V

X

Y

Printed in the United States of America.

FOOTNOTES:

[1] See upon this an excellent pamphlet by F. J. Gould, *History, the Supreme in the Instruction of the Young* (Watts & Co.).

[2] A compact and inspiring book to be noted here is Fairgrieve's *Geography and World Power*. Another very suggestive book is Andrew Reid Cowan's *Master Clues in World History*.

[3] For a convenient recent discussion of the origin of the earth and its early history before the seas were precipitated and sedimentation began, the student should consult Professor Burrell's contribution to the Yale lectures, *The Evolution of the Earth and Its Inhabitants* (1918), edited by President Lull.

[4] Here in this history of life we are doing our best to give only known and established facts in the broadest way, and to reduce to a minimum the speculative element that must necessarily enter into our account. The reader who is curious upon this question of life's beginning will find a very good summary of current suggestions done by Professor L. L. Woodruff in President Lull's excellent compilation *The Evolution of the Earth* (Yale University Press). Professor H. F. Osborn's *Origin and Evolution of Life* is also a very vigorous and suggestive book upon this subject, but it demands a fair knowledge of physics and chemistry. Two very stimulating essays *for the student* are A. H. Church's *Botanical Memoirs*. No 183, Ox. Univ. Press.

[5] Theophrastus, quoting Xenophanes.

[6] There is a discussion of fossils in the Holkham Hall Leonardo MS.

[7] An admirable recent book, short and written in a style intelligible to the general reader, is Arthur Holmes, *The Age of the Earth*. He gives a good summary of this most interesting discussion, and sustains the maximum estimate of 1600 million years.

[8] It might be called with more exactness the *Survival of the Fitter*.

[9] See Evans, The Sudden Appearance of the Cambrian Fauna. (*Proc. of XIe Congrès Geolog. Inst., 1910*) for a discussion of this.

[10] Phanerogams.

[11] Deciduous trees.

[12] This, says Mr. R. I. Pocock, has to be qualified. There were Carboniferous spiders with spinnerets, though they may have used the silk only for egg cases. And he thinks that the Carboniferous myriapods point to *ground* beneath the trees.

[13] See Sir R. Ball's *Causes of the Great Ice Age*, and Dr. Croll's *Climate and Time*. These are sound books to read still, but the reader will find many of their conclusions modified in Wright's *The Quaternary Ice Age*, which is a quarter of a century more recent.

[14] Dr. Marie Stopes, *Monograph on the Constitution of Coal*.

[15] See article "Cephalopoda" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* for its anatomy.

[16] And here the genius of a great humorous artist (E. T. Reed) obliges us to add a footnote to clear away a common misconception. He was the creator of a series of fantastic pictures, *Prehistoric Peeps*, which have had a deserved and immense vogue, and it was his whim to represent primitive men as engaged in an unending wild struggle with great Plesiosaurs and the like. His fantasy has become a common belief. As we shall see, millions of years elapsed between the vanishing of the last great Mesozoic reptile and the first appearance of man upon this earth. Early man had as contemporaries some monstrous animals, as we shall note, but not these extreme monsters.

In these opening six chapters we have been much indebted, in addition to the books already named in the text or in footnotes, to Ray Lankester's *Extinct Animals*, Osborne's *Age of Mammals*, Jukes Browne's, Lyell's and Pirsson and Schuchert's textbooks of geology, and the collections and catalogues of the Natural History Museum at South Kensington. H. R. Knipe's *From Nebula to Man* and his *Evolution in the Past* have also been very useful and suggestive. These two books are full of admirable illustrations of extinct monsters by Miss G. M. Woodward and Mr. Bucknall. There are good figures also in *Extinct Monsters* and *Creatures of Other Days* by H. N. Hutchinson.

[17] They secrete a nutritive fluid on which the young feeds from glands scattered over the skin. But the glands are not gathered together into mammæ with nipples for suckling. The stuff oozes out, the mother lies on her back, and the young browse upon her moist skin.

[18] *Die Alpen in Eiszeitalters*, vol. iii.

[19] "Graphic Projection of the Pleistocene," "Climatic Oscillations," in *Bulletin of Geological Soc. Am.*, vol. xxvi.

[20] In this and the next chapters the writer has used Osborn's *Men of the Stone Age*, Sollas' *Ancient Hunters*, Dr. Keith's *Antiquity of Man*, W. B. Wright's *The Quaternary Ice Age*, Worthington Smith's *Man, the Primeval Savage*, F. Wood Jones' *Arboreal Man*, H. G. F. Spurrell's *Modern Man and his Forerunners*, O. T. Mason's *Origins of Invention*, Parkyn's *History of Prehistoric Art*, Salomon Reinach's *Repertoire de l'Art Quaternaire*, and various of the papers in Ray Lankester's *Science from an Easy Chair*.

[21] Darwin's *Descent of Man*.

[22] In *Conquest* for February, 1920, Mr. R. I. Pocock published a very useful criticism of this section as it stood in the first version of the *Outline*. It has been carefully modified in accordance with his views. In addition, we take the liberty of quoting the following:

"It was formerly held, I believe, that, so far as habits are concerned, the transitional steps in man's descent were to be traced from an active arboreal monkey to the equally active arboreal gibbon, and thence to the less active, but still mainly arboreal, orang-utang; from the latter to the half arboreal, half terrestrial chimpanzee, thence, through the mainly terrestrial gorilla, to wholly terrestrial man. In other words, the stages of man's evolution were a series of structural modifications resulting from the gradual dropping of the ancestral habit of living in trees in favour of life on the ground. But such a conception leaves unexplained the great differences between monkeys and gibbons in arboreal and terrestrial activity. Were it correct, we should expect the gibbons to show a transition between monkeys and other apes in their method of moving through trees and on the ground. They show no such transition. It is necessary, therefore, to formulate another theory.

"Since all the active climbing monkeys have well-developed tails, and since the tail tends to shorten or disappear in species of less active habits which live, like the monkey of Gibraltar, on rocky hillsides, the absence of the tail in apes suggests very forcibly that their ancestor had to a great extent given up living in trees. Moreover, the short broad foot of the apes, their ability to stand and walk erect, their peculiar way of climbing, all point to the conclusion that they are descended, not from a truly arboreal ape, but from an ape which had already taken to terrestrial life, with partly bipedal, partly quadrupedal progression; an ape which, while still retaining the power to ascend trees for purposes of feeding and escaping from carnivorous foes, was, at best, probably a slow, inactive climber, certainly not an arboreal leaper like a monkey. A large ape of that mode of life, with hands and feet not very different from those of a chimpanzee or gorilla, but with stronger legs and shorter arms, is my conception of the ancestor of existing apes and of man. And the progenitor of that hypothetical ancestor was probably a big ground monkey."

[23] Among the earlier pioneers of the latter view was Mr. Harrison, a grocer of Ightham in Kent, one of those modest and devoted observers to whom British geology owes so much. At first his "Eoliths" were flouted and derided by archæologists, but to-day he has the scientific world with him in the recognition of the quasi-human origin of many of his specimens. With him we must honour Mr. W. J. Lewis Abbott, a jeweller of St. Leonards, whose intimate knowledge of stone structure has been of the utmost value in these discussions. See "Occ. Papers," No. 4, of the Royal Anthropl. Inst., for a

description by Sir E. R. Lankester of one of the better formed of these early implements.

[24] Some writers suppose that a Wood and Shell age preceded the earliest Stone Age. South Sea Islanders, Negroes, and Bushmen still make use of wood and the sharp-edged shells of land and water molluscs as implements.

[25] For some interesting suggestions on the origin of flint implements see Elliot Smith's presidential address to the Anthropl. Sect. of the Brit. Assn., 1912.

[26] Sollas' *Ancient Hunters*, p. 40.

[27] We follow Penck.

[28] For sixpence and postage the reader can get from the British Museum, South Kensington, a very fully illustrated pamphlet *A Guide to the Fossil Remains of Man*, showing the Piltdown material in great detail.

[29] Three phases of human history before the knowledge and use of metals are often distinguished. First there is the so-called Eolithic Age (dawn of stone implements), then the Palæolithic Age (old stone implements), and finally an age in which the implements are skilfully made and frequently well finished and polished (Neolithic Age). The Palæolithic period is further divided into an earlier (sub-human) and a later (fully human) period. We shall comment on these divisions later.

[30] From Chelles and Le Moustier in France.

[31] Osmond Fisher, quoted in Wright's *Quaternary Ice Age*.

[32] *Social Origins*, by Andrew Lang, and *Primal Law*, by J. J. Atkinson. (Longmans, 1903.)

[33] This first origin of fire was suggested by Sir John Lubbock (*Prehistoric Times*), and Ludwig Hopf, in *The Human Species*, says that "Flints and pieces of pyrites are found in close proximity in palæolithic settlements near the remains of mammoths."

[34] But compare Sollas' *Ancient Hunters*. Elliot Smith (*Primitive Man*, Proceedings Brit. Acad., vol. vii) says they approach the Neanderthal type.

[35] What is known of the Tasmanian Old Stone men is to be found in Roth and Butler's *Aborigines of Tasmania*. See also footnote on the Tasmanian language to Chapter XIII.

[36] The opinion that the Neanderthal race (*Homo Neanderthalensis*) is an extinct species which did not interbreed with the true men (*Homo sapiens*) is held by

Professor Osborn, and it is the view to which the writer inclines and to which he has pointed in the treatment of this section; but it is only fair to the reader to note that many writers do not share this view. They write and speak of living "Neanderthalers" in contemporary populations. One observer has written in the past of such types in the west of Ireland; another has observed them in Greece. These so-called "living Neanderthalers" have neither the peculiarities of neck, thumb, nor teeth that distinguish the Neanderthal race of pro-men. The cheek teeth of true men, for instance, have what we call fangs, long fangs; the Neanderthaler's cheek tooth is a *more complicated and specialized* cheek tooth, a long tooth with short fangs, and his canine teeth were *less* marked, *less* like dog-teeth, than ours. Nothing could show more clearly that he was on a different line of development. We must remember that so far only western Europe has been properly explored for Palæolithic remains, and that practically all we know of the Neanderthal species comes from that area (see Map, p. 89). No doubt the ancestor of *Homo sapiens* (which species includes the Tasmanians) was a very similar and parallel creature to *Homo Neanderthalensis*. And we are not so far from that ancestor as to have eliminated not indeed "Neanderthal," but "Neanderthaloid" types. The existence of such types no more proves that the Neanderthal species, the makers of the Chellean and Mousterian implements, interbred with *Homo sapiens* in the European area than do monkey-faced people testify to an interbreeding with monkeys; or people with faces like horses, that there is an equine strain in our population.

[37] R. I. Pocock.

[38] See Osborn in his *Men of the Old Stone Age*. But see Wright's *Quaternary Ice Age* for a different view of the Magdalenian Age.

[39] See, for example, H. G. F. Spurrell, *Modern Man and His Forerunners*, end of Chapter III.

[40] Upon this question W. J. Sollas' *Ancient Hunters* is very full and suggestive.

[41] From the cave of Mas d'Azil.

[42] But our domestic cattle are derived from some form of aurochs—probably from some lesser Central Asiatic variety.—H. H. J.

[43] "The various finds of human remains in North America for which the geological antiquity has been claimed have been thus briefly passed under review. In every instance where enough of the bones is preserved for comparison, the evidence bears witness against the geological antiquity of the remains and for their close affinity to or

identity with the modern Indians." (Smithsonian Institute, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 33. Dr. Hrdlicka.)

But J. Deniker quotes evidence to show that eoliths and early palæoliths have been found in America. See his compact but full summary of the evidence and views for and against in his *Races of Man*, pp. 510, 511.

[44] "Questioned by some authorities," says J. Deniker in *The Races of Man*.

[45] A good account of Palæolithic and Neolithic man is to be found in Rice Holmes' *Ancient Britain*, 1907. Otis T. Mason's *Origins of Invention* also illuminates this period.

[46] The deposits at Susa show neolithic remains perhaps more than 20,000 years old. See Montelius *Congrès Internat. d'Anthrop. Prehist.*, 1906, p. 32. Sir Arthur Evans says the neolithic age began in Crete more than 14,000 years ago.—G. Wh.

[47] See Peisker, *Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. I, for some interesting views upon domestication.—E. B.

[48] Native copper is still found to-day in Italy, Hungary, Cornwall, and many other places.

[49] This view of the origin of bronze is that of Dr. Gowland, *The Metals Antiquity* (Huxley Lecture, 1912). But Lord Avebury quotes the verbal opinion of the late Lord Swansea against this view, and sets it aside without further argument.

[50] Ridgeway (*Early Age of Greece*) says a lump of tin has been found in the Swiss pile-dwelling deposits.

[51] Tin was known as a foreign import in Egypt under the XVIIIth Dynasty; there is (rare) Mycenæan tin, and there are (probably later, but not clearly dated) tin objects in the Caucasus. But it is very difficult to distinguish tin from antimony. There is a good deal of Cyprus bronze which contains antimony; a good deal which seems to be tin is antimony—the ancients trying to get tin, but actually getting antimony and thinking it was tin.—J. L. M.

[52] In connection with iron, note the distinction of ornamental and useful iron. Ornamental iron, a rarity, perhaps meteoric, as jewellery or magical stuff, occurs in east Europe sporadically in the time of the XVIIIth Dynasty. This must be distinguished from the copious useful iron which appears in Greece much later from the North.—J. L. M.

[53] People were probably healthier and longer lived in the Bronze than in the Neolithic age. The disparity of stature between male and female was much less.—G. Wh.

[54] Lord Avebury. For a good account of Avebury, Stonehenge, and the traces of a well-developed social system in England before the coming of the Keltic peoples, see Hippesley Cox, *The Green Roads of England*.

[55] Caesar *de Bello Gallico* says the Britons tabooed hare, fowl and goose.—G. Wh.

[56] All Old World peoples who had entered upon the Neolithic stage grew and ate wheat, but the American Indians must have developed agriculture independently in America after their separation from the Old World populations. They never had wheat. Their cultivation was maize, Indian corn, a new-world grain.

[57] Poultry and hens' eggs were late additions to the human cuisine, in spite of the large part they now play in our dietary. The hen is not mentioned in the Old Testament (but note the allusion to an egg, Job vi, 6) nor by Homer. Up to about 1300 B.C. the only fowls in the world were jungle denizens in India and Burmah. The crowing of jungle cocks is noted by Glasfurd in his admirable accounts of tiger shooting as the invariable preliminary of dawn in the Indian jungle. Probably poultry were first domesticated in Burmah. They got to China, according to the records, only about 1100 B.C. They reached Greece via Persia before the time of Socrates. In the New Testament the crowing of the cock reproaches Peter for his desertion of the Master.

[58] Later Palæolithic bone whistles are known. One may guess that reed pipes were an early invention.

[59] In addition to authorities already cited, we have used for this and the following chapters Lord Avebury's *Prehistoric Times*, Schrader and Jevons' *Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan Peoples*, and A. H. Keane's *Man Past and Present*.

[60] Among other books we have used Jukes Browne's *Building of the British Isles*.

[61] *The Quaternary Ice Age.*

[62] Our treatment of this chapter is written for the general reader and is broad and general. But the student who wishes to go more thoroughly into the development of the civilized mentality out of the elements of the primitive human mind should read and study very carefully that very illuminating book, Jung's *Psychology of the Unconscious* (English translation by Beatrice M. Hinckle), and especially the opening two chapters. That book is a most important contribution to the mental history of mankind.

[63] J. J. Atkinson's *Primal Law*.

[64] See Sir J. G. Frazer, *Belief in Immortality*.

[65] Glasfurd's *Rifle and Romance in the Indian Jungle*, 1915.

[66] For some interesting suggestions here see Sigismund Freud, *Totem and Taboo, Resemblances between the Psychic Life of Savages and Neurotics*.

[67] Ludwig Hopf, in *The Human Species*, calls the later Palæolithic art "masculine" and the Neolithic "feminine." The pottery was made by women, he says, and that accounts for it. But the arrowheads were made by men, and there was nothing to prevent Neolithic men from taking scraps of bone or slabs of rock and carving them—had they dared. We suggest they did not dare to do so.

[68] But Cicero says relegere, "*to read over*," and the "binding" by those who accept *religare* is often written of as being merely the binding of a vow.

[69] Bateman, *Ten Years' Digging in Celtic and Saxon Gravehills*, quoted by Lord Avebury in *Prehistoric Times*, p. 176.

[70] Cabot in *Labrador*, by Grenfell and others. Macmillan, New York.

[71] Quoted in *Ency. Brit.*, vol. ix, p. 850.

[72] This is not a good name, and may perhaps drop out of use later. Blumenbach chose a particular skull as the "type" of this race and it happened to be a skull from the Caucasus.—G. S.

[73] The skull shape of the Lombards, says Flinders Petrie, changed from dolichocephalic to brachycephalic in a few hundred years. See his Huxley Lecture for 1906, *Migrations*, published by the *Anthropological Institute*. Ripley is the great authority on the other side.

[74] *My Diaries*, under date of July 25, 1894.

[75] "Sunstone" culture because of the sun worship and the megaliths. This is not a very happily chosen term. It suggests a division equivalent to palæolithic (old stone) and neolithic (new stone), whereas it is a development of the Neolithic culture.

[76] Megalithic monuments have been made quite recently by primitive Indian peoples.

[77] For some interesting suggestions in this matter, see W. H. R. Rivers, "*Sun Cult and Megaliths in Oceana*" (*American Anthropologist* (N.S.), vol. xvii). Hose and

MacDougall, *The Pagan Tribes of Borneo*, contains some very interesting parallelisms between the culture of modern Borneo and the prehistoric culture of southern Europe. See also Dr. W. Warde Fowler's "Ancient Italy and Modern Borneo" in the *Journal of Roman Studies* (1916).

[78] Sir Arthur Evans suggests that in America sign-language arose before speech, because the sign-language is common to all Indians in North America, whereas the languages are different. See his *Anthropology and the Classics*.—G. M.

Samuel Butler (*Note Books*) suggests that language was "originally confined to a few scholars."—G. Wh.

[79] See article "Grammar" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

[80] Sir H. H. Johnston gives this estimate in his *Comparative Study of the Bantu and Semi-Bantu Languages*.

[81] Greek—ox-ford.

[82] Ratsel (quoted in the *Ency. Brit.*, art. "Caspian").

[83] *Encyclopædia Britannica*, article "Japan."

[84] The four characters indicating "Affairs, query, imperative, old," placed in that order, for example, represent "Why walk in the ancient ways?" The Chinaman gives the bare cores of his meaning; the Englishman gets to it by a bold metaphor. He may be talking of conservatism in cooking or in bookbinding, but he will say: "Why walk in the ancient ways?" Mr. Arthur Waley, in the interesting essay on Chinese thought and poetry which precedes his book, *170 Chinese Poems* (Constable, 1918), makes it clear how in these fields Chinese thought is kept practical and restricted by the limitations upon metaphor the linguistic structure of Chinese imposes. See also Hirst, *Ancient History of China*, ch. vii.

[85] See Farrand, *The American Nation*, and E. S. Payne, *History of the New World called America*, and note footnote to § 1 of this chapter.

[86] These are discussed compactly, but with very special knowledge, by Sir Harry Johnston in his little book on *The Opening up of Africa*, in the Home University Library. The student who finds this subject of philological history interesting, should read the introduction to the same writer's *Comparative Study of the Bantu and Semi-Bantu Languages*.

[87] The Polynesians appear to be a later eastward extension of the dark whites or brown peoples. See again § 4 of chap. xiii.

[88] “The Keltic group of languages, of which it has been said that they combined an Aryan vocabulary with a Berber (or Iberian) grammar.” Sir Harry Johnston. See also Sir John Rhys, The Welsh People, Mac Neilh’s *Phases in Irish History*, and various articles by Prof. Stewart Macalister in the *Irish Monthly* (1917-1919).

[89] See Schrader (translated by Jevons), *Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan Peoples*, p. 404. But though the word Aryan was undoubtedly in its original application the name only of the Indo-Iranian people, it has been used in modern discussion for more than half a century in the wider sense. A word was badly wanted for that purpose, and “Aryan” was taken; failing “Aryan” we should be obliged to fall back on “Indo-Germanic” or “Indo-European,” terms equally open to objection and ugly and clumsy to employ.

[90] But these may have been an originally Semitic people who learnt an Aryan speech.

[91] On this point see Perry, *An Ethnological Study of Warfare*, vol. lxi., Mem. Manchester Lit. and Phil. Soc., and also published separately 1917.—G. Wh.

[92] Fools, I think, were not wits, but deformed idiots, whom the company teased and laughed at. Certainly so in Roman and mediæval times. They do not occur in the Hellenic Age, except at courts in Asia Minor; but they must have been present in pre-Hellenic kingdoms; cf. end of *Iliad I.*, where the gods laugh consumedly not at Hephaestus’ wit, but at his lameness. The idealized Fool of Shakespeare is, like the idealized Hermit of the romances, the invention of later days.—G. M

[93] The Aryans developed their languages and their ballads and epics between 10,000 B.C. and the historical period. Very much later in time, probably within the last 3,000 years, the nomadic Mongolian peoples of Asia began to develop their Ural-Altaic speech, under similar conditions, by similar poetic uses. Later we shall note the presence of bards at the court of Attila the Hun.

[94] It is suggested in the text that blind men became bards: Myres says that bards were (artificially) blinded to stop them from going elsewhere—the tribe wanted to keep them. The poetic touch is that “the Muses” blind the poet. Not a bit of it. (Homer, being a blind bard, describes things by sound—the twanging arrow, the far-thundering sea, the noise of the chariot going through the gate. He is audile, not visual.)—E. B.

But in this matter note the adjectives in the passage quoted here from the *Iliad*; they are all visual.—G. H. M.

Mr. L. Lloyd, of the experimental station at Cheshunt, tells me he has seen in Rhodesia the musician and singer of a troupe of native dancers who had been blinded by his chief to prevent him leaving the village.—H. G. W.

[95] G.M.

[96] The *Iliad* describes what Chadwick calls a Heroic Age: *i.e.* a time when the barbarians or nomads are breaking up an old civilization. Men are led by chiefs who live by plunder and conquest and make themselves kingdoms. The tribe is broken up; instead comes the comitatus of casual men who attach themselves to a particular chief, as Phœnix or Patroclus to Achilles. Religion is broken up, being by origin local. Hence there is almost no religion in the *Iliad* or the *Nibelungenlied*. Almost no magic. No family life. Tremendous booty, and *la carrière ouverte aux talents* with a vengeance.—G. M.

[97] *Some Aspects of Hindu Life in India.* Paper read to the Royal Society of Arts, Nov. 28, 1918.

[98] No Greek heroes, in Homer or the heroic tradition, ever get drunk. In the comic tradition they do, and of course centaurs and barbarians do.—G. M.

[99] Babylonian expedition of the University of Pennsylvania.

[100] H. R. Hall, *Ancient History of the Near East*, says it has been found in Palestine.—S. H.

The late Mr. Aaron Aaronson found a real wild wheat upon the slopes of Mt. Hermon. See Bulletin 274, Plant Indus. Bureau, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture; and Stapf in Suppl. to the *Jour. of the Board of Agri., Lond.*, vol. xvii, No. 3.—E. J. R.

[101] We shall use "Mesopotamia" here loosely for the Euphrates-Tigris country generally. Strictly, of course, as its name indicates, Mesopotamia (mid rivers) means only the country *between* those two great rivers. That country in the fork was probably very marshy and unhealthy in early times (Sayce), until it was drained by man, and the early cities grew up west of the Euphrates and east of the Tigris. Probably these rivers then flowed separately into the Persian Gulf.

[102] My friend Colonel Lawrence tells me that the movement among the Arabs is somewhat as follows: (1) the sessile village cultivators are pushed out by over-population into the desert—very reluctantly; (2) they wander in the desert for a thousand years or so—as a stick pushed into the water gets carried about for a long way; (3) they are pushed again out of the desert, back again into sessile life by starvation—very reluctantly (they have learned to love the desert); and when they

come back into sessile life they are on the other side—*i.e.* having started in west Arabia, they land in Mesopotamia. Thus they wander a thousand years or so, and end up thousands of miles from where they started.—E. B.

[103] Sir H. H. Johnston is inclined to believe that a common late Neolithic and early bronze culture spread widely in this primitive world. He links the Dravidian languages of India—some of which group are to be found in Beluchistan and the eastern fringe of Persia—with certain languages in the Caucasian Mountains, and these again with Basque. He would bring the Sumerians, the early Cretans, and the early peoples of Asia Minor into this early "brown" or dark white culture before the Aryans, Semites, or Hamites developed their language cultures and thrust across this band of primordial civilization. He connects these "class and prefix" languages with the creation of the African Bantu, but that is a speculation beyond the scope of this present work. A series of articles on this subject by the Rev. W. Crabtree will be found in the *Journal of the African Society*. The connection of Sumerian and Bantu was first suggested by Sir Richard Burton in 1885. These views are in complete accordance with Elliot Smith's suggestion of a widespread heliolithic culture already dealt with in chap. xiii, § 4, p. 146

[104] Excavations conducted at Eridu by Capt. R. Campbell Thompson during the recent war have revealed an early Neolithic agricultural stage, before the invention of writing or the use of bronze, beneath the earliest Sumerian foundations. The crops were cut by sickles of earthenware. Capt. Thompson thinks that these pre-Sumerian people were not of Sumerian race, but proto-Elamites. Entirely similar Neolithic remains have been found at Susa, once the chief city of Elam.

[105] Sayce, in *Babylonian and Assyrian Life*, estimates that in 6500 B.C. Eridu was on the seacoast.

[106] Authorities vary upon this date. Some put back Sargon I to 3750 B.C. This latter was his traditional date based on Babylonian records.

[107] Of unknown language and race, "neither Sumerians nor Semites," says Sayce. Their central city was Susa. Their archæology is still largely an unworked mine. They are believed by some, says Sir H. H. Johnston, to have been negroid in type. There is a strong negroid strain in the modern people of Elam.

[108] For most of these dates here Winckler in *Helmolt's World History* has been followed.

[109] II. Kings xv. 29, and xvi. 7 *et seq*.

[110] II. Kings xvii. 3.

[111] To be murdered by his sons.

[112] Winckler (Craig), *History of Babylonia and Assyria*.

[113] "The original home or centre of development of this 'Dynastic' Egyptian type seems to have been in southern or south-western Arabia. This region of south-western and southern Arabia, ten to fifteen thousand years ago, was probably an even better favoured province than it is at the present day, when it still bears the Roman designation of Arabia Felix—so much of the rest of this gaunt, lava-covered, sand-strewn peninsula being decidedly 'infelix.' It has high mountains—a certain degree of rainfall on them, and was anciently clothed in rich forests before the camels, goats, and sheep of Neolithic and Bronze Age man nibbled away much of this verdure. Above all there grew trees oozing with delicious-scented resins or gums. These, when civilization dawned on the world, became very precious and an offering of sweet savour to the civilized man's gods, because so grateful to his own nostrils." *Africa*, by Sir H. H. Johnston.

[114] 3733 B.C., Wallis Budge.

[115] But compare the citation of *Beowulf* in Chap. XV, § 2.—R. L. C.

[116] The great pyramid is 450 feet high and its side 700 feet long. It is calculated (says Wallis Budge) to weigh 4,883,000 tons. All this stone was lugged into place chiefly by human muscle.

[117] There are variants to these names, and to most Egyptian names, for few self-respecting Egyptologists will tolerate the spelling of their colleagues. One may find, for instance, Thethmosis, Thoutmosis, Tahutmes, Thutmose, or Thethmosis; Amunothph, Amenhotep or Amenothes. A pleasing variation is to break up the name, as, for instance, Amen Hetep. This particular little constellation of variants is given here not only because it is amusing, but because it is desirable that the reader should know such variations exist. For most names the rule of this book has been to follow whatever usage has established itself in English literature, regardless of the possible contemporary pronunciation. Amenophis, for example, has been so written in English books for two centuries. It came into the language by indirect routes, but it is now as fairly established as is Damascus as the English name of a Syrian town. Nevertheless, there are limits to this classicism. The writer, after some vacillation, has abandoned Oliver Goldsmith and Dr. Johnson in the case of "Peisistratus" and "Keltic," which were formerly spelt "Pisistratus" and "Celtic."

[118] *China and the League of Nations*, a pamphlet by Mr. Liang-Chi-Chao. (*Pekin Leader* Office.)

[119] Here we touch on highly controversial matters. The reader interested in the question of the separate origin of the American civilization should consult *Nature*, Jan. 27, 1916, Spinden and Elliot Smith in discussion.

[120] F. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*.

[121] Sayce.

[122] Mosso, *The Dawn of Mediterranean Civilization*.—R. L. G.

[123] Cecil Torr, *Ancient Ships*.

[124] See Evans' *Prehistoric Tombs of Cnossos*.

[125] This is, I think, too dogmatic about Helen. True, raids on women were a real cause of war, but they were also a very favourite *ficelle* of fiction. A war with Troy might easily arise by the carrying off of a woman. But why was Troy destroyed six several times? It looks to me as if there was some strong motive for building just there, and an equally strong motive for great confederacies destroying the city when built.—G. M.

Walter Leaf in his *Homer and History* is in agreement with G. M. on this point.—G. Wh.

[126] There were no domesticated camels in Africa until after the Persian conquest of Egypt. This must have greatly restricted the desert routes. (See Bunbury, *History of Ancient Geography*, note to Chap. VIII.) But the Sahara desert of 3000 or 2000 years ago was less parched and sterile than it is to-day. From rock engravings we may deduce the theory that the desert was crossed from oasis to oasis by riding oxen and by ox-carts: perhaps, also, on horses and asses. The camel as a beast of transport was seemingly not introduced into North Africa till the Arab invasions of the seventh century A.D. The fossil remains of camels are found in Algeria, and wild camels may have lingered in the wastes of the Sahara and Somaliland till the domesticated camel was introduced. The Nubian wild ass also seems to have extended its range to the Sahara.—H. H. J.

[127] There was Sumerian trade organized round the temples before the Semites got into Babylonia. See Hall and King, *Archæological Discoveries in Western Asia*.—E. B.

[128] Iron bars of fixed weight were used for coin in Britain. Cæsar, *De Bello Gallico*.—G. Wh.

[129] The earliest coinage of the west coast of Asia Minor was in electrum, a mixture of gold and silver, and there is an interesting controversy as to whether the first issues were stamped by cities, temples, or private bankers.—P. G.

[130] Small change was in existence before the time of Alexander. The Athenians had a range of exceedingly small silver coins running almost down to the size of a pinhead, which were generally carried in the mouth; a character in Aristophanes was suddenly assaulted, and swallowed his change in consequence.—P. G.

[131] There is an inn-keeper in Aristophanes, but it may be inferred from the circumstance that she is represented as letting lodgings in hell that the early inn left much to be desired.—P. G.

[132] See the *Encyclopædia Brit.*, Article *China*, p. 218.

[133] The writer's friend, Mr. L. Y. Chen, thinks that this is only partially true. He thinks that the emperors insisted upon a minute and rigorous study of the set classics in order to check intellectual innovation. This was especially the case with the Ming emperors, the first of whom, when reorganizing the examination system on a narrower basis, said definitely, "This will bring all the intellectuals of the world into my trap." The Five Classics and the Four Books have imprisoned the mind of China.

[134] The Libyan alphabet survived in North Africa until a century ago, and was still used then for correspondence. It was supposed to be extinct, but in 1897 Sir Arthur Evans and Mr. J. L. Myres saw what looked like ancient Cretan lettering on some dyed skins from the Sahara in the bazaar at Tripoli. It was the ancient alphabet still in use for commercial signs.—E. B.

[135] The Sumerians allowed much more freedom and authority to women than the Semites. They had priestess-queens, and one of their great divinities was a goddess, Ishtar.

[136] See Johnson's *Byeways of British Archæology*.

[137] Many Christian churches, almost all, indeed, built between the fifth century and the Renaissance, are oriented to the east. St. Peter's at Rome is oriented east and west.

[138] In his *Dawn of Astronomy*.

[139] Legrain's *Le Temps des Rois d'Ur* (Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes) was useful here.

[140] Cp. Moses and the Egyptian Magicians.

[141] According to Winckler, Sargon II, unlike his son, was pro-priest, and his usurpation of the throne was the result of an intrigue of the Babylonian priests against the feudal Assyrian military system of Tiglath Pileser III.

[142] See the last two verses of the Second Book of Chronicles, and Ezra, ch. i.

[143] A book of the utmost interest and value here is Breasted's *Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt*.

[144] See S. Sharpe's *Egyptian Mythology and Egyptian Christianity*.

[145] Akhnaton lost some or all his father's Syrian conquests.—G. W. B.

[146] Many authorities regard Alexander as a man with the ideas of a pushful nineteenth-century (A.D.) monarch, and consider this visit to Jupiter Ammon as a master-stroke of policy. He was, we are asked to believe, deliberately and cynically acquiring divinity as a "unifying idea." The writer is totally unable to accept anything of the sort. For a discussion of the question, see Ferguson's *Greek Imperialism*.

[147] "His reforming zeal made him unpopular with the upper classes. Schoolmen and pedants held up to the admiration of the people the heroes of the feudal times and the advantages of the system they administered. Seeing in this propaganda danger to the state, Shi Hwang-ti determined to break once and for all with the past. To this end he ordered the destruction of all books having reference to the past history of the empire, and many scholars were put to death for failing in obedience to it."—The late Sir R. K. Douglas in the *Encyclopædia Brit.*, article *China*.

Mr. L. Y. Chen does not agree with Sir R. K. Douglas here. He thinks that the motives of Shi Hwang-ti were obscurantist. His object was the intellectual slavery of the people. He collected a library for his own use.

[148] There were literary expressions of social discontent in Egypt before 2000 B.C. See "Social Forces and Religion" in Breasted's *Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt* for some of the earliest complaints of the common man under the ancient civilizations.

[149] The student should compare with this J. J. Atkinson's account (in his *Primal Law*) of the significance of marriage by capture and his theory of the origin of marriage.

[150] See also his shorter *Social Life of the Babylonians and Assyrians*.

[151] See Mary Austin, *The Flock*.

[152] J. L. M. says this is the view of a Londoner. In a village or small town where everyone knows everyone, long credits are possible with barter. In Asia Minor there is much reckoning with quite imaginary money of account.

[153] From *casta*, a word of Portuguese origin; the Indian word is *varna*, colour.

[154] In the time of Confucius classes were much more fixed than later. Under the Han Dynasty the competitive examination system was not yet established. Scholars were recommended for appointments by local dignitaries, etc.—L. Y. C.

[155] The Grand Canal of China, the longer portion of which was made in the sixth century A.D., has a total length of nearly 900 miles. It was begun in the fifth century B.C. "Between Su-chow and Chin-kiang the canal is often 100 feet wide and its sides are, in many places, faced with stone. It is spanned by fine stone bridges, and near its banks are many memorial arches and lofty pagodas." The Great Wall of China, which was begun in the third century B.C., was built originally to defend China against the Huns. It is about 1500 miles long; its average height is between 20 and 30 feet, and every 200 yards there are towers 40 feet high.

[156] Damascus was already making Damask, and "Damascening" steel.

[157] *The Encyclopædia Biblica* has been of great use here.

[158] This is probably much too early an estimate. The Book of Daniel was not written until 167-5 B.C. Ecclesiastes and several Psalms are later than Alexander.—G. W. B.

[159] See also G. B. Gray, *A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament*.

[160] This may seem to contradict Genesis xx. 15, and xxi. and xxvi. various verses, but compare with this the *Encyclopædia Biblica* article *Philistines*.

[161] So this name should be spelt in English. It is now the fashion among the learned and among the sceptical to spell it Yahwe or Jahveh or Jahve, or in some such fashion. There is a justification for this in the fact that at first only the consonants were written in Hebrew, and then, for reasons into which we will not enter here, the wrong vowels were inserted in this name. But ever since the days of Tyndale's Bible, Jehovah has been established in English literature as the name of the God of Israel, and it is not to be lightly altered. There is at present a deplorable tendency to strange spelling among historians. Attention has already been called to the confusion that is being accumulated in people's minds by the variable spelling of Egyptologists, but the tendency is now almost universal among historical writers. In an otherwise admirable little book, *The Opening-up of Africa*, by Sir H. H. Johnston, for example, one finds him spelling Saul as Sha'ul and Solomon as Shelomoh; Jerusalem becomes Yerusalim and

the Hebrews, Habiru or Ibrim. Historians do not realize how the mind of the general reader is distressed and discouraged by these constantly fluctuating attempts to achieve phonetic exactitude. This treatment of old forms has much the same effect as the dazzle-painting of ships that went on during the submarine warfare. It is dazzle-spelling. The ordinary educated man is so confused that he fails altogether to recognize even his oldest friends under their modern disguises. He loses his way in the story hopelessly. The old events occur to novel names in unfamiliar places. He conceives a disgust for history in which no record seems to tally with any other record. Still more maddening and confusing is the variable spelling of Chinese names. A large part of the popular indifference to Chinese history may be due to the impossibility of holding on to the thread of a story in which one narrator talks of T'sin and another of Sin, and both forms mix themselves with Chin and T'chin. A boldly Europeanized name, such as Confucius, is far more readily grasped. Modern writers in their zeal for phonetics seem to have lost their sense of proportion. It is of far more importance not merely to civilization, but to the welfare, respect, and endowment of historians, that the general community should form clear and sound ideas of historical processes, than that it should pronounce the name Jehovah exactly as this or that learned gentleman believes it was pronounced by the Hebrews of the days of Ezra. A day may come in the future for one final, conclusive reform in the spelling of historical names. Meanwhile, it will probably save school teachers of history from endless confusion and muddle if they adhere firmly to the time-established spelling. Yet we have attempted no pedantic classicalism. The reader will find Peisistratus for Goldsmith's Pisistratus, the Arabic spelling of Muhammad, Kelt for Celt, and Habsburg taking the place of the older Hapsburg.

[162] Figures certainly exaggerated.—G. M.

[163] That is, where is the glory?

[164] But upon the question whether its "Centralization" was the work of Solomon or a much later idea, cp. S. R. Driver, *Deuteronomy* (Int. Crit. Commentary).—G. W. B.

[165] Estimates of the cubit vary. The greatest is 44 inches. This would extend the width to seventy-odd feet.

[166] But one version of the Creation story and the Eden story, though originally from Babylon, seem to have been known to the Hebrews before the Exile.—G. W. B.

[167] For early Egyptian anticipations of the idea of a Messiah and of the prophetic style, see Breasted's *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt*. A very good book on the Hebrew prophets is W. A. C. Allen's *Old Testament Prophets*.

[168] Fletcher H. Swift's *Education in Ancient Israel from Earliest Times to A.D. 70* is an interesting account of the way in which the Jewish religion, because it was a literature-sustained religion, led to the first efforts to provide elementary education for all the children in the community.

[169] Ridgeway's *Early History of Greece* has been used here, and Gilbert Murray's *Rise of the Greek Epic*.

[170] Roger Pocock's *Horses* is a good and readable book on these questions.

[171] This is a little misleading. I may quote from C. D. Buch, *Introduction to the Study of Greek Dialects* (*a*) "The great majority of the dialects play no rôle whatever in literature" (p. 14); (*b*) "In the course of literary development the dialects" (in a mixed and artificial form, *e.g.* the "epic" dialect) "came to be characteristic of certain classes of literature; and their rôle once established, the choice usually depended upon this factor, rather than upon the native dialect of the author." (p. 12.) Speaking generally, each class of literature preserved the dialect of the region where it was first cultivated.

The following work is a most illuminating one on this subject: A. Meillet, *Aperçu d'une Histoire de la Langue Grecque* (Paris, 1913).—H. L. J.

[172] Vowels were less necessary for the expression of a Semitic language. In the early Semitic alphabets only A, I, and U were provided with symbols, but for such a language as Greek, in which many of the inflectional endings are vowels, a variety of vowel signs was indispensable.

[173] See Zimmern's *Greek Commonwealth*, Bury's *History of Greece*, and Barker's *Greek Political Theory*.

[174] "For them the state did not exist." This needs qualification. Cephalus, at whose house the conversation of Plato's *Republic* is placed, was a resident alien. He was a wealthy man in the best society, and taken as a type of the "happy man." His son, Lysias, was a leading orator. Even in the matter of the slaves: the Old Oligarch, in the "Constitution of Athens," complains that the Athenian slaves had no distinctive dress or manners, and so a gentleman could not even push one of them! In the *Republic* itself there is a description of the Democratic State, in which the slaves push you off the pavement. Moreover, even during the Peloponnesian War, there was no persecution of aliens and no expulsion of aliens from Athens. They were evidently a loyal and contented class. True, in time of food shortage, the claims of everybody to true citizenship were scrutinized more and more closely; but that was unavoidable.—G. M.

[175] I do not agree with “hereditary barristers” or “fee-hunting.” The Athenian dicasts were not barristers, but judges: they sat in panels (sometimes a panel of some hundreds) and judged. They had to be paid for attendance as judges (don’t we pay jurymen?) because it took them away from their work as potters, dyers, and stone-masons. Pay was a genuine and good democratic institution; it was just what made possible the ordinary citizen’s co-operation in the life of the state, and stopped its business from being the perquisite of the rich. I feel strongly that the text is unjust to Athens.—E. B.

See Zimmern’s *Greek Commonwealth*, and Barker’s *Greek Political Theory*, pp. 29-30.

[176] From ostrakon, a tile; the voter wrote the name on a tile or shell.

[177] 776 B.C. is the year of the First Olympiad, a valuable starting-point in Greek chronology.

[178] It is, at least, doubtful whether any change of climate expelled either lion or elephant from southeast Europe and Asia Minor; the cause of their gradual disappearance was—I think—nothing but Man, increasingly well armed for the chase. Lions lingered in the Balkan peninsula till about the fourth century B.C., if not later. Elephants had perhaps disappeared from western Asia by the eighth century B.C. The lion (much bigger than the existing form) stayed on in southern Germany till the Neolithic period. The panther inhabited Greece, southern Italy, and southern Spain likewise till the beginning of the historical period (say 1000 B.C.).—H. H. J.

[179] But a thousand years earlier the Hittites seem to have had paved high roads running across their country.

[180] But cp. Bury’s *History of Greece*, ch. vi., § 5.

[181] Winckler, in Helmolt’s *Universal History*.

[182] See in relation to this chapter, Zimmern’s *Greek Commonwealth*. A very handy book for the student in this section is Abbott’s *Skeleton Outline of Greek History*.

[183] *Ancient Greek Literature*, by Gilbert Murray (Heinemann, 1911).

[184] *Plutarch*.

[185] For an account of his views, see Burnet’s *Early Greek Philosophy*. Gomperz, *Greek Thinkers* is also a good book for this section.

[186] “But it was not only against the lives, properties, and liberties of Athenian citizens that the Thirty made war. They were not less solicitous to extinguish the

intellectual force and education of the city, a project so perfectly in harmony both with the sentiment and practice of Sparta, that they counted on the support of their foreign allies. Among the ordinances which they promulgated was one, expressly forbidding any one 'to teach the art of words.' The edict of the Thirty was, in fact, a general suppression of the higher class of teachers or professors, above the rank of the elementary (teacher of letters or) grammatist. If such an edict could have been maintained in force for a generation, combined with the other mandates of the Thirty—the city out of which Sophocles and Euripides had just died, and in which Plato and Isocrates were in vigorous age, would have been degraded to the intellectual level of the meanest community in Greece. It was not uncommon for a Grecian despot to suppress all those assemblies wherein youths came together for the purpose of common training, either intellectual or gymnastic, as well as the public banquets and clubs or associations, as being dangerous to his authority, tending to elevation of courage, and to a consciousness of political rights among the citizens."—Grote's *History of Greece*.

[187] A very good and useful account of this great literature for the reader who is not a classical student is Norwood's *Greek Tragedy*.

[188] Mahaffy.

[189] There is not a single sentence in praise of Alexander, no dedication, no compliments, in all Aristotle. On the other hand, he never mentions Demosthenes nor quotes him in the Rhetoric.—G. M.

[190] Wheeler.

[191] Bauer, in *Vom Griechentum zum Christentum*, says that Alexander sent a mission of exploration to Abyssinia to enable Aristotle to settle the question of the cause of the Nile inundations (melting of mountain snows), and that he also had tropical flora and other material collected for him—E. B.

[192] *Ancient Greek Literature.*

[193] Jung in his *Psychology of the Unconscious* is very good in his chapter I on the differences between ancient (pre-Athenian) thought and modern thought. The former he calls Undirected Thinking, the latter Directed Thinking. The former was a thinking in images, akin to dreaming; the latter a thinking in words. Science is an organization of directed thinking. The Antique spirit (before the Greek thinkers, *i.e.*) created not science but mythology. The ancient human world was a world of subjective fantasies like the world of children and uneducated young people to-day, and like the world of savages and dreams. Infantile thought and dreams are a re-echo of the prehistoric

and savage. Myths are the mass dreams of peoples, and dreams the myths of individuals. The work of hard and disciplined thinking by means of carefully analyzed words and statements which was begun by the Greek thinkers and resumed by the scholastic philosophers of whom we shall tell in the middle ages, was a necessary preliminary to the development of modern science.

[194] "For the proper administration of justice and for the distribution of authority it is necessary that the citizens be acquainted with each other's characters, so that, where this cannot be, much mischief ensues, both in the use of authority and in the administration of justice; for it is not just to decide arbitrarily, as must be the case with excessive population." Aristotle's *Politics*, quoted by Wheeler, who adds, "Aristotle comes to the conclusion that the natural 'limit to the size of the state must be found in the capability of being easily taken in at a glance.'" But Murray notes that the word Eusunopton means also "capable of being comprehended as a unity"—a very different and wider idea.

[195] Benjamin Ide Wheeler's *Alexander the Great* and G. D. Hogarth's *Philip and Alexander* have been very useful here.

[196] To the common Athenians, that is. But to many thoughtful Greeks the rôle of Macedonia in their future was a matter of earnest speculation. Herodotus (viii. 137) tells a long story of a prophecy by which the inheritance of Perdiccas, the ancestor of the Macedonian kings, was to embrace at last the whole round world. This was written a hundred years before Philip and Alexander.

[197] Goldsmith's *History of Greece*. The picturesque disposition of the novelist rather than the austere method of the historian, is apparent here.

[198] But Phocis was treated in the same way by Philip and his friends in 346, and Mantinea by Sparta in 385. It was a regular Greek punishment of a city to break it up into villages; and as for selling into slavery, Callicratidas the Spartan, in the Peloponnesian War, was held to be very noble when he said he would not sell Greeks into slavery. Anyhow, the destruction of Thebes was due to the *Greek* enemies of Thebes, who pressed it on Alexander.—E. B.

[199] Mahaffy. Their names have undergone various changes—*e.g.* Candahar (Iskender) and Secunderabad.

[200] D. G. Hogarth.

[201] The stages by which Bactria degenerated into Afghanistan may be studied neatly in the progressive deterioration of its coinage from a decent standard of Hellenic

accomplishment into the vague flourishes of Orientalism; it began by displaying a Heracles of pure Greek blood and a pair of horsemen who would hardly have seemed out of place on the frieze of the Parthenon, and it fell steadily to a level of incompetence only equalled by the crude imitations of Roman currency that were being made in pre-Roman Britain about the same time.—P. G.

[202] Before that time. But such speculation was going on then. There is some interesting economic theory in Plato's *Republic*, and Aristotle was writing the *œconomica*. Xenophon wrote on Athenian revenues and other economic matters. Thucycides wrote an excellent passage on the Greek past, and Aristotle dealt with barbaric customs.—E. B.

[203] *Vide* Mahaffy's *Greek Life and Thought and his Progress of Hellenism in Alexander's Empire*, Marvin's *Living Past*, Legge's *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity*, and Reinach's *Orpheus*.

[204] The question whether the vivisection of human beings, or, indeed, whether any vivisection at all occurred at Alexandria, is one of considerable importance because of the light it throws upon the moral and intellectual quality of the time. One of the editors of this book was inclined to throw doubt upon it, as a thing antipathetic to the Greek spirit. The writer has taken some pains to find out the facts of the case, and he has been so fortunate as to have the help of Dr. Singer, one of the greatest living authorities upon the history of medicine. There are statements made by Tertullian (*De Anima*, chap. xxv.), but he was a biased and untrustworthy witness. The conclusive passage is taken from Celsus, who wrote during the reign of Tiberius, three centuries after the great days of Alexandria. "If you are to have one witness," writes Dr. Singer, "you could hardly have a better. In my own mind I am satisfied with the evidence of Celsus, and I have asked Dr. E. T. Wittrington, our best authority on Greek medicine, and he also is satisfied."

The following is a translation of the passage in Celsus, *De Re Medica*. One school says that "it is necessary to dissect the bodies of the dead, and to examine their viscera and intestines. Herophilus and Erasistratus adopted by far the best method, for they obtained criminals from prison by royal permission, and dissected them alive, and they examined, while they still breathed, the parts which Nature had concealed, noting their position, warmth (or possibly 'colour'—*colorem* instead of *calorem*), shape, size, relation, hardness, softness, smoothness, and feel; also the projections and depressions of each and how they fit into one another. For if there happen any inward pain, he who has not learned where the viscera and intestines are placed, cannot know where the pain is; nor can the diseased part be cured by one who does

not know what part it is. Again, if the viscera of any one are exposed by a wound, he who is ignorant of the natural colour of that part in the healthy state cannot know whether it be sound or corrupted, and therefore cannot cure the corrupted part. Moreover remedies can be applied more appropriately externally when the position, shape, and size of the internal parts is known, and the same argument holds for all the other matters that we have mentioned. Nor is it a cruel act, as many would have it, to seek remedies for innocent mankind throughout the ages by torture of a few criminals."

Against this view, says Celsus, the other school argues that "to cut open the abdomen and thorax of living men, and thus to turn that art which concerns itself with the health of mankind not only into an instrument of death (*pestem*—lit. 'a plague'), but (death) in its most horrible form, and this although some of the things that we seek thus barbarously can by no means be known, while others may be learned without cruelty. For the colour, smoothness, softness, hardness, and all their like are not the same when the body is cut open as when it is whole; and, moreover, even in bodies that have not been thus ravaged, these properties are often changed by fear, grief, want of food, or of digestion, fatigue and a thousand other lesser causes. It is thus more likely that the inner organs, which are more tender, and to which the light is a new experience, are changed by serious wounds and by mangling.

"Further, nothing can be more foolish than to think that any things are the same in a live man as in a moribund one, or, rather, in one practically dead. It is indeed true that the abdomen, with which our argument is less concerned, can be opened while a man yet lives, but as soon as the knife reaches the thorax (præcordium), and outs the transverse septum, which is a membrane dividing the superior parts from the inferior and called diaphragma by the Greeks, the man at once gives up the ghost, and thus it is the breast and its viscera of a dead and not a living man which the murderous physician examines. He has thus but performed a cruel murder, and has not learned what the viscera of a living man are like."

Celsus' own judgment is given a little later: "To dissect a living body is both cruel and unnecessary; to dissect dead bodies is necessary."

It is to be noted, says Professor Murray, that Herophilus and Erasistratus were not living in a Greek city state, but under an *oriental despot*.

[205] Mahaffy.

[206] It has been suggested that new books were perhaps dictated to a roomful of copyists, and so issued in a first edition of some hundreds at least. In Rome, Horace and Virgil seem to have been issued in quite considerable editions.

[207] See Ferguson's *Hellenistic Athens*.

[208] Serapis sounds like a compound of Apis and Osiris, but there is reason for supposing that the name is really of Chaldean origin. See Cumont, *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism*.

[209] Legge, *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity*.

[210] See for much light on the syncretic religions before Christianity Franz Cumont, *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism*. This is a very able and thoroughly interesting book.

[211] Rhys Davids' *Buddhism* and other writings by him have been our chief guide here.

[212] Pronounced Ashoka.

[213] The *Burmese Chronicle*, quoted by Rhys Davids.

[214] The *Madhurattha Vilasini*, quoted by Rhys Davids.

[215] Rhys Davids, *Buddhism*.

[216] See R.F. Johnston, *Buddhist China*.—L.C.B.

[217] Hue's *Travels in Tartary, Tibet, and China*.

[218] Rhys Davids. He was the son of a king by a low-caste mother.

[219] See Giles, *Confucianism and its Rivals*.

[220] S. N. Fu.

[221] Hirth's *The Ancient History of China*.

[222] The reader will find a footnote to Chap. XXXI, § 8, signed L. C. B., which gives the main differences between the teachings of Confucius and Lao Tse.

[223] See Hue's *Travels in Tartary, Thibet, and China*.

[224] A very convenient handbook for this and the next two chapters is Matheson's *Skeleton Outline of Roman History*.

[225] For Italian pre-history see Modestov's *Introduction à l'histoire Romaine*, and Peet's *Stone and Bronze Age in Italy and Sicily*.

[226] See Lloyd's *Making of the Roman People*.

[227] Latin *Pœni* = Carthaginians. *Punicus (adj.)* = Carthaginian, *i.e.* Phœnician.

[228] See Pelham, *Outlines of Roman History*; Mommsen, *History of Rome*; and the histories of the Roman Empire by Bury, H. Stuart Jones, and W. E. Heitland.

[229] Ferrero, *The Greatness and Decline of Rome*.

[230] J. Wells, *Short History of Rome to the Death of Augustus*.

[231] J. Wells.

[232] But note that Athens had (1) no taxes on foreigners, and inflicted no disabilities on them except absence of citizenship. No "expulsions of aliens" such as were regular at Sparta, and common in most places. This is a frequent Athenian boast. Cp. Thucydides, ii. 39, "Our city is thrown open to the world. We never expel a foreigner or prevent him from seeing and learning anything of which the secret, if revealed, might be useful to an enemy." (2) Practically Free Trade; only a general 5 per cent. import duty. (3) Great interest in foreign places, constitutions, customs, etc. Athens was very oppressive—by modern standards—to its subject-allies; chiefly because there was no representation, and because she was so much at war. But even here, after her defeat in 404, they voluntarily gathered to her again. The second Athenian Empire was not in any way forced upon them.—G. M.

[233] Haverfield says—and I think he is right—that Rome had a great advantage in her imperial development—viz., that she was a city and not a nation. A nation implies some unity of race, and race prejudice. A city is based on the mere fact of citizenship. We should have said to St. Paul: "Citizen or no citizen, you are only a Levantine Jew." But a Roman, apparently, did not think of saying so. Hence the great freedom with which emperors and senators are taken from other races.—G. M.

[234] The point raised here that Rome never developed representation is a very interesting one. There was a golden chance in the Social War (90 B.C.). The allies of Rome (socii) revolted, and set up a counter Rome in Corfinium. Now, to our minds, the obvious thing for them to do was (1) to make Corfinium just a capital; (2) to set up a parliament there, consisting of representatives drawn from the allies, who lived, of course, all over Italy. Not a bit of it. They made Corfinium a city state (not a capital), and feigned themselves all to be citizens of it, meeting in a primary assembly there. They also set up, it is true, a senate of 500; but this was just a copy of the Roman

senate, and not a representative body (see Mommsen, vol. iii. pp. 237-8, Eng. trans.). Under the Roman Empire there were germs of representation in provincial assemblies: see Bury, *Student's Roman Empire*, on the *concilium Lugdunense* in Gaul and τὰ κοιγὰ in Asia Minor.—E. B.

[235] Seyffert's *Dictionary of Classical Antiquities*. (Nettleship Sandys.)

[236] Aristotle, *Politics*, Bk. ii. ch. xi.; and J. Wells, *Rome to the Death of Augustus*.

[237] J. Wells, *op. cit.*

[238] Plutarch, *Life of Cato*.

[239] Mommsen says the other provinces cost as much as they paid.

[240] But it was this Scipio Nasica who was responsible for the killing of Tiberius Gracchus. On the whole, he seems to have been a statesman of very distinguished abilities. He was the means of bringing the Asiatic Great Mother Goddess to Rome. "People at Rome generally were beginning to see that they would have to take over Asia. Had they any right? Nasica was sent on a mission to invite the Magna Mater at Pessinus to come to Rome. Her image nodded 'yes.' She was brought and installed in Rome. Now this is a policy of peaceful assimilation. Just as in Babylon you get gods of other cities brought to Babylon, just as Nabonidus (see Chap. xix. § 6) was trying to get an amicable pantheon as a way of peaceful assimilation, and failing to do so because he did not bring the priesthoods as well as the gods, so Rome was at this time thinking on the same lines. Camillus had shown the way when he suggested the invitation of Juno of Veii to Rome. Now Nasica, it may be suggested, wanted to treat Carthage in the same fashion. He opposed the destruction of Carthage in 146 (Mommsen, iii. p. 23, p. 39). If he had had his way, one may guess, he would have invited the Carthaginian gods to Rome, and the corollary would have been the enfranchisement of the Carthaginian population—the treatment of the Carthaginians as equals, whose gods had been received in Rome, and stood in Rome. Mummius did the same in carrying off the statues of Greek gods to Rome, only, being stupid, he did not understand why (146 B.C.)."

Nasica's visit to Pessinus was as important as the testament of Attalus. His policy is not the policy of Rome the conqueror, but Rome the assimilator. He is trying to get a nexus by a common pantheon. If this had been done, the Republic might have survived. As it was, the deification of the ruler had to provide the nexus, as in Alexander's empire. The "Synœcism of gods" or the "deification of rulers," those are the only ways of amalgamating peoples. It is a pity Alexander and Rome did not attempt the former.—J. L. M. and E. B.

[241] The intervening Scipio was a man of learning and high character who died young.—G. M.

[242] Julius Cæsar (60 B.C.) caused the proceedings of the Senate to be published by having them written up upon bulletin boards, *in albo* (upon the white). It had been the custom to publish the annual edict of the prætor in this fashion. There were professional letter-writers who sent news by special courier to rich country correspondents, and these would copy down the stuff upon the Album (white board). Cicero, while he was governor in Cilicia, got the current news from such a professional correspondent. He complains in one letter that it was not what he wanted; the expert was too full of the chariot races and other sporting intelligence, and failed to give any view of the political situation. Obviously this news-letter system was available only for public men in prosperous circumstances.

[243] Seyffert, *op. cit.*

[244] Authorities differ here. Mayor says thumbs up (to the breast) meant death and thumbs down meant "Lower that sword." The popular persuasion is that thumbs down meant death. Seyffert's *Dict. Class. Antiq.* gives this view. See the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, article "Gladiators."

[245] "A little more needs to be said on this matter. The Greeks cited gladiatorial shows as a reason for regarding the Romans as *Barbaroi*, and there were riots when some Roman proconsul tried to introduce them in Corinth. Among Romans, the better people evidently disliked them, but a sort of shyness prevented them from frankly denouncing them as cruel. For instance, Cicero, when he had to attend the Circus, took his tablets and his secretary with him, and didn't look. He expresses particular disgust at the killing of an elephant; and somebody in Tacitus (Drusus, Ann. 1. 76) was unpopular because he was too fond of gladiatorial bloodshed—"*quamquam vili sanguine nimis gaudens*" ("rejoicing too much in blood, worthless blood though it was"). The games were unhesitatingly condemned by Greek philosophy, and at different times two Cynics and one Christian gave their lives in the arena, protesting against them, before they were abolished.

"I do not think Christianity had any such relation to slavery as is here stated. St. Paul's action in sending back a slave to his master, and his injunction, 'Slaves, obey your masters,' were regularly quoted on the pro-slavery side, down to the nineteenth century; on the other hand, both the popular philosophies and the Mystery religions were against slavery in their whole tendency, and Christianity of course in time became the chief representative of these movements. Probably the best test is the number of slaves who occupied posts of honour in the religious and philosophic

systems, like Epictetus, for instance, or the many slaves who hold offices in the Mithraic Inscriptions. I do not happen to know if any slaves were made Christian bishops, but by analogy I should think it likely that some were. In all the Mystery religions, as soon as you entered the community, and had communion with God, earthly distinctions shrivelled away."—G. M.

The Spirit of Jesus is something different from formal Christianity, which I regard as the vehicle, the largely unsympathetic vehicle, by which that spirit was carried about the world.—H. G. W.

[246] *Greatness and Decline of Rome*, bk. i. ch. xi.

[247] There is no evidence of forgery and no contemporary suggestion of the sort. The bequest of Attalus, even if it was a forgery (Mommsen accepts it, iii. p. 55), is of importance, as showing that a great many people did think that Rome was the best administrator. Otherwise, the story (if it is only a story) could not have caught on. *A priori* there seems good reason for the testament. The Attalid dynasty was "petering out"; there were troublesome Gauls about (Mommsen, iii. p. 53).—J. L. M. and E. B.

[248] Ferrero.

[249] Ferrero.

[250] Plutarch. To which, however, G. M. adds the following note. "It is generally believed that Sulla died through bursting a blood-vessel in a fit of temper. The story of abominable vices seems to be only the regular slander of the Roman mob against anyone who did not live in public."

[251] Plutarch.

[252] The bow was probably the composite bow, so called because it is made of several plates (five or so) of horn, like the springs of a carriage: it discharges a high-speed arrow with a twang. This was the bow the Mongols used. This short composite bow (it was not a long bow) was quite old in human experience. It was the bow of Odysseus; the Assyrians had it in a modified form. It went out in Greece, but it survived as the Mongol bow. It was quite short, very stiff to pull, with a flat trajectory, a remarkable range, and a great noise (cp. Homer's reference to the twang of the bow). It went out in the Mediterranean because the climate was not good for it, and because there were insufficient animals to supply the horn.—J. L. M.

[253] For a good compact account of Cæsar, much more appreciative of him than our text, see Warde Fowler's *Julius Cæsar*.

[254] See Strachan Davidson's *Cicero*, or, better, his own letters to Atticus.

[255] H. S. Jones, in *The Encyclopædia Britannica*, article "Rome." His contribution is admirably verified and exact, and we are greatly indebted to it.

[256] The best book in a compact compass for expanding this chapter is H. Stuart Jones's *The Roman Empire*.

[257] Gibbon.

[258] *Encyclopædia Britannica*, article "Rome."

[259] See *Encyclopædia Britannica*, article "Longinus." The Syrian queen referred to by Gibbon is Zenobia. Longinus was put to death by Aurelian. See ch. xxxii., § 2.

[260] The natural result of a plutocratic rule above was a vigorous trade-unionism intent only on short hours and high wages below, and as indifferent as the rich to the common weal. See Hubbard's *Fate of Empires*, a very stimulating book, differing widely in its spirit and conclusions from those of the writer.

[261] See Legge, *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity*.

[262] No really good, full, and popular descriptive history, with maps and illustrations, of early and medieval China, nor of the Mongol (Hun) and Turkish peoples, seems to exist in the English language. The writer has consulted Skrine and Ross's *Heart of Asia*, Hirth's *Ancient History of China*, S. Wells Williams' *History of China*, *A Thousand Years of the Tartars*, by E. H. Parker, H. H. Howorth's History of the Mongols, and has found much useful material scattered through Ratzel and Helmolt. He has later on made a useful section from Watters' translation and commentary upon the *Travels of Yuan Chwang*, supplemented by the *Life of Yuan Chwang*, edited by L. Cranmer Byng. Yule's edition of Marco Polo has also been a very inspiring source of material.

[263] E. H. Parker, *A Thousand Years of the Tartars*.

[264] Even in eastern Turkestan there are still strong evidences of Nordic blood in the physiognomy of the people. See Ella and Percy Sykes, *Through Deserts and Oases of Central Asia*.

[265] See Roger Pocock, *Horses*, a very interesting and picturesque little book.

[266] *The History of Mankind*, book v., C.

[267] *The History of Mankind*, book v., C.

[268] See *Migrations*, by Flinders Petrie, the 1906 Huxley Lecture of the Royal Anthrop. Institute.

[269] E. B.

[270] In Helmolt's *History of the World*.

[271] E. B. disagrees with this view. He regards it as the pro-Teutonic view of the German historians.

[272] Gibbon.

[273] Gibbon.

[274] The spread and the vitality of the place-name "Rome" were even greater than the vogue of the title "Cæsar." All the countries which had formed part of the Eastern and Western divisions of the Roman Empire (excepting the ephemeral extension of Roman rule over Mesopotamia) were known to the Saracens, the Arabs, the Berbers as "Rum," and their peoples as "Rumis," "Rumas." And this name was applied without, in all cases, carrying with it the signification of "Christian" or "Christendom." Thus the Spanish Moors were, and their descendants are, styled by the Moroccan Moors and the Algerians and Tunisians: "Rumas." When expelled from Spain most of them took service under the Sharifian Emperors of Morocco, and brought with them a European knowledge of fire-arms. Thus you are told in Algeria that "Romans" (*i.e.* Spanish Moors) conquered the Upper Niger basin for Morocco in the seventeenth century; their descendants remain there till to-day between Jenné and Timbuktu, still known to the French as "Roumas." Some Spanish Moors even penetrated to the coast of eastern equatorial Africa and carried the name of "Rome" into the fierce expulsion of the Portuguese from those parts which was begun by the Omani Arabs.—H. H. J.

[275] Josephus.

[276] See *Encyclopædia Biblica*; article "Jesus."

[277] Matt. xii. 46-50.

[278] Mark x. 17-25.

[279] Mark. vii. 1-9.

[280] Mark xii. 13-17.

[281] Mark x. 35-45.

[282] For the connexion of Jesus with the Messiah idea, see E. F. Scott's *Kingdom of the Messiah*.

[283] Hirth, *The Ancient History of China*. Chap. viii.

[284] "St. Paul understood what most Christians never realize, namely, that the Gospel of Christ is not a religion, but religion itself in its most universal and deepest significance."—Dean Inge in *Outspoken Essays*.

[285] Authorities vary considerably upon this date, and upon most of the dates of the life of Jesus. See *Encyclopædia Biblica*, art. "Chronology."

[286] See *Judaism and St. Paul*, by C. G. Montefiore, for some interesting speculations on the religion of Paul before his conversion. See also the very interesting paper on St. Paul in Dean Inge's *Outspoken Essays* already quoted in a footnote. An excellent book widely divergent from the opinions expressed in the text is W. Morgan's *Religion and Theology of St. Paul*.

[287] Paul's Greek is very good. He is affected by the philosophical jargon of the Hellenistic schools and by that of Stoicism. But his mastery of sublime language is amazing.—G. M.

[288] The spirit of Jesus, the animating spirit of Christianity, which breathes through the gospels, was flatly opposed both to private property and slavery, but the attitude of the Christians was never so definite. Generally they ameliorated rather than abolished.—H. G. W.

Patristic theory justified slavery as a result of the Fall. See Carlyle, *Medieval Political Theory in the West*.—E. B.

[289] Serapis was a synthesis of Osiris and Apis.

[290] See Legge, *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity*, chap. xii. See also Cumont's *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* for a very clear account of the gradual development of Roman Paganism into a religion very similar to Christianity *pari passu* with the development of Christianity.

[291] Cp. Father Hugh Benson's account of the procession of the Host in his book *Lourdes*.

[292] In any prayer book of the Episcopalian Church. The Athanasian Creed embodies the view of Athanasius, but probably was not composed by him.

[293] Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chap. xvi.

[294] Here, from another point of view, are some remarks upon the acceptance of Christianity by the empire. Let us remember that the Church, an object so familiar to us, was to the decent Roman a very strange thing. It was a vast society for mutual help, quite outside the state and the recognized corporations; it was secret (hence the frequent inquisitions and the praise given by Church historians to those who "confessed Christ"); it drew its main strength from a class "not well thought of by the police, the proletariat of the big manufacturing towns of Syria and the Levant, like Antioch." Alternately proscribed and connived at, much subjected to pogroms, it gradually increased in strength. Diocletian summoned his two associated Cæsars to a conference on the subject, and they decided to crush the society by a drastic persecution. They persecuted and failed, and Diocletian resigned. Constantine the Great, the next claimant to the empire, made terms with the society and succeeded. He established it as official, and overcame its hatred of Rome by showering wealth and power on it. Eventually, when in fear of death, he got baptized. All modern analogies are fallacious, but if you imagine a blend of pacifist international socialists with some mystical Indian sect, drawing its supporters mainly from an oppressed and ill-liked foreign proletariat, such as the "hunkey" population of some big American towns, full of the noblest moral professions but at the same time alien, or even hostile, to the whole established order of society, I think you will get the sort of impression that the Christian society made on a Roman. The conception of the blameless and saintly Early Christian is, I think, hugely romance. Of course, like most religious reformers, they were in the main seekers after righteousness and above the average of their contemporaries. Also the Christian writers are apt to have more life and vision than their conventional or reactionary Pagan contemporaries. But consider the appalling accusations made by all the Christian sects against each other, and the furious denunciation of the turbulent Christian monastics by Augustine. Also consider what a spirit lies behind the Book of Revelation! Read especially Chapters 17-19, a series of elaborate and horrific curses upon Rome (including repeated threats of its destruction by fire, which the Christians were believed to have attempted), or the end of Chapter 14 where the ministers of the Son of Man tread the winepress of the world till the blood comes "even to the bridles of the horses." If we found such a book now circulating in India, with England taking the place of Rome, I fear there would be some shooting and hanging. The fact that the Christians actually prayed for the destruction of the whole world by fire seemed to the average non-Christian evidence of almost maniacal wickedness.

I do not of course write to blame the Revelationist; such visions of hatred are the natural outcome of persecution and great suffering. I am merely trying to make

intelligible the dislike and even dread of the Christians which seems to have been commonly felt. (See also Seek, *Untergang der Antiken Welt*, vol. 3, esp. the notes.)—G.M.

[295] q.v., *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chap. xiv.

[296] On the rise of dogma or tradition in the Church, especially at Rome, see Davis, *Mediæval Europe* (Home University Library).—E. B.

[297] *Encyclopædia Britannica*, art. "Church History," p. 336.

[298] E. B. (quoted from Tröltsch).

[299] See Haverfield. *The Romanization of Roman Britain*.—E. B.

[300] No literature! I demur entirely. Apuleius, Ammianus, St. Augustine, the Vulgate, Claudian, Sidonius Apollinaris, Ausonius—I mention but a few names—are not these literature?—E. B.

I forgot the *Golden Ass* and St. Augustine as coming into the Imperial period, but do these two names save the situation? E. B. ekes out with one second-rate historian, a translation, three court poets. Yet we are dealing here with the literature of a "world" empire.—H. G. W.

[301] A very interesting and suggestive book bearing on this question of disease in relation to political history is *Malaria: a Neglected Factor in the History of Greece and Rome*, by W. H. S. Jones.

[302] Baring Gould's *Lives of the Saints*.

[303] On Benedictinism, see Dom. Berlière's *L'Ordre Monastique*.—E. B.

[304] See Holmes' *Justinian and Theodora*.—E. B.

[305] Great importance is attached to this task by historians, including one of the editors of this history. We are told that the essential contribution of Rome to the inheritance of mankind is the idea of society founded on law, and that this exploit of Justinian was the crown of the gift. The writer is ill-equipped to estimate the peculiar value of Roman legalism to mankind. Existing law seems to him to be based upon a confused foundation of conventions, arbitrary assumptions, and working fictions about human relationship, and to be a very impracticable and antiquated system indeed; he is persuaded that a time will come when the whole theory and practice of law will be recast in the light of a well-developed science of social psychology in accordance with a scientific conception of human society as one developing

organization and in definite relationship to a system of moral and intellectual education. He contemplates the law and lawyers of to-day with a temperamental lack of appreciation. This may have made him negligent of Justinian and unjust to Rome as a whole.

[306] *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chap. xxiii.

[307] Turanians from Turkestan or Avars from the Caucasus.

[308] There is a good account of Mithraism in C. Bigg's *The Church's Task in the Roman Empire*.—E. B.

[309] Julian was not so much a Mithraist as a syncretist. See Alice Gardner, *Julian the Apostate*.—E. B.

[310] The Ephthalites on the Oxus produced a coinage in silver and copper consisting of three denominations: heavy silver, light silver, and copper. Thirteen specimens are known to survive, the light silver denomination being represented by two specimens in the British Museum and one at Petrograd, until I was fortunate enough to add two to their number by a *trouvaille* in Oxford Street.—P. G.

Our illustration shows one of these two coins. It may have been struck in India in some state under Ephthalite dominion. Its interest for us lies in the figure it gives of a Hun horseman. He seems to wear a feather head-dress, reminding one of a Red Indian or a Moscow hotel porter, and his leg gear suggests an American cow-boy. Note his great quiver of arrows.—H. G. W.

[311] I am greatly indebted to Mr. S. N. Fu and to Mr. Duyvendak for much information and criticism upon the matter of this and the next section. They have both been rewritten since the appearance of the *Outline* in parts.

[312] There were girl slaves who did domestic work and women who were bought and sold.—J.J.L.D.

[313] It is doubtful if the Chinese knew of the mariner's compass. Hirth, *Ancient History of China*, p. 126 sqq. comes to the conclusion, after a careful examination of all data, that, although it is probable something like the compass was known in high antiquity, the knowledge of it was lost for a long time afterwards, until, in the Middle Ages, it reappears as an instrument in the hands of geomancers (people who selected favourable sites for graves, etc). The earliest unmistakable mention of its use as a guide to mariners occurs in a work of the 12th century and refers to its use on foreign ships trading between China and Sumatra. Hirth is rather inclined to assume that Arab travellers may have seen it in the hands of Chinese geomancers and applied its use to

navigation, so that it was afterwards brought back by them to China as the “mariner’s compass.”—J. J. L. D.

[314] Helmolt.

[315] The reason for the stationariness of China goes, we think, deeper than a script. China has formed a social-economic system which (1) cannot be transplanted, and (2) cannot be changed without tremendous effort. She lives by agriculture—rice-growing. (There is some tea among the foot hills, but it has to grow *with* rice to support the population.) Towns exist—on the edge of the rice-fields, for their needs. The town is dependent on the country, not, as elsewhere, country on town. There are small properties; all the hands are wanted, and can be absorbed, in old ancestral agricultural jobs. A state of small peasants, tilling, tilling, tilling, has no source of initiative towards change. If coal is to be mined in the future, and China industrialized, then a society that has not fundamentally changed for thousands of years may be changed. China is like an Egypt or Sumeria, so big that the nomads—those terrible agents of change—beat on its mass in vain. What the nomads have not done, modern industrialism may do.—J. L. M. and E. B.

Both Mr. Chen and Mr. Fu lay considerable stress upon the institution of the patriarchal Chinese family clan, which retains its sons at home, marrying them at an early age before they achieve economic independence, as a retarding influence upon Chinese progress. Mr. Chen and Mr. Duyvendak are also inclined to lay stress upon the paralyzing effect of the classical examinations upon the Chinese mind. These examinations have subdued or rejected all innovating intelligences. Mr. Duyvendak also points out that J. L. M. and E. B. have overlooked the fact that rice is grown only in South China.

L. C. B. disagrees with J. L. M. and E. B. in his analysis of the Chinese problem. His sympathies are with the south; with the philosophy of Lao Tse. He writes as follows:—

“In order to answer the question—why China achieved so much under the T’ang, Sung, and Ming dynasties, and thereafter failed to achieve more, it is necessary to consider what were the principal factors of culture and progress under these dynasties, and how they came to be extinguished.

“From the earliest times there have always been two widely differing types of Chinese mind—the Northern or Confucian, and the Southern or Taoist. As Mr. Okakura has pointed out, the Yangtse-Kiang and the Hwang-Ho rivers are respectively, from the point of view of thought and culture, the Mediterranean and the Baltic of China. Taoism was the idealism of the south, Confucianism the practice of the north. Both

stood for adjustment; but the adjustment of Confucius was the adjustment of the individual in his social and ceremonial relations to others, while that of Lao Tse was the adjustment of the individual soul in its relation to the Infinite. The history of China is bound up with the struggle of those two forces, culminating in the practically complete defeat of Taoism after centuries of ebb and flow. Chu Hsi, A.D. 1130-1200, was the later St. Paul of modern Confucianism. During the T'ang, Sung, and Ming dynasties China was temporarily united, and free play was allowed to the thought of both schools. Each played its part and each reacted upon the other, to the great benefit of the Empire. Yet both systems carried within them the seeds of decay. Taoism, divorced from the affairs of everyday life and the education of the people, lost itself in art, literature, and mythology. Confucianism added layer after layer of hard shell about the inert organism of social life. The end was finally reached in 1421 under the Mings with the transference of the capital from Nanking to Peking, and the dominance of the Confucian party who had brought it about. Only in the later Ming period does the great solitary figure of Wang Yang Ming arise. His central doctrine that thought and learning are of small value unless translated into action had little immediate effect in China, but it fell upon Japanese soil, quickened the drooping Samurai spirit, and reached maturity with the Russo-Japanese war and the advance of modern Japan.

"The imprisonment of the Chinese mind in the ancient script is merely one aspect of Confucianism in its bondage to the past. The statement of J. L. M. and E. B. that China is a nation of peasants is incomprehensible to me. There has always been a great urban industrialism and a great commerce. 'The Chinese,' as Dyer Ball says, 'are pre-eminently a trading race.... Nor has the trade of China been simply a modern affair. From remote antiquity the Chinese have been true to their commercial instincts, and have not only been the civilizers of Eastern Asia, supplying them with their letters and literature' [and artistic products], 'but they have also provided for their more material wants, and received in exchange the commodities which they required from the neighbouring nations.' Trade with India was developed to a great extent in the ninth century A.D."

This interesting question is also discussed very ably and interestingly in Hubbard's *The Fate of Empires*.

In discussing §§ 7 and 8, Mr. S. N. Fu has pointed out that little or nothing is said in this Outline of the period of confusion before Shi-Hwang-ti. It was an age of political division indeed, but of very great intellectual initiatives. Unhappily there exists as yet little or no material in Europe available for the purposes of this history, upon this equivalent to the Athenian period of mental vigour in Europe.

[316] See Watters' *Travels of Yuan Chwang* and Beal's *Life of Hiuen Tsiang* (= Yuan Chwang).

[317] There is some little doubt about this identification. See Watters.

[318] The *British Encyclopædia* article (Hsuan Tsang) is full and good on his Indian travels.

[319] See Margoliouth's *Mahommedanism* and his *Life of Mahomet*.—E. B.

[320] Should be spelt Mădina and Măkka.—H. H. J.

[321] Mark Sykes.

[322] Should be spelt and pronounced Hijra.—H. H. J.

[323] From the year of this flight (= Hegira) from Mecca through the desert to Medina, the Moslem world dates its era. The Moslem year is a year of twelve lunar months (354 days), and is therefore shorter than the year of Western chronology by eleven days. A.H. (the Moslem reckoning) gains a year on A.D. once in every 33 years (about). A.D. 1920 is A.H. 1338 until September 15, when A.H. 1339 begins. A.D. 20,526 and A.H. 20,526 will be partly coincident.

[324] Published by the *Islamic Review*.

[325] But Schurtz, in Helmolt's *History of the World*, says that the private life of the gallant Khalid was a scandal to the faithful. He committed adultery, a serious offence in a world of polygamy.

[326] At Ctesiphon.

[327] Paraphrased from Schurtz in Helmolt's *History of the World*.

[328] Mark Sykes.

[329] St. John's Gospel, chap. i. 1.

[330] Thus Sykes. But Skrine and Ross say only that seventy members of the Omayyad family were invited to a feast under promise of amnesty, and then massacred by the attendants. Gibbon gives eighty victims, and tells his story thus: "Four score of the Omayyads, who had yielded to the faith or clemency of their foes, were invited to a banquet at Damascus. The laws of hospitality were violated by a promiscuous massacre; the board was spread over their fallen bodies; and the festivity of their guests were enlivened by the music of their dying groans." History is not yet an exact science.

[331] Harun-ar-Rashid = Aaron the Just.—H. H. J.

[332] *The Caliph's Last Heritage*.

[333] *A General History of Europe*.

[334] Alcohol as "spirits of wine" was known to Pliny (100 A.D.) The studentof the history of science should consult Campbell Brown's *History of Chemistry* and check these statements in the text.

[335] *Encyclopædia Britannica*, article "Feudalism," by Professor G. B. Adams.

[336] The Franks differed from the Swabians and South Germans, and came much nearer the Anglo-Saxons in that they spoke a "Low German" and not a "High German" dialect. Their language resembled plattdeutsch and Anglo-Saxon, and was the direct parent of Dutch and Flemish. In fact, the Franks where they were not Latinized became Flemings and "Dutchmen" of South Holland (North Holland is still Friesisch—*i.e.* Anglo-Saxon). The "French" which the Latinized Franks and Burgundians spoke in the seventh to the tenth centuries was remarkably like the Rumansch language of Switzerland, judging from the vestiges that remain in old documents.—H. H. J.

[337] *A General History of Europe*, Thatcher and Schwill.

[338] N. B.—Vik-ings, not Vi-kings. Vik = a fiord or inlet.

[339] *Vide* Stubbs' *History of Germany in the Middle Ages*, and Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire*.

[340] The Lateran was the earlier palace of the Popes in Rome. Later they occupied the Vatican.

[341] Eginhard's *Life of Karl the Great*. (Glaister.)

[342] The addition was discreetly opposed by Leo III. "In the correspondence between them the Pope assumes the liberality of a statesman and the prince descends to the prejudice and passions of a priest."—Gibbon, chap. lx.

[343] The Byzantine style in Gaul is, I fancy, much earlier than Charlemagne, and goes back to the 4th century or earlier. See Rivoira's *History of Lombard Architecture*, or T. G. Jackson's *History of Gothic Architecture*.—E. B.

[344] See L. Brechier, *L'Eglise et l'Orient au Moyen Age*.

[345] Gibbon mentions a second Theodora, the sister of Marozia.

[346] This period is a tangled one. The authority is Gregorovius, *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages* (an excellent general book from A.D. 400 to 1527), vol. iii of the Eng. trans., p. 249 seq. John X owed the tiara to his mistress, the elder Theodora, but he was "the foremost statesman of his age" (Gregorovius, p. 259). He fell in 928 owing to Marozia. John XI became Pope in 931 (after two Popes had intervened in the period 928-931); he was Marozia's son, possibly by Pope Sergius III. John XII did not come at once after John XI, who died in 936; there were several Popes in between; and he became Pope in 955.—E. B.

[347] There were three dynasties of emperors in the early Middle Ages:

Saxon: Otto I (962) to Henry II, ending 1024.

Salian: Conrad II to Henry V, ending about 1125.

Hohenstaufen: Conrad III to Frederic II, ending in 1250.

The Hohenstaufens were Swabian in origin. Then came the Habsburgs with Rudolph I in 1273, who lasted until 1918.

[348] These dates are from Gibbon. Beazley gives 865, 904-7, 935, 944, 971-2. (*History of Russia*, Clarendon Press.)

[349] "A Turkish people whose leaders had adopted Judaism," says Harold Williams.

[350] For the development of the papacy, see H. W. C. Davis, *Mediæval Europe*.

[351] E. Barker, art. "Crusades," *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

[352] Technically only twice, the excommunication of 1245 was a renewal by Innocent IV of that of 1239.—E. B.

[353] "The custody of the *True Cross*, which on Easter Sunday was solemnly exposed to the people, was entrusted to the Bishop of Jerusalem; and he alone might gratify the curious devotion of the pilgrims, by the gift of small pieces, which they encased in gold or gems, and carried away in triumph to their respective countries. But, as this gainful branch of commerce must soon have been annihilated, it was found convenient to suppose that the marvellous wood possessed a secret power of vegetation, and that its substance, though continually diminished, still remained entire and unimpaired."—Gibbon.

[354] The Popes inhabited the palace of the Lateran until 1305, when a French Pope set up the papal court at Avignon. When the Pope returned to Rome in 1377 the Lateran was almost in ruins, and the palace of the Vatican became the seat of the

papal court. It was, among other advantages, much nearer to the papal stronghold, the Castle of San Angelo.

[355] He was crowned emperor in 1220 by Honorius III, the successor of Innocent.

[356] Some authorities deny his authorship of this letter. See A. L. Smith's *Church and State in the Middle Ages*.

[357] Perhaps parchment, rather than leather. Such promises on parchment were also used by the Carthaginians. Was Frederick's money an inheritance from an old tradition living on in Sicily since Carthaginian times?—E. B.

[358] *Encyclopædia Britannica*, art. "Frederick II."

[359] In relation to this section, see the chapter on the "Unity of the Middle Ages" in F. S. Marvin's *Unity of Western Civilization*.

[360] See Paul Sabatier's *Vie de S. Francois d'Assise* (English trans. by Houghton).

[361] *Encyclopædia Britannica*, art. "Dominic."

[362] J. H. Robinson.

[363] Sir Mark Sykes, *The Caliphs' Last Heritage*.

[364] Sir Mark Sykes, *The Caliphs' Last Heritage*.

[365] But see Pastor, *History of the Popes*, Vol. I.

[366] See Beazley, Forbes and Birkett's *Russia* for a fuller account of the Cossacks and also see later chap. xxxvi, § 10.

[367] See Malleson's *Akbar*, in the *Rulers of India* series.

[368] "Mogul" is our crude rendering of the Arabic spelling Mughal, which itself was a corruption of Mongol, the Arabic alphabet having no symbol for *ng*.—H. H. J.

[369] Dr. Schmit in Helmolt's *History of the World*.

[370] I do not think this is fair. See *Edinburgh Review* for January, 1920, article on Calcutta University Commission.—E. B.

But popular education!—H. G. W.

[371] Renascence here means rebirth, and it is applied to the recovery of the entire Western world. It is not to be confused with "the Renaissance," an educational, literary, and artistic revival that went on in Italy and the Western world affected by Italy

during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The Renaissance was only a part of the Renascence of Europe. The Renaissance was a revival due to the exhumation of classical art and learning; it was but one factor in the very much larger and more complicated resurrection of European capacity and vigour, with which we are dealing in this chapter.

[372] The early Frankish and other German kings were not elective. They were hereditary; but as there was no primogeniture, there was either partition among the sons, or a struggle to decide which son or relative should succeed. In such a struggle the nobles might take part, and this might mean some form of election. But heredity is the thing: *reges ex nobilitate sumunt*, says Tacitus: the king must have the nobility of being Woden-born, or he cannot be king. The genealogies of our early Saxon kings all go back to Woden, and George V is Woden-born.—E. B.

[373] But the Jews were already holding their community together by systematic education at least as early as the beginning of the Christian era.

[374] The Greeks had this idea.—E. B.

[375] I do not think this is just. The Anglo-Saxons were not anti-monastic. They were converted by Benedictine monks in 600; just after 700 they sent out monks to convert Germany; about 960, under Dunstan and Edgar, they experienced a monastic revival. The Normans after 1066 introduced the Cluniac and Cistercian orders, and spread monasticism, while the earlier Northmen, after 900, were quite favourable to the Church in England.

Note that Gregory's imposition of celibacy on the clergy was accepted, and willingly accepted, by the contemporary lay world. William the Conqueror, through Archbishop Lanfranc, enforced celibacy in England.—E. B.

[376] Wycliffe believed in a real presence—but he held that it was spiritual and not substantial. The host was two things—bread, and at the same time a spiritual Christ. This is not the "memorial" view.—E. B.

[377] Lützow's *Bohemia*.

[378] Dr. C. O. Stallybrass says that this plague reached China thirty or forty years after its first appearance in Europe. Ibn Batuta, the Arab traveller, who was in China from 1342 to 1346, first met with it on his return to Damascus. The Black Death is the human form of a disease endemic among the jerboas and other small rodents in the districts round the head of the Caspian Sea.

[379] The seeds of conflict which grew up into the Peasants' Revolt of 1381 were sown upon ground which is strangely familiar to any writer in 1920. A European catastrophe had reduced production and consequently increased the earnings of workers and traders. Rural wages had risen by 48 per cent in England, when an unwise executive endeavored to enforce in the Ordinance and Statute of Labourers (1350-51) a return to the pre-plague wages and prices of 1346, and aimed a blow in the Statute of 1378 against labour combinations. The villeins were driven to desperation by the loss of their recent increase of comfort, and the outbreak came, as Froissart saw it from the angle of the Court, "all through the too great comfort of the commonalty." Other ingredients which entered into the outbreak were the resentment felt by the new working class at the restrictions imposed on its right to combine, the objection of the lower clergy to papal taxes, and a frank dislike of foreigners and landlords. There was no touch of Wycliffe's influence in the rising. It was at its feeblest in Leicestershire, and it murdered one of the only other Liberal churchmen in England.—P. G.

[380] See article "Typography" in the *Encyclo. Brit*.

[381] Standard Italian dates from Dante (1300); standard English from Chaucer and Wycliffe (1380); standard German from Luther (1520).—E. B.

[382] But Nonconformity was stamped out in Germany. See § 11 B of this chapter.

[383] "If I were writing a history of democracy," comments E. B., "I should deal first with democracy in religion, which is Calvinism, founded by a great Frenchman at Geneva, and then with democracy in politics, which is the French Revolution, inaugurated by another great Frenchman at Geneva, Rousseau. (The parallel of these two is striking—both typical exponents of the French genius, in its ardent logic and its apostolic fervour which gives in a burning lava to the world the findings of its logic.) It is noticeable in England how democracy in religion (Presbyterianism, which is simply Calvinism, plus Independency or Congregationalism) leads straight under the Stuarts to the English democratic ideas of the seventeenth century. I do not think the democratic element in Protestantism is sufficiently appreciated in the text. Even Luther, in the early days of 1520, could write *The Freedom of a Christian Man* and champion the priesthood of each believer and his direct access to his Maker. Luther, it is true, changed by 1525, and became a monarchist, the apostle of a state religion, under a godly prince who was *summus episcopus*. Anglicanism was from the first a monarchist religion, under a Henry VIII who was *supremum caput*. But if Lutheranism became, and Anglicanism was from the first, a religion of the State, Calvinism was always the religion of resistance to the State—in Holland and in Scotland most especially. The Reformation thus produced two opposite effects in politics; so far as it

was Lutheran and Anglican it was monarchist; so far as it was Calvinistic, it was democratic. It is at first sight curious, but it is really quite natural, that the Catholics of the counter-reformation should also have been democratic. The Catholics could not admit the control of the monarch in the sphere of religion any more than the Calvinist; and here, as in other things (*e.g.* in the claim to possession of infallible truth), the Catholic priest and the Calvinistic presbyter were agreed. Filmer, an exponent of Anglican monarchism, expresses this well when he says, in speaking of the doctrine of a social contract, that 'Cardinal Bellarmine and Calvin both look asquint this way.' For the doctrine of a social contract was the democratic doctrine put forward by Catholics and Calvinists in opposition to the Lutheran and Anglican doctrine of divine right."

[384] Aristotle's *Organon*, or logic, had always been in part known to the West and was known as a whole after about 1130. In the thirteenth century the rest of his writings became known, in two ways. One way was that of direct translation from the Greek into Latin: it was in this way that St. Thomas Aquinas knew the *Ethics* and the *Politics* (the latter translated about 1260 by William of Moerbeke, Archbishop of Corinth in the Latin Empire of Constantinople started under Baldwin of Flanders in 1204, and a Fleming himself). The other way was that of indirect translation, that is to say, of translations of Arabic paraphrases of, or commentaries on, the works of Aristotle, such as had been made by Averroes and by Avicenna before him. It was Aristotle's *Physics* and (I think) *Metaphysics* that first became known in this way. In this latter way the West received a version of Aristotle which, like Bottom the Weaver, was strangely "translated." Sometimes translations were made direct from Arabic into Latin; sometimes they were made first into Hebrew, and then new translations were made from Hebrew into Latin. As the Arabic version of Aristotle was not always itself direct, but sometimes made from Syriac versions of the Greek, confusion became confounded. The Latin translations of the Arabic Aristotle sometimes contained not translation, but *transliteration* of Arabic words or sentences; and Roger Bacon very naturally objected to their unintelligibility. What is more, Aristotle's views, as well as his words, were transmogrified in the process. But the important thing is that for Aristotle's *Organon*, *Ethics*, and *Politics* there were direct translations from the Greek. (See Sandys' *History of Classical Scholarship* and Renan's *Averroes et l'Averroisme*.)—E. B.

[385] I do not agree with this paragraph. In the first sentence things are alleged about Realism which are not justified. It was the philosophy of the priests and most humane thinkers of the Middle Ages, of St. Anselm and of John Wycliffe. Nor is it true that Realism was the philosophy of the church. It was, in the early Middle Ages; but after

Occam (1330) Nominalism triumphed, and was the philosophy of the church till the Reformation. Luther denounced Nominalism.—E. B.

[386] *Encyclopædia Britannica*, article "Scholasticism."

[387] *The Medieval Mind*, by Henry Osborn Taylor.

[388] This gives a wrong impression about Nominalism, that it was banned in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The contrary is the case. The attempt of 1339 came to nothing; that of 1473 was belated and unsuccessful. Except Wycliffe, there is no considerable thinker of these centuries, so far as I know, who is not Nominalist. The triumph of Nominalism was no unmixed benefit. Its insistence on study of the individual was indeed favourable to natural science; and Harnack says that it led to good work in psychology. But its nescience about Universals led to obscurantism in theology. Wycliffe as a Realist could hold that God acted *secundum rationes exemplares*, by certain and known universal rules; the Nominalists reduced God to inscrutable omnipotence. They went on to add that He could therefore only be known at all by the miraculous intervention of the mass through the priesthood. Their scepticism about Universals thus overleapt itself, and fell on the other side, into obscurantist ecclesiasticism.—E. B.

[389] *Cp.* chap. ii, § 1, towards the end.

[390] See Gregory's *Discovery*, chap. vi.

[391] Not from 1340-1360, under Edward III, but later under Henry V, 1413-1422.—E. B.

Edward had Flemish and Bavarian allies.—H. G. W.

[392] From Dr. Tille in Helmolt's *History of the World*.

[393] Charles Dickens in his *American Notes* mentions swine in Broadway, New York, in the middle nineteenth century.

[394] In these maritime adventures in the eastern Atlantic and the west African coast the Portuguese were preceded in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and early fifteenth centuries by Normans, Catalonians, and Genoese. See Raymond Beazley, *History of Exploration in the Middle Ages*.—H. H. J.

[395] See Guillemard's *Ferdinand Magellan*.

[396] For an interesting account of these American civilizations, see L. Spence, *The Civilization of Ancient Mexico and Myths of Mexico and Peru*.

[397] See Prescott's *History of the Conquest of Mexico* and his *History of the Conquest of Peru*.

[398] See Cunninghame Graham's *A Vanished Arcadia*.

[399] Machiavelli examines the causes of Cæsar's collapse, but he holds that it was due to *fortuna*, against which Cæsar's *virtú* could not prevail.—E. B.

[400] E. B. writes as follows: "I think better of Machiavelli than you do, and especially on two points. (1) He raises a real issue—whether, when a crisis besets the State, the ruler is not bound to abandon the rules of private morality, if by doing so he can preserve the State. If he abandons those rules, he does *wrong*—and Machiavelli admits that—but, at the same time, as the agent and organ of the State, he does *right* by preserving it, so far, at any rate, as it is right that it should be preserved. This is a real issue, which one cannot simply dismiss. *E.g.*, all war is wrong, by the rules of private morality, because it is killing; but it may have a qualified and conditioned rightness if it is necessary to preserve the State, and if the State, as a scheme of good life, ought to be preserved. (2) Machiavelli did believe in the people. He only exalts the *new* prince, who arises to restore order and security in a troubled State. In normal times he believes that the people is a good judge of men: that 'better than many fortresses is not to be hated by the people'; that the trite proverb, 'He who founds himself on the people founds himself on mud,' is untrue, except as applied to demagogues."

[401] But he had a better reason for doing this in the fact that there was no heir to the throne. The Wars of the Roses, a bitter dynastic war, were still very vivid in the minds of English people.—F. H. H.

[402] Prescott's Appendix to Robertson's *History of Charles V.*

[403] Prescott.

[404] It was private *conscience*, rather than private property, that quarrelled with and limited princes. The Puritan Revolution in England (1640-1660) was a puritan revolution—it sprang from the religious motive first and foremost. The economic motive was secondary. The "economic interpretation of history" is always tempting, but men's souls have always mattered more than their pockets. Englishmen fought Charles I for the sake of free consciences rather than for the sake of free pockets. This is a large issue, on which much could be written; but I feel sure that religion came first in our Civil War.—E. B.

I do not agree. Loath as I am to differ from E. B., I can find no evidence of any religious issue as important as the issue of taxation either in the English Civil War or the American War of Independence.—H. G. W.

I did not mention the Americans. I will surrender them to H. G. W.—E. B.

[405] Englishmen did try to control the foreign policy of James I, because it involved questions of religion, and because their primary concern was religious. They wanted foreign policy to be directed to the militant defence of Protestantism. James I, a good internationalist (in his way), and at any rate a lover of peace, wanted to secure European peace by diplomacy—and failed to do so. His parliaments, and all seventeenth-century parliaments, were vitally interested in foreign policy.—E. B.

[406] A very good general history of Great Britain, too little known as yet, is A. D. Innes' *History of the British Nation* (1912).

[407] This is not the same Simon de Montfort as the leader of the crusades against the Albigenses, but his son.

[408] But Sir Joshua Reynolds, Hogarth, Gray, Gibbon, for instance!—G. M. And the golden age of the great cabinet-makers!—P. G.

Exactly! Culture taking refuge in the portraits, libraries, and households of a few rich people. No national culture in the court, nor among the commonalty; a steady decay.—H. G. W.

[409] *Rise of the Dutch Republic*.

[410] See his fragment of autobiography (*The Autobiography of Edward Gibbon*, edited by John Murray).

[411] Frederick the Great of Prussia.

[412] Catherine the Great of Russia.

[413] Louis XVI of France and Charles III of Spain.

[414] Gibbon forgets here that cannon and the fundamentals of modern military method came to Europe with the Mongols.

[415] See for the expansion of the topics of this section, Hammond's *Town Labourer*, *Village Labourer*, and *Skilled Labourer*. These three books are too little known to the general reader. They are not dry-as-dust compilations of statistics, but full of interesting matter and delightfully well written.

[416] “Our present public school system is candidly based on training a dominant master class. But the uprising of the workers and modern conditions are rapidly making the *dominant method* unworkable.... The change in the aim of schools will transform all the organizations and methods of schools, and my belief is that this change will make the new era.”—F. W. Sanderson, Head Master of Oundle, in an address at Leeds, February 16, 1920.

[417] The student who looks up the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, article “Goldsmith,” instead of going to the poem itself, will find some hostile comments thereon which are themselves now literature and history; they were written by Lord Macaulay (1800-59).

[418] Channing’s excellent new *History of the United States* to vol. iv. has been our handbook here.

[419] You are, I think, unjust to Great Britain and her “great power game.” She was not playing that game—or, so far as she was, she was acting against “France” to liberate the colonies from the French menace in the hinterland which alarmed them. Once liberated, they broke loose, somewhat selfishly, refusing to pay the piper, though they had enjoyed, and done much to call, the tune. Great Britain was indeed to blame, not on the “great power” ground, but on the “sovereignty” ground, which made her stickle for the “sovereignty” of the British parliament over colonial legislature. It wasn’t diplomatists, it was lawyers in both countries, who precipitated the struggle of 1776.—E. B.

But see §§ 2 and 3.—H. G. W.

[420] See Channing’s *History of the United States*, vol. ii.

[421] *John Smith’s Travels*.

[422] There is some doubt about the name of Carolina. Channing, in his short history, says it was named in honour of Charles II. Bassett says it was named originally Carolana, in honour of Charles I, in 1629, and kept the name, under the new form of Carolina in honour of Charles II. Fiske, *Old Virginia and Her Neighbors*, vol. i. p. 265, speaks of Carolina, in 1629, as named “either in honour of Charles I or because the name had been given by Huguenots in 1562 in honour of Charles IX of France.” Another authority speaks of the name as used before, and now no doubt retained in honour of the English king; but, according to him, the name had not been used for the country (called, by the French, Florida), but for a fort in it, the arx Carolana. He adds that in 1629 the name Carolana is used, but Carolina appears afterwards, and becomes normal after 1662.—E. B.

[423] From the Spanish word Sabaña = “meadow.”—H. H. J.

[424] See for the fundamental differences of north and south, W. Wilson, *The State*, the historical sections at the beginning of the chapter on the United States Government.—E. B.

[425] An admirable account of negro slavery is to be found in Sir H. H. Johnston’s *The Negro in the New World*.

[426] I disbelieve in this “commercial selfishness” emphasized in the text. Modern American historians, such as Beer, themselves rebut the charge. On the whole, English commercial policy was fair. (1) If the colonists could only export certain “enumerated” commodities to England, the English market was the best, and they were given privileges there; while non-enumerated commodities could be exported anywhere, and even “enumerated” articles were in practice smuggled everywhere. (2) If the colonists had to import from England, it was their best market, and they got “drawbacks” on dutiable goods imported into England from the Continent when they took them out of England; while again in practice they freely smuggled goods from any country to America. (3) The English navigation laws, in the long run, encouraged American shipbuilding; and if some colonial manufactures were stopped in order that they might not compete with English manufactures, the amount of such restriction was slight. On all this, see Sir William Ashley, *Surveys Historic and Economic*, pp. 300 *seqq*.—E. B.

[427] See Tudor’s *Life of James Otis*.

[428] I disagree entirely with this. George, with the bulk of Parliament behind him, was out to insist on the sovereignty of the British Parliament (not of himself) over the colonists. Nor was it the Whig noblemen who opposed him, but Burke (conservatively inclined, and therefore up in arms for the traditional rights of the colonial legislatures) and Chatham (liberally inclined, and therefore up in arms for the principle of “no representation, no taxation”).—E. B.

[429] This again in my view is wrong. The system proposed, I read in an American writer, meant cheaper tea in the colonies. The objection taken by the colonists was legal.—E. B.

[430] I think this gives an erroneous impression that there was no real chance of reconciliation in 1776. There was. And indeed the whole separation was far from inevitable. If the British had (1) recognized the autonomy in each colony of its legislature, and (2) granted to the colonies cabinet government in place of government by governors sent from England, there would have been no schism. By 1839, the time

of Lord Durham's report, the British had learned to make the recognition and the grant; and with greater wisdom they could have made both in 1776. A great statesman in 1776 could have stopped the separation, and made history different. I am inclined to say that nothing is inevitable in history—except that when you don't have good men, you don't get good results. And that was the position under George III and Lord North.—E. B.

[431] The Tripoli Treaty, see Channing, vol. iii. chap. xviii.

[432] Wells, *The Future in America*.

[433] In 1776 Lord Dartmouth wrote that the colonists could not be allowed "to check or discourage a traffic so beneficent to the nation."

[434] A very readable and remarkably well-illustrated book for the general reader upon the French Revolution is Wheeler's *French Revolution*. Carlyle's *French Revolution* has some splendid passages, but it is often unjust and evil-spirited. Madelin's *French Revolution* is a good recent book.

[435] But see Rocquain's *L'Esprit révolutionnaire avant la Révolution*. He traces the growth of a revolutionary spirit in the 18th century, and points to many predictions of a debacle in 18th-century French literature.—E. B.

[436] I disagree utterly and entirely with this view of Rousseau, which is quite unfair to the man who wrote *Du Contrat Social*. (1) He did *not* believe in the "state of nature"; he believed in the State, which had lifted man from being a brute that followed its nose into a reasoning being and a man. (2) He did not write to excuse breakers of the covenant. On the contrary, he wrote to preach the sovereignty of the general will, and he believed in the entire control of the individual by that will. Rousseau has been much misrepresented, and the text follows the misrepresentations. See Vaughan, *The Political Writings of Rousseau*, introduction to *Du Contrat Social*.—E. B.

[437] Article "France," *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

[438] There is a very picturesque account of the storming of the Bastille in Carlyle's *French Revolution*, book v, chap. vi.

[439] Carlyle is at his best on this flight, *French Revolution*, book iv, chaps. iv and v.

[440] Wiriath.

[441] The Declaration of Pillnitz was a diplomatic *démarche* that failed. Great Britain had definitely refused to intervene in favour of the French monarchy, and Austrian statesmanship proposed to save the collective face of European monarchy by a

sounding announcement of sympathy with the French Bourbons, followed by a proviso that unanimity should be secured before intervention was attempted. French opinion (and most historians) concentrated on the announcement and overlooked the proviso.—P.G.

[442] The sour grapes of Champagne spread dysentery in the Prussian army.—P.G.

[443] The intelligence of the French army of the Revolution was largely due to a period of intelligent military thinking and writing which set in among French soldiers after the defeats of the army of Louis XV in the Seven Years War. Napoleon himself was full of traces of this inspiration.—P. G.

[444] I cannot agree that England was ever, at any moment, "a prospective ally" of France. There was a deep divergence of interests; and it is impossible to think of Pitt and the Whig nobles being in any way the allies of the France of 1793.—E. B.

[445] In his article, "French Revolutionary Wars," in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

[446] In the thirteen months before June, 1794, there were 1220 executions; in the following seven weeks there were 1376.—P. G.

[447] Channing, vol. iii. chap. xviii.

[448] Two very useful books have been Holland Rose's *Personality of Napoleon* and his *Life of Napoleon I*. A compact and convenient biography, with good battle maps, is R. M. Johnston's *Napoleon*. Thomas Hardy's great epic-drama, *The Dynasts*, is a magnificent picture of Napoleon's career, historically very exact. It is one of the great stars of English literature, too little known as yet to the general public.

[449] See Mahan's *Life of Nelson*.

[450] Gourgaud quoted by Holland Rose.

[451] The resumption of war was more directly due to the publication in France of the Sebastiani Report, a full account by the staff officer of the ports and strong places of Egypt and Syria. The alarm occasioned by this document hardened the determination of the British government to retain a garrison at Malta in spite of the obligation to evacuate it imposed by the Peace of Amiens.—P. G.

[452] All this is admirably told in Tolstoy's wonderful *War and Peace*.

[453] The best textbook to follow in expanding this chapter is W. A. Phillips' *Confederation of Europe*.

[454] See J. W. Headlam's *Life of Bismarck*.

[455] W. A. Phillips' *Confederation of Europe* is the leading textbook here. H. E. Egerton's *British Foreign Policy in the Nineteenth Century* and L. S. Woolf's *International Government* are very illuminating. See also Thatcher and Schwill's convenient *General History of Europe* and Philip Guedalla's *Partition of Europe; 1715-1815*.

[456] The Dukes of Savoy (ancestors of the present Italian kings) had been astride the Alps, ruling in France and Italy, for centuries; and their strategic position had long given them a European importance. The Dukes of Savoy had been kings since 1713, first as Kings of Sicily, 1713-20, and then (when Sicily was exchanged for Sardinia in 1720) as Kings of Sardinia.—E. B.

[457] An excellent book on the substance of this chapter is F. S. Marvin's *Century of Hope*. Another is R. A. Gregory's *Discovery*. See also Seignobos' *Political History of Contemporary Europe*.

[458] But note Boyle and Sir Wm. Hamilton as conspicuous scientific men who were Irishmen.

[459] It is worth noting that nearly all the great inventors in England during the eighteenth century were working men, that inventions proceeded from the workshop, and not from the laboratory. It is also worth noting that only two of these inventors accumulated fortunes and founded families.—E. B.

[460] Here America led the old world.

[461] In Northumberland and Durham in the early days of coal mining they were so cheaply esteemed that it was unusual to hold inquests on the bodies of men killed in mine disasters.

[462] It is sometimes argued against Marx that the proportion of people who have savings invested has increased in many modern communities. These savings are technically "capital" and their owners "capitalists" to that extent, and this is supposed to contradict the statement of Marx that property concentrates into few and fewer hands. Marx used many of his terms carelessly and chose them ill, and his ideas were better than his words. When he wrote property he meant "property so far as it is power." The small investor has remarkably little power over his invested capital.

[463] See J. H. Noyes, *History of American Socialisms*, and Eastlake, *The Oneida Community*.

[464] See his *A New View of Society, or Essays on the Principles of the Formation of the Human Character*.

[465] See F. Podmore, *Life of Robert Owen*, or his own *Life of Robert Owen, Written by Himself*.

[466] Increases or diminutions of the passive shareholding class would not affect this concentration very materially. A shareholder has very little power over his property.

[467] I find in a book of essays and addresses by Professor Soddy an interesting and compact statement of certain resemblances in spirit between scientific research and modern socialism. I venture to quote a passage here because of its great significance at the present time.

“The immense acquisition,” he says, “to the wealth and resources of mankind which has been the result of the past century of science, should have been the golden opportunity of statesmen and humanitarians and the raw material out of which the sum total of human happiness could have been augmented. Instead, it has but revealed a growing incapacity and failure on the part of the altruist to appreciate the nature and power of the new weapon that science has placed in his hands, and an ever-increasing rapacity and far-sightedness on the part of the egotist to secure it for his own ends.

“For many a decade now, owing primarily and indisputably to the intellectual achievements of a comparative handful of men of communistic and cloisteral habit of thought, a steady shower of material benefits has been raining down upon humanity, and for these benefits men have fought in the traditional manner of the struggle when the fickle sunlight was the sole hazardous income of the world. The strong have fed and grown fat upon a larger and ever larger share of the manna. Initial slight differences of strength and sagacity have become so emphasized by the virile stream that the more successful are becoming monstrously so, and the unsuccessful less and less able to secure a full meal than before the shower began.

“Already it savours of indelicacy and tactlessness to recall that the exploiters of all this wealth are not its creators; that the spirit of acquisitiveness which has ensured success to them, rather than to their immediate neighbours, is the antithesis of the spirit by which the wealth was won.

“Amid all the sneers at the impracticability and visionary character of communist schemes, let it not be forgotten that science is a communism, neither theoretical nor on paper, but actual and in practice. The results of those who labour in the fields of knowledge for its own sake are published freely and pooled in the general stock for the benefit of all. Common ownership of all its acquisitions is the breath of its life. Secrecy or individualism of any kind would destroy its fertility.”

So far Professor Soddy, but let the writer add that there is this point about the scientific world not to be overlooked. Every worker in the latter is a specially educated man, and he is free to leave the communism of science if he thinks fit. This is very different from a communism imposed upon an unprepared mass of people containing large recalcitrant minorities or majorities. A communism sustained by a community of will based on education—an extension, that is, of the communism of scientific research to human affairs generally—is the ideal underlying the political ideas of most intelligent modern men.

[468] We may note a very interesting experiment in wages payment here that has been made by the American Oneida silver company. A committee on which the workers are strongly represented makes a summary week by week of the current prices of staple commodities and common necessities. Week by week it is noted that prices are so much per cent, above the normal figure of January, 1914 (or some such date), which is taken as the standard. On pay-day every worker receives his wages *plus* a percentage representing the higher prices, so that though the actual sums paid vary week by week, the purchasing power of the wages paid remains practically constant. Here, perhaps, we have a germ of a system that may grow to considerable importance. The burthen of rising prices is shifted to the employer, who can take them into account in fixing his prices.

[469] For a closely parallel view of religion to that given here, see that admirable book, *Outspoken Essays*, by Dean Inge, Essays VIII and IX on *St. Paul* and on *Institutionalism and Mysticism*.

[470] *Town Topics*, November 26th, 1919.

[471] Kropotkin's *Mutual Aid* is worth noting here as one of the earliest correctives to these popular misconceptions of Darwinism.—G. M.

[472] Morley's *Life of Gladstone*.

[473] R. A. Gregory's *Discovery*.

[474] The great Oxford school of *Literæ Humaniores*, which means a serious study of Ancient Philosophy and Ancient History, was already thirty years old in Gladstone's time, and was a really serious training in solid philosophy and solid history. It was all the more serious, as every candidate for Honours had to take *two* schools and to offer Mathematics as well as *Literæ Humaniores*. Both Peel (about 1810) and Gladstone (about 1830) took these two schools, and both gained Firsts in both. (This, by the way, is the only true and genuine "double first.") Men with such a training were genuinely and nobly trained for statesmanship.—E. B.

With no knowledge of ethnology, no vision of history as a whole, misconceiving the record of geology, ignorant of the elementary ideas of biological science, of modern political, social, and economic science and modern thought and literature!—H. G. W.

[475] The old classical training had great faults, but not quite those which are here imputed to it. It was the education of an aristocratic leisured class who had not to earn their living. Hence it was (1) entirely idealist and non-utilitarian. It aimed not at fitting people for a paid profession, but at culture and inner development. (2) It depended enormously on *leisure*. The work done in compulsory work-hours was small in range, but severe, almost entirely classics and mathematics. These were intended as a training of the mind and a test of ability, but were not the real field of ambition. That lay in the large amount of time allotted to *free study*. Peel, Gladstone, Macaulay, Hallam, etc., show what was expected of the best men. Literature, modern history, French and Italian, theology and philosophy, and even a good deal of generalised science, were things you read in your free time. Think what Macaulay's "schoolboy" was supposed to know, and reflect that practically none of it was taught in school hours! Some of the best papers on English literature that I ever read were done by a certain sixth form which had, I was told, no time at all given to the subject in the time-table. As the Head Master told me, "A good man was rather laughed at if he did not know Shakespeare and Milton."

This conception of a small hard nucleus of compulsory work, combined with a wide margin of leisure, was very good for the best men, who used their free time in the right way, but left the weak men thoroughly uneducated. The reaction against it came with long hours, wide curriculum, and compulsory games, leaving no leisure either for study or for mischief.

The modern idea that school should teach *all* that a boy ought to know, is educationally disastrous; but it is the natural result of boys coming from uneducated homes. The home, not the school, is the real key to the wider and higher side of education. But this raises large questions.—G. M.

G. M., I submit, has not grasped the modern idea in education. The modern idea of a public school as exemplified in such a case as Oundle does not fill up the time of the boy with prescribed work and games; it leaves large spaces for self-development; but also it provides museums, a good collection of pictures, libraries, and an abundance of good music in addition to the mere "playing fields" of the old type of public school. And it inquires into the use a boy is making of his free energies. The phase of "cram" is over, but the new schools do provide good pasture, show the way thither, and "vet" a boy who displays no appetite. G. M. ignores entirely the clear statement in the text

that Gladstone was a grossly *ignorant* man, and the instances given of the feebleness and worthlessness of the "generalized science" these boys of the old persuasion picked up. So far from the old classical training being the education of an aristocratic class, it was, as G. M. admits within a line or so, the education of a few individuals, the rest of the class remaining barbarians. It may have aimed at culture and inner development, but it missed its aim. Consequently, the bright lads of the Gladstone-Macaulay-Peel type who did not pick up a few enlightened ideas by accident or at home, were quite unable to carry their own class with them; it remained politically boorish. They had to appeal for understanding to classes whose education had been free from "classical" pretentiousness....

These notes submitted to E. B. at this stage provoked him to a warm protest. His sympathies were "heart and soul with G. M.," and Mr. Gladstone, he declared with emphasis, was not an ignorant man. A little more must be said on this question. If the reader realize, what we have been trying to make clear in this history, that human progress is largely mental progress, a clearing and an enlargement of ideas, then he will understand why it is that the compiler of this *Outline* has given so much space here to these controversial notes upon the education of Mr. Gladstone. For the education of Mr. Gladstone was typical of that ruling-class education which has dominated British and European affairs, so far as they have been dominated by ideas, up to the present time. It is most significant of the differences and difficulties of our age that the statement, which seemed to the writer a simple statement of an obvious fact, that Mr. Gladstone was a profoundly ignorant man, should have so scandalized two of the editors of this work. No doubt Mr. Gladstone knew much and knew many things, and it is just because he did so and was in many respects the fine flower of the education of his period, that his ignorance is so interesting to us. Many Chinese mandarins knew much and many things—beautifully. And were ignorant men. Mr. Gladstone's was not the ignorance of deficiency, but the ignorance of excess, a copious ignorance; it was not a failure to know this or that particular fact, an ignorance excusable enough, but a profound and sought-after and established ignorance of reality, so that he did not grasp the bearing of definite facts presented to him or of far-reaching ideas put before him, upon the great issues with which he was concerned. He lived, as it were, in a luminous and blinding cloud. That cloud, which I call his ignorance, my two editors call his wonderful and abounding culture. It was a culture that wrapped about and adorned the great goddess Reality. But indeed he is not to be adorned but stripped. She ceases to be herself or to bless her votary unless she is faced stark and faced fearlessly.—H. G. W.

[476] The impression made on me, an old Gladstonian, by Gladstone's politics, was mainly twofold. (1) A strong assertion that politics were (as Aristotle said) a development of ethics, and concerned with discovering and doing what is Right, not what is convenient or profitable to any particular class or nation. (2) A strong subconscious suggestion that the highest education and culture and knowledge were useful for politics, which was in fact a very high practical art, demanding the highest qualities. Hence largely the horror we had of Dizzy. (3) A general sanguine conviction that Honesty was the best policy; that what was right would also prove to be ultimately the most profitable, so that there was no real conflict.

I do not say that Mr. G. acted consistently up to these principles, or that they could be acted up to; but they formed the milk of the word for most of us.—G. M.

I cannot agree that Gladstone was a prophet of nationalism. He was a prophet of Liberalism, and, as such, a hater of oppression. He protested against Bourbon oppression in Naples or Turkish oppression in Bulgaria or Armenia; but to protest against oppression is not to champion nationalism. Gladstone championed not nationalism, but internationalism; he emphasized the idea that "public right" should control the relations of states. The fine words which Mr. Asquith used to state the British cause in August, 1914, were (unless I am mistaken) an echo of Gladstone's own words. A noble objection to oppression; a noble championing of the rule of public right—these were the staples of Gladstone's prophecy. The pity was that, when it came to the actual handling of foreign affairs (*e.g.* in Egypt about 1884), Gladstone could not translate his ideals into practice.—E. B.

[477] G. B. Stern's *Children of No Man's Land* is a novel of this topic of British nationality in relation to German Jews written with great insight.

[478] The doctrine of nationalities was in reality a legacy of French revolutionary theory. From the men of the First Republic, who found it a useful excuse for a forward foreign policy in the best Richelieu tradition, it passed into the possession of Napoleon, who gave more attention to it at St. Helena than he had ever done at the Tuileries. Thence it came naturally into the political inheritance of Napoleon III, who sacrificed France to his belief in it. Gladstone only got it by a side wind, the theory having drifted into the British tradition by reason of the accident of Canning's anti-interventionist foreign policy during the Spanish-American War of Independence.—P. G.

[479] This is a paradox to which I cannot subscribe. Please put me down as convinced of the opposite.—E. B.

[480] Albert Thomas in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

[481] There were also hopes of an Italian alliance for France, and these, combined with the anti-Prussian direction of Austrian policy, and the Franco-Russian *rapprochement* which had followed the Crimean War, almost justified Napoleon in believing that he would not be left entirely alone.—P. G.

[482] Hence "Jingo" for any rabid patriot.

[483] See *England's Debt to India* by Lajpat Rai for a good statement of India's economic grievance.

[484] Now a French Protectorate.—P. G.

[485] See Putnam Weale's *Indiscreet Letters from Pekin*, a partly fictitious book, but true and vivid in its effects.

[486] With the exception of one wretched Dutch factory on the minute island of Deshima in the harbour of Nagasaki. The Dutch were exposed to almost unendurable indignities. They had no intercourse with any Japanese except the special officials appointed to deal with them.

[487] A new and much more liberal Maltese constitution was promulgated in June, 1920, practically putting Malta on the footing of a self-governing colony.

[488] All intelligent Englishmen or Englishwomen with a vote owe it to the Empire and themselves to read at least one book dealing with India or Egypt from the native point of view. For India, Lajpat Rai's Political Future of India is to be recommended. A compact book running counter to the views in this text, and giving the Church missionary point of view, is the Rev. W. E. S. Holland's Goal of India. William Archer's *India and the Future* is an interesting display of the temperamental clash of a Nordic writer with things Dravidian. It sustains the argument that even the most high-minded Nordic type cannot be trusted to govern other races sympathetically. (See also in that matter Archer's *In Afro-America*.) The Aga Khan's *India in Transition* gives very admirably the views of a liberal Indian gentleman. Sidney Low's *A Vision of India* is still not yet superseded as a picture of India in 1905-6, when the present stir was only brewing.

[489] A very good book for the expansion of this chapter is Stearns Davis' (with Anderson and Tyler) *Armed Peace*, a history of Europe from 1870 to 1914. Even more illuminating is G. P. Gooch's *History of Our Time (1885-1911)*. This is quite a tiny book, but very clear and thorough. It was revised in its present form in February, 1914, so

that its title is misleading; it comes up to 1914. It contains an excellent student's bibliography.

[490] See F. M. Hueffer's able but badly named book, *When Blood is their Argument*. It gives an admirable account of just how the pressure was applied to the teaching organization.

[491] These quotations are from Sir Thomas Barclay's article "Peace" in *The Encyclopædia Britannica*.

[492] St. John Ervine's novel, *Changing Winds*, gives a good account of the mentality of this time.

[493] See the various publications of the Irish Dominion League, St. Stephen's Green, Dublin. A good recent account of Irish ideas is to be found in Lynd's *Ireland a Nation* (1919).

[494] Wilfred Scawen Blunt regards the English remaining in Egypt, when they had pledged themselves to go, as the greatest cause of the troubles that culminated in 1914. To pacify the French over Egypt, England connived at the French occupation of Morocco, which Germany had looked upon as her share of North Africa. Hence Germany's bristling attitude to France, and the *revival* in France of the *revanche* idea, which had died down. See Blunt's *My Diaries*, vol. i, September 30th, 1891.—A. C. W.

[495] It should not be forgotten that Italian action against Turkey was precipitated by the granting of a charter by the Sultan to an Austro-German company or syndicate for the "taking over" of the Tripolitaine: a process which could only have ended by the hoisting of the Imperial German flag on the southern shores of the Mediterranean, opposite Italy. Also, that through Morocco the Germans were attempting to undermine the French position in Algeria and Tunis by supplying the Moroccans with arms and money, and inducing them to attack French rule separately in Western Algeria, and even by way of Saharan oases in Southern Tunis. The writer of this note has actually witnessed this process going on between 1898 and 1911. He asserts that, whether from right or wrong motives, Germany forced France to tackle the thorny problem of Morocco. Either she had to do so or prepare for the evacuation of Algeria. France may have made a few mistakes, but she has conferred enormous benefits on North Africa. Under her control the indigenous population has increased remarkably.—H. H. J.

[496] The general reader who wants some picture in his mind of the recent state of Russia should read Ernest Poole's *The Village*. Pre-revolutionary Russia is admirably sketched in Maurice Baring's *Mainsprings of Russia*, *The Russian People*, and *A Year in*

Russia. A small, very illuminating book on the Russian revolution is M. H. Barber's *A British Nurse in Bolshevik Russia*.

[497] One very good reason for the provisional retention of the Philippines under American control is the certainty that the "Moros," the Muhammadan peoples of Palawan, and the southern islands of the main groups would proceed to conquer the "Christian" Filipinos, and that after a welter of civil war and destruction, Japan or some other outside power would be appealed to to intervene.—H. H. J.

[498] An unfriendly critic might denounce the treaty-making power of the United States, and the machinery by which it operates, as complicated and cumbersome, ill adapted to the complex demands of international intercourse, slow in action and uncertain in outcome. The requirement of a two-thirds rather than a majority vote in the Senate he might criticize not unjustly as a dubious excess of caution.... Believe me, the American people are like for many years to accomplish through this means their compacts with mankind. The checks and balances by which it is surrounded, the free and full debate which it allows, are in their eyes virtues rather than defects. They rejoice in the fact that all engagements which affect their destinies must be spread upon the public records, and that there is not, and there never can be, a secret treaty binding them either in law or in morals. Looking back upon a diplomatic history which is not without its chapters of success, they feel that on the whole the scheme the fathers builded has served the children well. With a conservatism in matters of government as great perhaps as that of any people in the world, they will suffer much inconvenience and run the risk of occasional misunderstanding before they make a change.—J. W. Davis (U. S. A. Ambassador to Britain), *The Treaty Making Power of the United States*. (Oxf. Univ. Brit. Am. Club. Paper No. 1.)

[499] I think his policy was quite clear. He said to Germany, "If you bring on war, you must expect England to support France and Russia." To France and Russia he said: "If you are unreasonable, do not expect England to support you." He thus brought pressure to bear on both sides.—G. M.

An illuminating book on the causes of the war is Lord Loreburn's *How the War Came*.—H. H. J.

[500] Kautsky's report on the origin of the war.

[501] For the common soldier's view of the war there is no better book than *Le Feu* by Barbusse. An illustrated book of great quaintness, beauty, and veracity is André Hellé's *Le Livre des Heures*. No other book recalls so completely the *feel* and effect of the phases of the war. An admirably written and very wise book is Philip

Gibbs' *Realities of War*. Some light upon the peculiar difference of the fighting of the Great War from any previous warfare will be found in McCurdy's *War Neuroses* and Eder's book on the same subject.

[502] "What mainly was wrong with our generalship was the system which put the High Command into the hands of a group of men belonging to the old school of war, unable by reason of their age and traditions to get away from rigid methods, and to become elastic in face of new conditions. Our Staff College had been hopelessly inefficient in its system of training, if I am justified in forming such an opinion from specimens produced by it, who had the brains of canaries and the manners of Potsdam. There was also a close corporation among the officers of the Regular Army, so that they took the lion's share of Staff appointments, thus keeping out brilliant young men of the New Armies, whose brain power, to say the least of it, was on a higher level than that of the Sandhurst standard." Philip Gibbs, *Realities of War*.

[503] "The smart society of G.H.Q. was best seen at the Officers' Club at dinnertime. It was as much like musical comedy as any stage setting of war at the Gaiety. The band played rag-time and light music while the warriors fed, and all these generals and staff officers, with their decorations and Army bands, and polished buttons and crossed swords, were waited upon by little W.A.A.C.s., with the G.H.Q. colours tied up in bows on their hair, and khaki stockings under their short skirts, and fancy aprons. Such a chatter! Such bursts of light-hearted laughter! Such whisperings of secrets, of intrigues, and scandals in high places! Such callous-hearted courage when British soldiers were being blown to bits, gassed, blinded, maimed, and shell-shocked in places that were far, so very far, from G.H.Q."—Phillip Gibbs, *The Realities of War*.

[504] But see Roch, *Mr. Lloyd George and the War*, and Arthur's *Life of Lord Kitchener*.

[505] "The want of an unlimited quantity of high explosives was a fatal bar to our success."—*The Times*, May 14th, 1915.

[506] But compare the British bombardment of Japanese towns noted in Chap. xxxix, § 11. And aeroplane bombs and machine-gun fire have since been used by the British military authorities against Indian village crowds *suspected* of sedition.

[507] *E.g.* in hand grenades.

[508] For the flighty incapacity of the British military authorities in this adventure, see Sir Ian Hamilton's *Gallipoli Diary*. It is only fair to the British commander to add that the incapacity was that of the home authorities to understand his demands for men and material.—P. G.

[509] See Stern, *Tanks 1914-1918*. See also Fuller, *Tanks in the Great War*.

[510] "I found a general opinion among officers and men under the command of the Fifth Army that they had been victims of atrocious staff work, tragic in its consequence. From what I saw of some of the Fifth Army staff officers, I was of the same opinion. Some of these young gentlemen, and some of the elderly officers, were arrogant and supercilious, without revealing any sign of intelligence. If they had wisdom, it was deeply camouflaged by an air of inefficiency. If they had knowledge, they hid it as a secret of their own. General Gough in Flanders, though personally responsible for many tragic happenings, was badly served by some of his subordinates, and battalion officers and divisional staffs raged against the whole of the Fifth Army organization, or lack of organization, with an extreme passion of speech."—Philip Gibbs, *Realities of War*.

[511] A very good account of the state of mind of Paris during and after the war is in W. P. Adams' *Paris Sees it Through*.

[512] *The Times*, December 8th, 1919.

[513] Authorities vary between 250,000 and a million houses.

[514] J. M. Keynes, *op. cit*.

[515] They debauched the currency, *i.e.* and wasted money recklessly.

[516] Mr. Keynes ignores the fortunes made by deliberately cornering and withholding commodities in a time of shortage.

[517] Among the books consulted here, for this and the two following sections, were Dr. Dillon's *Peace Conference*; H. Wilson Harris's *The Peace in the Making* and *President Wilson, his Problems and his Policy*; J. M. Keynes's *Economic Consequences of the Peace*; Weyl's *The End of the War*; Stallybrass's *Society of States*; Brailsford's *A League of Nations*; F. C. Howe's *Why War?* L. S. Woolf's *International Government*; J. A. Hobson's *Towards International Government*; Lowes Dickinson's *The Choice before Us*; Sir Walter Phillimore's *Three Centuries of Treaties*, and C. E. Fayle's *Great Settlement*.

[518] "The Allied Governments," the effective passage ran, "have given careful consideration to the correspondence which has passed between the President of the United States and the German Government. Subject to the qualifications which follow, they declare their readiness to make peace with the Government of Germany on the terms of peace laid down in the President's Address to Congress of January 8th, 1918, and the principles of settlement enunciated in his subsequent Addresses."

(Note transmitted to the German Government by the Allies through the Swiss Minister on November 5th, 1918.)

[519] In his book, *The Peace Conference*.

[520] Dillon.

[521] Dillon. And see his *The Peace Conference*, Chapter III, for instances of the amazing ignorance of various delegates.

[522] See *Clemenceau*, by C. Ducray.

[523] He wrote several novels. They are not very good novels; they incline to sentimental melodrama. *Le Plus Fort* is now available to English readers in a translation under the title of "The Stronger." It is tawdry and dull. A cinematograph version has been shown.

[524] Keynes.

[525] Checked by subsequent comparison with the published article in the *Jour. of the Roy. United Service Institution*, vol. lxv., No. 457, February, 1920.

[526] Cp. Psalm cxxxvi.

[527] Here is another glimpse of the agreeable dreams that fill the contemporary military mind. It is from Fuller's recently published *Tanks in the Great War*. Colonel Fuller does not share that hostility to tanks characteristic of the older type of soldier. In the next war, he tells us: "Fast-moving tanks, equipped with tons of liquid gas ... will cross the frontier and obliterate every living thing in the fields and farms, the villages, and cities of the enemy's country. Whilst life is being swept away around the frontier, fleets of aeroplanes will attack the enemy's great industrial and governing centres. All these attacks will be made, at first, not against the enemy's army ... but against the civil population, in order to compel it to accept the will of the attacker."

For a good, well-balanced account of what modern war really means, see Philip Gibbs, *Realities of War*, already cited in two footnotes to § 8.

[528] A suggestive book here containing a good account of the drift of modern religious thought is G. W. Cooke's *Social Evolution of Religion*.

[529] Compare Basil Thompson, *The Fijians, a Study of the Decay of Custom*; Introduction and opening chapters. This is a fine study of an ancient "heliolithic" culture breaking up under modernization.

Typographical errors corrected by the etext transcriber:

Volume I.

parellel=> parallel {pg 618}

Justianian=> Justinian {pg 618}

Kaniska=> Kanishka {pg 646}

Volume II.

agressive=> aggressive {pg 503}

completer=> complete {pg 527}

Arisona=> Arizona {index}

Vimeiro=> Vimiero {index}