes the royal foundation of Eton, or 'The College of the Blessed Mary of Eton, near Windsor.' It was founded by Henry VI., A. D. 1446, upon the model of Winchester, with a collegiate establishment of a provost, ten fellows (reduced to seven in the reign of Edward IV.), seventy scholars, and ten chaplains (now reduced to two, who are called 'conducts'), and a head and lower master, ten lay clerks, and twelve choristers. The provost and fellows are the governing body, who appoint the head master. . . . Around this center the great school, numbering now a thousand boys, has gathered, the college, however, still retaining its own separate organization and traditions. Besides the splendid buildings and playing-fields at Eton, the college holds real property of the yearly

value of upward of £20,000, and forty livings ranging from £100 to £1,200 of yearly value. . . . The school next in date stands out in sharp contrast to Winchester and Eton. It is St. Paul's School, founded by Dean Colet. . . . Shrewsbury School, which follows next in order of seniority, claims a royal foundation, but is in reality the true child of the town's folk. The dissolution of the monasteries destroyed also the seminaries attached to many of them, to the great injury of popular education. This was especially the case in Shropshire, so in 1551 the bailiffs, burgesses, and inhabitants of Shrewsbury and the neighborhood petitioned Edward VI. for a grant of some portion of the estates of the dissolved collegiate churches for the purpose of founding a free school. The King consented, and granted to the petitioners the appropriate tithes of several livings and a charter, but died before the school was organized. It was begun before during Mary's reign, but opened in the fourth year of Elizabeth, 1562, by Thomas Aston. . . . We have now reached the great group of Elizabethan schools, to which indeed Shrewsbury may also be said to belong, as it was not opened until the Queen had been three years on the throne. The two metropolitan schools of Westminster and Merchant Taylors' were in fact founded in 1560, two years before the opening of Shrewsbury. Westminster as a royal foundation must take precedence. It is a grammar-school attached by the Queen to the collegiate church of St. Peter, commonly called Westminster Abbey, and founded for the free education of forty scholars in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. The Queen, with characteristic thriftiness, provided no endowment for her school, leaving the cost of maintenance as a charge on the general revenues of the dean and chapter, which indeed were, then as now, fully competent to sustain the burden. . . . Merchant Taylors', the other metropolitan school founded in 1560, owes its origin to Sir Thomas White, a member of the Court of Assistants of the company, and founder of St. John's College, Oxford. It was probably his promise to connect the school with his college which induced the Company to undertake the task. . . . Sir Thomas White redeemed his promise by endowing the school with thirty-seven fellowships at St. John's College. . . . Rugby, or the free school of Lawrence Sheriff, follows next in order, having been founded in 1567 by Lawrence Sheriff, grocer, and citizen of London. His 'intent' (as the document expressing his wishes is called) declares that his lands in Rugby and Brownsover, and his 'third of a pasture-ground in Gray's Inn Fields, called Conduit Close,' shall be applied to maintain a free grammar school for the children of Rugby and Brownsover, and the places adjoining, and four poor almsmen of the same parishes. These estates, after providing a fair schoolhouse and residences for the master and almsmen, at first produced a rental of only £24 13s. 4d. In due time, however, Conduit Close became a part of central London, and Rugby School the owner of eight acres of houses in and about the present Lamb's Conduit Street. The income of the whole trust property amounts now to about £8,000, of which £255 is expended on the maintenance of the twelve almsmen. . . . Harrow School was founded in 1571, four years later than Rugby, by John Lyon, a yeoman of the parish. He was owner of certain small estates in and about Har-



row and Barnet, and of others at Paddington and Kilburn. All these he devoted to public purposes, but unfortunately gave the former for the perpetual education of the children and youth of the parish, and the latter for the maintenance and repair of the highways from Harrow and Edgware to London. The present yearly revenue of the school estates is barely over £1,000, while that of the highway trust is nearly £4,000. But, though the poorest in endowments, Harrow, from its nearness to London, and consequent attractions for the classes who spend a large portion of their year in the metropolis either in attendance in Parliament, or for pleasure, has become the rival of Eton as a fashionable school. . . . Last on the list of the nine schools comes the Charterhouse (the Whitefriars of Thackeray's novels). It may be fairly classed with the Elizabethan schools, though actually founded in 1609, after the accession of James I. In that year a substantial yeoman, Thomas Sutton by name, purchased from Lord Suffolk the lately dissolved Charterhouse, by Smithfield, and obtained letters patent empowering him to found a hospital and school on the old site."—T. Hughes, *The Public Schools of England* (*N. Am. Rev.*, April, 1879).—**Fagging.**—"In rougher days it was found, that in large schools the stronger and larger boys reduced the smaller and weaker to the condition of Helots. Here the authorities stepped in, and despairing of eradicating the evil, took the power which mere strength had won, and conferred it upon the seniors of the school—the members, that is, of the highest form or forms. As in those days, promotion was pretty much a matter of rotation, every one who remained his full time at the school, was pretty sure to reach in time the dominant class, and the humblest fag looked forward to the day when he would join the ranks of the ruling aristocracy. Meantime he was no longer at the beck of any stronger or ruder classfellow. His 'master' was in theory, and often in practice, his best protector: he imposed upon him very likely what may be called menial offices—made him carry home his 'Musse'—field for him at cricket—brush his coat; if we are to believe school myths and traditions, black his shoes, and even take the chill off his sheets. The boy, however, saw the son of a Howard or a Percy similarly employed by his side, and in cheerfully submitting to an ancient custom, he was but following out the tendencies of the age and class to which he belonged. . . . The mere abolition of the right of fagging, vague and undefined as were the duties attached to it, would have been a loss rather than a gain to the oppressed as a class. It would merely have substituted for the existing law, imperfect and anomalous as that law might be, the licence of brute force and the dominion of boyish truculence. . . . Such was, more or less, the state of things when he to whom English education owes so incalculable a debt, was placed at the head of Rugby School. . . . It was hoped that he who braved the anger of his order by his pamphlet on Church Reform—at whose bold and uncompromising language bishops stood aghast and courtly nobles remonstrated in vain—would make short work of ancient saws and mediæval traditions—that a revolution in school life was at hand. And they were not mistaken. . . . What he did was to seize on the really valuable part of the existing system—to inspire it with that new life, and

those loftier purposes, without which mere institutions, great or small, must, sooner or later, wither away and perish. His first step was to effect an important change in the actual machinery of the school—one which, in itself, amounted to a revolution. The highest form in the school was no longer open to all whom a routine promotion might raise in course of time to its level. Industry and talent as tested by careful examinations (in the additional labour of which he himself bore the heaviest burden), were the only qualifications recognised. The new-modelled 'sixth form' were told, that the privileges and powers which their predecessors had enjoyed for ages were not to be wrested from them; but that they were to be held for the common good, as the badges and instruments of duties and responsibilities, such as any one with less confidence in those whom he addressed would have hesitated to impose. They were told plainly that without their co-operation there was no hope of keeping in check the evils inherent in a society of boys. Tyranny, falsehood, drinking, party-spirit, coarseness, selfishness—the evil spirits that infest schools—these they heard Sunday after Sunday put in their true light by a majestic voice and a manly presence, with words, accents, and manner which would live in their memory for years; but they were warned that, to exercise such spirits, something more was needed than the watchfulness of masters and the energy of their chief. They themselves must use their large powers, entrusted to them in recognition of the principle, or rather of the fact, that in a large society of boys some must of necessity hold sway, to keep down, in themselves and those about them, principles and practices which are ever ready, like hideous weeds, to choke the growth of all that is fair and noble in such institutions. Dr. Arnold persevered in spite of opposition, obloquy, and misrepresentation. . . . But he firmly established his system, and his successors, men differing in training and temperament from himself and from each other, have agreed in cordially sustaining it. His pupils and theirs, men in very different walks of life, filling honourable posts at the universities and public schools, or ruling the millions of India, or working among the blind and toiling multitudes of our great towns, feel daily how much of their usefulness and power they owe to the sense of high trust and high duty which they imbibed at school."—*Our Public Schools—Their Discipline and Instruction* (*Fraser's Magazine*, v. 1, pp. 407-409).

**England: A. C. 1699-1870.—The rise of Elementary Schools.**—"The recognition by the English State of its paramount duty in aiding the work of national education is scarcely more than a generation old. The recognition of the further and far more extensive work of supplementing by State aid, or by State agency, all deficiencies in the supply of schools, dates only thirteen years back [to 1870]; while the equally pressing duty of enforcing, by a universal law, the use of the opportunities of education thus supplied, is a matter almost of yesterday. The State has only slowly stepped into its proper place; more slowly in the case of England than in the case of any other of the leading European nations. . . . In 1699 the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge was founded, and by it various schools were established throughout the country. In 1782 Robert Raikes established his first Sun-

day school, and in a few years the Union, of which he was the founder, had under its control schools scattered all over the country. But the most extensive efforts made for popular education were those of Andrew Bell and Joseph Lancaster towards the close of the eighteenth century. . . . They misconceived and misjudged the extent of the work that had to be accomplished. They became slaves to their system—that which was called the Monitorial system . . . and by elevating it to undue importance they did much to discredit the very work in which they were engaged. . . . Amongst the Nonconformist followers of Lancaster there arose the British and Foreign School Society; while by those of Bell there was established, on the side representing the Church, the National Society. The former became the recognised agency of the Dissenters, the latter of the Church; and through one or other of these channels State aid, when it first began to flow, was obliged to take its course. . . . In 1802 the first Sir Robert Peel passed a Bill which restricted children's labour in factories, and required that reading, writing, and arithmetic should be taught to them during a part of each day. This was the beginning of the factory legislation. . . . In 1807 Mr. Whitebread introduced a Bill for the establishment of parochial schools through the agency of local vestries, who were empowered to draw on the rates for the purpose. The House of Commons accepted the Bill, but it was thrown out in the House of Lords. . . . The movement for a State recognition of education was pressed more vigorously when the fears and troubles of European war were clearing away. It was in 1816 that Brougham obtained his Select Committee for Inquiring into the Education of the Poor in the Metropolis. . . . In 1820 Brougham introduced, on the basis of his previous inquiries, an Education Bill. . . . By this Bill the issue between the contending parties in the State, which was henceforward destined to be the chief stumbling-block in the way of a State education, was placed on a clear and well-defined basis. . . . The Church was alarmed at anything which seemed to trench upon what she naturally thought to be her appointed task. The Dissenters dreaded what might add to the impregnability of the Church's strongholds. . . . When the beginning was actually made it came . . . as an almost unnoticed proposal of the Executive. In 1833 the sum of £20,000 for public education was placed in the estimates; it was passed by the Committee of Supply; and the first step was taken on that course from which the State has never since drawn back. No legislation was necessary. . . . The next great step was taken in 1839, when the annual vote was increased from £20,000 to £30,000, and when a special department was created to supervise the work. Hitherto grants had been administered by the Treasury to meet a certain amount of local exertion, and in general reliance upon vague assurances as to maintenance of the schools by local promoters. . . . The conditions which were soon found to be necessary as securities, either for continuance or for efficiency, were not yet insisted upon. To do this it was necessary to have a Department specially devoted to this work; and the means adopted for creating such a Department was one which had the advantage of requiring no Act of Parliament. By an Order in Council a Special Committee of the

Privy Council was established, and, in connection with this Committee, a special staff of officers was engaged. The same year saw the appointment of the first inspectors of schools. It was thus that the Education Department was constituted. The plan which the advisers of the Government in this new attempt had most at heart was that of a Normal Training College for teachers. . . . But it was surrounded with so much matter for dispute, gathered during a generation of contention, that the proposal all but wrecked the Government of Lord Melbourne. The Church objected to the scheme. . . . In the year 1844, after five years of the new administration, it was possible to form some estimate, not only of the solid work accomplished, but of the prospects of the immediate future. . . . Between 1839 and 1844, under the action of the Committee of Council, £170,000 of Imperial funds had been distributed to meet £430,000 from local resources. In all, therefore, about one million had been spent in little more than ten years. What solid good had this accomplished? . . . According to a careful and elaborate report in the year 1845, only about one in six, even of the children at school, was found able to read the Scriptures with any ease. Even for these the power of reading often left them when they tried a secular book. Of reading with intelligence there was hardly any; and about one-half of the children who came to school left, it was calculated, unable to read. Only about one child in four had mastered, even in the most mechanical way, the art of writing. As regards arithmetic, not two per cent. of the children had advanced as far as the rule of three. . . . The teaching of the schools was in the hands of men who had scarcely any training, and who had often turned to the work because all other work had turned away from them. Under them it was conducted upon that monitorial system which was the inheritance from Dr. Bell, the rival of Lancaster. The pupils were set to teach one another. . . . The inquiries of the Committee of Council thus gave the death-blow, in public estimation, to the once highly-vaunted monitorial system. But how was it to be replaced? The model of a better state of things was found in the Dutch schools. There a selected number of the older pupils, who intended to enter upon the profession of teachers, were apprenticed, when they had reached the age of thirteen, to the teacher. . . . After their apprenticeship they passed to a Training College. . . . Accordingly, a new and important start was made by the Department on the 25th of August 1846. . . . In 1851 twenty-five Training Colleges had been established; and these had a sure supply of qualified recruits in the 6,000 pupil teachers who were by that time being trained to the work. . . . The ten years between 1842 and 1852 saw the Parliamentary grant raised from £40,000 to £160,000 a year, with the certainty of a still further increase as the augmentation grants to teachers and the stipends to pupil teachers grew in number. Nearly 3,800 schools had been built with Parliamentary aid, providing accommodation for no less than 540,000 children. The State had contributed towards this more than £400,000; and a total expenditure had been incurred in providing schools of more than £1,000,000. . . . But the system was as yet only tentative; and a mass of thorny religious questions had to be faced before a really national system could be established.

. . . All parties became convinced that the first step was to inquire into the merits and defects of the existing system, and on the basis of sound information to plan some method of advance. Under this impression it was that the Commission on Public Education, of which the Duke of Newcastle was chairman, was appointed in 1858." The result of the Commission of 1858 was a revision of the educational Code which the Committee of the Privy Council had formulated. The New Code proved unsatisfactory in its working, and every year showed more plainly the necessity of a fully organized system of national education. "Out of the discussions there arose two societies, which fairly expressed two different views. . . . The first of these was the Education League, started at Birmingham in 1869. . . . Its basis, shortly stated, was that of a compulsory system of school provision, by local authorities through means of local rates; the schools so provided to be at once free and unsectarian. . . . In this programme the point which raised most opposition was the unsectarian teaching. It was chiefly to counteract this part of the League's objects that there was formed the Education Union, which urged a universal system based upon the old lines. . . . By common consent the time for a settlement was now come. Some guarantee must be taken that the whole edifice should not crumble to pieces; that for local agencies there should be substituted local authorities; and that the State should be supplied with some machinery whereby the gaps in the work might be supplied. It was in this position of opinion that Mr. Forster, as Vice-President, introduced his Education Bill in 1870. . . . The measure passed the House of Lords without any material alteration; and finally became Law on the 9th of August 1870."—H. Craik, *The State in its Relation to Education*.—The schools to which the provisions of the Act of 1870 extends, and the regulations under which such schools are to be conducted, are defined in the Act as follows: "Every elementary school which is conducted in accordance with the following regulations shall be a public elementary school within the meaning of this Act; and every public elementary school shall be conducted in accordance with the following regulations (a copy of which regulations shall be conspicuously put up in every such school); namely (1.) It shall not be required, as a condition of any child being admitted into or continuing in the school, that he shall attend or abstain from attending any Sunday school, or any place of religious worship, or that he shall attend any religious observance or any instruction in religious subjects in the school or elsewhere, from which observance or instruction he may be withdrawn by his parent, or that he shall, if withdrawn by his parent, attend the school on any day exclusively set apart for religious observance by the religious body to which his parent belongs: (2.) The time or times during which any religious observance is practised or instruction in religious subjects is given at any meeting of the school shall be either at the beginning or at the end or at the beginning and the end of such meeting, and shall be inserted in a time-table to be approved by the Education Department, and to be kept permanently and conspicuously affixed in every school-room; and any scholar may be withdrawn by his parent from such observance or instruction with-

out forfeiting any of the other benefits of the school: (3.) The school shall be open at all times to the inspection of any of Her Majesty's inspectors, so, however, that it shall be no part of the duties of such inspector to inquire into any instruction in religious subjects given at such school, or to examine any scholar therein in religious knowledge or in any religious subject or book: (4.) The school shall be conducted in accordance with the conditions required to be fulfilled by an elementary school in order to obtain an annual parliamentary grant."—J. H. Rigg, *National Education, app. A.*—"The new Act retained existing inspected schools, . . . it also did away with all denominational classifications of schools and with denominational inspection, treating all inspected schools as equally belonging to a national system of schools and under national inspection, the distinctions as to inspectors and their provinces being henceforth purely geographical. But the new Act no longer required that public elementary schools established by voluntary agency and under voluntary management should have in them any religious character or element whatever, whether as belonging to a Christian Church or denomination, or as connected with a Christian philanthropic society, or as providing for the reading of the Scriptures in the school. It was left open to any party or any person to establish purely voluntary schools if they thought fit. But, furthermore, the Act made provision for an entirely new class of schools, to be established and (in part) supported out of local rates, to be governed by locally-elected School Boards, and to have just such and so much religious instruction given in them as the governing boards might think proper, at times preceding or following the prescribed secular school hours, and under the protection of a time-table Conscience Clause, as in the case of voluntary schools, with this restriction only, that in these schools no catechism or denominational religious formulary of any sort was to be taught. The mode of electing members to the School Boards was to be by what is called the cumulative vote—that is, each elector was to have as many votes as there were candidates, and these votes he could give all to one, or else distribute among the candidates as he liked; and all ratepayers were to be electors. . . . The new law . . . made a clear separation, in one respect, between voluntary and Board schools. Both were to stand equally in relation to the National Education Department, under the Privy Council; but the voluntary schools were to have nothing to do with local rates or rate aid, no Local Boards to have any control over voluntary schools."—J. H. Rigg, *National Education, ch. 10.*—"To sum up . . . in few words what may be set down as the chief characteristics of our English system of Elementary Education, I should say (1) first, that whilst about 30 per cent. of our school accommodation is under the control of school boards, the cost of maintenance being borne in part by local rates as well as by the Parliamentary grant, fully 70 per cent. is still in the hands of voluntary school-managers, whose subscriptions take the place of the rates levied by school boards. (2) In case a deficiency in school accommodation is reported in any school district, the Education Department have the power to require that due provision shall be made for the same within a limited time;

the 'screw' to be applied to wilful defaulters in a voluntary school district being the threat of a board, and in a school board district the supersession of the existing board by a new board, nominated by the Department, and remunerated out of the local rates. (3) Attendance is enforced everywhere by bye-laws, worked either by the school board or by the School Attendance Committee; and although these local authorities are often very remiss in discharging their duties, and the magistrates not seldom culpably lenient in dealing with cases brought before them, there are plenty of districts in which regularity of school attendance has been improved fully 10 per cent. in the past two or three years. . . . (4) The present provision for teachers, and the means in existence for keeping up the supply, are eminently satisfactory. Besides a large but somewhat diminishing body of apprenticed pupil teachers, there is a very considerable and rapidly increasing number of duly qualified assistants, and at their head a large array of certificated teachers, whose ranks are being replenished, chiefly from the Training Colleges, at the rate of about 2,000 a year. (5) The whole of the work done is examined and judged every year by inspectors and inspectors' assistants organised in districts each superintended by a senior inspector—the total cost of this inspection for the present year being estimated at about £150,000.—Rev. H. Roe, *The Eng. System of Elementary Education (International Health Exhibition, London, 1884: Conference on Education, sect. A)*.—"The result of the work of the Education Department is causing a social revolution in England. If the character of the teaching is too mechanical, if the chief aim of the teacher is to earn as much money as possible for his managers, it must be remembered that this cannot be done without at least giving the pupil the ability to read and write. Of course the schools are not nearly so good as the friends of true education wish. Much remains to be done. . . . Free education will shortly be an accomplished fact; the partial absorption of the voluntary schools by the School Boards will necessarily follow, and further facilitate the abolition of what have been the cause of so much evil—result examinations, and 'grant payments,' 'Write "Grant factory" on three-fourths of our schools,' said an educator to me. . . . The schools are known as (1) Voluntary Schools, which have been built, and are partly supported by voluntary subscriptions. These are under denominational control. (2) Board Schools: viz., schools built and supported by money raised by local taxation, and controlled by elected School Boards. Out of 4,688,000 pupils in the elementary schools, 2,154,000 are in the schools known as Voluntary, provided by, and under the control of the Church of England; 1,780,000 are in Board Schools; 330,000 attend schools under the British School Society, or other undenominational control; 248,000 are in Roman Catholic schools; and 174,000 belong to Wesleyan schools. The schools here spoken of correspond more nearly than any other in England to the Public School of the United States and Australia; but are in many respects very different, chiefly from the fact that they are provided expressly for the poor, and in many cases are attended by no other class."—W. C. Grasby, *Teaching in Three Continents*, ch. 2.

**England: A. D. 1891.—Attainment of Free Education.**—In 1891, a bill passed Parliament which aims at making the elementary schools of the country free from the payment of fees. The bill as explained in the House of Commons, "proposed to give a grant of 10s. per head to each scholar in average attendance between five and fourteen years of age, and as regarded such children schools would either become wholly free, or would continue to charge a fee reduced by the amount of the grant, according as the fee at present charged did or did not exceed 10s. When a school had become free it would remain free, or when a fee was charged, the fee would remain unaltered unless a change was required for the educational benefit of the locality; and under this arrangement he believed that two-thirds of the elementary schools in England and Wales would become free. There would be no standard limitations, but the grant would be restricted to schools where the compulsory power came in, and as to the younger children, it was proposed that in no case should the fee charged exceed 2d." In a speech made at Birmingham on the free education bill, Mr. Chamberlain discussed the opposition to it made by those who wished to destroy the denominational schools, and who objected to their participation in the proposed extension of public support. "To destroy denominational schools," he said, "was now an impossibility, and nothing was more astonishing than the progress they had made since the Education Act of 1870. He had thought, he said, they would die out with the establishment of Board schools, but he had been mistaken, for in the last twenty-three years they had doubled their accommodation, and more than doubled their subscription list. At the present time they supplied accommodation for two-thirds of the children of England and Wales. That being the case, to destroy voluntary schools—to supply their places with Board schools, as the Daily News cheerfully suggested—would be to involve a capital expenditure of £50,000,000, and £5,000,000 extra yearly in rates. But whether voluntary or denominational schools were good or bad, their continued existence had nothing to do with the question of free education, and ought to be kept quite distinct from it. To make schools free was not to give one penny extra to any denominational government. At the present time the fee was a tax, and if the parents did not pay fees they were brought before the magistrates, and if they still did not pay they might be sent to gaol. The only thing the Government proposed to do was not to alter the tax but to alter the incidence. The same amount would be collected; it would be paid by the same people, but it would be collected from the whole nation out of the general taxation." The bill was passed by the Commons July 8, and by the Lords on the 24th of the same month. The free education proposals of the Government are said to have been generally accepted throughout the country by both Board and Voluntary schools.—*Annual Register*, 1891, pp. 128 and 97, and pt. 2, p. 51.

**France: A. D. 1565-1802.—The Jesuits.—Port Royal.—The Revolution.—Napoleon.**—"The Jesuits invaded the province long ruled by the University alone. By that adroit management of men for which they have always been eminent, and by the more liberal spirit of

their methods, they outdid in popularity their superannuated rival. Their first school at Paris was established in 1563, and in 1762, two years before their dissolution, they had eighty-six colleges in France. They were followed by the Port Royalists, the Benedictines, the Oratorians. The Port Royal schools [see PORT ROYAL], from which perhaps a powerful influence upon education might have been looked for, restricted this influence by limiting very closely the number of their pupils. Meanwhile the main funds and endowments for public education in France were in the University's hands, and its administration of these was as ineffective as its teaching. . . . The University had originally, as sources of revenue, the Post Office and the Messageries, or Office of Public Conveyance; it had long since been obliged to abandon the Post Office to Government, when in 1719 it gave up to the same authority the privilege of the Messageries, receiving in return from the State a yearly revenue of 150,000 livres. For this payment, moreover, it undertook the obligation of making the instruction in all its principal colleges gratuitous. Paid or gratuitous, however, its instruction was quite inadequate to the wants of the time, and when the Jesuits were expelled from France in 1764, their establishments closed, and their services as teachers lost, the void that was left was strikingly apparent, and public attention began to be drawn to it. It is well known how Rousseau among writers, and Turgot among statesmen, busied themselves with schemes of education; but the interest in the subject must have reached the whole body of the community, for the instructions of all three orders of the States General in 1789 are unanimous in demanding the reform of education, and its establishment on a proper footing. Then came the Revolution, and the work of reform soon went swimmingly enough, so far as the abolition of the old schools was concerned. In 1791 the colleges were all placed under the control of the administrative authorities; in 1792 the jurisdiction of the University was abolished; in 1793 the property of the colleges was ordered to be sold, the proceeds to be taken by the State; in September of the same year the suppression of all the great public schools and of all the University faculties was pronounced. For the work of reconstruction Condorcet's memorable plan had in 1792 been submitted to the Committee of Public Instruction appointed by the Legislative Assembly. This plan proposed a secondary school for every 4,000 inhabitants; for each department, a departmental institute, or higher school; nine lycées, schools carrying their studies yet higher than the departmental institute, for the whole of France; and to crown the edifice, a National Society of Sciences and Arts, corresponding in the main with the present institute of France. The whole expense of national instruction was to be borne by the State, and this expense was estimated at 29,000,000 of francs. But 1792 and 1793 were years of furious agitation, when it was easier to destroy than to build. Condorcet perished with the Girondists, and the reconstruction of public education did not begin till after the fall of Robespierre. The decrees of the Convention for establishing the Normal School, the Polytechnic, the School of Mines, and the écoles centrales, and then Daunou's law in 1795, bore, however, many traces of Condor-

cet's design. Daunou's law established primary schools, central schools, special schools, and at the head of all the Institute of France, this last a memorable and enduring creation, with which the old French Academy became incorporated. By Daunou's law, also, freedom was given to private persons to open schools. The new legislation had many defects. . . . The country, too, was not yet settled enough for its education to organise itself successfully. The Normal School speedily broke down; the central schools were established slowly and with difficulty; in the course of the four years of the Directory there were nominally instituted ninety-one of these schools, but they never really worked. More was accomplished by private schools, to which full freedom was given by the new legislation, at the same time that an ample and open field lay before them. They could not, however, suffice for the work, and education was one of the matters for which Napoleon, when he became Consul, had to provide. Fourcroy's law, in 1802, took as the basis of its school-system secondary schools, whether established by the communes or by private individuals; the Government undertook to aid these schools by grants for buildings, for scholarships, and for gratuities to the masters; it prescribed Latin, French, geography, history, and mathematics as the instruction to be given in them. They were placed under the superintendence of the prefects. To continue and complete the secondary schools were instituted the lycées; here the instruction was to be Greek and Latin, rhetoric, logic, literature, moral philosophy, and the elements of the mathematical and physical sciences. The pupils were to be of four kinds: boursiers nat' naux, scholars nominated to scholarships by the State; pupils from the secondary schools, admitted as free scholars by competition; paying boarders, and paying day-scholars."—M. Arnold, *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, ch. 1.

**France: A. D. 1833-1889.**—The present System of Public Instruction.—“The question of the education of youth is one of those in which the struggle between the Catholic Church and the civil power has been, and still is, hottest. It is also one of those in which France, which for a long time had remained far in the rear, has made most efforts, and achieved most progress in these latter years. . . . Napoleon I. conceived education as a means of disciplining minds and wills and moulding them into conformity with the political system which he had put in force; accordingly he gave the University the monopoly of public education. Apart from the official system of teaching, no competition was allowed except that specially authorised, regulated, and controlled by the State itself. Religious instruction found a place in the official programmes, and members of the clergy were even called on to supply it, but this instruction itself, and these priests themselves, were under the authority of the State. Hence two results: on the one hand the speedy impoverishment of University education, . . . on the other hand, the incessant agitation of all those who were prevented by the special organisation given to the University from expounding their ideas or the faith that was in them from the professorial chair. This agitation was begun and carried on by the Catholic Church itself, as soon as it felt more at liberty to let its ambitions be discerned. On this point the

Church met with the support of a good number of Liberals, and it is in a great measure to its initiative that are due the three important laws of 1833, 1850, and 1875, which have respectively given to France freedom of primary education, of secondary education, and finally that of higher education; which have given, that is to say, the right to every one, under certain conditions of capacity and character, to open private schools in competition with the three orders of public schools. But the Church did not stop there. Hardly had it insured liberty to its educational institutions—a liberty by which all citizens might profit alike, but of which its own strong organisation and powerful resources enabled it more easily to take advantage—hardly was this result obtained than the Church tried to lay hands on the University itself, and to make its doctrines paramount there. . . . Thence arose a movement hostile to the enterprises of the Church, which has found expression since 1880 in a series of laws which excluded her little by little from the positions she had won, and only left to her, as to all other citizens, the liberty to teach apart from and concurrently with, the State. The right to confer degrees has been given back to the State alone; the privilege of the 'letter of obedience' has been abolished; religious teaching has been excluded from the primary schools; and after having 'laicized,' as the French phrase is, the curriculum, the effort was persistently made to 'laicize' the staff. . . . From the University point of view, the territory of France is divided into seventeen academies, the chief towns of which are Paris, Douai, Caen, Rennes, Poitiers, Bordeaux, Toulouse, Montpellier, Aix, Grenoble, Chambéry, Lyons, Besançon, Nancy, Dijon, Clermont, and Algiers. Each academy has a rector at its head, who, under the authority of the Minister of Public Instruction, is charged with the material administration of higher and secondary education, and with the methods of primary instruction in his district. The administration of this last belongs to the prefect of each department, assisted by an academy-inspector. In each of these three successive stages—department, academy, and central administration—is placed a council, possessing administrative and disciplinary powers. The Departmental Council of Public Instruction, which comprises six officials . . . forms a disciplinary council for primary education, either public or free (i. e., State or private). This council sees to the application of programmes, lays down rules, and appoints one or more delegates in each canton to superintend primary schools. The Academic Council . . . performs similar functions with regard to secondary and higher education. The Higher Council of Public Instruction sits at Paris. It comprises forty-four elected representatives of the three educational orders, nine University officials, and four 'free' schoolmasters appointed by the Minister, and is the disciplinary court of appeal for the two preceding councils. . . . Such is the framework, administrative as well as judicial, in which education, whether public or free, lives and moves. . . . Since 1883 Primary Education has been compulsory for all children of both sexes, from the age of six to the end of the thirteenth year, unless before reaching the latter age they have been able to pass an examination, and to gain the certificate of primary studies. To satisfy the

law, the child's name must be entered at a public or private school; he may, however, continue to receive instruction at home, but in this case, after he has reached the age of eight, he must be examined every year before a State board. . . . At the age of thirteen the child is set free from further teaching, whatever may be the results of the education he has received. . . . In public schools the course of instruction does not include, as we have said, religious teaching; but one day in the week the school must take a holiday, to allow parents to provide such teaching for their children, if they wish to do so. The school building cannot be used for that purpose. In private schools religious instruction may be given, but this is optional. The programme of primary education includes: moral and civic instruction; reading, writing, French, geography and history (particularly those of France); general notions of law and science; the elements of drawing, modelling, and music; and gymnastics. No person of either sex can become a teacher, either public or private, unless he possesses the 'certificate of capacity for primary instruction' given by a State board. For the future—putting aside certain temporary arrangements—no member of a religious community will be eligible for the post of master in a public school. . . . As a general rule, every commune is compelled to maintain a public school, and, if it has more than 500 inhabitants, a second school for girls only. . . . The sum total of the State's expenses for primary education in 1887 is as high as eighty-five million francs (£3,400,000), and that without mentioning grants for school buildings, whereas in 1877 the sum total was only twelve millions (£480,000). . . . From 1877 to 1886, the number of public schools rose from 61,000 to 68,500; that of the pupils from 4,200,000 to 4,500,000, with 90,600 masters and mistresses; that of training schools for male teachers from 79 to 89, of training schools for female teachers from 18 to 77, with 5,400 pupils (3,500 of them women), and 1,200 masters. As to the results a single fact will suffice. In these ten years, before the generations newly called to military service have been able to profit fully by the new state of things, the proportion of illiterate recruits (which is annually made out directly after the lots are drawn) has already fallen from 15 to 11 per cent." —A. Lebon and P. Pelet, *France as it is*, ch. 5.— "In 1872, after the dreadful disaster of the war, Monsieur Thiers, President of the Gouvernement de la Défense Nationale, and Monsieur Jules Simon, Minister of Public Instruction, felt that what was most important for the nation was a new system of public instruction, and they set themselves the task of determining the basis on which this new system was to be established. In September, 1882, Monsieur Jules Simon issued a memorable circular calling the attention of all the most distinguished leaders of thought to some proposed plans. He did not long remain in power, but in his retirement he wrote a book entitled: 'Réforme de l'Enseignement Secondaire.' Monsieur Bréal, who was commissioned to visit the schools of Germany, soon after published another book which aroused new enthusiasm in France. . . . From that day a complete educational reform was decided on. In 1872 we had at the Ministère de l'Instruction Publique three distinguished men: Monsieur Dumont for the Enseignement Supérieur, one from whom we

hoped much and whose early death we had to mourn in 1884; Monsieur Zévort for the Enseignement Secondaire, who also died ere the good seed which he had sown had sprung up and borne fruit (1887); and Monsieur Buisson to whose wisdom, zeal, and energy we owe most of the work of the Enseignement Primaire. At their side, of maturer years than they, stood Monsieur Gréard, Recteur de l'Académie de Paris. . . . All the educationists of the first French Revolution had insisted on the solidarity of the three orders of education; maintaining that it was not possible to separate one from another, and that there ought to be a close correspondence between them. This principle lies at the root of the whole system of French national instruction. Having established this principle, the four leaders called upon all classes of teachers to work with them, and professors who had devoted their life to the promotion of superior instruction brought their experience and their powers of organization to bear upon schools for all classes, from the richest to the poorest. . . . But to reform and to reconstruct a system of instruction is not a small task. It is not easy to change at once the old methods, to give a new spirit to the masters, to teach those who think that what had been sufficient for them need not be altered and is sufficient forever. However, we must say that as soon as the French teachers heard of the great changes which were about to take place, they were all anxious to rise to the demands made on them, and were eager for advice and help. Lectures on pedagogy and psychology were given to them by the highest professors of philosophy, and these lessons were so much appreciated that the attention of the University of France was called to the necessity for creating at the Sorbonne a special course of lectures on pedagogy. Eleven hundred masters and mistresses attended them the first year that they were inaugurated; from that time till now their number has always been increasing. Now we have at the Sorbonne a Chaire Magistrale and Conférences for the training of masters and professors; and the faculties at Lyons, Bordeaux, Nancy, and Montpellier have followed the example given at the Sorbonne, Paris. . . . In 1878, the Musée Pédagogique was founded; in 1882, began the publication of the Revue Pédagogique and the Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement. Four large volumes of the Dictionnaire de Pédagogie, each containing about 3,000 closely printed pages, have also come out under the editorship of Monsieur Buisson, all the work of zealous teachers and educationists. In 1879 normal schools were opened. Then in 1880 primary schools, and in 1882 we may say that the Ecoles Maternelles and the Ecoles Infantines were created, so different are they from the infant schools or the Salles d'Asile; in 1883 a new examination was established for the Professorat and the Direction des Ecoles Normales, as well as for the inspectors of primary instruction; and in July, 1889, the law about public and private teaching was promulgated, perhaps one of the most important that has ever been passed by the Republic."—Mme. Th. Armagnac, *The Educational Renaissance of France (Education, Sept., 1890)*.

France: A. D. 1890-1891.—Statistics.—The whole number of pupils registered in the primary, elementary and superior schools, public and private, of France and Algiers (excluding the

"écoles maternelles") for the school-year 1890-91, was 5,598,883; of which 4,384,905 were in public schools (3,700,601, "laïque," and 624,304 "congréganiste"), and 1,208,978 in private schools (151,412 "laïques," and 1,057,566 "congréganiste"). Of 36,484 communes, 35,503 possessed a public school, and 875 were joined for school purposes with another commune. The male teachers employed in the elementary and superior public schools numbered 28,657; female teachers, 24,273; total 52,930.—Ministère de l'Instruction publique, *Résumé des états de situation de l'enseignement primaire pour l'année scolaire 1890-1891*.

Ireland.—"The present system of National Education in Ireland was founded in 1831. In this year grants of public money for the education of the poor were entrusted to the lord-lieutenant in order that they might be applied to the education of the people. This education was to be given to children of every religious belief, and to be superintended by commissioners appointed for the purpose. The great principle on which the system was founded was that of 'united secular and separate religious instruction.' No child should be required to attend any religious instruction which should be contrary to the wishes of his or her parents or guardians. Times were to be set apart during which children were to have such religious instruction as their parents might think proper. It was to be the duty of the Commissioners to see that these principles were carried out and not infringed on in any way. They had also power to give or refuse money to those who applied for aid to build schools. Schools are 'vested' and 'non-vested.' Vested schools are those built by the Board of National Education; non-vested schools are the ordinary schools, and are managed by those who built them. If a committee of persons build a school, it is looked on by the Board as the 'patron.' If a landowner or private person builds a school, he is regarded as the patron if he has no committee. The patron, whether landlord or committee, has power to appoint or dismiss a manager, who corresponds with the Board. The manager is also responsible for the due or thorough observance of the laws and rules. Teachers are paid by him after he certifies that the laws have been kept, and gives the attendance for each quarter. When an individual is patron, he may appoint himself manager, and thus fill both offices. . . . The teachers are paid by salaries and by results fees. The Boards of Guardians have power to contribute to these results fees. Some unions do so and are called 'contributory.' School managers in Ireland are nearly always clerics of some denomination. There are sometimes, but very rarely, lay managers. . . . From the census returns of 1881 it appears that but fifty-nine per cent. of the people of Ireland are able to read and write. The greater number of national schools throughout Ireland are what are called 'unmixed,' that is, attended by children of one denomination only. The rest of the schools are called 'mixed,' that is, attended by children of different forms of religion. The percentage of schools that show a 'mixed' attendance tends to become smaller each year. . . . There are also twenty-nine 'model' schools in different parts of Ireland. These schools are managed directly by the Board of National Education. . . . According to the



report of the Commissioners of National Education for 1890, the 'percentage of average attendance to the average number of children on the rolls of the schools was but 59.0,' and the percentage of school attendance to the estimated population of school age in Ireland would be less than 50. Different reasons might be given for this small percentage of attendance. The chief reasons are, first, attendance at school not being compulsory, and next, education not being free. . . . The pence paid for school fees in Ireland may seem, to many people, a small matter. But in a country like Ireland, where little money circulates, and a number of the people are very poor, school pence are often not easily found every week. In 1890, £104,550 4s. and 8d. was paid in school fees, being an average of 4s. 3d. per unit of average attendance."—*The Irish Peasant*; by a *Guardian of the Poor*, ch. 8.

**Norway.**—"In 1730 the schools throughout the country were regulated by a royal ordinance, but this paid so little regard to the economical and physical condition of Norway that it had to be altered and modified as early as 1741. Compulsory instruction, however, had thus been adopted, securing to every child in the country instruction in the Christian doctrine and in reading, and this coercion was retained in all later laws. . . . Many portions of the country are intersected by high mountains and deep fords, so that a small population is scattered over a surface of several miles. In such localities the law has established 'ambulatory schools,' whose teachers travel from one farm to another, living with the different peasants. Although this kind of instruction has often been most incomplete and the teachers very mediocre, still educational coercion has everywhere been in force, and Christian instruction everywhere provided for the children. These 'ambulatory schools' formerly existed in large number, but with the increase of wealth and population, and the growing interest taken in education, their number has gradually diminished, and that of fixed circle-schools augmented in the same proportion."—G. Gade, *Rep.'s on the Educational System of Norway* (U. S. Bureau of Education, *Circulars of Information*, July, 1871).—"School attendance is compulsory for at least 12 weeks each year for all children in the country districts from 8 years of age to confirmation, and from 7 years to confirmation in the towns. According to the law of 1889, which in a measure only emphasizes preceding laws, each school is to have the necessary furnishings and all indispensable school material. The Norwegians are so intent upon giving instruction to all children that in case of poverty of the parents the authorities furnish text-books and the necessary clothing, so that school privileges may be accorded to all of school age."—U. S. Comm'r of Education, *Report*, 1889-90, p. 513.

**Prussia: A. D. 1809.**—Education and the liberation movement.—"The most important era in the history of public instruction in Prussia, as well as in other parts of Germany, opens with the efforts put forth by the king and people, to rescue the kingdom from the yoke of Napoleon in 1809. In that year the army was remodeled and every citizen converted into a soldier; landed property was declared free of feudal service; restrictions on freedom of trade were abolished, and the whole state was reorganized. Great reliance was placed on infusing a German spirit into the people by

giving them freer access to improved institutions of education from the common school to the university. Under the councils of Hardenberg, Humboldt, Stein, Altenstein, these reforms and improvements were projected, carried on, and perfected in less than a single generation. The movement in behalf of popular schools commenced by inviting C. A. Zeller, of Wirtemberg, to Prussia. Zeller was a young theologian, who had studied under Pestalozzi in Switzerland, and was thoroughly imbued with the method and spirit of his master. On his return he had convened the school teachers of Wirtemberg in barns, for want of better accommodations being allowed him, and inspired them with a zeal for Pestalozzi's methods, and for a better education of the whole people. On removing to Prussia he first took charge of the seminary at Koenigsberg, soon after founded the seminary at Karalene, and went about into different provinces meeting with teachers, holding conferences, visiting schools, and inspiring school officers with the right spirit. The next step taken was to send a number of young men, mostly theologians, to Pestalozzi's institution at Ifferten, to acquire his method, and on their return to place them in new, or reorganized teachers' seminaries. To these new agents in school improvement were joined a large body of zealous teachers, and patriotic and enlightened citizens, who, in ways and methods of their own, labored incessantly to confirm the Prussian state, by forming new organs for its internal life, and new means of protection from foreign foes. They proved themselves truly educators of the people. Although the government thus not only encouraged, but directly aided in the introduction of the methods of Pestalozzi into the public schools of Prussia, still the school board in the different provinces sustained and encouraged those who approved and taught on different systems. . . . Music, which was one of Pestalozzi's great instruments of culture, was made the vehicle of patriotic songs, and through them the heart of all Germany was moved to bitter hatred of the conqueror who had desolated her fields and homes, and humbled the pride of her monarchy. All these efforts for the improvement of elementary education, accompanied by expensive modifications in the establishments of secondary and superior education, were made when the treasury was impoverished, and taxes the most exorbitant in amount were levied on every province and commune of the kingdom."—H. Barnard, *National Education in Europe*, pp. 83-84.—For this notable educational work begun in Prussia in 1809, and which gave a new character to the nation, "the Providential man appeared in Humboldt, as great a master of the science and art of education as Schurnhorst was a master of the organisation of war. Not only was he himself, as a scholar and an investigator, on a level with the very first of his age, not only had he lived with precisely those masters of literature, Schiller and Goethe, who were most deliberate in their self-culture, and have therefore left behind most instruction on the higher parts of education, but he had been specially intimate with F. A. Wolf. It is not generally known in England that Wolf was not merely the greatest philologist but also the greatest teacher and educationist of his time. . . . Formed by such teachers, and supported by a more intense belief in culture than almost any man of his time, Humboldt began his work in



April, 1809. In primary education Fichte had already pointed to Pestalozzi as the best guide. One of that reformer's disciples, C. A. Zeller, was summoned to Königsberg to found a normal school, while the reformer himself, in his weekly educational journal, cheered fallen Prussia by his panegyric, and wrote enthusiastically to Nicolovius pronouncing him and his friends the salt and leaven of the earth that would soon leaven the whole mass. It is related that in the many difficulties which Zeller not unnaturally had to contend with, the King's genuine benevolence, interest in practical improvement, and strong family feeling, were of decisive use. . . . The reform of the Gymnasias was also highly successful. Sliven here was among the most active of those who worked under Humboldt's direction. In deference to the authority of Wolf the classics preserved their traditional position of honour, and particular importance was attached to Greek. . . . But it was on the highest department of education that Humboldt left his mark most visibly. He founded the University of Berlin; he gave to Europe a new seat of learning, which has ever since stood on an equality with the very greatest of those of which Europe boasted before. We are not indeed to suppose that the idea of such a University sprang up for the first time at this moment, or in the brain of Humboldt. Among all the losses which befell Prussia by the Peace of Tilsit none was felt more bitterly than the loss of the University of Halle, where Wolf himself had made his fame. Immediately after the blow fell, two of the Professors of Halle made their way to Memel and laid before the King a proposal to establish a High School at Berlin. This was on August 22nd, 1807. . . . On September 4th came an Order of Cabinet, in which it was declared to be one of the most important objects to compensate the loss of Halle. It was added that neither of the two Universities which remained to Prussia, those of Königsberg and Frankfurt-on-the-Oder, could be made to supply the place of Halle, Königsberg being too remote from the seat of Government and Frankfurt not sufficiently provided with means. At Berlin a University could best, and at least expense, be established. Accordingly all funds which had hitherto gone to Halle were to go for the future to Berlin, and assurances were to be given to the expelled Professors which might prevent their talents being lost to the country. A University is not founded in a day, and accordingly while Stein held office the design did not pass beyond the stage of discussion. . . . Humboldt sent in his Report on May 12, 1809, and on August 16th followed the Order of Cabinet assigning to the new University, along with the Academies of Science and Art, an annual dotation of 150,000 thalers, and the Palace of Prince Henry as its residence. During the rest of his term of office Humboldt was occupied in negotiations with eminent men of science all over Germany, whose services he hoped to procure. He was certainly not unsuccessful. He secured Fichte for Philosophy; Schleiermacher, De Wette, and Marheiake for Theology; Savigny and Schmalz for Jurisprudence; Friedländer, Kohlrausch, Hufeland, and Reil for Medicine; Wolf, Buttmann, Böckh, Heindorf, and Spalding for the Study of Antiquity; Niebuhr and Rühls for History; Trailes for Mathematics (Gauss refused the invitation). The University was opened at

Michaelmas of 1810, and as the first result of it the first volume of Niebuhr's Roman History, opening so vast a field of historical speculation, was published in 1811. . . . Altogether in that period of German history the relations of literature, or rather culture in general, to politics are remarkable and exceptional. There had been a most extraordinary intellectual movement, a great outpouring of genius, and yet this had taken place not, as according to some current theories it ought to have done, in the bosom of political liberty, but in a country where liberty was unknown. And as it was not the effect, so the new literature did not seem disposed to become the cause, of liberty. Not only was it careless of internal liberty, but it was actually indifferent to national independence. The golden age of German literature is the very period when Germany was conquered by France. . . . So far literature and culture seemed a doubtful benefit, and might almost be compared to some pernicious drug, which should have the power to make men forget their country and their duties. Not unreasonably did Friedrich Perthes console himself for the disasters of Germany by reflecting that at least they had brought to an end 'the paper time,' the fool's paradise of a life made up of nothing more substantial than literature. In Humboldt's reform we have the compensation for all this. Here while on the one hand we see the grand spectacle of a nation in the last extremity refusing to part with the treasures of its higher life, on the other hand that higher life is no longer unnaturally divorced from political life. It is prized as one of the bulwarks of the State, as a kind of spiritual weapon by which the enemy may be resisted. And in the new and public-spirited generation of thinkers, of which Fichte and Schleiermacher were the principal representatives, culture returns to politics the honour that has been done to it. . . . In Humboldt and his great achievements of 1809, 1810, meet and are reconciled the two views of life which found their most extreme representatives in Goethe and Stein."—J. R. Seeley, *Life and Times of Stein*, pt. 6, ch. 3 (v. 2).

**Prussia: A. D. 1874.—The Educational Administration.**—"There is no organic school-law in Prussia, . . . though sketches and projects of such a law have more than once been prepared. But at present the public control of the higher schools is exercised through administrative orders and instructions, like the minutes of our Committee of Council on Education. But the administrative authority has in Prussia a very different basis for its operations from that which it has in England, and a much firmer one. It has for its basis these articles of the Allgemeine Landrecht, or common law of Prussia, which was drawn up in writing in Frederick the Great's reign, and promulgated in 1794, in the reign of his successor:—"Schools and universities are State institutions, having for their object the instruction of youth in useful and scientific knowledge. Such establishments are to be instituted only with the State's previous knowledge and consent. All public schools and public establishments of education are under the State's supervision, and must at all times submit themselves to its examinations and inspections. Whenever the appointment of teachers is not by virtue of the foundation or of a special privilege vested in certain persons or corporations, it belongs to the

State. Even where the immediate supervision of such schools and the appointment of their teachers is committed to certain private persons or corporations, new teachers cannot be appointed, and important changes in the constitution and teaching of the school cannot be adopted without the previous knowledge or consent of the provincial school authorities. The teachers in the gymnasiums and other higher schools have the character of State functionaries. . . . It would be a mistake to suppose that the State in Prussia shows a grasping and centralising spirit in dealing with education; on the contrary, it makes the administration of it as local as it possibly can; but it takes care that education shall not be left to the chapter of accidents. . . . Prussia is now divided into eight provinces, and these eight provinces are again divided into twenty-six governmental districts, or *Regierungen*. There is a Provincial School Board (*Provincial-Schulcollegium*) in the chief town of each of the eight provinces, and a Governmental District Board in that of each of the twenty-six *Regierungen*. In general, the State's relations with the higher class of secondary schools are exercised through the Provincial Board; its relations with the lower class of them, and with the primary schools, through the District Board. In Berlin, the relations with these also are managed by the Provincial Board. A *Provincial-Schulcollegium* has for its president the High President of the province; for its director the vice-president of that governmental district which happens to have for its centre the provincial capital. The Board has two or three other members, of whom, in general, one is a Catholic and one is a Protestant; and one is always a man practically conversant with school matters. The District Board has in the provincial capitals the same president and director as the Provincial Board; in the other centres of *Regierungen* it has for its president the President of the *Regierung*, and three or four members selected on the same principle as the members of the Provincial Board. The provincial State authority, therefore, is, in general, for gymnasiums, the larger *progymnasiums*, and *Realschulen* of the first rank, the Provincial School Board; for the smaller *progymnasiums*, *Realschulen* of the second rank, the higher *Burger Schools*, and the primary schools of all kinds, the Governmental District Board. Both boards are in continual communication with the Educational Minister at Berlin. . . . Besides the central and provincial administration there is a local or municipal administration for schools that are not Crown patronage schools. . . . In most towns the local authority for schools of municipal patronage is the town magistracy, assisted by a *Stadtschulrath*; sometimes the local authority is a *Curatorium* or *Schulcommission*."—M. Arnold, *Higher Schools and Universities in Germany*, ch. 3.—"The secondary school differs from the elementary schools by a course of instruction going beyond the immediate demands of every-day life; from the special school, by the more general character of the courses of instruction; from the university, by its preparatory character. It has the special aim to give that sound basis of scientific and literary education which enables a man to participate in solving the higher problems of life in church, state, and society. In accordance with their historical development, two directions can be clearly traced, viz., the

gymnasium and the real-school; the former comprising gymnasiums and *progymnasiums*; and the latter real-schools of the first class, real-schools of the second class, and higher *Burger-schools*."—*Hist. of Secondary Instruction in Germany* (U. S. Bureau of Education, *Circulars of Information*, 1874, no. 3), p. 41.—"The name gymnasium came into use as early as the sixteenth century. The ministerial decree of the 13th of November, 1812, ordered that all learned school institutions, such as lyceums, *pedagogiums*, *collegiums*, Latin schools, etc., should bear the name gymnasium. A gymnasium is and has long been a classical school."—U. S. Comm'r of Education, *Report*, 1889-90, p. 318.

ALSO IN: V. Cousin, *Report on the state of public instruction in Prussia*.

**Prussia: A. D. 1885-1889.**—**The Elementary School-System.**—"The New Yorker, anxious for a high degree of perfection in the elementary schools of his State, must be struck forcibly by the following merits of the Elementary School System of Prussia. . . . 1. Compulsory education laws, necessitating a full and regular attendance of the children of school age. 2. Official courses of study fixing the work to be accomplished in each of the different grades of schools. Uniformity is thus secured in the work done in all schools of the same class. 3. Definite qualifications and experience in teaching for eligibility to the office of school commissioner. 4. Provisions elevating teaching to the dignity of a profession and making the tenure of office secure. 5. Trained teachers in rural as well as city districts and a school year of at least forty weeks. 6. General supervision of instruction for children of school age in private schools and families, including the qualifications of instructors. . . . Every Prussian child between the ages of 6 and 14 must, except in cases of severe illness or other extraordinary cause, be present at every session of the school he attends. The lists of the children of school age, in charge of the local police (in rural districts the *Burgermeister*), are kept so carefully that it is impossible to escape the provisions of the compulsory education laws, as much so as it is to evade the military service. Dispensations amounting to more than four weeks in the school year are never given to children under 12 years of age, and to them only when sickness in the family or other unusual cause make it advisable. . . . In order to understand the qualifications required of school commissioners (*Kreischulinspektoren*) in Prussia, let us review briefly the requirements of male teachers. 1. Elementary schools. It may be stated at the outset that almost all the male elementary school teachers are normal school graduates. To insure similarity in training and a thorough knowledge of character, few foreigners and few beside normal school (*Schullehrer-Seminar*) graduates are admitted to the male teaching force. From 6 to 14 the would-be teacher has attended, let us suppose, an elementary school. He must then absorb the three years' course laid down for the preparatory schools. . . . He is now ready for the normal school. At the close of a three years' course at the normal school he is admitted to the first teachers' examination. If successful, he must next practice as candidate or assistant teacher not less than two years and not more than five years before his admission to the final test. . . . If a teacher fails to pass the ex-

amination within five years, he is dropped. 2. Middle schools. For teachers of lower classes the same requirements with the addition of ability to teach a foreign tongue, or natural history in its broadest sense, and the attainment of the mark 'good' in all subjects at the final examination. . . . For higher classes, a special examination provided for middle school teachers. . . . There is really no gradation between elementary and middle schools. The latter merely go on somewhat further with elementary school work, introducing French, Latin and English. 3. High schools (Realschulen, Realgymnasien, Progymnasien and Gymnasien). All high school teachers, except those engaged in technical departments, must first absorb the nine years' gymnasial course, which commences at the close of the third school year. Next comes the university course of three or four years. The candidate is now ready for the State examination. The subjects for this State examination . . . are divided into four classes: 1. The ancient languages and German; 2. Mathematics and natural sciences; 3. History and geography; 4. Religion and Hebrew. At the close of one year's practice to test teaching capacity he receives a second certificate and is thereupon engaged provisionally. . . . The school commissioners . . . are either former regular high school teachers, general doctors of philosophy or more rarely theologians, or former normal school teachers. All must have had practical experience in teaching. . . . The work to be accomplished in each Prussian elementary school is definitely laid down by law. Each school is not a law unto itself as to what shall be done and when and how this is to be done. I have learned by practical experience that the work in ungraded schools compares most favorably with that of graded schools."—J. R. Parsons, Jr., *Prussian Schools through American eyes*, ch. 1, sect. 5-10.—Prussian elementary schools are now free. "In this respect Prussia has passed through three stages. Under the first elementary schools were entirely self-supporting; under the second they received State aid, but were still largely self-supporting; under the third, Laws of 1888 and 1889, elementary schools were made free and the State pays a larger proportion of the cost of maintenance. Districts must pay for repairs, new buildings and cost of heating. If unwilling to provide proper accommodations for the children of school age, they can be forced by the government to do so. Poor districts may receive special government aid to meet such expenses. . . . The direct aim of the laws of June 14, 1888, and March 31, 1889, was to lighten the burden of local taxation for schools for children of school age. These laws have had a beneficial effect in increasing slightly the wages of teachers. Teachers' salaries are still quite small in Prussia, particularly in the case of females. Allowances are generally made for house-rent and fuel. Teachers in rural districts are provided with a house and garden. Their salaries are often not much more than half those paid city teachers of the same grade, and yet, as regards professional training and character of work, they are fully equal to city teachers. . . . The average annual salary received by teachers in Prussia in 1886 was \$267.50. The average for the same year in New York was \$409.27. The Prussian teacher, however, received fuel and dwelling free, in addition to his

regular salary. . . . In 1885 the population of Prussia was 28,318,470, and the total cost of public education per caput was \$1,777.77. Drs. Schneider and Petersille of Berlin, in 'Preussische Statistik 101,' published in 1889, reckon the total cost for 1888, excluding army and navy schools, at \$50,192,857. . . . In Prussia, elementary instruction is the first consideration. The resolution adopted by the national assembly (Landtag) December 22, 1870, is a good illustration of this. It was at the very crisis of the Franco-German war, yet the Landtag called on the government to increase the number of normal schools and the capacity of those already existing, and 'thus to put an end to the practice of filling up teachers' vacancies by appointing unqualified individuals.'"—J. R. Parsons, Jr., *Prussian Schools through American eyes*, ch. 1, sect. 15-17.—"Throughout Prussia there is now one school-room and one teacher to 446 inhabitants and 78.8 children actually attending school. This shows that there are far too few teachers. But the government and the cities have recently devoted considerable sums to the establishment of new places for teachers, so that, in the year 1881, there were 10,000 more teachers working in the public schools than in 1873. The salaries of the teachers were also raised. The average payment in the country is 954 marks, in the cities 1,430 marks. . . . The expense of maintaining the Prussian national schools amounts annually to about 102,000,000 marks, 43,000,000 of which are paid by the cities. One hundred and ten colleges for the training of teachers are now engaged in the education of male and female instructors, with an attendance of 9,893 pupils; that is, there is one pupil to every 2,758 inhabitants. In the case of the female teachers only, a considerable degree of assistance is rendered by private institutions. . . . The intermediary schools established in 1872, and recently converted into the higher citizen schools, form a transition from the national schools to the higher schools. These teach religion, German, French, English, history and geography, arithmetic and mathematics, natural history and physics, writing, drawing, singing, and gymnastics. The course embraces six years without Latin, with the privilege of one year's service in the army instead of three. Complementary to the national school is the finishing school. There are a large number in Prussia, namely, 1,261 with 63,766 pupils; 617 with 10,395 in the country, and 644 with 58,371 in the cities. Of these 644,342 are obligatory by local statutes, 302 are optional. Since the law of 1878 special care has been devoted to the compulsory education of orphaned children. . . . The preparatory instruction of female teachers leaves much to be desired."—F. Kirchner, *Contemporary Educational Thought in Prussia (Educational Rev., May, 1891)*.—"About 25 per cent. of all the teachers in public middle schools are women, hence . . . women hold positions in these schools more frequently than in the lower, the purely elementary, schools of the kingdom. The greatest ratio of women teachers in Prussia is found in private middle schools, where 2,422 of 3,126 (or nearly 80 per cent.) are women. . . . In all the public schools of Prussia (elementary, middle, and secondary) only 10,600 women teachers were employed [1887], or 14½ per cent. of all the teachers in the kingdom. . . . Before the public schools of the kingdom had the care and close

supervision on the part of the state which they have now, many more private schools were in existence than at present. During the last 25 years the private schools have not increased in numbers, but perceptibly decreased."—U. S. Comm'r of Education, *Report*, 1889-90, pp. 287-289.

**Russia.**—"After serfdom had been abolished, the Emperor Alexander II. saw that the indispensable consequence of this great reform must be a thorough reorganization of public instruction. In 1861 a committee was appointed to draw up the plan of a law. In 1862 M. Taneeff submitted to the Emperor a 'General plan for the organization of popular education,' which contained some very excellent points. The result was the General Regulations of 1864, which are still in force. . . . The difficulties which a complete reorganization of popular education meets in Russia are enormous. They are principally caused by the manner in which the inhabitants live, scattered over a large extent of country, and by their extreme poverty. . . . The density of population is so small that there are only 13.6 inhabitants to one square kilometer (2½ square kilometers to 1 square mile), instead of 69 as in France. Under these circumstances only the children from the center hamlet and those living nearest to it could attend school regularly, especially during the winter-months. The remainder of the inhabitants would pay their dues without having any benefit, which would necessarily foster discontent. As Prince Gagarin says, 'It has, therefore, not been possible to make education in Russia compulsory, as in Germany, nor even to enforce the establishment of a school in each community.' It is doubtless impossible at present to introduce into Russia the educational systems of the western countries."—É. de Laveaux, *Progress of Education in Russia* (U. S. Bureau of Education, *Circulars of Information*, 1875, no. 3), pp. 31-32.

**Scotland.**—"The existing system of education in Scotland is an outcome of causes deeply involved in the political and religious history of the country. . . . This system was preceded by a complicated variety of educational agencies, of which the chief were parish schools, founded upon a statute of 1646, which was revived and made operative in 1696. Parish and burgh schools, supported by local funds and by tuition fees, made up the public provision for education. In addition there were schools partly maintained by parliamentary grants, mission and sessional schools maintained by the Established Church and the Free Church, and other parochial and private schools. Parish and burgh schools carried instruction to the level of the universities, which were easily accessible to all classes. The date of the passage of the 'Scotch Education Act' (1872) was opportune for the organization of these various agencies into a system maintained by the combined action of the Government and local authorities. In framing the Scotch act care was taken, as in framing the English act two years before, to guard the rights of the Government with respect to funds appropriated from the public treasury. At the same time equal care was shown for the preservation of the Scotch ideal. This was a broad and comprehensive ideal, embracing the different grades of scholastic work. . . . This ideal differentiates the Scotch act from the English act passed two

years before. The latter related to elementary schools exclusively; the former has a wider scope, providing the foundations of a system of graded schools correlated to the universities which lie beyond its province. With respect to the interests of the Government, the two acts are substantially the same. . . . For the general direction of the system a Scotch educational department was created, composed, like the English department, of lords of the privy council, and having the same president. . . . The act ordered every parent to secure the instruction of his children between the ages of 5 and 13, or until a certificate of exemption should be secured. Parents failing in this obligation are subject to prosecution and penalty by fine or imprisonment. The compulsory provision extends to blind children. Parochial or burghal authorities were authorized to pay the tuition fees of those children whose parents could not meet the expenditure, a provision rendered unnecessary by the recent remission of all fees. The Scotch act, by a sweeping clause, made compulsory attendance universal; the English act left the matter of compulsion to local managers. A subsequent act (1878) fixed the standard of exemption in Scotland at the fifth [grade, or year of study], which pupils should pass at 11 years of age. In 1883, the upper limit of compulsory attendance in Scotland was raised to 14 years. . . . The universities of Scotland have been more intimately related to the life of the common people than those of any other country. In this respect, even more if possible than in their constitution, they present a marked contrast to the English universities. To their democratic spirit may be traced many of the characteristics which differentiate the Scotch people and policies from those of England. To their widespread influence, to the ambitions which they awakened, and the opportunities which they brought within the reach of the whole body of Scottish youth is due, in large measure, the independent and honorable part that Scotland has played in the history of the United Kingdom. This popular character of the universities has been fostered by the curriculum of the common schools, by the easy passage from the schools to the higher institutions; by the inexpensive mode of student life in the university towns, and by the great number of scholarship funds available for the poor. These conditions, however, have not been without their disadvantages. Of these, the chief are the low entrance standards and the consequent forcing of preparatory instruction upon the university professors. . . . As a result of long-continued efforts a Scotch universities act was passed in 1889. This act provided for the reorganization of the four universities; for the elevation of their standards; the enrichment of their curricula, and the increase of their resources. . . . The Scotch universities have taken part in the popular movements of the last decade. They maintain local examinations for secondary schools and students. St. Andrews has been particularly active in promoting the higher education of women, having instituted the special degree of L. L. A. (lady literate in arts). Edinburgh also grants a certificate in arts to women. Aberdeen has recently appointed a lecturer on education, following thus the precedent set by Edinburgh and St. Andrews. The four universities are united in a scheme of university extension."—U. S. Com-

missioner of Education, *Report, 1889-90, v. 1, pp. 188-207.*

**Sweden.**—"Sweden has two ancient and famous universities—Upsala and Lund. That of Lund is in the south part of the kingdom, and when founded was on Danish territory. The income from its estates is about 176,000 rik-dollars (\$46,315) per annum. It also receives yearly aid from the state. In 1867 it had 75 professors and tutors, and 400 students. Upsala is the larger university, located at the old town of that name—the ancient capital of Sweden—an hour and a half by rail north of Stockholm. It has 100 professors and tutors, and 1,449 students, an increase of 131 over the year 1869. . . . This university had its beginning as an institution of learning as far back as 1250. In 1438 it had one academic professorship, and was dedicated as an university in 1477. Its principal endowment was by Gustavus Adolphus in 1624, when he donated to it all of the estate in lands that he possessed, amounting in all to 300 farms."—C. C. Andrews, *Rept. on the Educational System of Sweden (U. S. Bureau of Education, Circulars of Information, July, 1871).*

**Switzerland.**—"The influence of the Reformation, and, in the following age, of the Jesuit reaction, gave to Switzerland, as to Germany, its original and fundamental means and agencies of national education, and impressed also upon the population a habit of dutiful regard for schools and learning. It was not, however, till forty years ago that the modern education of Switzerland was organized. 'The great development of public education in Switzerland,' to quote Mr. Kay, 'dates from 1832, after the overthrow of the old oligarchical forms of cantonal government and the establishment of the present democratic forms.' Zürich, Lausanne, and Geneva take the lead in Switzerland as centres of educational influence. The canton in which the work of educational reform began was Zürich. . . . The instrument of the reform, rather the revolution, was Scherr, a trained school-teacher from Württemberg, a teacher, in particular, of deaf mutes to speak articulately. This man initiated in Zürich the new scheme and work of education, and founded the first Training College. He was looked upon by the oligarchs, partly feudalists, and partly manufacturers, as a dangerous revolutionist, and was exiled from Zürich. But now a monument to his memory adorns the city. The work which he began could not be suppressed or arrested. Zürich has ever since taken the lead in education among the cantons of Switzerland. Derived originally from Germany, the system is substantially identical with that of Germany. . . . The principles and methods are substantially alike throughout. There are, first, the communal schools—these of course in largest number—one to every village, even for every small hamlet, provided and maintained, wholly or chiefly, by the commune; there are burgher schools in towns, including elementary, real, and superior schools, supported by the towns; there are cantonal schools—gymnasias and industrial or technical schools—supported by the State, that is, by the canton. There is often a Cantonal University. There is of course a Cantonal Training School or College, and there are institutes of various kinds. The Cantonal Universities, however, are on a small and economical scale; as yet there is no Federal

University. School life in Switzerland is very long, from six to fourteen or fifteen, and for all who are to follow a profession, from fifteen to twenty-two."—J. H. Riggs, *National Education, ch. 4.*

#### Modern: Asiatic Countries.

**China.**—"Every step in the process of teaching is fixed by unalterable usage. So much is this the case, that in describing one school I describe all, and in tracing the steps of one student I point out the course of all; for in China there are no new methods or short roads. In other countries, a teacher, even in the primary course, finds room for tact and originality. In those who dislike study, a love of it is to be inspired by making 'knowledge pleasant to the taste'; and the dull apprehension is to be awakened by striking and apt illustrations. . . . In China there is nothing of this. The land of uniformity, all processes in arts and letters are as much fixed by universal custom as is the cut of their garments or the mode of wearing their hair. The pupils all tread the path trodden by their ancestors of a thousand years ago, nor has it grown smoother by the attrition of so many feet. The undergraduate course may be divided into three stages, in each of which there are two leading studies: In the first the occupations of the student are committing to memory (not reading) the canonical books and writing an infinitude of diversely formed characters, as a manual exercise. In the second, they are the translation of his text books (i. e., reading), and lessons in composition. In the third, they are belles lettres and the composition of essays. Nothing could be more dreary than the labors of the first stage. . . . Even the stimulus of companionship in study is usually denied, the advantages resulting from the formation of classes being as little appreciated as those of other labor saving machinery. Each pupil reads and writes alone, the penalty for failure being so many blows with the ferule or kneeling for so many minutes on the rough brick pavement which serves for a floor. At this period fear is the strongest motive addressed to the mind of the scholar. . . . This arctic winter of monotonous toil once passed, a more auspicious season dawns on the youthful understanding. The key of the cabala which he has been so long and so blindly acquiring is put into his hands. He is initiated in the translation and exposition of those sacred books which he had previously stored away in his memory. . . . The light however is let in but sparingly, as it were, through chinks and rifts in the long dark passage. A simple character here and there is explained, and then, it may be after the lapse of a year or two, the teacher proceeds to the explication of entire sentences. Now for the first time the mind of the student begins to take in the thoughts of those he has been taught to regard as the oracles of wisdom. . . . The value of this exercise can hardly be overestimated. When judiciously employed it does for the Chinese what translation into and out of the dead languages of the west does for us. It calls into play memory, judgment, taste, and gives him a command of his own vernacular which, it is safe to assert, he would never acquire in any other way. . . . The first step in composition is the yoking together of double characters. The second is the reduplication of these binary compounds and the construc-

tion of parallels—an idea which runs so completely through the whole of Chinese literature that the mind of the student requires to be imbued with it at the very outset. This is the way he begins: The teacher writes, 'wind blows,' the pupil adds, 'rain falls': the teacher writes, 'rivers are long,' the pupil adds, 'seas are deep,' or 'mountains are high,' &c. From the simple subject and predicate, which in their rude grammar they describe as 'dead' and 'living' characters, the teacher conducts his pupil to more complex forms, in which qualifying words and phrases are introduced. He gives as a model some such phrase as 'The Emperor's grace is vast as heaven and earth,' and the lad matches it by 'The Sovereign's favor is profound as lake and sea.' These couplets often contain two propositions in each member, accompanied by all the usual modifying terms; and so exact is the symmetry required by the rules of the art that not only must noun, verb, adjective, and particle respond to each other with scrupulous exactness, but the very tones of the characters are adjusted to each other with the precision of music. Begun with the first strokes of his untaught pencil, the student, whatever his proficiency, never gets beyond the construction of parallels. When he becomes a member of the institute or a minister of the imperial cabinet, at classic festivals and social entertainments, the composition of impromptu couplets, formed on the old model, constitutes a favorite pastime. Reflecting a poetic image from every syllable, or concealing the keen point of a cutting epigram, they afford a fine vehicle for sallies of wit; and poetical contests such as that of Melibœus and Menelaus are in China matters of daily occurrence. If a present is to be given, on the occasion of a marriage, a birth-day, or any other remarkable occasion, nothing is deemed so elegant or acceptable as a pair of scrolls inscribed with a complimentary distich. When the novice is sufficiently exercised in the 'parallels' for the idea of symmetry to have become an instinct, he is permitted to advance to other species of composition which afford freer scope for his faculties. Such are the 'shotiah,' in which a single thought is expanded in simple language, the 'lun,' the formal discussion of a subject more or less extended, and epistles addressed to imaginary persons and adapted to all conceivable circumstances. In these last, the forms of the 'complete letter writer' are copied with too much servility; but in the other two, substance being deemed of more consequence than form, the new fledged thought is permitted to essay its powers and to expatiate with but little restraint. In the third stage, composition is the leading object, reading being wholly subsidiary. It takes for the most part the artificial form of verse, and of a kind of prose called 'wen-chang,' which is, if possible, still more artificial. The reading required embraces mainly rhetorical models and sundry analogies. History is studied, but only that of China, and that only in compends; not for their lessons of wisdom, but for the sake of the allusions with which it enables a writer to embellish classic essays. The same may be said of other studies; knowledge and mental discipline are at a discount and style at a premium. The goal of the long course, the flower and fruit of the whole system, is the 'wen-chang'; for this alone can insure success in the public examinations for the civil service, in which students be-

gin to adventure soon after entering on the third stage of their preparatory course. . . . We hear it asserted that 'education is universal in China; even coolies are taught to read and write.' In one sense this is true, but not as we understand the terms 'reading and writing.' In the alphabetical vernaculars of the west, the ability to read and write implies the ability to express one's thoughts by the pen and to grasp the thoughts of others when so expressed. In Chinese, and especially in the classical or book language, it implies nothing of the sort. A shopkeeper may be able to write the numbers and keep accounts without being able to write anything else; and a lad who has attended school for several years will pronounce the characters of an ordinary book with faultless precision, yet not comprehend the meaning of a single sentence. Of those who can read understandingly (and nothing else ought to be called reading), the proportion is greater in towns than in rural districts. But striking an average, it does not, according to my observation, exceed one in twenty for the male sex and one in ten thousand for the female." The literary examinations, "coming down from the past, with the accretions of many centuries, . . . have expanded into a system whose machinery is as complex as its proportions are enormous. Its ramifications extend to every district of the empire; and it commands the services of district magistrates, prefects, and other civil functionaries up to governors and viceroys. These are all auxiliary to the regular officers of the literary corporation. In each district there are two resident examiners, with the title of professor, whose duty it is to keep a register of all competing students and to exercise them from time to time in order to stimulate their efforts and keep them in preparation for the higher examinations in which degrees are conferred. In each province there is one chancellor or superintendent of instruction, who holds office for three years, and is required to visit every district and hold the customary examinations within that time, conferring the first degree on a certain percentage of the candidates. There are, moreover, two special examiners for each province, generally members of the Hanlin, deputed from the capital to conduct the great triennial examination and confer the second degree. The regular degrees are three: 1st. 'Siu-tsai' or 'Budding talent.' 2d. 'Kujin' or 'Deserving of promotion.' 3d. 'Tsin-shi' or 'Fit for office.' To which may be added, as a fourth degree, the Hanlin, or member of the 'Forest of Pencils.' . . . The first degree only is conferred by the provincial chancellor, and the happy recipients, fifteen or twenty in each department, or 1 per cent. of the candidates, are decorated with the insignia of rank and admitted to the ground floor of the nine storied pagoda. The trial for the second degree is held in the capital of each province, by special commissioners, once in three years. It consists of three sessions of three days each, making nine days of almost continuous exertion—a strain to the mental and physical powers, to which the infirm and aged frequently succumb. In addition to composition in prose and verse, the candidate is required to show his acquaintance with history, (the history of China,) philosophy, criticism, and various branches of archæology. Again 1 per cent. is decorated; but it is not until the more fortunate among them succeed in passing the metropolitan

triennial that the meed of civil office is certainly bestowed. They are not, however, assigned to their respective offices until they have gone through two special examinations within the palace and in the presence of the emperor. On this occasion the highest on the list is honored with the title of 'chiang yuen' or 'laureate,' a distinction so great that in the last reign it was not thought unbecoming the daughter of a 'chiang yuen' to be raised to the position of consort of the Son of Heaven. A score of the best are admitted to membership in the Academy, two or three score are attached to it as pupils or probationers, and the rest drafted off to official posts in the capital or in the provinces, the humblest of which is supposed to compensate the occupant for a life of penury and toil."—Rev. W. A. P. Martin, *Rept. on the System of Public Instruction in China (U. S. Bureau of Education, Circulars of Information, 1877, no. 1).*

ALSO IN: W. A. P. Martin, *The Chinese: their Education, &c.*

**Japan.**—From the fourth to the eighth centuries of the Christian era, "after the conquest of Corea by the Japanese emperor Jijo Kogo, came letters, writing, books, literature, religion, ethics, politics, medicine, arts, science, agriculture, manufactures, and the varied appliances of civilization; and with these entered thousands of immigrants from Corea and China. Under the intellectual influence of Buddhism—the powerful and aggressive faith that had already led captive the half of Asia—of the Confucian ethics and philosophy, and Chinese literature, the horizon of the Japanese mind was immensely broadened. . . . In the time of the European 'dark ages' the Japanese were enjoying what, in comparison, was a high state of civilization. . . . Under the old régime of the Sho-guns, all foreign ideas and influences were systematically excluded, and the isolation of Japan from the rest of the world was made the supreme policy of the government. Profound peace lasted from the beginning of the seventeenth century to 1868. During this time, schools and colleges, literature and learning, flourished. It was the period of scholastic, not of creative, intellectual activity. The basis of education was Chinese. What we consider the means of education, reading and writing, were to them the ends. Of classified science there was little or none. Mathematics was considered as fit only for merchants and shop-keepers. No foreign languages were studied, and their acquisition was forbidden. . . . There was no department of education, though universities were established at Kioto and Yedo, large schools in the daimio's capitals, and innumerable private schools all over the country. Nine-tenths of the people could read and write. Books were very numerous and cheap. Circulating libraries existed in every city and town. Literary clubs and associations for mutual improvement were common even in country villages. Nevertheless, in comparison with the ideal systems and practice of the progressive men of New Japan, the old style was as different from the present as the training of an English youth in mediæval times is from that of a London or Oxford student of the present day. Although an attempt to meet some of the educational necessities arising from the altered conditions of the national life were made under the Sho-gun's régime, yet the first attempt at systematic work in the large cities was made

under the Mikado's government, and the idea of a new national plan of education is theirs only. In 1871 the Mom Bu Sho, or department of education, was formed, of which the high counselor Okl, a man of indomitable vigor and perseverance, was made head. . . . According to the scheme of national education promulgated in 1872, the empire is divided into eight Dai Gaku Ku, (Daigaku), or great educational divisions. In each of these there is to be a university, normal school, schools of foreign languages, high schools, and primary schools. The total number of schools will number, it is expected, over 55,000. Only in the higher schools is a foreign language to be taught. In the lower schools the Japanese learning and elementary science translated or adopted from European or American text-books are to be taught. The general system of instruction, methods, discipline, school-aids, furniture, architecture, are to be largely adopted from foreign models, and are now to a great extent in vogue throughout the country."—W. E. Griffiths, *Education in Japan (U. S. Bureau of Education, Circulars of Information, 1875, no. 2).*

#### Modern: America.

**A. D. 1610-1819.**—**Virginia.**—**College of William and Mary.**—"In 1619—one year before the Pilgrim Fathers came to the land named New England by Captain John Smith—Sir Edwin Sandys, president of the Virginia Company in old England, moved the grant of ten thousand acres of land for the establishment of a university at Henrico. The proposed grant, which was duly made, included one thousand acres for an Indian college; the remainder was to be 'the foundation of a seminary of learning for the English.' The very same year the bishops of England, at the suggestion of the King, raised the sum of fifteen hundred pounds for the encouragement of Indian Education. . . . Tenants were sent over to occupy the university lands, and Mr. George Thorpe, a gentleman of His Majesty's Privy Chamber, came over to be the superintendent of the university itself. This first beginning of philanthropy toward the Indians and of educational foundations for the Indians in America was suspended by reason of the Indian massacre, in the spring of 1622, when Mr. Thorpe and three hundred and forty settlers, including tenants of the university, were cut off by an insurrection of savages. It was only two years after this terrible catastrophe that the idea of a university in Virginia was revived. Experience with treacherous Indians suggested that the institution should be erected upon a secluded sheltered site—an island in the Susquehanna River. . . . The plan was broken off by the death of its chief advocate and promoter, Mr. Edward Palmer. But the idea of a university for Virginia was not lost. . . . In 1660, the colonial Assembly of Virginia took into their own hands the project of founding educational institutions within their borders. The motive of the Virginians was precisely the same as that of the great and general Court of Massachusetts, when it established Harvard College, and grammar schools to fit youth 'for ye university.' The Virginians voted 'that for the advance of learning, education of youth, supply of the ministry, and promotion of piety, there be land taken upon purchases for a college and free schools, and that there be, with as much speed as may be convenient, houseing



erected thereon for entertainment of students and scholars.' It was also voted in 1660 that the various commissioners of county courts take subscriptions on court days for the benefit of the college, and that the commissioners send orders throughout their respective counties to the vestrymen of all the parishes for the purpose of raising money from such inhabitants as 'have not already subscribed.' It appears from the record of this legislation in Henning's Statutes of Virginia that already in 1660, 'His Majesty's Governour, Council of State, and Burgesses of the present grand Assembly have severally subscribed several considerable sumes of money and quantites of tobacco,' to be paid upon demand after a place had been provided and built upon for educational purposes. A petition was also recommended to Sir William Berkeley, then governor of Virginia, that the King be petitioned for letters patent authorizing collections from 'well disposed people in England for the erecting of colleges and schooles in this countrye.' This action of the Virginians in 1660 ought to be taken as much better evidence of an early regard for education in that colony than the well-known saying of Governor Berkeley would seem to indicate. In reply to an inquiry by the lords commissioners of trades and plantations respecting the progress of learning in the colony of Virginia, Berkeley said, 'I thank God there are no free schools nor printing, and I hope we shall not have these hundred years.' This answer by a crusty old governor has been quoted perhaps too often as an index of the real sentiments of colonial Virginia toward the cause of education. Not only is the tone of popular legislation entirely opposed to the current view, but Berkeley's own acts should modify our judgment of his words. He actually subscribed, with other gentlemen of the colony, for 'a Colledge' of students of the liberal arts and sciences.' Undoubtedly Sir William did not believe in popular education as it is now understood. If he had done so, he would have been much in advance of his time. . . . Some writers would have us believe that the college was actually planted as early as 1661, but this is highly improbable. Early educational enactments in Virginia were like many of those early towns—on paper only. And yet the Virginians really meant to have both towns and a college. In 1688-'89, twenty-five hundred pounds were subscribed by a few wealthy gentlemen in the colony and by their merchant friends in England toward the endowment of the higher education. In 1691 the colonial Assembly sent the Rev. James Blair, the commissary or representative of the Bishop of London, back to England to secure a charter for the proposed college. Virginia's agent went straight to Queen Mary and explained the educational ambition of her colony in America. The Queen favored the idea of a college, and William wisely concurred. The royal pair agreed to allow two thousand pounds out of the quitrents of Virginia toward building the college. . . . The English Government concluded to give not only £2,000 in money, but also 20,000 acres of land, with a tax of one penny on every pound of tobacco exported from Maryland and Virginia, together with all fees and profits arising from the office of surveyor-general, which were to be controlled by the president and faculty of the college. They were authorized to appoint special surveyors for the counties whenever the governor

and his council thought it necessary. These privileges, granted by charter in 1693, were of great significance in the economic history of Virginia. They brought the entire land system of the colony into the hands of a collegiate land office. Even after the Revolution, one-sixth of the fees to all public surveyors continued to be paid into the college treasury down to the year 1819, when this custom was abolished."—H. B. Adams, *The College of William and Mary (Circulars of Information of the Bureau of Education, 1887, no. 1).*

**A. D. 1635.—Massachusetts.—Boston Latin School.**—"The Public Latin School of Boston enjoys the distinction of being the oldest existing school within the bounds of the United States. It was founded in the spring of 1635, thus antedating Harvard College, and has been in continuous existence ever since, with the interruption of a few months, during the siege of Boston, 1775-1776." The two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the school was celebrated April 23, 1885, on which occasion the Rev. Phillips Brooks, D. D., delivered an address from which the following passages are taken: "The colony under Winthrop arrived in the Arbella and founded Boston in 1630. On the 4th of September, 1633, the Griffin brought John Cotton from the Lincolnshire Boston, full of plous spirit and wise plans for the new colony with which he had cast in his lot. It has been suggested that possibly we owe to John Cotton the first suggestion of the first town-school. . . . However this may be, here is the town record of the 13th of the second month, 1635. It is forever memorable, for it is the first chapter of our Book of Genesis, the very cradle of all our race: 'At a general meeting upon publique notice. . . . It was then generally agreed upon that our brother Philemon Pormort shall be entreated to become scholemaster, for the teaching and nourtering of children among us.' It was two hundred and fifty years ago to-day [April 23, 1885] just nineteen years after the day when William Shakespeare died, just seventy-one years after the day when he was born. How simple that short record is, and how unconscious that short view is of the future which is wrapped up in it! Fifty-nine thousand children who crowd the Boston public schools to-day—and who can count what thousands yet unborn?—are to be heard crying out for life in the dry, quaint words of that old vote. By it the first educational institution, which was to have continuous existence in America, and in it the public school system of the land, came into being. Philemon Pormort, the first teacher of the Latin School, is hardly more than a mere shadow of a name. It is not even clear that he ever actually taught the school at all. A few years later, with Mr. Wheelwright, after the Hutchinson excitement, he disappears into the northern woods, and is one of the founders of Exeter, in New Hampshire. There are rumors that he came back to Boston and died here, but it is all very uncertain. . . . The name 'free school' in those days seems to have been used to characterize an institution which should not be restricted to any class of children, and which should not be dependent on the fluctuating attendance of scholars for its support. It looked forward to ultimate endowment, like the schools of England. The town set apart the rent of Deer Island, and some of the other



islands in the harbor, for its help. All the great citizens, Governor Winthrop, Governor Vane, Mr. Bellingham, and the rest, made generous contributions to it. But it called, also, for support from those who sent their children to it, and who were able to pay something; and it was only of the Indian children that it was distinctly provided that they should be 'taught gratis.' It was older than any of the schools which, in a few years, grew up thick around it. The same power which made it spring out of the soil was in all the rich ground on which these colonists, unlike any other colonists which the world has ever seen, had set their feet. Roxbury had its school under the Apostle Eliot in 1645. Cambridge was already provided before 1643. Charlestown did not wait later than 1636. Salem and Ipswich were, both of them, ready in 1637. Plymouth did not begin its system of public instruction till 1663. It was in 1647 that the General Court enacted that resolve which is the great charter of free education in our Commonwealth, in whose preamble and ordinance stand the immortal words: 'That learning may not be buried in the grave of our fathers, in church and Commonwealth, the Lord assisting our endeavors, it is therefore ordered that every township in this jurisdiction, after the Lord hath increased them to the number of fifty householders, shall then forthwith appoint one within their town to teach all such children as shall resort to him to write and read.' There can be no doubt, then, of our priority. But mere priority is no great thing. The real interest of the beginning of the school is the large idea and scale on which it started. It taught the children, little Indians and all, to read and write. But there seems every reason to suppose that it taught also the Latin tongue, and all that then was deemed the higher knowledge. It was the town's only school till 1682."

—*The Oldest School in America*, pp. 5-24.

**A. D. 1636.—Massachusetts.**—**Harvard College.**—"The first settlers in New England, recognizing the importance of a higher education than could be given in the common schools, began at once the founding of a university. The avowed object of this university was the training of young men for the ministry. Nothing could show clearer the spirit of these early colonists. Though less than four thousand in number, and scattered along the shores of Massachusetts Bay in sixteen hamlets, they were, nevertheless, able to engage in such an enterprise before adequate provision had been made for food, raiment, shelter, a civil government, or divine worship; at a time when soil and climate had disappointed them, and their affairs were in a most critical condition; for, not only were they called to face famine, disease, and death, but the mother country and the surrounding savage tribes were threatening them with war. . . . It was near the close of 1636, a little more than six years after the landing of the Puritans, when this first step was taken by the General Court of the Massachusetts Colony. At this assembly, presided over by Sir Henry Vane, governor of the colony, the General Court agreed to give £400 (a magnificent sum for the time) towards the founding of a school or college, but left the question of its location and building to be determined by the Court that was to sit in September of the following year. This, it is said, was the first assembly 'in which the people by their representatives

ever gave their own money to found a place of education.' At the next Court it was decided to locate the college at Newtown, or 'the New Towne,' and twelve of the principal magistrates and ministers were chosen to carry out this design. A few months later, they changed the name of the town to Cambridge, not only to tell their posterity whence they came, but also, as Quincy aptly says, to indicate 'the high destiny to which they intended the institution should aspire.' Another year, however, passed before the College was organized. The impulse given to it then was due to aid which came from so unexpected a quarter that it must have seemed to the devout men of New England as a clear indication of the divine favor. The Rev. John Harvard, a Non-conformist minister, was graduated, in 1635, from the Puritan college of Emmanuel, at Cambridge, England, and came, two years later, to America and settled in Charlestown, where he immediately took a prominent part in town affairs. His contemporaries gave him the title of reverend, and he is said to have officiated occasionally in Charlestown as 'minister of God's word.' One has recently said of him that he was 'beloved and honored, a well-trained and accomplished scholar of the type then esteemed,' and that in the brief period of his life in America—scarcely more than a year—he cemented more closely friendships that had been begun in earlier years. The project of a college was then engrossing the thought of these early friends and doubtless he also became greatly interested in it. Thus it happened that, when his health failed, through his own love of learning and through sympathy with the project of his daily associates, he determined to bequeath one-half of his estate, probably about £800, besides his excellent library of three hundred and twenty volumes, towards the endowment of the college. This bequest rendered possible the immediate organization of the college, which went into operation 'on the footing of the ancient institutions of Europe,' and, out of gratitude to Harvard, the General Court voted that the new institution should bear his name."—G. G. Bush, *Harvard*, pp. 12-15.

ALSO IN: J. Quincy, *Hist. of Harvard University*.—S. A. Eliot, *Sketch of the History of Harvard College*.

**A. D. 1642-1732.—New England and New York.—Early Common Schools.**—"New England early adopted, and has, with a single exception, constantly maintained the principle that the public should provide for the instruction of all the youth. That which elsewhere, as will be found, was left to local provision, as in New York; or to charity, as in Pennsylvania; or to parental interest, as in Virginia, was in most parts of New England early secured by law. . . . The act of 1642 in Massachusetts, whose provisions were adopted in most of the adjacent colonies, was admirable as a first legislative school law. It was watchful of the neglect of parents, and looked well after the ignorant and the indigent. But it neither made schooling free, nor imposed a penalty for its neglect. . . . Schools were largely maintained by rates, were free only to the necessitous, and in not a few of the less populous districts closed altogether or never opened. This led, five years later, to more stringent legislation. . . . As suggesting the general scope and tenor of the law, the following extract

is made. . . . 'It is therefore ordered by this Court and authority thereof that every township within this jurisdiction, after the Lord hath increased them to the number of fifty householders, shall then forthwith appoint one within their town to teach all such children as shall resort to him, to write and read; whose wages shall be paid, either by the parents or masters of such children, or by the inhabitants in general, by way of supply, as the major part of those who order the prudentials of the town shall appoint; provided that those who send their children be not oppressed by paying much more than they can have them taught for in the adjoining towns. And it is further ordered that where any town shall increase to the number of one hundred families or house-holders, they shall set up a grammar-school, the master thereof being able to instruct youths so far as they may be fitted for the university; and if any town neglect the performance hereof, above one year, then every such town shall pay five pounds per annum to the next such school, till they shall perform this order.' . . . Three years after the law just cited Connecticut passed a very similar one. . . . In Rhode Island there was no attempt at a school system prior to the efforts of John Howland about 1790. There were schools in both Providence and Newport; but the colony was small (with a population of less than ten thousand in 1700), broken into feeble settlements, and offering little opportunity for organization. . . . It is claimed that, at the surrender of the Dutch in New York (1664), so general was the educational spirit, almost every town in the colony had its regular school and more or less permanent teachers. After the occupation of the province by the English, little attention was given to education. . . . Thirteen years after the surrender, a Latin school was opened in the city; but the first serious attempt to provide regular schooling was in the work of the 'Society for the Propagation of the Gospel' (1704) in the founding of Trinity School. The society kept up an efficient organization, for many years, and at the opening of the Revolution had established and chiefly supported more than twenty schools in the colony. About 1732, also, there was established in New York city a school after the plan of the Boston Latin School, free as that was free, and which became, according to eminent authority, the germ of the later King's (now Columbia) College."—R. G. Boone, *Education in the United States*, ch. 3.

**A. D. 1683-1779.—Pennsylvania.**—Origin of the University of Pennsylvania.—"Education had not been over-looked in the policy of Penn. In his Frame of Government we read: 'The governor and provincial council shall erect and order all public schools, and encourage and reward the authors of useful sciences and laudable inventions, in the said province. . . . And . . . a committee of manners, education and arts, that all wicked and scandalous living may be prevented, and that youth may be successively trained up in virtue and useful knowledge and arts.' The first movement to establish an educational institution of a high grade was in the action of the Executive Council which proposed, November 17, 1683, 'That Care be Taken about the Learning and Instruction of Youth, to wit: A School of Arts and Sciences.' It was not until 1689, however, that the 'Public Grammar School' was set up in Philadelphia. This insti-

tution, founded upon the English idea of a 'free school,' was formally chartered in 1697 as the 'William Penn Charter School.' It was intended as the head of a system of schools for all, rather than a single school for a select few, an idea which the founders of the Charitable School, fifty years later, had also in mind—an idea which was never carried out in the history of either institution. The failure of Penn's scheme of government, and the turmoil during the early part of the eighteenth century arising from the conflicts between different political parties, for a time influenced very decidedly educational zeal in the province. The government, which at the outset had taken such high ground on the subject, ceased to exert itself in behalf of education, and the several religious denominations and the people themselves in neighborhood organizations took up the burden and planted schools as best they could throughout the growing colony. . . . Feeling the importance for some provision to supplement the education then given in the established schools, Benjamin Franklin as early as 1743 drew up a proposal for establishing an academy. . . . He secured the assistance of a number of friends, many of them members of the famous Junto, and then published his pamphlet entitled 'Proposals Relating to the Education of Youth in Pennsylvania.' . . . On all sides the paper met with great favor and generous support. The result was the organization of a board of trustees, consisting of 24 of those who had subscribed to the scheme of the Academy, with Franklin as president. This body immediately set about to realize the object of the pamphlet, and nourished by subscriptions, lotteries, and gifts the Academy was placed in a flourishing condition. . . . The Academy comprised three schools, the Latin, the English, and the mathematical, over each of which was placed a master, one of whom was the rector of the institution. . . . The English School was neglected. The other schools were favored, especially the Latin School. In the eyes of Franklin and many of the supporters of the Academy, the English School was the one of chief importance. What we would call a 'starving out' process was begun by which the English School was kept in a weak condition, most of the funds going to the Latin School. . . . The success of the Academy was so gratifying to all interested in it that it was determined to apply for a charter. This was granted to the trustees by Thomas and Richard Penn, the proprietors, on July 13, 1753. Desirous at the same time of enlarging the course of instruction, the trustees elected Mr. William Smith teacher of logic, rhetoric, natural and moral philosophy. Mr. Smith accepted the position and entered upon his duties at the Academy in May, 1754. The history of the institution from this date, whether known as the Academy or the College, to 1779 is the history of the life of William Smith."—J. L. Stewart, *Hist. Sketch of the University of Pennsylvania (U. S. Bureau of Education, Circular of Information, 1892, no. 2; Benj. Franklin and the Univ., ch. 4).*

**A. D. 1701-1717.—Connecticut.**—Yale College.—"For sixty years the only school for higher education in New England had been Harvard College, at Cambridge. The people, and especially the clergy, of Connecticut naturally desired the benefit of a similar establishment nearer home. The three ministers of New Haven,

Milford, and Branford first moved in the enterprise. Ten ministers, nine of them being graduates of Harvard College, met at Branford [1701] and made a contribution from their libraries of about forty volumes in folio 'for the founding of a college.' Other donations presently came in. An Act of Incorporation was granted by the General Court. It created a body of trustees, not to be more than eleven in number nor fewer than seven, all to be clergymen and at least forty years of age. The Court endowed the College with an annual grant, subject to be discontinued at pleasure, of one hundred and twenty pounds in 'country pay,'—equivalent to sixty pounds sterling. The College might hold property 'not exceeding the value of five hundred pounds per annum'; its students were exempted from the payment of taxes and from military service; and the Governor and his Council gave a formal approval of its application to the citizens for pecuniary aid. . . . The first President was Abraham Pierson, minister of Killingworth, at which place he continued to reside, though the designated seat of the College was at Saybrook. Eight students were admitted, and arranged in classes. At each of the first two annual commencements one person, at the third three persons, received the degree of Bachelor of Arts. President Pierson was succeeded, at his death, by Mr. Andrew, minister at Milford, to which place the elder pupils were accordingly transferred, while the rest went to Saybrook, where two tutors had been provided to assist their studies. . . . For nearly twenty years the College of Connecticut . . . continued to be an unsatisfactory experiment. While the rector taught some youth at Milford, and two tutors had other pupils at Saybrook, and the few scores of books which had been obtained for a library were divided between the two places, there was small prospect of the results for which institutions of learning are created. Notwithstanding the general agreement that whatever facilities for the higher education could be commanded should be brought together and combined, the choice of the place was embarrassed by various considerations. . . . Saybrook, Wethersfield, Hartford, and New Haven competed with each other for the preference, offering such contributions as they were able towards the erection of a college building. The offer from New Haven, larger than that of any other town, was seven hundred pounds sterling. The plan of fixing the College there, promoted by the great influence of Governor Saltonstall, was adopted by the trustees; and with money obtained by private gifts, and two hundred and fifty pounds accruing from a sale of land given by the General Assembly, a building was begun [1717], which finally cost a thousand pounds sterling. . . . The Assembly gave the College a hundred pounds. Jeremiah Dummer sent from England a substantial present of books. Governor Saltonstall contributed fifty pounds sterling, and the same sum was presented by Jahluel Brenton, of Newport, in Rhode Island. But the chief patronage came from Elihu Yale,—a native of New Haven, but long resident in the East Indies, where he had been Governor of Fort St. George. He was now a citizen of London, and Governor of the East India Company. His contributions, continued through seven years, amounted to some four hundred pounds sterling; and he was understood to have made arrange-

ments for a further bounty of five hundred pounds, which, however, through unfortunate accidents, never came to its destination. The province made a grant of forty pounds annually for seven years."—J. G. Palfrey, *Hist. of New England*, bk. 4, ch. 11, and bk. 5, ch. 4 (v. 4).

**A. D. 1746-1787.—New York.—King's College, now Columbia College.**—The establishment of a college in the city of New York was many years in agitation before the design was carried into effect. At length, under an act of Assembly passed in December, 1746, and other similar acts which followed, moneys were raised by public lottery 'for the encouragement of learning and towards the founding a college' within the colony. These moneys were, in November, 1751, vested in trustees. . . . The trustees, in November, 1753, invited Dr. Samuel Johnson, of Connecticut, to be President of the intended college. Dr. Johnson consequently removed to New York in the month of April following, and in July, 1754, commenced the instruction of a class of students in a room of the school-house belonging to Trinity Church; but he would not absolutely accept the presidency until after the passing of the charter. This took place on the 31st of October in the same year, 1754; from which period the existence of the college is properly to be dated. The Governors of the college, named in the charter, are the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the first Lord Commissioner for Trade and Plantations, both empowered to act by proxies; the Lieutenant-governor of the province, and several other public officers; together with the rector of Trinity Church, the senior minister of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, the ministers of the German Lutheran Church, of the French Church, of the Presbyterian Congregation, and the President of the college, all ex officio, and twenty-four of the principal gentlemen of the city. The college was to be known by the name of King's College. Previously to the passing of the charter, a parcel of ground to the westward of Broadway, bounded by Barclay, Church, and Murray streets and the Hudson River, had been destined by the vestry of Trinity Church as a site for the college edifice; and, accordingly, after the charter was granted, a grant of the land was made on the 13th of May, 1755. . . . The part of the land thus granted by Trinity Church, not occupied for college purposes, was leased, and became a very valuable endowment to the college. The sources whence the funds of the institution were derived, besides the proceeds of the lotteries above mentioned, were the voluntary contributions of private individuals in this country, and sums obtained by agents who were subsequently sent to England and France. In May, 1760, the college buildings began to be occupied. In 1763 a grammar school was established. In March, 1763, Dr. Johnson resigned the presidency, and the Rev. Dr. Myles Cooper, of Oxford, who had previously been appointed Professor of Moral Philosophy and assistant to the President, was elected in his place. . . . In consequence of the dispute between this and the parent country, Dr. Cooper returned to England, and the Rev. Benjamin Moore was appointed *pro tempore* during the absence of Dr. Cooper, who, however, did not return. On the breaking out of the Revolutionary War the business of the college was almost entirely broken up, and it was not until after the return of peace that its

affairs were again regularly attended to. In May, 1784, the college, upon its own application, was erected into a university; its corporate title was changed from King's College to Columbia College, and it was placed under the control of a board termed Regents of the University. . . . The college continued under that government until April, 1787, when the Legislature of the State restored it to its original position under the present name of Columbia College. . . . At the same time a new body was created, called by the same name, 'The Regents of the University,' under which all the seminaries of learning mentioned in the act creating it were placed by the legislature. This body still exists under its original name."—*Columbia College Handbook*, pp. 5-6.

**A. D. 1776-1880.—New England and New York.—State School Systems.**—"It was not until over thirty years after the close of the war of 1776 that a regular system of schools at the public expense was established. New England boasted with pride of being the first in education, as she had been in war. Her example was closely followed by the other States. In New York, in 1805, many gentlemen of prominence associated for the purpose of establishing a free school in New York City for the education of the children of persons in indigent circumstances, and who did not belong to, or were not provided for by, any religious society. These public-spirited gentlemen presented a memorial to the Legislature, setting forth the benefits that would result to society from educating such children, and that it would enable them more effectually to accomplish the objects of their institution if the schools were incorporated. The bill of incorporation was passed April 9, 1805. This was the nucleus from which the present system of public schools started into existence. Later on, in the year 1808, we find from annual printed reports that two free schools were opened and were in working order. . . . It was the intention of the founders of these schools—among whom the names of De Witt Clinton, Ferdinand de Peyster, John Murray, and Leonard Bleecker stand prominent as officers—to avoid the teachings of any religious society; but there were among the people many who thought that sufficient care was not being bestowed upon religious instruction: to please these malcontents the literary studies of the pupils were suspended one afternoon in every week, and an association of fifty ladies of 'distinguished consideration in society' met on this day and examined the children in their respective catechisms. . . . To read, write, and know arithmetic in its first branches correctly, was the extent of the educational advantages which the founders of the free-school system deemed necessary for the accomplishment of their purposes."—A. H. Rhine, *The Early Free Schools of Am. (Popular Science Monthly, March, 1880)*.

**A. D. 1785-1880.—The United States.—Land-grants for Schools.**—"The question of the endowment of educational institutions by the Government in aid of the cause of education seems to have met no serious opposition in the Congress of the Confederation, and no member raised his voice against this vital and essential provision relating to it in the ordinance of May 20, 1785, 'for ascertaining the mode of disposing of lands in the Western Territory.' This provided: 'There

shall be reserved the lot No. 16 of every township for the maintenance of public schools within said township.' This was an endowment of 640 acres of land (one section of land, one mile square) in a township 6 miles square, for the support and maintenance of public schools 'within said township.' The manner of establishment of public schools thereunder, or by whom, was not mentioned. It was a reservation by the United States, and advanced and established a principle which finally dedicated one thirty-sixth part of all public lands of the United States, with certain exceptions as to mineral, &c., to the cause of education by public schools. . . . In the Continental Congress, July 13, 1787, according to order, the ordinance for the government of the 'Territory of the United States northwest of the river Ohio' came on, was read a third time, and passed [see NORTHWEST TERRITORY: A. D. 1787]. It contained the following: 'Art. 3. Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.' The provision of the ordinance of May 20, 1785, relating to the reservation of the sixteenth section in every township of public land, was the inception of the present rule of reservation of certain sections of land for school purposes. The endowment was the subject of much legislation in the years following. The question was raised that there was no reason why the United States should not organize, control, and manage these public schools so endowed. The reservations of lands were made by surveyors and duly returned. This policy at once met with enthusiastic approval from the public, and was tacitly incorporated into the American system as one of its fundamental organic ideas. Whether the public schools thus endowed by the United States were to be under national or State control remained a question, and the lands were held in reservation merely until after the admission of the State of Ohio in 1803. . . . To each organized Territory, after 1803, was and now is reserved the sixteenth section (until after the Oregon Territory act reserved the thirty-sixth as well) for school purposes, which reservation is carried into grant and confirmation by the terms of the act of admission of the Territory or State into the Union; the State then becoming a trustee for school purposes. These grants of land were made from the public domain, and to States only which were known as public-land States. Twelve States, from March 3, 1803, known as public-land States, received the allowance of the sixteenth section to August 14, 1848. . . . Congress, June 13, 1812, and May 20, 1824, by the acts ordering the survey of certain towns and villages in Missouri, reserved for the support of schools in the towns and villages named, provided that the whole amount reserved should not exceed one-twentieth part of the whole lands included in the general survey of such town or village. These lots were reserved and sold for the benefit of the schools. Saint Louis received a large fund from this source. . . . In the act for the organization of the Territory of Oregon, August 14, 1848, Senator Stephen A. Douglas inserted an additional grant for school purposes of the thirty-sixth section in each township, with immunity for all public-land States thereafter to be admitted, making the reservation for school purposes the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections,

or 1,280 acres in each township of six miles square reserved in public-land States and Territories, and confirmed by grant in terms in the act of admission of such State or Territory into the Union. From March 13, 1853, to June 30, 1880, seven States have been admitted into the Union having a grant of the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections, and the same area has been reserved in eight Territories."—T. Donaldson, *The Public Domain*, ch. 13.

**A. D. 1789.—The United States.**—"The Constitution of the United States makes no provision for the education of the people; and in the Convention that framed it, I believe the subject was not even mentioned. A motion to insert a clause providing for the establishment of a national university was voted down. I believe it is also the fact, that the Constitutions of only three of the thirteen original States made the obligation to maintain a system of Free Schools a part of their fundamental law."—H. Mann, *Lect's and Annual Rep'ts on Education*, lect. 5.

**A. D. 1793.—Massachusetts.—Williams College.**—"Williams College, at Williamstown, Berkshire County, Mass., was chartered in 1793. The town and the college were named in honor of Col. Ephraim Williams, who had command of the forts in the Hoosac Valley, and was killed in a battle with the French and Indians, September 8, 1755. By his will he established a free school in the township which was to bear his name. The most advanced students of this free school became the first college class, numbering 4, and received the regular degree of bachelor of arts in the autumn of 1795. The small amount left by the will of Colonel Williams was carefully managed for 30 years by the executors, and they then obtained permission from the State legislature to carry out the benevolent purposes of the testator. The fund for building was increased by individual subscriptions, and by the avails of a lottery, which the general court granted for that purpose. The building which is now known as West College was then erected for the use of the free school and was finished in 1790. . . . The free school was opened in 1791, with Rev. Ebenezer Fitch, a graduate of Yale College, as preceptor, and Mr. John Lester as assistant. . . . The success of the school was so great that the next year the trustees asked the legislature to incorporate the school into a college. This was done, and a grant of \$4,000 was made from the State treasury for the purchase of books and philosophical apparatus. The college was put under the care of 12 trustees, who elected Preceptor Fitch the first president of the college."—E. B. Parsons (*U. S. Bureau of Education, Circular of Information*, 1891, no. 6: *Hist. of Higher Education in Mass.*, ch. 9).

**A. D. 1795-1867.—The United States.—State School Funds.**—"Connecticut took the lead in the creation of a permanent fund for the support of schools. The district known as the Western Reserve, in Northern Ohio, had been secured to her in the adjustment of her claims to lands confirmed to her by the charter of King Charles II. The Legislature of the State, in 1795, passed an act directing the sale of all the land embraced in the Reserve, and setting apart the avails as a perpetual fund for the maintenance of common schools. The amount realized was about \$1,120,000. . . . New York

was the next State to establish a common school fund for the aid and maintenance of schools in the several school districts of the State. The other Northern States except New Hampshire, Vermont, Pennsylvania, and one or two others, have established similar funds. . . . In all the new States the 500,000 acres, given by act of Congress, on their admission into the Union, for the support of schools, have been sacredly set apart for that purpose, and generally other lands belonging to the States have been added to the fund. . . . Prior to the war the Slave States had made attempts to establish plans for popular education, but with results of an unsatisfactory character. In Virginia a school system was in force for the education of the children of indigent white persons. In North Carolina a large school fund, exceeding two millions of dollars, had been set apart for the maintenance of schools. In all of these States common schools had been introduced, but they did not flourish as in the North and West. . . . There was not the same population of small and independent farmers, whose families could be united into a school district. . . . A more serious obstacle was the slave population, constituting one-third of the whole, and in some of the States more than half, whom it was thought dangerous to educate."—V. M. Rice, *Special Report on the Present State of Education*, 1867, pp. 19-23.

**A. D. 1804-1837.—Michigan.—The University.**—"In 1804, when Michigan was organized as a Territory, Congress granted a township of land for a seminary of learning, and the university to be established in 1817 was to be in accordance with this grant. The Territorial government committed the interests of higher education to the care of the Governor and the Judges, and it is supposed that through the exertions of Hon. A. B. Woodward, then presiding Judge of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Michigan, that the act establishing a university was framed. A portion of this most curious document of the early history of Michigan will be given. It is entitled 'An act to establish the Catholepistemiad or University Michiganiana.' 'Be it enacted by the Governor and Judges of the Territory of Michigan, That there shall be in the said Territory a catholepistemiad or university denominated the Catholepistemiad or University Michiganiana. The Catholepistemiad or University of Michiganiana shall be composed of thirteen didaxum or professorships; first, a didaxia or professorship catholepistemia, or universal science, the dictator or professor of which shall be president of the institution; second, a didaxia or professorship of anthropoglossica, or literature embracing all of the epistemum or sciences relative to language; third, a didaxia or professorship of mathematica or mathematics; fourth, a didaxia or professorship of physiognostica or natural history, etc.' The act thus continues through the whole range of the 'thirteen didaxum'; the remaining nine are as follows: Natural philosophy, astronomy, chemistry, medical sciences, economical sciences, ethical sciences, military sciences, historical sciences, and intellectual. The university was to be under the control of the professors and president, who were to be appointed by the Governor, while the institution was to be the center and controlling power of the educational system of the State. . . . was to be supported by taxation by an in-

crease of the amount of taxes already levied, by 15 per cent. Also power was given to raise money for the support of the university by means of lotteries. This remarkable document was not without its influence in shaping the public school policy of Michigan, but it was many years before the State approximated its learned provisions. Impracticable as this educational plan appears for a handful of people in the woods of Michigan, it served as a foundation upon which to build. The officers and president were duly appointed, and the work of the new university began at once. At first the university appeared as a school board, to establish and maintain primary schools which they held under their charge. Then followed a course of study for classical academies, and finally, in October, 1817, an act was passed establishing a college in the city of Detroit called 'The First College of Michiganiana.' . . . The people contributed liberally to these early schools, the sum of three thousand dollars being subscribed at the beginning. . . . An act was passed on the 30th of April, 1821, by the Governor and Judges establishing a university in Detroit to take the place of the catholopistemiad and to be called the 'University of Michigan.' In its charter nearly all the powers of the former institution were substantially confirmed, except the provision for taxes and lotteries. . . . The second corporation, known as the 'University of Michigan,' carried on the work of education already begun from 1821 to the third organization, in 1837. The education was very limited, consisting in one classical academy at Detroit, and part of the time a Lancasterian school. The boards of education kept up and transmitted the university idea to such an extent that it may be said truly and legally that there was one University of Michigan, which passed through three successive stages of development marked by the dates 1817, 1821, and 1837," at which time it was removed to Ann Arbor.—F. W. Blackmar, *Federal and State Aid to Higher Education (U. S. Bureau of Education, Circular of Information, 1890, no. 1), pp. 230-241.*

ALSO IN: E. M. Farrand, *Hist. of the University of Michigan*.—A. Ten Brook, *American State Universities.*

**A. D. 1818-1821.—Massachusetts.—Amherst College.**—"Amherst College originated in a strong desire on the part of the people of Massachusetts to have a college near the central part of the State, where the students should be free from the temptations of a large city, where the expenses of an education should not be beyond the means of those who had but little money, and where the moral and religious influences should be of a decidedly Christian character. . . . The ministers of Franklin County, at a meeting held in Shelburne May 18, 1815, expressed it as their opinion that a literary institution of high order ought to be established in Hampshire County, and that the town of Amherst appeared to them to be the most eligible place for it. Their early efforts for a literary institution in Hampshire County resulted in the first place in the establishment of an academy in Amherst, which was incorporated in the year 1816. . . . In the year 1818 a constitution was adopted by the trustees of Amherst Academy, for the raising and management of a fund of at least \$50,000, for the classical education of indigent young men of

piety and talents for the Christian ministry. . . . This charity fund may be said to be the basis of Amherst College, for though it was raised by the trustees of Amherst Academy it was really intended to be the foundation of a college, and has always been a part of the permanent funds of Amherst College, kept sacredly from all other funds for the specific object for which it was given. . . . This was for many years the only permanent fund of Amherst College, and without this it would have seemed impossible at one time to preserve the very existence of the college. So Amherst College grew out of Amherst Academy, and was built permanently on the charity fund raised by the trustees of that academy. . . . Although the charity fund of \$50,000 had been received in 1818, it was not till 1820 that the recipient felt justified in going forward to erect buildings for a college in Amherst. Efforts were made for the removal of Williams College from Williamstown to Hampshire County, and to have the charity fund used in connection with that college; and, if that were done, it was not certain that Amherst could be regarded as the best location for the college. But the legislature of Massachusetts decided that Williams College could not be removed from Williamstown, and nothing remained but for the friends of the new institution to go on with their plans for locating it at Amherst. . . . This first college edifice was ready for occupation and dedicated on the 18th of September, 1821. In the month of May, 1821, Rev. Zephaniah Swift Moore, D. D., was unanimously elected by the trustees of Amherst Academy president of the new institution."—T. P. Field (*U. S. Bureau of Education, Circular of Information, 1891, no. 6: Hist. of Higher Education in Mass.*), ch. 11.

**A. D. 1837.—Massachusetts.—Horace Mann and the State System.**—"When Massachusetts, in 1837, created a Board of Education, then were first united into a somewhat related whole the more or less excellent but varied and independent organizations, and a beginning made for a State system. It was this massing of forces, and the hearty co-operation he initiated, in which the work of Horace Mann showed its matchless greatness. 'Rarely,' it has been said, 'have great ability, unselfish devotion, and brilliant success, been so united in the course of a single life.' A successful lawyer, a member of the State Legislature, and with but limited experience as a teacher, he has left his impress upon the educational sentiments of, not only New England, but the United States."—R. G. Boone, *Education in the U. S.*, p. 103.

**A. D. 1840-1836.—The United States.—Proportion of College Students.**—"It is estimated that in 1840 the proportion of college students to the entire population in the United States was 1 to 1,540; in 1860, 1 to 2,012; in 1870, 1 to 2,546; in 1880, 1 to 1,840; and in 1890, 1 to about 1,400. Estimating all our combined efforts in favor of higher education, we fall far short of some of the countries of the Old World."—F. W. Blackmar, *Federal and State Aid to Higher Education in the U. S. (U. S. Bureau of Education, Circulars of Information, 1890, no. 1), p. 36.*

**A. D. 1844-1876.—Canada.—Ontario School System.**—"From the earliest settlement of Ontario, schools were established as the wants of the inhabitants required. The Legislature soon recognized the needs of the country, and made

grants of land and money in aid of elementary, secondary, and superior education. Statutes were passed from time to time for the purpose of opening schools to meet the demands of the people. The sparsely settled condition of the Province delayed for a while the organization of the system. It was not until 1844 that the elementary schools were put on a comprehensive basis. In that year the Rev. Egerton Ryerson, LL. D., was appointed Chief Superintendent of Education, and the report which he presented to the House of Assembly sketched in an able manner the main features of the system of which he was the distinguished founder, and of which he continued for thirty-three years to be the efficient administrator. In 1876 the office of chief superintendent was abolished, and the schools of the Province placed under the control of a member of the Government with the title of Minister of Education. . . . The system of education in Ontario may be said to combine the best features of the systems of several countries. To the Old World it is indebted for a large measure of its stability, uniformity and centralization; to the older settled parts of the New World for its popular nature, its flexibility and its democratic principles which have given, wherever desirable, local control and individual responsibility. From the State of New York we have borrowed the machinery of our school; from Massachusetts the principle of local taxation; from Ireland our first series of text books; from Scotland the co-operation of parents with the teacher, in upholding his authority; from Germany the system of Normal Schools and the Kindergarten; and from the United States generally the non-denominational character of elementary, secondary, and university education. Ontario may claim to have some features of her system that are largely her own. Among them may be mentioned: a division of state and municipal authority on a judicious basis; clear lines separating the function of the University from that of the High Schools, and the function of the High Schools from that of the Public or elementary schools; a uniform course of study; all High and Public Schools in the hands of professionally trained teachers; no person eligible to the position of inspector who does not hold the highest grade of a teacher's certificate, and who has not had years of experience as a teacher; inspectors removable if inefficient, but not subject to removal by popular vote; the examinations of teachers under Provincial instead of local control; the acceptance of a common matriculation examination for admission to the Universities and to the learned professions; a uniform series of text books for the whole Province; the almost entire absence of party politics in the manner in which school boards, inspectors and teachers discharge their duties; the system national instead of sectarian, but affording under constitutional guarantees and limitations protection to Roman Catholic and Protestant Separate Schools and denominational Universities."—J. Millar, *Educational System of the Province of Ontario*.

**A. D. 1862.—The United States.—Land-grant for industrial Colleges.**—"Next to the Ordinance of 1787, the Congressional grant of 1862 is the most important educational enactment in America. . . . By this gift forty-eight colleges and universities have received aid, at least to the extent of the Congressional grant; thirty-three of these, at least, have been called into ex-

istence by means of this act. In thirteen States the proceeds of the land scrip were devoted to institutions already in existence. The amount received from the sales of land scrip from twenty-four of these States aggregates the sum of \$13,930,456, with land remaining unsold estimated at nearly two millions of dollars. These same institutions have received State endowments amounting to over eight million dollars. The origin of this gift must be sought in local communities. In this country all ideas of national education have arisen from those States that have felt the need of local institutions for the education of youth. In certain sections of the Union, particularly the North and West, where agriculture was one of the chief industries, it was felt that the old classical schools were not broad enough to cover all the wants of education represented by growing industries. There was consequently a revulsion from these schools toward the industrial and practical side of education. Evidences of this movement are seen in the attempts in different States to found agricultural, technical, and industrial schools. These ideas found their way into Congress, and a bill was introduced in 1858, which provided for the endowment of colleges for the teaching of agriculture and the mechanical arts. The bill was introduced by Hon. Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont; it was passed by a small majority, and was vetoed by President Buchanan. In 1863 the bill was again presented with slight changes, passed and signed, and became a law July 2, 1862. . . . It stipulated to grant to each State thirty thousand acres of land for each Senator and Representative in Congress to which the States were respectively entitled by the census of 1860, for the purpose of endowing 'at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the Legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life.' . . . From this proposition all sorts of schools sprang up, according to the local conception of the law and local demands. It was thought by some that boys were to be taught agriculture by working on a farm, and purely agricultural schools were founded with the mechanical arts attached. In other States classical schools of the stereotyped order were established, with more or less science; and, again, the endowment in others was devoted to scientific departments. The instruction of the farm and the teaching of pure agriculture have not succeeded in general, while the schools that have made prominent those studies relating to agriculture and the mechanic arts, upon the whole, have succeeded best. . . . In several instances the managers of the land scrip have understood that by this provision the State could not locate the land within the borders of another State, but its assignees could thus locate lands, not more than one million acres in any one State. By considering this question, the New York land scrip was bought by Ezra Cornell, and located by him for the college in valuable lands in the State of Wisconsin, and thus the fund was augmented. However, the majority of the States sold their land at a sacrifice, frequently for less than half



its value. There was a lull in the land market during the Civil War, and this cause, together with the lack of attention in many States, sacrificed the gift of the Federal Government. The sales ranged all the way from fifty cents to seven dollars per acre, as the average price for each State."—F. W. Blackmar, *Federal and State Aid to Higher Education* (U. S. Bureau of Education, *Circulars of Information*, 1890, no. 1), pp. 47-49.

**A. D. 1862-1886.—New York.—Cornell University.**—"On the second of July, 1862, . . . [President Lincoln] signed the act of congress, donating public lands for the establishment of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts. This act had been introduced into congress by the Hon. Justin S. Morrill. . . . The Morrill act provided for a donation of public land to the several states, each state to receive thirty thousand acres for each senator and representative it sent to congress. States not containing within their own borders public land subject to sale at private entry received land scrip instead. But this land scrip the recipient states were not allowed to locate within the limits of any other state or of any territory of the United States. The act inconspicuously directed 'said scrip to be sold by said states.' The proceeds of the sale, whether of land or scrip, in each state were to form a perpetual fund. . . . In the execution of this trust the State of New York was hampered by great and almost insuperable obstacles. For its distributive share it received land scrip to the amount of nine hundred and ninety thousand acres. The munificence of the endowment awakened the cupidity of a multitude of clamorous and strangely unexpected claimants. . . . If the princely domain granted to the State of New York by congress was not divided and frittered away, we owe it in great measure to the foresight, the energy, and the splendid courage of a few generous spirits in the legislature of whom none commanded greater respect or exercised more influence than Senator Andrew Dickson White, the gentleman who afterwards became first president of Cornell University. . . . But the all-compelling force which prevented the dispersion and dissipation of the bounty of congress was the generous heart of Ezra Cornell. While rival institutions clamored for a division of the 'spoils,' and political tricksters played their base and desperate game, this man thought only of the highest good of the State of New York, which he loved with the ardor of a patriot and was yet to serve with the heroism of a martyr. . . . When the legislature of the State of New York was called upon to make some disposition of the congressional grant, Ezra Cornell sat in the senate. . . . Of his minor legislative achievements I shall not speak. One act, however, has made his name as immortal as the state it glorified. By a gift of half a million dollars (a vast sum in 1865, the last year of the war!) he rescued for the higher education of New York the undivided grant of congress; and with the united endowments he induced the legislature to establish, not merely a college of applied science but a great modern university—"an institution," according to his own admirable definition, "where any person can find instruction in any study." It was a high and daring aspiration to crown the educational system of our imperial state with an organ of universal knowledge, a nursery of every science and of all scholarship, an instrument of liberal

culture and of practical utility to all classes of our people. This was, however, the end; and to secure it Ezra Cornell added to his original gift new donations of land, of buildings, and of money. . . . But one danger threatened this latest birth of time. The act of congress donating land scrip required the states to sell it. The markets were immediately glutted. Prices fell. New York was selling at an average price of fifty cents an acre. Her princely domain would bring at this rate less than half a million dollars! Woe the splendid donation to issue in such disaster! If it could be held till the war was over, till immigration opened up the Northwest, it would be worth five times five hundred thousand dollars! So at least thought one far-seeing man in the State of New York. And this man of foresight had the heart to conceive, the wisdom to devise, and the courage to execute—he alone in all the states—a plan for saving to his state the future value of the lands donated by congress. Ezra Cornell made that wonderful and dramatic contract with the State of New York! He bound himself to purchase at the rate of sixty cents per acre the entire right of the commonwealth to the scrip, still unsold; and with the scrip, thus purchased by him as an individual he agreed to select and locate the lands it represented, to pay the taxes, to guard against trespasses and defend from fires, to the end that within twenty years when values had appreciated he might sell the land and turn into the treasury of the State of New York for the support of Cornell University the entire net proceeds of the enterprise. Within a few years Ezra Cornell had located over half a million acres of superior pine land in the Northwestern states, principally in Wisconsin. Under bonds to the State of New York to do the state's work he had spent about \$600,000 of his own cash to carry out the trust committed to him by the state, when, alas, in the crisis of 1874, fortune and credit sank exhausted and death came to free the martyr-patriot from his bonds. The seven years that followed were the darkest in our history. . . . Ezra Cornell was our founder; Henry W. Sage followed him as wise masterbuilder. The edifices, chairs and libraries which bear the name of 'Sage' witness to [his] later gifts; but though these now aggregate the princely sum of \$1,250,000, [his] management of the university lands has been [his] greatest achievement. From these lands, with which the generosity and foresight of Ezra Cornell endowed the university, there have been netted under [Mr. Sage's] administration, not far short of \$4,000,000, with over 100,000 acres still to sell. Ezra Cornell's contract with the state was for twenty years. It expired August 4, 1886, when a ten years' extension was granted by the state. The trust will be closed in 1896."—J. G. Schurman, *Address at Inauguration to the Presidency of Cornell University*, Nov. 11, 1892.

**A. D. 1866-1869.—The United States.—Bureau of Education.**—"Educators, political economists, and statesmen felt the need of some central agency by which the general educational statistics of the country could be collected, preserved, condensed, and properly arranged for distribution. This need found expression finally in the action taken at a convention of the superintendence department of the National Educational Association, held at Washington February, 1866, when it was resolved to petition Congress



in favor of a National Bureau of Education. . . . The memorial was presented in the House of Representatives by General Garfield, February 14, 1866, with a bill for the establishment of a National Bureau on essentially the basis the school superintendents had proposed. Both bill and memorial were referred to a committee of seven members. . . . The bill was reported back from the committee, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, providing for the creation of a department of education instead of the bureau originally proposed. Thus altered, it was passed by a vote of nearly two to one. In the Senate it was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary . . . who the following winter reported it without amendment and with a recommendation that it pass, which it did on the 1st of March, 1867, receiving on the next day the approval of the President. By the act of July 28, 1868, which took effect June 30, 1869, the Department of Education was abolished, and an Office of Education in the Department of the Interior was established, with the same objects and duties. . . . The act of March 2, 1867, . . . established an agency 'for the purpose of collecting such statistics and facts as shall show the condition and progress of education in the several States and Territories, and of diffusing such information respecting the organization and management of school systems and methods of teaching as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems and otherwise promote the cause of education.' It will be perceived that the chief duty of the office under the law is to act as an educational exchange. Exercising and seeking to exercise no control whatever over its thousands of correspondents, the office occupies a position as the recipient of voluntary information which is unique."—C. Warren, *Answers to Inquiries about the U. S. Bureau of Education*, ch. 2-3.

**A. D. 1867.—New York.—Public Schools made entirely free.**—The public schools of the State of New York were not entirely free until 1867. In his report to the Legislature made in February of that year, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Hon. Victor M. Rice, said: "The greatest defect in our school system is, as I have urged in previous reports, the continuance of the rate bill system. Our common schools can never reach their highest degree of usefulness until they shall have been made entirely free. . . . To meet this public demand, to confer upon the children of the State the blessings of free education, a bill has already been introduced into your honorable body. . . . The main features of the bill are the provisions to raise, by State tax, a sum about equal to that raised in the districts by rate bills, and to abolish the rate bill system; to facilitate the erection and repair of school houses." The bill referred to was passed at the same session of the Legislature, and in his next succeeding report, Superintendent Rice gave the following account of the law and its immediate effects: "While the general structure of the school law was not disturbed, a material modification was made by the Act (chap. 406, Laws of 1867), which took effect on the first day of October of the same year, and which, among other things, provided for the abolishment of rate-bills, and for increased local and State taxation for school purposes. This was primarily a change

in the manner of raising the requisite funds; not an absolute increase of the aggregate amount to be raised. It involved and encouraged such increase, so far as the inhabitants in the several school districts should authorize it, by substituting taxation exclusively on property, for a mixed assessment which, in part, was a tax on attendance. Thus relieved of an old impediment, and supplied with additional power and larger resources, the cause of public instruction, during the last fiscal year, has wrought results unequalled in all the past. . . . The effect of this amendment has not been confined to the financial policy thereby inaugurated. It is distinctly traceable in lengthened terms of school, in a larger and more uniform attendance, and in more liberal expenditures for school buildings and appliances."—Supt. of Pub. Instruction of the State of N. Y., *Annual Report*, 1869, pp. 5-6.

**A. D. 1867.—Maryland.—Johns Hopkins University.**—"By the will of Johns Hopkins, a merchant of Baltimore, the sum of \$7,000,000 was devoted to the endowment of a university (chartered in 1867) and a hospital, \$3,500,000 being appropriated to each. . . . To the bequest no burdensome conditions were attached. . . . Just what this new university was to be proved a very serious question to the trustees. The conditions of Mr. Hopkins's bequest left the determination of this matter open. . . . A careful investigation led the trustees to believe that there was a growing demand for opportunities to study beyond the ordinary courses of a college or a scientific school, particularly in those branches of learning not included in the schools of law, medicine and theology. Strong evidence of this demand was afforded by the increasing attendance of American students upon the lectures of the German universities, as well as by the number of students who were enrolling themselves at Harvard and Yale for the post-graduate courses. It was therefore determined that the Johns Hopkins should be primarily a university, with advanced courses of lectures and fully equipped laboratories; that the courses should be voluntary, and the teaching not limited to class instruction. The foundation is both old and new. In so far as each feature is borrowed from some older university, where it has been fairly tried and tested, it is old, but at the same time\* this particular combination of separate features has here been made for the first time. . . . In the ordinary college course, if a young man happens to be deficient in mathematics, for example, he is either forced to lose any advantage he may possess in Greek or Latin, or else is obliged to take a position in mathematics for which he is unprepared. In the college department of the Johns Hopkins, this disadvantage does not exist; the classifying is specific for each study. The student has also the privilege of pushing forward in any one study as rapidly as he can with advantage; or, on the other hand, in case of illness or of unavoidable interruption, of prolonging the time devoted to the course, so that no part of it shall be omitted. As the studies are elective, it is possible to follow the usual college course if one desires. Seven different courses of study are indicated, any of which leads to the Baccalaureate degree, thus enabling the student to direct and specialize his work. The same standard of matriculation and the same severity of examinations are maintained in all these courses. A

student has the privilege of extending his study beyond the regular class work, and he will be credited with all such private and outside study, if his examiners are satisfied of his thoroughness and accuracy."—S. B. Herrick, *The Johns Hopkins University* (Scribner's Monthly, Dec. 1879).

**A. D. 1867-1891.—The United States.—The Peabody Education Fund.**—"The letter announcing and creating the Peabody endowment was dated February 7, 1867. In that letter, after referring to the ravages of the late war, the founder of the Trust said: 'I feel most deeply that it is the duty and privilege of the more favoured and wealthy portions of our nation to assist those who are less fortunate.' He then added: 'I give one million of dollars for the encouragement and promotion of intellectual, moral, and industrial education among the young of the more destitute portions of the Southern and Southwestern States of the Union.' On the day following, ten of the Trustees selected by him held a preliminary meeting in Washington. Their first business meeting was held in the city of New York, the 19th of March following, at which a general plan was adopted and an agent appointed. Mr. Peabody returned to his native country again in 1869, and on the 1st day of July, at a special meeting of the Trustees held at Newport, added a second million to the cash capital of the fund. . . . According to the donor's directions, the principal must remain intact for thirty years. The Trustees are not authorized to expend any part of it, nor yet to add to it any part of the accruing interest. The manner of using the interest, as well as the final distribution of the principal, was left entirely to the discretion of a self-perpetuating body of Trustees. Those first appointed had, however, the rare advantage of full consultation with the founder of the Trust while he still lived, and their plans received his cordial and emphatic approbation. . . . The pressing need of the present seemed to be in the department of primary education for the masses, and so they determined to make appropriations only for the assistance of public free schools. The money is not given as a charity to the poor. It would be entirely inadequate to furnish any effectual relief if distributed equally among all those who need it, and would, moreover, if thus widely dissipated, produce no permanent results. But the establishment of good public schools provides for the education of all children, whether rich or poor, and initiates a system which no State has ever abandoned after a fair trial. So it seemed to the donor as well as to his Trustees, that the greatest good of the greatest number would be more effectually and more certainly attained by this mode of distribution than by any other. No effort is made to distribute according to population. It was Mr. Peabody's wish that those States which had suffered most from the ravages of war should be assisted first."—*Am. Educational Cyclopædia*, 1875, pp. 224-225.—The report made by the treasurer of the Fund in 1890, showed a principal sum invested to the amount of \$2,075,175.22, yielding an income that year of \$97,818. In the annual report of the U. S. Commissioner of Education made Feb. 1, 1891, he says: "It would appear to the student of education in the Southern States that the practical wisdom in the administration of the Peabody Fund and the fruitful results that have

followed it could not be surpassed in the history of endowments."—*Proceedings of the Trustees of the Peabody Education Fund, 1887-1892*.

**A. D. 1884-1891.—California.—Leland Stanford Junior University.**—"The founding at Palo Alto of a university for both sexes, with the colleges, schools, seminaries of learning, mechanical institutes, museums, galleries of art, and all other things necessary and appropriate to a university of high degree," was determined upon by the Hon. Leland Stanford and Jane Lathrop Stanford in 1884. In March of the year following the Legislature of California passed an Act providing for the administration of trust funds in connection with institutions of learning. November 14, 1885, the Grant of Endowment was publicly made, in accordance with this Act, and on the same day the Board of Trustees held its first meeting in San Francisco. The work of construction was at once begun, and the cornerstone laid May 14, 1887. The University was formally opened to students October 1, 1891. The idea of the university, in the words of its founders, 'came directly and largely from our son and only child, Leland, and in the belief that had he been spared to advise us to the disposition of our estate, he would have desired the devotion of a large portion thereof to this purpose, we will that for all time to come the institution hereby founded shall bear his name, and shall be known as The Leland Stanford Junior University.' The object of the University, as stated in its Charter, is 'to qualify students for personal success and direct usefulness in life'; and its purposes, 'to promote the public welfare by exercising an influence in behalf of humanity and civilization, teaching the blessings of liberty regulated by law, and inculcating love and reverence for the great principles of government as derived from the inalienable rights of man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' The University is located on the Palo Alto estate in the Santa Clara valley, thirty-three miles southeast of San Francisco, on the Coast Division of the Southern Pacific Railway. The estate consists of over eight thousand acres, partly lowland and partly rising into the foothills of the Santa Cruz range. On the grounds is the residence of the Founders, and an extensive and beautiful arboretum containing a very great variety of shrubs and trees. The property conveyed to the University, in addition to the Palo Alto estate, consists of the Vina estate, in Tehama County, of fifty-five thousand acres, of which about four thousand acres are planted in vines, and the Gridley estate, in Butte County, of twenty-two thousand acres, devoted mainly to the raising of wheat. . . . The founders of the Leland Stanford Junior University say: 'As a further assurance that the endowment will be ample to establish and maintain a university of the highest grade, we have, by last will and testament, devised to you and your successors additional property. We have done this as a security against the uncertainty of life and in the hope that during our lives the full endowment may go to you.' The aggregate of the domain thus dedicated to the founding of the University, is over eighty-five thousand acres, or more than one hundred and thirty-three square miles, among the best improved and most valuable lands in the State."—Leland Stanford Junior University, *Circulars of Information, nos. 6 and 1-2*.

**A. L. 1887-1889.—Massachusetts.—Clark University.**—"Clark University was founded [at Worcester] by . . . a native of Worcester County, Massachusetts. It was 'not the outcome of a freak of impulse, or of a sudden wave of generosity, or of the natural desire to perpetuate in a worthy way one's ancestral name. To comprehend the genesis of the enterprise we must go back along the track of Mr. Clark's personal history 20 years at least. For as long ago as that, the idea came home with force to his mind that all civilized communities are in the hands of experts. . . . Looking around at the facilities obtainable in this country for the prosecution of original research, he was struck with the meagerness and the inadequacy. Colleges and professional schools we have in abundance, but there appeared to be no one grand inclusive institution, unsaddled by an academic department, where students might pursue as far as possible their investigation of any and every branch of science. . . . Mr. Clark went abroad and spent eight years visiting the institutions of learning in almost every country of Europe. He studied into their history and observed their present working. . . . It is his strong and expressed desire that the highest possible academic standards be here forever maintained; that special opportunities and inducements be offered to research; that to this end the instructors be not overburdened with teaching or examinations. . . . A charter was granted early in 1887. Land and other property that had been before secured by the founder was transferred to the board, and the erection of a central building was begun. In the spring of 1888 G. Stanley Hall, then a professor at the Johns Hopkins University, was invited to the presidency. . . . The plans of the university had so far progressed that work was begun in October, 1889, in mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, and psychology."—G. G. Bush *Hist. of Higher Education in Mass. (U. S. Bureau of Education, Circular of Information, 1901, no. 6), ch. 18*

**A. D. 1889-1892.—Illinois.—Chicago University.**—"At its Annual Meeting in May, 1889, the Board of the American Baptist Education Society resolved to take immediate steps toward the founding of a well-equipped college in the city of Chicago. At the same time John D. Rockefeller made a subscription of \$600,000 and this sum was increased during the succeeding year by about \$600,000 more in subscriptions representing more than two thousand persons. Three months after the completion of this subscription, Mr. Rockefeller made an additional proffer of \$1,000,000. The site of the University consists of three blocks of ground—about two thousand feet long and three hundred and sixty-two feet wide, lying between the two South Parks of Chicago, and fronting on the Midway Plaisance, which is itself a park connecting the other two. One-half of this site is a gift of Marshall Field of Chicago, and the other half has been purchased at a cost of \$132,500. At the first meeting of the Board after it had become an incorporated body, Professor William R. Harper, of Yale University, was unanimously elected President of the University. . . . It has been decided that the University will begin the work of instruction on the first day of October, 1892. . . . The work of the University shall be arranged under three general divisions, viz., The Univer-

sity Proper, The University-Extension Work, The University Publication Work."—*University of Chicago, Official Bulletin no. 1, Jan., 1891.*

**A. D. 1890.—United States.—Census Statistics.**—The following statistics of education in the United States are from the returns gathered for the Eleventh Census, 1890. In these statistics the states and territories are classed in five great geographical divisions, defined as follows: North Atlantic Division, embracing the New England States, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania; South Atlantic Division, embracing the States of the eastern coast, from Delaware to Florida, together with the District of Columbia; North Central Division, embracing Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas; South Central Division, embracing Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, and Oklahoma; Western Division, embracing all the remaining States and Territories. The total taxation for public schools in the United States, as reported by this census, was \$102,164,796; of which \$37,019,786 was raised in the North Atlantic Division, \$5,678,474 in the South Atlantic Division, \$47,033,142 in the North Central Division, \$5,698,562 in the South Central Division, and \$6,134,832 in the Western Division. From funds and rents there were raised for school purposes a total of \$25,694,449 in the United States at large, of which \$8,273,147 was raised in the North Atlantic Division, \$2,307,051 in the South Atlantic Division, \$8,432,593 in the North Central Division, \$3,720,158 in the South Central Division, and \$2,961,500 in the Western Division. The total of all "ordinary" receipts for school support in the United States was \$139,619,440, of which \$49,201,216 were in the North Atlantic Division, \$8,685,223 in the South Atlantic Division, \$61,108,263 in the North Central Division, \$10,294,621 in the South Central Division, and \$10,330,117 in the Western Division. The total "ordinary expenditures" were \$138,786,393 in the whole United States; being \$47,625,548 in the North Atlantic Division, \$8,630,711 in the South Atlantic Division, \$62,815,531 in the North Central Division, \$9,860,059 in the South Central Division, and \$9,854,544 in the Western Division. For teachers' wages there was a total expenditure of \$88,705,092, \$28,067,821 being in the North Atlantic Division, \$6,400,063 in the South Atlantic Division, \$39,866,831 in the North Central Division, \$8,209,509 in the South Central Division, and \$6,161,768 in the Western Division. The total expenditure for Libraries and Apparatus was \$1,667,787, three-fourths of which was in the North Atlantic and North Central Divisions. The expenditure reported for construction and care of buildings, was \$24,224,793, of which \$10,087,114 was in the North Atlantic Division, \$894,277 was in the South Atlantic Division, \$9,869,489 in the North Central Division, \$770,257 in the South Central Division, and \$2,013,656 in the Western Division. Reported estimates of the value of buildings and other school property are incomplete, but \$27,892,831 are given for Massachusetts, \$41,626,735 for New York, \$35,435,412 for Pennsylvania, \$32,631,549 for Ohio, \$26,814,480 for Illinois, and these are the States that stand highest in the column. The apparent enrollment in Public Schools for the census year, reported to July, 1891, was as follows: North

Atlantic Division, 3,124,417; South Atlantic Division, 1,758,285; North Central Division, 5,082,182; South Central Division, 2,334,694; Western Division, 529,286; Total for the United States, 12,769,804, being 20.39 per cent. of the population, against 15.84 per cent. in 1880. The reported enrollment in Private Schools at the same time was: North Atlantic Division, 196,173; South Atlantic Division, 105,253; North Central Division, 187,827; South Central Division, 200,202; Western Division, 54,749; Total for the United States, 804,204. The reported enrollment in Parochial Schools was: North Atlantic Division, 311,684; South Atlantic Division, 30,869; North Central Division, 398,585; South Central Division, 41,115; Western Division, 17,349; Total for the United States, 799,602. Of this total, 626,496 were enrolled in Catholic and 151,651 in Lutheran Parochial Schools; leaving only 21,455 in the schools of all other denominations. Total enrollment reported in all schools 14,373,670. The colored public school enrollment in the Southern States was 1,288,229 in 1890, against 797,286 in 1880,—an increase of more than 61 per cent. The enrollment of whites was 3,358,527, against 2,301,804,—an increase of nearly 46 per cent. The approximate number of Public School-houses in the United States, for the census year 1890 is given at 219,992, being 42,949 in the North Atlantic Division, 32,142 in the South Atlantic Division, 97,166 in the North Central Division, 38,962 in the South Central Division, 8,773 in the Western Division. The largest number reported is 14,214 in Pennsylvania. Of 8,408 school-houses in Virginia 4,568 are for white, and 1,840 for colored children; in North Carolina, 3,973 white and 1,820 colored.

The above statistics are taken in part from the Compendium of the Eleventh Census, published in 1894, and partly from tables courteously furnished from the Census Bureau in advance of their publication.

#### Modern : Reforms and Movements.

A. D. 1638-1671.—Comenius.—“To know Comenius [born in Moravia, 1592] and the part he played in the seventeenth century, to appreciate this grand educational character, it would be necessary to begin by relating his life; his misfortunes; his journeys to England [1638], where Parliament invoked his aid; to Sweden [1642], where the Chancellor Oxenstiern employed him to write manuals of instruction; especially his relentless industry, his courage through exile, and the long persecutions he suffered as a member of the sect of dissenters, the Moravian Brethren; and the schools he founded at Fulneck, in Bohemia, at Lissa and at Patak, in Poland.”—G. Compayré, *The Hist. of Pedagogy*, ch. 6 (sect. 137). —“Comenius’s inspiring motive, like that of all leading educationalists, was social regeneration. He believed that this could be accomplished through the school. He lived under the hallucination that by a proper arrangement of the subject-matter of instruction, and by a sound method, a certain community of thought and interests would be established among the young, which would result in social harmony and political settlement. He believed that men could be manufactured. . . . The educational spirit of the Reformers, the conviction that all—even the humblest—must be taught to know God, and Jesus Christ whom he has sent, was inherited by Come-

nus in its completeness. In this way, and in this way only, could the ills of Europe be remedied, and the progress of humanity assured. While, therefore, he sums up the educational aim under the threefold heads of Knowledge, Virtue, and Piety or Godliness, he in truth has mainly in view the last two. Knowledge is of value only in so far as it forms the only sound basis, in the eyes of a Protestant theologian, of virtue and godliness. We have to train for a hereafter. . . . By knowledge Comenius meant knowledge of nature and of man’s relation to nature. It is this important characteristic of Comenius’s educational system that reveals the direct influence of Bacon and his school. . . . It is in the department of Method, however, that we recognise the chief contribution of Comenius to education. The mere attempt to systematise was a great advance. In seeking, however, for foundations on which to erect a coherent system, he had to content himself with first principles which were vague and unscientific. . . . In the department of knowledge, that is to say, knowledge of the outer world, Comenius rested his method on the scholastic maxim, ‘Nihil est in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu.’ This maxim he enriched with the Baconian induction, comprehended by him only in a general way. . . . From the simple to the complex, from the particular to the general, the concrete before the abstract, and all, step by step, and even by insensible degrees,—these were among his leading principles of method. But the most important of all his principles was derived from the scholastic maxim quoted above. As all is from sense, let the thing to be known be itself presented to the senses, and let every sense be engaged in the perception of it. When it is impossible, from the nature of the case, to present the object itself, place a vivid picture of it before the pupil. The mere enumeration of these few principles, even if we drop out of view all his other contributions to method and school-management, will satisfy any man familiar with all the more recent treatises on Education, that Comenius, even after giving his precursors their due, is to be regarded as the true founder of modern Method, and that he anticipates Pestalozzi and all of the same school. . . . Finally, Comenius’s views as to the inner organisation of a school were original, and have proved themselves in all essential respects correct. The same may be said of his scheme for the organisation of a State-system—a scheme which is substantially, mutatis mutandis, at this moment embodied in the highly-developed system of Germany. When we consider, then, that Comenius first formally and fully developed educational method, that he introduced important reforms into the teaching of languages, that he introduced into schools the study of Nature, that he advocated with intelligence, and not on purely sentimental grounds, a milder discipline, we are justified in assigning to him a high, if not the highest, place among modern educational writers.”—S. S. Lanrie, *John Amos Comenius*, pp. 217-226.

A. D. 1681-1878.—The Christian Brothers.—“Any description of popular education in Europe would be incomplete, which should not give prominence to the Institute of the Christian Brothers—or the Brothers of the Christian Doctrine—including in that term the earliest professional school for the training of teachers in

Europe; one of the most remarkable body of teachers devoted exclusively and without pay to the education of the children of the poor that the world has ever seen. . . . The Institute was established as a professional school in 1681, and to Abbe John Baptist de la Salle, belongs the high honor not only of founding it, but of so infusing into its early organization his own profound conviction of the Christ-like character of its mission among the poor, that it has retained for nearly two centuries the form and spirit of its origin. This devoted Christian teacher was born at Rheims on the 30th of April, 1651. . . . He was early distinguished for his scholarly attainments and maturity of character; and at the age of seventeen, before he had completed his full course of theological study, he was appointed Canon in the Cathedral church of Rheims. From the first, he became interested in the education of the young, and especially of the poor, as the most direct way of leading them to a Christian life;—and with this view before he was twenty-one years old, he assumed the direction of two charities, devoted to female education. From watching the operation of these schools, conducted by teachers without professional training, without plan and without mutual sympathy and aid, he conceived the design of bringing the teachers of this class of schools from the neighboring parishes into a community for their moral and professional improvement. For this purpose, he invited them first to meet, and then to lodge at his house, and afterwards, about the year 1681, he purchased a house for their special accommodation. Here, out of school hours and during their holydays, they spent their time in the practice of religious duties, and in mutual conferences on the work in which they were engaged. About this period, a large number of free schools for the poor were established in the neighboring towns; and applications were constantly made to the Abbe for teachers formed under his training, care, and influence. To meet this demand, and make himself more directly useful in the field of Christian education, he resigned his benefice, that he might give his whole attention to the work. To close the distance between himself, having a high social position and competence from his father's estate, and the poor schoolmasters to whom he was constantly preaching an unreserved consecration of themselves to their vocation—he not only resigned his canonry, with its social and pecuniary advantages, but distributed his patrimony, in a period of scarcity, in relieving the necessities of the poor, and in providing for the education of their children. He thus placed himself on a footing of equality—as to occupation, manner of life, and entire dependence on the charity of others—with the schoolmasters of the poor. The annals of education or religion show but few such examples of practical self-denial, and entire consecration to a sense of duty. . . . Having completed his act of resignation and self-imposed poverty, he assembled his teachers, announced to them what he had done, and sung with them a *Te Deum*. After a retreat—a period set apart to prayer and fasting—continued for seventeen days, they devoted themselves to the consideration of the best course to give unity, efficiency, and permanence to their plans of Christian education for the poor. They assumed the name of 'The Brothers of the Christian Doc-

trine,' as expressive of their vocation—which by usage came to be abbreviated into 'Christian Brothers.' They took on themselves vows of poverty, celibacy, and obedience for three years. They prescribed to themselves the most frugal fare, to be provided in turns by each other. They adopted at that time some rules of behavior, which have since been incorporated into the fundamental rules of the order. . . . In 1702 the first step was taken to establish an Institute at Rome, under the mission of one of the brothers, Gabriel Drolin, who after years of poverty, was made conductor of one of the charitable schools founded by Pope Clement XI. This school became afterwards the foundation of the house which the brothers have had in Rome since the pontificate of Benedict XIII., who conferred on the institute the constitution of a religious order. In 1703, under the pecuniary aid of M. Chateau Blanc, and the countenance of the archbishop, M. de Gontery, a school was opened at Avignon. . . . In 1789, the National Assembly prohibited vows to be made in communities; and in 1790, suppressed all religious societies; and in 1791, the institute was dispersed. At that date there were one hundred and twenty houses, and over one thousand brothers, actively engaged in the duties of the school room. The continuity of the society was secured by the houses established in Italy, to which many of the brothers fled. . . . In 1801, on the conclusion of a Concordat between the Pope and the government, the society was revived in France by the opening of a school at Lyons; and in 1815, they resumed their habit, and opened a novitiate, the members of which were exempt from military service. At the organization of the university in 1808, the institute was legally reorganized, and from that time has increased in numbers and usefulness. . . . In 1842, there were 300 houses (of which 320 were in France), with 3,030 brothers, and 585 novices. There were 642 schools with 163,700 children, besides evening schools with 7,800 adults in attendance, and three reformatory schools with 2,000 convicts under instruction."—Henry Barnard, *National Education in Europe*, pp. 435-441.—"In 1878 their numbers had increased to 11,640; they had 1,249 establishments, and the number of their scholars was 390,607."—Mrs. R. F. Wilson, *The Christian Brothers, their Origin and Work*, ch. 21.

**A. D. 1762.—Rousseau.**—"Rousseau, who had educated himself, and very badly at that, was impressed with the dangers of the education of his day. A mother having asked his advice, he took up the pen to write it; and, little by little, his counsels grew into a book, a large work, a pedagogic romance [*Émile*]. This romance, when it appeared in 1762, created a great noise and a great scandal. The Archbishop of Paris, Christophe de Beaumont, saw in it a dangerous, mischievous work, and gave himself the trouble of writing a long encyclical letter in order to point out the book to the reprobation of the faithful. This document of twenty-seven chapters is a formal refutation of the theories advanced in '*Émile*.' . . . In those days, such a condemnation was a serious matter; its consequences to an author might be terrible. Rousseau had barely time to flee. His arrest was decreed by the parliament of Paris, and his book was burned by the executioner. . . . As a fugitive, Rousseau did not find a safe retreat even in his own coun-

try. He was obliged to leave Geneva, where his book was also condemned, and Berne, where he had sought refuge, but whence he was driven by intolerable. He owed it to the protection of Lord Keith, governor of Neuchâtel, a principality belonging to the King of Prussia, that he lived for some time in peace in the little town of Motiers in the Val de Travers. . . . The renown of the book, condemned by so high an authority, was immense. Scandal, by attracting public attention to it, did it good service. What was most serious and most suggestive in it was not, perhaps, seized upon; but the 'craze' of which it was the object had, notwithstanding, good results. Mothers were won over, and resolved to nurse their own infants; great lords began to learn handicrafts, like Rousseau's imaginary pupil; physical exercises came into fashion; the spirit of innovation was forcing itself a way. . . . Three men above all the rest are noted for having popularized the pedagogic method of Rousseau, and for having been inspired in their labors by 'Emile.' These were Basedow, Pestalozzi, and Froebel. Basedow, a German theologian, had devoted himself entirely to dogmatic controversy, until the reading of 'Emile' had the effect of enlarging his mental horizon, and of revealing to him his true vocation. . . . Pestalozzi of Zürich, one of the foremost educators of modern times, also found his whole life transformed by the reading of 'Emile,' which awoke in him the genius of a reformer. . . . The most distinguished among his disciples and continuators is Froebel, the founder of those primary schools . . . known by the name of 'kindergartens,' and the author of highly esteemed pedagogic works. These various attempts, these new and ingenious processes which, step by step, have made their way among us, and are beginning to make their workings felt, even in institutions most stoutly opposed to progress, are all traceable to Rousseau's 'Emile.' . . . It is true that 'Emile' contains pages that have outlived their day, many odd precepts, many false ideas, many disputable and destructive theories; but at the same time we find in it so many sagacious observations, such upright counsels, suitable even to modern times, so lofty an ideal, that, in spite of everything, we cannot read and study it without profit. . . . There is absolutely nothing practicable in his [Rousseau's] system. It consists in isolating a child from the rest of the world; in creating expressly for him a tutor, who is a phoenix among his kind; in depriving him of father, mother, brothers, and sisters, his companions in study; in surrounding him with a perpetual charlatanism, under the pretext of following nature; and in showing him only through the veil of a factitious atmosphere the society in which he is to live. And, nevertheless, at each step it is sound reason by which we are met; by an astonishing paradox, this whimsicality is full of good sense; this dream overflows with realities; this improbable and chimerical romance contains the substance and the marrow of a rational and truly modern treatise on pedagogy. Sometimes we must read between the lines, and what experience has taught us since that day, transpose into an atmosphere of open democracy those pages, written under the old order of things, but even then quivering with the new world which they were bringing to light, and for which they prepared the way. Reading 'Emile' in the

light of modern prejudices, we can see in it more than the author wittingly put into it; but not more than logic and the instinct of genius set down there. To unfold the powers of children in due proportion to their age; not to transcend their ability; to arouse in them the sense of the observer and of the pioneer; to make them discoverers rather than imitators; to teach them accountability to themselves and not slavish dependence upon the words of others; to address ourselves more to the will than to custom, to the reason rather than to the memory; to substitute for verbal recitations lessons about things; to lead to theory by way of art; to assign to physical movements and exercises a prominent place, from the earliest hours of life up to perfect maturity; such are the principles scattered broadcast in this book, and forming a happy counterpoise to the oddities of which Rousseau was perhaps most proud."—J. Steeg, *Introduction to Rousseau's 'Emile.'*

A. D. 1798-1827.—Pestalozzi.—In Switzerland, up to the end of the eighteenth century, the state of primary instruction was very bad. "The teachers were gathered up at hazard; their pay was wretched; in general they had no lodgings of their own, and they were obliged to hire themselves out for domestic service among the well-off inhabitants of the villages, in order to find food and lodging among them. A mean spirit of caste still dominated instruction, and the poor remained sunk in ignorance. It was in the very midst of this wretched and unpropitious state of affairs that there appeared, towards the end of the eighteenth century, the most celebrated of modern educators. . . . Born at Zurich in 1746, Pestalozzi died at Brugg in Argovia in 1827. This unfortunate great man always felt the effects of the sentimental and unpractic' education given him by his mother, who was left a widow with three children in 1751. He early formed the habit of feeling and of being touched with emotion, rather than of reasoning and of reflecting. The laughing-stock of his companions, who made sport of his awkwardness, the little scholar of Zurich accustomed himself to live alone and to become a dreamer. Later, towards 1760, the student of the academy distinguished himself by his political enthusiasm and his revolutionary daring. At that early period he had conceived a profound feeling for the miseries and the needs of the people, and he already proposed as the purpose of his life the healing of the diseases of society. At the same time there was developed in him an irresistible taste for a simple, frugal, and almost ascetic life. To restrain his desires had become the essential rule of his conduct, and, to put it in practice, he forced himself to sleep on a plank, and to subsist on bread and vegetables."—G. Compayré, *The Hist. of Pedagogy*, ch. 18.—"In spite . . . of Pestalozzi's patent disqualifications in many respects for the task he undertook; in spite of his ignorance of even common subjects (for he spoke, read, wrote, and cyphered badly, and knew next to nothing of classics or science); in spite of his want of worldly wisdom, of any comprehensive and exact knowledge of men and of things; in spite of his being merely an elementary teacher,—through the force of his all-conquering love, the nobility of his heart, the resistless energy of his enthusiasm, his firm grasp of a few first principles, his eloquent exposition of them in words, his resolute manifestation of them in

deeds,—he stands forth among educational reformers as the man whose influence on education is wider, deeper, more penetrating, than that of all the rest—the prophet and the sovereign of the domain in which he lived and laboured. . . . It was late in life—he was fifty-two years of age—before Pestalozzi became a practical schoolmaster. He had even begun to despair of ever finding the career in which he might attempt to realize the theories over which his loving heart and teeming brain had been brooding from his earliest youth. . . . At fifty-two years of age, then, we find Pestalozzi utterly unacquainted with the science and the art of education, and very scantily furnished even with elementary knowledge, undertaking at Stanz, in the canton of Unterwalden, the charge of eighty children, whom the events of war had rendered homeless and destitute. . . . The house in which the eighty children were assembled to be boarded, lodged, and taught, was an old tumble-down Ursuline convent, scarcely habitable, and destitute of all the conveniences of life. The only apartment suitable for a schoolroom was about twenty-four feet square, furnished with a few desks and forms; and into this were crowded the wretched children, noisy, dirty, diseased, and ignorant, with the manners and habits of barbarians. Pestalozzi's only helper in the management of the institution was an old woman, who cooked the food and swept the rooms; so that he was, as he tells us himself, not only the teacher, but the paymaster, man-servant, and almost the housemaid of the children. . . . 'My wishes [he writes] were now accomplished. I felt convinced that my heart would change the condition of my children as speedily as the springtide sun reannates the earth frozen by the winter. Nor,' he adds, 'was I mistaken. Before the springtide sun melted away the snow from our mountains, you could no longer recognise the same children.' . . . 'I was obliged,' he says, 'unceasingly to be everything to my children. I was alone with them from morning to night. It was from my hand they received whatever could be of service both to their bodies and minds. All succour, all consolation, all instruction came to them immediately from myself. Their hands were in my hand; my eyes were fixed on theirs, my tears mingled with theirs, my smiles encountered theirs, my soup was their soup, my drink was their drink. I had around me neither family, friends, nor servants; I had only them. I was with them when they were in health, by their side when they were ill. I slept in their midst. I was the last to go to bed, the first to rise in the morning. When we were in bed I used to pray with them and talk to them till they went to sleep. They wished me to do so.' . . . 'I knew,' he says, 'no system, no method, no art but that which rested on the simple consequences of the firm belief of the children in my love towards them. I wished to know no other.' . . . Gradually . . . Pestalozzi advanced to the main principles of his system of moral education. . . . He says:—'Nature develops all the human faculties by practice, and their growth depends on their exercise.' 'The circle of knowledge commences close around a man, and thence extends concentrically.' 'Force not the faculties of children into the remote paths of knowledge, until they have gained strength by exercise on things that are near them.' 'There is in Nature an order and march of de-

velopment. If you disturb or interfere with it, you mar the peace and harmony of the mind. And this you do, if, before you have formed the mind by the progressive knowledge of the realities of life, you fling it into the labyrinth of words, and make them the basis of development.' 'The artificial march of the ordinary school, anticipating the order of Nature, which proceeds without anxiety and without haste, inverts this order by placing words first, and thus secures a deceitful appearance of success at the expense of natural and safe development.' In these few sentences we recognise all that is most characteristic in the educational principles of Pestalozzi. . . . To set the intellectual machinery in motion—to make it work, and keep it working; that was the sole object at which he aimed; of all the rest he took little account. . . . He relied upon a principle which must be insisted on as cardinal and essential in education. He secured the thorough interest of his pupils in the lesson, and mainly through their own direct share in it. . . . Observation, . . . according to Pestalozzi (and Bacon had said the same thing before him), is the absolute basis of all knowledge, and is therefore the prime agent in elementary education. It is around this theory, as a centre of gravity, that Pestalozzi's system revolves."—J. Payne, *Lect's on the Hist. of Education*, lect. 9. —"During the short period, not more than a year, which Pestalozzi spent among the children at Stanz, he settled the main features of the Pestalozzian system. Sickness broke out among the children, and the wear and tear was too great even for Pestalozzi. He would probably have sunk under his efforts if the French, pressed by the Austrians, had not entered Stanz, in January, 1799, and taken part of the Ursuline Convent for a military hospital. Pestalozzi was, therefore, obliged to break up the school, and he himself went to a medicinal spring on the Gurnigel in the Canton Bern. . . . He came down from the Gurnigel, and began to teach in the primary schools (i. e., schools for children from four to eight years old) of Burgdorf, the second town in the Canton. Here the director was jealous of him, and he met with much opposition. . . . In less than a year Pestalozzi left this school in bad health, and joined Krüsi in opening a new school in Burgdorf Castle, for which he afterwards (1802) obtained Government aid. Here he was assisted in carrying out his system by Krüsi, Tobler, and Blass. He now embodied the results of his experience in a work which has obtained great celebrity—'How Gertrude Teaches her Children' [also published in England under the title of 'Leonard and Gertrude']. In 1803 Pestalozzi, for once in his life a successful and popular man, was elected a member of a deputation sent by the Swiss people to Paris. On the restoration of the Cantons in 1804, the Castle of Burgdorf was again occupied by one of the chief magistrates, and Pestalozzi and his establishment were moved to the Monastery of Buchsee. Here the teachers gave the principal direction to another, the since celebrated Feilenburg, 'not without my consent,' says Pestalozzi, 'but to my profound mortification.' He therefore soon accepted an invitation from the inhabitants of Yverdon to open an institution there, and within a twelvemonth he was followed by his old assistants, who had found government by Feilenburg less to their taste than no-government by Pesta-



iozzi. The Yverdun Institute had soon a world-wide reputation. Pestalozzian teachers went from it to Madrid, to Naples, to St. Petersburg. Kings and philosophers joined in doing it honor. But, as Pestalozzi himself has testified, these praises were but as a laurel-wreath encircling a skull. The life of the Pestalozzian institutions had been the love which the old man had infused into all the members, teachers as well as children; but this life was wanting at Yverdun. The establishment was much too large to be carried on successfully without more method and discipline than Pestalozzi, remarkable, as he himself says, for his 'unrivalled incapacity to govern,' was master of. The assistants began each to take his own line, and even the outward show of unity was soon at an end. . . . Thus the sun went down in clouds, and the old man, when he died at the age of eighty, in 1827, had seen the apparent failure of all his toils. He had not, however, failed in reality. It has been said of him that his true fortune was to educate ideas, not children, and when twenty years later the centenary of his birth was celebrated by school-masters, not only in his native country, but throughout Germany, it was found that Pestalozzian ideas had been sown, and were bearing fruit, over the greater part of central Europe."—R. H. Quick, *Essays on Educational Reformers*, ch. 8.

A. D. 1804-1891.—Co-education and the Higher Education of Women in the United States.—"When to a few darling minds the conviction came that education was a right of personality rather than of sex, and when there was added to this growing sentiment the pressing demand for educated women as teachers and as leaders in philanthropy, the simplest means of equipping women with the needful preparation was found in the existing schools and colleges. . . . In nearly every State west of the Alleghenies, 'Universities' had been founded by the voluntary tax of the whole population. Connected with all the more powerful religious denominations were schools and colleges which called upon their adherents for gifts and students. These democratic institutions had the vigor of youth, and were ambitious and struggling. 'Why,' asked the practical men of affairs who controlled them, 'should not our daughters go on with our sons from the public schools to the university which we are sacrificing to equip and maintain?' It is not strange that with this and much more practical reasoning of a similar kind, co-education was established in some colleges at their beginning, in others after debate, and by a radical change in policy. When once the chivalrous desire was aroused to give girls as good an education as their brothers, Western men carried out the principle unflinchingly. From the kindergarten to the preparation for the doctorate of philosophy, educational opportunities are now practically alike for men and women. The total number of colleges of arts and sciences empowered by law to give degrees, reporting to Washington in 1888, was three hundred and eighty-nine. Of these, two hundred and thirty-seven, or nearly two-thirds, were co-educational. Among them are nearly all the State universities, and nearly all the colleges under the patronage of the Protestant sects. Hitherto I have spoken as if co-education were a Western movement; and in the West it certainly has had greater currency

than elsewhere. But it originated, at least so far as concerns superior secondary training, in Massachusetts. Bradford Academy, chartered in 1804, is the oldest incorporated institution in the country to which boys and girls were from the first admitted; but it closed its department for boys in 1836, three years after the foundation of co-educational Oberlin, and in the very year when Mount Holyoke was opened by Mary Lyon, in the large hope of doing for young women what Harvard had been founded to do for young men just two hundred years before. Ipswich and Abbot Academies in Massachusetts had already been chartered to educate girls alone. It has been the dominant sentiment in the East that boys and girls should be educated separately. The older, more generously endowed, more conservative seats of learning, inheriting the complications of the dormitory system, have remained closed to women. . . . In the short period of the twenty years after the war the four women's colleges which are the richest in endowments and students of any in the world were founded and set in motion. These colleges—Vassar, opened in 1865, Wellesley and Smith in 1875, and Bryn Mawr in 1885—have received in gifts of every kind about \$6,000,000, and are educating nearly two thousand students. For the whole country the Commissioner of Education reports two hundred and seven institutions for the superior instruction of women, with more than twenty-five thousand students. But these resources proved inadequate. There came an increasing demand, especially from teachers, for education of all sorts. . . . In an attempt to meet a demand of this sort the Harvard Annex began twelve years ago [in 1879] to provide a few women with instruction from members of the Harvard faculty. . . . Barnard College in New York is an annex of Columbia only in a sense, for not all her instruction is given by Columbia's teaching force, though Columbia will confer degrees upon her graduates. The new woman's college at Cleveland sustains temporarily the same relations to Adelbert College, though to a still greater extent she provides independent instruction."—A. F. Palmer, *Review of the Higher Education of Women (Woman and the Higher Education, pp. 105-127)*.—"The Cleveland College for Women, Cleveland, Ohio, was first opened for instruction in 1888 as a department of Western Reserve University. At the same time the trustees of the university decided to receive no more women into Adelbert College. That the success of the new school might be assured, the faculty of Adelbert College generously offered their services for a term of years as instructors. During the first year twenty-three young women were admitted, but two of whom were in the regular courses. During 1889-90 the number of students increased to thirty-eight. . . . In 1887 Evelyn College, an institution for women, was opened at Princeton, N. J. Its location at this place gives the institution very great advantages, inasmuch as the use of the libraries and museums of the College of New Jersey, popularly known as Princeton College, are granted to the students."—U. S. Comm'r of Education, *Report, 1889-90*, v. 2, p. 744.—"The latest report of the United States Commissioner of Education contains over two hundred institutions for the superior education of women. The list includes colleges and seminaries entitled to confer degrees, and a few



seminaries, whose work is of equal merit, which do not give degrees. Of these more than two hundred institutions for the education of women exclusively, only 47 are situated within [western states]. . . . Of these 47, but 30 are chartered with authority to confer degrees. . . . The extent to which the higher education of women is in the West identified with co-education, can be seen by comparing the two statements above given. Of the total 212 higher institutions receiving women, and of the total 195 such institutions which confer the regular degrees in arts, science, and letters, upon their graduates, 165 are co-educational. . . . Among colleges characterized from birth by a liberal and progressive spirit may be mentioned 'The Cincinnati Wesleyan Woman's College.' This institution was chartered in 1842, and claims to be 'the first liberal collegiate institution in the world for the exclusive education of women.' . . . The West is committed to co-education, excepting only the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, and the Protestant Episcopal sects,—which are not yet, as sects, committed to the collegiate education of women at all,—and the Presbyterian sect, whose support, in the West, of 14 co-educational colleges against 4 for the separate education of young men, almost commits it to the co-educational idea. . . . In 1853, Antioch College was opened at Yellow Springs, O. It was the first endeavor in the West to found a college under Christian but non-sectarian auspices. Its president, Horace Mann, wrote of it: 'Antioch is now the only first-class college in all the West that is really an unsectarian institution.' . . . Antioch was from the first avowedly co-educational."—M. W. Sewall, *Education of Women in the Western States (Woman's Work in Am., pp. 61-70)*.—"Most people would probably be ready to say that except for the newly founded Woman's College in Baltimore and Tulane University [State university of Louisiana], the collegiate education of women does not exist in the South. But as matter of fact, there are no less than one hundred and fifty institutions in the South which are authorized by the Legislatures of their respective States to confer the regular college degrees upon women. Of these, forty-one are co-educational, eighty-eight are for women alone, and twenty-one are for colored persons of both sexes. The bureau of education makes no attempt to go behind the verdict of the State Legislatures, but on looking over the catalogues of all these institutions it is, as might have been expected, easy to see that the great majority of them are not in any degree colleges, in the ordinary sense of the word. Not a single one of the so-called female colleges presents a real college course, and many of the co-educational colleges are colleges only in name."—C. L. Franklin, *Education of Women in the Southern States (Woman's Work in Am., pp. 93-94)*.

**A. D. 1816-1892.**—Fröbel and the Kindergarten.—"Fröbel (Friedrich Wilhelm August) was born April 21, 1782, at Oberweissbach, in the principality of Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt. His mother died when he was so young that he never even remembered her; and he was left to the care of an ignorant maid-of-all-work, who simply provided for his bodily wants. . . . Not until he was ten years of age did he receive the slightest regular instruction. He was then sent to school, to an uncle who lived in the neighbor-

hood. . . . He pronounced the boy to be idle (which, from his point of view, was quite true) and lazy (which certainly was not true)—a boy, in short, that you could do nothing with. . . . It was necessary for him to earn his bread, and we next find him a sort of apprentice to a woodman in the great Thuringian forest. Here, as he afterward tells us, he lived some years in cordial intercourse with nature and mathematics, learning even then, though unconsciously, from the teaching he received, how to teach others. . . . In 1801 he went to the University of Jena, where he attended lectures on natural history, physics, and mathematics; but, as he tells us, gained little from them. . . . This . . . was put an end to by the failure of means to stay at the University. For the next few years he tried various occupations. . . . While engaged in an architect's office at Frankfurt, he formed an acquaintance with the Rector of the Model School, a man named Gruner. Gruner saw the capabilities of Fröbel, and detected also his entire want of interest in the work that he was doing; and one day suddenly said to him: 'Give up your architect's business; you will do nothing at it. Be a teacher. We want one now in the school; you shall have the place.' This was the turning point in Fröbel's life. He accepted the engagement, began work at once, and tells us that the first time he found himself in the midst of a class of 30 or 40 boys, he felt that he was in the element that he had missed so long—"the fish was in the water." He was inexpressibly happy. . . . In a calmer mood he severely questioned himself as to the means by which he was to satisfy the demands of his new position. About this time he met with some of Pestalozzi's writings, which so deeply impressed him that he determined to go to Yverduin and study Pestalozzi on the spot. He accomplished his purpose, and lived and worked for two years with Pestalozzi. His experience at Yverduin impressed him with the conviction that the science of education had still to draw out from Pestalozzi's system those fundamental principles which Pestalozzi himself did not comprehend. 'And therefore,' says Schmidt, 'this genial disciple of Pestalozzi supplemented his system by advancing from the point which Pestalozzi had reached through pressure from without, to the innermost conception of man, and arriving at the thought of the true development and culture of mankind.' . . . His educational career commenced November 13th, 1816, in Greisheim, a little village near Stadt-Ilm, in Thuringia; but in 1817, when his Pestalozzian friend, Middendorf, joined him . . . the school was transferred to the beautiful village of Keilhau, near Rudolstadt, which may be considered as his chief starting-place. . . . Langenthal, another Pestalozzian, associated himself with them, and they commenced building a house. The number of pupils rose to twelve in 1818. Then the daughter of war-counselor Hoffman of Berlin, from enthusiasm for Fröbel's educational ideas, became his wife. She had a considerable dowry, which, together with the accession of Fröbel's elder brother, increased the funds and welfare of the school. In 1831 he was invited by the composer, Schnyder von Wartensee, to erect a similar garden on his estate, near the lake of Sempach, in the canton Luzern. It was done. Fröbel changed his residence the next year, from Keilhau to Switzerland. In 1834 the government

of Bern invited him to arrange a training course for teachers in Burgdorf. In 1835 he became principal of the orphan asylum in Burgdorf, but in 1836 he and his wife wished to return to Germany. There he was active in Berlin, Keilhau, Blankenburg, Dresden, Liebenstein in Thuringia, Hamburg, (1840,) and Marienthal, near Liebenstein, where he lived until his decease in 1852, among the young ladies, whom he trained as nurses for the kindergartens, and the little children who attended his school."—H. Barnard, *ed. Papers on Froebel's Kindergarten: Memoir.*—"The child thinks only through symbols. In other words, it explains all it sees not by the recorded experience of others, as does an adult, but by marshaling and comparing its own concept or symbol of what it has itself seen. Its sole activity is play. 'The school begins with teaching the conventionalities of intelligence. Froebel would have the younger children receive a symbolic education in plays, games, and occupations which symbolize the primitive arts of man.' For this purpose, the child is led through a series of primitive occupations in plaiting, weaving, and modeling, through games and dances, which bring into play all the social relations, and through songs and the simple use of number, form and language. The 'gifts' all play their manifold purpose, inspiring the child, awakening its interest, leading the individual along the path the race has trod, and teaching social self-control. The system has its palpable dangers. The better and more intricate the tool, the more skill needed in its safe use. . . . The kindergartens requires trained hands. With trivial teachers its methods may easily degenerate into mere amusement, and thwart all tendency to attention, application, or industry. Valuable as it is in its hints for the care and development of children, its gay round needs to be ballasted with the purpose and theory uppermost in Froebel's mind when he opened his first school in a German peasant village, down whose main street a brook tumbled, and through whose lanes the halberdier still walked by night and sang the hours. It is idle to suppose that Froebel founded a perfect system, or to insist on all the details of the professional kindergartner's creed. Here as elsewhere, and aforesaid, it has taken only forty years from the founder's death for faith to degenerate into religion and sect. But the central purpose he had in view must be steadily maintained. He sought his ends through play, and not through work. It is as dangerous for this method to harden into an approach to the primary school as it is for it to soften into a riot of misrule, and lax observance of order. . . . Switzerland, then the only republic in Europe, was the first country to adopt Froebel's method, though in some Swiss towns the kindergarten is still supported by private associations. France, another republic, has more children beginning school under an adaptation of Froebel than all the rest of the world put together. It was Froebel's own opinion that 'the spirit of American nationality was the only one in the world with which his method was in complete harmony, and to which its legitimate institutions would present no barriers.' The figures given below of the growth of the kindergarten in this country are the best possible proof of the truth of Froebel's prescient assertion. . . . In 1870 there were in this country only five kindergarten schools, and

In 1872 the National Education Association at its Boston meeting appointed a committee which reported a year later recommending the system. Between 1870 and 1873, experimental kindergartens were established in Boston, Cleveland, and St. Louis, public attention was enlisted by the efforts of Miss Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, the most important worker in the early history of the kindergarten in this country, and the system began a rapid growth. Taking private and public kindergartens together, the advance of the system has displayed this most rapid progress:

	1873	1880	1885	1891-2
Schools. . . . .	95	232	413	1,001
Teachers. . . . .	216	524	902	2,242
Pupils. . . . .	2,809	8,871	18,780	50,423

Down to 1880, these figures, outside of St. Louis, relate almost altogether to private schools. By 1885 the public kindergartens were not over a fifth in number of the schools, and held not over a fourth of the pupils. In the figures last given in this table there are 724 private kindergartens with 1,517 teachers and 29,857 pupils, and 277 public kindergartens with 725 teachers and 21,006 pupils, so that the latter have now 27 per cent. of the schools, 33 per cent. of the teachers, and 42 per cent. of the pupils. . . . Yet great as is this advance, the kindergartens as yet plays but an infinitesimal part in our educational system as a whole. . . . Of the sixteen American cities with a population of over 200,000 in 1890, only four—Philadelphia, Boston, Milwaukee, and St. Louis—have incorporated the kindergarten on any large scale in their public-school systems. Four more—New York, Chicago, Brooklyn, and Buffalo—have kindergarten associations organized to introduce the new method as a part of free public education."—T. Williams, *The Kindergarten Movement (The Century, Jan., 1893).*

**A. D. 1865-1883.—The Higher Education of Women in England.**—The movement in England to secure a higher education for women dates from 1865. "In that year a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into and report on the endowed grammar schools of England and Wales, and on what is called 'secondary' education generally. Several ladies who were already alive to the deficiencies in the education of their own sex, memorialized this Commission to extend the scope of its inquiry to girls' schools, and the Commission taking what was then thought quite a bold step, consented to do so. . . . One of the points brought out was the absence of any institutions doing for women what the universities did for men, and the consequent difficulty in which women stood of obtaining the highest kind of education—a difficulty which told on girls' schools by making it hard for them to procure thoroughly competent mistresses. This led in the course of the next year or two—to the report of the Commission having been published in 1868—to the establishment of a college for women, which was first placed at Hitchin, a town on the Great Northern Railway, between London and Cambridge, and in a little while, when money had been collected sufficient for the erection of buildings, this college was finally settled at Girton, a spot about two miles from Cambridge, whence it takes the name of Girton College. Its purpose was to provide for women the same teaching in the same subjects as men receive in Cambridge University, and the teachers were nearly

all of them professors or tutors there, men in some cases of high eminence. Meanwhile, in Cambridge itself, a system of day classes for women, taught by University teachers, had been created, at first as an experiment for one year only. When several years had passed, when the number attending had increased, and it was found that women came to lodge in Cambridge in order to profit by these lectures, a house was hired in which to receive them, and ultimately a company was formed and a building erected a little way out of Cambridge, under the name of Newnham Hall, to which the lectures, now mainly designed for these students coming from a distance, were attached. Thus, at about the same time, though from somewhat different origins, Girton and Newnham came into being and began their course of friendly rivalry. Both have greatly developed since then. Their buildings have been repeatedly enlarged. Their numbers have risen steadily. . . . In Girton the charge for lodging, board and instruction is £100 per annum, in Newnham a little less. The life in both is very similar, a lady being placed at the head as resident principal, while the affairs are managed by a committee including both men and women. The lectures are delivered partly by Cambridge men, professors in the University, or tutors or lecturers in some of the colleges, partly by ladies, who, having once been students themselves, have come back as teachers. These lectures cover all the subjects required in the degree examinations of the University; and although students are not obliged to enter themselves for those examinations, they are encouraged to do so, and do mostly set the examinations before them as their goal. Originally the University took no official notice of the women students, and their being examined by the regular degree examiners of the University was a matter of pure favor on the part of those gentlemen. . . . At last, however, some examiners came into office (for the examiners are changed every two years) who disapproved of this informal examination of the women candidates, and accordingly a proposal was made to the University that it should formally authorize and impose on the examiners the function heretofore discharged by them in their individual capacity. This proposal, after some discussion and opposition, was carried, so that now women may enter both for the honor examinations and the pass examinations for the University degree as a matter of right. Their names do not appear in the official lists among those of the men, but separately; they are, however, tested by the same question papers and judged by the same standard. . . . Some Oxford graduates and their friends, stimulated by the success of Girton and Newnham, have founded two similar institutions in Oxford, one of which, Episcopalian and indeed High Church in its proclivities, is called Lady Margaret Hall, while the other, in compliment to the late Mrs. Somerville, has been given the title of Somerville Hall. These establishments are conducted on much the same lines as the two Cambridge colleges. . . . In the large towns where new colleges have been lately founded or courses of lectures established, such as Manchester, Liverpool, and Leeds, steps are usually taken to provide lectures for women. . . . What is called among you the question of co-education has come up very little in England. All the

lectures given inside the walls of the four English colleges I have mentioned are, of course, given to women only, the colleges being just as exclusively places for women as Trinity and St. John's are places for men. . . . At this moment the principal of one of the two halls of which Newnham consists is a daughter of the Prime Minister [Miss Helen Gladstone], while her predecessor was a niece of the Marquis of Salisbury. The principal of Girton is a niece of the late Lord Lawrence, the famous Governor-General of India. Of the students a fair proportion belong to the wealthy classes, while a somewhat larger proportion mean to take teaching as their profession."—*Progress of Female Education in Eng. (Nation, July 5, 1883)*.—See, also, above, SCOTLAND.

**A. D. 1865-1886.—Industrial Education in the United States.**—"In 1865 John Boynton of Templeton, Mass., gave \$100,000 for the endowment and perpetual support of a Free Institute for the youth of Worcester County, Mass. He thus explained his objects: 'The aim of this school shall ever be the instruction of youth in those branches of education not usually taught in the public schools, which are essential and best adapted to train the young for practical life'; especially such as were intending to be mechanics, or manufacturers, or farmers. In furtherance of this object, ten months later, in 1866, Ichabod Washburn of Worcester gave \$25,000, and later \$50,000 more to erect, equip, and endow a machine-shop which should accommodate twenty apprentices and a suitable number of skilled workmen to instruct them and to carry on the shop as a commercial establishment. The apprentices were to be taught the use of tools in working wood and metals, and to be otherwise instructed, much as was customary fifty years ago for boys learning a trade. The Worcester Free Institute was opened for students in November, 1868, as a technical school of about college grade; and the use of the shops and shop instruction was limited to those students in the course of mechanical engineering. Thus did the Worcester School under the leadership of Prest. C. O. Thompson incorporate tool-instruction and shop-practice into the training of mechanical engineers. . . . In the same year, 1868, Victor Della-Vos introduced into the Imperial Technical (engineering) School at Moscow the Russian method of class-instruction in the use of tools. . . . The great value of the work of Della-Vos lay in the discovery of the true method of tool-instruction, for without his discovery the later steps would have been impossible. In 1870, under the direction of Prof. Robinson and Prest. J. M. Gregory of the University of Illinois, a wood-working shop was added to the appliances for the course in architecture, and an iron-working shop to the course in mechanical engineering in that institution. In 1871, the Stevens Institute of Hoboken, N. J., munificently endowed by Edwin A. Stevens, as a school of mechanical engineering, fitted up a series of shops for the use of its students. The next step forward was taken by Washington University in St. Louis in providing for all its engineering students systematic instruction in both wood and metals. In 1872, a large shop in the Polytechnic School was equipped with work-benches, two lathes, a forge, a gear-cutter and full sets of carpenters', machinists', and forging tools. . . . Thus far had we progressed when the Philadelphia Exposition

of 1876 was opened. None of us knew anything of the Moscow school, or of the one in Bohemia in which the Russian method had been adopted in 1874. . . . In his report of 1876, Prest, J. D. Runkle, of the Mass. Institute of Technology, gave a full exposition of the theory and practice of tool-instruction of Della-Vos as exhibited at the Philadelphia Exposition, and he recommended that without delay the course in mechanical engineering at the Institute be completed by the addition of a series of Instruction Shops. The suggestion was acted on, and in the spring of 1877 a class of mechanical engineering students was given instruction in chipping and filing. . . . The St. Louis Manual Training School was established June 6, 1879. It embodied hopes long cherished and plans long formed. For the first time in America the age of admission to school-shops was reduced to fourteen years as a minimum, and a very general three-years' course of study was organized. The ordinance by which the school was established specified its objects in very general terms:—"Its objects shall be instruction in mathematics, drawing, and the English branches of a high-school course, and instruction and practice in the use of tools. The tool-instruction, as at present contemplated, shall include carpentry, wood-turning, pattern-making, iron clipping and filing, forge-work, brazing and soldering, the use of machine-shop tools, and such other instruction of a similar character, as it may be deemed advisable to add to the foregoing from time to time. The students will divide their working hours, as nearly as possible, equally between mental and manual exercises." . . . The Baltimore Manual Training School, a public school, on the same footing as the high school, was opened in 1883. The Chicago Manual Training School, established as an incorporated school by the Commercial Club of that city, was opened in January, 1884. . . . Manual training was introduced into the high school of Eau Claire, Wisconsin, in 1884. The 'Scott Manual Training School' was organized as a part of the high school of Toledo in 1884. . . . Manual training was introduced into the College (high school) of the City of New York in 1884. The Philadelphia Manual Training School, a public high school, was opened in September, 1885. The Omaha high school introduced manual training in 1885. . . . Dr. Adler's Workingman's School for poor children has for several years taught manual training to the very lowest grades. . . . The Cleveland Manual Training School was incorporated in 1885, and opened in connection with the city high school, in 1886. New Haven, which had for some time encouraged the use of tools by the pupils of several of its grammar schools, in September, 1886, opened a regular shop and furnished systematic instruction in tool-work. The school board of Chicago added manual training to the course of the 'West Side High School' in September, 1886."—C. M. Woodward, *The Manual Training School*, ch. 1.—"Concerning the manual-training school there are two widely different views. The one insists that it shall teach no trade, but the rudiments of all of them; the other that the particular industries may properly be held to maintain schools to recruit their own ranks. The first would teach the use of the axe, the saw, the plane, the hammer, the square, the chisel, and the file; claiming that 'the graduate from such a course at the end of

three years is within from one to three months of knowing quite as thoroughly as an apprentice who had served seven years any one of the twenty trades to which he may choose to turn.' Of this class are, besides most of those already named, the Halsey Manual Training School of Denver; that of Tulane University, New Orleans; the Felix Adler's Workingman's School, of New York City; and the School of Manual Technology, Vanderbilt University, Nashville. Among schools of the second class are some interesting institutions. They include the numerous general and special trade-schools for boys, instruction in the manifold phases of domestic economy for girls, and the yet small but rapidly growing class of industries open alike to both. Sewing is taught in public or private schools in Baltimore, Boston, Cincinnati, Chicago, New York, Philadelphia, Providence, St. Louis, and about a dozen other cities, besides in a number of special institutions. Cooking-schools are no longer a novelty in half as many of the larger cities, since their introduction into New York city in 1876. Printing may be learned in the Kansas Agricultural College; Cooper Union, New York; Girard College, Philadelphia, and elsewhere. Telegraphy, stenography, wood-engraving, various kinds of smithing, and carpentry, have, especially the last two, numerous representatives. The New York Kitchen Garden, for the instruction of children in the work of the household, is an interesting modification of the Kindergarten along the industrial line. For young ladies, the Elizabeth Aull Seminary, Lexington, Missouri, is a school of home-work, in which 'are practically taught the mysteries of the kitchen and laundry,' and upon whose graduates is conferred the degree of 'Mistress of Home-Work.' The Lasell Seminary at Auburndale, Massachusetts, also has recently (1885) undertaken a similar but more comprehensive experiment, including lessons and lectures in anatomy and physiology, with hygiene and sanitation, the principles of common law by an eminent attorney, instruction and practice in the arts of domestic life, the principles of dress, artistic house-furnishing, healthy homes, and cooking. Of training-schools for nurses there are thirty-one. . . . Of schools of a different character still, there have been or are the Carriage Builder's Apprenticeship School, New York; those of Hoe & Co., printing-press manufacturers; and Tiffany & Co., jewelers; and the Tailors' 'Trades School' recently established and flourishing in Baltimore, besides the Pennsylvania Railroad novitiate system, at Altoona; in which particular trades or guilds or corporations have sought to provide themselves with a distinct and specially trained class of artisans. The latest and in some respects the most interesting experiment of the kind is that of the 'Baltimore and Ohio Railroad service' at Mt. Clare, Baltimore. It was inaugurated in 1885, apprentices being selected from applicants by competitive examination."—R. G. Boone, *Education in the United States*, ch. 13.

**A. D. 1873-1889.—University Extension in England.**—"The University Extension Movement, which has now been before the country eighteen years, has revealed the existence of a real need for larger opportunities of higher education amongst the middle and working classes. From the time of its inauguration in 1873 by the University of Cambridge, owing mainly to the

enthusiastic advocacy and skill in practical affairs of Mr. James Stuart (at that time Fellow and Lecturer of Trinity College), down to the present day, when the principle has been accepted by all the Universities in Great Britain and by some in countries beyond the seas, the movement has shown marvellous vitality and power of adjustment to changing conditions. From a small beginning in three towns in the Midlands, it has grown until the centres in connection with the various branches are to be numbered by hundreds and the students by tens of thousands. The success attained by Cambridge in the first three years led, in 1876, to the formation of the London Society for the Extension of University Teaching, for the express purpose of carrying on similar work within the metropolitan area. In 1878 the University of Oxford undertook to make similar arrangements for Lectures, but after a year or two, they were for the time abandoned. Subsequently in 1885 the Oxford work was revived and has since been carried on with vigour and success. The University of Durham is associated with Cambridge in this work in the north-east of England, while courses of Lectures on the Extension plan have been given for several years in connection with Victoria University in centres around Manchester. Two or three years ago the four Scottish Universities united in forming a like scheme for Scotland, while at the close of 1889 a Society for the Extension of University Teaching was formed in the north of Ireland. Finally the movement has spread to Greater Britain and the United States, and there are signs that work on similar lines is about to be established in various countries on the continent of Europe."—R. D. Roberts, *Eighteen years of University Extension*, ch. 1.—"One of the chief characteristics of the system is the method of teaching adopted in connection with it. A working man at one of the centres in the north of England who had attended the lectures for several terms, described the method as follows in a paper read by him at a meeting:—"Any town or village which is prepared to provide an audience, and pay the necessary fees, can secure a course of twelve lectures on any subject taught in the University, by a lecturer who has been educated at the University, and who is specially fitted for lecturing work. A syllabus of the course is printed and put into the hands of students. This syllabus is a great help to persons not accustomed to note-taking. Questions are given on each lecture, and written answers can be sent in by any one, irrespective of age or sex. All the lectures, except the first, are preceded by a class, which lasts about an hour. In this class the students and the lecturer talk over the previous lecture. The written answers are returned with such corrections as the lecturer deems necessary. At the end of the course an examination is held and certificates are awarded to the successful candidates. These lectures are called University Extension Lectures.' Another definition which has been given is this:—"Advanced systematic teaching for the people, without distinction of rank, sex, or age, given by means of lectures, classes, and written papers during a connected course, conducted by men "who believe in their work, and intend to do it," teachers who connect the country with the University by manner, method, and information."—R. D. Roberts, *The University Extension Scheme*, pp. 6-7.

**A. D. 1887-1892.—University Extension in the United States.**—"The first conscious attempts to introduce English University Extension methods into this country were made in 1887, by individuals connected with the Johns Hopkins University. The subject was first publicly presented to the American Library Association at their meeting upon one of the Thousand Islands in September, 1887. The idea was heartily approved," and the first result of the suggestion was a course of lectures on economic questions given in one of the lecture-rooms of the Buffalo Library the following winter by Dr. Edward W. Bemis. The next winter "Dr. Bemis repeated his course on 'Economic Questions of the Day' in Canton, Ohio. . . . The Canton experiment was followed in February, 1889, by another course, conducted by Dr. Bemis, in connection with the Public Library at St. Louis. . . . About the time when these various experiments were being tried in St. Louis, Canton, and Buffalo, individual members of Johns Hopkins University were attempting to introduce University Extension methods in connection with local lectures in the city of Baltimore. . . . The idea of University Extension in connection with Chautauqua was conceived by Dr. J. H. Vincent during a visit to England, in 1886, when he saw the English lecture system in practical operation and his own methods of encouraging home reading in growing favor with university men. The first definite American plan, showing at once the aims, methods, cost, and history, of University Extension lectures, was drawn up at Chautauqua by the writer of this article in the early summer of 1888. . . . Contemporaneous with the development of Chautauqua College and University Extension was the plan of Mr. Seth T. Stewart, of Brooklyn, New York, for 'University and School Extension.' . . . Several public meetings were held in New York in 1889-90 for the promotion of University and School Extension. . . . One of the most gratifying recent experiments in University Extension in America has been in the city of Philadelphia under the auspices of the American Society for the Extension of University Teaching. At various local centres Mr. Richard G. Moulton, one of the most experienced lecturers from Cambridge, England, lectured for ten weeks in the winter and spring of 1891 to large and enthusiastic audiences. All the essential features of English University Extension were methodically and persistently carried out. . . . The American field for University Extension is too vast for the missionary labors of any one society or organization. . . . The most significant sign of the times with regard to University Extension in America is the recent appropriation of the sum of \$10,000 for this very object by the New York legislature. The money is to be expended under the direction of the Regents of the University of the State of New York. . . . The intention of the New York act is simply to provide the necessary means for organizing a State system of University Extension . . . and to render such general assistance and co-operation as localities may require."—H. B. Adams, *University Extension in America* (*Forum*, July, 1891).—On the opening, in 1893, of the Chicago University, munificently endowed by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, of Cleveland, University Extension was made one of the three grand divisions of its organization.

**EDWARD**, King of Portugal, A. D. 1433-1488. . . . Edward, called the Confessor, King of England, A. D. 1042-1065. . . . Edward, called the Elder, King of Wessex, A. D. 901-925. . . . Edward, called the Martyr, King of Wessex, A. D. 975. . . . Edward I., King of England, A. D. 1274-1307. . . . Edward II., King of England, A. D. 1307-1327. . . . Edward III., King of England, A. D. 1327-1377. . . . Edward IV., King of England (first king of the House of York), A. D. 1461-1483. . . . Edward V., titular King of England, A. D. 1483 (from April 9, when his father, Edward IV., died, until June 23, when he is believed to have been murdered in the Tower by command of his uncle, the usurper, Richard III.). . . . Edward VI., King of England, A. D. 1547-1553.

**EDWARD**, Fort: A. D. 1755.—Built by the New England troops. See CANADA: A. D. 1755 (SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1777.—Abandoned to the British. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777 (JULY—OCTOBER).

**EDWIG**, King of Wessex, A. D. 955-957.  
**EDWIN**, King of Northumbria, A. D. 617-633.  
**EGESTA**. See SYRACUSE: B. C. 415-413; and SICILY: B. C. 409-405.  
**EGFRITH**, King of Northumbria, A. D. 670-685.  
**EGINA**.—**EGINETANS**. See **ÆGINA**.  
**EGMONT**, Count, and the struggle in the Netherlands. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1562-1566, and 1566-1568.  
**EGNATIAN WAY**, The.—A Roman road constructed from Apollonia on the Adriatic to the shores of the Hellespont; finally carried to Byzantium.  
**EGRA**: A. D. 1647.—Siege and capture by the Swedes. See GERMANY: A. D. 1646-1648.

## EGYPT.

**Its Names**.—"Egypt is designated in the old inscriptions, as well as in the books of the later Christian Egyptians, by a word which signifies 'the black land,' and which is read in the Egyptian language Kem, or Kami.\* The ancients had early remarked that the cultivable land of Egypt was distinguished by its dark and almost black colour. . . . The neighbouring region of the Arabian desert bore the name of Teshur, or the red land. . . . The Egyptians designated themselves simply as 'the people of the black land,' and . . . the inscriptions, so far as we know, have handed down to us no other appellation. . . . A real enigma is proposed to us in the derivation and meaning of the curious proper name, by which the foreign peoples of Asia, each in its own dialect, were accustomed to designate Egypt. The Hebrews gave the land the name of Mizraim; the Assyrians Muzur; the Persians, Mudraya. We may feel assured that at the basis of all these designations there lies an original form which consisted of the three letters M-z-r, all explanations of which have been as yet unsuccessful. Although I intend hereafter to consider more particularly the derivation of this puzzling name, which is still preserved at the present day in the Arabic appellation Misr, I will here premise the remark that this name was originally applied only to a certain definite part of Egypt, in the east of the Delta, which, according to the monuments, was covered and defended by many 'zor,' or fortresses, and was hence called in Egyptian Mazar (that is, fortified)."—H. Brugsch-Bev, *Hist. of Egypt under the Pharaohs*, ch. 2.—'Erugsch explains the name Egypt by 'ha-ka-ptah,' i. e. 'the precinct of Ptah.' As Ptah was more especially the god of Memphis, this name would have come from Memphis."—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, bk. 1, ch. 1, note.—"The last use of Kem died out in the form Chemi in Coptic, the descendant of the classical language, which ceased to be spoken a century ago. It survives among us in the terms 'chemistry' and 'alchemy,' sciences thought to be of Egyptian origin."—R. S. Poole, *Cities of Egypt*, int.

**Its Historical Antiquity**.—The lists of Egyptian kings which have been found "agree in

presenting the name of Mena [or Menes] as that of the first Pharaoh of Egypt, and as such he is unhesitatingly accepted, although no contemporary monumental record of the fact has yet been discovered. According to Manetho, the age of Mena dates back to a period of 5,004 years before the Christian era, a date which is nearly equal to 7,000 years from the present day. Brugsch favours a somewhat less interval, namely, 4455 B. C.; others place it as low as 2700 B. C., whilst Birch and Chabas adopt a medium date, namely 4000 B. C., which is equivalent to 6000 years backward from the existing time. These extreme variations are chiefly referable to the difficulty of ascertaining the precise length of each individual reign, and especially to the occasional contemporaneous reign of two or more kings, and sometimes the existence of two or more dynasties in different parts of the empire. . . . Lieblein gives full credit to the chronology of Manetho [a priest of Heliopolis, who wrote about 260 B. C.], as recorded by the historian Africanus, as likewise did the distinguished Marlette, and differs very little from the standard adopted by Birch. He assigns to Mena, as the pioneer of the first monarchy, a date in round numbers of 8000 years."—E. Wilson, *The Egypt of the Past*, ch. 1.—"As to the era . . . when the first Pharaoh mounted the throne, the German Egyptologists have attempted to fix it at the following epochs: Boeckh, B. C. 5702; Unger, 5613; Brugsch, 4455; Lauth, 4157; Lepsius, 3892; Bunsen, 3623. The difference between the two extreme points of the series is amazingly great, for its number of years amounts to no less than 2079. . . . The calculations in question are based on the extracts already often mentioned from a work by the Egyptian priest Manetho on the history of Egypt. That learned man had then at his command the annals of his country's history, which were preserved in the temples, and from them, the best and most accurate sources, he derived the materials for his work, composed in the Greek language, on the history of the ancient Egyptian Dynasties. His book, which is now lost, contained a general review of the kings of the land, divided into Thirty Dynasties, arranged

\* *Kamit* in the edition of 1891.

in the order of their names, with the lengths of their reigns, and the total duration of each dynasty. Though this invaluable work was little known and certainly but little regarded by the historians of the old classical age, large extracts were made from it by some of the ecclesiastical writers. In process of time the copyists, either by error or designedly, corrupted the names and the numbers, and thus we only possess at the present day the ruins instead of the complete building. The truth of the original, and the authenticity of its sources were first proved by the deciphering of the Egyptian writings. And thus the Manethonian list served, and still serves, as a guide for assigning to the royal names read on the monuments their places in the Dynasties."—H. Brugsch-Bey, *Hist. of Egypt under the Pharaohs*, ch. 4.—See, also, MANETHO, LIST OF.

**Origin of the ancient people.**—"The Egyptians, together with some other nations, form, as it would seem, a third branch of that [the Caucasian] race, namely, the family called Cushite, which is distinguished by special characters from the Pelasgian and the Semitic families. Whatever relations may be found always to exist between these great races of mankind, thus much may be regarded as certain, that the cradle of the Egyptian people must be sought in the interior of the Asiatic quarter of the world. In the earliest ages of humanity, far beyond all historical remembrance, the Egyptians, for reasons unknown to us, left the soil of their primeval home, took their way towards the setting sun, and finally crossed that bridge of nations, the Isthmus of Suez, to find a new fatherland on the favoured banks of the holy Nile. Comparative philology, in its turn, gives powerful support to this hypothesis. The Egyptian language . . . shows in no way any trace of a derivation and descent from the African families of speech. On the contrary, the primitive roots and the essential elements of the Egyptian grammar point to such an intimate connection with the Indo-Germanic and Semitic languages that it is almost impossible to mistake the close relations which formerly prevailed between the Egyptians and the races called Indo-Germanic and Semitic."—H. Brugsch-Bey, *Hist. of Egypt under the Pharaohs*, ch. 1.—"It has been maintained by some that the immigration was from the south, the Egyptians having been a colony from Ethiopia which gradually descended the Nile and established itself in the middle and lower portions of the valley; and this theory can plead in its favour, both a positive statement of Diodorus, and the fact, which is quite certain, of an ethnic connection between the Egyptians and some of the tribes who now occupy Abyssinia (the ancient Ethiopia). But modern research has shown quite unmistakably that the movement of the Egyptians was in the opposite direction. . . . We must look, then, rather to Syria or Arabia than to Ethiopia as the cradle of the Egyptian nation. At the same time we must admit that they were not mere Syrians or Arabs, but had, from the remotest time whereto we can go back, distinct characteristics, whereby they have a good claim to be considered as a separate race."

—G. Rawlinson, *Hist. of Ancient Egypt*, ch. 3.—"So far as our knowledge reaches, the northern edge of Africa, like the valley of the Nile as far as the marshes at the foot of the Abyssinian

hills, was inhabited by nations who in colour, language, and customs were sharply distinguished from the negro. These nations belong to the whites: their languages were most closely allied to the Semitic. From this, and from their physical peculiarities, the conclusion has been drawn that these nations at some time migrated from Asia to the soil of Africa. They formed a vast family, whose dialects still continue in the language of the Berbers. Assisted by the favourable conditions of their land, the tribe which settled on the Lower Nile quickly left their kinsmen far behind. Indeed the latter hardly rose above a pastoral life. The descendants of these old inhabitants of the valley of the Nile, in spite of the numerous layers which the course of centuries has subsequently laid upon the soil of the land, still form the larger part of the population of Egypt, and the ancient language is preserved in the dialect of the Copts."—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, bk. 1, ch. 1.

**The Old Empire and the Middle Empire.**—The following are the Egyptian Dynasties, from the first Pharaoh, Menes, to the epoch of the Hyksos, or Shepherd kings, with the dates and periods assigned to each by Brugsch: The First Dynasty; of Thisis: B. C. 4400–4166.—The Second; of Thisis: 4133–4000.—The Third; of Memphis: 3966–3766.—The Fourth; of Memphis: 3733–3600.—The Fifth; of Elephantine: 3566–3333.—The Sixth; of Memphis: 3300–3066.—The Seventh to the Eleventh (a confused and obscure period): 3033–2500.—The Twelfth; of Thebes: 2466–2266.—H. Brugsch-Bey, *Hist. of Egypt under the Pharaohs*, app. A.—"The direct descendants of Menes [or Menes] form the First Dynasty, which, according to Manetho, reigned 253 years. No monument contemporary with these princes has come down to us. . . . The Second Dynasty, to which Manetho assigns nine kings, lasted 302 years. It was also originally from This [or Thisis], and probably related to the First. . . . When this family had become extinct, a Dynasty, originally from Memphis, seized the throne, forming the Third, and to it a duration of 214 years is attributed. . . . With the Fourth Dynasty, Memphis like the Third, and which reigned 284 years, history becomes clearer and monuments more numerous. This was the age of the three Great Pyramids, built by the three kings, Khufu (the Pyramids of Herodotus), Shafra (Chefreden), and Menkara (Mycerinus). . . . The Fifth Dynasty came originally from Elephantine, at the southern extremity of Upper Egypt, and there possibly the kings generally resided, though at the same time Memphis was not deprived of its importance. . . . On the death of the last king of the Fifth Dynasty, a new family, of Memphitic origin according to Manetho, came to the throne. . . . Primitive art attained its highest point under the Sixth Dynasty. . . . But, from the time of the civil commotions in which Neit-aker [the Nitocris of Herodotus] perished, Egyptian civilization underwent a sudden and unaccountable eclipse. From the end of the Sixth Dynasty to the commencement of the Eleventh, Manetho reckons 436 years, and for this whole period the monuments are absolutely silent. Egypt seems then to have disappeared from the rank of nations; and when this long slumber ended, civilization commenced a new career, entirely independent of the past. . . . Thus ends that period of nineteen centuries,



which modern scholars know as the Old Empire. . . . Thebes did not exist in the days of the glory of the Old Empire. The holy city of Amen seems to have been founded during the period of anarchy and obscurity, succeeding, as we have said, to the Sixth Dynasty. Here was the birthplace of that renewed civilization, that new monarchy, we are accustomed to call the Middle Empire, the middle age in fact of ancient Egypt—a middle age anterior to the earliest ages of all other history. From Thebes came the six kings of the Eleventh Dynasty. . . . We again quote the excellent remarks of M. Mariette: 'When, with the Eleventh Dynasty, we see Egypt awake from her long slumber, all old traditions appear to be forgotten; the proper names used in ancient families, the titles of functionaries, the style of writing, and even the religion—all seem new. This, Elephantine, and Memphis, are no longer the favourite capitals. Thebes for the first time becomes the seat of sovereign power. Egypt, moreover, has lost a considerable portion of her territory, and the authority of her legitimate kings hardly extends beyond the limited district of the Thebaid. The study of the monuments confirms these general views; they are rude, primitive, sometimes coarse; and when we look at them we may well believe that Egypt, under the Eleventh Dynasty, again passed through a period of infancy, as she had already done under the Third Dynasty.' A dynasty probably related to, and originally from the same place as these first Theban princes succeeded them. . . . This Twelfth Dynasty reigned for 213 years, and its epoch was one of prosperity, of peace at home and glorious achievements abroad. . . . Although the history of the Twelfth Dynasty is clear and well known, illustrated by numerous monuments, there is, nevertheless, no period in the annals of Egypt more obscure than the one closing with the Thirteenth Dynasty. It is one long series of revolutions, troubles, and internal dissensions, closed by a terrible catastrophe, the greatest and most lasting recorded in Egyptian history, which a second time interrupted the march of civilization on the banks of the Nile, and for a while struck Egypt from the list of nations."—F. Lenormant and E. Chevallier, *Manual of Ancient Hist. of the East*, bk. 3, ch. 1-2.

ALSO IN: C. C. J. Bunsen, *Egypt's Place in Universal Hist.*, v. 2.—See, also, MEMPHIS, and THEBES, EGYPT.

**The Hyksos, or Shepherd-Kings.**—According to the Mæthethonian account which the Jewish historian Josephus has preserved to us by transcribing it, the Egyptian Netherlands were at a certain time overspread by a wild and rough people, which came from the countries of the east, overcame the native kings who dwelt there, and took possession of the whole country, without finding any great opposition on the part of the Egyptians. They were called Hyksos, which Josephus interpreted as meaning Shepherd-kings. "Hyk," he explained, meant King, in the holy language, and "sos," in the dialect of the people, signified Shepherd. But Dr. Brugsch identifies "sos" with the name "Shasu" which the old Egyptians gave to the Bedouins, whose name became equivalent to Shepherds. Hence Dr. Brugsch inclines to the ancient opinion transmitted by Josephus, that the Hyksos were Arabs or Bedouins—the Shasus of the Egyptian records, who

hung on the northeastern frontier of Egypt from the most ancient times and were always pressing into the country, at every opportunity. But many objections against this view are raised and the different theories advanced to account for the Hyksos are quite numerous. Canon Rawlinson says: "The Egyptians of the time of Herodotus seem to have considered that they were Philistines. Moderns have regarded them as Canaanites, Syrians, Hittites. It is an avoidance rather than a solution of the difficulty to say that they were 'a collection of all the nomad hordes of Arabia and Syria' [Lenormant], since there must have been a directing hand. . . . On the whole, therefore, we lean to the belief that the so-called Hyksos or Shepherds were Hittites."—G. Rawlinson, *Hist. of Ancient Egypt*, ch. 19.—"It is maintained on good authority that the Hyksos, or Shepherd-Kings, had secured possession of the eastern frontier of Lower Egypt immediately after the close of the Twelfth Dynasty; that at this time the Thirteenth and the Fourteenth Dynasties ruled contemporaneously, the former in Upper, the latter in Lower Egypt; one was the legitimate, the other the illegitimate line; but authors are not in accord as to their right of priority. It is supposed that, while Egypt claimed the Thirteenth Dynasty as her own, the Hyksos usurped the mastery over the Fourteenth Dynasty, and governed through the agency of its kings, treating them meanwhile as vassal chiefs. These local kings had cities from which they were unable to escape, and were deprived of an army of defence. Such was the state of the country for 184 years, when the Fourteenth Dynasty died out, and when the Fifteenth Dynasty, constituted of six successive Hyksos kings, took the reins of government into their own hands. Lieblein, whose views we are now endeavouring to express, assigns as the date of the invasion of the Hyksos 2108 years B. C. . . . It is not improbable that the well-known journey of Abraham to Egypt was made during the early period of the reign of the Shepherd-Kings; whilst the visit of Joseph occurred near the close of their power."—E. Wilson, *The Egypt of the Past*, ch. 5.—"The Shepherds possessed themselves of Egypt by violence," writes Mariette-Bey, 'but the civilization which they immediately adopted on their conquest was rather Egyptian than Asiatic, and the discoveries of Avaris (San) prove that they did not even banish from their temples the gods of the ancient Egyptian nation.' In fact the first shepherd-king, Solatis himself, employed an Egyptian artist to inscribe . . . his title on the statue of a former legitimate Pharaoh. 'They did not disturb the civilization more than the Persians or the Greeks, but simply accepted the higher one they had conquered.' So our revered scholar Dr. Birch has summed up the matter; and Prof. Maspero has very happily described it thus: 'The popular hatred loaded them with ignominious epithets, and treated them as accursed, plague-stricken, leprous. Yet they allowed themselves very quickly to be domesticated. . . . Once admitted to the school of Egypt, the barbarians progressed quickly in the civilized life. The Pharaonic court reappeared around these shepherd-kings, with all its pomp and all its following of functionaries great and small. The royal style and title of Cheops and the Amnemes had been fitted to the outlandish names of Janes and Apapi.



The Egyptian religion, without being officially adopted, was tolerated, and the religion of the Canaanites underwent some modification to avoid hurting beyond measure the susceptibilities of the worshippers of Osiris."—H. G. Tomkins, *Studies on the Times of Abraham*, ch. 8.—In a late Italian work ("Gli Hyksôs") by Dr. C. A. de Cara, "he puts together all that is ascertained in regard to them [the Hyksôs], criticises the theories that have been propounded on their behalf, and suggests a theory of his own. Nothing that has been published on the subject seems to have escaped his notice. . . . His own view is that the Hyksôs represented a confederacy of various Asiatic tribes, under the leadership of the northern Syrians. That their ruling class came from this part of the world seems to me clear from the name of their supreme god Sutekh, who occupied among them the position of the Semitic Baal."—A. H. Sayce, *The Hyksôs (Academy, Sept. 20, 1890)*.—"Historical research concerning the history of the Hyksôs may be summed up as follows:—I. A certain number of non-Egyptian kings of foreign origin, belonging to the nation of the Menti, ruled for a long time in the eastern portion of the Delta. II. These chose as their capitals the cities of Zoon and Avaris, and provided them with strong fortifications. III. They adopted not only the manners and customs of the Egyptians, but also their official language and writing, and the order of their court was arranged on Egyptian models. IV. They were patrons of art, and Egyptian artists erected, after the ancient models, monuments in honour of these usurpers, in whose statues they were obliged to reproduce the Hyksôs physiognomy, the peculiar arrangement of the beard and head-dress, as well as other variations of their costume. V. They honored Sutekh, the son of Nut, as the supreme god of their newly acquired country, with the surname Nub, 'the golden.' He was the origin of all that is evil and perverse in the visible and invisible world, the opponent of good and the enemy of light. In the cities of Zoon and Avaris, splendid temples were constructed in honour of this god, and other monuments raised, especially Sphinxes, carved out of stone from Syene. VI. In all probability one of them was the founder of a new era, which most likely began with the first year of his reign. Down to the time of the second Ramses, four hundred years had elapsed of this reckoning which was acknowledged even by the Egyptians. VII. The Egyptians were indebted to their contact with them for much useful knowledge. In particular their artistic views were expanded and new forms and shapes, notably that of the winged sphinx, were introduced, the Semitic origin of which is obvious at a glance. . . . The inscriptions on the monuments designate that foreign people who once ruled in Egypt by the name of Men or Menti. On the walls of the temple of Edfu it is stated that 'the inhabitants of the land of Asher are called Menti.' . . . In the different languages, . . . and in the different periods of history, the following names are synonymous: Syria, Rutennu of the East, Asher, and Menti."—"Since, on the basis of the most recent and best investigations in the province of ancient Egyptian chronology, we reckon the year 1350 B. C. as a mean computation for the reign of Ramses, the reign of the Hyksôs king, Nub, and probably its beginning, falls in the year 1750 B. C., that is, 400 years before Ramses II. Although we are com-

pletely in the dark as to the place King Nub occupied in the succession of the kindred princes of his house, yet the number mentioned is important, as an approximate epoch for the stay of the foreign kings in Egypt. According to the statement in the Bible, the Hebrews from the immigration of Jacob into Egypt until the Exodus remained 430 years in that land. Since the Exodus from Egypt took place in the time of Menepthah II., the son of Ramses II.—the Pharaoh of the oppression—the year B. C. 1300 may be an approximate date. If we add to this 430 years, as expressing the total duration of the sojourn of the Hebrews in Egypt, we arrive at the year 1730 B. C. as the approximate date for the immigration of Jacob into Egypt, and for the time of the official career of Joseph at the court of Pharaoh. In other words, the time of Joseph (1730 B. C.) must have fallen in the period of the Hyksôs domination, about the reign of the above-mentioned prince Nub (1750 B. C.)."—H. Brugsch-Bey, *Egypt under the Pharaohs* (edition of 1891, by M. Brodrick), pp. 106-109, and 126.—**See JEWS: THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL IN EGYPT.**

**ALSO IN:** F. C. H. Wendel, *Hist. of Egypt*, ch. 4.

**About B. C. 1700-1400.—The New Empire.—The Eighteenth Dynasty.**—"The dominion of the Hyksôs by necessity gave rise to profound internal divisions, alike in the different princely families and in the native population itself. Factions became rampant in various districts, and reached the highest point in the hostile feeling of the inhabitants of Patoris or the South country against the people of Patomit or North country, who were much mixed with foreign blood. . . . From this condition of divided power and of mutual jealousy the foreign rulers obtained their advantage and their chief strength, until King Aahmes made himself supreme."—H. Brugsch-Bey, *Egypt under the Pharaohs* (edition of 1891, by M. Brodrick).—"The duration of the reign of this first Pharaoh of the New Empire was twenty-five years. He was succeeded by his son Amenhotep I. and the latter by his son Thothmes I. "The reign of Thothmes I. . . . derives its chief distinction from the fact that, at this period of their history, the Egyptians for the first time carried their arms deep into Asia, overrunning Syria, and even invading Mesopotamia, or the tract between the Tigris and the Euphrates. Hitherto the furthest point reached in this direction had been Sharuhen in Southern Palestine. . . . Syria was hitherto almost an undiscovered region to the powerful people which nurturing its strength in the Nile valley, had remained content with its own natural limits and scarcely grasped at any conquests. A time was now come when this comparative quietude and absence of ambition were about to cease. Provoked by the attack made upon her from the side of Asia, and smarting from the wounds inflicted upon her pride and prosperity by the Hyksôs during the period of their rule, Egypt now set herself to retaliate, and for three centuries continued at intervals to pour her armies into the Eastern continent, and to carry fire and sword over the extensive and populous regions which lay between the Mediterranean and the Zagros mountain range. There is some uncertainty as to the extent of her conquests; but no reasonable doubt can be entertained that for a space of three hundred years Egypt was the most powerful and the most

aggressive state that the world contained, and held a dominion that has as much right to be called an 'Empire' as the Assyrian, the Babylonian or the Persian. While Babylonia, ruled by Arab conquerors, declined in strength, and Assyria proper was merely struggling into independence, Egypt put forth her arm and grasped the fairest regions of the earth's surface." The immediate successor of Thothmes I. was his son, Thothmes II., who reigned in association with a sister of masculine character, queen Hatsusa. The strong-minded queen, moreover, prolonged her reign after the death of this elder brother, until a younger brother, Thothmes III. displaced her. The Third Thothmes was the greatest of Egyptian conquerors and kings. He carried his arms beyond the Euphrates, winning a memorable victory at Megiddo over the confederated kings of the Syrian and Mesopotamian countries. He left to his son (Amenhotep II.) "a dominion extending about 1,100 miles from north to south, and (in places) 450 miles from west to east." He was a great builder, likewise, and "has left the impress of his presence in Egypt more widely than almost any other of her kings, while at the same time he has supplied to the great capitals of the modern world their most striking Egyptian monuments." The larger of the obelisks now standing in Rome and Constantinople, as well as those at London and New York were all of them produced in the reign of this magnificent Pharaoh. The two obelisks last named stood originally, and for fourteen centuries at the front of the great temple of the sun, in Heliopolis. They were removed by the Roman Emperor, Augustus, B. C. 23, to Alexandria, where they took in time the name of Cleopatra's Needles,—although Cleopatra had no part in their long history. After nineteen centuries more of rest, these strangely coveted monuments were again disturbed, and transported into lands which their builder knew not of. The later kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty seem to have, none of them, possessed the energy and character of Thothmes III. The line ended about 1400 B. C. with Horemheb, who left no heirs.—G. Rawlinson, *Hist. of Ancient Egypt*, ch. 20.

ALSO IN: H. Brugsch-Bey, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, ch. 13.—H. II. Goringe, *Egyptian Obelisks*.

About B. C. 1500-1400.—The Tell el-Amarna Tablets.—Correspondence of the Egyptian kings with Babylonia, Assyria, Armenia, Asia Minor, Syria and Palestine.—"The discovery made in 1887 by a peasant woman of Middle Egypt may be described as the most important of all contributions to the early political history of Western Asia. We have become possessed of a correspondence, dating from the fifteenth century B. C., which was carried on during the reigns of three Egyptian kings, with the rulers of Babylon, Assyria, Armenia, Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine, during a period of great activity, when revolutions which affected the whole history of the east shore lands of the Mediterranean were in progress; and we find in these tablets a contemporary picture of the civilisation of the age. . . . The Tell Amarna tablets represent a literature equal in bulk to about half the Pentateuch, and concerned almost exclusively with political affairs. They are clay tablets, varying from two inches to a foot in length, with a few as large as eighteen inches, covered with cuneiform writing

generally on both sides, and often on the edges as well. The peasantry unearthed nearly the complete collection, including some 320 pieces in all; and explorers afterwards digging on the site have added only a few additional fragments. The greater number were bought for the Berlin Museum, while eighty-two were acquired for England, and the rest remain either in the Boulak Museum at Cairo, or, in a few instances, in the hands of private collectors. . . . Tell Amarna (apparently 'the mound of the tumuli') is an important ruined site on the east bank of the Nile, about a hundred and fifty miles in a straight line south of Cairo. Its Egyptian name is said to have been Khu-en-aten, 'Glory of the Sun-disk.'—*The Tell Amarna Tablets* (Edinburgh Rev., July, 1893).—"The collection of Cuneiform Tablets recently found [1887] at Tell el-Amarna in Upper Egypt, consisted of about three hundred and twenty documents, or portions of documents. The British Museum possesses eighty-two. . . the Berlin Museum has one hundred and sixty, a large number being fragments; the Gizeh Museum has sixty; and a few are in the hands of private persons. . . . In color the Tablets vary from a light to a dark dust tint, and from a flesh-color to dark brick-red. The nature of the clay of which they are made sometimes indicates the countries from which they come. The size of the Tablets in the British Museum varies from 8½ inches x 4½ in. to 2½ in. x 1½ in.; the longest text contains 98 lines, the shortest 10. . . . The greater number are rectangular, and a few are oval; and they differ in shape from any other cuneiform documents known to us. . . . The writing . . . resembles to a certain extent the Neo-Babylonian, i. e., the simplification of the writing of the first Babylonian Empire used commonly in Babylonia and Assyria for about seven centuries B. C. It possesses, however, characteristics different from those of any other style of cuneiform writing of any period now known to exist; and nearly every tablet contains forms of characters which have hitherto been thought peculiar to the Ninevite or Assyrian style of writing. But, compared with the neat, careful hand employed in the official documents drawn up for the kings of Assyria, it is somewhat coarse and careless, and suggests the work of unskilled scribes. One and the same hand, however, appears in tablets which come from the same person and the same place. On some of the large tablets the writing is bold and free; on some of the small ones the characters are confused and cramped, and are groups of strokes rather than wedges. The spelling . . . is often careless, and in some instances syllables have been omitted. At present it is not possible to say whether the irregular spelling is due to the ignorance of the scribe or to dialectic peculiarities. . . . The Semitic dialect in which these letters are written is Assyrian, and is, in some important details, closely related to the Hebrew of the Old Testament. . . . The documents were most probably written between the years B. C. 1500 to 1450. . . . They give an insight into the nature of the political relations which existed between the kings of Western Asia and the kings of Egypt, and prove that an important trade existed between the two countries from very early times. . . . A large number of the present tablets are addressed to 'the King of Egypt,' either Amenophis III. or Amenophis IV. Nearly all of them consist of reports of disasters

to the Egyptian power and of successful intrigues against it, coupled by urgent entreaties for help, pointing to a condition of distraction and weakness in Egypt. . . . The most graphic details of the disorganized condition, and of the rival factions, of the Egyptian dependencies lying on the coast-line of Phœnicia and Northern Palestine, are to be gathered from a perusal of the dispatches of the governors of the cities of Byblos, Beyrut and Tyre."—*The Tell el-Amarna Tablets in the British Museum, introd.*—"In the present state of cuneiform research I believe it to be impossible to give a translation of the Tell el-Amarna texts which would entirely satisfy the expert or general reader. No two scholars would agree as to any interpretation which might be placed upon certain rare grammatical forms and unknown words in the Babylonian text, and any literal translation in a modern language would not be understood by the general reader on account of the involved style and endless repetition of phrases common to a Semitic idiom and dialect. About the general meaning of the contents of the greater number of the letters there can be no doubt whatever, and it is therefore possible to make a summary of the contents of each letter, which should, as a rule, satisfy the general reader, and at the same time form a guide to the beginner in cuneiform. Summaries of the contents of the Tell el-Amarna tablets in the British Museum have been published in 'The Tell el-Amarna Tablets in the British Museum, with autotype facsimiles,' printed by order of the Trustees, London, 1893, and it is hoped that the transliteration, given in the following pages may form a useful supplement to that work. . . . No. 1. A Letter from Egypt—Amenophis III. to Kallimma (?) Sin, King of Karaduniyash, referring to his proposed marriage with Sukharti, the daughter of Kallimma-Sin, and containing the draft of a commercial treaty, and an allusion to the disappearance of certain chariots and horses. No. 2. Letters from Babylonia—Burraburiyash, King of Karaduniyash, to Amenophis IV., referring to the friendship which had existed between their respective fathers, and the help which had been rendered to the King of Egypt by Burraburiyash himself; the receipt of two manahs of gold is acknowledged and a petition is made for more. No. 3. Burraburiyash, King of Karaduniyash to Amenophis IV., complaining that the Egyptian messengers had visited his country thrice without bringing gifts, and that they withheld some of the gold which had been sent to him from Egypt; Burraburiyash announces the despatch of a gift of lapis-lazuli for the Egyptian princess who was his son's wife. . . . No. 30. Letter from Abi-milki, governor of Tyre, to the King of Egypt, reporting that he believes Zinrida will not be able to stir up disaffection in the city of Sidon, although he has caused much hostility against Tyre. He asks for help to protect the city, and for water to drink and wood to burn, and he sends with his messenger III-milki five talents of copper and other gifts for the King of Egypt. He reports that the King of Danuna is dead and that his brother reigns in his stead; one half of the city of Ugarit has been destroyed by fire; the soldiers of the Khatti have departed; Itagamapairi, governor of Kedash, and Aziru are fighting against Namyawiza. If the King of Egypt will but send a few troops, all will be well with Tyre. . . . No. 43. Letter from the gov-

ernor of a town in Syria to the King of Egypt, reporting that the rebels have asserted their independence; that Birdnshwi has stirred up rebellion in the city of Inu-Amma; that its people have captured chariots in the city of Ashtarti; that the kings of the cities of Buzruna and Khaluni have made a league with Birdashwi to slay Namyawiza (who, having taken refuge in Damascus and being attacked by Arzawiya, declared himself to be a vassal of Egypt); that Arzawiya went to the city of Gizza and afterwards captured the city of Shaddu; that Itakama ravaged the country of Gizza; and that Arzawiya and Birdashwi have wasted the country of Abitu. No. 44. Continuation (?) of a letter to the King of Egypt, reporting that, owing to the hostilities of Abd-Ashirta, Khaya, an official, was unable to send ships to the country of Amurri, as he had promised. The ships from Arvad which the writer has in his charge, lack their full complement of men for war service, and he urges the king to make use of the ships and crews which he has had with him in Egypt. The writer of the letter also urges the King of Egypt to appoint an Egyptian official over the naval affairs of Sidon, Beyrut and Arvad, and to seize Abd-Ashirta and put him under restraint to prevent him obstructing the manning of the ships of war. . . . No. 58. Letter from the governor of a district in Palestine (?) to the governors of neighbouring states in the land of Canaan, informing them that he is about to send his messenger Akiya on a mission to the King of Egypt, and to place himself and every thing that he has at his disposal. Akiya will go to Egypt by the way of Canaan, and the writer of this letter suggests that any gifts they may have to send to Egypt should be carried by him, for Akiya is a thoroughly trustworthy man."—C. Bezold, *Oriental Diplomacy: Being the transliterated text of the Cuneiform Despatches, preface.*—Under the title of "The Story of a 'Tell,'" Mr. W. M. Flinders Petrie, the successful excavator and explorer of Egyptian antiquities, gave a lecture in London, in June, 1893, in which he described the work and the results of an excavation then in progress under his direction on the supposed site of Lachish, at a point where the maritime plain of Philistia rises to the mountains of Judea, on the route from Egypt into Asia. The chairman who introduced Mr. Petrie defined the word "Tell" as follows: "A Tell is a mound of earth showing by the presence of broken pottery or worked stone that it is the site of a ruined city or village. In England when a house falls down or is pulled down the materials are usually worth the expense of removing for use in some new building. But in Egypt common houses have for thousands of years been built of sun-dried bricks, in Palestine of rough rubble walling, which, on falling, produces many chips, with thick flat roofs of plaster. It is thus often less trouble to get new than to use old material; the sites of towns grow in height, and depressions are filled up." The mound excavated by Mr. Petrie is known as Tell el Hesi. After he left the work it was carried on by Mr. Bliss, and Mr. Petrie in his lecture says: "The last news is that Mr. Bliss has found the long looked for prize, a cuneiform tablet. . . . From the character of the writing, which is the same as on the tablets written in Palestine in 1400 B. C., to the Egyptian king at Tell el Amarna, we have a close

agreement regarding the chronology of the town. Further, it mentions Zimrida as a governor, and this same man appears as governor of Lachish on the tablets found at Tel el Amarna. We have thus at last picked up the other end of the broken chain of correspondence between Palestine and Egypt, of which one part was so unexpectedly found in Egypt a few years ago on the tablets at Tel el Amarna; and we may hope now to recover the Palestinian part of this intercourse and so establish the pre-Israelite history of the land."—W. M. F. Petrie, *The Story of a "Tell" (The City and the Land, lect. 6)*.—See, also, PALESTINE.

ALSO IN: C. R. Conder, *The Tell Amarna Tablets, translated*.

About B. C. 1400-1200.—The first of the Ramesides.—The Pharaohs of the Oppression and the Exodus.—"Under the Nineteenth Dynasty, which acquired the throne after the death of Har-em-Heh [or Hor-em-heb] the fortune of Egypt maintained to some extent its ascendancy; but, though the reigns of some warlike kings throw a bright light on this epoch, the shade of approaching trouble already darkens the horizon." Ramses I. and his son, or son-in-law, Seti I., were involved in troublesome wars with the rising power of the Hittites, in Syria, and with the Shasu of the Arabian desert. Seti was also at war with the Libyans, who then made their first appearance in Egyptian history. His son Ramses II., the Sesostris of the Greeks, who reigned for sixty-seven years, in the fourteenth century B. C., has always been the most famous of the Egyptian kings, and, by modern discovery, has been made the most interesting of them to the Christian world. He was a busy and boastful warrior, who accomplished no important conquests; but "among the Pharaohs he is the builder 'par excellence.'" It is almost impossible to find in Egypt a ruin or an ancient mound, without reading his name." . . . It was to these works, probably, that the Israelites then in Egypt were forced to contribute their labor; for the Pharaoh of the oppression is identified, by most scholars of the present day, with this building and boasting Sesostris.—F. Lenormant and E. Chevallier, *Manual of the Ancient Hist. of the East, bk. 3, ch. 3*.—"The extreme length of the reign of Ramses was, as in other histories, the cause of subsequent weakness and disaster. His successor was an aged son, Menptah, who had to meet the difficulties which were easily overcome by the youth of his energetic father. The Libyans and their maritime allies broke the long tranquillity of Egypt by a formidable invasion and temporary conquest of the north-west. The power of the monarchy was thus shaken, and the old king was not the leader to restore it. His obscure reign was followed by others even obscurer, and the Nineteenth Dynasty ended in complete anarchy, which reached its height when a Syrian chief, in what manner we know not, gained the rule of the whole country. It is to the reign of Menptah that Egyptian tradition assigned the Exodus, and modern research has come to a general agreement that this is its true place in Egyptian history. . . . Unfortunately we do not know the duration of the oppression of the Israelites, nor the condition of Lower Egypt during the Eighteenth Dynasty, which, according to the hypothesis here adopted, corresponds to a

great part of the Hebrew sojourn. It is, however, clear from the Bible that the oppression did not begin till after the period of Joseph's contemporaries, and had lasted eighty years before the Exodus. It seems almost certain that this was the actual beginning of the oppression, for it is very improbable that two separate Pharaohs are intended by the 'new king which knew not Joseph' and the builder of Ramses, or, in other words, Ramses II., and the time from the accession of Ramses II. to the end of Menptah's reign can have little exceeded the eighty years of Scripture between the birth of Moses and the Exodus. . . . If the adjustment of Hebrew and Egyptian history for the oppression, as stated above, be accepted, Ramses II. was probably the first, and certainly the great oppressor. His character suits this theory; he was an undoubted autocrat who . . . covered Egypt and Lower Nubia with vast structures that could only have been produced by slave-labor on the largest scale."—R. S. Poole, *Ancient Egypt (Contemp. Rev., Mar., 1870)*.

ALSO IN: H. Brugsch-Bey, *Egypt Under the Pharaohs, ch. 14*.—H. G. Tomkins, *Life and Times of Joseph*.—See, also: JEWS: THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL IN EGYPT.

About B. C. 1300.—Exodus of the Israelites. See JEWS: THE ROUTE OF THE EXODUS.

About B. C. 1200-670.—The decline of the empire of the Pharaohs.—From the anarchy in which the Nineteenth Dynasty came to its end, order was presently restored by the seating in power of a new family, which claimed to be of the Rameside stock. The second of its kings, who called himself Ramses III. and who is believed to be the Rhampsinitus of the Greeks, appears to have been one of the ablest of the monarchs of his line. The security and prosperity of Egypt were recovered under his reign and he left it in a state which does not seem to have promised the rapid decay which ensued. "It is difficult to understand and account for the suddenness and completeness of the collapse. . . . The hieratic chiefs, the high priests of the god Ammon at Thebes, gradually increased in power, usurped one after another the prerogatives of the Pharaohs, by degrees reduced their authority to a shadow, and ended with an open assumption not only of the functions, but of the very insignia of royalty. A space of nearly two centuries elapsed, however, before this change was complete. Ten princes of the name of Ramses, and one called Meri-Tum, all of them connected by blood with the great Rameside house, bore the royal title and occupied the royal palace, in the space between B. C. 1280 and B. C. 1100. Egyptian history during this period is almost wholly a blank. No military expeditions are conducted—no great buildings are reared—art almost disappears—literature holds her tongue." Then came the dynasty of the priest-kings, founded by Her-Hor, which held the throne for more than a century and was contemporary in its latter years with David and Solomon. The Twenty-Second Dynasty which succeeded had its capital at Bubastis and is concluded by Dr. Brugsch to have been a line of Assyrian kings, representing an invasion and conquest of Egypt by Nimrod, the great king of Assyria. Other Egyptologists disagree with Dr. Brugsch in this, and Prof. Rawlinson, the historian of Assyria, finds objections to the hypothe-

sis from his own point of view. The prominent monarch of this dynasty was the Sheshonk of Biblical history, who sheitered Jeroboam, invaded Palestine and plundered Jerusalem. Before this dynasty came to an end it had lost the sovereignty of Egypt at large, and its Pharaohs contended with various rivals and invaders. Among the latter, power grew in the hands of a race of Ethiopians, who had risen to importance at Napata, on the Upper Nile, and who extended their power, at last, over the whole of Egypt. The Ethiopian domination was maintained for two-thirds of a century, until the great wave of Assyrian conquest broke upon Egypt in 672 B. C. and swept over it, driving the Ethiopians back to Napata and Merot.—G. Rawlinson, *Hist. of Ancient Egypt*, ch. 25.

ALSO IN: H. Brugsch-Bey, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, ch. 15-18.—E. Wilson, *Egypt of the Past*, ch. 8.—See, also, *ERITRIA*.

**B. C. 670-525.—Assyrian conquest and restored independence.—The Twenty-sixth Dynasty.—The Greeks at Naucratis.**—Although Syria and Palestine had then been suffering for more than a century from the conquering arms of the Assyrians, it was not until 670 B. C., according to Prof. Rawlinson, that Esarhaddon passed the boundaries of Egypt and made himself master of that country. His father Sennacherib, had attempted the invasion thirty years before, at the time of his siege of Jerusalem, and had recoiled before some mysterious calamity which impelled him to a sudden retreat. The son avenged his father's failure. The Ethiopian masters of Egypt were expelled and the Assyrian took their place. He "broke up the country into twenty governments, appointing in each town a ruler who bore the title of king, but placing all the others to a certain extent under the authority of the prince who reigned at Memphis. This was Neco, the father of Psammetichus (Psamtik I.)—a native Egyptian of whom we have some mention both in Herodotus and in the fragments of Manetho. The remaining rulers were likewise, for the most part, native Egyptians." These arrangements were soon broken up by the expelled Ethiopian king, Tirhakah, who rallied his forces and swept the Assyrian kinglets out of the country; but Asshur-bani-pal, son and successor of Esarhaddon, made his appearance with an army in 668 or 667 B. C. and Tirhakah fled before him. Again and again this occurred, and for twenty years Egypt was torn between the Assyrians and the Ethiopians, in their struggle for the possession of her. At length, out of the chaos produced by these conflicts there emerged a native ruler—the Psammetichus mentioned above—who subjugated his fellow princes and established a new Egyptian monarchy, which defended itself with success against Assyria and Ethiopia, alike. The Twenty-Sixth Dynasty, of Sais, founded by Psammetichus, is suspected to have been of Libyan descent. It ruled Egypt until the Persian conquest, and brought a great new influence to bear on the country and people, by the introduction of Greek soldiers and traders. It was under this dynasty that the Greek city of Naucratis was founded, on the Canobic branch of the Nile.—G. Rawlinson, *The Five Great Monarchies: Assyria*, ch. 9.—The site of Naucratis, near the Canobic branch of the Nile, was determined by excavations which Mr. W. M. Flinders Petrie began in 1884, and from which

much has been learned of the history of the city and of early relations between the Egyptians and the Greeks. It is concluded that the settlement of Naucratis dates from about 660 B. C.—not long after the beginning of the reign of Psammetichus—and that its Greek founders became the allies of that monarch and his successors against their enemies. "All are agreed that before the reign of Psammetichus and the founding of Naucratis, Egypt was a sealed book to the Greeks. It is likely that the Phoenicians, who were from time to time the subjects of the Pharaohs, were admitted, where all as like the Greeks were excluded. We have indeed positive evidence that the Egyptians did not wish strange countries to learn their art, for in a treaty between them and the Hittites it is stipulated that neither country shall harbour fugitive artists from the other. But however the fact may be accounted for, it is an undoubted fact that long before Psammetichus threw Egypt open to the foreigner, the Phoenicians had studied in the school of Egyptian art, and learned to copy all sorts of handiwork procured from the valley of the Nile. . . . According to Herodotus and Diodorus, the favour shown to the Greeks by the King was the cause of a great revolt of the native Egyptian troops, who left the frontier-fortresses, and marched south beyond Elephantine, where they settled, resisting all the entreaties of Psammetichus, who naturally deplored the loss of the mainstay of his dominions, and developed into the race of the Sebridae. Wiedemann, however, rejects the whole story as unhistorical, and certainly, if we closely consider it, it contains great inherent improbabilities. . . . Psammetichus died in B. C. 610, and was succeeded by his son Necho, who was his equal in enterprise and vigour. This King paid great attention to the fleet of Egypt, and Greek shipwrights were set to work on both the Mediterranean and Red Seas to build triremes for the State navy. A fleet of his ships, we are told, succeeded in sailing round Africa, a very great feat for the age. The King even attempted the task, of which the completion was reserved for the Persian Darius, the Ptolemies, and Trajan, of making a canal from the Mediterranean to the Red Sea. Herodotus says that, after sacrificing the lives of 120,000 men to the labour and heat of the task, he gave it up, in consequence of the warning of an oracle that he was toiling only for the barbarians. . . . Necho, like his father, must needs try the edge of his new weapon, the Ionian mercenaries, on Asia. At first he was successful. Josiah, King of Judah, came out against him, but was slain, and his army dispersed. Greek valour carried Necho as far as the Euphrates. . . . But Nebuchadnezzar, son of the King of Babylon, marched against the invaders, and defeated them in a great battle near Carchemish. His father's death recalled him to Babylon, and Egypt was for the moment saved from counter-invasion by the stubborn resistance offered to the Babylonian arms by Jehoiakim, King of Judah, a resistance fatal to the Jewish ruler. Jerusalem was captured after a long siege, and most of the inhabitants carried into captivity. Of Psammetichus II., who succeeded Necho, we should know but little were it not for the archaeological record. Herodotus only says that he attacked Ethiopia, and died after a reign of six years. But of the expedition thus summarily recorded

we have a lasting and memorable result in the well-known inscriptions written by Rhodians and other Greek mercenaries on the legs of the colossi at Abu Simbel in Nubia, which record how certain of them came thither in the reign of Psammitichus, pushing up the river in boats as far as it was navigable, that is, perhaps, up to the second cataract. . . . Apries, the Hophra of the Bible, was the next king. The early part of his reign was marked by successful warfare against the Phoenicians and the peoples of Syria; but, like his predecessor, he was unable to maintain a footing in Asia in the face of the powerful and warlike Nebuchadnezzar. The hostility which prevailed between Egypt and Babylon at this time caused King Apries to open a refuge for those Jews who fled from the persecution of Nebuchadnezzar. He assigned to their leaders, among whom were the daughters of the King of Judah, a palace of his own at Daphnae, 'Pharaoh's house at Tahpanhes,' as it is called by Jeremiah. That prophet was among the fugitives, and uttered in the palace a notable prophecy (xliiii. 9) that King Nebuchadnezzar should come and spread his conquering tent over the pavement before it. Formerly it was supposed that this prophecy remained unfulfilled, but this opinion has to be abandoned. Recently-discovered Egyptian and Babylonian inscriptions prove that Nebuchadnezzar conquered Egypt as far as Syene. . . . The fall of Apries was brought about by his ingratitude to the Greeks, and his contempt for the lives of his own subjects. He had formed the project of bringing under his sway the Greek cities of the Cyrenaica. . . . Apries despatched against Cyrene a large force; but the Cyreneans bravely defended themselves, and as the Egyptians on this occasion marched without their Greek allies, they were entirely defeated, and most of them perished by the sword, or in the deserts which separate Cyrene from Egypt. The defeated troops, and their countrymen who remained behind in garrison in Egypt, imputed the disaster to treachery on the part of Apries. . . . They revolted, and chose as their leader Amasis, a man of experience and daring. But Apries, though deserted by his subjects, hoped still to maintain his throne by Greek aid. At the head of 30,000 Ionians and Carians he marched against Amasis. At Memphis a battle took place between the rival kings and between the rival nations; but the numbers of the Egyptians prevailed over the arms and discipline of the mercenaries, and Apries was defeated and captured by his rival, who, however, allowed him for some years to retain the name of joint-king. It is the best possible proof of the solidity of Greek influence in Egypt at this time that Amasis, though set on the throne by the native army after a victory over the Greek mercenaries, yet did not expel these latter from Egypt, but, on the contrary, raised them to higher favour than before. . . . In the delightful dawn of connected European history we see Amasis as a wise and wealthy prince, ruling in Egypt at the time when Polycrates was tyrant of Samos; and when Croesus of Lydia, the richest king of his time, was beginning to be alarmed by the rapid expansion of the Persian power under Cyrus. . . . In the days of Psammitichus III., the son of Amasis, the storm which had overshadowed Asia broke upon Egypt. One of the leaders of the Greek

mercenaries in Egypt named Phanes, a native of Halicarnassus, made his way to the Persian Court, and persuaded Cambyses, who, according to the story, had received from Amasis one of those affronts which have so often produced wars between despots, to invade Egypt in full force."—P. Gardner, *New Chapters in Greek History*, ch. 7.

ALSO IN: W. M. F. Petrie, *Naukratis*.—See, also, *NAUKRATIS*.

**B. C. 525-332.—Persian conquest and sovereignty.**—The kings of the Twenty-Sixth or Saite Dynasty maintained the independence of Egypt for nearly a century and a half, and even revived its military glories briefly, by Necho's ephemeral conquests in Syria and his overthrow of Josiah king of Judah. In the meantime, Assyria and Babylonia had fallen and the Persian power risen up by Cyrus had taken their place. In his own time, Cyrus did not finish a plan of conquest which included Egypt; his son Cambyses took up the task. "It appears that four years were consumed by the Persian monarch in his preparations for his Egyptian expedition. It was not until B. C. 525 that he entered Egypt at the head of his troops and fought the great battle which decided the fate of the country. The struggle was long and bloody [see PERSIA: B. C. 549-521]. Psammenitus, who had succeeded his father Amasis, had the services, not only of his Egyptian subjects, but of a large body of mercenaries besides, Greeks and Carians. . . . In spite of their courage and fanaticism, the Egyptian army was completely defeated. . . . The conquest of Egypt was followed by the submission of the neighbouring tribes. . . . Even the Greeks of the more remote Barca and Cyrene sent gifts to the conqueror and consented to become his tributaries." But Cambyses wasted 50,000 men in a disastrous expedition through the Libyan desert to Ammon, and he retreated from Ethiopia with loss and shame. An attempted rising of the Egyptians, before he had quitted their country, was crushed with merciless severity. The deities, the temples and the priests of Egypt were treated with insult and contempt and the spirit of the people seems to have been entirely broken. "Egypt became now for a full generation the obsequious slave of Persia, and gave no more trouble to her subjugator than the weakest, or the most contented, of the provinces."—Geo. Rawlinson, *The Five Great Monarchies: Persia*, ch. 7.—"The Persian kings, from Cambyses to Darius II. Nothus, are enrolled as the Twenty-Seventh Dynasty of Manetho. The ensuing revolts [see ATHENS: B. C. 460-449] are recognized in the Twenty-Eighth (Saite) Dynasty, consisting only of Amyrtaeus, who restored the independence of Egypt (B. C. 414-408), and the Twenty-Ninth (Mendesian) and Thirtieth (Sebennyte) Dynasties (about B. C. 408-353), of whose intricate history we need only here say that they ruled with great prosperity and have left beautiful monuments of art. The last king of independent Egypt was Nectanebo II., who succumbed to the invasion of Artaxerxes Ochus, and fled to Ethiopia (B. C. 353). The last three kings of Persia, Ochus, Arses, and Darius Codomannus, form the Thirty-First Dynasty of Manetho, ending with the submission of Egypt to Alexander the Great (B. C. 332)."—P. Smith, *Ancient Hist. of the East (Students')*, ch. 8.

ALSO IN: S. Sharpe, *Hist. of Egypt*, ch. 5.

**B. C. 332.—Alexander's conquest.**—"In the summer of 332 [after the siege and destruction of Tyre—see TYRE: B. C. 332, and MACEDONIA, &c.: B. C. 334-330] Alexander set forward on his march toward Egypt, accompanied by the fleet, which he had placed under the orders of Hephestion." But, being detained on the way several months by the siege of Gaza, it was not before December that he entered Egypt. "He might safely reckon not merely on an easy conquest, but on an ardent reception, from a people who burnt to shake off the Persian tyranny. . . . Mazaces [the Persian commander] himself, as soon as he heard of the battle of Issus, became aware that all resistance to Alexander would be useless, and met him with a voluntary submission. At Pelusium he found the fleet, and, having left a garrison in the fortress, ordered it to proceed up the Nile as far as Memphis, while he marched across the desert. Here he conciliated the Egyptians by the honours which he paid to all their gods, especially to Aps, who had been so cruelly insulted by the Persian invaders. . . . He then embarked, and dropt down the western or Canobic arm of the river to Canobus, to survey the extremity of the Delta on that side, and having sailed round the lake Mareotis, landed on the narrow belt of low ground which parts it from the sea, and is sheltered from the violence of the northern gales . . . by a long ridge of rock, then separated from the main land by a channel, nearly a mille (seven stades) broad and forming the isle of Pharos. On this site stood the village of Racotis, where the ancient kings of Egypt had stationed a permanent guard to protect this entrance of their dominions from adventurers. . . . Alexander's keen eye was immediately struck by the advantages of this position for a city, which should become a great emporium of commerce, and a link between the East and the West. . . . He immediately gave orders for the beginning of the work, himself traced the outline, which was suggested by the natural features of the ground itself, and marked the site of some of the principal buildings, squares, palaces and temples" (see ALEXANDRIA: B. C. 332). Alexander remained in Egypt until the spring of 331, arranging the occupation and administration of the country. "The system which he established served in some points as a model for the policy of Rome under the Emperors." Before quitting the country he made a toilsome march along the coast, westward, and thence, far into the desert, to visit the famous oracle of Ammon.—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 50.

**B. C. 323-30.—The kingdom of the Ptolemies.**—In the division of the empire of Alexander the Great between his generals, when he died, Ptolemy Lagus—reputed to be a natural son of Alexander's father Philip—chose Egypt (see MACEDONIA: B. C. 323-316), with a modesty which proved to be wise. In all the provinces of the Macedonian conquest, it was the country most easily to be held as an independent state, by reason of the sea and desert which separated it from the rest of the world. It resulted from the prudence of Ptolemy that he founded a kingdom which lasted longer and enjoyed more security and prosperity than any other among the monarchies of the Diadochi. He was king of Egypt, in fact, for seventeen years before, in 307, B. C., he ventured to

assume the name (see MACEDONIA: B. C. 310-301). Meantime, he had added to his dominion the little Greek state of Cyrene, on the African coast with Phœnicia, Judea, Cœle-Syria, and the island of Cyprus. These latter became disputed territory, fought over for two centuries, between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids, sometimes dominated by the one and sometimes by the other (see SELEUCIDÆ: B. C. 281-234, and 224-187). At its greatest extent, the dominion of the Ptolemies, under Ptolemy Philadelphus, son of Ptolemy Lagus, included large parts of Asia Minor and many of the Greek islands. Egypt and Cyrene they held, with little disturbance, until Rome absorbed them. Notwithstanding the vices which the family of Ptolemy developed, and which were as rank of their kind as history can show, Egypt under their rule appears to have been one of the most prosperous countries of the time. In Alexandria, they more than realized the dream of its Macedonian projector. They made it not only the wealthiest city of their day, but the greatest seat of learning,—the successor of Athens as the capital of Greek civilization in the ancient world.—S. Sharpe, *Hist. of Egypt*, ch. 7-12.—The first Ptolemy abdicated in favor of his son, Ptolemy Philadelphus, in 284 B. C., and died in the second year following. See MACEDONIA: B. C. 297-280.—"Although the political constitution of Egypt was not greatly altered when the land fell into Greek hands, yet in other respects great changes took place. The mere fact that Egypt took its place among a family of Hellenistic nations, instead of claiming as of old a proud isolation, must have had a great effect on the trade, the manufactures, and the customs of the country. To begin with trade. Under the native kings Egypt had scarcely any external trade, and trade could scarcely spring up during the wars with Persia. But under the Ptolemies, intercourse between Egypt and Sicily, Syria or Greece, would naturally and necessarily advance rapidly. Egypt produced manufactured goods which were everywhere in demand; fine linen, ivory, porcelain, notably that papyrus which Egypt alone produced, and which was necessary to the growing trade in manuscripts. Artificial barriers being once removed, enterprising traders of Corinth and Tarentum, Ephesus and Rhodes, would naturally seek these goods in Egypt, bringing in return whatever of most attractive their own countries had to offer. It seems probable that the subjects of the Ptolemies seldom or never had the courage to sail direct down the Red Sea to India. In Roman times this voyage became not unusual, but at an earlier time the Indian trade was principally in the hands of the Arabs of Yemen and of the Persian Gulf. Nevertheless the commerce of Egypt under the Ptolemies spread eastwards as well as westwards. The important towns of Arsinoë and Berenice arose on the Red Sea as emporia of the Arabian trade. And as always happens when Egypt is in vigorous hands, the limits of Egyptian rule and commerce were pushed further and further up the Nile. The influx into Alexandria and Memphis of a crowd of Greek architects, artists, and artizans, could not fail to produce movement in that stream of art which had in Egypt long remained all but stagnant. . . . If we may trust the somewhat over-coloured and flighty panegyrics which have



come down to us, the material progress of Egypt under Ptolemy Philadelphus was most wonderful. We read, though we cannot for a moment trust the figures of Appian, that in his reign Egypt possessed an army of 200,000 foot soldiers and 40,000 horsemen, 300 elephants and 2,000 chariots of war. The fleet at the same period is said to have included 1,500 large vessels, some of them with twenty or thirty banks of oars. Allowing for exaggeration, we must suppose that Egypt was then more powerful than it had been since the days of Rameses."—P. Gardner, *New Chapters in Greek History*, ch. 7.—See, also, ALEXANDRIA: B. C. 282-246; and EDUCATION, ANCIENT: ALEXANDRIA.

**B. C. 80-48.—Strife among the Ptolemies.—Roman pretensions.**—The throne of Egypt being disputed, B. C. 80, between Cleopatra Berenice, who had seized it, and her step-son, Ptolemy Alexander, then in Rome, the latter bribed the Romans to support his claims by making a will in which he named the Roman Republic as his heir. The Senate, thereat, sent him to Alexandria with orders that Berenice should marry him and that they should reign jointly, as king and queen. The order was obeyed. The foully mated pair were wedded, and, nineteen days afterwards, the young king procured the death of his queen. The crime provoked an insurrection in which Ptolemy Alexander was slain by his own guard. This ended the legitimate line of the Ptolemies; but an illegitimate prince, usually called Auletes, or "the piper," was put on the throne, and he succeeded in holding it for twenty-four years. The claim of the Romans, under the will of Ptolemy Alexander, seems to have been kept in abeyance by the bribes which Auletes employed with liberality among the senatorial leaders. In 58 B. C. a rising at Alexandria drove Auletes from the throne; in 54 B. C. he bought the support of Gabinius, Roman pro-consul in Syria, who reinstated him. He died in 51 B. C. leaving by will his kingdom to his elder daughter, Cleopatra, and his elder son, Ptolemy, who, according to the abominable custom of the Ptolemies, were to marry one another and reign together. The Roman people, by the terms of the will were made its executors. When, therefore, Cæsar, coming to Alexandria, three years afterwards, found the will of Auletes set at nought, Ptolemy occupying the throne, alone, and Cleopatra struggling against him, he had some ground for a pretension of right to interfere.—S. Sharpe, *Hist. of Egypt*, ch. 11.

**B. C. 48-47.—Civil war between Cleopatra and Ptolemy.—Intervention of Cæsar.—The rising against him.—The Romans besieged in Alexandria.—Their ruthless victory.** See ALEXANDRIA: B. C. 48-47.

**B. C. 30.—Organized as a Roman province.**—After the battle of Actium and the death of Cleopatra, Egypt was reduced by Octavius to the rank of a Roman province and the dynasty of the Ptolemies extinguished. But Octavius "had no intention of giving to the senate the rich domain which he tore from its native rulers. He would not sow in a foreign soil the seeds of independence which he was intent upon crushing nearer home. . . . In due time he persuaded the senate and people to establish it as a principle, that Egypt should never be placed under the administration of any man of superior rank to the equestrian, and that no senator should be allowed even

to visit it, without express permission from the supreme authority."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 29.

**A. D. 100-500.—Roman and Christian.** See ALEXANDRIA: B. C. 48-47 to A. D. 413-415; and CHRISTIANITY: A. D. 33-100, and 100-312.

**A. D. 296.—Revolt crushed by Diocletian.** See ALEXANDRIA: A. D. 296.

**A. D. 616-628.—Conquest by Chosroes, the Persian.**—The career of conquest pursued by Chosroes, the last Persian conqueror, extended even to Egypt, and beyond it. "Egypt itself, the only province which had been exempt since the time of Diocletian from foreign and domestic war, was again subdued by the successors of Cyrus. Pelusium, the key of that impervious country, was surprised by the cavalry of the Persians; they passed with impunity the innumerable channels of the Delta, and explored the long valley of the Nile from the pyramids of Memphis to the confines of Ethiopia. Alexandria might have been relieved by a naval force, but the archbishop and the prefect embarked for Cyprus; and Chosroes entered the second city of the empire, which still preserved a wealthy remnant of industry and commerce. His western trophy was erected, not on the walls of Carthage, but in the neighbourhood of Tripoli; the Greek colonies of Cyrene were finally extirpated." By the peace concluded in 628, after the death of Chosroes, all of his conquests were restored to the empire and the cities of Syria and Egypt evacuated by their Persian garrisons.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 46.—See PERSIA: A. D. 226-627.

**A. D. 640-646.—Moslem conquest.** See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 640-646.

**A. D. 967-1171.—Under the Fatimite Caliphs.** See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 908-1171.

**A. D. 1: 68-1250.—Under the Atabeg and Ayoubite sultans.** See SALADIN, THE EMPIRE OF.

**A. D. 1218-1220.—Invasion by the Fifth Crusade.** See CRUSADES: A. D. 1216-1220.

**A. D. 1249-1250.—The crusading invasion by Saint Louis of France.** See CRUSADES: A. D. 1248-1254.

**A. D. 1250-1517.—The Mameluke Sultans.**—The Mamelukes were a military body created by Saladin. "The word means slave (literally 'the possessed'), and . . . they were brought in youth from northern countries to serve in the South. Saladin himself was a Kurd, and long before his accession to power, Turkish and Kurdish mercenaries were employed by the Caliphs of Bagdad and Cairo, as the Pope employs Swiss. . . . Subsequently, however, Circassia became the country which most largely furnished this class of troops. Their apprenticeship was a long and laborious one: they were taught, first of all, to read the Koran and to write; then followed lance-exercise, during which time nobody was allowed to speak to them. At first they either resided in the castle, or were exercised living under tents; but after the time of Sultan Barkouk they were allowed to live in the town [Cairo], and the quarter now occupied by the Jews was at that time devoted to the Circassian Mamelukes. After this period they neglected their religious and warlike exercises, and became degenerate and corrupt. . . . The dynasty of Saladin . . . was of no duration, and ended in 648 A. H., or 1250



of the Christian era. Then began the so-called Bahrite Sultans, in consequence of the Mamelukes of the sultan Negm-ed-din having lodged in Rodah, the Island in the Nile (Bah-en-Nil). The intriguer of the period was Sieger-ed-dur, the widow of the monarch, who married one of the Mamelukes, Moez-eddin-ibek-el-Turcomany, who became the first of these Bahrite Sultans, and was himself murdered in the Castle of Calro through this woman. . . . Their subsequent history, until the conquest of Egypt by Sultan Selim in 1517, presents nothing but a series of acts of lust, murder and rapine. So rapidly did they expel each other from power, that the average reign of each did not exceed five or six years. . . . The 'flecting purple' of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire is the spectacle which these Mameluke Dynasties constantly present."—A. A. Paton, *Hist. of the Egyptian Revolution*, v. 1, ch. 3-5.

**A. D. 1516-1517.—Overthrow of the Mameluke Sultans.—Ottoman conquest by Sultan Selim.** See TURKS: A. D. 1481-1520.

**A. D. 1798-1799.—The French conquest and occupation by Bonaparte.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1798 (MAY—AUGUST), and 1798-1799 (AUGUST—AUGUST).

**A. D. 1798-1799.—Bonaparte's organization of government.—His victory at Aboukir.—His return to France.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1798-1799 (AUGUST—AUGUST), and 1799 (NOVEMBER).

**A. D. 1800.—Discontent and discouragement of the French.—The repudiated Treaty of El Arish.—Turkish defeat at Heliopolis.—Revolt crushed at Cairo.—Assassination of Kleber.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1800 (JANUARY—JUNE).

**A. D. 1801-1802.—Expulsion of the French by the English.—Restoration of the province to Turkey.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1801-1802.

**A. D. 1803-1811.—The rise of Mohammad 'Aly (or Mehemet Ali) to power.—His treacherous destruction of the Mamelukes.**—"It was during the French occupation that Mohammad 'Aly [or Mehemet Ali] came on the scene. He was born in 1768 at the Albanian port of Kaballa, and by the patronage of the governor was sent to Egypt in 1801 with the contingent of troops furnished by Kaballa to the Ottoman army then operating with the English against the French. He rapidly rose to the command of the Arnaut or Albanian section of the Turkish army, and soon found himself an important factor in the confused political position which followed the departure of the British army. The Memluk Beys had not been restored to their former posts as provincial governors, and were consequently ripe for revolt against the Porte; but their party was weakened by the rivalry of its two leaders, El-Elfy and El-Bardisy, who divided their followers into two hostile camps. On the other hand, the Turkish Pasha appointed by the Porte had not yet gained a firm grip of the country, and was perpetually apprehensive of a recall to Constantinople. Mohammad 'Aly at the head of his Albanians was an important ally for either side to secure, and he fully appreciated his position. He played off one party against the other, the Pasha against the Beys, so successfully, that he not only weakened both sides, but made the people of Cairo, who were disgusted with the anarchy of Memluk and Turk alike, his firm friends; and at last suffered him-

self, with becoming hesitation, to be persuaded by the entreaty of the populace to become [1805] their ruler, and thus stepped to the supreme power in the curious guise of the people's friend. A fearful time followed Mohammad 'Aly's election—for such it was—for the governorship of Egypt. The Turkish Pasha, Khurshid, held the citadel, and Mohammad 'Aly, energetically aided by the people of Cairo, laid siege to it. From the minaret of the mosque of Sultan Hasan, and from the heights of Mukattam, the besiegers poured their fire into the citadel, and Khurshid replied with an indiscriminate cannonade upon the city. The firing went on for weeks (pausing on Fridays), till a messenger arrived from Constantinople bringing the confirmation of the popular vote, in the form of a firman, appointing Mohammad 'Aly governor of Egypt. Khurshid shortly afterwards retired, and the soldiery amused themselves in the approved Turkish and (even worse) Albanian fashion by making havoc of the houses of the citizens. Mohammad 'Aly now possessed the title of Governor of Egypt, but beyond the walls of Cairo his authority was everywhere disputed by the Beys. . . . An attempt was made to ensnare certain of the Beys, who were encamped north of the metropolis. On the 17th of August, 1805, the dam of the canal of Cairo was to be cut, and some chiefs of Mohammad 'Aly's party wrote informing them that he would go forth early on that morning with most of his troops to witness the ceremony, inviting them to enter and seize the city, and, to deceive them, stipulating for a certain sum of money as a reward. The dam, however, was cut early in the preceding night, without any ceremony. On the following morning these Beys, with their Memluks, a very numerous body, broke open the gate of the suburb El-Hosey-niyeh, and gained admittance into the city. . . . They marched along the principal street for some distance, with kettle-drums behind each company, and were received with apparent joy by the citizens. At the mosque called the Ashrafyeh they separated, one party proceeding to the Azhar and the houses of certain sheykhs, and the other party continuing along the main street, and through the gate called Bab-Zuweyleh, where they turned up towards the citadel. Here they were fired on by some soldiers from the houses; and with this signal a terrible massacre commenced. Falling back towards their companions, they found the by-streets closed; and in that part of the main thoroughfare called Beyn-el-Kasreyn, they were suddenly placed between two fires. Thus shut up in a narrow street, some sought refuge in the collegiate mosque of the Barkukiyyeh, while the remainder fought their way through their enemies, and escaped over the city wall with the loss of their horses. Two Memluks had in the meantime succeeded, by great exertions, in giving the alarm to their comrades in the quarter of the Azhar, who escaped by the eastern gate called Bab-el-Ghureyyib. A horrible fate awaited those who had shut themselves up in the Barkukiyyeh. Having begged for quarter and surrendered, they were immediately stripped nearly naked, and about fifty were slaughtered on the spot; and about the same number were dragged away. . . . The wretched captives were then chained and left in the court of the Pasha's house; and on the following morning the heads

of their comrades, who had perished the day before, were skinned and stuffed with straw before their eyes. One Bey and two other men paid their ransom, and were released; the rest, without exception, were tortured, and put to death in the course of the ensuing night. . . . The Beys were disheartened by this revolting butchery, and most of them retired to the upper country. Urged by England, or more probably by the promise of a bribe from El-Elfy, the Porte began a leisured interference in favour of the Memluks; but the failure of El-Elfy's treasury, and a handsome bribe from Mohammad 'Aly, soon changed the Sultan's views, and the Turkish fleet sailed away. . . . An attempt of the English Government to restore the Memluks by the action of a force of 5,000 men under General Fraser ended in disaster and humiliation, and the citizens of Cairo had the satisfaction of seeing the heads of Englishmen exposed on stakes in the Ezbekiyeh. Mohammad 'Aly now adopted a more conciliatory policy towards the Memluks, granted them land, and encouraged them to return to Cairo. The clemency was only assumed in order to prepare the way for the act of consummate treachery which finally uprooted the Memluk power. . . . Early in the year 1811, the preparations for an expedition against the Wahhabis in Arabia being complete, all the Memluk Beys then in Cairo were invited to the ceremony of investing Mohammad 'Aly's favourite son, Tusun, with a pelisse and the command of the army. As on the former occasion, the unfortunate Memluks fell into the snare. On the 1st of March, Shahin Bey and the other chiefs (one only excepted) repaired with their retinues to the citadel, and were courteously received by the Pasha. Having taken coffee, they formed in procession, and, preceded and followed by the Pasha's troops, slowly descended the steep and narrow road leading to the great gate of the citadel; but as soon as the Memluks arrived at the gate it was suddenly closed before them. The last of those who made their exit before the gate was shut were Albanians under Salih Kush. To those troops their chief now made known the Pasha's orders to massacre all the Memluks within the citadel; therefore having returned by another way, they gained the summit of the walls and houses, that hem in the road in which the Memluks were, and some stationed themselves upon the eminences of the rock through which that road is partly cut. Thus securely placed, they commenced a heavy fire on their defenceless victims, and immediately the troops who closed the procession, and who had the advantage of higher ground, followed their example. . . . 470 Memluks entered the citadel, and of these very few, if any, escaped. One of these is said to have been a Bey. According to some, he leaped his horse from the ramparts, and alighted uninjured, though the horse was killed by the fall. Others say that he was prevented from joining his comrades, and discovered the treachery while waiting without the gate. He fled and made his way to Syria. This massacre was the signal for an indiscriminate slaughter of the Memluks throughout Egypt, orders to this effect being transmitted to every governor; and in Cairo itself, the houses of the Beys were given over to the soldiery, who slaughtered all their adherents, treated their women in the most shameless manner, and sacked

their dwellings. . . . The last of his rivals being now destroyed, Mohammad 'Aly was free to organize the administration of the country, and to engage in expeditious abroad."—S. Lane-Poole, *Egypt*, ch. 8.

ALSO IN: A. A. Paton, *Hist. of the Egyptian Revolution*, v. 2.

A. D. 1807.—Occupation of Alexandria by the English.—Disastrous failure of their expedition. See TURKS: A. D. 1806-1807.

A. D. 1831-1840.—Rebellion of Mehemet Ali.—Successes against the Turks.—Intervention of the Western Powers.—Egypt made an hereditary Pashalik. See TURKS: A. D. 1831-1840.

A. D. 1840-1860.—Mehemet Ali and his successors.—The khedives.—The opening of the Suez Canal.—"By the treaty of 1840 between the Porte and the European Powers, . . . his title to Egypt having been . . . affirmed . . . Mehemet Ali devoted himself during the next seven years to the social and material improvement of the country, with an aggregate of results which has fixed his place in history as the 'Peter the Great' of Egypt. Indeed, except some additions and further reforms made during the reign of his reputed grandson, Ismail Pasha, the whole administrative system, up till less than ten years ago, was, in the main, his work; and notwithstanding many admitted defects, it was at his death incomparably the most civilised and efficient of then existing Mussulman Governments. In 1848, this great satrap, then verging on his eightieth year, was attacked by a mental malady; induced, as it was said, by a potion administered in mistaken kindness by one of his own daughters, and the government was taken over by his adopted son, Ibrahim Pasha, the hero of Koniah and Nezib. He lingered till August 1849, but Ibrahim had already predeceased him; and Abbas, a son of the latter, succeeded to the viceregal throne. Though born and bred in Egypt, Abbas was a Turk of the worst type—ignorant, cowardly, sensual, fanatic, and opposed to reforms of every sort. Thus his feeble reign of less than six years was, in almost everything, a period of retrogression. On a night in July, 1854, he was strangled in his sleep by a couple of his own slaves,—acting, it was variously said, on a secret order from Constantinople, or at the behest of one of his wives. To Abbas succeeded Said, the third son of Mehemet Ali, an amiable and liberal-minded prince who retrieved much of the mischief done by his predecessor, but lacked the vigorous intelligence and force of character required to carry on the great work begun by his father. His reign will be chiefly memorable for the concession and commencement of the Suez Canal, the colossal work which, while benefiting the trade of the world, has cost so much to Egypt. Said died in January 1863, and was succeeded by his nephew Ismail Pasha, the second son of Ibrahim. As most of the leading incidents of this Prince's reign, as also the chief features of his character, are still fresh in the public memory, I need merely recall a few of the more salient of both. Amongst the former, history will give the first place to his creation of the huge public debt which forms the main element of a problem that still confronts Europe. But, for this the same impartial judge will at least equally blame the financial panders who ministered to his ex-

travagance, with exorbitant profit to themselves, but at ruinous cost to Egypt. On the other hand, it is but historical justice to say that Ismail did much for the material progress of the country. He added more than 1,000 to the 200 miles of railway in existence at the death of Said. He greatly improved the irrigation, and so increased the cultivable area of the country; multiplied the primary schools, and encouraged native industries. For so much, at least, history will give him credit. As memorable, though less meritorious, were the magnificent fetes with which, in 1869, he opened the Suez Canal, the great work which England had so long opposed, but through which—as if by the irony of history—the first ship that passed flew the English flag, and to the present traffic of which we contribute more than eighty per cent. In personal character, Ismail was of exceptional intelligence, but cruel, crafty, and untrustworthy both in politics and in his private relations. . . . It may be mentioned that Ismail Pasha was the first of these Ottoman Viceroy's who bore the title of 'Khedive,' which is a Perso-Arabic designation signifying rank a shade less than regal. This he obtained in 1867 by heavy bribes to the Sultan and his chief ministers, as he had the year before by similar means ousted his brother and uncle from the succession, and secured it for his own eldest son,—in virtue of which the latter now [1890] nominally reigns."—J. C. McCoan, *Egypt (National Life and Thought, lect. 18)*.—The same, *Egypt under Ismail, ch. 1-4*.

**A. D. 1870-1883.—Conquest of the Soudan.**  
—Measures for the suppression of the slave-trade.—The government of General Gordon.  
—Advent of the Mahdi and beginning of his revolt.—In 1870, Ismail Pasha "made an appeal for European assistance to strengthen him in completing the conquest of Central Africa. [Sir Samuel] Baker was accordingly placed in command of 1,200 men, supplied with cannon and steam-boats, and received the title of Governour-General of the provinces which he was commissioned to subdue. Having elected to make Gondokoro the seat of his government, he changed its name to Ismailia. He was not long in bringing the Bari to submission, and then, advancing southwards, he came to the districts of Dufilé and Fatiko, a healthy region endowed by nature with fertile valleys and irrigated by limpid streams, but for years past converted into a sort of hell upon earth by the slave-hunters who had made it their headquarters. From these pests Baker delivered the locality, and having by his tact and energy overcome the distrust of the native rulers, he established over their territory a certain number of small military settlements. . . . Baker returned to Europe flattering himself with the delusion that he had put an end to the scourge of slave dealing. 'It was true that various slave-dealers' dens on the Upper Nile had been destroyed, a number of outlaws had been shot, and a few thousand miserable slaves had been set at liberty; but beyond that nothing had been accomplished; no sooner had the liberator turned his back than the odious traffic recommenced with more vigour than before through the region south of Gondokoro. This, however, was only one of the slave-hunting districts, and by no means the worst. . . . Under European compulsion . . . the Khedive Ismail undertook to promote measures to put a stop to the scandal.

He entered into various conventions with England on the subject; and in order to convince the Powers of the sincerity of his intentions, he consented to put the equatorial provinces under the administration of an European officer, who should be commissioned to carry on the work of repression, conquest and organisation that had been commenced by Baker. His choice fell upon a man of exceptional ability, a brilliant officer trained at Woolwich, who had already gained high renown in China, not only for military talent, but for his adroitness and skill in negotiation and diplomacy. This was Colonel Gordon, familiarly known as 'Chinese Gordon,' who was now to add fresh lustre to his name in Egypt as Gordon Pasha. Gordon was appointed Governour-General of the Soudan in 1874. With him were associated Chailié-Long, an American officer, who was chief of his staff; the German, Dr. Emil Effendi, medical officer to the expedition; Lieutenants Chippendall and Watson; Gessi and Kemp, engineers. . . . Thenceforward the territories, of which so little had hitherto been known, became the continual scene of military movements and scientific excursions. . . . The Soudan was so far conquered as to be held by about a dozen military outposts stationed along the Nile from Lake No to Lakes Albert and Iorahim. . . . In 1876 Gordon went back to Cairo. Nevertheless, although he was wearied with the continual struggle of the past two years, worn down by the incessant labours of internal organisation and geographical investigations, disheartened, too, by the jealousies, rivalries, and intrigues of all around him, and by the ill feeling of the very people whom the Khedive's Government had sent to support him, he consented to return again to his post; this time with the title of Governour-General of the Soudan, Darfur, and the Equatorial Provinces. At the beginning of 1877 he took possession of the Government palace at Khartoum. . . . Egyptian authority, allied with European civilisation, appeared now at length to be taking some hold on the various districts, and the Cairo Government might begin to look forward to a time when it could reckon on some reward for its labours and sacrifices. The area of the new Egyptian Soudan had now become immense. Geographically, its centre included the entire valley of the Nile proper, from Berber to the great lakes; on the east were such portions of the valleys of the Blue Nile and Atbara as lay outside Abyssinia; and on the west were the districts watered by the Bahr-el-Ghazal, and the Bahr-el-Arab, right away to the confines of Wadal. . . . Unfortunately in 1879 Ismail Pasha was deposed, and, to the grievous loss of the Soudan, Gordon was recalled. As the immediate consequence, the country fell back into the hands of Turkish pashas; apathy, disorder, carelessness, and ill feeling reappeared at Khartoum, and the Arab slave-dealers, who had for a period been kept under by Baker, Gessi, and Gordon, came once more to the front. . . . It was Raouf Pasha who, in 1879, succeeded Gordon as Governour-General. He had three Europeans as his subordinates—Emil Bey, who before Gordon left, had been placed in charge of the province of the equator; Lupton Bey, an Englishman, who had followed Gessi as Governour on the Bahr-el-Ghazal; and Slatin Bey, an Austrian, in command of Darfur. Raouf had barely been two years at Khartoum when the Mahdi appeared on

the scene. Prompted either by personal ambition or by religious hatred, the idea of playing the part of 'Mahdi' had been acted upon by many an Arab fanatic [see MAHDI]. Such an idea, at an early age, had taken possession of a certain Soudanese of low birth, a native of Dongola, by name Mohammed Ahmed. Before openly aspiring to the rôle of the regenerator of Islam he had filled several subordinate engagements, notably one under Dr. Peney, the French surgeon-general in the Soudan, who died in 1861. Shortly afterwards he received admittance into the powerful order of the Ghelaul dervishes, and then commenced his schemes for stirring up a revolution in defence of his creed. His proceedings did not fail to attract the attention of Gessi Pasha, who had him arrested at Shekka and imprisoned for five months. Under the government of Raouf he took up his abode upon the small island of Abba, on the Nile above Khartoum, where he gained a considerable notoriety by the austerity of his life and by the fervour of his devotions, thus gradually gaining a high reputation for sanctity. Not only offerings but followers streamed in from every quarter. He became rich as well as powerful. . . . Waiting till May 1881, he then assumed that a propitious time had arrived for the realisation of his plans, and accordingly had himself publicly proclaimed as 'Mahdi,' inviting every fakir and every religious leader of Islam to come and join him at Abba. . . . Convinced that it was impolitic to tolerate any longer the revolutionary intrigues of such an adventurer at the very gates of Khartoum, Raouf Pasha resolved to rid the country of Mohammed and to send him to Cairo for trial. An expedition was accordingly despatched to the island of Abba, but unfortunately the means employed were inadequate to the task. Only a small body of black soldiers were sent to arrest the agitator in his quarters, and they, inspired no doubt by a vague and superstitious dread of a man who represented himself as the messenger of Allah, wavered and acted with indecision. Before their officers could rally them to energy, the Mahdi, with a fierce train of followers, knife in hand, rushed upon them, and killing many, put the rest to flight; then, seeing that a renewed assault was likely to be made, he withdrew the insurgent band into a retreat of safety amongst the mountains of Southern Kordofan. Henceforth revolt was openly declared. Such was the condition of things in August 1881. Chase was given, but every effort to secure the person of the pretended prophet was baffled. A further attempt was made to arrest him by the Mudir of Fashoda with 1,500 men, only to be attended with a still more melancholy result. After a desperate struggle the Mudir lay stretched upon the ground, his soldiers murdered all around him. One single officer, with a few straggling cavalry, escaped the massacre, and returned to report the fatal news. The reverse caused an absolute panic in Khartoum, an intense excitement spreading throughout the Soudan. . . . Meantime the Mahdi's prestige was ever on the increase, and he soon felt sufficiently strong to assume the offensive. His troops overran Kordofan and Sennar, advancing on the one hand to the town of Sennar, which they set on fire, and on the other to El-Obeid, which they placed in a state of siege. In the following July a fresh and more powerful expedition, this time numbering 6,000 men, under the command of Yussuf Pasha, left Fashoda and

made towards the Mahdi's headquarters. It met with no better fate than the expeditions that had gone before. . . . And then it was that the English Government, discerning danger for Egypt in this insurrection of Islam, set to work to act for the Khedive. It told off 11,000 men, and placed them under the command of Hicks Pasha, an officer in the Egyptian service who had made the Abyssinian campaign. At the end of December 1882 this expedition embarked at Suez for Suakin, crossed the desert, reached the Nile at Berber, and after much endurance on the way, arrived at Khartoum. Before this, El-Obeid had fallen into the Mahdi's power, and there he had taken up his headquarters. Some trifling advantages were gained by Hicks, but having entered Kordofan with the design of retaking El-Obeid, he was, on the 5th of November 1883, hemmed in amongst the Kasgil passes, and after three days' heroic fighting, his army of about 10,000 men was overpowered by a force five or six times their superior in numbers, and completely exterminated. Hicks Pasha himself, his European staff, and many Egyptian officers of high rank, were among the dead, and forty-two guns fell into the hands of the enemy. Again, not a man was left to carry the fatal tidings to Khartoum. Rebellion continued to spread. After being agitated for months, the population of the Eastern Soudan also made a rising. Osman Digna, the foremost of the Mahdi's lieutenants, occupied the road between Suakin and Berber, and surrounded Sukat and Tokar; then, having destroyed, one after another, two Egyptian columns that had been despatched for the relief of these towns, he finally cut off the communication between Khartoum and the Red Sea. The tide of insurrection by this time had risen so high that it threatened not only to overthrow the Khedive's authority in the Soudan, but to become the source of serious peril to Egypt itself.—A. J. Wauters, *Stanley's Emin Pasha Expedition*, ch. 1-2.

ALSO IN: Maj. R. F. Wingate, *Mahdism and the Egyptian Sudan*, bk. 1-4.—Col. Sir W. F. Butler, *Charles George Gordon*, ch. 5-6.—A. E. Hake, *The Story of Chinese Gordon*, ch. 10-15.

A. D. 1875-1882.—**Bankruptcy of the state.**—**English and French control of finances.**—**Native hostility to the foreigners.**—**Rebellion, led by Arabi.**—**English bombardment of Alexandria.**—"The facilities given by foreign money-lenders encouraged extravagance and ostentation on the part of the sovereign and the ruling classes, while mismanagement and corrupt practices were common among officials, so that the public debt rose in 1875 to ninety-one millions, and in January, 1881, to ninety-eight millions. . . . The European capitalists obtained for their money nominally six to nine per cent., but really not less than eight to ten per cent., as the bonds were issued at low rates. . . . The interest on these borrowed millions was punctually paid up to the end of 1875, when the Khedive found that he could not satisfy his creditors, and the British government interfered in his favour. Mr. Cave was sent to examine into Egyptian finances, and he reported that loans at twelve and thirteen per cent. were being agreed to and renewed at twenty-five per cent., and that some measure of consolidation was necessary. The two western Powers now took the matter in hand, but they thereby recognized the whole of these usurious

demands. The debt, although under their control, and therefore secured, was not reduced by the amount already paid in premiums for risk. Nor was the rate of interest diminished to something more nearly approaching the rate payable on English consols, which was three per cent. A tribunal under the jurisdiction of united European and native judges was also established in Egypt to decide complaints of foreigners against natives, and vice versa. In May, 1876, this tribunal gave judgment that the income of the Khedive Ismail, from his private landed property, could be appropriated to pay the creditors of the state, and an execution was put into the Viceregal palace, Er Ramlah, near Alexandria. The Khedive pronounced the judgment invalid, and the tribunal ceased to act. Two commissioners were now again sent to report on Egyptian finances—M. Joubert, the director of the Paris Bank, for France, and Mr. Goschen, a former minister, for England. These gentlemen proposed to hand over the control the finances to two Europeans, depriving the state of all independence and governing power. The Khedive, in order to resist these demands, convoked a sort of Parliament in order to make an appeal to the people. From this Parliament was afterwards developed the Assembly of Notables, and the National party, now so often spoken of. In 1877 a European commission of control over Egyptian finance was named. . . . Nubar Pasha was made Prime minister in 1878; the control of the finances was entrusted to Mr. Wilson, an Englishman; and later, the French controller, M. de Bignonères, entered the Cabinet. Better order was thus restored to the finances. Rothschild's new loan of eight and a half millions was issued at seventy-three, and therefore brought in from six to eight per cent. nett. . . . But to be able to pay the creditors their full interest, economy had to be introduced into the national expenditure. To do this, clumsy arrangements were made, and the injustice shown in carrying them out embittered many classes of the population, and laid the foundations of a fanatical hatred of race against race. . . . In consequence of all this, the majority of the notables, many ulemas, officers, and higher officials among the Egyptians, formed themselves into a National party, with the object of resisting the oppressive government of the foreigner. They were joined by the great mass of the discharged soldiers and subordinate officials, not to mention many others. At the end of February, 1879, a revolt broke out in Cairo. Nubar, hated by the National party, was dismissed by the Khedive Ismail, who installed his son Tewfik as Prime minister. In consequence of this, the coupons due in April were not paid till the beginning of May, and the western Powers demanded the reinstatement of Nubar. That Tewfik on this occasion retired and sided with the foreigners is the chief cause of his present [1882] unpopularity in Egypt. Ismail, however, now dismissed Wilson and De Bignonères, and a Cabinet was formed, consisting chiefly of native Egyptians, with Sherif Pasha as Prime minister. Sherif now raised for the first time the cry of which we have since heard so much, and which was inscribed by Arabi on his banners, 'Egypt for the Egyptians.' The western Powers retorted by a menacing naval demonstration, and demanded of the Sultan the deposition of the Khedive. In June, 1879, this

demand was agreed to. Ismail went into exile, and his place was filled by Mahomed Tewfik. . . . The new Khedive, with apathetic weakness, yielded the reconstruction of his ministry and the organization of his finances to the western Powers. Mr. Harling and M. de Bignonères, as commissioners of the control, aided by officials named by Rothschild to watch over his private interests, now ruled the land. They devoted forty-five millions (about sixteen shillings per head on the entire population) to the payment of interest. The people were embittered by the distrust shown towards them, and the further reduction of the army from fifty to fifteen thousand men threw a large number out of employment. . . . Many acts of military insubordination occurred, and at last, on the 8th of November, 1881, the great military revolt broke out in Cairo. . . . Ahmed Arabi, colonel of the 4th regiment, now first came into public notice. Several regiments, headed by their officers, openly rebelled against the orders of the Khedive, who was compelled to recall the nationalist, Sherif Pasha, and to refer the further demands of the rebels for the increase of the army, and for a constitution to the Sultan. Sherif Pasha, however, did not long enjoy the confidence of the National Egyptian party, at whose head Arabi now stood, winning every day more reputation and influence. The army, in which he permitted great laxity of discipline, was entirely devoted to him. . . . A pretended plot of Circassian officers against his life he dexterously used to increase his popularity. . . . Twenty-six officers were condemned to death by court-martial, but the Khedive, at the instance of the western Powers, commuted the sentence, and they were banished to Constantinople. This leniency was stigmatized by the National party as treachery to the country, and the Chamber of Notables retorted by naming Arabi commander-in-chief of the army and Prime minister without asking the consent of the Khedive. The Chamber soon afterwards came into conflict with the foreign controllers. . . . This ended by De Bignonères resigning his post, and in the May of the present year (1882) the consuls of the European Powers declared that a fleet of English and French ironclads would appear before Alexandria, to demand the disbanding of the army and the punishment of its leaders. The threat was realized, and, in spite of protests from the Sultan, a fleet of English and French ironclads entered the harbour of Alexandria. The Khedive, at the advice of his ministers and the chiefs of the National party, appealed to the Sultan. . . . The popular hatred of foreigners now became more and more apparent, and began to assume threatening dimensions. . . . On the 30th of May, Arabi announced that a despatch from the Sultan had reached him, promising the deposition of Tewfik in favour of his uncle Halim Pasha. . . . On the 3rd of June, Dervish Pasha, a man of energy notwithstanding his years, had sailed from Constantinople. . . . His object was to pacify Egypt and to reconcile Tewfik and Arabi Pasha. . . . Since the publication of the despatch purporting to proclaim Halim Pasha as Khedive, Arabi had done nothing towards dethroning the actual ruler. But on the 2nd of June he began to strengthen the fortifications of Alexandria with earthworks. . . . The British admiral protested, and the

Sultan, on the remonstrances of British diplomacy, forbade the continuation of the works. . . . Serious disturbances took place in Alexandria on the 11th. The native rabble invaded the European quarter, plundered the shops, and slew many foreigners. . . . Though the disturbances were not renewed, a general emigration of foreigners was the result. . . . On the 22nd a commission, consisting of nine natives and nine Europeans . . . began to try the ringleaders of the riot. . . . But events were hurlyburly on towards war. The works at Alexandria were recommenced, and the fortifications armed with heavy guns. The English admiral received information that the entrance to the harbour would be blocked by sunken storeships, and this, he declared, would be an act of open war. A complete scheme for the destruction of the Suez canal was also discovered. . . . The English, on their side, now began to make hostile demonstrations; and Arabi, while repudiating wantlike intentions, declared himself ready for resistance. . . . On the 27th the English vice-consul advised his fellow-countrymen to leave Alexandria, and on the 3rd of July, according to the 'Times,' the arrangements for war were complete. . . . Finally, as a reconnaissance on the 9th showed that the forts were still being strengthened, he [the English admiral] informed the governor of Alexandria, Zulficar Pasha, that unless the forts had been previously evacuated and surrendered to the English, he intended to commence the bombardment at four the next morning. . . . As the French government were unable to take part in any active measures (a grant for that purpose having been refused by the National Assembly), the greater part of their fleet, under Admiral Conrad, left Alexandria for Port Said. The ironclads of other nations, more than fifty in number, anchored outside the harbour of Alexandria. . . . On the evening of the 10th of July . . . and at daybreak on the 11th, the . . . ironclads took up the positions assigned to them. There was a gentle breeze from the east, and the weather was clear. At 6.30 a. m. all the ships were cleared for action. At seven the admiral signalled to the Alexandria to fire a shell into Fort Ada. . . . The first shot fired from the Alexandria was immediately replied to by the Egyptians; whereupon the ships of the whole fleet and the Egyptian forts and batteries opened fire, and the engagement became general. . . . At 8.30 Fort Marsa-el-Kanat was blown up by shells from the Invincible and Monarch, and by nine o'clock the Téméraire, Monarch, and Penelope had silenced most of the guns in Fort Meks, although four defied every effort from their protected situation. By 11.45 Forts Marabout and Adjemi had ceased firing, and a landing party of seamen and marines was despatched, under cover of the Bittern's guns, to spike and blow up the guns in the forts. At 1.30 a shell from the Superb burst in the chief powder magazine of Fort Ada and blew it up. By four o'clock all the guns of Fort Pharos, and half an hour later those of Fort Meks, were disabled, and at 5.30 the admiral ordered the firing to cease. The ships were repeatedly struck and sustained some damage. . . . The English casualties were five killed and twenty-eight wounded, a comparatively small loss. The Egyptian loss is not known. . . . At 1 p. m. on the 12th of July, the white flag was hoisted by the Egyptians. Admiral Seymour demanded, as a prelimi-

nary measure, the surrender of the forts commanding the entrance to the harbour, and the negotiations on this point were fruitlessly protracted for some hours. As night approached the city was seen to be on fire in many places, and the flames were spreading in all directions. The English now became aware that the white flag had merely been used as means to gain time for a hasty evacuation of Alexandria by Arabi and his army. Sailors and marines were now landed, and ships of other nations sent detachments on shore to protect their countrymen. But it was too late; Bedouins, convicts, and ill-disciplined soldiers had plundered and burnt the European quarter, killed many foreigners, and a Reuter's telegram of the 14th said, 'Alexandria is completely destroyed.'—H. Vogt, *The Egyptian War of 1882*, pp. 2-32.

ALSO IN: J. C. McCoan, *Egypt under Ismail*, ch. 8-10.—C. Royle, *The Egyptian Campaign*, v. 1, p. 1-20.—*Khedives and Pashas*.—C. F. Goodrich, *Rept. on British Military and Naval Operations in Egypt*, 1882, pt. 1.

**A. D. 1882-1883.—The massacre and destruction in Alexandria.—Declared rebellion of Arabi.—Its suppression by the English.—Banishment of Arabi.—English occupation.**—The city of Alexandria had become "such a scene of pillage, massacre, and wanton destruction as to make the world shudder. It was the old tale of horrors. Houses were plundered and burned; the European quarter, including the stately buildings surrounding the Great Square of Mehemet Ali, was sacked and left a heap of smoldering ruins; and more than two thousand Europeans, for the most part Levantines, were massacred with all the cruelty of oriental fanaticism. This was on the afternoon of the 13th. It was the second massacre that had occurred under the very eyes of the British fleet. The admiral's failure to prevent it has been called unfortunate by some and criminal by others. It seems to have been wholly without excuse. . . . The blue-jackets were landed on the 13th, and cleared the way before them with a Gatling gun. The next day, more ships having arrived, a sufficient force was landed to take possession of the entire city. The khedive was escorted back to Ras-el-Tin from Ramleh, and given a strong guard. Summary justice was dealt out to all hostile Arabs who had been captured in the city. In short, English intervention was followed by English occupation. The bombardment of Alexandria had defined clearly the respective positions of Arabi and the khedive toward Egypt and the Egyptian people. . . . The khedive was not only weak in the eyes of his people, but he was regarded as the tool of England. . . . From the moment the first shot was fired upon Alexandria, Arabi was the real ruler of the people. . . . The conference at Constantinople was stirred by the news of the bombardment of Alexandria. It presented a note to the Porte, July 15, requesting the dispatch of Turkish troops to restore the status quo in Egypt. But the sultan had no idea of taking the part of the Christian in what all Islam regarded as a contest between the Moslem and the unbeliever. . . . In Egypt, the khedive had been prevailed upon, after some demur, to proclaim Arabi a rebel and discharge him from his cabinet. Arabi had issued a counter-proclamation, on the same day, declaring Tewfik a traitor to his people

and his religion. Having received the news of the khedive's proclamation, Lord Dufferin, the British ambassador at Constantinople, announced to the conference that England was about to send an expedition to Egypt to suppress the rebellion and to restore the authority of the khedive. Thereupon the sultan declared that he had decided to send a Turkish expedition. Lord Dufferin feigned to accept the sultan's co-operation, but demanded that the Porte, as a preliminary step, should declare Arabi a rebel. Again the sultan was confronted with the danger of incurring the wrath of the Moslem world. He could not declare Arabi a rebel. . . . In his desperation he sent a force of 3,000 men to Suva bay with orders to hold themselves in readiness to enter Egypt at a moment's notice. . . . In the meantime, however, the English expedition had arrived in Egypt and was proceeding to crush the rebellion, regardless of the diplomatic delays and bickerings at Constantinople. . . . It was not until the 15th of August that Sir Garnet Wolsley arrived with his force in Egypt. The English at that time held only two points, Alexandria and Suez, while the entire Egyptian interior, as well as Port Said and Ismailia, were held by Arabi, whose force, it was estimated, now amounted to about 70,000 men, of whom at least 50,000 were regulars. The objective point of General Wolsley's expedition to crush Arabi was, of course, the city of Cairo. There were two ways of approaching that city, one from Alexandria, through the Delta, and the other from the Suez canal. There were many objections to the former route. . . . The Suez canal was supposed to be neutral water. . . . But England felt no obligation to recognize any neutrality, . . . acting upon the principle, which is doubtless sound, that 'the neutrality of any canal joining the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans will be maintained, if at all, by the nation which can place and keep the strongest ships at each extremity.' In other words, General Wolsley decided to enter Cairo by way of the Suez canal and Ismailia. But he kept his plan a profound secret. Admiral Seymour alone knew his purpose. . . . On the 19th, the transports moved eastward from Alexandria, as if to attack Abukir; but under the cover of darkness that night, they were escorted on to Port Said, where they learned that the entire canal, owing to the preconcerted action of Admiral Seymour, was in the hands of the British. On the 21st, the troops met Sir Henry McPherson's Indian contingent at Ismailia. Two days were now consumed in rest and preparation. The Egyptians cut off the water supply, which came from the Delta by the Sweet Water canal, by damming the canal. A sortie to secure possession of the dam was therefore deemed necessary, and was successfully made on the 24th. Further advances were made, and on the 26th, Kassassin, a station of some importance on the canal and railway, was occupied. Here the British force was obliged to delay for two weeks, while organizing a hospital and a transport service. This gave Arabi opportunity to concentrate his forces at Zagazig and Tel-el-Kebir. But he knew it was for his interest to strike at once before the British transports could come up with the advance. He therefore made two attempts, one on August 28, and the other on September 9, to regain the position lost at Kas-

sassin. But he failed in both, though inflicting some loss upon his opponents. On the 12th of September preparations were made by General Wolsley for a decisive battle. He had become convinced from daily reconnoissance and from the view obtained in the engagement of September 9, that the fortifications at Tel-el-Kebir were both extensive and formidable. . . . It was therefore decided to make the approach under cover of darkness. . . . At 1.30 on the morning of the 13th General Wolsley gave the order for the advance, his force consisting of about 11,000 infantry, 2,000 cavalrymen, and sixty field-guns. They had only the stars to guide them, but so accurately was the movement conducted that the leading brigades of each division reached the enemy's outposts within two minutes of each other. 'The enemy (says General Wolsley) were completely surprised, and it was not until one or two of their advanced sentries fired their rifles that they realized our close proximity to their works.' . . . The intrenchments were not carried without a severe struggle. The Egyptians fought with a desperate courage and hundreds of them were bayoneted at their posts. . . . But what could the rank and file accomplish when 'each officer knew that he would run, but hoped his neighbor would stay.' At the first shot Arabi and his second in command took horse and galloped to Belbeis, where they caught a train for Cairo. Most of the other officers, as the reports of killed and wounded show, did the same. The Egyptians fired their first shot at 4.55 A. M., and at 6.45 the English had possession of Arabi's headquarters and the canal bridge. The British loss was 57 killed, 380 wounded, and 22 missing. The Egyptian army left about 2,000 dead in the fortifications. . . . A proof of the completeness of the success was the entire dissipation of Arabi's army. Groups of soldiers, it is true, were scattered to different parts of Egypt; but the army organization was completely broken up with the battle of Tel-el-Kebir. . . . 'Major-General Lowe was ordered to push on with all possible speed to Cairo. . . . General Lowe [reached] the great barracks of Abbassieh, just outside of Cairo, at 4.45 P. M., on the 14th instant. The cavalry marched sixty-five miles in these two days. . . . A message was sent to Arabi Pasha through the prefect of the city, calling upon him to surrender forthwith, which he did unconditionally.' . . . Before leaving England, Wolsley had predicted that he would enter Cairo on the 16th of September; but with still a day to spare the feat was accomplished, and Arabi's rebellion was completely crushed. England now stood alone. Victory had been won without the aid of France or the intervention of Turkey. In Constantinople negotiations regarding Turkish expeditions were still pending when Lord Dufferin received the news of Wolsley's success, and announced to the Porte that there was now no need of a Turkish force in Egypt, as the war was ended. France at once prepared to resume her share in the control; but England, having borne the sole burden of the war, did not propose now to share the influence her success had given her. And it was for the interest of Egypt that she should not. . . . England's first duty, after quiet was assured, was to send away all the British troops except a force of about 11,000 men, which it was deemed advisable to retain in Egypt until



the khedive's authority was placed on a safe footing throughout the land. . . . What should be done with Arabi was the question of paramount interest, when once the khedive's authority was re-established and recognized. Tewfik and his ministers, if left to themselves, would unquestionably have taken his life. . . . But England was determined that Arabi should have a fair trial. . . . It was decided that the rebel leaders should appear before a military tribunal, and they were given English counsel to plead their cause. . . . The trial was a farce. Everything was 'cut and dried' beforehand. It was arranged that Arabi was to plead guilty to rebellion, that he was forthwith to be condemned to death by the court, and that the khedive was immediately to commute the sentence to perpetual exile. In fact, the necessary papers were drawn up and signed before the court met for Arabi's trial on December 3. . . . On the 26th of December Arabi and his six companions . . . upon whom the same sentence had been passed, left Cairo for the Island of Ceylon, there to spend their life of perpetual exile. . . . Lord Dufferin . . . had been sent from Constantinople to Cairo, early in November, with the special mission of bringing order out of governmental chaos. In two months he had prepared a scheme of legislative reorganization. This was, however, somewhat altered; so that it was not until May, 1883, that the plan in its improved form was accepted by the decree of the khedive. The new constitution provided for three classes of assemblies: the 'Legislative Council,' the 'General Assembly,' and the 'Provincial Councils,' of which there were to be fourteen, one for each province. . . . Every Egyptian man, over twenty years of age, was to vote (by ballot) for an 'elector-delegate' from the village in the neighborhood of which he lived, and the 'electors-delegate' from all the villages in a province were to form the constituency that should elect the provincial council. . . . The scheme for reorganization was carried forward to the extent of electing the 'electors-delegate' in September; but by that time Egypt was again in a state of such disquietude that the British advisers of the khedive considered it unwise to put the new institutions into operation. In place of legislative council and general assembly, the khedive appointed a council of state, consisting of eleven Egyptians, two Armenians, and ten Europeans. The reforms were set aside for the time being in view of impending troubles and dangers in the Sudan."—J. E. Bowen, *The Conflict of East and West in Egypt*, ch. 5-6.

ALSO IN: Col. J. F. Maurice, *Military Hist. of the Campaign of 1882 in Egypt*.—C. Royle, *The Egyptian Campaigns*, v. 1, ch. 22-44.

A. D. 1884-1885.—General Gordon's Mission to Khartoum.—The town beleaguered by the Mahdists.—English rescue expedition.—The energy that was too late.—"The abandonment of the Sudan being decided upon, the British Government confided to General Gordon the task of extricating the Egyptian garrisons scattered throughout the country. . . . Gordon's original instructions were dated the 18th January, 1884. He was to proceed at once to Egypt, to report on the military situation in the Sudan, and on the measures which it might be advisable to take for the security of the Egyptian garrisons and for the safety of the European population in Khar-

toum. . . . He was to be accompanied by Colonel Stewart. . . . Gordon's final instructions were given him by the Egyptian Government in a firman appointing him Governor-General. . . . Gordon arrived at Khartoum on the 18th February. . . . While Gordon was sending almost daily expressions of his view as to the only way of carrying out the policy of eventual evacuation, it was also becoming clear to him that he would very soon be 'cut off' from the rest of Egypt. His first remark on this subject was to express 'the conviction that I shall be caught in Khartoum'; and he wrote,—'Even if I was mean enough to escape I have no power to do so.' The accuracy of this forecast was speedily demonstrated. Within a few days communications with Khartoum were interrupted, and although subsequently restored for a time, the rising of the riparian tribes rendered the receipt and despatch of messages exceedingly uncertain. . . . Long before the summer of 1884, it was evident that the position of Gordon at Khartoum had become so critical, that if he were to be rescued at all, it could only be by the despatch of a British force. . . . Early in May, war preparations were commenced in England, and on the 10th of the month the military authorities in Cairo received instructions to prepare for the despatch in October of an expedition for the relief of the Sudanese capital. 12,000 camels were ordered to be purchased and held in readiness for a forward march in the autumn. On the 16th May a half-battalion of English troops was moved up the Nile to Wady Halfa. A few weeks later some other positions on the Nile were occupied by portions of the Army of Occupation. Naval officers were also sent up the river to examine and report upon the cataracts and other impediments to navigation. Still it was not till the 6th August that Mr. Gladstone rose in the House of Commons to move a vote of credit of £300,000 to enable the Government to undertake operations for the relief of Gordon. . . . It was agreed that there were but two routes by which Khartoum could be approached by an expedition. One by way of the Nile, and the other via Souakim and Berber. . . . The Nile route having been decided on, preparations on a large scale were begun. . . . It was at first arranged that not more than 5,000 men should form the Expedition, but later on the number was raised to 7,000. . . . The instructions given to Lord Wolsley stated that the primary object of the Expedition was to bring away Gordon and Stewart from Khartoum; and when that purpose should be effected, no further offensive operations of any kind were to be undertaken."—C. Royle, *The Egyptian Campaigns*, 1882-1885, v. 2, ch. 12-18.—"First, it was said that our troops would be before the gates of Khartoum on January 14th; next it was the middle of February; and then the time stretched out to the middle of March. . . . Lord Wolsley offered a hundred pounds to the regiment covering the distance from Sarras to Debbeh most expeditiously and with least damage to boats. . . . He also dispatched Sir Herbert Stewart on the immortal march to Gakdul. Stewart's force, composed principally of the Mounted Infantry and Camel Corps, and led by a troop of the 19th Hussars, acting as scouts—numbering about 1,100 in all—set out from Korti on December 80th. Its destination was about 100 miles from headquarters, and about 80 from the Nile at



Shendy. The enterprise, difficult and desperate as it was, was achieved with perfect success. . . . On the 17th January Sir Herbert Stewart engaged the enemy on the road to Metemneh, and after defeating some 10,000 Arabs—collected from Berber, Metemneh, and Omdurman—pushed forward to the Abu Klea Wells. His tactics were much the same as those of General Graham at Eltelh, and those of the Mahdi's men—of attacking when thirst and fatigue had well-nigh prostrated the force—were at all points similar to those adopted against Hicks. Our losses were 65 non-commissioned officers and men killed and 85 wounded, with 9 officers killed—among them Colonel Burnaby—and 9 wounded. Stewart at once pushed on for Metemneh and the Nile. He left the Wells on the 18th Jan. to occupy Metemneh, if possible, but, failing that, to make for the Nile and entrench himself. After a night's march, some five miles south of Metemneh, the column found itself in presence of an enemy said to have been about 18,000 strong. Stewart halted and formed a zareba under a deadly fire. He himself was mortally hurt in the groin, and Mr. Cameron, of the Standard, and Mr. Herbert, of the Morning Post, were killed. The zareba completed, the column advanced in square, and the Arabs, profiting by Abu Klea, moved forward in echelon, apparently with the purpose of charging. At thirty yards or so they were brought to bay, so terrific was the fire from the square, and so splendidly served was Norton's artillery. For two hours the battle raged; and then the Arabs, 'mown

down in heaps,' gave way. Meantime Sir Charles Wilson had made a dash for the Nile, where he found steamers and reinforcements from Gordon, and the laconic message, 'All right at Khartoum. Can hold out for years.' . . . In the joy at the good news, none had stopped to consider the true meaning of the message, 'All right. Can hold out for years,' for none was aware that nearly two months before Gordon had said he had just provisions enough for 40 days, and that what he really meant was that he had come to his last biscuit. The message—which was written for the enemy—was dated Dec. 29, and Sir Charles Wilson would reach Khartoum on Jan. 28, just a month after its despatch. . . . The public, carefully kept in ignorance . . . and hopeful beyond their wont, were simply stupefied to hear, on Feb. 5, that Khartoum was in the hands of the Mahdi and Gordon captured or dead.—A. E. Hake, *The Story of Chinese Gordon*, v. 2, ch. 10.

ALSO IN: H. M. Stanley, *In Darkest Africa*, ch. 1.—Col. H. E. Colville, *Hist. of the Sudan Campaign*.—Col. C. W. Wilson, *From Korti to Khartoum*.—Col. Sir W. F. Butler, *The Campaign of the Cataracts*.—W. M. Pimblett, *The Story of the Sudan War*.—Gen. C. G. Gordon, *Journals at Khartoum*.—H. W. Gordon, *Events in the Life of Charles George Gordon*, ch. 14-20.

A. D. 1893.—The reigning khedive.—Mohamed Tewfik died in January, 1892 and was succeeded by his son Abbas, born in 1874.—*Statesman's Year-book*, 1893.

**EGYPTIAN EDUCATION.** See EDUCATION, ANCIENT.

**EGYPTIAN TALENT.** See TALENT.

**EIDGENOSSEN.**—The German word Eidgenossen, signifying "confederates," is often used in a special sense, historically, as applied to the members of the Swiss Confederation.—see SWITZERLAND: THE THREE FOREST CANTONS. The name of the Huguenots is believed by some writers to be a corruption of the same term.

**EIGHT SAINTS OF WAR, The.** See FLORENCE: A. D. 1375-1378.

**EIKON BASILIKE, The.** See ENGLAND: A. D. 1649 (FEBRUARY).

**EION, Siege and capture of (B. C. 470).** See ATHENS: B. C. 470-466.

**EIRE.** See IRELAND: THE NAME.

**EKKLESIA.** See ECCLESIA.

**EKOWE, Defence of (1879).** See SOUTH AFRICA: A. D. 1877-1879.

**ELAGABALUS, Roman Emperor, A. D. 218-222.**

**ELAM.**—"Genesis calls a tribe dwelling on the Lower Tigris, between the river and the mountains of Iran, the Elamites, the oldest son of Shem. Among the Greeks the land of the Elamites was known as Kissia [Cissia], and afterwards as Susiana, from the name of the capital. It was also called Elymais."—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, bk. 2, ch. 1.—About 2300 B. C. Chaldea, or Babylonia, was overwhelmed by an Elamite invasion—an invasion recorded by king Assurbanipal, and which is stated to have laid waste the land of Accad and desecrated its temples. "Nor was this a passing inroad or raid of booty-seeking mountaineers. It was a real conquest. Khudur-Nankhundi and his successors remained in Southern Chaldea. . . . This is the first time we meet authentic monumental records

of a country which was destined through the next sixteen centuries to be in continual contact, mostly hostile, with both Babylonia and her northern rival, Assyria, until its final annihilation by the latter [B. C. 649, under Assurbanipal, the Sardanapulus of the Greeks, who reduced the whole country to a wilderness]. Its capital was Shusian (afterwards pronounced by foreigners Susa), and its own original name Shushinak. Its people were of Turanian stock, its language was nearly akin to that of Shumir and Accad. . . . Elam, the name under which the country is best known, both from the Bible and later monuments, is a Turanian word, which means, like 'Accad,' 'Highlands.' . . . One of Khudur-Nankhundi's next successors, Khudur-Lagamar, was not content with the addition of Chaldea to his kingdom of Elam. He had the ambition of a born conqueror, and the generalship of one. The Chap. xiv. of Genesis—which calls him Chedorlaomer—is the only document we have descriptive of this king's warlike career, and a very striking picture it gives of it. . . . Khudur-Lagamar . . . lived, according to the most probable calculations, about 2200 B. C."—Z. A. Ragozin, *Story of Chaldea*, ch. 4.—It is among the discoveries of recent times, derived from the records in clay unearthed in Babylonia, that Cyrus the Great was originally king of Elam, and acquired Persia, as he acquired his later dominions, by conquest.—See PERSIA, B. C. 549-521.—See, also, BABYLONIA.

**EL ARISH, Treaty of.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1800 (JANUARY—JUNE).

**ELBA: A. D. 1735.**—Ceded to Spain by Austria. See FRANCE: A. D. 1733-1735.

**A. D. 1802.**—Annexation to France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1802 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER).

**A. D. 1814.**—Napoleon in exile. See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (MARCH—APRIL), and (APRIL—JUNE).

# APPENDICES.



# APPENDIX A.

NOTES TO ETHNOGRAPHICAL MAP, PLACED AT THE BEGINNING OF THIS VOLUME.

TO THE eye of modern scholarship "language" forms the basis of every ethnic distinction. Physical and exterior features like the stature, the color of the skin, the diversity of habits and customs, the distinctions which once formed in great part the basis of ethnic research have all in our own day been relegated to a subordinate place.

The "language" test is of course subject to very serious limitations. The intermingling of different peoples, more general to be sure in our own day than in past ages, has nevertheless been sufficiently great in every age to make the tracing of linguistic forms a task of great difficulty. In special cases where both the civilization and language of one people have become lost in that of another the test must of course fail utterly.

With all these restrictions however the adoption of the linguistic method by modern criticism has been practically universal. Its defence, if it requires any, is apparent. It is the only method of ethnic study the deductions of which, where successful at all, approach anything like certainty. The points wherein linguistic criticism has failed have been freely admitted; on the other hand the facts which it has established are unassailable by any other school of criticism.

Taking language then as the only tangible working basis the subject resolves itself from the start into a two-fold division: the debatable and the certain. It is the purpose to indicate in the course of these notes, what is merely conjecture and what may be safely accepted as fact.

The ethnology of Europe, studied on this basis, has for its central feature the *Indo-Germanic* (*Indo-European*) or *Aryan* race. The distinction between the races clearly Aryan and those doubtful or non-Aryan forms the primary division of the subject. As the map is intended to deal only with the Europe of the present, a historical distinction must be made at the outset between the doubtful or non-Aryan peoples who preceded the Aryans and the non-Aryan peoples who have appeared in Europe in comparatively recent times.

The simple formula, *pre-Aryan*, *Aryan*, *non-Aryan*, affords the key to the historical development of European ethnology.

## PRE-ARYAN PEOPLES.

Of the presumably pre-Aryan peoples of western Europe the *Iberians* occupy easily the first place.

The seat of this people at the dawn of history was in Spain and southern France; their ethnology belongs entirely to the realm of conjecture. They are of much darker complexion than the Aryans and their racial characteristic is conservatism even to stubbornness, which places them in marked contrast to their immediate Aryan neighbors, the volatile Celts. Among the speculations concerning the origin of the Iberians a plausible one is that of Dr. Bodichon, who assigns to them an African origin making them, indeed, cognate with the modern Berbers (see R. H. Patterson's

"Ethnology of Europe" in "Lectures on History and Art"). This generalization is made to include also the *Bretons* of the north west. It is clear however that the population of modern Brittany is purely Celtic; made up largely from the immigrations from the British Isles during the fifth century.

To the stubbornness with which the Iberians resisted every foreign aggression and refused intermingling with surrounding races is due the survival to the present day of their descendants, the *Basques*.

The mountain ranges of northern Spain, the Cantabrians and Eastern Pyrenees have formed the very donjon-keep of this people in every age. Here the *Cantabri* successfully resisted the Roman arms for more than a century after the subjugation of the remainder of Spain, the final conquest not occurring until the last years of Augustus. While the *Iberian* race as a whole has become lost in the greater mass of Celtic and Latin intruders, it has remained almost pure in this quarter. The present seat of the *Basques* is in the Spanish provinces of Viscaya, Alava, Guipuzcoa, and Navarre and in the French department of Basses Pyrénées. The *Iernians* of Ireland, now lost in the Celtic population, and the *Ligurians* along the shores of the Genoeve gulf, later absorbed by the Romans, both belong likewise to this pre-Aryan class: (Modern research concerning these pre-Aryan peoples has in large part taken its inspiration from the "Untersuchungen" of Humboldt, whose view concerning the connection between the Basques and Iberians is substantially the one stated.)

Another early non-Aryan race now extinct were the *Etruscans* of Italy. Their origin was manifestly different from that of the pre-Aryan peoples just mentioned. By many they have been regarded as a branch of the great Ural-Altai family. This again is conjecture.

## ARYAN PEOPLES.

In beginning the survey of the *Aryan* peoples it is necessary to mention the principal divisions of the race. As generally enumerated there are seven of these, viz., the *Sanskrit* (Hindoo), *Zend* (Persian), *Greek*, *Latin*, *Celtic*, *Germanic* and *Slavic*. To these may be added two others not definitely classified, the *Albanian* and the *Lithuanian*. These bear the closest affinity respectively to the *Latin* and the *Slavic*.

Speculation concerning the origin of the Aryans need not concern us. It belongs as yet entirely to the arena of controversy. The vital question which divides the opposing schools is concerning their European or Asiatic origin. Of the numerous writers on this subject the two who perhaps afford the reader of English the best view of the opposing opinions are, on the Asiatic side, Dr. Max Müller (Lectures on the Science of Language); on the other, Prof. A. H. Sayce (Introduction to the Science of Language).

Of the divisions of the Aryan race above enumerated the first two do not appear in European ethnology. Of the other branches, the *Latin*, *Germanic* and *Slavic* form by great odds the bulk of the European population.

#### THE LATIN BRANCH.

The *Latin* countries are France, Spain, Portugal, Italy and the territory north of the Danube, between the Dniester and the Theiss. In the strictest ethnic sense however the term Latin can be applied only to Italy and then only to the central part. As Italy first appears in history it is inhabited by a number of different races: the *Japygians* and *Oenotrians* of the south who were thrown in direct contact with the Greek settlers; the *Umbrians*, *Sabines*, *Latins*, *Volscians* and *Oscans* in the centre; the *Etruscans* on the west shore north of the Tiber; while in the north we find the *Gauls* in the valley of the Po, with the *Ligurians* and *Venetians* respectively on the west and east coasts. Of this motley collection the central group bore a close affinity to the Latin, yet all alike received the Latin stamp with the growing power of Rome.

The ethnic complex of Italy thus formed was hardly modified by the great Germanic invasions which followed with the fall of the West-Roman Empire.

This observation applies with more or less truth to all the Latin countries, the Germanic conquerors becoming everywhere merged and finally lost in the greater mass of the conquered. Only in Lombardy where a more enduring Germanic kingdom existed for over two centuries (568-774), has the Germanic made any impression, and this indeed a slight one, on the distinctly Latin character of the Italian peninsula.

In Spain an interval between the Iberian period and the Roman conquest appears to have existed, during which the population is best described as *Celt-Iberian*. Upon this population the Latin stamp was placed by the long and toilsome, but for that reason more thorough, Roman conquest. The ethnic character of Spain thus formed has passed without material change through the ordeal both of Germanic and Saracenic conquest. The *Gothic* kingdom of Spain (418-714) and the *Suevic* kingdom of northern Portugal (406-584) have left behind them scarcely a trace. The effects of the great Mohammedan invasion cannot be dismissed so lightly.

Conquered entirely by the Arabs and Moors in 714, the entire country was not freed from the invader for nearly eight centuries. In the south (Granada) where the Moors clung longest their influence has been greatest. Here their impress on the pure Aryan stock has never been effaced.

The opening phrase of Caesar's Gallic war, "all Gaul is divided into three parts," states a fact as truly ethnic as it is geographical or historical. In the south (Aquitania) we find the *Celtic* blending with the *Iberian*; in the north-east the *Cimbrian Belgae*, the last comers of the Celtic family, are strongly marked by the characteristics of the Germans; while in the vast central territory the people "calling themselves Galli" are of pure Celtic race. This brief statement of Caesar, allowing for the subsequent influx of the German, is no mean description of the ethnic divisions of France as they exist at the present day, and is an evidence of the remarkable

continuity of ethnological as opposed to mere political conditions.

The four and a half centuries of Roman rule placed the Latin stamp on the Gallic nation, a preparation for the most determined siege of Germanic race influence which any Latin nation was fated to undergo.

In Italy and Spain the exotic kingdoms were quickly overthrown; the *Frankish* kingdom in northern Gaul was in strictness never overthrown at all.

In addition we soon have in the extreme north a second Germanic element in the Scandinavian *Norman*. Over all these outside elements, however, the Latin influence eventually triumphed. While the *Franks* have imposed their name upon the natives, the latter have imposed their language and civilization on the invaders.

The result of this clashing of influences is seen, however, in the present linguistic division of the old Gallic lands. The line running east and west through the centre of France marks the division between the *French* and the *Provençal* dialects, the *langued'oil* and the *langued'oc*. It is south of this line in the country of the *langued'oc* that the Latin or Romance influence reigns most absolute in the native speech.

In the northeast, on the other hand, in the *Walloon* provinces of Belgium, we have, as with the Belgae of classic times, the near approach of the Gallic to the Germanic stems.

Our survey of the Latin peoples must close with a short notice of its outlying members in the Balkan and Danubian lands. The *Albanians* (*Skipetars*) and the *Roumans* (*Vlachs* or *Wallachs*) represent as nearly as ethnology can determine the ancient populations respectively of Illyricum and Thrace. The ethnology of the Albanians is entirely uncertain. Their present location, considerably to the south of their supposed pristine seat in Illyricum, indicates some southern migration of the race. This migration occurred at an entirely unknown time, though it is generally believed to have been contemporary with the great southward movement of the Slavic races in the seventh century.

The *Albanian* migrations of the time penetrated Attica, Actolia and the entire Peloponnesus; with the *Slavs* and *Vlachs* they formed indeed a great part of the population of Greece during the Middle Ages. While the Slavic stems have since been merged in the native Greek population, and the *Vlachs* have almost entirely disappeared from these southern lands, the Albanians in Greece have shown a greater tenacity. Their part in later Greek history has been a prominent one and they form to-day a great part of the population of Attica and Argolis.

The *Roumans* or *Vlachs*, the supposed native population of Thrace, are more closely identified than the Albanians with the other Latin peoples. They occupy at present the vast country north of the Danube, their boundary extending on the east to the Dniester, on the west almost to the Theiss.

Historically these people form a perplexing yet interesting study. The theory once general that they represented a continuous Latin civilization north of the Danube, connecting the classic Dacia by an unbroken chain to the present, has now been generally abandoned. (See Roesler's "Romänische Studien" or Freeman's "Hist. Geog. of Europe," p. 435.)

The present geographical location of the Vlach peoples is probably the result of a migration from the Thracian lands south of the Danube, which occurred for unexplained causes in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The kernel of the race at the present day is the separate state of Roumania; in the East and West they come under the respective rules of Russia and Hungary.

In mediæval times the part played by them south of the Balkans was an important one, and to this day they still linger in considerable numbers on either side of the range of Pindus. (For a short dissertation on the Vlach peoples, see Finlay, "Hist. of Greece," vol. 3, pp. 224-230.)

#### THE GERMANIC BRANCH.

The *Germanic* nations of modern Europe are *England, Germany, Holland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden*. The Germanic races also form the major part of the population of Switzerland, the Cis-Leithan division of the Austrian Empire, and appear in isolated settlements throughout Hungary and Russia.

Of the earlier Germanic nations who overthrew the Roman Empire of the West scarcely a trace remains.

The population of the British Isles at the dawn of history furnishes a close parallel to that of Gaul. The pre-Aryan *Iceni*ans (the possible *Iberians* of the British Isles) had been forced back into the recesses of Scotland and Ireland; next to them came the *Celts*, like those of Gaul, in two divisions, the *Goidels* or *Gaels* and the *Britons*.

In Britain, contrary to the usual rule, the Roman domination did not give the perpetual Latin stamp to the island; it is in fact the only country save the Pannonian and Rhaetian lands south of the upper Danube, once a Roman possession, where the Germanic element has since gained a complete mastery. The invasion of the Germanic races, the *Angles, Saxons and Jutes*, from the sixth to the eighth centuries, were practically wars of extermination. The Celtic race is to-day represented on the British Isles only in *Wales* and the western portions of *Scotland and Ireland*. The invasions of the *Danes*, and later the *Norman* conquest, bringing with them only slight infusions of kindred Germanic nations, have produced in England no marked modification of the *Saxon* stock.

The *German Empire*, with the smaller adjoining realms, *Holland and Switzerland* and the Austrian provinces of *Austria, Styria, Carinthia, Salzburg and Tyrol*, contain the great mass of the Germanic peoples of the continent.

During the confusion following the overthrow of the West-Roman Empire the *Germanic* peoples were grouped much further westward than they are at present; the eastward reaction involving the dispossession of the *Slavic* peoples on the Elbe and Oder, has been going on ever since the days of Charlemagne. Germany like France possesses a linguistic division, *Low German (Nieder-Deutsche)* being generally spoken in the lands north of the cross line, *High German (Hoch-Deutsche)* from which the written language is derived, to the south of it. *Holland* uses the *Flemish*, a form of the *Nieder-Deutsche*; *Belgium* is about equally divided between the *Flemish* and the *Walloon*.

*Switzerland*, though predominantly German, is encroached upon by the French in the western

cantons, while in the southeast is used the Italian and a form allied to the same, the Romance speech of the *Rhaetian (Tyrolean)* Alps. This form also prevails in *Friuli* and some mountainous parts of northern Italy.

The present population of the German Empire is almost exclusively Germanic, the exceptions being the *Slavic Poles* of Posen, Pomerellen, southeastern Prussia and eastern Silesia, the remnant of the *Wends* of Lusatia and the French element in the recently acquired Imperial lands of Alsace and Lorraine. Beyond the Empire we find a German population in the Austrian territories already noted, in the border lands of Bohemia, and in isolated settlements further east. The great settlement in the *Siebenbürgen* was made by German emigrants in the eleventh century and similar settlements dot the map both of Hungary and Russia. On the Volga indeed exists the greatest of them all.

*Denmark, Norway and Sweden* are peopled by the *Scandinavian* branch of the Germanic race. Only in the extreme north do we find another and non-Aryan race, the *Lapps*. On the other hand a remnant of the *Sveetics* still retain a precarious hold on the coast line of their former possession, the *Russian Finland*.

#### THE SLAVIC BRANCH.

The *Slavs*, though the last of the Aryan nations to appear in history, form numerically by far the greatest branch of the Indo-European family. Their present number in Europe is computed at nearly one hundred million souls.

At the time of the great migrations they extended over nearly all modern Germany; their slow dispossession by the Germanic peoples, beginning in the eighth century, has already been noticed. In the course of this dispossession the most westerly Slavic group, the *Polabie*, between the Elbe and the Oder, were merged in the German, and, barring the remnant of *Wends* in Lusatia (the *Sorabi* or *Northern Serbs*), have disappeared entirely from ethnic geography.

The great *Slavic* nation of the present day is *Russia*, but the great number of Slavic peoples who are not Russian and the considerable Russian population which is not Slavic renders impossible the study of this race on strictly national lines.

The Slavic peoples are separated, partly by geographical conditions, into three great divisions: the *Eastern, the Western and the Southern*. The greatest of these divisions, the Eastern, lies entirely within the boundaries of the Russian Empire. The sub-divisions of the Eastern group are as follows: The *Great Russians* occupying the vast inland territory and numbering alone between forty and fifty millions, the *Little Russians* inhabiting the entire south of Russia from Poland to the Caspian, and the *White Russians*, the least numerous of this division, in Smolensk, Wilna, and Minsk, the west provinces bordering on the Lithuanians and Poles.

The *West Slavic* group, omitting names of peoples now extinct, are the *Poles, Slovaks, Czechs* and the remnants of the *Lusatian Wends*. The *Poles*, excepting those already mentioned as within the German empire, and the *Austrian Poles* of Cracow, are all under the domination of Russia. Under the sovereignty of Austria are the *Slovaks, Moravians and Czechs* of Bohemia, the latter the most westerly as well as historically the

oldest of the surviving Slavic peoples, having appeared in their present seats in the last years of the fifth century.

In connection with this West Slavic group we should also refer to the *Lithuanians* whose history, despite the racial difference, is so closely allied with that of Poland. Their present location in the Russian provinces of Kowno, Kurland and Livland has been practically the same since the dawn of history.

The *South Slavic* peoples were isolated from their northern kinsmen by the great *Finnno-Tatar* invasions.

The invasion of Europe by the Avars in the sixth century clove like a wedge the two great divisions of the Slavic race, the southernmost being forced upon the confines of the East-Roman Empire. Though less imposing as conquests than the Germanic invasions of the Western Empire, the racial importance of these Slavic movements is far greater since they constitute, in connection with the *Finnno-Tatar* invasions which caused them, the most important and clearly defined series of ethnic changes which Europe has experienced during the Christian Era. During the sixth and seventh centuries these Slavic emigrants spread over almost the entire Balkan peninsula, including Epirus and the Peloponnesus. In Greece they afterwards disappeared as a separate people, but in the region between the Danube, the Save and the Balkans they immediately developed separate states (Serbia in 641, Bulgaria in 678). As they exist at present they may be classed in three divisions. The *Bulgarians*, so called from the *Finnno-Tatar* people whom they absorbed while accepting their name, occupy the district included in the separate state of Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia, with a considerable territory to the south of it in Macedonia and Thrace. It was this last named territory or one very nearly corresponding to it that was actually ceded to Bulgaria by the peace of San Stefano though she unfortunately lost it by the subsequent compromise effected at the Congress of Berlin. The second division includes the *Serrians*, *Montenegrans*, *Bosnians* and *Croatians*, the last two under Austrian control; the third and smallest are the *Stoerens* of Carniola, likewise under Austrian sovereignty. (Schafarik's "Slawische Alterthümer" is the greatest single authority on the early history and also comparative ethnology of the *Slavs*.)

The territory occupied by the *Greek* speaking people is clearly shown on the accompanying map. As in all history, it is the coast lands where they seem to have formed the strongest hold. In free Greece itself and in the Turkish territories immediately adjoining, the *Greek* population overwhelmingly preponderates.

Nevertheless there is still a considerable Albanian element in Attica and Argolis, a *Vlach* element in Epirus while the *Turk* himself still lingers in certain quarters of Thessaly. All these are remnants left over from the successive migrations of the Middle Ages. The *Slavs*, who also figured most prominently in these migrations, have disappeared in Greece as a distinct race. The question as to the degree of Slavic admixture among the modern Greeks is however another fruitful source of ethnic controversy. The general features of the question are most compactly stated in Finlay, vol. 4, pp. 1-37.

#### NON-ARYAN PEOPLES.

The *Non-Aryan* peoples on the soil of modern Europe, excepting the *Jets* and also probably excepting those already placed in the unsolved class of pre-Aryan, all belong to the *Finnno-Tatar* or *Ural-Altai* family, and all, possibly excepting the *Fins*, date their arrival in Europe from comparatively recent and historic times. The four principal divisions of this race, the *Ugric*, *Finnic*, *Turkic* and *Mongolic*, all have their European representatives.

Of the first the only representatives are the *Hungarians* (*Magyars*). The rift between the North and South Slavic peoples opened by the *Huns* in the fifth century, reopened and enlarged by the *Avars* in the sixth, was finally occupied by their kinsmen the *Magyars* in the ninth. The receding of this wave of Asiatic invasion left the *Magyars* in utter isolation among their Aryan neighbors. It follows as a natural consequence that they have been the only one of the *Ural-Altai* peoples to accept the religion and civilization of the West. Since the conversion of their king St. Stephen in the year 1000, their geographical position has not altered. Roughly speaking, it comprises the western half of Hungary, with an outlying branch in the Carpathians.

More closely allied to the *Magyars* than to their more immediate neighbors of the same race are the *Finnic* stems of the extreme north. Stretching originally over nearly the whole northern half of Scandinavia and Russia they have been gradually displaced, in the one case by their Germanic, in the other by their Slavic neighbors. Their present representatives are the *Ehats* and *Tschudes* of Elisland, the *Fins* and *Karelians* of Finland, the *Thecheremissians* of the upper Volga, the *Siryenians* in the basin of the Petchora and the *Lapps* in northern Scandinavia and along the shores of the Arctic ocean.

East of the *Lapps*, also bordering the Arctic ocean, lie the *Samojedes*, a people forming a distinct branch of the *Ural-Altai* family though most closely allied to the *Finnic* peoples.

The great division of the *Ural-Altai* family known indifferently as *Tatar* (*Tartar*) or *Turk*, has, like the Aryan Slavs, through the accidents of historical geography rather than race divergence been separated into two great divisions: the northern or Russian division commonly comprised under the specific name of *Tartar*; and the southern, the *Turk*.

These are the latest additions to the European family of races. The *Mongol-Tartar* invasion of Russia occurred as late as the thirteenth century while the *Turks* did not gain their first foothold in Europe through the gates of Gallipoli until 1353. The bulk of the *Turks* of the present day are congregated in Asia-Minor.

Barring the *Armenians*, the *Georgians* of the northeast, the *Greeks* of the seacoast and the scattered *Circassians*, the whole peninsula is substantially Turkish.

In Europe proper the *Turks* as a distinct people never cut a great figure. Even in the grandest days of Osmanli conquest they were always outnumbered by the conquered nations whose land they occupied, and with the decline of their power this numerical inferiority has become more and more marked. At the present day there are very few portions of the Balkan peninsula where the Turkish population actually pre-

dominates; their general distribution is clearly shown on the map.

The *Tartars* or *Russian Turks* represent the siftings of the Asiatic invasions of the thirteenth century.

Their number has been steadily dwindling until they now count scarcely three millions, a mere handful in the mass of their former Slavie subjects.

The survivors are scattered in irregular and isolated groups over the south and east. Prominent among them are the *Crim Tartars*, the *kludred Nogais* of the west shores of the Caspian, the *Kirghis* of the north shore and Ural valley, and the *Bashkirs* between the upper Ural and the Volga, with an isolated branch of *Tartars* in the valley of the Araxes south of the Caucasus.

The great Asiatic irruption of the thirteenth century has been commonly known as the Mongol invasion. Such it was in leadership, though the residuum which it has left behind in European Russia proves that the rank and file were mostly Tartars. One Mongol people however, the *Kalmucks*, did make their way into Europe and still exist in the steppes between the lower Don and the lower Volga.

The ethnology of the Caucasian peoples is the most difficult part of the entire subject. On the steppes of the Black and Caspian seas up to the very limit of the Caucasus we have two races between whom the ethnic distinction is clearly defined, the Mongol-Tartar and the Slav. Entering the Caucasus however we find a vast number of races differing alike from these and from each other.

To enumerate all the different divisions of these races, whose ethnology is so very uncertain, would

be useless. Grouped in three general divisions however they are as follows: the so-called *Circassians* who formerly occupied the whole western Caucasus with the adjoining Black sea coast but who, since the Russian conquest of 1864, have for the most part emigrated to different quarters of the Turkish Empire; the *Leghians*, under which general name are included the motley crowd of peoples inhabiting the eastern Caucasus; and the *Georgians*, the supposed descendants of the ancient *Iberians* of the Caucasus, who inhabit the southern slope, including all the Tiflis province and the Trapezuntine lands on the southeast coast of the Black sea.

The *Tartars* are hardly found in the Caucasus though they reappear immediately south of it in the lower basin of the Kura and the Araxes. Here also appear the various *Iranian* stems of the Asiatic Aryans, the *Armenians*, the *Persians* and the *Kurds*.

R. H. Latham's works on "European Ethnology" are the best general authority in English. Of more recent German guides, map and otherwise, the following are noteworthy: Bastin's "Ethnologisches Bilderbuch," "Das Beständige in den Menschenrassen," "Allgemeine Grundzüge der Ethnologie," Klepert's "Ethnographische Uebersichtskarte des Europäischen Orients," Menke's "Europa nach seinen Ethnologischen Verhältnissen in der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts," Rittich's "Ethnographie des europäischen Russland," Sax's "Ethnographische Karte der europäischen Türkei," Berghaus's "Ethnographische Karte vom österreichischen Kaiserstaat," Weudt's "Bilder Atlas der Länder und Völkerkunde," Andree's "Allgemeiner Handatlas (Ethnographischen Karten)," Gerland's "Atlas der Ethnographie."—A. C. Reiley.



## APPENDIX B.

NOTES TO FOUR MAPS OF THE BALKAN PENINSULA. (TWELFTH TO THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.)

THERE exists to-day upon the map of Europe no section whose historical geography has a greater present interest than the Danubian, Balkan and Levantine states. It is these and the Austro-Hungarian lands immediately adjoining which have formed one of the great fulcrums for those national movements which constitute the prime feature of the historical geography of the present age.

Upon the present map of Europe in this quarter we discover a number of separate and diminutive national entities, the *Roumanian*, *Bu'arian*, *Serbian* and *Montenegrin*, the *Greek* and *Albanian*, all struggling desperately to establish themselves on the debris of the crumbling Turkish Empire.

What the issue will be of these numerous and mutually conflicting struggles for separate national existence it is out of our province to forecast.

It is only intended in this map series to throw all possible light on their true character from the lessons and analogies of the past. At first sight the period treated in the four Levantine maps (from the last of the twelfth to the middle of the fifteenth century) must appear the most intricate and the most obscure in the entire history of this region. The most intricate it certainly is, and possibly the most obscure, though the obscurity arises largely from neglect. Its importance, however, arises from the fact that it is the only past period of Levantine history which presents a clear analogy to the present, not alone in its purely transitional character, but also from the several national movements which during this time were diligently at work.

During the Roman and the earlier Byzantine periods, which from their continuity may be taken as one, any special tendency was of course stifled under the preponderant rule of a single great empire.

The same was equally true at a later time, when all of these regions passed under the rule of the *Turk*. These four maps treat of that most interesting period intervening between the crumbling of the Byzantine power and the Turkish conquest. That in our own day the crumbling in turn of the Turkish power has repeated, in its general features, the same historical situation, is the point upon which the interest must inevitably centre.

What the outcome will be in modern times forms the most interesting of political studies. Whether the native races of the Danube, the Balkans and the southern peninsula are to work out their full national development, either federately or independently, or whether they are destined to pass again, as is threatened, under the domination of another and greater empire, is one of the most important of the questions which agitates the mind of the modern European statesman. That the latter outcome is now the less likely is due to the great unfolding of separate

national spirit which marks so strongly the age in which we live. The reason why the previous age treated in this map series ended in nothing better than foreign and Mohammedan conquest may perhaps be sought in the imperfect development of this same national spirit.

### THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE.

The first map (Asia Minor and the Balkans near the close of the twelfth century) is intended to show the geographical situation as it existed immediately prior to the dismemberment of the Byzantine Empire. The Byzantine Empire of this period is in itself an important study. It must be regarded more as the offspring than the direct continuation of the great East-Roman Empire of Arcadius and Justinian; for with the centuries which had intervened the great changes in polity, internal geography, external neighbors and lastly the continual geographical contraction, present us with an entirely new series of relations. It is this geographical contraction which concerns us most vitally, for with it the frontiers of the empire conform more and more closely to the ethnic limits of the *Greek* nation.

The later Byzantine Empire was, therefore, essentially a Greek Empire, and as such it appeals most vividly to the national consciousness of the Greek of our own time. The restoration of this empire, with the little kingdom of free Greece as the nucleus, is the vision which inspires the more aggressive and venturesome school of modern Greek politicians.

In the twelfth century the bulk of Asia Minor had been wrested from the Byzantine Empire by the *Turks*, but it was the Crusaders, not the *Turks*, who overthrew the first empire. In one view this fact is fortunate, otherwise there would have been no transition period whose study would be productive of such fruitful results.

Owing to the artful policy of the Comnenian emperors, the Byzantine Empire actually profited by the early crusades and was enabled through them to recover a considerable part of Asia Minor from the *Turks*. This apparent success, however, was only the prelude to final disaster.

Isolated from western Christendom by the schism, the *Greeks* were an object of suspicion and hatred to the Latin Crusaders and it only required a slight abatement of the original crusading spirit for their warlike ardor to be diverted from Jerusalem to Constantinople. Cyprus was torn away from the Greek Empire and created a separate kingdom under Latin rule, in 1191. Finally, the so-called Fourth Crusade, controlled by Venetian intrigue, ended in the complete dismemberment of the Byzantine Empire (1204).

This nefarious enterprise forms a dark spot in history; it also ushers in the greatest period of geographical intricacy in Levantine annals. The

geography which immediately resulted from it is not directly shown in this Levantine map series, but can be seen on the general map of Europe at the opening of the thirteenth century. Briefly stated, it represented the establishment of a fragmentary and disjointed Latin Empire in the place of the former Greek Empire of Constantinople. Known as the Latin Empire of Romania, this new creation included the Empire of Constantinople proper and its feudal dependencies, the kingdom of Thessalonica, the duchy of Athens, and the principality of Achaia.

Three orphan Greek states survived the fall of the parent power; in Europe, the despotat of Epirus, and in Asia, the empires of Niceæ and Trebizond.

The Latin states of the East are scarcely worthy the historian's notice. They have no place whatever in the natural development, either political or geographical, of the Levantine states. They were not only forced by foreign lance upon an unwilling population, but were clumsy feudalisms, established among a people to whom the feudal idea was unintelligible and barbarous. Like their prototypes, the Crusading states of Syria, they resembled artificial encroachments upon the sea, standing for a time, but with the ordinary course of nature the ocean reclaims its own.

Even the weak little Greek states were strong in comparison and immediately began to recover ground at their expense. The kingdom of Thessalonica was overthrown by the despot of Epirus in 1222; the Latin Empire of Constantinople itself fell before the Greek Emperor of Niceæ in 1261; while the last of the barons of the principality of Achaia submitted to the Byzantine despots of the Morea in 1430.

The duchy of Athens alone of all these Latin states survived long enough to fall at last before the Turkish conquest. The Levantine possessions won by Venice at this and later times were destined, partly from their insular or maritime location, and partly from the greater vitality of trade relations, to enjoy a somewhat longer life.

To the Nicæan emperors of the house of Paleologus belongs the achievement of having restored the Byzantine Empire in the event of 1261. The expression Restored Byzantine Empire has been employed, since it has the sanction of usage, though a complete restoration never occurred. The geography of the Restored Empire as shown on the second map (1265 A. D.) fails to include the greater part of what we may term the cradle of the Greek race. The only subsequent extension was over the balance of the Morea. In every other quarter the frontiers of the Restored Empire soon began to recede until it included only the city of Constantinople and an ever decreasing portion of Thrace. With the commencement of the fourteenth century the Turks, having thrown off the Mongol-Tartar dominion, began under the house of Osmanlis their final career of conquest. This, of course, was the beginning of the end. Their first foothold in Europe was gained in 1353, but over a century was destined to elapse before the completion of their sovereignty in all the lands south of the Danube. There remains, therefore, a considerable period during which whatever separate national tendencies existed had full opportunity to work.

#### THE FIRST AND SECOND BULGARIAN KINGDOMS.

It was this age which saw not only the highest point in the national greatness of Bulgaria and Servia, but also witnessed the evolution of the Wallachian principalities in the lands north of the Danube.

The separate states of Bulgaria and Servia, born in the seventh century of the great southward migration of the Slavic peoples, had in after times risen or fallen according to the strength or weakness of the Byzantine Empire. Bulgaria had hitherto shown the greatest power. At several different periods, notably under Simeon (883-927), and again under Samuel (976-1014), it developed a strength which fairly overawed the Empire itself. These Slavic states had, however, been subjected by the Byzantine Empire in the first half of the eleventh century, and though Servia enjoyed another period of independence (1040-1148), it was not until the final crumbling of the Byzantine Empire, the premonition of the event of 1204, that their expansion recommenced.

The Wallachian, or Second Bulgarian kingdom, which came into existence in 1187 in the lands between the Balkans and the Danube, has been the subject of an ethnic discussion which need not detain us. That it was not purely Slavic is well established, for the great and singular revival of the Vlach or Rouman peoples and their movement from the lands south of Haemus to their present seats north of the Danube, which is one of the great features of this age, had already begun. (The country between the Danube and the Balkans, the seat of the Second Bulgarian kingdom, appears as Aspro or White-Wallachia in some Byzantine writings. So also north of the Danube the later Moldavia and Great Wallachia are known respectively as *Vallo* [Black] and *Hungarowallachia*. Still the fact of a continuous Rouman civilization north of the Danube is not established. The theory of a great northward movement of the Vlach peoples is the one now generally accepted and is ably advocated in Roesler's "Romänische Studien.")

At the present day this movement has been so long completed that scarcely the trace of a Vlach population remains in the lands south of the Danube. These emigrants appear, as it were, in passing, to have shared with the native Bulgarians in the creation of this Second Bulgarian kingdom. This realm achieved a momentary greatness under its rulers of the house of Asau. The dismemberment of the Byzantine Empire in 1204 enabled them to make great encroachments to the south, and it seemed for a time that to the Bulgarian, not the Greek, would fall the task of overthrowing the Latin Empire of Roumania (see general map of Europe at the opening of the thirteenth century). With the reestablishment, however, of the Greek Empire of Constantinople, in 1261, the Bulgarian kingdom began to lose much of its importance, and its power was finally broken in 1285 by the Mongols.

#### SERVIA.

In the following century it was the turn of Servia to enjoy a period of preëminent greatness. The latter kingdom had recovered its independence under the house of Nemanja in 1183.

Under the great giant conqueror Stephen Dushan (1321-1355) it enjoyed a period of greater power than has ever before or since fallen to the

lot of a single Balkan state. The Restored Byzantine Empire had sustained no permanent loss from the period of Bulgarian greatness: it was by the sudden Servian conquest that it was deprived forever of nearly all its European possessions (see Balkan map III). A Byzantine reaction might have come under other conditions, but already another and greater enemy was at her gates. Dushan died in 1355; and already, in 1353, two years before, the Turk at Gallipoli had made his entrance into Europe. From this time every Christian state of the East grew steadily weaker until Bulgaria, Servia, the Greek Empire, and finally even Hungary, had passed under the Turkish dominion.

#### THE VLACHS.

Passing on from these Slavic peoples, another national manifestation of the greatest importance belonging to this period, one which, unlike the Greek and Slavic, may be said in one sense to have originated in the period, was that of the *Vlachs*. This Latin population, which ethnologists have attempted to identify with the ancient *Thracians*, was, previous to the twelfth century, scattered in irregular groups throughout the entire Balkan peninsula. During the twelfth century their great northward migration began. A single result of this movement has already been noticed in the rise of the Second Bulgarian kingdom. South of the Danube, however, their influence was transitory. It was north of the river that the evolution of the two principalities, Great Wallachia (Roumania) and Moldavia, and the growth of a *Vlach* population in the Transylvanian lands of Eastern Hungary, has yielded the ethnic and in great part the political geography of the present day.

The process of this evolution may be understood from a comparative study of the four Balkan maps. Upon the first map the *Cumanians*, a Finno-Tatar people, who in the twelfth century had displaced a kindred race, the *Patzinaks* or *Petchenegs*, occupy the whole country between the Danube and the Transylvanian Alps. These were in turn swept forever from the map of Europe by the Mongols (1224). With the receding of this exterminating wave of Asiatic conquest the great wilderness was thrown open to new settlers. The settlements of the *Vlachs* north of the Danube and east of the Aluta became the principality of Great Wallachia, the nucleus of the modern Roumania. West of the Aluta the district of Little Wallachia was incorporated for a long period, as the banat of Severin, in the Hungarian kingdom.

Finally, the principality of Moldavia came into existence in 1341, in land previously won by the Hungarians from the Mongols, between the Dniester and the Carpathians. Both the principalities of Great Wallachia and Moldavia were in the fourteenth century dependencies of Hungary. The grasp of Hungary was loosened, however, towards the close of the century and after a period of shifting dependence, now on Hungary, now on Turkey, and for a time, in the case of Moldavia, on Poland, we come to the period of permanent Turkish supremacy.

With the presence and influence of the *Vlachs* south of the Balkans, during this period, we are less interested, since their subsequent disappearance has removed the subject from any direct connection with modern politics. The only quar-

ter where they still linger and where this influence led to the founding of an independent state, was in the country east of the range of Pindus, the Great Wallachia of the Byzantines. Here the principality of Wallachian Thessaly appeared as an offshoot of the Greek despotat of Epirus in 1259 (see map II).

This state retained its independent existence until 1308, when it was divided between the Catalan dukes of Athens and the Byzantine Empire.

#### ALBANIANS.

The *Skipetars* (*Albanians*) during this period appear to have been the slowest to grasp out for a separate national existence. The southern section of Albania formed, after the fall of Constantinople, a part of the despotat of Epirus, and whatever independence existed in the northern section was lost in the revival, first of the Byzantine, then, in the ensuing century, of the Servian power. It was not until 1444 that a certain George Castriot, known to the Turks as Iskander-i-beg, or Scanderbeg, created a Christian principality in the mountain fastnesses of Albania.

This little realm stretched along the Adriatic from Butrinto almost to Antivari, embracing, further inland, Kroja and the basin of the Drin (see map IV).

It was not until after Scanderbeg's death that Ottoman control was confirmed over this spirited Albanian population.

#### THE TURKISH CONQUEST.

The reign of Mohammed II. (1451-1481) witnessed the final conquest of the entire country south of the Danube and the Save. The extent of the Turkish Empire at his accession is shown on map IV. The acquisitions of territory during his reign included in Asia Minor the old Greek Empire of Trebizond (1461) and the Turkish dynasty of Karaman; in Europe, Constantinople, whose fall brought the Byzantine Empire to a close in 1453, the duchy of Athens (1450), the despotats of Patras and Misthra (1460), Servia (1458), Bosnia (1463), Albania (1468), Epirus and Acarnania, the continental dominion of the Counts of Cephalonia (1470), and Herzegovina (1481). In the mountainous district immediately south of Herzegovina, the principality of Montenegro, situated in lands which had formed the southern part of the first Servian kingdom, alone preserved its independence, even at the height of the Turkish domination.

The chronicle of Turkish history thereafter records only conquest after conquest. The islands of the Ægean were many of them won during Mohammed's own reign, the acquisition of the remainder ensued shortly after. Venice was hunted step by step out of all her Levantine possessions save the Ionian Islands; the superiority over the *Crim Tartars*, Wallachia, Moldavia and Jeddah followed, finally, the defeat at Mohacs (1526), and the subsequent internal anarchy left nearly all Hungary at the mercy of the Ottoman conqueror.

The geographical homogeneity thus restored by the Turkish conquest was not again disturbed until the present century. The repetition of almost the same conditions in our own time, though with the process reversed, has been referred to in the sketch of Balkan geography of the present day. The extreme importance of the period just described, for the purposes of minute historical

analogy, will be apparent at once wherever comparison is attempted.

The thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries were of course periods of far greater geographical intricacy, but the purpose has been rather to indicate the nature of this intricacy than to describe it in detail. The principal feature, namely, the national movements, wherever they have manifested themselves, have been more carefully dwelt upon. The object has been simply to show that the four separate national movements, the *Greek*, the *Slavic*, the *Romanian*, and the *Albanian*, which may be said to have created the present Levantine problem, were all present, and in the case of the two last may even be said

to have had their inception, in the period just traversed.

In the present century the unfolding of national spirit has been so much greater and far-reaching that a different outcome may be looked for. It is sufficient for the present that the incipient existence of these same movements has been shown to have existed in a previous age.

The best general text authority in English for the geography of this period is George Finlay's "History of Greece," vols. III. and IV.; a more exhaustive guide in German is Hopf's "Geschichte Griechenlands." For the purely geographical works see the general bibliography of historical geography.—A. C. Reiley.

# APPENDIX C.

NOTES TO THE MAP OF THE BALKAN PENINSULA. (PRESENT CENTURY.)

THE present century has been a remarkable one for the settlement of great political and geographical questions. These questions resolve themselves into two great classes, which indicate the political forces of the present age, — the first, represented in the growth of democratic thought, and the second arising from the awakening of national spirit. The first of these concerns historical geography only incidentally, but the second has already done much to reconstruct the political geography of our time.

## RECENT NATIONAL MOVEMENTS.

Within a little over thirty years it has changed the map of central Europe from a medley of small states into a united Italy and a united Germany; it has also led to a reconstruction of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, in Italy, Germany and Austria-Hungary, the national questions may, however, be regarded as settled; and if, in the case of Austria-Hungary, owing to exactly reverse conditions, the settlement has been a tentative one, it has at least removed the question from the more immediate concern of the present. In a different quarter of Europe, however, the rise of the national movements has led to a question, infinitely more complicated than the others, and which, so far from being settled, is becoming ever more pressing year by year. This reference is to the great Balkan problem.

That this question has been delayed in its solution for over four centuries, is due, no doubt, to the conquests of the Turk, and it is still complicated by his presence. In the notes to the four previous Balkan maps (1191-1451), attention was especially directed to the national movements, so far as they had opportunity to develop themselves during this period. These movements, feeble in their character, were all smothered by the Turkish conquest. With the decline of this power in the present century the Greeks once more have opportunity for reappearance. In this regard the history of the Balkans during the nineteenth century is simply the history of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries read backwards.

The Turkish Empire had suffered terrible reverses during the eighteenth century. Hungary (1699), the Crim Tartars (1774), Bukovina (1777), Jedisan (1793), Bessarabia and Eastern Moldavia (1812) were all successively wrested from the Ottomans, while Egypt on one side and Moldavia and Wallachia on another recovered practical autonomy, the one under the restored rule of the Mamelukes (1766), the other under native hospodars.

## THE SERVIAN AND GREEK REVOLTS.

All of these losses, though greatly weakening the Ottoman power, did not destroy its geographical integrity. It was with the Servian revolt of 1804 that the series of events pointing to the actual disruption of the Turkish Empire may be

said to have begun. The first period of dissolution was measured by the reign of Mahmoud II. (1808-1839), at once the greatest and the most unfortunate of all the later Turkish sultans. Servia, first under Kara Georg, then under Milosch Obrenovitch, the founder of the present dynasty, maintained a struggle which led to the recognition of Servian local autonomy in 1817. The second step in the process of dissolution was the tragic Greek revolution (1821-1828). The Sultan, after a terrible war of extermination, had practically reduced Greece to subjection, when all his work was undone by the intervention of the great powers.

The Turkish fleet was destroyed by the combined squadrons of England, France and Russia at Navaria, October 20, 1827, and in the campaign of the ensuing year the Moscovite arms for the first time in history penetrated south of the Balkans. The treaty of Adrianople, between Russia and Turkey (September 14, 1829), gave to the Czar the protectorate over Moldavia and Wallachia. By the treaty of London earlier in this year Greece was made autonomous under the suzerainty of the Sultan, and the protocol of March 22, 1829, drew her northern frontier in a line between the gulfs of Arta and Volo. The titular sovereignty of the Sultan over Greece was annulled later in the year at the peace of Adrianople, though the northern boundary of the Hellenic kingdom was then curtailed to a line drawn from the mouth of the Aehelous to the gulf of Lamia. With the accession of the Bavarian king Otho, in 1833, after the failure of the republic the northern boundary was again adjusted, returning to about the limits laid down in the March protocol of 1829. Greece then remained for over fifty years bounded on the north by Mount Othrys, the Pindus range and the gulf of Arta. In 1863, on the accession of the Danish king George I., the Ionian Isles, which had been under English administration since the Napoleonic wars, were ceded to the Greek kingdom, and in May, 1881, almost the last change in European geography to the present day was accomplished in the cession, by the Sultan, of Thessaly and a small part of Epirus.

The agitation in 1886 for a further extension of Greek territory was unsuccessful.

## THE TREATY OF UNKIAR SKELESSI.

A series of still greater reverses brought the reign of the Sultan Mahmoud to a close. The chief of these were the defeats sustained at the hands of his rebellious vassal Mehemet Ali, pacha of Egypt, a man who takes rank even before the Sultan himself as the greatest figure in the Mohammedan world during the present century. The immediate issue of this struggle was the practical independence of Egypt, where the descendants of Mehemet still rule, their title having been changed in 1871 from viceroy to that of khedive. An event incidental to the strife between Mehemet Ali and the Sultan is of far

greater importance in the history of European Turkey. Mahmoud in his distress looked for aid to the great powers, and the final issue of the rival interests struggling at Constantinople was the memorable treaty of Unklar Skelessi (July, 1833) by which the Sultan resigned himself completely to the interests of his former implacable foe, the Czar of Russia. In outward appearance this treaty was an offensive and defensive alliance; in practical results it gave the Moscovite, in exchange for armed assistance, when needed, the practical control of the Dardanelles. It is no extravagance of statement to say that this treaty forms absolutely the high watermark of Russian predominance in the affairs of the Levant. During the subsequent sixty years, this influence, taken as a whole, strange paradox as it may seem, has rather receded than advanced. The utter prostration of the Turkish Empire on the death of Mahmoud (1839) compelled Russia to recede from the conditions of Unklar Skelessi while a concert of the European powers undertook the task of rehabilitating the prostrate power; the Crimean war (1854-1855) struck a more damaging blow at the Russian power, and the events of 1878, though they again shattered the Turkish Empire, did not, as will be shown, lead to corresponding return of the Czar's ascendancy.

#### THE CRIMEAN WAR AND TREATY OF PARIS.

The Crimean War was brought on by the attempt of the Czar to dictate concerning the internal affairs of the Ottoman Empire—a policy which culminated in the occupation of Moldavia and Wallachia (1853). All Europe became arrayed against Russia on this question,—Prussia and Austria in tacit opposition, while England, France, and afterwards Piedmont, drifted into war with the northern power.

By the treaty of Paris (1856), which terminated the sanguinary struggle, the Danube, closed since the peace of Adrianople (1829), was reopened; the southern part of Bessarabia was taken from Russia and added to the principality of Moldavia; the treaty powers renounced all right to interfere in the internal affairs of the Porte; and, lastly, the Black Sea, which twenty years before, by the treaty of Unklar Skelessi, had become a private Russian pond, was swept of the Russian fleets and converted into a neutral sea. The latter condition however was abrogated by the powers (March 13, 1871).

Despite the defeat of Russia, the settlement effected at the congress of Paris was but tentative. The most that the allied powers could possibly have hoped for, was so far to cripple Russia as to render her no longer a menace to the Ottoman Empire. They succeeded only in so far as to defer the recurrence of a Turkish crisis for another twenty years.

The chief event of importance during this interval was the birth of the united Roumania. In 1857 the representative councils of both Moldavia and Wallachia voted for their union under this name. This personal union was accomplished by the choice of a common ruler, John Cuza (1859), whose election was confirmed by a new conference at Paris in 1861. A single ministry and single assembly were formed at Bucharest in 1862. Prince Karl of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen was elected hospodar in 1866, and finally crowned as king in 1881.

#### THE REVIVED EASTERN QUESTION OF 1875-78.

The Eastern question was reopened with all its perplexities in the Herzegovinian and Bosnian revolt of August, 1875. These provinces, almost cut off from the Turkish Empire by Montenegro and Servia, occupied a position which rendered their subjugation almost a hopeless task.

Preparations were already under way for a settlement by joint action of the powers, when a wave of fanatical fury sweeping over the Ottoman Empire rendered all these efforts abortive. Another Christian insurrection in Bulgaria was suppressed in a series of wholesale and atrocious massacres. Servia and Montenegro in a ferment declared war on Turkey (July 2, 1876). The Turkish arms, however, were easily victorious, and Russia only saved the Servian capital by compelling an armistice (October 30). A conference of the representatives of the powers was then held at Constantinople in a final effort to arrange for a reorganization of the Empire, which should include the granting of autonomy to Bosnia, Herzegovina and Bulgaria. These conditions, though subsequently embodied in a general ultimatum, the London protocol of March 31, 1877, were rejected by the Porte, and Russia, who had determined to proceed alone in the event of this rejection, immediately declared war (April 24). Into this war, owing to the horror excited in England by the Bulgarian massacres, and the altered policy of France, the Turk was compelled to go without allies, and thus unassisted his defeat was assured. Then followed the sanguinary campaigns in Bulgaria, the memories of which are still recent and unobscured. Plewna, the central point of the Turkish resistance, fell on December 10th; Adrianople was occupied by the Russians on January 20th, 1878; and on January 31st, an armistice was granted.

Great Britain now seemed roused to a sense of the danger to herself in the Russian approach to Constantinople, and public opinion at last permitted Lord Beaconsfield to send a fleet to the Bosphorus.

By the Russo-Turkish peace of San Stephano (March 3, 1878) Turkey recognized the complete independence of Servia, Roumania and Montenegro, while Bulgaria became what Servia and Roumania had just ceased to be, an autonomous principality under nominal Turkish sovereignty. Russia received the Dobrucha in Europe, which was to be given by the Czar to Roumania in exchange for the portion of Bessarabia lost in 1856. Servia and Montenegro received accessions of territory, the latter securing Antivari on the coast, but the greatest geographical change was the frontier assigned to the new Bulgaria, which was to include all the territory bounded by an irregular line beginning at Midia on the Black Sea and running north of Adrianople, and, in addition, a vast realm in Macedonia, bounded on the west only by Albania, approaching Salonica, and touching the Ægean on either side of the Chalcidice.

It was evident that the terms of this treaty involved the interests of other powers, especially of Great Britain. An ultimate settlement which involved as parties only the conqueror and conquered was therefore impossible. A general congress of the Powers was seen to be the only solvent of the difficulty; but before such a congress was possible it was necessary for Great

Britain and Russia to find at least a tangible basis of negotiation for the adjustment of their differences.

By the secret agreement of May 30th, Russia agreed to abandon the disputed points—chief among these the creation of a Bulgarian seaboard on the *Ægean*—and the congress of Berlin then assembled (June 13—July 13, 1878).

#### ARRANGEMENTS OF THE TREATY OF BERLIN.

Great Britain was represented at the congress by the Marquis of Salisbury and the premier, the Earl of Beaconsfield. The treaty of Berlin modified the conditions of San Stephano by reducing the Russian acquisitions in Asia Minor and also by curtailing the cessions of territory to Servia and Montenegro. A recommendation was also made to the Porte to cede Thessaly and a part of Epirus to Greece, a transfer which was accomplished in 1881. A more important provision was the transfer of the administrative control of the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina to Austria. This cession was the outcome of the secret agreement between Russia and Austria at Reichstadt, in July of the previous year, by which the former had secured from her rival a free hand in the Turkish war. These districts were at once occupied by Austria, despite the resistance of the Mohammedan population, and the sanjak of Novibazar, the military occupation of which was agreed to by the Porte, was also entered by Austrian troops in September of the following year. England secured as her share of the spoil the control of the island of Cyprus.

The greatest work accomplished at Berlin, however, was the complete readjustment of the boundaries of the new Bulgarian principality.

This result was achieved through the agency of Great Britain. The great Bulgarian domain, which by the treaty of San Stephano would have conformed almost to the limits of the Bulgarian Empire of the tenth century, was, with the exception of a small western strip including the capital, Sofia, pushed entirely north of the Balkans. This new principality was to enjoy local autonomy; and immediately south of the Balkans was formed a new province, Eastern Roumelia, also with local autonomy, although under the military authority of the Sultan.

The result of the Berlin Congress was the apparent triumph of the Beaconsfield policy. It is doubtful, however, if the idea of this triumph has been fully sustained by the course of subsequent events. The idea of Beaconsfield appears to have been that the new Bulgaria could not become other than a virtual dependency of Russia, and that in curtailing its boundaries he was checking by so much the growth of Russian influence. If he could have foreseen, however, the unexpected spirit with which the Bulgarians have defended their autonomy, not from Turkish but from Russian aggression, it is doubtful if he would have lent himself with such vigor to that portion of his policy which had for its result the weakening of this "buffer" state. The determination to resist Russian aggression in the Balkans continues to form the purpose of English politicians of nearly all schools; but the idea that this policy is best served by maintaining the integrity of the Ottoman Empire in Europe has been steadily losing adherents since Beaconsfield's day. The one event of importance in Balkan his-

tory since 1878 has served well to illustrate this fact.

#### LATER CHANGES.

In September, 1885, the revolt of Eastern Roumelia partially undid the work of the Berlin treaty. After the usual negotiations between the Powers, the question at issue was settled by a conference of ambassadors at Constantinople in November, by which Eastern Roumelia was placed under the rule of the Bulgarian prince as vassal of the Sultan. This result was achieved through the agency of England, and against the opposition of Russia and other continental powers. England and Russia had in fact exchanged policies since 1878, now that the real temper of the Bulgarian people was more generally understood.

The governments of Greece and Servia, alarmed at the predominance thus given to Bulgaria among the liberated states, sought similar compensation, but were both foiled.

Servia, which sought this direct from Bulgaria, was worsted in a short war (Nov.—Dec. 1885), and Greece was checked in her aspiration for further territorial aggrandizement at the expense of Turkey by the combined blockade of the Powers in the spring of 1886.

Since then, no geographical change has taken place in the old lands of European Turkey. Prince Alexander of Bulgaria was forced to abdicate by Russian intrigue in September 1886; but under his successor, Prince Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg (crowned in 1887), and his able minister Stambouloff, Bulgaria has successfully preserved its autonomy.

#### THE PRESENT-DAY PROBLEM.

A general statement of the Balkan problem as it exists to-day may be briefly given. The non-Turkish populations of European Turkey, for the most part Christian, are divided ethnically into four groups: the *Roumans* or *Vlachs*, the *Greeks*, the *Albanians* and the *Slavs*. The process of liberation, as it has proceeded during the present century, has given among these people the following separate states. The *Vlachs* are represented in the present kingdom of Roumania ruled by a Hohenzollern prince; the *Greeks* are represented in the little kingdom of Greece ruled by a prince of the house of Denmark; while the *Slavs* are represented by three autonomous realms: Bulgaria under Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg, Servia under the native dynasty of Obrenovitch, and the little principality of Montenegro, the only one of all which had never yielded to Turkish supremacy, under the Petrovic house, which is likewise native.

The *Albanians* alone of the four races, owing in part, perhaps, to their more or less general acceptance of Mohammedanism, have not as yet made a determined effort for separate national existence.

To these people, under any normal process of development, belongs the inheritance of the Turkish Empire in Europe. The time has long passed when any such process can be effectually hindered on the Turkish side. It will be hindered, if at all, either by the aggressive and rival ambitions of their two great neighbors, Austria and Russia, or by the mutual jealousies and opposing claims of the peoples themselves.

The unfortunate part which these jealousies are likely to play in the history of the future

was dimly foreshadowed in the events of 1885. It is indeed these rival aspirations, rather than the collapse of the Turkish power, which are most likely to afford Russia and even Austria the opportunity for territorial extension over the Balkan lands. A confederation, or even a tacit understanding between the Balkan states, would do much to provide against this danger; but the idea of a confederation, though often suggested and even planned, belongs at present only to the realm of possibilities. On the one hand Serbia, menaced by the proximity of Austria, leans upon Russian support; on the other, Bulgaria, under exactly reverse conditions, yields to the influence of Austria. It will be seen at once that these are unfavorable conditions on which to build up any federative action. If at the next crisis, however, the liberated states are fated to act independently, it will be seen at once that Greece and Bulgaria possess the better chance. Not only are they the most remote from any of the great powers, but they alone possess a geography which is entirely open on the Turkish side.

Moreover, what is of still greater consequence, it is they who, from an ethnic standpoint, have the most legitimate interest in the still unliberated population of European Turkey. The unliberated Greek population predominates in southern Macedonia, the Chalcidian peninsula and along almost the entire seaboard, both of Thrace and Asia Minor; on the other hand the ethnographical limits of the Bulgarian people conform almost exactly to the boundaries of Bulgaria as provided for at San Stephano. The creation of a political Bulgaria to correspond to the ethnic Bulgaria was indeed the purpose of the Russian government in 1878, though with the repetition of the same conditions it would hardly be its purpose again.

Barring, therefore, the Albanians of the west, who as yet have asserted no clearly defined national claim, the Greeks and the Bulgarians are the logical heirs to what remains of European Turkey.

These observations are not intended as a forecast; they merely indicate what would be an inevitable outcome, were the question permitted a natural settlement.

Concerning the *Turks* themselves a popular fallacy has ever been to consider their destiny as a whole. But here again an important division of the subject intrudes itself.

In Asia Minor, where the *Turkish* population overwhelmingly preponderates, the question of their destiny, barring the ever threatened Russian interference, ought not to arouse great concern in the present. But in European Turkey the utter lack of this predominance seems to deprive the Ottoman of his only legitimate title. The *Turkish* population in Thrace and the Balkans never did in fact constitute a majority; and with its continual decline, measured indeed by the decline of the Ottoman Empire itself, the greatest of all obstacles to an equitable and final settlement has been removed. (See the ethnic map of Europe at the present day.)

The historical geography of the Balkans during the present century is not so intricate that it may not be understood even from the current literature of the subject. The best purely geographical authority is E. Hertslet's "Map of Europe by Treaty." Of text works A. C. Fyffe's "History of Modern Europe," and J. H. Rose's "A Century of Continental History" afford excellent general views. The facts concerning the settlement of the most northern boundary of free Greece are given in Bunlay's "History of Greece," Vol. VII. Of excellent works dealing more or less directly with present Balkan politics there is hardly an end. It is necessary to mention but a few: É. de Laveleye's "The Balkan Peninsula," E. A. Freeman's "The Ottoman Power in Europe," and the Duke of Argyll's "The Eastern Question," and James Baker's "Turkey." See also the general bibliography of historical geography.—A. C. Reiley.



# APPENDIX D.

## NOTES TO THE DEVELOPMENT MAP OF CHRISTIANITY.

THE subject matter contained in this map is of a character so distinct from that of the other maps of this series that the reader must expect a corresponding modification in the method of treatment.

The use of historical maps is confined, for the most part, to the statement of purely political conditions.

This is in fact almost the only field which admits of exact portrayal, within the limits of historical knowledge, by this method. Any other phase of human life, whether religious or social, which concerns the belief or the thought of the people rather than the exact extent of their race or their government, must remain, so far as the limitations of cartography is concerned, comparatively intangible.

Again, it should be noted that, even in the map treatment of a subject as comparatively exact as political geography, it is one condition of exactness that this treatment should be specific in its relation to a date, or at least to a limited period.

The map which treats a subject in its historical development has the undoubted merit of greater comprehensiveness; but this advantage cannot be gained without a certain loss of relation and proportion. Between the "development" map and the "date" map there is this difference: In the one, the whole subject passes before the eye in a sort of moving panorama, the salient points evident, but with their relation to external facts often obscured; in the other, the subject stands still at one particular point and permits itself to be photographed. A progressive series of such photographs, each forming a perfect picture by itself, yet each showing the clear relation with what precedes and follows, affords the method which all must regard as the most logical and the most exact. But from the very intangible nature of the subject treated in this map, the date method, with its demand for exactness, becomes impracticable. These observations are necessary in explaining the limitations of cartography in dealing with a subject of this nature. The notes that follow are intended as a simple elucidation of the plan of treatment.

The central feature in the early development of Christianity is soon stated. The new faith spread by churches from city to city until it became the religion of the Roman Empire; afterwards this spread was continued from people to people until it became the religion of Europe. The statement of the general fact in this crude and untempered form might in an ordinary case provoke criticism, and its invariable historic truth with reference to the second period be open to some question; but within the limits of map presentation it is substantially accurate. It forms, indeed, the key upon which the entire map is constructed.

### THE ANTE-NICENE CHURCHES.

During the first three centuries of the Christian era, up to the Constantinian or Nicene period, there is no country, state or province which can be safely described as Christian; yet as early as the second century there is hardly a portion of the Empire which does not number some Christians in its population. The subject of the historical geography of the Christian church during the ante-Nicene period is confined, therefore, to the locating of these Christian bodies wherever they are to be found. On this portion of the subject the map makes its own statement. It is possible merely to elucidate this statement, with the suggestion, in addition, of a few points which the map does not and cannot contain.

Concerning the ante-Nicene churches there is only one division attempted. This division, into the "Apostolic" and "post-Apostolic," concerns merely the period of their foundation. Concerning the churches founded in the Apostolic period (33-100), our knowledge is practically limited to the facts culled from the Acts, the Epistles and the Apocalypse. The churches of the post-Apostolic period afford a much wider field for research, although the materials for study bearing upon them are almost as inadequate. According to the estimate of the late Prof. R. D. Hitchcock, there were in the Roman Empire at the close of the persecutions about 1,800 churches, 1,000 in the East and 800 in the West. Of this total, the cities in which churches have been definitely located number only 525. They are distributed as follows: Europe 188, Asia 214, Africa 123 (see v. I, p. 443). Through the labors of Prof. Henry W. Hulbert, the locations of these 525 cities, so far as established, have been cast in available cartographic form.

It is much to be regretted that, despite the sanction of the author, it has been found impossible, owing to the limitations of space, to locate all of these cities in the present map. The attempt has been limited therefore to the placing of only the more prominent cities, or those whose location is subject to the least dispute.

The Apostolic and post-Apostolic churches, as they appear upon the map, are distinguished by underlines in separate colors. A special feature has been the insertion of double underlines to mark the greater centres of diffusion, so far as their special activity in this respect can be safely assumed. In this class we have as centres in Apostolic times *Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Philippi, Thessalonica* and *Corinth*; in post-Apostolic times, when the widening of the field necessitates special and limited notices, we may name *Alexandria, Edessa, Rome* and *Carthage*.

The city of *Rome* contains a Christian community in Apostolic times, but its activity as a great diffusion centre, prior to early post-Apostolic times, is a point of considerable historical

controversy. In this respect it occupies a peculiar position, which is suggested by the special underlines in the map.

#### CONVERSION OF THE EMPIRE.

The above method of treatment carries us in safety up to the accession in the West of the first Christian Emperor (311). The attempt, however, to pursue the same method beyond that period would involve us at once in insurmountable difficulties.

The exact time of the advent of the Christian-Roman world it is indeed impossible to define with precision. The Empire after the time of Constantine was predominantly Christian, yet paganism still lingered in formidable though declining strength. A map of religions designed to explain this period, even with unlimited historical material, could hardly be executed by any system, for the result could be little better than a chaos, the fragments of the old religion everywhere disappearing or blending with the new. The further treatment of the growth of Christianity by cities or churches is now impossible; for the rapid increase of the latter has carried the subject into details and intricacies where it cannot be followed; on the other hand, to describe the Roman world in the fourth century as a Christian world would be taking an unwarranted liberty with the plain facts of history.

The last feeble remnants of paganism were in fact burned away in the fierce heat of the barbaric invasions of the fifth century. After that time we can safely designate the former limits of the Roman Empire as the Christian world. From this point we can resume the subject of church expansion by the "second method" indicated at the head of this article. But concerning the transition period of the fourth and fifth centuries, from the time Christianity is predominant in the Roman world until it becomes the sole religion of the Roman world, both methods fail us and the map can tell us practically nothing.

#### BARBARIANS OF THE INVASION.

Another source of intricacy occurring at this point should not escape notice. It was in the fourth century that Christianity began its spread among the barbarian Teutonic nations north of the Danube. The *Goths*, located on the Danube, between the Theiss and the Euxine, were converted to Christianity, in the form known as Arianism, by the missionary bishop Ulphilas, and the faith extended in the succeeding century to many other confederations of the Germanic race. This fact represented, for a time, the Christianization, whole or partial, of some peoples beyond the borders of the Empire. With the migrations of the fifth and sixth centuries, however, these converts, without exception, carried their new faith with them into the Empire, and their deserted homes, left open to new and pagan settlers, simply became the field for the renewed missionary effort of a later age. It is a historical fact, from a cartographic standpoint a fortunate one, that, with all the geographic oscillations of this period between Christianity and paganism, the Christian world finally emerged with its boundaries conforming, with only a few exceptions, to the former frontiers of the Roman Empire.

Whether or not this is a historical accident it nevertheless gives technical accuracy from the geographic standpoint to the statement that

Christianity first made the conquest of the Roman world; from thence it went out to complete the conquest of Europe.

#### CONVERSION OF EUROPE.

With the view, as afforded on the map, of the extent of Christianity at the commencement of the seventh century, we have entered definitely upon the "second method." Indeed, in Ireland, Wales and Scotland, where the Celtic church has already put forth its missionary effort, the method has, in point of date, been anticipated; but this fact need cause no confusion in treatment. Henceforth the spread of Christianity is noted as it made its way from "people to people." At this point, however, occurs the greatest intangibility of the subject. The dates given under each country represent, as stated in the key to the map, "the approximate periods of conversion." It is not to be inferred, however, that Christianity was completely unknown in any of these countries prior to the periods given, or that the work of conversion was in each case entirely completed within the time specified. But it is an absolute necessity to give some definiteness to these "periods of conversion"; to assign with all distinctness possible the time when each hand passed from the list of pagan to the list of Christian nations. The dates marking the limits to these periods are perhaps chosen by an arbitrary method. The basis of their selection, however, has been almost invariably some salient point, first in the introduction and finally in the general acceptance of the Christian faith. In order that the reader may possess the easy means of independent opinion or critical judgment, the explanation is appended of the dates thus used, concerning which a question might legitimately arise.

**Goths.**—*Converted to Arian Christianity by Ulphilas, 341-381.*—These dates cover the period of the ministry of Ulphilas, whose efforts resulted in the conversion of the great body of the Danubian Goths. He received his ordination and entered upon his work in 341, and died at Constantinople in 381. (See C. A. A. Scott's "Ulphilas.")

**Suevi, Burgundians and Lombards.**—These people, like the Goths, passed from paganism through the medium of Arian Christianity to final Orthodoxy. Concerning the first process, it is possible to establish nothing, save that these Teutonic peoples appeared in the Empire in the fifth century as professors of the Arian faith. The exact time of the acceptance of this faith is of less consequence. The second transition from Arianism to Orthodoxy occurred at a different time in each case. The Suevi embraced the Catholic faith in 550; the Visigoths, through their Catholic king Reccared, were brought within the church at the third council of Toledo (589). Further north the Burgundians embraced Catholicism through their king Sigismund in 517, and, finally, the Lombards, the last of the Arians, accepted Orthodoxy in the beginning of the seventh century. The Vandals, another Arian German nation of this period, figured in Africa in the fourth century.

They were destroyed, however, by the arms of Belisarius in 534, and their early disappearance renders unnecessary their representation on the present map.

**Franks.**—*Christianity introduced in 496.*—This is the date of the historic conversion of Clovis and his warriors on the battlefield of

**Tolbiac.** The Franks were the first of the Germanic peoples to pass, as a nation, to orthodoxy direct from paganism, and their conversion, as we have seen, was soon followed by the progress from Arianism to Orthodoxy of the other Germanic nations within the borders of the Empire.

**Ireland.**—*Christianity introduced by Patrick, 440-493.*—St. Patrick entered upon his missionary work in Ireland in 440; he died on the scene of his labors in 493. This period witnessed the conversion of the bulk of the Irish nation.

**Picts.**—*Christianity introduced from Ireland by Columba, 503-597.*—These dates cover the period of St. Columba's ministry. The work of St. Ninian, the "apostle of the Lowlands" in the previous century, left very few enduring results. The period from 563, the date of the founding of the famous Celtic monastery of Iona, to the death of Columba in 597, witnessed, however, the conversion of the great mass of the Pictish nation.

**Strathclyde.**—*Christianity introduced by Kentigern, 550-603.*—These dates, like the two preceding, cover the period of the ministry of a single man, Kentigern, the "apostle of Strathclyde." The date marking the commencement of Kentigern's labors is approximate. He died in 603.

**England.**—The Celtic church had been uprooted in England by the Anglo-Saxon invasions of the fifth and sixth centuries. While its missionary efforts were now being expended on Scotland, Strathclyde, and Cornwall, its pristine seat had thus fallen away to complete paganism. The Christianization of England was the work of the seventh century, and in this work the Celtic church, though expending great effort, was anticipated and ultimately outstripped by the church of Rome.

**Kent.**—*Christianity introduced by Augustine, 597-604.*—These dates cover the ministry of St. Augustine, the apostle of Kent. This was the first foothold gained by the Roman church on the soil of Britain.

**Northumbria.**—627-651.—Edwin (Endwine), king of Northumbria, received baptism from the Kentish missionary Paulinus on Easter Eve, 627.

The process of conversion was continued by the Celtic missionary, Aidin, who died in 651. The Christianity of Northumbria had begun before the latter date, however, to influence the surrounding states.

**East Anglia.**—630-647.—East Anglia had one Christian king prior to this period; but it was only with the accession of Sigebert (630) that great progress was made in the conversion of the people. The reign of king Anna witnesses the practical completion of this work. In 647 the efforts of this sovereign led to the baptism of Cenwalch, king of the West Saxons.

**Wessex.**—634-648.—The conversion of the West Saxons was begun by the missionary Birinus in 634. The year 648 witnessed the restoration of the Christian king Cenwalch.

**Mercia.**—654-670.—Mercia was one of the last of the great English kingdoms to accept the faith. Their king, Penda, was indeed the most formidable foe the church encountered in the British Isles. The conversion of Penda's son Peada admitted the gospel to the Middle Angles, who accepted Christianity in 653. The East Saxons embraced the faith at about the same time. Fi-

nally in 654 the defeat and death of Penda at the hand of Oswy, the Christian king of Northumbria, opened the doors of Mercia as well. The conversion of the realm was practically accomplished during the next few years.

**Sussex.**—681.—The leaders of the South Saxons received baptism at the hands of the apostle Wilfred in 681. Sussex was the last retreat of paganism on the English mainland, and five years later the conversion of the inhabitants of the Isle of Wight completed the spread of Christianity over every portion of the British Isles.

**Frisians.**—*Christianity introduced by Willibrord, 690-739.*—The work of St. Willibrord among the Frisians was one of many manifestations of the missionary activity of the Celtic church. Willibrord introduced Christianity among these people during the years of his ministry, but to judge by the subsequent martyrdom of Boniface in Friesland (755) the work of conversion was not fully completed in all quarters until a later time.

**Mission Field of Boniface.**—722-755.—The object of the map is not merely to locate the mission field of the great "apostle of Germany," but also to give the location and date of the various bishoprics which owed their foundation to his missionary efforts.

**Saxons.**—787-805.—Of all the nations converted to Christianity up to this time the Saxons were the first conquest of the sword. The two most powerful Saxon chiefs were baptized in 787; but it was not until their complete defeat and subjugation by Charlemagne in 805 that the work of conversion showed a degree of completeness. With the Christianization of the Saxons the cordon of the church was completed around the Germanic nations.

**Moravia.**—*Christianity introduced by Cyrillus and Methodius, 863-900.*—St. Cyrillus, the "apostle of the Slavs," entered upon his mission in Moravia in 863. The political Moravia of the ninth century, under Rastislav and Svatopluk, exceeded greatly the limits of the modern province; but the missionary labor of the brothers Cyrillus and Methodius seems to have produced its principal results in the modern Moravian territory, as indicated on the map. Methodius, the survivor of the brothers, died about 900. In the tenth century Moravia figures as Christian.

**Czechs.**—880-1039.—The door to Bohemia was first opened from Moravia in the time of Svatopluk. The reactions in favor of paganism were, however, unusually prolonged and violent. Severus, Archbishop of Prague, finally succeeded in enforcing the various rules of the Christian cultus (1039).

**Poles.**—960-1034.—The Polish duke Mieczyslaw was baptized in 960. Mieczyslaw II. died in 1034. These dates cover the active missionary time when, indeed, the efforts of the clergy were backed by the strong arm of the sovereign. Poland did not, however, become completely Christian until a somewhat later period.

**Bulgarians.**—863-900.—The Bulgarian prince Bogoris was baptized in 863. Again, as in so many other cases, the faith was compelled to pass to the people through the medium of the sovereign. The second date is arbitrary, although Bulgaria appears definitely as a Christian country at the commencement of the tenth century.

**Magyars.**—950-1050.—Missionaries were admitted into the territory of the magyars in 950.

The coronation of St. Stephen, the "apostolic king," (1000) marked the real triumph of Christianity in Hungary. A number of pagan reactions occurred, however, in the eleventh century, so that it is impossible to place the conversion of the Magyars at an earlier date than the last one assigned.

**Russians.**—888-1015.—The Russian grand-duke Vladimir was baptized on the occasion of his marriage to the princess Anne, sister of the Byzantine Emperor, in 988. Before his death in 1015 Christianity had through his efforts become the accepted religion of his people.

**Danes.**—*Converted by Ansgar and his successors, 827-1035.*—The Danes had been visited by missionaries prior to the ninth century, but their work had left no permanent result. The arrival of Ansgar, the "apostle of the North" (827), marks the real beginning of the period of conversion. This period in Denmark was an unusually long one. It was not fully complete until the reign of Canute the Great (1019-1035).

**Swedes (Gothia).**—*Christianity introduced by Ansgar and his successors, 820-1000.*—Ansgar made his first visit to Sweden in 829, two years after his arrival in Denmark. The period of conversion, as in Denmark, was a long one; but by the year 1000 the southern section, Gothia or Gothland, had become Christian. The conversion of the northern Swedes was not completed for another century.

**Norwegians.**—935-1030.—The period of conversion in Norway began with the reign of the Christian king Hakon the Good. The faith made slow progress, however, until the reign of Olaf Trygvesson, who ascended the throne near the end of the tenth century. The work of conversion was completed in the reign of Olaf the Saint (1014-1030).

**Pomeranians.**—*Christianity introduced by Otho of Bamberg, 1124-1128.*—The attempt of the Poles to convert the Pomeranians by the sword prior to these dates had proven unavailing, and missionaries had been driven from the country. Within the short space of four years, however, Otho of Bamberg succeeded in bringing the great mass of the people within the pale of the church.

**Abotrites.**—1125-1162.—The conversion of these people was clearly the work of the sword. It was accomplished within the time specified by Albert the Bear, first margrave of Brandenburg, and Henry the Lion, duke of Saxony. The last heathen king became the first Christian duke of Mecklenburg in 1162. Further south the kindred Wend nations between the Elbe and the Oder had been the object of German effort, both missionary and military, for over two centuries, but had generally come within the church before this time.

**Lives and Prussians.**—*Christianity introduced by the Sverd Brothers, 1202-1230, and by the Teutonic Knights, 1230-1289.*—These conversions, the work of the transplanted military orders of Palestine, were direct conquests of the sword, and as such possess a definiteness which is so unfortunately lacking in so many other cases.

So much for the character and the purpose of the dates which appear on this map. In the employment of the colors, the periods covered are longer, and as a consequence the general results are somewhat more definite. The use of a color system directly over a date system is intended to afford an immediate though general view. From

this to the special aspects presented by the date features is a simple step in the development of the subject.

Another feature of the map which may not escape notice is the different systems used, respectively, in the Roman and Medieval period for the spelling of urban names. A development map covering a long period of history cannot be entirely free from anachronisms of this nature; but a method has nevertheless been followed in the spelling of these place names:—to give in each case the spelling current at the period of conversion. The fact that the labors of the Christian missionaries were confined mostly to the Roman world in the Roman period, and did not extend to non-Roman lands until the Middle Ages, enables us to limit our spelling of civic names to a double system. The cities of the Roman and of the Medieval period are shown on the map and in the key in two different styles of type. Only in the cases of cities like Rome, Constantinople and Antioch, where the current form has the absolute sanction of usage even for classic times, has there been any deviation from the strict line of this method.

In conclusion, the general features of the subject present themselves as follows: Had the advance of Christianity, like Mohammedanism, been by conquest, had the bounds of the Christian faith been thus rendered ever continuous with the limits of a people or an empire, then, indeed, the subject of church expansion would possess a tangibility and coherency concerning which exact statement would be possible. The historical geography of the Christian church would then partake of some of the precision of political division. But the non-political element in the Christian cultus deprives us, in the study of the subject, of this invaluable aid. At a later time, when the conquests of the soul were backed by the strong arm of power, and when the new faith, as often happened, passed to the people from the sovereign, a measure of this exactness is perhaps possible.

We have witnessed an indication of these tendencies in many cases, as we approached the termination of the period covered by this map. But the fact remains that the fundamental character of the Christian faith precludes, in the main, the possibility of its growth being measured by the rules which govern ordinary political expansion.

This being then a subject on which definiteness is well nigh impossible, it has been treated by a method correspondingly elastic. A working basis for the study of the subject is, however, afforded by this system. This basis secured, the student may then systematically pursue his theme.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The historical geography of the Christian church, if studied only within narrow limits, can be culled from the pages of general church history. All of these accounts, however, are brief—those in the smaller histories extremely so. If studied thus, the reader will derive the most help from Neander's "History of the Christian Religion and Church," vol. I, pp. 68-86, vol. II, pp. 1-84, 93-129; Schaff's "History of the Christian Church," vol. I, pp. 224-406, vol. II, pp. 13-84, vol. III, pp. 10-71, vol. IV, pp. 17-142, and Moeller's "History of the Christian Church."

These works may be supplemented by a vast number of books treating of special phases of church history, though the number in English dealing specifically with geographical expansion is very small.

The most recent, dealing with the ante-Nicene period, is Ramsey's "Church in the Roman Empire before A. D. 170," to which the same author's "Historical Geography of Asia Minor" forms a most indispensable prelude.

Entering the mediæval period, the best general guides are the little books of G. F. Maclear, entitled respectively the conversion of the Celts, English, Continental Teutons, Northmen and Slavs. These works may be supplemented by Thomas Smith's "Mediæval Missions," and for special subjects by G. T. Stokes' "Ireland and the Celtic Church," W. F. Skene's "Celtic Scotland" (vol. II), and S. Baring Gould's "The Church in Germany."

The texts of the Councils as contained in Harduin, Labbe, and Mansi are indispensable original aids in the study of church geography.

Of German Works, J. E. T. Wiltch's "Atlas Sacer," and the same author's "Church Geography and Statistics," translated by John Leitch, have long remained the standard guides for a study of the historical geography of the church.

The Atlas Sacer, containing five large plates, is the only pure atlas guide to the subject. The "Church Geography and Statistics," being an ecclesiastical work, dwells with great fulness on the internal facts of church geography, but the outward expansion, barring the early growth of the church, is not so concisely treated. For the history of mediæval missions the reader will be better served elsewhere. To the reader using German, C. G. Blumhardt's "Die Missionsgeschichte der Kirche Christi" (3 vols., 1828-1837), and a later work, "Handbuch der Missionsgeschichte und Missionsgeographie" (3 vols., 1863), may be noted.

For modern missions there is a very full literature. Comprehensive works on this subject are Grundemann's "Allgemeine Missions Atlas," Burkhardt and Grundemann's "Les Missions Evangéliques" (4 vols.), and in English the "Encyclopædia of Missions." Several articles in the "Encyclopædia of Missions" should not escape notice. Among them are "Mediæval Missions," and the "Historical Geography of Missions," the latter by Dr Henry W. Hulbert. The writer is glad at this point to return his thanks to Dr. Hulbert for the valued aid extended in the location of the Church of the ante-Nicene period.—A. C. Reiley,

# APPENDIX E.

THE FOLLOWING NOTES AND CORRECTIONS TO MATTER RELATING TO AMERICAN ABORIGINES  
(PP. 76-108) HAVE BEEN KINDLY MADE BY MAJOR J. W. POWELL AND  
MR. J. OWEN DORSEY, OF THE BUREAU OF ETHNOLOGY.

**Adai.**—This tribe, formerly classed as a distinct family—the Adaižan—is now regarded by the Bureau of Ethnology as but a part of the Caddoan or Pawnee.

**Apache Group.**—Indians of different families are here mentioned together: (A) the Comanches, etc., of the Shoshonean Family; (B) the Apaches (including the Chiricaguils, or Chiricahua, Coyoteris, etc., but excluding the Tejuas who are Tañon) of the Athapascan Family; the Navajos of the same family; and (C) the Yuman Family, including the Cosinios, who are not Apache (Athapascan stock).

**Athapascan Family.**—Not an exact synonym of "Chippewyans, Tinnch and Sareces." The whole family is sometimes known as Tinnch, though that appellation is more frequently limited to part of the Northern group, the Chippewyans. The Sareces are an offshoot of the Beaver tribe, which latter form part of one of the subdivisions of the Northern group of the Athapascan Family. The Sareces are now with the Blackfeet.

**Atsinas (Caddoes).**—The Atsinas are not a Caddoan people, but they are Algonquian, as are the Blackfeet (Sik-sik-a). The Atsinas are the "Fall Indians," "Minnetarees of the Plains," or "Gros Ventres of the Plains," as distinguished from the Hidatsa, who are sometimes called the "Minnetarees of the Missouri," "Gros Ventres of the Missouri."

**Blackfeet or Siksikas.**—The Sarece are a Tinnch or Athapascan tribe, but they are not the Tinnch (see above). The "Atsina" are not a Caddo tribe (see above).

**Cherokees.**—These people are now included in the Iroquoian Family. See Powell, in *Seventh Annual Rept.*, Bureau of Ethnology, p. 79.

**Flatheads (Salishan Family).**—The "Cherakiks," though included among the Flatheads by Force, are of the Iroquoian Family. The "Chicachas" or Chickasaws, are not Salishan, but Muskogean. See Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept.*, Bureau of Ethnology, p. 95. The Totiris of Force, are the Tutelos, a tribe of the Siouan Family. See Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept.*, Bureau of Ethnology, p. 116. The Cathlamans, Killmucks (i. e., Tillamooks), Clatsops, Chinooks and Chlits are of the Chinookan Family. See Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept.*, Bureau of Ethnology, pp. 65, 66.

**Gros Ventres (Minnetaree; Hidatsa).**—There are two distinct tribes which are often confounded, both being known as the Gros Ventres or Minnetarees. 1. The Atsina or Fall Indians, an Algonquian tribe, the "Gros Ventres of the Plains," or the "Minnetarees of the Plains." 2. The Hidatsa, a Siouan tribe, the "Gros Ventres of the Missouri," or the "Minnetarees of the Missouri." The former, the Atsina, have been wrongly styled "Caddoes" on p. 81.

**Hidatsa, or Minnetaree, or Gros Ventres.**—Often confounded with the Atsina, who belong to the Algonquian Family, the Hidatsa being a tribe of the Siouan Family. The Hidatsa have been called Gros Ventres, "Big Paunches," but this nickname could have no reference to any personal peculiarities of the Hidatsa. It seems to have originated in a quarrel between some Indians over the big paunch of a buffalo, resulting in the separation of the people into the present tribes of Hidatsa and Absarokas or Crows, the latter of whom now call the Hidatsa, "Ki-khatsa," from ki-kha, a paunch.

**Hupas.**—They belong to the Athapascan Family; the reference to the Modocs is misleading.

**Iroquois Tribes of the South.**—"The Meherrins or Tuteloes."—These were not identical, the Tuteloes being a Siouan tribe, the Meherrins being now identified with the Susquehannocks.

**Kenai or Blood Indians.**—The Kenai are an Athapascan people inhabiting the shores of Cook's Inlet and the Kenai Peninsula, Southern Alaska; while the Blood Indians are a division of the Blackfeet (Siksika), an Algonquian tribe, in Montana.

**Kusan Family.**—The villages of this family were on Coos River and Bay, and on both sides of Coquille River, near the mouth. See Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept.*, Bureau of Ethnology, p. 89.

ALSO IN: J. Owen Dorsey, *The Gentile System of the Siletz Tribes, in Jour. Amer. Folk-Lore, July—Sept., 1890*, p. 231.

**Minnetarees.** See above, ATSINA and HIDATSA.

**Modocs (Klamaths) and their California and Oregon neighbors.**—The Klamaths and Modocs are of the Lutuamian Family; the Shastas of the Sastean; the Pit River Indians of the Palaiuhian; the Eurocs of the Weltspekan; the Cahrocs of the Quorntean; the Hoopahs, Tolewas, and the lower Rogue River Indians of the Athapascan; the upper Rogue River Indians of the Takilmian.

**Muskogean Family.**—The Biloxi tribe is not Muskogean but Siouan. See Dorsey (James Owen), "The Biloxi Indians of Louisiana," reprinted from v. 42, *Proc. Amer. Assoc. Adv. Sci., Madison meeting, 1893*.

**Natchitoches.**—A tribe of the Caddoan Family. —Dorsey (J. Owen), *MS. in the Bureau of Ethnology, 1882*.

ALSO IN: *Seventh Annual Rept.*, Bureau of Ethnology, p. 1.

**Pueblos.**—"The Zuni was Cibola it is needless to attempt to prove any further."—A. F. Bandelier, *Journal of Am. Eth. and Arch.*, v. 3, p. 19, 1892.

**Rogue River Indians.**—This includes tribes of various families; the upper Rogue River In-

dians being the Takelma, who are assigned to a special family, the Takilman; and the lower Rogue River Indians, who are Athapascan tribes. See Dorsey (J. Owen), "*The Gentile System of the Siletz Tribes*," in *Jour. Amer. Folk-Lore*, July—Sept., 1890, pp. 228, 232-236.

**Santees.**—Two divisions of the Siouan Family are known by this name: 1. The I-mau-ya-tl or Dwellers on Knife Lake, Minnesota, identical with the Mdewakantonwan Dakota. These figured in the Minnesota outbreak of 1862. The survivors are in Knox County, Nebraska, on what was once the Santee reservation, and near Flandreau, South Dakota. 2. The Santees of South Carolina were part of the Catawba confederacy. The Santee river is named after them.

**Sarcee.**—These are not all of the Tinneh, nor are they really Blackfeet, though living with them. The Sarcees are an offshoot of the Beaver Indians, a tribe of one of the divisions of the Northern group of the Athapascan Family.

**Siouan Family.**—All the tribes of this family do not speak the Sioux language, as is wrongly stated on p. 193. Those who speak the "Sioux" language are the Dakota proper, nicknamed Sioux, and the Assiniboin. There are, or have been, nine other groups of Indians in this family: to the Cegiha or Dhegiha group belong the Omahas, Ponkas, Osages, Kansas or Kaws, and Kwapas or Quapaws; to the Tchiwere group belong the Iowas, Otos, and Missouris; the Winnebago or Hochangara constitute another group; the fifth group consists of the survivors of the Mandan nation; to the sixth group belong the Hidatsa and the Absarokas or Crows; the Tutelos, Keyauwees, Aconcechis, etc., constituted the seventh group; the tribes of the Catawba confederacy, the eighth; the Biloxis, the ninth; and certain Virginia tribes the tenth group. The Winnebagos call themselves Hochangara, or First Speech (not "Trout Nation"), they are not called Horoje

("fish-eaters") by the Omahas, but Iiu-tan-ga, Big Voices, a mistranslation of Hochangara. The Dakotas proper sometimes speak of themselves as the "O-che-ti sha-ko-win," or the Seven Council-fires. Their Algonquian foes called them Nadowe-ssi-wak, the Snake-like ones, from nadowe, a snake; this was corrupted by the Canadian French to Nadouessioux, of which the last syllable is Sioux. The seven primary divisions of the Dakota are as follows: Mdewakantonwan, Wakhpekute, Sisseton or Sisseton, Wakhpetonwan or Warpeton, Ihanktonwan or Yankton, Ihanktonwanna or Yanktonnai, and Tetonwan or Teton.

The Sheyennes or Cheyennes, mentioned in connection with the Sioux by Gallatin and Carver, are an Algonquian people. Gallatin styles the "Mandan" a Minnetaree tribe; but as has just been stated, the survivors of the Mandan nation, a people that formerly inhabited many villages (according to Dr. Washington Matthews and others) belong to a distinct group of the Siouan Family, and the Hidatsa (including the Amakhami or "Annahawas" of Gallatin) and the Absaroka, Upsaroka or Crows constitute the sixth group of that family. The "Quappas or Arkansas" of Gallatin are the Kwapas or Quapaws of recent times. The Osages call themselves, not "Wausashic," but Wa-sha-she.

**Takilman Family.**—"The Takilma formerly dwelt in villages along upper Rogue River, Oregon, all the latter, with one exception, being on the south side, from Illinois River on the southwest, to Deep Rock, which was nearer the head of the stream. They are now included among the 'Rogue River Indians,' and they reside on the Siletz Reservation, Tillamook County, Oregon, where Dorsey found them in 1884."—Powell, *Seventh Annual Rept., Bureau of Ethnology*, p. 121.—They call themselves, Takelma.—Dorsey.—Dorsey had their chief make a map showing the locations of all their villages.

# APPENDIX F.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY.

THE BETTER LITERATURE OF HISTORY IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ON SUBJECTS  
NAMED BELOW.

*In the following Classified List, the date of the first appearance of each one among the older works is given in parentheses, if ascertained. The period covered by the several memoirs, and other works limited in time, is stated in brackets.*

### AMERICA.

(DISCOVERY.—EXPLORATION.—SETTLEMENT.—ARCHÆOLOGY.—ETHNOLOGY.)

#### GENERAL.

- BANCROFT, GEORGE. History of the United States of Am., pt. 1. (Author's last revision.) New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1883-5. 6 v.
- BANCROFT, HUBERT HOWE. History of the Pacific States of N. Am.: Central Am., v. 1-2; Mexico, v. 1-2. San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft & Co. 1882-3.
- BANVARD, Rev. JOSEPH. Novelties of the new world. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1851.
- BELKNAP, JEREMY. American biography, v. 1. (1794-8.) New York: Harper & Bros. 3 v.
- BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY. Notes of Americana. (Bulletins, v. 3, pp. 205-209.)
- BROWNELL, HENRY. North and South America illustrated, from its first discovery. Hartford: Hurlbut, Kellogg & Co. 1860. 2 v.
- BRYANT, WM. CULLEN, and SIDNEY H. GAY. Popular history of the U. S., v. 1. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1876-81. 4 v.
- BUMP, C. W. Bibliographies of America. Baltimore, 1892. (Johns Hopkins University studies in historical and political science, 10th series, nos. 10-11, app.)
- CARVER, ELVIRA, and MARA L. PRATT. Our fatherland. [Juvenile.] Boston: Educational Pub. Co. 1890. v. 1-.
- FISKE, JOHN. The discovery of America; with some account of ancient Am. and the Spanish conquest. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1892. 2 v.
- GORDON, THOMAS F. History of Am., v. 1-2; containing the history of the Spanish discoveries prior to 1520. Philadelphia. 1332. 2 v.
- HAKLUYT, RICHARD, *coll.* Divers voyages touching the discovery of America and the islands adjacent (1582); with notes by John W. Jones. London: Hakluyt Soc. 1850.
- HARRISSE, HENRY. The discovery of N. Am.: a critical, documentary, and historic investigation. London: H. Stevens & Son. 1892.
- HIGGINSON, THOMAS, WENTWORTH. A book of American explorers. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1877.
- Larger history of the U. S. of Am., ch. 1-5. New York: Harper & Bros. 1886.
- HOLMES, ABIEL. The annals of Am., 1492-1826 (1805); 2d ed. Cambridge: Hillard & Brown. 1826. 2 v.
- HUMBOLDT, ALEXANDER von. Cosmos (1845-58), trans. by E. C. Otis, pt. 2, sect. 6 (v. 2). London: H. Bohn. 1847-53. 5 v. New York: Harper & Bros. 1850-. 5 v.
- KERR, ROBERT, *ed.* General history and collection of voyages and travels (1811-1834). v. 1-6. Edinburgh: W. Blackwood. 18 v.
- KINGSLEY, CHARLES. The first discovery of Am. (Lect's delivered in Am. in 1874. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1875. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates. 1875.)
- LODGE, H. C. Gravier's Découverte de l'Amérique. (N. Am. Rev., 119: 166, 1874.)
- MACGREGOR, JOHN. Progress in America. London: Whittaker & Co. 1847. 2 v.
- MACKENZIE, ROBERT. America; a history. London: Nelson & Sons. 1882.
- MAVOR, WM. Historical account of the most celebrated voyages, v. 1 and 17. London: 1796-7. 20 v.
- PALFREY, JOHN G. History of New England, v. 1, ch. 2. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1858-90.
- PAYNE, EDWARD JOHN. History of the new world called America. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1892-. v. 1-. New York: Macmillan & Co. 1892-. v. 1-.
- PINKERTON, JOHN, *ed.* General collection of the best and most interesting voyages and travels, v. 14. London: Longman. 1808-14. 17 v.
- ROBERTSON, WILLIAM. History of America (1777-96). (Works, v. 6-8. Oxford: Talboys & Wheeler. 1825.)
- SCAIFE, WALTER B. America, its geographical history, 1492-1892. (Johns Hopkins University studies in historical and political science, extra v. 13.) Baltimore. 1892.
- SNOWDEN, RICHARD. History of North and South Am., from its discovery to the death of Gen. Washington. (1894.) Philadelphia: B. Warner. 2 v.
- STEVENS, HENRY. Historical and geographical notes on the earliest discoveries in Am., 1492-1530. London: Henry Stevens. 1860. New Haven: American Journal of Science. 1869.
- WILLSON, MARCIUS. American history. New York: Mark H. Newman & Co. 1847.
- WINSOR, JUSTIN. Harrisse's Discovery of N. Am. (Nation, 55: 244, 264.)  
*ed.* Narrative and critical history of Am. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1886. 8 v.
- YATES, JOHN V. N., and MOULTON, JOS. W. History of the state of New York, v. 1, pt. 1. New York: A. T. Goodrich. 1824-6. 2 v.

#### PRE-COLUMBIAN DISCOVERIES.

- ANDERSON, RASMUS B. America not discovered by Columbus. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1874.
- BEAMISH, NORTH LUDLOW. The discovery of Am. by the Northmen in the 10th century. London: T. & W. Boone. 1841.
- BOWEN, Rev. BENJ. F. America discovered by the Welsh in 1170. A. D. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1876.
- DALL, W. H. Alleged early Chinese voyages to Am. (Science, 8: 402, 1895.)
- DAVIS, ASAHEL. Discovery of Am. by the Northmen. Rochester: D. Hoyt. 1839.
- DE COSTA, Rev. BENJ. FRANKLIN, *ed.* The pre-Columbian discovery of Am. by the Northmen, illustrated by translations from the Icelandic sagas. Albany: Joel Munsell. 1868.



- DIMAN, J. L. De Costa's Pre-Columbian discovery of Am. (N. Am. Rev., 1909, 303, 1892.)
- DISCOVERY OF AMERICA BY THE NORTHERN. (Atlantic Monthly, 54: 382, 1894.)
- DU BOIS, H. H. Did the Norse discover Am.? (Mag. of Am. History, 37: 309, 1892.)
- ELLIOTT, CHARLES W. The New England history, ch. 1. New York: Chas. Scribner, 1857. 2 v.
- EVERETT, EDWARD. Discovery of Am. by the Northerners. (N. Am. Rev., 46: 161, 1894.)
- FISKE, JOHN. How America came to be discovered. (Harper's Mag., 64: 111, 1891.)
- HIGGINSON, THOMAS W. The visit of the Vikings. (Harper's Mag., 65: 515, 1892.)
- HORSFORD, EHEN NORTON. The problem of the Northerners. Cambridge: J. Wilson & Son, 1889.
- LEGENDS OF OLD AM. (Cornhill Mag., 30: 432, 1873.)
- LELAND, CHARLES GODFREY. The ante-Norse discoverers of Am. (Continental Monthly, 1: 380, 530, 1862.)
- Fusing; or the discovery of Am. by Chinese Buddhist priests in the 5th century. London: Tribner, 1875. New York: J. W. Bouton, 1875.
- MacLEAN, J. P. Pre-Columbian discovery of Am. (American Antiquarian, 11, 1892.)
- MAJOR, RICHARD HENRY. The life of prince Henry of Portugal, surnamed the navigator, and its results. London: A. Adler & Co., 1894.
- On the voyages of the Venetian brothers Zeno. (Mass. Hist. Soc. Proceedings, 1873-75.)
- Trams, and ed. Voyages of the Venetian brothers, Nicolò and Antonio Zeno, to the northern seas, in the 14th century. London: Hakluyt Soc., 1873.
- ONDERDONK, J. L. Pre-Columbian discoveries of Am. (National Quart. Rev., 33: 1, 1876.)
- PILON, M. R. Visits of Europeans to Am. in the 10th and 11th centuries. (Potter's Am. Monthly, 5: 903, 1875.)
- RANKING, JOHN. Historical researches on the conquest of Peru, Mexico, etc., in the 13th century, by the Mongols. London: Longman, 1827.

## COLUMBUS.

- ADAMS, CHARLES KENDALL. Christopher Columbus, his life and work. ("Makers of America.") New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1892.
- Some recent discoveries concerning Columbus. (Mag. of Am. History, 37: 107, 1892.)
- ADAMS, HERBERT B., and HENRY WOOD. Columbus and his discovery of America. (Johns Hopkins University studies in historical and political science, 10th series, Nos. 10-11.) Baltimore, Oct.—Nov., 1892.
- BLIND, K. The forerunners of Columbus. (New Rev., 7: 346, Living Age, 195: 387, 1892.)
- CASTELAR, EMILIO. Christopher Columbus. (Century, 22: 123-921, 1892.)
- COLUMBUS, CHRISTOPHER. Journal, 1492-3; and doc's relating to the voyages of John (and Sebastian) Cabot and Gaspar Corte Real; trans. by C. E. Markham. London: Hakluyt Soc., 1893.
- The letter on the discovery of America; a facsimile of the pictorial ed., with a new and literal trans. Printed by the Lenox Library. New York, 1892.
- Letter to Gabriel Sanchez, 1493. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. (Old South leaflets, general series, No. 33.)
- Select letters, with other original documents; trans. and ed. by R. H. Major. London: Hakluyt Soc., 1847.
- Writings descriptive of the discovery and occupation of the new world; ed. by Paul Leicester Ford. New York: C. L. Webster & Co., 1892.
- COLUMBUS, FERDINAND. The discovery of America; from the life of Columbus. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. (Old South leaflets, general series, No. 29.)
- ELTON, CHARLES. The career of Columbus. New York: Cassell Publishing Co., 1892.
- GOODRICH, AARON. History of the character and achievements of the so-called Christopher Columbus. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1874.

- REEVES, ARTHUR MIDDLETON. The finding of Wine-land and the good. London: Henry Frowde, 1890.
- ROPEL, A. R. Early explorations of Am., real and imaginary. (English Historical Rev., 2: 78, 1887.)
- SHORT, JOHN T. Claims to the discovery of Am. (Galaxy, 20: 500, 1875.)
- SLAFETER, Rev. EDMUND F. The discovery of Am. by the Northerners, 985-1014; a discourse delivered before the New Hampshire Historical Society, Apr. 24, 1889.
- ed. Voyages of the Northerners to Am.; including extracts from the Icelandic sagas in an Eng. translation by N. L. Bentzish, opinion of Prof. Rafn, etc. Boston: Prince Soc., 1877.
- SMITH, JOSHUA TOULMIN. The discovery of Am. by the Northerners in the 10th century; comprising translations of all the most important original narratives (1890). 2d ed. London: Wm. S. Orr & Co., 1842.
- SOUTHEY, ROBERT. Madoc (1805). London: Longmans. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.
- STEPHENS, THOS. Madoc; an essay on the discovery of Am. by Madoc ap Owen Gwynedd in the 13th century. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1893.
- STORM, GJSTAV. Studies on the Vineland voyages. Copenhagen: Thiele, 1880.
- VINING, EDWARD F. An igglorious Columbus; or, evidence that Hsui-shan and a party of Buddhist monks from Afghanistan discovered America in the 5th century. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1885.
- VOYAGES TO VINLAND. THE. From the saga of Eric the red. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. (Old South leaflets, general series, No. 81.)
- WATSON, PAUL B. Bibliography of the pre-Columbian discoveries of Am. (Library Journal, 6: 227, 1881.)
- WINSOR, JUSTIN. America prefigured: an address at Harvard, Oct. 21, 1892. Cambridge, 1893.

## COLUMBUS.

- HELPS, Sir ARTHUR, and H. P. Thomas. Life of Columbus. London: Bell & Daldy, 1869.
- IRVING, WASHINGTON. Life and voyages of Christopher Columbus (1828); to which are added those of his companions (1831). New York: G. P. Putnam, 3 v.
- LORGUES, ROSELY DE. Life of Christopher Columbus, from Spanish and Italian documents; comp. from the Fr. by J. J. Barry. Boston: P. Donahoe, 1870.
- MACKIE, CHAS. PAUL. The last voyages of the Admiral of the Ocean Sea, as related by himself and his companions. Chicago: A. C. McCharg & Co., 1892.
- MACKINTOSH, J. The discovery of America by Columbus and the origin of the N. Am. Indians. Toronto, 1836.
- MARKHAM, CLEMENTS R. Life of Christopher Columbus. London: Geo. Philip & Son, 1892.
- MAURY, M. An examination of the claims of Columbus. (Harper's Mag., 42: 425, 527, 1871.)
- OBER, FREDERICK A. In the wake of Columbus; adventures of the special commissioner sent by the World's Columbian Exposition to the West Indies. Boston: D. Lothrop Co., 1893.
- SEELYE, ELIZABETH EGGLESTON. The story of Columbus; with introd. by Edward Eggleston. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1892.
- SPALDING, J. L. Columbus. (Catholic World, 56: 1, 1892.)
- TARDUCCI, FRANCESCO. The life of Christopher Columbus; trans. from the It. by H. F. Brownson. Detroit: H. F. Brownson, 1890. 2 v.
- WINSOR, JUSTIN. Christopher Columbus, and how he received and imparted the spirit of discovery. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1891.
- Columbiana. (Nation, 52: 297, 1891.)

## POST-COLUMBIAN DISCOVERIES.

- ARBER, EDWARD, ed. The first three English books on America (1511)-1555 A. D.; being chiefly trans., compilations, &c., by Richard Eden, from the writings of Pietro Martire, Sebastian Münster, Sebastian Cabot. Birmingham, 1885.
- ASHER, G. M., ed. Henry Hudson the navigator: original documents in which his career is recorded. London: Hakluyt Soc., 1890.

- BIDDLE, RICHARD. Memoir of Sebastian Cabot. Philadelphia: Carey & Lea, 1831.
- BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY. America in the 16th century (bibliog<sup>1</sup> note in Bulletins, v. 3, pp. 136-141).
- Early English explorations in America (bibliog<sup>1</sup> note in Bulletins, v. 3, pp. 241-244).
- Early explorations in America (bibliog<sup>1</sup> note in Bulletins, v. 3, pp. 103-109).

- BREVOORT, J. C. Verrazano the navigator [from report of the Am. Geographical Soc. of N. Y. for 1875]. New York, 1874.
- CHAMPLAIN, SAMUEL DE. Voyages (1608-1610); trans. by Chas. P. Otis, [ed.] with memoir by E. F. Blaffer. Boston: Prince Society, 1878-82. 3 v.
- DE VRIES, D. P. Extracts from the voyages; tr. from a Dutch ms. in the Philadelphia Library, by Dr. G. Troost. (Coll's of the N. Y. Hist. Soc., 2d series, v. 1. New York, 1841.)
- Voyages from Holland to Am., 1622-1644; tr. by H. C. Murphy. (Coll's of the N. Y. Hist. Soc., 2d series, v. 2. New York, 1857.)
- FISKE, JOHN. The romances of the Spanish and French explorers. (Harper's Mag., 61: 498, 1886.)
- FORCE, M. F. Some observations on the letters of Amerigo Vesputi (1879). Cincinnati: Robt. Clarke & Co., 1885.
- HAKLUYT, RICHARD, ed. The principal navigations, voyages, traffiques and discoveries of the English nation (1590); ed. by E. Goldenier, v. 12-15. Edinburgh: E. & G. Goldsmid, 1889-90.
- HIGGINSON, THOMAS W. The old English seamen. (Harper's Mag., 66: 217, 1881.)
- The Spanish discoverers. (Harper's Mag., 65: 729, 1882.)
- HUDSON, HENRY. Divers voyages and northern discoveries. (Purchase his pilgrimages, v. 3. Coll's of the N. Y. Hist. Soc., v. 1. New York, 1811.)
- JUET, ROBERT. Extract from the journal of the voyage of the Half-Moon, Henry Hudson, master, 1609. (Coll's of the N. Y. Hist. Soc., 2d series, v. 1. New York, 1841.)
- KOHL, J. G. History of the discovery of Maine; with an app. on the voyages of the Cabots. (Coll's of the Maine Hist. Soc., 2d series, v. 1. Portland, 1869.)
- LESTER, C. EDWARDS, and A. FOSTER. Life and voyages of Amerigo Vesputius. New York: Baker & Scribner, 1846.

- NICHOLS, J. P. Remarkable life, adventure, and discovery of Sebastian Cabot. London: Sampson Low, Son & Marston, 1869.
- PARKMAN, FRANCIS. Pioneers of France in the New World. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1865.
- PAYNE, EDWARD JAMES. Voyages of the Elizabethan seamen to America; 13 original narratives from the collection of Hakluyt. London: Thos. Ag. In. & Co., 1886.
- HEAD, JOHN MEREDITH, Jr. Historical inquiry concerning Henry Hudson. Albany: J. Munsell, 1869.
- SANTAREM, VINCENZO. Researches respecting Amerigo Vesputius and his voyages. (1842); trans. by E. V. Childs. Boston: C. C. Little & Jas. Brown, 1850.
- STANLEY OF ALDERLEY, Lord. The first voyage round the world, by Magellan; trans. from the acc'ts of Pigafetta and other contemporary writers; with documents, notes, etc. London: Hakluyt Soc., 1874.
- TARDUCCI, FRANCESCO. John and Sebastian Cabot, biog. notice, with documents; trans. from the It. by Henry F. Brownson. Detroit: H. F. Brownson, 1863.
- TOWLE, GEORGE M. Magellan. Boston: Lee & Shepard, 1870.
- VERRAZANO, JOHN DE. The relation of. (Coll's of the N. Y. Hist. Soc., v. 1. New York, 1811.)
- The same; a new translation, by J. G. Cogswell. (Coll's of the N. Y. Hist. Soc., 2d series, v. 1. New York, 1841.)
- Voyage, 1524. (Old South leaflets, general series, No. 17.) Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.
- VESPUCCI, AMERIGO. Account of his first voyage; letter to Pier Soderlin. (Old South leaflets, general series, No. 34.) Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.
- The first four voyages; reprinted in facsimile and trans. from the rare original ed. (1505-6). London: Bernard Quaritch, 1893.
- VOYAGES OF THE CABOTS, THE. From Hakluyt's "Principal navigations." Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. (Old South leaflets, general series, No. 37.)

## SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE CONQUEST AND OCCUPATION.

- ANDAGOYA, PASCUAL DE. Narrative of the proceedings of Pedrarias Davila [1514-1541]; trans. and ed. by C. B. Markham. London: Hakluyt Soc., 1865.
- BANDELAER, ADOLF F. A. Discovery of New Mexico [Cibola] by Fray Marcos of Nizza. (Mag. of Western History, 4: 359, 1885.)
- BENZONI, GIROLAMO. History of the new world, shewing his travels in America, 1541-1556; trans. and ed. by W. H. Smyth. London: Hakluyt Soc., 1857.
- BLACKMAR, FRANK W. Spanish institutions of the southwest. Baltimore, 1891. (Johns Hopkins University studies in hist. and pol. science. Extra v. 10.)
- CHARLEVOIX, Father F. P. X. DE. History of Paraguay (1736); [trans. from the Fr.]. London: L. Davis, 1769. 2 v.
- CHEVALIER, MICHEL. Mexico, ancient and modern; trans. by T. Alpass. London: J. Maxwell & Co., 1864. 2 v.
- CIEZA DE LEON, PEDRO DE. Travels. A. D. 1532-50, contained in the first and second parts of his Chronicle of Peru (1533-); trans. and ed. by C. H. Markham. London: Hakluyt Soc., 1864-83.
- CLAVIGERO, Abbé D. FRANCESCO SAVERIO. History of Mexico, collected from Spanish and Mexican historians, from mss. and ancient paintings of the Indians; trans. from the It by Chas. Cullen. Philadelphia: Thos. Dobson, 1864. 3 v.
- CORTEZ, HERNANDO. Despatches addressed to the emperor Charles V. during the conquest; trans. from the Span. with introd. and notes by Geo. Folsom. New York: Wiley & Putnam, 1843.
- DLAZ DEL CASTILLO, BERNAL. Memoirs, containing a true and full account of the discovery and conquest of Mexico and New Spain (1632); trans. from the Span. by John I. Lockhart. London: J. Hatchard & Son, 1844. 2 v.
- DISCOVERY and conquest of Terra Florida, by Don Fernando de Soto; written by a gentleman of Elvas (1537), and trans. out of Portuguese by Richard Hakluyt; ed. by W. B. Kye. London: Hakluyt Soc., 1851.
- FANCOURT, CHAS. ST. J. History of Yucatan. London: J. Murray, 1854.
- HELPS, Sir ARTHUR. Life of Hernando Cortes. London: Bell & Son, 1871. 2 v.
- Life of Las Casas. London: Bell & Son, 1868.
- Life of Pizarro. London: Bell & Son, 1869.

- HELPS, Sir ARTHUR. The Spanish conquest in America. London: Parker & Son, (1865-61.) New York: Harper & Bros., 1867. 4 v.
- IRVING, THEODORE. History of De Soto's conquest of Florida (1835). New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- MARKHAM, CLEMENTS R. History of Peru, ch. 1-1. Chicago: C. H. Sergel & Co., 1892.
- ed. and trans. Reports on the discovery of Peru. London: Hakluyt Soc., 1872.
- MAYER, BRANT. Mexico, Aztec, Spanish and republican, bk. 1. Hartford: S. Drake & Co., 1851. 2 v.
- PRESCOTT, WILLIAM H. History of the conquest of Mexico (1843); ed. by J. F. Kirk, Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 3 v.
- History of the conquest of Peru (1847); ed. by J. F. Kirk, Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 2 v.
- RAYNAL, Abbé. A philosophical and political history of the settlements and trade of the Europeans in the east and west Indies (1770); trans. from the It. by J. O. Justamond. London, 1788. 8 v.
- RIVERO, M. E., and TSCHUDI, J. J. von. Peruvian antiquities; trans. from the Span. by F. L. Hawks. New York: G. P. Putnam & Co., 1853.
- SIMPSON, J. H. Coronado's march in search of the "Seven cities of Cibola." Washington, 1871.
- SOLIS, Don ANTONIO DE. History of the conquest of Mexico by the Spaniards (1684); trans. from the Span. by T. Townsend, rev. and corr. by N. Hook. London: T. Woodward, 1738. 2 v.
- SOUTHEY, ROBERT. History of Brazil, v. 1. London: Longman, 1810-19. 3 v.
- SOUTHEY, THOMAS. Chronological history of the West Indies, v. 1. London: Longman, 1827. 3 v.
- TOWLE, GEORGE M. Pizarro. Boston: Lee & Shepard, 1879.
- TYLOR, EDWARD B. Anahuac, or Mexico and the Mexicans, ancient and modern. London: Longman, Green & Co., 1861.
- WASHBURN, CHAS. A. History of Paraguay, ch. 1-4. Boston: Lee & Shepard, 1871. 2 v.
- WATSON, ROBERT G. The Spanish and Portuguese in S. America during the colonial period, v. 1. London: Trübner & Co., 1884. 2 v.
- WILSON, ROBERT A. A new history of the conquest of Mexico, in which Las Casas' denunciations of the popular historians of that war are v. Philadelphia: Jas. Challen & Son, 1859.

## ENGLISH AND FRENCH COLONIZATION.

- ACRELIUS, ISRAEL. History of New Sweden. (Memoirs of the Pennsylvania Hist. Soc., v. 11. Philadelphia, 1876.)
- ADAMS, CHARLES FRANCIS. Three episodes of Massachusetts history. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1892. 2 v.
- BAYLIES, FRANCIS. Historical memoir of the colony of New Plymouth (1830). Boston: Wiggln & Lunt, 1866. 2 v.
- BEVERLEY, ROBERT. History of Virginia (1705). Richmond: J. W. Randolph, 1855.
- BOZMAN, JOHN L. Hist. of Maryland, 1633-1660. Baltimore: Lucas & Deaver. 1837 (introd. 1811.) Baltimore: John Murphy & Co.
- BRADFORD, WILLIAM. History of Plymouth Plantation. (Coll's of the Mass. Hist. Soc., 4th series, v. 3. Boston, 1854.)
- BRIDGES, GEORGE W. Annals of Jamaica, v. 1. London: J. Murray, 1827. 2 v.
- BRODHEAD, JOHN R., ed. Documents relating to the colonial history of the state of New York. Albany, 1856-87. 14 v.  
History of the state of New York, v. 1. New York: Harper & Bros. 1853. 2 v.
- BROWN, ALEXANDER, ed. The genesis of the U. S. [a collection of historical mss. and tracts, with notes, etc.]. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1890. 2 v.
- BROWN, WILLIAM HAND, ed. Archives of Maryland. Baltimore, 1889.
- BURKE, EDMUND. An account of the European settlements in America. London: R. & J. Dodsley, 1757. 2 v.
- BURY, Viscount. Exodus of the western nations. London: Richard Bentley, 1865. 2 v.
- CAMPBELL, CHARLES. Introduction to the history of the colony and ancient dominion of Virginia. Richmond: B. B. Minor, 1847.
- CAMPBELL, DOUGLAS. The Puritan in Holland, England and America. New York: Harper & Bros. 1892. 2 v.
- CARROLL, B. R., ed. Historical collections of South Carolina. New York: Harper & Bros. 1836. 2 v.
- CHARENLEVOIX, *Father* PIERRE F. X. DE. History and general description of New France (1744); trans., with notes, by John G. Shea. New York: J. G. Shea, 1866-72. 6 v.
- CHEEVER, GEORGE B., ed. Journal of the Pilgrims at Plymouth in 1620. New York: J. Wiley, 1848.
- DALTON, HENRY G. History of British Guiana, ch. 2. London: Longmans, 1855. 2 v.
- DOUGLASS, WILLIAM. Summary, historical and political, of the British settlements in N. Am. London: R. Baldwin, 1755. 2 v.
- DOYLE, JOHN A. The American colonies (Arnold prize essay). London: Rivingtons, 1869.  
The English in Am.: Virginia, Maryland and the Carolinas (1882). The Puritan colonies (1887). 2 v. London: Longmans, Green & Co. New York: Henry Holt & Co.
- DRAKE, SAMUEL ADAMS. The making of New England, 1580-1643. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1880.  
The making of Virginia and the middle colonies. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1893.
- DRAKE, SAMUEL G. History and antiquities of Boston, 1630-1770. Boston: L. Steves, 1856.
- EDWARDS, BRYAN. History, civil and commercial, of the British colonies in the West Indies. (Caribs, etc.) London: J. Stockdale, 1793-1801. 3 v.
- FERRIS, BENJ. History of the original settlements on the Delaware. Wilmington: Wilson & Heath, 1846.
- FISHER, GEORGE P. The colonial era (Am. Hist. series). New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1892.
- FISKE, JOHN. The beginnings of New England. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1889.
- FORCE, PETER, ed. Tracts and other papers relating principally to the origin, settlement and progress of the colonies in N. Am. Washington, 1836-47. 4 v.
- GAYARRÉ, CHARLES. History of Louisiana; the French colonization (1851-4). New York: Wm. J. Widdleton, 1847.
- GOODWIN JOHN A. The pilgrim republic. Boston: Ticknor & Co. 1868.
- GRAHAM, JAMES. History of the rise and progress of the United States of N. A. till 1688, v. 1. London: Longman, 1827. 2 v.  
The same, enlarged [to 1776] and amended [ed. by Josiah Quincy, and published under the title of "History of the United States"]. Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard, 1846.
- HAWKS, FRANCIS L. History of North Carolina [to 1720] (1857-60). Fayetteville: Hale & Son. 2 v.
- HIGGINSON, THOMAS W. The French Voyageurs. (Harper's Mag., 66: 505. 1883.)
- HUBBARD, Rev. WILLIAM. General history of New England, to 1680 (1815). (Coll's of the Mass. Hist. Soc., 2d series, v. 5-6. Boston, 1848.)
- HUTCHINSON, THOMAS. History of the colony [and province] of Massachusetts-Bay [to 1749]. Boston: T. & J. Fleet, 1764-7. 2 v.
- LAMBRECHTSEN, N. C. Short description of the discovery and subsequent history of the New Netherlands (1614) [trans. from the Dutch]. (Coll's of the N. Y. Hist. Soc., 2d series, v. 1. New York, 1841.)
- LODGE, HENRY CABOT. Short history of the English colonies in America. New York: Harper & Bros. 1881.
- MARSHALL, JOHN. History of the colonies planned by the English on the continent of North America. Philadelphia: A. Small, 1824.
- MOORE, N. Pilgrims and Puritans: the story of the planting of Plymouth and Boston. Boston: Gunn & Co. 1888.
- MOURT, GEORGE. Relation, or journal of the plantation at Plymouth (1622); with introd. and notes by H. M. Dexter. Boston: J. K. Wiggln, 1865.
- MILL, EDWARD D. English colonization of Am. during the 17th century. London: Strahan & Co. 1871.  
History of the Virginia Company of London. Albany: J. Munsel, 1870.  
Virginia vetusta [supplement to above]. Albany: J. Munsel's Sons, 1885.
- O'CALLAGHAN, E. B. Register of New Netherland, 1624-1674. Albany: J. Munsel, 1865.
- PALFREY, JOHN G. History of New England during the Stuart dynasty. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1838-1864. 3 v.
- PRINCE, THOMAS. Chronological history of New England [to 1833] (1730-55). Boston: Cummings, Hilliard & Co. 1826.
- SAINSBURY, W. N., ed. Calendar of state papers: colonial series [America and the West Indies]. London: Longman, 1860-89. 3 v. 1850-84. 6 v.
- SHURTLIFF, N. B., ed. Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay, 1628-86. Printed by order of the Legislature. Boston, 1853-4. 5 v. in 6.
- SHURTLIFF, N. B., and D. PULSIFER, eds. Records of the colony of New Plymouth. Printed by order of the Legislature. Boston, 1855-61. 12 v. in 10.
- STITH, WILLIAM. History of the first discovery and settlement of Virginia (1747). New York: Reprinted for Jos. Sabin, 1865.
- TARBOX, Rev. INCREASE N. Sir Walter Raleigh and his colony in Am. Boston: Prince Soc. 1884.
- TRUMBULL, BENJAMIN. General history of the U. S. of Am. to 1792. Boston: Farrand, Maltory & Co. 1810. v. 1.
- TYTLER, PATRICK F. Historical view of the progress of discovery on the more northern coasts of America; with natural history, by Jas. Wilson, Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1832. New York: Harper Bros.
- WHITEFIELD, WM. A., ed. Documents relating to the colonial history of the state of New Jersey. Newark, 1880-11 v.
- WILSON, JAMES GRANT, ed. Memorial history of the city of New York. v. 1. New York: History Co. 1862. 4 v.
- WINTHROP, JOHN. History of New England, 1630-1649 (1825-6). New ed. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1853. 2 v.
- YOUNG, ALEXANDER. Chronicles of the first planters of the colony of Massachusetts Bay, 1623-1636. Boston: Little & Brown, 1846.  
Chronicles of the pilgrim fathers, 1602-1635. Boston: Little & Brown, 1841.

## AMERICAN ARCHÆOLOGY.

- ABBOTT, CHAS. C. Primitive industry; or illustrations of the handiwork, in stone, bone and clay, of the native races of the northern Atlantic seaboard of Am. Salem: G. A. Bates, 1881.  
Traces of an Am. antoethon. (American Naturalist, 10: 329, 1876.)
- AMERICAN ANTIQUARIAN AND ORIENTAL JOURNAL. Chicago, 1878-.
- AMERICAN ANTIQUARIAN SOCIETY. Proceedings, Boston.
- AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ARCHÆOLOGY. Baltimore, 1895-7. Boston: Ginn & Co. 1898-.
- ANTHROPOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON. Proceedings (1879-). (Smithsonian miscellaneous colls., v. 25-. Washington, 1892-.)
- ATWATER, CALEB. Description of the antiquities discovered in Ohio and other western states. (Archæologia Americana, v. 1. Worcester: Am. Antiq. Soc. 1890.)
- BACON, A. T. Ruins of the Colorado valley. (Lippincott's Mag., 26: 521, 1880.)
- BAILEY, Rev. JACOB. Observations and conjectures on the antiquities of Am. (Coll's of the Mass. Hist. Soc., v. 4. Boston, 1795.)
- BALDWIN, JOHN D. Ancient America. New York: Harper & Bros. 1872.  
Pre-historic nations. New York: Harper & Bros. 1893.
- BANDELLER, ADOLF F. A historical introduction to studies among the sedentary Indians of New Mexico. Report on the ruins of the Pueblo of Pecos. Boston: A. Williams & Co. 1881. (Papers Archaeological Inst. of Am.)  
Report of an archeological tour in Mexico, in 1881. Boston: Cupples, Upham & Co. 1884.
- BARBER, EDWIN A. Ancient pueblos, Rio San Juan. (Am. Naturalist, 12: 526, 606, 1878.)  
Pueblo pottery. (Am. Naturalist, 15: 453, 1881.)  
Rock inscriptions of the "ancient pueblos." (Am. Naturalist, 10: 716, 1876.)
- BAXTER, SYLVESTER. The father of the pueblos [Zuni]. (Harper's Mag., 65: 72, 1882.)
- BEAUCHAMP, W. V. Indian occupation of New York. (Science, 19: 76, 1892.)
- BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY. America before Columbus. (Bibliographical note in Bulletin, v. 3, pp. 65-71.)
- BOYD SOCIETY OF NATURAL HISTORY. Palæolithic implements of the valley of the Delaware; by C. C. Abbott and others (from Proceedings, v. 1). Cambridge, 1881.
- BRINTON, DANIEL G. The books of Chilan Balam, the prophetic and historic records of the Mayas of Yucatan. Philadelphia: Edw. Stern & Co. 1832.  
Essays of an Americanist. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, 1890.  
Prehistoric chronology of Am. (Science, 10: 76, 1887.)
- BRYANT, W. C. Interesting archeological studies in and about Buffalo. [Buffalo, 1890.]
- BYRCE, GEO. The mound builders. Wionipeg Hist. Soc. 1884-5.
- CARR, LUCIEN. The mounds of the Mississippi valley, historically considered. Cincinnati: Robt. Clarke & Co. 1883.
- CHARNAY, DESIRÉ. Ancient cities of the new world, being voyages and explorations in Mexico and Central Am., 1857-82; trans. from the Fr. by J. Gonino and H. S. Conant. New York: Harper & Bros. 1887.
- CONANT, A. J. Footprints of vanished races in the Mississippi valley. St. Louis: C. R. Barns, 1879.
- CUSHING, FRANK H. The nation of the willows [Zanis]. (Atlantic Monthly, 90: 303, 541, 1882.)  
Zuni social, mythic and religious systems. (Popular Science Monthly, 21: 180, 1882.)
- DALL, W. H. On the remains of late pre-historic man obtained from caves in the Catherine Archipelago, Alaska (1876). (Smithsonian contributions to knowledge, v. 22. Washington, 1880.)
- EVERETT, J. T. The earliest Am. people. (Mag. of Am. History, 22: 114, 1889.)
- FISKE, JOHN. The discovery of America. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1892, 2 v.
- FORCE, M. F. Some early notices of the Indians of Ohio: to what race did the mound builders belong. Cincinnati: Robt. Clarke & Co. 1879.
- FOSTER, J. W. Prehistoric races of the U. S. of Am. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co., 1873.
- GANNETT, HENRY. Prehistoric ruins in southern Colorado. (Popular Science Monthly, 16: 666, 1880.)
- HABEL, S. The sculptures of Santa Lucia Cosumalwuhupa in Guatemala (1878). (Smithsonian contributions to knowledge, v. 22. Washington, 1880.)
- HALE, HORATIO. Indian migrations, as evidenced by language; compising the Huron-Cherokee stock, Dakota, Algonkins, Chaita-Muskoki, mound-builders, Iberians, Chicago, 1883. (Am. Ass'n for the Adv't of Sci., 1882, American Antiquarian, Jan., Apr., 1883.)
- HARVARD UNIVERSITY. Peabody Museum of Am. Archaeology and ethnology. Reports. Cambridge, 1898-.
- HAVEN, SAMUEL F. Archaeology of the U. S. (1855). (Smithsonian contributions to knowledge, v. 8. Washington, 1856.)
- HIGGINSON, T. W. The first Americans. (Harper's Mag., 65: 342, 1882.)
- HUMBOLDT, ALEXANDER VON. Researches concerning the institutions and monuments of the ancient inhabitants of Am.; trans. by Helen M. Williams. London: Longman, 1824, 3 v.
- JACKSON, W. H. Ancient ruins in southwestern Colorado. (Am. Naturalist, 10: 31, 1876.)
- JONES, CHARLES C., Jr. Antiquities of the southern Indians, particularly of the Georgia tribes. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1873.  
Monumental remains of Georgia, pt. 1. Savannah: J. M. Cooper & Co. 1861.
- JONES, JOS. Explorations of the aboriginal remains of Tennessee (1876). (Smithsonian contributions to knowledge, v. 22. Washington, 1880.)
- JOURNAL OF AMERICAN ETHNOLOGY AND ARCHÆOLOGY. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1891-.
- KINGSBOROUGH, Lord. Antiquities of Mexico: comprising fac-similes of ancient Mexican paintings and hieroglyphics, etc., illustrated by many valuable incised me. London: R. Havell, 1830-48, 9 v.
- LAPHAM, I. A. The antiquities of Wisconsin (1853). (Smithsonian contributions to knowledge, v. 7. Washington, 1855.)
- LARKIN, FREDERICK. Ancient man in America. 1880.
- MACLEAN, J. P. The mound builders. Cincinnati: Robt. Clarke & Co. 1879.
- MINDELLEFF, V. \*Origine of pueblo architecture. (Science, 9: 593, 1887.)
- MITCHILL, Dr. SAMUEL. Communications [on Am. antiquities, ethnology, etc.]. (Archæologia Americana, v. 1. Worcester: Am. Antiquarian Soc. 1820.)
- MOREHEAD, WARREN K. Fort Ancient, the great prehistoric earthwork of Warren Co., Ohio; compiled from a careful survey. Cincinnati: Robt. Clarke & Co. 1890.
- NADAILLAC, Marguis de. Prehistoric America (1882); trans. by N. d'Auvers, ed. by W. H. Dall. New York: G. W. Putnam's Sons, 1884.
- NEWBERRY, JOHN S. Ancient civilizations of Am. (Popular Science Monthly, 41: 187, 1892.)
- OHIO STATE ARCHÆOLOGICAL SOCIETY. Report on the antiquities of Ohio. (Final report of the Ohio State board of Centennial managers. Columbus, 1877.)
- PEET, Rev. STEPHEN D. Prehistoric America. Chicago: American Antiquarian Office, 1890., 5 v., v. 1, The mound builders, v. 2, Emblematic mounds and animal effigies.
- PHILADELPHIA Numismatic and Antiquarian Society. Proceedings.
- POWELL, J. W. Annual reports of the Bureau of Ethnology. Washington.  
Prehistoric man in Am. (Forum, 8: 480, 1890.)
- PRIEST, JOSIAH. American antiquities and discoveries in the west, 2d ed., rev. Albany: Hoffmao & White, 1833.
- PUTNAM, I. W. Archaeological notes, and other pamphlets.  
Prehistoric remains in the Ohio valley. (Century, 17: 608, 1890.)
- QUATREFOGAS, A. DE. The peopling of Am. (Popular Science Monthly, 38: 305, 1891.)
- RAU, CHARLES. The archaeological collection of the U. S. National Museum (1876). (Smithsonian contributions to knowledge, v. 22. Washington, 1880.)  
The Palenque tablet in the U. S. National Museum (1879). (Smithsonian contributions to knowledge, v. 22. Washington, 1880.)

- READ, M. C. *Archæology of Ohio*. Cleveland: Western Reserve Hist. Soc. [1888.]
- REISS, W., and A. STÜBEL. *The necropolis of Ancon in Peru*. Le-im: A. Asher & Co. 1880-7. 3 v.
- RIO, DON ANTONIO DEL. *Description of the ruins of an ancient city, discovered near Palenque, Guatemala (1787)*; trans.: [also] *Teatro Critico Americano*, by Dr. Paul Felix Cabrera. London: Henry Berthoud, 1822.
- RIVERO, MARIANO EDW., and JOHN JAMES von TSCHUDI. *Peruvian antiquities*; trans. from the Span. by Francis L. Hawks. New York: G. P. Putnam, 1853.
- ST. LOUIS ACADEMY OF SCIENCE. *Contributions to the archæology of Missouri*, pt. 1: *Pottery*. Salem: Geo. A. Bates, 1880.
- SHORT, JOHN T. *The North Americans of antiquity; their origin, migrations and type of civilization considered*. New York: Harper & Bros. 1880.
- STEPHENS, JOHN L. *Incidents of travel in Central America, Chiapas, and Yucatan*. New York: Harper & Bros. 1841. 2 v.
- Incidents of travel in Yucatan*. New York: Harper & Bros. 1843. 2 v.
- SQUIER, E. G. *Aboriginal monuments of N. Y. (1849)*. (Smithsonian contributions to knowledge, v. 2. Washington, 1851.)
- The same. *Antiquities of the state of N. Y.; with a supplement on the antiquities of the west*. Buffalo: G. H. Derby & Co. 1851.
- Nicaragua: *Its people, scenery, monuments*. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1852. 2 v.

- SQUIER, E. G., and E. H. DAVIS. *Ancient monuments of the Mississippi valley (1847)*. (Smithsonian contributions to knowledge, v. 1. Washington, 1848.)
- THOMAS, CYRUS. *Catalogue of prehistoric works east of the Rocky Mts.* Washington, 1891. (Smithsonian Inst. Bureau of Ethnology.)
- The *Cherokees in pre-Columbian times*. New York: N. D. C. Hodges, 1890.
- The *circular, square, and octagonal earthworks of Ohio*. Washington, 1889. (Smithsonian Inst. Bureau of Ethnology.)
- The *problem of the Ohio mounds*. Washington, 1889. (Smithsonian Inst. Bureau of Ethnology.)
- A *study of the ms Troano*. (U. S. geol. and geol. survey. Contributions to N. Am. ethnology, v. 5. Washington, 1882.)
- THRUSTON, GATES P. *The antiquities of Tennessee and the adjacent states, and the state of aboriginal society in the scale of civilization represented by them*. Cincinnati: Robt. Clarke & Co. 1890.
- UNITED STATES. Bureau of Ethnology, John W. Powell, director. *Annual reports*. Washington.
- WALLACE, A. R. *American museums, of Am. prehistoric archæology*. (Fortnightly Rev., 48: 605. 1887.)
- WHITTELEY, CHAS. *Description of ancient works in Ohio (1850)*. (Smithsonian contributions to knowledge, v. 3. Washington, 1852.)
- WINSOR, JUSTIN, ed. *Narrative and critical history of Am.*, v. 1. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1886. 8 v.

## AMERICAN ABORIGINES.

## GENERAL.

- ADAIR, JAMES. *The history of the Am. Indians, particularly those nations adjoining to the Mississippi, E. and W. Florida, Georgia, S. and N. Carolina, and Virginia*. London: E. & C. Dilly, 1775.
- ALLEN, PAUL. *History of the expedition under the command of Lewis and Clarke, to the Pacific Ocean, 1804-6*. Philadelphia, Dutton: J. Christie, 1817. 2 v.
- AMERICAN STATE PAPERS: *Indian affairs, 1780-1827*. Washington: 1829-4. 2 v.
- ATWATER, CALEB. *Remarks made on a tour to Prairie du Chien in 1829*. Columbus, O.: I. N. Whiting, 1831.
- BANCROFT, GEORGE. *History of the U. S. of Am.; the author's last revision*, v. 2. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1883-5. 6 v.
- BANCROFT, HUBERT HOWE. *The native races of the Pacific States of N. Am.* New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1874-6. 5 v.
- BARROWS, WM. *The Indian's side of the Indian question*. Boston: D. Lothrop & Co. 1887.
- BEACH, W. W., ed. *The Indian miscellany*. Albany: J. Munsey, 1877.
- BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY. *The Indian question (list in Bulletins, v. 4, pp. 68-70)*.
- BRINTON, DANIEL G. *The American race; a linguistic classification and ethnographic description of the native tribes of N. and S. Am.* New York: N. D. C. Hodges, 1891.
- Races and peoples: *lectures on the science of ethnography*. New York: N. D. C. Hodges, 1890.
- BROOKS, ELBRIDGE S. *The story of the Am. Indian, his origin, development, decline and destiny*. Boston: D. Lothrop & Co. 1887.
- BROWN, ROBERT. *The races of mankind*, v. 1. London: Cassell, Petter & Galpin, 1873-7. 4 v.
- BROWNELL, CHAS. DE WOLF. *The Indian races of N. and S. Am.* New York: Am. Subscription House, 1857.
- CANADA. Department of Indian affairs. *Annual reports*. Ottawa.
- CATLIN, GEORGE. *Illustrations of the manners, customs and condition of the N. Am. Indians (1841)*. London: Henry (H. Bohn, 1861. 2 v. Chatto & Windus, 1876. 2 v.
- North Am. portfolio of hunting scenes, etc. London: H. Bohn, 1844.
- CHARLEVOIX, *Father*. *Letters to the Dutchess of Lesdiguières [containing account of the N. Am. tribes, 1730-32]*; trans.]. London, 1763.
- COLDEN, CADWALLADER. *History of the five Indian nations of Canada, which are dependent on the province of N. Y.* In Am. New York, 1737. [Enlarged ed.]. London, 1747.
- COLTON, C. *Tour of the Am. lakes, in 1890*. London: F. Westley & A. H. Davis, 1893. 2 v.
- CRAIG, NEVILLE B., ed. *The olden time*. Pittsburg, 1846-8. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1876. 2 v.
- DODGE, COL. RICHARD I. *Our wild Indians; thirty-three years' personal experience among the red men of the great west; with an introd. by Gen. Sherman*. Hartford: A. D. Worthington & Co. 1862.
- DOMENECCH, ABBÉ EM. *Seven years' residence in the great deserts of N. Am.* London: Longman, Green & Co. 1890. 2 v.
- DONALDSON, THOS. *The George Catlin Indian gallery, U. S. National Museum, Washington*. (Report of the Smithsonian Inst., 1885, pt. 2.)
- DRAKE, FRANCIS S. *Indian history for young folks*. New York: Harper & Bros. 1885.
- DRAKE, SAMUEL G. *The aboriginal races of N. Am.*, 15th ed. Philadelphia: C. Desilver & Sons, 1859.
- Biography and history of the Indians of N. Am. (1841), 11th ed. Boston: B. B. Mussey & Co. 1851.
- The *old Indian chronicle*; being a collection of exceeding rare tracts written and published in the time of king Philip's war. Boston: Antiquarian Inst. 1836.
- ELIAS, GEORGE E. *The red man and the white man in N. Am.* Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1882.
- FIELD, THOS. W. *An essay towards an Indian bibliography*. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1873.
- FLETCHER, ALICE C. *Indian education and civilization; a report*. Washington, 1888.
- GALLATIN, ALBERT. *A synopsis of the Indian tribes of N. Am.* (Archæologia Americana, v. 2. Cambridge: Am. Antiquarian Soc. 1835.) *Writings*; ed. by H. Adams. Lippincott, 1879. 3 v.
- HOLMES, Rev. ABIEL. *Annals of Am.*, 1492-1836 (1895). Cambridge: Am. and Brown, 1852. 2 v.
- HUMBOLDT, ALEXANDER von. *Personal narrative of travels to the equinoctial regions of the new continent, 1799-1804*, by Alex. de Humboldt und Aimé Bonpland; trans. by L. M. Williams, v. 5, pp. 315-331. London: Longman, 1826. 7 v.
- INDIAN RIGHTS ASSOCIATION. *Annual reports of the executive committee*. Philadelphia.
- JACKSON, Mrs. HELEN HUNT. *A century of dishonor (1881)*. New ed., with appendix. Boston: Roberts Bros. 1885.
- KINGSLEY, JOHN S., ed. *The standard natural history, v. 6*. Boston: S. E. Chissno & Co. 1885. 6 v.
- KIP, Rev. WM. INGRAHAM. *The early Jesuit missions in North America; comp. and trans. from the letters of the French Jesuits*. New York: Wiley & Putnam, 1846. 2 v.
- LAHONTAN, Baron. *New voyages to N. Am. containing an account of the several nations of that vast continent, 1683-1693*. (1702); (trans. from the Fr.) 2<sup>d</sup> ed. London, 1735. 2 v.

- LAKE MOHONK** annual conference of friends of the Indian. Proceedings. Philadelphia.
- McKENNEY, THOMAS L., and JAMES HALL.** History of the Indian tribes of N. Am., with 120 portraits from the Indian gallery at Washington (1829-44). Philadelphia: D. Rice & A. N. Hart. 1854. 8 v.
- MANYPENNY, GEORGE W.** Our Indian wards. Cincinnati: Robt. Clarke & Co. 1820.
- MASON, Prof. OTIS T., ed.** Miscellaneous papers relating to anthropology, from the Smithsonian report for 1861. Washington, 1863.
- MASSACHUSETTS.** The Indian question; report of the committee appointed by Gov. Long. Boston, 1880.
- MORGAN, LEWIS H.** Houses and house-life of the Am. aborigines. Washington, 1881. (U. S. geog. and geol. survey, Contributions to N. Am. ethnology, v. 4.)
- Systems of consanguinity and affinity of the human family (1868). (Smithsonian contributions to knowledge, v. 17. Washington, 1871.)
- MORSE, Rev. JEDIDIAH.** A report to the secretary of war of the U. S., on Indian affairs, comprising a narrative of a tour in 1820. New Haven: S. Converse, 1822.
- MORTON, SAMUEL G.** Crania Americana; or a comparative view of the skulls of various aboriginal nations of N. and S. Am. Philadelphia: J. Pennington, 1839.
- NOTT, J. C., GEO. R. GLIDDON, and others.** Indigenous races of the earth. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1857.
- OTIS, ELWELL S.** The Indian question. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1878.
- PARKMAN, FRANCIS.** History of the conspiracy of Pontiac (1851). Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1888. 2 v.
- The Jesuits in N. Am. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1867.
- PESCHEL, OSCAR.** The races of man and their geographical distribution; from the Ger. (1874). New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1878.
- PRICHARD, JAMES C.** Researches into the physical history of mankind (1813). 2d ed. London: J. & A. Arch. 1828. 2 v.
- RADISSON, PETER ESPRIT.** Voyages, being an account of his travels and experiences among the N. Am. Indians, 1652-1694; with hist. illustrations and an introd. by Gideon D. Scull. Boston: Prince Soc. 1885.
- RAWLE, WM.** A vindication of Heckewelder's "History of the Indian nations." (Memoirs of the Pennsylvania Historical Soc., v. 1. Philadelphia, 1826. J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1864.)
- ROGERS, Major ROBERT.** A concise account of N. Am. London, 1765.
- SCHOOLCRAFT, HENRY R.** Historical and statistical information respecting the history, condition and prospects of the Indian tribes; prepared under the direction of the Bureau of Indian affairs. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co. 1851-5. 5 v.
- SHALER, NATHANIEL S.** Nature and man in America. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons. 1891.
- STANFORD'S COMPENDIUM OF GEOGRAPHY AND TRAVEL;** North America; ed. and enlarged by Prof. F. V. Hayden and Prof. A. R. C. Selwyn. London: E. Stanford, 1883.
- STANLEY'S PORTRAITS OF N. AM. INDIANS IN SMITHSONIAN INST. Catalogue (1862).** (Smithsonian misc. coll's, v. 2. Washington, 1862.)
- THATCHER, B. B.** Indian biography. New York: J. & J. Harper. 1832. 2 v.
- UNITED STATES.** Board of Indian Commissioners. Annual reports. Washington.
- Commissioner of Indian affairs. Annual reports. Washington.
- WALKER, FRANCIS A.** The Indian question. Boston: J. R. Osgood & Co. 1874.
- WOMEN'S NATIONAL INDIAN ASSOCIATION.** Annual reports. Philadelphia.

## AMERICAN ABORIGINES.

## SPECIAL TRIBES, GROUPS AND REGIONS.

- AB-SA-RA-KA, HOME OF THE CROWS.** Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1868.
- BANDELLER, ADOLF F. TL.** Delight makers. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. 1890.
- The glided man (El Dorado). New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1893.
- BARTRAM, WM.** Travels through N. and S. Carolina, Georgia, etc. [1773-8]. [Creeks, Cherokees and Choctaws.] Philadelphia, 1791.
- BEAUCHAMP, W. M.** The Iroquois trail, in which are included David Gusick's sketches of ancient history of the six nations. Fayetteville, N. Y.: H. C. Beauchamp, 1892.
- BECKWORTH, JAMES P., Chief of the Crows.** Life and adventures (1856). New York: Harper & Bros. 1858.
- BENSON, HENRY C.** Life among the Choctaw Indians. Cincinnati: L. Swornsted & A. Poe. 1860.
- BIART, LUCIEN.** The Aztecs, their history, manners and customs (1885); [trans.] from the Fr. by J. L. Garner. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. 1887.
- BLACKBIRD, ANDREW J. (BLACK-AW-DE-BE-NESSY).** History of the Ottawa and Chippewa Indians of Michigan, a grammar of their language, etc. Ypsilanti, Mich. 1887.
- BLAKE, Lady.** The Beothuks of Newfoundland. (Nineteenth Century, 24: 890, 1888.)
- BRETT, Rev. W. H.** The Indian tribes of Guiana. London: Bell & Daldy. 1853.
- BRINTON, DANIEL G., ed.** The annals of the Cakchiquels; the original text, with a trans., notes and introd. Philadelphia, 1885.
- The Lenapé and their legends, with the complete text and symbols of the Walam Olum. Philadelphia, 1875.
- Ed. The Maya chronicles. Philadelphia: D. G. Brinton, 1882.
- Notes on the Floridian peninsula. Philadelphia: Jos. Scha. 1859.
- The Shawnees and their migrations. (Historical magazine, v. 10, January, 1866.)
- BRODHEAD, JOHN R.** History of the state of N. Y., v. 1. New York: Harper & Bros. 1853-7. 2 v.
- CASWELL, Mrs. HARRIET S.** Our life among the Iroquois Indians. Boston: Congregational S. S. & Pub. Soc. 1892.
- CATON, JOHN D.** The last of the Illinois, and a sketch of the Potawatomies (1870). (Fergus historical series.) Chicago: Fergus Printing Co. 1876.
- CLAIBORNE, J. F. H.** Mississippi, as a province, territory and state. Jackson, Miss.: Power & Barksdale. 1880. v. 1.
- CLARKE, PETER D.** Origin and traditional history of the Wyandotts, etc. Toronto: H. Luter, Rose & Co. 1870.
- COPWAY, GEORGE (KAH-GE-GA-GAI-BOWH).** Chief. Traditional history and characteristic sketches of the Ojibwa nation. London: C. Gilpin. 1850.
- COX, ROSS.** Adventures on the Columbia River. London. 2 v. New York: J. & J. Harper. 1822.
- COZZENS, SAMUEL W.** The marvelous country; or, three years in Arizona and New Mexico, the Apaches' home (1873). Boston: Lee & Shepard.
- CRANTZ, DAVID.** History of Greenland, b'k 4 (v. 1). London: 1767. 2 v.
- CRUISE OF THE REVENUE-STEAMER CORWIN IN ALASKA, AND THE N. W. ARCTIC OCEAN IN 1881.** Washington, 1883. (H. of Rep's, 47th cong., 2d sess. Ex. doc. 105.)
- CUSHING, FRANK HAMILTON.** My adventures in Zuni. (Century, v. 3-4, Dec., 1882, Feb., May, 1883.)
- CUSTER, Gen. G. A.** My life on the plains. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1874.
- DALL, WM. H.** Tribes of the extreme northwest. (U. S. geog. and geol. sur. ev. Contributions to N. Am. ethnology, v. 1. Washington, 1877.)
- DALTON, HENRY G.** History of British Guiana. v. 1. London: Longman, 1855. 2 v.
- DEFOREST, JOHN W.** History of the Indians of Connecticut (1853). Albany: J. Munsell, 1871.
- DENTON, DANIEL.** A brief description of N. Y.; likewise a brief relation of the customs of the Indians there (1670). New York: Wm. Gowans, 1545.
- DOBRIZHOFFER, MARTIN.** An account of the Abipones, an equestrian people of Paraguay (1784); from the Latin. London: John Murray, 1822. 3 v.
- DODGE, J. R.** Red men of the Ohio valley, 1650-1795. Springfield, O.: Ruralist Pub. Co. 1890.

- DORSEY, JAS. OWEN. The Biloxi Indians of Louisiana. Salem. 1863.  
The gentile system of the Siletz tribes.  
Migrations of Siouan tribes. (American Naturalist, v. 20, March, 1886.)
- DUNBAR, I. B. The Pawnee Indians. (Magazine of Am. History, v. 4, April, 1880.)
- EASTMAN, Mrs. MARY. Dacotah; or life and legends of the Sioux around Fort Snelling. New York: John Wiley. 1849.
- ESLUS, M. Indians of Puget Sound. (American Antiquarian, 9: 1, 271. 10: 20, 174. 1887-8.)
- EGOLESTON, EDWARD, and LILLIE E. SEELYE. Pochontas. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. [1879.]
- GATSCHET, ALBERT S. The Klamath Indians of southwestern Oregon. Washington. 1890. 2 v. (U. S. geog. and geol. survey. Contributions to N. Am. ethnology, v. 2.)  
A migration legend of the Creek Indians, with a linguistic, historic and ethnographic introd. Philadelphia: D. G. Brinton. 1884. v. 1.
- GIBBS, GEO. Tribes of western Washington and northwestern Oregon. (U. S. geog. and geol. survey. Contributions to N. Am. ethnology, v. 1. Washington. 1877.)
- GOOKIN, DANIEL. Historical account of the doings and sufferings of the Christian Indians of New England. (Archæologia Americana, v. 2. Cambridge: Am. Antiquarian Soc. 1836.)  
Historical collections of the Indians in New England. (Coll's of the Mass. Hist. Soc., v. 1. Boston. 1792.)
- GRANT, Mrs. ANNE (of Laggan). Memoirs of an Am. lady [Mrs. Philip Schuyler] (1808). (Mohawks.) New York.
- GRINNEL, GEO. BIRD. Pawnee hero stories and folk-tales, with notes on the origin, customs and character of the Pawnee people. New York: Forest and Stream Pub. Co. 1889.
- GWYNHER, G. Pueblo Indians. (Overland Monthly, 6: 290. 1871.)
- HALE, HORATIO, ed. The Iroquois book of rites. Philadelphia: D. G. Brinton. 1883.
- HARDACRE, EMMA C. The cliff-dwellers. (Scribner's Monthly, 17: 266. 1878.)
- HAUGHTON, JAS. Additional memoir of the Mohegans. (Coll's of the Mass. Hist. Soc., v. 9. Boston. 1804.)
- HEALY, Capt. M. A. Report of the cruise of the revenue marine steamer Corwin in the Arctic Ocean in 1885. Washington. 1887. (H. of Rep's, 49th cong., 1st sess. Ex. doc. 123.)
- HEARNE, SAMUEL. A journey from Hudson's Bay to the Northern Ocean, 1769-72. London: A. Strahan & T. Cadell. 1795.
- HECKEWELDER, Rev. JOHN. History of the manners and customs of the Indian nations who once inhabited Penn., etc. (1818; new ed., with introd. by Rev. Wm. C. Reichel. Memoirs of the Pennsylvania Historical Soc., v. 12. Philadelphia. 1876.)  
Narrative of the mission of the United Brethren among the Delaware and Mohegan Indians, 1740-1808. Philadelphia: McCarthy & Davis. 1820.
- HENRY, ALEX. Travels and adventures in Canada and the Indian territories, 1700-76. New York: I. Riley. 1809.
- HILLARD, O. S. Life of captain John Smith. (Library of Am. biography; conducted by Jared Sparks. 1834. New York: Harper & Bros. 10 v.)
- HIND, HENRY V. Explorations in the interior of the Labrador peninsula; the country of the Montagnais and Nasquapee Indians. London: Longman, Green & Co. 1863. 2 v.  
Narrative of the Canadian Red River exploring expedition of 1837, and of the Assiniboine and Saskatchewan expedition of 1838. London: Longman, Green & Co. 1850. 2 v.
- HOWARD, OLIVER O. Nez Percé Joseph; an account of his ancestors, his lands, etc. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1881
- HUBBARD, J. NILES. An account of Sa-go-yew-wat-ha, or Red Jacket and his people, 1750-1830. Albany: Joel Munsell's Sons. 1886.
- HUNTER, JOHN D. Manners and customs of several Indian tribes located west of the Mississippi. Philadelphia. 1822.  
The same. Memoirs of a captivity among the Indians. London: Longman. 1824.
- HURT, Dr. GARLAND. Indians of Utah. (Simpson's Report of explorations, 1852. Washington. 1876.)
- HUTCHINSON, THOS. J. The Parana. London: Edward Stanford. 1868.

- IM THURN, EVERARD F. Among the Indians of Guiana. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1883.
- IRVING, JOHN TREAT. Indian sketches taken during a U. S. expedition to make treaties with the Pawnee and other tribes of Indians in 1833 (1833). New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1885.
- JAMES, EDWIN. Comp. Account of an expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mts., 1819-20, under command of Maj. Long. Philadelphia: Carey & Lea. 1823. 2 v. with atlas.
- JEWITT, JOHN R. Narrative of adventures and sufferings among the Indians of Nootka Sound. Ithaca, N. Y.: Andrus, Gauntlett & Co. 1831.
- JOGUES PAPERS, TIE (1642-6); trans. with a memoir, by J. G. Shea. (Coll's of the N. Y. Hist. Soc., 2d series, v. 3. New York, 1887.)
- JOHNSON, ELLIAS. Tuscarora chief. Legends, traditions and laws of the Iroquois or six nations, and history of the Tuscarora Indians. Lockport. 1881.
- JONES, Rev. PETER ('KAHKEWAQUONABY). History of the Ojebway Indians. London: A. W. Bennett. 1861.
- KEATING, WM. H., comp. Narrative of an expedition to the source of St. Peter's River, Lake Winnepeek, &c., in 1823, under command of Maj. Long. Philadelphia: Carey & Lea. 1824. 2 v.
- KETCHUM, WM. Authentic and comprehensive history of Buffalo, with some account of its early inhabitants; comprising historic notices of the six nations [Senecas, chiefly]. Buffalo: Rockwell, Baker & Hill. 1854. 2 v.
- KIDDER, FREDERIC. The Abenaki Indians. (Collections of the Maine Historical Soc., v. 6. Portland: 1859.)
- KIP, Rev. WM. INGRAHAM, comp. and trans. The early Jesuit missions in N. Am.; from the letters of the Fr. Jesuits, with notes. New York: Wiley & Putnam. 1816. 2 v. Albany: J. Munsell. 1873.
- KOHL, J. G. Kitchi-gami; wanderings round Lake Superior [trans from the Ger.]. [Ojibbewas.] London: Chapman & Hall. 1860.
- LA ROCHEFOUCAULT LIANCOURT, Duc de. Travels through the U. S., the country of the Iroquois and upper Canada, 1703-7. London. 1719.
- Le CLERCQ, Father CHRISTIAN. First establishment of the faith in New France (1691); now first trans., with notes, by John G. Shea. New York: J. G. Shea. 1881. 2 v.
- LEWIS AND CLARKE. Journal to the Rocky Mts., 1804-6, as related by Patrick Gass (1807). Dayton: Ellis, Clafin & Co. 1847.
- LORD, JOHN K. The Naturalist in Vancouver's Island and British Columbia, v. 2. London: Richard Bentley. 1866. 2 v.
- LOSKIEL, GEO. HENRY. History of the mission of the United Brethren among the Indians of N. Am.; trans. from the Ger. by C. I. La Trole. London 1794.
- LUMMIS, CHAS. F. The land of poco tiempo [New Mexico]. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons. 1893.
- McKENNA, J. A. J. Indians of Canada. (Catholic World, 53: 350. 1891.)
- McKENNEY, THOS. L. Sketches of a tour to the lakes [1823], the Chippeway Indians, etc. Baltimore: F. Lucas, Jr. 1827
- MARCY, Col. R. B. Thirty years of army life on the border. New York: Harper & Bros. 1866.
- MARCY, Col. R. B., and GEO. B. McCLELLAN. Exploration of the Red River of Louisiana in 1823. [Comanches and Kiowas.] Washington. 1854. (H. of Rep's, 33d cong., 1st sess. Ex. doc.)
- MARSHALL, ORSAMUS H. Historical writings relating to the early history of the west; with introd. by Wm. L. Stone. Albany: Joel Munsell's Sons. 1847.  
The Niagara frontier; read before the Buffalo Historical Club, Feb. 27, 1865. [Buffalo: The author.]
- MATTHEWS, WASHINGTON. Ethnography and philology of the Hidatsa Indians. Washington. 1877. (U. S. geog. and geol. survey, F. V. Hayden in charge; miscellaneous publications, No. 7.)
- MEGAPOLENSIS, J., Jr. Short sketch of the Mohawk Indians in New Netherland (1644); trans., rev. with an introd., by J. R. Proelhard. (Coll's of the N. Y. Hist. Soc., 2d series, v. 3. New York. 1857.)
- MEMOIR OF THE PEQUOTS, etc. (Coll's of the Mass. Hist. Soc., v. 10. Boston. 1809.)
- MILLER, JOAQUIN. Unwritten history: life amongst the Modocs. Hartford: American Pub. Co. 1874.
- MILLER, WM. J. Notes concerning the Wampanoag tribe of Indians. Providence: S. S. Rider. 1890

- MINER, LEWIS H. *The valley of Wyoming*. New York; Robt. H. Johnston & Co. 1906.
- MÖLLHAUSEN, BALDWIN. *Diary of a journey from the Mississippi to the coasts of the Pacific, with a U. S. gov.'s expedition (1823-4)*. Trans. by Mrs. Percy Sinnett. London: Longman. 1858. 2 v.
- MORELET, ARTHUR. *Travels in Central America*; [trans.], from the Fr. by Mrs. M. F. Squier; introd. by E. G. Squier. London: Trübner & Co. 1871. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1871.
- MORGAN, LEWIS H. *League of the Ho-de-no-sau-nee, or Iroquois*. Rochester: Sage & Bro. 1851.  
Report on the fabrics, inventions, implements and utensils of the Iroquois, made to the regents of the university [of N. Y.], 1851.
- NEW YORK STATE. *Commissioners of Indian affairs, for the extinguishment of Indian titles*. Proceedings, with introd. and notes by F. B. Hough. Albany: Joel Munsell. 1861. 2 v.  
Regents of the university. *Annual reports on the condition of the state cabinet of natural history and the historical and antiquarian collection*. Albany. Special committee to investigate the Indian problem. Report. Albany. 1880.
- OSBORN, B. M. *Rumbles in Yucatan*; including a visit to the remarkable ruins of Chi-Chen, Kabah, Zayi, and Uxmal. New York: J. & H. G. Langley. 1842.
- NUTTALL, THOS. *Journal of travels into the Arkansas territory, 1819*. Philadelphia. T. H. Palmer. 1821.
- OBER, F. A. *Acuma, a picturesque pueblo*. (Am. architect, 29: 65. 1896.)
- PALFREY, JOHN GORHAM. *Compendious history of New England, 1494-1775 (1884)*. v. 1. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 4 v.
- PIDGEON, WM. *Traditions of De-coo-dah, comprising extensive explorations, surveys and excavations of the remains of the moundbuilders in Am. (1853)*. New York: Horace Thayer. 1858.
- POWERS, STEPHEN. *Tribes of California*. Washington. 1877. (U. S. geog. and geol. survey, Contributions to N. Am. ethnology, v. 3.)
- RAE, J. *Indians of Hudson's Bay territories*. (Journal of the Soc. of Arts, 30: 483. 1882.)
- REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL POLAR EXPEDITION TO POINT BARROW, ALASKA [1881-2]. Washington. 1885. (II. of Rep's, 48th cong., 2d sess. Ex. doc. 41.)
- RIGGS, *Rev. Dr. STEPHEN R.* *Mary and I; forty years with the Sioux*. Chicago: W. G. Holmes. 1880.
- KINK, DR. HENRY. *The Eskimo tribes; their distribution and characteristics, with a comparative vocabulary (v. 11 of the "Middleleber on Greenland")*. Copenhagen; C. A. Reitzel. London: Williams & Norgate. 1887.  
Tales and traditions of the Eskimo, with a sketch of their habits, religions, language, etc. (1866-71); trans. from the Danish by the author, ed. by Dr. R. Brown. Edinburgh: Wm. Blackwood & Sons. 1875.
- RONAN, PETER. *Historical sketch of the Flathead Indian nation, 1813-1860*. Helena: Journal Publishing Co. 1890.
- RONDTHALER, REV. EDWARD. *Life of John Hecke-welder*; ed. by B. H. Coates. Philadelphia: T. Ward. 1847.
- KUTTENBER, E. M. *History of the Indian tribes of Hudson's River; their origin, manners, etc.* Albany: J. Munsell. 1872.
- SCHERMERHORN, J. F. *Report on the western Indians*. (Coll's of the Mass. Hist. Soc., 2d series, v. 2. Boston. 1814.)
- SCHOLCRAFT, HENRY R. *Notes on the Iroquois*. Albany: E. H. Pease & Co. 1847.  
Personal memoirs of a residence of thirty years with the Indian tribes on the Ala. frontiers, 1812-1842 (1851). Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.
- SCHWEINITZ, EDMUND W. *Life and times of David Zeisberger, apostle of the Indians*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1870.
- SEAVEY, JAS. E. *Life of Mary Jemison: Deh-he-wá-mis (1742)*. New York: Miller, Orton & Mulligan. 1856.
- SHEA, J. G. *Inquiries respecting the lost neutral nation*. (Schoolcraft's Information respecting the Indian tribes, pt. 4.)
- SHELDON, WM. *Account of the Caribs*. (Archæologia Americana, v. 1. Worcester: Am. Antiquarian Soc. 1820.)
- SIMPSON, JAS. H. *Journal of a military reconnaissance from Santa Fé to the Navajo country, 1849*. [Navajos and Pueblos.] Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co. 1852.  
The shortest route to California, with some account of the Indian tribes [of Utah]. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1860.
- SITGREAVES, CAPT. L. *Report of an expedition down the Zuni and Colorado rivers*. Washington. 1854. (Sen. ex. doc's, 33d cong., 1st sess.)
- SKENANDOAL. *Letters on the Iroquois; addressed to Albert Gallatin*. (Reprinted in v. 2 of Craig's "The olden time." Pittsburgh: Wright & Charlton. 1848. 2 v.)
- SMET, FATHER, P. J. DE. *Letters and sketches, with a narrative of a year's residence among the Indian tribes of the Rocky Mts.* Philadelphia: M. Fitch. 1843.  
Oregon missions and travels over the Rocky Mts., 1845-6. New York: Edw. Dunigan. 1847.  
Western missions and missionaries. New York: T. W. Strong. 1859.
- SMITH, CAPT. JOHN. *Description of Virginia*. General history of Virginia. (Works, 1608-1631; ed. by E. Arber. Birmingham. 1884.)
- SPRAQUE, JOHN T. *The origin, progress, and conclusion of the Florida war*. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1848.
- SQUIER, E. G. *Historical and mythological traditions of the Algonquians, with a trans. of the "Walum-oluk"*. (New York Historical Soc.)
- STONE, WM. L. *Life and times of Sa-go-ye-wat-ha, or Red Jacket (1841)*. Albany: J. Munsell. 1866.  
Life of Joseph Brant—Tiyandanequa (1828). Albany: J. Munsell. 1865. 2 v.
- STRACHEY, WM. *Historie of travell into Virginia Britania*. (1618). London: Hakluyt Soc. 1849.
- SWAN, JAMES G. *The Ialdah Indians of Queen Charlotte's Islands (1874)*. (Smithsonian contributions to knowledge, v. 21. Washington. 1876.)  
The Indians of Cape Flattery, Washington Ter. (1863). (Smithsonian contributions to knowledge, v. 16. Washington. 1870.)  
The northwest coast; or three years [1852-5] in Washington Ter. New York: Harper & Bros. 1857.
- SULLIVAN, HON. JAMES. *History of the Penobscot Indians*. (Coll's of the Mass. Hist. Soc., v. 9. Boston. 1804.)
- VETROMILE, EUGENE. *The Abnaki Indians*. (Coll's of the Maine Hist. Soc., v. 6. Portland. 1850.)  
The Abnakis and their history. New York: J. B. Kirker. 1866.
- WILLIAMSON, WM. D. *Indian tribes in New England (1859)*. (Coll's of the Mass. Hist. Soc., 3d series, v. 9. 1846.)
- WILLIS, WM. *The language of the Abnaki or eastern Indians; appendix by C. E. Potter*. (Coll's of the Maine Historical Soc., v. 3. Portland. 1856.)
- WILSON, DANIEL. *The Huron-Iroquois of Canada*. (Trans. Royal Soc., Canada. 1884.)
- ZEISBERGER, DAVID. *Moravian missionary, Ohio, Diary [1781-1798]*; trans. from the Ger. and ed. by E. F. Bliss. Cincinnati: Robt. Clarke & Co. 1885. 2 v.
- ZYLKYFF. *The Ponca chiefs, an Indian's attempt to appeal from the tomahawk to the courts; with introd. by Insitahemba (Bright Eyes), and dedication by Wendell Phillips*. Boston: Lockwood, Brooks & Co. 1880.

## AUSTRIA.

## GENERAL.

- BRUCE, JAMES. *The holy Roman empire (1864)*. London: Macmillan & Co.
- COXE, WM. *History of the house of Austria, 1218-1792 (1807)*. London: H. G. Bohn. 8 v.
- DUNHAM, S. A. *History of the Germanic empire*. London: Longman. 1884. 3 v.
- DYER, THOMAS HENRY. *History of modern Europe, 1453-1857 (1861)*. London: John Murray, 4 v.; Geo. Bell & Sons. 4 v.
- FREEMAN, EDWARD A. *The historical geography of Europe*. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1881. 2 v.



- GOULD, S. BARING-. The story of Germany (Story of the nations). London: T. F. Unwin. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1896.
- HEEREN, A. H. L. A manual of the history of the political system of Europe and its colonies (1869); trans. from the Ger. London: H. G. Bohn.
- KOCH, CHRISTOPHER WM. The revolutions of Europe (1771); from the French. London: Whittaker & Co. 1839.
- KOHLRAUSCH, FRIEDRICH. History of Germany (1816); (trans. by J. D. Haas). London: Chapman & Hall. 1844. New York: Appleton. 1845.
- LATHAM, ROBT. G. Ethnology of Europe. London: J. Van Voorst. 1852.
- The nationalities of Europe. v. 2. London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1863. 2 v.
- LAVISSE, ERNEST. General view of the political history of Europe; trans. by Charles Cross. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1891.
- LEGER, LOUIS. History of Austro-Hungary (1866; 2d ed., 1878-88); trans. by M. V. Birkbeck Hill. London: Rivingtons. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- LEWIS, CHARLTON T. History of Germany. New York: Harper & Bros. 1874.

- LODGE, RICHARD. History of modern Europe, 1453-1878. London: J. Murray. 1885. New York: Harper Bros.
- MALLESON, G. B. Lost opportunities of the house of Austria (Royal Hist. Soc. Papers, v. 12, p. 225).
- MENZEL, WOLFGANG. History of Germany (1834-5); trans. from 4th Ger. ed. by Mrs. G. Horrocks. London: H. G. Bohn. 1848. 3 v.
- MICHELET, JULES. A summary of modern history (1857); trans. and continued by M. C. M. Slapson. London: Macmillan & Co. 1875.
- RUSSELL, WM. History of modern Europe (1779). London: Geo. Routledge & Sons. 4 v. Whittaker & Co. 4 v. New York: Harper Bros. 3 v.
- SIME, JAMES. History of Germany. London: Macmillan & Co. 1874. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1874.
- SMYTH, WM. Lectures on modern history (1840). London: H. G. Bohn. 2 v.
- TURNER, SAMUEL EPES. Sketch of the Germanic constitution from early times to the dissolution of the empire. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1853.
- VOLTAIRE, F. M. AROUET ne. Annals of the empire, from the time of Charlemagne (Works, trans. by Smollett and others, 1761, v. 20-22).

## MEDIÆVAL.

- BUSK, Mrs. WM. Mediæval popes, emperors, kings and crusaders. London: Hookham & Sons. 1854-6. 4 v.
- COMYN, Sir ROBERT. History of the western empire, from Charlemagne to Charles V. [800-1530]. London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1841. 2 v.
- DURUY, VICTOR. The history of the middle ages (1839); trans. by E. H. and M. D. Whitney, with notes and rev. by G. B. Adams. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1891.

- HALLAM, HENRY. View of the state of Europe during the middle ages. London: J. Murray. 3 v. New York: W. J. Widdleton. 3 v.
- HENDRISON, ERNEST F. trans. and ed. Select historical documents of the middle ages. London: Geo. Bell & Sons. 1892. New York: Macmillan & Co.
- STUBBS, WM. Seventeen lectures on the study of mediæval and modern history. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1886. New York: Macmillan & Co. 1887.

## 16TH-17TH CENTURIES.—REFORMATION.—THIRTY YEARS WAR.

- CUST, Sir EDWARD. Lives of the warriors of the thirty years' war. London: John Murray. 1865. 2 v.
- GARDNER, SAMUEL R. The thirty years' war, 1618-1648 (Epochs of history). London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1874. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- GINDELY, ANTON. History of the thirty years' war (1609-80); trans. by A. Ten Brook. London: Richard Bentley & Son. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1884. 2 v.
- MALDEN, HENRY E. Vienna, 1683. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1883.
- MARTIN, HENRY. History of France: age of Louis XIV. (1660); trans. by Mrs. Booth. Boston: Walker, Wise & Co. 2 v.
- MAXWELL, Sir WILLIAM STIRLING. Don John of Austria, 1547-78. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1883. 2 v.
- MITCHELL, Lieut.-Col. J. Life of Wallenstein. London: Jas. Fraser. 1837.

- PRAET, JULES VAN. Essays on the political history of the 16th, 16th and 17th centuries; [trans.] ed. by Sir Edmund Head. London: Richard Bentley. 1868.
- RANKE, LEOPOLD von. Ferdinand I. and Maxhalian II. of Austria (1832); trans. by Lady Duff Gordon. London: Longman.
- History of the Latin and Teutonic nations, 1494-1514 (1824); trans. from the Ger. by Philip A. Ashworth. London: Geo. Bell & Sons. 1887.
- History of the reformation to Germany (1839-43); trans. by Sarah Austin. London: Longman. 1845-7. 3 v.
- ROBERTSON, WM. History of the reign of the emperor Charles V. (1769); with life of the emperor after his abdication, by W. H. Prescott (1857). London: Geo. Routledge & Sons. 2 v. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. 3 v.
- TRENCH, RICHARD C. Gustavus Adolphus in Germany. London: Macmillan & Co. 2d ed. 1872.

## 18TH CENTURY.

- BRACKENBURY, Col. C. B. Frederick the great. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1884.
- BROGHE, Duc de. Frederick the great and Maria Theresa (1842); trans. by Mrs. Hoey and J. Lillie. London: Low, Marston & Co. 2 v.
- CARLYLE, THOMAS. History of Frederick II. of Prussia, called Frederick the great (1858). London: Chapman & Hall. New York: Harper & Bros.
- CUST, Sir Edward. Annals of the wars of the eighteenth century. London: John Murray. 1862. 5 v.
- DOVER, Lord. Life of Frederick II., King of Prussia. London: Longman. 1831. New York: Harper & Bros. 2 vol.
- FREDERICK II. (called the great). History of my own times [1740-1745]. (Posthumous works; trans. by Thos. Holcroft. v. 1. London. 1789. 13 v.)
- GERARD, JAMES W. The peace of Utrecht, 1713-14. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1885.
- KUGLER, FRANCIS. Pictorial history of Germany during the reign of Frederick the great (1842); [trans. from the Ger.]. London: H. G. Bohn.
- LECKY, WM. E. H. History of England in the 18th century. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1878-90. 8 v. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1878-90. 8 v.
- LONGMAN, F. W. Frederick the great and the seven years' war. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1881. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons.

- MACAULAY, Lord. Essays: Frederick the great (1842). London: Longmans, Green & Co. Boston: Estes & Lauriat. 3 v.
- MALLESON, Col. G. B. London [Austrian fieldmarshal, 1743-1706]. London: Chapman & Hall. 1784.
- MALLET, CHARLES EDWARD. The French revolution. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons. 1893.
- MIGNET, FRANÇOIS A. M. History of the French revolution, 1789-1814 (1834); trans. from the Fr. London: Geo. Bell & Sons.
- RAUMER, FREDERICK VON. Contributions to modern history: Frederick II. and his times. London: Chas. Knight & Co. 1837.
- SCHLOSSER, F. C. History of the eighteenth century, etc.; trans. by D. Davison. London: Chapman & Hall. 1843-52. 8 v.
- STANHOPE, Earl (Lord Mahon). History of England 1713-1783 (1836-53). London: John Murray.
- STEPHENS, II. MORSE. History of the French revolution, v. 1-2. London: Rivingtons. 1886. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons. 1886-91.
- THIERS, LOUIS ADOLPHE. History of the French revolution (1827); trans. by F. Shoberl (1854). London: Richard Bentley & Son. 5 v. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 4 v.

## 19TH CENTURY: EARLY AND GENERAL.

- ADAMS, Major CHARLES. Great campaigns in Europe from 1700 to 1850; ed. by C. C. King. Edinburgh: Wm. Blackwood & Sons. 1877.
- ALISON, Mr. ARCHIBALD. History of Europe, 1780-1815 (1842). 10 v.
- The same: 1815-1852 (1857). 6 v. Edinburgh: Wm. Blackwood & Sons. New York: Harper & Bros.
- AUSTRIA. (North British Rev., 44: 27. 1806.)
- AUSTRIAN NATIONALITIES AND AUSTRIAN POLICY; by J. W. W. (Fraser's Mag., 52: 163. 1855).
- DEFF, MOUNTSTUART E. GRANT. Studies in European politics. Edinburgh: Edmonston & Douglas. 1863.
- FYFFE, C. A. History of modern Europe [1799-1878]. London: Cassell. 1880-1880. 3 v. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1881-00. 3 v.
- JOURNAL OF A NOBLEMAN: his residence at Vienna during the congress. London: Philadelphia. 1833.
- KELLY, WALTER K. History of the house of Austria [1732-1848]. And Genesis, or the late Austrian revolution; by an officer of state (Count Hartig); trans. from the Ger. Loude.: H. G. Bohm. 1853.
- KOHL, J. G. Austria. London: Chapman & Hall. 1841.
- KRAUSE, GUSTAV. The growth of German unity. London: David Nutt. 1892.
- LANFREY, P. History of Napoleon I. (trans. from the Fr.). London: Macmillan & Co. 1871-1879. 4 v.
- MALLESON, Col. G. B. Life of Prince Metternich (Statesmen series). London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1888. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.
- METTERNICH, Prince. Memoirs [1773-1855]; trans. by Mrs. Napier. London: Bentley & Son. 1880. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons.
- MICHELIS, ALFRED, comp. Secret history of the Austrian government. London: Chapman & Hall. 1850.
- MÜLLER, W. Political history of recent times, 1816-1875; trans. (and continued to 1881) by J. P. Peters. New York: Harper & Bros. 1882.
- ROSE, J. H. A century of continental history, 1780-1880. London: Edward Stanford. 1880.
- STEFFENS, H. MORSE. Europe, 1780-1815. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.
- THIERS, ADOLPH. History of the consulate and the empire of France under Napoleon (1815-62); trans. by D. F. Campbell and H. W. Herbert. London: Geo. Bell & Sons (Bohn). Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 5 v.
- TURNBULL, PETER E. Austria, v. 2. London: J. Murray. 1840. 2 v.
- VEISE, E. Memoirs of the court, aristocracy and diplomacy of Austria; trans. by F. Demmler. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1856. 2 v.
- WEIR, ARCHIBALD. The historical basis of modern Europe, 1750-1815. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1886.
- WHITMAN, SIDNEY. The realm of the Habsburgs. London: Wm. Heinemann. 1863.
- AUSTRIA AND HUNGARY. (Edinburgh Rev., 90: 230. 1849.)
- AUSTRIA IN 1938-9. (Edinburgh Rev., 171: 440. 1891.)
- BONER, CHARLES. Transylvania. London: Longmans. 1865.
- BRACE, CHARLES LORING. Hungary in 1851. New York: Clas. Scribner. 1852.
- FELBERMANN, LOUIS. Hungary and its people. London: Griffith, Farran & Co. 1892.
- FITZMAURICE, EDMOND. Home rule in Austria. (Nineteenth Century, 19: 443. 1886.)
- FÖRSTER, FLORENCE A. Francis Deak, Hungarian statesman: a memoir, with a preface by M. E. Grant Duff. London: Macmillan & Co. 1880.
- GETARD, E. The land beyond the forest (Transylvania). Edinburgh: Wm. Blackwood & Sons. 1888. 2 v.
- GODKIN, EDWIN L. History of Hungary and the Magyars. London: Cassell & Co. 1853.
- GÖRGEI, ARTHUR. My life and acts in Hungary, 1848-9 (1851); trans. London: D. Bogue. New York: Harper & Bros.
- HOFER, ANDREW. Memoirs of the life of; containing an account of the transactions in the Tyrol, 1809; from the Ger., by O. H. Hall. London: J. Murray. 1820.
- KAY, DAVID. Home rule in Austria-Hungary. (Nineteenth Century, 19: 41. 1886.)
- KLAPKA, General GEORGE. Memoirs of the war of independence in Hungary; trans. by O. Wenckstern. London: C. Gilpin. 1850. 2 v.
- MAURICE, C. EDMUND. Revolutionary movement of 1848-9 in Italy, Austria-Hungary, and Germany. London: Geo. Bell & Sons. 1887. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- PAGET, JOHN. Travels in Hungary and Transylvania (1839). London: John Murray. Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard. 1850. 2 v.
- PARDOE, Miss JULIA. The city of the Magyar, or Hungary and her institutions in 1839-40. London: G. Virtue. 1840. 3 v.
- PATON, A. A. Highlands and islands of the Adriatic. London: Chapman & Hall. 1849. 2 v.
- PATTERSON, ARTHUR J. The Magyars: their country and institutions. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1860. 2 v.
- PLANTA, JOSEPH. History of the Helvetic confederacy. London. 1830. 2 v.
- PRICE, BONAMY. Austria and Hungary. (Fraser's Mag., 65: 384. 1862.)
- STILES, WM. H. Austria in 1848-49. New York: Harper & Bros. 1852-3. 2 v.
- SZABAD, EMERIC. Hungary, past and present. Edinburgh: A. & C. Black. 1854.
- VÁNBÉRY, ARMINIUS, and LOUIS HELLPRIN. The story of Hungary (Story of the nations). New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1886. London: T. F. Unwin.

## AUSTRIA AND ITALY.

- ARRIVABENE, Count CHARLES. Italy under Victor Emmanuel. London: Hurst & Blackett. 1862. 2 v.
- AUSTRIA, FRANCE AND ITALY. (Edinburgh Rev., 100: 285. 1830.)
- AUSTRIANS AND ITALY, The. (Eclectic Mag., 47: 538. 1853.)
- GARIBALDI, GIUSEPPE. Autobiography; trans. by A. Werner, with a supplement by Jessie White Mario. London: Walter Smith & Innes. 1880. 3 v.
- ITALY AND THE WAR OF 1866. (Westminster Rev., 87: 275. 1867.)
- MAZALE, CHARLES DE. Life of Count Cavour. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1877.
- O'CLERY, PATRICK KEYES (The O'Clery). The history of the Italian revolution: 1st period, 1796-1849. London: R. Washburne. 1875.
- The making of Italy. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench & Co. 1892.
- PROBYN, JOHN W. Italy, 1815-1890. London: Cassell & Co. 1891.
- STUART, R. The Austro-Italian alliance. (Contemporary Rev., 40: 921. 1881.)
- THAYER, WM. ROSCOE. The dawn of Italian independence, 1814-1849. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1893. 2 v.
- WRIGHTSON, RICHARD H. A history of modern Italy [1800-50]. London: Richard Bentley. 1855.

## AUSTRIA AND GERMANY.

- DICEY, EDWARD. The campaign [of 1866] in western Germany. (Blackwood's Mag., 101: 68. 1867.)
- DICEY, EDWARD. The battlefields of 1866. London: Tinsley Bros. 1866.
- The campaign [of 1866] in Germany. (Macmillan's Mag., 14: 380. 1866.)
- DICEY, EDWARD. The campaign [of 1866] in Italy. (Macmillan's Mag., 14: 241. 1866.)
- GERMANIC CONFEDERATION and the Austrian empire, The. (Quarterly Rev., 84: 425. 1849.)
- HOOZIER, H. M. The seven weeks' war [1866]. 2 v. London: Macmillan & Co. 1867. 2 v.

- LOWE, CHARLES. Prince Bismarck; an historical biography. London: Cassell & Co. 1885. 2 v.
- MALET, Sir ALEXANDER. The overthrow of the Germanic confederation. 1866. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1870.
- MALLESON, Col. G. B. Battle-fields of Germany. London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1884.
- The refounding of the German empire, 1848-71. London: Seeley & Co. 1893.
- PRUSSIAN CAMPAIGN OF 1866. (Edinburgh Rev., 125: 187, 1867.)
- RECONSTRUCTION OF GERMANY, The. (North British Rev., 51: 133, 1860.)
- SIMON, EDOUARD. The emperor William and his reign; from the Fr. London: Remington & Co. 1890. 2 v.
- SYBEL, HEINRICH von. The founding of the German empire by William I.; based chiefly upon Prussian state documents; trans. by M. L. Perrin and G. Bradford, Jr. New York: T. Y. Crowell & Co. 1890-1. 5 v.

## AUSTRIA AND THE SOUTHEASTERN STATES.

- AUSTRIA, GERMANY AND THE EASTERN QUESTION. (Fraser's Mag., 96: 407, 1877.)
- AUSTRIA'S POLICY IN THE EAST. (Macmillan's Mag., 53: 17, 1885.)
- BOURCHIER, J. D. The sentinel of the Balkans. (Fortnightly Rev., 52: 806, 1889.)
- CAI' LARD, VINCENT. The Bulgarian imbroglio. (Fortnightly Rev., 44: 840, 1885.)
- FREEMAN, EDWARD A. The house of Habsburg in south-eastern Europe. (Fortnightly Rev., 51: 830, 1889.)
- The position of the Austrian power in south-eastern Europe. (Contemporary Rev., 41: 727, 1882.)

## THE RECONSTRUCTED EMPIRE: ITS REFORMS AND POLICY.

- AUSTRIA AND HER REFORMS. (Westminster Rev., 75: 568, 1861.)
- AUSTRIA SINCE SADOWA. (Quarterly Rev., 131: 90, 1871.)
- AUSTRIA: qu'est que c'est l'Austrie? (Edinburgh Rev., 40: 298, 1824.)
- AUSTRIAN CONSTITUTIONALISM. (Westminster Rev., 79: 333, 1863.)
- BEUST, FRIEDRICH F. Count von. Memoirs [1830-1885]. London: Remington & Co. 2 v.
- BOURCHIER, J. D. The heritage of the Hapsburgs. (Fortnightly Rev., 51: 377, 1889.)
- DILKE, Sir CHARLES W. Position of European politics, 1887. London: Chapman & Hall, 1887.
- DUALISM IN AUSTRIA. (Westminster Rev., 88: 431, 1867.)
- FOREIGN POLICY AND INTERNAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE AUSTRIAN EMPIRE. (Foreign Quarterly Rev., 18: 257, 1837.)
- NATIONAL LIFE AND THOUGHT. London: T. F. Unwin, 1891.

