

A Political and Social History of Modern Europe V.1.

Carlton J. H. Hayes

The Project Gutenberg EBook of A Political and Social History of Modern Europe V.1., by Carlton J. H. Hayes

Copyright laws are changing all over the world. Be sure to check the copyright laws for your country before downloading or redistributing this or any other Project Gutenberg eBook.

This header should be the first thing seen when viewing this Project Gutenberg file. Please do not remove it. Do not change or edit the header without written permission.

Please read the "legal small print," and other information about the eBook and Project Gutenberg at the bottom of this file. Included is important information about your specific rights and restrictions in how the file may be used. You can also find out about how to make a donation to Project Gutenberg, and how to get involved.

****Welcome To The World of Free Plain Vanilla Electronic Texts****

****eBooks Readable By Both Humans and By Computers, Since 1971****

*******These eBooks Were Prepared By Thousands of Volunteers!*******

Title: A Political and Social History of Modern Europe V.1.

Author: Carlton J. H. Hayes

Release Date: September, 2004 [EBook #6417]
[Yes, we are more than one year ahead of schedule]
[This file was first posted on December 8, 2002]

Edition: 10

Language: English

Character set encoding: ISO-8859-1

***** START OF THE PROJECT GUTENBERG EBOOK HISTORY OF EUROPE V1 *****

Produced by Anne Soulard, Charles Franks
and the Online Distributed Proofreading Team.

Livros Grátis

<http://www.livrosgratis.com.br>

Milhares de livros grátis para download.

A POLITICAL AND SOCIAL HISTORY OF MODERN EUROPE
VOLUME I
1500-1815

BY CARLTON J. H. HAYES

PREFACE

This book represents an attempt on the part of the author to satisfy a very real need of a textbook which will reach far enough back to afford secure foundations for a college course in modern European history.

The book is a long one, and purposely so. Not only does it undertake to deal with a period at once the most complicated and the most inherently interesting of any in the whole recorded history of mankind, but it aims to impart sufficiently detailed information about the various topics discussed to make the college student feel that he is advanced a grade beyond the student in secondary school. There is too often a tendency to underestimate the intellectual capabilities of the collegian and to feed him so simple and scanty a mental pabulum that he becomes as a child and thinks as a child. Of course the author appreciates the fact that most college instructors of history piece out the elementary textbooks by means of assignments of collateral reading in large standard treatises. All too frequently, however, such assignments, excellent in themselves, leave woeful gaps which a slender elementary manual is inadequate to fill. And the student becomes too painfully aware, for his own educational good, of a chasmal separation between his textbook and his collateral reading. The present manual is designed to supply a narrative of such proportions that the need of additional reading will be somewhat lessened, and at the same time it is provided with critical bibliographies and so arranged as to enable the judicious instructor more easily to make substitutions here and there from other works or to pass over this or that section entirely. Perhaps these considerations will commend to others the judgment of the author in writing a long book.

Nowadays prefaces to textbooks of modern history almost invariably proclaim their writers' intention to stress recent happenings or at least those events of the past which have had a direct bearing upon the present. An examination of the following pages will show that in the case of this book there is no discrepancy between such an intention on the part of the present writer and its achievement. Beginning with the sixteenth century, the story of the civilization of modern Europe is carried down the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries with constant *_crescendo_*. Of the total space devoted to the four hundred years under review, the last century fills half. And the greatest care has been taken to bring the story down to date and to indicate as clearly and calmly as possible the underlying causes of the vast contemporaneous European war, which has already put a new complexion on our old historical knowledge and made everything that went before seem part and parcel of an old régime.

As to why the author has preferred to begin the story of modern Europe with the sixteenth century, rather than with the thirteenth or with the

French Revolution, the reader is specially referred to the _Introduction_. It has seemed to the author that particularly from the Commercial Revolution of the sixteenth century dates the remarkable and steady evolution of that powerful middle class--the bourgeoisie--which has done more than all other classes put together to condition the progress of the several countries of modern Europe and to create the life and thought of the present generation throughout the world. The rise of the bourgeoisie is the great central theme of modern history; it is the great central theme of this book.

Not so very long ago distinguished historians were insisting that the state, as the highest expression of man's social instincts and as the immediate concern of all human beings, is the only fit subject of historical study, and that history, therefore, must be simply "past politics"; under their influence most textbooks became compendiums of data about kings and constitutions, about rebellions and battles. More recently historians of repute, as well as eminent economists, have given their attention and patronage to painstaking investigations of how, apart from state action, man in the past has toiled or traveled or done the other ordinary things of everyday life; and the influence of such scholars has served to provide us with a considerable number of convenient manuals on special phases of social history. Yet more recently several writers of textbooks have endeavored to combine the two tendencies and to present in a single volume both political and social facts, but it must be confessed that sometimes these writers have been content to tell the old political tale in orthodox manner and then to append a chapter or two of social miscellany, whose connection with the body of their book is seldom apparent to the student.

The present volume represents an effort really to combine political and social history in one synthesis: the author, quite convinced of the importance of the view that political activities constitute the most perfect expression of man's social instincts and touch mankind most universally, has not neglected to treat of monarchs and parliaments, of democracy and nationalism; at the same time he has cordially accepted the opinion that political activities are determined largely by economic and social needs and ambitions; and accordingly he has undertaken not only to incorporate at fairly regular intervals such chapters as those on the Commercial Revolution, Society in the Eighteenth Century, the Industrial Revolution, and Social Factors, 1870-1914, but also to show in every part of the narrative the economic aspects of the chief political facts.

Despite the length of this book, critics will undoubtedly note omissions. Confronting the writer of every textbook of history is the eternal problem of selection--the choice of what is most pointedly significant from the sum total of man's thoughts, words, and deeds. It is a matter of personal judgment, and personal judgments are notoriously variant. Certainly there will be critics who will complain of the present author's failure to follow up his suggestions concerning sixteenth-century art and culture with a fuller account of the development of philosophy and literature from the seventeenth to the twentieth century; and the only rejoinders that the harassed author can make are the rather lame ones that a book, to be a book, must conform to the mechanical laws of space and dimension, and that a serious attempt on the part of the present writer to make a synthesis of social and political facts precludes no effort on the part of other and abler writers to synthesize all these facts with the phenomena which are conventionally assigned to the realm of "cultural" or "intellectual"

history. In this, and in all other respects, the author trusts that his particular solution of the vexatious problem of selection will prove as generally acceptable as any.

In the all-important matter of accuracy, the author cannot hope to have escaped all the pitfalls that in a peculiarly broad and crowded field everywhere trip the feet of even the most wary and persistent searchers after truth. He has naturally been forced to rely for the truth of his statements chiefly upon numerous secondary works, of which some acknowledgment is made in the following Note, and upon the kindly criticisms of a number of his colleagues; in some instances, notably in parts of the chapters on the Protestant Revolt, the French Revolution, and developments since 1848 in Great Britain, France, and Germany, he has been able to draw on his own special studies of primary source material, and in certain of these instances he has ventured to dissent from opinions that have been copied unquestioningly from one work to another.

No period of history can be more interesting or illuminating than the period with which this book is concerned, especially now, when a war of tremendous magnitude and meaning is attracting the attention of the whole civilized world and arousing a desire in the minds of all intelligent persons to know something of the past that has produced it. The great basic causes of the present war the author has sought, not in the ambitions of a single power nor in an isolated outrage, but in the history of four hundred years. He has tried to write a book that would be suggestive and informing, not only to the ordinary college student, but to the more mature and thoughtful student of public affairs in the university of the world.

CARLTON J. H. HAYES. AFTON, NEW YORK, May, 1916.

NOTE OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author begs to acknowledge his general indebtedness to a veritable host of historical writers, of whose original researches or secondary compilations he has constantly and almost unblushingly made use in the preparation of this book. At the close of the Introduction will be found a list of the major works dealing with the whole period under review, or with the greater part of it, which have been drawn upon most heavily. And there is hardly a book cited in any of the special bibliographies following the several chapters that has not supplied some single fact or suggestion to the accompanying narrative.

For many of the general ideas set forth in this work as well as for painstaking assistance in reading manuscript and correcting errors of detail, the author confesses his debt to various colleagues in Columbia University and elsewhere. In particular, Professor R. L. Schuyler has helpfully read the chapters on English history; Professor James T. Shotwell, the chapter on the Commercial Revolution; Professor D. S. Muzzey, the chapters on the French Revolution, Napoleon, and Metternich; Professor William R. Shepherd, the chapters on "National Imperialism"; and Professor Edward B. Krehbiel of Leland Stanford Junior University, the chapter on recent international relations. Professor E. F. Humphrey of Trinity College (Connecticut) has given

profitable criticism on the greater part of the text; and Professor Charles A. Beard of Columbia University, Professor Sidney B. Fay of Smith College, and Mr. Edward L. Durfee of Yale University, have read the whole work and suggested several valuable emendations. Three instructors in history at Columbia have been of marked service--Dr. Austin P. Evans, Mr. D. R. Fox, and Mr. Parker T. Moon. The last named devoted the chief part of two summers to the task of preparing notes for several chapters of the book and he has attended the author on the long dreary road of proof reading.

CONTENTS

VOLUME I

PART I

FOUNDATIONS OF MODERN EUROPE

CHAPTER I. THE COUNTRIES OF EUROPE AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

- The New National Monarchies
- The Old Holy Roman Empire
- The City-States
- Northern and Eastern Europe in the year 1500

CHAPTER II. THE COMMERCIAL REVOLUTION

- Agriculture in the Sixteenth Century
- Towns on the Eve of the Commercial Revolution
- Trade Prior to the Commercial Revolution
- The Age of Exploration
- Establishment of Colonial Empires
- Effects of the Commercial Revolution

CHAPTER III. EUROPEAN POLITICS IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

- The Emperor Charles V
- Philip II and the Predominance of Spain

CHAPTER IV. THE PROTESTANT REVOLT AND THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION

- The Catholic Church at the Opening of the Sixteenth Century
- The Protestant Revolt
- Lutheranism
- Calvinism
- Anglicanism
- The Catholic Reformation
- Summary of the Religious Revolution in the Sixteenth Century

CHAPTER V. THE CULTURE OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

- The Invention of Printing
- Humanism
- Art in the Sixteenth Century
- National Literatures in the Sixteenth Century
- Beginnings of Modern Natural Science

PART II

DYNASTIC AND COLONIAL RIVALRY

CHAPTER VI. THE GROWTH OF ABSOLUTISM IN FRANCE AND THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN BOURBONS AND HABSBURGS, 1589-1661

Growth of Absolutism in France: Henry IV, Richelieu, and Mazarin
Struggle between Bourbons and Habsburgs: The Thirty Years' War

CHAPTER VII. THE GROWTH OF ABSOLUTISM IN FRANCE AND THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN BOURBONS AND HABSBURGS, 1661-1743

The Age of Louis XIV
Extension of French Frontiers
The War of the Spanish Succession

CHAPTER VIII. THE TRIUMPH OF PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT IN ENGLAND

Conflicting Political Tendencies in England: Absolutism _versus_
Parliamentarianism
The Puritan Revolution
The Restoration: the Reign of Charles II
The "Glorious Revolution" and the Final Establishment of
Parliamentary Government in Great Britain

CHAPTER IX. THE WORLD CONFLICT OF FRANCE AND GREAT BRITAIN

French and English Colonies in the Seventeenth Century
Preliminary Encounters, 1689-1748
The Triumph of Great Britain: The Seven Years' War, 1756-1763

CHAPTER X. THE REVOLUTION WITHIN THE BRITISH EMPIRE

The British Colonial System in the Eighteenth Century
The War of American Independence, 1775-1783
The Reformation of the British Empire

CHAPTER XI. THE GERMANIES IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

The Holy Roman Empire in Decline
The Habsburg Dominions
The Rise of Prussia. The Hohenzollerns
The Minor German States
The Struggle between Hohenzollerns and Habsburgs

CHAPTER XII. THE RISE OF RUSSIA, AND THE DECLINE OF TURKEY, SWEDEN, AND POLAND

Russia in the Seventeenth Century
Peter the Great
Sweden and the Career of Charles XII
Catherine the Great: the Defeat of Turkey and the Dismemberment of
Poland

PART III

"LIBERTY, EQUALITY, FRATERNITY"

CHAPTER XIII. EUROPEAN SOCIETY IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Agriculture in the Eighteenth Century
Commerce and Industry in the Eighteenth Century
The Privileged Classes
Religious and Ecclesiastical Conditions in the Eighteenth Century
Scientific and Intellectual Developments in the Eighteenth Century

CHAPTER XIV. EUROPEAN GOVERNMENTS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

- The British Monarchy
- The Enlightened Despots
- The French Monarchy

CHAPTER XV. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

- Introductory
- The End of Absolutism in France, 1789
- The End of the Old Regime: the National Constituent Assembly, 1789-1791
- The Limited Monarchy in Operation: the Legislative Assembly (1791-1792) and the Outbreak of Foreign War
- Establishment of the First French Republic: the National Convention, 1792-1795
- The Directory (1795-1799) and the Transformation of the Republic into a Military Dictatorship
- Significance of the French Revolution

CHAPTER XVI. THE ERA OF NAPOLEON

- The French Republic under the Consulate, 1799-1804
- The French Empire and its Territorial Expansion
- Destruction of the French Empire
- Significance of the Era of Napoleon

INTRODUCTION

The story of modern times is but a small fraction of the long epic of human history. If, as seems highly probable, the conservative estimates of recent scientists that mankind has inhabited the earth more than fifty thousand years [Footnote: Professor James Geikie, of the University of Edinburgh, suggests, in his *Antiquity of Man in Europe* (1914), the possible existence of human beings on the earth more than 500,000 years ago!], are accurate, then the bare five hundred years which these volumes pass in review constitute, in time, less than a hundredth part of man's past. Certainly, thousands of years before our day there were empires and kingdoms and city-states, showing considerable advancement in those intellectual pursuits which we call civilization or culture,—that is, in religion, learning, literature, political organization, and business; and such basic institutions as the family, the state, and society go back even further, past our earliest records, until their origins are shrouded in deepest mystery. Despite its brevity, modern history is of supreme importance. Within its comparatively brief limits are set greater changes in human life and action than are to be found in the records of any earlier millennium. While the present is conditioned in part by the deeds and thoughts of our distant forbears who lived thousands of years ago, it has been influenced in a very special way by historical events of the last five hundred years. Let us see how this is true.

Suppose we ask ourselves in what important respects the year 1900 differed from the year 1400. In other words, what are the great distinguishing achievements of modern times? At least six may be noted:

- (1) *Exploration and knowledge of the whole globe*. To our ancestors from time out of mind the civilized world was but the lands adjacent to the Mediterranean and, at most, vague stretches of Persia,

India, and China. Not much over four hundred years ago was America discovered and the globe circumnavigated for the first time, and very recently has the use of steamship, telegraph, and railway served to bind together the uttermost parts of the world, thereby making it relatively smaller, less mysterious, and in culture more unified.

(2) Higher standards of individual efficiency and comfort. The physical welfare of the individual has been promoted to a greater degree, or at all events preached more eloquently, within the last few generations than ever before. This has doubtless been due to changes in the commonplace everyday life of all the people. It must be remembered that in the fifteenth century man did the ordinary things of life in much the same manner as did early Romans or Greeks or Egyptians, and that our present remarkable ways of living, of working, and of traveling are the direct outcome of the Commercial Revolution of the sixteenth century and of the Industrial Revolution of the nineteenth.

(3) Intensification of political organization, with attendant public guarantees of personal liberties. The ideas of nationalism and of democracy are essentially modern in their expression. The notion that people who speak the same language and have a common culture should be organized as an independent state with uniform laws and customs was hardly held prior to the fifteenth century. The national states of England, France, and Spain did not appear unmistakably with their national boundaries, national consciousness, national literature, until the opening of the sixteenth century; and it was long afterwards that in Italy and Germany the national idea supplanted the older notions of world empire or of city-state or of feudalism. The national state has proved everywhere a far more powerful political organization than any other: its functions have steadily increased, now at the expense of feudalism, now at the expense of the church; and such increase has been as constant under industrial democracy of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as under the benevolent despotism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. But in measure as government has enlarged its scope, the governed have worked out and applied protective principles of personal liberties. The Puritan Revolution, the French Revolution, the American Revolution, the uprisings of oppressed populations throughout the nineteenth century, would be quite inexplicable in other than modern times. In fact the whole political history of the last four centuries is in essence a series of compromises between the conflicting results of the modern exaltation of the state and the modern exaltation of the individual.

(4) Replacement of the idea of the necessity of uniformity in a definite faith and religion by toleration of many faiths or even of no faith. A great state religion, professed publicly, and financially supported by all the citizens, has been a distinguishing mark of every earlier age. Whatever else may be thought of the Protestant movement of the sixteenth century, of the rise of deism and skepticism in the seventeenth and eighteenth, and of the existence of scientific rationalism in the nineteenth and twentieth, there can be little doubt that each of them has contributed its share to the prevalence of the idea that religion is essentially a private, not a public, affair and that friendly rivalry in good works is preferable to uniformity in faith.

(5) Diffusion of learning. The invention of printing towards the close of the fifteenth century gradually revolutionized the pursuit of knowledge and created a real democracy of letters. What learning might

have lost in depth through its marvelous broadening has perhaps been compensated for by the application of the keenest minds in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to experimental science and in our own day to applied science.

(6) Spirit of progress and decline of conservatism. For better or for worse the modern man is intellectually more self-reliant than his ancestors, more prone to try new inventions and to profit by new discoveries, more conscious and therefore more critical of conditions about him, more convinced that he lives in a better world than did his fathers, and that his children who come after him should have a better chance than he has had. This is the modern spirit. It is the product of all the other elements of the history of five hundred years--the larger geographical horizon, the greater physical comfort, the revolutionized political institutions, the broader sympathies, the newer ideals of education. Springing thus from events of the past few centuries, the modern spirit nevertheless looks ever forward, not backward. A debtor to the past, it will be doubly creditor to the future. It will determine the type of individual and social betterment through coming centuries. Such an idea is implied in the phrase, "the continuity of history"--the ever-flowing stream of happenings that brings down to us the heritage of past ages and that carries on our richer legacies to generations yet unborn.

From such a conception of the continuity of history, the real significance of our study can be derived. It becomes perfectly clear that if we understand the present we shall be better prepared to face the problems and difficulties of the future. But to understand the present thoroughly, it becomes necessary not only to learn what are its great features and tendencies, but likewise how they have been evolved. Now, as we have already remarked, six most important characteristics of the present day have been developed within the last four or five centuries. To follow the history of this period, therefore, will tend to familiarize us both with present-day conditions and with future needs. This is the genuine justification for the study of the history of modern times.

Modern history may conveniently be defined as that part of history which deals with the origin and evolution of the great distinguishing characteristics of the present. No precise dates can be assigned to modern history as contrasted with what has commonly been called ancient or medieval. In a sense, any division of the historical stream into parts or periods is fundamentally fallacious: for example, inasmuch as the present generation owes to the Greeks of the fourth century before Christ many of its artistic models and philosophical ideas and very few of its political theories, the former might plausibly be embraced in the field of modern history, the latter excluded therefrom. But the problem before us is not so difficult as may seem on first thought. To all intents and purposes the development of the six characteristics that have been noted has taken place within five hundred years. The sixteenth century witnessed the true beginnings of the change in the extensive world discoveries, in the establishment of a recognized European state system, in the rise of Protestantism, and in the quickening of intellectual activity. It is the foundation of modern Europe.

The sixteenth century will therefore be the general subject of Part I of this volume. After reviewing the geography of Europe about the year 1500, we shall take up in turn the four factors of the century

which have had a lasting influence upon us: (1) socially and economically--The Commercial Revolution; (2) politically--European Politics in the Sixteenth Century; (3) religiously and ecclesiastically--The Protestant Revolt; (4) intellectually--The Culture of the Sixteenth Century.

ADDITIONAL READING

THE STUDY OF HISTORY. On historical method: C. V. Langlois and Charles Seignobos, *Introduction to the Study of History*, trans. by G. G. Berry (1912); J. M. Vincent, *Historical Research: an Outline of Theory and Practice* (1911); H. B. George, *Historical Evidence* (1909); F. M. Fling, *Outline of Historical Method* (1899). Different views of history: J. H. Robinson, *The New History* (1912), a collection of stimulating essays; J. T. Shotwell, suggestive article *History* in 11th edition of *Encyclopædia Britannica*; T. B. Macaulay, essay on *History*; Thomas Carlyle, *Heroes and Hero Worship*; Karl Lamprecht, *What is History?* trans. by E. A. Andrews (1905). Also see Henry Johnson, *The Teaching of History* (1915); Eduard Fueter, *Geschichte der neueren Historiographie* (1911); Ernst Bernheim, *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode und der Geschichtsphilosophie*, 5th ed. (1914); G. P. Gooch, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century* (1913).

TEXTBOOKS AND MANUALS OF MODERN HISTORY. J. H. Robinson and C. A. Beard, *The Development of Modern Europe*, 2 vols. (1907), a political and social narrative from the time of Louis XIV, and by the same authors, *Readings in Modern European History*, 2 vols. (1908-1909), an indispensable sourcebook, with critical bibliographies; Ferdinand Schevill, *A Political History of Modern Europe from the Reformation to the Present Day* (1907); T. H. Dyer, *A History of Modern Europe from the Fall of Constantinople*, 3d ed. revised and continued to the end of the nineteenth century by Arthur Hassall, 6 vols. (1901), somewhat antiquated but still valuable for its vast store of political facts; Victor Duruy, *History of Modern Times from the Fall of Constantinople to the French Revolution*, trans. by E. A. Grosvenor (1894), verbose and somewhat uncritical, but usable for French history. More up-to-date series of historical manuals are now appearing or are projected by Henry Holt and Company under the editorship of Professor C. H. Haskins, by The Century Company under Professor G. L. Burr, by Ginn and Company under Professor J. H. Robinson, and by Houghton Mifflin Company under Professor J. T. Shotwell: such of these volumes as have appeared are noted in the appropriate chapter bibliographies following. The Macmillan Company has published *Periods of European History*, 8 vols. (1893-1901), under the editorship of Arthur Hassall, of which the last five volumes treat of political Europe from 1494 to 1899; and a more elementary political series, *Six Ages of European History*, 6 vols. (1910), under the editorship of A. H. Johnson, of which the last three volumes cover the years from 1453 to 1878. Much additional information is obtainable from such popular series as *Story of the Nations* (1886 _sq_.), *Heroes of the Nations* (1890 _sq_.), and *Home University Library*, though the volumes in such series are of very unequal merit. Convenient chronological summaries are: G. P. and G. H. Putnam, *Tabular Views of Universal History* (1914); Carl Ploetz, *Manual of Universal History*, trans. and enlarged by W. H. Tillinghast, new edition (1915); *Haydn's Dictionary of Dates*, 25th ed. (1911); C. E. Little, *Cyclopædia of Classified Dates* (1900); *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. XIII (1911). The best atlas--a vitally necessary adjunct

of historical study--is either that of W. R. Shepherd, *Historical Atlas* (1911), or that of Ramsay Muir, *Hammond's New Historical Atlas for Students*, 2d ed. (1915); a smaller historical atlas is that of E. W. Dow (1907), and longer ones are *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. XIV (1912) and, in German, Putzger, *Historischer Schulatlas*. Elaborate treatises on historical geography: Elisée Reclus, *The Universal Geography*, trans. and ed. by E. G. Ravenstein, 19 vols.; *Nouveau Dictionnaire de Géographie Universelle*, by Vivien de Saint-Martin and Louis Rousselet, 10 vols. See also H. B. George, *The Relations of Geography and History* (1910) and Ellen C. Semple, *The Influence of Geographic Environment* (1911).

STANDARD SECONDARY WORKS AND SETS ON MODERN HISTORY. *The Cambridge Modern History*, 12 vols. and 2 supplementary vols. (1902-1912), planned by Lord Acton, edited by A. W. Ward, G. W. Prothero, and Stanley Leathes, written by English scholars, covering the period from 1450 to 1910, generally sound but rather narrowly political. Better balanced is the monumental work of a group of French scholars, *Histoire générale du IV^e siècle à nos jours*, edited by Ernest Lavisse and Alfred Rambaud, 12 vols. (1894-1901), of which the last nine treat of the years from 1492 to 1900. For social history a series, *Histoire universelle du travail*, 12 vols., is projected under the editorship of Georges Renard. *The Encyclopædia Britannica*, 11th ed. (1910-1911), is the work mainly of distinguished scholars and a storehouse of historical information, political, social, and intellectual. Also available in English is *History of All Nations*, 24 vols. (1902), the first nineteen based on translation of Theodor Flathe, *Allgemeine Weltgeschichte*,--Vols. X-XXIV dealing with modern history,--Vol. XX, on Europe, Asia, and Africa since 1871, by C. M. Andrews, and Vols. XXI-XXIII, on American history, by John Fiske; likewise H. F. Helmolt (editor), *Weltgeschichte*, trans. into English, 8 vols. (1902-1907). Sets and series in German: Wilhelm Oncken (editor), *Allgemeine Geschichte in Einzeldarstellungen*, 50 vols. (1879-1893); *Geschichte der europäischen Staaten*, an enormous collection, appearing more or less constantly from 1829 to the present and edited successively by such famous scholars as A. H. L. Heeren, F. A. Ukert, Wilhelm von Giesebrecht, and Karl Lamprecht; G. von Below and F. Meinecke (editors), *Handbuch der mittel-alterlichen und neueren Geschichte*, a series begun in 1903 and planned, when completed, to comprise 40 vols.; Paul Hinneberg (editor), *Die Kultur der Gegenwart, ihre Entwicklung und ihre Ziele*, a remarkable series begun in 1906 and intended to explain in many volumes the civilization of the twentieth century in all its aspects; Erich Brandenburg (editor), *Bibliothek der Geschichtswissenschaft*, a series recently projected, the first volume appearing in 1912; J. von Pflugk-Hartung, *Weltgeschichte: die Entwicklung der Menschheit in Staat und Gesellschaft, in Kultur und Geistesleben*, 6 vols. illust. (1908-1911); Theodor Lindner, *Weltgeschichte seit der Völkerwanderung*, 8 vols. (1908-1914). Valuable contributions to general modern history occur in such monumental national histories as Karl Lamprecht, *Deutsche Geschichte*, 12 vols. in 16 (1891-1909), and, more particularly, Ernest Lavisse (editor), *Histoire de France depuis les origines jusqu'à la Révolution*, 9 double vols. (1900-1911).

BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARIES. General: *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th ed., 29 vols. (1910-1911); *New International Encyclopedia*, 2d ed., 24 vols. (1914-1916); *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 15 vols. (1907-1912). Great Britain: Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee (editors), *Dictionary of National Biography*, 72 vols. (1885-1913). France: Hoefer (editor),

Nouvelle biographie générale, 46 vols. (1855-1866); _Dictionnaire de biographie française_, projected (1913) under editorship of Louis Didier, Albert Isnard, and Gabriel Ledos. Germany: Liliencron and Wegele (editors), _Allgemeine deutsche Biographie_, 54 vols. (1875 _sq_.). Austria-Hungary: Wurzbach (editor), _Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Oesterreich_, 60 vols. (1856-1891). There is also a well-known French work--L. G. Michaud, _Biographie universelle ancienne et moderne_, 45 vols. (1880).

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Many of the works cited above and most of the works mentioned in the following chapter bibliographies contain convenient bibliographies on special topics. The best general guide to collections of source material and to the organization of historical study and research, though already somewhat out-of-date, is C. V. Langlois, _Manuel de bibliographie historique_, 2 vols. (1901-1904). See also C. M. Andrews, J. M. Gambrill, and Lida Tall, _A Bibliography of History for Schools and Libraries_ (1910); and C. K. Adams, _A Manual of Historical Literature_, 3d ed. (1889). Specifically, for Great Britain: W. P. Courtney, _A Register of National Bibliography_, 3 vols. (1905-1912); S. R. Gardiner and J. B. Mullinger, _Introduction to the Study of English History_, 4th ed. (1903); H. L. Cannon, _Reading References for English History_ (1910); _Bibliography of Modern English History_, now (1916) in preparation under the auspices of English scholars and of the American Historical Association. For German bibliography: Dahlmann-Waitz, _Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte_, 8th ed. (1912); _Jahresberichte der Geschichtswissenschaft_, a valuable annual publication issued under the auspices of the Historical Association of Berlin. For French bibliography: Gabriel Monod, _Bibliographie de l'histoire de France_ (1888), new ed. projected (1910) in 4 vols.; _Manuels de bibliographie historique_ (1907-1916): Part II, 1494-1610, by Henri Hauser, _Part III, 1610-1715_, by Émile Bourgeois and Louis André; _Répertoire méthodique de l'histoire moderne et contemporaine de la France_, an annual publication edited by Brière and Caron. For American bibliography: Edward Channing, A. B. Hart, and F. J. Turner, _Guide to the Study of American History_ (1912). Among important historical periodicals, containing bibliographical notes and book reviews, are, _History Teacher's Magazine_, The American Historical Review, The English Historical Review, Die historische Zeitschrift, Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine, La revue historique, and _La revue des questions historiques_. For periodical literature see _Poole's Index_ (1802-1906) and _Readers' Guide_ (1900 _sq_.). The most famous lists of published books are: _The American Catalogue_ (1876 _sq_.); the _English Catalogue_ (1835 _sq_.); C. G. Kayser, _Bücher-Lexikon_ (1750 _sq_.); Wilhelm Heinsius, _Bücher-Lexikon_ (1700-1892); Otto Lorenz, _Catalogue général de la librairie française_ (1840 _sq_.); and, for general comment, American Library Association, _Index to General Literature_ (1893 _sq_.).

PART I

FOUNDATIONS OF MODERN EUROPE

CHAPTER I

THE COUNTRIES OF EUROPE AT THE OPENING OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

1. THE NEW NATIONAL MONARCHIES

[Sidenote: "National Monarchies" in 1500]

Before we can safely proceed with the story of European development during the past four hundred years, it is necessary to know what were the chief countries that existed at the beginning of our period and what were the distinctive political institutions of each.

A glance at the map of Europe in 1500 will show numerous unfamiliar divisions and names, especially in the central and eastern portions. Only in the extreme west, along the Atlantic seaboard, will the eye detect geographical boundaries which resemble those of the present day. There, England, France, Spain, and Portugal have already taken form. In each one of these countries is a real nation, with a single monarch, and with a distinctive literary language. These four states are the _national_ states of the sixteenth century. They attract our immediate attention.

ENGLAND

[Sidenote: The English Monarchy]

In the year 1500 the English monarchy embraced little more than what on the map is now called "England." It is true that to the west the principality of Wales had been incorporated two hundred years earlier, but the clannish mountaineers and hardy lowlanders of the northern part of the island of Great Britain still preserved the independence of the kingdom of Scotland, while Irish princes and chieftains rendered English occupation of their island extremely precarious beyond the so-called Pale of Dublin which an English king had conquered in the twelfth century. Across the English Channel, on the Continent, the English monarchy retained after 1453, the date of the conclusion of the Hundred Years' War, only the town of Calais out of the many rich French provinces which ever since the time of William the Conqueror (1066-1087) had been a bone of contention between French and English rulers.

While the English monarchy was assuming its geographical form, peculiar national institutions were taking root in the country, and the English language, as a combination of earlier Anglo-Saxon and Norman-French, was being evolved. The Hundred Years' War with France, or rather its outcome, served to exalt the sense of English nationality and English patriotism, and to enable the king to devote his whole attention to the consolidation of his power in the British islands. For several years after the conclusion of peace on the Continent, England was harassed by bloody and confused struggles, known as the Wars of the Roses, between rival claimants to the throne, but at length, in 1485, Henry VII, the first of the Tudor dynasty, secured the crown and ushered in a new era of English history.

[Sidenote: Increase of Royal Power in England under Henry VII]

Henry VII (1485-1509) sought to create what has been termed a "strong monarchy." Traditionally the power of the king had been restricted by a

Parliament, composed of a House of Lords and a House of Commons, and as the former was then far more influential than the latter, supreme political control had rested practically with the king and the members of the upper house--great land-holding nobles and the princes of the church. The Wars of the Roses had two effects which redounded to the advantage of the king: (1) the struggle, being really a contest of two factions of nobles, destroyed many noble families and enabled the crown to seize their estates, thereby lessening the influence of an ancient class; (2) the struggle, being long and disorderly, created in the middle class or "common people" a longing for peace and the conviction that order and security could be maintained only by repression of the nobility and the strengthening of monarchy. Henry took advantage of these circumstances to fix upon his country an absolutism, or one-man power in government, which was to endure throughout the sixteenth century, during the reigns of the four other members of the Tudor family, and, in fact, until a popular revolution in the seventeenth century.

Henry VII repressed disorder with a heavy hand and secured the establishment of an extraordinary court, afterwards called the "Court of Star Chamber," to hear cases, especially those affecting the nobles, which the ordinary courts had not been able to settle. Then, too, he was very economical: the public revenue was increased by means of more careful attention to the cultivation of the crown lands and the collection of feudal dues, fines, benevolences [Footnote: "Benevolences" were sums of money extorted from the people in the guise of gifts. A celebrated minister of Henry VII collected a very large number of "benevolences" for his master. If a man lived economically, it was reasoned he was saving money and could afford a "present" for the king. If, on the contrary, he lived sumptuously, he was evidently wealthy and could likewise afford a "gift."], import and export duties, and past parliamentary grants, while, by means of frugality and a foreign policy of peace, the expenditure was appreciably decreased. Henry VII was thereby freed in large measure from dependence on Parliament for grants of money, and the power of Parliament naturally declined. In fact, Parliament met only five times during his whole reign and only once during the last twelve years, and in all its actions was quite subservient to the royal desires.

[Sidenote: Foreign relations of England under Henry VII]

Henry VII refrained in general from foreign war, but sought by other means to promote the international welfare of his country. He negotiated several treaties by which English traders might buy and sell goods in other countries. One of the most famous of these commercial treaties was the Intercursus Magnus concluded in 1496 with the duke of Burgundy, admitting English goods into the Netherlands. He likewise encouraged English companies of merchants to engage in foreign trade and commissioned the explorations of John Cabot in the New World. Henry increased the prestige of his house by politic marital alliances. He arranged a marriage between the heir to his throne, Arthur, and Catherine, eldest daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella, the Spanish sovereigns. Arthur died a few months after his wedding, but it was arranged that Catherine should remain in England as the bride of the king's second son, who subsequently became Henry VIII. The king's daughter Margaret was married to King James IV of Scotland, thereby paving the way much later for the union of the crowns of England and Scotland.

England in the year 1500 was a real national monarchy, and the power of the king appeared to be distinctly in the ascendant. Parliament was fast becoming a purely formal and perfunctory body.

FRANCE

[Sidenote: The French Monarchy]

By the year 1500 the French monarchy was largely consolidated territorially and politically. It had been a slow and painful process, for long ago in 987, when Hugh Capet came to the throne, the France of his day was hardly more than the neighborhood of Paris, and it had taken five full centuries to unite the petty feudal divisions of the country into the great centralized state which we call France. The Hundred Years' War had finally freed the western duchies and counties from English control. Just before the opening of the sixteenth century the wily and tactful Louis XI (1461-1483) had rounded out French territories: on the east he had occupied the powerful duchy of Burgundy; on the west and on the southeast he had possessed himself of most of the great inheritance of the Angevin branch of his own family, including Anjou, and Provence east of the Rhone; and on the south the French frontier had been carried to the Pyrenees. Finally, Louis's son, Charles VIII (1483-1498), by marrying the heiress of Brittany, had absorbed that western duchy into France.

[Sidenote: Steady Growth of Royal Power in France]

Meanwhile, centralized political institutions had been taking slow but tenacious root in the country. Of course, many local institutions and customs survived in the various states which had been gradually added to France, but the king was now recognized from Flanders to Spain and from the Rhone to the Ocean as the source of law, justice, and order. There was a uniform royal coinage and a standing army under the king's command. The monarchs had struggled valiantly against the disruptive tendencies of feudalism; they had been aided by the commoners or middle class; and the proof of their success was their comparative freedom from political checks. The Estates-General, to which French commoners had been admitted in 1302, resembled in certain externals the English Parliament,—for example, in comprising representatives of the clergy, nobles, and commons,—but it had never had final say in levying taxes or in authorizing expenditures or in trying royal officers. And unlike England, there was in France no live tradition of popular participation in government and no written guarantee of personal liberty.

[Sidenote: Foreign Relations of the French Kings about 1500]

Consolidated at home in territory and in government, Frenchmen began about the year 1500 to be attracted to questions of external policy. By attempting to enforce an inherited claim to the crown of Naples, Charles VIII in 1494 started that career of foreign war and aggrandizement which was to mark the history of France throughout following centuries. His efforts in Italy were far from successful, but his heir, Louis XII (1498-1515), continued to lay claim to Naples and to the duchy of Milan as well. In 1504 Louis was obliged to resign Naples to King Ferdinand of Aragon, in whose family it remained for two centuries, but about Milan continued a conflict, with varying fortunes, ultimately merging into the general struggle between Francis I (1515-1547) and the Emperor Charles V.

France in the year 1500 was a real national monarchy, with the beginnings of a national literature and with a national patriotism centering in the king. It was becoming self-conscious. Like England, France was on the road to one-man power, but unlike England, the way had been marked by no liberal or constitutional mile-posts.

SPAIN AND PORTUGAL

[Sidenote: Development of the Spanish and Portuguese Monarchies]

South of the Pyrenees were the Spanish and Portuguese monarchies, which, in a long process of unification, not only had to contend against the same disuniting tendencies as appeared in France and England, but also had to solve the problem of the existence side by side of two great rival religions--Christianity and Mohammedanism. Mohammedan invaders from Africa had secured political control of nearly the whole peninsula as early as the eighth century, but in course of time there appeared in the northern and western mountains several diminutive Christian states, of which the following may be mentioned: Barcelona, in the northeast, along the Mediterranean; Aragon, occupying the south-central portion of the Pyrenees and extending southward toward the Ebro River; Navarre, at the west of the Pyrenees, reaching northward into what is now France and southward into what is now Spain; Castile, west of Navarre, circling about the town of Burgos; Leon, in the northwestern corner of the peninsula; and Portugal, south of Leon, lying along the Atlantic coast. Little by little these Christian states extended their southern frontiers at the expense of the Mohammedan power and showed some disposition to combine. In the twelfth century Barcelona was united with the kingdom of Aragon, and a hundred years later Castile and Leon were finally joined. Thus, by the close of the thirteenth century, there were three important states in the peninsula --Aragon on the east, Castile in the center, and Portugal on the west-- and two less important states--Christian Navarre in the extreme north, and Mohammedan Granada in the extreme south.

While Portugal acquired its full territorial extension in the peninsula by the year 1263, the unity of modern Spain was delayed until after the marriage of Ferdinand (1479-1516) and Isabella (1474-1504), sovereigns respectively of Aragon and Castile. Granada, the last foothold of the Mohammedans, fell in 1492, and in 1512 Ferdinand acquired that part of the ancient kingdom of Navarre which lay upon the southern slope of the Pyrenees. The peninsula was henceforth divided between the two modern states of Spain and Portugal.

[Sidenote: Portugal a Real National Monarchy in 1500]

Portugal, the older and smaller of the two states, had become a conspicuous member of the family of nations by the year 1500, thanks to a line of able kings and to the remarkable series of foreign discoveries that cluster about the name of Prince Henry the Navigator. Portugal possessed a distinctive language of Latin origin and already cherished a literature of no mean proportions. In harmony with the spirit of the age the monarchy was tending toward absolutism, and the parliament, called the Cortes, which had played an important part in earlier times, ceased to meet regularly after 1521. The Portuguese royal family were closely related to the Castilian line, and there were people in both kingdoms who hoped that one day the whole peninsula

would be united under one sovereign.

[Sidenote: The Spanish Kingdom in 1500]

From several standpoints the Spanish monarchy was less unified in 1500 than England, France, or Portugal. The union of Castile and Aragon was, for over two centuries, hardly more than personal. Each retained its own customs, parliaments (Cortes), and separate administration. Each possessed a distinctive language, although Castilian gradually became the literary "Spanish," while Catalan, the speech of Aragon, was reduced to the position of an inferior. Despite the continuance of excessive pride in local traditions and institutions, the cause of Spanish nationality received great impetus during the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella. It was under them that territorial unity had been obtained. It was they who turned the attention of Spaniards to foreign and colonial enterprises. The year that marked the fall of Granada and the final extinction of Mohammedan power in Spain was likewise signalized by the first voyage of Christopher Columbus, which prefigured the establishment of a greater Spain beyond the seas. On the continent of Europe, Spain speedily acquired a commanding position in international affairs, as the result largely of Ferdinand's ability. The royal house of Aragon had long held claims to the Neapolitan and Sicilian kingdoms and for two hundred years had freely mixed in the politics of Italy. Now, in 1504, Ferdinand definitely secured recognition from France of his rights in Naples, Sicily, and Sardinia. Spain was becoming the rival of Venice for the leadership of the Mediterranean.

[Sidenote: Increase of Royal Power in Spain under Ferdinand and Isabella]

While interfering very little with the forms of representative government in their respective kingdoms, Ferdinand and Isabella worked ever, in fact, toward uniformity and absolutism. They sought to ingratiate themselves with the middle class, to strip the nobility of its political influence, and to enlist the church in their service. The Cortes were more or less regularly convened, but their functions were almost imperceptibly transferred to royal commissions and officers of state. Privileges granted to towns in earlier times were now gradually revoked. The king, by becoming the head of the ancient military orders which had borne prominent part in the struggle against the Mohammedans, easily gained control of considerable treasure and of an effective fighting force. The sovereigns prevailed upon the pope to transfer control of the Inquisition, the medieval ecclesiastical tribunal for the trial of heretics, to the crown, so that the harsh penalties which were to be inflicted for many years upon dissenters from orthodox Christianity were due not only to religious bigotry but likewise to the desire for political uniformity.

In population and in domestic resources Spain was not so important as France, but the exploits of Ferdinand and Isabella, the great wealth which temporarily flowed to her from the colonies, the prestige which long attended her diplomacy and her armies, were to exalt the Spanish monarchy throughout the sixteenth century to a position quite out of keeping with her true importance.

2. THE OLD HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE

[Sidenote: The Idea of an "Empire" Different in 1500 from that of a "National Monarchy"]

The national monarchies of western Europe--England, France, Spain, and Portugal--were political novelties in the year 1500: the idea of uniting the people of similar language and customs under a strongly centralized state had been slowly developing but had not reached fruition much before that date. On the other hand, in central Europe survived in weakness an entirely different kind of state, called an empire. The theory of an empire was a very ancient one--it meant a state which should embrace all peoples of whatsoever race or language, bound together in obedience to a common prince. Such, for example, had been the ideal of the old Roman Empire, under whose Caesars practically the whole civilized world had once been joined, so that the inhabitant of Egypt or Armenia united with the citizen of Britain or Spain in allegiance to the emperor. That empire retained its hold on portions of eastern Europe until its final conquest by the Ottoman Turks in 1453, but a thousand years earlier it had lost control of the West because of external violence and internal weakness. So great, however, was the strength of the idea of an "empire," even in the West, that Charlemagne about the year 800 temporarily united what are now France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Belgium into what he persisted in styling the "Roman Empire." Nearly two centuries later, Otto the Great, a famous prince in Germany, gave other form to the idea, in the "Holy Roman Empire" of which he became emperor. This form endured from 962 to 1806.

[Sidenote: The Holy Roman Empire; Its Mighty Claims in Theory and its Slight Power in Practice]

In theory, the Holy Roman Empire claimed supremacy over all Christian rulers and peoples of central and western Europe, and after the extinction of the eastern empire in 1453 it could insist that it was the sole secular heir to the ancient Roman tradition. But the greatness of the theoretical claim of the Holy Roman Empire was matched only by the insignificance of its practical acceptance. The feudal nobles of western Europe had never recognized it, and the national monarchs, though they might occasionally sport with its honors and titles, never admitted any real dependence upon it of England, France, Portugal, or Spain. In central Europe, it had to struggle against the anarchical tendencies of feudalism, against the rise of powerful and jealous city-states, and against a rival organization, the Catholic Church, which in its temporal affairs was at least as clearly an heir to the Roman tradition as was the Holy Roman Empire. From the eleventh to the thirteenth century the conflict raged, with results important for all concerned,--results which were thoroughly obvious in the year 1500.

[Sidenote: The Holy Roman Empire practically Restricted by 1500 to the Germanies]

In the first place, the Holy Roman Empire was practically restricted to German-speaking peoples. The papacy and the Italian cities had been freed from imperial control, and both the Netherlands--that is, Holland and Belgium--and the Swiss cantons were only nominally connected. Over the Slavic people to the east--Russians, Poles, etc.--or the Scandinavians to the north, the empire had secured comparatively small influence. By the year 1500 the words Empire and Germany had become virtually interchangeable terms.

Secondly, there was throughout central Europe no conspicuous desire for strong centralized national states, such as prevailed in western Europe.

[Sidenote: Internal Weakness of the Holy Roman Empire]

Separatism was the rule. In Italy and in the Netherlands the city-states were the political units. Within the Holy Roman Empire was a vast hodge-podge of city-states, and feudal survivals--arch-duchies, such as Austria; margravates, such as Brandenburg; duchies, like Saxony, Bavaria, and Württemberg; counties like the Palatinate, and a host of free cities, baronies, and domains, some of them smaller than an American township. In all there were over three hundred states which collectively were called "the Germanies" and which were united only by the slender imperial thread. The idea of empire had not only been narrowed to one nation; it also, in its failure to overcome feudalism, had prevented the growth of a real national monarchy.

[Sidenote: Government of the Holy Roman Empire]

What was the nature of this slight tie that nominally held the Germanies together? There was the form of a central government with an emperor to execute laws and a Diet to make them. The emperor was not necessarily hereditary but was chosen by seven "electors," who were the chief princes of the realm. These seven were the archbishops of Mainz (Mayence), of Cologne, and of Trier (Trèves), the king of Bohemia, the duke of Saxony, the margrave of Brandenburg, and the count palatine of the Rhine. Not infrequently the electors used their position to extort concessions from the emperor elect which helped to destroy German unity and to promote the selfish interests of the princes. The imperial Diet was composed of the seven electors, the lesser princes (including the higher ecclesiastical dignitaries, such as bishops and abbots), and representatives of the free cities, grouped in three separate houses. The emperor was not supposed to perform any imperial act without the authorization of the Diet, and petty jealousies between its members or houses often prevented action in the Diet. The individual states, moreover, reserved to themselves the management of most affairs which in western Europe had been surrendered to the central national government. The Diet, and therefore the emperor, was without a treasury or an army, unless the individual states saw fit to act favorably upon its advice and furnish the requested quotas. The Diet resembled far more a congress of diplomats than a legislative body.

[Sidenote: The Habsburgs: Weak as Emperors but Strong as Rulers of Particular States within the Holy Roman Empire]

It will be readily perceived that under these circumstances the emperor as such could have little influence. Yet the fear of impending Slavic or Turkish attacks upon the eastern frontier, or other fears, frequently operated to secure the election of some prince who had sufficiently strong power of his own to stay the attack or remove the fear. In this way, Rudolph, count of Habsburg, had been chosen emperor in 1273, and in his family, with few interruptions, continued the imperial title, not only to 1500 but to the final extinction of the empire in 1806. Several of these Habsburg emperors were influential, but it must always be remembered that they owed their power not to the empire but to their own hereditary states.

Originally lords of a small district in Switzerland, the Habsburgs had

gradually increased their holdings until at length in 1273 Rudolph, the maker of his family's real fortunes, had been chosen Holy Roman Emperor, and three years later had conquered the valuable archduchy of Austria with its capital of Vienna. The family subsequently became related by marriage to reigning families in Hungary and in Italy as well as in Bohemia and other states of the empire. In 1477 the Emperor Maximilian I (1493-1519) married Mary of Burgundy, daughter of Charles the Bold and heiress of the wealthy provinces of the Netherlands; and in 1496 his son Philip was united to Joanna, the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella and heiress of the crowns of Castile and Aragon. The fortunes of the Habsburgs were decidedly auspicious.

[Sidenote: Vain Attempts to "Reform" the Holy Roman Empire]

Of course, signs were not wanting of some national life in the Germanies. Most of the people spoke a common language; a form of national unity existed in the Diet; and many patriots raised their voice in behalf of a stronger and more centralized government. In 1495 a Diet met at the city of Worms to discuss with Emperor Maximilian projects of reform. After protracted debates, it was agreed that private warfare, a survival of feudal days, should be abolished; a perpetual peace should be declared; and an imperial court should be established to settle all disputes between states within the empire. These efforts at reform, like many before and after, were largely unfruitful, and, despite occasional protests, practical disunion prevailed in the Germanies of the sixteenth century, albeit under the high-sounding title of "Holy Roman Empire."

3. THE CITY-STATES

[Sidenote: "City-States" in 1500]

Before the dawn of the Christian era the Greeks and Romans had entertained a general idea of political organization which would seem strange to most of us at the present time. They believed that every city with its outlying country should constitute an independent state, with its own particular law-making and governing bodies, army, coinage, and foreign relations. To them, the idea of an empire was intolerable and the concept of a national state, such as we commonly have to-day, unthinkable.

Now it so happened, as we shall see in the following chapter, that the commerce of the middle ages stimulated the growth of important trading towns in Italy, in Germany, and in the Netherlands. These towns, in one way or another, managed to secure a large measure of self-government, so that by the year 1500 they had become somewhat similar to the city-states of antiquity. In Germany, though they still maintained their local self-government, they were loosely attached to the Holy Roman Empire and were overshadowed in political influence by other states. In the case of Italy and of the Netherlands, however, it is impossible to understand the politics of those countries in the sixteenth century without paying some attention to city-states, which played leading rôles in both.

[Sidenote: Italy in 1500 neither a National Monarchy nor Attached to the Holy Roman Empire]

In the Italy of the year 1500 there was not even the semblance of

national political unity. Despite the ardent longings of many Italian patriots [Footnote: Of such patriots was Machiavelli (see below, p. 194). Machiavelli wrote in *The Prince*: "Our country, left almost without life, still waits to know who it is that is to heal her bruises, to put an end to the devastation and plunder of Lombardy and to the exactions and imposts of Naples and Tuscany, and to stanch those wounds of hers which long neglect has changed into running sores. We see how she prays God to send some one to rescue her from these barbarous cruelties and oppressions. We see too how ready and eager she is to follow any standard, were there only some one to raise it."], and the rise of a common language, which, under such masters as Dante and Petrarch, had become a great medium for literary expression, the people of the peninsula had not built up a national monarchy like those of western Europe nor had they even preserved the form of allegiance to the Holy Roman Empire. This was due to several significant events of earlier times. In the first place, the attempt of the medieval German emperors to gain control of Italy not only had signally failed but had left behind two contending factions throughout the whole country,—one, the Ghibellines, supporting the doctrine of maintaining the traditional connection with the Germanies; the other, the Guelphs, rejecting that doctrine. In the second place, the pope, who exercised extensive political as well as religious power, felt that his ecclesiastical influence would be seriously impaired by the creation of political unity in the country; a strong lay monarch with a solid Italy behind him would in time reduce the sovereign pontiff to a subservient position and diminish the prestige which the head of the church enjoyed in foreign lands; therefore the popes participated actively in the game of Italian politics, always endeavoring to prevent any one state from becoming too powerful. Thirdly, the comparatively early commercial prominence of the Italian towns had stimulated trade rivalries which tended to make each proud of its independence and wealth; and as the cities grew and prospered to an unwonted degree, it became increasingly difficult to join them together. Finally, the riches of the Italians, and the local jealousies and strife, to say nothing of the papal policy, marked the country as natural prey for foreign interference and conquest; and in this way the peninsula became a battleground for Spaniards, Frenchmen, and Germans.

Before reviewing the chief city-states of northern Italy, it will be well to say a word about two other political divisions of the country. The southern third of the peninsula comprised the ancient kingdom of Naples, which had grown up about the city of that name, and which together with the large island of Sicily, was called the kingdom of the Two Sicilies.

[Sidenote: Southern Italy in 1500: the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies]

This state, having been first formed by Scandinavian adventurers in the eleventh century, had successively passed under papal suzerainty, under the domination of the German emperors, and at length in 1266 under French control. A revolt in Sicily in the year 1282, commonly called the Sicilian Vespers, had severed the relation between the island and the mainland, the former passing to the royal family of Aragon, and the latter troublously remaining in French hands until 1442. The reunion of the Two Sicilies at that date under the crown of Aragon served to keep alive the quarrel between the French and the Spanish; and it was not until 1504 that the king of France definitely renounced his Neapolitan claims in favor of Ferdinand of Aragon. Socially and politically Naples was the most backward state in Italy.

[Sidenote: Italy in 1500: the Papal States]

About the city of Rome had grown up in the course of centuries the Papal States, or as they were officially styled, the Patrimony of St. Peter. It had early fallen to the lot of the bishop, as the most important person in the city, to exercise political power over Rome, when barbarian invasions no longer permitted the exercise of authority by Roman emperors; and control over neighboring districts, as well as over the city, had been expressly recognized and conferred upon the bishop by Charlemagne in the eighth century. This bishop of Rome was, of course, the pope; and the pope slowly extended his territories through central Italy from the Tiber to the Adriatic, long using them merely as a bulwark to his religious and ecclesiastical prerogatives. By the year 1500, however, the popes were becoming prone to regard themselves as Italian princes who might normally employ their states as so many pawns in the game of peninsular politics. The policy of the notorious Alexander VI (1492-1503) centered in his desire to establish his son, Cesare Borgia, as an Italian ruler; and Julius II (1503-1513) was famed more for statecraft and military prowess than for religious fervor.

[Sidenote: The City-States of Northern Italy in 1500]

North and west of the Papal States were the various city-states which were so thoroughly distinctive of Italian politics at the opening of the sixteenth century. Although these towns had probably reached a higher plane both of material prosperity and of intellectual culture than was to be found at that time in any other part of Europe, nevertheless they were deeply jealous of each other and carried on an interminable series of petty wars, the brunt of which was borne by professional hired soldiers and freebooters styled condottieri. Among the Italian city-states, the most famous in the year 1500 were Milan, Venice, Genoa, and Florence.

[Sidenote: Italian City-States: Milan Governed by Despots]

Of these cities, Milan was still in theory a ducal fief of the Holy Roman Empire, but had long been in fact the prize of despotic rulers who were descended from two famous families--the Visconti and the Sforza--and who combined the patronage of art with the fine political subtleties of Italian tyrants. The Visconti ruled Milan from the thirteenth century to the middle of the fifteenth, when a Sforza, a leader of condottieri established the supremacy of his own family. In 1499, however, King Louis XII of France, claiming the duchy as heir to the Visconti, seized Milan and held it until he was expelled in 1512 by the Holy League, composed of the pope, Venice, Spain, and England, and a Sforza was temporarily reinstated.

[Sidenote: Venice, a Type of the Commercial and Aristocratic Italian City-States]

As Milan was the type of Italian city ruled by a despot or tyrant, so Venice was a type of the commercial, oligarchical city-states. Venice was by far the most powerful state in the peninsula. Located on the islands and lagoons at the head of the Adriatic, she had profited greatly by the crusades to build up a maritime empire and an enviable trade on the eastern Mediterranean and had extended her sway over rich lands in the northeastern part of Italy. In the year 1500, Venice

boasted 3000 ships, 300,000 sailors, a numerous and veteran army, famous factories of plate glass, silk stuffs, and gold and silver objects, and a singularly strong government. Nominally Venice was a republic, but actually an oligarchy. Political power was intrusted jointly to several agencies: (1) a grand council controlled by the commercial magnates; (2) a centralized committee of ten; (3) an elected doge, or duke; and (4), after 1454, three state inquisitors, henceforth the city's real masters. The inquisitors could pronounce sentence of death, dispose of the public funds, and enact statutes; they maintained a regular spy system; and trial, judgment, and execution were secret. The mouth of the lion of St. Mark received anonymous denunciations, and the waves which passed under the Bridge of Sighs carried away the corpses. To this regime Venice owed an internal peace which contrasted with the endless civil wars of the other Italian cities. Till the final destruction of the state in 1798 Venice knew no political revolution. In foreign affairs, also, Venice possessed considerable influence; she was the first European state to send regular envoys, or ambassadors, to other courts. It seemed in 1500 as if she were particularly wealthy and great, but already had been sowed the seed of her subsequent decline and humiliation. The advance of the Ottoman Turks threatened her position in eastern Europe, although she still held the Morea in Greece, Crete, Cyprus, and many Ionian and Ægean islands. The discovery of America and of a new route to India was destined to shake the very basis of her commercial supremacy. And her unscrupulous policy toward her Italian rivals lost her friends to the west. So great was the enmity against Venice that the formidable League of Cambrai, entered into by the emperor, the pope, France, and Spain in 1508, wrung many concessions from her.

[Sidenote: Genoa]

Second only to Venice in commercial importance, Genoa, in marked contrast with her rival, passed through all manner of political vicissitudes until in 1499 she fell prey to the invasion of King Louis XII of France. Thereafter Genoa remained some years subject to the French, but in 1528 the resolution of an able citizen, Andrea Doria, freed the state from foreign invaders and restored to Genoa her republican institutions.

The famed city-state of Florence may be taken as the best type of the democratic community, controlled by a political leader. The city, as famous for its free institutions as for its art, in the first half of the fifteenth century had come under the tutelage of a family of traders and bankers, the wealthy Medici, who preserved the republican forms, and for a while, under Lorenzo de' Medici (1449-1492), surnamed the Magnificent, made Florence the center of Italian culture and civilization.

[Sidenote: Florence, a Type of the Cultured and Democratic Italian City-State]

Soon after the death of Lorenzo, a democratic reaction took place under an enthusiastic and puritanical monk, Savonarola, who welcomed the advent of the French king, Charles VIII, in 1494, and aided materially in the expulsion of the Medici. Savonarola soon fell a victim to the plots of his Florentine enemies and to the vengeance of the pope, whom Charles VIII had offended, and was put to death in 1498. The democracy managed to survive until 1512 when the Medici returned. The city-state of Florence subsequently became the grand-duchy of Tuscany.

[Sidenote: The Obscure Duchy of Savoy in 1500]

Before we take leave of the Italian states of the year 1500, mention should be made of the insignificant duchy of Savoy, tucked away in the fastnesses of the northwestern Alps, whose duke, after varying fortunes, was to become, in the nineteenth century, king of a united Italy.

[Sidenote: The City-States in the Netherlands]

The city-state was the dominant form of political organization not only in Italy but also in the Netherlands. The Netherlands, or the Low Countries, were seventeen provinces occupying the flat lowlands along the North Sea,—the Holland, Belgium, and northern France of our own day. Most of the inhabitants, Flemings and Dutch, spoke a language akin to German, but in the south the Walloons used a French dialect. At first the provinces had been mere feudal states at the mercy of various warring noblemen, but gradually in the course of the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries, important towns had arisen so wealthy and populous that they were able to wrest charters from the lords. Thus arose a number of municipalities—practically self-governing republics—semi-independent vassals of feudal nobles; and in many cases the early oligarchic systems of municipal government speedily gave way to more democratic institutions. Remarkable in industry and prosperity were Ghent, Bruges, Antwerp, Brussels, Liege, Utrecht, Delft, Rotterdam, and many another.

[Sidenote: Relation of the City-Stats of the Netherlands to the Dukes of Burgundy]

Beginning in 1384 and continuing throughout the fifteenth century, the dukes of Burgundy, who as vassals of the French king had long held the duchy of that name in eastern France, succeeded by marriage, purchase, treachery, or force in bringing one by one the seventeen provinces of the Netherlands under their rule. This extension of dominion on the part of the dukes of Burgundy implied the establishment of a strong monarchical authority, which was supported by the nobility and clergy and opposed by the cities. In 1465 a common parliament, called the States General, was constituted at Brussels, containing deputies from each of the seventeen provinces; and eight years later a grand council was organized with supreme judicial and financial functions. Charles the Bold, who died in 1477, was prevented from constructing a great central kingdom between France and the Germanies only by the shrewdness of his implacable foe, King Louis XI of France. As we have seen, in another connection, Louis seized the duchy of Burgundy on the death of Charles the Bold, thereby extending the eastern frontier of France, but the duke's inheritance in the Netherlands passed to his daughter Mary. In 1477 Mary's marriage with Maximilian of Austria began the long domination of the Netherlands by the house of Habsburg.

Throughout these political changes, the towns of the Netherlands maintained many of their former privileges, and their prosperity steadily increased. The country became the richest in Europe, and the splendor of the ducal court surpassed that of any contemporary sovereign. A permanent memorial of it remains in the celebrated Order of the Golden Fleece, which was instituted by the duke of Burgundy in the fifteenth century and was so named from the English wool, the raw material used in the Flemish looms and the very foundation of the

country's fortunes.

4. NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE IN THE YEAR 1500

[Sidenote: Northern and Eastern Europe of Small Importance in the Sixteenth Century, but of Great Importance Subsequently]

We have now reviewed the states that were to be the main factors in the historical events of the sixteenth century--the national monarchies of England, France, Portugal, and Spain; the Holy Roman Empire of the Germanies; and the city-states of Italy and the Netherlands. It may be well, however, to point out that in northern and eastern Europe other states had already come into existence, which subsequently were to affect in no small degree the history of modern times, such as the Scandinavian kingdoms, the tsardom of Muscovy, the feudal kingdoms of Poland and Hungary, and the empire of the Ottoman Turks.

[Sidenote: Northwestern Europe: the Scandinavian Countries]

In the early homes of those Northmen who had long before ravaged the coasts of England and France and southern Italy and had colonized Iceland and Greenland, were situated in 1500 three kingdoms, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, corresponding generally to the present-day states of those names. The three countries had many racial and social characteristics in common, and they had been politically joined under the king of Denmark by the Union of Calmar in 1397. This union never evoked any popularity among the Swedes, and after a series of revolts and disorders extending over fifty years, Gustavus Vasa (1523-1560) established the independence of Sweden. Norway remained under Danish kings until 1814.

[Sidenote: The Slavs in Central and Eastern Europe]

East of the Scandinavian peninsula and of the German-speaking population of central Europe, spread out like a great fan, are a variety of peoples who possess many common characteristics, including a group of closely related languages, which are called Slavic. These Slavs in the year 1500 included (1) the Russians, (2) the Poles and Lithuanians, (3) the Czechs, or natives of Bohemia, within the confines of the Holy Roman Empire, and (4) various nations in southeastern Europe, such as the Serbs and Bulgars.

[Sidenote: Russia in 1500]

The Russians in 1500 did not possess such a huge autocratic state as they do to-day. They were distributed among several principalities, the chief and center of which was the grand-duchy of Muscovy, with Moscow as its capital. Muscovy's reigning family was of Scandinavian extraction but what civilization and Christianity the principalities possessed had been brought by Greek missionaries from Constantinople. For two centuries, from the middle of the thirteenth to the middle of the fifteenth, the Russians paid tribute to Mongol [Footnote: The Mongols were a people of central Asia, whose famous leader, Jenghiz Khan (1162-1227), established an empire which stretched from the China Sea to the banks of the Dnieper. It was these Mongols who drove the Ottoman Turks from their original Asiatic home and thus precipitated the Turkish invasion of Europe. After the death of Jenghiz Khan the Mongol Empire was broken into a variety of "khanates," all of which in

course of time dwindled away. In the sixteenth century the Mongols north of the Black Sea succumbed to the Turks as well as to the Russians.] khans who had set up an Asiatic despotism north of the Black Sea. The beginnings of Russian greatness are traceable to Ivan III, the Great (1462-1505), [Footnote: Ivan IV (1533-1584), called "The Terrible," a successor of Ivan III, assumed the title of "Tsar" in 1547.] who freed his people from Mongol domination, united the numerous principalities, conquered the important cities of Novgorod and Pskov, and extended his sway as far as the Arctic Ocean and the Ural Mountains. Russia, however, could hardly then be called a modern state, for the political and social life still smacked of Asia rather than of Europe, and the Russian Christianity, having been derived from Constantinople, differed from the Christianity of western Europe. Russia was not to appear as a conspicuous European state until the eighteenth century.

[Sidenote: Poland in 1500]

Southwest of the tsardom of Muscovy and east of the Holy Roman Empire was the kingdom of Poland, to which Lithuanians as well as Poles owed allegiance. Despite wide territories and a succession of able rulers, Poland was a weak monarchy. Lack of natural boundaries made national defense difficult. Civil war between the two peoples who composed the state and foreign war with the neighboring Germans worked havoc and distress. An obstructive parliament of great lords rendered effective administration impossible. The nobles possessed the property and controlled politics; in their hands the king gradually became a puppet. Poland seemed committed to feudal society and feudal government at the very time when the countries of western Europe were ridding themselves of such checks upon the free growth of centralized national states.

[Sidenote: Hungary in 1500]

Somewhat similar to Poland in its feudal propensities was the kingdom of Hungary, which an invasion of Asiatic tribesmen [Footnote: Hungarians, or Magyars--different names for the same people.] in the tenth century had driven like a wedge between the Slavs of the Balkan peninsula and those of the north Poles and Russians. At first, the efforts of such kings as St. Stephen (997-1038) promised the development of a great state, but the weakness of the sovereigns in the thirteenth century, the infiltration of western feudalism, and the endless civil discords brought to the front a powerful and predatory class of barons who ultimately overshadowed the throne. The brilliant reign of Matthias Hunyadi (1458-1490) was but an exception to the general rule. Not only were the kings obliged to struggle against the nobles for their very existence--the crown was elective in Hungary--but no rulers had to contend with more or greater enemies on their frontiers. To the north there was perpetual conflict with the Habsburgs of German Austria and with the forces of the Holy Roman Empire; to the east there were spasmodic quarrels with the Vlachs, the natives of modern Rumania; to the south there was continual fighting, at first with the Greeks and the Slavs--Serbs and Bulgars, and later, most terrible of all, with the Ottoman Turks.

[Sidenote: The Ottoman Turks in 1500]

To the Eastern Roman Empire, with Constantinople as its capital, and with the Greeks as its dominant population, and to the medieval kingdoms of the Bulgars and Serbs, had succeeded by the year 1500 the

empire of the Ottoman Turks. The Ottoman Turks were a tribe of Asiatic Mohammedans who took their name from a certain Othman (died 1326), under whom they had established themselves in Asia Minor, across the Bosphorus from Constantinople. Thence they rapidly extended their dominion over Syria, and over Greece and the Balkan peninsula, except the little mountain state of Montenegro, and in 1453 they captured Constantinople. The lands conquered by the arms of the Turks were divided into large estates for the military leaders, or else assigned to the maintenance of mosques and schools, or converted into common and pasturage lands; the conquered Christians were reduced to the payment of tribute and a life of serfdom. For two centuries the Turks were to remain a source of grave apprehension to Europe.

ADDITIONAL READINGS

THE NATIONAL MONARCHIES ABOUT 1600. A. F. Pollard, *Factors in European History* (1907), ch. i on "Nationality" and ch. iii on "The New Monarchy"; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. I, ch. xiv, xii, xi; *Histoire générale*, Vol. IV, ch. xiii, iv, v; *History of All Nations*, Vol. X, ch. xii-xvi; A. H. Johnson, *Europe in the Sixteenth Century* (1897), ch. i, ii; Mary A. Hollings, *Renaissance and Reformation* (1910), ch. i-v. On England: A. L. Cross, *History of England and Greater Britain* (1914), ch. xviii; J. F. Bright, *History of England*, Vol. II, a standard work; James Gairdner, *Henry VII* (1889), a reliable short biography; Gladys Temperley, *Henry VII* (1914), fairly reliable and quite readable; H. A. L. Fisher, *Political History of England 1485-1547* (1906), ch. i-iv, brilliant and scholarly; A. D. Innes, *History of England and the British Empire* (1914), Vol. II, ch. i, ii; William Cunningham, *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times*, 5th ed., 3 vols. (1910-1912), Vol. I, Book V valuable for social conditions under Henry VII; William (Bishop) Stubbs, *Lectures on Mediæval and Modern History*, ch. xv, xvi; F. W. Maitland, *The Constitutional History of England* (1908), Period II. On Scotland: P. H. Brown, *History of Scotland*, 3 vols. (1899-1909), Vol. I from earliest times to the middle of the sixteenth century; Andrew Lang, *A History of Scotland*, 2d ed., 4 vols. (1901-1907), Vol. I. On France: A. J. Grant, *The French Monarchy, 1483-1789*, 2 vols. (1900), Vol. I, ch. i, ii, brief and general; G. B. Adams, *The Growth of the French Nation* (1896), ch. viii-x, a suggestive sketch; G. W. Kitchin, *A History of France*, 4th ed., 3 vols. (1894-1899), Vol. I and Vol. II (in part), dry and narrowly political; Lavissee (editor), *Histoire de France*, Vol. V, Part I (1903), an exhaustive and scholarly study. On Spain and Portugal: E. P. Cheyney, *European Background of American History* (1904), pp. 60-103; U. R. Burke, *A History of Spain from the Earliest Times to the Death of Ferdinand the Catholic*, 2d ed., 2 vols. (1900), edited by M. A. S. Hume, Vol. II best account of the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella; W. H. Prescott, *History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella*, 3 vols. (1836), antiquated but extremely readable; Mrs. Julia Cartwright, *Isabella the Catholic* (1914), in "Heroes of the Nations" Series; H. M. Stephens, *Portugal* (1891) in "Story of the Nations" Series; F. W. Schirrmacher, *Geschichte von Spanien*, 7 vols. (1902), an elaborate German work, of which Vol. VII covers the years 1492-1516.

THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE. *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. I (1902), ch. ix, a political sketch; James (Viscount) Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, new ed. revised (1911); William Coxe, *History of the House of*

Austria_, Bohn edition, 4 vols. (1893-1894), a century-old work but still useful for Habsburg history; Sidney Whitman, *Austria* (1899), and, by the same author, *The Realm of the Habsburgs* (1893) 5 Kurt Kaser, *Deutsche Geschichte zur Zeit Maximilians I, 1486-1519* (1912), an excellent study appearing in "Bibliothek deutscher Geschichte," edited by Von Zwiedineck-Südenhorst; Franz Krones, *Handbuch der Geschichte Oesterreichs von der ältesten Zeit*, 5 vols. (1876-1879), of which Vol. II, Book XI treats of political events in Austria from 1493 to 1526 and Vol. III, Book XII of constitutional development 1100-1526; Leopold von Ranke, *History of the Latin and Teutonic Nations*, 1494-1514, a rev. trans. in the Bohn Library (1915) of the earliest important work of this distinguished historian, published originally in 1824.

ITALY AND THE CITY STATES. *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. I (1902), ch. iv-viii; *Histoire générale*, Vol. IV, ch. i, ii; Mrs. H. M. Vernon, *Italy from 1494 to 1790* (1909), a clear account in the "Cambridge Historical Series"; J. A. Symonds, *Age of the Despots* (1883), pleasant but inclined to the picturesque; Pompeo Molmenti, *Venice, its Individual Growth from the Earliest Beginnings to the Fall of the Republic*, trans. by H. F. Brown, 6 vols. (1906-1908), an exhaustive narrative of the details of Venetian history; Edward Armstrong, *Lorenzo de' Medici* (1897), in the "Heroes of the Nations" Series, valuable for Florentine history about 1500; Col. G. F. Young, *The Medici*, 2 vols. (1909), an extended history of this famous Florentine family from 1400 to 1743; Ferdinand Gregorovius, *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages*, trans. from 4th German ed. by Annie Hamilton, 8 vols. in 13, a non-Catholic account of the papal monarchy in Italy, of which Vol. VII, Part II and Vol. VIII, Part I treat of Rome about 1500. For the city-states of the Netherlands see *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. I (1902), ch. xiii; the monumental *History of the People of the Netherlands*, by the distinguished Dutch historian P. J. Blok, trans. by O. A. Bierstadt, 5 vols. (1898-1912), especially Vols. I and II; and *Belgian Democracy: its Early History*, trans. by J. V. Saunders (1915) from the authoritative work of the famous Belgian historian Henri Pirenne (1910). For the German city-states see references under HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE above.

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE ABOUT 1500. General: *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. I (1902), ch. x, iii; *Histoire générale*, Vol. IV, ch. xviii-xxi; R. N. Bain, *Slavonic Europe: a Political History of Poland and Russia from 1447 to 1796* (1908), ch. i-iv; T. Schiemann, *Russland, Polen, und Livland bis ins 17ten Jahrhundert*, 2 vols. (1886-1887). Norway: H. H. Boyesen, *The History of Norway* (1886), a brief popular account in "Story of the Nations" Series. Muscovy: V. O. Kliuchevsky, *A History of Russia*, trans. with some abridgments by C. J. Hogarth, 3 vols. to close of seventeenth century (1911-1913), latest and, despite faulty translation, most authoritative work on early Russian history now available in English; Alfred Rambaud, *Histoire de la Russie depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours*, 6th ed. completed to 1913 by Émile Haumant (1914), a brilliant work, of which the portion down to 1877 has been trans. by Leonora B. Lang, 2 vols. (1879); W. R. A. Morfill, *Russia*, in "Story of the Nations" Series, and *Poland*, a companion volume in the same series. See also Jeremiah Curtin, *The Mongols: a History* (1908). For the Magyars: C. M. Knatchbull-Hugessen, *The Political Evolution of the Hungarian Nation*, 2 vols. (1908), especially Vol. I, ch. i-iii; A. Vámbéry, *The Story of Hungary* (1886) in "Story of the Nations" Series; Count Julius Andrássy, *The Development of Hungarian Constitutional Liberty*, trans. by C. Arthur

and Ilona Ginever (1908), the views of a contemporary Magyar statesman on the constitutional development of his country throughout the middle ages and down to 1619, difficult to read. For the Ottoman Turks and the Balkan peoples: Stanley Lane-Poole, *Turkey* (1889), in "Story of the Nations" Series, best brief introduction; A. H. Lybyer, *The Government of the Ottoman Empire in the Time of Suleiman the Magnificent* (1913); Prince and Princess Lazarovich-Hrebelianovich, *The Servian People, their Past Glory and their Destiny*, 2 vols. (1910), particularly Vol. II, ch. xi, xii; far more pretentious works are, Joseph von Hammer, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, 2d ed., 4 vols. (1834-1835), and Nicolae Jorga, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches nach den Quellen dargestellt*, 5 vols. (1908-1913), especially Vol. II, *1451-1538*, and H. A. Gibbons, *The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire* (1916), covering the earlier years, from 1300 to 1403.

CHAPTER II

THE COMMERCIAL REVOLUTION

[Sidenote: Introductory]

Five hundred years ago a European could search in vain the map of "the world" for America, or Australia, or the Pacific Ocean. Experienced mariners, and even learned geographers, were quite unaware that beyond the Western Sea lay two great continents peopled by red men; of Africa they knew only the northern coast; and in respect of Asia a thousand absurd tales passed current. The unexplored waste of waters that constituted the Atlantic Ocean was, to many ignorant Europeans of the fifteenth century, a terrible region frequented by fierce and fantastic monsters. To the average European the countries surveyed in the preceding chapter, together with their Mohammedan neighbors across the Mediterranean, still comprised the entire known world.

Shortly before the close of the fifteenth century, daring captains began to direct long voyages on the high seas and to discover the existence of new lands; and from that time to the present, Europeans have been busily exploring and conquering--veritably "Europeanizing"--the whole globe. Although religion as well as commerce played an important role in promoting the process, the movement was attended from the very outset by so startling a transformation in the routes, methods, and commodities of trade that usually it has been styled the Commercial Revolution. By the close of the sixteenth century it had proceeded far enough to indicate that its results would rank among the most fateful events of all history.

It was in the commonplace affairs of everyday life that the Commercial Revolution was destined to produce its most far-reaching results. To appreciate, therefore, its true nature and significance, we must first turn aside to ascertain how our European ancestors actually lived about the year 1500, and what work they did to earn their living. Then, after recounting the story of foreign exploration and colonization, we shall be in a position to reappraise the domestic situation in town and on the farm.

AGRICULTURE IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

[Sidenote: Differences between Sixteenth-century Farming and That of To-day]

Agriculture has always been the ultimate basis of society, but in the sixteenth century it was of greater relative importance than it is now. People then reckoned their wealth, not by the quantity of stocks and bonds they held, but by the extent of land they owned. Farming was still the occupation of the vast majority of the population of every European state, for the towns were as yet small in size and few in number. The "masses" lived in the country, not, as to-day, in the city.

A twentieth-century observer would be struck by other peculiarities of sixteenth-century agriculture. He would find a curious organization of rural society, strange theories of land-ownership, and most unfamiliar methods of tillage. He would discover, moreover, that practically each farm was self-sufficing, producing only what its own occupants could consume, and that consequently there was comparatively little external trade in farm produce. From these facts he would readily understand that the rural communities in the year 1500, numerous yet isolated, were invulnerable strongholds of conservatism and ignorance.

[Sidenote: Two Rural Classes: Nobility and Peasantry]

In certain respects a remarkable uniformity prevailed in rural districts throughout all Europe. Whether one visited Germany, Hungary, France, or England, one was sure to find the agricultural population sharply divided into two social classes--nobility and peasantry. There might be varying gradations of these classes in different regions, but certain general distinctions everywhere prevailed.

[Sidenote: The Nobility]

The nobility [Footnote: As a part of the nobility must be included at the opening of the sixteenth century many of the higher clergy of the Catholic Church--archbishops, bishops, and abbots--who owned large landed estates quite like their lay brethren.] comprised men who gained a living from the soil without manual labor. They held the land on feudal tenure, that is to say, they had a right to be supported by the peasants living on their estates, and, in return, they owed to some higher or wealthier nobleman or to the king certain duties, such as fighting for him, [Footnote: This obligation rested only upon lay noblemen, not upon ecclesiastics.] attending his court at specified times, and paying him various irregular taxes (the feudal dues). The estate of each nobleman might embrace a single farm, or "manor" as it was called, inclosing a petty hamlet, or village; or it might include dozens of such manors; or, if the landlord were a particularly mighty magnate or powerful prelate, it might stretch over whole counties.

Each nobleman had his manor-house or, if he were rich enough, his castle, lording it over the humble thatch-roofed cottages of the villagers. In his stables were spirited horses and a carriage adorned with his family crest; he had servants and lackeys, a footman to open his carriage door, a game-warden to keep poachers from shooting his deer, and men-at-arms to quell disturbances, to aid him against quarrelsome neighbors, or to follow him to the wars. While he lived, he might occupy the best pew in the village church; when he died, he would be laid to rest within the church where only noblemen were buried.

[Sidenote: Reason for the Preëminence of the Nobility]

In earlier times, when feudal society was young, the nobility had performed a very real service as the defenders of the peasants against foreign enemies and likewise against marauders and bandits of whom the land had been full. Then fighting had been the profession of the nobility, And to enable them to possess the expensive accoutrements of fighting--horses, armor, swords, and lances--the kings and the peasants had assured them liberal incomes.

Now, however, at the opening of the sixteenth century, the palmy days of feudalism were past and gone. Later generations of noblemen, although they continued by right of inheritance to enjoy the financial income and the social prestige which their forbears had earned, no longer served king, country, or common people in the traditional manner. At least in the national monarchies it was the king who now had undertaken the defense of the land and the preservation of peace; and the nobleman, deprived of his old occupation, had little else to do than to hunt, or quarrel with other noblemen, or engage in political intrigues. More and more the nobility, especially in France, were attracted to a life of amusement and luxury in the royal court. The nobility already had outlived its usefulness, yet it retained its old-time privileges.

[Sidenote: The Peasantry]

In striking contrast to the nobility--the small minority of land-owning aristocrats--were the peasantry--the mass of the people. They were the human beings who had to toil for their bread in the sweat of their brows and who were deemed of ignoble birth, as social inferiors, and as stupid and rude. Actual farm work was "servile labor," and between the man whose hands were stained by servile labor and the person of "gentle birth" a wide gulf was fixed.

[Sidenote: Serfdom and the Manorial System]

During the early middle ages most of the peasants throughout Europe were "serfs." For various reasons, which we shall explain presently, serfdom had tended gradually to and the die out in western Europe, but at the opening of the sixteenth century most of the agricultural laborers in eastern and central Europe, and even a considerable number in France, were still serfs, living and working on nobles' manors in accordance with ancient customs which can be described collectively as the "manorial system."

The serf occupied a position in rural society which it is difficult for us to understand. He was not a slave, such as was usual in the Southern States of the American Union before the Civil War; he was neither a hired man nor a rent-paying tenant-farmer, such as is common enough in all agricultural communities nowadays. The serf was not a slave, because he was free to work for himself at least part of the time; he could not be sold to another master; and he could not be deprived of the right to cultivate land for his own benefit. He was not a hired man, for he received no wages. And he was not a tenant-farmer, inasmuch as he was "attached to the soil," that is, he was bound to stay and work on his land, unless he succeeded in running away or in purchasing complete freedom, in which case he would cease to be a serf and would become a freeman.

[Sidenote: Obligations of the Serf to the Lord]

To the lord of the manor the serf was under many and varied obligations, the most essential of which may be grouped conveniently as follows: (1) The serf had to work without pay two or three days in each week on the strips of land and the fields whose produce belonged exclusively to the nobleman. In the harvest season extra days, known as "boon-days," were stipulated on which the serf must leave his own work in order to harvest for the lord. He also might be called upon in emergencies to draw a cord of wood from the forest to the great manor-house, or to work upon the highway (*_corvée_*). (2) The serf had to pay occasional dues, customarily "in kind." Thus at certain feast-days he was expected to bring a dozen fat fowls or a bushel of grain to the pantry of the manor-house. (3) Ovens, wine-presses, gristmills, and bridges were usually owned solely by the nobleman, and each time the peasant used them he was obliged to give one of his loaves of bread, a share of his wine, a bushel of his grain, or a toll-fee, as a kind of rent, or "banality" as it was euphoniously styled. (4) If the serf died without heirs, his holdings were transferred outright to the lord, and if he left heirs, the nobleman had the rights of "heriot," that is, to appropriate the best animal owned by the deceased peasant, and of "relief," that is, to oblige the designated heir to make a definite additional payment that was equivalent to a kind of inheritance tax.

[Sidenote: Free-Tenants]

As has been intimated, the manorial system was already on a steady decline, especially in western Europe, at the opening of the sixteenth century. A goodly number of peasants who had once been serfs were now free-tenants, lessees, or hired laborers. Of course rent of farm-land in our present sense--each owner of the land letting out his property to a tenant and, in return, exacting as large a monetary payment as possible--was then unknown. But there was a growing class of peasants who were spoken of as free-tenants to distinguish them from serf-tenants. These free-tenants, while paying regular dues, as did the others, were not compelled to work two or three days every week in the lord's fields, except occasionally in busy seasons such as harvest; they were free to leave the estate and to marry off their daughters or to sell their oxen without the consent of the lord; and they came to regard their customary payments to the lord not so much as his due for their protection as actual rent for their land.

[Sidenote: Hired Laborers]

While more prosperous peasants were becoming free-tenants, many of their poorer neighbors found it so difficult to gain a living as serfs that they were willing to surrender all claim to their own little strips of land on the manor and to devote their whole time to working for fixed wages on the fields which were cultivated for the nobleman himself, the so-called lord's demesne. Thus a body of hired laborers grew up claiming no land beyond that on which their miserable huts stood and possibly their small garden-plots.

[Sidenote: Métayers]

Besides hired laborers and free-tenants, a third group of peasants appeared in places where the noble proprietor did not care to superintend the cultivation of his own land. In this case he parceled

it out among particular peasants, furnishing each with livestock and a plow and expecting in return a fixed proportion of the crops, which in France usually amounted to one-half. Peasants who made such a bargain were called in France *métayers*, and in England "stock-and-land lessees." The arrangement was not different essentially from the familiar present-day practice of working a farm "on shares."

[Sidenote: Steady Decline of Serfdom]

In France and in England the serfs had mostly become hired laborers, tenants, or *métayers* by the sixteenth century. The obligations of serfdom had proved too galling for the serf and too unprofitable for the lord. It was much easier and cheaper for the latter to hire men to work just when he needed them, than to bother with serfs, who could not be discharged readily for slackness, and who naturally worked for themselves far more zealously than for him. For this reason many landlords were glad to allow their serfs to make payments in money or in grain in lieu of the performance of customary labor. In England, moreover, many lords, finding it profitable to inclose [Footnote: There were no fences on the old manors. Inclosing a plot of ground meant fencing or hedging it in.] their land in order to utilize it as pasturage for sheep, voluntarily freed their serfs. The result was that serfdom virtually had disappeared in England before the sixteenth century. In France as early as the fourteenth century the bulk of the serfs had purchased their liberty, although in a few districts serfdom remained in its pristine vigor until the French Revolution.

In other countries agricultural conditions were more backward and serfdom longer survived. Prussian and Austrian landowners retained their serfs until the nineteenth century; the emancipation of Russian serfs on a large scale was not inaugurated until 1861. There are still survivals of serfdom in parts of eastern Europe.

[Sidenote: Survival of Servile Obligations after Decline of Serfdom]

Emancipation from serfdom by no means released the peasants from all the disabilities under which they labored as serfs. True, the freeman no longer had week-work to do, provided he could pay for his time, and in theory at least he could marry as he chose and move freely from place to place. But he might still be called upon for an occasional day's labor, he still was expected to work on the roads, and he still had to pay annoying fees for oven, mill, and wine-press. Then, too, his own crops might be eaten with impunity by doves from the noble dovecote or trampled underfoot by a merry hunting-party from the manor-house. The peasant himself ventured not to hunt: he was precluded even from shooting the deer that devoured his garden. Certain other customs prevailed in various localities, conceived originally no doubt in a spirit of good-natured familiarity between noble and peasants, but now grown irritating if none the less humorous. It is said, for instance, that in some places newly married couples were compelled to vault the wall of the churchyard, and that on certain nights the peasants were obliged to beat the castle ditch in order to rest the lord's family from the dismal croaking of the frogs.

[Sidenote: Persistence of "Three-field System" of Agriculture]

In another important respect the manorial system survived long after serfdom had begun to decline. This was the method of doing farm work. A universal and insistent tradition had fixed agricultural method on the

medieval manor and tended to preserve it unaltered well into modern times. The tradition was that of the "three-field system" of agriculture. The land of the manor, which might vary in amount from a few hundred to five thousand acres, was not divided up into farms of irregular shape and size, as it would be now. The waste-land, which could be used only for pasture, and the woodland on the outskirts of the clearing, were treated as "commons," that is to say, each villager, as well as the lord of the manor, might freely gather fire-wood, or he might turn his swine loose to feed on the acorns in the forest and his cattle to graze over the entire pasture. The cultivable or arable land was divided into several--usually three--great grain fields. Ridges or "balks" of unplowed turf divided each field into long parallel strips, which were usually forty rods or a furlong (furrow-long) in length, and from one to four rods wide. Each peasant had exclusive right to one or more of these strips in each of the three great fields, making, say, thirty acres in all; [Footnote: In some localities it was usual to redistribute these strips every year. In that way the greater part of the manor was theoretically "common" land, and no peasant had a right of private ownership to any one strip.] the lord too had individual right to a number of strips in the great fields.

[Sidenote: Disadvantages of Three-field System of Agriculture]

This so-called three-field system of agriculture was distinctly disadvantageous in many ways. Much time was wasted in going back and forth between the scattered plots of land. The individual peasant, moreover, was bound by custom to cultivate his land precisely as his ancestors had done, without attempting to introduce improvements. He grew the same crops as his neighbors--usually wheat or rye in one field; beans or barley in the second; and nothing in the third. Little was known about preserving the fertility of the soil by artificial manuring or by rotation of crops; and, although every year one-third of the land was left "fallow" (uncultivated) in order to restore its fertility, the yield per acre was hardly a fourth as large as now. Farm implements were of the crudest kind; scythes and sickles did the work of mowing machines; plows were made of wood, occasionally shod with iron; and threshing was done with flails. After the grain had been harvested, cattle were turned out indiscriminately on the stubble, on the supposition that the fields were common property. It was useless to attempt to breed fine cattle when all were herded together. The breed deteriorated, and both cattle and sheep were undersized and poor. A full-grown ox was hardly larger than a good-sized calf of the present time. Moreover, there were no potatoes or turnips, and few farmers grew clover or other grasses for winter fodder. It was impossible, therefore, to keep many cattle through the winter; most of the animals were killed off in the autumn and salted down for the long winter months when it was impossible to secure fresh meat.

[Sidenote: Peasant Life on the Manor]

Crude farm-methods and the heavy dues exacted by the lord [Footnote: In addition to the dues paid to the lay lord, the peasants were under obligation to make a regular contribution to the church, which was called the "tithe" and amounted to a share, less than a tenth, of the annual crops.] of the manor must have left the poor man little for himself. Compared with the comfort of the farmer today, the poverty of sixteenth-century peasants must have been inexpressibly distressful. How keenly the cold pierced the dark huts of the poorest, is hard for us to imagine. The winter diet of salt meat, the lack of vegetables,

the chronic filth and squalor, and the sorry ignorance of all laws of health opened the way to disease and contagion. And if the crops failed, famine was added to plague.

On the other hand we must not forget that the tenement-houses of our great cities have been crowded in the nineteenth century with people more miserable than ever was serf of the middle ages. The serf, at any rate, had the open air instead of a factory in which to work. When times were good, he had grain and meat in plenty, and possibly wine or cider, and he hardly envied the tapestried chambers, the bejeweled clothes, and the spiced foods of the nobility, for he looked upon them as belonging to a different world.

In one place nobleman and peasant met on a common footing--in the village church. There, on Sundays and feast-days, they came together as Christians to hear Mass; and afterwards, perhaps, holiday games and dancing on the green, benignantly patronized by the lord's family, helped the common folk to forget their labors. The village priest, [Footnote: Usually very different from the higher clergy, who had large landed estates of their own, the parish priests had but modest incomes from the tithes of their parishioners and frequently eked out a living by toiling on allotted patches of ground. The monks too were ordinarily poor, although the monastery might be wealthy, and they likewise often tilled the fields.] himself often of humble birth, though the most learned man on the manor, was at once the friend and benefactor of the poor and the spiritual director of the lord. Occasionally a visit of the bishop to administer confirmation to the children, afforded an opportunity for gayety and universal festivity.

[Sidenote: Rural Isolation and Conservatism]

At other times there was little to disturb the monotony of village life and little to remind it of the outside world, except when a gossiping peddler chanced along, or when the squire rode away to court or to war. Intercourse with other villages was unnecessary, unless there were no blacksmith or miller on the spot. The roads were poor and in wet weather impassable. Travel was largely on horseback, and what few commodities were carried from place to place were transported by pack-horses. Only a few old soldiers, and possibly a priest, had traveled very much; they were the only geographers and the only books of travel which the village possessed, for few peasants could read or write.

Self-sufficient and secluded from the outer world, the rural village went on treasuring its traditions, keeping its old customs, century after century. The country instinctively distrusted all novelties; it always preferred old ways to new; it was heartily conservative. Country-folk did not discover America. It was the enterprise of the cities, with their growing industries and commerce, which brought about the Commercial Revolution; and to the development of commerce, industry, and the towns, we now must turn our attention.

TOWNS ON THE EVE OF THE COMMERCIAL REVOLUTION

[Sidenote: Trade and the Towns]

Except for the wealthy Italian city-states and a few other cities which traced their history back to Roman times, most European towns, it must be remembered, dated only from the later middle ages. At first there

was little excuse for their existence except to sell to farmers salt, fish, iron, and a few plows. But with the increase of commerce, which, as we shall see, especially marked the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, more merchants traveled through the country, ways of spending money multiplied, and the little agricultural villages learned to look on the town as the place to buy not only luxuries but such tools, clothing, and shoes as could be manufactured more conveniently by skillful town artisans than by clumsy rustics. The towns, moreover, became exchanges where surplus farm products could be marketed, where wine could be bartered for wool, or wheat for flax. And as the towns grew in size, the prosperous citizens proved to be the best customers for foreign luxuries, and foreign trade grew apace. Town, trade, and industry thus worked together: trade stimulated industry, industry assisted trade, and the town profited by both. By the sixteenth century the towns had grown out of their infancy and were maintaining a great measure of political and economic freedom.

[Sidenote: Freedom of the Towns.]

[Sidenote: Town Charters]

Originally many a town had belonged to some nobleman's extensive manor and its inhabitants had been under much the same servile obligations to the lord as were the strictly rural serfs. But with the lapse of time and the growth of the towns, the townsmen or burghers had begun a struggle for freedom from their feudal lords. They did not want to pay servile dues to a baron, but preferred to substitute a fixed annual payment for individual obligations; they besought the right to manage their market; they wished to have cases at law tried in a court of their own rather than in the feudal court over which the nobleman presided; and they demanded the right to pay all taxes in a lump sum for the town, themselves assessing and collecting the share of each citizen. These concessions they eventually had won, and each city had its charter, in which its privileges were enumerated and recognized by the authority of the nobleman, or of the king, to whom the city owed allegiance. In England these charters had been acquired generally by merchant guilds, upon payment of a substantial sum to the nobleman; in France frequently the townsmen had formed associations, called communes, and had rebelled successfully against their feudal lords; in Germany the cities had leagued together for mutual protection and for the acquisition of common privileges. Other towns, formerly founded by bishops, abbots, or counts, had received charters at the very outset.

[Sidenote: Merchant Guilds]

A peculiar outgrowth of the need for protection against oppressive feudal lords, as well as against thieves, swindlers, and dishonest workmen, had been the typically urban organization known as the merchant guild or the merchants' company. In the year 1500 the merchant guilds were everywhere on the decline, but they still preserved many of their earlier and more glorious traditions. At the time of their greatest importance they had embraced merchants, butchers, bakers, and candlestick-makers: in fact, all who bought or sold in the town were included in the guild. And the merchant guild had then possessed the widest functions.

[Sidenote: Earlier Functions of the Merchant Guild.]

[Sidenote: Social]

Its social and religious functions, inherited from much earlier bodies, consisted in paying some special honor to a patron saint, in giving aid to members in sickness or misfortune, attending funerals, and also in the more enjoyable meetings when the freely flowing bowl enlivened the transaction of gild business.

[Sidenote: Protective]

As a protective organization, the gild had been particularly effective. Backed by the combined forces of all the gildsmen, it was able to assert itself against the lord who claimed manorial rights over the town, and to insist that a runaway serf who had lived in the town for a year and a day should not be dragged back to perform his servile labor on the manor, but should be recognized as a freeman. The protection of the gild was accorded also to townsmen on their travels. In those days all strangers were regarded as suspicious persons, and not infrequently when a merchant of the gild traveled to another town he would be set upon and robbed or cast into prison. In such cases it was necessary for the gild to ransom the imprisoned "brother" and, if possible, to punish the persons who had done the injury, so that thereafter the liberties of the gild members would be respected. That the business of the gild might be increased, it was often desirable to enter into special arrangements with neighboring cities whereby the rights, lives, and properties of gildsmen were guaranteed; and the gild as a whole was responsible for the debts of any of its members.

[Sidenote: Regulative]

The most important duty of the gild had been the regulation of the home market. Burdensome restrictions were laid upon the stranger who attempted to utilize the advantages of the market without sharing the expense of maintenance. No goods were allowed to be carried away from the city if the townsmen wished to buy; and a tax, called in France the octroi, was levied on goods brought into the town. [Footnote: The octroi is still collected in Paris.] Moreover, a conviction prevailed that the gild was morally bound to enforce honest straightforward methods of business; and the "wardens" appointed by the gild to supervise the market endeavored to prevent, as dishonest practices, "forestalling" (buying outside of the regular market), "engrossing" (cornering the market), [Footnote: The idea that "combinations in restraint of trade" are wrong quite possibly goes back to this abhorrence of engrossing.] and "regrating" (retailing at higher than market price). The dishonest green grocer was not allowed to use a peck-measure with false bottom, for weighing and measuring were done by officials. Cheats were fined heavily and, if they persisted in their evil ways, they might be expelled from the gild.

These merchant gilds, with their social, protective, and regulative functions, had first begun to be important in the eleventh century. In England, where their growth was most rapid, 82 out of the total of 102 towns had merchant gilds by the end of the thirteenth century. [Footnote: Several important places, such as London, Colchester, and Norwich, belonged to the small minority without merchant gilds.] On the Continent many towns, especially in Germany, had quite different arrangements, and where merchant gilds existed, they were often exclusive and selfish groups of merchants in a single branch of business.

[Sidenote: Decline of Merchant Guilds]

With the expansion of trade and industry in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the rule of the old merchant guilds, instead of keeping pace with the times, became oppressive, limited, or merely nominal. Where the merchant guilds became oppressive oligarchical associations, as they did in Germany and elsewhere on the Continent, they lost their power by the revolt of the more democratic "craft guilds." In England specialized control of industry and trade by craft guilds, journeymen's guilds, and dealers' associations gradually took the place of the general supervision of the older merchant gild. After suffering the loss of its vital functions, the merchant gild by the sixteenth century either quietly succumbed or lived on with power in a limited branch of trade, or continued as an honorary organization with occasional feasts, or, and this was especially true in England, it became practically identical with the town corporation, from which originally it had been distinct.

[Sidenote: Industry: the Craft Guilds]

Alongside of the merchant guilds, which had been associated with the growth of commerce and the rise of towns, were other guilds connected with the growth of industry, which retained their importance long after 1500. These were the craft guilds. [Footnote: The craft gild was also called a company, or a mistery, or *métier* (French), or *Zunft* (German).] Springing into prominence in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the craft gild sometimes, as in Germany, voiced a popular revolt against corrupt and oligarchical merchant guilds, and sometimes most frequently so in England--worked quite harmoniously with the merchant gild, to which its own members belonged. In common with the merchant gild, the craft gild had religious and social aspects, and like the merchant gild it insisted on righteous dealings; but unlike the merchant gild it was composed of men in a single industry, and it controlled in detail the manufacture as well as the marketing of commodities. There were bakers' guilds, brewers' guilds, smiths' guilds, saddlers' guilds, shoemakers' guilds, weavers' guilds, tailors' guilds, tanners' guilds, even guilds of masters of arts who constituted the teaching staff of colleges and universities.

When to-day we speak of a boy "serving his apprenticeship" in a trade, we seldom reflect that the expression is derived from a practice of the medieval craft guilds, a practice which survived after the guilds were extinct. Apprenticeship was designed to make sure that recruits to the trade were properly trained. The apprentice was usually selected as a boy by a master-workman and indentured--that is, bound to work several years without wages, while living at the master's house. After the expiration of this period of apprenticeship, during which he had learned his trade thoroughly, the youth became a "journeyman," and worked for wages, until he should finally receive admission to the gild as a master, with the right to set up his own little shop, with apprentices and journeymen of his own, and to sell his wares directly to those who used them.

This restriction of membership was not the only way in which the trade was supervised. The gild had rules specifying the quality of materials to be used and often, likewise, the methods of manufacture; it might prohibit night-work, and it usually fixed a "fair price" at which goods were to be sold. By means of such provisions, enforced by wardens or inspectors, the gild not only perpetuated the "good old way" of doing things, but guaranteed to the purchaser a thoroughly good article at a

fair price.

[Sidenote: Partial Decay of Craft Gilds]

By the opening of the sixteenth century the craft gilds, though not so weakened as the merchant gilds, were suffering from various internal diseases which sapped their vitality. They tended to become exclusive and to direct their power and affluence in hereditary grooves. They steadily raised their entrance fees and qualifications. Struggles between gilds in allied trades, such as spinning, weaving, fulling, and dyeing, often resulted in the reduction of several gilds to a dependent position. The regulation of the processes of manufacture, once designed to keep up the standard of skill, came in time to be a powerful hindrance to technical improvements; and in the method as well as in the amount of his work, the enterprising master found himself handicapped. Even the old conscientiousness often gave way to greed, until in many places inferior workmanship received the approval of the gild.

Many craft gilds exhibited in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries a tendency to split somewhat along the present lines of capital and labor. On the one hand the old gild organization would be usurped and controlled by the wealthier master-workmen, called "livery men," because they wore rich uniforms, or a class of dealers would arise and organize a "merchants' company" to conduct a wholesale business in the products of a particular industry. Thus the rich drapers sold all the cloth, but did not help to make it. On the other hand it became increasingly difficult for journeymen and apprentices to rise to the station of masters; oftentimes they remained wage-earners for life. In order to better their condition they formed new associations, which in England were called journeymen's or yeomen's companies. These new organizations were symptomatic of injustice but otherwise unimportant. The craft gilds, with all their imperfections, were to continue in power awhile longer, slowly giving away as new trades arose outside of their control, gradually succumbing in competition with capitalists who refused to be bound by gild rules and who were to evolve a new "domestic system," [Footnote: See Vol. II, ch xviii.] and slowly suffering diminution of prestige through royal interference.

[Sidenote: Life in the Towns]

In the year 1500 the European towns displayed little uniformity in government or in the amount of liberty they possessed. Some were petty republics subject only in a very vague way to an extraneous potentate; some merely paid annual tribute to a lord; some were administered by officers of a king or feudal magnate; others were controlled by oligarchical commercial associations. But of the general appearance and life of sixteenth-century towns, it is possible to secure a more uniform notion.

It must be borne in mind that the towns were comparatively small, for the great bulk of people still lived in the country. A town of 5000 inhabitants was then accounted large; and even the largest places, like Nuremberg, Strassburg, London, Paris, and Bruges, would have been only small cities in our eyes. The approach to an ordinary city of the time lay through suburbs, farms, and garden-plots, for the townsman still supplemented industry with small-scale agriculture. Usually the town itself was inclosed by strong walls, and admission was to be gained only by passing through the gates, where one might be accosted by

soldiers and forced to pay toll. Inside the walls were clustered houses of every description. Rising from the midst of tumble-down dwellings might stand a magnificent cathedral, town-hall, or guild building. Here and there a prosperous merchant would have his luxurious home, built in what we now call the Gothic style, with pointed windows and gables, and, to save space in a walled town, with the second story projecting out over the street.

The streets were usually in deplorable condition. There might be one or two broad highways, but the rest were mere alleys, devious, dark, and dirty. Often their narrowness made them impassable for wagons. In places the pedestrian waded gallantly through mud and garbage; pigs grunted ponderously as he pushed them aside; chickens ran under his feet; and occasionally a dead dog obstructed the way. There were no sidewalks, and only the main thoroughfares were paved. Dirt and filth and refuse were ordinarily disposed of only when a heaven-sent rain washed them down the open gutters constructed along the middle, or on each side, of a street. Not only was there no general sewerage for the town, but there was likewise no public water supply. In many of the garden plots at the rear of the low-roofed dwellings were dug wells

which provided water for the family; and the visitor, before he left the town, would be likely to meet with water-sellers calling out their ware. To guard against the danger of fires, each municipality encouraged its citizens to build their houses of stone and to keep a tub full of water before every building; and in each district a special official was equipped with a proper hook and cord for pulling down houses on fire. At night respectable town-life was practically at a standstill: the gates were shut; the curfew sounded; no street-lamps dispelled the darkness, except possibly an occasional lantern which an altruistic or festive townsman might hang in his front-window; and no efficient police-force existed--merely a handful of townsmen were drafted from time to time as "watchmen" to preserve order, and the "night watch" was famed rather for its ability to sleep or to roister than to protect life or purse. Under these circumstances the citizen who would escape an assault by ruffians or thieves remained prudently indoors at night and retired early to bed. Picturesque and quaint the sixteenth-century town may have been; but it was also an uncomfortable and an unhealthful place in which to live.

TRADE PRIOR TO THE COMMERCIAL REVOLUTION

Just as agriculture is the ultimate basis of human society, so town-life has always been an index of culture and civilization. And the fortunes of town-life have ever depended upon the vicissitudes of trade and commerce. So the reviving commerce of the later middle ages between Europe and the East meant the growth of cities and betokened an advance in civilization.

[Sidenote: Revival of Trade with the East]

Trade between Europe and Asia, which had been a feature of the antique world of Greeks and Romans, had been very nearly destroyed by the barbarian invasions of the fifth century and by subsequent conflicts between Mohammedans and Christians, so that during several centuries the old trade-routes were traveled only by a few Jews and with the Syrians. In the tenth century, however, a group of towns in southern Italy--Brindisi, Bari, Taranto, and Amalfi--began to send ships to the

eastern Mediterranean and were soon imitated by Venice and later by Genoa and Pisa.

This revival of intercourse between the East and the West was well under way before the first Crusade, but the Crusades (1095-1270) hastened the process. Venice, Genoa, and Pisa, on account of their convenient location, were called upon to furnish the crusaders with transportation and provisions, and their shrewd Italian citizens made certain that such services were well rewarded. Italian ships, plying to and from the Holy Land, gradually enriched their owners. Many Italian cities profited, but Venice secured the major share. It was during the Crusades that Venice gained numerous coastal districts and islands in the Ægean besides immunities and privileges in Constantinople, and thereby laid the foundation of her maritime empire.

The Crusades not only enabled Italian merchants to bring Eastern commodities to the West; they increased the demand for such commodities. Crusaders--pilgrims and adventurers--returned from the Holy Land with astonishing tales of the luxury and opulence of the East. Not infrequently they had acquired a taste for Eastern silks or spices during their stay in Asia Minor or Palestine; or they brought curious jewels stripped from fallen infidels to awaken the envy of the stay-at-homes. Wealth was rapidly increasing in Europe at this time, and the many well-to-do people who were eager to affect magnificence provided a ready market for the wares imported by Italian merchants.

[Sidenote: Commodities of Eastern Trade]

It is desirable to note just what were these wares and why they were demanded so insistently. First were spices, far more important then than now. The diet of those times was simple and monotonous without our variety of vegetables and sauces and sweets, and the meat, if fresh, was likely to be tough in fiber and strong in flavor. Spices were the very thing to add zest to such a diet, and without them the epicure of the sixteenth century would have been truly miserable. Ale and wine, as well as meats, were spiced, and pepper was eaten separately as a delicacy. No wonder that, although the rich alone could buy it, the Venetians were able annually to dispose of 420,000 pounds of pepper, which they purchased from the sultan of Egypt, to whom it was brought, after a hazardous journey, from the pepper vines of Ceylon, Sumatra, or western India. From the same regions came cinnamon-bark; ginger was a product of Arabia, India, and China; and nutmegs, cloves, and allspice grew only in the far-off Spice Islands of the Malay Archipelago.

Precious stones were then, as always, in demand for personal adornment as well as for the decoration of shrines and ecclesiastical vestments; and in the middle ages they were thought by many to possess magical qualities which rendered them doubly valuable. [Footnote: Medieval literature is full of this idea. Thus we read in the book of travel which has borne the name of Sir John Maundeville:

"And if you wish to know the virtues of the diamond, I shall tell you, as they that are beyond the seas say and affirm, from whom all science and philosophy comes. He who carries the diamond upon him, it gives him hardiness and manhood, and it keeps the limbs of his body whole. It gives him victory over his enemies, in court and in war, if his cause be just; and it keeps him that bears it in good wit; and it keeps him from strife and riot, from sorrows and enchantments, and from fantasies and illusions of wicked spirits. ... [It] heals him that is lunatic, and those whom the fiend torments or pursues."] The supply of diamonds,

rubies, pearls, and other precious stones was then almost exclusively from Persia, India, and Ceylon.

Other miscellaneous products of the East were in great demand for various purposes: camphor and cubebs from Sumatra and Borneo; musk from China; cane-sugar from Arabia and Persia; indigo, sandal-wood, and aloes-wood from India; and alum from Asia Minor.

The East was not only a treasure-house of spices, jewels, valuable goods, and medicaments, but a factory of marvelously delicate goods and wares which the West could not rival--glass, porcelain, silks, satins, rugs, tapestries, and metal-work. The tradition of Asiatic supremacy in these manufactures has been preserved to our own day in such familiar names as damask linen, china-ware, japanned ware, Persian rugs, and cashmere shawls.

In exchange for the manifold products of the East, Europe had only rough woolen cloth, arsenic, antimony, quicksilver, tin, copper, lead, and coral to give; and a balance, therefore, always existed for the European merchant to pay in gold and silver, with the result that gold and silver coins grew scarce in the West. It is hard to say what would have happened had not a new supply of the precious metals been discovered in America. But we are anticipating our story.

[Sidenote: Oriental Trade-Routes]

Nature has rendered intercourse between Europe and Asia exceedingly difficult by reason of a vast stretch of almost impassable waste, extending from the bleak plains on either side of the Ural hills down across the steppes of Turkestan and the desert of Arabia to the great sandy Sahara. Through the few gaps in this desert barrier have led from early times the avenues of trade. In the fifteenth century three main trade-routes--a central, a southern, and a northern--precariously linked the two continents.

(1) The central trade-route utilized the valley of the Tigris River. Goods from China, from the Spice Islands, and from India were brought by odd native craft from point to point along the coast to Ormuz, an important city at the mouth of the Persian Gulf, thence to the mouth of the Tigris, and up the valley to Bagdad. From Bagdad caravans journeyed either to Aleppo and Antioch on the northeastern corner of the Mediterranean, or across the desert to Damascus and the ports on the Syrian coast. Occasionally caravans detoured southward to Cairo and Alexandria in Egypt. Whether at Antioch, Jaffa, or Alexandria, the caravans met the masters of Venetian ships ready to carry the cargo to Europe.

(2) The southern route was by the Red Sea. Arabs sailed their ships from India and the Far East across the Indian Ocean and into the Red Sea, whence they transferred their cargoes to caravans which completed the trip to Cairo and Alexandria. By taking advantage of monsoons,--the favorable winds which blew steadily in certain seasons,--the skipper of a merchant vessel could make the voyage from India to Egypt in somewhat less than three months. It was often possible to shorten the time by landing the cargoes at Ormuz and thence dispatching them by caravan across the desert of Arabia to Mecca, and so to the Red Sea, but caravan travel was sometimes slower and always more hazardous than sailing.

(3) The so-called "northern route" was rather a system of routes leading in general from the "back doors" of India and China to the Black Sea. Caravans from India and China met at Samarkand and Bokhara, two famous cities on the western slope of the Tian-Shan Mountains. West of Bokhara the route branched out. Some caravans went north of the Caspian, through Russia to Novgorod and the Baltic. Other caravans passed through Astrakhan, at the mouth of the Volga River, and terminated in ports on the Sea of Azov. Still others skirted the shore of the Caspian Sea, passing through Tabriz and Armenia to Trebizond on the Black Sea.

The transportation of goods from the Black Sea and eastern Mediterranean was largely in the hands of the Italian cities,[Footnote: In general, the journey from the Far East to the ports on the Black Sea and the eastern Mediterranean was performed by Arabs, although some of the more enterprising Italians pushed on from the European settlements, or fondachi, in ports like Cairo and Trebizond, and established fondachi in the inland cities of Asia Minor, Persia, and Russia.] especially Venice, Genoa, Pisa, and Florence, although Marseilles and Barcelona had a small share. From Italy trade-routes led through the passes of the Alps to all parts of Europe. German merchants from Nuremberg, Augsburg, Ulm, Regensburg, and Constance purchased Eastern commodities in the markets of Venice, and sent them back to the Germanies, to England, and to the Scandinavian countries. After the lapse of many months, and even years, since the time when spices had been packed first in the distant Moluccas, they would be exposed finally for sale at the European fairs or markets to which thousands of countryfolk resorted. There a nobleman's steward could lay in a year's supply of condiments, or a peddler could fill his pack with silks and ornaments to delight the eyes of the ladies in many a lonesome castle.

[Sidenote: Difficulties of European Commerce]

Within Europe commerce gradually extended its scope in spite of the almost insuperable difficulties. The roads were still so miserable that wares had to be carried on pack-horses instead of in wagons. Frequently the merchant had to risk spoiling his bales of silk in fording a stream, for bridges were few and usually in urgent need of repair. Travel not only was fraught with hardship; it was expensive. Feudal lords exacted heavy tolls from travelers on road, bridge, or river. Between Mainz and Cologne, on the Rhine, toll was levied in thirteen different places. The construction of shorter and better highways was blocked often by nobles who feared to lose their toll-rights on the old roads. So heavy was the burden of tolls on commerce that transportation from Nantes to Orleans, a short distance up the River Loire, doubled the price of goods. Besides the tolls, one had to pay for local market privileges; towns exacted taxes on imports; and the merchant in a strange city or village often found himself seriously handicapped by regulations against "foreigners," and by unfamiliar weights, measures, and coinage.

Most dreaded of all, however, and most injurious to trade were the robbers who infested the roads. Needy knights did not scruple to turn highwaymen. Cautious travelers carried arms and journeyed in bands, but even they were not wholly safe from the dashing "gentlemen of the road." On the seas there was still greater danger from pirates. Fleets of merchantmen, despite the fact that they were accompanied usually by a vessel of war, often were assailed by corsairs, defeated, robbed, and sold as prizes to the Mohammedans. The black flag of piracy flew over

whole fleets in the Baltic and in the Mediterranean. The amateur pirate, if less formidable, was no less common, for many a vessel carrying brass cannon, ostensibly for protection, found it convenient to use them to attack foreign craft and more frequently "took" a cargo than purchased one.

[Sidenote: Venice]

These dangers and difficulties of commercial intercourse were due chiefly to the lack of any strong power to punish pirates or highwaymen, to maintain roads, or to check the exactions of toll-collectors. Each city attempted to protect its own commerce. A great city-state like Venice was well able to send out her galleys against Mediterranean pirates, to wage war against the rival city of Genoa, to make treaties with Oriental potentates, and to build up a maritime empire. Smaller towns were helpless. But what, as in the case of the German towns, they could not do alone, was partially achieved by combination.

[Sidenote: The Hanseatic League. Towns in the Netherlands: Bruges]

The Hanse or the Hanseatic League, as the confederation of Cologne, Brunswick, Hamburg, Lübeck, Dantzic, Königsberg, and other German cities was called, waged war against the Baltic pirates, maintained its trade-routes, and negotiated with monarchs and municipalities in order to obtain exceptional privileges. From their Baltic stations,--Novgorod, Stockholm, Königsberg, etc.,--the Hanseatic merchants brought amber, wax, fish, furs, timber, and tar to sell in the markets of Bruges, London, and Venice; they returned with wheat, wine, salt, metals, cloth, and beer for their Scandinavian and Russian customers. The German trading post at Venice received metals, furs, leather goods, and woolen cloth from the North, and sent back spices, silks, and other commodities of the East, together with glassware, fine textiles, weapons, and paper of Venetian manufacture. Baltic and Venetian trade-routes crossed in the Netherlands, and during the fourteenth century Bruges became the trade-metropolis of western Europe, where met the raw wool from England and Spain, the manufactured woolen cloth of Flanders, clarets from France, sherry and port wines from the Iberian peninsula, pitch from Sweden, tallow from Norway, grain from France and Germany, and English tin, not to mention Eastern luxuries, Venetian manufactures, and the cunning carved-work of south-German artificers.

THE AGE OF EXPLORATION

[Sidenote: Desire of Spaniards and Portuguese for New Trade-Routes]

In the unprecedented commercial prosperity which marked the fifteenth century, two European peoples--the Portuguese and the Spanish--had little part. For purposes of general Continental trade they were not so conveniently situated as the peoples of Germany and the Netherlands; and the Venetians and other Italians had shut them off from direct trade with Asia. Yet Spanish and Portuguese had developed much the same taste for Oriental spices and wares as had the inhabitants of central Europe, and they begrudged the exorbitant prices which they were compelled to pay to Italian merchants. Moreover, their centuries-long crusades against Mohammedans in the Iberian peninsula and in northern Africa had bred in them a stern and zealous Christianity which urged them on to undertake missionary enterprises in distant pagan lands.

This missionary spirit reënforced the desire they already entertained of finding new trade-routes to Asia untrammelled by rival and selfish Italians. In view of these circumstances it is not surprising that Spaniards and Portuguese sought eagerly in the fifteenth century to find new trade-routes to "the Indies."

[Sidenote: Geographical Knowledge]

In their search for new trade-routes to the lands of silk and spice, these peoples of southwestern Europe were not as much in the dark as sometimes we are inclined to believe. Geographical knowledge, almost non-existent in the earlier middle ages, had been enriched by the Franciscan friars who had traversed central Asia to the court of the Mongol emperor as early as 1245, and by such merchants and travelers as Marco Polo, who had been attached to the court of Kublai Khan and who subsequently had described that potentate's realms and the wealth of "Cipangu" (Japan). These travels afforded at once information about Asia and enormous incentive to later explorers.

Popular notions that the waters of the tropics boiled, that demons and monsters awaited explorers to the westward, and that the earth was a great flat disk, did not pass current among well-informed geographers. Especially since the revival of Ptolemy's works in the fifteenth century, learned men asserted that the earth was spherical in shape, and they even calculated its circumference, erring only by two or three thousand miles. It was maintained repeatedly that the Indies formed the western boundary of the Atlantic Ocean, and that consequently they might be reached by sailing due west, as well as by traveling eastward; but at the same time it was believed that shorter routes might be found northeast of Europe, or southward around Africa.

[Sidenote: Navigation]

Along with this general knowledge of the situation of continents, the sailors of the fifteenth century had learned a good deal about navigation. The compass had been used first by Italian navigators in the thirteenth century, mounted on the compass card in the fourteenth. Latitude was determined with the aid of the astrolabe, a device for measuring the elevation of the pole star above the horizon. With maps and accurate sailing directions (portolani), seamen could lose sight of land and still feel confident of their whereabouts. Yet it undoubtedly took courage for the explorers of the fifteenth century to steer their frail sailing vessels either down the unexplored African coast or across the uncharted Atlantic Ocean.

[Sidenote: The Portuguese Explorers]

In the series of world-discoveries which brought about the Commercial Revolution and which are often taken as the beginning of "modern history," there is no name more illustrious than that of a Portuguese prince of the blood,—Prince Henry, the Navigator (1394-1460), who, with the support of two successive Portuguese kings, made the first systematic attempts to convert the theories of geographers into proved fact. A variety of motives were his: the stern zeal of the crusader against the infidel; the ardent proselyting spirit which already had sent Franciscan monks into the heart of Asia; the hope of reëstablishing intercourse with "Prester John's" fabled Christian empire of the East; the love of exploration; and a desire to gain for Portugal a share of the Eastern trade.

To his naval training-station at Sagres and the neighboring port of Lagos, Prince Henry attracted the most skillful Italian navigators and the most learned geographers of the day. The expeditions which he sent out year after year rediscovered and colonized the Madeira and Azores Islands, and crept further and further down the unknown coast of the Dark Continent. When in the year 1445, a quarter of a century after the initial efforts of Prince Henry, Denis Diaz reached Cape Verde, he thought that the turning point was at hand; but four more weary decades were to elapse before Bartholomew Diaz, in 1488, attained the southernmost point of the African coast. What he then called the Cape of Storms, King John II of Portugal in a more optimistic vein rechristened the Cape of Good Hope. Following in the wake of Diaz, Vasco da Gama rounded the Cape in 1497, and then, continuing on his own way, he sailed up the east coast to Malindi, where he found a pilot able to guide his course eastward through the Indian Ocean to India. At Calicut Vasco da Gama landed in May, 1498, and there he erected a marble pillar as a monument of his discovery of a new route to the Indies.

[Sidenote: Occupation of Old Trade-Routes by the Turks]

While the Portuguese were discovering this new and all-water route to the Indies, the more ancient Mediterranean and overland routes, which had been of inestimable value to the Italians, were in process of occupation by the Routes by Ottoman Turks. [Footnote: Professor A. H. Lybyer has recently and ably contended that, contrary to a view which has often prevailed, the occupation of the medieval trade-routes by the Ottoman Turks was not the cause of the Portuguese and Spanish explorations which ushered in the Commercial Revolution. He has pointed out that prior to 1500 the prices of spices were not generally raised throughout western Europe, and that apparently before that date the Turks had not seriously increased the difficulties of Oriental trade. In confirmation of this opinion, it should be remembered that the Portuguese had begun their epochal explorations long before 1500 and that Christopher Columbus had already returned from "the Indies."] These Turks, as we have seen, were a nomadic and warlike nation of the Mohammedan faith who "added to the Moslem contempt for the Christian, the warrior's contempt for the mere merchant." Realizing that advantageous trade relations with such a people were next to impossible, the Italian merchants viewed with consternation the advance of the Turkish armies, as Asia Minor, Thrace, Macedonia, Greece, and the islands of the Ægean were rapidly overrun. Constantinople, the heart of the Eastern Empire, repeatedly repelled the Moslems, but in 1453 Emperor Constantine XI was defeated by Sultan Mohammed II, and the crescent replaced the Greek cross above the Church of Saint Sophia. Eight years later Trebizond, the terminal of the trade-route from Tabriz, was taken. In vain Venice attempted to defend her possessions in the Black Sea and in the Ægean; by the year 1500 most of her empire in the Levant was lost. The Turks, now in complete control of the northern route, proceeded to impose crushing burdens on the trade of the defeated Venetians. Florentines and other Italians who fared less hardly continued to frequent the Black Sea, but the entire trade suffered from Turkish exactions and from disturbing wars between the Turks and another Asiatic people--the Mongols.

[Sidenote: Loss to the Italians]

For some time the central and southern routes, terminating respectively

in Syria and Egypt, exhibited increased activity, and by rich profits in Alexandria the Venetians were able to retrieve their losses in the Black Sea. But it was only a matter of time before the Turks, conquering Damascus in 1516 and Cairo in 1517, extended their burdensome restrictions and taxes over those regions likewise. Eastern luxuries, transported by caravan and caravel over thousands of miles, had been expensive and rare enough before; now the added peril of travel and the exactions of the Turks bade fair to deprive the Italians of the greater part of their Oriental trade. It was at this very moment that the Portuguese opened up independent routes to the East, lowered the prices of Asiatic commodities, and grasped the scepter of maritime and commercial power which was gradually slipping from the hands of the Venetians. The misfortune of Venice was the real opportunity of Portugal.

[Sidenote: Columbus]

Meanwhile Spain had entered the field, and was meeting with cruel disappointment. A decade before Vasco da Gama's famous voyage, an Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus, had presented himself at the Spanish court with a scheme for sailing westward to the Indies. The Portuguese king, by whom Columbus formerly had been employed, already had refused to support the project, but after several vexatious rebuffs Columbus finally secured the aid of Ferdinand and Isabella, the Spanish monarchs who were at the time jubilant over their capture of Granada from the Mohammedans (January, 1492). In August, 1492, he sailed from Palos with 100 men in three small ships, the largest of which weighed only a hundred tons. After a tiresome voyage he landed (12 October, 1492) on "San Salvador," one of the Bahama Islands. In that bold voyage across the trackless Atlantic lay the greatness of Columbus. He was not attempting to prove a theory that the earth was spherical--that was accepted generally by the well informed. Nor was he in search of a new continent. The realization that he had discovered not Asia, but a new world, would have been his bitterest disappointment. He was seeking merely another route to the spices and treasures of the East; and he bore with him a royal letter of introduction to the great Khan of Cathay (China). In his quest he failed, even though he returned in 1493, in 1498, and finally in 1502 and explored successively the Caribbean Sea, the coast of Venezuela, and Central America in a vain search for the island "Cipangu" and the realms of the "Great Khan." He found only "lands of vanity and delusion as the miserable graves of Castilian gentlemen," and he died ignorant of the magnitude of his real achievement.

[Sidenote: America]

Had Columbus perished in mid ocean, it is doubtful whether America would have remained long undiscovered. In 1497 John Cabot, an Italian in the service of Henry VII of England, reached the Canadian coast probably near Cape Breton Island. In 1500 Cabral with a Portuguese expedition bound for India was so far driven out of his course by equatorial currents that he came upon Brazil, which he claimed for the king of Portugal. Yet America was named for neither Columbus, Cabot, nor Cabral, but for another Italian, the Florentine Amerigo Vespucci, who, returning from voyages to Brazil (1499-1500), published a letter concerning what he called "the new world." It was thought that he had discovered this new world, and so it was called after him,--America.

[Sidenote: First Circumnavigation of the Earth]

Very slowly the truth about America was borne in upon the people of Europe. They persisted in calling the newly discovered lands the "Indies," and even after Balboa had discovered (1513) that another ocean lay beyond the Isthmus of Panama, it was thought that a few days' sail would bring one to the outlying possessions of the Great Khan. Not until Magellan, leaving Spain in 1519, passed through the straits that still bear his name and crossed the Pacific was this vain hope relinquished. Magellan was killed by the natives of the Philippine Islands, but one of his ships reached Seville in 1522 with the tale of the marvelous voyage.

Even after the circumnavigation of the world explorers looked for channels leading through or around the Americas. Such were the attempts of Verrazano (1524), Cartier (1534), Frobisher (1576-1578), Davis (1585-1587), and Henry Hudson in 1609.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COLONIAL EMPIRES

[Sidenote: Portugal]

When Vasco da Gama returned to Lisbon in 1499 with a cargo worth sixty times the cost of his expedition, the Portuguese knew that the wealth of the Indies was theirs. Cabral in 1500, and Albuquerque in 1503, followed the route of Da Gama, and thereafter Portuguese fleets rounded the Cape year by year to gain control of Goa (India), Ormuz, Diu (India), Ceylon, Malacca, and the Spice Islands, and to bring back from these places and from Sumatra, Java, Celebes, and Nanking (China) rich cargoes of "spicery." After the Turkish conquest of Egypt in 1517 the bulk of commerce was carried on by way of the Cape of Good Hope, for it was cheaper to transport goods by sea than to pay taxes to the Turks in addition to caravan cartage. Lisbon rapidly gained prominence as a market for Eastern wares.

The Portuguese triumph was short-lived. Dominion over half the world--for Portugal claimed all Africa, southern Asia, and Brazil as hers by right of discovery--had been acquired by the wise policy of the Portuguese royal house, but Portugal had neither products of her own to ship to Asia, nor the might to defend her exclusive right to the carrying trade with the Indies. The annexation of Portugal to Spain (1580) by Philip II precipitated disaster. The port of Lisbon was closed to the French, English, and Dutch, with whom Philip was at war, and much of the colonial empire of Portugal was conquered speedily by the Dutch.

[Sidenote: Spain]

On the first voyage of Columbus Spain based her claim to share the world with Portugal. In order that there might be perfect harmony between the rival explorers of the unknown seas, Pope Alexander VI issued on 4 May, 1493, the famous bull [Footnote: A bull was a solemn letter or edict issued by the pope.] attempting to divide the uncivilized parts of the world between Spain and Portugal by the "papal line of demarcation," drawn from pole to pole, 100 leagues west of the Azores. A year later the line was shifted to about 360 leagues west of the Cape Verde Islands. Portugal had the eastern half of modern Brazil, Africa, and all other heathen lands in that hemisphere; the rest comprised the share of Spain.

For a time the Spanish adventurers were disappointed tremendously to find neither spices nor silks and but little gold in the "Indies," and Columbus was derisively dubbed the "Admiral of the Mosquitos." In spite of failures the search for wealth was prosecuted with vigor. During the next half century Haiti, called Hispaniola ("Spanish Isle"), served as a starting point for the occupation of Puerto Rico, Cuba (1508), and other islands. An aged adventurer, Ponce de Leon, in search of a fountain of youth, explored the coast of Florida in 1513, and subsequent expeditions pushed on to the Mississippi, across the plain of Texas, and even to California.

Montezuma, ruler of the ancient Aztec [Footnote: The Aztec Indians of Mexico, like various other tribes in Central America and in Peru, had reached in many respects a high degree of civilization before the arrival of Europeans.] confederacy of Mexico, was overthrown in 1519 by the reckless Hernando Cortez with a small band of soldiers. Here at last the Spaniards found treasures of gold and silver, and more abundant yet were the stores of precious metal found by Pizarro in Peru (1531). Those were the days when a few score of brave men could capture kingdoms and carry away untold wealth.

In the next chapter we shall see how the Spanish monarchy, backed by the power of American riches, dazzled the eyes of Europe in the sixteenth century. Not content to see his standard waving over almost half of Europe, and all America (except Brazil), Philip II of Spain by conquering Portugal in 1580 added to his possessions the Portuguese empire in the Orient and in Brazil. The gold mines of America, the spices of Asia, and the busiest market of Europe--Antwerp--all paid tribute to his Catholic Majesty, Philip II of Spain.

By an unwise administration of this vast empire, Spain, in the course of time, killed the goose that laid the golden egg. The native Indians, enslaved and lashed to their work in Peruvian and Mexican silver mines, rapidly lost even their primitive civilization and died in alarming numbers. This in itself would not have weakened the monarchy greatly, but it appeared more serious when we remember that the high-handed and harassing regulations imposed by short-sighted or selfish officials had checked the growth of a healthy agricultural and industrial population in the colonies, and that the bulk of the silver was going to support the pride of grandees and to swell the fortunes of German speculators, rather than to fill the royal coffers. The taxes levied on trade with the colonies were so exorbitant that the commerce with America fell largely into the hands of English and Dutch smugglers. Under wise government the monopoly of the African trade-route might have proved extremely valuable, but Philip II, absorbed in other matters, allowed this, too, to slip from his fingers.

While the Spanish monarchy was thus reaping little benefit from its world-wide colonial possessions, it was neglecting to encourage prosperity at home. Trade and manufacture had expanded enormously in the sixteenth century in the hands of the Jews and Moors. Woolen manufactures supported nearly a third of the population. The silk manufacture had become important. It is recorded that salt-works of the region about Santa Maria often sent out fifty shiploads at a time.

These signs of growth soon gave way to signs of decay and depopulation. Chief among the causes of ruin were the taxes, increased enormously during the sixteenth century. Property taxes, said to have increased 30

per cent, ruined farmers, and the "alcabala," or tax on commodities bought and sold, was increased until merchants went out of business, and many an industrial establishment closed its doors rather than pay the taxes. Industry and commerce, already diseased, were almost completely killed by the expulsion of the Jews (1492) and of the Moors (1609), who had been respectively the bankers and the manufacturers of Spain. Spanish gold now went to the English and Dutch smugglers who supplied the peninsula with manufactures, and German bankers became the financiers of the realm.

The crowning misfortune was the revolt of the Netherlands, the richest provinces of the whole empire. Some of the wealthiest cities of Europe were situated in the Netherlands. Bruges had once been a great city, and in 1566 was still able to buy nearly \$2,000,000 worth of wool to feed its looms; but as a commercial and financial center, the Flemish city of Antwerp had taken first place. In 1566 it was said that 300 ships and as many wagons arrived daily with rich cargoes to be bought and sold by the thousand commercial houses of Antwerp. Antwerp was the heart through which the money of Europe flowed. Through the bankers of Antwerp a French king might borrow money of a Turkish pasha. Yet Antwerp was only the greatest among the many cities of the Netherlands.

Charles V, king of Spain during the first half of the sixteenth century, had found in the Netherlands his richest source of income, and had wisely done all in his power to preserve their prosperity. As we shall see in Chapter III, the governors appointed by King Philip II in the second half of the sixteenth century lost the love of the people by the harsh measures against the Protestants, and ruined commerce and industry by imposing taxes of 5 and 10 per cent on every sale of land or goods. In 1566 the Netherlands rose in revolt, and after many bloody battles, the northern or Dutch provinces succeeded in breaking away from Spanish rule.

Spain had not only lost the little Dutch provinces; Flanders was ruined: its fields lay waste, its weavers had emigrated to England, its commerce to Amsterdam. Commercial supremacy never returned to Antwerp after the "Spanish Fury" of 1576. Moreover, during the war Dutch sailors had captured most of the former possessions of Portugal, and English sea-power, beginning in mere piratical attacks on Spanish treasure-fleets, had become firmly established. The finest part of North America was claimed by the English and French. Of her world empire, Spain retained only Central and South America (except Brazil), Mexico, California, Florida, most of the West Indies, and in the East the Philippine Islands and part of Borneo.

[Sidenote: Dutch Sea Power]

The Dutch, driven to sea by the limited resources of their narrow strip of coastland, had begun their maritime career as fishermen "exchanging tons of herring for tons of gold." In the sixteenth century they had built up a considerable carrying trade, bringing cloth, tar, timber, and grain to Spain and France, and distributing to the Baltic countries the wines and liquors and other products of southwestern Europe, in addition to wares from the Portuguese East Indies.

The Dutch traders had purchased their Eastern wares largely from Portuguese merchants in the port of Lisbon. Two circumstances--the union of Spain with Portugal in 1580 and the revolt of the Netherlands from Spain--combined to give the Dutch their great opportunity. In 1594

the port of Lisbon was closed to Dutch merchants. The following year the Dutch made their first voyage to India, and, long jealous of the Portuguese colonial possessions, they began systematically to make the trade with the Spice Islands their own. By 1602, 65 Dutch ships had been to India. In the thirteen years--1602 to 1615--they captured 545 Portuguese and Spanish ships, seized ports on the coasts of Africa and India, and established themselves in the Spice Islands. In addition to most of the old Portuguese empire,--ports in Africa and India, Malacca, Oceanica, and Brazil, [Footnote: Brazil was more or less under Dutch control from 1624 until 1654, when, through an uprising of Portuguese colonists, the country was fully recovered by Portugal. Holland recognized the Portuguese ownership of Brazil by treaty of 1662, and thenceforth the Dutch retained in South America only a portion of Guiana (Surinam).]--the Dutch had acquired a foothold in North America by the discoveries of Henry Hudson in 1609 and by settlement in 1621. Their colonists along the Hudson River called the new territory New Netherland and the town on Manhattan island New Amsterdam, but when Charles II of England seized the land in 1664, he renamed it New York.

Thus the Dutch had succeeded to the colonial empire of the Portuguese. With their increased power they were able entirely to usurp the Baltic trade from the hands of the Hanseatic (German) merchants, who had incurred heavy losses by the injury to their interests in Antwerp during the sixteenth century. Throughout the seventeenth century the Dutch almost monopolized the carrying-trade from Asia and between southwestern Europe and the Baltic. The prosperity of the Dutch was the envy of all Europe.

[Sidenote: Beginnings of English and French Explorations]

It took the whole sixteenth century for the English and French to get thoroughly into the colonial contest. During that period the activities of the English were confined to exploration and piracy, with the exception of the ill-starred attempts of Gilbert and Raleigh to colonize Newfoundland and North Carolina. The voyages of the Anglo-Italian John Cabot in 1497-1498 were later to be the basis of British claims to North America. The search for a northwest passage drove Frobisher (1576-1578), Davis (1585-1587), Hudson (1610-1611), and Baffin (1616) to explore the northern extremity of North America, to leave the record of their exploits in names of bays, islands, and straits, and to establish England's claim to northern Canada; while the search for a northeast passage enticed Willoughby and Chancellor (1553) around Lapland, and Jenkinson (1557-1558) to the icebound port of Archangel in northern Russia. Elizabethan England had neither silver mines nor spice islands, but the deficiency was never felt while British privateers sailed the seas. Hawkins, the great slaver, Drake, the second circumnavigator of the globe, Davis, and Cavendish were but four of the bold captains who towed home many a stately Spanish galleon laden with silver plate and with gold. As for spices, the English East India Company, chartered in 1600, was soon to build up an empire in the East in competition with the Portuguese, the Dutch, and the French, but that story belongs to a later chapter.

France was less active. The rivalry of Francis I [Footnote: See below, pp. 77 ff.] with Charles I of Spain had extended even to the New World. Verrazano (1524) sailed the coast from Carolina to Labrador, and Cartier (1534-1535) pushed up the Saint Lawrence to Montreal, looking for a northwest passage, and demonstrating that France had no respect for the Spanish claim to all America. After 1535, however, nothing of

permanence was done until the end of the century, and the founding of French colonies in India and along the Saint Lawrence and Mississippi rivers belongs rather to the history of the seventeenth century.

[Sidenote: Motives for Colonization]

One of the most amazing spectacles in history is the expansion of Europe since the sixteenth century. Not resting content with discovering the rest of the world, the European nations with sublime confidence pressed on to divide the new continents among them, to conquer, Christianize, and civilize the natives, and to send out millions of new emigrants to establish beyond the seas a New England, a New France, a New Spain, and a New Netherland. The Spaniards in Spain to-day are far outnumbered by the Spanish-speaking people in Argentina, Chili, Peru, Venezuela, Colombia, Central America, and the Philippine Islands.

[Sidenote: Religion]

It was not merely greed for gold and thirst for glory which inspired the colonizing movement. To the merchant's eager search for precious metals and costly spices, and to the adventurer's fierce delight in braving unknown dangers where white man never had ventured, the Portuguese and Spanish explorers added the inspiration of an ennobling missionary ideal. In the conquest of the New World priests and chapels were as important as soldiers and fortresses; and its settlements were named in honor of Saint Francis (San Francisco), Saint Augustine (St. Augustine), the Holy Saviour (San Salvador), the Holy Cross (Santa Cruz), or the Holy Faith (Santa Fé). Fearless priests penetrated the interior of America, preaching and baptizing as they went. Unfortunately some of the Spanish adventurers who came to make fortunes in the mines of America, and a great number of the non-Spanish foreigners who owned mines in the Spanish colonies, set gain before religion, and imposed crushing burdens on the natives who toiled as slaves in their mines. Cruelty and forced labor decimated the natives, but in the course of time this abuse was remedied, thanks largely to the Spanish bishop, Bartolomé de las Casas, and instead of forming a miserable remnant of an almost extinct race, as they do in the United States, the Indians freely intermarried with the Spaniards, whom they always outnumbered. As a result, Latin America is peopled by nations which are predominantly Indian in blood, [Footnote: Except in the southern part of South America.] Spanish or Portuguese [Footnote: In Brazil.] in language, and Roman Catholic in religion.

The same religious zeal which had actuated Spanish missionary-explorers was manifested at a later date by the French Jesuit Fathers who penetrated North America in order to preach the Christian faith to the Indians. Quite different were the religious motives which in the seventeenth century inspired Protestant colonists in the New World. They came not as evangelists, but as religious outcasts fleeing from persecution, or as restless souls worsted at politics or unable to gain a living at home. This meant the dispossession and ultimate extinction rather than the conversion of the Indians.

[Sidenote: Decline of the Hanseatic League]

The stirring story of the colonial struggles which occupied the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries will be taken up in another chapter; at this point, therefore, we turn from the expanding nations

on the Atlantic seaboard to note the mournful plight of the older commercial powers--the German and Italian city-states. As for the former, the Hanseatic League, despoiled of its Baltic commerce by enterprising Dutch and English merchants, its cities restless and rebellious, gradually broke up. In 1601 an Englishman metaphorically observed: "Most of their [the league's] teeth have fallen out, the rest sit but loosely in their head,"--and in fact all were soon lost except Lübeck, Bremen, and Hamburg.

[Sidenote: Decay of Venice]

Less rapid, but no less striking, was the decay of Venice and the other Italian cities. The first cargoes brought by the Portuguese from India caused the price of pepper and spices to fall to a degree which spelled ruin for the Venetians. The Turks continued to harry Italian traders in the Levant, and the Turkish sea-power grew to menacing proportions, until in 1571 Venice had to appeal to Spain for help. To the terror of the Turk was added the torment of the Barbary pirates, who from the northern coast of Africa frequently descended upon Italian seaports. The commerce of Venice was ruined. The brilliance of Venice in art and literature lasted through another century (the seventeenth), supported on the ruins of Venetian opulence; but the splendor of Venice was extinguished finally in the turbulent sea of political intrigue into which the rest of Italy had already sunk.

EFFECTS OF THE COMMERCIAL REVOLUTION

In a way, all of the colonizing movements, which we have been at pains to trace, might be regarded as the first and greatest result of the Commercial Revolution--that is, if by the Commercial Revolution one understands simply the discovery of new trade-routes; but, as it is difficult to separate explorations from colonization, we have used the term "Commercial Revolution" to include both. By the Commercial Revolution we mean that expansive movement by which European commerce escaped from the narrow confines of the Mediterranean and encompassed the whole world. We shall proceed now to consider that movement in its secondary aspects or effects.

One of the first in importance of these effects was the advent of a new politico-economic doctrine?mercantilism--the result of the transference of commercial supremacy from Italian and German city-states to national states.

[Sidenote: Nationalism in Commerce]

With the declining Italian and German commercial cities, the era of municipal commerce passed away forever. In the peoples of the Atlantic seaboard, who now became masters of the seas, national consciousness already was strongly developed, and centralized governments were perfected; these nations carried the national spirit into commerce. Portugal and Spain owed their colonial empires to the enterprise of their royal families; Holland gained a trade route as an incident of her struggle for national independence; England and France, which were to become the great commercial rivals of the eighteenth century, were the two strongest national monarchies.

[Sidenote: Mercantilism]

The new nations founded their power not on the fearlessness of their chevaliers, but on the extent of their financial resources. Wealth was needed to arm and to pay the soldiers, wealth to build warships, wealth to bribe diplomats. And since this wealth must come from the people by taxes, it was essential to have a people prosperous enough to pay taxes. The wealth of the nation must be the primary consideration of the legislators. In endeavoring to cultivate and preserve the wealth of their subjects, European monarchs proceeded upon the assumption that if a nation exported costly manufactures to its own colonies and imported cheap raw materials from them, the money paid into the home country for manufactures would more than counterbalance the money paid out for raw materials, and this "favorable balance of trade" would bring gold to the nation. This economic theory and the system based upon it are called mercantilism. In order to establish such a balance of trade, the government might either forbid or heavily tax the importation of manufactures from abroad, might prohibit the export of raw materials, might subsidize the export of manufactures, and might attempt by minute regulations to foster industry at home as well as to discourage competition in the colonies. Thus, intending to retain the profits of commerce for Englishmen, Cromwell and later rulers required that certain goods must be carried on English ships.

[Sidenote: Chartered Companies]

By far the most popular method of developing a lucrative colonial trade--especially towards the end of the sixteenth and throughout the seventeenth century--was by means of chartered commercial companies. England (in 1600), Holland (in 1602), France (in 1664), Sweden, Denmark, Scotland, and Prussia each chartered its own "East India Company." The English possessions on the Atlantic coast of America were shared by the London and Plymouth Companies (1606). English companies for trade with Russia, Turkey, Morocco, Guiana, Bermuda, the Canaries, and Hudson Bay were organized and reorganized with bewildering activity. In France the crop of commercial companies was no less abundant.

To each of these companies was assigned the exclusive right to trade with and to govern the inhabitants of a particular colony, with the privilege and duty of defending the same. Sometimes the companies were required to pay money into the royal treasury, or on the other hand, if the enterprise were a difficult one, a company might be supported by royal subsidies. The Dutch West India Company (1621) was authorized to build forts, maintain troops, and make war on land and sea; the government endowed the company with one million florins, sixteen ships, four yachts, and exemption from all tolls and license dues on its vessels. The English East India Company, first organized in 1600, conducted the conquest and government of India for more than two centuries, before its administrative power was taken away in 1858.

[Sidenote: Financial Methods.]

[Sidenote: The "Regulated Company"]

The great commercial companies were a new departure in business method. In the middle ages business had been carried on mostly by individuals or by partnerships, the partners being, as a rule, members of the same family. After the expansion of commerce, trading with another country necessitated building forts and equipping fleets for protection against savages, pirates, or other nations. Since this could not be accomplished with the limited resources of a few individuals, it was

necessary to form large companies in which many investors shared expense and risk. Some had been created for European trade, but the important growth of such companies was for distant trade. Their first form was the "regulated company." Each member would contribute to the general fund for such expenses as building forts; and certain rules would be made for the governance of all. Subject to these rules, each merchant traded as he pleased, and there was no pooling of profits. The regulated company, the first form of the commercial company, was encouraged by the king. He could charter such a company, grant it a monopoly over a certain district, and trust it to develop the trade as no individual could, and there was no evasion of taxes as by independent merchants.

[Sidenote: The Joint-stock Company]

After a decade or so, many of the regulated companies found that their members often pursued individual advantage to the detriment of the company's interests, and it was thought that, taken altogether, profits would be greater and the risk less, if all should contribute to a common treasury, intrusting to the most able members the direction of the business for the benefit of all. Then each would receive a dividend or part of the profits proportional to his share in the general treasury or "joint stock." The idea that while the company as a whole was permanent each individual could buy or sell "shares" in the joint stock, helped to make such "joint-stock" companies very popular after the opening of the seventeenth century. The English East India Company, organized as a regulated company in 1600, was reorganized piecemeal for half a century until it acquired the form of a joint-stock enterprise; most of the other chartered colonial companies followed the same plan. In these early stock-companies we find the germ of the most characteristic of present-day business institutions--the corporation. In the seventeenth century this form of business organization, then in its rudimentary stages, as yet had not been applied to industry, nor had sad experience yet revealed the lengths to which corrupt corporation directors might go.

[Sidenote: Banking]

The development of the joint-stock company was attended by increased activity in banking. In the early middle ages the lending of money for interest had been forbidden by the Catholic Church; in this as in other branches of business it was immoral to receive profit without giving work. The Jews, however, with no such scruples, had found money-lending very profitable, even though royal debtors occasionally refused to pay. As business developed in Italy, however, Christians lost their repugnance to interest-taking, and Italian (Lombard) and later French and German money-lenders and money-changers became famous. Since the coins minted by feudal lords and kings were hard to pass except in limited districts, and since the danger of counterfeit or light-weight coins was far greater than now, the "money-changers" who would buy and sell the coins of different countries did a thriving business at Antwerp in the early sixteenth century. Later, Amsterdam, London, Hamburg, and Frankfort took over the business of Antwerp and developed the institutions of finance to a higher degree. [Footnote: The gold of the New World and the larger scope of commercial enterprises had increased the scale of operations, as may be seen by comparing the fortunes of three great banking families: 1300--the Peruzzi's, \$800,000; 1440--the Medici's, \$7,500,000; 1546--the Fuggers', \$40,000,000.] The money-lenders became bankers, paying interest on

deposits and receiving higher interest on loans. Shares of the stock of commercial companies were bought and sold in exchanges, and as early as 1542 there were complaints about speculating on the rise and fall of stocks.

Within a comparatively short time the medieval merchants' guilds had given way to great stock-companies, and Jewish money-lenders to millionaire bankers and banking houses with many of our instruments of exchange such as the bill of exchange. Such was the revolution in business that attended, and that was partly caused, partly helped, by the changes in foreign trade, which we call the Commercial Revolution.

[Sidenote: New Commodities]

Not only was foreign trade changed from the south and east of Europe to the west, from the city-states to nations, from land-routes to ocean-routes; but the vessels which sailed the Atlantic were larger, stronger, and more numerous, and they sailed with amazing confidence and safety, as compared with the fragile caravels and galleys of a few centuries before. The cargoes they carried had changed too. The comparative cheapness of water-transportation had made it possible profitably to carry grain and meat, as well as costly luxuries of small bulk such as spices and silks. Manufactures were an important item. Moreover, new commodities came into commerce, such as tea and coffee. The Americas sent to Europe the potato, "Indian" corn, tobacco, cocoa, cane-sugar (hitherto scarce), molasses, rice, rum, fish, whale-oil and whalebone, dye-woods and timber and furs; Europe sent back manufactures, luxuries, and slaves.

[Sidenote: Slavery]

Slaves had been articles of commerce since time immemorial; at the end of the fifteenth century there were said to have been 3000 in Venice; and the Portuguese had enslaved some Africans before 1500. But the need for cheap labor in the mines and on the sugar and tobacco plantations of the New World gave the slave-trade a new and tremendous impetus. The Spaniards began early to enslave the natives of America, although the practice was opposed by the noble endeavors of the Dominican friar and bishop, Bartolomé de las Casas. But the native population was not sufficient,—or, as in the English colonies, the Indians were exterminated rather than enslaved,—and in the sixteenth century it was deemed necessary to import negroes from Africa. The trade in African negroes was fathered by the English captain Hawkins, and fostered alike by English and Dutch. It proved highly lucrative, and it was long before the trade yielded to the better judgment of civilized nations, and still longer before the institution of slavery could be eradicated.

[Sidenote: Effects on Industry and Agriculture]

The expansion of trade was the strongest possible stimulus to agriculture and industry. New industries--such as the silk and cotton manufacture--grew up outside of the antiquated gild system. The old industries, especially the English woolen industry, grew to new importance and often came under the control of the newer and more powerful merchants who conducted a wholesale business in a single commodity, such as cloth. Capitalists had their agents buy wool, dole it out to spinners and weavers who were paid so much for a given amount of work, and then sell the finished product. This was called the "domestic system," because the work was done at home, or

"capitalistic," because raw material and finished product were owned not by the man who worked them, but by a "capitalist" or rich merchant. How these changing conditions were dealt with by mercantilist statesmen, we shall see in later chapters.

The effect on agriculture had been less direct but no less real. The land had to be tilled with greater care to produce grain sufficient to support populous cities and to ship to foreign ports. Countries were now more inclined to specialize--France in wine, England in wool--and so certain branches of production grew more important. The introduction of new crops produced no more remarkable results than in Ireland where the potato, transplanted from America, became a staple in the Irish diet: "Irish potatoes" in common parlance attest the completeness of domestication.

[Sidenote: General Significance of Commercial Revolution]

In the preceding pages we have attempted to study particular effects of the Commercial Revolution (in the broad sense including the expansion of commerce as well as the change of trade-routes), such as the decline of Venice and of the Hanse, the formation of colonial empires, the rise of commercial companies, the expansion of banking, the introduction of new articles of commerce, and the development of agriculture and industry. In each particular the change was noticeable and important.

But the Commercial Revolution possesses a more general significance.

[Sidenote: Europeanization of the World]

(1) It was the Commercial Revolution that started Europe on her career of world conquest. The petty, quarrelsome feudal states of the smallest of five continents have become the Powers of to-day, dividing up Africa, Asia, and America, founding empires greater and more lasting than that of Alexander. The colonists of Europe imparted their language to South America and made of North America a second Europe with a common cultural heritage. The explorers, missionaries, and merchants of Europe have penetrated all lands, bringing in their train European manners, dress, and institutions. They are still at work Europeanizing the world.

[Sidenote: 2. Increase of Wealth, Knowledge, and Comfort]

(2) The expansion of commerce meant the increase of wealth, knowledge, and comfort. All the continents heaped their treasures in the lap of Europe. Knowledge of the New World, with its many peoples, products, and peculiarities, tended to dispel the silly notions of medieval ignorance; and the goods of every land were brought for the comfort of the European--American timber for his house, Persian rugs for his floors, Indian ebony for his table, Irish linen to cover it, Peruvian silver for his fork, Chinese tea, sweetened with sugar from Cuba.

[Sidenote: 3. The Rise of the Bourgeoisie]

(3) This new comfort, knowledge, and wealth went not merely to nobles and prelates; it was noticeable most of all in a new class, the "bourgeoisie." In the towns of Europe lived bankers, merchants, and shop-keepers,--intelligent, able, and wealthy enough to live like kings or princes. These bourgeois or townspeople (_bourg_ = town) were to grow in intelligence, in wealth, and in political influence; they

were destined to precipitate revolutions in industry and politics, thereby establishing their individual rule over factories, and their collective rule over legislatures.

ADDITIONAL READING

GENERAL. A. F. Pollard, *Factors in Modern History* (1907), ch. ii, vi, x, three illuminating essays; E. P. Cheyney, *An Introduction to the Industrial and Social History of England* (1901), ch. ii-vi, a good outline; F. W. Tickner, *A Social and Industrial History of England* (1915), an interesting and valuable elementary manual, ch. i-vii, x-xii, xvi, xvii, xix-xxi, xxiv-xxvii; W. J. Ashley, *The Economic Organization of England* (1914), ch. i-v; G. T. Warner, *Landmarks in English Industrial History*, 11th ed. (1912), ch. vii-xiii; H. D. Traill and J. S. Mann (editors), *Social England* (1909), Vols. II, III; H. de B. Gibbins, *Industry in England*, 6th ed. (1910), compact general survey; William Cunningham, *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times*, 5th ed., 3 vols. (1910-1912), a standard work; H. D. Bax, *German Society at the Close of the Middle Ages* (1894), brief but clear, especially ch. i, v, vii on towns and country-life in the Germanies. Very detailed works: Maxime Kovalevsky, *Die ökonomische Entwicklung Europas bis zum Beginn der kapitalistischen Wirtschaftsform*, trans. into German from Russian, 7 vols. (1901-1914), especially vols. III, IV, VI; Émile Levasseur, *Histoire des classes ouvrières et de l'industrie en France avant 1789*, Vol. II (1901), Book V; Georges d'Avenel, *Histoire économique de la propriété, des salaires, etc.*, 1200-1800, 6 vols. (1894-1912).

AGRICULTURE IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. R. E. Prothero, *English Farming Past and Present* (1912), ch. iv; E. C. K. Gonner, *Common Land and Inclosure* (1912), valuable for England; R. H. Tawney, *The Agrarian Problem in the Sixteenth Century* (1912); E. F. Gay, *Essays on English Agrarian History in the Sixteenth Century* (1913); H. T. Stephenson, *The Elizabethan People* (1910); W. Hasbach, *A History of the English Agricultural Labourer*, trans. by Ruth Kenyon (1908), an excellent work, particularly Part I on the development of the class of free laborers from that of the medieval serfs. Valuable for feudal survivals in France is the brief *Feudal Regime* by Charles Seignobos, trans. by Dow. Useful for social conditions in Russia: James Mavor, *An Economic History of Russia*, 2 vols. (1914), Vol. I, Book I, ch. iii. See also Eva M. Tappan, *When Knights were Bold* (1911) for a very entertaining chapter for young people, on agriculture in the sixteenth century; Augustus Jessopp, *The Coming of the Friars* (1913), ch. ii, for a sympathetic treatment of "Village Life Six Hundred Years Ago"; and W. J. Ashley, *Surveys, Historical and Economic*, for a series of scholarly essays dealing with recent controversies in regard to medieval land-tenure.

TOWNS AND COMMERCE ABOUT 1500. Clive Day, *History of Commerce* (1907), best brief account; W. C. Webster, *A General History of Commerce* (1903), another excellent outline; E. P. Cheyney, *European Background of American History* (1904) in "American Nation" Series, clear account of the medieval trade routes, pp. 3-40, of the early activities of chartered companies, pp. 123-167, and of the connection of the Protestant Revolution with colonialism, pp. 168-239; W. S. Lindsay,

History of Merchant Shipping and Ancient Commerce, 4 vols. (1874-1876), very detailed. The best account of sixteenth-century industry is in Vol. II of W. J. Ashley, English Economic History and Theory, with elaborate critical bibliographies. For town-life and the gilds: Mrs. J. R. Green, Town Life in England in the Fifteenth Century, 2 vols. (1894); Charles Gross, The Gild Merchant, 2 vols. (1890); Lujo Brentano, On the History and Development of Gilds (1870); George Unwin, The Gilds and Companies of London (1908), particularly the interesting chapter on "The Place of the Gild in the History of Western Europe." A brief view of English town-life in the later middle ages: E. Lipson, An Introduction to the Economic History of England, Vol. I (1915), ch. v-ix. On town-life in the Netherlands: Henri Pirenne, Belgian Democracy: its Early History, trans. by J. V. Saunders (1915). On town-life in the Germanies: Helen Zimmern, The Hansa Towns (1889) in "Story of the Nations" Series; Karl von Hegel, Städte und Gilden der germanischen Völker im Mittelalter, 2 vols. (1891), the standard treatise in German. On French gilds: Martin St. Leon, Histoire des corporations des métiers (1897). See also, for advanced study of trade-routes, Wilhelm Heyd, Geschichte des Levantehandels im Mittelalter, 2 vols. (1879), with a French trans. (1885-1886), and Aloys Schulte, Geschichte des mittelalterlichen Handels und Verkehrs zwischen Westdeutschland und Italien, 2 vols. (1900).

GENERAL TREATMENTS OF EXPLORATION AND COLONIZATION. Cambridge Modern History, Vol. I (1902), ch. i, ii; A. G. Keller, Colonization: a Study of the Founding of New Societies (1908), a textbook, omitting reference to English and French colonization; H. C. Morris, History of Colonization, 2 vols. (1908), a useful general text; M. B. Synge, A Book of Discovery: the History of the World's Exploration, from the Earliest Times to the Finding of the South Pole (1912); Histoire générale, Vol. IV, ch. xxii, xxiii, and Vol. V, ch. xxii; S. Ruge, Geschichte des Zeitalters der Entdeckungen (1881), in the ambitious Oncken Series; Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, La colonisation chez les peuples modernes, 6th ed., 2 vols. (1908), the best general work in French; Charles de Lannoy and Hermann van der Linden, Histoire de l'expansion coloniale des peuples européens, an important undertaking of two Belgian professors, of which two volumes have appeared--Vol. I, Portugal et Espagne (1907), and Vol. II, Néerlande et Danemark, 17e et 18e siècle (1911); Alfred Zimmermann, Die europäischen Kolonien, the main German treatise, in 5 vols. (1896-1903), dealing with Spain and Portugal (Vol. I), Great Britain (Vols. II, III), France (Vol. IV), and Holland (Vol. V). Much illustrative source-material is available in the publications of the Hakluyt Society, Old Series, 100 vols. (1847-1898), and New Series, 35 vols. (1899-1914), selections having been separately published by E. J. Payne (1893-1900) and by C. R. Beazley (1907). An account of the medieval travels of Marco Polo is published conveniently in the "Everyman" Series, and the best edition of the medieval travel-tales which have passed under the name of Sir John Maundeville is that of The Macmillan Company (1900). For exploration prior to Columbus and Da Gama, see C. R. Beazley, The Dawn of Modern Geography, 3 vols. (1897-1906).

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO AMERICA: J. S. Bassett, A Short History of the United States (1914), ch. i, ii, a good outline; Edward Channing, A History of the United States, Vol. I (1905), an excellent and more detailed narrative; Livingston Farrand, Basis of American History (1904), Vol. II of the "American Nation" Series, especially valuable on the American aborigines; E. J. Payne, History

of the New World called America_, 2 vols. (1892-1899); John Fiske, _Colonization of the New World_, Vol. XXI of _History of All Nations_, ch. i-vi; R. G. Watson, _Spanish and Portuguese South America_, 2 vols. (1884); Bernard Moses, _The Establishment of Spanish Rule in America_ (1898), and, by the same author, _The Spanish Dependencies in South America_, 2 vols. (1914). With special reference to Asiatic India: Mountstuart Elphinstone, _History of India: the Hindu and Mohametan Periods_, 9th ed. (1905), an old but still valuable work on the background of Indian history; Sir W. W. Hunter, _A Brief History of the Indian Peoples_, rev. ed. (1903), and, by the same author, _A History of British India_ to the opening of the eighteenth century, 2 vols. (1899-1900), especially Vol. I; Pringle Kennedy, _A History of the Great Moghuls_, 2 vols. (1905-1911). With special reference to African exploration and colonization in the sixteenth century: Sir Harry Johnston, _History of the Colonization of Africa by Alien Races_ (1899), a very useful and authoritative manual; Robert Brown, _The Story of Africa_, 4 vols. (1894-1895), a detailed study; G. M. Theal, _South Africa_ (1894), a clear summary in the "Story of the Nations" Series; J. S. Keltic, _The Partition of Africa_ (1895). See also Sir Harry Johnston, _The Negro in the New World_ (1910), important for the slave-trade and interesting, though in tone somewhat anti-English and pro-Spanish; J. K. Ingram, _A History of Slavery and Serfdom_ (1895), a brief sketch; and W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, _The Negro_ (1915), a handy volume in the "Home University Library."

EXPLORATION AND COLONIZATION COUNTRY BY COUNTRY. Portugal: C. R. Beazley, _Prince Henry the Navigator_ in "Heroes of the Nation," Series (1897); J. P. Oliveira Martins, _The Golden Age of Prince Henry the Navigator_, trans. with notes and additions by J. J. Abraham and W. E. Reynolds (1914); K. G. Jayne, _Vasco da Gama and his Successors_, 1460-1580 (1910); H. M. Stephens, _Portugal_ (1891), a brief sketch in the "Story of the Nations" Series; F. C. Danvers, _The Portuguese In India_, 2 vols. (1894), a thorough and scholarly work; H. M. Stephens, _Albuquerque and the Portuguese Settlements in India_ (1892), in "Rulers of India" Series; Angel Marvaud, _Le Portugal et ses colonies_ (1912); G. M. Theal, _History and Ethnography of Africa South of the Zambesi_, Vol. I, _The Portuguese in South Africa from 1505 to 1700_ (1907), a standard work by the Keeper of the Archives of Cape Colony. Spain: John Fiske, _Discovery of America_, 2 vols. (1892), most delightful narrative; Wilhelm Roscher, _The Spanish Colonial System_, a brief but highly suggestive extract from an old German work trans. by E. G. Bourne (1904); E. G. Bourne, _Spain in America_, 1450-1580 (1904), Vol. III of "American Nation" Series, excellent in content and form; W. R. Shepherd, _Latin America_ (1914) in "Home University Library." pp. 9-68, clear and suggestive; Sir Arthur Helps, _The Spanish Conquest in America_, new ed., 4 vols. (1900-1904). A scholarly study of Columbus's career is J. B. Thacher, _Christopher Columbus_, 3 vols. (1903-1904), incorporating many of the sources; Washington Irving, _Life and Voyages of Christopher Columbus_, originally published in 1828-1831, but still very readable and generally sound; Filson Young, _Christopher Columbus and the New World of his Discovery_, 2 vols. (1906), a popular account, splendidly illustrated; Henry Harrisse, _Christophe Colomb, son origine, sa vie, ses voyages_, 2 vols. (1884), a standard work by an authority on the age of exploration; Henri Vignaud, _Histoire critique de la grande entreprise de Christophe Colomb_, 2 vols. (1911), destructive of many commonly accepted ideas regarding Columbus; F. H. H. Guillemard, _The Life of Ferdinand Magellan_ (1890); F. A. MacNutt, _Fernando Cortes and the

Conquest of Mexico_, 1485-1547 (1909), in the "Heroes of the Nations" Series, and, by the same author, both _Letters of Cortes_, 2 vols. (1908), and _Bartholomew de las Casas_ (1909); Sir Clements Markham, _The Incas of Peru_ (1910). On the transference of colonial power from Spain to the Dutch and English, see _Cambridge Modern History_, Vol. IV (1906), ch. xxv, by H. E. Egerton. England: H. E. Egerton, _A Short History of British Colonial Policy_, 2d ed. (1909), a bald summary, provided, however, with good bibliographies; W. H. Woodward, _A Short History of the Expansion of the British Empire, 1500-1911_, 3d ed. (1912), a useful epitome; C. R. Beazley, _John and Sebastian Cabot: the Discovery of North America_ (1898); J. A. Williamson, _Maritime Enterprise, 1485-1558_ (1913); E. J. Payne (editor), _Voyages of the Elizabethan Seamen to America_, 2 vols. (1893-1900); L. G. Tyler, _England in America, 1580-1652_ (1904), Vol. IV of "American Nation" Series; George Edmundson, _Anglo-Dutch Rivalry, 1600-1653_ (1911). France: R. G. Thwaites, _France in America, 1497-1763_ (1905), Vol. VII of "American Nation" Series.

ECONOMIC RESULTS OF THE COMMERCIAL REVOLUTION. William Cunningham, _An Essay on Western Civilization in its Economic Aspects_, Vol. II, _Mediaeval and Modern Times_ (1910), pp. 162-224, and, by the same author, ch. xv of Vol. I (1902) of the _Cambridge Modern History_; E. P. Cheyney, _Social Changes in England in the Sixteenth Century_ (1912); George Unwin, _Industrial Organization in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries_ (1904); G. Cawston and A. H. Keane, _Early Chartered Companies_ (1896); W. R. Scott, _The Constitution and Finance of English, Scottish, and Irish Joint-Stock Companies to 1720_, Vol. I (1912); C. T. Carr (editor), _Select Charters of Trading Companies_ (1913); Beckles Willson, _The Great Company_ (1899), an account of the Hudson Bay Company; Henry Weber, _La Compagnie française des Indes, 1604-1675_ (1904); _Recueil des voyages de la Compagnie des Indes orientales des Hollandais_, 10 vols. (1730), the monumental source for the activities of the chief Dutch trading-company.

CHAPTER III

EUROPEAN POLITICS IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

THE EMPEROR CHARLES V

As we look back upon the confused sixteenth century, we are struck at once by two commanding figures,—the Emperor Charles V [Footnote: Charles I of Spain.] and his son Philip II,—about whom we may group most of the political events of the period. The father occupies the center of the stage during the first half of the century; the son, during the second half.

[Sidenote: Extensive Dominions of Charles]

At Ghent in the Netherlands, Charles was born in 1500 of illustrious parentage. His father was Philip of Habsburg, son of the Emperor Maximilian and Mary, duchess of Burgundy. His mother was the Infanta Joanna, daughter and heiress of Ferdinand of Aragon and Naples and Isabella of Castile and the Indies. The death of his father and the incapacity of his mother—she had become insane—left Charles at the

tender age of six years an orphan under the guardianship of his grandfathers Maximilian and Ferdinand. The death of the latter in 1516 transferred the whole Spanish inheritance to Charles, and three years later, by the death of the former, he came into possession of the hereditary dominions of the Habsburgs. Thus under a youth of nineteen years were grouped wider lands and greater populations than any Christian sovereign had ever ruled. Vienna, Amsterdam, Antwerp, Brussels, Milan, Naples, Madrid, Cadiz,--even the City of Mexico,--owed him allegiance. His titles alone would fill several pages.

Maximilian had intended not only that all these lands should pass into the hands of the Habsburg family, but also that his grandson should succeed him as head of the Holy Roman Empire. This ambition, however, was hard of fulfillment, because the French king, Francis I (1515-1547), feared the encircling of his own country by a united German-Spanish-Italian state, and set himself to preserve what he called the "Balance of Power"--preventing the undue growth of one political power at the expense of others. It was only by means of appeal to national and family sentiment and the most wholesale bribery that Charles managed to secure a majority of the electors' votes against his French rival [Footnote: Henry VIII of England was also a candidate.] and thereby to acquire the coveted imperial title. He was crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle in his twenty-first year.

[Sidenote: Character of Charles]

Never have greater difficulties confronted a sovereign than those which Charles V was obliged to face throughout his reign; never did monarch lead a more strenuous life. He was the central figure in a very critical period of history: his own character as well as the painstaking education he had received in the Netherlands conferred upon him a lively appreciation of his position and a dogged pertinacity in discharging its obligations. Both in administering his extensive dominions and in dealing with foreign foes, Charles was a zealous, hard-working, and calculating prince, and the lack of success which attended many of his projects was due not to want of ability in the ruler but to the multiplicity of interests among the ruled. The emperor must do too many things to allow of his doing any one thing well.

[Sidenote: Difficulties Confronting Charles]

Suppose we turn over in our minds some of the chief problems of Charles V, for they will serve to explain much of the political history of the sixteenth century. In the first place, the emperor was confronted with extraordinary difficulties in governing his territories. Each one of the seventeen provinces of the Netherlands--the country which he always considered peculiarly his own--was a distinct political unit, for there existed only the rudiments of a central administration and a common representative system, while the county of Burgundy had a separate political organization. The crown of Castile brought with it the recently conquered kingdom of Granada, together with the new colonies in America and scattered posts in northern Africa. The crown of Aragon comprised the four distinct states of Aragon, Valencia, Catalonia, and Navarre, [Footnote: The part south of the Pyrenees. See above, p. 8.] and, in addition, the kingdoms of Naples, Sicily, and Sardinia, each with its own customs and government. At least eight independent cortes or parliaments existed in this Spanish-Italian group, adding greatly to the intricacy of administration. Much the same was true of that other Habsburg group of states,--Austria, Styria, Carniola, Carinthia, the

Tyrol, etc., but Charles soon freed himself from immediate responsibility for their government by intrusting them (1521) to his younger brother, Ferdinand, who by his own marriage and elections added the kingdoms of Bohemia [Footnote: Including the Bohemian crown lands of Moravia and Silesia.] and Hungary (1526) to the Habsburg dominions. The Empire afforded additional problems: it made serious demands upon the time, money, and energies of its ruler; in return, it gave little but glamour. In all these regions Charles had to do with financial, judicial, and ecclesiastical matters. He had to reconcile conflicting interests and appeal for popularity to many varied races. More than once during his reign he even had to repress rebellion. In Germany, from his very first Diet in 1521, he was face to face with rising Protestantism which seemed to him to blaspheme his altar and to assail his throne.

The emperor's overwhelming administrative difficulties were complicated at every turn by the intricacies of foreign politics. In the first place, Charles was obliged to wage war with France throughout the greater part of his reign; he had inherited a longstanding quarrel with the French kings, to which the rivalry of Francis I for the empire gave a personal aspect. In the second place, and almost as formidable, was the advance of the Turks up the Danube and the increase of Mohammedan naval power in the Mediterranean. Against Protestant Germany a Catholic monarch might hope to rely on papal assistance, and English support might conceivably be enlisted against France. But the popes, who usually disliked the emperor's Italian policy, were not of great aid to him elsewhere; and the English sovereigns had domestic reasons for developing hostility to Charles. A brief sketch of the foreign affairs of Charles may make the situation clear.

[Sidenote: Francis I of France and the Reasons for his Wars with the Emperor Charles V]

Six years older than Charles, Francis I had succeeded to the French throne in 1515, irresponsible, frivolous, and vain of military reputation. The general political situation of the time,--the gradual inclosure of the French monarchy by a string of Habsburg territories,--to say nothing of the remarkable contrast between the character of Francis and that of the persevering Charles, made a great conflict inevitable, and definite pretexts were not lacking for an early outbreak of hostilities. (1) Francis revived the claims of the French crown to Naples, although Louis XII had renounced them in 1504. (2) Francis, bent on regaining Milan, which his predecessor had lost in 1512, invaded the duchy and, after winning the brilliant victory of Marignano in the first year of his reign, occupied the city of Milan. Charles subsequently insisted, however, that the duchy was a fief of the Holy Roman Empire and that he was sworn by oath to recover it. (3) Francis asserted the claims of a kinsman to the little kingdom of Navarre, the greater part of which, it will be remembered, had recently [Footnote: In 1512. See above.] been forcibly annexed to Spain. (4) Francis desired to extend his sway over the rich French-speaking provinces of the Netherlands, while Charles was determined not only to prevent further aggressions but to recover the duchy of Burgundy of which his grandmother had been deprived by Louis XI. (5) The outcome of the contest for the imperial crown in 1519 virtually completed the breach between the two rivals. War broke out in 1521, and with few interruptions it was destined to outlast the lives of both Francis and Charles.

[Sidenote: The Italian Wars of Charles V and Francis I]

Italy was the main theater of the combat. In the first stage, the imperial forces, with the aid of a papal army, speedily drove the French garrison out of Milan. The Sforza family was duly invested with the duchy as a fief of the Empire, and the pope was compensated by the addition of Parma and Piacenza to the Patrimony of Saint Peter. The victorious Imperialists then pressed across the Alps and besieged Marseilles. Francis, who had been detained by domestic troubles in France, [Footnote: These troubles related to the disposition of the important landed estates of the Bourbon family. The duke of Bourbon, who was constable of France, felt himself injured by the king and accordingly deserted to the emperor.] now succeeded in raising the siege and pursued the retreating enemy to Milan. Instead of following up his advantage by promptly attacking the main army of the Imperialists, the French king dispatched a part of his force to Naples, and with the other turned aside to blockade the city of Pavia. This blunder enabled the Imperialists to reform their ranks and to march towards Pavia in order to join the besieged. Here on 24 February, 1525,--the emperor's twenty-fifth birthday,--the army of Charles won an overwhelming victory. Eight thousand French soldiers fell on the field that day, and Francis, who had been in the thick of the fight, was compelled to surrender. "No thing in the world is left me save my honor and my life," wrote the king to his mother. Everything seemed auspicious for the cause of Charles. Francis, after a brief captivity in Spain, was released on condition that he would surrender all claims to Burgundy, the Netherlands, and Italy, and would marry the emperor's sister.

[Sidenote: The Sack of Rome, 1527]

Francis swore upon the Gospels and upon his knightly word that he would fulfill these conditions, but in his own and contemporary opinion the compulsion exercised upon him absolved him from his oath. No sooner was he back in France than he declared the treaty null and void and proceeded to form alliances with all the Italian powers that had become alarmed by the sudden strengthening of the emperor's position in the peninsula,--the pope, Venice, Florence, and even the Sforza who owed everything to Charles. Upon the resumption of hostilities the league displayed the same want of agreement and energy which characterized every coalition of Italian city-states; and soon the Imperialists were able to possess themselves of much of the country. In 1527 occurred a famous episode--the sack of Rome. It was not displeasing to the emperor that the pope should be punished for giving aid to France, although Charles cannot be held altogether responsible for what befell. His army in Italy, composed largely of Spaniards and Germans, being short of food and money, and without orders, mutinied and marched upon the Eternal City, which was soon at their mercy. About four thousand people perished in the capture. The pillage lasted nine months, and the brigands were halted only by a frightful pestilence which decimated their numbers. Convents were forced, altars stripped, tombs profaned, the library of the Vatican sacked, and works of art torn down as monuments of idolatry. Pope Clement VII (1523-1534), a nephew of the other Medici pope, Leo X, had taken refuge in the impregnable castle of St. Angelo and was now obliged to make peace with the emperor.

[Sidenote: Peace of Cambrai, 1529]

The sack of Rome aroused bitter feelings throughout Catholic Europe,

and Henry VIII of England, at that time still loyal to the pope, ostentatiously sent aid to Francis. But although the emperor made little headway against Francis, the French king, on account of strategic blunders and the disunion of the league, was unable to maintain a sure foothold in Italy. The peace of Cambrai (1529) provided that Francis should abandon Naples, Milan, and the Netherlands, but the cession of Burgundy was no longer insisted upon. Francis proceeded to celebrate his marriage with the emperor's sister.

[Sidenote: Habsburg Predominance in Italy]

Eight years of warfare had left Charles V and the Habsburg family unquestionable masters of Italy. Naples was under Charles's direct government. For Milan he received the homage of Sforza. The Medici pope, whose family he had restored in Florence, was now his ally. Charles visited Italy for the first time in 1529 to view his territories, and at Bologna (1530) received from the pope's hands the ancient iron crown of Lombard Italy and the imperial crown of Rome. It was the last papal coronation of a ruler of the Holy Roman Empire.

The peace of Cambrai proved but a truce, and war between Charles and Francis repeatedly blazed forth. Francis made strange alliances in order to create all possible trouble for the emperor,—Scotland, Sweden, Denmark, the Ottoman Turks, even the rebellious Protestant princes within the empire. There were spasmodic campaigns between 1536 and 1538 and between 1542 and 1544, and after the death of Francis and the abdication of Charles, the former's son, Henry II (1547-1559), continued the conflict, newly begun in 1552, until the conclusion of the treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis in 1559, by which the Habsburgs retained their hold upon Italy, while France, by the occupation of the important bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun, extended her northeastern frontier, at the expense of the empire, toward the Rhine River.

[Footnote: It was during this war that in 1558 the French captured Calais from the English, and thus put an end to English territorial holdings on the Continent. The English Queen Mary was the wife of Philip II of Spain.]

[Sidenote: Results of the Wars between Charles V and Francis I]

Indirectly, the long wars occasioned by the personal rivalry of Charles and Francis had other results than Habsburg predominance in Italy and French expansion towards the Rhine. They preserved a "balance of power" and prevented the incorporation of the French monarchy into an obsolescent empire. They rendered easier the rise of the Ottoman power in eastern Europe; and French alliance with the Turks gave French trade and enterprise a decided lead in the Levant. They also permitted the comparatively free growth of Protestantism in Germany.

[Sidenote: The Turkish Peril]

More sinister to Charles V than his wars with the French was the advance of the Ottoman Turks. Under their greatest sultan, Suleiman II, the Magnificent (1520-1566), a contemporary of Charles, the Turks were rapidly extending their sway. The Black Sea was practically a Turkish lake; and the whole Euphrates valley, with Bagdad, had fallen into the sultan's power, now established on the Persian Gulf and in control of all of the ancient trade-routes to the East. The northern coasts of Africa from Egypt to Algeria acknowledged the supremacy of Suleiman, whose sea power in the Mediterranean had become a factor to be reckoned

with in European politics, threatening not only the islands but the great Christian countries of Italy and Spain. The Venetians were driven from the Morea and from the Aegean Islands; only Cyprus, Crete, and Malta survived in the Mediterranean as outposts of Christendom.

[Sidenote: Suleiman the Magnificent]

Suleiman devoted many years to the extension of his power in Europe, sometimes in alliance with the French king, sometimes upon his own initiative,--and with almost unbroken success. In 1521 he declared war against the king of Hungary on the pretext that he had received no Hungarian congratulations on his accession to the throne. He besieged and captured Belgrade, and in 1526 on the field of Mohács his forces met and overwhelmed the Hungarians, whose king was killed with the flower of the Hungarian chivalry. The battle of Mohács marked the extinction of an independent and united Hungarian state; Ferdinand of Habsburg, brother of Charles V, claimed the kingdom; Suleiman was in actual possession of fully a third of it. The sultan's army carried the war into Austria and in 1529 bombarded and invested Vienna, but so valiant was the resistance offered that after three weeks the siege was abandoned. Twelve years later the greater part of Hungary, including the city of Budapest, became a Turkish province, and in many places churches were turned into mosques. In 1547 Charles V and Ferdinand were compelled to recognize the Turkish conquests in Hungary, and the latter agreed to pay the sultan an annual tribute of 30,000 ducats. Suleiman not only thwarted every attempt of his rivals to recover their territories, but remained throughout his life a constant menace to the security of the hereditary dominions of the Habsburgs.

[Sidenote: Charles V and the Holy Roman Empire.]

[Sidenote: Possibility of transforming the Empire into a National German Monarchy]

At the very time when Charles V was encountering these grave troubles in administering his scattered hereditary possessions and in waging war now with the French and now with the Mohammedans, he likewise was saddled with problems peculiar to the government of his empire. Had he been able to devote all his talent and energy to the domestic affairs of the Holy Roman Empire, he might have contributed potently to the establishment of a compact German state. It should be borne in mind that when Charles V was elected emperor in 1519 the Holy Roman Empire was virtually restricted to German-speaking peoples, and that the national unifications of England, France, and Spain, already far advanced, pointed the path to a similar political evolution for Germany. Why should not a modern German national state have been created coextensive with the medieval empire, a state which would have included not only the twentieth-century German Empire but Austria, Holland, and Belgium, and which, stretching from the Baltic to the Adriatic and from the English Channel to the Vistula, would have dominated the continent of Europe throughout the whole modern era? There were certainly grave difficulties in the way, but grave difficulties had also been encountered in consolidating France or Spain, and the difference was rather of degree than of kind. In every other case a strong monarch had overcome feudal princes and ambitious nobles, had deprived cities of many of their liberties, had trampled upon, or tampered with, the privileges of representative assemblies, and had enforced internal order and security. In every such case the monarch had commanded the support of important popular elements and had directed his major efforts to the realization of national aims.

National patriotism was not altogether lacking among Germans of the sixteenth century. They were conscious of a common language which was already becoming a vehicle of literary expression. They were conscious of a common tradition and of a common nationality. They recognized, in many cases, the absurdly antiquated character of their political institutions and ardently longed for reforms. In fact, the trouble with the Germans was not so much the lack of thought about political reform as the actual conflicts between various groups concerning the method and goal of reform. Germans despised the Holy Roman Empire, much as Frenchmen abhorred the memory of feudal society; but Germans were not as unanimous as Frenchmen in advocating the establishment of a strong national monarchy. In Germany were princes, free cities, and knights,--all nationalistic after a fashion, but all quarreling with each other and with their nominal sovereign.

[Sidenote: Charles V bent on Strengthening Monarchical Power though not on a National Basis]

The emperors themselves were the only sincere and consistent champions of centralized monarchical power, but the emperors were probably less patriotic than any one else in the Holy Roman Empire. Charles V would never abandon his pretensions to world power in order to become a strong monarch over a single nation. Early in his reign he declared that "no monarchy was comparable though not to the Roman Empire. This the whole world had once obeyed, and Christ Himself had paid it honor and obedience. Unfortunately it was now only a shadow of what it had been, but he hoped, with the help of those powerful countries and alliances which God had granted him, to raise it to its ancient glory." Charles V labored for an increase of personal power not only in Germany but also in the Netherlands, in Spain, and in Italy; and with the vast imperial ambition of Charles the ideal of creating a national monarchy on a strictly German basis was in sharp conflict. Charles V could not, certainly would not, pose simply as a German king--a national leader.

[Sidenote: Nationalism among the German Princes]

Under these circumstances the powerful German princes, in defying the emperor's authority and in promoting disruptive tendencies in the Holy Roman Empire, were enabled to lay the blame at the feet of their unpatriotic sovereign and thereby arouse in their behalf a good deal of German national sentiment. In choosing Charles V to be their emperor, the princely electors in 1519 had demanded that German or Latin should be the official language of the Holy Roman Empire, that imperial offices should be open only to Germans, that the various princes should not be subject to any foreign political jurisdiction, that no foreign troops should serve in imperial wars without the approval of the Diet, and that Charles should confirm the sovereign rights of all the princes and appoint from their number a Council of Regency (_Reichsregiment_) to share in his government.

[Sidenote: The Council of Regency, 1521-1531]

[Sidenote: Its Failure to Unify Germany]

In accordance with an agreement reached by a Diet held at Worms in 1521, the Council of Regency was created. Most of its twenty-three members were named by, and represented the interests of, the German princes. Here might be the starting-point toward a closer political union of the German-speaking people, if only a certain amount of

financial independence could be secured to the Council. The proposal on this score was a most promising one; it was to support the new imperial administration, not, as formerly, by levying more or less voluntary contributions on the various states, but by establishing a kind of customs-union (Zollverein) and imposing on foreign importations a tariff for revenue. This time, however, the German burghers raised angry protests; the merchants and traders of the Hanseatic towns insisted that the proposed financial burden would fall on them and destroy their business; and their protests were potent enough to bring to nought the princes' plan. Thus the government was forced again to resort to the levy of special financial contributions,—an expedient which usually put the emperor and the Council of Regency at the mercy of the most selfish and least patriotic of the German princes.

[Sidenote: Nationalism among the German Knights]

More truly patriotic as a class than German princes or German burghers were the German knights—those gentlemen of the hill-top and of the road, who, usually poor in pocket though stout of heart, looked down from their high-perched castles with badly disguised contempt upon the vulgar tradesmen of the town or beheld with anger and jealousy the encroachments of neighboring princes, lay and ecclesiastical, more wealthy and powerful than themselves. Especially against the princes the knights contended, sometimes under the forms of law, more often by force and violence and all the barbarous accompaniments of private warfare and personal feud. Some of the knights were well educated and some had literary and scholarly abilities; hardly any one of them was a friend of public order. Yet practically all the knights were intensely proud of their German nationality. It was the knights, who, under the leadership of such fiery patriots as Ulrich von Hutten and Franz von Sickingen, had forcefully contributed in 1519 to the imperial election of Charles V, a German Habsburg, in preference to non-German candidates such as Francis I of France or Henry VIII of England. For a brief period Charles V leaned heavily upon the German knights for support in his struggle with princes and burghers; and at one time it looked as if the knights in union with the emperor would succeed in curbing the power of the princes and in laying the foundations of a strongly centralized national German monarchy.

[Sidenote: Rise of Lutheranism Favored by the Knights and Opposed by Charles V]

But at the critical moment Protestantism arose in Germany, marking a cleavage between the knightly leaders and the emperor. To knights like Ulrich von Hutten and Franz von Sickingen the final break in 1520 between Martin Luther and the pope seemed to assure a separation of Germany from Italy and the erection of a peculiar form of German Christianity about which a truly national state could be builded. As a class the knights applauded Luther and rejoiced at the rapid spread of his teachings throughout Germany. On the other hand, Charles V remained a Roman Catholic. Not only was he loyally attached to the religion of his fathers through personal training and belief, but he felt that the maintenance of what political authority he possessed was dependent largely on the maintenance of the universal authority of the ancient Church, and practically he needed papal assistance for his many foreign projects. The same reasons that led many German princes to accept the Lutheran doctrines as a means of lessening imperial control caused Charles V to reject them. At the same Diet at Worms (1521), at which the Council of Regency had been created, Charles V prevailed upon the

Germans present to condemn and outlaw Luther; and this action alienated the knights from the emperor.

[Sidenote: The Knights' War, 1522-1523]

Franz von Sickingen, a Rhenish knight and the ablest of his class, speedily took advantage of the emperor's absence from Germany in 1522 to precipitate a Knights' War. In supreme command of a motley army of fellow-knights, Franz made an energetic attack upon the rich landed estates of the Catholic prince-bishop of Trier. At this point, the German princes, lay as well as ecclesiastical, forgetting their religious predilections and mindful only of their common hatred of the knights, rushed to the defense of the bishop of Trier and drove off Sickingen, who, in April, 1523, died fighting before his own castle of Ebernburg. Ulrich von Hutten fled to Switzerland and perished miserably shortly afterwards. The knights' cause collapsed, and princes and burghers remained triumphant. [Footnote: The Knights' War was soon followed by the Peasants' Revolt, a social rather than a political movement. For an account of the Peasants' Revolt see pp. 133 ff.] It was the end of serious efforts in the sixteenth century to create a national German state.

[Sidenote: Failure of German Nationalism in the Sixteenth Century]

The Council of Regency lasted until 1531, though its inability to preserve domestic peace discredited it, and in its later years it enjoyed little authority. Left to themselves, many of the princes espoused Protestantism. In vain Charles V combated the new religious movement. In vain he proscribed it in several Diets after that of Worms. In vain he assailed its upholders in several military campaigns, such as those against the Schmalkaldic League, which will be treated more fully in another connection. But the long absences of Charles V from Germany and his absorption in a multitude of cares and worries, to say nothing of the spasmodic aid which Francis, the Catholic king of France, gave to the Protestants in Germany, contributed indirectly to the spread of Lutheranism. In the last year of Charles's rule (1555) the profession of the Lutheran faith on the part of German princes was placed by the peace of Augsburg [Footnote: See below, p. 136.] on an equal footing with that of the Catholic religion. Protestantism among the German princes proved a disintegrating, rather than a unifying, factor of national life. The rise of Protestantism was the last straw which broke German nationalism.

[Sidenote: Charles V and England]

With England the relations of Charles V were interesting but not so important as those already noted with the Germans, the Turks, and the French. At first in practical alliance with the impetuous self-willed Henry VIII (1509-1547), whose wife--Catherine of Aragon--was the emperor's aunt, Charles subsequently broke off friendly relations when the English sovereign asked the pope to declare his marriage null and void. Charles prevailed upon the pope to deny Henry's request, and the schism which Henry then created between the Catholic Church in England and the Roman See increased the emperor's bitterness. Towards the close of Henry's reign relations improved again, but it was not until the accession of Charles's cousin, Mary (1553-1558), to the English throne that really cordial friendship was restored. To this Queen Mary, Charles V married his son and successor Philip.

[Sidenote: Abdication of Charles V]

At length exhausted by his manifold labors, Charles V resolved to divide his dominions between his brother Ferdinand and his son Philip and to retire from government. In the hall of the Golden Fleece at Brussels on 25 October, 1555, he formally abdicated the sovereignty of his beloved Netherlands. Turning to the representatives, he said: "Gentlemen, you must not be astonished if, old and feeble as I am in all my members, and also from the love I bear you, I shed some tears." At least in the Netherlands the love was reciprocal. In 1556 he resigned the Spanish and Italian crowns, [Footnote: He made over to his brother all his imperial authority, though he nominally retained the crown of the Holy Roman Empire until 1558] and spent his last years in preparation for a future world. He died in 1558. Personally, Charles V had a prominent lower jaw and a thin, pale face, relieved by a wide forehead and bright, flashing eyes. He was well formed and dignified in appearance. In character he was slow and at times both irresolute and obstinate, but he had a high sense of duty, honest intentions, good soldierly qualities, and a large amount of cold common sense. Though not highly educated, he was well read and genuinely appreciative of music and painting.

PHILIP II AND THE PREDOMINANCE OF SPAIN

For a century and a half after the retirement of Charles V in 1556, we hear of two branches of the Habsburg family--the Spanish Habsburgs and the Austrian Habsburgs, descended respectively from Philip II and Ferdinand. By the terms of the division, Ferdinand, the brother of Charles, received the compact family possessions in the East--Austria and its dependencies, Bohemia, that portion of Hungary not occupied by the Turks, and the title of Holy Roman Emperor,--while the remainder went to Charles's son, Philip II,--Spain, the Netherlands, Franche Comté (the eastern part of Burgundy), the Two Sicilies, Milan, and the American colonies.

Over the history of Ferdinand and his immediate successors, we need not tarry, because, aside from efforts to preserve religious peace and the family's political predominance within the empire and to recover Hungary from the Turks, it is hardly essential. But in western Europe Philip II for a variety of reasons became a figure of world-wide importance: we must examine his career.

[Sidenote: Character and policies of Philip II]

Few characters in history have elicited more widely contradictory estimates than Philip II. Represented by many Protestant writers as a villain, despot, and bigot, he has been extolled by patriotic Spaniards as Philip the Great, champion of religion and right. These conflicting opinions are derived from different views which may be taken of the value and inherent worth of Philip's policies and methods, but what those policies and methods were there can be no doubt. In the first place, Philip II prized Spain as his native country and his main possession--in marked contrast to his father, for he himself had been born in Spain and had resided there during almost all of his life--and he was determined to make Spain the greatest country in the world. In the second place, Philip II was sincerely and piously attached to Catholicism; he abhorred Protestantism as a blasphemous rending of the seamless garment of the Church; and he set his heart upon the universal

triumph of his faith. If, by any chance, a question should arise between the advantage of Spain and the best interests of the Church, the former must be sacrificed relentlessly to the latter. Such was the sovereign's stern ideal. No seeming failure of his policies could shake his belief in their fundamental excellence. That whatever he did was done for the greater glory of God, that success or failure depended upon the inscrutable will of the Almighty and not upon himself, were his guiding convictions, which he transmitted to his Spanish successors. Not only was Philip a man of principles and ideals, but he was possessed of a boundless capacity for work and an indomitable will. He preferred tact and diplomacy to war and prowess of arms, though he was quite willing to order his troops to battle if the object, in his opinion, was right. He was personally less accustomed to the sword than to the pen, and no clerk ever toiled more industriously at his papers than did this king. From early morning until far into the night he bent over minutes and reports and other business of kingcraft. Naturally cautious and reserved, he was dignified and princely in public. In his private life, he was orderly and extremely affectionate to his family and servants. Loyalty was Philip's best attribute.

There was a less happy side to the character of Philip II. His free use of the Inquisition in order to extirpate heresy throughout his dominions has rendered him in modern eyes an embodiment of bigotry and intolerance, but it must be remembered that he lived in an essentially intolerant age, when religious persecution was stock in trade of Protestants no less than of Catholics. It is likewise true that he constantly employed craft and deceit and was ready to make use of assassination for political purposes, but this too was in accordance with the temper of the times: lawyers then taught, following the precepts of the famous historian and political philosopher, Machiavelli, that Christian morality is a guide for private conduct rather than for public business, and that "the Prince" may act above the laws in order to promote the public good, and even such famous Protestant leaders as Coligny and William the Silent entered into murder plots. But when all due allowances have been made, the student cannot help feeling that the purpose of Philip II would have been served better by the employment of means other than persecution and murder.

The reign of Philip II covered approximately the second half of the sixteenth century (1556-1598). In his efforts to make Spain the greatest power in the world and to restore the unity problems of Christendom, he was doomed to failure. The chief Confronting reason for the failure is simple--the number and [side note Problems Confronting Philip II] variety of the problems and projects with which Philip II was concerned. It was a case of the king putting a finger in too many pies--he was cruelly burned. Could Philip II have devoted all his energies to one thing at a time, he might conceivably have had greater success, but as it was, he must divide his attention between supervising the complex administration of his already wide dominions and annexing in addition the monarchy and empire of Portugal, between promoting a vigorous commercial and colonial policy and suppressing a stubborn revolt in the Netherlands, between championing Catholicism in both England and France and protecting Christendom against the victorious Mohammedans. It was this multiplicity of interests that paralyzed the might of the Spanish monarch, yet each one of his foreign activities was epochal in the history of the country affected. We shall therefore briefly review Philip's activities in order.

[Sidenote: Spain under Philip II: Political]

As we have seen, Philip II inherited a number of states which had separate political institutions and customs. He believed in national unification, at least of Spain. National unification implied uniformity, and uniformity implied greater power of the crown. So Philip sought to further the work of his great-grandparents, Ferdinand and Isabella,--absolutism and uniformity became his watchwords in internal administration. Politically Philip made no pretense of consulting the Cortes on legislation, and, although he convoked them to vote new taxes, he established the rule that the old taxes were to be considered as granted in perpetuity and as constituting the ordinary revenue of the crown. He treated the nobles as ornamental rather than useful, retiring them from royal offices in favor of lawyers and other subservient members of the middle class. All business was conducted by correspondence and with a final reference to the king, and the natural result was endless delay.

[Sidenote: Spain under Philip II: Economic]

Financially and economically the period was unfortunate for Spain. The burden of the host of foreign enterprises fell with crushing weight upon the Spanish kingdom and particularly upon Castile. Aragon, which was poor and jealous of its own rights, would give little. The income from the Netherlands, at first large, was stopped by the revolt. The Italian states barely paid expenses. The revenue from the American mines, which has been greatly exaggerated, enriched the pockets of individuals rather than the treasury of the state. In Spain itself, the greater part of the land was owned by the ecclesiastical corporations and the nobles, who were exempt from taxation but were intermittently fleeced. Moreover, the 10 per cent tax on all sales--the alcabala [Footnote: See above, p. 57.]--gradually paralyzed all native industrial enterprise. And the persecution of wealthy and industrious Jews and Moors diminished the resources of the kingdom. Spain, at the close of the century, was on the verge of bankruptcy.

[Sidenote: Spain under Philip II: Religious]

In religious matters Philip II aimed at uniform adherence to the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. He felt, like so many of his contemporaries, that disparity of belief among subjects would imperil a state. Both from political motives and from religious zeal Philip was a Catholic. He therefore advised the pope, watched with interest the proceedings of the great Council of Trent which was engaged with the reformation of the Church, [Footnote: See below, pp. 158 ff.] and labored for the triumph of his religion not only in his own dominions and in France, but also in Poland, in England, and even in Scandinavia. In Spain he strengthened the Inquisition and used it as a tool of royal despotism.

[Sidenote: Temporary Union of Spain and Portugal]

Territorially Philip II desired to complete political unity in the peninsula by combining the crown of Portugal with those of Castile and Aragon. He himself was closely related to the Portuguese royal family, and in 1580 he laid formal claim to that kingdom. The duke of Braganza, whose claim was better than Philip's, was bought off by immense grants and the country was overrun by Spanish troops. Philip endeavored to placate the Portuguese by full recognition of their constitutional

rights and in particular by favoring the lesser nobility or country gentry. Although the monarchies and vast colonial possessions of Spain and Portugal were thus joined for sixty years under a common king, the arrangement never commanded any affection in Portugal, with the result that at the first opportunity, in 1640, Portuguese independence was restored under the leadership of the Braganza family.

[Sidenote: Rebellions Against Philip II in Spain]

The most serious domestic difficulty which Philip had to face was the revolt of the rich and populous Netherlands, which we shall discuss presently. But with other revolts the king had to contend. In his efforts to stamp out heresy and peculiar customs among the descendants of the Moors who still lived in the southern part of Spain, Philip aroused armed opposition. The Moriscos, as they were called, struggled desperately from 1568 to 1570 to reestablish the independence of Granada. This rebellion was suppressed with great cruelty, and the surviving Moriscos were forced to find new homes in less favored parts of Spain until their final expulsion from the country in 1609. A revolt of Aragon in 1591 was put down by a Castilian army; the constitutional rights of Aragon were diminished and the kingdom was reduced to a greater measure of submission.

[Sidenote: Revolt of the Netherlands: The Causes]

The causes that led to the revolt of the Netherlands may be stated as fourfold. (1) Financial. The burdensome taxes which Charles V had laid upon the country were increased by Philip II and often applied to defray the expenses of other parts of the Spanish possessions. Furthermore, the restrictions which Philip imposed upon Dutch commerce in the interest of that of Spain threatened to interfere seriously with the wonted economic prosperity of the Netherlands. (2) Political. Philip II sought to centralize authority in the Netherlands and despotically deprived the cities and nobles of many of their traditional privileges. Philip never visited the country in person after 1559, and he intrusted his arbitrary government to regents and to Spaniards rather than to native leaders. The scions of the old and proud noble families of the Netherlands naturally resented being supplanted in lucrative and honorable public offices by persons whom they could regard only as upstarts. (3) Religious. Despite the rapid and universal spread of Calvinistic Protestantism throughout the northern provinces, Philip was resolved to force Catholicism upon all of his subjects. He increased the number of bishoprics, decreed acts of uniformity, and in a vigorous way utilized the Inquisition to carry his policy into effect. (4) Personal. The Dutch and Flemish loved Charles V because he had been born and reared among them and always considered their country as his native land. Philip II was born and brought up in Spain. He spoke a language foreign to the Netherlands, and by their inhabitants he was thought of as an alien.

[Sidenote: Margaret of Parma and the "Beggars"]

At first the opposition in the Netherlands was directed chiefly against the Inquisition and the presence of Spanish garrisons in the towns. The regent, Margaret of Parma, Philip's half-sister, endeavored to banish public discontent by a few concessions. The Spanish troops were withdrawn and certain unpopular officials were dismissed. But influential noblemen and burghers banded themselves together early in 1566 and presented to the regent Margaret a petition, in which, while

protesting their loyalty, they expressed fear of a general revolt and begged that a special embassy be sent to Philip to urge upon him the necessity of abolishing the Inquisition and of redressing their other grievances. The regent, at first disquieted by the petitioners, was reassured by one of her advisers, who exclaimed, "What, Madam, is your Highness afraid of these beggars (_ces gueux_)?" Henceforth the chief opponents of Philip's policies in the Netherlands humorously labeled themselves "Beggars" and assumed the emblems of common begging, the wallet and the bowl. The fashion spread quickly, and the "Beggars'" insignia were everywhere to be seen, worn as trinkets, especially in the large towns. In accordance with the "Beggars'" petition, an embassy was dispatched to Spain to lay the grievances before Philip II.

[Sidenote: Duke of Alva in the Netherlands, 1567-1573]

Philip II at first promised to abolish the Inquisition in the Netherlands, but soon repented of his promise. For meanwhile mobs of fanatical Protestants, far more radical than the respectable "Beggars," were rushing to arms, breaking into Catholic churches, wrecking the altars, smashing the images to pieces, profaning monasteries, and showing in their retaliation as much violence--as their enemies had shown cruelty in persecution. In August, 1566, this sacrilegious iconoclasm reached its climax in the irreparable ruin of the magnificent cathedral at Antwerp. Philip replied to these acts, which he interpreted as disloyalty, by sending (1567) his most famous general, the duke of Alva, into the Netherlands with a large army and with instructions to cow the people into submission. Alva proved himself quite capable of understanding and executing his master's wishes: one of his first acts was the creation of a "Council of Troubles," an arbitrary tribunal which tried cases of treason and which operated so notoriously as to merit its popular appellation of the "Council of Blood." During the duke's stay of six years, it has been estimated that eight thousand persons were executed, including the counts of Egmont and Horn, thirty thousand were despoiled of their property, and one hundred thousand quitted the country. Alva, moreover, levied an enormous tax of one-tenth upon the price of merchandise sold. As the tax was collected on several distinct processes, it absorbed at least seven-tenths of the value of certain goods--of cloth, for instance. The tax, together with the lawless confusion throughout the country, meant the destruction of Flemish manufactures and trade. It was, therefore, quite natural that the burgesses of the southern Netherlands, Catholic though most of them were, should unite with the nobles and with the Protestants of the North in opposing Spanish tyranny. The whole country was now called to arms.

[Sidenote: William the Silent, Prince of Orange]

One of the principal noblemen of the Netherlands was a German, William of Nassau, prince of Orange.[Footnote: William (1533-1584), now commonly called "the Silent." There appears to be no contemporaneous justification of the adjective as applied to him, but the misnomer, once adopted by later writers, has insistently clung to him.] He had been governing the provinces of Holland and Zeeland when Alva arrived, but as he was already at the point of accepting Protestantism he had prudently retired into Germany, leaving his estates to be confiscated by the Spanish governor. Certain trifling successes of the insurgents now called William back to head the popular movement. For many years he bore the brunt of the war and proved himself not only a resourceful general, but an able diplomat and a whole-souled patriot. He eventually

gained the admiration and love of the whole Dutch people.

[Sidenote: The "Sea Beggars"]

The first armed forces of William of Orange were easily routed by Alva, but in 1569 a far more menacing situation was presented. In that year William began to charter corsairs and privateers to prey upon Spanish shipping. These "Sea Beggars," as they were called, were mostly wild and lawless desperadoes who stopped at nothing in their hatred of Catholics and Spaniards: they early laid the foundations of Dutch maritime power and at the same time proved a constant torment to Alva. They made frequent incursions into the numerous waterways of the Netherlands and perpetually fanned the embers of revolt on land. Gradually William collected new armies, which more and more successfully defied Alva.

[Sidenote: The "Spanish Fury" and the Pacification of Ghent, 1576]

The harsh tactics of Alva had failed to restore the Netherlands to Philip's control, and in 1573 Alva was replaced in the regency by the more politic Requesens, who continued the struggle as best he could but with even less success than Alva. Soon after Requesens's death in 1576, the Spanish army in the Netherlands, left without pay or food, mutinied and inflicted such horrible indignities upon several cities, notably Antwerp, that the savage attack is called the "Spanish Fury." Deputies of all the seventeen provinces at once concluded an agreement, termed the Pacification of Ghent (1576), by which they mutually guaranteed resistance to the Spanish until the king should abolish the Inquisition and restore their old-time liberties.

Then Philip II tried a policy of concession, but the new governor, the dashing Don John of Austria, fresh from a great naval victory over the Turks, soon discovered that it was too late to reconcile the Protestants. William the Silent was wary of the Spanish offers, and Don John died in 1578 without having achieved very much.

[Sidenote: Farnese, Duke of Parma]

[Sidenote: The Treaty of Array and the Union of Utrecht (1579): the Permanent Division of the Netherlands]

But Philip II was not without some success in the Netherlands. He was fortunate in having a particularly determined and tactful governor in the country from 1578 to 1592 in the person of Alexander Farnese, duke of Parma. Skillfully mingling war and diplomacy, Farnese succeeded in sowing discord between the northern and southern provinces: the former were Dutch, Calvinist, and commercial; the latter were Flemish and Walloon, Catholic, and industrial. The ten southern provinces might eventually have more to fear from the North than from continued union with Spain; their representatives, therefore, signed a defensive league at Arras in 1579 for the protection of the Catholic religion and with the avowed purpose of effecting a reconciliation with Philip II. In the same year the northern provinces agreed to the Union of Utrecht, binding themselves together "as if they were one province" to maintain their rights and liberties "with life-blood and goods" against Spanish tyranny and to grant complete freedom of worship and of religious opinion throughout the confederation. In this way the Pacification of Ghent was nullified and the Netherlands were split into two parts, each going its own way, each developing its own history. The southern portion was to remain in Habsburg hands for over two centuries, being

successively termed "Spanish Netherlands" and "Austrian Netherlands"--roughly speaking, it is what to-day we call Belgium. The northern portion was to become free and independent, and, as the "United Provinces" or simply "Holland," to take its place among the nations of the world. For a considerable period of time Holland was destined to be more prosperous than Belgium. The latter suffered more grievously than the former from the actual hostilities; and the Dutch, by closing the River Scheldt and dominating the adjacent seas, dealt a mortal blow at the industrial and commercial supremacy of Antwerp and transferred the chief trade and business of all the Netherlands to their own city of Amsterdam.

[Sidenote: Reasons for the Success of the Dutch]

For many years the struggle dragged on. At times it seemed probable that Farnese and the Spaniards would overcome the North by force as they had obtained the South by diplomacy. But a variety of reasons explain the ultimate success of the Dutch. The nature of the country rendered ordinary campaigning very difficult--the network of canals constituted natural lines of defense and the cutting of the dikes might easily imperil an invading army. Again, the seafaring propensities of the Dutch stimulated them to fit out an increasing number of privateers which constantly preyed upon Spanish commerce: it was not long before this traffic grew important and legitimate, so that in the following century Amsterdam became one of the greatest cities of the world, and Holland assumed a prominent place among commercial and colonial nations. Thirdly, the employment of foreign mercenaries in the army of defense enabled the native population to devote the more time to peaceful pursuits, and, despite the persistence of war, the Dutch provinces increased steadily in wealth and prosperity. Fourthly, the cautious Fabian policy of William the Silent prevented the Dutch from staking heavily upon battles in the open field. Fifthly, the Dutch received a good deal of assistance from Protestants of Germany, England, and France. Finally, Philip II pursued too many great projects at once to be able to bring a single one to a satisfactory conclusion: his war with Queen Elizabeth of England and his interference in the affairs of France inextricably complicated his plans in the Netherlands.

[Sidenote: Formal Declaration of Dutch Independence, 1581]

In 1581 Philip II published a ban against William of Orange, proclaiming him a traitor and an outlaw and offering a reward to any one who would take him dead or alive. William replied by his famous "Apology" to the charges against him; but his practical answer to the king was the Act of Abjuration, by which at his persuasion the representatives of the northern provinces, assembled at The Hague, solemnly proclaimed their separation from the crown of Spain, broke the royal seal of Philip II, and declared the king deprived of all authority over them. We should call this Act of 1581 the Dutch declaration of independence. It was an augury of the definitive result of the war.

[Sidenote: Recognition of Dutch Independence]

Although William the Silent was assassinated by an agent of Spain (1584), and Antwerp was captured from the Protestants in 1585, the ability and genius of Farnese did not avail to make further headway against the United Provinces; but Philip II, stubborn to the end,

positively refused to recognize Dutch independence. In 1609 Philip III of Spain consented to a twelve years' truce with the States-General of The Hague. In the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) the Dutch and Spaniards again became embroiled, and the freedom of the republic was not recognized officially by Spain till the general peace of Westphalia in 1648. [Footnote: See below, p. 229.]

The seven provinces, which had waged such long war with Spain, constituted, by mutual agreement, a confederacy, each preserving a distinct local government and administration, but all subject to a general parliament--the States-General--and to a stadtholder, or governor-general, an office which subsequently became hereditary in the Orange family. Between the States-General and the stadtholder, a constitutional conflict was carried on throughout the greater part of the seventeenth century--the former, supported by well-to-do burghers, favoring a greater measure of political democracy, the latter, upheld by aristocratically minded nobles, laboring for the development of monarchical institutions under the Orange family.

[Sidenote: Natural Opposition of England and France to the Policies of Philip II]

Not only his efforts in the Netherlands but many other projects of Philip II were frustrated by remarkable parallel developments in the two national monarchies of England and France. Both these countries were naturally jealous of opposition and fearful of an undue expansion of Spain, which might upset the balance of power. Both states, from their geographical locations, would normally be inimical to Philip II: England would desire, from her island position, to destroy the monopoly which Spain claimed of the carrying trade of the seas; France, still encircled by Habsburg possessions in Spain, Italy, and the Netherlands, would adhere to her traditional policy of allying herself with every foe of the Spanish king. Then, too, the papal authority had been rejected in England and seriously questioned in France: Philip's crusading zeal made him the champion of the Church in those countries. For ecclesiastical as well as for economic and political purposes it seemed necessary to the Spanish king that he should bring France and England under his direct influence. On their side, patriotic French and English resented such foreign interest in their domestic affairs, and the eventual failure of Philip registered a wonderful growth of national feeling among the peoples who victoriously contended against him. The beginnings of the real modern greatness of France and England date from their struggle with Philip II.

[Sidenote: Philip II and Mary Tudor]

At the outset of his reign, Philip seemed quite successful in his foreign relations. As we have seen, he was in alliance with England through his marriage with Queen Mary Tudor (1553-1558): she had temporarily restored the English Church to communion with the Holy See, and was conducting her foreign policy in harmony with Philip's--because of her husband she lost to the French the town of Calais, the last English possession on the Continent (1558). Likewise, as has been said, Philip II concluded with France in 1559 the advantageous treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis. But during the ensuing thirty years the tables were completely turned. Both England and France ended by securing respite from Spanish interference.

[Sidenote: Philip II and Elizabeth]

Mary Tudor died unhappy and childless in 1558, and the succession of her sister Queen Elizabeth, daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn, altered the relations between the English and Spanish courts. Elizabeth (1558-1603) was possessed of an imperious, haughty, energetic character; she had remarkable intelligence and an absorbing patriotism. She inspired confidence in her advisers and respect among her people, so that she was commonly called "Good Queen Bess" despite the fact that her habits of deceit and double-dealing gave color to the French king's remark that she was the greatest liar in Christendom. This was the woman with whom Philip II had to deal; he tried many tactics in order to gain his ends,--all of them hopelessly unsuccessful.

Philip first proposed matrimony, but Elizabeth was very careful not to give herself, or England, such a master. Then when the queen declared herself a Protestant and showed no inclination to assist Philip in any of his enterprises, the Spanish king proceeded to plot against her throne. He subsidized Roman Catholic priests, especially Jesuits, who violated the laws of the land. He stirred up sedition and even went so far as to plan Elizabeth's assassination. Many conspiracies against the English queen centered in the person of the ill-starred Mary Stuart, [Footnote: Mary Stuart (1542-1587).] queen of Scotland, who was next in line of succession to the English throne and withal a Catholic.

[Sidenote: Mary Stuart]

Descended from the Stuart kings of Scotland and from Henry VII of England, related to the powerful family of Guise in France, Mary had been brought up at the French court and married to the short-lived French king, Francis II. Upon the death of the latter she returned in 1561 to Scotland, a young woman of but eighteen years, only to find that the government had fallen victim to the prevalent factional fights among the Scotch nobles and that in the preceding year the parliament had solemnly adopted a Calvinistic form of Protestantism. By means of tact and mildness, however, Mary won the respect of the nobles and the admiration of the people, until a series of marital troubles and blunders--her marriage with a worthless cousin, Henry Darnley, and then her scandalous marriage with Darnley's profligate murderer, the earl of Bothwell--alienated her people from her and drove her into exile. She abdicated the throne of Scotland in favor of her infant son, James VI, who was reared a Protestant and subsequently became King James I of England, and she then (1568) threw herself upon the mercy of Elizabeth. She thought she would find in England a haven of refuge; instead she found there a prison.

For the score of years during which she remained Elizabeth's prisoner, Mary Stuart was the object of many plots and conspiracies against the existing governments of both Scotland and England. In every such scheme were to be found the machinations and money of the Spanish king. In fact, as time went on, it seemed to a growing section of the English people as though the cause of Elizabeth was bound up with Protestantism and with national independence and prosperity just as certainly as the success of Mary would lead to the triumph of Catholicism, the political supremacy of Spain, and the commercial ruin of England. It was under these circumstances that Mary's fate was sealed. Because of a political situation over which she had slight control, the ex-queen of Scotland was beheaded by Elizabeth's orders in 1587.

[Sidenote: The Armada]

Philip II had now tried and failed in every expedient but one,--the employment of sheer force. Even this he attempted in order to avenge the death of Mary Stuart and to bring England, politically, religiously, and commercially, into harmony with his Spanish policies. The story of the preparation and the fate of the Invincible Armada is almost too well known to require repetition. It was in 1588 that there issued from the mouth of the Tagus River the most formidable fleet which up to that time Christendom had ever beheld--130 ships, 8000 seamen, 19,000 soldiers, the flower of the Spanish chivalry. In the Netherlands it was to be joined by Alexander Farnese with 33,000 veteran troops. But in one important respect Philip had underestimated his enemy: he had counted upon a divided country. Now the attack upon England was primarily national, rather than religious, and Catholics vied with Protestants in offering aid to the queen: it was a united rather than a divided nation which Philip faced. The English fleet, composed of comparatively small and easily maneuvered vessels, worked great havoc upon the ponderous and slow-moving Spanish galleons, and the wreck of the Armada was completed by a furious gale which tossed ship after ship upon the rocks of northern Scotland. Less than a third of the original expedition ever returned to Spain.

Philip II had thus failed in his herculean effort against England. He continued in small ways to annoy and to irritate Elizabeth. He tried--without result--to incite the Catholics of Ireland against the queen. He exhausted his arsenals and his treasures in despairing attempts to equip a second and even a third Armada. But he was doomed to bitterest disappointment, for two years before his death an English fleet sacked his own great port of Cadiz. The war with England ruined the navy and the commerce of Spain. The defeat of the Armada was England's first title to commercial supremacy.

[Sidenote: Economic Benefits of the Period for England]

It was long maintained that the underlying causes of the conflict between England and Spain in the second half of the sixteenth century and its chief interest was religious--that it was part of an epic struggle between Protestantism and Catholicism. There may be a measure of truth in such an idea, but most recent writers believe that the chief motives for the conflict, as well as its important results, were essentially economic. From the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, English sailors and freebooters, such as Hawkins and Drake, took the offensive against Spanish trade and commerce; and many ships, laden with silver and goods from the New World and bound for Cadiz, were seized and towed into English harbors. The queen herself frequently received a share of the booty and therefore tended to encourage the practice. For nearly thirty years Philip put up with the capture of his treasure ships, the raiding of his colonies, and the open assistance rendered to his rebellious subjects. Only when he reached the conclusion that his power would never be secure in the Netherlands or in America did he dispatch the Armada. Its failure finally freed Holland and marked the collapse of the Spanish monopoly upon the high seas and in the New World.

[Sidenote: Affairs in France]

Before we can appreciate the motives and results of the interference of Philip II in French affairs, a few words must be said about what had happened in France since Francis I (1515-1547) and his son, Henry II (1547-1559), exalted the royal power in their country and not only

preserved French independence of the surrounding empire of Charles V but also increased French prestige by means of a strong policy in Italy and by the extension of frontiers toward the Rhine. Henry II had married a member of the famous Florentine family of the Medici--Catherine de' Medici--a large and ugly woman, but ambitious, resourceful, and capable, who, by means of trickery and deceit, took an active part in French politics from the death of her husband, throughout the reigns of her feeble sons, Francis II (1559-1560), Charles IX (1560-1574), and Henry III (1574-1589). Catherine found her position and that of her royal children continually threatened by (1) the Protestants (Huguenots), (2) the great nobles, and (3) Philip II of Spain.

[Sidenote: Dangers to Royal Power in France: Protestantism]

French Protestantism had grown steadily during the first half of the sixteenth century until it was estimated that from a twentieth to a thirtieth of the nation had fallen away from the Catholic Church. The influence of the advocates of the new faith was, however, much greater than their number, because the Huguenots, as they were called, were recruited mainly from the prosperous, intelligent middle class--the bourgeoisie--who had been intrusted by preceding French kings with many important offices. The Huguenots represented, therefore, a powerful social class and likewise one that was opposed to the undue increase of royal power. They demanded, not only religious toleration for themselves, but also regular meetings of the Estates-General and control of the nation's representatives over financial matters. The kings, on their part, felt that political solidarity and their own personal rule were dependent upon the maintenance of religious uniformity in the nation and the consequent defeat of the pretensions of the Huguenots. Francis I and Henry II had persecuted the Protestants with bitterness. From 1562 to 1593 a series of so-called religious wars embroiled the whole country.

[Sidenote: Dangers to Royal Power in France: the Nobles]

French politics were further complicated during the second half of the sixteenth century by the recrudescence of the power of the nobles. The so-called religious wars were quite as much political as religious--they resulted from efforts of this or that faction of noblemen to dictate to a weak king. Two noble families particularly vied with each other for power--the Bourbons and the Guises--and the unqualified triumph of either would be certain to bring calamity to the sons of Catherine de' Medici.

[Sidenote: The Bourbons]

The Bourbons bore the proud title of princes of the blood because they were direct descendants of a French king. Their descent, to be sure, was from Saint Louis, king in the thirteenth century, and they were now, therefore, only distant cousins of the reigning kings, but as the latter died off, one after another, leaving no direct successors, the

Bourbons by the French law of strict male succession became heirs to the royal family. The head of the Bourbons, a certain Anthony, had married the queen of Navarre and had become thereby king of Navarre, although the greater part of that country--the region south of the Pyrenees--had been annexed to Spain in 1512. Anthony's brother Louis, prince of Condé, had a reputation for bravery, loyalty, and ability.

Both Condé and the king of Navarre were Protestants.

[Sidenote: The Guise Family]

The Guise family was descended from a duke of Lorraine who had attached himself to the court of Francis I. It was really a foreign family, inasmuch as Lorraine was then a dependency of the Holy Roman Empire, but the patriotic exploits of the head of the family in defending Metz against the Emperor Charles V and in capturing Calais from the English endeared the Guises to a goodly part of the French nation. The duke of Guise remained a staunch Catholic, and his brother, called the Cardinal of Lorraine, was head of as many as twelve bishoprics, which gave him an enormous revenue and made him the most conspicuous churchman in France. During the reign of Henry II (1547-1559) the Guises were especially influential. They fought valiantly in foreign wars. They spurred on the king to a great persecution of the Huguenots. They increased their own landed estates. And they married one of their relatives--Mary, queen of Scots--to the heir to the throne. But after the brief reign of Mary's husband, Francis II (1559-1560), the Guise family encountered not only the active opposition of their chief noble rivals, the Bourbons, with their Huguenot allies, but likewise the jealousy and crafty intrigues of Catherine de' Medici.

[Sidenote: Religious Wars in France]

Catherine feared both the ambition of the powerful Guise family and the disruptive tendencies of Protestantism. The result was a long series of confused civil wars between the ardent followers, respectively Catholic and Protestant, of the Guise and Bourbon families, in which the queen-mother gave support first to one side and then to the other. There were no fewer than eight of these sanguinary conflicts, each one ending with the grant of slight concessions to the Huguenots and the maintenance of the weak kings upon the throne. The massacre of Saint Bartholomew's Day (1572) was a horrible incident of Catherine's policy of "trimming." Fearing the undue influence over the king of Admiral de Coligny, an upright and able Huguenot leader, the queen-mother, with the aid of the Guises, prevailed upon the weak-minded Charles IX to authorize the wholesale assassination of Protestants. The signal was given by the ringing of a Parisian church-bell at two o'clock in the morning of 24 August, 1572, and the slaughter went on throughout the day in the capital and for several weeks in the provinces. Coligny was murdered; even women and children were not spared. It is estimated that in all at least three thousand--perhaps ten thousand--lost their lives.

[Sidenote: The "Politiques"]

The massacre of Saint Bartholomew's Day did not destroy French Protestantism or render the Huguenot leaders more timid in asserting their claims. On the other hand, it brought into clear light a noteworthy division within the ranks of their Catholic opponents in France--on one side, the rigorous followers of the Guise family, who complained only that the massacre had not been sufficiently comprehensive, and, on the other side, a group of moderate Catholics, usually styled the "Politiques" who, while continuing to adhere to the Roman Church, and, when called upon, bearing arms on the side of the king, were strongly opposed to the employment of force or violence or persecution in matters of religion. The Politiques were particularly patriotic, and they blamed the religious wars and the intolerant policy of the Guises for the seeming weakness of the French monarchy. They

thought the massacre of Saint Bartholomew's Day a blunder as well as a crime.

The emergence of the Politiques did not immediately make for peace; rather, it substituted a three-sided for a two-sided conflict.

[Sidenote: Philip II and the War of the Three Henries]

After many years, filled with disorder, it became apparent that the children of Catherine de' Medici would have no direct male heirs and that the crown would therefore legally devolve upon the son of Anthony of Bourbon--Henry of Bourbon, king of Navarre and a Protestant. Such an outcome was naturally distasteful to the Guises and abhorrent to Philip II of Spain. In 1585 a definite league was formed between Henry, duke of Guise, and the Spanish king, whereby the latter undertook by military force to aid the former's family in seizing the throne: French politics in that event would be controlled by Spain, and Philip would secure valuable assistance in crushing the Netherlands and conquering England.[Footnote: At that very time, Mary, Queen of Scots, cousin of Henry, duke of Guise, was held a prisoner in England by Queen Elizabeth. See above, p. 99.] The immediate outcome of the agreement was the war of the three Henries--Henry III, son of Catherine de' Medici and king of France; Henry of Bourbon, king of Navarre and heir to the French throne; and Henry, duke of Guise, with the foreign support of Philip II of Spain. Henry of Guise represented the extreme Catholic party; Henry of Navarre, the Protestant faction; and Henry of France, the Catholic moderates--the Politiques--who wanted peace and were willing to grant a measure of toleration. The last two were upholders of French independence against the encroachments of Spain.

The king was speedily gotten into the power of the Guises, but little headway was made by the extreme Catholics against Henry of Navarre, who now received domestic aid from the _Politiques_ and foreign assistance from Queen Elizabeth of England and who benefited by the continued misfortunes of Philip II. At no time was the Spanish king able to devote his whole attention and energy to the French war. At length in 1588 Henry III caused Henry of Guise to be assassinated. The king never had a real chance to prove whether he could become a national leader in expelling the foreigners and putting an end to civil war, for he himself was assassinated in 1589. With his dying breath he designated the king of Navarre as his successor.

[Sidenote: Henry of Navarre]

Henry of Navarre, the first of the Bourbon family upon the throne of France, took the title of Henry IV (1589-1610). [Footnote: It is a curious fact that Henry of Navarre, like Henry of Guise and Henry of France, died by the hand of an assassin.] For four years after his accession, Henry IV was obliged to continue the civil war, but his abjuration of Protestantism and his acceptance of Catholicism in 1593 removed the chief source of opposition to him within France, and the rebellion speedily collapsed. With the Spanish king, however, the struggle dragged on until the treaty of Vervins, which in the last year of Philip's life practically confirmed the peace of Cateau-Cambrésis.

[Sidenote: Decline of Spain and Rise of France]

Thus Philip II had failed to conquer or to dismember France. He had been unable to harmonize French policies with those of his own in the

Netherlands or in England. Despite his endeavors, the French crown was now on the head of one of his enemies, who, if something of a renegade Protestant himself, had nevertheless granted qualified toleration to heretics. Nor were these failures of Philip's political and religious policies mere negative results to France. The unsuccessful interference of the Spanish king contributed to the assurance of French independence, patriotism, and solidarity. France, not Spain, was to be the center of European politics during the succeeding century.

[Sidenote: Philip II and the Turks]

In concluding this chapter, a large section of which has been devoted to an account of the manifold failures of Philip II, a word should be added about one exploit that brought glory to the Spanish monarch. It was he who administered the first effective check to the advancing Ottoman Turks.

After the death of Suleiman the Magnificent (1566), the Turks continued to strengthen their hold upon Hungary and to fit out piratical expeditions in the Mediterranean. The latter repeatedly ravaged portions of Sicily, southern Italy, and even the Balearic Islands, and in 1570 an Ottoman fleet captured Cyprus from the Venetians. Malta and Crete remained as the only Christian outposts in the Mediterranean. In this extremity, a league was formed to save Italy. Its inspirer and preacher was Pope Pius V, but Genoa and Venice furnished the bulk of the fleet, while Philip II supplied the necessary additional ships and the commander-in-chief in the person of his half-brother, Don John of Austria. The expedition, which comprised 208 vessels, met the Ottoman fleet of 273 ships in the Gulf of Lepanto, off the coast of Greece, on 7 October, 1571, and inflicted upon it a crushing defeat. The Turkish warships were almost all sunk or driven ashore; it is estimated that 8000 Turks lost their lives. When news of the victory reached Rome, Pope Pius intoned the famous verse, "There was a man sent from God whose name was John."

[Sidenote: Lepanto]

The battle of Lepanto was of great political importance. It gave the naval power of the Mohammedans a blow from which it never recovered and ended their aggressive warfare in the Mediterranean. It was, in reality, the last Crusade: Philip II was in his most becoming rôle as champion of church and pope; hardly a noble family in Spain or Italy was not represented in the battle; volunteers came from all parts of the world; the celebrated Spanish writer Cervantes lost an arm at Lepanto. Western Europe was henceforth to be comparatively free from the Ottoman peril.

[Illustration: THE HABSBURG FAMILY IN THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES]

[Illustration: THE VALOIS, BOURBON, AND GUISE FAMILIES, PHILIP OF SPAIN AND MARY, QUEEN OF SCOTS]

[Illustration: THE HOUSE OF TUDOR: SOVEREIGNS OF ENGLAND (1485-1603)]

ADDITIONAL READING

GENERAL, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE HABSBURG TERRITORIES. A. H.

Johnson, *Europe in the Sixteenth Century, 1494-1598* (1897), ch. iii-ix, a political summary; Mary A. Hollings, *Renaissance and Reformation, 1453-1660* (1910), ch. vi, ix, x, a brief outline; E. M. Hulme, *Renaissance and Reformation*, 2d ed. (1915), ch. x, xiv, xxiv-xxviii, a brief and fragmentary account; T. H. Dyer, *A History of Modern Europe*, 3d ed., rev. by Arthur Hassall (1901), ch. ix, xi-xxvii, old but containing a multitude of political facts; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. II (1904), ch. ii, iii, vii, viii, and Vol. III (1905), ch. xv, v; *History of All Nations*, Vol. XI and Vol. XII, ch. i-iii, by the German scholar on the period, Martin Philippson; *Histoire générale*, Vol. IV, ch. iii, ix, Vol. V, ch. ii-v, xv. Of the Emperor Charles V the old standard English biography by William Robertson, still readable, has now been largely superseded by that of Edward Armstrong, 2 vols. (1902); two important German works on Charles V are Baumgarten, *Geschichte Karls V*, 3 vols. (1885-1892), and Konrad Häbler, *Geschichte Spaniens unter den Habsburgern*, Vol. I (1907). Of Philip II the best brief biography in English is Martin Hume's (1902), which should be consulted, if possible, in connection with Charles Bratli, *Philippe II, Roi d'Espagne: Etude sur sa vie et son caractère*, new ed. (1912), an attempt to counteract traditional Protestant bias against the Spanish monarch. Also see M. A. S. Hume, *Spain, its Greatness and Decay, 1479-1788* (1898), ch. i-vi, for a general account of the reigns of Philip II and Philip III; and Paul Herre, *Papsttum und Papstwahl im Zeitalter Philipps II* (1907) for a sympathetic treatment of Philip's relations with the papacy. For a proper understanding of sixteenth-century politics the student should read that all-important book, Machiavelli's *Prince*, the most convenient English edition of which is in "Everyman's Library." For political events in the Germanies in the sixteenth century: E. F. Henderson, *A Short History of Germany*, 2 vols. in 1 (1902); Sidney Whitman, *Austria* (1899); Gustav Welf, *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation* (1899), an elaborate study; Franz Krones, *Handbuch der Geschichte Oesterreichs von der ältesten Zeit*, Vol. III (1877), Book XIII.

FRANCE IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. A. J. Grant, *The French Monarchy, 1483-1789* (1900), Vol. I, ch. iii-v; G. W. Kitchin, *A History of France*, 4th ed. (1894-1899), Vol. II, Book II, ch. iv-v, and Book III; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. III (1905), ch. i; Ernest Lavisse (editor), *Histoire de France*, Vol. V (1903), Books III, IV, VII, VIII, and Vol. VI (1904), Books I-III, the most thorough and best treatment; Edward Armstrong, *The French Wars of Religion* (1892); J. W. Thompson, *The Wars of Religion in France: the Huguenots, Catherine de Medici and Philip II of Spain, 1559-1576* (1909), containing several suggestions on the economic conditions of the time; A. W. Whitehead, *Gaspard de Coligny, Admiral of France* (1904); C. C. Jackson, *The Last of the Valois*, 2 vols. (1888), and, by the same author, *The First of the Bourbons*, 2 vols. (1890); Lucien Romier, *Les origines politiques des Guerres de Religion*, Vol. I, *Henri II et l'Italie, 1547-1555* (1913), scholarly and authoritative, stressing economic rather than political aspects; Louis Batiffol, *The Century of the Renaissance in France*, Eng. trans. by Elsie F. Buckley (1916), covering the years 1483-1610, largely political.

ENGLAND IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. Brief accounts: A. L. Cross, *History of England and Greater Britain* (1914), ch. xix-xxvi; E. P. Cheyney, *A Short History of England* (1904), ch. xii, xiii; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. III (1905), ch. viii-xi; J. F. Bright, *History of*

England_, 5 vols. (1884-1904), Vol. II, _Personal Monarchy, 1485-1688_ (in part); A. D. Innes, _History of England and the British Empire_, 4 vols. (1914), Vol. II, ch. iii-viii; J. R. Seeley, _Growth of British Policy_, 2 vols. (1895), a brilliant work, of which Vol. I, Part I, affords an able account of the policy of Elizabeth. More detailed studies: J. S. Brewer, _The Reign of Henry VIII from his Accession to the Death of Wolsey_, 2 vols. (1884); H. A. L. Fisher, _Political History of England, 1485-1547_ (1906), ch. vi-xviii; A. F. Pollard, _History of England from the Accession of Edward VI to the Death of Elizabeth_ (1910); J. A. Froude, _History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada_, 12 vols. (1870-1872), a masterpiece of prose-style but strongly biased in favor of Henry VIII and against anything connected with the Roman Church; E. P. Cheyney, _A History of England from the Defeat of the Armada to the Death of Elizabeth_, Vol. I (1914), scholarly and well-written. Also see Andrew Lang, _A History of Scotland_, 2d ed. (1901-1907), Vols. I and II; and P. H. Brown, _History of Scotland_ (1899-1900), Vols. I and II. Important biographies: A. F. Pollard, _Henry VIII_ (1905), the result of much research and distinctly favorable to Henry; E. L. Taunton, _Thomas Wolsey, Legate and Reformer_ (1902), the careful estimate of a Catholic scholar; Mandell Creighton, _Cardinal Wolsey_ (1888), a good clear account, rather favorable to the cardinal; J. M. Stone, _Mary the First, Queen of England_ (1901), a sympathetic biography of Mary Tudor; Mandell Creighton, _Queen Elizabeth_ (1909), the best biography of the Virgin Queen; E. S. Beesly, _Queen Elizabeth_ (1892), another good biography. For Mary, Queen of Scots, see the histories of Scotland mentioned above and also Andrew Lang, _The Mystery of Mary Stuart_ (1901); P. H. Brown, _Scotland in the Time of Queen Mary_ (1904); and R. S. Rait, _Mary Queen of Scots_, 2d ed. (1899), containing important source-material concerning Mary. Walter Walsh, _The Jesuits in Great Britain_ (1903), emphasizes their political opposition to Elizabeth. Martin Hume, _Two English Queens and Philip_ (1908), valuable for the English relations of Philip II. For English maritime development see David Hannay, _A Short History of the English Navy_ (1898); J. S. Corbett, _Drake and the Tudor Navy_, 2 vols. (1898), and, by the same author, _The Successors of Drake_ (1900); J. A. Froude, _English Seamen in the Sixteenth Century_ (1895).

THE NETHERLANDS IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. A good brief account is that of George Edmundson in the _Cambridge Modern History_, Vol. III (1905), ch. vi, vii, and Vol. II (1904), ch. xix. For the Dutch Netherlands the great standard work is now P. J. Blok, _History of the People of the Netherlands_, trans. in large part by O. A. Bierstadt, and for the Belgian Netherlands a corresponding function is performed in French by Henri Pirenne. J. L. Motley, _Rise of the Dutch Republic_, 3 vols. (many editions), is brilliantly written and still famous, but it is based on an inadequate study of the sources and is marred throughout by bitter prejudice against the Spaniards and in favor of the Protestant Dutch: it is now completely superseded by the works of Blok and Pirenne. Admirable accounts of William the Silent are the two-volume biography by Ruth Putnam and the volume by the same author in the "Heroes of the Nations" Series (1911); the most detailed study is the German work of Felix Rachfahl.

THE TURKS IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. _Cambridge Modern History_, Vol. III (1905), ch. iv; A. H. Lybyer, _The Government of the Ottoman Empire in the Time of Suleiman the Magnificent_ (1913); Stanley Lane-Poole, _Turkey_ (1889) in the "Story of the Nations" Series; Nicolae Jorga, _Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches_; Leopold von

Ranke, _Die Osmanen und die spanische Monarchie im sechzehnten und siebzehnten Jahrhundert_; Joseph von Hammer, _Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches_, 2d ed., 4 vols. (1834-1835), Vol. II, a famous German work, which has been translated into French.

CHAPTER IV

THE PROTESTANT REVOLT AND THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AT THE OPENING OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

[Sidenote: Differences between Religious Bodies in 1500 and Those in 1900]

Four hundred years ago, practically all people who lived in central or western Europe called themselves "Christians" and in common recognized allegiance to an ecclesiastical body which was called the "Catholic Church." This Catholic Church in 1500 differed from any present-day religious society in the following respects: (1) Every child was born into the Church as now he is born into the state; every person was expected to conform, at least outwardly, to the doctrines and practices of the Church; in other words the Catholic Church claimed a universal membership. (2) The Church was not supported by voluntary contributions as now, but by compulsory taxes; every person was compelled to assist in defraying the expenses of the official religion. (3) The state undertook to enforce obedience on the part of its subjects to the Church; a person attacking the authority of the Catholic Church would be liable to punishment by the state, and this held true in England and Germany as well as in Spain or Italy.

[Sidenote: Rise of Protestantism]

Then, within fifty years, between 1520 and 1570, a large number of Catholic Christians, particularly in Germany, Scandinavia, Scotland, and England, and a smaller number in the Low Countries and in France, broke off communion with the ancient Church and became known as Protestants. Before the year 1500 there were no Protestants; since the sixteenth century, the dominant Christianity of western and central Europe has been divided into two parts--Catholic and Protestant. It is important that we should know something of the origin and significance of this division, because the Christian religion and the Christian Church had long played very great roles in the evolution of European civilization and because ecclesiastical and religious questions have continued, since the division, to deserve general attention.

[Sidenote: "Catholic" Christianity]

Let us understand clearly what was meant in the year 1500 by the expression "Catholic Christianity." It embraced a belief in certain religious precepts which it was believed Jesus of Nazareth had taught at the beginning of the Christian era, the inculcation of certain moral teachings which were likewise derived from Jesus, and a definite organization--the Church--founded, it was assumed, by Jesus in order to teach and practice, till the end of time, His religious and moral doctrines. By means of the Church, man would know best how to order his

life in this world and how to prepare his soul for everlasting happiness in the world to come.

[Sidenote: The Catholic Church]

The Catholic Church was, therefore, a vast human society, believed to be of divine foundation and sanction, and with a mission greater and more lofty than that of any other organization. Church and state had each its own sphere, but the Church had insisted for centuries that it was greater and more necessary than the state. The members of the Church were the sum-total of Christian believers who had been baptized --practically the population of western and central Europe--and its officers constituted a regular governing hierarchy.

[Sidenote: Head of the Church]

At the head of the hierarchy was the bishop of Rome, styled the pope or sovereign pontiff, who from the first had probably enjoyed a leading position in the Church as the successor of St. Peter, prince of the apostles, and whose claims to be the divinely appointed chief bishop had been generally recognized throughout western Europe as early as the third century--perhaps earlier. The bishop of Rome was elected for life by a group of clergymen, called cardinals, who originally had been in direct charge of the parish churches in the city of Rome, but who later were frequently selected by the pope from various countries because they were distinguished churchmen. The pope chose the cardinals; the cardinals elected the pope. Part of the cardinals resided in Rome, and in conjunction with a host of clerks, translators, lawyers, and special officials, constituted the _Curia_, or papal court, for the conduct of general church business.

[Sidenote: Local Administration of the Church]

[Sidenote: Secular Clergy]

For the local administration of church affairs, the Catholic world was divided under the pope into several territorial subdivisions, (1) The patriarchates had been under patriarchs who had their sees [Footnote: "See," so called from the Latin _sedes_, referring to their seat or chair of office. Similarly our word "cathedral" is derived from the Latin _cathedra_, the official chair which the bishop occupies in his own church.] in such ancient Christian centers as Rome, Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch. and Constantinople. (2) The provinces were divisions of the patriarchates and usually centered in the most important cities, such as Milan, Florence, Cologne, Upsala, Lyons, Seville, Lisbon, Canterbury, York; and the head of each was styled a metropolitan or archbishop. (3) The diocese--the most essential unit of local administration--was a subdivision of the province, commonly a city or a town, with a certain amount of surrounding country, under the immediate supervision of a bishop. (4) Smaller divisions, particularly parishes, were to be found in every diocese, embracing a village or a section of a city, and each parish had its church building and its priest. Thus the Catholic Church possessed a veritable army of officials from pope and cardinals down through patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops, to the parish priests and their assistants, the deacons. This hierarchy, because it labored _in the world_ (_sæculo_), was called the "secular clergy."

[Sidenote: "Regular" Clergy]

Another variety of clergy--the "regulars"--supplemented the work of the seculars. The regulars were monks, [Footnote: The word "monk" is applied, of course, only to men; women who followed similar rules are commonly styled nuns.] that is, Christians who lived by a special _rule_ (_regula_), who renounced the world, took vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience, and strove to imitate the life of Christ as literally as possible. The regular clergy were organized under their own abbots, priors, provincials, or generals, being usually exempt from secular jurisdiction, except that of the pope. The regulars were the great missionaries of the Church, and many charitable and educational institutions were in their hands. Among the various orders of monks which had grown up in the course of time, the following should be enumerated: (1) The monks who lived in fixed abodes, tilled the soil, copied manuscripts, and conducted local schools. Most of the monks of this kind followed a rule, or society by-laws, which had been prepared by the celebrated St. Benedict about the year 525: they were called therefore Benedictines. (2) The monks who organized crusades, often bore arms themselves, and tended the holy places connected with incidents in the life of Christ: such orders were the Knights Templars, the Knights Hospitalers of St. John and of Malta, and the Teutonic Knights who subsequently undertook the conversion of the Slavs. (3) The monks who were called the begging friars or mendicants because they had no fixed abode but wandered from place to place, preaching to the common people and dependent for their own living upon alms. These orders came into prominence in the thirteenth century and included, among others, the Franciscan, whose lovable founder Saint Francis of Assisi had urged humility and love of the poor as its distinguishing characteristics, and the Dominican, or Order of the Preachers, devoted by the precept of its practical founder, Saint Dominic, to missionary zeal. All the mendicant orders, as well as the Benedictine monasteries, became famous in the history of education, and the majority of the distinguished scholars of the middle ages were monks. It was not uncommon, moreover, for regulars to enter the secular hierarchy and thus become parish priests or bishops, or even popes.

[Sidenote: Church Councils]

[Sidenote: Conciliar Movement]

The clergy--bishops, priests, and deacons--constituted, in popular belief, the divinely ordained administration of the Catholic Church. The legislative authority in the Church similarly was vested in the pope and in the general councils, neither of which, however, could set aside a law of God, as affirmed in the gospels, or establish a doctrine at variance with the tradition of the early Christian writers. The general councils were assemblies of prelates of the Catholic world, and there had been considerable discussion as to the relative authority of their decrees and the decisions and directions of the pope. [Footnote: Papal documents have been called by various names, such as decretals, bulls, or encyclicals.] General church councils held in eastern Europe from the fourth to the ninth centuries had issued important decrees or canons defining Christian dogmas and establishing ecclesiastical discipline, which had been subsequently ratified and promulgated by the pope as by other bishops and by the emperors; and several councils had been held in western Europe from the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries under the direct supervision of the bishop of Rome, all the canons of which had been enacted in accordance with his wishes. But early in the fifteenth century a movement was inaugurated by certain Catholic bishops and scholars in favor of making the councils superior to the pope and a regular source of supreme legislation for the Church.

In this way, the councils of Constance (1414-1418) and Basel (1431 ff.) had endeavored to introduce representative, if not democratic, government into the Church. The popes, however, objected to this conciliar movement and managed to have it condemned by the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438-1442). By the year 1512 the papal theory had triumphed and Catholics generally recognized again that the government of the Church was essentially monarchical. The laws of the Catholic Church were known as canons, and, of several codes of canon law which had been prepared, that of a monk named Gratian, compiled in the twelfth century, was the most widely used.

[Sidenote: The Pope and his Powers]

We are now in a position to summarize the claims and prerogatives of the bishop of Rome or pope. (1) He was the supreme lawgiver. He could issue decrees of his own, which might not be set aside by any other person. No council might enact canons without his approval. From any law, other than divine, he might dispense persons. (2) He was the supreme judge in Christendom. He claimed that appeals might be taken from decisions in foreign courts to his own Curia, as court of last resort. He himself frequently acted as arbitrator, as, for example, in the famous dispute between Spain and Portugal concerning the boundaries of their newly discovered possessions. (3) He was the supreme administrator. He claimed the right to supervise the general business of the whole Church. No archbishop might perform the functions of his office until he received his insignia--the pallium--from the pope. No bishop might be canonically installed until his election had been confirmed by the pope. The pope claimed the right to transfer a bishop from one diocese to another and to settle all disputed elections. He exercised immediate control over the regular clergy--the monks and nuns. He sent ambassadors, styled legates, to represent him at the various royal courts and to see that his instructions were obeyed. (4) He insisted upon certain temporal rights, as distinct from his directly religious prerogatives. He crowned the Holy Roman Emperor. He might depose an emperor or king and release a ruler's subjects from their oath of allegiance. He might declare null and void, and forbid the people to obey, a law of any state, if he thought it was injurious to the interests of the Church. He was temporal ruler of the city of Rome and the surrounding papal states, and over those territories he exercised a power similar to that of any duke or king. (5) He claimed financial powers. In order to defray the enormous expenses of his government, he charged fees for certain services at Rome, assessed the dioceses throughout the Catholic world, and levied a small tax--Peter's Pence--upon all Christian householders.

[Sidenote: Purpose of the Church]

So far we have concerned ourselves with the organization of the Catholic Church--its membership, its officers, the clergy, secular and regular, all culminating in the pope, the bishop of Rome. But why did this great institution exist? Why was it loved, venerated, and well served? The purpose of the Church, according to its own teaching, was to follow the instructions of its Divine Master, Jesus Christ, in saving souls. Only the Church might interpret those instructions; the Church alone might apply the means of salvation; outside the Church no one could be saved. [Footnote: Catholic theologians have recognized, however, the possibility of salvation of persons outside the visible Church. Thus, the catechism of Pope Pius X says: "Whoever, without any fault of his own, and in good faith, being outside the Church, happens

to have been baptized or to have at least an implicit desire for baptism, and, furthermore, has been sincere in seeking to find the

truth, and has done his best to do the will of God, such an one, although separated from the body of the Church, would still belong to her soul, and therefore be in the way of salvation."] The salvation of souls for eternity was thus the supreme business of the Church.

[Sidenote: Theology]

This salvation of souls involved a theology and a sacramental system, which we shall proceed to explain. Theology was the study of God. It sought to explain how and why man was created, what were his actual and desirable relations with God, what would be the fate of man in a future life. The most famous theologians of the Catholic Church, for example, St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274), studied carefully the teachings of Christ, the Bible, the early Christian writings, and the decrees of popes and councils, and drew therefrom elaborate explanations of Christian theology--the dogmas and faith of the Catholic Church.

[Sidenote: The Sacramental System]

The very center of Catholic theology was the sacramental system, for that was the means, and essentially the only means, of saving souls. It was, therefore, for the purpose of the sacramental system that the Church and its hierarchy existed. The sacraments were believed to have been instituted by Christ Himself, and were defined as "outward signs instituted by Christ to give grace." The number generally accepted was seven: baptism, confirmation, holy eucharist, penance, extreme unction, holy orders, and matrimony. By means of the sacraments the Church accompanied the faithful throughout life. Baptism, the pouring of water, cleansed the child from original sin and from all previous actual sins, and made him a Christian, a child of God, and an heir of heaven. The priest was the ordinary minister of baptism, but in case of necessity any one who had the use of reason might baptize. Confirmation, conferred usually by a bishop upon young persons by the laying on of hands and the anointing with oil, gave them the Holy Ghost to render them strong and perfect Christians and soldiers of Jesus Christ. Penance, one of the most important sacraments, was intended to forgive sins committed after baptism. To receive the sacrament of penance worthily it was necessary for the penitent (1) to examine his conscience, (2) to have sorrow for his sins, (3) to make a firm resolution never more to offend God, (4) to confess his mortal sins orally to a priest, (5) to receive absolution from the priest, (6) to accept the particular penance--visitation of churches, saying of certain prayers, or almsgiving--which the priest might enjoin. The holy eucharist was the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the consecration of bread and wine by priest or bishop, its miraculous transformation (transubstantiation) at his word into the very Body and Blood of Christ, and its reception by the faithful. It was around the eucharist that the elaborate ritual and ceremonies of the Mass developed, that fine vestments and candles and incense and flowers were used, and that magnificent cathedrals were erected. Extreme unction was the anointing at the hands of a priest of the Christian who was in immediate danger of death, and it was supposed to give health and strength to the soul and sometimes to the body. By means of holy orders--the special imposition of hands on the part of a bishop--priests, bishops, and other ministers of the Church were ordained and received the power and grace to perform their sacred duties. Matrimony was the sacrament, held

to be indissoluble by human power, by which man and woman were united in lawful Christian marriage.

Of the seven sacraments it will be noticed that two--baptism and penance--dealt with the forgiveness of sins, and that two--holy orders and matrimony--were received only by certain persons. Three--baptism, confirmation, and holy orders--could be received by a Christian only once. Two--confirmation and holy orders--required the ministry of a bishop; and all others, except baptism and possibly matrimony, required the ministry of at least a priest. The priesthood was, therefore, the absolutely indispensable agent of the Church in the administration of the sacramental system. It was the priesthood that absolved penitents from their sins, wrought the great daily miracle of transubstantiation, and offered to God the holy sacrifice of the Mass.

[Sidenote: Various Objections to the Church]

It must not be supposed that either the theology or the organization of the Catholic Church, as they existed in the year 1500, had been precisely the same throughout the Christian era. While educated Catholics insisted that Christ was indirectly the source of all faith and all practice, they were quite willing to admit that external changes and adaptations of institutions to varying conditions had taken place. Moreover, it must not be supposed that the proud eminence to which the Catholic Church had attained by 1500 in central and western Europe had been won easily or at that time was readily maintained. Throughout the whole course of Christian history there had been repeated objections to new definitions of dogma--many positively refused to accept the teaching of the Church as divine or infallible--and there had been likewise a good deal of opposition to the temporal claims of the Church, resulting in increasing friction between the clergy and the lay rulers. Thus it often transpired that the kings who vied with one another in recognizing the spiritual and religious headship of the pope and in burning heretics who denied doctrines of the Catholic Church, were the very kings who quarreled with the pope concerning the latter's civil jurisdiction and directed harsh laws against its exercise.

[Sidenote: Sources of Conflict between Church and State]

As strong national monarchies rose in western Europe, this friction became more acute. On one side the royal power was determined to exalt the state and to bring into subjection to it not only the nobles and common people but the clergy as well; the national state must manage absolutely every temporal affair. On the other side, the clergy stoutly defended the special powers that they had long enjoyed in various states and which they believed to be rightly theirs. There were four chief sources of conflict between the temporal and spiritual jurisdictions, (1) Appointments of bishops, abbots, and other high church officers. Inasmuch as these were usually foremost citizens of their native kingdom, holding large estates and actually participating in the conduct of government, the kings frequently claimed the right to dictate their election. On the other hand the popes insisted upon their rights in the matter and often "reserved" to themselves the appointment to certain valuable bishoprics. (2) Taxation of land and other property of the clergy. The clergy insisted that by right they were exempt from taxation and that in practice they had not been taxed since the first public recognition of Christianity in the fourth century. The kings pointed out that the wealth of the clergy and

the needs of the state had increased along parallel lines, that the clergy were citizens of the state and should pay a just share for its maintenance. (3) Ecclesiastical courts. For several centuries the Church had maintained its own courts for trying clerical offenders and for hearing certain cases, which nowadays are heard in state courts--probating of wills, the marriage relations, blasphemy, etc. From these local church courts, the pope insisted that appeals might be taken to the Roman Curia. On their side, the kings were resolved to substitute royal justice for that of both feudal and ecclesiastical courts: they diminished, therefore, the privileges of the local church courts and forbade the taking of appeals to Rome. (4) How far might the pope, as universally acknowledged head of the Church, interfere in the internal affairs of particular states? While the pope claimed to be the sole judge of his own rights and powers, several kings forbade the publication of papal documents within their states or the reception of papal legates unless the royal assent had been vouchsafed.

[Sidenote: Royal Restrictions on the Church]

Gradually the national monarchs secured at least a partial control over episcopal appointments, and in both England and France papal jurisdiction was seriously restricted in other ways. In England the power of the ecclesiastical courts had been reduced (1164); no property might be bestowed upon the Church without royal permission (1279); the pope might not make provision in England for his personal appointees to office (1351); and appeals to Rome had been forbidden (1392). [Footnote: All these anti-papal enactments were very poorly enforced.] In France the clergy had been taxed early in the fourteenth century, and the papacy, which had condemned such action, had been humiliated by a forced temporary removal from Rome to Avignon, where it was controlled by French rulers for nearly seventy years (1309-1377); and in 1438 the French king, Charles VII, in a document, styled the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, solemnly proclaimed the "liberties of the Gallican Church," that a general council was superior to the pope, that the pope might not interfere in episcopal elections, that he might not levy taxes on French dioceses. The Pragmatic Sanction was condemned by the pope, but for three-quarters of a century after its issuance there were strained relations between the Church in France and the sovereign pontiff.

[Sidenote: Political Differences Distinct from Religious Differences]

Similar conflicts between spiritual and temporal jurisdictions were common to all Christian states, but the national strength and the patriotism of the western monarchies caused them to proceed further than any other state in restricting the papal privileges. Despite the conflict over temporal affairs, which at times was exceedingly bitter, the kings and rulers of England and France never appear to have seriously questioned the religious authority of the Church or the spiritual supremacy of the pope. Religiously, the Catholic Church seemed in 1500 to hold absolute sway over all central and western Europe.

[Sidenote: Religious Opposition to Catholicism]

Yet this very religious authority of the Catholic Church had been again and again brought into question and repeatedly rejected. Originally, a united Christianity had conquered western Asia, northern Africa, and eastern Europe; by 1500 nearly all these wide regions were lost to

Catholic Christianity as that phrase was understood in western Europe. The loss was due to (1) the development of a great Christian schism, and (2) the rise of a new religion--Mohammedanism.

[Sidenote: The Schism between the East and the West]

Eastern Europe had been lost through an ever-widening breach in Christian practice from the fifth to the eleventh century. The Eastern Church used the Greek language in its liturgy; that of the West used the Latin language. The former remained more dependent upon the state; the latter grew less dependent. Minor differences of doctrine appeared. And the Eastern Christians thought the pope was usurping unwarrantable prerogatives, while the Western Christians accused the Oriental patriarchs of departing from their earlier loyalty to the pope and destroying the unity of Christendom. Several attempts had been made to reunite the Catholic Church of the West and the Orthodox Church of the East, but with slight success. In 1500, the Christians of Greece, the Balkan peninsula, and Russia were thought to be outside the Catholic Church and were defined, therefore, by the pope as schismatics.

[Sidenote: Mohammedanism]

Far more numerous and dangerous to Catholic Christianity than the schismatic Easterners were the Mohammedans. Mohammed himself had lived in Arabia in the early part the seventh century and had taught that he was the inspired prophet of the one true God. In a celebrated book,--the Koran,--which was compiled from the sayings of the prophet, are to be found the precepts and commandments of the Mohammedan religion. Mohammedanism spread rapidly: within a hundred years of its founder's death it had conquered western Asia and northern Africa and had gained a temporary foothold in Spain; thenceforth it stretched eastward across Persia and Turkestan into India and southward into central Africa; and in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as we have seen, it possessed itself of Constantinople, the Balkans, Greece, and part of Hungary, and threatened Christendom in the Germanies and in the Mediterranean.

[Sidenote: Western Heresies]

Even in western Europe, the Catholic Church had had to encounter spasmodic opposition from "heretics," as those persons were called who, although baptized as Christians, refused to accept all the dogmas of Catholic Christianity. Such were the Arian Christians, who in early times had been condemned for rejecting the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, and who had eventually been won back to Catholicism only with the greatest efforts. Then in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the Albigensian heretics in southern France had assailed the sacramental system and the organization of the Church and had been suppressed only by armed force. In the fourteenth century, John Wycliffe appeared in England and John Hus in Bohemia, both preaching that the individual Christian needs no priestly mediation between himself and God and that the very sacraments of the Church, however desirable, are not essentially necessary to salvation. The Lollards, as Wycliffe's English followers were called, were speedily extirpated by fire and sword, through the stern orthodoxy of an English king, but the Hussites long defied the pope and survivals of their heresy were to be found in 1500.

[Sidenote: Skeptics]

In addition to these heretics and the Jews, [Footnote: For detailed accounts of the Jews during the middle ages as well as in modern times, see the Jewish Encyclopædia, ed. by Isidore Singer, 12 vols. (1901-1906).] many so-called skeptics no doubt existed. These were people who outwardly conformed to Catholicism but inwardly doubted and even scoffed at the very foundations of Christianity. They were essentially irreligious, but they seem to have suffered less from persecution than the heretics. Many of the Italian humanists, concerning whom we shall later say a word, [Footnote: See below] were in the fifteenth century more or less avowed skeptics.

THE PROTESTANT REVOLT

[Sidenote: A Religious and Political Movement]

We have seen in the preceding pages that prior to 1500 there had been many conflicts between kings and popes concerning their respective temporal rights and likewise there had been serious doubts in the minds of various people as to the authority and teachings of the Catholic Church. But these two facts--political and religious--had never been united in a general revolt against the Church until the sixteenth century. Then it was that Christians of Germany, Scandinavia, Scotland, and England, even of the Low Countries and France, successfully revolted against the papal monarchy and set up establishments of their own, usually under the protection of their lay rulers, which became known as the Protestant churches. The movement is called, therefore, the Protestant Revolt. It was begun and practically completed between 1520 and 1570.

[Sidenote: Political Causes of Protestant Revolt]

In explaining this remarkable and sudden break with the religious and ecclesiastical development of a thousand years, it is well to bear in mind that its causes were at once political, economic, and religious. Politically, it was merely an accentuation of the conflict which had long been increasing in virulence between the spiritual and temporal authorities. It cannot be stated too emphatically that the Catholic Church during many centuries prior to the sixteenth had been not only a religious body, like a present-day church, but also a vast political power which readily found sources of friction with other political institutions. The Catholic Church, as we have seen, had its own elaborate organization in every country of western and central Europe; and its officials--popes, bishops, priests, and monks--denied allegiance to the secular government; the Church owned many valuable lands and estates, which normally were exempt from taxation and virtually outside the jurisdiction of the lay government; the Church had its own independent and compulsory income, and its own courts to try its own officers and certain kinds of cases for every one. Such political jurisdiction of the Church had been quite needful and satisfactory in the period--from the fifth to the twelfth century, let us say--when the secular governments were weak and the Church found itself the chief unifying force in Christendom, the veritable heir to the universal dominion of the ancient Roman Empire.

But gradually the temporal rulers themselves repressed feudalism. Political ambition increased in laymen, and local pride was exalted into patriotism. By the year 1200 was begun the growth of that notable idea of national monarchy, the general outline of which we sketched in

the opening chapter. We there indicated that at the commencement of the sixteenth century, England, France, Spain, and Portugal had become strong states, with well-organized lay governments under powerful kings, with patriotic populations, and with well-developed, distinctive languages and literatures. The one thing that seemed to be needed to complete this national sovereignty was to bring the Church entirely under royal control. The autocratic sovereigns desired to enlist the wealth and influence of the Church in their behalf; they coveted her lands, her taxes, and her courts. Although Italy, the Netherlands, and the Germanies were not yet developed as strong united monarchies, many of their patriotic leaders longed for such a development, worked for it, and believed that the principal obstacle to it was the great Christian Church with the pope at its head. Viewed from the political standpoint, the Protestant Revolt was caused by the rise of national feeling, which found itself in natural conflict with the older cosmopolitan or catholic idea of the Church. It was nationalism _versus_ Catholicism.

[Sidenote: Economic Causes of Protestant Revolt]

Economically, the causes of the Protestant Revolt were twofold. In the first place, the Catholic Church had grown so wealthy that many people, particularly kings and princes, coveted her possessions. In the second place, financial abuses in ecclesiastical administration bore heavily upon the common people and created serious scandal. Let us say a word about each one of these difficulties.

At the opening of the sixteenth century, many bishops and abbots in wealth and power were not unlike great lay lords: they held vast fair dominions--in the Germanics a third of the whole country, in France a fifth, etc.--and they were attended by armies of retainers. Most of them were sons of noblemen who had had them consecrated bishops so as to insure them fine positions. Even the monks, who now often lived in rich monasteries as though they had never taken vows of poverty, were sometimes of noble birth and quite worldly in their lives. The large estates and vast revenues of Catholic ecclesiastics were thus at first the lure and then the prey of their royal and princely neighbors. The latter grew quite willing to utilize any favorable opportunity which might enable them to confiscate church property and add it to their own possessions. Later such confiscation was euphemistically styled "secularization."

On the other hand, many plain people, such as peasants and artisans, begrudged the numerous and burdensome ecclesiastical taxes, and an increasing number felt that they were not getting the worth of their money. There was universal complaint, particularly in the Germanies, that the people were exploited by the Roman Curia. Each ecclesiastic, be he bishop, abbot, or priest, had right to a benefice, that is, to the revenue of a parcel of land attached to his post. When he took possession of a benefice, he paid the pope a special assessment, called the "annate," amounting to a year's income--which of course came from the peasants living on the land. The pope likewise "reserved" to himself the right of naming the holders of certain benefices: these he gave preferably to Italians who drew the revenues but remained in their own country; the people thus supported foreign prelates in luxury and sometimes paid a second time in order to maintain resident ecclesiastics. The archbishops paid enormous sums to the pope for their badges of office (_pallia_). Fat fees for dispensations or for court trials found their way across the Alps. And the bulk of the

burden ultimately rested upon the backs of the people. At least in the Germanics the idea became very prevalent that the pope and Curia were really robbing honest German Christians for the benefit of scandalously immoral Italians.

There were certainly grave financial abuses in church government in the fifteenth century and in the early part of the sixteenth. A project of German reform, drawn up in 1438, had declared: "It is a shame which cries to heaven, this oppression of tithes, dues, penalties, excommunication, and tolls of the peasant, on whose labor all men depend for their existence." An "apocalyptic pamphlet of 1508 shows on its cover the Church upside down, with the peasant performing the services, while the priest guides the plow outside and a monk drives the horses." It was, in fact, in the Germanics that all the social classes--princes, burghers, knights, and peasants--had special economic grievances against the Church, and in many places were ready to combine in rejecting papal claims.

This emphasis upon the political and particularly upon the economic causes need not belittle the strictly religious factor in the movement. The success of the revolt was due to the fact that many kings, nobles, and commoners, for financial and political advantages to themselves, became the valuable allies of real religious reformers. It required dogmatic differences as well as social grievances to destroy the dominion of the Church.

[Sidenote: Abuses in the Catholic Church]

Nearly all thoughtful men in the sixteenth century recognized the existence of abuses in the Catholic Church. The scandals connected with the papal court at Rome were notorious at the opening of the century. Several of the the popes lived grossly immoral lives. Simony (the sale of church offices for money) and nepotism (favoritism shown by a pope to his relatives) were not rare. The most lucrative ecclesiastical positions throughout Europe were frequently conferred upon Italians who seldom discharged their duties. One person might be made bishop of several foreign dioceses and yet continue to reside in Rome. Leo X, who was pope when the Protestant Revolt began, and son of Lorenzo de' Medici, surnamed the Magnificent, had been ordained to the priesthood at the age of seven, named cardinal when he was thirteen, and speedily loaded with a multitude of rich benefices and preferments; this same pope, by his munificence and extravagance, was forced to resort to the most questionable means for raising money: he created many new offices and shamelessly sold them; he increased the revenue from indulgences, jubilees, and regular taxation; he pawned palace furniture, table plate, pontifical jewels, even statues of the apostles; several banking firms and many individual creditors were ruined by his death.

[Sidenote: Attacks on Immorality of Clergymen]

What immorality and worldliness prevailed at Rome was reflected in the lives of many lesser churchmen. To one of the popes of the fifteenth century, a distinguished cardinal represented the disorders of the clergy, especially in the Germanics. "These disorders," he said, "excite the hatred of the people against all ecclesiastical order; if it is not corrected, it is to be feared that the laity, following the example of the Hussites, will attack the clergy as they now openly menace us with doing." If the clergy of Germany were not reformed promptly, he predicted that after the Bohemian heresy was crushed

another would speedily arise far more dangerous. "For they will say," he continued, "that the clergy is incorrigible and is willing to apply no remedy to its disorders. They will attack us when they no longer have any hope of our correction. Men's minds are waiting for what shall be done; it seems as if shortly something tragic will be brought forth. The venom which they have against us is becoming evident; soon they will believe they are making a sacrifice agreeable to God by maltreating or despoiling the ecclesiastics as people odious to God and man and immersed to the utmost in evil. The little reverence still remaining for the sacred order will be destroyed. Responsibility for all these disorders will be charged upon the Roman Curia, which will be regarded as the cause of all these evils because it has neglected to apply the necessary remedy." To many other thoughtful persons, a moral reformation in the head and members of the Church seemed vitally necessary.

Complaints against the evil lives of the clergy as well as against their ignorance and credulity were echoed by most of the great scholars and humanists of the time. The patriotic knight and vagabond scholar, Ulrich von Hutten (1488-1523), contributed to a clever series of satirical "Letters of Obscure Men," which were read widely, and which poked fun at the lack of learning among the monks and the ease with which the papal court emptied German pockets.

[Sidenote: Ulrich von Hutten and Erasmus]

Then, too, the great Erasmus (1466-1536) employed all his wit and sarcasm, in his celebrated "Praise of Folly," against the theologians and monks, complaining that the foolish people thought that religion consisted simply in pilgrimages, the invocation of saints, and the veneration of relics. Erasmus would have suppressed the monasteries, put an end to the domination of the clergy, and swept away scandalous abuses. He wanted Christianity to regain its early spiritual force, and largely for that purpose he published in 1516 the Greek text of the New Testament with a new Latin translation and with notes which mercilessly flayed hair-splitting theologians.

Thus throughout the fifteenth century and the early part of the sixteenth, much was heard from scholars, princes, and people, of the need for "reformation" of the Church. That did not signify a change of the old regulations but rather their restoration and enforcement. For a long time it was not a question of abolishing the authority of the pope, or altering ecclesiastical organization, or changing creeds. It was merely a question of reforming the lives of the clergy and of suppressing the means by which Italians drew money from other nations.

[Sidenote: Religious Causes of Protestant Revolt]

In the sixteenth century, however, a group of religious leaders, such as Luther, Cranmer, Zwingli, Calvin, and Knox, went much further than Erasmus and the majority of the humanists had gone: they applied the word "reformation" not only to a reform in morals but to an open break which they made with the government and doctrines of the Catholic Church. The new theology, which these reformers championed, was derived mainly from the teachings of such heretics as Wycliffe and Hus and was supposed to depend directly upon the Bible rather than upon the Church. The religious causes of the Protestant Revolt accordingly may be summed up as: first, the existence of abuses within the Catholic Church; second, the attacks of distinguished men upon the immorality and

worldliness of the Catholic clergy; and third, the substitution by certain religious leaders of new doctrines and practices, which were presumed to have been authorized by the Bible, but which were at variance with those of the medieval Church.

[Sidenote: Date and Extent of the Protestant Revolt]

For the great variety of reasons, which we have now indicated,-- political, economic, and religious,--the peoples of northern Germany, Scandinavia, the Dutch Netherlands, most of Switzerland, Scotland, England, and a part of France and of Hungary, separated themselves, between the years 1520 and 1570, from the great religious and political body which had been known historically for over a thousand years as the Catholic Christian Church. The name "Protestant" was first applied exclusively to those followers of Martin Luther in the Holy Roman Empire who in 1529 protested against an attempt of the Diet of Speyer to prevent the introduction of religious novelties, but subsequently the word passed into common parlance among historians and the general reading public as betokening all Christians who rejected the papal supremacy and who were not in communion with the Orthodox Church of eastern Europe.

Of this Protestant Christianity three main forms appeared in the sixteenth century--Lutheranism, Calvinism, and Anglicanism. Concerning the origin and development of each one of these major forms, a brief sketch must be given.

LUTHERANISM

[Sidenote: Martin Luther]

Lutheranism takes its name from its great apostle, Martin Luther. Luther was born in Eisleben in Germany in 1483 of a poor family whose ancestors had been peasants. Martin early showed himself bold, headstrong, willing to pit his own opinions against those of the world, but yet possessing ability, tact, and a love of sound knowledge. Educated at the university of Erfurt, where he became acquainted with the humanistic movement, young Martin entered one of the mendicant orders--the Augustinian--in 1505 and went to live in a monastery. In 1508 Luther was sent with some other monks to Wittenberg to assist a university which had been opened there recently by the elector of Saxony, and a few years later was appointed professor of theology in the institution.

[Sidenote: Justification by Faith]

While lecturing and preaching at Wittenberg, where he was very popular, Luther developed from the writings of St. Paul and St. Augustine an important doctrinal conviction which differed widely from the faith of the Catholic Church. It concerned the means of eternal salvation. The Church taught, as we have seen, that she possessed the sole means, and that every Christian must perform certain "good works" in order to secure salvation. Luther, on the other hand, became convinced that man was incapable, in the sight of God, of any good works whatsoever, and could be saved only by faith in God's promises. In other words, this monk placed his doctrine of "justification by faith" in opposition to the generally accepted belief in "justification by faith and works."

[Sidenote: Tetzel's "Sale" of Indulgences]

So far, Luther certainly had no thought of revolting against the authority of the Church. In fact, when he visited Rome in 1511, it was as a pious pilgrim rather than as a carping critic. But a significant event in the year 1517 served to make clear a wide discrepancy between what he was teaching and what the Church taught. That year a certain papal agent, Tetzel by name, was disposing of indulgences in the great archbishopric of Mainz. An indulgence, according to Catholic theology, was a remission of the temporal punishment in purgatory due to sin, and could be granted only by authority of the Church; the grant of indulgences depended upon the contrition and confession of the applicant, and often at that time upon money-payments. Against what he believed was a corruption of Christian doctrine and a swindling of the poorer people, Luther protested in a series of ninety-five Theses which he posted on the church door in Wittenberg (31 October, 1517).

[Sidenote: The Ninety-five Theses]

The Theses had been written in Latin for the educated class but they were now speedily translated into German and spread like wildfire among all classes throughout the country. Luther's underlying principle of "salvation through simple faith" was in sharp contrast with the theory of "good works," on which the indulgences rested. "The Christian who has true repentance," wrote Luther, "has already received pardon from God altogether apart from an indulgence, and does not need one; Christ demands this true repentance from every one." Luther's attitude provoked spirited discussion throughout the Germanics, and the more discussion, the more interest and excitement. The pope, who had dismissed the subject at first as a mere squabble among the monks, was moved at length to summon Luther to Rome to answer for the Theses, but the elector of Saxony intervened and prevailed upon the pope not to press the matter.

[Sidenote: Disputation at Leipzig, 1519]

The next important step in the development of Luther's religious ideas was a debate on the general question of papal supremacy, held at Leipzig in 1519, between himself and an eminent Catholic apologist, Johann Eck. Eck skillfully forced Luther to admit that certain views of his, especially those concerning man's direct relation with God, without the mediation of the Church, were the same as those which John Hus had held a century earlier and which had been condemned both by the pope and by the great general council of Constance. Luther thereby virtually admitted that a general council as well as a pope might err. For him, the divine authority of the Roman Catholic Church ceased to be.

[Sidenote: Separation of Luther from the Catholic Church]

Separation from the traditional Church was the only course now open to Luther and this was consummated in the year 1520. In a series of three bold pamphlets, he vigorously and definitely attacked the position of the Church. In the first--An Address to the Nobility of the German Nation--Luther stated that there was nothing inherently sacred about the Christian priesthood and that the clergy should be deprived immediately of their special privileges; he urged the German princes to free their country from foreign control and shrewdly called their attention to the wealth and power of the Church which they might justly

appropriate to themselves. In the second--_On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church of God_--he assailed the papacy and the whole sacramental system. The third--_On the Freedom of a Christian Man_--contained the essence of Luther's new theology that salvation was not a painful _progress_ toward a goal by means of sacraments and right conduct but a _condition_ "in which man found himself so soon as he despaired absolutely of his own efforts and threw himself on God's assurances"; the author claimed that man's utter personal dependence on God's grace rendered the system of the Church superfluous.

In the midst of these attacks upon the Church, the pope excommunicated Luther, and in the following year (1521) influenced the Diet of the Holy Roman Empire, assembled at Worms, to pronounce him an outlaw. But the rebel calmly burnt the papal bull and from the imperial ban he was protected by the elector of Saxony. He at once devoted himself to making a new German translation of the Bible, which became very popular and is still prized as a monument in the history of German literature. [Footnote: The first edition of the Bible in German had been printed as early as 1466. At least eighteen editions in German (including four Low German versions) had appeared before Luther issued his German New Testament in 1522.]

[Sidenote: Spread of Lutheranism]

Within the next few years the Lutheran teachings carried everything before them throughout the northern and central Germanies. Nor are the reasons for Luther's success in defying pope and emperor and for the rapid acceptance of his new theology hard to understand. The movement was essentially popular and national. It appealed to the pious-minded who desired a simplification of Christian dogma and a comprehensible method of salvation. It also appealed to the worldly minded who longed to seize ecclesiastical lands and revenues. Above all, it appealed to the patriots who were tired of foreign despotism and of abuses which they traced directly to the Roman Curia. Then, too, the Emperor Charles V, who remained a loyal Catholic, was too immersed in the difficulties of foreign war and in the manifold administrative problems of his huge dominions to be able to devote much time to the extirpation of heresy in the Germanies. Finally, the character of Luther contributed to effective leadership--he was tireless in flooding the country with pamphlets, letters, and inflammatory diatribes, tactful in keeping his party together, and always bold and courageous. Princes, burghers, artisans, and peasants joined hands in espousing the new cause.

[Sidenote: Luther and the German Peasants]

But the peasants espoused it in a manner altogether too logical and too violent to suit Luther or the desires of the princes. The German peasants had grievances against the old order compared with which those of the knights and towns-folk were imaginary. For at least a century several causes had contributed to make their lot worse and worse. While their taxes and other burdens were increasing, the ability of the emperor to protect them was decreasing; they were plundered by every class in the community, especially by the higher clergy. Thus, under the influence of social and economic conditions, various uprisings of the peasants had taken place during the latter part of the fifteenth century. These insurrections became almost regular in the southwestern Germanies, and were called _Bundschuhe_, a shoe fastened upon the end of a pole serving as a standard of revolt. When Luther urged the

princes to assail the ecclesiastics, to seize church lands, and to put an end to financial abuses, the peasants naturally listened to his words with open ears and proceeded with glad hearts to apply his advice themselves.

The new Lutheran theology may have been too refined for the peasants, but they imagined they understood its purport. And spurred on by fanatics, whom the religious ferment of the times produced in large numbers, [Footnote: Many of these radical religious leaders were more consistent and thoroughgoing than Luther in maintaining the right of each Christian to interpret the Scriptures for himself. Since they generally refused to recognize infant baptism as valid and insisted that baptism should be administered only to adults, they were subsequently often referred to as "Anabaptists." Many of the "Anabaptists" condemned oaths and capital punishment; some advocated communism of worldly goods, in several instances even the community of women. Nicholas Storch (d. 1525), a weaver, and Thomas Munzer (d. 1525), a Lutheran preacher, spread these doctrines widely among the peasants. Luther vehemently denounced the "Anabaptists."] the peasants again took arms against feudal oppression. That the peasants' demands were essentially moderate and involved no more than is granted everywhere to-day as a matter of course, may be inferred from their declaration of principles, the Twelve Articles, among which were: abolition of serfdom, free right of fishing and hunting, payment in wages for services rendered, and abolition of arbitrary punishment. So long as the peasants directed their efforts against the Catholic ecclesiastics, Luther expressed sympathy with them, but when the revolt, which broke out in 1524, became general all over central and southern Germany and was directed not only against the Catholic clergy but also against the lay lords,--many of whom were now Lutheran,--the religious leader foresaw a grave danger to his new religion in a split between peasants and nobles. Luther ended by taking strong sides with the nobles--he had most to expect from them. He was shocked by the excesses of the revolt, he said. Insisting upon toleration for his own revolt, he condemned the peasants to most horrible fates in this world and in the world hereafter. [Footnote: Although Luther was particularly bitter against the "Anabaptist" exhorters, upon whom he fastened responsibility for the Peasants' Revolt, and although many of them met death thereby, the "Anabaptists" were by no means exterminated. Largely through the activity of a certain Melchior Hofmann, a widely traveled furrier, "Anabaptist" doctrines were disseminated in northern Germany and the Netherlands. From 1533 to 1535 they reigned supreme, attended by much bloodshed and plenty of personal license, in the important city of Munster in western Germany. Subsequently, Carlstadt (1480-1541), an early associate of Luther, though his later antagonist, set forth Anabaptist views with greater moderation; and in course of time the sect became more or less tinged with Calvinistic theology.] He furiously begged the princes to put down the insurrection. "Whoever can, should smite, strangle, or stab, secretly or publicly!"

[Sidenote: The Peasants' Revolt]

The Peasants' Revolt was crushed in 1525 with utmost cruelty. Probably fifty thousand lost their lives in the vain effort. The general result was that the power of the territorial lords became greater than ever, although in a few cases, particularly in the Tyrol and in Baden, the condition of the peasants was slightly improved. Elsewhere, however, this was not the case; and the German peasants were assigned for over two centuries to a lot worse than that of almost any people in Europe.

Another result was the decline of Luther's influence among the peasantry in southern and central Germany. They turned rapidly from one who, they believed, had betrayed them. On the other hand, many Catholic princes, who had been wavering in their religious support, now had before their eyes what they thought was an object lesson of the results of Luther's appeal to revolution, and so they cast their lot decisively with the ancient Church. The Peasants' Revolt registered a distinct check to the further spread of Lutheranism.

[Sidenote: Diets of Speyer 1526, 1529]

[Sidenote: The Word "Protestant"]

The Diet of the Holy Roman Empire which assembled at Speyer in 1526 saw the German princes divided into a Lutheran and a Roman Catholic party, but left the legal status of the new faith still in doubt, contenting itself with the vague declaration that "each prince should so conduct himself as he could answer for his behavior to God and to the emperor." But at the next Diet, held at the same place in 1529, the emperor directed that the edict against heretics should be enforced and that the old ecclesiastical revenues should not be appropriated for the new worship. The Lutheran princes drafted a legal protest, in which they declared that they meant to abide by the law of 1526. From this protest came the name _Protestant_.

[Sidenote: Confession of Augsburg, 1530]

The next year, Luther's great friend, Melancthon, presented to the Diet of Augsburg an account of the beliefs of the German reformers, which later became known as the Confession of Augsburg and constitutes to the present day the distinctive creed of the Lutheran Church. The emperor was still unconvinced, however, of the truth or value of the reformed doctrine, and declared his intention of ending the heresy by force of arms.

[Sidenote: Religious Peace of Augsburg, 1555]

In this predicament, the Lutheran princes formed a league at Schmalkald for mutual protection (1531); and from 1546 to 1555 a desultory civil war was waged. The Protestants received some assistance from the French king, who, for political reasons, was bent on humiliating the emperor. The end of the religious conflict appeared to have been reached by the peace of Augsburg (1555), which contained the following provisions: (1) Each prince was to be free to dictate the religion of his subjects [Footnote: _Cuius regio eius religio_.]; (2) All church property appropriated by the Protestants before 1552 was to remain in their hands; (3) No form of Protestantism except Lutheranism was to be tolerated; (4) Lutheran subjects of ecclesiastical states were not to be obliged to renounce their faith; (5) By an "ecclesiastical reservation" any ecclesiastical prince on becoming a Protestant was to give up his see.

[Sidenote: Lutheranism in the Germanies]

Thus, between 1520 and 1555, Martin Luther [Footnote: He died in 1546, aged 62.] had preached his new theology at variance with the Catholic, and had found general acceptance for it throughout the northern half of the Germanies; its creed had been settled and defined in 1530, and its official toleration had been recognized in 1555. The toleration was limited, however, to princes, and for many years Lutheran rulers showed

themselves quite as intolerant within their own dominions as did the Catholics.

[Sidenote: Lutheranism in Scandinavia]

The triumph of Lutheranism in the Scandinavian countries has been traced largely to political and economic causes. When Martin Luther broke with the Catholic Church, Christian II (1513-1523) was reigning as elected king over Denmark and Norway and had recently conquered Sweden by force of arms. The king encountered political difficulties with the Church although he maintained Catholic worship and doctrine and apparently recognized the spiritual supremacy of the pope. But Christian II had trouble with most of his subjects, especially the Swedes, who were conscious of separate nationality and desirous of political independence; and the king eventually lost his throne in a general uprising. The definite separation of Sweden from Denmark and Norway followed immediately. The Swedes chose the celebrated Gustavus Vasa (1523-1560) as their king, while the Danish and Norwegian crowns passed to the uncle of Christian II, who assumed the title of Frederick I (1523-1533).

[Sidenote: Denmark]

In Denmark, King Frederick was very desirous of increasing the royal power, and the subservient ecclesiastical organization which Martin Luther was advocating seemed to him for his purposes infinitely preferable to the ancient self-willed Church. But Frederick realized that the Catholic Church was deeply rooted in the affections of his people and that changes would have to be effected slowly and cautiously. He therefore collected around him Lutheran teachers from Germany and made his court the center of the propaganda of the new doctrine, and so well was the work of the new teachers done that the king was able in 1527 to put the two religions on an equal footing before the law. Upon Frederick's death in 1533, the Catholics made a determined effort to prevent the accession of his son, Christian III, who was not only an avowed Lutheran but was known to stand for absolutist principles in government.

The popular protest against royal despotism failed in Denmark and the triumph of Christian III in 1536 sealed the fate of Catholicism in that country and in Norway. It was promptly enacted that the Catholic bishops should forfeit their temporal and spiritual authority and all their property should be transferred to the crown "for the good of the commonwealth." After discussions with Luther the new religion was definitely organized and declared the state religion in 1537. It might be added that Catholicism died with difficulty in Denmark,--many peasants as well as high churchmen resented the changes, and Helgesen, the foremost Scandinavian scholar and humanist of the time, protested vigorously against the new order. But the crown was growing powerful, and the crown prevailed. The enormous increase of royal revenue, consequent upon the confiscation of the property of the Church, enabled the king to make Denmark the leading Scandinavian country throughout the second half of the sixteenth century and the first quarter of the seventeenth. In time national patriotism came to be intertwined with Lutheranism.

[Sidenote: Sweden]

In Sweden the success of the new religion was due to the crown quite as

much as in Denmark and Norway. Gustavus Vasa had obtained the Swedish throne through the efforts of a nationalist party, but there was still a hostile faction, headed by the chief churchman, the archbishop of Upsala, who favored the maintenance of the union with Denmark. In order to deprive the unionists of their leader, Gustavus begged the pope to remove the rebellious archbishop and to appoint one in sympathy with the nationalist cause. This the pope peremptorily refused to do, and the breach with Rome began. Gustavus succeeded in suppressing the insurrection, and then persevered in introducing Protestantism. The introduction was very gradual, especially among the peasantry, and its eventual success was largely the result of the work of one strong man assisted by a subservient parliament.

At first Gustavus maintained Catholic worship and doctrines, contenting himself with the suppression of the monasteries, the seizure of two-thirds of the church tithes, and the circulation of a popular Swedish translation of the New Testament. In 1527 all ecclesiastical property was transferred to the crown and two Catholic bishops were cruelly put to death. Meanwhile Lutheran teachers were encouraged to take up their residence in Sweden and in 1531 the first Protestant archbishop of Upsala was chosen. Thenceforth, the progress of Lutheranism was more rapid, although a Catholic reaction was threatened several times in the second half of the sixteenth century. The Confession of Augsburg was adopted as the creed of the Swedish Church in 1593, and in 1604 Catholics were deprived of offices and estates and banished from the realm.

CALVINISM

The second general type of Protestantism which appeared in the sixteenth century was the immediate forerunner of the modern Presbyterian, Congregational, and Reformed Churches and at one time or another considerably affected the theology of the Episcopalians and Baptists and even of Lutherans. Taken as a group, it is usually called Calvinism. Of its rise and spread, some idea may be gained from brief accounts of the lives of two of its great apostles--Calvin and Knox. But first it will be necessary to say a few words concerning an older reformer, Zwingli by name, who prepared the way for Calvin's work in the Swiss cantons.

[Sidenote: Zwingli]

Switzerland comprised in the sixteenth century some thirteen cantons, all of which were technically under the suzerainty of the Holy Roman Empire, but constituted in practice so many independent republics, bound together only by a number of protective treaties. To the town of Einsiedeln in the canton of Schwyz came Huldreich Zwingli in the year 1516 as a Catholic priest. Slightly younger than Luther, he was well born, had received an excellent university education in Vienna and in Basel, and had now been in holy orders about ten years. He had shown for some time more interest in humanism than in the old-fashioned theology, but hardly any one would have suspected him of heresy, for it was well known that he was a regular pensioner of the pope.

Zwingli's opposition to the Roman Church seems to have been based at first largely on political grounds. He preached eloquently against the practice of hiring out Swiss troops to foreign rulers and abused the Church for its share in this shameless traffic in soldiers. Then he was

led on to attack all manner of abuses in ecclesiastical organization, but it was not until he was installed in 1518 as preacher in the great cathedral at Zürich that he clearly denied papal supremacy and proceeded to proclaim the Scriptures as the sole guide of faith and morals. He preached against fasting, the veneration of saints, and the celibacy of the clergy. Some of his hearers began to put his teachings into practice: church edifices were profaned, statues demolished, windows smashed, and relics burned. Zwingli himself took a wife.

[Sidenote: Zwinglian Revolt in Switzerland]

In 1523 a papal appeal to Zürich to abandon Zwingli was answered by the canton's formal declaration of independence from the Catholic Church. Henceforth the revolt spread rapidly throughout Switzerland, except in the five forest cantons, the very heart of the country, where the ancient religion was still deeply entrenched. Serious efforts were made to join the followers of Zwingli with those of Luther, and thus to present a united front to the common enemy, but there seemed to be irreconcilable differences between Lutheranism and the views of Zwingli. The latter, which were succinctly expressed in sixty-seven Theses published at Zürich in 1523, insisted more firmly than the former on the supreme authority of Scripture, and broke more thoroughly and radically with the traditions of the Catholic Church. Zwingli aimed at a reformation of government and discipline as well as of theology, and entertained a notion of an ideal state in which the democracy would order human activities, whether political or religious. Zwingli differed essentially from Luther in never distrusting "the people." Perhaps the most distinctive mark of the Swiss reformer's theology was his idea that the Lord's Supper is not a miracle but simply a symbol and a memorial.

In 1531 Zwingli urged the Protestant Swiss to convert the five forest cantons to the new religion by force of arms. In answer to his entreaties, civil war ensued, but the Catholic mountaineers won a great victory that very year and the reformer himself was killed. A truce was then arranged, the provisions of which foreshadowed the religious settlement in the Germanies--each canton was to be free to determine its own religion. Switzerland has remained to this day part Catholic and part Protestant.

[Sidenote: Calvin]

By the sudden death of Zwingli, Swiss Protestantism was left without a leader, but not for long, because the more celebrated Calvin took up his residence in Geneva in 1536. From that time until his death in 1564 Calvin was the center of a movement which, starting from these small Zwinglian beginnings among the Swiss mountains, speedily spread over more countries and affected more people than did Lutheranism. In Calvinism, Catholicism was to find her most implacable foe.

John Calvin, who, next to Martin Luther, was the most conspicuous Protestant leader of the sixteenth century, was a Frenchman. Born of middle-class parentage at Noyon in the province of Picardy in 1509, he was intended from an early age for an ecclesiastical career. A pension from the Catholic Church enabled him to study at Paris, where he displayed an aptitude for theology and literature. When he was nineteen years of age, however, his father advised him to abandon the idea of entering the priesthood in favor of becoming a lawyer--so young Calvin spent several years studying law.

[Sidenote: Calvin in France]

It was in 1529 that Calvin is said to have experienced a sudden "conversion." Although as yet there had been no organized revolt in France against the Catholic Church, that country, like many others, was teeming with religious critics. Thousands of Frenchmen were in sympathy with any attempt to improve the Church by education, by purer morals, or by better preaching. Lutheranism was winning a few converts, and various evangelical sects were appearing in divers places. The chief problem was whether reform should be sought within the traditional Church or by rebellion against it. Calvin believed that his conversion was a divine call to forsake Roman Catholicism and to become the apostle of a purer life. His heart, he said, was "so subdued and reduced to docility that in comparison with his zeal for true piety he regarded all other studies with indifference, though not entirely abandoning them. Though himself a beginner, many flocked to him to learn the pure doctrine, and he began to seek some hiding-place and means of withdrawal from people."

[Sidenote: "The Institutes"]

His search for a hiding-place was quickened by the announced determination of the French king, Francis I, to put an end to religious dissent among his subjects. Calvin abruptly left France and found an asylum in the Swiss town of Basel, where he became acquainted at first hand with the type of reformed religion which Zwingli had propagated and where he proceeded to write a full account of the Protestant position as contrasted with the Catholic. This exposition,--_The Institutes of the Christian Religion_,--which was published in 1536, was dedicated to King Francis I and was intended to influence him in favor of Protestantism.

Although the book failed of its immediate purpose, it speedily won a deservedly great reputation. It was a statement of Calvin's views, borrowed in part from Zwingli, and in part from Luther and other reformers. It was orderly and concise, and it did for Protestant theology what the medieval writers had done for Catholic theology. It contained the germ of all that subsequently developed as Calvinism.

[Sidenote: Calvin and Luther]

It seemed for some time as if the _Institutes_ might provide a common religious rule and guide for all Christians who rebelled against Rome. But Calvin, in mind and nature, was quite different from Luther. The latter was impetuous, excitable, but very human; the former was ascetic, calm, and inhumanly logical. Then, too, Luther was quite willing to leave everything in the church which was not prohibited by Scripture; Calvin insisted that nothing should remain in the church which was not expressly authorized by Scripture. The _Institutes_ had a tremendous influence upon Protestantism but did not unite the followers of Calvin and Luther. Calvin's book seems all the more wonderful, when it is recalled that it was written when the author was but twenty-six years of age.

[Sidenote: Calvin at Geneva]

In 1536 Calvin went to Geneva, which was then in the throes of a revolution at once political and religious, for the townsfolk were

freeing themselves from the feudal suzerainty of the duke of Savoy and banishing the Catholic Church, whose cause the duke championed. Calvin aided in the work and was rewarded by an appointment as chief pastor and preacher in the city. This position he continued to hold, except for a brief period when he was exiled, until his death in 1564. It proved to be a commanding position not only in ordering the affairs of the town, but also in giving form to an important branch of Protestant Christianity.

The government of Geneva under Calvin's regime was a curious theocracy of which Calvin himself was both religious leader and political "boss." The minister of the reformed faith became God's mouthpiece upon earth and inculcated an unbending puritanism in daily life. "No more festivals, no more jovial reunions, no more theaters or society; the rigid monotony of an austere rule weighed upon life. A poet was decapitated because of his verses; Calvin wished adultery to be punished by death like heresy, and he had Michael Servetus [Footnote: A celebrated Spanish reformer.] burned for not entertaining the same opinions as himself upon the mystery of the Trinity."

Under Calvin's theocratic despotism, Geneva became famous throughout Europe as the center of elaborate Protestant propaganda. Calvin, who set the example of stern simplicity and relentless activity, was sometimes styled the Protestant pope. He not only preached every day, wrote numerous theological treatises, and issued a French translation of the Bible, but he established important Protestant schools--including the University of Geneva--which attracted students from distant lands, and he conducted a correspondence with his disciples and would-be reformers in all points of Europe. His letters alone would fill thirty folio volumes.

[Sidenote: Diffusion of Calvinism]

Such activities account for the almost bewildering diffusion of Calvinism. French, Dutch, Germans, Scotch, and English flocked to Geneva to hear Calvin or to attend his schools, and when they returned to their own countries they were likely to be so many glowing sparks ready to start mighty conflagrations.

Calvinism was known by various names in the different countries which it entered. On the continent of Europe it was called the Reformed Faith, and in France its followers were styled Huguenots; in Scotland it became Presbyterianism; and in England, Puritanism. Its essential characteristics, however, remained the same wherever it was carried.

[Sidenote: Calvinism in Switzerland]

We have already noticed how Switzerland, except for the five forest cantons, had been converted to Protestantism by the preaching of Zwingli. Calvin was Zwingli's real theological successor, and the majority of the Swiss, especially those in the urban cantons of Zürich and Bern as well as of Geneva, cheerfully accepted Calvinism.

[Sidenote: Calvinism in France: the Huguenots]

Calvinism also made converts in France. The doctrines and writings of Luther had there encountered small success. Many French reformers believed that greater good would eventually be achieved within the Catholic Church than without. There appeared to be fewer abuses among

the French clergy than among the ecclesiastics of northern Europe, for they possessed less wealth and power. The French sovereign felt less prompted to lay his hand upon the dominions of the clergy, because a special agreement with the pope in 1516 bestowed upon the king the nomination of bishops and the disposition of benefices. For these reasons the bulk of the French people resisted Protestantism of every form and remained loyally Catholic.

What progress the new religion made in France was due to Calvin rather than to Luther. Calvin, as we have seen, was a Frenchman himself, and his teachings and logic appealed to a small but influential body of his fellow-countrymen. A considerable portion of the lower nobility, a few merchants and business men, and many magistrates conformed to Calvinism openly; the majority of great lawyers and men of learning adhered to it in public or in secret. Probably from a twentieth to a thirtieth of the total population embraced Calvinism. The movement was essentially confined to the middle-class or *bourgeoisie*, and almost from the outset it acquired a political as well as a religious significance. It represented among the lesser nobility an awakening of the aristocratic spirit and among the middle-class a reaction against the growing power of the king. The financial and moneyed interests of the country were largely attracted to French Calvinism. The Huguenots, as the French Calvinists were called, were particularly strong in the law courts and in the Estates-General or parliament, and these had been the main checks upon royal despotism.

[Sidenote: Edict of Nantes]

The Huguenots were involved in sanguinary civil and religious wars which raged in France throughout the greater part of the sixteenth century and which have already been treated in their appropriate political aspect. The outcome was the settlement accorded by King Henry IV in the famous Edict of Nantes (1598), which contained the following provisions: (1) Private worship and liberty of conscience were allowed to the Calvinists throughout France; (2) Public Protestant worship might be held in 200 enumerated towns and over 3000 castles; (3) A financial grant was made to Protestant schools, and the publication of Calvinist books was legalized; (4) Huguenots received full civil rights, with admission to all public offices; (5) Huguenots were granted for eight years the political control of two hundred towns, the garrisons of which were to be maintained by the crown; and (6) Huguenots were accorded certain judicial privileges and the right of holding religious and political assemblies. For nearly a hundred years France practiced a religious toleration which was almost unique among European nations, and it was Calvinists who benefited.

[Sidenote: Calvinism in the Netherlands]

The Netherlands were too near the Germanies not to be affected by the Lutheran revolt against the Catholic Church. And the northern or Dutch provinces became quite thoroughly saturated with Lutheranism and also with the doctrines of various radical sects that from time to time were expelled from the German states. The Emperor Charles V tried to stamp out heresy by harsh action of the Inquisition, but succeeded only in changing its name and nature. Lutheranism disappeared from the Netherlands; but in its place came Calvinism, [Footnote: Many Anabaptist refugees from Germany had already sought refuge in the Netherlands: they naturally found the teachings of Zwingli and Calvin more radical, and therefore more appropriate to themselves, than the

teachings of Luther. This fact also serves to explain the acceptance of Calvinism in regions of southern Germany where Lutheranism, since the Peasants' Revolt, had failed to take root.] descending from Geneva through Alsace and thence down the Rhine, or entering from Great Britain by means of the close commercial relations existing between those countries. While the southern Netherlands eventually were recovered for Catholicism, the protracted political and economic conflict which the northern Netherlands waged against the Catholic king of Spain contributed to a final fixing of Calvinism as the national religion of patriotic Dutchmen. Calvinism in Holland was known as the Dutch Reformed religion.

[Sidenote: Calvinism in Southern Germany]

We have already noted that southern Germany had rejected aristocratic Lutheranism, partially at least because of Luther's bitter words to the peasants. Catholicism, however, was not destined to have complete sway in those regions, for democratic Calvinism permeated Württemberg, Baden, and the Rhenish provinces, and the Reformed doctrines gained numerous converts among the middle-class. The growth of Calvinism in Germany was seriously handicapped by the religious settlement of Augsburg in 1555 which officially tolerated only Catholicism and Lutheranism. It was not until after the close of the direful Thirty Years' War in the seventeenth century that German Calvinists received formal recognition.

[Sidenote: Scotland]

Scotland, like every other European country in the early part of the sixteenth century, had been a place of protest against moral and financial abuses in the Catholic Church, but the beginnings of ecclesiastical rebellion are to be traced rather to political causes. The kingdom had long been a prey to the bitter rivalry of great noble families, and the premature death of James V (1542), which left the throne to his ill-fated infant daughter, Mary Stuart, gave free rein to a feudal reaction against the crown. In general, the Catholic clergy sided with the royal cause, while the religious reformers egged on the nobles to champion Protestantism in order to deal an effective blow against the union of the altar and the throne. Thus Cardinal Beaton, head of the Catholic Church in Scotland, ordered numerous executions on the score of protecting religion and the authority of the queen-regent; on the other hand several noblemen, professing the new theology, assassinated the cardinal and hung his body on the battlements of the castle of St. Andrews (1546). Such was the general situation in Scotland when John Knox appeared upon the scene.

[Sidenote: John Knox]

Born of peasant parents about 1515, John Knox [Footnote: John Knox (c. 1515-1572).] had become a Catholic priest, albeit in sympathy with many of the revolutionary ideas which were entering Scotland from the Continent and from England. In 1546 he openly rejected the authority of the Church and proceeded to preach "the Gospel" and a stern puritanical morality. "Others snipped the branches," he said, "he struck at the root." But the Catholic court was able to banish Knox from Scotland. After romantic imprisonment in France, Knox spent a few years in England, preaching an extreme puritanism, holding a chaplaincy under Edward VI (1547-1553), and exerting his influence to insure an indelibly Protestant character to the Anglican Church. Then upon the

accession to the English throne of the Catholic Mary Tudor, Knox betook himself to Geneva where he made the acquaintance of Calvin and found himself in essential agreement with the teachings of the French reformer.

[Sidenote: Calvinism in Scotland]

After a stay of some five years on the Continent, Knox returned finally to Scotland and became the organizer and director of the "Lords of the Congregation," a league of the chief Protestant noblemen for purposes of religious propaganda and political power. In 1560 he drew up the creed and discipline of the Presbyterian Church after the model of Calvin's church at Geneva; and in the same year with the support of the "Lords of the Congregation" and the troops of Queen Elizabeth of England, Knox effected a political and religious revolution in Scotland. The queen-regent was imprisoned and the subservient parliament abolished the papal supremacy and enacted the death penalty against any one who should even attend Catholic worship. John Knox had carried everything before him.

Mary Stuart, during her brief stay in Scotland (1561-1567), tried in vain to stem the tide. The jealous barons would brook no increase of royal authority. The austere Knox hounded the girl-queen in public sermons and fairly flayed her character. The queen's downfall and subsequent long imprisonment in England finally decided the ecclesiastical future of Scotland. Except in a few fastnesses in the northern highlands, where Catholicism survived among the clansmen, the whole country was committed to Calvinism.

[Sidenote: Calvinism in England]

Calvinism was not without influence in England. Introduced towards the close of the reign of Henry VIII, it gave rise to a number of small sects which troubled the king's Anglican Church almost as much as did the Roman Catholics. Under Edward VI (1547-1553), it considerably influenced the theology of the Anglican Church itself, but the moderate policies of Elizabeth (1558-1603) tended to fix an inseparable gulf between Anglicans and Calvinists. Thenceforth, Calvinism lived in England, in the forms of Presbyterianism, Independency, [Footnote: Among the "Independents" were the Baptists, a sect related not so immediately to Calvinism as to the radical Anabaptists of Germany. See above, pp. 134 f., 145, footnotes] and Puritanism, as the religion largely of the commercial middle class. It was treated with contempt, and even persecuted, by Anglicans, especially by the monarchs of the Stuart family. After a complete but temporary triumph under Cromwell, in the seventeenth century, it was at length legally tolerated in England after the settlement of 1689. It was from England that New England received the Calvinistic religion which dominated colonial forefathers of many present-day Americans.

ANGLICANISM

Anglicanism is the name frequently applied to that form of Protestantism which stamped the state church in England in the sixteenth century and which is now represented by the Episcopal Church in the United States as well as by the established Church of England. The Methodist churches are comparatively late off-shoots of Anglicanism.

The separation of England from the papacy was a more gradual and halting process than were the contemporary revolutions on the Continent; and the new Anglicanism was correspondingly more conservative than Lutheranism or Calvinism.

[Sidenote: English Catholicism in 1500]

[Sidenote: Church of England]

At the opening of the sixteenth century, the word "Catholic" meant the same in England as in every other country of western or central Europe --belief in the seven sacraments, the sacrifice of the Mass, and the veneration of saints; acceptance of papal supremacy and support of monasticism and of other institutions and practices of the medieval Church. During several centuries it had been customary in legal documents to refer to the Catholic Church in England as the *Ecclesia Anglicana*, or Anglican Church, just as the popes in their letters repeatedly referred to the "Gallican Church," the "Spanish Church," the "Neapolitan Church," or the "Hungarian Church." But such phraseology did not imply a separation of any one national church from the common Catholic communion, and for nearly a thousand years--ever since there had been an *Ecclesia Anglicana*--the English had recognized the bishop of Rome as the center of Catholic unity. In the course of the sixteenth century, however, the great majority of Englishmen changed their conception of the *Ecclesia Anglicana*, so that to them it continued to exist as the Church of England, but henceforth on a strictly national basis, in communion neither with the pope nor with the Orthodox Church of the East nor with the Lutherans or Calvinists, abandoning several doctrines that had been universally held in earlier times and substituting in their place beliefs and customs which were distinctively Protestant. This new conception of the Anglican Church--resulting from the revolution in the sixteenth century--is what we mean by Anglicanism as a form of Protestantism. It took shape in the eventful years between 1520 and 1570.

[Sidenote: Religious Opposition to the Roman Catholic Church in England]

In order to understand how this religious and ecclesiastical revolution was effected in England, we must appreciate the various elements distrustful of the Catholic Church in that country about the year 1525. In the first place, the Lutheran teachings were infiltrating into the country. As early as 1521 a small group at Cambridge had become interested in the new German theology, and thence the sect spread to Oxford, London, and other intellectual centers. It found its early converts chiefly among the lower clergy and the merchants of the large towns, but for several years it was not numerous.

In the second place, there was the same feeling in England as we have already noted throughout all Europe that the clergy needed reform in morals and in manners. This view was shared not only by the comparatively insignificant group of heretical Lutherans, but likewise by a large proportion of the leading men who accounted themselves orthodox members of the Catholic Church. The well-educated humanists were especially eloquent in preaching reform. The writings of Erasmus had great vogue in England. John Colet (1467?-1519), a famous dean of St. Paul's cathedral in London, was a keen reformer who disapproved of auricular confession and of the celibacy of the clergy. Sir Thomas More (1478-1535), one of the greatest minds of the century, thought the

monks were lazy and indolent, and the whole body of churchmen in need of an intellectual betterment. But neither Colet nor More had any intention of breaking away from the Roman Church. To them, and to many like them, reform could be secured best within the traditional ecclesiastical body.

[Sidenote: Political Opposition to the Roman Catholic Church in England]

A third source of distrust of the Church was a purely political feeling against the papacy. As we have already seen, the English king and English parliament on several earlier occasions had sought to restrict the temporal and political jurisdiction of the pope in England, but each restriction had been imposed for political reasons and even then had represented the will of the monarch rather than that of the nation. In fact, the most striking limitations of the pope's political jurisdiction in the kingdom had been enacted during the early stages of the Hundred Years' War, when the papacy was under French influence, and had served, therefore, indirectly as political weapons against the French king. Before that war was over, the operation of the statutes had been relaxed, and for a century or more prior to 1525 little was heard of even a political feeling against the bishop of Rome.

Nevertheless an evolution in English government was in progress at that very time, which was bound sooner or later to create friction with the Holy See. On one hand, a sense of nationalism and of patriotism had been steadily growing in England, and it was at variance with the older cosmopolitan idea of Catholicism. On the other hand, a great increase of royal power had appeared in the fifteenth century, notably after the accession of the Tudor family in 1485. Henry VII (1485-1509) had subordinated to the crown both the nobility and the parliament, and the patriotic support of the middle class he had secured. And when his son, Henry VIII (1509-1547), came to the throne, the only serious obstacle which appeared to be left in the way of royal absolutism was the privileged independence of the Catholic Church.

[Sidenote: Early Loyalty of Henry VIII to the Roman Catholic Church]

Yet a number of years passed before Henry VIII laid violent hands upon the Church. In the meanwhile, he proved himself a devoted Roman Catholic. He scented the new Lutheran heresy and sought speedily to exterminate it. He even wrote in 1521 with his own royal pen a bitter arraignment of the new theology, and sent his book, which he called *The Defence of the Seven Sacraments*, with a delightful dedicatory epistle to the pope. For his prompt piety and filial orthodoxy, he received from the bishop of Rome the proud title of *Fidei Defensor*, or Defender of the Faith, a title which he jealously bore until his death, and which his successors, the sovereigns of Great Britain, with like humor have continued to bear ever since. He seemed not even to question the pope's political claims. He allied himself on several occasions with Leo X in the great game of European politics. His chief minister and adviser in England for many years was Thomas Wolsey, the most conspicuous ecclesiastic in his kingdom and a cardinal of the Roman Church.

[Sidenote: The Marriage Difficulty of Henry VIII]

Under these circumstances it is difficult to see how the Anglican Church would have immediately broken away from Catholic unity had it

not been for the peculiar marital troubles of Henry VIII. The king had been married eighteen years to Catherine of Aragon, and had been presented by her with six children (of whom only one daughter, the Princess Mary, had survived), when one day he informed her that they had been living all those years in mortal sin and that their union was not true marriage. The queen could hardly be expected to agree with such a definition, and there ensued a legal suit between the royal pair.

To Henry VIII the matter was really quite simple. Henry was tired of Catherine and wanted to get rid of her; he believed the queen could bear him no more children and yet he ardently desired a male heir; rumor reported that the susceptible king had recently been smitten by the brilliant black eyes of a certain Anne Boleyn, a maid-in-waiting at the court. The purpose of Henry was obvious; so was the means, he thought. For it had occurred to him that Catherine was his elder brother's widow, and, therefore, had no right, by church law, to marry him. To be sure, a papal dispensation had been obtained from Pope Julius II authorizing the marriage, but why not now obtain a revocation of that dispensation from the reigning Pope Clement VII? Thus the marriage with Catherine could be declared null and void, and Henry would be a bachelor, thirty-six years of age, free to wed some princess, or haply Anne Boleyn.

[Sidenote: Difficult Position of the Pope]

There was no doubt that Clement VII would like to do a favor for his great English champion, but two difficulties at once presented themselves. It would be a most dangerous precedent for the pope to reverse the decision of one of his predecessors. Worse still, the Emperor Charles V, the nephew of Queen Catherine, took up cudgels in his aunt's behalf and threatened Clement with dire penalties if he nullified the marriage. The pope complained truthfully that he was between the anvil and the hammer. There was little for him to do except to temporize and to delay decision as long as possible.

The protracted delay was very irritating to the impulsive English king, who was now really in love with Anne Boleyn. Gradually Henry's former effusive loyalty to the Roman See gave way to a settled conviction of the tyranny of the papal power, and there rushed to his mind the recollection of efforts of earlier English rulers to restrict that power. A few salutary enactments against the Church might compel a favorable decision from the pope.

Henry VIII seriously opened his campaign against the Roman Church in 1531, when he frightened the English clergy into paying a fine of over half a million dollars for violating an obsolete statute that had forbidden reception of papal legates without royal sanction, and in the same year he forced the clergy to recognize himself as supreme head of the Church "as far as that is permitted by the law of Christ." His subservient Parliament then empowered him to stop the payment of annates and to appoint the bishops without recourse to the papacy. Without waiting longer for the papal decision, he had Cranmer, one of his own creatures, whom he had just named archbishop of Canterbury, declare his marriage with Catherine null and void and his union with Anne Boleyn canonical and legal. Pope Clement VII thereupon handed down his long-delayed decision favorable to Queen Catherine, and excommunicated Henry VIII for adultery.

[Sidenote: Separation of England from the Roman Catholic Church: the Act of Supremacy]

The formal breach between England and Rome occurred in 1534. Parliament passed a series of laws, one of which declared the king to be the "only supreme head in earth of the Church of England," and others cut off all communication with the pope and inflicted the penalty of treason upon any one who should deny the king's ecclesiastical supremacy.

One step in the transition of the Church of England had now been taken. For centuries its members had recognized the pope as their ecclesiastical head; henceforth they were to own the ecclesiastical headship of their king. From the former Catholic standpoint, this might be schism but it was not necessarily heresy. Yet Henry VIII encountered considerable opposition from the higher clergy, from the monks, and from many intellectual leaders, as well as from large numbers of the lower classes. A popular uprising--the Pilgrimage of Grace--was sternly suppressed, and such men as the brilliant Sir Thomas More and John Fisher, the aged and saintly bishop of Rochester, were beheaded because they retained their former belief in papal supremacy. Tudor despotism triumphed.

[Sidenote: The "Six Articles"]

The breach with Rome naturally encouraged the Lutherans and other heretics to think that England was on the point of becoming Protestant, but nothing was further from the king's mind. The assailant of Luther remained at least partially consistent. And the Six Articles (1539) reaffirmed the chief points in Catholic doctrine and practice and visited dissenters with horrible punishment. While separating England from the papacy, Henry was firmly resolved to maintain every other tenet of the Catholic faith as he had received it. His middle-of-the-road policy was enforced with much bloodshed. On one side, the Catholic who denied the royal supremacy was beheaded; on the other, the Protestant who denied transubstantiation was burned! It has been estimated that during the reign of Henry VIII the number of capital condemnations for politico-religious offenses ran into the thousands--an inquisition that in terror and bloodshed is comparable to that of Spain.

[Sidenote: Suppression of the Monasteries]

It was likewise during the reign of Henry VIII that one of the most important of all earlier Christian institutions--monasticism--came to an end in England. There were certainly grave abuses and scandals in some of the monasteries which dotted the country, and a good deal of popular sentiment had been aroused against the institution. Then, too the monks had generally opposed the royal pretensions to religious control and remained loyal to the pope. But the deciding factor in the suppression of the monasteries was undoubtedly economic. Henry, always in need of funds on account of his extravagances, appropriated part of the confiscated property for the benefit of the crown, and the rest he astutely distributed as gigantic bribes to the upper classes of the laity. The nobles who accepted the ecclesiastical wealth were thereby committed to the new anti-papal religious settlement in England.

[Sidenote: Protestantizing the Church of England: Edward VI]

The Church of England, separated from the papacy under Henry VIII,

became Protestant under Edward VI (1547-1553). The young king's guardian tolerated all manner of reforming propaganda, and Calvinists as well as Lutherans preached their doctrines freely. Official articles of religion, which were drawn up for the Anglican Church, showed unmistakably Protestant influence. The Latin service books of the Catholic Church were translated into English, under Cranmer's auspices, and the edition of the Book of Common Prayer, published in 1552, made clear that the Eucharist was no longer to be regarded as a propitiatory sacrifice: the names "Holy Communion" and "Lord's Supper" were substituted for "Mass," while the word "altar" was replaced by "table." The old places of Catholic worship were changed to suit a new order: altars and images were taken down, the former service books destroyed, and stained-glass windows broken. Several peasant uprisings signified that the nation was not completely united upon a policy of religious change, but the reformers had their way, and Protestantism advanced.

[Sidenote: Temporary Roman Catholic Revival under Mary Tudor]

A temporary setback to the progress of the new Anglicanism was afforded by the reign of Mary Tudor (1553-1558), the daughter of Catherine of Aragon, and a devout Roman Catholic. She reinstated the bishops who had refused to take the oath of royal supremacy and punished those who had taken it. She prevailed upon Parliament to repeal the ecclesiastical legislation of both her father's and her brother's reigns and to reconcile England once more with the bishop of Rome. A papal legate, in the person of Cardinal Reginald Pole, sailed up the Thames with his cross gleaming from the prow of his barge, and in full Parliament administered the absolution which freed the kingdom from the guilt under Mary incurred by its schism and heresy. As an additional support to her policy of restoring the Catholic Church in England, Queen Mary married her cousin, Philip II of Spain, the great champion of Catholicism upon the Continent.

But events proved that despite outward appearances even the reign of Mary registered an advance of Protestantism. The new doctrines were zealously propagated by an ever-growing number of itinerant exhorters. The Spanish alliance was disastrous to English fortunes abroad and distasteful to all patriotic Englishmen at home. And finally, the violent means which the queen took to stamp out heresy gave her the unenviable surname of "Bloody" and reacted in the end in behalf of the views for which the victims sacrificed their lives. During her reign nearly three hundred reformers perished, many of them, including Archbishop Cranmer, by fire. The work of the queen was in vain. No heir was born to Philip and Mary, and the crown, therefore, passed to Elizabeth, the daughter of Anne Boleyn, a Protestant not so much from conviction as from circumstance.

[Sidenote: Definite Fashioning of Anglicanism: the Reign of Elizabeth]

It was in the reign of Elizabeth (1558-1603) that the Church of England assumed definitely the doctrines and practices which we now connect with the word "Anglicanism." By act of Parliament, the English Church was again separated from the papacy, and placed under royal authority, Elizabeth assuming the title of "supreme governor." The worship of the state church was to be in conformity with a slightly altered version of Cranmer's Book of Common Prayer. A uniform doctrine was likewise imposed by Parliament in the form of the Thirty-nine Articles, which set a distinctively Protestant mark upon the Anglican Church in

its appeal to the Scriptures as the sole rule of faith, its insistence on justification by faith alone, its repudiation of the sacrifice of the Mass, and its definition of the Church. All the bishops who had been appointed under Mary, with one exception, refused to accept the changes, and were therefore deposed and imprisoned, but new bishops, Elizabeth's own appointees, were consecrated and the "succession of bishops" thereby maintained. Outwardly, the Church of England appeared to retain a corporate continuity throughout the sixteenth century; inwardly, a great revolution had changed it from Catholic to Protestant.

Harsh laws sought to oblige all Englishmen to conform to Elizabeth's religious settlement. Liberty of public worship was denied to any dissenter from Anglicanism. To be a "papist" or "hear Mass"--which were construed as the same thing--was punishable by death as high treason. A special ecclesiastical court--the Court of High Commission--was established under royal authority to search out heresy and to enforce uniformity; it served throughout Elizabeth's reign as a kind of Protestant Inquisition.

[Sidenote: English Dissent from Anglicanism]

While the large majority of the English nation gradually conformed to the official Anglican Church, a considerable number refused their allegiance. On one hand were the Roman Catholics, who still maintained the doctrine of papal supremacy and were usually derisively styled papists, and on the other hand were various Calvinistic sects, such as Presbyterians or Independents or Quakers, who went by the name of "Dissenters" or "Non-conformists." In the course of time, the number of Roman Catholics tended to diminish, largely because, for political reasons which have been indicated in the preceding chapter, Protestantism in England became almost synonymous with English patriotism. But despite drastic laws and dreadful persecutions, Roman Catholicism survived in England among a conspicuous group of people. On the other hand, the Calvinists tended somewhat to increase their numbers so that in the seventeenth century they were able to precipitate a great political and ecclesiastical conflict with Anglicanism.

THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION

We have now traced the origins of the Protestant Revolt against the Catholic Church, and have seen how, between 1520 and 1570, three major varieties of new theology--Lutheranism, Calvinism, and Anglicanism--appeared on the scene and divided among themselves the nations of northern Europe. The story of how, during that critical half-century, the other civilized nations retained their loyalty to the Catholic Church virtually as it had existed throughout the middle ages, remains to be told. The preservation of the papal monarchy and Catholic doctrine in southern Europe was due alike to religious and to political circumstances.

It must not be supposed that pious critics of ecclesiastical abuses were confined to countries which subsequently became Protestant. There were many sincere Catholics in Italy, Austria, France, and Spain who complained of the scandals and worldliness that afflicted the Church at the opening of the sixteenth century: they demanded sweeping reforms in discipline and a return of the clergy to a simple apostolic life. They

believed, however, that whatever change was desirable could best be achieved by means of a reformation within the Catholic Church--that is, without disturbing the unity of its organization or denying the validity of its dogmas--while the critics of northern Europe, as we have seen, preferred to put their reforms into practice by means of a revolution--an out-and-out break with century-old traditions of Catholic Christianity. Even in northern Europe some of the foremost scholars of that period desired an intellectual reformation within Catholicism rather than a dogmatic rebellion against it: with Luther's defiance of papal authority, the great Erasmus had small sympathy, and Sir Thomas More, the eminent English humanist, sacrificed his life for his belief in the divine sanction of the papal power.

Thus, while the religious energy of northern Europe went into Protestantism of various kinds, that of southern Europe fashioned a reformation of the Catholic system. And this Catholic reformation, on its religious side, was brought to a successful issue by means of the improved conditions in the papal court, the labors of a great church council, and the activity of new monastic orders. A few words must be said about each one of these religious elements in the Catholic reformation.

[Sidenote: Reforming Popes]

Mention has been made of the corruption that prevailed in papal affairs in the fifteenth century, and of the Italian and family interests which obscured to the Medici pope, Leo X (1513-1521), the importance of the Lutheran movement in Germany. And Leo's nephew, who became Clement VII (1523-1534), continued to act too much as an Italian prince and too little as the moral and religious leader of Catholicism in the contest which under him was joined with Zwinglians and Anglicans as well as with Lutherans. But under Paul III (1534-1549), a new policy was inaugurated, by which men were appointed to high church offices for their virtue and learning rather than for family relationship or financial gain. This policy was maintained by a series of upright and far-sighted popes during the second half of the sixteenth century, so that by the year 1600 a remarkable reformation had been gradually wrought in the papacy, among the cardinals, down through the prelates, even to the parish priests and monks.

[Sidenote: The Council of Trent]

The reforming zeal of individual popes was stimulated and reinforced by the work of the Council of Trent (1545-1563). The idea of effecting a "reformation in head and members" by means of a general council of the Catholic Church had been invoked several times during the century that preceded the Protestant Revolt, but, before Luther, little had been accomplished in that way.

With the widening of the breach between Protestantism and the medieval Church, what had formerly been desirable now became imperative. It seemed to pious Catholics that every effort should be made to reconcile differences and to restore the unity of the Church. The errors of the manifold new theologies which now appeared might be refuted by a clear statement of Catholic doctrine, and a reformation of discipline and morals would deprive the innovators of one of their most telling weapons against the Church.

It was no easy task, in that troublous time, to hold an ecumenical

council. There was mutual distrust between Catholics and Protestants. There was uncertainty as to the relative powers and prerogatives of council and pope. There were bitter national rivalries, especially between Italians and Germans. There was actual warfare between the two chief Catholic families--the Habsburgs of Germany and Spain and the royal house of France.

Yet despite these difficulties, which long postponed its convocation and repeatedly interrupted its labors, the Council of Trent [Footnote: Trent was selected largely by reason of its geographical location, being situated on the boundary between the German-speaking and Italian-speaking peoples.] consummated a great reform in the Church and contributed materially to the preservation of the Catholic faith. The Protestants, whom the pope invited to participate, absented themselves; yet such was the number and renown of the Catholic bishops who responded to the summons that the Council of Trent easily ranked with the eighteen œcumenical councils which had preceded it. [Footnote: Its decrees were signed at its close (1563) by 4 cardinal legates, 2 cardinals, 3 patriarchs, 25 archbishops, 167 bishops, 7 abbots, 7 generals of orders, and 19 proxies for 33 absent prelates.] The work of the council was twofold--dogmatic and reformatory.

Dogmatically, the fathers at Trent offered no compromise to the Protestants. They confirmed with inexorable frankness the main points in Catholic theology which had been worked out in the thirteenth century by Thomas Aquinas and which before the appearance of Protestantism had been received everywhere in central and western Europe. They declared that the tradition of the Church as well as the Bible was to be taken as the basis of the Christian religion, and that the interpretation of the Holy Scripture belonged only to the Church. The Protestant teachings about grace and justification by faith were condemned, and the seven sacraments were pronounced indispensable. The miraculous and sacrificial character of the Lord's Supper (Mass) was reaffirmed. Belief in the invocation of saints, in the veneration of images and of relics, in purgatory and indulgences was explicitly stated, but precautions were taken to clear some of the doctrines of the pernicious practices which at times had been connected with them. The spiritual authority of the Roman See was confirmed over all Catholicism: the pope was recognized as supreme interpreter of the canons and incontestable chief of bishops.

[Sidenote: Reformatory Canons of the Council of Trent]

A volume of disciplinary statutes constituted the second achievement of the Tri

Livros Grátis

(<http://www.livrosgratis.com.br>)

Milhares de Livros para Download:

[Baixar livros de Administração](#)

[Baixar livros de Agronomia](#)

[Baixar livros de Arquitetura](#)

[Baixar livros de Artes](#)

[Baixar livros de Astronomia](#)

[Baixar livros de Biologia Geral](#)

[Baixar livros de Ciência da Computação](#)

[Baixar livros de Ciência da Informação](#)

[Baixar livros de Ciência Política](#)

[Baixar livros de Ciências da Saúde](#)

[Baixar livros de Comunicação](#)

[Baixar livros do Conselho Nacional de Educação - CNE](#)

[Baixar livros de Defesa civil](#)

[Baixar livros de Direito](#)

[Baixar livros de Direitos humanos](#)

[Baixar livros de Economia](#)

[Baixar livros de Economia Doméstica](#)

[Baixar livros de Educação](#)

[Baixar livros de Educação - Trânsito](#)

[Baixar livros de Educação Física](#)

[Baixar livros de Engenharia Aeroespacial](#)

[Baixar livros de Farmácia](#)

[Baixar livros de Filosofia](#)

[Baixar livros de Física](#)

[Baixar livros de Geociências](#)

[Baixar livros de Geografia](#)

[Baixar livros de História](#)

[Baixar livros de Línguas](#)

[Baixar livros de Literatura](#)
[Baixar livros de Literatura de Cordel](#)
[Baixar livros de Literatura Infantil](#)
[Baixar livros de Matemática](#)
[Baixar livros de Medicina](#)
[Baixar livros de Medicina Veterinária](#)
[Baixar livros de Meio Ambiente](#)
[Baixar livros de Meteorologia](#)
[Baixar Monografias e TCC](#)
[Baixar livros Multidisciplinar](#)
[Baixar livros de Música](#)
[Baixar livros de Psicologia](#)
[Baixar livros de Química](#)
[Baixar livros de Saúde Coletiva](#)
[Baixar livros de Serviço Social](#)
[Baixar livros de Sociologia](#)
[Baixar livros de Teologia](#)
[Baixar livros de Trabalho](#)
[Baixar livros de Turismo](#)